Some Smart People:

Views and Lives 2

Scott Douglas Jacobsen

Foreword by Erik Haereid

In-Sight Publishing

Some Smart People: Views and Lives 2

Cover page image credit to [Gayatri Malhotra](#) on [Unsplash](#)

This first edition published in 2024

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

For *Some Smart People: Views and Lives 1*: Manahel Thabet for being the first in this series and giving a gauge on the feasibility of this project, and to Rick Rosner, Evangelos Katsioulis, Paul Cooijmans, Marco Ripà, and Jason Betts; in spite of far more men in these communities, it, interview-wise, started with a woman, even the Leo Jung Mensa article arose from the generosity of a woman friend, Jade.

For *Some Smart People: Views and Lives 2*: Deb Stone, Kirk Kirkpatrick, Rick Rosner, Dr. Claus Volko, Ivan Ivec, Monika Orski, Hasan Zuberi, and Erik Haereid.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen

Foreword by Erik Haereid

I want to thank Scott for an excellent work over many years, and something as rare as collecting free thoughts from people of high intelligence; without editorial correction. I have not seen the likes of that anywhere. Editorial offices tend to present material that reinforces norms and established truths rather than challenging and exploring them. Together with all the other interviewees over more than ten years, I would like to thank him for giving us the opportunity to express some of our opinions and thoughts.

In this second part of the series, we meet personalities such as the charming and highly intelligent, self-ironic multi-artist and self-proclaimed "Dumbass Genius" Rick Rosner from the USA, and the knowledgeable and insightful Austrian Claus Volko. We get to know the leaders of Mensa in Sweden, Monika Orski, and in Pakistan, Hasan Zuberi, and the experienced Deb Stone from the USA; i.e. she is an actuary, like me. The very intelligent Kirk Kirkpatrick from the USA is also in this volume, and not least the mathematician, IQ test creator and one of the most noble and unifying figures in the high-IQ world; Ivan Ivec from Croatia.

People can be roughly divided between those who try to reinforce the existing and those who find it painfully necessary to create new habits and patterns. This division applies to smart people to the same extent as the rest. The question is how the individual uses his abilities and will. Do we imitate others? Are we afraid of compromising the norms? Or do we dare to challenge the establishment?

If one is to use high intelligence for something sensible, then it must be to push oneself to think and ask difficult questions, such as: What is right and what is wrong? Why should I change anything? What is wrong with following my desires and inclinations? Should I put more emphasis on the ego or the community? What are the consequences, in the short and long term, for one and the other?

As an intelligent person, you are also well-equipped to stop your inclinations, ask critical questions and give some answers that can lead to new and perhaps slightly better habits. We like to see ourselves as a species that evolves us and the world for the better. But what is "better"? Are we self-critical enough in relation to the way we live our lives; politically, economically, socially, in terms of education...? Are not many of our institutions based on old habits; on patterns we should strictly re-evaluate, seen in the light of our own history?

When Mensa was established shortly after World War II and its unbearable suffering created by human stupidity, selfishness, fear and greed, in 1946, part of the motivation was to gather the smartest people on earth to prevent future war. Has Mensa lived up to this ambitious goal? Or are Mensa, and other high-IQ societies, playgrounds for the egos of intelligent people?

Was the DJ who used his power to play John Lennon's "Imagine" during this summer's Olympic women's beach volleyball final between Brazil and Canada smart? Many will think so. He achieved what the referee tried and failed to do; to calm tempers between the teams. The DJ was able to stop the escalating argument between the Brazilian and Canadian performers, with a single move; by playing a simple song everyone associates with peace; including the volleyball players.

Self-criticism is a difficult exercise; painful, introspective, and needed now more than ever. This is where the smart can play a significant role. I hope that everyone will take on this task in the

future. And that this great and comprehensive series by Scott can help to influence that.

Erik Haereid,

August 26, 2024

Larkollen, Norway

An Interview with Deb Stone (Part One)

2016-09-08

*An interview with **Deb Stone**. She discusses: geographic, cultural, and linguistic background; influenced on development; pivotal moments in major cross-sections of early life; interest in mathematics and education; interest in operations research connected to mathematics and education; benefits and purposes for memberships in organizations; lessons from actuarial experience; and general lessons from the diverse, but associated, professional stations.*

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: In terms of geography, culture, and language, where does your family background reside?

Deb Stone: I was born in New Hampshire, and with the exception of a few years in southern California I have lived my life in the northeast US (New England, upstate NY, grad school in Philadelphia and a three years in New Jersey.) My ancestors on one side came from England (17th century) and from Ireland, Scotland & Sweden (late 19th & early 20th century) and on the other from eastern Europe (mostly Russia, Poland & Ukraine) in the late 19th & early 20th century. The eastern European part of the family is Jewish and the other side is mostly Christian. We are American/English speakers primarily, although my paternal grandparents were born in Russia and Ukraine and learned English when they arrived as kids, and on the maternal side my great-grandmother arrived in this country from Sweden at age 20 speaking no English.

Jacobsen: How did this influence development?

Stone: I have relatively traditional Yankee values because I grew up mostly in NH and CT, with parents who were Yankees as well. There was a focus on education & learning on both sides of the family, but more so from the Jewish side. My family is very diverse (multiple races, religions, etc) which made me relatively socially liberal and I like to think open-minded and non-judgmental. The cultural diversity of the family is also, I expect, behind my own fascination with other cultures and languages.

Jacobsen: What about influences and pivotal moments in major cross-sections of early life including kindergarten, elementary school, junior high school, high school, and undergraduate studies (college/university)?

Stone: I realized pretty early on that I didn't really need school. I was reading by the time I was about 2 ½ or 3 and I told my parents when I started first grade (age 5) that I was going to go to UNH and study math. Up until then, my parents were my biggest influence. They provided an environment in which I could learn, they were both readers and encouraged my love of reading and they also encouraged my desire to know things and to keep learning. Once I started school I was lucky to have a few good teachers along the way. By good I mean they let me explore things on my own while providing support, and kept exposing me to stuff outside the normal curriculum. Like many Mensans, I became a de facto teacher's aide and tutor.

Also like many Mensans, I was painfully shy and somewhat withdrawn (a lively internal life

helped with that). Also, my family moved fairly often, which meant I was often in an environment in which I didn't know anyone and starting over to try to make friends. When we relocated near the beginning of my sophomore year in high school, I entered a new school about a week into the school year, not knowing anyone. At lunch that first day, a girl came over to me as I was looking around the cafeteria, and said "We saw you in French class and Algebra – would you like to come sit with us?" I made friends that day that I still have now (45 years later). I was so grateful for the way she made me feel welcome, that I decided that I wanted to be able to do that for someone else someday. So, thanks to Chris Braen, I started trying to reach out to people, learn to listen and draw people out, and come out of my shell. She was a huge influence, because she was instrumental in helping shape the rest of my life.

College was in some ways more of the same. I entered (UNH as a math major!) with credits for the first full year of calculus, and exempted from certain other requirements through testing. That meant I was once again a little bit of a fish out of water, since I wasn't in very many classes with freshmen. I also worked for the math department as a calculus exam grader in their testing center, which again set me a little apart from the people coming in to take exams who were mostly those same freshmen. My college roommate started dating the son of one of my first college math professors, and I got to know the whole family. Dr. Ross was another big influence on my; he accepted me, and encouraged me in my math studies and in leading a full life.

Jacobsen: You earned a BS (1974-1977) in mathematics and education from the University of New Hampshire and an MBA (1980-1981) in operations research from University of Pennsylvania (The Wharton School).[5] What was the interest in mathematics and education for you?

Stone: I always loved math, right from the beginning when it was just arithmetic. I have a very analytical mind (and approach to just about everything) and I loved the problem solving. My friends and classmates hated the word problems, they were my favorites! And I found that by learning how to approach a problem, taking disparate pieces of information and acknowledging when there was incomplete information, I could still come up with a way to solve the problem. It was not only natural to me; it was a joy as well. And, as I mentioned earlier, I really enjoy learning new things. Even though I graduated from college a semester early, I still completed a double major (math and education) as well as a minor in history. I ran out of time with that early graduation, or I would have completed an Economics minor as well. And this analytical/strategic/problem-solving ability has been a huge benefit to me in my professional life as well.

As for education, what better joy is there than passing that love of learning and, if possible, how to actually apply what one knows effectively to solve problems, to others as well? I found that I could help other people learn, and that I was pretty good at communicating to many different audiences. To this day, I do tutoring of adults through a program that works with immigrants and those studying for high-school equivalency or life skills. One of the great things about working with others is not only does one teach them but one can learn so much.

Jacobsen: What about interest in operations research connected to the educational background of mathematics and education?

Stone: Operations research was a natural fit for the way my brain works. It's mathematical modelling to solve business problems. I started at Wharton expecting to be a finance major, but as soon as I started the required O/R course (part of the core curriculum for all MBA candidates) I realized it was just FUN! While I no longer use much in the way of those actual techniques, the study of it and the few years that I worked in that field, contributes every day to my approach to problem-solving.

Jacobsen: You remain a member of the Fellow of the Casualty Actuarial Society (FCAS) and member of the American Academy of Actuaries (MAAA).[6] What benefits and purposes come from membership in these organizations?

Stone: I have worked at least partly in the actuarial field since 1985, and achieved my ACAS/MAAA in 1995 and my FCAS in 1997. The designations allow me to practice in the actuarial field, and do the things a designated actuary can do (that an aspiring actuary is not qualified to do.) The designations as extremely well-known in the insurance industry, and in many cases pre-requisites for certain positions. I intend to maintain them for as long as I have any involvement or interest in working in the insurance industry.

Jacobsen: You held a number of positions, as follows: NNIC (1987-1991) as an actuarial assistant, Hanover Insurance (December, 1991-March, 1999) as a director, William M. Mercer, Inc. (April, 1999-September 1999) as a principal, Firemans Fund Insurance Company (April, 2000-May, 2005) as a regional actuary and finance director, Allianz Global Risks US (June, 2005-December, 2005) as a vice president and chief actuary, NH Insurance Department (November, 2006-July, 2010) as a P & C assistant actuary, RiverStone Resources (August, 2010-January, 2011) as a vice president and chief actuary, NH Insurance Department (February, 2011-June, 2012) as a P & C assistant actuary, NH Insurance Department (July, 2012-May, 2014) as a actuary and director of market regulation, and NH Insurance Department (May, 2014-July, 2015) as a director of financial regulation.[7] With this background in mind, what particular lessons came from the experience as an actuary?

Stone: Experience as an actuary has taught me a lot. It solidified my love for and appreciation of creative, analytical problem-solving. In order to do the job in the best way I could, I felt that it was necessary to understand not only actuarial techniques and methods, but also the entire spectrum of insurance and how it works. So I learned all I could. It has given me a network or thoughtful, insightful and intelligent folks that I can rely on to help me out when I met something in my professional life that I needed help with. Being a working actuary also exposed me to the new methods and ideas that have come along over my more than 30 years in the industry – I get to keep learning new things, and learning and applying things in way that help others, whether they are friends, colleagues, management of my company or clients.

In addition, because I am a person with a more strategic view of the world and the ability to apply my knowledge and skills in different arenas, I have been fortunate enough to have expanded my horizons beyond just the actuarial side. I have worked in finance, as an underwriting director, as an insurance executive in charge of a 'Small Business' unit, I have been an insurance regulator, I am a partner in a real estate investment business and also a new real estate company and I now run a business as a private consultant covering actuarial, risk

managements and business.

Jacobsen: What general lessons came from experience throughout these diverse, but associated, professional stations?

Stone: The lessons one learns are myriad, but here are a few of the things that I think about:

- Never give up – there is always another way to address a problem, issue or situation.

- Nothing happens in isolation. Always try to think strategically – what are the implications of what you are doing or saying?

- Take joy in what you do, and leverage that into better work and better relationships.

- Don't get into an analysis/paralysis situation – at some point it's necessary to make a decision and take action.

- Don't be afraid of making mistakes; that's how one learns. If you never make a mistake, you aren't taking enough risk. (And that's from a risk professional).

- Always look to learn something new. And welcome challenges; we learn through them.

Appendix I: Footnotes

[1] Chair (2015, July), AMC (National Board of Directors), American Mensa; Owner (2015, August), Stone Business & Risk Consulting LLC.

[2] Individual Publication Date: September 8, 2016 at **www.in-sightjournal.com**; Full Issue Publication Date: January 1, 2017 at **https://in-sightjournal.com/insight-issues/**.

[3] Thompson River University (1986-1988); Douglas College (1984-1986); Kamloops Senior Secondary.

[4] Photograph courtesy of Deb Stone.

[5] LinkedIn. (2016). Deb Stone. Retrieved from **https://www.linkedin.com/in/deb-stone-9578395**.

[6] LinkedIn. (2016). Deb Stone. Retrieved from **https://www.linkedin.com/in/deb-stone-9578395**.

[7] LinkedIn. (2016). Deb Stone. Retrieved from **https://www.linkedin.com/in/deb-stone-9578395**.

An Interview with Deb Stone (Part Two)

2016-09-15

*An interview with **Deb Stone**. She discusses: idea for Stone Business & Risk Consulting; tasks and responsibilities with own a consulting company; general advice relevant for those without the expertise in consultation; tasks and responsibilities as the chair of the national board of directors for American Mensa, Ltd.; interest in intelligence tests; interest in high IQ societies; greatest emotional struggle in personal life; greatest emotional struggle in professional life; general philosophy; political philosophy; social philosophy; economic philosophy; aesthetic philosophy; and the interrelationship of the philosophies.*

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: How did the professional credentials align with the eventual work as a vice president, actuary, and director, and so on?

Deb Stone: I received my designations while I worked for Hanover Insurance, and that allowed me to take on leadership positions there. But the move out to California would not have happened if I was not an FCAS, and the Chief Actuary jobs also would not have been possible without my FCAS. While the designations gave me credibility for the non-actuarial positions, they were not necessary. Now that I am doing private consulting, having my FCAS is an imperative as there are many other actuaries out there. The combination of my being designated and having the broad background in insurance (instead of just the actuarial background) and business help me attract clients.

Jacobsen: Any advice for those coming into actuarial work?

Stone: Sure – look at what you like to do. You will have to decide what practice area attracts you (property/casualty, life, annuities, health) and what your ultimate goal is likely to be. Actuaries can stay in insurance their entire career, or branch out into affiliated or non-traditional roles. Think about whether you want to be back-office kind of person or eventually work closer to the customer. Choose an employer who truly supports you as an aspiring actuary. Many employers offer study programs, and those that offer study time at work are a great help. Think about the timing of the work load at a prospective employer; e.g. consulting firms have a lot of work in the later winter and early spring because of when filings are due. It can be difficult to balance your time between work, study and life in that environment, especially for folks just coming into the field. Big data, predictive modelling and other technology driven applications are becoming more and more important in the field; be open to those possibilities. LEARN ABOUT INSURANCE – don't be content with just the actuarial stuff. You'll have many more and diverse opportunities if you really understand the entire business.

Jacobsen: Now, you own Stone Business & Risk Consulting (since August, 2015).[5] How did the idea for this company come to you?

Stone: I had, at the request of my Commissioner at the NH Insurance Department, taken on a role as the Director of Financial Regulation. It turned out not to be the best fit for me; it was very technical but not really analytical. As I became increasingly familiar with the laws and

regulations, processes, accounting standards, etc that are part of the financial regulation side, I just started to become a little bored and wasn't really enjoying my position as much. I decided that it made sense, for the sake of the Department and myself, that I leave. Originally, my intention had really been to take some time off before deciding on a next move, but within a short time after announcing my departure and while still at the Department. I started hearing from some people who were interested in having me work with them. I was not willing to take on another full-time job as I am more interested now in some entrepreneurial possibilities, so a consulting firm seemed like a natural fit.

Jacobsen: What tasks and responsibilities come with owning the consulting company?

Stone: Everything! I am a sole proprietor at this point, so have to do all the work. That includes research, evaluating projects, scheduling of my time, on some occasions acting as a project manager, bookkeeping and tax efforts, legal issues if they come up, data mining when necessary, building spreadsheets, liaising with clients or others involved in the project, writing reports, being available close to 24/7, etc.

Jacobsen: What general advice seems relevant for those without the relevant expertise to know about consultation?

Stone: The best advice I can give someone who is interested in consulting is to talk to people who do that kind of work. As I mentioned earlier, it can be very difficult to pass the spring actuarial exams working in certain environments (because the work loads overtakes study time). Decide whether you are going to be looking for a job in an existing consulting firm or are going to start your own. If you are trying to join an existing firm, don't meet with just one or more principals – talk to the associates, the people who support the projects. Find out whether the work environment/culture is a good fit for you. What would be your responsibilities for work? Are you responsible for client prospecting? Is there a mentoring and/or peer review process in place? If you are going out on your own, be honest about your capabilities and the amount of time you are willing to spend working for your clients – and how you are going to split your time between finding clients and working. Figure out what you need help with, and find the help. Make sure to keep some time for yourself, and communicate that to the people who are depending on you.

Jacobsen: In addition to Stone Business & Risk Consulting, you are the chair of the national board of directors for American Mensa, Ltd. What tasks and responsibilities come with this high-level position?

Stone: The American Mensa Committee (AMC) is the national board of American Mensa. The chair runs the board meetings and the annual business meeting. The chair is a member of some committees, and may be (I am) an ex officio member of all other committees. The chair of AML is also an ex officio member of the Mensa Foundation board, a member of the Mensa International Board of Directors (IBD) and a member of the IBD Executive Committee. The chair writes an (almost) monthly column for our national magazine (the Mensa Bulletin) and an occasional column for the international publication. As an individual with prior board experience, I have tried to provide as much guidance and as many development opportunities to

our board members as I can. Of course, the Chair sets the tone of the board. I also try to follow the various Mensa Facebook groups and other social media. I work with the appropriate board members, committee members or staff on anything that comes up that needs direction from the board or executive committee. I attend Mensa events around the country when I can, and most times will be asked to speak. I make presentations at other forums on occasion as well (and I do interviews sometimes J). I know there are other things, but it's impossible to remember then all at once!

Jacobsen: Where did interest in intelligence tests originate for you?

Stone: Honestly, I didn't have any real interest in IQ tests per se. A teacher told me my IQ when I was 11 years old, because "I had the highest IQ in my class." It didn't impress me much. In 1983, I was on a business trip and read a short blurb about Mensa in an airline magazine. It included a 10-question sample test, and I was able to complete the test in less than half the maximum time and with all 10 questions complete. The article suggested I take the Mensa admission test, and I did so. I qualified and joined. But I think that most Mensans actually don't care so much about IQ in and of itself. I have yet to ask another Mensan, or be asked by another Mensan about an IQ score. It's enough that through IQ testing, we have formed this community.

I care about IQ tests because they are the way people can qualify for Mensa and so I want our test(s) to be good ones.

Jacobsen: What about high IQ societies?

Stone: Well, as a 32+ year member of Mensa, and a pretty active one at that, I'm in favor of them! Seriously, I appreciate Mensa for the benefits and relationships it has provided me, and for what are now life-long friendships. I was a member of another High-IQ society (Intertel) for a few years, but didn't feel like I was getting much real benefit from that membership. Many of the members were also Mensa members, and the number of members in my area was quite small – so there weren't really a lot of opportunities to get together.

So – I guess I would say that High-IQ societies are what we find in them and what we make of them. If the benefits and community that they create is of value to one, great! That value means different things to different people, and that's great too. They work for some people, but not for others. I would love to see us grow our membership – because I think there are so many great things that Mensa provides – and so I value IQ tests as the means to that end.

Jacobsen: What seems like the greatest emotional struggle in personal life?

Stone: For me, that would probably be conquering my own insecurities and shyness – still sometimes with me, despite all of the years.

Jacobsen: What seems like the greatest emotional struggle in professional life?

Stone: My greatest professional struggle has always been managing my own expectations about people. There are a lot of things that are obvious to me that aren't obvious to other people – and

that surprises me constantly. When someone just doesn't get something, I can have a tendency to appear to be impatient, irritated or intimidating. I'm better at managing it than I was when I was younger, but I have to be constantly aware.

Jacobsen: What general philosophy seems the most correct to you?

Stone: *Don't do unto others what you would not have them do unto you.*

This is a paraphrase of something Hillel said: "That which is hateful to you, do not do to your fellow. That is the whole Torah."

Jacobsen: What political philosophy seems the most correct to you?

Stone: I don't identify with one party or one platform. Philosophically, I believe in fiscal responsibility, personal freedom accompanied by personal responsibility and letting people live their own lives. I guess maybe a combination of deliberative democracy, some measure of republicanism and the capability approach.

Jacobsen: What social philosophy seems the most correct to you?

Stone: I'm not sure how to answer this question. Social philosophy to me is too broad to summarize here, but I think you if you read the other questions related to my philosophy you will see a pattern to them. Respect, hope, personal responsibility, personal accountability, giving back to the communities in which one takes part, providing support in any or all of its aspects to those with a true need and contributing in a meaningful way.

Jacobsen: What economic philosophy seems the most correct to you?

Stone: I'm a capitalist and a Yankee. I believe in competitive markets, and I believe that value isn't measured only in dollars.

Jacobsen: What aesthetic philosophy seems the most correct to you?

Stone: I would say my aesthetic philosophy is a combination of the music aesthetic and the mathematics aesthetic – very broadly interpreted. There is, in my mind, a clear link between mathematics and music (patterns & symbols) but there is music in more than just music. Beautiful prose and poetry have their own music, as does art like paintings or sculpture. And nature as well. I guess I believe we should look for the beauty in all things around us, and appreciate how they fit into a grand pattern of life.

Jacobsen: What interrelates these philosophies?

Stone: I guess I can only repeat what I said at the end of my response on social philosophy – the same things contribute to and inform all of my philosophy: Respect, hope, personal responsibility, personal accountability, giving back to the communities in which one takes part, providing support in any or all of its aspects to those with a true need and contributing in a

meaningful way.

Appendix I: Footnotes

[1] Chair (2015, July), AMC (National Board of Directors), American Mensa; Owner (2015, August), Stone Business & Risk Consulting LLC.

[2] Individual Publication Date: September 15, 2016 at **www.in-sightjournal.com**; Full Issue Publication Date: January 1, 2017 at **https://in-sightjournal.com/insight-issues/**.

[3] Thompson River University (1986-1988); Douglas College (1984-1986); Kamloops Senior Secondary.

[4] Photograph courtesy of Deb Stone.

[5] LinkedIn. (2016). Deb Stone. Retrieved from **https://www.linkedin.com/in/deb-stone-9578395**.

An Interview with Deb Stone (Part Three)

2016-09-22

An interview with **Deb Stone**. *She discusses: self-expression; Mensa previous high male-to-female issue; anything being done about it; instantaneous access to information and the need to single out geniuses; Mensa raising American political discourse; Mensa Match; its success; Mensa marriages; becoming geniuses through engineered circuitry in brains; first engineered brain member of Mensa; famous Mensa members; reasons for joining Mensa; most popular Mensa activities; stereotypes of about smart people that are inaccurate or annoying; accurate stereotypes; annoying things about non-smart people; upcoming collaborative projects; upcoming solo projects; and recommended authors.*

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: What forms of self-expression provide meaning in life for you?

Deb Stone: I love most kinds of music and play the piano. I attend concert, classical music, opera and theatre events. I love representational art (painting, sculpture, etc) but tend to shy away from some of the more modern and more abstract art. I read voraciously, and I write – but mostly for myself. I do needlework, I love to color and I love thunderstorms. I love to cook and I don't really use recipes. I try to live my life doing the right things in the right way for the right reasons. My hope, manifested in the way I live my life (my own form of self-expression) is that when I'm gone I will have left a positive impact on those around me.

Jacobsen: In the past, Mensa had a high male-to-female ratio. Does this remain the case?

Stone: Yes, the ratio is still skewed to a much larger proportion of males to females.

Jacobsen: Is there anything being done about it?

Stone: I think the simple answer is no. We encourage people from many different groups that may be underrepresented in our current membership to join, not just women. Mensa, like any organization, doesn't appeal to everyone equally. We have a single criterion for entry, and we welcome anyone who meets that criterion. Interestingly, at the current time a majority of the AMC is female so the general membership ratio is not reflected on the national board.

Jacobsen: In a world where everyone has instantaneous access to information and expertise via cellphones, why do we still need to single out geniuses?

Stone: Genius is not the same thing as information or expertise. I do believe we need genius, because genius can help move things forward. Information and expertise is based on what we already know and the way we interpret or use what we already know. Sometimes genius is the spark for finding out something new, or interpreting something in a new way. Sometimes it's an ability to do something better than it's been done before – there are many ways genius can manifest (some positive and some negative). But ultimately, it's part of what makes us human.

And I would add, we don't need only genius – we need wisdom as well. Wisdom is not just

being smart or having a high IQ. It's much more than that, and I think it's in relatively short supply in our world right now.

Jacobsen: American politics certainly doesn't seem to be getting smarter. Could Mensa help raise the discourse?

Stone: Perhaps we could. But while some of our individual members may try to do so, Mensa as an organization holds no opinions. That has been part of our guiding principles for much longer than I have been a member. And, as I have already said in this interview, smart varies depending on circumstance. What's smart in terms of American politics? I have my opinion, but other Mensans have theirs as well. Within Mensa, we sometime say "Leading Mensans is like herding cats!". You will also hear people make statements like "If you put 100 Mensans in a room you have at least 125 opinions."

Jacobsen: In 2014, you introduced Mensa Match, for Mensa members interested in dating.

Stone: Yes, that's correct.

Jacobsen: Has that been successful?

Stone: I haven't taken part in it myself so have no direct knowledge, but I believe most people would answer that it has been successful.

Jacobsen: Have you had any Mensa marriages?

Stone: There have been many Mensa marriages over many years, going back decades.

Jacobsen: Do you think that during your lifetime, people will be able to become geniuses by adding engineered circuitry to their brains?

Stone: In my opinion, no, this will not happen in my lifetime. But I've been wrong before!

Jacobsen: In what year do you think Mensa will admit its first member with an engineered brain – a synthetic brain with artificial intelligence?

Stone: Honestly, I have no idea. But it will be interesting to see how an artificial intelligence rates on an IQ scale as opposed to an achievement or knowledge-based test.

Jacobsen: What famous members do you have?

Stone: There have been many famous Mensans over the years, and they have been famous for many different reasons. Just a few of them include Geena Davis & Alan Rachins (actors), Marilyn Vos Savant, Dr. Lance L Ware & Roland Berrill (co-founders of Mensa), Terance Black (screenwriter), Deborah Yates (Radio City Rockette), Andrain Cronauer, Bobby Czyz (WBA Cruiserweight Champion), Jean Auel (author) Patricia P Jennings (pianist), Richard Lederer (writer/speaker), Isaac Asimov (author), Dr. Abbie F Salny (former Mensa supervisory

psychologist and author of the Mensa 'Quiz-a-Day' books.

Jacobsen: Why would someone join Mensa?

Stone: There are lots and lots of reasons people join. Some join to see if they can. Some join so that they can show membership on a resume. Some join for access to people with like interests or backgrounds or perspectives. Some join for some of our special events or activities. Some join for access to our special interest groups. Some join for fun. Some join for fellowship. Some join for intellectual stimulation. Some join for family and relationships (I ended up with an entire second 'family' once I became active in Mensa).

Jacobsen: What are your most popular activities?

Stone: There are a few national activities/events, including our national convention (called the Annual Gathering or AG), MindGames and Culture Quest (which is a national trivia contest.) There are also many SIGs (Special Interest Groups) which can be national or local. AML is made up of over 120 different local groups in 10 regions. The majority of face-to-face activities happen at the local group level. Among the most popular of these are activities like visits by a group of Mensans to museums or other non-M-specific venues or activities, dinner or lunch get-togethers, games get-togethers and what we call Regional Gathering or RGs. Depending on where (what part of the country) these things happen, they may draw anywhere from a just a few to several hundred members and guests. Like many membership organizations, the number of members who engage by attending events is a minority of the overall membership. In these days, there are may more members who are involved in activities that don't include regular face-to-face interactions, but are instead primarily online, use communication like email or are social media based. One of the things that consistently ranks as one of the most popular benefits of membership is our national publication (Mensa Bulletin), so that's probably the most popular activity in terms of pure numbers.

Jacobsen: What stereotypes about smart people do you find most inaccurate and annoying?

Stone: I most dislike stereotypes that focus on externals. For example, that 'all smart people' are nerdy, wear glasses, aren't athletic, are unattractive, aren't socially adept, are shy or are just 'weird'. On the other hand, we have the stereotypes that all smart people know about computers, are like absent-minded professors, are obsessive, only want to do nerdy things (like science, math computers, etc), all play weird role-playing games and don't have to work hard to know or learn things.

Jacobsen: What stereotypes are most accurate?

Stone: In my experience, the one thing that almost all Mensans have in common (because there are lots and lots and lots of differences) is books. Almost every Mensa home I have entered has books. We like to learn things, we like to know things, and so most of us read. A lot!

Jacobsen: What do you find most annoying about not-smart people?

Stone: I challenge the premise of this question; what makes a person "not-smart"? People have different expertise, certainly. I scored in the top 2% on an IQ test. Does that make me smart? In some ways, I guess so. However, I don't know practically anything about plumbing, so does that make a plumber smarter than I am?

In any case, I don't find groups of people annoying. I do find some individual people annoying and it's generally when they are being intentionally or purposefully obtuse or disagreeable or negative.

Jacobsen: Any upcoming collaborative projects?

Stone: As I mentioned a little earlier, my business partner and I are just opening a new real estate business. The business will offer not only standard brokerage services, but will also provide additional ancillary services on a fee-for-service basis to a particular niche market.

Jacobsen: Any upcoming solo projects?

Stone: I'm working on a couple of articles related to workers' compensation, focused on the concept of integrated disability management. I'm currently planning a home improvement project to add a shower to an existing powder room, and am in the design phase.

Jacobsen: Any recommended authors?

Stone: I read non-fiction on occasion, but I am primarily a fiction reader for fun and enjoyment. Having said that, my tastes are pretty eclectic. At any moment in time I probably have 5 or 6 books going. One might be classic science fiction (Asimov or Heinlein before he got too self-indulgent or John Brunner or even Burroughs or EE Smith). Another is probably a mystery of some kind; I love Sayers and Rex Stout, some of Robert B Parker's books, Martha Grimes and some of the cozy series that are so ubiquitous right now. Another will definitely be a PG Wodehouse or Wizard of Oz book. I'm always re-reading Austen and Fielding, or I might be in the middle of Boccaccio or reading part of the Bible or the Koran or maybe some Kai Lung (Ernest Bramah). Oh, and the poetry and essays of John Donne.

You will see that there are a lot of books written anywhere from 20 to 200 or more years ago. One problem with being a reader, and being a reader who reads very quickly is that there are seldom books around the house that I haven't already read. As a result, when I'm looking for a new book at 2:00am or some equally ridiculous time, I find myself pulling out old favorites and reading them again.

Having an e-reader does help provide access to books at those odd moments, but I prefer the visceral feel of a real book so usually use the Kindle when I'm traveling.

Jacobsen: Thank you for your time, Deb Stone.

Bibliography

1. LinkedIn. (2016). Deb Stone. Retrieved from **https://www.linkedin.com/in/deb-stone-9578395**.

Appendix I: Footnotes

[1] Chair (2015, July), AMC (National Board of Directors), American Mensa; Owner (2015, August), Stone Business & Risk Consulting LLC.

[2] Individual Publication Date: September 22, 2016 at **www.in-sightjournal.com**; Full Issue Publication Date: January 1, 2017 at **https://in-sightjournal.com/insight-issues/**.

[3] Thompson River University (1986-1988); Douglas College (1984-1986); Kamloops Senior Secondary.

[4] Photograph courtesy of Deb Stone.

Ask A Genius (or Two): Conversation with Kirk Kirkpatrick and Rick Rosner on the "American Disease" and "Super Empowerment"

2018-02-08

Rick Rosner and I conduct a conversational series entitled Ask A Genius on a variety of subjects through In-Sight Publishing on the personal and professional website for Rick. Rick exists on the World Genius Directory listing as the world's second highest IQ at 192 based on several ultra-high IQ test scores developed by independent psychometricians. Kirk Kirkpatrick earned a score at 185, near the top of the listing, on a mainstream IQ test, the Stanford-Binet. Both scores on a standard deviation of 15. A sigma of ~6.13 for Rick – a general intelligence rarity of 1 in 2,314,980,850 – and ~5.67 for Kirk – a general intelligence rarity of 1 in 136,975,305. Of course, if a higher general intelligence score, then the greater the variability in, and margin of error in, the general intelligence scores because of the greater rarity in the population. This amounts to a joint interview or conversation with Kirk Kirkpatrick, Rick Rosner, and myself on the "American Disease," as identified and labeled by Kirk, and "Super Empowerment," as observed and named by Rick.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: So, let's open the discussion with the election and lead into healthcare. Rick, I believe you had some thoughts on the election. We had some discussions before.

Rick Rosner: Kirk wanted to go deeper than that. Right before we started taping, he wanted to talk about deeper causes because everybody has had a stomach full of the more obvious proximate causes, but I believe deeper trends help generate the situate we're in.

Kirk Kirkpatrick: Yes, I think he's right. If I can start the conversation, my background is rather diverse considering most Americans. I lived in 8 countries. I have probably have been to every country in the northern hemisphere. I speak several languages.

My wife is a native Chinese. I tend to take a more international look at things. But when I returned back to living in the United States, one the things that struck me was the way people think they are entitled to hold an opinion.

And they confuse the entitlement of holding an opinion with the veracity of the opinion. In other words, "I have a right to hold an opinion, and that means you need to consider this opinion as valid." So, I see, if I can give an example.

If I had never been to LA and I was speaking with Rick, and we were having a discussion about Los Angeles, and Rick said to me, "You know, Kirk, I grew up here. I lived here all of my life." I would start deferring to him about finding out what Los Angeles was like.

I would be the last person in the world to start arguing with him about a place I had never been to before, and that he happened to live in and had grown up in, and is a rational, intelligent human being. Do you understand my point?

Rosner: Yup.

Jacobsen: Yes.

Rosner: And I agree with it. I've been calling it "super empowerment." Where a lot of our tech and social media give people reinforcement of the idea that whatever you believe must be the truth, you're entitled to spread that truth by whatever means necessary.

Kirkpatrick: The evangelists, I think that's a very good point. The way I put it, or the succinct way I say it, "A Google search does not an expert make." Because you Googled an article and read it doesn't even tell me that you 1) had the background to understand the article that you read or 2), and more importantly, to validate the article and find out whether or not the author knew what he was talking about.

Rosner: I heard on NPR yesterday, day before. Some country or entity wants to install something before you're allowed to comment on the article. You have to take a quiz on the article to make sure you even read it and understood it.

Kirkpatrick: [Laughing].

Jacobsen: [Laughing] That's very good.

Kirkpatrick: I can give you a perfect example that will illustrate it excellently. If you remember a while back, we did a deal, or I say we were part of a deal, with Iran to try to prevent them from developing nuclear weapons.

While that was going on, I had a phone call from a woman who claimed to be from my congress, which I don't believe. But she said she was. I'll quote her as quickly or as accurately as I can. She wanted to know my opinion on "Obama's deal with Iran."

And those were her exact words. I said to her, "Ma'am, can I ask you a couple of questions first?" She said, "Yes." I said, "What is your opinion on Obama's deal with Iran?" She said, "I don't like it."

Rosner: Sure.

Kirkpatrick: I said, "Have you been to Iran?" She said, "No." I said, "Can you name 5 cities in Iran?" She said, "No." I said, "How about 3?" She said, "No." I said, "Can you name the countries that border Iran?" She said, "No." I said, "Then, what is it that bothers you about this deal?" She said, "It threatens Israel." I said, "That sounds reasonable. Can you name 5 cities in Israel?" She said, "No." I said, "Can you name 3?"

She said, "No." I said, "Can you name the countries that border Israel?" She said, "No." I said, "Have you ever visited the place or been there?" She said, "No."

I said, "Then allow me to answer your question." I said, "Firstly, I don't know any deal that Obama did with Iran, but I know a deal that the P5+1 nations did with Iran under the auspices of the Security Council at the UN. If that's the one that you're referring to, I've been to Iran and

can easily name 5 cities in the place, and can tell you every country that touches it."

I continued, "And on top of that, I lived in Israel. So, 5 cities are really easy. I can tell you every country that touches Israel. I have been to all of them. And in spite of all of this, I still don't know enough about this arms deal to form an opinion one way or another. So, the operative question for me is, 'Why do you care what I think? And why do you even have an opinion?'"

Of course, she hung the phone up.

Rosner: Nice.

Kirkpatrick: That's my point. You're going to have an opinion on an arms deal that you incorrectly describe to these people, and it's an arms deal! You know, it's like, who are you?

Rosner: What she characterized as an arms deal was the nuclear weapons development negotiation going on, I guess, right?

Kirkpatrick: She meant the P5+1 nations' deal with Iran. But my point is, you're going to form an opinion about something like that. You're not bothering to educate yourself? Not knowing the countries that border Iran?

It isn't that advanced. Let's put it this way, if Rick and I were talking, and Rick put an equation in front of me that said, "y+ 8=4," and I looked at him and said, "You can't add letters to numbers." I'm not sure he'd take my opinion on math very seriously.

Rosner: Yes, Yes.

Kirkpatrick: That's the point I'm trying to make. This is what I call the "American Disease." Where because we have TV, cable news, and Google, we think, "Oh, I'll Google this." The American becomes unaware of the fact that the guy who wrote the article doesn't know any more about the subject than he does. He's writing down what somebody else has said, over and over again.

Rosner: I've watched a lot of the middle to Left-leaning news. I watched a lot of MSNBC. I reluctantly watch CNN. With Fox News, at least you know, you're getting biased news. CNN presents itself as news and tries to be even handed, or at least they present the appearance of being even handed.

That involves assembling these panels of 6 or 8 people. Most of whom either don't know what they're talking about or who are dispensing fairly pure bullshit. And this was a staple of coverage during the election. CNN has stayed with that format.

All of the little tricks they learned about drawing in eyeballs during the election. These cross-partisan panels. People on Trump's side. People on the other side. Countdown clocks, town halls, they've kept it all. It's as if the election is still going on.

It is endless presentations of uninformed and/or deliberately misleading opinion.

Kirkpatrick: Yes, I have to give you credit here because I can't stomach any of it. I watch no, absolutely zero, television news. So, you understand, I can't do it.

Rosner: I used to write jokes for late night TV. Which meant that I…

Kirkpatrick: you had to…

Rosner: Yes, I had to be informed. I've kept the habit. Much to the detriment of my blood pressure.

Jacobsen: [Laughing].

Kirkpatrick: Here's what I advise my friends who come and ask me, because my news is a little tough, in that, I speak multiple languages. I am able to read Het Parool in Holland or Die Welt in German. So, I get a little different viewpoint.

But what I tell them is to go to Google News, if they go down to Google News at the bottom, there's a link that says, "Other languages." Or there's about 20 overseas editions of Google News that are English, but presented from the perspective of the person in that country.

So, for example, India has an English Google News and Australia has an English Google News, Israel has an English Google News, and South Africa has an English Google News. If you click that, then there's every article that you'll never see in the United States.

Rosner: That's really good to know. I get sick of my three stupid go-to sources. The ones that I can stomach. I go through it pretty fast. I'm unnecessarily informed after going through it.

Kirkpatrick: They all have to buy it. That's why I say, "If you get a bunch of them, you read them in the middle." The other thing I tell people is that if you want to, for example, tell me about Germany and the problem they're having, or perhaps not having, with the immigrants, and then try to sit there and argue with me.

First thing I'm going to do. I'm going to research it in the German press. Because when I lived in Europe, sometimes, you can see the European press writing in glee about a problem The United of States was having.

When you look down into the problems, it wasn't nearly as bad. There was a lot added to it because they wanted that. That goes in all directions for any country. I'm not blaming Europeans or anybody else.

Rosner: I had a discussion with a super conservative friend about Sweden being the rape capital of Europe because of the Muslims. My buddy is an artist, which means he's using his eyes and hands all day but his ears are free.

He pipes in ten hours a day of conservative talk about this stuff. He is very informed on all the conservative talking points. The story about this rape in Sweden. You poke at it a little bit. It starts to fall apart because it starts turning into mush where you really have to do a lot of research on it.

It's all the parts, but you're not left with anything because now you're left with uncertainty. One reason that Sweden seems rapey is that they have a super inclusive definition of sexual assault that can include things such as micro aggressions.

Kirkpatrick: It is worse than that, okay? Now, let me give you an example, my company, the one I am the CEO of, has about 15 employees who has 10 on contract. We build countrywide telecommunication systems, but we generally use the manpower of whoever is buying our system to build it.

So, let's get to Sweden, I'm talking to some young thing in the bar. I tell her I'm the CEO of a telecommunication company. Then we go to bed because she thinks I'm hot. In the next morning, I get a phone call.

I say, "I've got to do this and that. It's my accountant. I don't have a secretary." She asks, "How big is your company?" I reply, "We have five employees and ten contractors." Now, she thought I was this rich Apple type CEO, but, in fact, now she found out that my company is not as big as she thought it was.

That's right; I deceived her. That's rape after the fact. That's what Julian Assange has been accused of; that exact thing. That he lied to the woman about who he was. I'm not going to show what they do about it, but I don't think that that's right in the other direction.

But it's the same thing when you're talking to a conservative about the crime rate in the UK. If I raise my fist to you in the UK, then I've assaulted you, even though I've never hit you. In the United States, that's not a violent crime and in the UK it is.

But I think that's my point in the case of discussing this about Sweden. I will move this on social media. This will come up and almost lead into the conversation. A guy who is not only Swedish, but he lives there. He's living there now. He's never lived any place else.

I'll still have Americans who argue with him. Sure, that's much more.

Rosner: Yes, so, in a deeper sense or looking at its people feeling super empowered, at the same time, they're almost more manipulable than at a lot of other points in history.

Kirkpatrick: Does that mean the Dunning-Kruger effect?

Rosner: Yes, I love that thing. I tweeted about that during the election so many times. To explain to everybody, the Dunning-Kruger Effect, let me explain: in movies, there are magical characters. Often, in movies, dumb people have a special wisdom. They know they're dumb.

Forrest Gump, he's retarded. He's got an IQ 70. Yet, he's full of this wisdom, a deeper wisdom that goes beyond his academic difficulties. That's in the movies. In real life, the Dunning-Kruger Effect is that somebody who's dumb is also dumb about their level of dumbness.

So, a lot of people who are dumb think they're super smart because they're too dumb to realize that they're dumb. There's nothing magic about them. There's no deep wisdom about them. There's a deep assurance that they know what's what.

They've been catered to by these news sources. Fox being the first one to it. I'm not sure my understanding is completely accurate, but it is my understanding. That 30-40 years ago conservative think-tanks started researching how to win people.

They realized that dumb, colourful, easy branding, easy issues were the way to grab low information – meaning dumb – voters, and yank them around. They started by that. Anyway, Fox News has been going for 37 years. People have their brain tenderized.

They are super confident about what they think, but they're not good in the head.

Kirkpatrick: I think you're giving them a little too much credit.

Jacobsen: [Laughing].

Kirkpatrick: Let me tell you what mean by that. I think this is more Rupert saying that there's the gullible objects. First, what I'll say is this, we say it about CNN and MSNBC. I think MSNBC tried to be FOX a little bit.

But what I would say is most of the American media and a lot of European media are biased towards sensationalists. If it bleeds, it leads. They want to be sensational. CNN is the worst with this, but Fox is appealing to a specific constituency that Rupert Murdoch realized CNN wasn't available to feed these people.

When I was dealing with a man who was very close in the group, I helped set up Sky Latin America for him down in Latin America. He told me that they had brought in a bunch of marketers who'd do a marketing plan for Sky Latin American.

The groups produced a document about a 158 pages long. Rupert wasn't there. Rupert came down. My friend whose name happens to be Scott, came in to say you may have this marketing plan in his hand, which they put together.

He said, "I handed it to Rupert." As I see Rupert glance at the cover, he said, "This hand never stopped moving towards the next page." Finally, he dropped it. He looked at him. He said, "Scott, you buy the football. You put dishes on the roofs. That's the marketing." You get it?

I would say deep understanding of these markets. 80% of the decisions when multi-channel video is made on the basis of sports program in Latin America; soccer is everything. So, Rupert was much more fundamental than Scott was.

Guys, it's really simple. These guys want football, buy the rights, then y'all run to you to get it, okay? Same with FOX. You could out that conservative being this The people will have confirmation by us. They want that to be right and will turn you into the exclusivity of everybody.

Rosner: I can't get me to shut up about the size of the American population. 325-329 million people You got the dumbest half of the country. Then half of that again is the dumbest half of the dumbest half. That's still 80 million people.

Kirkpatrick: FOX has this subscribership of about 30 million. So, that's not even half of that, but look at how much money they've made.

Rosner: By the way, this is little off what you were saying, where the coverage is people who are on the Left. They lost the election, lost the government. All the branches feel pretty angst and bereft.

Perhaps, beyond even the immediate or midterm consequences of the laws, I think it's hard on people's sadness that the coverage took the form of sports coverage during the election. So, it's not the political implications, but there's this emotional bond you have with your political team now.

The way that people either love or hate you the way they do with the Patriots.

Kirkpatrick: You definitely have this, but I think there's ignorance. I know that there's a lot of – I didn't say – angst because we lost the election, but this in my opinion is fundamentally different. I'll tell you why for a couple of reasons. Number one, as I told you, I've lived more than half of my life in other countries.

You might imagine other countries follow American politics closely. The reason is because it affects their lives. But until the second George Bush election, I had never seen that end up with the American people. What I mean by that is people saying, "I don't like your government at all, but I think the Americans are best people who work." You understand what I mean?

Rosner: We're starting to get hit hard with our own brushes.

Kirkpatrick: Yes. After the second George Bush election, people started saying, "Straighten this out, if that is the way you are, then, maybe, the American people are not who we thought they were." I don't think the average American understands the picture that we started painting for over the border.

If I can give you an example, did either of you gentlemen see the movie 'The American Sniper'?

Jacobsen: Nope.

Rosner: No.

Kirkpatrick: I haven't either, on purpose. But I know about the scene because I went out and looked at it, because of the description of the scene. The first scene of this movie they're attacking a neighborhood in Iraq. I believe it's Iraq.

The red's a woman in a Hijab and Abaya, where she's got a 10-year-old kid.

Rosner: I heard about that scene too.

Kirkpatrick: You've heard about it? So, he shoots the woman. The whole time he's sitting there saying, "Please don't throw the grenade, please don't throw." But she starts to throw and he kills her. The little 10-year-old kid picks up the grenade and he starts back with this.

Of course, to make it more dramatic, his partner says, "If you're wrong about this, you're going to go to prison." And, of course, he hesitates, the boy throws the grenade, but it doesn't make it all the way to Americans. So, he saved their lives.

I say to people, "If you watch this scene in this movie, the only thing about the movie is that you convert the American soldier into a Soviet Union informant and make the woman and the boy Afghans, how would you feel? Would you feel the Soviet guy was a hero because he is saving the other Soviet soldiers from this evil Afghani woman and her child, as they're invading their country?"

Rosner: Not so, much.

Kirkpatrick: Not so much, what's different about the situation with Chris, Scott? We're invading their country. They're defending their homes the same way. Yet, now, he's a hero and the whole world looks and wonders.

Let me give you a second example to chock the crap out of them, my wife is Chinese. She became an American citizen. She applied for American Citizenship. They had a nationalization ceremony. 80 people got their citizenship. I went to it.

While she went to what should have been a solemn ceremony, they had a big screen in the centre of the room that would pop down when they played the national anthem. People stood up. After they said their oaths and stuff, they handed out to these little American flags.

After the ceremony, the screen comes back down, then they start playing Proud to be an American, the country music song. A woman walks on stage swinging a huge American flag back and forth. She yells at these guys and says, "Now, new American citizens stand up, wave your flag and sing."

Now, I'm sure my wife has never heard this song before. She's sitting right in front of me. They (new immigrants) were sitting together. But my point was when the song is over, of course, the 80 guys stood up and smiled and waved their flags.

It was as soon as it was over my wife not knowing what she was doing looks over at me six rows

across the room and says out loud, "Just like IN CHINA, So Communist."

Jacobsen: [Laughing].

Kirkpatrick: Guys, that's exactly what I was thinking. I spent time behind the Iron Curtain. I was thinking "This looks eerily like in Moscow." What do you mean stand up, wave your flag and sing? Is that an order? I never did anything for it. Scott, you're Canadian, right?

Jacobsen: I am, yes.

Kirkpatrick: Yet, can you imagine a lumberjack in the middle of the nationalization ceremony?

Jacobsen: [Laughing] If on the condition that it was a replay of a Monty Python song.

Kirkpatrick: Oh, right, right. And you don't have the guy doing Doug & Bob McKenzie impressions from the podium. No, I can end this by saying my team I hired him out of Moscow. He grew up in the Soviet Union and has lived in the US for 5 years. ,

He came to me and said "One of the big differences between the Soviet Union and the US is that we have understood that our propaganda was all bullshit, "But you guys believe yours!"

Rosner: Because it comes out of an earnest people because the basic American values are not cynical. The 20th century marked the decay of American institutions that people used to believe in wholeheartedly: the church, Boy Scouts, patriotism, and so on. Everything got torched.

That stuff worked great for a while. So, it's easy to sell people on stuff that used to work without examination and qualification. I remember in the '60s being taught critical thinking skills in elementary school.

There was a lesson on the nine ways advertising manipulates you. It was good to have that.

Jacobsen: [Laughing].

Rosner: If that is still taught, but I know that we're in the middle of a bunch of new technology and new social media, that makes us vulnerable because we haven't learned the considerate bullshit. We're still virgins.

When I worked in bars, one of my jobs was walking through the bar and looking for underage people who'd snuck in one way or another. One way I found them was I'd look for the clump of lame guys over there night after night without picking anybody up.

If there were several of those gathered around somebody, I knew at the center of the cluster of lame-Os would be an underage girl who had yet to bullshit. She didn't have the experience yet on how to detect bullshit, how to push it away.

We are in that situation, where there's all this new stuff. It looks shiny and powerful and makes

us feel powerful. It makes us manipulable.

Jacobsen: Then maybe a closure question for the two of you: do you think social media, the new technology, amplifies the American Disease as you call it, Kirk, or the Super Empowered population as you call it, Rick?

Kirkpatrick: I think we're both right. What I mean by this is I think it amplifies the American Disease, but as Rick implies, it's probably going to be solved. In the end, it's probably going to be the closest to the point that, as he mentioned before, you're going to pull something and it's going to pop up.

Instead, I've marked this is incorrect for anybody who might read.

Rosner: I totally agree with that. It takes a while to get resistant. When people first had cell phones, only 10% of the population had cell phones. We saw a lot of behaviour because it made everybody else pissed off: talking really loud on your phone in the line at the bank or in a restaurant.

Over time, people calmed down with that. Now, the new prop is texting all over the place, in crosswalks or while driving. Eventually, people will calm down with that and will learn to make better use of technology and understand. They will be less swayed by it. The trouble is by that time. It will be two or three new ways of tech to mess with people, but I remain optimistic.

Kirkpatrick: I do too.

Rosner: Is that a good place to end right there?

Jacobsen: That is a good line to end on, I think.

References

1. [LevelOneBossDotcom]. (2009, June 7). PlayStation Riot (Jimmy Kimmel Live!). Retrieved from **https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vODq5OGiI9Q**.

2. [The Daily]. (2012, April 23). Is Rick Rosner the World's Smartest Man?. Retrieved from **https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fYo46N-Kfuw**.

3. [Thomas Boyer]. (2009, January 3). Domino's Commerical with Go. Retrieved from **https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rlEEUTTesHM**.

4. [WWTBAMclassics]. (2011, September 8). Who Wants to be a Millionaire 7/9/00 FULL SHOW. Retrieved from **https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UG0w2Vk5zio**.

5. AtlantIQ Society (2014). AtlantIQSociety. Retrieved from **http://www.atlantiqsociety.com/atlantiqsmagazine.htm**.

6. (2012, March 1). AtlantIQ: Issue 8. Retrieved from **https://www.box.com/s/g1si4czvf6c76a82ptpd**.

7. Bertrand, N. (2015, February 25). The 40 smartest people of all time. Retrieved from **http://www.businessinsider.com.au/the-40-smartest-people-of-all-time-2015-2#40-richard-rick-rosner-1.**

8. Betts, J. (2018). The World Genius Directory Geniuses. Retrieved from **https://psiq.org/world_genius_directory_geniuses/geniuses.htm**.

9. Carmichael, C. (2017, January 6). Top 10 People with the Highest IQ Scores Ever. Retrieved from **http://gazettereview.com/2017/01/top-10-people-highest-iq-scores-ever/**.

10. Corcoran, K. (2014, December 3). Revealed: The 38 pills taken by 'world's second-smartest man' to stay on top form – though he admits most do nothing, and haven't kept him from being unemployed. Retrieved from **http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2858565/The-38-pills-taken-day-Rick-Rosney-world-s-second-smartest-man-body-brain-sharp-admits-two-thirds-probably-useless.html**.

11. ESOTERIQ High IQ Society. (n.d.). ESOTERISTS. Retrieved from **http://esoteriqsociety.com/esoterists/**.

12. Farquhar, P. (2014, November 6). 10 Things You Need To Know As Asian Markets Open. Retrieved from **http://www.businessinsider.com/10-things-asia-november-7-2014-11**.

13. Gay, J. (2002, December 16). Kimmel Hires Jilted Contestant. Retrieved from **http://observer.com/2002/12/kimmel-hires-jilted-contestant/**.

14. Griffiths, S. (2016, August 3). From child prodigies to playwrights, the world's 40 smartest people of all time revealed. Retrieved from **http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-3721556/The-smartest-40-people-time-revealed-List-includes-geniuses-Einstein-da-Vinci-s-number-one.html**.

15. Hendy, I. (2016, May 8). Can You Beat This? See The Most Intelligent People In The World. Retrieved from **http://buzznigeria.com/intelligent-people-world/**.

16. Hoeflin, R. (1992, August). A Letter from Ron Hoeflin. *Noesis, 72.* Retrieved from **http://megasociety.org/noesis/72.htm**.

17. Genius Society. (n.d.). Honorary Members: Rick G. Rosner. Retrieved from **http://www.geniussociety.com/honorarymembers.html**.

18. Jacobsen, S.D. (2015). Rick's Highest IQ Scores. Retrieved from **https://in-sightpublishing.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/rick_s-highest-iq-scores.pdf.**

19. Kolbert, E. (2000, September 25). Common Man. Retrieved from **http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2000/09/25/common-man**.

20. Krier, B. (1992, July 28). As Whiz Kids Grow Up: Do exceptional children become exceptional adults? Not always. Sometimes there are a few bumps along the way. Retrieved from **http://articles.latimes.com/1992-07-28/news/vw-4603_1_exceptional-children**.

21. London, B. (2013, June 7). The 13-year-old girl from Surbiton who is smarter than Stephen Hawking. Retrieved from **http://www.dailymail.co.uk/femail/article-2337394/Neha-Ramu-13-Surbiton-IQ-162–smarter-Stephen-Hawking.html**.

22. Lubin, G. (2012, April 23). The Man With The Highest IQ In The World Doesn't Think He's Very Smart At All. *Business Insider*. Retrieved from **http://www.businessinsider.com/the-man-with-the-highest-iq-in-the-world-doesnt-think-hes-very-smart-at-all-2012-4**.

23. Mata, J.D. [jd mata]. (2009, April 23). WISDOM AND ALL HIS WISDOM…… episode: Elliott in/out created by J.D. Mata. Retrieved from **https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FbXsWqzy6xo**.

24. Mata, J.D. [jd mata]. (2009, April 23). WISDOM AND ALL HIS WISDOM…… episode: "Mexican" friends created by J.D. Mata. Retrieved from **https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1f60j4G9KaM**.

25. Mata, J.D. [jd mata]. (2009, April 23). WISDOM AND ALL HIS WISDOM…… episode: Midwest Melissa……created by J.D. Mata. Retrieved from **https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bL7thW6lnVA**.

26. Mata, J.D. & Rosner, R. [jd mata] (2009, July 29). Rick Rosner eats a chicken sandwich….. a jd mata art house film. Retrieved from **https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dqXmboM0ZVM**.

27. McMahon, L. [Luke McMahon]. (2012, July 3). Highest IQ – Rick Rosner. Retrieved from **https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lcDfoo76dKY&list=RDlcDfoo76dKY**.

28. Predavec, M. (2014). Anoteleia 44. Retrieved from **http://news.generiq.net/Anoteleia/anoteleia44.html**.

29. Prendergast, A. (2009, June 9). Rick Rosner's latest gig: obsessed, in treatment. Retrieved from **http://blogs.westword.com/latestword/2009/06/rick_rosners_latest_gig_obsess.php**.

30. PSIQ (n.d.). PSIQ: LUX. Retrieved from**http://www.psiq.org/lux/**.

31. PSIQ (n.d.). World Genius Directory. Retrieved from **http://www.psiq.org/world_genius_directory_geniuses/geniuses.htm**.

32. Rosner, R. (2018, February 8). Blog – Rick Rosner. Retrieved from **https://rickrosner.org/blog-2/**.

33. Spector, D. (2016, May 25). The world's 2nd-smartest man reveals the 'brain drugs' that he thinks makes him smarter. Retrieved from **http://uk.businessinsider.com/rick-rosner-iq-health-2016-5**.

34. Spector, D. (2014, December 3). The World's 2nd-Smartest Man Reveals The 'Brain Drugs' That Make Him Smarter. Retrieved from **http://www.businessinsider.sg/rick-rosner-iq-and-health-2014-12/#epZJgDvLJKUUsMpG.99**.

35. Strike TV [SmartestGuyITW]. (2008, November 10). Smartest Guy in the World – EP 1 – Little Rickey. Retrieved from **https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tPTmBcQ62Cc**.

36. Strike TV [SmartestGuyITW]. (2008, November 10). Smartest Guy in the World – EP 2 Sock, Sock, Shoe, Shoe. Retrieved from **https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FJW2SoCxFfo**.

37. Strike TV [SmartestGuyITW]. (2008, November 10). Smartest Guy in the World – EP 3 Dylan or Cole Sprouse. Retrieved from **https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5uFS-9hTm5c**.

38. Strike TV [SmartestGuyITW]. (2008, November 10). Smartest Guy in the World – EP 4 – Eiffel Tower. Retrieved from **https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dBJSS2T-pTc**.

39. Strike TV [SmartestGuyITW]. (2008, November 10). Smartest Guy in the World EP 5 – Fame or Fortune. Retrieved from **https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xnhEmoVM9tQ**.

40. Strike TV [SmartestGuyITW]. (2008, November 10). Smartest Guy in the World EP 6 – Money. Retrieved from **https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=e3EaX6ULaJo**.

41. Strike TV [SmartestGuyITW]. (2008, November 10). Smartest Guy in the World EP 7 – The Fate of the Universe. Retrieved from **https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FJW2SoCxFfo**.

42. Strike TV [SmartestGuyITW]. (2008, November 10). Smartest Guy in the World EP 8 – Dark Matter. Retrieved from **https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FJW2SoCxFfo**.

43. The Daily [WatchTheDaily]. (2012, April 23). Is this the World's Smartest Man?. Retrieved from **https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fYo46N-Kfuw**.

44. The World Genius Directory (2013). Rick Rosner, World Genius Directory: 2013 Genius of the Year – America. Retrieved

from **http://www.psiq.org/world_genius_directory_awards/goty2013rickrosner.pdf**.

45. Trivia Hall of Fame. (2004, March). Interview: Rick Rosner, quiz show writer. Retrieved from **http://www.triviahalloffame.com/rosner.php**.

46. Tsatsou, M. (2012, October 31). Evangelos Katsioulis Has World's Highest IQ: 198. Retrieved from **http://greece.greekreporter.com/2012/10/31/evangelos-katsioulis-has-worlds-highest-iq-198/**.

Appendix I: Footnotes

[1] Kirk Kirkpatrick: Founder & CEO, MDS America Inc. Corporation; Rick Rosner: Former Comedy Writer, Jimmy Kimmel Live!; Former Editor, Noesis: The Journal of the Mega Society.

[2] Individual Publication Date: February 8, 2018 at **www.in-sightjournal.com/american-disease-super-empowerment**; Full Issue Publication Date: May 1, 2018 at **https://in-sightjournal.com/insight-issues/**.

Ask A Genius (or Two): Conversation with Dr. Claus Volko and Rick Rosner on "The Nature of Intelligence" (Part One)

2018-06-01

Rick Rosner and I conduct a conversational series entitled Ask A Genius on a variety of subjects through In-Sight Publishing on the personal and professional website for Rick. Rick exists on the World Genius Directory listing as the world's second highest IQ at 192 based on several ultra-high IQ tests scores developed by independent psychometricians. Dipl.-Ing Dr. Claus D. Volko, B.Sc., earned a score at 172, on the Equally Normed Numerical Derivation Tests (ENNDT) by Marco Ripà and Gaetano Morelli. Both scores on a standard deviation of 15. A sigma of ~6.13 for Rick – a general intelligence rarity of 1 in 2,314,980,850 – and 4.80 for Claus – a general intelligence rarity of 1 in 1,258,887. Of course, if a higher general intelligence score, then the greater the variability in, and margin of error in, the general intelligence scores because of the greater rarity in the population. This amounts to a joint interview or conversation with Dr. Claus Volko, Rick Rosner, and myself on the "The Nature of Intelligence."

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: Claus meet Rick. Rick meet Claus. The topic is "The Nature of Intelligence" for this discussion. Claus, you are a programmer, medical scientist, and expert in computational intelligence. That is, you have the relevant expertise. Therefore, it seems most appropriate to have the groundwork, e.g. common terms, premises (or assumptions), and theories within computational intelligence, provided by you. To begin, what are the common terms, premises (or assumptions), and theories within computational intelligence at the frontier of the discipline? From there, we can discuss the nature of intelligence within a firm context.

Dipl.-Ing. Dr. Claus D. Volko, B.Sc.: Hello Scott, hello Rick, I am happy to be around with you.

Computational intelligence is a subdiscipline of computer science that has the aim to enable computers to make autonomous decisions based on reasoning. So computers should ultimately display behavior which human beings would consider "intelligent". The primary assumption of computational intelligence is that intelligent behavior can emerge from computation. Techniques scientists use in this subdiscipline include neural networks, machine learning, search algorithms, metaheuristics and evolutionary computation.

Nowadays a lot of computer scientists specialize in machine learning. It is a subdiscipline of computational intelligence in which the computer is trained to solve classification and regression problems on its own. There are three types, supervised learning, unsupervised learning and reinforcement learning. In supervised learning, the computer is given a training set, based on which it learns to classify data or compute a regression curve. After the training, the computer can classify new data of a similar kind on its own. In unsupervised learning, the computer tries to find ways to classify data by itself. One type of unsupervised learning is known as clustering: the computer is provided with data and has to come up with categories which subsets of this data can be assigned to. Finally, reinforcement learning is a type of machine learning in which the computer gets a "reward" for correct behavior and sees to it that this reward gets maximized. Nowadays you often bump into the buzzword "deep learning"; that is a superset of various

variants of machine learning having in common that they employ neural networks. Deep learning techniques have recently yielded a lot of success, e.g. in gaming. For instance, the program AlphaGo which beat one of the best Go players of the world a couple of years ago employs deep learning.

In general, speech recognition, image recognition and natural language processing are considered real-world applications of machine learning. Machine learning algorithms are used for optical character recognition (to process handwritten texts), for controlling computers by voice (as it is already possible in Windows 10 using MS Cortana) and for automated translation (e.g. Google Translate).

Commonly used search algorithms include the Minimax algorithm and Alpha-beta pruning, which is an optimized variant of the former. These algorithms allow the computer to traverse through a search tree and decide which path to take in order to arrive at the optimal result as quickly as possible. Such algorithms are regularly used in computer games in order to make decisions how the computer-controlled opponents should act.

I personally specialized in metaheuristics and evolutionary computation in my studies. Metaheuristics is a programming paradigm for solving combinatorial optimization problems that comprises various algorithms which allow to speed up computation while not guaranteeing that the (globally) optimal solution is found. This is useful when working with computationally hard problems, such as NP-complete or non-polynomial problems, where it would take a lot of time to find the global optimum and where it would be acceptable to find a solution that is very good, although it is not the global optimum. Some examples of metaheuristics include variable neighborhood search, simulated annealing, tabu search, and branch-and-bound. In general they have the disadvantage that they sometimes get stuck in local optima, that is solutions that are better than all of their "neighbors" but still far from the global optimum. To overcome this obstacle, metaheuristics have built-in mechanisms to rapidly move away from local neighborhoods and try to find a better local optimum elsewhere.

Evolutionary computation is a variant of metaheuristics that is based on the idea of Darwinian selection. So it is a range of algorithms inspired by biology and mechanisms such as mutation. One interesting subtype of evolutionary computation is genetic programming, in which the computer creates new programs itself and selects the ones that seem to work best.

All of this is supposed to make the computer behave in an "intelligent" manner. And researchers working in this field are becoming increasingly successful: Some computer programs already achieve an average score in intelligence tests designed for human beings. And yet, the computer lacks one thing man has at his/her disposal: self-awareness. Computers may be able to think, but they are not aware of their doing so. That is why it is still ethical to turn off or throw away a computer, while of course it is not ethical to kill a human being.

Computational intelligence, just like human intelligence, relies heavily on logic, which is why lectures on formal logic, history of logic and non-classical logics make up a large part of the computational intelligence curriculum at university. A computer is excellent at computing logical conclusions from given premises, but it lacks the ability to come up with new ideas of its own. It

can only draw conclusions from data that is given to it. Of course, it is debatable whether human beings are really different in this aspect. Perhaps it is also the norm for human beings to be only able to come up with new ideas by combining knowledge and experiences that have previously been acquired in a creative way.

Rick Rosner: The general question for Claus and me is the nature of intelligence and Claus has talked a lot about it because it is his field, which is computational intelligence. Claus, you talk about various forms of computational intelligence and AI. I just want to talk a little bit about – I think most people who don't work in the field, like me, who think about AI they think about robot butlers or a robot girlfriend. Often, it is a human-type brain in a human type body. Or, at least, something you can talk to. (We did this interview many months ago, and I've taken a shamefully long time to go over my comments. But in that time, I think the public has become much more aware of machine learning. We may not understand it, but more and more we know it's not just robot girlfriends.)

Then when people who work in the field of AI and machine learning talk about that stuff, I don't think you mean fully conscious human thinking. I think you mean various forms of very powerful computation, which may or may not embrace an ability to improve performance through self-feedback or machine learning. I have a friend who says by the year 2100 there will be a trillion AIs in the world.

But that doesn't mean a trillion robot butlers or girlfriends. He means a trillion machine intelligences of various types, with most of them engineered for specific functions and most without consciousness. Sophisticated computational devices will surround us. It's been predicted that sidewalks will have chips in them to record pedestrian traffic to help city managers know how to deal with pavement durability and congestion issues, and who knows what else. But that doesn't mean that the sidewalk will be conscious. It would be a sad life for a sidewalk chip that has to be conscious 24/7 of itself being a sidewalk.

A conscious sidewalk would be overkill. Though it wouldn't be overkill to have sophisticated tallying technology in a sidewalk, especially in a future when such technology will be cheap.

When it comes to consciousness versus machine intelligence, I think what I believe about consciousness is closest to Minsky's Society of Mind with massive feedback among the brain's various subsystems. Today, machine learning and AI do not include the massive amount of shared information among expert subsystems that goes into having a fully fleshed consciousness. The option is not there yet. And even when it is, AI for most tasks will not require the massive and intricate information-sharing that constitutes consciousness. However, in the farther future, more than a century from now, information processing will be so powerful, ubiquitous, highly networked and flexible, that consciousness will not be considered as special as it is now. It could be something that is or is not present in parts of a system at a given time, depending on its immediate information-processing needs.

Volko: First, before answering Scott's new questions, I would like to comment on Rick's statement regarding consciousness.

I think that Rick is right in that artificial intelligence enables computers to make very complex computations, but that it does not make the machines conscious.

There has recently been an article about this matter in Singularity Hub (**https://singularityhub.com/2017/11/01/heres-how-to-get-to-conscious-machines-neuroscientists-say/**). Quote from this article:

"Consciousness is 'resolutely computational,' the authors say, in that it results from specific types of information processing, made possible by the hardware of the brain. [...] If consciousness results purely from the computations within our three-pound organ, then endowing machines with a similar quality is just a matter of translating biology to code. [...] To Dehaene and colleagues, consciousness is a multilayered construct with two 'dimensions:' C1, the information readily in mind, and C2, the ability to obtain and monitor information about oneself. Both are essential to consciousness, but one can exist without the other. [...] Would a machine endowed with C1 and C2 behave as if it were conscious? Very likely: a smartcar would 'know' that it's seeing something, express confidence in it, report it to others, and find the best solutions for problems. If its self-monitoring mechanisms break down, it may also suffer 'hallucinations' or even experience visual illusions similar to humans."

I personally tend to be highly skeptical about this statement. I doubt the basic assumption that "consciousness results purely from computations".

It is not easy to explain what consciousness is. I can only speak for myself: I have a strong feeling that "I am something (or someone)". I "hear" my own thoughts, I have the feeling that I can control them, as well as my actions. I doubt that this can be just achieved by computation. In this context, it may be interesting that Drs. Vernon Neppe and Edward Close recently proposed a "theory of everything" which they called the "Triadic Dimensional Distinction Vortical Paradigm" (see also: **http://vernonneppe.com/world_of_9_dimensions.aspx**). They stated that reality has three dimensions of space, three dimensions of time and three dimensions of consciousness – nine dimensions in total. I have, admittedly, not studied this theory in detail yet, having had other priorities in my life so far, but I consider the notion that there are three dimensions of consciousness, whatever that is supposed to be, highly interesting. A similar proposition has been made by physicist Dirk Meijer ("The mind may reside in another spatial dimension", see **https://m.theepochtimes.com/uplift/a-new-theory-of-consciousness-the-mind-exists-as-a-field-connected-to-the-brain_2325840.html**).

Also, the highly renowned theoretical physicist Edward Witten recently stated: "I tend to think that the workings of the conscious brain will be elucidated to a large extent. Biologists and perhaps physicists will understand much better how the brain works. But why something that we call consciousness goes with those workings, I think that will remain mysterious." (Source: **https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/cross-check/world-s-smartest-physicist-thinks-science-can-t-crack-consciousness/**)

Jacobsen: When I reflect on the nature of intelligence or the subject of the conversation for us, Claus, you focus on computational intelligence as this amounts to the field of specialization for you, which interests me. Rick, you wrote for broadcast television, specifically as a comedy

writer for late-night television, for more than a decade. Your examples represent popular culture examples because the cultural stew of Los Angeles, California, where you live, worked, and continue to independently write with me. Of course, we discussed these examples in previous publications.

I note a few main points – and this may run into more and more questions. One is the division between more general and more specified applications for human utility. One former example being the robot butler. Something tasked for a broader set of purposes to serve human beings. One latter example being sensors on the sidewalk tied into some central processor underneath a city. Some things with a specific task and nothing more. According to Rick's friend, there could be one trillion of these AIs, mostly, by 2100. Nonetheless, both assume functional utility to people.

However, taking off the late Marvin Minsky point with the society of mind, what about the butler? The robot butler could be upgraded with additional processing to have self-awareness beyond the rudimentary, even have a rich personality and internal dialogue life – able to entertain guests in the home as it serves them dinner. Rick, how might this play out? How has this played out in popular culture representations or in science fiction portrayals?

Rosner: Bear with me – I'll get to the robot butler. The same friend who says that we'll have a trillion AIs also says that technology is driven by sex, meaning that the internet is as developed as it is today because, among other things, it is an efficient pornography delivery system. To put it a nicer way, our humanity, via market forces, will continue to drive technology, even as we become what has been called transhuman. Whatever we turn into, we will still want friends and companions. We will be deeply embedded in social/computational networks. For the past 10,000 years and more, we have been the planet's apex thinkers. That is changing. The new apex thinkers will be alliances between humans and AIs. As we grow in information-processing power, we will have AI friends and work partners. Eventually, much of future humanity + AI will become subsumed in a planet-wide information-processing thought blob, out of which individual consciousnesses will bud off, go about some business or pleasure, and possibly be reabsorbed. It'll be weird but not a dystopia – positive values will continue to be embodied in the inconceivable swirl.

Most science fiction misses the mark. Someone said something like, "Science fiction is the present dressed up in future clothes." It's hard to predict and present the full, crazy complexity of the future. Star Trek basically presents the people of today (well, the mid-1960s) having standard adventures but on other planets with people in body paint and on a starship with doors that go "whoosh." Star Trek is not what 250 years from now will look like – it's incompletely imagined, with an emphasis on what is acceptable to TV executives and exciting to viewers without breaking the production budget. There's a new show on Netflix called *Altered Carbon*, set 300 years in the future. According to *Altered Carbon*, people of the 24th century will have smokin' hot but largely unaugmented bodies (20 hours a week at the gym + diuretics) and will spend much time naked or in nice underwear, humping, shooting and torturing each other. And the streets are grubby and rainy and neon-filled, because *Blade Runner*. (At least *Blade Runner 2049* doesn't pretend to be the future – its creators think of it as a meditation on the future – a bleakly poetic futuristic fantasia.) The denizens of the real 24th century will be highly

transformed, inside and out. They probably won't be as interested in sex as we are – there will be so much else for them.

Science fiction (movies and TV) does what's easy. That includes actors portraying robots and rainy, *Blade Runnery* streets. Few productions attempt complete futures. I think *Her* is good because it's set 10 to 15 years in the future, so there hasn't been enough time for much to change. I like some authors because their futures seem more weird or complete – Neal Stephenson, but he doesn't always write about the near future. *The Diamond Age* might be Stephenson's best version of a near future, but it's already 23 years old. In 2007, Clooney was supposed to make it into a series for the Sci-Fi Channel, but it didn't happen. Charles Stross is good, particularly *Accelerando*. Cory Doctorow is good. David Marusek – especially his short story, "The Wedding Album." Margaret Atwood, Ramez Naan, **Paolo Bacigalupi**, William Gibson. *Blood Music*, by Greg Bear, but it's 33 years old. Women are underrepresented on my list, so, some links. Of course, most of these authors haven't attempted all-encompassing versions of the near future.

http://ew.com/books/27-female-authors-sci-fi-fantasy/

https://www.bustle.com/p/the-9-best-sci-fi-fantasy-books-written-by-women-in-2017-according-to-amazon-3255319

Appendix I: Footnotes

[1] **Dipl.-Ing. Dr. Claus D. Volko, B.Sc.**: "I was born in 1983 in Vienna, Austria, Europe. My father wanted me to become a doctor while I was more interested in computers in my youth. After teaching myself to program when I was eight, I started editing an electronic magazine at age twelve and kept spending almost my entire sparetime on it – **Hugi Magazine**.

Upon graduation from high school, I studied medicine and computer science in parallel. In the end I became a software developer who occasionally participated in medical research projects as a leisure activity.

I am also the maintainer of the website **21st Century Headlines** where I try to give interested readers an up-to-date overview of current trends in science and technology, especially biomedical sciences, computers and physics, and I recently founded the **Web Portal on Computational Biology**. I think there is no doubt I am a versatile mind and a true polymath."

Rick G. Rosner: "According to **semi-reputable sources**, Rick Rosner has the world's second-highest IQ. He earned 12 years of college credit in less than a year and graduated with the equivalent of 8 majors. He has received 8 Writer's Guild Award and Emmy nominations, and was named 2013 North American Genius of the Year by The World Genius Registry.

He has written for Remote Control, Crank Yankers, The Man Show, The Emmy Awards, The Grammy Awards, and Jimmy Kimmel Live!. He has also worked as a stripper, a bouncer, a roller-skating waiter, and a nude model. In a TV commercial, Domino's Pizza named him the World's Smartest Man. He was also named Best Bouncer in the Denver Area by Westwood

Magazine.

He spent the disco era as an undercover high school student. 25 years as a bar bouncer, American fake ID-catcher, 25+ years as a stripper, and nude art model, and nearly 30 years as a writer for more than 2,500 hours of network television.

He lost on Jeopardy!, sued Who Wants to Be a Millionaire over a bad question, and lost the lawsuit. He spent 35+ years on a modified version of Big Bang Theory. Now, he mostly sits around tweeting in a towel. He lives in Los Angeles, California with his wife and daughter.

You can send an **email** or a direct message via **Twitter**, or find him on **LinkedIn**, or see him on **YouTube**."

[2] Individual Publication Date: June 1, 2018 at **http://www.in-sightjournal.com/kay-two**; Full Issue Publication Date: September 1, 2018 at **https://in-sightjournal.com/insight-issues/**.

Ask A Genius (or Two): Conversation with Dr. Claus D. Volko and Rick Rosner on "The Nature of Intelligence" (Part Two)

2018-06-08

Rick Rosner and I conduct a conversational series entitled Ask A Genius on a variety of subjects through In-Sight Publishing on the personal and professional website for Rick. Rick exists on the World Genius Directory listing as the world's second highest IQ at 192 based on several ultra-high IQ tests scores developed by independent psychometricians. Dipl.-Ing Dr. Claus D. Volko, B.Sc., earned a score at 172, on the Equally Normed Numerical Derivation Tests (ENNDT) by Marco Ripà and Gaetano Morelli. Both scores on a standard deviation of 15. A sigma of ~6.13 for Rick – a general intelligence rarity of 1 in 2,314,980,850 – and 4.80 for Claus – a general intelligence rarity of 1 in 1,258,887. Of course, if a higher general intelligence score, then the greater the variability in, and margin of error in, the general intelligence scores because of the greater rarity in the population. This amounts to a joint interview or conversation with Dr. Claus Volko, Rick Rosner, and myself on the "The Nature of Intelligence."

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: Claus, as computational intelligence research is a subdiscipline with computer science, the specialization in computational intelligence would, seems to me, imply the end goal of the robot butler example. An autonomous machine still with a utility defined by human needs and wants at any given moment.

I see this as the main point of contact: the notions in general culture and an end goal of the experts in computational intelligence. One question for you, Claus, out of "neural networks, machine learning, search algorithms, metaheuristics and evolutionary computation," what one is the dominant methodology?

In the long-term, which one or set of them will likely provide the foundation for a fully autonomous machine? As a sub-question, why did you pick the latter two – metaheuristics and evolutionary computation – to focus research questions for yourself?

Also, does anyone within the field, or even outside who has valid thoughts about the field, disagree with the fundamental assumption about intelligent behavior arising from the basis of computation? It seems hard to disagree with the fundamental premise, but it seems wise to ask about it. Also, Claus, and sorry for more questions for yourself at the moment, your final statement struck me:

A computer is excellent at computing logical conclusions from given premises, but it lacks the ability to come up with new ideas of its own. It can only draw conclusions from data that is given to it.

Of course, it is debatable whether human beings are really different in this aspect. Perhaps it is also the norm for human beings to be only able to come up with new ideas by combining knowledge and experiences that have previously been acquired in a creative way.

Within computational intelligence research, if the assertion amounts to human beings as

computational engines or information processors with the ability to create or generate premises, compute conclusions from the data, e.g., integrated sensory experience, connected with the premises, and act or behave in the world from those conclusions, then human beings would have one distinct trait from other computational intelligences – in some large set space of possible computational intelligences given current technology and methodologies, which would be the ability to "come up with new ideas." Of course, you note this is in question, as well.

What may be the computational basis for the creation or generation of suited to circumstance new ideas? Or if, as some think, this generation of new ideas is something machines cannot do on their own, what would differentiate this trait of human computation from other computation known now? Rick, many of these questions apply to you too.

Dipl.-Ing Dr. Claus D. Volko, B.Sc.: The dominant methodology is definitely neural networks in combination with machine learning. As a matter of fact, neural networks is not a new concept. It has been around for decades. But the big problem connected with it was the inability of this method to classify data sets that were not linearly separable, as pointed out by Marvin Minsky, Oliver Selfridge and Seymour Papert (Minsky, M. L., & O. G. Selfridge, 1961, "Learning in Random Nets", in C. Cherry (ed.), "Information Theory: Fourth Symposium (Royal Institution)", London: Butterworth, pp. 335 – 347; also see "Unrecognizable Sets of Numbers" (with Seymour Papert), JACM 31, 2, April, 1966, pp. 281-286).

To my knowledge, it is mostly thanks to the achievements of a couple of researchers including Geoffrey Hinton that this problem was overcome. Hinton published a paper about the backpropagation algorithm already in 1986, but it took until about 2011 that the new technique of "deep learning" became well-established, resulting in great successes, with artificial intelligence becoming stronger and stronger ever since. Interesting enough, Hinton himself has recently turned to be skeptical of backpropagation since he believes that this is not the way the human brain really works (see also: **https://medium.com/intuitionmachine/the-deeply-suspicious-nature-of-backpropagation-9bed5e2b085e**).

Even if it is right that the human brain works in a different way, I am convinced that the technology we have now would suffice to create fully autonomous machines, at least for serving certain defined purposes. However, when I have recently been at a demonstration of a language-processing robot here in Vienna, I was disappointed to see that the robot failed to recognize either of the words that had been spoken to it by the demonstrator. Still we should acclaim the progress artificial intelligence has made. Not only is Google Translate quite good already, there is also a website founded by German computer scientists called **www.deepl.com** which is an even better translator of text documents, especially from German to English and from English to German. When I write my blog postings in German, I use this website to obtain an English version fast. The results need some post-processing, but far less than similar translation programs would have required only ten years ago.

The reason why I focused on metaheuristics and evolutionary computation during my days as a graduate student was mostly that I found these approaches to be fascinating, especially as I also have a background in biomedical sciences and a good understanding of Charles Darwin's Theory of Evolution. Also, I am one of those people who are especially interested in algorithm design. I

tend to believe that I have a special talent for that. For instance, I recently developed and implemented a complete mesh voxelizer from scratch, starting with the underlying algorithm. That is, a computer program that takes a description of a three-dimensional geometrical object (e.g. a cone, a sphere, or something even more complex) and converts it into a (possibly huge) set of identical blocks.

I am not aware that anybody working in the field of computational intelligence disagrees with "the fundamental assumption about intelligent behavior arising from the basis of computation". If somebody disagrees with this fundamental assumption, then I guess he or she does not work in the field. Otherwise his/her behavior would be inconsistent.

Regarding your remark about human beings having "one distinct trait from other computational intelligences", namely "the ability to come up with new ideas", Ray Kurzweil wrote about this in his seminal book "The Singularity Is Near", from 2005. He stated that human intelligence is particularly good at pattern recognition and that this is something machines are still weak at (although I must say that machines have dramatically improved on this in the past decade, just thinking of unsupervised learning and clustering). By contrast, according to Kurzweil machines are particularly good at storing huge amounts of data and retrieving this data within a very short time. That's what he considers the strength of machine intelligence.

It is difficult to answer your question what is the computational basis for the creation of new ideas. I must say in this context that I am a big fan of the Swiss psychiatrist Carl Gustav Jung who invented the Jungian Function Theory which the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and Socionics are based on – I consider him the greatest genius of all times (see also: **http://geniuses.21stcenturyheadlines.com/**). Carl Gustav Jung defined eight psychological functions, one of them being introverted intuition. This function is defined as follows (from **http://personalitygrowth.com/introverted-intuition/**):

"Introverted Intuition (Ni) deals with understanding how the world works through internal intuitive analysis. Ni relies on gut feelings and intuition about a situation to help them understand. Introverted Intuition does not look at what is seen. Introverted Intuition forms an internal map and framework of how things work. The map is slowly adapted and adjusted over time to allow the user to get a better sense of the 'big picture of things' and what steps to take to get the desired outcome. Introverted Intuition will take pieces of abstract information and make sense of it. It is not interested so much in concrete facts, as it is with the essence of ideas and theories, and how they all fit together. They are very good at recognizing patterns. […] Introverted Intuition asks questions like 'what's really going on here?' or 'where have I felt this way before?' Introverted Intuition is one of the toughest functions to explain to someone else that doesn't have it. Because of this, Ni has been labeled as 'mystical' and 'psychic.' And sure, it can appear that way to others, but it is more complex and involved than just 'magically' coming to conclusions."

So, the human ability to come up with new ideas is related to what Carl Gustav Jung called "introverted intuition". How this exactly works, science has not found an explanation for yet. We are still in the time of hypothesis generation regarding this aspect of the human psyche.

However, as already mentioned, machines do have the ability to discover non-obvious properties of given data, as is employed in the "clustering" method. For instance, if you feed a machine with data regarding name, eye color, size and weight, a machine might find out correlations between e.g. eye color and weight that would possible be non-obvious for a human being.

Rick Rosner: Claus comments that he has been skeptical of backpropagation because he does not consider this the way the human brain really works. Evolution is opportunistic. We can assume brains in general take advantage of anything that works.

That is easily made and energetically efficient. Evolution will follow easy, effective pathways, which may mean brains have more than one computational/information-processing strategy.

Because evolution not being a conscious force does not give a crap. Things that work tend to persist over time. There is discussion here about the strengths and weaknesses of machine intelligence.

I feel like that is somewhat entangled with information processing machines still being really primitive. That when they come into their own. They will have roughly the same abilities as the human brain.

It is that we are at such a beginning point. Being able to store data is barely machine intelligence. Comparing computer data storage to the brain is like comparing a pulley to an engine. I've talked with you (ed. Scott) about this a lot.

I was arguing with my buddy, Lance, last night about free will. I don't see how free will can exist since thought has to be based on the information. I also don't see why it is needed.

I prefer informed will: knowing why I am thinking everything I am thinking and without being subject to bias that I am not aware of. But when it comes down to it, I think machine thinking – not the thinking of machines now, but machines in the future or human-machine hybrids, or super powerful genetically tweaked humans in the future – will all be thinking based on the information.

I think Claus talks about it, as it is stated. Thought is a form of information processing. It is not this magical other thing. When you get powerful enough and flexible enough information processing, it is the equivalent of thought.

Free will is like a concept left over from a time before people thought in terms of information.

Jacobsen: Claus, in correspondence, you wisely wanted to redirect the conversation from artificial intelligence and computational intelligence into the more substantive unsolved problem of human intelligence in the context of a full framework for explanation.

Given the redirection from one sub-topic of artificial intelligence to another in human intelligence, to Claus and Rick, what defines human intelligence to you, e.g. parameters, limits, capabilities, measurements, observational markers, empirically verifiable general factors, and so

on?

How does artificial intelligence differ from human intelligence? Can artificial intelligence replicate human intelligence in another substrate? If so, why does this seem possible in theory? If not, why does this not seem possible in theory?

Does intelligence amount to the currency of the universe? If so, how? If not, how not? How does human intelligence compare to other primate and mammalian intelligences? What appear to be the probabilities for extraterrestrial intelligences? How might human and other known intelligences shed light on the possible range and variety of extraterrestrial intelligences?

Volko: These are very interesting questions, thank you for asking them. First of all, I have recently watched a TED talk with Jeff Hawkins, a former IT entrepreneur who turned into an AI and brain researcher (**https://www.ted.com/talks/jeff_hawkins_on_how_brain_science_will_change_computing**). In my opinion, the definition of intelligence he provided in his talk is very reasonable. He stated that intelligence is all about making predictions. Indeed that is the case when solving IQ test tasks. You are presented with a list of numbers, for instance, and have to guess what numbers will follow if the principle the number pattern is based on is continuously applied. The same goes for tasks involving patterns, verbal analogies etc.

In fact there are many different definitions of intelligence, which is also why it is sometimes difficult if not even impossible to compare IQ scores obtained in two different tests. My late father, who had studied psychology at university (even though he did not complete the degree), used to prefer the definition that intelligence is the ability to get by novel situations not experienced before. Of course, this definition is compatible with Hawkins' definition, since getting by novel situations requires to make predictions.

In his recent book "Life 3.0 – Being human in the age of Artificial Intelligence", Max Tegmark, a professor of physics at the MIT, defines intelligence as the "ability to achieve complex goals". He states that intelligence is multi-faceted and cannot be measured by a single IQ value, and also that while machines are superior to humans at particular types of intelligence such as arithmetics and a couple of strategy games (Chess, Go), there are various forms of human intelligence where machines have not reached a comparable level of performance yet, such as artistic intelligence, scientific intelligence, and social intelligence.

I personally prefer Hawkins' definition of intelligence. In my opinion, many researchers and of course also laymen make the mistake to use the term intelligence for all sorts of abilities while in reality, intelligence is only a basic cognitive talent that may be required for accomplishing various sorts of intellectual tasks, but intelligence is not to be confused with these intellectual abilities themselves. Also, when Howard Gardner talks about multiple intelligences, I would say that much of what he calls types of intelligence is abilities which, of course, may be related to intelligence (the ability to make predictions), but general intelligence is only a basic requirement for developing these abilities, and the abilities themselves (such as social skills or musical talent) go way beyond intelligence as such.

For instance, as a child I was fond of computer games, and so it happened that I ended up trying to make computer games of my own. Computer games mainly consist of three components: graphics, music and code. I tried all the three things, but it turned out that I have only talent for code. Thus, I am able to create working computer programs, including games, but without assistance from other people, these games are destined to have rather weak graphics and music. I am intelligent, I usually score very high on IQ tests (as Rick can confirm, the two of us once took part in the beta-testing session of a novel, experimental numerical IQ test, and in this beta-testing session Rick obtained the second highest score of all 86 participants from the world, all having an IQ of 135 or higher according to traditional IQ tests, while I obtained the third highest score). Yet I lack talent at graphic design and music composition. Programming, however, comes natural to me. Probably that's not only due to my level of intelligence but because I also have a special talent for algorithm design, which goes beyond what traditional IQ tests measure. After all, I also got to know some people scoring very high on traditional IQ tests who failed to solve basic programming exercises when they were required to do so in mandatory university courses for beginners.

So, there are some researchers who perceive intelligence as a set of general and several sets of special abilities (also called g and s, respectively), but I do not adhere to this notion. In my opinion, intelligence should be called cognitive talent and intelligence testing should be all about the basic ability to make predictions from given data. In this context, of course that is also what machine learning does, especially unsupervised learning and clustering. For this reason, it is definitely justified to call machine learning a form of (artificial) intelligence. When the computer makes predictions based on given sets of data, the computer in fact does behave in an intelligent manner. Being able to make intelligent predictions, on the other hand, does not imply being a life-form equipped with consciousness and self-awareness, as I have already stated.

I do not think intelligence can be called the currency of the universe. A currency is something that can be used to exchange goods. But intelligence cannot be used for that purpose. That said, I do think that animals are intelligent as well. I even think that animals are self-aware. I have a German Shepherd dog myself (hi, Archie!), and as my mother keeps saying, my dog seems to be able to understand everything that is going on around him and every word we are saying to him. Animals have something to them which machines such as computers do not yet have, even though machines are already able to make intelligent predictions. I am a strong advocate for animal rights, and I have even been pondering over bacterial rights recently, bacteria being a life-form themselves as well (Charles S. Cockell has published a few papers dealing with that matter, if you are interested, which can be freely downloaded from the Internet – I am corresponding with him these days as I am working on a related new scientific theory on my own, which is supposed to shed light on new ways of treating infectious diseases and cancer).

It is possible that there are also intelligent life-forms in outer space, but what makes me a bit skeptical about that is simply that we have not encountered any of them so far, at least not to my knowledge. However, even if we have not met extraterrestrial life-forms yet, that of course does not suffice to conclude with certainty that there are none. The universe is huge, so who knows what may be existing in a remote place where no man has ever gone before. I personally consider the SETI project a good thing, and I would also be ready to donate computational power to it if it was not the case that I am already donating my computational power to research projects in

biomedical science (protein folding).

Rosner: This whole section is about machine intelligence versus human intelligence. I think the thing that differentiates them currently is that human intelligence; we perceive the world in great detail because our brains have 10^{10} neurons each with 10^3 dendrites.

So, in a lot of situations, the brain has reality constructing resources to spare. We do not notice the graininess of perception because our brains are big and powerful, though not infinitely big and powerful.

When you have so much perceptual and simulatory and, as Claus mentioned, predictive resources to throw at the world, you get good results without necessarily being conscious of mental strategies and algorithms.

You get a seamless feeling simulation of the world. I agree with Claus and the TED Talk guy, and Lisa Feldman Barrett who wrote How Emotions Are Made. She said the brain's primary objective is to predict the world to allow you to most efficiently address the world.

Our brains answer the questions: what is going to happen next? What do I need to do with what is going to happen next? But given our brains are so powerful, we tend not to see the mechanics of thought in everyday life.

Say you are a thief and part of your caper is that you need to duplicate a key, if you are trying to duplicate a key, and if you only had tools that came out of Minecraft, for instance, they'd be blocky and clunky, and you would have to come up with a special strategy to duplicate the key.

In caper movies, you need to a wad of wax. The graininess of the wax, the scale of the particles in the wax, are smaller than the scale of the notches in the key. The graininess of that is not noticed.

You have material that you press the key into that has 10^{10} atoms per millimetre. We do not notice the graininess. As machine intelligence becomes more powerful, we will less and less notice the graininess of the products of intelligence.

You can see that in video games. You started with one pixel with Pong. Then you went to these rough blocky things like the creatures in Dig Dug and Pac-Man. Now, we are deep into the or beyond the Uncanny Valley with most video games.

People look perfectly fleshy and have the right body dynamics. There is a lot of coding that has delivered that, but it is also in combination with raw computational power.

Jacobsen: I paid attention to Hawkins for some time several years ago, almost a decade now. He talked about some models – some related to intelligence and others not, created by others and himself, as revolutionary at the time. It seems interesting to me, too.

Claus and Rick, you both perform exceptionally well on tests of general intelligence. The

performance on the tests, on average, translate into general life performance or standard success metrics. If somebody performs well on an IQ test, they tend to succeed in school and life.

This seems truer than in the past with the Fourth Industrial Revolution and the knowledge economy: both ongoing. Each requires more education. Those who perform well on IQ tests tend to perform well in school, so better in the knowledge economy compared to others.

With the subject of human intelligence, I want to focus on the big pool of failed theories. What about the theories purported to explain human intelligence better than others but with failure in predictive validity?

Those theories with claims to validity, but do not predict success in different domains of human endeavour. In short, what theories claim to measure human intelligence while these lack the empirical evidence to support them? Claus, you touched on some. This may narrow the field of possibilities down a bit.

Also, if we can mathematicize the processes of the universe with descriptive laws, then we can mathematicize the processes of parts of the universe with descriptive laws. If the human brain and consciousness are part of the universe, then we can (in theory) mathematicize the brain and consciousness with descriptive laws.

This seems to lead to the main point about human intelligence within the bigger topic of the nature of intelligence: a set of descriptive laws for the processes of the human brain and consciousness, so human intelligence as well.

With such a set of descriptive laws, it would encapsulate human intelligence by implication. As we simulate the parts of the universe in digital computers, e.g. galactic mergers, rotation of planets around stars and satellites around planets, and so on, with the descriptive laws programmed into a digital computer, this may extend to human intelligence too.

Does this lead to an inevitable conclusion with human intelligence as replicable inside a substrate including digital computers with such a set of descriptive laws for human intelligence programmed as an algorithm into a digital computer?

Any speculations on the early form of this algorithm?

Volko: I am aware of some historical attempts at intelligence testing that have more or less failed. For instance, Francis Galton, the founder of the science of human genetics, invented some practical tasks such as guessing the weight of an item and believed that the majority of common people would fail these tasks. However, in reality the majority of the people he tested passed. So this test was not an adequate intelligence test assuming that the distribution of intelligence follows a Gaussian curve. I also know that in the middle of the 20th century, it sometimes happened that vocabulary tests were used as intelligence tests. In reality vocabulary tests give an advantage to people of a particular social class and lifestyle. I recall I once saw a test sheet from the 1950s and was unable to define some of the German words from this test (my native language is German) despite having a good general education. Some of this words were simply

old-fashioned and not in use nowadays, and some, as said, referred to everyday items of people of a particular social class with a particular lifestyle which are more or less unknown to other people. I also recall that when I was learning English at high school, it was easy for me to memorize philosophical and scientific terms because I was interested in these things, while I had a hard time to memorize words that were about kitchen equipment, for instance. It is the same situation with these vocabulary tests – they are definitely not suitable for testing intelligence without bias.

I am also aware that many people have tried to "mathematicize" the universe and come up with their own "theories of everything". Again, the problem with most of these theories is that they fail to come up with plausible explanations of the phenomenon of consciousness. Science in fact often assumes a "naturalist" worldview suggesting that everything that happens in the world can be explained by observable causes. I tend to believe that the focus on the physical world and the rejection of the possibility that something *might* exist out of the physical world, in a kind of immaterial world that cannot be observed with our five senses, is the reason why this approach to understanding the world will never lead to a complete explanation of everything. On the contrary, I do think that we need to speculate and enter the domain of metaphysics if we want to obtain a coherent theory of how the world might actually work. In this context, let me clearly state that I do not reject religion, I only reject dogmatism and the social mechanisms of enforcing a certain set of beliefs on other people and suppressing the non-believers. I myself am not religious, I have not even been brought up in a religious fashion, yet I do not consider myself an atheist but rather am of the opinion that there is something we cannot observe, something we probably cannot even measure indirectly (at least not without distortions and artifacts from other origins), and this *could* be called a "divine force" or God. I agree with atheists that it is silly to imagine God as an omnipotent old man with a long white beard, but I do believe in some sort of "divine force" that is stronger than anything else in the world, and that is why I consider myself a theist. The term "God" may be used as a metaphor for this "divine force".

However, it might in fact be possible indeed to describe human intelligence by some set of laws, and by programming computers to obey these laws, computers might be equipped with the ability to come up with predictions just as human beings do. I actually believe that what we call human intelligence is a function of the brain, or perhaps of the central nervous system. While I am not sure whether consciousness is a product of the brain or whether a conscious "persona" or "psyche" exists in an immaterial world we cannot perceive with our sensory organs and is only, in some way, attached to a brain, I believe that the brain is the "computer" that enables us to make intelligent predictions. So what intelligence tests measure is a property of this "computer".

At the moment I am spending some of my spare time reading about the "Cognitive-Theoretic Model of the Universe", which is a "theory of everything" invented by the autodidact Christopher Langan. I have acquired only a basic understanding of this rather complex theory so far, but I am definitely able to say that it is an interesting read and I am particularly curious about learning how Langan explains phenomena such as consciousness which science fails to explain so far, and which science, as long as it limits itself to phenomena observable in the physical world, will probably never be able to fully explain.

Regarding the question what the algorithm employed by the human brain to make intelligent

predictions might be, I would like to mention again that Geoffrey Hinton, the inventor of backpropagation, has recently stated that his own algorithm is definitely not the way the human brain works and that the artificial intelligence community should see to it that a replacement for it be found as soon as possible. To my mind, the only thing that can be definitely said about how human intelligence works is that the process of making predictions is basically a search algorithm in which syntactically possible, but contextually wrong solutions are excluded until only one solution remains, or until only a few solutions remain from which the brain chooses the one that appears to be the most reasonable one. Differences in human intelligence may be due to differences in the efficiency of the search algorithm employed by the proband. Efficiency is not only about raw speed. If you have the talent to come up with ways to exclude more possible solutions at the same time than other people, you will find the right solution sooner than another person with the same "raw processing speed" of the brain. Human intelligence definitely is not all about "raw speed".

The more powerful computers become, the more possibilities, of course, we will have to simulate complex things such as human intelligence and possibly even living organisms. In the past year, I have read several papers and books about artificial life. This is a branch of science that is still in its infancy. While artificial intelligence has made tremendous progress since 2010, even though it will still need another revolution until we will have artificial general intelligence that matches or even surpasses human intelligence, not much progress has been made in the simulation of living organisms since the field of artificial life was coined by Christopher Langton (not the same person as Christopher Langan) 30 years ago. I have been even a bit surprised to see that the artificial life community nowadays mainly focuses on evolutionary algorithms, one of the things I learned about in my computer science studies, instead of trying to simulate living organisms. But a reason for this is certainly that it still requires an enormous amount of computational power even to simulate a few hundred nanoseconds of the folding of a protein. That is why existing artificial life systems are usually highly abstract and have little to do with actual living organisms. An exception to this rule might be the Open Worm project, which tries to simulate the nematode Caenorhabditis elegans in a computer and about which new publications appear on the Internet now and then.

As you wrote that people who score high on intelligence tests usually perform well at school: I can confirm this from my own experience. I was a very good student and even graduated from high school with a straight-A record. What I, however, would like to state in this context is that high intelligence does not seem to give you a benefit when studying things you are not really interested in. I recall I had a hard time memorizing things I was oblivious to, such as some areas of biology and geology. However, it seems to me that people who perform well on intelligence tests usually also have a rather wide range of interests. That is why they are able to acquire knowledge about many things without really having to study hard. And yet, scoring high on an intelligence test does not always imply that you will eventually become a polymath one day. There are many other factors that are relevant as well, such as your personality and the (social) environment in which you grow up.

Rosner: The field of intelligence testing and the related field of statistics have had pasts that are questionable, but they are even worse than that. A lot of the people associated with statistics and intelligence testing were racist or trying to reach racist or try to support racist conclusions.

Pearson, apparently, was racist. I do not know the whole history of this. If you want to read a history of this, though it is obsolete, then you can read Stephen J. Gould's The Mismeasure of Man. That book is probably close to 40-years-old now.

There might be more recent books that talk about this better. Pearson is the guy who came up with the Pearson Coefficient, r, which is a huge part of statistics. Apparently, he was not a great guy.

I question the need for intelligence testing in a modern context. There are many measures of people. I can go along with IQ testing if you are using IQ testing for its original purpose – the purpose imagined by Binet when he came up with the idea, which is getting kids help in school, either because they are smarter than average or not as smart as average. Beyond that, when you start talking about national IQs and national average IQs, all that stuff is racist and doesn't help anybody except racist assholes.

There is not much need for improvements in human intelligence testing. The rate at which technology is galloping along and the rate at which we will merge with information processing technology means we do not need anything as old school as everybody knowing their IQ to three purported digits.

Technology is making a lot of us stupider via social media and texting all the time. But in the aggregate and in the long run, technology is making us smarter. Native intelligence will be less and less of a factor.

What will be more and more of a factor will be how well we merge with the technologies and the technological social structures of the future, we are already seeing that. I call the 2016 election the first AI election. The American election was a complete mess because of all sorts of technology that we do not have a handle on yet. The social media manipulation of opinion. The angry electorate because of jobs lost in part due to automation.

America continues to be – and anywhere where Russia hd gotten its cybernetic and social media cyber paws – in semi-turmoil. England is a mess with Brexit. Russia has its paws over that too.

Russia tried to mess with France's election. When Western nations lose power because we are governed by idiots and everyone is pissed at everybody else, Russia somehow gains power.

Appendix I: Footnotes

[1] **Dipl.-Ing. Dr. Claus D. Volko, B.Sc.**: "I was born in 1983 in Vienna, Austria, Europe. My father wanted me to become a doctor while I was more interested in computers in my youth. After teaching myself to program when I was eight, I started editing an electronic magazine at age twelve and kept spending almost my entire sparetime on it – **Hugi Magazine**.

Upon graduation from high school, I studied medicine and computer science in parallel. In the end I became a software developer who occasionally participated in medical research projects as a leisure activity.

I am also the maintainer of the website **21st Century Headlines** where I try to give interested readers an up-to-date overview of current trends in science and technology, especially biomedical sciences, computers and physics, and I recently founded the **Web Portal on Computational Biology**. I think there is no doubt I am a versatile mind and a true polymath."

Rick G. Rosner: "According to **semi-reputable sources**, Rick Rosner has the world's second-highest IQ. He earned 12 years of college credit in less than a year and graduated with the equivalent of 8 majors. He has received 8 Writer's Guild Award and Emmy nominations, and was named 2013 North American Genius of the Year by The World Genius Registry.

He has written for Remote Control, Crank Yankers, The Man Show, The Emmy Awards, The Grammy Awards, and Jimmy Kimmel Live!. He has also worked as a stripper, a bouncer, a roller-skating waiter, and a nude model. In a TV commercial, Domino's Pizza named him the World's Smartest Man. He was also named Best Bouncer in the Denver Area by Westwood Magazine.

He spent the disco era as an undercover high school student. 25 years as a bar bouncer, American fake ID-catcher, 25+ years as a stripper, and nude art model, and nearly 30 years as a writer for more than 2,500 hours of network television.

He lost on Jeopardy!, sued Who Wants to Be a Millionaire over a bad question, and lost the lawsuit. He spent 35+ years on a modified version of Big Bang Theory. Now, he mostly sits around tweeting in a towel. He lives in Los Angeles, California with his wife and daughter.

You can send an **email** or a direct message via **Twitter**, or find him on **LinkedIn**, or see him on **YouTube**."

[2] Individual Publication Date: June 8, 2018 at **http://www.in-sightjournal.com/rosner-and-volko-two**; Full Issue Publication Date: September 1, 2018 at **https://in-sightjournal.com/insight-issues/**.

Ask A Genius (or Two): Conversation with Dr. Claus D. Volko and Rick Rosner on "The Nature of Intelligence" (Part Three)

2018-06-15

*Rick Rosner and I conduct a conversational series entitled Ask A Genius on a variety of subjects through In-Sight Publishing on the personal and professional website for Rick. Rick exists on the World Genius Directory listing as the world's second highest IQ at 192 based on several ultra-high IQ tests scores developed by independent psychometricians. **Dipl.-Ing Dr. Claus D. Volko, B.Sc.**, earned a score at 172, on the Equally Normed Numerical Derivation Tests (ENNDT) by Marco Ripà and Gaetano Morelli. Both scores on a standard deviation of 15. A sigma of ~6.13 for Rick – a general intelligence rarity of 1 in 2,314,980,850 – and 4.80 for Claus – a general intelligence rarity of 1 in 1,258,887. Of course, if a higher general intelligence score, then the greater the variability in, and margin of error in, the general intelligence scores because of the greater rarity in the population. This amounts to a joint interview or conversation with Dr. Claus Volko, Rick Rosner, and myself on the "The Nature of Intelligence."*

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: Thank you for the thoughtful and thorough responses, both of you. It is a treat.

Perhaps, based on reflection from the responses from Claus, the nature of consciousness may not need explanation to know the functional basis of human intelligence, where the hows for the information processing of the human brain would account for human intelligence on a functional level without the whys.

The whys, the larger explanatory structure, would require an expanded conversation on human consciousness, consciousness generally, and, maybe, the metaphysics mentioned in the responses of Claus.

The conversation leads to some preliminary pivots and recaps in the conversation for me. (Please bear with me, this will be repetitive.):

- A large portion of artificial intelligence will remain narrow, in the near and middle future, in its function and less rich in the sub-system information exchange seen in the operations of the human nervous system.

- Complex computations seen in artificial intelligences permits very complex information processes while these do not make them conscious. Consciousness may not amount to computations alone.

- A planet-wide information-processing thought blob may mark the far future for us.

- Hollywood gives misleading images of future people. Humans plus AI in the future may appear unlike us in surprising and unpredictable ways.

- The dominant methodologies in Claus's expert view remain neural networks tied to

machine learning in the mainstream of the field's studying these and similar phenomena.

- Machines seem stronger than humans at massive data storage and rapid information retrieval. Intelligence does not equate to speed and relates more to efficiency.

- The computational basis for the creation of novel ideas remains a difficult question to answer.

- Different theories of intelligence abound with various degrees of success. Some theories of intelligence failed outright. IQ predicts educational success based on the personal experience of Claus.

- The nature of intelligence seems bigger than and includes both artificial intelligence and human intelligence.

- The knowledge of the workings of the brain could suffice in a functional explanation of human intelligence with zero coverage of human consciousness in the theory. The field of artificial life remains too inchoate to suffice on the issue of human intelligence.

This leads to the next stage of the discussion. The first on artificial intelligence. The second on human intelligence. The third prompted by Claus on a larger-than-physical or natural explanation, a metaphysical perspective.

External to and including physical and natural explanations, what about metaphysics?

If knowledge of the functional operations of the brain through some algorithm comes from the sciences relevant to its discovery and implementation in a digital substrate, then the algorithm may explain the processes of human intelligence while consciousness may remain an unsolved problem without explanations outside of the material or the physical, and the natural, as Claus noted with metaphysics.

In this, metaphysics may play a role in a theory of consciousness and of the brain (and human intelligence), especially of the brain and human intelligence if the aforementioned algorithm is incorporated into it.

Where the larger framework for the understanding of the hows of the brain within the physical sciences can derive more satisfactory explanations with an infusion of metaphysics, this leads to another line of questioning while remaining tight to the subject of the nature of (artificial and human) intelligence. I have three big interrelated questions on reflection.

What would comprise a metaphysical explanation for the human brain and intelligence? How would this metaphysical explanation of the human brain and intelligence incorporate the naturalist explanation of the human brain and intelligence?

Why would this metaphysical explanation be more satisfactory than a physicalist/materialist and naturalist explanation of the human brain and intelligence? (I apologize for my repetitions.)

Volko: Your summary of the debate so far is very good, well done. Regarding your questions: Well, as I said it is primarily the phenomenon of consciousness that seems to require a metaphysical explanation since it appears to be something that exists out of the physical world. By contrast, I do not think that human intelligence needs a metaphysical explanation. When it comes to making intelligent predictions, the human brain seems to be a computer based on biology. It is not that we do not understand how the human brain works at all. On the contrary, the fact that machine learning and neural networks work suggests that we might at least have a tiny, tiny clue about the actual workings of the human brain. Neural networks, after all, are based on several scientific hypotheses about how the human brain might work, such as Hebbian learning. Probably Geoffrey Hinton is right when he says that backpropagation might not be the algorithm employed by the human brain, although it has been proven to work quite well, but that does not mean that the researchers who believed that neural networks would model the human brain are totally wrong. I believe that the question how the human brain is able to make intelligent predictions will sooner or later be solved, at least sooner than the question what makes us conscious beings and what "we" actually are.

To my mind it is just the phenomenon of consciousness for which there will probably not be found any explanation by scientists who restrict themselves to naturalism or physicalism.

I myself have recently invented a metaphysical model of the human organism that is based on the view that there are three components which make a human being: the psyche, the body and the brain (where, when I am talking about the "brain", I also imply the other components of the central nervous system and the endocrine system). While the body belongs to the physical world and the psyche to some sort of immaterial world that is hard to define, the brain, as a mediator between these two worlds, somehow belongs to both of these worlds at the same time. There might even be a component of the brain which anatomists cannot perceive since it is located in the "immaterial" world. Most of the rest of the paper which I have written about this model is based on the assumption that there is a symmetry between the psyche and the body, i. e. everything that applies to the body has an analogon with the psyche and vice versa. For instance, I deduce from these assumptions that not only does the body have metabolism, as we all know (eating, drinking, breathing,…), but that there is also a sort of metabolism related to the psyche, which is equally essential for life. This "metabolism" might be related to dreams, ideas, thoughts, and fantasy. We seem to be hunting for these "nutrients" during sleep and while "daydreaming" – that might even be the reason (or at least one of the reasons) why we sleep at all. After all, it is well-known that sleep deprivation over a certain period of time is fatal. Moreover, with this metaphysical model I also managed to explain Carl Gustav Jung's personality theory as well as the "model of stress induced steroidal hormone cascade changes" and a couple of related scientific hypotheses my late friend and mentor Dr. Uwe Rohr and I came up with and published about a couple of years ago. Metaphysics is definitely not nonsense! I am aware that people who develop and publish about metaphysical ideas of their own are often viewed upon with suspicion, which is why many scientists avoid doing so, fearing that otherwise their career might be harmed, but to my mind, the problematic thing is not the people who develop these ideas but those who are intolerant against whoever and whatever deviates from the ideological beliefs of the mainstream. History has repeatedly shown to us that this attitude is not a good thing (thinking of Copernicus, Galilei, Bruno,…).

Rosner: It's close to a fundamental principle of existence that simple, self-consistent systems are durable and common. For instance, numbers are highly self-consistent, simple in many ways, and fantastically common in their pertinence to the world. Just about any time you have a bunch of real-world objects, there is a specific number of objects in that bunch.

One-ness pervades the world – the idea that each thing, considered alone, is one thing – as does two-ness for groups of two things, and so on. As Godel proved, mathematics can never be proved to be entirely self-consistent, but math – particularly arithmetic – is self-consistent enough that it is one of the primary ways we define the world. Numbers, being simple, easy, and self-consistent, arise everywhere.

Similarly, there are simple systems for machine learning – for AI. I have very little knowledge of these systems. I can say they incorporate layered feedback, but I'm kind of BSing when I say it. However, I'm not BSing when I say that human-created, algorithm-based machine learning at micro levels is quite similar to human cognition at micro levels, because simple, effective systems arise again and again in a variety of contexts.

Evolution is opportunistic – it stumbles onto simple, durable systems, including those for information processing and learning. (Obviously, some heuristics will be better for specific types of information processing than others.) In a nutshell, machine learning and brain learning are convergent (with some task specificity).

For a very nice constructivist analysis of emotions, see Lisa Feldman Barrett's How Emotions Are Made. It implies that world-modeling – predicting – is a massive do-it-yourself project in conjunction with blankish but imprintable brain strata and personal plus cultural experience.

Unlike Claus, my performance in school was all over the place. I had good years and bad years. I had close to a straight A record in high school. Until, I completely melted down over my inability to get a girlfriend, then my senior year was a lot of Fs.

It took me until age 31 to graduate from college because of extreme fecklessness. People should know feckless now because of the Samantha Bee versus Trump thing.

I suspect that consciousness is an inevitable consequence or aspect of sufficiently broadband information sharing within a self-consistent system. A system like our brains and like the universe itself, where every part of the system is at least roughly aware of every other part of the system.

That part of the awareness of the system Being aware of itself. That has, in the past, stood in for consciousness. That is erroneous. You can have a conscious system that is not conscious of itself. If you take the example of a security system, that watches over a set of warehouses with such high level information sharing and information processing, and receiving, and understanding of information.

That it is super conscious on what is going on in all of those warehouses. That system would not necessarily have to be aware of itself, as the thing that is observing. You would expect it to be

somewhat aware of itself, of its cameras, of it self-monitoring to make sure that it is functioning properly.

But it wouldn't have to be overly aware of what it is in comparison to its being highly conscious of the things going on in the warehouse. Consciousness is basically being so aware of a linked set of a ball of information. That is generally linked.

All the information in our consciousness is linked by being related to us. We are the consumer. All the information we consume and process is related because it is information that has come to us. Some of that information less highly entwined with other information.

For instance, a sitcom or watching of the first episode that you happened upon at random. The information in that sitcom. It doesn't particularly pertain to us. It is linked to the rest of our consciousness because it is what we are watching at some point in the day.

Because we are experienced TV viewers. The whole thing, everything is roughly linked. Some things are more central to us than others. But it is it his ball of relevant or semi-relevant information. We are able to process that information from so many different angles.

We have so many different sub-modules that we are able to analyze and appreciate that information related to other stuff so thoroughly that it gives a feeling of well-established reality to what we are experiencing.

Somewhere in that sloppy description of consciousness is a more strict idea of consciousness. It is a broadband real-time sharing of information among systems that analyze that information to the extent that you experience a fully-fleshed reality.

Even that is a pretty loose definition of consciousness, that is still what consciousness is. It is not just the definition that is a little loose. Consciousness itself is not a strictly structured phenomenon. It is a phenomenon that arises where you have information thrown into a central hopper, when there are unconscious processes like walking and breathing, usually.

They do not become conscious. The more complicated or dramatic stuff gets thrown into a central hopper where it becomes part of your awareness. It is important enough that is becomes part of your consciousness and becomes available for analysis by all your sub-systems.

It is under the general principle that you need to be aware of your world and will suffer for jot being aware of it, even to the point of making fatal mistakes. If you drive, and if you look around at other drivers a lot to get pissed of a lot, like I do, you see quite a lot of drivers who are out of it to some extent.

It used to be that most of the drivers who I saw who seemed to be out of it had health issues. Either they were drugged up or they were so physically unhealthy that it was affecting their mental processing.

This was a wild and cynical guess. It was watching other drivers as they attempt to drive and

seeing that they seem to be glazed over and not as present in the world as you would want other drivers to be.

Nowadays, they are out of it because of their digital devices. I am sure there are a lot of drugged up drivers, but they have demographically overwhelmed by people who think they can driver while texting – but are really severely hampered because their attention has been sucked into their devices. They do what I call half driving.

They approximate the behaviours of driving, but they drive 15 miles under the speed limit. The wander in and out of lanes. They stop three cars behind the stop bar at a light. They have a very crappy internal representation of their driving environment because their attention is elsewhere.

It illustrates the point because they are driving dangerously. It is not as dangerously as the people who drove when the predominant modes in the 70s were hauling; now, everyone, as I said, drives slowly and all our cars have 8 or 10 airbags in them, so the fatality has been dropping.

Anyway, information enters your central awareness because it demands attention in order to live safely and advantageously within the world. That process – I would assume under evolution – of the development of powerful consciousness has the potential to evolve again and again.

It offers the organism that possesses it such an advantage and because there is such sharing and processing of information. We see this in eyes. Eyes have evolved a bunch of separate times over the course of evolutionary history.

I do not know much about the evolution of consciousness or intelligence. However, it has evolved at least twice. Where we have super intelligent primates, which include us, there are super intelligent octopuses too.

They didn't become smart at the same time or along the same lineage because octopuses evolved from molluscs, which are super dumb. Dumb to the point of I am not sure even if some of them have brains. I know starfish do not have brains.

I think molluscs may give up brains once they are situated some place. There be some strict principles as to what consciousness is, but I guess that they are not strict hardware rules for how to get to consciousness. You can get it a bunch of different ways.

I am shamefully ignorant about machine learning. Except it involves these various strata of feedback of loops, where when you get a good signal. Then you are achieving what you want to achieve. The linkages that help the system get closer to its objective.

Those linkages are strengthened. But I would guess that organically, and probably mechanically, there are quite a few ways to establish those feedback systems.

Jacobsen: You raise some points of intrigue. However, before discussion on the metaphysics point, I want to talk on a footnote point. You wrote, "…the problematic thing is not the people who develop these ideas but those who are intolerant against whoever and whatever deviates

from the ideological beliefs of the mainstream."

A straightforward statement with extensive meaning. From the perspective of an academic, e.g. tenured professor at an institution, what might prevent deviation from the mainstream?

From the view of a someone without academic protections, e.g. a student or a lay person, what might prevent deviation from the mainstream? Of course, the definition of "mainstream" does not confine itself to the academic alone, whether staff, administration, or students. Also, how may everyone break from the mainstream in order to facilitate creativity and novelty in thought when standard models of a system seem insufficient to solve the problems?

To metaphysics, what factors may comprise the sustenance of the psyche in the model proposed by Dr. Rohr and yourself? If Hebbian associative linkages, neural networks, backpropagation, and machine learning models help with comprehension of the workings of the brain, how might these physicalist and naturalist frameworks integrate with the aforementioned metaphysical model of the human organism with the psyche, body, and brain?

Volko: My general impression is that if you do not comply by the mainstream views, you risk having a hard time in life. The mainstream views are mostly defined by the government, the educational institutions, the media, and partly also by religious institutions. I have made the experience that many people are very intolerant against anything or anybody that does not fit in their views of the world. I even met some people who hated me for stating my opinion in an Internet forum because they did not share my views – note that I did not contradict a statement of theirs, but simply stated what I was thinking without knowing, and without being interested in what the views of these (self-important) people were. Once a German university professor told me that in Germany, for instance, you will not get employed by a state-owned company (e.g. a university) if you expressed certain views on the Internet which are incompatible with the official government doctrine (e.g., pro-eugenics views). In my opinion, this policy is by far the greater scandal than somebody stating pro-eugenics views in an Internet forum… I have to add that I have been somewhat spoilt since my mother was a teacher employed by the municipal government of the City of Vienna, and my father had a position at a privately-owned company that was also pretty secure. That's why I realized only late that unless you are overwhelmingly rich, you are always dependent on the good will of other people. Even if you are a skilled worker and do your job well, your employer can sack you for some arbitrary reason, or, if you are a young adult who has not been employed yet, it might – if you have bad luck – even happen that you will never get employed and thus be dependent on your parents or on social welfare for the rest of your life… This does not only concern people from socially disadvantaged backgrounds, but people from all walks of life.

For this reason, some people might prefer to keep their mouths shut and never express their true views to the public. But that attitude would make me unhappy. I love the debate. It is something that is almost as vital for me as food. So that is why I often behave in a somewhat unreasonable manner and state openly what I think. As already mentioned, this has had the effect that there are quite a lot of people who don't like me (well, the term "enemy" might be an overstatement, fortunately). In fact it has already happened once that somebody I was discussing with on the Internet contacted my employer and tried to damage my reputation. Fortunately my employer

was so convinced of my abilities, and in need of them, that he was not impressed. As a matter of fact, I made a lot of effort during my student years to get to know as many intelligent people as possible so that I could broaden my (and their) horizon and also get to know views neither shared by my parents or contained in books or magazines I was reading. I made a lot of bad experiences, most of all with local people from Mensa Austria – they are among the worst people I've met, to be honest. Perhaps that is because requiring an IQ in the 98th percentile or higher is not a sufficient selection criterion. In fact, I have made far better experiences with people in societies with stricter selection criteria than Mensa, such as Infinity International Society, Global Genius Generation Group, and VeNuS Society. In any case, I have gotten to know a lot of people, and in the course of the time I have stopped communicating with those who seemed to have a bad character, so now I am mostly in touch with rational people of good nature, and I am quite happy with my situation. It hardly ever happens any more that I am misunderstood, that statements of mine are deliberately misinterpreted or placed out of context, that people react emotionally when I express a view they disagree with, etc.

To answer your questions, I do think that people working in academia are especially under pressure that everything they state in public more or less matches the views of the government and what is considered the "scientific mainstream". If you are able to read German, you might in this context be interested in an article which the Austrian TV company ORF published a couple of years ago, the title being "Kein Jude, kein Linker, kein Positivist" ("No Jew, no left-winger, no positivist"). The article can be found at the URL **http://sciencev2.orf.at/stories/1726786/index.html**. It deals with the policy of Heinrich Drimmel, who served as a minister in the Austrian government for a long time, one of his areas of responsibility being the Austrian state-owned universities (note that until the beginning of the 21st century, there were no privately-owned universities in Austria). Mr Drimmel was a member of the Christian Democratic Party and he actively chose people with political views similar to his own for open positions at university. It was almost impossible to become a university professor in Austria if you were a Jew, a left-winger or an adherent of the positivist philosophy as long as he was in office (from 1946 until 1964). I was studying at university from 2001 to 2013 (I was studying for such a long period because I completed two independent graduate degrees, in medicine and computer science) and even during my days as a student, I had the impression that especially the medical university was dominated by members of the Christian Democratic Party and also that it was easier for young alumni to get a job at the university upon graduation if they were a member of this party or one of the organizations associated with it. This was especially hard for me as I had learned at high school to think more like a Social Democrat, as most teachers had been members of the Social Democratic Party or the Greens. In the end I rejected both Social Democracy and Christian Democracy and adopted views that could be classified as classical liberal or libertarian. As a matter of fact, there are quite a lot of people here in Austria who have made similar experiences as I have, and we founded a new political party devoted to classical liberalism a couple of years ago. The first time we tried to get into Austrian Parliament, in 2013, we succeeded at once. At least I am happy that there now is a party in parliament that more or less shares my views.

In fact, I believe that people not working in academia (including university graduates working in the private sector) have more freedom to disagree with the mainstream and develop their own ideologies since they cannot be made accountable for their publicly expressed opinions to the

same degree as e.g. a university professor can be. A university professor delivering lectures in front of hundreds or thousands of students has to carefully watch what he or she is saying. After all, he or she is supposed to represent his or her subject of expertise and is expected only to state things that match the current "state of science". By contrast, a person working in the private sector usually does not have such a large audience as a professor anyway. Moreover, for the evaluation of the job performance of a person working in the private sector, e.g. a software developer, other criteria are far more relevant than whether his or her opinion matches what is currently considered the scientific mainstream or the "politically correct" world view. Of course, if somebody works in the public sector, at a state-owned company, this situation might again be different.

Regarding metaphysics, I have recently written a paper called "The Synthesis of Metaphysics and Jungian Personality Theory", which I published at my personal homepage (**www.cdvolko.net**). In this paper, I mentioned the scientific theory developed by Dr. Uwe Rohr and myself since it can be embedded in this metaphysical framework. Basically, we proposed that there are two types of steroidal hormones. One type adapts the organism to stress reactions. These hormones increase physical performance (temporarily) but more or less "shut down" the psyche, which may eventually lead to severe mental disorders. The other type adapts the organism to physical threats such as infectious agents or cancer. These hormones boost the immune system while temporarily decreasing the physical performance. This theory fits very well into my metaphysical framework, considering that there is a symmetry in the relations between the psyche and the brain on the one hand, and the brain and the body on the other. In other words, everything that applies to the body seems to have a correlate with the psyche and vice versa.

I see no problem in integrating scientific theories about the human brain, such as Hebbian learning, with my metaphysical model.

In general, I would like to encourage as many people as possible, especially intelligent people, to follow my example and develop their own worldviews instead of adapting themselves too much into the mainstream. This will not only enrich their own intellectual lives but also the intellectual lives of others.

Rosner: In general, you're talking about the future of intelligence with your ten things. I read an article, recently. It was attacking the apocalyptic fears of Elon Musk and others about war with the robots – us vs. AI.

When you and I, Scott, started talking about this stuff 3 or 4 years ago, no one was worrying about AI on the horizon. I have been fairly heartened that some of these other billionaires have been talking about it.

This article attacks these fears by saying that all of these billionaires are afraid of AIs. They are behaving the way these billionaires do themselves, being viciously competitive in business. These guys have projected their business behavior onto future AI and are afraid of it.

They think that future AI may act like aggressive, predatory A-holes, basically. That makes for

an interesting article. I think that those fears should be thrown up into the constellation of all possible hopes and fears for future AI.

Where I was trying to think of the right phrase, which isn't, it is close: "The future with AI will be a perilous flowering." All sorts of new forms of existence will come into being, which will be awesome and also hard to negotiate.

It will be hard. We will not be living in the world of 12th-century shoemakers. A shoemaker knows how his life is going to play out if he is lucky and does not get the Plague. He is going to make shoes until he dies at age 56.

As long as he makes shoes, and does not get embroiled in a war or bitten by a rat, or a flea on a rat, he has a pretty straightforward rest of his life. The future with the flowering of all this new stuff means that individual little conscious blips in the maelstrom of newness.

It is like a Cambrian explosion. The Cambrian explosion was after all the big dinosaurs got wiped out. I may have this wrong. The Yucatan meteorite wipes out the dinosaurs. It wipes out 90% of species.

I know I have this wrong. At various points in evolutionary history, there have been mass extinction events. At those points, life has evolved new strategies. It leads to these crazy flowerings that lead to all these new forms competing to find their niches.

What might happen in Cambrian explosion, which might take 80 million years, it will happen with an AI explosion that will occur in a century or two. All these crazy changes will take place on the scale of months and decades and within individual human lifetimes or lifespans.

It is like the shoemaker having to go from making shoes to podcasting to having his brain downloaded into a module to get sent to Alpha Centauri. Our individual lives, we will have to scramble.

We will have to scramble to find temporarily – we hope – 'footing.' Everyone will search out their islands of stability within this burgeoning world. It will be like now, but 50 times worse. Now, we do not wake up every morning.

It is like, "Crap! How am I going to get through the day with 80 apps on my phone?" There are still large degrees of stability within our lives. Smartphones have changed a lot of the flavor of daily life.

But we still do the same crap that we have all done. We shop for stuff. We eat. We sleep. We try to hook up. It is going to become more hectic and weird. Let me mention, we have been touching on the structure of thinking, intelligence, and consciousness.

I would like to bring up Bayesian logic and statistics. Bayesian statistics is something widely misunderstood, including by me. It doesn't mean I can't talk about it. It means how you order the world based on past experience and incorporation new information into that.

It is a fairly straightforward formula. Where I always think about it in terms of fake ID because I spent 25 years in bars trying to catch people with fake IDs at the door, my rough or general assumption about the frequency of fake IDs, which was based on long experience during the 80s and 90s mostly in popular, was that about 1 person in 90 would come to me with a fake ID.

What I would do, I would try to look at the person and the ID and then ask questions to put this person who is initially part of a group with a 1 in 90 fakenesses into a subgroup where almost nobody has a fake ID or almost everybody has a fake ID.

Then I would decide whether to let them in or not. For instance, I ask the person what their star sign or Zodiac sign is. If they do not know it, they enter a subgroup based on professional experience. Well over 90% of those people have a fake ID. Then I ask them what year they graduated high school.

If they get that wrong and do not know their sign, they enter a group where well over 99% of people have a fake ID. If the person did not look pretty young, I wouldn't be asking them that question in the first place.

If they get those questions right and look over 27 or 28, then they go into a subgroup, where less than 1% or 1/10th of 1 % of people have a fake ID. Occasionally, I would still catch a person obviously still old enough using a fake ID.

Someone who lost their real ID and went back to using their fake ID. Or some crazy stuff, I asked a guy to write his name including his middle name. He misspells his middle name. I am like, "This is bullshit. It is your name." He goes, "No, no, no, no, I was in a softball accident. I got hit in the head. I have got brain damage."

I think, "Alright, yeah." He goes away. 20 minutes later, he comes back with an inch-thick stack of medical documents showing he was in an accident. So, I brought him a pitcher of beer to add to his brain damage.

Another guy had a beautiful signature. Then when he signed it, it was an illegible scrawl. He said, "Dude!" He showed me his hand. He accidentally skied over the hand and severed the nerves. He has got these deep grooves over the top of his hand.

That subgroup of people. Occasionally, you find people who defy the group classifications. But it is a powerful tool because most people did not forget their ID or ski over their hand. There are two things with Bayesian logic.

One thing is the initial estimate based on life experience or instinct, or whatever, of what you think the landscape is. When I first started working in bars, since my job was to check for IDs, my assumption was a certain fraction of people were going to be bullshitting me based on the nature of the job.

That is a prior weighting that goes into Bayesian stuff. The rest of Bayesian stuff is using a formula based on either instinct or accumulated experience to put people into subgroups with

each subgroup having a different probability for the event that you're looking for.

It is a powerful way of classifying the world. It is done naturally in your brain. Your brain probably classifies the world in a bunch of other ways. Any way that is helping your brain will exploit given the economics of the brain.

The Bayesian considerations come into play, where your brain and millions of years of evolution of the brain. All this has developed this system of a somewhat rewireable information processing structure, which has these built-in Bayesian factors.

Your brain wants to rewire itself in view of new experiences. It is not a good strategy. It is not good for your brain to rewire itself completely every time something new happens. There is the weight of past experience and the thinness of new experience and the cost of rewiring.

It is all a Bayesian system of your brain, and evolution, trying to make the best of the equipment and the mental economics that it has to contend with. That is, the cost of running your information processing system.

When I talk about mental economics, I am talking about the limiting factors on our brain. Obviously, the rise of humans has proven that it is a good strategy to have a big brain. It might be even better to have bigger brains, but we are limited by how big of a brain you can squeeze out of the mom without killing the mom.

Our heads are as big as they can be to get out of the mom. The mom's pelvis has to snap into two to make way for the head. The kid's head, the plates of the skull have to overlap each other temporarily as they come through the birth canal squishing for a few minutes.

The brain or your noggin has to grow fantastically once it is out of the mom. Being born, it puts an upper limit on brain size. Energy considerations, your brain uses a huge amount of the calories that you consume.

If everybody is going to die because in the wild they cannot find enough calories to feed their brain, that is a crappy system. There are limiting factors. There are the informational factors. You are dumb if you keep rejiggering your brain as you pay attention to each leaf that falls into your path.

Also, and some other points, information processing including AI will get fantastically cheap, which means it will be annoyingly all over the place – largely market driven. If you can sell ten percent more refrigerators if they can talk to you, then they will talk to you?

You car keys will talk to you. A lot of things we would find ridiculous talking to us will talk to us. They will do things that we do not even think about or find ridiculous that are useful. Like objects will find themselves or talk to us, they will do things.

Lost objects, they will find themselves. You can buy systems like that now. You can put RFI stickers on stuff that you lose all the time. You can have an app that helps you find all your

frequently lost stuff. You can have an app in the future for that.

We will be annoyed. As AI and information processing gets cheap, consciousness will get cheap, which will lead to a loss of respect for human consciousness. Humans will still have pride of place. We will still be the king shits of the world.

We will be slightly less king shits. We will be hybrid forms of humans plus powerful forms of augmentation technology. They will be the new king shits and potentially the mean girls of the world.

It will be a scramble to find islands of security and safety. It will be hard to keep your money if you do not move because of the fast economy. It will not be an economy to fully employ everybody.

It may be needed to provide people with some free money, which drives conservatives crazy that anybody would get anything for free. But maybe, there is a utopia of the future, where everybody can plug into shared information processing processes and earn some money that way.

Just as likely as that, the world will run in all sorts of various automatic ways, which do not need the ability to do macrame. You might have to take some guaranteed minimum wage. Conservatives, like my buddy Lance, are worried about encroachment and the end of America with immigrants taking all our stuff.

I think there is more zero-sum thinking in conservatism than liberalism. I think history is on the side of things getting cheaper as automation and productivity continue to increase. Compared to 100 years ago, clothing and food cost 1/4 of what they did versus the average wage to the point where 2/3rds of Americans are overweight because food is cheap and delicious.

I predict a future of abundance, where science fiction makes all sorts of fantastic predictions. Things that will be awesome when they arrive. But when they arrive, they are beat-up, sucky, and grubby and made cheesy by market forces and advertising.

Still with some awesomeness left intact, Idiocracy shows a future where people are in some ways taken care of. But everybody is an idiot. All the crap they consume is crap. We will have a future of abundance. It will have a tinge of grubbiness and crappiness.

But it will also be awesome. One dumb example, there are all these tall skinny skyscrapers along 57th street in New York City for billionaires. They all look roughly the same. These tall glass buildings sticking up.

Somebody put together an architectural plan or proposals for one of these things that would be gargoyles all the way up. It would be computer generated and computer created. You wouldn't have to have craftsmen chipping away at marble or granite.

The gargoyles would be 3D printed and have this fantastically ornate 96-story building looming weirdly over 56th street. We will get a bunch of stuff like that. Weirdly ornate, fantastically

intricate, AI-generated stuff, that will be awesome, fantastically beautiful, but also both grubby and creepy.

The self-containment of consciousness will erode. There is this saying that is particularly unhelpful, which is "no man is an island." It means nobody exists in isolation. Obama got in trouble for saying something like this when he was addressing a bunch of entrepreneurs while president.

"You didn't build this," he said, "We built this all together. You're business, which you built. You did not build it alone." When he said, "not build alone," that had all the conservatives jump on him, saying, "Socialist! Treasonous!"

No man is an island. It means that we all benefit from a shared civilization. But when it comes to consciousness, that saying doesn't work at all because we all are islands because we are all trapped inside our skulls.

Almost all our information skulls are done within our own brains. But that is eroding, slowly at first via our apps. You do not have to hink, "What is the best way to get from here to Glendale?"

Because you have a thing on your phone that will do the thinking for you. We have dozens of things that do little bits of thinking for us. We have dozens of other things that do little bits of thinking for us.

We have more immediate ways of sharing the products of our thoughts. We can post videos. We can text all the time. Those still leave our consciousnesses more self-contained. But more bombarded by information 24/7.

That self-containment is going to erode as we come up with better and better technology to link our information processing apparatuses more directly. So, the saying could be, with regard to consciousness, "Every man, or woman, or person, is an island, but less and less so," until we have access to what have been calling the worldwide thought "Blob" of the future.

Jacobsen: This seems like an important side road to pursue to share experiences. Thank you for sharing your experiences, I am sorry for your short-term losses, but also happy for your long-term wins.

If we look at these sectors of societies – "the government, the educational institutions, the media, and partly… religious institutions," these sectors, and some of the personal stories told by Claus, bring some new dynamics to the conversation.

Highly and even exceptionally – as noted by the case with Claus – intelligent people around the world become abused in deed and emotion and word, held back in their academics and professional advancement, labelled with epithets, left unemployed – and unemployable – with intimidation from employers and then given the boot, silenced by legitimate threats of violence, and taken to task in public media if becoming of particular note in the public discussion, even found dead in some cases.

In terms of the government, the politicians, the campaign managers for the politicians, and the political party representatives lesser in authority than the leaders in the political parties will remain beholden to the party lines and policies, but also to the impression of acceptability to the constituency of some of the questioning members of the opposition.

Politicians want the votes of their constituency and the opposition, so this seems natural and an extension of the need to appease as many people as possible to acquire the necessary votes to win in an election.

In terms of the educational institutions, the emphasis on intellectual conformity seems strong to me. I know administrators, professors, and instructors who will state one thing in public and another in private, which seems like a self-protective mechanism in order to survive in the academic world, in the university system, because this amounts to the only world known to them.

If an administrator, professor, or instructor sacrifices the comfort of post-secondary or tertiary educational professional life, especially with the surrender of personal finances, time, potential opportunities, and energy into the development of an identity within the university system, then the lack of experience or contact with the external-to-academia world can make the transition difficult, emotionally and financially, and possibly impossible.

Which relates to the media, "impossible" if they spoke out on a particular issue sensitive to the general public, of which the public may harbour false views about but which the theories and empirical findings show clearly. The university system across the world needs the finances, and so approval, of the public, which creates, in a way, an apologist class who comfort and cajole in public fora in order to bridge semi-true/semi-false middle grounds between public opinion and the empirical findings in some domains.

The same for the students who need to acquire the credential or qualification from an accredited polytechnic university, research university, or college, where, as you note Claus, students perform most often for their livelihood and would forsake honest discussion in order to pursue and further their professional lives – too risky, too often, not to otherwise.

Scandals within student unions occur at a consistent rate without public mention, where only some become mentioned and the number of smaller physical, emotional, and verbal abuses to individuals in the student union happen because of the potential threat of those who speak out about abuses of power or may hold different opinions in private from the other student union members.

I recall several experiences within a student union, and as a student in contact with other students, instructors and professors, and administrators at a number of universities, and as a young research professional in different fields, where certain intellectual or ideological lines *shall not be crossed* and if stepped over the proportional consequences can be expected. It seems the same for university professors via the example from Claus.

These resulted in lost job opportunities, educational time, money, intimidation, and so on – the myriad listed aforementioned forms and techniques of social control, essentially all of them to be

frank. The interesting thing, I do not think these techniques for social control within the academic system amount to conscious processes with most people inside of the university system most of the time.

The techniques of intellectual and ideological control seem like tense-stress reactions, which need to release in some form, to people who disagree with the individual.

My suspicion, the views do not equate to views alone but to views embedded in personal identity, where a disagreement with the university system status quo comes across as a disagreement, an affront and offense, against the person in academia as an individual – who often claims to speak for a group without legitimate justification, and so an affront and offense to the group as a whole, which suffices for attack on the individual with the disagreement.

The classical liberal and libertarian viewpoints properly understood, and the private sector compared to the public sector, may provide more freedom in intellectual and professional life, respectively.

With respect to the metaphysics and the nature of intelligence, with a touch on consciousness, these topics, for example intelligence, may not enter into the proper empirical discussion via their presentation in governments, in the university system, and in the media. For example, "We have theories of intelligence x, y, and z. Yesterday, we learned about x. Today, we will learn about x. Tomorrow, we will learn about z. You decide for yourself on the relative merits of it."

These are presented as if on the same empirical plane. Then students leave the classroom, in an educational example, into an academic culture, especially in the social sciences, oriented towards a default of liberalism and non-nativist perspectives, which influences the perspectives on intelligence, for one within-topic discussion, in spite of the merits of the theories of intelligence relative to their empirical support and respect within the field of intelligence studies and the study of individual differences.

With all of this said, the main message seems to me the importance of independent thought, where some large institutions and social structures work against this to the detriment of the society and the deviant individual at times, which Claus encourages – and me too. This leads right into the domain of metaphysics and the nature of intelligence and consciousness once more.

What if we take an inverted approach to the question of metaphysics? Rather than an emphasis on metaphysics in order to gain insight into the natural and physical basis on intelligence, what about the things known in the natural and physical world about intelligence to garner knowledge about the traits of the metaphysical world? A simple set of extrapolations from the known to theorize about the metaphysics around intelligence and consciousness – open question.

Volko: I doubt that what we know of the natural and physical world will lead to new insights into metaphysics. Metaphysics is mainly about the immaterial world that seems to co-exist with the physical world. If this immaterial world does have an impact on the physical world, then its effects may be studied with the scientific method. But from a logical point of view, we only

perceive implications, and can only speculate about the causes.

Rosner: Claus talks about metaphysics as if it's the influence of the immaterial on the material. Another way to look at it would be them would be the influence of form on the material world.

The principles of existence which I think have a strong basis in the avoidance of contradiction. The things that are best at existing have the least self-contradiction. Starting with small time and space scales, you have quantum entities, quantum particles, which exist probabilistically.

They are not macro enough exist with indisputable certainty or near certainty. There is the de Broglie wavelength, which is inversely proportional to mass. The example always is given in beginning physics is to calculate the de Broglie wavelength of a baseball.

It contains roughly 10^26th atoms. Consisting of so many particles, its existence and position in space is indisputable. A baseball is definitely there in a way an electron is not. An electron is this piddly thing, which is hard to pin down, according to any measurable characteristic.

Quantum physics is perhaps the closest to metaphysics of any modern scientific theory. Relativity is up there too. Where there are aspects of each that are impinged upon by basic principles of what can and cannot be, which also encompasses the principles of information because information is basically what exists when you strip everything else away.

Something is either yes-or-no, one of two states. That is the tiniest bit of information that you can work with, the tiniest clear bit of information. You can g smaller if you are willing to deal with nebulousness.

I believe metaphysics impinges on the real. I believe now is the time to look at metaphysics, where it hasn't been for the past 3 or 4 centuries of science because concrete aspects of science have returned or flourished. The concrete aspects of the world.

It has paid off ridiculously well. Metaphysics hasn't paid off at all. But we have reached the point, where we have Relativity and Quantum Mechanics which are impacted by the principles of existence, which means it's time to get into metaphysics once more.

Because we have reached the point in science where it can productively encompass metaphysics. Earlier parts of this discussion were talking about how really smart people don't necessarily flourish in the world.

At some point, the correlation between intelligence and academic/financial/relationship success & happiness – positive correlations – peak, below the level of really, really smart part, so that among people who would be considered super smart; you see a wide assortment of life situations and outcomes from super great to super miserable.

There are structures. Society has evolved to accommodate the range of skills people have, which is a Bell Curve and most people have middling skills. Because society runs on the middling, it is likely that people who are on one side or the other of middling will run into trouble.

Society has structural protections against being in constant turmoil. If you look at American society now, it is an example of what happens when previously existing structures that helped give stability are under assault by, to a large extent, new media.

The Internet has cooked our brains. People can't make the measured judgments or reasonable judgments to the extent that they used to, because we have not yet developed the ability to reasonably evaluate and react to new media.

There is also the disruption in employment caused by advances in technology. But, in general, when you look back at an apparently more stable time in society, like the 50s – though you could argue it was only stable on the surface, the 50s has the reputation of being a time of great conformity.

People who attempted to defy it didn't have much in the way of resources. Now, any kind of lunatic can go online and find all sorts of peers and support for disruptive behaviour. But in the 50s, people who didn't conform and had fewer resources were more isolated.

You have famous stories of people who didn't conform suffering extreme penalties. Alan Turing who basically won WWII for us. He was forced into suicide because the cops or the authorities found out that he was gay, and then chemically castrated him with hormones and wrecked his body, made him sad, and then he died from cyanide.

It was just for the minor non-conforming character of not being gay. Some of the things that deny super smart people success reside in society. Some of those things reside in the smart people themselves and a bunch of it is a crazy or messy interaction among everything.

The example I always think of, and I don't know if it is any good, imagine if the realtors. Smart people tend to be drawn to smart people disciplines like Chess and Go. Modern examples would be coding.

So, if you look at the area of selling real estate, not as it is now, but say any time until ten years ago, realtors are generally not brilliant. But if smart people were somehow driven to embrace selling real estate in the way that they are pushed to study higher math or like chess or science fiction, the real estate market would be entirely disrupted.

Within the last ten years, it has been entirely disrupted because smart people methodologies are disrupting everything. Once you bring AI technology and internet technology to a field, it completely disrupts the field, like the field of paying somebody drive you some place.

The cab industry is destroyed. All retail is under siege, bricks-and-mortar retail, because you can go on eBay and get something on a price that is driven down based on everyone having access to this technology rather than simply getting something close enough to what you want in a store.

Structures that middling society had erected are all getting their asses kicked by outlier technology.

Appendix I: Footnotes

[1] **Dipl.-Ing. Dr. Claus D. Volko, B.Sc.**: "I was born in 1983 in Vienna, Austria, Europe. My father wanted me to become a doctor while I was more interested in computers in my youth. After teaching myself to program when I was eight, I started editing an electronic magazine at age twelve and kept spending almost my entire sparetime on it – **Hugi Magazine**.

Upon graduation from high school, I studied medicine and computer science in parallel. In the end I became a software developer who occasionally participated in medical research projects as a leisure activity.

I am also the maintainer of the website **21st Century Headlines** where I try to give interested readers an up-to-date overview of current trends in science and technology, especially biomedical sciences, computers and physics, and I recently founded the **Web Portal on Computational Biology**. I think there is no doubt I am a versatile mind and a true polymath."

Rick G. Rosner: "According to **semi-reputable sources**, Rick Rosner has the world's second-highest IQ. He earned 12 years of college credit in less than a year and graduated with the equivalent of 8 majors. He has received 8 Writer's Guild Award and Emmy nominations, and was named 2013 North American Genius of the Year by The World Genius Registry.

He has written for Remote Control, Crank Yankers, The Man Show, The Emmy Awards, The Grammy Awards, and Jimmy Kimmel Live!. He has also worked as a stripper, a bouncer, a roller-skating waiter, and a nude model. In a TV commercial, Domino's Pizza named him the World's Smartest Man. He was also named Best Bouncer in the Denver Area by Westwood Magazine.

He spent the disco era as an undercover high school student. 25 years as a bar bouncer, American fake ID-catcher, 25+ years as a stripper, and nude art model, and nearly 30 years as a writer for more than 2,500 hours of network television.

He lost on Jeopardy!, sued Who Wants to Be a Millionaire over a bad question, and lost the lawsuit. He spent 35+ years on a modified version of Big Bang Theory. Now, he mostly sits around tweeting in a towel. He lives in Los Angeles, California with his wife and daughter.

You can send an **email** or a direct message via **Twitter**, or find him on **LinkedIn**, or see him on **YouTube**."

[2] Individual Publication Date: June 15, 2018 at **http://www.in-sightjournal.com/claus-and-rosner-three**; Full Issue Publication Date: September 1, 2018 at **https://in-sightjournal.com/insight-issues/.**

Ask A Genius (or Two): Conversation with Dr. Claus D. Volko and Rick Rosner on "The Nature of Intelligence" (Part Four)

2018-06-22

Rick Rosner and I conduct a conversational series entitled Ask A Genius on a variety of subjects through In-Sight Publishing on the personal and professional website for Rick. Rick exists on the World Genius Directory listing as the world's second highest IQ at 192 based on several ultra-high IQ tests scores developed by independent psychometricians. Dipl.-Ing Dr. Claus D. Volko, B.Sc., earned a score at 172, on the Equally Normed Numerical Derivation Tests (ENNDT) by Marco Ripà and Gaetano Morelli. Both scores on a standard deviation of 15. A sigma of ~6.13 for Rick – a general intelligence rarity of 1 in 2,314,980,850 – and 4.80 for Claus – a general intelligence rarity of 1 in 1,258,887. Of course, if a higher general intelligence score, then the greater the variability in, and margin of error in, the general intelligence scores because of the greater rarity in the population. This amounts to a joint interview or conversation with

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: With everything, we could continue forever. However, the discussion started on January 25, 2017 with an email from me. In other words, that seems like a long time for the discussion to come to fruition at this point. Maybe, we can close.

We typed about artificial intelligence, human intelligence, intelligence, and the relationship with mathematics and metaphysics. This kept the conversation forward into consciousness. If I take the summaries from before and include some new ones, and if I bring these into statements rather than points, these may help with the final questions from me.

Human intelligence and artificial intelligence amount to two distinct but overlapping forms of information processing. Human intelligence has strength in pattern recognition and novel idea production. Novel idea production may need more than computation alone. Artificial intelligence has strengths in data storage and speed. Intelligence relates more to efficiency than speed. Intelligence encapsulates both human intelligence and artificial intelligence. Theories of intelligence fail and succeed in different areas. IQ, or general intelligence tests and scores, predict educational success.

In near future, artificial intelligence will remain narrow. Neural networks and machine learning will continue to characterize the development of artificial intelligence. Media will continue to misrepresent the future of artificial intelligence and people. In far future, general artificial intelligence may emerge. Narrow artificial intelligence will exist more than general artificial intelligence. These technology trends may lead to a planet-spanning data processor.

Comprehension of the brain could explain human intelligence without consciousness. This may help create human intelligence in computers. Consciousness may require more than physical and natural explanations. "More than physical or natural explanations" leads to metaphysics. A natural and physical theory, or algorithm, could explain human intelligence. However, for consciousness and intelligence in general, metaphysics seems necessary.

What barriers – e.g., methodology, epistemology, academic bureaucracy, limitations in general

intelligence, personality flaws in lack of persistence or conscientiousness, hindrance of creativity from various means, inadequate technological tools, insufficient evidence, and so on – may exist to the discovery of the explanatory framework?

If any of the listed examples, can you elaborate, please? What scientific discoveries and technological capabilities hint at the emergence of a theoretical framework for these more general comprehensions of intelligence writ large?

Once these come to the fore, on the assumption the natural philosophy and philosophy provide the basis in the future, how might influence the perspective on the nature of human intelligence and, subsequently, human life?

Why would these discoveries influence the notion of personhood for human beings and artificial life seen in better representations of science fiction? Claus, you are a theist. Rick, you follow, more or less, Reformed Judaism, which implies a God. Final question, why would the natural and physical explanations for human intelligence and artificial intelligence, and the eventual framework for consciousness and intelligence in general, align with a theistic view of the world?

Dipl.-Ing. Dr. Claus D. Volko, B.Sc.: I think that all the things you mentioned can be barriers hindering the discovery of the explanatory framework. I especially think that certain tabus that are widespread in our Western societies prevent thinkers and researchers from really questioning what is considered established knowledge, having quasi-dogmatic status. I am quite ambivalent about the "skeptics" movement, for instance. On the one hand, it may be true that many people are uncritical of pseudoscience and esoterics, and so it might be a good idea to make them aware of the limitations of these approaches and explain why the scientific method is more credible. On the other hand, adherents of the "skeptics" movement sometimes fail to see the limitations of science itself, and fail to be equally "skeptic" about science as they are about pseudoscience.

To me it seems real progress is not coming from mainstream science but from fringe groups that are not afraid of questioning or even rejecting scientific dogmata and "thinking out of the box". I would like to direct your attention to the aforementioned "Triadic Distinction Dimensional Vortical Paradigm" invented by Drs. Neppe and Close and the "Cognitive-Theoretic Model of the Universe" by Christopher Langan. Admittedly, I have not studied them in detail yet and am thus not able to rate their credibility. But at least they seem to be attempts that go into the right direction.

Both Drs. Neppe and Close and Christopher Langan happen to consider themselves theists. Actually the terms atheist and theist may be a bit misleading. While Drs. Neppe and Close and Christopher Langan may perceive themselves as theists primarily due to their religious upbringing and their motivation for inventing "theories of everything" that admit the existence of some sort of "deity" may be due to this as well, I was not brought up in a religious fashion. Yet I feel awkward about calling myself an atheist and have decided some time ago to identify myself with "theism". In my case, it is not that I believe in any God persona bearing resemblance to man, but that I simply assume there to be things that can be considered "divine", or "divine forces", which cannot be explained by a naturalist or physicalist approach alone. This view is actually rooted in my own "childhood religion" which I invented as a young boy. Nota bene, this

does not mean that there will never be any explanation for these "divine forces" that might be considered "rational" by a large proportion of humanity.

Actually I tend to believe that thanks to backpropagation and deep learning, we are currently experiencing a true revolution in domain-specific artificial intelligence, while it might still take at least yet another revolution until what people such as Ray Kurzweil or Max Tegmark call "Artificial General Intelligence" will arrive. Another technology that is going to have a big impact in the next couple of years is gene editing (CRISPR/Cas9). Eventually it might lead to "designer babies"; this is primarily a matter of legislation, since currently it is outlawed in most Western countries to genetically modify human embryos. Moreover, 3D printing will revolutionize the way things are manufactured. Quantum computing is still more fiction than science, although it has also made some progress in the past years. I think it is these technologies that will shape the world the most in the next ten years. I myself have also been working on a theoretical framework for an alternative to treating bacterial infections with antibiotics, keeping the bacteria alive instead of killing them, but reprogramming them (converting them from "parasites" to "symbionts"; that is why I am calling my framework "Symbiont Conversion Theory"). This might evolve to a new trend in medicine and it might solve a great problem as physicians are to an increasing extent confronted with "superbugs" that are resistant against many different sorts of antibiotics. My theory also concerns cancer treatment, since cancer cells can themselves be considered parasites that could possibly be converted into symbionts.

Rosner: You say that my thinking aligned with Reformed Judaism. To some extent, that is right. Nobody knows what Reformed Judaism thinks about anything. It is so reformed that is has no philosophical underpinning.

My actual thinking is that the model of consciousness being an inevitable and unavoidable aspect high-level information processing. That is something I subscribe or ascribe to. With my limited imagination, I cannot imagine any other system of existence, except for things being entangled with high-level information processing and with consciousness almost always being associated with that.

It means that existence, including the universe, is lousy with or peppered or speckled with consciousnesses, but with no consciousness or no entity having absolute god-like powers. But with powerful entities being able to do all sorts of stuff, including, at some level, the ability to create little universes.

But that every entity is subject to the rules of existence, which include the rules of consciousness and information processing. So, the structures of thought and information processing are replicated or peppered throughout the universe and embodied in the universe itself, in my thinking, but with omnipotence not being a thing.

Nobody gets to be omnipotent. Nobody gets to be a God-god. Entities may be god-like because they have been around so long and incorporate so much information-processing power, so that they are vastly more powerful than we are. But they are still subject to the principles of existence.

So, throughout history, people had a pretty stable idea of what makes a person. A person is somebody who is a body with a brain and where everything that brain thinks about is pertinent to that person, and is a reaction to that person's sensory input plus the information processing that goes on in the brain plus what philosophy you adhere to – some transcendent mind stuff.

But everything is personal to that person. Everybody's thoughts are relevant to that person and locked into the processes going on in their skull with the possibility of some addition of a personal mind in some other realm helping things out.

Now, more and more people do not believe in that other realm. More and more people believe that everything that happens can be explained by what happens in the brain. Everything relating to personhood is linked to an individual brain.

That is going to get its ass kicked in the next few centuries as information processing is able to move out of individual brains and then we get to link up. That processing has already been going on to a – not great extent because we do not have really any brain device interfaces beyond our five senses yet – decent extent because the relationships with our devices or with other people as mediated through our devices are much more informationally intense.

Much more information is being exchanged among people and among people and their devices now than ever before. Information processing will, eventually, not be isolated in individual brains and, instead, will become distributive, mutable, changeable, from moment-to-moment and with that the notion of discrete personhood will be eroded.

When we're all linked together and thinking together and we're spitting out tasked consciousnesses and AIs for specific tasks, budding them off and sending them off and then bringing them back in and integrating them again, it is going to look like a big crazy lava lamp rather than marbles of individual awarenesses locked into individual skulls.

Those barriers will come down. It will look like a lava lamp with people merging and unmerging and then importance of individual consciousness declining as we become part of this global thought cloud, which isn't to say that we're going to live in some dictatorship of thought.

The story that sums this up the best is I Have No Mouth, and I Must Scream by Harlan Ellison, where one giant artificial consciousness, robot brain, has taken over the world and is taking people prisoner and torturing them 24/7 for its own perverse amusement.

That is the most dystopian version of a worldwide thought cloud taking over and oppressing everybody. Instead, the worldwide thought cloud will, for the most part, set individual consciousnesses free to mash up with other consciousnesses.

It sounds scary. But it is like everything else, driven by market forces. By the time every aspect gets to us. It will be made grubby by capitalism. Nothing ever hits us as pure wonder because it takes a while to get to us, and then it comes in the form of being offered by T-Mobile.

The barriers to understanding consciousness and the other context of information processing,

which encompasses the business of the entire universe – the barriers to looking at that stuff and getting it right – are that it has been considered a super hard problem for thousands of years and everybody's got it wrong for thousands of years, to the point where two people do not mean the same thing when they talk about consciousness.

When people talk about a car or a dog, there might be some small issues needing clarification. When one person talks about a car, they may be including truck. That could be cleared up with a conversation between people, maybe in a legislature when trying to figure out what to do with driverless vehicles.

The idea of "car" is easily clarified. The idea of "consciousness" can mean a gazillion different things. People tend not to bother with it. To even bring up consciousness has, for a couple hundred years, made people wary that you may hear some flaky astrological theory of the vibes of stuff, and how trees and rocks have their own awareness; consciousness has been associated with a lot off garbage thinking and unclear thinking.

Also, as a more philosophical level, it has been thought of as something too hard to figure out, to the point that in the 1930s psychologists or people looking in the field of brain performance in psychology decided to do without any theorizing altogether and then invented Behaviorism.

It said, "We are not going to think about it. We are going to consider the brain a black box. Then we will consider anything coming out of the brain as not thinking but reflexes." So, the barriers, historically, have been that it is too hard of a problem and people had all sorts of unclear and wrong ideas about what it is.

A third things is that people did not have the experiential background to properly deal with consciousness and frameworks for information processing. Information Theory didn't come around until Claude Shannon in the 1940s.

I think part two of the questions about what are some hints for going after it now. The big deal now is that we live in a or are in an ocean of information processing now. At least, when we weren't in an obvious way before, maybe 30 years ago; now, everybody walks about with a super powerful information processor in their hand.

We get to watch the real-time operation of high-powered information processing devices. Everybody has a better idea of how all this stuff works because information-processing is basically the biggest industry in the world in the world right now and will continue to be; it will suck up more and more parts of our lives

There are people working things. We will have a biotech revolution that will be the application of high powered information processing technology to the systems of the human body. Everybody, now, has a better idea of how consciousness works because we see how our devices work and approach tasks.

The analogies are not perfect but they are better than what people had in the 19th century or in the BC years. We have all these analogies via our devices that are very powerful in helping us

understand how our minds work with the switching from app to app being similar to switching from focus to focus, from driving and the light or the asshole in front of you when he/she slams on their breaks.

Or what is more common now, the times when people come to a near stop when everyone is texting. Consciousness becomes solvable because we have the technology and we have the experience to go after consciousness now.

Jacobsen: Thank you for the opportunities and your times, Claus and Rick.

Appendix I: Footnotes

[1] **Dipl.-Ing. Dr. Claus D. Volko, B.Sc.**: "I was born in 1983 in Vienna, Austria, Europe. My father wanted me to become a doctor while I was more interested in computers in my youth. After teaching myself to program when I was eight, I started editing an electronic magazine at age twelve and kept spending almost my entire sparetime on it – **Hugi Magazine**.

Upon graduation from high school, I studied medicine and computer science in parallel. In the end I became a software developer who occasionally participated in medical research projects as a leisure activity.

I am also the maintainer of the website **21st Century Headlines** where I try to give interested readers an up-to-date overview of current trends in science and technology, especially biomedical sciences, computers and physics, and I recently founded the **Web Portal on Computational Biology**. I think there is no doubt I am a versatile mind and a true polymath."

Rick G. Rosner: "According to **semi-reputable sources**, Rick Rosner has the world's second-highest IQ. He earned 12 years of college credit in less than a year and graduated with the equivalent of 8 majors. He has received 8 Writer's Guild Award and Emmy nominations, and was named 2013 North American Genius of the Year by The World Genius Registry.

He has written for Remote Control, Crank Yankers, The Man Show, The Emmy Awards, The Grammy Awards, and Jimmy Kimmel Live!. He has also worked as a stripper, a bouncer, a roller-skating waiter, and a nude model. In a TV commercial, Domino's Pizza named him the World's Smartest Man. He was also named Best Bouncer in the Denver Area by Westwood Magazine.

He spent the disco era as an undercover high school student. 25 years as a bar bouncer, American fake ID-catcher, 25+ years as a stripper, and nude art model, and nearly 30 years as a writer for more than 2,500 hours of network television.

He lost on Jeopardy!, sued Who Wants to Be a Millionaire over a bad question, and lost the lawsuit. He spent 35+ years on a modified version of Big Bang Theory. Now, he mostly sits around tweeting in a towel. He lives in Los Angeles, California with his wife and daughter.

You can send an **email** or a direct message via **Twitter**, or find him on **LinkedIn**, or see him

on **YouTube**.”

[2] Individual Publication Date: June 22, 2018 at **http://www.in-sightjournal.com/claus-and-rosner-four**; Full Issue Publication Date: September 1, 2018 at **https://in-sightjournal.com/insight-issues/**.

Ask A Genius (or Two): Conversation with Ivan Ivec and Rick Rosner on "The Spiritual Life"

2018-07-22

Rick Rosner and I conduct a conversational series entitled Ask A Genius on a variety of subjects through In-Sight Publishing on the personal and professional website for Rick. Rick exists on the World Genius Directory listing as the world's second highest IQ at 192 based on several ultra-high IQ tests scores developed by independent psychometricians. Ivan Ivec, earned a score at 174, on Algebrica by Mislav Predavec. Both scores on a standard deviation of 15. A sigma of ~6.13 for Rick – a general intelligence rarity of 1 in 2,314,980,850 – and 4.80 for Ivan – a general intelligence rarity of 1 in 2,470,424. Of course, if a higher general intelligence score, then the greater the variability in, and margin of error in, the general intelligence scores because of the greater rarity in the population. This amounts to a joint interview or conversation with Ivan Ivec, Rick Rosner, and myself on the "The Spiritual Life."

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: Ivan meet Rick. Rick meet Ivan. The topic is 'The Spiritual Life' for this discussion. Ivan, you are Christian. Rick, you follow Reformed Judaism. Each have respective life philosophies and practices. It seems most appropriate to have the groundwork of the life philosophies and practices provided by both of you.

We can find textbook definitions. However, the nuances come from individual lives. To begin, what are its components and relationships – entities, ethical precepts, ideas, and practices? For Ivan, the context is Christianity. For Rick, the context is Reformed Judaism.

Ivan Ivec: Christianity is very simple religion and pretty hard. All persons ready to follow good even when this is hard can be considered Christians, because this is the base of Christianity, and not some profound knowledge.

The main entity is of course Jesus Christ. We believe that he makes all this possible, because humans are too weak to follow this idea, no matter how simple and logical it seems sometimes.

Because of its simplicity, textbook definitions are pretty important in Christianity, but of course they should come together with experience.

Rick Rosner: I do have spiritual beliefs, but most of my hopeful beliefs of a religious type are founded on faith in future technology. I'm a science person. I haven't been convinced by organized religions, or by most aspects of organized religion. So I would like to believe in resurrection, but there's not enough evidence for resurrection through religion for me to believe in resurrection – except in only the tiniest, tiniest way.

So I put my hope in technology's ability to extend our lives significantly in the near future, and in the near- to medium-future science and technology's ability to come up with ways to replicate and extend the contents of our brains. Our thoughts and memories. Thus, we have a type of technical resurrection. I tend not to believe that there is some kind of supreme being who dispenses justice.

Though I don't have that belief that goes with the science of the 20th century, which is a cold random universe in which nothing really matters because everything is the result of happenstance events according to the laws of physics – the universe unfolds according to the rules of Quantum Mechanics and Relativity, with nobody and nothing in charge. Whatever happens doesn't really matter because there's no one judging.

Instead, I tend to think that rather than randomness being in charge that information is in charge, and that the universe, at least as we experience it, is a place of increasing order, and that that can be seen as providing some structures and some values. To have order, you need protection from disorder.

Jacobsen: Ivan, I feel drawn to the opening sentence: "Christianity is very simple religion and pretty hard." Does this mean the foundation of Christianity is simple and its practice is difficult? For example, as you know, we find the Golden Rule in Matthew 7:12 for a summarization of one core ethical precept within Christianity. It is simple and applicable as a general moral principle, but it is difficult to practice in every context.

As well, you mentioned the main entity, Jesus Christ. With the main entity as Jesus Christ, other entities tend to be part of the theological discourse. For example, the beings of spirit such as angels and the Devil. Do these other entities—angels and the Devil—fit within your view of Christianity as well? If so, what role do entities such as angels and the Devil play in the world today, especially in people's spiritual lives?

Rick, in your response, I note the equivalency of "spiritual beliefs" and "hopeful beliefs of a religious type," which makes spiritual beliefs a subset of hopeful beliefs to you. Those of a "religious type." To clarify, was this intentional? As well, you have a faith, in future technology tied to science because you are a "science person," which remains disconnected from "most aspects of organized religion." You deny the resurrection, except connected to future technology through science.

Furthermore, you disbelieve in a "supreme being who dispenses justice." Your source of justice comes from the Golden Rule, and associated principles and values, derived from information-based principles connected to increasing order. Without an ultimate authority for right and wrong, for objective (not universal) moral values and judgments, does this make ultimate ethical evaluations dependent on conscious beings? If so, what does this mean for the spiritual life?

Ivec: Christianity talks about things which cannot be understood without God's mercy. It talks about truth (indeed simple truth), but which is beyond our current ability to understand.

That's why many people do not have faith, and that's way I say that Christianity is difficult. Angels, the Devil, humans – all are spiritual beings and fit in Christianity. However, Jesus Christ was talking about things mentioned above, which are beyond our understanding, but this is so because he wants to heal our understanding progressively.

Two big weapons of the Devil:

1) he tries to convince people that he does not exist;

2) if he fails in step 1), he tries to convince people that he is dangerous.

One big weakness of the Devil:

1) All his attempts are misery in comparison with God's plans.

Rosner: Under all forms of Christianity, God is the Creator. God is the source of everything good. Under most forms of Christianity, though I don't know how it works in full, the Devil is a very bad guy with unsurpassed power, except for the power of God. Again, I do not know that much about Christianity. Under my point of view, God and the Devil are personifications of the ways to divide the world into good and bad. In other words, God is a metaphor for order and for increasing order, for information, for safety, for persistence, for positive ethical standards, for finding the strength within yourself and within your community to make the right ethical choices.

There is the one set of footprints on the beach because Jesus was carrying you. God is representative of what is good and right. God is representative of the strength you can find to do what is good while the Devil is pretty much the opposite. A force for bad decisions, wanton destruction, chaos and increasing chaos, danger, and death. It is a helpful way to divide the world, to group the things in the world into good and bad, which people have been trying to do for thousands of years.

The Devil is an interesting model. In that, God is like Superman. Superman is straightforward. He pretty much always does good. There is nothing paradoxical about Superman. In TV terms, God is the game show Who Wants to be a Millionaire, where everything pulls in the same direction. You're cheering for the person to win as opposed to reality shows or the game show The Weakest Link, where generally on the show The Weakest Link the biggest dicks, the biggest jerks, win because they gang up on the best players and knock them out, leaving only the biggest jerks. I don't think it's on anymore anywhere. It's hard to watch because it pulls in opposite directions.

You're pulling for the good people, but the jerks prevail. However, God is straightforward and entirely good, even if we don't understand God's decisions with what he does about the world. The Devil is less straightforward, is more complicated. He's closer to Batman. Where Batman has darkness within and is more complicated, and I'm not saying Batman is the Devil, I'm saying he's more complicated because he's tormented. The Devil is more complicated because he can take more forms, even the apparently good, to do bad. The Devil wants everyone to fail, to embrace evil and to fail, but he has a trickier utility belt to accomplish that.

He can take all sorts of forms including forms that look good and can trick people into doing what is ultimately bad. We see that in some of the current political debates in America. On the liberal side, liberals like to give people safety nets, which seems like doing good. It is charitable. It is helping your fellow humans. The new conservative person, not super-new but the conservatives who have been active for the past 30 years, say that there is the Devil in those

welfare-type, entitlement-type, safety nets. That by attempting to do good, you are really doing bad. That you are making people soft. That you are making people unable to fend for themselves.

That maybe you need to deny the Devil of Liberalism and safety nets and embrace the toughness of the not helpful and make people get out there and work for themselves, which is, as I see it, mostly a garbage argument for F-ing over other people. That is what today's Republican Party tends to try to do. Regardless of how they feel in their hearts, the result of Republican policies is rich people getting richer and everyone else staying the same or falling back.

Appendix I: Footnotes

[1] Ivan Ivec (From two webpage links **here** and **here**: "My name is Ivan Ivec and I come from Croatia. I'm a teacher of mathematics with a Ph.D. degree in mathematics. I'll present here my IQ tests and other activities."

"However, I'm not interested only in IQ tests and mathematics, which is my profession. I believe in God and try to live my faith. As I'm pretty bad theologician, under **Religion** link I'll only try to help people in need. I pray God to give me enough humbleness to maintain this site in the productive way. Finally, under **Steven Fell's Art** link I'll promote one American artist, who did my portrait for this website."

Rick G. Rosner: "According to **semi-reputable sources**, Rick Rosner has the world's second-highest IQ. He earned 12 years of college credit in less than a year and graduated with the equivalent of 8 majors. He has received 8 Writer's Guild Award and Emmy nominations, and was named 2013 North American Genius of the Year by The World Genius Registry.

He has written for Remote Control, Crank Yankers, The Man Show, The Emmy Awards, The Grammy Awards, and Jimmy Kimmel Live!. He has also worked as a stripper, a bouncer, a roller-skating waiter, and a nude model. In a TV commercial, Domino's Pizza named him the World's Smartest Man. He was also named Best Bouncer in the Denver Area by Westwood Magazine.

He spent the disco era as an undercover high school student. 25 years as a bar bouncer, American fake ID-catcher, 25+ years as a stripper, and nude art model, and nearly 30 years as a writer for more than 2,500 hours of network television.

He lost on Jeopardy!, sued Who Wants to Be a Millionaire over a bad question, and lost the lawsuit. He spent 35+ years on a modified version of Big Bang Theory. Now, he mostly sits around tweeting in a towel. He lives in Los Angeles, California with his wife and daughter.

You can send an **email** or a direct message via **Twitter**, or find him on **LinkedIn**, or see him on **YouTube**."

[2] Individual Publication Date: July 22, 2018 at **http://www.in-sightjournal.com/rosner-ivec**; Full Issue Publication Date: September 1, 2018 at **https://in-sightjournal.com/insight-**

issues/.

An Interview with Monika Orski (Part One)

2018-08-22

Monika Orski is the Ordförande/Chairwoman, Mensa Sverige/Mensa Sweden. She discusses: family background; development in early life; learning of giftedness; nurturance of giftedness; investment in the gifted and talented; families and friends and guidance for the gifted, and a myth about gifted peoples' social skills; precision in the definition of Western Europe and the provisions for gifted peoples in it; geniuses in the more precisely defined geography of "Western Europe"; high-IQ as never being a detriment; and feeling connection with one's cultural heritage.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: In terms of geography, culture, language, and religion/irreligion, what is personal family background?

Monika Orski: I was born and raised in Stockholm, Sweden. My parents had immigrated from Poland just over a year before my birth, the effect of an antisemitic campaign that resulted in many Polish Jews emigrating, among them a few thousand to Sweden. Thus, I'm first generation Swedish. Or, in the parlance of official language as well as large part of the public view, second-generation immigrant.

The Jewish inheritance in my family is a matter of culture and ethnicity, not a religious one. I was not brought up to care about any religion at all. Which, by the way, fits well into the general, relatively secular Swedish culture.

As for language, my native Swedish has always been supplemented with the Polish that remained the everyday language for family life in my childhood, and that my parents still use when we talk. Then, I was taught English and French in school. I consider this early access to multiple languages a real treasure.

Jacobsen: How did these multiple facets of family background feed into early life for you?

Orski: It's all part of me, of course. Being part of a minority is a very basic experience, and in some ways defining. I never had a choice not to be visibly "different", and I'm sure it has shaped a certain outlook. I am, of course, as much of a consensus seeker as anyoneSwedish, but I am not afraid to stand out when needed.

Also, I am aware that family background was an important influence when I chose my field of work. I studied literature in parallel with computer engineering, but it was always clear that the serious, long-term part was to become an engineer. It had to be something that wasn't language dependent, something that could be used more or less anywhere in the world. An element of "just in case" was always part of the equation.

Not that I ever regretted being a software engineer. Today, I have been a freelancing consultant for a long time, mostly in the area of solution architecture, and also do other things on the side. I am a writer with books published, and I offer lectures on leadership, mostly based on my

experience within Mensa.

Jacobsen: When did giftedness become a fact of life for you, explicitly? Of course, you lived and live with it. The key, when was the high general intelligence formally measured, acknowledged, and integrated into personal identity and loved ones' perception of you?

Orski: It was formally measured when I took a Mensa admission test at age 21. But there was no change in either personal identity or loved ones' perception caused by this formal measure. By then, I was a student, and had been considered – and considered myself – intelligent since childhood. For better or worse.

Jacobsen: Was your giftedness nurtured in early life into adolescence?

Orski: Yes and no.

I was lucky to grow up in a family where academic success was encouraged, or even expected. I guess we fit the stereotype of a Jewish family, at least in that way. Also, there were always books around, and while my parents often tried to make me spend more time outdoors, they were never opposed to my copious reading as such.

School was another matter. I was not a top-grade student, but I did well enough, while I was horribly bored by school work and had no chance to learn how to actually work to gain knowledge. Being different didn't help the social interaction either. For quite a long time, a day without physical violence would count as a good day, and there were not that many good school days.

In class, I was often used as an unpaid teaching assistant, starting somewhere around the age 9 or 10. Then, I was a child, and only saw that this singled me out even more, and certainly didn't help. But as an adult, I am most appalled by what those teachers did to my classmates. Imagine you are eleven and have some trouble following the class in math – and then you are supposed to be taught by a frustrated ten-year-old. Doesn't that sound like a failsafe way to turn temporary difficulties into permanent failures? Although with time, I actually learned some pedagogical skills, mostly the hard way by trial and error.

Jacobsen: Why should governments and communities invest in the gifted, identification and education?

Orski: First and foremost, because every child should be allowed to explore their potential, and feel validated in doing so. Of course, it is more important to teach everyone the basic skills: read and write etc. However, if that is the only level you measure your education system by, you have already given up.

There is the individual point of view. People are not happy when they are kept back, and while adults always have at least some opportunities to counteract this themselves, children usually do not. Even more so when they know they are somehow different from those around them, and are left with only the negative consequences. Also, if you don't learn how to work to learn things,

you will probably experience a sudden change at some point, when you no longer can absorb everything without effort. If that happens before you are old enough to understand it, it will probably cause a traumatic decline of self-esteem.

There is also the society point of view. Many of the gifted will end up in regular, but qualified careers, and thus benefit society as a whole. But there is more to it. If allowed a broad education, some of those gifted children will shape future fields we do not even have names for today, and provide huge contributions. Some, of course, will choose other paths, not visibly using their intelligence in career or public life, but the community will benefit in those cases too. Overall, the number of gifted trouble makers, in schools as well as far beyond, will be less if everyone gets the chance to explore their potential. We cannot know in advance who will end up where, but we do know that either way society as a whole will benefit from investing in their education.

Jacobsen: How can families and friends help prevent gifted kids from a) acting arrogant and b) becoming social car crashes (with a) and b) being related, of course)?

Orski: There is a prevailing myth that intelligent people have poor social skills. In fact, research shows the contrary. There is a positive correlation between intelligence and social skills.

That said, all children have some tendencies to see themselves as the center of the world, and act accordingly. This is perfectly natural. It is true that in gifted children, an arrogance rooted in their giftedness would be a common symptom of this tendency. Like all children, they need to be taught to interact with others, and called on behavior that is not acceptable. That would include to let them know that kindness is usually more important than specific skills, as well as more important than an ability to learn quickly.

Another aspect is that all children need to have peers they will consider equals. When other gifted children are not a natural part of a child's environment, the most valuable assistance family and friends can provide is to help them find them. This can be done via aMensa youth program, or a chess club (if they like chess), or a choir (if they like singing) or online gaming (if they like games), or some other context that brings people of similar interests and gifts together. Of course, I am personally very much in favor of the Mensapath.

Jacobsen: How well-established and funded is the acceptance and nurturance of the gifted and talented through the formal mechanisms of the countries in Western Europe?

Orski: Western Europe is a very diverse area, and it's hard to discuss it as a whole. In short, every country has it's own educational system. Now, I'm not sure how many European countries should be included when using a term like "Western Europe", but to provide some understanding of the diversity, remember the European Union currently has 28 members, and that not all European countries are part of the EU.

However, among the things we do have in common one comes to mind when discussing education. Tuition is financed by tax money in most European countries, including university tuition. The access to university education is subject to many things, and will again vary between countries, but no potential student needs to worry about whether their finances, or those of their

parents, will allow them to pay for their education.

To narrow down to an area I do know, for a few years Sweden has a law stating that in elementary and secondary school, every pupil should be allowed to learn and develop to their potential. In practice, this is far from being the case at every school, but at least there is a general framework that is supposed to help nurture all children, including gifted children.

Among the things we are most proud of within Mensa Sweden, is the Gifted Children Program (GCP). Our GCP-volunteers offer schools a free 2-hour education on giftedness for their staff. Thus, we help not only gifted children with parents who recognize their talents and seek ways to nurture them, but also children we never meet, as their teachers are taught how to recognize them. This year, between them our 40+ volunteers give 2-3 such lectures a week.

Jacobsen: Western Europe produced a number of great geniuses. Who comes to mind for you? What periods of time represent the largest flowering of intellectual progress in this region of the world?

Orski: Again, I would like to start with the proviso that Western Europe as a concept is diverse and without clear delimitation.

Among those who come to mind for me are scientists Isaac Newton, Carl Linnaeus, Marie Curie and Albert Einstein; philosophers Spinoza, Voltaire, Hegel and de Beauvoir; writers Cervantes, Dante, Shakespeare, de la Fayette, Goethe, Austen, Heine, Lagerlöf, Strindberg, Ibsen … I could go on at length regarding writers.

Intellectual progress spreads over the long history of Europe. Not being particularly well versed in the history of ideas, I will however venture the guess that the age of enlightenment (17th – 18th century) represents a flowering with effects also seen in the 19th century, and that the Romantic era (late 18th – 19th century) represent a surge in arts and literature that is still relevant to these areas today.

Jacobsen: How can a high-IQ be a detriment in life?

Orski: High-IQ itself is never a detriment. On the contrary, high-IQ makes many things in life easier, and there is research indicating a positive correlation between intelligence and many desirable things, such as longevity and health.

However, high-IQ can have detrimental side effects. Being and feeling different always has its downsides, especially while you are very young. Even a child who is told "you're really gifted and that makes you different in all sorts of good ways" will only hear "you're different". Those who do not know about their intelligence often feel like aliens, not being able to understand why they don't think the way most people around them do, and they often draw the conclusion there is something wrong with them.

This is part of why the acknowledgment of high general intelligence can make a fantastic difference in an individual's life. Suddenly they get the tools needed to understand why they feel

the way they do. Even more important, they gain an understanding that helps them look for peers they can feel equal to, sometimes after half a life of feeling inferior because they perceive themselves as different.

Jacobsen: How can ethnic heritage provide a bulwark for confidence in life? Something of a pride or happiness in heritage and culture, and tradition, but not in the accident of birth with ethnic grouping.

Orski: I agree, to feel pride in the accident of birth with ethnic grouping would be like pride in the color of your eyes – basically meaningless and in my view inconceivable.

While I can see a point in discussing pride in heritage, I am rather reluctant to use the word pride in this context. A feeling of connection and history is a better description. The heritage of culture will always be part of every one of us, and it's usually good to feel a connection and continuity within it. Also, such a connection can foster feelings of responsibility, and a will to do good in and for the world around us.

References

1. Mensa International. (2018). Mensa Sweden. Retrieved from **https://www.mensa.org/country/sweden**.

2. Mensa Sverige. (2018). Mensa Sverige. Retrieved from **https://www.mensa.se/**.

Appendix I: Footnotes

[1] Ordförande/Chairman, Mensa Sverige/Mensa Sweden.

[2] Individual Publication Date: August 22, 2018: **www.in-sightjournal.com/orski-one**; Full Issue Publication Date: September 1, 2018: **https://in-sightjournal.com/insight-issues/**.

An Interview with Monika Orski (Part Two)

2018-09-01

Monika Orski is the Ordförande/Chairman, Mensa Sverige/Mensa Sweden. She discusses: books by Orski and their contents; the reason for the topics in the texts; membership of Mensa Sweden; demographics; Mensa groups associated with Mensa Sweden; provisions of Mensa Sweden for its members; average standard deviation IQ score of the membership; the relationship between Mensa at 2-sigma and other high-IQ groups at 3-sigma and 4-sigma; the identification, education, and utilization of the young gifted and talented population; programs in the advanced industrial economies; some informal education and practical life skills the gifted and talent should acquire if they wish to pursue a life in writing; and some prominent cases of when a known highly gifted person went wrong, e.g. antisocial, violent, and so on.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: What have been the books written by you? What topics tend to be the focus for you?

Monika Orski: In this area, I am a typical mensan, in that my activity is diverse. This far I have published three books, each of them very different from the others.

My first book, in 2007, is an introduction to open source software. There was no such book in Swedish, and I saw a need for it, as part of my computer systems related consulting work.

The second book, in 2011, is a young adults novel. It tells a story of friendship, incipient romantic interests, and mental illness. When it was published, I often got the question whether it's autobiographic. It is not.

The third and most recent book is a collection of short stories, published in 2017 but written over many years. The short stories are partially intertwined, with most of the main characters part of a Jewish family in Stockholm, Warsaw and Jerusalem. Again, I often get the question if it's autobiographic. It is not, but of course I have used settings I am familiar with, and in part processed stories I have heard.

If things turn out according to plan, there will be a fourth book published next year, 2019. This time around I go back to nonfiction, for a book on leadership of the highly gifted, largely based on my Mensa experience.

Jacobsen: Also, why those topics for the texts?

Orski: Well, they are all topics that interest me. I always write something or other. Some texts reach publication, others do not. Writing is a hobby I find rewarding in itself, even when it does not produce tangible results.

I also look to what is currently topical in Swedish literature, as for the young adults book, and of course to what I know about, as in the nonfiction. All in all, there are many factors shaping the choice of topics, and I am aware that I am probably unaware of half of them. Like most writers, I

would presume.

Jacobsen: Let us talk about the different functions and facets of Mensa Sweden: how many members?

Orski: Around 7,000 members, and the number increases every year. With Sweden's circa 10 million population, we are the national Mensa with the highest number of members per million inhabitants, which we are very proud of.

I also find it noteworthy that the only other national Mensa at a similar level of members per million is Mensa Finland. Since many years, we have a friendly competition with our neighbours for this first place. There are larger national groups, of course, but no other is even near the same numbers per million.

Jacobsen: What demographics remain a part of Mensa Sweden?

Orski: Well, we do not really keep statistics of demographics regarding anything but age and gender. The average age of Swedish mensans is 36. We have around 25 % women, 74% men, 1% others / unknown gender.

As a side note, the success rate of candidates who take the admission test is slightly higher for women than for men. Not a large difference, but visible. Thus, if we could only persuade as many women as men to take the admission test, the gender balance would even out with time.

Jacobsen: What other Mensa groups frequently associated with Mensa Sweden?

Orski: All the national Mensa groups, currently around 50 of them, are associated under the realm of Mensa International. But there are also regional cooperations, and we are very happy about the close cooperation we have between the Nordics, i.e. the national Mensas of Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden.

Jacobsen: What does Mensa Sweden provide for its members?

Orski: Mensa is member-driven, and almost all work within the organization is done by volunteers. This means the most important service we provide are ways to meet other members, and decide what to do together. There are local meetings spread around Sweden, organized by members who simply announce a pub meeting, or book a lecturer and a room for the lecture, etc.

There are, of course, larger meetings organized by groups of volunteers and supervised by elected Mensa officers on the board. There is also a magazine published 8 times a year, by volunteer editors and with contributions from members.

Then there is the opportunity to help out as a volunteer in the Gifted Children Program I mentioned before, and many members see this as a key function. It is a very tangible way to contribute to one of the three stated purposes of Mensa: to identify and foster human intelligence for the benefit of humanity, to encourage research in the nature, characteristics and uses of

intelligence, and to promote stimulating intellectual and social opportunities for its members.

Jacobsen: What is the average standard deviation IQ score of the members?

Orski: The criteria to join Mensa is the same all over the world, to score among the highest 2% on a supervised intelligence test.

We prefer the use of percentile to IQ scores. To still answer the question about scores: Intelligence is normally distributed. Assuming a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15, a passing Mensa score is 131 or above.

Jacobsen: What is the relationship between Mensa at 2-sigma and other high-IQ groups at 3-sigma and 4-sigma?

Orski: In short, none. Mensa is by far the most well-established high-IQ group, and has no direct relationship to any other group.

Of course, there are members who also join other groups, like Intertel (1%) or Triple Nine (0.1%) or ISPE (0.1%). In my experience, those who do usually stay in Mensa too, and are more likely to continue their Mensa membership than members of any of the others.

Jacobsen: There seems to be a widespread loss of the gifted and talent for the benefit of society and the fulfillment and meaning, in their own lives. How would you recommend Sweden move forward in the identification, education, and utilization of the young gifted and talented population?

Orski: I'm not at all sure there is such a widespread loss. Of course, most of the gifted people I come across are members of Mensa, which means they are in the relatively small group that wants to join a high-IQ society. Among them, far from everyone has any sort of visibly intellectual career, but that doesn't imply they cannot be happy with their life and benefit society.

That said, I still think that much can be gained if gifted children are identified and given an education proper to their needs. If schools learn to identify them early, they can be taught in slightly different ways, to cater to their intellectual conditions and needs. Most important, they should not be held back. It can make a significant difference just to allow a child to sit quietly and read about something s/he is interested in, instead of having to explicitly wait for their classmates to accomplish a task they themselves were able to do in a few minutes. Not only does it let them do something meaningful, it also gives them a feeling of being rewarded for having done the standard tasks, instead of being punished for completing them faster than others.

Jacobsen: What programs exist in advanced industrial economies for the gifted and talented that could easily be implemented in Sweden?

Orski: There are probably many good programs I am not aware of. Then, every educational system has its problems. However, I think the schooling systems of France and Finland would probably be interesting to look to for hints, as both tend to produce good results.

Jacobsen: What gifted and talented programs would take the longest to establish in Sweden but would have the greatest long-term impact on the intellectual flourishing of the country?

Orski: In my view, the greatest long-term positive impact would be produced by a shift of focus in university education. Today, it is mostly about training students for specific professions. We have university education for teachers, psychologists, engineers etc – but to gain a broad education that spans over several subjects is hard, not in terms of the actual learning process but in terms of being able to put such an education together. The system is designed to streamline student throughput, not to let them explore several possible talents.

Gifted young people should be able to combine subjects more easily. If they are allowed to find new combinations, and follow their usual multiple talents, some of them will be eminent in fields that do not even exist yet. But that takes a shift in education as a whole, and especially a shift that would allow university students to still pursue a specific field, but also let them create new combinations for learning.

Also, there remains the basic imperative never to punish gifted youth for being gifted. It is not as easy as it sounds, as every educational system has to be mostly adapted for the average, for practical reasons. However, I think much can be accomplished by the general approach that no one should be held back.

Jacobsen: What are some informal education and practical life skills the gifted and talent should acquire if they wish to pursue a life in writing?

I will start with the things everyone who wants to pursue a life in writing should do: Read, read, write, read, write and then read some more. You need to be truly rooted in your language, you need to know about other literature in your field, and you also need to read classics to be able to relate to current writing, including your own. If you do not enjoy reading, writing is not the path for you. Also, writing is a craft. It takes practice.

The next thing is, remember that very few writers can actually live off their writing. This is especially true for all of us who work in small linguistic regions. Here, the gifted usually have an advantage. Most highly gifted people have multiple talents, and thus it is easier to pursue a "daytime job", or another parallel career, as well as being a writer.

Another important practical thing is to find peers to exchange text analysis. Find other writers at about your own level, and form a group that will share text and help each other by criticism. It is important that you should not be in the habit of praise each other's texts, but actually criticize. That is the way to learn, and also learn to pay more attention to the strengths and weaknesses of the text before you. This group should, ideally, contain writers from different walks of life and with different intellectual skills.

Jacobsen: What are some prominent cases of when a known highly gifted person went wrong, e.g. antisocial, violent, and so on?

Orski: My Internet search is no better than that of anybody else… It has been widely published

that the "Unabomber" Ted Kaczynski is probably highly gifted. The same things are said about another terrorist, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed. Of course, I have no way to corroborate these claims.

High intelligence is no guarantee against mental illness. Neither is it a guarantee for high morals. Unfortunately, there is no sign that the highly intelligent don't go wrong about as often – or as seldom – as those of average intelligence.

References

1. Mensa International. (2018). Mensa Sweden. Retrieved from **https://www.mensa.org/country/sweden**.

2. Mensa Sverige. (2018). Mensa Sverige. Retrieved from **https://www.mensa.se/**.

Appendix I: Footnotes

[1] Ordförande/Chairman, Mensa Sverige/Mensa Sweden.

[2] Individual Publication Date: September 1, 2018: **www.in-sightjournal.com/orski-two**; Full Issue Publication Date: January 1, 2019: **https://in-sightjournal.com/insight-issues/**.

An Interview with Monika Orski (Part Three)

2018-09-08

Monika Orski is the Ordförande/Chairman, Mensa Sverige/Mensa Sweden. She discusses: collaboration with other Mensa chapters; other chapters helpful in the development of Mensa Sweden; the trend towards streamlined education; sex differences and similarities in general intelligence; signifiers of giftedness; typical means by which the gifted are punished; the unprecedented flourishing of women; pitfalls and difficulties in a life of writing; and some of the activities, memorable dialogues, and decisions made through the EMAG.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: How does collaboration work with the other Mensa chapters? What have been some of the collaborative projects worked on together?

Monika Orski: There is formal cooperation, to shape the rules that make Mensa chapters around the world all stay part of the federation. Then there is informal and semi-formal cooperation, mostly to create opportunities for members to meet.

Within Europe, there is a semi-formal cooperation around an annual common meeting, known as EMAG (European Mensa Annual Gathering). Formally, it is hosted by a different Mensa each year, but previous and future organizers cooperate closely for every event. I have attended every one since the start in 2008, and they have all been great fun. Also, I was the coordinator when we did one in Stockholm, in 2012.

Within the Nordics, we have a more recent common annual meeting, known as the Floating Mensans, as it is always a cruise between two of the countries. We have done two this far, had good success, and expect this meeting type to continue. We also cooperate to try and help create Mensa groups in neighbouring countries where Mensa is not yet present. In addition, I think all Nordic chairs are very happy about an annual chairs' meeting, when we exchange experiences and best practices and offer each other support when needed.

Jacobsen: How have the other chapters been helpful in the development of Mensa Sweden?

Orski: The very first Mensa group in Sweden was founded in 1964 by a member of American Mensa, Jay Albrecht, who lived in Stockholm for a few years. Without that seed, who knows if we would have the thriving national group of today.

Then, there is always an exchange of ideas. For example, when Mensa Sweden had a large revision of our bylaws around 15 years ago, we got many good ideas from Mensa Norway, who had done a similar revision about a year earlier, but we also picked up some ideas from Mensa Hungary. More recently, we have been able to use experiences from Czech Mensa in discussions about paper publishing or e-publishing of our Mensa magazine, seen some interesting ideas from Australian Mensa regarding young members, etc. We are all part of an international organization, and that is among the key strengths of Mensa.

Jacobsen: Some individuals work to reduce the diversity of the possible programs for an

individual student's training. Some recent news items arose in the feed for me. With respect to the training and education earned in various disciplines including the typically higher-prestige and higher-paying jobs mentioned by you, what might shift the emphasis from the siloed education typified in some modern post-secondary education – for a teacher, a psychologist, or an engineer, and so on – to a broader base? An education for someone with the more plural, life-long intellectual interests rather than the singular professional ones.

Orski: There seems to be a continued development towards more streamlined, and siloed, education. My guess is that it's mostly driven by short-term economic reasons, but it can also be perceived as making it easier to find the right education for a student with a purpose to pursue a specific profession. It would certainly not be easy to shift the other way, into a broader base.

One step towards such a broader base would be to allow students to start out with two, or even three, parallel courses from start. Let the multi-talented, and the multi-curious, try out several paths without a clear-cut switch between them. Then, let them continue – one path or several – and add more learning, some of which can be from entirely different disciplines.

While I think the general tracks for education into specific jobs also needs to remain there for those who know that one of those tracks is what they want, it should also be made easy to put together the required parts of such a track from the multi-course track, for those who start out there and then want to be qualified for a certain profession. Even within the specific job educational tracks, there should be room for, and time for, the possibility to also take some courses in other disciplines.

Not an easy change, of course. But in the long run, it would benefit all students.

Jacobsen: In personal and experience and knowing the data better than me, what differences exist between girls and boys, men and women, with respect to general intelligence? What similarities exist between them too? Do these considerations influence the provisions of Mensa Sweden?

Orski: In short, as far as we know there are no such differences. At least, I have not heard of any serious research that showed such differences and could be repeated.

There are many theories regarding this topic, usually spread along with claims of "natural differences" that any quick examination will disprove as things that have differed over time and differ between cultures. These assertions are usually made by people with a clear political agenda, and do not merit anything but the quick examination that disproves them.

As far as I know, there has actually been one scientific study that showed a small difference between men and women regarding the spread of intelligence. According to this study, while the average intelligence of men and women is the same, there is a small but measurable predominance of men in the extremes of intelligence – very low intelligence as well as very high. However, the study has been criticized for not having enough subjects at these extremes to be statistically significant, and no one has yet been able to recreate the results.

As I mentioned before, we do see a small but clear difference among those who take our admission test, in that women are more likely to "pass", i.e. score among the top 2%. But there is absolutely no proof that this shows a general difference in intelligence. After all, only a very small portion of the population take our test, and among those who do there are many more men than women. It seems probable the difference in "pass" percentage simply exposes a difference in how sure of their own high intelligence women and men need to be to go take the test.

Jacobsen: If someone is a layperson and has an inkling someone in their life is gifted, what non-professional observational clue would indicate the various levels of the giftedness of this person in their life? The signifiers, maybe not universal but probably indicative, of the person being gifted, highly gifted, even profoundly and exceptionally gifted.

Orski: The highly gifted usually display some combination of the following traits: thinks fast, asks many questions, quickly infers more information from what they are told, has many ideas, has multiple interests, has more than one profession, likes in-depth discussions, likes to learn new things, has a well-developed sense of humour, learns easily. Many are also high achievers, and set extremely high standards for themselves. Sometimes impossibly high standards, that they would not dream of setting for anyone else.

In children, you can add that they are usually early in many things. Read early, pass intellectual milestones early, develop an interest in world events and adult conversations early. They also tend to be easily bored, and can have some trouble in interactions with other children. Regardless of whether they find other children they like to spend time with, they also tend to like solitary activities.

None of those traits are universal, of course. But if you see several of them in someone, they are likely to be highly gifted.

Jacobsen: Regarding punitive educational philosophies and methodologies, what seems like the more typical forms of punishing the gifted for being gifted?

Orski: Holding them back, is my short answer. I know many stories of young children who, when they showed their teachers they had done all the exercises in their textbook, were told to "do them over again". As if there could be nothing more for them to learn. And of course, they often get explicitly told to hold back, and try and adjust to the average pace of their classmates.

Jacobsen: We watch the unique flourishing of women in most areas of education, especially in undergraduate education in the developed nations. Girls and young women continue to opt into the world of education. Boys and young men seem to opt out more now. Girls and young women had various ceilings imposed on them for a long time, especially in the world of education. Boys and young men did not have the ceilings. Now, though, they seem to have the problem of a motivational ceiling – of sorts – imposed on themselves. Why the gap in education attendance, completion, and performance between girls and boys, and young women and young men?

Orski: I doubt that anyone really has a good answer to this question. As you say, there seems to be sort of motivational ceiling, or motivational deficit. Formal education is considered less

important, partially as an effect of the growing importance within our whole society of personal characteristics and certain sets of social skills, at the expense of knowledge. And areas considered less important are usually left to women.

We also need to remember that the exact same behaviour will be assessed differently, depending on whether the person doing it is male or female. We all learn this so early, it is almost impossible to fully counteract it in our own reactions, even when we are aware of it. For some reason, judgements of boys not making an effort to take in the education they are offered seem to be much more tolerant than they are of girls with the same behaviour.

Many boys and young men seem to expect to get good jobs and incomes without having to make any sort of effort. There is such a tendency among some girls and young women too, but it is much less common. At the other end of the spectrum, more boys seem to give up early, and expect nothing more than to gain a kind of respect from their peers by the ability to use their fists, or at worst, the ability to procure and use weapons. But as to why this is so? I have no answer.

Jacobsen: What are the pitfalls and main difficulties of a life in writing?

Orski: The first difficulty is to actually sit down and write the text. I have met many persons who say "I would like to write a book", but what they really mean is "I would like to have written a book". Most of them never even try, of course. I guess someone with very strong character and determination could write a book only driven by the wish to have written it, but most of us need to like the writing itself to do it.

To like writing means to like hours by yourself with your text. There are sometimes good hours of progress, but sometimes also very slow hours when things simply will not work out, until you tried tens of different ways to put your words down. The ensuing frustration and criticism of your own work go with the territory.

Then, there is the obvious difficulty of having it published and, most crucially, read. Today, self-publication is easy, but to get readers without a publishing house to help is very difficult. I would strongly recommend to try and get the help of old-fashioned publishing house publication. Even then, as I mentioned before, only a few writers can make a living out of their writing, especially if you work within a small linguistic region.

Jacobsen: What have been some of the activities and memorable dialogues and decisions made through the EMAG?

Orski: Over the years, there have been workshops on improv theatre, math, dancing, geocaching, Wikipedia, singing, martial arts, meditation, creative writing and many other topics. Among the lectures, the topics range from business to science and from art to language studies. To mention a few, this year in Belgrade in August, I heard very good lectures on Behavioural Economics and on Nikola Tesla. I also gave a lecture this year, on leading intelligent people, with a bias towards the challenges and joys of leading Mensa volunteers.

There is also a tourist program every year, a great opportunity to see a town you might not have visited otherwise. But the most important part are the mensans, old friends you see every year and new ones you meet for the first time. I have had very interesting conversations on climate change, EU politics, complex computer systems, health issues, data protection, dating life, education of gifted children, midnight sun, and how to mix a drink – just to mention a few from this year.

References

1. Mensa International. (2018). Mensa Sweden. Retrieved from **https://www.mensa.org/country/sweden**.

2. Mensa Sverige. (2018). Mensa Sverige. Retrieved from **https://www.mensa.se/**.

Appendix I: Footnotes

[1] Ordförande/Chairman, Mensa Sverige/Mensa Sweden.

[2] Individual Publication Date: September 8, 2018: **www.in-sightjournal.com/orski-three**; Full Issue Publication Date: January 1, 2019: **https://in-sightjournal.com/insight-issues/**.

An Interview with Monika Orski (Part Four)

2018-09-15

Monika Orski is the Ordförande/Chairman, Mensa Sverige/Mensa Sweden. She discusses: wisest person ever met; smartest people ever met; asking fundamental questions about society; the advancement and empowerment of women; donation of time, skills, professional networks, and so on, to Mensa Sweden; more men joining Mensa compared to women; positives and negatives of perfectionism; the potential of gifted and talented; smartest person in history; women being held back; writing tally; downsides and upsides to the bureaucracy; boundaries and possibilities of national Mensa groups; Behavioural Economics and Nikola Tesla at EMAG; and alternative IQ tests.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: If you reflect on personal interactions and literature read in life, who seems like the wisest person ever met by you?

Monika Orski: A thought-provoking question, but also a difficult and rather personal one.

There are friends I have learned many things from, and wise people I have met in different situations, and also books that have made me think – mostly reading the classics, ranging from Dostoevsky to Austen, from de la Fayette to Kafka, and from Cervantes to Woolf. But to name one wisest person seems an impossible task.

Jacobsen: Also, in terms of IQ, which is non-trivial as a life factor, who are the smartest people ever met by you?

Orski: Well, I am not in the habit of asking people about their IQ scores.

I have met many very smart people through Mensa, of course. I also have friends who have never taken an intelligence test, but who are clearly among the smartest people I ever met.

Jacobsen: Do these moves towards more streamlined and siloed educational systems inadvertently prevent the development of minds capable of asking fundamental questions about society, querying about the undergirding structures running the nation?

Orski: No, I wouldn't say they prevent it. They do, however, make the development of minds more difficult, in the meaning that these systems obstruct the systematic, guided search for broad knowledge. Anyone can read a text book on a subject they are not yet familiar with, but a curriculum set by people already proficient in the area will give a starting point that is much better.

I return to the assertion that an educational system that allows for the development of the multi-curious while it still has clear paths for those in search of training for at specific profession, would be advantageous to all students, as well as to society. But it's not an easy thing to implement. It would take partially new structures, and a different approach to university education.

Jacobsen: With the rise of women, in some limited domains, we see the counter to it. The rise in hyper-masculine, whether religious or non-religious manifestations, and even authoritarian groups in much of the West with the intent, in some of their efforts, to retract and regress the progress seen in women's rights for the last few decades. Does this seem to be the case to you? If so, does this concern you? If it does concern you, what can effectively work to continue the advancement and empowerment of women?

Orski: I agree, and see this as a very palpable concern. I does concern me, and people close to me.

First thing, in my view, is to recognize that the authoritarian groups we are talking about try to reverse progress in several areas. They are racist, anti gay rights, against religious freedom – and also against the human rights of women. All those aspects should be viewed together, and fiercely opposed.

When we see these groups growing, it's easy to be discouraged. I certainly am, sometimes. But all in all, most things still advance over time. The very strength of the backlash proves the power of progress. Of course, it also proves that progress has to be fought for, over and over again. This fight is done by a continuous assertion of basic democratic and human rights, for all.

But there are also everyday ways to continue the empowerment of women. We are all brought up to assess identical behavior slightly differently when done by a man then when done by a woman. We can all try to counteract this in our own reactions. Learn to use the same words when we describe the actions of a woman as we use when describing identical actions of a man, and for example not call her "aggressive" where he is "confident".

Thus, let it be part of everyday life, but also a very important part of everyday politics.

Jacobsen: In terms of the pursuits of the multi-talented and multi-curious, I appreciate the work and effort for decades to help the gifted and talented young. It has been a significant concern for a long time for me. It warms my heart to see the work of the various national Mensa groups. Honestly, the population still seems underserved. Same with the older gifted and talented, who could be mentors and wise counsel for some of the gifted and talented young. It seems as if a waste of human capital and human flourishing to not invest in them more. How can people donate time, skills, professional networks, or join Mensa Sweden?

Orski: To join Mensa Sweden, start by going to **www.mensa.se** to find information about and register for an admittance test. Or, if you are not in Sweden, start at **www.mensa.org** to find a link to the website of your national Mensa, and look for information there.

Other than that, there are several volunteer organizations, not directly related to Mensa, that help young people add more knowledge and skills – and more fun – to the things they learn in school. Look for them to volunteer time and skills, they always need it.

Jacobsen: Why do so many more men join Mensa compared to women? How does this phenomenon impact relationships, dating, marriage, and potential family life for the mensans?

Orski: I wish I knew why. The figures do differ for different national Mensas, but this fact only underscores that there seem to be cultural factors of different sorts. My guess would be that men, statistically, tend to think more of their own intelligence. There might also be a factor of risk aversion, that women are more inclined not to want to take a test unless they are sure to get a high score.

Another interesting fact is that while the membership of Mensa Sweden is only about 25% women, the group of volunteers is significantly closer to 50-50. Thus, it seems that women are less likely to want to join the society, but those who do seek membership are more likely to take active part once they have joined.

I don't think the gender statistics within Mensa has any significant impact on the dating and family life of mensans in general. I know some couples who have met through Mensa, and others who joined together, but at the end of the day it's simply another social context for people to meet a potential partner, fortunately not the only one.

Jacobsen: What are the positives and negatives of the "sometimes impossibly high standards" of the gifted and talented?

Orski: Ambition is generally a good thing. So is the endeavour always to do a little better, get a little further. I also think that a will always to ask more of yourself than of anybody else, is a sign of being a sentient a sensible person.

There is a risk to it, too. The risk is that you try to overachieve in ways that push yourself beyond what is reasonable to expect of any human being with normal, human weaknesses. That is what I mean by the gifted sometimes having not only high standards for themselves, but impossibly high standards.

Jacobsen: How are the gifted and talented often left languishing or simply wasted as not only individuals with needs but also potential massive contributors to the flourishing of the nation?

Orski: I am still not convinced that they are. There are many ways to make a happy life for yourself and contribute to the society you are part of. While I am very much in favour of a schooling system that would recognize the needs of the gifted earlier, I would not say that the gifted and talented are often wasted. Which, of course, does not diminish the need to work to let more people explore their potential, and find paths to do so at earlier ages.

Jacobsen: Who seems like the smartest person in history to you, as a pervasively intelligent human being?

Orski: I could repeat the list of names from your question about geniuses in the history of Western Europe, and add some. Inventors like Cai Lun (if he did invent paper, as has been attributed to him), Leonardo da Vinci, Johannes Gutenberg. Writers like Sophocles, Murasaki Shikibu, Dostoevsky, Tolstoy. I could go on at length. But to put down only one name is an impossible task.

Jacobsen: Women remain more objectified than men. This ties into the evaluations of women not as complete persons with rights, responsibilities, wants, needs, and goals and dreams but as objects of beauty and admiration of physical characteristics. How does this cross-cultural phenomenon undermine women's intellectual courage, capacity to pursue their dreams without undue and unfair criticism and setback not normally expected in – for example – the lives of most men, and lower their standards for themselves and, if heterosexual, the men in their lives too? Why would working on the reduction of this phenomena lead to more flourishing – *eudaimonia* – of women and a raising of standards for the men in their lives?

Orski: This is another aspect of being held back, in all sorts of ways. It is also among the things explored in the rich feminist literature, from "A Vindication of the Rights of Women" by Wollstonecraft, via "Le Deuxième Sexe" by de Beauvoir, and on to our days.

It is something that has to be worked at every day, in the everyday lives of all of us. As I already mentioned, we know that we assess identical behavior slightly differently depending on the gender of the person we interact with. I can get angry with myself when I notice that I expect a little more work, and a slightly higher quality of work, form women I work with than from a man in the same position. We all need to counteract this in ourselves.

Then, there are all the things that women are taught to take in stride, while no man is expected to accept them. The resent "me too" movement has made people more aware of this fact. I actually think that bringing up the everyday mostly-not-quite-harassment that basically every women is subject to at some point, has had even more of an impact than the loud and outrageous cases that, of course, should be handled by the judicial system.

And yes, I do agree that this will, step by step, lead to more flourishing of women and men alike.

Jacobsen: How many words do you write per day? How many days per week? When is there a break between writing?

Orski: Sometimes, when I sit down to write for an hour, the result is the draft of at short story of 5 pages. At other times, it's a single paragraph. It all depends on the stage of that particular text. When I edit a longer text, as I do now with the upcoming book, I spend less time on new material. On the other hand, to go for a walk and than write a flash fiction short story can be a great way to free the brain of blockage when things do not come out right in the text I'm mainly working at.

As writing is not my primary work, it also depends on how much time and effort I need to spend on my consulting work, as well as the volunteer work I have taken on. But in general, if I do not write at all for a week or two, it is usually a sign that I have taken on to much to be able to relax, and I try to consider that a warning sign to be heeded.

Jacobsen: Are there bureaucratic downsides to a national and international Mensa leadership? What are the upsides, comparatively?

Orski: There are bureaucratic downsides to every organization. Not even Mensa has been able to

come up with a complete remedy for this phenomenon.

From a national Mensa point of view, we have some rules set down by national and local traditions, and other by being part of an international organization. Mensa International business is always conducted in English, which adds a language barrier for all of us who are not in English-speaking countries. For example, we always have to keep an English translation of the bylaws of our national Mensa, and before the membership can vote on changing anything in the bylaws, the proposal has to be translated into English and reviewed at the international level.

But all in all, Mensa is not very bureaucratic, for being an international organization with around 150 000 members world wide. That is one of the upsides of an organization being run by members for members, with most of the work done by volunteers.

Jacobsen: What are boundaries and possibilities of national Mensa groups? What can and cannot be done? That is, what are the limits for the national groups or representative organizations?

Orski: In short, Mensa as an organization shall not express an opinion as being that of Mensa, take any political action, or have any ideological, philosophical, political or religious affiliation. Members can have all sorts of opinions and affiliations, of course, bur Mensa cannot.

As a national Mensa chapter, we keep to the purpose of Mensa:

"to identify and foster human intelligence for the benefit of humanity; to encourage research in the nature, characteristics, and uses of intelligence; and to provide a stimulating intellectual and social environment for members."

Jacobsen: What was most fascinating about Behavioural Economics and Nikola Tesla?

Orski: Both of those EMAG lectures were well prepared and well performed. Also, I learned new things, which is always a pleasure.

Behavioural Economics, with its mixture of well-researched psychology into more classic economic theory, is a highly interesting area. We probably all know we are not always strictly rational, but here is a way to measure and explain it.

The lecture on Nicola Tesla focused on the inventor Tesla's work on energy sources, where he was very early to see the need for new, renewable and alternative energy sources. An interesting and quite modern topic for someone active in the 1920s and 1930s.

Jacobsen: There are alternative IQ tests for societies with very high IQ cutoffs. Some developed by qualified psychometricians, or at least those with experimental psychology and statistics backgrounds. Others are from intelligent people without these formal qualifications. What is the general perspective of the high-IQ community of these tests? What is the range of quality of them? What is the average of the quality of them? Has Mensa ever accepted them for membership? Have they ever been considered for qualification of membership?

Orski: The qualification definition, being among the 2%, is the same for Mensa all over the world. The tests accepted as evidence, however, can differ between national Mensas. This is the reason I do not really know the answer to this. There might be some such "very high-IQ" test created by a qualified psychometrician and accepted as evidence somewhere, although I am not currently aware of any such instance.

Mostly, those tests remain in the realm of puzzles. Some people really like doing them, and the creators usually get a certain amount of good reputation for providing them. However, it's very hard to measure intelligence at levels where the number of possible test subjects is scarce. Thus, most of these test will probably remain nice puzzles, rather than actual tests.

References

1. Mensa International. (2018). Mensa Sweden. Retrieved from **https://www.mensa.org/country/sweden**.

2. Mensa Sverige. (2018). Mensa Sverige. Retrieved from **https://www.mensa.se/**.

Appendix I: Footnotes

[1] Ordförande/Chairman, Mensa Sverige/Mensa Sweden.

[2] Individual Publication Date: September 15, 2018: **www.in-sightjournal.com/orski-four**; Full Issue Publication Date: January 1, 2019: **https://in-sightjournal.com/insight-issues/**.

An Interview with Hasan Zuberi, M.B.A. (Part One)

2018-09-22

Hasan Zuberi, M.B.A. is the Chairman for Mensa Pakistan. He discusses: personal family background; family background feeding into early life; giftedness becoming a factor in life; nurturance of giftedness; reasons for community investment in the gifted; the acceptance and nurturance of the gifted and talented through the formal mechanisms of the countries in the Middle East-North Africa region; the largest flowering of intellectual progress in the Islamic tradition; M.B.A. and early education for the gifted; benefits of multilingualism; PR company; detriment of high-IQ; membership of Mensa Pakistan; Mensa Pakistan demographics; other Mensa groups closely working with Mensa Pakistan; provisions for Mensa Pakistan members; average standard deviation IQ of Mensa Pakistan members; and the relationship between Mensa at 2-sigma and other high-IQ groups at 3-sigma and 4-sigma.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: In terms of geography, culture, language, and religion/irreligion, what is personal family background?

Hasan Anwer Zuberi: My family name Zuberi (or Zubairi) hails from present-day Saudi city of Makkah, and is a sub-tribe started from Zubair bin Al-Awam, a companion and cousin of Prophet Muhammad (Peace Be Upon Him) who is buried in a city called Az-Zubair, near Basra present-day Iraq. The spread of Islam leads our clan to move towards the East and a substantial portion settled in the subcontinent (present-day India), and after the partition of British-India, mostly migrated to Karachi, Pakistan.

Both my parents, grandparents and great-grandparents from both sides were Zuberis, due to internal marriages. Our family excels in Education and has many institutions to its name in the Indian subcontinent, including Muslim Aligarh University, Karachi School of Arts, Mardan Women Degree College, to name a few.

Our primary language is Urdu. However, I am married to an Indonesian and my kids speak: Urdu, Bahasa Indonesian, and English.

Jacobsen: How did these multiple facets of family background feed into early life for you?

Zuberi: Since our family is mostly in education, I started at an early age and by 15 I was through with my 10th grade, and by 22 was done with my M.B.A. in Marketing. In between, I joined Alliance Francaise to learn French, that started as a hobby and was done with DELF 1er Degre and this is where I was introduced to Mensa. I tried the test, qualified in the 99th percentile, and later became the youngest Chairman at the age of 21.

Jacobsen: When did giftedness become a fact for you, explicitly? Of course, you lived and live with it. The key, when was the high general intelligence formally measured, acknowledged, and integrated into personal identity and loved ones' perception of you?

Zuberi: It was at the time of my French studies that my teachers, mostly French, showed their

surprise in my capability of picking the language, especially in an English language dominant country, and of my accent. They were the ones who identified the potential and helped me participate more. These were very troubled days in Karachi, with the civil-ethnic war going on and everyday killings and business shutdown strikes were common. The language center, which served as a refuge from all that was happening around me, helped me open and I organized many events including the only and the biggest mime-show in Karachi, Volleyball, Table Tennis, and Pétanque tournaments, reading and poetry sessions, and so on.

I came across a Mensa poster there and just out of curiosity sat for the test, which resulted in this long association.

Jacobsen: Was your giftedness nurtured in early life into adolescence?

Zuberi: I will say, "Yes," it did get nurtured. Learning the fact that I am among the population considered to be of the highly intelligent. It helped in my daily calculations and decision-making. Although I was not a high achiever until my college, the fact of being a Mensa qualifier, and member, helped me secure 3.5+ CGPA and scholarship in my M.B.A. degree. This also resulted in starting my own business, a PR company, at the age of 27.

Jacobsen: Why should governments and communities invest in the gifted, identification and education? How can families and friends help prevent gifted kids from a) acting arrogant and b) becoming social car crashes (with a) and b) being related, of course)?

Zuberi: As all five fingers are not the same, all children have their specific requirements and need to focus on it. Governments, communities, family and friends all have a pivotal role in shaping and carving a gifted personality. High IQ is not necessarily always positive; it has its negative side.

I have myself witnessed many cases in Mensa Pakistan, and this is one of our primary foci and objectives to help shape the gifted mind in a gifted person. In families, particularly in our society, high IQ often results in anti-social disorder among the gifted children, as they find it hard to cope with the average intellect, and it makes them isolate within their respective circles, be it in the family, among friends, or even at schools.

We at Mensa Pakistan focus at school, establish our school-chapters (club), and from time to time engage teachers, staff, and parents along with the gifted children to make them understand that high IQ is a gift, and should be treated like one. On the one hand, we tell the teachers and parents on how to best utilize the hidden talents of the high IQ individual, and on the other, we make sure the students should not take this natural talent as an achievement, act arrogant, and should realize that it also has its negative sides if not tamed in the right direction, with the help and guidance from the loved ones around them.

Jacobsen: How well-established and funded is the acceptance and nurturance of the gifted and talented through the formal mechanisms of the countries in the Middle East-North Africa region?

Zuberi: If we talk about MENA region, the concept of gifted/high IQ is still in its infancy stage, number of reasons involved, top being the poverty, low literacy rate, and the governance systems. For instance, even in the rich Gulf states, there is no visible effort to identify, polish, or to utilize the potential and skills of high IQ/gifted children. But for a change, in countries like Egypt, Turkey, Jordan and Pakistan, I came to know about certain initiatives that were to foster the human intelligence on the positive side.

Jacobsen: Islam maintains a long intellectual legacy unknown to much of the rest of the world, especially in relation to the geniuses in the Arab world. Who comes to mind for you? What periods of time represent the largest flowering of intellectual progress in this tradition?

Zuberi: We can start with *Al-Khwarizmi*, the father of "Al Jabr" (or Algebra), then we had *Abu Nasar Al Farabi* (or Alpharabius), *Abu Ali Sena* (or Avicenna), *Abu Rayhan Al Biruni,* and the father of modern surgery *Al-Zahrawi* (or Abulcasis) and all are from the Islamic golden age that was around 650-750 AD.

There was also much progress made in the modern times until the WWI, but that was divided between the rival Caliphates (Khilafah or Kingdoms) and later Nationalism even destroyed the Arabs, which still exists to date and can be seen in the present-day Arab world.

Jacobsen: How have the early graduation and M.B.A. helped with personal and professional life? When would education acceleration be inappropriate for a highly gifted child?

Zuberi: Early graduation didn't help me much compared to starting work at an early age. I started my work life right after my 12th grade. This helped me a lot when I started my M.B.A. and even resulted in attaining high GPA and scholarship. The education acceleration should come when the gifted child is made aware of his potential and at the tender age. Too much pressure may also result in a negative result at an early age.

Jacobsen: What are the benefits of multilingualism, being a polyglot? What downsides come from it?

Zuberi: Multilingualism is always helpful. It helps kids open more to respect others, be it culture, language, or cuisine. To me, it helped in understanding others, guiding others (literally also I served as a tour guide), and interact with humans of another race, colour, and ethnicity.

Jacobsen: What was the PR company? How did this develop and influence professional life? Why focus on a PR company?

Zuberi: Public Relation Consultancy, the best part of PR is that it comes naturally. It is a normal interaction with people around us. The relationship with the public, where the public is everyone. Starting from the time we wake up and the first person that we see, it can be wife, kids, siblings, mother, father, to the first person we meet outside our house. To the office, on the way, until we return to our bed, how good are we with every other human being. So, for me, it became a passion more than a profession. That is one core reason, I never looked back.

In the professional base, we advise brands on how to interact with their public. Customers, partners, management, staff, employees. Each and every one with whom the brand interacts considering brand itself as an individual. To start a 2-way communication, listen to others and share your story, your good side, with them.

Jacobsen: How can a high-IQ be a detriment in life?

Zuberi: Like every good thing, there are good and bad sides to it. If not controlled, or tamed, high IQ can be as explosive and destructive as any bomb and can result in negativity. A high IQ person with a negative attitude can cause serious harm.

Gifted people can easily turn into an anti-social person, due to acceptability and difficulty in making others understand their thoughts. and this, at times, diverts them towards ill for the society and people in general.

Jacobsen: Let us talk about the distinct functions and facets of Mensa Pakistan: how many members?

Zuberi: Considering the fact that Pakistan is the 6th most populous country in the world, with an estimated population of 210 million (*approx – 2018), Mensa Pakistan is still a very small chapter.

In my tenure since 1999 as GS, and then in 2000 onward as the Chairman, we had almost 10,000 qualifiers but majority of them were high school students and a Mensa qualification was one of the point-scoring sheets for them and majority, nearly 60% went abroad for high studies and hardly 5-7% returned until date.

At this date, we stand at only 300+ members in good standing but are in contact with almost 1200, who are either too busy or too old to be worth the membership.

Jacobsen: What demographics remain a part of Mensa Pakistan?

Zuberi: Demographically, we are present in 3 big cities, namely Karachi, Lahore, and Islamabad, with active chapters, though have conducted tests in almost 18 cities across Pakistan. Gender-wise it's a good M:F = 48:52 % mix and most are aged between (16 – 35) with few exceptions including myself.

Jacobsen: What other Mensa groups frequently associated with Mensa Pakistan?

Zuberi: We work very closely with British, Canadian, and US Mensa chapters, mostly for membership transfers. In addition, I have played my part in the development of Mensa chapters in Indonesia, and the UAE, and maintain good relations with them.

In Pakistan, we have hosted visiting Mensan from 6 countries to date; namely from Germany, Finland, India, Indonesia, Norway, and the Philippines.

Jacobsen: What does Mensa Pakistan provide for its members?

Zuberi: Mensa Pakistan provides its members mainly with the platform to utilize their high IQ skills in a positive manner. In addition, we provide our members with hands-on work opportunity in management, leadership, finance, and marketing. Our senior members serve as mentors for youngsters for guidance, career advises, scholarship opps, and internships.

Jacobsen: What is the average standard deviation IQ score of the members?

Zuberi: The minimum accepted score on the Harcourt's FRT Tests is 135 in the 98th%ile and the average score is in the 99th percentile among qualifiers. Whereas among general populations, we have had an average of 75%ile in the Urban areas; whereas, in the rural areas, it was 65%.

Jacobsen: What is the relationship between Mensa at 2-sigma and other high-IQ groups at 3-sigma and 4-sigma?

Zuberi: I am not much familiar with other IQ groups as none are present in Pakistan.

Appendix I: Footnotes

[1] Chairman, Mensa Pakistan.

[2] Individual Publication Date: September 22, 2018: **http://www.in-sightjournal.com/zuberi-one**; Full Issue Publication Date: January 1, 2019: **https://in-sightjournal.com/insight-issues/**.

Ask A Genius (or Two): Conversation with Erik Haereid and Rick Rosner (Part One)

2018-10-01

Rick Rosner and I conduct a conversational series entitled Ask A Genius on a variety of subjects through In-Sight Publishing on the personal and professional website for Rick. Rick exists on the World Genius Directory listing as the world's second highest IQ at 192 based on several ultra-high IQ tests scores developed by independent psychometricians. Erik Haereid earned a score at 185, on the N-VRA80. Both scores on a standard deviation of 15. A sigma of ~6.13 for Rick – a general intelligence rarity of 1 in 2,314,980,850 – and ~5.67 for Erik – a general intelligence rarity of 1 in 136,975,305. Of course, if a higher general intelligence score, then the greater the variability in, and margin of error in, the general intelligence scores because of the greater rarity in the population. This amounts to a joint interview or conversation with Erik Haereid, Rick Rosner, and myself.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: Erik meet Rick. Rick meet Erik. The topic is 'The Future of Statistics and Actuarial Science' for this discussion. Erik, you are a statistician and actuary. That is, you have the relevant expertise. Therefore, it seems most appropriate to have the groundwork, e.g. common terms, premises (or assumptions), and theories within statistics and actuarial science, provided by you. To begin, what are the common terms, premises (or assumptions), and theories within statistics and actuarial science at the frontier of the disciplines? From there, we can discuss the future of statistics and actuarial science within a firm context.

Erik Haereid*:* I thought the topic should be more common. I am not comfortable talking about the latest theories within Statistics and Actuarial Science; I have never practiced as a statistician even though I have an M.Sc. in Statistics. I have worked the last 20 years primarily with insurance administration; as manager, entrepreneur and as a consultant (pension schemes for companies; DB- and DC-plans, pension accounting and so on), and only in the life insurance and pension fields. I have not worked with insurance mathematics in 20 years. If you insist on using insurance as a topic, we must concentrate on life insurance and pension in Norway from 1960 to today. This is my premise. I think that I know the Norwegian life insurance area from the 1960's until today well, but I hoped that we could concentrate on a more interesting and common topic; there are so many things going on in the world today. I thought we should talk about a common topic like refugee problems, economy, politics, war, peace, social psychology, aggression, love, existential questions, as intelligent laypeople, and not about topics related to my profession. I have several profound thoughts about many topics. Rick Rosner and I are both 50+ years and have experienced the 1970's, 80's and 90's. Why not use this fact as a basis for a discussion?

Jacobsen: Let us start with the first recommendation of the refugee problems:

Both of you are over 50+ years. You have experienced the changes of the 1970s to the present. There is a problem with refugees now. Have there been comparable problems within your lifetimes? What seems like the source of this current refugee crisis? What might alleviate the problems associated with it? What might be a general solution for it?

Haereid: One week ago, a Kenyan judge ruled that the Kenyan government's plan to close Dadaab, the world's largest refugee camp, was wrong ("illegal" and "discriminatory"). I think this is a beginning of many refugee camps closures in the future; in Kenya, Liberia, Uganda, Lebanon, Jordan etc.

A lot of migrants moved from Central America to the USA in the 1970's and 80's. The Refugee Act brought USA closer to the UN Convention from 1951. Maybe Rick can say something about this event. The Reagan administration was not too happy about the situation. And I would like to hear Rick's opinion about Donald Trump's apparent xenophobia.

I am born 18 years after the end of WW2, and the first catastrophe I remember is the Biafran War, the Nigerian Civil War, from 1967 to 1970. I remember the pictures of the malnourished children with huge bellies. This was hard. The picture of the famine left some psychological scars in a five-year-old boy from a developed country. The Biafran War led to a huge number of refugees inside the country. Then the Biafran Airlift was established and dropped food and medicines over the camps. Nigerian aircrafts tried to stop them from doing this, using hunger as a weapon against the people. I remember the commitment from the rest of the world, how everybody wanted to help. The media did a good job there, by transmitting pure pain into ordinary peoples living rooms. It made people feel empathy, and act.

There have been several wars and refugees for the last five decades, but not like today. The many conflicts, and the Syrian conflict as the main, make the situation today the most severe since WW2. There are approximately 65 million refugees in the world today, and about 21 million are refugees in other countries than their own.

The UNHCR and the international community have to take this situation more serious; this is only a beginning of a possible mass migration that has no end. In my opinion, we have to build separate cities or communities spread all over the world, where migrants and refugees can live temporarily in a sustainable environment. The tent camps have to be replaced by ordinary houses and infrastructure. This will be cheap compared to the alternative; more war, more suffering, more violence, an increasing pressure on the stabilized countries… The international community can for instance rent land from different countries that has land to spare.

When integrating or resettling too many refugees we will experience more far-right politics. We can expect a blooming extremism and fundamentalism when we try to integrate too many refugees and migrants in developed countries like the USA and Europe. Xenophobia expands when we don't control the stream of refugees. This is as I see it the most important cause to define a limit of the number of migrants coming into USA and Europa. I have to add that I am myself in favour of diversity in any culture; diversity implies less xenophobia when the integration is done right. We learn to like and love; we can't rush it. The diversity has to rise in right pace. If we move too fast, people get scared and their votes are based on that fear.

We have to learn from the many failures we have done concerning the treatment of refugees all over the world. The Syria crisis is a wake-up call. Today it's about 5 million Syrian refugees outside Syria; most of them in neighbouring countries like Turkey, Lebanon and Jordan. I think we have to use more money on more sustainable solutions, and that one solution is to build more

sustainable reception centers for refugees in areas where they can live temporarily with support from the international community; cities or communities with a certain level of infrastructure, independent of local fluctuations in politics and business. It would be like enclaves protected by the international community; UN, the different governments, non-profit organizations etc.

The final answer is, of course, to make the world more peaceful and balanced, but this answer does not help the 65 million refugees in the world today. This is another question, like how to cure cancer.

The sources of the crisis are war, starvation, environment, despotism, population growth, dreams about a better place…

Well, I think building sustainable communities in migration zones may alleviate the problem. The main task is to help the people who suffer beyond our imaginations. Wars are a consequence of instability. People have to feel safe, feel that they can live normal lives. And to achieve this we have to restore the meaning of the word *respect.*

Rosner: I recently had the immigration argument with a very conservative guy. So, I am generally not overly informed about political stuff, but on immigration, I am slightly less ill-informed than usual. My buddy argues that the US has let in something like 60 million immigrants in the past 40 years, which is somewhat higher than historical percentages. So, if it weren't such a politically charged issue, I could see slightly reducing the rate of immigration from the average of 1.5 million per year over the past 40 years, even though that's well under 1% of the U.S. population per year.

I find that for most political issues, there's a large set of facts which most people don't know, and the people who are informing us using these facts cherry-pick the facts to fit their biases. In the case of my conservative buddy, he listens to people who cherry-pick facts about Islam to make Islam sound like the worst thing possible. And because I am ignorant, I can't argue against them very well.

All I can say is, "Well, that sounds way too awful to actually be the case." But I don't have the countervailing facts to fight his facts. One set of facts pertains to the rates and sources of terrorism in America and the rest of the western world. In America, current arguments about immigration are, for the most part, about whether we're leaving ourselves open to terrorist acts and terrorist infiltrators—terrorist sleepers.

My conservative buddy has the additional argument that if you let in too many Muslim people, who, according to him, have a strategy and a religious obligation to have kids at a higher rate than the native population to eventually turn the country into a Muslim majority country. If you let too many Muslims into America, according to my buddy, they will become a significantly large minority, and they will enforce Sharia Law.

He says to look at Germany and other European countries, where the population is at 10% of the country and seems to be causing some problems. And yeah, I can see where there are some problems there. My friend says that in the 70s, we only had like 60,000 Muslims in the whole

country. Now, we have 3 million Muslims because we've been letting in immigrants and because immigrants have kids.

My argument is that 3 million is still less than 1% of the total United States population. And even if those 3 million reproduce at a crazy rate, they will not reach the troublesome 10% level in 50 years or 60 years, and in that next 60 years, there will be so many other things happening in America. Muslims are having kids at a faster rate shouldn't be in the top 3 or top 5 things that we should be worrying about.

I would worry about the social and political upheaval because of the crazy waves of technology that we're going to continually be hit with over the next 60 years. I would counter the too many Muslims argument with what another friend who works in software and artificial intelligence (AI) says: "By the year 2100, the world may have 1 trillion AI at various levels of sophistication."

So, I think we need to worry more about how we are going to build a society that can incorporate hundreds of billions of AI rather than whether or not 3 million Muslims will be having too many kids. As I'm speaking, we're 6 or 7 weeks into the Trump presidency. He will soon be presenting the revised travel ban for 7 countries that give Trump the creeps because he thinks they're the source of potential bad guys coming in.

My feeling is that we're already fairly prudent in terms of letting people into the country to live. It takes—I've heard in my ignorant way—like 2 years of screening before people get to move here. In my ignorant way, I know that immigrants—both legal and otherwise—have lower crime rates than native-born Americans. So, it seems to me any adjusting we do does not need to be abrupt and draconian, but if we feel we need to protect ourselves more we can adjust existing practices to lower the level of risk presented by the people we let in as official immigrants.

We'll never get every single dangerous person. This freaks out my conservative friend. He also argues that even if you do get everybody and do let in everybody that it doesn't prevent the radicalization of their kids who grow up in America because, he claims, the first generation born here is more easily recruited to do terrorist stuff than perhaps their parents who came here as grateful immigrants.

Trump's first big issue, which he ran on, was kicking out illegal immigrants. In his early campaign, he characterized them as our #1 threat, which, to me, seems like bullshit right off the top because, if you believe the statistics (and some conservative people don't), prior to '08, we had about 12.7 million undocumented aliens, and after the economy tanked, the net flow of undocumented immigrants was out of the US.

So, 9 years later, we have 11.7 million undocumented immigrants. Some conservatives say, "How do you know? Maybe there are 30 million undocumented immigrants." But that's a hysterical exaggeration. It's around, say, 12 million. At 12 million, that's less than 4% of the people in America, and 4% of the people can't be the source of everything wrong in America in terms of crime, in terms of lost jobs.

It's 4%. So, you're not going to make everything better by kicking out the 4%, especially with regard to crime because that 4% has been shown to have a lower crime rate than people who were born here. They don't have a zero crime rate, there are plenty of bad people among the 4%, but they're not solidly bad people who are destroying the fabric of America.

Obama was deporting the hell out of people. I don't know the statistics, but millions over the course of his presidency. A lot of people got deported. Conservatives will argue those numbers are kinda fake because a lot of the deported people come back in, but Obama deported more undocumented aliens than, I guess any other president, ever. [NOTE: Here's a Snopes explainer of 21st-century US deportation stats. http://www.snopes.com/obama-deported-more-people/

So, I tend to be on the side of doing what we were doing under Obama and if we need to tighten things somewhat, fine, but we don't need the full-on Trump treatment of immigration. There are a lot of things in the world that should be based on statistics and the best outcomes. Like when you look at instances of possible police incompetence that lead to fatalities, unjustified fatalities, it seems that there should be some statistics-based training of cops the way that sports teams do statistics-based tracking and training.

Basketball, you learn where the sweet spots are. You learn the statistical outcomes. Good coaches know, in basketball, whether you should foul an opposing player or not based on how good he is at shooting free throws. Like Hack-a-Shaq, if somebody's terrible at free throws, then you deny them the likely 2 points of making a basket and make them shoot free throws. You can apply that to a general model where you don't foul somebody shooting from behind the 3-point line because that gives them three free throws to shoot.

All of that stuff is based on keeping a lot of statistics and building strategic models based on those stats. You can do the same thing with certain aspects of policing. When, as a cop, you're approaching a suspect and you're apprehensive about certain things you've noticed about the situation you're in, you should know what potential actions on your part have statistically minimized the worst possible outcomes.

It seems like that kind of statistical training might be helpful. I don't know. I'm not a cop. I don't know what statistics cops keep or what models they use, but, in any case, you can use statistics-based models for immigration. You look at immigration and related statistics, set your risk parameters, for tolerance of risk based on the US being a beacon for immigrants and for various other social and economic statistics, and you build your models and your strategies based on that stuff instead of on demagoguery and freaking out.

Appendix I: Footnotes

[1] Erik Haereid: "About my writing: Most of my journalistic work I did in the pre-Internet-period (80s, 90s), and the articles I have saved are, at best, aged in a box somewhere in the cellar. Maybe I can find some of it, but I don't think that's that interesting.

Most of my written work, including crime short stories in A-Magasinet (Aftenposten (one of the main newspapers in Norway, as **Nettavisen** is)), a second place (runner up) in a nationwide

writing contest in 1985 arranged by Aftenposten, and several articles in different newspapers, magazines and so on in the 1980s and early 1990s, is not published online, as far as I can see. This was a decade and less before the Internet, so a lot of this is only on paper.

From the last decade, where I used more time doing other stuff than writing, for instance work, to mention is my book from 2011, the IQ-blog and some other stuff I don't think is interesting here.

I keep my personal interests quite private. To you, I can mention that I play golf, read a lot, like debating, and 30-40 years and even more kilos ago I was quite sporty, and competed in cross country skiing among other things (I did my military duty in His Majesty The King's Guard (Drilltroppen)). I have been asked from a couple in the high IQ societies, if I know Magnus Carlsen. The answer is no, I don't :)"

Haereid has interviewed In-Sight: Independent Interview-Based Journal Advisory Board Member **Dr. Evangelos Katsioulis**, some select articles include topics on AI in ***What will happen when the ASI (Artificial superintelligence) evolves; Utopia or Dystopia?*** (Norwegian), on IQ-measures in **180 i IQ kan være det samme som 150**, and on the **Norwegian pension system** (Norwegian). His book on the **winner/loser-society model** based on social psychology published in 2011 (Nasjonalbiblioteket), which does have a summary review **here**.

Erik lives in Larkollen, Norway. He was born in Oslo, Norway, in 1963. He speaks Danish, English, and Norwegian. He is Actuary, Author, Consultant, Entrepreneur, and Statistician. He is the owner of, chairman of, and consultant at **Nordic Insurance Administration**.

He was the Academic Director (1998-2000) of insurance at the BI Norwegian Business School (1998-2000) in Sandvika, Baerum, Manager (1997-1998) of business insurance, life insurance, and pensions and formerly Actuary (1996-1997) at Nordea in Oslo Area, Norway, a self-employed Actuary Consultant (1996-1997), an Insurance Broker (1995-1996) at Assurance Centeret, Actuary (1991-1995) at Alfa Livsforsikring, novice Actuary (1987-1990) at UNI Forsikring, and a Journalist at Norsk Pressedivisjon.

He earned an M.Sc. in Statistics and Actuarial Sciences from 1990-1991 and a Bachelor's degree from 1984 to 1986/87 from the University of Oslo. He did some environmental volunteerism with Norges Naturvernforbund (Norwegian Society for the Conservation of Nature), where he was an activist, freelance journalist and arranged 'Sykkeldagen i Oslo' twice (1989 and 1990) as well as environmental issues lectures.

He has industry experience in accounting, insurance, and insurance as a broker. He writes in his IQ-blog the online newspaper *Nettavisen*. He has personal interests in history, philosophy, reading, social psychology, and writing.

He is a member of many high-IQ societies including 4G, Catholiq, Civiq, ELITE, GenerIQ, Glia, Grand, HELLIQ, HRIQ, Intruellect, ISI-S, ISPE, KSTHIQ, MENSA, MilenijaNOUS, OLYMPIQ, Real, sPIqr, STHIQ, Tetra, This, Ultima, VeNuS, and WGD.

Rick G. Rosner: "According to **semi-reputable sources**, Rick Rosner has the world's second-highest IQ. He earned 12 years of college credit in less than a year and graduated with the equivalent of 8 majors. He has received 8 Writer's Guild Award and Emmy nominations, and was named 2013 North American Genius of the Year by The World Genius Registry.

He has written for Remote Control, Crank Yankers, The Man Show, The Emmy Awards, The Grammy Awards, and Jimmy Kimmel Live!. He has also worked as a stripper, a bouncer, a roller-skating waiter, and a nude model. In a TV commercial, Domino's Pizza named him the World's Smartest Man. He was also named Best Bouncer in the Denver Area by Westwood Magazine.

He spent the disco era as an undercover high school student. 25 years as a bar bouncer, American fake ID-catcher, 25+ years as a stripper, and nude art model, and nearly 30 years as a writer for more than 2,500 hours of network television.

He lost on Jeopardy!, sued Who Wants to Be a Millionaire over a bad question, and lost the lawsuit. He spent 35+ years on a modified version of Big Bang Theory. Now, he mostly sits around tweeting in a towel. He lives in Los Angeles, California with his wife and daughter.

You can send an **email** or a direct message via **Twitter**, or find him on **LinkedIn**, or see him on **YouTube**."

[2] Individual Publication Date: October 1, 2018: **http://www.in-sightjournal.com/haereid-rosner-one**; Full Issue Publication Date: January 1, 2019: **https://in-sightjournal.com/insight-issues/**.

An Interview with Monika Orski (Part Five)

2018-10-01

Monika Orski is the Ordförande/Chairman, Mensa Sverige/Mensa Sweden. She discusses: the work of Mensa Sweden; announcement and organization of an event; electronic media; ground rules in online fora; tips for women and girls online; online moderators; in-person versus online interactions of Mensa Sweden members; similar interactions online and in-person; expansions of Mensa Sweden's in-person provisions; technology and online environments to improve Mensa Sweden experiences; and in-person experiences to improve online environments.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: I want to explore the world of possibilities more for Mensa Sweden. On the one side, the world of electronic media. On the other side, the interactions in-person of Mensa Sweden members. Then, of course, the ways in which electronic community can facilitate and enhance in-person interaction and vice versa. Let's work in the order presented: for the electronic media, the ability to organize meetups, have fora for discussions and debates, and even vote on important matters of Mensa Sweden governance and policy – at least, potentially – become easier. Does this reflect the work of Mensa Sweden – with examples in relevant domains, please?

Monika Orski: It does, in some ways. We have electronic communications as well as in-person communications. I like to refer to the electronic communications as virtual meetings, to mark that there are both similarities and differences compared to in-person, physical meetings.

We do not use any electronic voting systems, as least not yet. Some other national Mensas do, but decisions by our membership are made at a yearly general meeting, with the possibility of postal ballot for those who do not attend in person. But practically all social interactions and communications within the organization have both electronic and physical sides to them.

Jacobsen: How long is the standard time frame given in the announcement and organization of an event or meeting prior to its coming to fruition?

Orski: Depends on the meeting. Our Annual Gathering (AG) is usually decided on and announced two years in advance. The organizers need time to prepare for a four-day event with 500-600 participants. On the other hand, some small, local meetings are announced only days before the actual meeting.

Some local meetings are recurring. For example, in Stockholm, mensans meet at a restaurant on the first Tuesday of every month. We have done so for more than 25 years, and will probably continue to do so as long as the place stays open. This meeting can be considered announced for a long time to come, but the occurrences are usually put into our events calender at the beginning of each year, for the next 12 months.

Jacobsen: How can vigorous, respectful debates on various political, philosophical, mathematical, ethical, scientific, and so on, happen more easily through electronic media? I ask because, I know, most people, or everybody, experiences – or has experienced – intense and

unpleasant debates, or even simply sour dialogues and discussions, on a number of topics.

Orski: I wish I knew. Unfortunately, electronic communication channels seem to bring out the worst in people. They also tend to be dominated by the few who are very loud and have too much time on their hands. Facebook and Twitter are extreme examples, where obtrusive aggressive behaviour is clearly rewarded, but the basic problems tend to surface sooner or later even on well-handled fora and mailing lists.

There are, however, some counter actions. Groups of people who want a debate that is actual debate, not a hate fest, come together to step in and politely try to turn discussions into real exchange of ideas, with positive feedback to those who show normal, respectful human behaviour. It is hard, but the people who do this help all of us keep some faith in humanity

I do think it is possible to have an electronic forum where respectful debates are possible. It does take some work, and I think the key is to establish clear boundaries early on. Such a forum needs to be moderated, and the ground rules need to be clear, but it is also important to set the level of what is considered normal within that context. When someone steps out of line, it should be clear to everyone that this is not accepted, regardless of whether the moderator is there to immediately deal with the problem.

Jacobsen: What seems like reasonable ground rules to set in an online forum to prevent vitriol and maintain respectful communication between the parties involved in them, especially in the cognitively highly capable?

Orski: In my experience, it is important to set ground rules that are generic rather than detailed. A code of conduct, rather than very specific rules. Detailed rules will always trigger some troll to find the equivalent of waving his hand two centimeter from your face while triumphantly shouting "but I'm not touching you".

The rules should always include that participants need to stay polite, that no ad hominem is allowed, and a general rule that trolling is not allowed. Depending on the context, they might also include rules on what topics are allowed in the specific forum, and that all posts and comments should stay on topic.

Last but not least, a very important ground rule to communicate is "do not give the moderators a headache". You are free to think a moderator is wrong, but not to question that the moderator's ruling is the law of the forum. The referee is the sole judge of the game, and the moderator is the referee of the forum.

Jacobsen: In online environments, women and girls get more harassment. Indeed, they receive more harsh criticism and *ad hominem* attacks, even if their statements remain, functionally in content and tone, the same as a man or a boy – not in all cases but, from qualitative reportage and complaints of women, probably most cases. Any tips for women and girls, especially the highly gifted and talented to stay on topic, in self-protection of cyberbullying, stalking, and harassment?

Orski: Do report harassment. Do report threats. Do report the hate stalkers, or of course all

stalkers.

Unfortunately, the legal system tends to ignore those reports. I know very well that reporting threats to the police usually results in a formal answer that they have no way of finding the culprit, even when you provide details that in fact make it very easy to find them. But still, do file the reports. Don't let the quantity of these threats and harassments go unnoticed by not being in the statistics of reported crime.

My second tip is to talk about it. It's often hard to do so, but do talk about it. You will be reminded that you are not alone. And it might sound simplistic, but to see the harassing messages outnumbered by even very simple tokens of sympathy usually helps keep your spirit up.

And then, of course, for the cases that are not threats and harassment but simply stupid and often sexist digs, there is the more general tip to remember you are under no obligation to educate any random pundit. If there is no mutual respect, there is no real discussion. Don't waste your time, you have better things to do. Just leave the trolls to keep throwing mud at each other.

Jacobsen: What is the importance of an online moderator in the prevention of these behaviors by many men and boys – or some women and girls? What seems like the appropriate punishments, reactions, or mechanisms to acquire justice in the cases of legitimate cyberbullying, stalking, and harassment? That is, how can the bullied, stalked, and harassed deal with these individuals?

Orski: First and foremost: It is not the job of those bullied, stalked and harassed to deal with the people who abuse them. It is not the obligation of the victim of a crime to administer justice. Everyone, and especially anyone in any kind of leadership position, needs to be clear that it is not up to the victim to change the behaviour of the perpetrator, or to talk to them, or whatever.

Thus, I would say that the importance of online moderators must be clearly stated. If you run a forum, it is your duty to handle those who cannot behave as civilized human beings within the rules stated for that forum, and to remove them from the forum if they will not change their ways. This goes for any forum, be it a mailing list or a Facebook group.

Of course, in theory, the owners of platforms such as Twitter or Facebook should also be held accountable. But the way things work today, we know that does not happen.

Jacobsen: Now, to the second aspect, the in-person environment has been the main form of interaction of the highly intelligent in a relatively tight locale. What are some interactions Mensa Sweden members can get in-person but not online?

Orski: In-person interactions are always different to online interactions. That goes for groups as well as individuals. In today's world, most of us have people we care for but live to far from to see very often, and while online chats and emails certainly help keep those bonds alive, we are always happy to see them and be able to just sit down together to talk. In a slightly diluted form, this goes for group interactions too.

On a less general note, some things need to be done in person. To listen to a lecture online is not

the same as to be in the room and able to interact with the lecturer. Online gaming is different from sitting down to a board game. Board games are popular with many mensans, which makes it a good example.

Jacobsen: What about similar interactions online as in person but the interactions are simply better, richer experiences for the participants than online?

As mentioned, to sit down together to talk is different from exchanging messages online. In the context of Mensa meetings, or of any larger group, there is also the fact that some people have lots of time on their hands and therefore tend to spend a lot of time in online fora. I don't mean the trolls now, but people with perfectly normal online behaviour who simply take up a lot of the discussion bandwidth because they are interested and have the time to do so. At an in-person meeting, they will not dominate the discourse in the same way, as discussions tend to take place in smaller groups. This also gives more room for those who tend to talk less.

Jacobsen: In the future, what would be wonderful expansions of Mensa Sweden's in-person provisions for the membership? I mean wildest dreams, wonderful, and dreamy ideas – pie-in-the-sky.

Orski: I think I'm more of a pragmatic, practical Mensa leader than a dreaming visionary. Both kinds are needed, but I'm probably not a very good person to ask for the pie-in-the-sky ideas.

However, I can try. The educational needs of the highly gifted are not very well served today, as we have discussed at length. It would be wonderful to provide a Mensa university, with courses ranging from the level that would help school age children stay interested in education to very advanced post-graduate level courses for those who want to widen the horizons of their everyday work. All free and adapted to the learning pace of the highly intelligent.

Also, there are mensans who discuss plans of common holiday homes. Others dream of some kind of permanent version of the annual gatherings, with lectures and games and common dinners, and most importantly always lots of mensans around to talk to. Some even talk of retirement homes, especially for mensans. It would be a dream idea to provide some sort of complex with all these things, a kind of real life community that members could visit anytime, or even make their permanent home.

Jacobsen: To the third facet, the nature of the interaction between the two. How do technology and online environments improve in-person experiences of the Mensa Sweden group?

Orski: Some people come to the in-person meetings only after a time in online groups. They often have a feeling of not being totally new to the environment, and being already acquainted with some other members. Thus, it can help more members actually join the in-person interactions.

Online interactions also help keep up contacts between members in different local groups, and for that matter in different countries. If you meet once a year at a large gathering, it's good to have some interaction in online groups in-between those events.

Jacobsen: How do in-person experiences provide the basis for enhanced experiences in the virtual environments of the Mensa Sweden group?

Orski: It's always easier to have good online interactions once you have met the people you interact with. The other side of online interactions reinforcing the contacts made at gatherings, is that meeting up at a gathering will enhance the mutual understanding and discussion climate of online communications.

References

1. Mensa International. (2018). Mensa Sweden. Retrieved from **https://www.mensa.org/country/sweden**.

2. Mensa Sverige. (2018). Mensa Sverige. Retrieved from **https://www.mensa.se/**.

Appendix I: Footnotes

[1] Ordförande/Chairman, Mensa Sverige/Mensa Sweden.

[2] Individual Publication Date: October 1, 2018: **http://www.in-sightjournal.com/orski-five**; Full Issue Publication Date: January 1, 2019: **https://in-sightjournal.com/insight-issues/**.

Ask A Genius (or Two): Conversation with Erik Haereid and Rick Rosner (Part Two)

2018-10-08

Rick Rosner and I conduct a conversational series entitled Ask A Genius on a variety of subjects through In-Sight Publishing on the personal and professional website for Rick. Rick exists on the World Genius Directory listing as the world's second highest IQ at 192 based on several ultra-high IQ tests scores developed by independent psychometricians. Erik Haereid earned a score at 185, on the N-VRA80. Both scores on a standard deviation of 15. A sigma of ~6.13 for Rick – a general intelligence rarity of 1 in 2,314,980,850 – and ~5.67 for Erik – a general intelligence rarity of 1 in 136,975,305. Of course, if a higher general intelligence score, then the greater the variability in, and margin of error in, the general intelligence scores because of the greater rarity in the population. This amounts to a joint interview or conversation with Erik Haereid, Rick Rosner, and myself.

Erik Haereid: I do not know if you (Rick) think that I am on Trumps and his person's side concerning immigration policy. I am not! I want mixed cultures, including Muslims. I think multicultural societies enrich us as humans. What I am afraid of is immigration on a large scale, which will challenge the welfare states' infrastructure. This will probably lead to far-right movements, and unwanted political situations around the world. The best way to prevent far-right environments, racism and xenophobia, is to understand and respect how people think and react in different situations, as when people feel threatened (if the fear is based on facts or illusions doesn't matter). Mass migration can be the case; consequences of global warming, sea level rise, more wars and conflicts, poverty, hunger… The number of refugees can increase rapidly in the next few decades. This will cause substantial issues, especially moral ones, and on a larger scale than today. I think we have to prepare for worst case scenarios. The best way to do that, as I see it, is to build temporary homes and environments on available areas, directed by UN and the international community; not camps with simple tents and lack of hygiene.

You mention fear of a potential Muslim majority in western countries in the future, pushing Islam and Sharia Laws on the native Christian people. I guess this is a part of the bottomless well of fear that is established, on wrong conditions, among a lot of people in our cultures. Creating fear to gather votes (politicians) and money (Media) is as old as these institutions. Trump is part of a wave of populism hitting the mainland, not only in the USA but also the rest of the western world, like Europe, where we are not that familiar with populism. Trump and his buddies play with people's emotions, with a mixture of illusions and reality, as more or less decent rhetoricians have done since Cicero. Sometimes this is right and necessary. Other times, like that Trump has banned immigration from some predominantly Muslim countries, this is wrong.

You mention statistics as a basis for more true facts, and I agree. In Scandinavia, Sweden, we had a professor Hans Rosling that used statistics effectual to illustrate certain topics. You mention your buddy who believes that Muslim immigrants do get more children than the native population, as a strategy, and eventually turn the country into a Muslim majority country. Well, I looked it up, and for immigrants that came from Asia, Africa and Latin America to Scandinavia as adults the birthrate was 3,5 children per woman (from 1990 to 2004) (compared to

Scandinavian women; birthrate = 1,9 children, today). For immigrants that came to Scandinavia as children, the birthrate was 2,2, and for women born in Scandinavia with parents from Asia, the birthrate was the same as in Scandinavia. The tendency is that immigrants adapt to the same birthrate as the country they move to. I did not find statistics for Muslims separate though. But the point, as you indicated, is to collect data, and use statistical tools to remove fear rather than create it.

You say that the immigrants are not the big danger in the future, but AI. I agree that there are several threats, like you say uncontrolled technological evolution, but also pandemics, asteroids hitting the Earth, and environmental issues like global warming are major problems we have to deal with. These issues do not make migrant issues less important, I think. My view is based on worst-case scenarios. A vast immigration, or fear of it, implies that more people vote for far-right movements and parties. Statistics will certainly help, but fear seems to follow its own path. Statistics cannot say much about an unstable future unless it is almost a copy of the past; predictable. You can give Trump and his equals facts, true facts, but he can hit back with predictions that no one can prove; the future is to a certain extent steered by rhetoricians.

Statistics will have an importance to some degree, and then the irrational nature of humans takes over. In crises, like war zones, people stop acting rational. Another fact is that humans become irrational and immoral when we feel that our connection to the group is threatened.

A known psychological experiment is the Milgram experiment from the beginning of the 1960's, which revealed that people obey authorities and authority figures even if apparently causing serious injury and distress. Other experiments show that people tend to be irrational or in lack of basic knowledge, for instance answering "Madrid" as the capital of France if the others answered "Madrid" on that question, when they have the choice between using their cognitive abilities and doing the same as the others.

You mention police violence. Yes, there is a problem if one takes for granted that potential violence is correlated with a person's skin color, the clothes people are wearing and if they have body piercing or not. If the police get into a situation where they feel threatened, why can't they use methods and weapons that are harmless and remove the potential danger until they have clarified the situation?

I think that humans become more human if we understand how to live together in different cultures and take the best out of each culture; remove the violent parts (I know this is more difficult than I made it sound like). The problem is the fundamentalism, the lack of will to learn from others and adapt, and not the differences.

Rosner: Having read Erik's reply, I think that the Venn Diagram of how we feel about things is a couple of circles overlapping by 90% if not more. Sorry if he thought that I thought he was on Trump's side. I do not think that at all. I think that comes from me arguing against the opinions of a conservative friend whom I have been arguing with extensively about this stuff. No, I do not think Erik holds those Trumpian views at all.

And Erik's done an excellent job at laying out good arguments for not demagoguing

immigration. He has some excellent statistics showing that immigrants are generally not trying to take over countries by making a zillion babies. He does not have those statistics for Muslims, but the hope of any country welcoming immigrants is that the immigrants become part of the fabric of that country.

Newcomers embracing a country's values while adding cultural input of their own makes for that whole rich melting pot kind of deal, and the US has generally been successful as a melting pot. You let people in and you find that for the most part they embrace American values. We are a successful country of immigrants (successful for immigrants and their descendants at least; less so for people who were already here when Europeans arrived).

About the H-1B visas – the smart and talented people visa – it is scary that we might begin turning away people from other countries with skills and some education who want to expand their training or use their talents in this country. They get special visas because, hey, they can contribute. If we scuttle that and if we make the US look inhospitable and unfun for talented people from elsewhere in the world, we are screwing ourselves.

There are other countries – I said this elsewhere – who are very happy to admit smart, skilled people who would have otherwise come here. China seems as if it could be super fun if you are a high-level entrepreneur or engineer. In its industrial cities, you can be a giant of industry.

If you do not mind crappy air quality in places, you can probably live an NBA player-type jet-setty life in Guangzhou or wherever. If the US loses tens of thousands of talented people from around the world to China, maybe India and Europe – I do not know, wherever else people think they can build great lives for themselves, then we will end up being a dumber, less technically nimble nation, and we will eventually cease to lead the world in technology.

We will eventually become a slightly silly, semi-backwater, like Portugal or Spain – countries that used to dominate and are still modern but not at the very forefront of stuff. Not to mention, matters of international dominance aside, that it is straight out dickish to, in an automatic way, deny American values for purposes of fear and demagoguery, and political advantage.

Haereid: Thank you for endorsing my arguments. I agree that the USA is a successful country of immigrants. It's not easy, and you have done an excellent job the last 200 years. The complications you have had is minor compared to what it could have been. There are victims. But overall you have shown the rest of the world that one can handle a cultural crucible; in less than a couple of dozens of decades.

"About the H-1B visas…"

I agree. That doesn't seem like a good idea. In competition with the newcomer China you will need all the capacity you can get. It's not politically smart to prevent know-how, thirsty young people and bright brains helping the business to evolve; including persons from abroad. We are dealing with the butterfly effect. A few brains in a garage or at the boy/girl room can start companies that survive and grow beyond imagination, like GM, Microsoft and Apple. Bill Gates, Steve Jobs and their mates did something spectacular in the 70's and 80's. They used their

eagerness and intelligence to investigate new sides of life; they were at the cutting edge of information technology. Maybe they were smart <u>and</u> lucky; they were first. One should not prevent that kind of people, wherever they come from in the world, to live and nurture inside the USA if they want to.

9/11 was not only a catastrophic act of terror and violence, but also a lack of US intelligence. I don't think we can remove this kind of action from the future by closing our borders. There are several western native boys (and girls) that, because of their lack of affiliation, and despair, go into ISIS/Daesh or other fundamentalist groups to fight against whatever, or just do the violence on their own (like Anders B. Breivik in Oslo in 2011). It is not Islamic beliefs per se that makes violence, even though the text in some ways inspires to kill and get paid after death, but the fundamentalism that is attached to it and to all beliefs, all cultures, and all humans. Humans seem to exaggerate everything; we are so damn dramatic! It's not what we believe in that's the problem, but <u>why</u> we become narrow-minded and hateful. Our brains seem to take a bunch of shortcuts and easy tracks and forget some basic moral rules that our brains also try to establish. It's Dionysus against Apollo, Id contra Superego.

We forget that there were a lot more terror in the 1970's and 80's than today, which we forget because there was less terror in the 1990's. Then 9/11 in 2001 came as a chock to us all. You can say that 9/11 erased the terror in the 70's and 80's from our memories. A new era began; the Islamic fundamentalist-period. The difference between then and now is that the terror is more global; it can hit you anywhere. I remember the IRA (North Ireland) and ETA (Basque Country, Spain). I also remember the Baader-Meinhof Group (RAF) from Germany. These organizations dominated the news 30-40 years ago. Now it's Islamic extremists that spread fear around the world. I don't think it's clever to use fear as an excuse for closing borders and giving birth and nurture to demagogues. Terrorists want to push some buttons more than kill innocent people.

[Ed. Haereid Addendum]

May 7 I read in a newspaper (CBS News) that the 97-year-old prosecutor from the Nurnberg process in 1946, Benjamin Ferencz, said that "war makes murderers out of otherwise decent people". Several people, including philosophers like Hannah Arendt, have written about the Nazism, and asked necessary questions. Arendt meant, as I have read her, that evilness is (primarily) not based on sadism but rather obedience. Are human monsters, or are we obedient? The psychological Milgram experiment from 1961 implies that we are obedient and not sadists. But does it matter for the victims?

Why do humans act evil, not only on macro-level as national or religious leaders, but also on micro-level in the school yard (bullying), as mass murderers, psychopaths, sociopaths…? Is it because of one person's lack of love from his/her parents? Is it because of brain damage? Is it because of a potential destructive pattern we all have inside us? Is it because we get an ecstasy, a rapture that prevents us from acting rational and makes us un-empathic? Is it because of revenge? Or is it because this is the natural and best way to evolve as a species? Is it because we think this is what the authority expects from us?

Is there any way that we can control our monstrous side?

Appendix I: Footnotes

[1] Erik Haereid: "About my writing: Most of my journalistic work I did in the pre-Internet-period (80s, 90s), and the articles I have saved are, at best, aged in a box somewhere in the cellar. Maybe I can find some of it, but I don't think that's that interesting.

Most of my written work, including crime short stories in A-Magasinet (Aftenposten (one of the main newspapers in Norway, as **Nettavisen** is)), a second place (runner up) in a nationwide writing contest in 1985 arranged by Aftenposten, and several articles in different newspapers, magazines and so on in the 1980s and early 1990s, is not published online, as far as I can see. This was a decade and less before the Internet, so a lot of this is only on paper.

From the last decade, where I used more time doing other stuff than writing, for instance work, to mention is my book from 2011, the IQ-blog and some other stuff I don't think is interesting here.

I keep my personal interests quite private. To you, I can mention that I play golf, read a lot, like debating, and 30-40 years and even more kilos ago I was quite sporty, and competed in cross country skiing among other things (I did my military duty in His Majesty The King's Guard (Drilltroppen)). I have been asked from a couple in the high IQ societies, if I know Magnus Carlsen. The answer is no, I don't :)"

Haereid has interviewed In-Sight: Independent Interview-Based Journal Advisory Board Member **Dr. Evangelos Katsioulis**, some select articles include topics on AI in ***What will happen when the ASI (Artificial superintelligence) evolves; Utopia or Dystopia?*** (Norwegian), on IQ-measures in **180 i IQ kan være det samme som 150**, and on the **Norwegian pension system** (Norwegian). His book on the **winner/loser-society model** based on social psychology published in 2011 (Nasjonalbiblioteket), which does have a summary review **here**.

Erik lives in Larkollen, Norway. He was born in Oslo, Norway, in 1963. He speaks Danish, English, and Norwegian. He is Actuary, Author, Consultant, Entrepreneur, and Statistician. He is the owner of, chairman of, and consultant at **Nordic Insurance Administration**.

He was the Academic Director (1998-2000) of insurance at the BI Norwegian Business School (1998-2000) in Sandvika, Baerum, Manager (1997-1998) of business insurance, life insurance, and pensions and formerly Actuary (1996-1997) at Nordea in Oslo Area, Norway, a self-employed Actuary Consultant (1996-1997), an Insurance Broker (1995-1996) at Assurance Centeret, Actuary (1991-1995) at Alfa Livsforsikring, novice Actuary (1987-1990) at UNI Forsikring, and a Journalist at Norsk Pressedivisjon.

He earned an M.Sc. in Statistics and Actuarial Sciences from 1990-1991 and a Bachelor's degree from 1984 to 1986/87 from the University of Oslo. He did some environmental volunteerism with Norges Naturvernforbund (Norwegian Society for the Conservation of Nature), where he was an activist, freelance journalist and arranged 'Sykkeldagen i Oslo' twice (1989 and 1990) as well as environmental issues lectures.

He has industry experience in accounting, insurance, and insurance as a broker. He writes in his IQ-blog the online newspaper *Nettavisen*. He has personal interests in history, philosophy, reading, social psychology, and writing.

He is a member of many high-IQ societies including 4G, Catholiq, Civiq, ELITE, GenerIQ, Glia, Grand, HELLIQ, HRIQ, Intruellect, ISI-S, ISPE, KSTHIQ, MENSA, MilenijaNOUS, OLYMPIQ, Real, sPIqr, STHIQ, Tetra, This, Ultima, VeNuS, and WGD.

Rick G. Rosner: "According to **semi-reputable sources**, Rick Rosner has the world's second-highest IQ. He earned 12 years of college credit in less than a year and graduated with the equivalent of 8 majors. He has received 8 Writer's Guild Award and Emmy nominations, and was named 2013 North American Genius of the Year by The World Genius Registry.

He has written for Remote Control, Crank Yankers, The Man Show, The Emmy Awards, The Grammy Awards, and Jimmy Kimmel Live!. He has also worked as a stripper, a bouncer, a roller-skating waiter, and a nude model. In a TV commercial, Domino's Pizza named him the World's Smartest Man. He was also named Best Bouncer in the Denver Area by Westwood Magazine.

He spent the disco era as an undercover high school student. 25 years as a bar bouncer, American fake ID-catcher, 25+ years as a stripper, and nude art model, and nearly 30 years as a writer for more than 2,500 hours of network television.

He lost on Jeopardy!, sued Who Wants to Be a Millionaire over a bad question, and lost the lawsuit. He spent 35+ years on a modified version of Big Bang Theory. Now, he mostly sits around tweeting in a towel. He lives in Los Angeles, California with his wife and daughter.

You can send an **email** or a direct message via **Twitter**, or find him on **LinkedIn**, or see him on **YouTube**."

[2] Individual Publication Date: October 8, 2018: **http://www.in-sightjournal.com/haereid-rosner-two**; Full Issue Publication Date: January 1, 2019: **https://in-sightjournal.com/insight-issues/**.

An Interview with Hasan Zuberi, M.B.A. (Part Two)

2018-10-08

Hasan Zuberi, M.B.A. is the Chairman for Mensa Pakistan. He discusses: recommendation of the MENA region moving forward in the identification, education, and utilization of the young gifted and talented population; advanced industrial economies for the gifted and talented; gifted and talented programs in the MENA region that would have the greatest long-term impact on the intellectual flourishing of the region; some informal education and practical life skills the gifted and talent should acquire if they wish to pursue a life in entrepreneurship and business; some prominent cases when a known highly gifted person went wrong, e.g. antisocial, violent, and so on; collaboration work with the other Mensa chapters in Indonesia and the UAE; the British, Canadian, and US chapters; hosting visiting Mensans from Germany, Finland, India, Indonesia, Norway, and the Philippines; very rare cases of a 1 in 30,000 kid; the removal of important discoveries, sciences, and philosophies by colonial powers; the most important ethical theories and narratives; revive the influence and culture of Mensa in the MENA region once more; terrorist or extremist activity lure some gifted youth into an unhealthy life trajectory, individually and societally; favourite writers, philosophers, and artists; the wisest person ever met; the smartest people ever met; people donating time, skills, professional networks, or join Mensa Pakistan; more men join Mensa compared to women; the positives and negatives of the perfectionistic tendencies of the gifted and talented; the gifted and talented often left languishing or simply wasted as not only individuals with needs but also potential massive contributors to the flourishing of the nation; bureaucratic downsides to a national and international Mensa leadership; the boundaries and possibilities of national Mensa groups; and alternative IQ tests for societies with very high IQ cut-offs.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: There seems to be a widespread loss of the gifted and talent for the benefit of society and the fulfillment and meaning, in their own lives. How would you recommend the MENA region move forward in the identification, education, and utilization of the young gifted and talented population?

Hasan Zuberi: IMHO, the Academia, Government, and society, in general, has to realize the potential of individual giftedness and work on the various available gifted programs right from the school age. It will help them identify the true potential and direction for kids and on how to carve their intellect into a positive skills-set.

Jacobsen: What programs exist in advanced industrial economies for the gifted and talented that could easily be implemented in the MENA region?

Zuberi: There is a number of programs, Gifted Education is widely used in a number of Western countries as a specialized area. STEM, robotics, and coding are also on the go.

Then we have the Japanese gifted programs introduces in 2005, and above all the Quran based education, that is a mix of subjects from languages, to numerology, to basic astrology and medicine (tib) that has been practised since the Islamic golden age, but removed by colonial powers can also be revived.

Jacobsen: What gifted and talented programs would take the longest to establish in the MENA region but would have the greatest long-term impact on the intellectual flourishing of the region?

Zuberi: I think the last one I mentioned above, the Islamic golden era methodology, that mixes the education, religion, with the daily affairs and prepares a child for everyday task. it teaches a student right from personal hygiene to grooming, and from multiple languages to sociology, astrology, numerology, and basic medicine (tib) all derived from the holy scriptures of the Quran.

Interestingly Quran is 40% based on the Old Testament (Book of David, Torah & Zabur) and the new testament (Bible/Injeel), and the remaining 60% is of the present, and future and covers the base of the other subjects. So for a region predominantly Muslim and with Arabic as a primary language, it is something that can improve the society in general.

Jacobsen: What are some informal education and practical life skills the gifted and talent should acquire if they wish to pursue a life in entrepreneurship and business?

Zuberi: Languages skills, interpersonal skills, digital knowledge, and above all the personality traits, like honesty, dedication, and hard work. These should be part of the skills taught to every inspiring individual.

Jacobsen: What are some prominent cases when a known highly gifted person went wrong, e.g. antisocial, violent, and so on?

Zuberi: In Pakistan, we had a very talented boy. He qualified and joined Mensa Pakistan. He was from a very deprived background and was resident of a slum area, in fact, it is Asia's biggest slum called Orangi Town in Karachi, and was very bitter towards life.

After he joined Mensa, we the management committee tried our best to make him feel welcome and gave him responsibilities, which he did with pride and brilliantly. He got admission in the most prestigious University.

We helped him secure a scholarship to cover his education cost and, I personally, visited him to show our support at his university and met his teachers and fellow students, in one of my visit to Islamabad as Chairman Pakistan Mensa.

He was on honour roll and won a gold medal in the initial terms, but halfway there, he left the University, after putting up accusations on his faculty dean.

He returned to Karachi, and we hired him, as first paid post holder, but it turned out to be a disaster as soon after he took out his frustration directly on me and wrote to our Vice Chairman and other ManCom members to remove me from office, wrote to Mensa International accusing me of what not.

I had to answer Mensa International on all his false accusations, provided them with valid proofs on each point. After a long, due investigation process, the management committee of Mensa

Pakistan found his accusations false and revoked his membership.

He hasn't stopped there and till now, and often try to influence me through other international Mensa members, the last was Chair of Mensa Cyprus.

Jacobsen: How does collaboration work with the other Mensa chapters in Indonesia and the UAE? What have been some of the collaborative projects worked on together?

Zuberi: Well, Mensa Indonesia was long dead, when I visited Jakarta back in 2008, met some of the members and the Chairman, offered my help in reviving it. I wrote to Mensa International there and then and asked for assistance in terms of test booklets.

Mensa Germany came forward and provided support and send us the booklets there which were used for first revival test, on the same trip. Now Mensa Indonesia (MInd) is one of the very active chapters in the Asian region. I feel so proud of my small contribution to its revival.

Likewise, during my work year in UAE, I started contacting Mensa Pakistan and other members residing in the UAE. our first meeting, I still remember, had 12 people from 10 different countries.

After that Mensa UAE was active for a good number of years before slowing down again. Many of the members, like me, left the Emirates and others got busy with their lives.

Jacobsen: How have the British, Canadian, and US chapters been helpful in the development of Mensa Pakistan?

Zuberi: Well, the established chapters, British, Canada, and the US have always helped in terms of guidance, knowledge transfer, and above all accommodating visiting Pakistani Mensa members.

Mensa Germany has been always at the forefront in supporting, as in the case of Indonesia mentioned above, as well as in the time of our need, like when our office was flooded and everything destroyed, we got books from Germany.

Then there was a massive earthquake in Pakistan back in 2005 and many International chapters supported us in providing assistance.

Mensa Australia members send us their pocket money as monetary assistance at the time of floods in Pakistan. Likewise, Mensa China and Malaysia were accommodating to our visiting Mensa members and helped in every way possible.

Jacobsen: With hosting visiting Mensans from Germany, Finland, India, Indonesia, Norway, and the Philippines, what was involved in that?

Zuberi: Due to a decade of terrorism and violence in and around Pakistan, there were few incidents of foreigners visiting Pakistan; and among them, the Mensans were very small in

numbers.

But we had members from many countries visiting Pakistan, primarily for business, and we, as the host Mensa chapter, tried our best to facilitate them wherever applicable. The Philippine mensan was the master chef, who joined a leading 5-star hotel in Karachi. whereas Mensan from Finland was part of a big packaging company.

Our Indian neighbour was there to witness a friendly Cricket match between our countries. We hosted special meetups for them for the exchange of ideas and knowledge and it worked very well every time.

Jacobsen: What should be done with the very rare cases of a 1 in 30,000 kid, or even more rare. How should we educate them, the unusually bright?

Zuberi: It is called Gifted or Special. so should be treated like one. The problem is the identification of such gifted talent as in most countries the talents are not identified putting them in more isolation and depressing state. Once identified, certainly should be put up with experts and should be educated in their field of interest.

Jacobsen: Regarding the removal of important discoveries, sciences, and philosophies by colonial powers, can you explain in more depth? Those discoveries, sciences, and philosophies with the need for revival and renewal of professional-academic activity.

Zuberi: The colonial powers had to subdue the occupied land and demoralize the occupied people, and the tactics they used was to make them realize that their knowledge, education, discoveries were all worthless.

Hence creating a feeling that whatever the occupiers are doing is good, just, and accepted. From cultural to dressing and from language to inventions, everything was ridiculed and put up as backward.

Jacobsen: Within the Islamic context, what remain the most important ethical theories and narratives? How do these apply to the current context?

Zuberi: In Islamic context, the most important ethical theory, as prescribed in the holy scriptures is of Saving and Serving the humanity. even it is written there that Prophet Muhammad was sent for all humanity and not alone for any one religion, tribe, nation, or creed. The killing of one person is termed as the killing of humanity.

But it seems that the message is lost in present-day circumstances and with terrorists glorifying their acts as acts of religion and justifying it from selected verses.

Another interesting fact is that 40% of the Quran is comprised of the Old & New Testaments: *Zabur* (The book of Prophet Dawood or David) *Torah/Taw rat* – of Musa/Moses) and *Injeel/Bible* (of Prophet Isa/Jesus). Whereas 60% remaining covers the time of Prophet Muhammad, and future till the judgement day.

The 60% also covers Shariah (which literally means the *Daily routine/life*) that covers hygiene (brushing teeth, combing hair, cleanliness) to mannerism (treatment with family, neighbours, merchants, business etc), and from dressing up to dressing down.

Jacobsen: What could revive the influence and culture of Mensa in the MENA region once more?

Zuberi: IMHO, localization can help. Be it in language, culture, and national interests. For instance, in GCC countries, in particular, they have some strange rules to secure the interests of the ruling class, and gathering of intellectual brains in one place is termed as something against it.

So if it can be done under some other contexts, like (related to some trade of area of interest) it can work in a much effective and positive way.

Jacobsen: How does terrorist or extremist activity lure some gifted youth into an unhealthy life trajectory, individually and societally? What are some protections older generations can create for them?

Zuberi: If I can talk with a brief history and from the perspective of Pakistan, the terrorism was started as a sacred duty and disguised as Jihad (literal meaning: Struggle), against the oppressing Soviet occupying of Afghanistan.

And was sponsored by USA / CIA and other West European countries to stop Soviet expansion to the hot waters / Oil of the Middle East. It helped the mushroom growth of the unregistered holy school, which only used their own version of the Holy text to justify "fighting Atheist Soviets for protection of Monotheism"

The reward for these young kids, willing to fight and sacrifice their lives was: money (approx 200 USD in the early 80s), power (weapons/authority), and religious backing (Islamic context of helping the occupied poor Afghans). Then they were left unattended and uncontrolled with all the weapons, after the fall of Kabul, the departure of Soviets, and the collapse of USSR.

Fast forward, 2001, after 9/11 and the attack on US forces on Afghanistan to counter Al-Qaeda, the narrative changed. Now, the enemy has a new face but the game is still the same, and with many players. From Russia, China, India, and Gulf nations, to neighbouring Iran, Pakistan and Central Asian republics, all are part of it.

So, education is the key. It has started in Pakistan, but still controlled by powers with their interests. The need is to teach humanity from the perspective of the respective religions and sects.

Jacobsen: Who are your favourite writers, philosophers, and artists?

Zuberi: Starting from Dr. Muhammad Iqbal (national poet of Pakistan), and the great Persian philosophers Jalal Uddin Rumi, Sheikh Saadi Shirazi, and Khawaja Shams Tabraiz. and in the

present day Noam Chomsky.

Jacobsen: If you reflect on personal interactions, who seems like the wisest person ever met by you?

Zuberi: Have met many interesting people in my 22 years of journey with Mensa and my professional life. One of the best people was Late Mr. *Ardeshir Cowasjee*, a leading newspaper columnist and social activist of Pakistan.

Meeting him as Chairman Mensa was a great honour for me. I remember replying to his email was such a huge task, so articulate and well written it was, that it took me a good hour to reply to his email.

Jacobsen: Also, in terms of IQ, which is non-trivial as a life factor, who are the smartest people ever met by you?

Zuberi: I have met many, many amazing people. From all walks of life, not enough space for names here.

Jacobsen: How can people donate time, skills, professional networks, or join Mensa Pakistan?

Zuberi: People can join Mensa Pakistan after appearing and attaining IQ score in the top 2 percentile in a Mensa supervised test session, or by presenting an IQ equivalence score of 98% or above by a certified, recognized and registered Psychologist.

As it is a volunteer society, members willing to take up responsibilities donate time accordingly.

Jacobsen: Why do so many more men join Mensa compared to women? How does this phenomenon impact relationships, dating, marriage, and potential family life for the mensans?

Zuberi: Well, in my opinion, it depends on the choices and interests. Women have their own set of interest and do not really feel to showcase their intellect in front of a group.

Women are more compassionate and dedicated compared to us, the men, and prefer to use their intellect when it is required. In Pakistan, we have a mixed crowd, and almost equal number of qualifiers so the opportunities are also the same for all genders.

Jacobsen: What are the positives and negatives of the perfectionistic tendencies of the gifted and talented?

Zuberi: Positive tendencies are certainly that they keep control over their performances at their pace and as per their satisfaction. Whereas the negativity is that they want to keep everything under control, it affects their performance as team players and/or leader.

Jacobsen: How are the gifted and talented often left languishing or simply wasted as not only individuals with needs but also potential massive contributors to the flourishing of the nation?

Zuberi: I think; the biggest problem is of identifying the gifted talent; as if not identified, they have to follow the norms which result in getting bored from the routine lives and effects their own growth, as well as slow the pace of the tasks they are assigned to. But results can be 100% improved if utilized according to their intellect level and interests.

Jacobsen: Are there bureaucratic downsides to a national and international Mensa leadership? What are the upsides, comparatively?

Zuberi: Like many organizations, there certainly are. but Mensa is a high IQ society, we tend to find alt-routes, thanks to our amazing Mensans in mancom.

Jacobsen: What are the boundaries and possibilities of national Mensa groups? What can and cannot be done? That is, what are the limits for the national groups or representative organizations?

Zuberi: Well, like any organization, we too have cultural, national and territorial boundaries, and apply the law accordingly. Otherwise, all local chapters have their respective constitutions, in line with the core recommendations and duly approved by Mensa International.

For sure, we cannot interfere with any matter that is beyond our limitations and for that, we refer to Mensa International, which has an amazing system and protocols in line.

Jacobsen: There are alternative IQ tests for societies with very high IQ cut-offs. Some developed by qualified psychometricians, or at least those with experimental psychology and statistics backgrounds. Others are from intelligent people without these formal qualifications. What is the general perspective of the high-IQ community of these tests? What is the range of quality of them? What is the average of the quality of them? Has Mensa ever accepted them for membership? Have they ever been considered for qualification of membership?

Zuberi: Well, the societies are there, but since their acceptance rate is very limited, so is their membership base. So generally, it is very odd to see someone with qualification from these ultra high IQ societies. So far have not met anyone, in this part of the world, even from our Mensa crowd, interested or inclined towards these societies.

Appendix I: Footnotes

[1] Chairman, Mensa Pakistan.

[2] Individual Publication Date: October 8, 2018: **http://www.in-sightjournal.com/zuberi-two**; Full Issue Publication Date: January 1, 2019: **https://in-sightjournal.com/insight-issues/**.

An Interview with Monika Orski (Part Six)

2018-10-15

Monika Orski is the Ordförande/Chairman, Mensa Sverige/Mensa Sweden. She discusses: the fun of the super smart; researchers of the gifted and talented; theories of creativity and genius; other demographics of Mensa Sweden; and the old "nature" argument.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: Now, if the super smart are anything like ordinary people, where their higher general intelligence simply implies a bigger hammer or a stronger ox, they must have a friendly competition with some of the other chapters of the super smart groups. You mentioned some within the definition of Western Europe. How do some of the Mensa chapters have some competitive fun? How do smart people compete with one another, simply in a more amplified and varied set of ways?

Monika Orski: Probably in lots of ways I am not aware of, but of course I know of some kinds of competitive fun.

I am not a particular fan of board games myself, although I occasionally enjoy one at some Mensa meeting. There is a quite large group within Mensa who are very much into board games of different kinds, mostly with a preference for the strategic games where you need to think fast. No large Mensa gathering feels entirely complete without a games room, and some participants will spend almost all of their time in it, while others might step in for an hour or two in between other activities.

At EMAGs, the European meetings, there is usually also a football (soccer) tournament, where mensans from different national groups form teams – sometimes mixed nations teams, to get enough players.

Some national gatherings, including the AG of Mensa Sweden, often include a poker tournament. Only small money stakes, of course, as it's purely intended for friendly competition for the fun of it.

There has also been a logic puzzles competition with national teams from the four Nordic Mensas. It's been a while since anyone organized one of those, though. If I remember correctly, Sweden lost the finals to Denmark the latest time we had it. It might be time for us to try and organize a re-match.

Jacobsen: In the European context, who are some researchers with a great deal of experience and research into the gifted and talented community there?

Orski: This is a question where I need to resort to an excuse: I'm an engineer, not a psychologist. I don't have the deeper knowledge of psychological research needed to provide a good answer.

From my own reading, I would pick the names Ian Deary and Robert Plomin. In the more local,

Swedish context, I know that Roland Persson has done a lot of interesting research regarding gifted children, and there is also some interesting work by Berit Carlstedt on intelligence and intelligence testing. But those happen to be some names I know of, I'm sure there are many others.

Jacobsen: In the European context, who are individual, establishment or independent, researchers with interesting or unique take on creativity and, indeed, genius? Any personal theory or theories, from reading and observation, as to what comprises the roots necessary for genius to flourish – with, of course, a definition of genius as a bulwark for the theory or theories?

Orski: As above, I have no particular knowledge of the foremost research into creativity or genius. I think my reading is too amateur too really allow me in good conscience to point to anyone.

I know that there is a continuing debate on whether genius is a useful term at all. But if we are still going to use it, I think the definition used on the English language Wikipedia page for the subject "genius" is a good one: "A genius is a person who displays exceptional intellectual ability, creative productivity, universality in genres or originality, typically to a degree that is associated with the achievement of new advances in a domain of knowledge."

Thus, I think it important to remember that gifted rarely means genius. There are few geniuses, while gifted is a label used for a fast-thinking part of the population – be it the 2% allowed Mensa membership, or 5% as is often set as an estimate of the number of gifted children, or something in between. This is not a large minority, but it is not truly rare, as genius is.

How can we help genius to flourish? My theory, or maybe rather my guess, would be to follow the same principles as to help anyone gifted to flourish, only the genius would probably need more of it and at a much faster pace. Let people learn things, and keep learning. Leave room for creativity. Don't be afraid to give a young person space to explore things in solitary occupations. Keep teaching them new things. Let them find their multiple talents, even if they chose to pursue one of them more than others. Allow them to create positions for themselves to keep exploring, and to keep learning also when they are no longer young.

Jacobsen: Also, I am curious. What are the religious demographics, if known or even simply surmised, of Mensa Sweden? What are the political demographics? How does this, potentially, reflect the international data on intelligence and political orientation & religious beliefs?

Orski: The simple answer is, I don't know. We do not keep records of religious, ethnical, or political characteristics of our members. I might add that I would find it quite repugnant if a society like ours did.

Religion is not particularly present in Swedish everyday discourse. Many people would rather define themselves as of no particular religion at all. This makes it a bit hard to define. Also, it's not a particularly common topic in everyday talk.

Regarding politics, some people tend to talk much more about it than others, especially on social

media. Those are usually not the level headed, middle of the road types. But from what I know of the politics of the mensans I meet, I have no reason to believe there is any significant difference to the general political demographic. There might be reason to take into account that the educated part of the population is probably overrepresented in Mensa, but other than that – we have all sorts, just like everywhere else.

Which leads me to another demographic, where I have no statistics but a qualified guess based on who I meet in Mensa. While we have people from all walks of life, there is an overrepresentation of those with university education. Seems quite natural, especially if you take into account that in our part of the world, access to education is not limited by the financial means of your family.

Jacobsen: Occasionally, in the early 21st century less than the 20th century but still, we find individuals, internationally speaking, who crop up. They, at times, hold great stations of power and influence, and prestige.

They proclaim science as a male thing, not as a female thing; science only built, statistically speaking, for the male brain, in their some time terminology; even, that women simply are intellectually inferior to men and, therefore, should have a pre-ascribed role within society based on, what they see and argue, innate differences in not only abilities but also preferences based on temperaments.

Ironically, temperaments seen as innate in which they feel the need to encourage through all systems and channels reaching mass audiences in society, especially reflected in the reactions to non-traditional roles for women in representations within films and television, for example.

Even so, or while saying these things, often, these individuals will lose their jobs and be lambasted in public. Others, at the same time, will see them as pariahs of the genetic truth of the human species in sex differences – full stop, end of story, exclamation point.

What seems like the proper interpretation of the situation here? How can one respond to the arguments about innate differences and prescribed roles for women in society? Why do these individual make these arguments?

How do – in your lifetime of as one and in conversations with them – women tend to react to these individuals when speaking with one another, which may not be the same manner in which women speak in public or to men for that matter?

When they bring data forward, or historic examples of more men than women as the listed discoverers or inventors, what seems like a proper retort?

Orski: The old "nature" argument. Of course, if this was in fact a matter of nature, there would be no need to try to force that conviction on anyone, and even less to put it into laws, as those authoritarian sexists often will. No one seems to see it necessary to make laws to prevent that humans photosynthesize, or that we fly by way of flapping our arms. Why? Because there are truly innate traits of human nature that make those acts impossible.

My recipe for a proper retort is usually to simple say that is not true, and go on do something productive, nice, or both. There is usually no way you can reason with people like this. They obviously have a need to cling to some sense of being superior, no matter how unrealistic. Unless you are a psychologist they came to in order to get help with the inferiority complex that is likely to be somewhere at the bottom of this attitude, it is not your job to make them understand how the world works.

For those who are simply unaware of the different expectations men and women still live under, even in relatively equal societies, I recommend a little mind game. Next time you think a man is well qualified for a position, ask yourself if you would also think a woman of exactly the same merits and exactly the same level of professional behaviour qualified. Also ask yourself the corresponding question next time you think a woman might not be quite qualified for a position.

Lastly, for all the decent men with true merits of their own who encourage women to make sure they do not get positions based on gender: Ask yourself whether you would be in your current position if you were a woman with exactly the same qualifications. If your honest answer is yes, assuming you have a realistic assessment of your qualifications, then you can congratulate yourself on being hired on merit, and not on the all to common male quota.

References

1. Mensa International. (2018). Mensa Sweden. Retrieved from **https://www.mensa.org/country/sweden**.

2. Mensa Sverige. (2018). Mensa Sverige. Retrieved from **https://www.mensa.se/**.

Appendix I: Footnotes

[1] Ordförande/Chairman, Mensa Sverige/Mensa Sweden.

[2] Individual Publication Date: October 15, 2018: **http://www.in-sightjournal.com/orski-six**; Full Issue Publication Date: January 1, 2019: **https://in-sightjournal.com/insight-issues/**.

Ask A Genius (or Two): Conversation with Erik Haereid and Rick Rosner (Part Three)

2018-10-15

Rick Rosner and I conduct a conversational series entitled Ask A Genius on a variety of subjects through In-Sight Publishing on the personal and professional website for Rick. Rick exists on the World Genius Directory listing as the world's second highest IQ at 192 based on several ultra-high IQ tests scores developed by independent psychometricians. Erik Haereid earned a score at 185, on the N-VRA80. Both scores on a standard deviation of 15. A sigma of ~6.13 for Rick – a general intelligence rarity of 1 in 2,314,980,850 – and ~5.67 for Erik – a general intelligence rarity of 1 in 136,975,305. Of course, if a higher general intelligence score, then the greater the variability in, and margin of error in, the general intelligence scores because of the greater rarity in the population. This amounts to a joint interview or conversation with Erik Haereid, Rick Rosner, and myself.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: Let us talk about good and evil, what defines good? What defines evil? Do these terms suffice in the representation of the reality?

Or do these terms carry metaphysics and ethical baggage, which detracts from the reality of proper notions of morality? In a discussion on good and evil, we can analyze the topic from multiple levels.

Let us talk about the small acts and thoughts, the little world of good and evil, then the next session can engage on a micro-level foundation into dialogue on the medium- and macro-level forms of good and evil.

What seems like quintessential small acts of good and evil – everyday acts of kindness? Also, as an aside, does religious belief or faith influence personal conceptions of good and evil?

Erik Haereid: I have experienced a strong connection to others based on mutual feelings and empathy.

One time I met a stranger, a man, on the street downtown, crowded with a lot of people walking in their own thoughts, and he looked me in my eyes and I did the same and both smiled warmly.

It was nothing sexual (I am heterosexual, and I guess he was too), only a friendly empathic mutual silent confirmation ("Hey, I see you"). I felt good the rest of the day.

Small actions like that are good because they enhance something in us. We did both, I am quite sure he did too, became better persons after that moment. I smiled warmly to some others, become more tolerant, friendly and inviting.

Most people, at least in my country, do not understand warmly smiles; they misinterpret it in mistrust. Many, not all, of course, think you want something from them that they don't have or don't want to give to you.

The mistrust is basic in our culture. We want the kind smiles and friendly behaviour, but we mix things up. Either we make it sexual, or we think it's irony and contempt. Trust is essential here; you have to believe in yourself to receive good deeds and implement it into your personality and self-image.

When curiosity is replaced by judging people for their genes or personality, we have a problem as a group, if you ask me. Individual freedom has to be supported by respect for every individual in the crowd.

If not, some maybe gain a lot, but society is polarized, and this implies more conflicts. But, as we can see from for instance my country, the lack of winners strangles each individual; you are forced into an average (the average is the winner).

If you are outside the standard, the average tends to attack you. This system creates polarization too; you have to fit into the average to be accepted by the society.

A good deed or thought is when it makes the other person feel better, also in the long-term. It's trusting in it. We have to believe in the behaviour. And the same with evil actions; it has to be pointed at us, and we have to believe that the person wants to harm us.

A good thought and deed are one that strengthens the other person's self-esteem and self-image in a way that does not make him, her or them more extreme egocentric (narcissistic). Evilness is the same with the opposite sign.

In this context, I believe that good and evil deeds (and thoughts) have to make perpetual influences on the object's mentality. If you save a person from drowning, you make changes to that person's mentality for the rest of his life.

If you make a person feel bad about herself as part of her perpetual self-esteem, you make eternal changes to her mind. A rape is such a deed. Being bystander to for instance a school-killing, too.

The deeds and thoughts have to be **meant**; deeds, where the outcome is good/bad for the object, is not good/bad deeds if it is not intended to be. If it's by chance, by impulse, it's something else. A condition for good deeds is that the sender has empathy with the other person(s).

To hate or scorn someone for their genes and natural behaviour is evil, even though it's impulsive and one can't control the impulse at the moment. This is so, I believe because hate and contempt also are products of some nurturing processes.

You can choose to reflect on your impulsive thoughts, feelings and actions. If you nurture your impulses, you act evil/good. The fact that you have impulses doesn't make them acceptable or true; they can be worked on and changed.

You can blame the forces of evolution, that something is cemented and not possible to change, and then fasten your immediate emotional experiences.

Or you can believe, as I do, in the elasticity of our brains, and that almost everything is possible beyond the present stringent scientific discrimination and reduction; that we in the future with help from AI, nano- and biotechnology will find a way.

It's easier to act bad and evil, than good. Then you control your feelings. But the price is high; you also teach others to act the same way to you.

I think the best good act and deed one can do is to open up, and not close others out from your feelings or thoughts and invite others to express their feelings and thoughts whatever they are. This is, of course, more difficult than it sounds.

It assumes that we can handle our own feelings among other reactions and that we really are open-minded towards all other people. As soon we start discriminating, in thoughts or actions (normative, not descriptive), the tense and stress among all in that social realm increases.

Rick Rosner: I wanted one more comment on statistics. Now, it is frustrating because I have many, many years of college courses and extensive training in statistics. But statistics is beyond me now, in terms of being able to do it, because statistics is so coding based that I cannot do anything productive in the field anymore. Because I do not code.

I understand statistics and probability super well, but, at this point, I am nothing but a rank amateur because I cannot build databases, statistical apps, or work with statistical apps.

Now, in terms of good and evil, I look at good and evil as the preservation of order versus the destruction of order, order versus chaos.

Generally, everything is dressed in story and detail, but, basically, when people are fighting for good; they are fighting for the preservation of structure and order and, usually, higher order.

Star Wars is probably our most prominent good versus evil story now. You can see good as being a higher order that includes individuality and liberty, and the ability to do high-level things. That to be fully developed people who are free to pursue their lives.

The Empire is a suppressive force, which will blow up your planet if you defy them. It is a lower level of order. It is draconian and rule-based and is based on a few simple rules.

The people who are in favour of liberty, the Jedi and the Rebels, stand for a higher level of, say, information processing. The ability to look at the world and address it in sophisticated and creative ways rather than having to reduce the world into a few simple rules as The Empire does.

Good versus evil is about higher-level information processing versus chaos and lower level information processing. The increase in information and order in the world is basically good.

To further clarify based on the questions from you, Scott, evil is associated with the destruction of higher order, whether it is killing a living being, where the living being is higher order, or

destroying works of art that are reflections of higher order and so on.

These terms carry ethical baggage, sure, because the ideas are usually brought to us within a philosophical framework that is often obsolete to some extent and has developed its own repressive and not innovative characteristics.

For instance, America is based on, or a lot of American politics is rooted in, the Constitution is the highest level of rule-giving order.

What we have been running into in today's stupid American politics, the dumber forces in politics trying to justify whatever they do that is reactionary or repressive by saying that it is based on the originalist conception of the Constitution.

That this is immutable. You must let people have as many guns as they want given the Second Amendment to the Constitution. Then people on the Liberal side arguing less persuasively because they do not have the infrastructure and ruthlessness of the Conservative side.

That our understanding of the Constitution must be tempered by 225 years of history. That the Constitution is centuries old and it is not going to adequately address every possible thing.

So, the Constitution of this embodiment or this symbol of good, but it is obsolete in a lot of ways. So, yes, conceptions of good and evil can have ethical and historical baggage that fuck things up.

[Addendum from Rick.]

As an addendum, I have said this at greater length, and so have a lot of other people elsewhere. To quickly point out the political situation in the US, due to some demographic game playing that began with the Republicans 30/35/40 years ago – before Reagan, well-funded Republican thinktanks began to research how to wrangle voters.

They found that dumb voters are easier to wrangle. The current situation in American politics is the result of one party spending two generations getting better and better at manipulating dumb voters.

The Republicans, who started out as a respectable major political party, are, now, at their nadir. Because they have become a party of dumb assholes. Once you start herding dumb people, you have to keep going dumber.

You end with a base and elected officials being more and more amoral/immoral. The values that get lost in the demographic push further and further right. To quickly sum up, it is like smokers.

When I was a kid, a huge percentage of adults smoked, probably well over half. It was in planes and restaurants. Planes would be a bit blue with smoke because so many people smoked cigarettes. Nobody thought anything of it.

I worked in a bar in 1980. 2/3rds of the people smoked. The air was blue-ish with smoke. Over the past 30 years, more and more people have gotten the message about how terrible smoking is – for people and animals around them.

What was widely spread around the general population in 1984, the person who smokes in 2018 is more likely to be either a dick or an idiot. They are like, "Fuck you! I will keep smoking." They either didn't get the message.

Or if they did, they don't care. It is a smaller segment of the population. But in a Bayesian way, as that population shrinks, it keeps proportionately more of the idiots and the assholes. That is basically what has happened with the shrinkage of the Republican base.

If people want a more in-depth conversation on gerrymandering and electoral politics, then they can go elsewhere on other things you and I, Scott, have talked about.

Haereid: I have corrected my view on the evolution process; I see it as brutal, not evil. That's an important distinction. The evolution process seems evil because it (for humans) contains a lot of evil actions, like manipulations that harm others to gain possession. But in a pure form it's basically honest and egocentric. I clarify this below.

First a short comment on statistics and data. I also think that statistical methods and math will benefit more in the future, not least because of the huge access to data, such as Google and other big companies has. Greater storage capacity, stronger processors, and "infinite" data access (AI) in the computers will make statisticians' biggest nightmares, not getting enough data, history.

But, I am not aware of how much and where statistics is used today, but know it's used in many areas (like medicine and psychology).

Back to the topic: I agree that the development and freedom of the individual must be at the center and that we can and should mature to a higher order; as through a Hegelian dialectic.

It is the outcome of a creative, individual free will. This is what I mean when I say that **egoism is altruism** (see below); that the good exists in individual freedom and not in the appearance of a straightjacket of conformity and normality.

Egoism is altruism in practice (cf. Aristotle's Eudaimonia); I use altruism in the sense that all actions we make lead to a win-win situation or any other outcome where one or all loses, and where altruistic actions create win-win situations. I do not believe in complete self-sacrifice. Therefore, I do not use the term altruism in the strictest, most rigid sense.

The best example of altruism is when we feel better after doing others well. Since I feel better, I did it for me, even if you also felt better afterwards. Win-win. You could criticize it and say that it is lack of empathy. But I don't think so, because the feelings and emotions are contagious.

I do not use egoism and altruism as opposites. When we nurture ourselves, according to our own abilities, opportunities, in freedom, we influence others to do the same, and thus society becomes

good (theoretically).

Altruism in the usual meaning of the word, i.e. complete self-sacrifice, often leads to the opposite of intentional intent; violence, war, assault, exploitation, pecking order… It may be a good purpose, but by suppressing your own needs and abilities, your own opportunity to get the best out of your life, and be brainwashed to believe that an overall system, a culture, trumps your own preferences and opportunities, you develop evil.

We become evil of being hindered in our individual growth and development (this is also theoretical: of course not all become evil to others, but perhaps to themselves; self-destructive). The sense of belonging is conditional on being allowed to be oneself in that culture.

In Scandinavia we have a well-developed welfare model, something that I'm a fan of to some extent. And we also have a culture that cultivates equality; by nurturing an egalitarian society everyone gets the same possibilities, worth and we get a good community. This is the doctrine. In practice, it's almost the opposite.

By cultivating differences, people find each other in mutual respect, and then people act good against each other. It's about accepting the strengths of others, and using them as inspiration. When we focus on the weaknesses of others, we spend our time on others and not our own abilities and opportunities.

In short, it is not about being equal but about equal worth, and that equal worth is created through acceptance and respect of inequalities. This is good.

At a macro level, such as nations and global societies, one should (to act good) prepare for individual freedom, safety net for those who, for various reasons, should be abandoned, general healthcare, police, etc. (welfare model), and the right to be different; being ourselves (since everyone is different).

When the focus is on equality, the culture undermines the individual's needs; to develop their abilities, talent, opportunities. Thus, people get frustrated and attack each other.

Egoism (in my sense of the term) is about respecting each other, *narcissism* about not doing so. An egoist knows how to develop his abilities, but also to see what he is capable of and not. A narcissist believes he is God, Lord above others, and that others obey him.

Competition is important to acknowledge and see how far it is possible to develop. You are not competing to make the others worse, but to make the others even better so you have more to aspire after.

Appendix I: Footnotes

[1] Erik Haereid: "About my writing: Most of my journalistic work I did in the pre-Internet-period (80s, 90s), and the articles I have saved are, at best, aged in a box somewhere in the cellar. Maybe I can find some of it, but I don't think that's that interesting.

Most of my written work, including crime short stories in A-Magasinet (Aftenposten (one of the main newspapers in Norway, as **Nettavisen** is)), a second place (runner up) in a nationwide writing contest in 1985 arranged by Aftenposten, and several articles in different newspapers, magazines and so on in the 1980s and early 1990s, is not published online, as far as I can see. This was a decade and less before the Internet, so a lot of this is only on paper.

From the last decade, where I used more time doing other stuff than writing, for instance work, to mention is my book from 2011, the IQ-blog and some other stuff I don't think is interesting here.

I keep my personal interests quite private. To you, I can mention that I play golf, read a lot, like debating, and 30-40 years and even more kilos ago I was quite sporty, and competed in cross country skiing among other things (I did my military duty in His Majesty The King's Guard (Drilltroppen)). I have been asked from a couple in the high IQ societies, if I know Magnus Carlsen. The answer is no, I don't :)"

Haereid has interviewed In-Sight: Independent Interview-Based Journal Advisory Board Member **Dr. Evangelos Katsioulis**, some select articles include topics on AI in ***What will happen when the ASI (Artificial superintelligence) evolves; Utopia or Dystopia?*** (Norwegian), on IQ-measures in **180 i IQ kan være det samme som 150**, and on the **Norwegian pension system** (Norwegian). His book on the **winner/loser-society model** based on social psychology published in 2011 (Nasjonalbiblioteket), which does have a summary review **here**.

Erik lives in Larkollen, Norway. He was born in Oslo, Norway, in 1963. He speaks Danish, English, and Norwegian. He is Actuary, Author, Consultant, Entrepreneur, and Statistician. He is the owner of, chairman of, and consultant at **Nordic Insurance Administration**.

He was the Academic Director (1998-2000) of insurance at the BI Norwegian Business School (1998-2000) in Sandvika, Baerum, Manager (1997-1998) of business insurance, life insurance, and pensions and formerly Actuary (1996-1997) at Nordea in Oslo Area, Norway, a self-employed Actuary Consultant (1996-1997), an Insurance Broker (1995-1996) at Assurance Centeret, Actuary (1991-1995) at Alfa Livsforsikring, novice Actuary (1987-1990) at UNI Forsikring, and a Journalist at Norsk Pressedivisjon.

He earned an M.Sc. in Statistics and Actuarial Sciences from 1990-1991 and a Bachelor's degree from 1984 to 1986/87 from the University of Oslo. He did some environmental volunteerism with Norges Naturvernforbund (Norwegian Society for the Conservation of Nature), where he was an activist, freelance journalist and arranged 'Sykkeldagen i Oslo' twice (1989 and 1990) as well as environmental issues lectures.

He has industry experience in accounting, insurance, and insurance as a broker. He writes in his IQ-blog the online newspaper *Nettavisen*. He has personal interests in history, philosophy, reading, social psychology, and writing.

He is a member of many high-IQ societies including 4G, Catholiq, Civiq, ELITE, GenerIQ, Glia, Grand, HELLIQ, HRIQ, Intruellect, ISI-S, ISPE, KSTHIQ, MENSA, MilenijaNOUS,

OLYMPIQ, Real, sPIqr, STHIQ, Tetra, This, Ultima, VeNuS, and WGD.

Rick G. Rosner: "According to **semi-reputable sources**, Rick Rosner has the world's second-highest IQ. He earned 12 years of college credit in less than a year and graduated with the equivalent of 8 majors. He has received 8 Writer's Guild Award and Emmy nominations, and was named 2013 North American Genius of the Year by The World Genius Registry.

He has written for Remote Control, Crank Yankers, The Man Show, The Emmy Awards, The Grammy Awards, and Jimmy Kimmel Live!. He has also worked as a stripper, a bouncer, a roller-skating waiter, and a nude model. In a TV commercial, Domino's Pizza named him the World's Smartest Man. He was also named Best Bouncer in the Denver Area by Westwood Magazine.

He spent the disco era as an undercover high school student. 25 years as a bar bouncer, American fake ID-catcher, 25+ years as a stripper, and nude art model, and nearly 30 years as a writer for more than 2,500 hours of network television.

He lost on Jeopardy!, sued Who Wants to Be a Millionaire over a bad question, and lost the lawsuit. He spent 35+ years on a modified version of Big Bang Theory. Now, he mostly sits around tweeting in a towel. He lives in Los Angeles, California with his wife and daughter.

You can send an **email** or a direct message via **Twitter**, or find him on **LinkedIn**, or see him on **YouTube**."

[2] Individual Publication Date: October 15, 2018: **http://www.in-sightjournal.com/haereid-rosner-three**; Full Issue Publication Date: January 1, 2019: **https://in-sightjournal.com/insight-issues/**.

Ask A Genius (or Two): Conversation with Erik Haereid and Rick Rosner (Part Four)

2018-10-22

Rick Rosner and I conduct a conversational series entitled Ask A Genius on a variety of subjects through In-Sight Publishing on the personal and professional website for Rick. Rick exists on the World Genius Directory listing as the world's second highest IQ at 192 based on several ultra-high IQ tests scores developed by independent psychometricians. Erik Haereid earned a score at 185, on the N-VRA80. Both scores on a standard deviation of 15. A sigma of ~6.13 for Rick – a general intelligence rarity of 1 in 2,314,980,850 – and ~5.67 for Erik – a general intelligence rarity of 1 in 136,975,305. Of course, if a higher general intelligence score, then the greater the variability in, and margin of error in, the general intelligence scores because of the greater rarity in the population. This amounts to a joint interview or conversation with Erik Haereid, Rick Rosner, and myself.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: With a moderate pivot from good and evil, and morality, into religion and theology, what defines religion to each of you? What defines theology to each of you?

Within the definitions given, and in general, what seems reasonable and unreasonable in theology and religion? What seems true and false in theology and religion? What seems functional and dysfunctional in theology and religion?

Rick Rosner: The problem with theology and religion in general: it was designed to answer questions via making up stuff that were not yet answerable throughout history by actual understanding of how the world worked.

Religion has been and is a comfort. It has been a means of exercising social control and concentrating power. It contains a lot of guesses about the nature of things that have turned out, as we have learned more, not to be true.

It does not mean that you have to throw out the entire exercise. Because, to some extent, theologizing and building religions. That is practicing philosophy. It is just that philosophy, especially with it is theological, eventually turns out to be disproven.

On the other hand, as we have recently talked about, there is no guarantee that what we believe as supposedly scientific objective people will not be undermined by discoveries in the future.

I have been saying a lot, lately, that cold random universe is a misunderstanding and will be undermined by an order-based universe. A universe that where everything that exists and emerges from increasing order rather than the universe playing out as a kind of random bunch of collisions among particles bouncing off each other.

Who knows what philosophical implications will be of an order-based universe? But the older religions, the book, Homo Deus, talked about some of the reasons for the way that the religions of the time meshed with the economic and social structures of the time to reinforce them, to help

things function smoothly.

That the monotheistic religions, where Man in God's image, functions great for a farming society, where we have to believe that we have souls, but we cannot believe that animals have souls because that is too brutal.

Because look at what we do to animals, Man being created in the image of God and everything else being created for use by Man helps agricultural societies function. Then the earlier gods with dozens of gods and spirits and stuff.

Those were helpful in pre-literate periods, where those gods were probably more improvised. It did not matter because no one wrote anything down yet, because there was not language yet – 60,000-70,000 years ago.

So, I like the argument the author makes in the book. Religion is a tool of its era. Each type of religion is a tool of its era to support or provide mental buttressing and societal buttressing for the necessary structures of that society.

But most of religions guesses about the nature of things have been wrong except in the most generous, general terms. It would be weird to think that everything was wrong until now we have science and then we are right about everything.

That seems deluded, arrogant, and counter historical. At the same time, we have all this feedback that we are getting things right because science is so effective at manipulating the world.

So, it is a mix. Where lots of evidence that science is correct, lots of historical evidence that our beliefs at any point in time will be disproven later, my best guess is that the specifics of science, most of them, will survive.

There are definitely 100 or so elements made of protons, electrons, and neutrons. All that is not getting thrown out. It is not some made up a belief system that will be overthrown 200 years from now.

What might get overthrown are the philosophical underpinnings why science works and math works, there's always the chance that what we perceive as protons, neutrons, and electrons will get tweaked to the point that we barely recognize the later versions that people in the 1930s had a hard time adjusting to the quantum mechanical versions of the elements that make up the world.

Einstein famously hated the probabilistic nature of Quantum Mechanics. He worked hard to overthrow it. 90 years later, we are kind of okay with it. In the '70s, there was an ad for a Palm Olive Liquid, which was a dish soap that was emerald green.

It was supposed to be kind to your hands. So, there is a whole series of ads about Mash the Manicurist.

Jacobsen: [Laughing].

Rosner: She would talk about how Palm Olive is gentle on your hands. The housewife she is talking to in the nail salon says, "Oh, psha!" Mash would always say, "Well, you're soaking in it!"

Jacobsen: [Laughing].

Rosner: The woman would look down and her fingers were in this green liquid making them all nice.

Jacobsen: [Laughing].

Rosner: It is kind of what Quantum Mechanics is like. We have kind of been soaking in it culturally for almost a century now. What made people crazy in the 1920s and 30s, people say, "Oh, alright."

Nobody is freaking out about a single photon being able to travel through more than a single slit at a time. We have plenty of freak-outs to come, philosophically, as we move into the future.

One thing that is coming is the era of big data and the discovery of previously unrecognized relationships among aspects of the world that we could not find out because our brains are too small, and our data processing apparatuses are too primitive.

We will get hit with a bunch of new relationships to try to understand. Also, we will get hit with a bunch of black box relationships that will be tough to understand because the correlations will be made within systems that we cannot get at.

With the handiest example being, all the sudden: AI schema that has made computers the unbeatable champions of Chess and Go. We do not know what principles they have developed within their architecture.

We do not know what algorithms that are working off. I think there is a similar thing happening with Google Translate. It has developed a metalanguage within itself. That is not any human language but facilitates the translation among human languages.

That is a big scary black box deal. We will have our big data apparatuses. They will be coming up with all sorts of relationships and discovering new aspects of the world, and correlations.

Why those correlations are, they may be beyond us. I read some science fiction story. Maybe, it as by Chang. The guy who wrote the short story that became the Amy Adams movie.

Anyway, it concerns scientists 150 years from now. I do not know. They write for the Journal of Human Science, which is a completely bullshit journal because humans can no longer do science because it has moved beyond regular humans.

It is all being done by massive information processing AI entities. So, what used to be the chief or the noblest pursuit of humanity, it is now this little hobbyist magazine, which would be the

equivalent of a model railroad magazine today.

Jacobsen: [Laughing].

We will continue to be surprised. Those surprises will continue to be in philosophical, existential, and theological terms will be good and bad surprises. Theology got hit by bad surprises during the past 2,000 years.

Earth got knocked out of the center of the universe. The Star System got knocked out of the center of the universe. Humans got knocked out of the center of God's Creation. God got knocked out as the creator of the universe. Theology's ass got kicked.

In some ways, we have gone as far as we can go to kick ourselves to the corner of the universe. Although, I would argue that IC further kicks us, by establishing a super long timeline. So, we are not even favoured by having our own special place in time.

We got kicked out of our special place in space. Then IC kicks us out of our special place in time. A Big Bang universe, every moment of a Big Bang universe is its own unique moment.

But a universe that kind of keeps going as a rolling boil across trillions and octillions of years. There is no favoured place in time really either. But once we have taken it as far as we can go to kick humans and human consciousness into insignificance, there are surprises that will pull consciousness back to a pretty important role in the business of the universe

Erik Haereid: To me, religion is about people, imaginations and metaphysics. It's about what people in general need to believe in beyond their narrowed perceptions, and their struggle between conviction and if their perceptions are true or false.

Religion is also the history about all these imaginations, the doctrines, through history and in every culture that exists and ever has existed.

It's a broad conglomerate of fictions, in the space where we have needs, doubts, we are uncertain and scared, where we are children even though we are grown up. Religion contains our absent or dead father and mother.

Religion fills, for a majority of people, the mental gap people tend to get when they don't feel whole. But it departs from fictional movies and novels because its task is more existential; while ordinary fictions that we know are false are entertaining, religion is nurture and mental food.

Theology is the study of such religious belief. It's the investigation of those histories, trying to prove if it's true or false. To me, it's also associated with the priest, who spoke at school and in the church, and represented an alternative truth and path.

And therefore it's more like telling us the truth, like a teacher in history or geography, more than asking critical questions about if it's true or false. I can't remember much self-criticism from my childhood's priests.

They told us a truth, with conviction and aura. I can't remember that they said something like "…but, maybe what I tell you now is not true". So, theology is, to me, the beginning of and cause to religion wars (Here I link theology to every religion, not only Christianity).

It's the foundation of centuries with quarrels and unnecessary fights. Because it does not contain any doubt. And since religion contains several gods and texts which do not fit into a single truth, theology's lack of respect and humility creates violence and wars.

God does not exist, other than a need, a wish, as comfort, to reduce personal responsibility and emotional baggage. A type like Jesus may have existed. That's possible, and likely.

But most of the figures from the texts are mythical, and some of them may have existed in some way; the texts exaggerate them to fit the reader's needs, the aim of the text.

To me the Bible, Koran and the history of any God is a manmade project, well written, superb actually, fictions that fulfills many people's needs. In addition, it's an edifice of doctrines that force people into certain beliefs and ways of thinking.

It's a "dictator's" voice speaking to his audience, his uncertain and unsafe people, promising them safety and prosperity. And the people, in lack of independence and belief in themselves, listen, grasp and take it for granted.

To me, this castle of fantasies reminds me about how fragile we humans are, emotionally, and how dominating emotions like anxiety, guilt and shame, are. Religions are a tool for humans to abide by in their lives.

Therefore, theology in the sense that it tries to prove Gods existence, or at least to make arguments for Gods existence, is close to nonsense. The main problem is that some really think the text is true, whether it's the Bible, Koran or Vedas. But as fictions, the texts can be rewarding.

What is meaningful is discussing human's fantasy abilities. And our immense needs to build these kinds of illusions and imaginary worlds. And of course our inclination to let us convince; believe in such castles of words, symbols, actions, meaning, even though most people at some deep level understand that this can't be true.

The history of religions is more like a testimony of a wonderful creative human brain. It's absolutely amazing what abilities we have, to let us lead into such fantasy worlds, let us be seduced and directed.

And especially let the imaginations, or rather the people who manipulate, convince us that the imaginations are real. What I think is most interesting, which psychologists certainly can answer better, is where the boundary goes, that's where we let go of the imagination and think it's real.

I don't believe in any God, but in the creative power, human abilities and will that faith triggers in people. The downside is the hate that also often appears.

Faith makes us creative; think of all the monumental temples, churches, mosques, and other buildings and monuments that people have built to worship their God. And all the beautiful texts. And all the complex and wonderful rites and ceremonies. The problem is not all these manmade constructions, but the dogmatic and sometimes hateful content.

What are functional and not? I think there are some moral compasses in some biblical texts that are functional, for instance, the story of Jesus Christ. The Ten Commandments is another example. People use it, and also to the good.

To people who have faith, religious texts, rituals, spiritual leaders and monuments have functioned as a safety net, social acceptance, and as a beam through their lives.

To us who don't have faith, the monuments and rites can be affecting and beautiful. And the music. I have visited churches to calm down, to find inner peace. I like to walk on cemeteries. I feel quiet and peaceful when doing so. When I travel I often visit a church or two, because of its monumental and at the same time tranquil environment. It's relaxing.

Religions are dysfunctional as extreme dogmas, brainwashers, messing up people's perception of reality (in the sense that there is a reality), as inspiration to violence, and as motivation to perpetual religious wars.

A main problem in some religions is the double standard, like the situation in the Catholic Church with the Catholic priests abusing children. And when the theology doesn't open up for new and other interpretations of the texts.

Religions are a lot about extremities. When parents and other authorities teach their children to kill in the name of God, with great promises both in life and after, it's quite obvious that this becomes dangerous when it's systemized. As we can see.

Belief in prosperity or at least a nice continuation after death could be functional to a lot of people, because it reduces the anxiety connected to the thought of the scary and unknown phenomenon *death*.

On the other hand, most religions demand some strict behaviour to achieve the nice continuation, e.g. Karma. This could also motivate people to act good in life.

There is for sure some functionality in religions like Buddhism, where one uses contemplation and meditation techniques and rituals to achieve inner peace. In the secular world, we have adapted it as yoga and learned meditation techniques trying to get the same effects.

One way to conviction is when the belief in God helps you substantially in a traumatic situation in life. If a dogma, a faith, a strong belief in whatever it is, can bring you through the most severe trauma, alive, I guess you lean toward believing that this God or whatever exists in one or another way, even though it's maybe possible to explain the phenomenon via biochemistry, psychology or something.

I agree with Rick in that religion is an explanation of what people need to know, don't know, and based on an inner pressure of having to know. It's about human needs.

And why can't we live without knowing, without gaining complete control? Curiosity? Anxiety? Probably both based on a need to understand and see the whole picture that makes meaning and sense, and make us survive.

Humans try to explain their lives and the world they perceive, the Universe, based on various reasons. On this road, we get stuck, locked, because we tend to be convinced (because it pleases us).

When something feels odd or dangerous or dislikeable, people tend to reject it even if it's based on data, science, logic, and everything humans see as truth. These obstacles postpone a smooth understanding of how things work.

We need to feel safe in our environment, before we move on. Rick mentions Einstein's resistance to the probabilistic nature of Quantum Mechanics.

I am sure it took people some time, then back in 1543 (I had to look up the year) when Copernicus draw the new picture of where the earth stood in the Universe, and changed people's consciousness from a geo- to heliocentric view, before they accepted that the Earth orbits around the Sun and not the opposite.

We often choose what pleases us; fulfill our needs, even if it's false; even if it's plausible that it's false, and sometimes even if we know that it's false. Then our subjective truth becomes something else than an objective truth.

The irrational nature of us is a part of the truth. We can choose to call this nature whatever we like, for instance, a part of a deterministic Universe that we don't know yet, or that exists beyond what we are capable of ever knowing.

When people find peace, some other, alternative truth can be disturbing. Also, truths based on enormous amounts of data, information, and smart black boxes inside AI-agents. Maybe this is temporary, because we don't know or understand yet.

Maybe there exists an objective truth that is good and not bad, where every human brain and body on the planet fits into a higher level of consciousness. We'll see. Until then we are all more or less separated, with our own, individual truth, and in groups where each individual seemingly fit into some dogmatic truth.

If the absolute truth is a higher level of human consciousness, a summary of all individual truths, then the objective truth is the present truth, including science and religions, knowing, doubting and believing. Knowing can, after all, be reduced to a mental process. Maybe our own technology one day will help us to gain a common truth.

Religion is not wrong in the sense that it's not functional, on the contrary. It's, as Rick says, a

tool, like eyeglasses, cars and computers. We always look for the best tool, the most correct map, and adjust it all the time.

It's interesting and rewarding to read Ricks thoughts, like when he says that we, humans, are captured in theology, philosophy and existential questions and definitions, because we can never collect or reach science.

In the future, it's contained in the CI's black boxes with unknown algorithms finding new relationships and correlations to events and phenomenon. We will never be the Masters we dream about, gaining the total control we try to, understanding everything, being superior as we are to other animals.

Because on this road we invent things that prevent us from achieving this. Like AI and black boxes. And because this will happen perpetually, we will always turn us to theology and religion and spirituality, because we can't accept that we do not know everything! If I understand you right, Rick.

Jacobsen: Also, to close the Part Three add-ons, we talked about the little world of good and evil. In relation to religion or the lack thereof, what comprises the middle world and big world of good and evil?

Rosner: You have been asking questions about various levels of evil over the last few weeks and days. Good and evil on a small scale. This reminds me of a diatribe I went on with you. It was under a different topical umbrella about companies that suck and people who are assholes.

I assume this falls under little evil. Things that do not directly threaten people's welfare but make life a little bit more unpleasant for everyone. That can include microaggressions and even the refusal to grant cognitive credit to animals.

It allows us to, in America, to kill 10-20 billion chickens per year. We raise meat animals under terrible conditions. Also, milk cows don't have the greatest time. I assume that will be looked at as a greater evil when we have a better understanding of consciousness.

Although maybe not, because the kinds of consciousness that will be more commonplace, more complicated, and more powerful than ours in the future, the life of a chicken may not be any more important than we often view it.

Medium evils are acts that directly harm other people. That threatens their lives. That takes away their money or freedom. That discount their opinions. Right now, we are 18 days away from the mid-term elections.

There is massive voter suppression in the country. That seems like it is, at least, medium evil. The Republicans, or even each party, doing it. But the Republicans have been much more successful and ruthless about it, since 2010.

That is, at least, medium evil. Big evil would be things like war. In discussing all these, you have

to discuss whether the actions that lead to the goodnesses and evils are intentional or just a matter of generalized incompetence and not being able to resist our own tendencies.

Also, under big evil, I guess, you would have situations of which we are not yet aware that impinge larger structures than just our planet. It is reasonable to assume that there are other conscious species out there.

That many of them are going to be much, much older than us. That their actions might encompass much larger things. There is the possibility of Star Wars level of evil. Then there is the possibility that the universe has some intentionality.

It implies the possibility for universe level good and evil. I realized that talked about evil with all my examples…

Jacobsen: …[Laughing]…

Rosner: …and no examples of good at various levels. But having decent manners counts as a little good, some Jewish people joke, including us, about Mitzvoth.

Jacobsen: [Laughing].

Rosner: When I talk about them, it is about something really trivial I did. Nothing comes to mind like holding a door open for somebody. A medium good might be working to be less of a dick in a long-term relationship.

My wife and I, as a precautionary measure and not because we have a lot of conflicts, have been going to couples counselling for decades, about once per month. It is like doing maintenance on the relationship and then helping to build an emotional framework.

Where if there is something that annoys me, I can look at it, then decide, "Is this something I can let go because it has no real importance? Or is it something I need to call her on because it has the potential to impact our relationship? Also, are there things I need to work on myself that be annoying and whether I can lose them in the context of the relationship?"

Then there are medium goods, overt acts that have actual impacts on other people and also on you, like giving to charity. Since I have been unemployed, I have been crappy at it. Giving up money or time has a real impact on your life and someone else's life, it seems like a medium thing

It seems like something that you have to do. But it is not simply opening doors as an activity that you're used to, e.g., I was a doorman for years. I am very cognizant of doors. That's all I have time for.

Haereid: I believe that one main reason to evilness on all levels, from person to person, with groups like organizations involved, religious, political and others, and with states, big, medium or little evil, is overregulation (suppression, brainwashing, dogmatizing…).

When people are diminished or overruled by someone else beyond their own needs and opportunities, we seem to produce violence and evil actions, physically and psychologically, against ourselves and others.

We are kind of forced into a tyranny of egality, and of course, we hate it because it's not natural for us. But everyone (my exaggeration) tells us that we need to fit in by being egalitarian. No one (another exaggeration) sees that to fit in and be good we need to be different.

When I talk about equality and egality I mean equal in almost everything else than worth and quality; to achieve a perception and feelings of that humans have the same quality and worth, we have to incarnate that we are substantially different. That's my point.

A little evil could be to be rude by not answer a colleague or neighbour when it's natural to be polite, and you are not distracted by something else. And in general being rude to someone you just don't like, without any constructive criticism.

A little good could be to be more than polite to that neighbour or stranger you meet at the store, and say hello and smile or something like that.

I would say that if you torture one person to death, knowing that this person died under severe pain, it's big evil because of the severity of the pain, even though no state or government or religious organization is involved, and even though no other persons are seemingly influenced.

If the evil is medium or big depends on the amount of the pain, for how long this affects that person(s) and of how many persons this affect. If one person damages a world (by for instance creating and spreading a harmful internet virus, starting a war or intentionally spread an AI-agent that is programmed to kill or hurt as many people as possible), that is big evil.

And if a group of people, like a religious fanatic group as Daesh, creates violence by torturing and killing people, that is big evil.

If you kill a bird because you are hungry, it's not evil but brutal and necessary; it's life, it's natural. But if you catch a bird and make it suffers in some kind of pain some time before you kill it, it's evil. It's, as Rick says, the conditions before killing the animal whether it's by hunting or raising that matters.

Regimes, both secular and religious, and groups like political or religious movements, are good when they teach people to think for themselves, let them act as they want to (to some extent) and evolve as themselves and not necessarily to be approved by others (persons, regimes, groups, organizations…).

When we get what we basically need we tend to accept that other people think and act otherwise than us, and we also approve it and learn from it.

Goodness is about getting opportunities, evilness about not. Religious texts, rituals, cultures can both reveal opportunities and not. The same about secular societies; the regimes, the culture, the

organizations need to facilitate, so that each person get these optimal opportunities. This is big good; the freedom to choose, the number of possibilities.

A Norwegian priest said recently that God gives her a bigger perspective of life, and a room to express all her difficult emotions and feelings. Then God is good, for her and her surroundings.

I also believe that faith can raise one's consciousness over and beyond the levels people with no faith usually possess; faith can under certain circumstances make us more intelligent and embrace our emotions in a better way.

Its evil intentionally to focus on others flaws to gain position oneself. This is so on personal level, between groups and states.

Goodness is when for instance a political leader acknowledges and shows respect to an opponent. Such as John McCain did in the 2008 presidential campaign against Barack Obama, when a woman said Obama was "Arab". McCain stopped her, and said that "Obama is a decent family man…". McCain defended his political opponent.

Goodness is to embrace others by confirming them, and make the others see their own opportunities and abilities, talent, like a trainer.

I will also mention the decadence of the western world, illustrated in, for instance, the movie "The Wolf of Wall Street". This becomes evil when it escalates and harms people severely, because we are intelligent enough to know the consequences. I think it's qualified when religions criticize this kind of behaviour.

This decadence can be illustrated by let's say drinking two bottles of liquor containing 40 % alcohol each day instead of two-three glasses of wine to your Saturday dinner. It's about moderation.

Appendix I: Footnotes

[1] Erik Haereid: "About my writing: Most of my journalistic work I did in the pre-Internet-period (80s, 90s), and the articles I have saved are, at best, aged in a box somewhere in the cellar. Maybe I can find some of it, but I don't think that's that interesting.

Most of my written work, including crime short stories in A-Magasinet (Aftenposten (one of the main newspapers in Norway, as **Nettavisen** is)), a second place (runner up) in a nationwide writing contest in 1985 arranged by Aftenposten, and several articles in different newspapers, magazines and so on in the 1980s and early 1990s, is not published online, as far as I can see. This was a decade and less before the Internet, so a lot of this is only on paper.

From the last decade, where I used more time doing other stuff than writing, for instance work, to mention is my book from 2011, the IQ-blog and some other stuff I don't think is interesting here.

I keep my personal interests quite private. To you, I can mention that I play golf, read a lot, like debating, and 30-40 years and even more kilos ago I was quite sporty, and competed in cross country skiing among other things (I did my military duty in His Majesty The King's Guard (Drilltroppen)). I have been asked from a couple in the high IQ societies, if I know Magnus Carlsen. The answer is no, I don't :)"

Haereid has interviewed In-Sight: Independent Interview-Based Journal Advisory Board Member **Dr. Evangelos Katsioulis**, some select articles include topics on AI in ***What will happen when the ASI (Artificial superintelligence) evolves; Utopia or Dystopia?*** (Norwegian), on IQ-measures in **180 i IQ kan være det samme som 150**, and on the **Norwegian pension system** (Norwegian). His book on the **winner/loser-society model** based on social psychology published in 2011 (Nasjonalbiblioteket), which does have a summary review **here**.

Erik lives in Larkollen, Norway. He was born in Oslo, Norway, in 1963. He speaks Danish, English, and Norwegian. He is Actuary, Author, Consultant, Entrepreneur, and Statistician. He is the owner of, chairman of, and consultant at **Nordic Insurance Administration**.

He was the Academic Director (1998-2000) of insurance at the BI Norwegian Business School (1998-2000) in Sandvika, Baerum, Manager (1997-1998) of business insurance, life insurance, and pensions and formerly Actuary (1996-1997) at Nordea in Oslo Area, Norway, a self-employed Actuary Consultant (1996-1997), an Insurance Broker (1995-1996) at Assurance Centeret, Actuary (1991-1995) at Alfa Livsforsikring, novice Actuary (1987-1990) at UNI Forsikring, and a Journalist at Norsk Pressedivisjon.

He earned an M.Sc. in Statistics and Actuarial Sciences from 1990-1991 and a Bachelor's degree from 1984 to 1986/87 from the University of Oslo. He did some environmental volunteerism with Norges Naturvernforbund (Norwegian Society for the Conservation of Nature), where he was an activist, freelance journalist and arranged 'Sykkeldagen i Oslo' twice (1989 and 1990) as well as environmental issues lectures.

He has industry experience in accounting, insurance, and insurance as a broker. He writes in his IQ-blog the online newspaper *Nettavisen*. He has personal interests in history, philosophy, reading, social psychology, and writing.

He is a member of many high-IQ societies including 4G, Catholiq, Civiq, ELITE, GenerIQ, Glia, Grand, HELLIQ, HRIQ, Intruellect, ISI-S, ISPE, KSTHIQ, MENSA, MilenijaNOUS, OLYMPIQ, Real, sPIqr, STHIQ, Tetra, This, Ultima, VeNuS, and WGD.

Rick G. Rosner: "According to **semi-reputable sources**, Rick Rosner has the world's second-highest IQ. He earned 12 years of college credit in less than a year and graduated with the equivalent of 8 majors. He has received 8 Writer's Guild Award and Emmy nominations, and was named 2013 North American Genius of the Year by The World Genius Registry.

He has written for Remote Control, Crank Yankers, The Man Show, The Emmy Awards, The Grammy Awards, and Jimmy Kimmel Live!. He has also worked as a stripper, a bouncer, a roller-skating waiter, and a nude model. In a TV commercial, Domino's Pizza named him the

World's Smartest Man. He was also named Best Bouncer in the Denver Area by Westwood Magazine.

He spent the disco era as an undercover high school student. 25 years as a bar bouncer, American fake ID-catcher, 25+ years as a stripper, and nude art model, and nearly 30 years as a writer for more than 2,500 hours of network television.

He lost on Jeopardy!, sued Who Wants to Be a Millionaire over a bad question, and lost the lawsuit. He spent 35+ years on a modified version of Big Bang Theory. Now, he mostly sits around tweeting in a towel. He lives in Los Angeles, California with his wife and daughter.

You can send an **email** or a direct message via **Twitter**, or find him on **LinkedIn**, or see him on **YouTube**."

[2] Individual Publication Date: October 15, 2018: **http://www.in-sightjournal.com/haereid-rosner-four**; Full Issue Publication Date: January 1, 2019: **https://in-sightjournal.com/insight-issues/**.

An Interview with Hasan Zuberi, M.B.A. (Part Three)

2018-11-01

Hasan Zuberi, M.B.A. is the Chairman for Mensa Pakistan. He discusses: time frame for events; vigorous and respectful debates; the one rule in discussions; keeping debates on topic; punishments for poor behaviour; some interactions Mensa Pakistan members can get in-person but not online; similar interactions online as in person but the interactions are simply better, richer experiences for the participants than online; expansions of Mensa Pakistan's in-person provisions for the membership; technology and online environments improving in-person experiences; and in-person experiences enhancing experiences in the virtual environments.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: How long is the standard time frame given in the announcement and organization of an event or meeting prior to its coming to fruition?

Hasan Zuberi, M.B.A.: Standard time frame is usually at least 2 weeks, so that the members are well informed in advance and can manage their availability.

Jacobsen: How can vigorous, respectful debates on various political, philosophical, mathematical, ethical, scientific, and so on, happen more easily through electronic media?

I ask because, I know, most people, or everybody, experiences – or has experienced – intense and unpleasant debates, or even simply sour dialogues and discussions, on a number of topics.

Zuberi: Well, simply: Every day, we have a members group on WhatsApp, and there we discuss (not debate) on all topics at hand, be it political, religious, and even social issues. Since it is not a debate, it becomes more engaging and informative.

Jacobsen: What seems like reasonable ground rules to set in an online forum to prevent vitriol and maintain respectful communication between the parties involved in them, especially in the cognitively highly capable?

Zuberi: Guess, it's simply one rule: "Respect others' opinion." Senior members, play the role of moderators (if they are not the initiators) and keep the environment to the topic and if there is anything that can be deemed intense, it is politely discouraged.

So far we have not seen getting things out of control, and the credit goes to the fine diversified group of people we have.

Jacobsen: In online environments, women and girls get more harassment. Indeed, they receive more harsh criticism and *ad hominem* attacks, even if their statements remain, functionally in content and tone, the same as a man or a boy – not in all cases but, from qualitative reportage and complaints of women, probably most cases.

Any tips for women and girls, especially the highly gifted and talented to stay on topic, in self-protection of cyberbullying, stalking, and harassment?

Zuberi: Well, if I talk about our circle, it is very much protected and anything below the line can be communicated to the senior management for immediate action. We encourage our female members to speak up, and often appoint, senior female members/or our national psychologist to be at the listening end.

Jacobsen: What is the importance of an online moderator in the prevention of these behaviours by many men and boys – or some women and girls?

What seems like the appropriate punishments, reactions, or mechanisms to acquire justice in the cases of legitimate cyberbullying, stalking, and harassment? That is, how can the bullied, stalked, and harassed deal with these individuals?

Zuberi: Well in our system, as stated above, are the senior members, who are on senior and powerful positions and volunteer for the cause, they serve as the elders and advise on issues, referred to them.

Punishments, if required, are mostly related to warning the culprit at first and so far it has been enough just to let members know that Seniors are there to provide all help.

If required further, it can result in suspension and/or expulsion from the organization, and registering a case with Cyber Crime Cell of Federal Investigation Authority (FIA). Fortunately, Pakistan has a very string Cyber Crime Unit, called **NR3C**.

Jacobsen: Now, to the second aspect, the in-person environment has been the main form of interaction of the highly intelligent in a relatively tight locale. What are some interactions Mensa Pakistan members can get in-person but not online?

Zuberi: It is mostly in our meet-ups, and or other SIG activities, which provides a chance for in-person interaction.

Jacobsen: What about similar interactions online as in person but the interactions are simply better, richer experiences for the participants than online?

Zuberi: Well, obviously with technology in hands now, it has become easier for everyone to interact online, than offline, so it is normal.

Jacobsen: In the future, what would be wonderful expansions of Mensa Pakistan's in-person provisions for the membership? I mean wildest dreams, wonderful, and dreamy ideas – pie-in-the-sky.

Zuberi: Culturally speaking, in our part of the world, the in-person meetups are still considered formal and respectful. We as a platform, try to provide our members with the opportunity to come, meet their peers, to share their learning and experiences with others, and to learn from each other.

We are also planning to collaborate with other organizations that provide positive learning

opportunities, scholarships, activities etc., for our members.

Jacobsen: To the third facet, the nature of the interaction between the two. How do technology and online environments improve in-person experiences of the Mensa Pakistan group?

Zuberi: Above all, the technology and online environment has helped us to engage our long-lost old members who have migrated from Pakistan; or left the country for studies, family, work, to connect with the members back home. It also helps to connect and broaden their social networks.

Jacobsen: How do in-person experiences provide the basis for enhanced experiences in the virtual environments of the Mensa Pakistan group?

Zuberi: It serves as the basis. People understand others, especially when they meet them and express themselves in person, and in the online environment; it becomes easier to understand their words.

Jacobsen: Thank you for the opportunity and your time, Hasan.

Appendix I: Footnotes

[1] Chairman, Mensa Pakistan.

[2] Individual Publication Date: November 1, 2018: **http://www.in-sightjournal.com/zuberi-three**; Full Issue Publication Date: January 1, 2019: **https://in-sightjournal.com/insight-issues/**.

Ask A Genius (or Two): Conversation with Erik Haereid and Rick Rosner on Existence, Mathematics, and Philosophy (Part Five)

2019-04-08

Rick Rosner and I conduct a conversational series entitled Ask A Genius on a variety of subjects through In-Sight Publishing on the personal and professional website for Rick. Rick exists on the World Genius Directory listing as the world's second highest IQ at 192 based on several ultra-high IQ tests scores developed by independent psychometricians. Erik Haereid earned a score at 185, on the N-VRA80. Both scores on a standard deviation of 15. A sigma of ~6.13 for Rick – a general intelligence rarity of 1 in 2,314,980,850 – and ~5.67 for Erik – a general intelligence rarity of 1 in 136,975,305. Of course, if a higher general intelligence score, then the greater the variability in, and margin of error in, the general intelligence scores because of the greater rarity in the population. This amounts to a joint interview or conversation with Erik Haereid, Rick Rosner, and myself.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: How do philosophy and mathematics mix with one another? How do philosophy and mathematics not mix with one another? What insights into reality emerge from philosophy and not mathematics, or from mathematics and not from philosophy? Or do these seem inextricably linked to one another?

Traditionally, philosophy breaks into several disciplines: ethics, aesthetics, epistemology, metaphysics, and so on. Do some of these distinct fields seem unnecessary in philosophy? In that, some sub-disciplines in philosophy seem already explained within others.

Also, what seems like the limits of mathematics and philosophy in providing some fundamental explanation about the world? In that, the rules and principles of mathematics remain non-fundamental.

Same with the purported big questions of philosophy. They remain important. They give insights, even a sense of grandeur about existence. However, they fail, at least at present, for a complete explanation about the world – assuming such a thing exists in principle.

Erik Haereid: Mathematics is an abstract, logical, cognitive tool based on numerical symbols, based on some assumptions, axioms that we agree on. Whether the assumptions are proper or not is a philosophical issue. Mathematics is about structures and exact relations.

Philosophy is some logical investigation into what's true and false, and what's right and wrong. It's a compass in life. We use it trying to finish our mental map. It's a cognitive tool that helps us directing our lives more proper, as we see it, than lives that are lived in the present and based on pure intuition and urges.

Philosophy and mathematics go hand in hand thus that we begin with some philosophical inquiries, then we put some mathematics to those thoughts, then we make new philosophical inquiries and so on. An example is the Big Bang theory. It's reasonable that there many years ago were as many ideas of the Universe, what was outside the human perceptions when watching

the sky at day and night, as there were humans. That is, basic for philosophizing is our fantasy; thoughts and emotions in a mental soup based on our genes and experiences. The yellow light we saw at day time on the sky, and we thought were god's candle or whatever, became through philosophy, mathematics, and science to a massive spherical plasma object consisting of such as hydrogen and helium.

Einstein philosophized through his experimental thoughts about how the Universe could function and look like, and he had, for instance, Newton's work in his mind. He got some ideas, like that space is curved and cause gravity, which were reasonably for him, and he put mathematics to it. He also philosophized over that the three-dimensional space and time were not independent, but one four-dimensional phenomenon (spacetime). That kind of philosophy and related mathematics created new thoughts about how the Universe looked like, and what was beyond our perceptions.

Who could think of the Universe as a 13-14-billion-year-old highly dense little object exploding into a vast mess of matter and energy, impossible to imagine, thousand years ago? It was the philosophy and mathematics that dug the ditch. And still are. Because we don't know what's beyond the Big Bang. And probably, if we look to for instance Gödel's incompleteness theorems, we will never know. At least never get the whole picture.

Let's say we could explain the Universe; find some formulas that explained everything (determinism). Then we could explain, prove (based on some axiomatic, logical framework), every statement we had. There wouldn't be any statements that couldn't be proved. But according to Gödel, within any axiomatic, logical framework there are statements that cannot be proved and therefore human can never prove a deterministic Universe even though the Universe is deterministic.

But since we are curious, and maybe naive, we still dig. And then we make new and more fantasies, restrict it into some logical, philosophical frame of thoughts, put some mathematics, even more strict relations and order, to it, call them theories and try to prove them. The final act is to observe it; experience that the empirical observations are in accordance with the philosophy and mathematics. Then it's true, in our understanding of truth. When we have revealed the truth, we don't need to philosophize about it any more. Of course that's not completely true, because we don't believe in our perceptions, and/or we don't know what they are (what is a thought?). So we will continue philosophizing over that, until we get tired and give up, or get mad.

A harmonic alternation between fantasies (chaos), philosophy (order), mathematics (detailed and more order, relations) and empirical experiences (perceptual truth) is the track here.

Humans tend to try to see the surface of the three-/four-dimensional space we are confined in, from the outside. But there is no surface. What is "no surface?" And so on. The only possibility is to make fantasies about it, philosophize about it, create some mathematical formulas to it, but it's confined within our perceptions and abstract images. Our desire for knowing exceeds our possible limits of knowledge. Maybe this drive is crucial for human's evolution

AI and technology, build on better abilities, amplifiers, processors and storage possibilities than

we have, could be fruitful for human evolution. We have to respect our limitations, like we do when we make cars, planes, telephones and binoculars. And I think we also do.

I also think we should extend our mind and cognitive abilities to its limit. It's rewarding when mathematicians (and other scientists) find new solutions, invent new concepts or numbers (like when introducing irrational numbers, and later complex numbers).

We need philosophy as long as we don't know everything we want to know, independent of which philosophical field we talk about. In this context a single philosophical discipline's existence is a function of if we still see it proper to try to answer more questions about these topics.

When I know how trees grow, through photosynthesis, and am satisfied with that answer, I don't need philosophizing about trees and growth anymore. It fulfills my needs. But that's subjective, because the process, any process, has no end in the human mind. There are always questions to ask, even when we know "everything" about that topic.

If you see a tree, you can see it as timber to build houses, as a plant that grow and live through photosynthesis, as an imaginary picture of the phylogenetic development, as a family tree, as a nightmare, as beautiful, as a wish, as an oxygen producer, as a producer of apples and fruits, as x times heavier and higher than a human, etc. To discover all these angles and views is the aim of philosophy, in all areas and with everything we have any real perception or imaginary idea of.

To understand is beauty. We have to respect that we will never understand everything, and at the same time respect that there are always new things to learn. It's about a balance. It's like building a monument, like an enormous cathedral or tower; it takes hundreds, thousands, millions of years, but by putting one brick systematically on top of another we know that we each day get closer to the product; by creating time through successive events we experience that we can reach our goal. And until we know how to live forever, we reproduce and let our children continue the job.

What's the final point? Maybe to reveal a global truth. To reach the very end, where the illuminated revelation is right in front of us. Is this what life is about? Or is it just an uncorrelated mess, with seemingly none or few relations, no goal, a nihilistic travel through emptiness? Shall we reduce life to simple, cynical social maneuvers that suck all the beauty out of it? I choose not to reduce humans to a harsh evolution process, because it's meaningless, it's messy and violent, and it's logical in the simplest way. This makes me religious even though I don't believe in God. This also elevates my experience of life.

It's complicated to see the beauty in everything, and on that road we limit us to exclude what we have not understood yet. But still we unconsciously work towards that goal, because we know on an unconscious level that we need to see everything that exists in relation to each other.

In general we philosophize about everything and anything, and related to math about such as black holes and singularity, how to express the primes in a formula, multiple universes, artificial superintelligence, and how to travel and meet the aliens somewhere in the Andromeda Galaxy.

Dreaming about travelling to the Moon was one thing, philosophizing about it another and the next step, and then calculating how to do it and doing it the final steps.

Obviously, as we can see when we are at AI's kickoff, the human brain has many limitations concerning perceiving, storing and processing data. The black boxes are mentioned, and our lack of knowledge of what is going on there even though we have created these devices.

One of the blessings by being a child was the large quantity of fantasies. In books, stories told, dreams, what we saw in the nature we yet didn't restrict to pure science (Some trees grew into heaven, didn't they?).

Inventions are made by grown up "children". There is one person now and then through history that revealed something important, that made his/her fantasy becomes real; like that we can talk to each other from one side of the world to the other, or travel in space. The impossible became possible. This is an ongoing process which we all are a part of all the time.

Maybe our search for objectivity and truth, a real Universe, has something to do with us, our mind more than it's about if the Universe is objective or subjective. Of course, how is it possible to travel in a subjective Universe? Who are you if my mind is the only mind? How can I interact with something else if this is a part of me?

It's convenient to look at it as me and the surroundings, as different entities, subject and object, because that's how we experience it naturally. But when we go into it, philosophizing, exploring it with our thoughts and logic, it could be that everything "else" is sort of an unconscious part of ourselves. "We" are not confined in our body.

We just don't experience it like that, because we are not aware of it. But by putting it into a thought, we can think of it as a possibility, or just a fantasy. When you travel or do things, I do it, but as during surgery and anesthesia. It's a matter of consciousness and not. Or several levels of consciousness; I am not aware that I think your thoughts.

Don't misunderstand this; it sounds narcissistic. But it's not, it's a philosophical inquiry. If the person thinks he/she is God, then he/she tries to control all other's cognition, acts, behavior. But we don't control each other's thoughts and behavior. It's in this context the philosophical inquiry is done.

Maybe we are tricked by the fact that we experience that something is outside our own control, and therefore experience it as what we call objectivity. If I can't remember that I wrote that sentence or did that thing, how can I then claim that it's my act? How can I be certain of that *me* is confined within "my" body, "my" senses, "my" emotions and thoughts, "my" free will? It could happen that I am something else than I experience that I am, even *everything*. This is about how we identify ourselves, and what kind of responsibility we take.

Let's say that we all are the same. If everyone and everything are a part of you and you are a part of everything and everyone, then all the interactions are a part of us and we are not limited to our bodies. Subject is object. When you speak to me, even though I can't imagine or sense that this

spoken sentence came from myself, I have no control over it, I don't know where it came from within what I define as "me", I have to think, from this point of view, that your voice is my voice. It could be a voice from my unconscious part, like my autonomic nervous system.

It's not the chaos that is beautiful, but our adaptation to it in the sense of understanding and accepting the volatility in the surroundings, the magnitude of the Universe and life. This is what make logical practices like math and philosophy beautiful; they are tools evolving our understanding, abstract and not, and revealing that life is more than we have ever thought of before.

We talk a lot about what technology can do for us in the future, and obviously we need some kind of cognitive and emotional amplifiers to be what we want to be.

Inventions like social media, internet, shows creativity and that we are capable of doing almost what we want to. I am sure that evolution has its right pace, also related to technology.

[Ed. Further commentary]

We humans have the ability to think we are something we are not; we have the ability to believe we are gods and devils, for instance, that we are everything and nothing, abstractions or concrete manifestations different from which we really are, and base our existence on that false identity. The advantage of this feature is that we can create great ideas that can be converted into practical use. The downside is that we kill each other; become more destructive than necessary. Great ideas are also created by people that are self-aware, so let's stick with this.

I am in favor of self-awareness, to use a word that is not sufficient and do not cover what I mean; but that's the best word I came up with. It's about knowing that you are an entity, existence, and who you are, as best you possible can achieve that self-awareness through all your identity-changes through your life. It's a continuous struggle. And it's the best way to live your life, if you ask me; for you and the society. It's a state of contemplation, and maybe the Buddhist monks are the best achievers of that state, I don't know. We in the western cultures are not very good at it, though.

When we discuss ontological, epistemological, ethical or aesthetical issues, I choose to start with this: We have to know *that* we are and approximately *who* we are; for real, not as abstract or false features. If not, we are driven into insanity.

When I discuss whether ideas exist or not, I have to profoundly feel that I am the entity that thinks of and discuss this problem with myself or others. If not, I get lost.

If abstraction exists per se, beyond our abilities to think abstract, is a function of what concepts we so far in evolution have developed and defined, and which logical inference and irrational beliefs we have established (knowledge). Proofs of for instance abstractions' existence are based on our, humans, innate abilities and learned knowledge. The core is how we humans define *proof*. And this is about feelings, experiences, profound feeling of and so on; the core inside us (i.e. self-awareness), which is irrational as such.

It's possible to disagree about anything and everything, even though one wizard claims his or her right (like it seems I do here; I underline that this is my experience), and even "proves" it. Bottom line is that it ends here; reality, existence, truth cannot be proved as anything else than that we experience it and call it "truth, reality" and so on. Something is difficult to contradict as real, though, like physical events that "everyone" sees and experience. The closest we get to reality is therefore our experience of it. Do you see what I mean?

I think we have to see knowledge as a human phenomenon, a mental ability that helps advanced organisms like us to provide better identities and lives. Humans should focus more on what is real and not, and what is me and what is someone and something else; who are we, and how shall we capture a sense of that?

It's not about living all life in contemplation, but to evolve the ability to slow down the chaotic lives when needed, and find that inner peace or understanding of whom one is; a meditation skill.

We all change identities every minute, every day, all life, and it's a struggle knowing who we are on this bumpy travel. And since humans have these complex mental abilities, we also have the ability to dissociate, create several personalities, thinking we are something we are not and make a mess for ourselves and each other. I don't say that I think we would be angels if we all had this continuously inner contact with who we are, but I guess we certainly would have been nicer and lived better lives and also chose the right path; because we would have the inner knowledge and wisdom of "here I am, and that is who I am just now". Then the future would be easier regardless obstacles we met on the road.

So, if there is one certain achievable knowledge, it is the knowledge of who we are. No one can take that inner experience away from anybody (even though we try and succeed…). But we have to believe in it; it's not proved mathematically or a result from a syllogism. It's an experience. It's beyond thoughts and emotions, which are tools to gain that inner knowledge and wisdom.

If you want to be rich or a king, go for it, but the point is to experience and achieve an inner peace about who you are on that road. It's not about restraining our lives, on the contrary, but about achieving goals through self-awareness. Do you see what I mean? I don't believe in piety in the strictest meaning of the word, because that's a wrong approach to inner peace. I am more in favor of hedonism, but with that extra ability to always know who you really are, and not the narcissistic or ascending self.

Maybe I am a bit off-road concerning the topic in this thread, but when we talk about philosophy and what kind of mindful activities humans should strive for in the future, I have to mention this which I strongly believe in. We can ask ontological and epistemological questions about reality, existence and knowledge, and questions about what is beautiful and not, and what is good and not, but anyway we end up with ourselves. That kind of self-awareness is the key to evolve on every other area we deal with. Being human is not only to gain knowledge but also wisdom, and that is to know when enough is enough.

Because we tend to blend our abstractions of who we are with who we really are, also because other people, the culture, plant ideas in our mind about who we are and should be, we build a

distance between our perception of who we think we are and who we really are. This creates chaos in our minds and in the culture; socially.

It's the culture, family, friends, activities and your surroundings that function as mirrors, that make you be self-aware or not. If this culture make you believe that you are something else than you really are, then you go out searching for someone and something that mirrors the real you, that make you find yourself, until you find it; because we all have that inner profound wisdom about whom we are, all the time. We just need help; mirrors that lead us towards it.

Self-awareness is also about understanding ones limitations. If you are far away from knowing who you are, you are not capable of capturing your possibilities. It's like a child's growth: The child develops best when its parents function as mirrors for that child; sees it as it is. Then the child is open-minded for strangers and differences, curious about it, and is driven towards new phenomenon. It changes identity every second. And because its parents sees it whatever what (not accept everything it does, though), it will continue being self-aware. It's a process through life. When we get older other people function as mirrors, the culture does, and the same rules exists. When we are not seen as we are, when we cannot see ourselves in a film, a book or in a neighbor, we get lost in our minds and develop other and alternative pictures of who we are than we really are. When the culture contains many such individuals and features, then it gets messy.

One of my points is that we become xenophobic and hateful against each other when we abstract from our true self. And the contrary; friendly and inviting when we know who we are. Then ethics is to build a community and culture which embrace values that enhance each individual's self-awareness. A culture that motivates everyone to be something one impossibly can be is an unethical culture, and the opposite. It's not about restriction, but a consciousness about whom we are and who we can be. The sky's the limit in our mind, but not in real life. And I think that is crucial to understand, and making good citizens; people that know how to treat each other with respect and good. And even though it sounds imprisoning, it works opposite; you will actually achieve more in life when you are aware of this. Self-confidence is å product of being self-aware.

You can create a justice system that controls people's actions until a degree, but the basic problems are still the same; the system does not prevent violence. That's because it's still unfair; no such system embraces everyone. The thing, if you ask me, is not to prevent violence and make good citizens by telling people who they are and should be, but letting them be who they are. Then our natural social collisions will make us adapt properly. I think this is a path to more empathy and understanding, as I said before: Egoism is altruism. This is what I mean by that. I don't say this will prevent violence completely, not at all. But it is, in my opinion, the best way to achieve cultures where all live their best lives and that is inside the acceptable for almost everyone. Statistically spoken the expected value, the average, of life quality could be the same but the standard deviation much less. There would be shorter distance between the extremities. We (**think**) we need more rules and limitations and governmental institutions because we are less in contact with whom we really are, and more in contact with an abstract, false identity; that's my point.

About aesthetics: The idea with art is to elevate us, bring us into the contact I speak about, to our true self. So the idea of aesthetics, say art, is to bring us closer to mutual love and respect,

understanding and behavior that we all can accept.

It's about making the right picture, mirroring ourselves. I think it's not a question if, let's say in painting, impressionism is better for us than expressionism, or if that abstract art is better than figurative art, but what that piece of painting and sculpture does with us; like the book we read. I read novels that enhance my feelings of being, existing. It's like travelling and being aware of that. And as with esthetics, it's not possible to draw general and absolute rules. It's individual.

When that is said it's obvious that some with knowledge about paintings can help people to see things in the painting, and through that new insight evolve and appreciate that piece of art. Like in architecture, where you can look at a building and feel that it's ugly until the architect wizard tell you about the details, the reasons; why, where, how. Then it becomes beautiful, as the zoologist thinks when he watches tarantulas.

Should we draw a painting and write a novel as beautiful as possible, far from reality, to enhance our good feelings that we get when we watch beautiful things; idealizing? Or should we paint and describe reality, with the chaotic mix of ugliness and beauty, reflecting our real emotions in our real lives?

If everything in a culture is about creating idealistic, always beautiful art and social installations, we get lost in our hopes and wishes, in our abstractions and thoughts about how we want our lives to be. If we don't create any counterpoise to this, we will probably evolve abstract selves and huge distance to our true selves, and without the opportunity to evolve our true selves as we wish. To gain the optimal evolution we have to create idealistic art and art reflecting reality.

Being a true romantic, as an example, is not about being bohemian or poet, but being bohemian in the weekends, so to speak. Hedonism is a spare time phenomenon. It's about having this inner switch turning you self on and off. A naturalist, a person that embraces things as they are, has also to turn his and her romantic-switch on now and then. Art is not about destruction, but about making us understand that no one survives if life is pure destructive. We have to see, to internalize, that there are good as well. If we don't, it's not because of our existence but because of our culture, art, communications and perceptions of life. It's an illusion that reality is pure destructive. And it's an illusion that it's pure good.

[Ed., further additions]

We can divide reality into a concrete and an abstract world, where the abstractions meet the concretions now and then. It is "impossible" to claim that something created or perceived in the abstract world don't have the opportunity to appear in the concrete world, such as time travels. We don't know the range of the concrete possibilities that lie in our abstractions. We profit from distinguishing between our abstract and concrete identities. The abstractions as phenomenon are far ahead of us, far beyond, but at the same time provide us vast amounts of opportunities in the concrete world.

Example quantum physics: The fact that two particles can function completely synchronized on different physical places, with no concrete relation, is an example of changes in our perception of

reality based on evolved abstractions (math). When I say that we must be aware of our limitations, I mean strive for being self-aware, and not that we shall not endeavor and evolve through our abstractions; including convert from abstract concepts to real experiences like time travels. Abstractions are about aspiring, setting goals, and respect that we reach them when and if we do.

The very first grounds for anything is "because it is like that". Axioms are established because we feel and experience that this is right, and not because it's a logical context that leads to the axioms. My point is that all explanations, all mathematics and philosophy are based on an irrational, emotionalized elastic floor that we never can get under or beyond.

Math is about developing numerical logical coherences, formulas, based on some basic rules, axioms that we agree in. When we bump into problems that involve lack of concepts and definitions, we create them. That's the advantage by abstractions; it's quite easy to expand and evolve. When mathematicians stop developing concerning formulas containing strange numbers that they until then did not have defined in their number system, they invent new number concepts and symbols (i.e. from natural to rational, rational to irrational and further to complex numbers). They adapt to their abstract needs by expanding their abstract world. Even though complex numbers (square root of negative numbers) seem illogical and incomprehensible by first glimpse, based on traditional mathematical rules, it's about amplifying the system by thinking beyond what the mind think is possible.

In logical, abstract activities we have the possibility to achieve new coherences and correlations, after developing new abstract concepts, definitions and symbols and the logical rules we attend to, that we possibly couldn't within the frame of concepts and symbols we are captured into at that time.

It becomes a kind of abstract nanotechnology; we distort basic structures, and create new concepts, definitions and logical rules that we accept.

An intriguing thought: Maybe the prime numbers are math's enigma to mankind; we have to reveal the formula explaining the primes to understand what life is about; what is meaningful and not. If I was a zoologist I would probably have found another example, though. But maybe it's impossible to find that formula concerning the prime numbers without expanding into new mathematical concepts.

Maybe rhythm, logic, coherences actually is about developing concepts and symbols, enlarging our abstract world more than trying to gain control over the already existing abstractions we know of. That is, every lack of rhythm and understanding is a lack of new concepts, lack of abstract expansion. If that's so, it's not about what we want and not want, but how we can achieve that expanded wisdom.

Rick Rosner: I agree with Eric that our philosophizing about the nature of the world has been recently constrained in the last hundred years by our finally having a first overall picture of the structure of the universe.

Although, I would say that our first conclusions, including the Big Bang, are likely not going to turn out to be as right as we currently think they are. But until a hundred years ago, we didn't even know there were other galaxies.

It was less than a hundred years ago that the expansion of the universe was discovered. A hundred years ago, we didn't know that stars ran on fusion. That's less than ninety years ago. There was no way we would be even anywhere close to right in philosophizing about the universe because we had a very incomplete picture.

Our picture is still well short of, in our current philosophies and science, the overall structure and behavior of the universe; it is still off in the weeds. But it is closer to correct than ever before because we have more observational evidence than ever before, and it is not even a gradual incremental increase in accuracy.

It is an explosive increase in understanding over the past 100 years. We had Newton's universal gravitation, which itself was a huge step and then we had the relativities but they were brand new.

So, anyway we're living in a new era of philosophy and science on the largest scales and philosophy can be considered for science on the largest possible scale with an observational foundation for the first time ever.

Ten thousand years of trying to imagine the universe with some explosive steps towards understanding from time to time going from an earth-centered universe to a sun-centered universe, the discovery of the elements and all that stuff, but we've only gotten the tools for any observation and information based global philosophizing in the past few generations.

And this coincides with the idea that what science is supposed to do is boil everything down to a single general set of principles or a single theory; unification in general. Let's see how many things we can put under a single umbrella.

We wouldn't get arguments from many scientists if you said that biology and chemistry are at their most fundamental levels just physics. And they need to have some quibble saying there are emergent principles in biology and chemistry that you'd have a hard time predicting from physics. So, you can't do away with biology and chemistry.

Then if you came back and said, "Yes but all the physical interactions from which these emergent phenomena arise, that's still all physics." They might have to grudgingly say, "Yeah." You could argue that evolution is a unifying principle of life on earth.

Now still, you can take it all back on physics, but evolution is the framework that encompasses all that and gives you a philosophical structure for understanding what's going on. Evolution is still subject to severe revision.

It wasn't until the 60's and 70's when Stephen Jay Gould came on with punctuated equilibrium. Before that most people and still, most people have the idea that evolution, if they believe in it at

all, is this gradual thing that cuts along with occasional mutations being helpful and being integrated into net of life.

Whereas punctuated equilibrium says the species generally go on without changing much for tens and even hundreds of thousands or even millions of years until special circumstances permit for rapid change in evolution on change in a few hundred, a few thousand, or a couple ten thousand years based on either a changing environment or a small segment of a population being isolated.

If you were to graph somehow one finch changing into another finch, it wouldn't be a gradual transformation of one finch into the other. Instead, it would be finch A going along for fifteen thousand, twenty-five, or fifty-five thousand years and then all of a sudden part of that finch population, something happens to it; it gets isolated or the weather changes or some crap happens and then within fifteen hundred years finch B emerges.

But anyway, that's a recent addition to evolutionary theory and then epigenetics is probably even more recent, not that I can even talk about that in any decent terms but I think epigenetics is like Lamarckism that isn't wrong.

Lamarckism is the idea that an organism's life history is somehow incorporated into what it passes on genetically with the standard example being that if a giraffe has to reach higher and higher to get to stuff on trees that reaching is somehow going to be incorporated, it is going to be passed on to its kids because the giraffe had to be so reachy all its life.

It wants to have longer necks, which survive better and pass on their long neck genes. So, it is not individual experience changing, it is the better-adapted creatures pass on their genes and if this happens in enough increments; if there's a niche for longer-necked creatures, then longer-necked creatures are going to have more life success.

That is, they'll get more food. They'll be able to get laid better because they are healthier than the short-necked giraffes. So, the long-necked giraffes will have more descendants than the short-necked giraffes.

What I think epigenetics says, I should probably read the Wikipedia article so I'm not wrong, is that our genome; it has a bunch of junk genes. The genes that are expressed to make us and operate us are like in a teamwork with all the genes we have.

Most of the genes are right along those that have just been passed along because there's no reason for them to be knocked out across several billion years of evolution. But some of these genes can be turned on based on life experience, so you do have an options package based on your life experience because you have all these templates to express other stuff if you run into the right circumstances.

I'm not sure that this means that these will be passed on based on your life experience, except that there will be bias if you survive better because your genes have been turned on. But anyway, that's a whole new area of genetics that would've surprised the shit out of Darwin; he didn't

even know we had genes.

We have the bias towards unification looking for overall principles in philosophy, in math, in science and this unifying philosophy is generally successful. You've got the deductive principle and the inductive principle.

I don't know which is which, but like one is looking to generalize and the other is you're looking to specialize; take general principles and make new inventions from what you know. And science has had huge amounts of success going in both directions.

You're going to make a bunch of money going from the general to the specific and they are making these stuff, but you're going to get tenure and by going from this specific to the general.

I agree with most of what he says. It reminds me of three possible future paths for science which we talked about, which is:

1)   We complete science and know everything.

2)   We complete science without knowing everything because there are things beyond what we can know.

3)   Science proceeds to acquire a more and more complete picture of the universe but never reaching 100% completeness. There's always more to know.

That seems the most reasonable path that we'll render with AI, big data. So, our descendants and the things and people that will come after us will find all sorts of relationships in the world that we had no idea existed, probably don't even have the mental capacity to process.

But it is still part of the ongoing but never complete process of understanding the world. Eric also talks about the importance of beauty and emotion and it used to be a stereotype when presenting robots in science fiction that they would be emotionless.

They would make dispassionate judgments just based on algorithms. Some of these judgments would be horrifying. The Terminator series with this cold logic tells the robots to eradicate the humans.

I think you can't operate in the world effectively without assigning values to events and things and ideas and link to those values or emotions feeling good when positive things happen and bad when negative things happen and feeling good when you see something that appeals to your sense of aesthetics.

I think that the beings that come after us with much larger information processing capacity will continue to have emotions but emotions that will probably be even deeper than our own. If you can say something like our emotions are deeper than a dog's emotions because our emotions are informed from more angles and based on more information, very few dogs write poetry and I think it makes sense to extrapolate from that that the beings who come after us with their bigger

brains will have emotional structures that are bigger and deeper still.

The half robots of the year 2115 will feel deeply and have relationships among themselves and other beings that are as intricate and feeling and reflecting of values as our own and more so. Emotions and values are part of the toolkit that let you operate in the world. They are not for fun.

We as evolved beings; our emotions and values are largely evolved. Love is a cultural overlay; the feelings of love and the idea of love is a cultural overlay on our evolved drives to reproduce and to care for our offspring.

Future emotions and future values will have some of those same structures. People in the future may feel things strongly and the more stoic people of the future may feel emotions as being frippery but, in general, emotions help you navigate the world and help order emerge into the world.

They are a necessary part of conscious life and consciousness itself is probably a near necessary part of increasing order in the world. The point of view now is that everything boils down to physics. If you take biology apart everything happens because of physics, chemistry; because of physics.

So, all the more complicated sciences boil down to complicated instances of the simplest most basic science. I would say that similarly some of the complicated ideas of philosophy may be seen as boiling down to the more basic principles that might be found in math and in physics or even more basic than that in the principles of existence.

The consequence of this scientific program for the past few centuries has been to search for and boil everything down to essential principles and when you can't do that you look for more macro explanations and overarching systems of values and beliefs.

But those overarching systems are subject to being boiled down to more essential principles as those principles are discovered and expanded upon. The current dominant belief of our time is scientism. The belief in science is the dominant and most dynamic belief system of our time.

Humans and human society and the universe itself has been increasingly subject to scientific analysis and most scientifically educated people believe that we are the entirely biological products of billions of years of evolution rather than being imbued with certain magical properties by God.

Now, that doesn't mean that values have to be discarded, instead, we have to discover values within the more scientific framework and there is a lazy default form of science that says everything is random and nothing means anything but that is a misunderstanding of what goes on in an information-based universe.

It is hard to pull a bunch of values from a purely scientific point of view but you can pull some values and then you can build upon those like one value you can pull is that increasing order seems to be good, given how we fit into the world and the desires we've evolved to have.

If you can pull out that you want the preservation of order unless it is corrosive dictatorial preservation of order that's at the expense of other values. You can pull out the golden rule because we know from personal experience that we want certain things and we can assume that other beings share many of the same things, the same desires we have.

And from the preference for order and from the golden rule you can build more complicated philosophies.

Even though we're building not from benevolent God, His goodness, the magic property of consciousness and souls and all, you can still build from basic principles out to an entire philosophy, which will be helpful and necessary when we start to have to deal with the ethics of the new existences; new beings that we will bring into existence via AI and also the future humans and their future multiplicious forms and their augmentation and the new relationships among augmented humans and AI and the whole mess that's going to coming in the next century.

Appendix I: Footnotes

[1] Erik Haereid: "About my writing: Most of my journalistic work I did in the pre-Internet-period (80s, 90s), and the articles I have saved are, at best, aged in a box somewhere in the cellar. Maybe I can find some of it, but I don't think that's that interesting.

Most of my written work, including crime short stories in A-Magasinet (Aftenposten (one of the main newspapers in Norway, as **Nettavisen** is)), a second place (runner up) in a nationwide writing contest in 1985 arranged by Aftenposten, and several articles in different newspapers, magazines and so on in the 1980s and early 1990s, is not published online, as far as I can see. This was a decade and less before the Internet, so a lot of this is only on paper.

From the last decade, where I used more time doing other stuff than writing, for instance work, to mention is my book from 2011, the IQ-blog and some other stuff I don't think is interesting here.

I keep my personal interests quite private. To you, I can mention that I play golf, read a lot, like debating, and 30-40 years and even more kilos ago I was quite sporty, and competed in cross country skiing among other things (I did my military duty in His Majesty The King's Guard (Drilltroppen)). I have been asked from a couple in the high IQ societies, if I know Magnus Carlsen. The answer is no, I don't :)"

Haereid has interviewed In-Sight: Independent Interview-Based Journal Advisory Board Member **Dr. Evangelos Katsioulis**, some select articles include topics on AI in ***What will happen when the ASI (Artificial superintelligence) evolves; Utopia or Dystopia?*** (Norwegian), on IQ-measures in **180 i IQ kan være det samme som 150**, and on the **Norwegian pension system** (Norwegian). His book on the **winner/loser-society model** based on social psychology published in 2011 (Nasjonalbiblioteket), which does have a summary review **here**.

Erik lives in Larkollen, Norway. He was born in Oslo, Norway, in 1963. He speaks Danish,

English, and Norwegian. He is Actuary, Author, Consultant, Entrepreneur, and Statistician. He is the owner of, chairman of, and consultant at **Nordic Insurance Administration**.

He was the Academic Director (1998-2000) of insurance at the BI Norwegian Business School (1998-2000) in Sandvika, Baerum, Manager (1997-1998) of business insurance, life insurance, and pensions and formerly Actuary (1996-1997) at Nordea in Oslo Area, Norway, a self-employed Actuary Consultant (1996-1997), an Insurance Broker (1995-1996) at Assurance Centeret, Actuary (1991-1995) at Alfa Livsforsikring, novice Actuary (1987-1990) at UNI Forsikring, and a Journalist at Norsk Pressedivisjon.

He earned an M.Sc. in Statistics and Actuarial Sciences from 1990-1991 and a Bachelor's degree from 1984 to 1986/87 from the University of Oslo. He did some environmental volunteerism with Norges Naturvernforbund (Norwegian Society for the Conservation of Nature), where he was an activist, freelance journalist and arranged 'Sykkeldagen i Oslo' twice (1989 and 1990) as well as environmental issues lectures.

He has industry experience in accounting, insurance, and insurance as a broker. He writes in his IQ-blog the online newspaper *Nettavisen*. He has personal interests in history, philosophy, reading, social psychology, and writing.

He is a member of many high-IQ societies including 4G, Catholiq, Civiq, ELITE, GenerIQ, Glia, Grand, HELLIQ, HRIQ, Intruellect, ISI-S, ISPE, KSTHIQ, MENSA, MilenijaNOUS, OLYMPIQ, Real, sPIqr, STHIQ, Tetra, This, Ultima, VeNuS, and WGD.

Rick G. Rosner: "According to **semi-reputable sources**, Rick Rosner has the world's second-highest IQ. He earned 12 years of college credit in less than a year and graduated with the equivalent of 8 majors. He has received 8 *Writers Guild Award* and *Emmy* nominations, and was named *2013 North American Genius of the Year* by The World Genius Registry.

He has written for *Remote Control*, *Crank Yankers*, *The Man Show*, *The Emmys*, *The Grammys*, and *Jimmy Kimmel Live!*. He worked as a bouncer, a nude art model, a roller-skating waiter, and a stripper. In a television commercial, Domino's Pizza named him the "World's Smartest Man." The commercial was taken off the air after Subway sandwiches issued a cease-and-desist. He was named "Best Bouncer" in the Denver Area, Colorado, by *Westwood Magazine*.

Rosner spent much of the late Disco Era as an undercover high school student. In addition, he spent 25 years as a bar bouncer and American fake ID-catcher, and 25+ years as a stripper, and nearly 30 years as a writer for more than 2,500 hours of network television. He came in second or lost on *Jeopardy!*, sued *Who Wants to Be a Millionaire* over a flawed question and lost the lawsuit. He won one game and lost one game on *Are You Smarter Than a Drunk Person?* (He was drunk). Finally, he spent 37+ years working on a time invariant variation of the Big Bang Theory.

Currently, Rosner sits tweeting in a bathrobe (winter) or a towel (summer). He lives in Los Angeles, California with his wife, dog, and goldfish. He and his wife have a daughter. You can send him money or questions at **LanceversusRick@Gmail.Com**, or a direct message

via **Twitter**, or find him on **LinkedIn**, or see him on **YouTube**.”

[2] Individual Publication Date: April 8, 2019: **http://www.in-sightjournal.com/haereid-rosner-five**; Full Issue Publication Date: May 1, 2019: **https://in-sightjournal.com/insight-issues/**.

License and Copyright