INSIGHT

The Journal of the Titan Society

(Issue #13, April 1987)

I have recently finished a renorming of the Mega Test and my results (reported on pages 3-7) give the test an IQ range of 120 to 190. Although the precise percentile meaning of these IQs is still open to question, I have dropped the idea of raising the admission requirement from 43 to 46 and am considering lowering it instead to 41, which would be equivalent to an IQ of 180 according to this new norming. Your comments would be appreciated.

Ronald K. Hoeflin

Titan

Membership List

1987

Anthony J. Bruni P. O. Box 867418 Plano. Texas 75086

17

Chris Cole 2240 - 314 Park Newport Drive Newport Beach, California 92660

H. W. Corley 626 Charles Court Arlington, Texas 76013

James D. Hajicek 5894 Spring Valley Road Burlington, Wisconsin 53105

Bric Hart P. O. Box 813 Miller Place, New York 11764

Dean Inada 55 North Saint John Avenue Pasadena, California 91103 William Hacker 812 Gallop Hill Road, Apt. J Gaithersburg, Maryland 20879

Richard May 463 Beacon Street Boston, Massachusetts 02115

Marilyn vos Savant c/o Cameo Enterprises, Inc. 12072 Manchester Road, Suite 4 St. Louis, Missouri 63131

Jeff Ward 4468 Marlborough Avenue, #4 San Diego, California 92116

Karl G. Wikman Göteborg 861103 Cosselsgatan 3A 412 62 Göteborg, SWEDEN

Raymond Wise 50 Fairview Street Huntington, New York 11743

Founder and Editor:

Ronald K. Hoeflin P.O. Box 7430 New York, NY 10116

A Short Biography

Karl G. Wikman

I was born in the town of Helsingborg in southern Sweden 1943. Judging from my ambidexterity, the genes from my parents seem to have been quite democratically distributed, having an artistic father and a rational reasoning mother. Up to high school I was rather indifferent to the various disciplines and activities in school. The few exceptions that come to my mind are painting, algebra and later chemistry. I found the rest rather boring. My real interests between 7-13 were reading astronomy, science-fiction and accounts of paranormal events. However, overshadowing these activi-

ties was my interest in chemistry, centering around the main issue: fabrication of explosives. When chemistry was introduced in the curriculum in the 7th school-year, I had a fairly well-equipped laboratory and had synthetized most of the known explosives (no accidents!). By this time my keen interest in detonating items faded away and was

replaced by building rockets, propelled by solid fuels. After high school I went to study mathematics at the University of Gothenburg in 1963. I was quite successful and was offered a well paid appointment as a lecturer for undergraduate students in mathematics in 1965. However, I wanted to have some experience in the application of mathematics before I got completely stuck in its purer domains. So, I started with studying experimental physics. After having my M.Sc. in this subject I made an excursion into pedagogy to have a degree at Teacher's training College in Gothenburg (the real reason: my studies were well paid) in 1969. From there, I started studies in theoretical physics. After a period of studies and travelling I was tempted by a generous offer as a lecturer in theoretical solid state physics at the University of Lund in 1972, which I accepted.

At this time I felt a growing dissatisfaction with my work in theoretical physics, dealing manily with many-particle physics in the field of phase-transitions. I wanted to have a better understanding of the fundamentals, especially the foundations of quantum mechanics. My professor did not share the same taste for these questions and I left the univer-

sity in 1974.

Parallell with my academic work, I had been nourishing an interest in medicine, particularly the rationale behind the medical lore embodied in medical systems of ancient cultures. It was therefore not a big jump to engage myself in phytochemistry with applications in nutrition, medicine (including so soft-acting drugs in naturopathic medicine) and foodindustry. Currently, I am developping processing technology for the extraction and purification of plant material in a company owned by myself. Alongside, I am establishing a clearing house of information concerning both the ethnobotanical uses and the scientific documentation of plants.

I have not given up my interests in foudational questions in physics. Since a couple of years I have become more and more involved in a group of people around prof. David Bohm at Birbeck College in London.

To put it in a very condensed way, Bohm (together with prof. Hiley) has suggested a radical new way of describing physical processes. Starting from quantum theory, he is trying to resolve some very disturbing features of this theory by starting from scratch, building physics into a larger metaphysical framework. The primitive concepts in his theories are: process, wholeness and order(s), and on a technical level algebra(s) is the tool of choice. Personally, the most challenging aspects to me, lies in his general metaphysical framework, called soma-significance, where meaning is given an objective status in the description of reality. As perhaps can be seen from this short account, I prefer to work with both pragmatical issues and theoretical ones.

ķ

A Third Norming of the Mega Test

Ronald K. Hoeflin P.O. Box 7430 New York, NY 10116

I decided to norm the Mega Test this time using scores reported on three other tests: the Langdon Adult Intelligence Test, the California Test of Mental Maturity, and the Stanford-Binet. These 187 scores and the corresponding raw scores on the Mega Test are reported in Table 1: 78 of them from the LAIT, 63 from the CTMM, and 46 from the S-B. These three tests were chosen, in part, because they all have 16-point standard deviations, more or less, for the general population, making them fairly simple to combine.

I found that the mean IQ for this sample of 187 scores was 148.92 and that the mean of the corresponding 187 raw scores was 20.53. The standard deviation of the 187 IQs was found to be 14.30 IQ points and that of the corresponding 187 raw scores was 9.57 raw score points, yielding 14.30/9.57 = 1.494 IQ points per raw score point. Using this scaling and setting 20.53 raw score points equal to 148.92 IQ, it was found that the floor of the test (1 right) is 119.74 IQ, which can be rounded off to 120 IQ, and that the ceiling of the test (48 right) is 189.97 IQ, which can be rounded off to 190 IQ.

I was detered from accepting these IQs at face value for a long time because they imply that the one-in-a-million level of ability, which is theoretically at 4.7534 standard deviations above the mean, or 176.0544 IQ, would correspond to a raw score of 38.69, which can be rounded off to 39. Fifty people have scored that high or higher on the Mega Test so far, almost all of them in the United States, which seemed like an unacceptably high number, since it amounts to about 20% of the potential pool of people at the one-in-a-million level of ability, given the fact that the U.S. population is now almost 250,000,000. For the current distribution of scores of those who have attempted the Mega Test, after strenuous attempts were made to weed out all repeat attempts, see Table 2.

I understand that Omni magazine has a circulation of about 800,000 and a readership of about 4,000,000, which is only about one person in sixty in the United States. But it is not unreasonable to suppose that these readers are largely within the brightest 10% of the population, so that perhaps one in six rather than one in sixty of this brightest segment of the population would have had exposure to my test. These considerations make the notion that my test was actually attempted by 20% of those whose ability is at or above the one-in-a-million level of ability seem far more plausible to me now than it did before.

Assuming, then, that the IQs conform roughly to the normal curve, I have assigned to each raw score the IQs and percentiles that are reported in Table 3.

Table 1 Pairings of previously reported IQs with the corresponding raw scores attained on the Mega Test

LAIT	Mega	LAIT	Mega	CTMM	Mega	CTMM	Mega	S-B	Mega
IQ	Score	10	Score	10	Score	10	Score	10	Score
160	24	151	23	140	14	137	37	160	9
159	22	159	17	132	7	154	39	156	13
169	27	157	.19	153	15	148	43	168	28
164	ii	154	20	147	6	138	6	130	29
167	31	166	16	130	24	142	7	230	46
166	29	156	19	139	27	148	11	137	21
116	6	160	18	148	33	136	12	*148\dagger*	2
160	29	170	44	142	21	141	13	144	11
156	17	157	36	128	23	140	17	143	27
157	19	160	31	130	24	150	25	176	28
149	20	147	30	132	24	173	29	160	29
170	21	151	28	153	26	131	18	166	32
171	36	157	29	156	18	145	17	169	35
166	29	169	29	105	19	135	17	137	40
167	27	152	27	144	20	144	25	149	20
164	34	156	27	136	20	146	20	149	21
164	15	164	27	149	20	133	11	156	22
166	37	144	26	145	12	133	17	148	24
165	39	161	26	142	13	151	27	167	26
166	25	148	24	143	13	137	5	150	17
156	33	153	24	144	13	150	19	135	17
151	29	143	23	138	15	144	34	126	19
157	31	152	23	135	15	135	5	150	19
156	18	160	22	148	15			127	20
157	34	140	20	135	16			149	13
160	34	153	22	135	9	3-B	Mega	138	14
146	40	162	21	121	11	10	Score	148	8
173	35	148	20	143	11	127	24	130	8
167	41	155	18	139	5	160	11	139	9
162	32	156	17	135	5	170	17	128	10
158	20	153	16	138	7	148	10	143	11
159	22	155	15	144	8	147	17	134	11
153	21	127	13	154	18	*137 ±	4	140	14
162	31	136	13	143	19	124	34	(#No	te: The
132		141	10	179	17	137	3	•	es with
160		138	7	162	28	138	5		" after
144	11	120	3	145	33	148	7		are the
163	29	127	5	144	29	139	7		age of
156				140	25	138	8		reported
159				146	13	140	26	-	Tehot sag

scores.)

Table 2
Scores achieved by participants since the appearance of the test in Omni magazine in April 1985

Mega score	Total	Male	Penale	Unknown gender	Mega score	Total	Male	Pemale	Unknown gender
48	0	0	0	0	23	95	88	5	2
47	ì	1	Ō	0	22	106	97	7	2
46	ī	ō	ì	0	21	127	115	11	1
45	ī	ì	0	0	20	117	103	13	1
44	3	3	Ö	0	19	147	129	14	4
43	6	6	Ö	0	18	115	106	8	1
42	10	9	ī	0	17	149	134	13	2
41	10	10	0	0	16	153	118	31	4
40	5	4	ì	Ó	15	163	147	16	0
39	13	12	ī	0	14	143	120	19	4
38	12	12	0	o	13	164	141	23	0
37	16	15	1	0	12	165	134	28	3
36	23	22	ì	0	11	182	145	33	4
35	21	19	2	0	10	159	129	30	0
34	18	18	ō	0	9	181	141	35	5
33	35	33	2	Ó	8	141	115	26	0
32	45	45	0	0	7	152	117	33	2
31	46	41	5	0	6	151	122	29	0
30	34	33	ì	0	5	113	80	32	1
29	49	44	4	ı	4	90	65	23	2
28	66	62	4	0	3	51	36	15	0
27	49	47	2	0	2	33	20	12	1
26	77	72	5	0	1	24	18	5	1
25	73	68	5	0	0	6	3	3	0
24	84	76	5 8	0	Totals	3625	3076	508	41
		•			Percents	100	85	14	1

Note: In further justification of setting the one-in-a-million level at a raw score of 39, one finds that of the 50 participants who scored 39 or higher, 6 were not residents of the United States (3 were Canadian, 2 were residents of England, and 1 was a resident of Spain). As for the remaining 44 participants who were U.S. residents, it should be noticed that if the 13 who scored 39 are spread evently over the interval from 38.5 to 39.5, then about 2.5 of them would fall below the theoretical one-in-a-million line of 38.69. That leaves just 41.5 participants who are U.S. residents and who are rated at or above the one-in-a-million level--about one-sixth of the potential pool of U.S. residents with ability at or above this level. Assuming that most of Omni's 4 million readers are U.S. residents and that most of them are within the upper 10% in ability, it would appear likely that about one-sixth of the potential pool of persons with one-in-a-million ability levels in the U.S. would have seen the test. One then need merely surmise that most persons at such an extremely high level of ability would have attempted the test, which was prominently advertised on the front cover of Omni. - 5 -

Table 3
The new norms

Mega Score	10	Z-Score	Percentile	Ratio of Rarity
1	120	1.23	89	l in 9
2	121	1.33	91	l in 11
3	123	1.42	92	1 in 13
4	124	1.51	93	l in 15
5	126	1.61	95	1 in 19
6	127	1.70	96	l in 22
7	129	1.79	96	1 in 27
8	130	1.89	97	l in 34
9	132	1.98	97.6	1 in 42
10	133	2.07	98.1	1 in 52
11	135	2.17	98.5	1 in 67
12	136	2.26	9 8.8	1 in 84
13	138	2.36	99.1	1 in 109
14	139	2.45	99.3	1 in 140
15	141	2.54	99.5	1 in 180
16	142	2.64	99.6	l in 241
17	144	2.73	99.7	1 in 316
18	145	2.82	99.76	1 in 416
19	147	2.92	99.82	1 in 571
20	148	3.01	99.87	1 in 766
21	150	3.10	99.90	1 in 1,033
22	151	3.20	99.93	1 in 1,455
23	153	3.29	99.95	1 in 1,996
24	154	3.38	99.96	1 in 2,759
25	156	3.48	99.97	1 in 3,988
26	157	3.57	99.98	1 in 5,601
27 28	159	3.66	99.987	1 in 7,928
	160 162	3.76	99.992	l in 11,767
29 30	163	3.85 3.94	99.994	1 in 16,926 1 in 24,535
31	165	4.04	99.996 99.997	1 in 37,399
32	166	4.13	99.998	1 in 55,101
33	168	4.22	99.9988	1 in 81,813
34	169	4.32	99.9992	1 in 128,087
35	171	4.40	99.9995	1 in 184,606
36	172	4.50	99.9997	1 in 294,048
37	174	4.60	99.9998	1 in 472,893
38	175	4.69	99.99986	l in 731.212
39	177	4.78	99.99991	1 in 1,139,491
40	178	4.88	99.99995	l in 1,882,624
41	180	4.97	99.99997	l in 2,982,593
42	181	5.06	99.99998	1 in 4,762,368
43	182	5.16	99.999987	1 in 8,083,935
44	184	5.25	99.999992	l in 13,123,124
45	185	5.34	99.999995	1 in 21,471,390
46	187	5.44	99.999997	1 in 37,449,193
47	188	5.53	99.999998	1 in 62,297,530
48	190	5.62	99.999999	1 in 104,451,963

<u>Postscript</u>: These revised norms suggest that the cut-offs for the various high-IQ societies that accept the test should be modified as follows:

Society	Minimum Percentile	Old <u>Cut-off</u>	New Cut-off
Triple Nine	99.9	22	21
I.S.P.B.	99.96	22 + vocab	21 + vocab
Prome theus	99.997	30-41	31
Mega	99.9999	42-46	39
Titan	99.99997	43	41

The cut-offs for Prometheus and Mega have fluctuated, depending on how I normed the test and, in the case of Prometheus, on what admission percentile was used, so I have given the minimum and the maximum scores that were used.

Regarding the Titan Society, I previously rated a raw score of 43 at the 99.999 percentile (one-in-100,000), but I now rate it at the 99.999987 percentile (about one-in-8,000,000). If the 6 persons who scored 43 are spread over the interval from 42.5 to 43.5, then 3 of them would be rated as exceeding 43.0. Six others scored 44 or more, so this makes a total of 9 persons rated at or above the one-in-8,000,000 level. This figure is not as implausible as it might seem at first glance, since the U.S. alone has at least 30 persons who can potentially score at this level on my test. One person who scored 45 was a former U.S. champion in the Japanese game of "go" -- ranked third in the world among non-Oriental players. One person who scored 44 has a Ph.D. from M.I.T. and is currently governor of New Hampshire, indicating high verbal as well as non-verbal abilities, to judge from his education and profession. Another person who scored 44 is rated among the top recreational mathematicians in the U.S. and is a professor of mathematics at the University of Southern California. "go" player mentioned above is also a professor of mathematics at USC with specialties in coded communications and combinatorial geometry. A score of 45 is rated one-in-21,000,000 and a score of 44 is rated one-in-13,000,000, and these are the types of people that one would indeed expect to find at these levels of ability.

Since a cut-off of one-in-8,000,000 seems a bit excessive, I am planning to revise the Titan admission level downward to the 180 IQ level or one-in-3,000,000, which occurs at a raw score of 41. I will also adopt a more dignified name for the group: The Hoeflin Research Group.

As for the other societies, they are free to accept or to reject my recommended revisions in the cut-offs as they see fit, but I will put the above cut-offs on my score report forms unless otherwise instructed by the admissions officers of these groups.

Saturday, March 28, 1987

