I would like to thank Peter Sutherland for his timely review of *Uses and Abuses of Intelligence: Studies Advancing Spearman and Raven's Quest for non Arbitrary Metrics.*

However, he chides us for neglecting non-***g*** concepts of Intelligence (especially Gardner's) and their implications for education.

This suggests that we have not made some of the points we seek to make in the book as clearly as we should have done. The *abuses* of "Intelligence" we discuss include numerous studies purporting to demonstrate the differential effects of a wide range of educational policies and programmes that made use of measures which suffered from one or other of two defects. They either (1) used measures of ***g*** that have what have come to be known as "arbitrary" metrics because they yield difference scores which mean different things at different points in the scale or (2) failed to assess the most important outcomes of the processes being evaluated and thus, in effect, utilised an arbitrary selection of measures. These two methodological faults, between them, invalidate the conclusions drawn from very many widely reported studies.

The abuses of "Intelligence" arising from the use of such measures also include a wide range of everyday practices in schools and workplaces. Spearman's "passing" remark that the use of tests like those from which his ***g*** had emerged (viz measures of such things as reading, writing, and arithmetic) have no place in schools because they prevent teachers attending to and nurturing the unique talents of each pupil … that is to say, they prevent them delivering any form of education worth the name … is fundamental. Thus what Peter refers to as a "passing" reference actually provides the basis for a whole section of our book.

It is true that we do not refer to Gardner or Sternberg – or many other researchers for that matter. But this is because most of these authors persist in trying to reduce the description of the variance between people to "scores" on a limited number of *variables.* Spearman specifically observed that the problem to which he had drawn attention *could not be tackled using "any of the psychometric procedures in current use".* That is to say, tackling it required psychologists to move from a variable-based framework (exemplified by physics) to a *descriptive* paradigm (exemplified by biology and ecology).

In the century since Spearman wrote there have been even fewer attempts to tackle *this* source of arbitrary metrics … and the serious malpractices to which the use of such measures contribute … than there have been to tackle those stemming from the use of tests having arbitrary of one of the two kinds mentioned above.

As many readers of this *Review* will know, I have, in fact, devoted several books to developing a possible basis for an alternative, that is to say, category-based, psychometric model and its implications for educational and occupational practice – or rather in a kind of a recursive process – the implications of effective educational practice for the kind of psychometric model we need to develop. But to say that we do not mention these things within our 600 page book is misleading. Several chapters, including one of the longest in the book (namely one entitled "Intelligence, Engineered Invisibility, and the Destruction of Life on Earth"), are devoted to these issues. And we hope they will take readers back to the fuller discussions which lie behind them.

Yours sincerely,

John Raven