The review of my article, "Perfectly Marked, Fair Tests with Unfair Marks" (*Mathematical Gazette*, July 2009, pp. 256-260) that appeared in MATHEMATICS MAGAZINE (December 2009, p. 392) curiously made no mention of the *mathematics* on which my argument is based: It follows from the Arrow Impossibility Theorem and the definition of sampling that *sufficiently knowledgeable* teachers cannot *possibly* serve fairly as examiners of their own students. The review, instead, focused on standardized testing (which I did not mention or advocate) and inaccurate marks. Of inaccurate marks, I wrote: "Inaccurate marks, however, are not necessarily unfair marks. If they were, one would simply have to conclude that, after all, there are no fair tests, that representative samples will not do. That goes against intuition and also against universal practice and we will not consider it further here."

Standardized testing would *not* solve the problem of inaccurate marks which *inheres* in the method of sampling "including those designed by the top psychometricians," as I put it. Readers of the MAGAZINE are encouraged to consult the original article.

Joseph S. Fulda