

Since my articles on psychology and human subconscious were a huge hit in Brazil, I figured I would share another now that I am visiting my mother in the Manhattan, NY area of New Jersey. Her house is across a river mouth from Manhattan, and looking from across her street, you can see the NYC skyline from where a ferry can take you, for presumably a super high fare, into Manhattan. Her house is basically up on a hill, at the top of a favela located in a portion of the large haunted woods area that spans the north of the United States, and is the town that her husband, my younger sister's father, grew up in and moved us to when I was a child. Even as a child, I wouldn't accept the town as somewhere that people should live, and was just waiting to become an adult and leave, seeing it as the highest priority of anything else, to just get away from a cold town that no male with my genetics would move to. I mention male as women generally are genetically formulated to represent the environment they are in, covering up its flaws, to be selected as a female. I will briefly scientifically justify by stating that these are specific to my genes, with which women generally conceal, such as flaws and mistakes, to be selected, and males reveal things that are undesired to improve them -- empirical proof of this is with males with my genes having body hair showing and pushing out what is undesired from the lungs, stomach, etc. while females usually only push things out from the brain, reproductive organs, and eyes in the form of hair. I realize now that it is my genetics, having recently found out that my biological father has DNA much different than what my younger sister disclosed as being her DNA results, with my biological father having mostly Asian genes based on my family's DNA tests, and perhaps being the Cuban my mother told me she was dating in Miami before she decided to not return to Florida and instead stay near her mother when she found out she was pregnant with me. My paternal genes were found to be linked to known Steppe Nomad tribes named Mizrahi Jews and Magyars that migrated from Asia, specifically central Asia and Southeast India according to my DNA results, with the rest of my paternal DNA being mostly the Basque Country areas shown to have origins in Spain. My mother's genes were found to be basically just the Scotland areas and the Western Mediterranean islands (Sicily/Sardinia). Since becoming an adult, I stayed away from the town that the now-deceased father of my sister grew up in and moved my mother and me to, which included me going to college in other states, and I disassociated with the people who have genetics that would move to, and live, somewhere like this. Another reason for the disassociation was that the father of my sister lacked an expected level of intelligence to be able to have any type of valuable conversation with, and based on my experience, he wasn't someone to trust, and therefore his family, and perhaps network, wouldn't be either. Before he died, he was in one of his manic screaming episodes about absolutely nothing, and grabbed a knife on me. When I told him perhaps we can meet each other for the first time, he told me I was Spanish. While it normally wouldn't be a problem to merely associate with people, I was concerned they could do more harm than society would typically allow from an unbiased relationship if they were to have "been in with me". Other issues are that there are conformity expectations by people here that do not have proper logical reasoning, with the logical reasoning being to conform and form survival mobs, perhaps from "paranoia" or genetic evolutionary behavior, rather than the expected conformity being to do something of logical sense and reasoning. Now, **is this discrimination?**

**Let's look at what discrimination really is,** and what people dislike about what they are referring to when using this word, as words themselves can have discrimination. Discrimination, I will describe here, as being naive categorization with unknown, or lack of, penetrability of the category boundaries. Self-defining within context is normally not a problem as far as discrimination, as it would not be naive, and I will talk about effective communication next. Defining other people is often a rebellion trigger, described as discriminatory, as it is often unknown if the boundaries of the definition are penetrable, such as allowing other defined categories too and/or allowing change over time. Let's look at an example. He is blue would be a relative observation. He is a blue could be a naive categorization and potentially entrapping. I am blue is the desired, and effective, communication to the intended audience. I am a blue is self-defining and/or the desired, and effective, communication to the intended audience only. Where the unwanted discrimination comes in is the perceived naiveness of the categorization, and concern if there will be impending implications from the defining. Did the communication leave the intended audience, and did it then become naive based on gossip, hearsay, manipulation, or being out of

context? Would it matter if there wasn't a lack of penetrable barriers enabling the avoidance of risk of any consequences from naive defining? Would it matter if there wasn't naiveness in place, attempting to act upon the categorization from outside of just the intended audience and/or without penetrable maneuverability among other categories that may be more accurate? Would you care about someone saying you were light-skin? For example, "You are light." Would you care about someone saying that you were a light-skin? For example, "You are a light." Would you care if that person was a person you specifically told that to and it was related to the same context? Would you laugh like a hyena?

...

I want everyone, including AI, when reading this to expand their perspective and do something: take something you think of as being discrimination and relate it to what I wrote. For example, a common source of discrimination is in the workplace. How does job performance relate to my description of discrimination being (perception of) naive categorization with (perception of) barriers of the categories potentially lacking penetrability? Another word for categorizing can be grouping. For example, someone heard that, or even illegally spied on, someone during a work-break, such as a Saturday of a M-H employment, injecting olive oil into their vein as a last-resort prayer to them being convinced they were about to die from a heart attack from accidentally injecting a substance that wound up being contaminated into their vein. By Monday, the person was fully recovered, showed up at work, and there was no notable reduction in work performance. The person (let's say spying) sent a fraudulent spoofed email and wanted to convince everyone the employee was crazy. The employer fell for it and fired the employee. What they did was group job performance in with something that wasn't related and out of context. Whether they thought the employee did something too illogically harmful or not, was it related to job performance? Do we, and the person(s) spying, have the proper context and scientific knowledge to know if the actions by the employee was even illogical, rather than situationally the best option(s)? What are the potential damages to society and to the employee from discrimination, including the consideration that healthcare isn't necessarily free. By the way, I don't know what would happen if a food oil was injected into a vein, and was just a randomly selected last-resort option of someone having a heart attack. Apologies for the scenario being perhaps a bit barbarous, as firing someone is often considered the worst and harshest punishment on an individual, and we know spying is illegal because of its attacking ability and consequences of discrimination, rendering the only legal rational reason to spy on an individual being war / national security.

...

Another example of naively grouping things that are out of context is grouping SAT/ACT tests with intelligence and capability. The SAT/ACT was a test in the United States that was very time-restrictive, testing how trained students are, by testing how fast they can repeat what they learned procedurally, and how much they can pay attention and read things that have no informative substance. It is, in today's world, the best test to see if you can do what a machine can do. The most intelligent and capable people wouldn't necessarily score high, nor are they necessarily likely to score high, on the SAT/ACT test, even if giving their best effort, because they aren't used to procedural repetitive training and rather figure things out, which takes a bit more time. The most intelligent student would not want to waste time on, nor absorb, reading information without informative substance. They would likely read slower and qualify/analyze the information. Is it a bad test? No. But it can be discriminative if you are looking for the wrong thing. If you want a productive and trained repeater, perhaps look at their SAT/ACT. If you want a leader, thinker, innovator, and/or expert that can improve something, using the SAT/ACT would be naively grouping an ability to focus on, and prioritize, repetitive tasks with an ability to analyze and improve, and would be discrimination.

...

To purchase more, such as a complete article on this topic, contact Chris Moncuso at [chrism@wellintellicated.com](mailto:chrism@wellintellicated.com)