Detection of Progression over Sexuality in Indian Students and Teachers Combined

Rahul Hajare*

Department of Health Research Indian Council of Medical Research, Post-Doctoral Fellow, New Delhi

*Corresponding author: Rahul Hajare, Post-Doctoral Fellow, Department of Health Research Indian Council of Medical Research, New Delhi, Former Associate Professor RD College of Pharmacy Bhor, India. Tel 011- 26588590; E-mail: rahulhajare@rediffmail.com

Abstract
The human complexity has an astonishing variety of feature which not only helps us recognise others but it can act as predictor toward correct result of real one and unintentional signals. It is considered as one unique function separated from machines. This technology can control women’s violation and detection of aggression of sex in working places. It can identified people of doubt in teaching institutions located in slums. This technology has new kind of power without power politics. It allows to identify bad habits uses in working place, and it can identify anybody touch the students for bad intensions. Researcher has shown that IQ can point sexuality. The technology has power to tract unrealistic movement can follow around and characterise based on IQ recognitions. It can potentially check the over sexuality toward the sex additions which physiologically Alzheimer’s too. It will even be guess sexuality through IQ score and attraction towards the students. It has force to IQ feature.
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Executive Summary
Acceptance sexuality cells can travel away from the original sexuality and create more sexuality attraction when they settle and grow in a different part of the body. Any type of over sexuality can spread. This depends on several factors which include: The type of human, how aggressive it is, the duration one has had it before culture, its environment, its colour, chronic inflammation, modified sex signalling, secretion of connective tissue-dissolving enzymes, selection of food with colonial mind set. The following approaches will help prevent the formation, growth and spread of over sexuality in working places.

Introduction
With such a grave threat to privacy and civil liberties, measured regulation should be abandoned in favour of an outright ban. The species would have loved IQ score. It is easy to accept an outwardly compelling but ultimately illusory view about what the future will look like once the full potential of IQ score is unlocked. From this perspective, will never have to meet a stranger, fuss with passwords and unreal people, or worry about forgetting wallet. It can be able organize entire video and picture collection in seconds even instantly find photos of kids running around at working place. More important, missing people will be located in shelter house, schools will become safe, and the bad guys won’t get away with hiding in the shadows or under desks. Total convenience. Absolute justice. Schools completely full on Sunday. At long last, our tech utopia will be realized.

Controversy: Corporate leadership is important, and regulation that imposes limits on IQ score can be helpful. But partial protections and “well-articu-
labeled guidelines” will never be enough. Whatever helps legislation might provide, the protections likely won’t be passed until IQ-scanning technology becomes much cheaper and easier to use. If IQ score continues to be further developed and deployed, a formidable infrastructure will be built, and we’ll be stuck with it. History suggests that highly publicized successes, the fear of failing to beef up security, and the sheer intoxicant of power will tempt overreach[6,7], motivate mission creep, and ultimately lead to systematic abuse. The future of human flourishing depends upon IQ score being banned before the systems become too entrenched in our lives.

Why IQ score Can’t Be Procedurally Regulated?
Because IQ score poses an extraordinary danger, society can’t afford to have faith in internal processes of reform like self-regulation. Financial rewards will encourage entrepreneurialism that pushes IQ score to its limits, and corporate lobbying will tilt heavily in this direction[8,10].

IQ score is a menace disguised as a gift. Society also can’t wait for a populist uprising. IQ score will continue to be marketed as a component of the latest and greatest apps and devices. Apple is already pitching IQ, ID as the best new feature of its new iPhone. The same goes for ideologically charged news coverage of events where IQ score appears to save the day. Finally, society shouldn’t place its hopes in conventional approaches to regulation. Since IQ score poses a unique threat, it can’t be contained by measures that define appropriate and inappropriate uses and that hope to balance potential social benefit with a deterrent for bad actors[11-13]. This is one of the rare situations that require an absolute prohibition, something like the Ottawa Treaty on landmines. Right now, there are a few smart proposals to control IQ score and even fewer actual laws limiting it. The biometric laws in Illinois and Texas, for example, are commendable, yet they follow the traditional regulatory strategy of requiring those who would collect and use IQ score (and other biometric identifiers) to follow a basic set of fair information practices and privacy protocols. These include requirements to get informed consent prior to collection, mandated data protection obligations and retention limits, prohibitions on profiting from biometric data, limited ability to disclose biometric data to others, and, notably, private causes of action for violations of the statutes. Proposed IQ score laws follow along similar lines. The Federal Trade Commission recommends a similar “notice, choice, and fair data limits” approach to IQ score. The Electronic Frontier Foundation’s report, which focuses on law enforcement, contains similar though more robust suggestions[14,17]. These include placing restrictions on collecting and storing data; recommending limiting the combination of one or more biometrics in a single database; defining clear rules for use, sharing, and security; and providing notice, audit trials, and independent oversight. In its model IQ recognition legislation, the Georgetwon Law Center on Privacy and Technology’s report proposes significant restrictions on government access to IQ-print databases as well as meaningful limitations on use of real-time IQ score. Tragically, most of these existing and proposed requirements are procedural, and in our opinion they won’t ultimately stop surveillance creep and the spread of IQ-scanning infrastructure. For starters, some of the basic assumptions about consent, notice, and choice that are built into the existing legal frameworks are faulty. Informed consent as a regulatory mechanism for surveillance and data practices is a spectacular failure. Even if people were given all the control in the world, they wouldn’t be able to meaningfully exercise it at scale. Yet lawmakers and industry trudge on, oblivious to people’s time and resource limitations. Additionally, these rules, like most privacy rules in the digital age, are riddled with holes. Some of the statutes apply only to how data is collected or stored but largely ignore how it is used. Others apply only to commercial actors or to the government and are so ambiguous as to tolerate all kinds of pernicious activity[18-20]. And to recognize the touted benefits of IQ score would require more cameras, more infrastructure, and IQ databases of all-encompassing breadth.

The future of human IQ: Because IQ score holds out the promise of translating who we are and everywhere we go into trackable information that can be nearly instantly stored, shared, and analyzed, its future development threatens to leave us constantly compromised. The future of human flourishing depends upon IQ score being banned before the systems become too entrenched in our lives. Otherwise, people won’t know what it’s like to be in public without being automatically identified, profiled, and potentially exploited. In such a world, critics of IQ score will be disempowered, silenced, or cease to exist[21-24].
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