



Paris S. Miles-Brenden <paris.smb.0@gmail.com>

I was not 100% (as 98% is +2 quantifiers) correct...

1 message

Paris S. Miles-Brenden <paris.smb.0@gmail.com>

Fri, Aug 23, 2024 at 4:35 PM

To: avb@nordita.org, Jake Knudsen <jake.knudsen@gmail.com>, ohhdl@dalailama.com

In consideration of a 'retractibility of two, for in a substitutional (2/3/4/1) dialog, with computer and engineered material, my conclusion there is no unlimited process to design superconducting materials..... is correct, but, there is a remission of one for another process.

It is indeed possible - in a gesture of the past to future, to reappropriationally procure of a dialog to incompleteness a 'retro-action' on-behalf of a recoverable complete theorem of science, without the undialoged diagonal (similitude stream parallel in supernatural and evidenced measureable and physics), of mathematics, and physics.

Thus, in reconsideration of computation, a bias, chem process, of reduction and extrapolative, may amend the given of an inviolability of informed basis.

Interesting, - thus, we procure means - but it indeed remains that materials and a quantification of their phenomenon of separative and layerable 'descent of inferential rule to confirmative reproducibility' - do with superconducting materials require the understanding and multimanagement of a theoretical and experimental basis of approach.

Paris Miles-Brenden

I'll leave it here - I am publishing an-article.