

Conclusion

Paris [s.] Miles-Brenden

November 18th, 2023

I found that there is an ideal suggested by the 'judicious' choice of terms for that of my-equation, in subtle terms,.... a mean field should [additionally] suppose an-ideal, that of a Reisz basis. Thus, does not represent a different group, of spin, charge, mass?

I remain with two-distinct 'object(s)':

- a.) **Ideal(s), and Projective Equations.**
- b.) **Non-linear Equations.**

***Could the key be that the space [or envelope] of it's-relationship *possesses a pole 'outside'* - - at least initially?

There are only three potential situations or satisfactory answers.

- 1.) That of the ideal is 'cast' outside the space.
- 2.) The 'form' is merely $G_{\{\mu\nu\}} \sim T_{\{\mu\nu\}}$; and such that the basis is an equivalence of frames..... evaluated over general covariance with respect to quantum mechanics.
- 3.) The finite lattice, imposes a constraint.

I know 2.) and 3.) take-place, what I do not know is *how* 1.) imposes this nature of process.

The projective-basis assures that the ideal (outside the space) - adhere(s) of a \sqrt{n} on that of the Elliptic ontological basis,..... that local term(s) and the strata of the entire-group conform.

Then, with that of the 'tension, torsion' - there is that of a relativity, and a group-law, of which relate of a precise* statement of mathematics to physics.