Kaffe 04/11

It is not necessary an activity game to play, but it is
interesting to analyze and discuss.

The web page is starting to look okay, but...

1) Designing activities look games
   in order to achieve flow,

2) Design activities like research
   in order to achieve flow.
Should research always contain ideas for further research?

I think so!

Why?

1) It widens knowledge research
2) Next action.

...
Paranoid and feels deny, that as it looks like a scientific paper, and it is in fact a scientific paper, but is it poor research?

\[ \text{[Equation]} \]

\[ \text{[Equation]} \]

Nonetheless, if I could really delve to find the answers to the questions I’m posing here, I could improve ALL ASPECTS of the paper (chapt. 2, 3, 4, 5).
On the other hand, this is a summary of the research I did in 2005.

Perhaps I could publish at next IRIS.

or ARSS?
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How do I send the 8 points.

A. Model

→ 1

A. Theoretical issues

→ 1, models are needed in swine
2, hubs with CAS and GA

B. Practical issues

3. Pac-Man focus on skills
4. Flaw ("seven games")
Discuss

A. We are in need of a model
   1. Models are needed in science
   2. Link with CSS and GA
   3. Is the political issue in TQUB a real
   3. Pac-Net is still broken
   4. Pac-Net remains free
   5. [Blank]
   6. Why
   7. Strategic insights
      a) keep many patterns
      b) workload first priority
      c) when acquiring attack rules
         they can cluster