



Counter Argument of "Complements on Semantics"(3 / 3)

Translated to English and Edited by Jeff Demmers

5. Conclusion on the complementary elements for understanding UMMITE semantics

Memento of revised concepts

1. Introduction

This memento is the revised complement to that made by very largely inspired by that of J. Pollion which is available on <https://www.ummo-sciences.org/resume.htm>. When I have made a complement or modification, however small, the concept is noted in blue. The concepts probably to be revised are noted in orange.

2. Table of revised concepts

Phoneme	General Functional Concept	Some Applications of the Concept Following English Terminology
Has	<i>Effectiveness concept</i>	d) effective e) verifiable in dimensional cosmos f) real (common sense) g) dimensional reality
B or V	<i>Contribution concept</i>	a) external input What is a "non-external contribution"? The idea of external is already included in the contribution." I invite the author to reread Betrand Russell on the true meanings of our words. b) Contributory contribution for me, this expression is a pleonasm that can be saved: what is a non-contributory contribution? A contribution always contributes to something. c) contribution

Phoneme	General Functional Concept	Some Applications of the Concept Following English Terminology
D	<i>Event concept</i>	a) form b) appearance c) manifestation
E	<i>Concept of mental representation (adimensional)</i>	a) a-dimensional mental representation (a set of relational mental images) This expression is an obvious transformation, since assemblage of 3 fundamental ideas: set Y of mental images E in relation M - YEM . As far as I know E is not equal to YEM. There is a serious, structural inconsistency here. b) perception c) idea d) intangible, a-dimensional entity I don't agree. When an entity is a-dimensional it is the subject of a complex qualification and not in the form of a basic concept. According to this definition WOA is E. This is not expressed at all in the documents.
EE	<i>Concept of stable, permanent (a-dimensional) mental representation</i>	a) mental model a-dimensional b) immaterial model, a-dimensional c) adimensional pattern of form d) a-dimensional plane e) sequence coded a-dimensional f) archetype The adimensional indication is not correct. It's a rather non-functional addition. A mental model is independent of its content, it is simply an idea (E) in a situation of permanence, stability (double). To specify the model by the nature of its content is to leave functional thinking, for a thought "targeted, object". For example, is EEWE, which is a garment, using an "a-dimensional" model?
G	<i>Structure concept</i>	a) Organization

Phoneme	General Functional Concept	Some Applications of the Concept Following English Terminology
		b) Organized structure Here too, one could think about the "unsealed" nature of certain structures. Do they still qualify as structures?
I	<p><i>identification concept</i></p> <p><i>(The uniqueness of the identification is implicit, otherwise there is no identification!)</i></p> <p>I have already explained myself above about the incompatibility of the concept of identification and the principle of functional thinking.</p>	<p>a) <i>Identification system or identification system, identification, ID structure (NB: it is preferable to use the term system to avoid confusion with the concept "G" "structure, organization, arrangement")</i></p> <p>b) Identify (single) (coded, structural, chemical, etc.)</p> <p>c) Strictly identifying difference in a unique or specific way (otherwise, it will be the phoneme "W")</p> <p>d) Uniqueness, when it is a uniquely identified</p>
II	<p><i>identification concept</i></p> <p><i>"a" concept of identification</i></p> <p><i>stable, permanent, continuity identification concept</i></p> <p>I have already explained why a double phoneme has no place in such a table. You have to mention all the doubles, or none. The fact that some dubbed phonemes have a fairly easy equivalent in our language does not give them a special <u>logical</u> status.</p>	<p>a) <i>Stable identifying system or stable, permanent (between 2 media or repositories)</i></p> <p>b) <i>common identification between 2 repositories</i></p> <p>c) Limit</p> <p>d) Border</p> <p>e) Membrane</p> <p>The same identifier identifies something on one side and something else on the other "side." There is a common identification on either side of the boundary, <i>a permanence of identification.</i></p> <p>The limit can be an "identifying" "difference" between what is inside and what is outside. A difference that would not be "identifying" in a unique way, is in this case a difference that is simply "informational", i.e., relative to the concept "W".</p> <p>In the systemic sense of Ludwig Von Bertalanffy (3), a closed or semi-open system is identified by its limit. The systems allow flow exchanges (with the concepts "L" and "N").</p> <p>In a "border effect" (2) <i>LEEIYO</i>, on each side of "II" the flows are of a distinct nature. "Identification" is common on both sides. The</p>

Phoneme	General Functional Concept	Some Applications of the Concept Following English Terminology
		<p>continuity of the flows is ensured by the common "identifier" which is in a way a pivot.</p> <p>With the concept "II" defined as <i>a stable identification concept</i>, we check the application to a <i>limit, a border, a membrane</i>.</p>
K	<i>Mixing concept</i>	reconciliation I will add in secondary "mix" without obviously suggesting the revision of this fundamental concept.
L	<i>Equivalence concept</i>	<p>a) correspondence</p> <p>b) transposition</p>
M	<i>Junction concept</i>	<p>a) Join The join is a place, a joint. It is an object formulation, completely at odds with functional thinking.</p> <p>b) relationship</p>
N	<i>Flow concept</i>	<p>a) flux</p> <p>b) transfer</p> <p>c) flow</p>
O	<i>Dimensional existence concept</i>	<p>a) dimensional entity</p> <p>b) the</p> <p>c) creature</p>
R	<i>Replication concept</i>	<p>a) Imitation</p> <p>b) replication</p>
S	<i>Cyclicity concept</i>	<p>d) cycle</p> <p>e) alternating</p> <p>f) recurrence</p> <p>g) undulation</p> <p>h) wave</p> <p>i) rotation</p> <p>j) repetition</p> <p>k) series</p> <p>l) etc.</p>
T	<i>Evolutionary concept</i>	Become

Phoneme	General Functional Concept	Some Applications of the Concept Following English Terminology
U	<i>Concept of concrete or abstract dependence, by a one-off link</i>	e) dependence f) bid g) influence h) conditions (of dependence) I do not see the idea of condition without implied dependence associated. The mention is unnecessary and misleads on the semantic content of that word.
UU	<i>Concept of dependency, stable, permanent</i> Same remark as for EE or II	d) mutually dependent e) permanent dependence f) continuously dependent <i>(Concerns strength fields, parent-child relationship, food dependence, etc.)</i>
W	<i>Information concept</i>	g) information h) informative content i) difference This transcript does not make the "difference" with I. You should specify "non-identifying difference" to stay consistent with your I. In any case, the notion of identification is inconsistent with functional thinking. j) variation k) change l) event
Y	<i>Assembly concept</i>	a) set b) assemblage c) group d) graph

The addition of new equivalents in our languages, for any concept is not a revision to me. The list of equivalencies I gave was limited by the desire to be short and non-invasive by limiting myself to the simplest and most fundamental ideas.

The important thing is that each new equivalent expressed has the basic idea associated with the concept.

For example, "identification" is an operation of processing, comparative synthesis and associative of "differences", which are only its basis of work. Identification needs material

and tools, but never, logically, has the idea of the tool included a reference to its necessary accessories.

This is a second reason why identification has no place in the same box as the difference.

www.ummo-sciences.org