



Counter Argument of "Complements on Semantics"(2 / 3)

Translated to English and Edited by Jeff Demmers

3. An Important Complement to the Soncept "I".

3.1. Principle of complement on soncept "I".

Regarding the origin of this complement on the soncept "I", I was led to question strongly about the precise meaning of the soncept "I" for 2 reasons. Indeed, working on hypotheses on the emergence of BB and Vivant, I wanted to verify in a very precise way if I found through the terms UMMITE, the fundamental elements of my hypotheses.

To do this, I returned to Jean Pollion's description of the IBOZOO UU (p 299-309), his description of the soncept "I" (p 364-365) and the Ummite definition of the letter D59. I was then struck by the discrepancy between the fundamental functional property of the IBOZOO UU which is the *uniqueness* of any IBOZOO UU, and the concept of "difference-otherness" given by Jean Pollion.

The concept of "difference-otherness" seemed to me closer to the information "W" soncept than to the fundamental *uniqueness* of the IBOZOO UU. It was therefore necessary that the "difference-otherness" also marked this uniqueness in a precise way to function.

We are here in a problem of expression and understanding. My writing is a reflection of my understanding at the time 2000-2001, and my understanding has been refined. My expression too, I hope.

In my point of view (resulting from all my readings), the uniqueness, the "unparalleled" character of the IBOZOO UU is a reality that is not expressed by the word given to us.

It is clear that if we want to make him say it, we must change the meaning of one or more soncepts and re-align these changes in all other soncepts to test the adequacy. It is this kind of questioning, on several occasions, that has led to a 5,000-hour work!

So, I tested the concept of *uniqueness* (NB: uniqueness, but dependence per pair of IBOZOO) in case it is a limit "II". Unfortunately, I found that the concept of *uniqueness* was not enough either.

Finally, this led me to believe ***that the general concept associated with the soncept "I" had to be supplemented in order for it to include all ideas of difference and uniqueness.***

The general concept that **includes all these ideas** is the concept *of identification* and its form applied in the French terminology of: *System identifying*

I do not share that functional distinction.

Indeed, the concept of otherness expressed by the phoneme I, in the Ummite logic, but in logic at all, implies uniqueness and it is demonstrated by the absurd. If two objects are strictly identical, how can you declare one different from the other? When you have two seemingly identical objects in front of you, you forget that to differentiate them you assign them a different position, the only criterion differentiating in case of real identity.

Otherness implies uniqueness that does not need to be formulated.

As for the concept of identification, it cannot be linked to functional thinking. Identification is an "object" thought concept. In a functional logic, one can only "identify" (in fact describe a class) only by definition of a set of properties, functions attached, together descriptive enough to have no equivalent, ensuring the uniqueness of the identification (Aristotelian obsession) to an object, declared to be identified. This is the rare case of reducing the class to a single object.

Ummite thinking, functional, describes and explains behaviors by functions without designating objects.

The concept of identification is at odds with functional thinking.

Concept Positioning Scheme:

| | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| W information | I identification |
| Différence | Différence identifiante |

I recall and specify my reading:

- the concept I express the idea of otherness, convertible in all our words that include this idea. The difference expressed here is that of the "other", with the logical basis that each being, something cannot be declared other than itself. The principle of identity (not identification) recognized by Ummites.
- The concept W expresses the idea of variation, i.e., difference (state) for the same reality: you were happy, you are now grumpy: you have varied, changed state. Logically, it is always you and there is no otherness. I have explained this concept extensively in my book by adding the notion of novelty or information, because of the informative nature of any variation. This has a strong and primordial resonance on the

theory of IBOZOO UU, in particular on differential relationships (in the mathematical sense).

In other words, the concept conveyed by I is the result of a comparison between two dimensional realities, whereas the concept conveyed by W is the result of a comparison between two states of the same dimensional reality.

A difference that is not "identifying" in a unique way, is in this case a difference that is simply "informational", i.e., relative to the concept "W".

3.2. The application of the transcript of the concepts "I" and "II".

Beginning modification 1 - 2/09/03

So here is the table of definition and transcription following my method for the concept "I" and for the delicate "II" ...

| Phoneme | General Functional Concept | Some Applications of the Concept Following English Terminology |
|---------|---|---|
| I | identification concept <i>(The uniqueness of the identification is implicit, otherwise there is no identification!)</i> | <p>a) Identification system or identification system, identification, ID structure (NB: it is best to use the term system to avoid confusion with the concept "G" "structure, organization, layout")</p> <p>b) ID (unique) (coded, structural, chemical, etc.)</p> <p>c) Strictly identifying difference in a unique or specific way (otherwise, it will be the "W" phoneme)</p> <p>d) Uniqueness, when it is a unique identification</p> |
| II | identification concept "a" concept of identification concept of stable, permanent, continuity identification | <p>a) Stable, permanent identifying system</p> <p>b) Common identifier system at 2 repositories</p> <p>Why this brutal semantic difference? Where does the idea of two and the word repository come from? Isn't it to gently achieve the translation of the c) close enough to mine?</p> <p>c) Common identification between 2 repositories</p> <p>d) Limit, border, membrane, etc. 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</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>boundary, <i>a permanence of identification</i>. "The same identifier identifies one thing on one side and something else on the other "side"" makes it clear that there is no difference between the two things: they have the same identifier! Why are the two repositories you are talking about on both sides? It is an added idea that destroys the OBLIGATORY continuity of all the formulations made in this column for the same concept. If you don't have that rigor, you can have your system tell everything you want... Will this be what the Ummites wanted to express?</p> <p>The limit can be an "identifying" "difference" between what is inside and what is outside. In the systemic sense of Ludwig Von Bertalanffy (2), 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" <i>LEEIIYO</i>, on each side of "II" the flows are of a distinct nature. "Identification" is common on both sides. The continuity of the flows is ensured by the common "identifier", which is in a way the linchpin of an isomorphism.</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> |
|--|--|--|

In the Ummo cosmology the LEEIIYO is: "A critical pressure of more than fifteen million atmospheres in synchronicity with an intense magnetic field OXAAIUYYU causes a LEEIIYO (change of axes of the I.U.), which explains the OAUOOLE IBOZOO (Corpuscular inversion that allows our UEWA to travel via another WAAM (Cosmos))."

End amendment 1 - 2/09/03

3.3. Example of transcription of the term OEMMII.

This spelling is the most homogeneous. **By what criteria? What does it mean to you in the current context?** Following the method, we have functional and conceptual construction: [(("dimensional entity" "a" "mental representation") "a" "permanent joining") "a" "common identifying system to 2 repositories"]

| Relationships Between Phonemes | Transcript for the Relationship Between Functional Concepts | Literal Synthesis |
|--------------------------------|--|---|
| O "a" E | "dimensional entity" "a" "mental representation" | a) dimensional entity that has mental representations b) thinking entity |
| OE "a" MM | "thinking entity" "a" "permanent join" | thinking entity that has a permanent join with... |
| OEMM "a" II | "thinking entity that has a permanent join with... "a" "common identifier system with 2 repositories" | a) thinking entity that has a permanent join with a common identifier system at 2 repositories b) thinking entity that has a permanent join with a boundary between 2 media c) thinking entity that has a body limit d) thinking entity that has a body envelope e) thinking entity that has a body. The body is therefore the semantic equivalent of a "common identifying system with 2 repositories". There must be continuity of reformulations, in terms of semantic content. |

With "**thinking entity that has a body**" the transcription may still be perfect, but it has a human side that is familiar to us!

Perhaps, but it is achieved by consecutive twists of the logical principles of any semantics.

Moreover, does the transcription of an "exoplanetary" thought have to be familiar to be fair?

Closer to my reading:

The repeated doubling of MMII invites you to read "multiple or numerous MI" (see my book on plurals).

O = entity

E = (with) the mental image

M = relationship

I = (to) different, other

This gives OEMMII - Entity with the mental image of its many relationships with others.

This is not about "body," an idea that is fundamentally an object. This reading fully justifies the difference in spelling with OEMII, which is also often found.

The reading system presented to us here must involve the "body" also in OEMII....

Let's try to read the word UMMO by the method proposed here:

- U = dependance
- MM = dependance that has a permanent join
- O = with creatures.

The planet UMMO is therefore a planet "of dependance that has a permanent join with the creatures" What does that mean?

Not convincing here, this method.

3.4. Example of transcription for LEEIIYO effect.

| Relationships Between Concepts | Transcript for the Relationship Between Functional Concepts | Literal Synthesis |
|--------------------------------|---|---|
| L "a" EE | "Correspondence, equivalence" "a" permanent mental image, mental model | Correspondence, equivalence has a mental model a) Model match <i>b) isomorphism</i> |
| LEE "a" II | <i>"isomorphism"</i> "a" common identification (between 2 repositories)... | <i>a) Isomorphism has a common identification (between 2 repositories)...</i> |
| LEEII "a" Y | <i>"Isomorphism has a common identification (between two repositories)..."</i> "A" assembly | <i>Isomorphism has a common identification between two sets of...</i> |

| | | |
|--------------|---|---|
| LEEIIY "a" O | <i>"Isomorphism has a common identification between two sets of..."</i> "a" dimensional entity | a) Isomorphism has a common identification between two sets of dimensional features b) Isomorphic identification between 2 sets of dimensional features c) Isomorphic identification between 2 media |
|--------------|---|---|

According to the transcription *the LEEIIYO effect is therefore: "the effect of isomorphic identification between two media."*

I do not take up the detail of my argument and approximations, or even logical or rigorous defects of the progression of the transcription.

I only propose my reading:

The repetition of repetition in EEII invites the reading "multiple or numerous EI" (see my book on plurals)

So, it reads:

L = equivalence, correspondence

E = (to) mental images, perceptions

I = difference, otherness

Repetition - multiple, many

Y = (of the) together , group

O = entities, dimensional realities

This gives: "[effect] corresponding to multiple different perceptions of the whole dimensional realities" (these are the entities, dimensional realities included in the IITOA see the document on the naves . D69)

This is typically what happens when we change axes: "a LEEIIYO (change of axes of the I.U.), which explains the OAUOOLE IBOZOO (Corpuscular inversion that allows our UEWA to travel via another WAAM)."

We can compare the informative (descriptive) richness of reading according to my system:

All entities (included in the IITOA) undergo a corpuscular reversal by an effect "corresponding to multiple different perceptions of the whole dimensional realities". There is no longer any question of isomorphism or transfer. On the other hand, it is better

understood, with this reading, that a dimension of space can be perceived as time, etc., which is clearly expressed in a letter.

How can we justify the isomorphism that is precisely the opposite?

All corpuscular features of WAAM are transferred iso-morphically into the UWAAM.

In conclusion, the *general concept of "I"* must therefore be supplemented in the sense of a concept of identification and its form applied in the French terminology of: *Identification system or identification system*

We have seen that I am in opposition to this requirement, justifying my position.

A concept cannot, in a functional vision, single hand the idea of a system, which is a basic idea in itself (soncept G), and the idea of identification that is incompatible with functional thinking. Double inconsistency, then.

This impacts many words whose understanding may be more or less greatly changed.

These changes in the fine understanding of words are likely to be particularly important for the basic terms of Ummites texts. This is indisputable. The real problem is: does this new method lead to a truer understanding of Ummite language, or is it a method, supposedly simple, to obtain other meanings, more convenient to establish a metaphysical model?

4. Various Examples of Transcription with the Soncept "I".

Here are some examples of transcripts that will shed new light on the understanding of what the Ummites are telling us, and in the following documents where I make various assumptions.

4.1. The transcript of IBOZOO UU.

As stated in the letter D59-2: *"It is NOT POSSIBLE TO CHOOSE IN the IBOZOO UU a referential system. Such a REAL SYSTEM MUST BE BROUGHT BY ANOTHER IBOZOO UU, arbitrarily chosen. and "It is precisely this IOAWOO Theta (ANGLE-DIMENSION) that gives the IBOZOO UU its transcendent meaning."*

An IBOZOO is therefore identified by its ANGLE-DIMENSION. No! An IBOZOO UU is defined by the theta angle (in the example) that differentiates it from the other IBOZOO UU taken as a reference or as a "referential system". This IOAWOO is the angle of difference in the dimension considered [always implicitly related to time].

Depending on the use of the method I have described previously we have IBOZOO UU:

[(((Identification 'a' Contribution) 'a' 'dimensional entity') 'a' 'form') 'a' 'cyclicality') "a" permanent dimensional entity] "a" ("permanent dependence").

| Relationships Between Phonemes | Transcript for the Relationship Between Functional Concepts | Literal Synthesis |
|--------------------------------|--|---|
| I "a" B | Identification "a" Contribution | <p>a) The Identifying System(<i>ANGLE-DIMENSION</i>)has a contribution (factor, external contribution)</p> <p>b)<i>ANGLE-DIMENSION</i> has an external contribution</p> <p>Here there is literally "scam" by substitution of a functional transcription "identifying system" (even if I find it incongruous) by an arbitrary value "angle-size", an object concept so referred to for educational reasons. Why not the NAME which is also an identifying system? A single quote obviously does not allow these gymnastics too easy...</p> |
| IB "a" O | "THE <i>ANGLE-DIMENSION</i> has an external input" "a" a dimensional entity | a) <i>The ANGLE-DIMENSION, which has an external input, has a dimensional entity</i> |
| IBO "a" D (car Z-DS) | "The <i>ANGLE-DIMENSION</i>, which has an external input, has a dimensional entity" "has" a form of ... | The <i>ANGLE-DIMENSION</i>, which has an external input, has a dimensional entity. It manifests itself in the form of ... |
| IBOD "a" S | "The <i>ANGLE-DIMENSION</i>, which has an external input, has a dimensional entity. It manifests itself in the form of... "a" a cyclicity | The <i>ANGLE-DIMENSION</i>, which has an external input, has a dimensional entity. It manifests itself in a cyclical form |
| IBODS "a" OO | "The <i>ANGLE-DIMENSION</i>, which has an external input, has a dimensional entity. It | a) <i>The ANGLE-DIMENSION, which has an external input, has a dimensional entity. It manifests itself in a cyclical form. All this</i> |

| Relationships Between Phonemes | Transcript for the Relationship Between Functional Concepts | Literal Synthesis |
|--------------------------------|---|---|
| | manifests itself in a cyclical form "a" a permanent dimensional entity | makes the dimensional entity permanent. <i>b) The ANGLE-DIMENSION has a dimensional external input that the cyclicity makes permanent.</i> |
| | | |
| IBOZOO "a" UU | IBOZOO "has" a permanent dependency | <i>IBOZOO has a permanent dependence</i> (with another IBOZOO, because it does not exist alone). |

In summary, therefore, **IBOZOO** has an opportunity for methodical translation that is easy to use, stable in transcription. This transcription from the method is consistent with the description of the **Ummites texts**, the D59 in particular and the pages (p 299-309) of Jean Pollion's book, and the word **perfectly describes the functional process**:

- *The Identifying System (ANGLE-DIMENSION) has a dimensional external input that the cyclicity makes permanent.*

The word thus transcribed describes the functional process of IBOZOO and if one strictly respects the relational transcription step by step, with care, it remains possible to make some slight variations for the needs of more literary formulations:

- *The ANGLE-DIMENSION has a dimensional external contribution whose permanence emerges by a phenomenon of a cyclical nature.*

- *The ANGLE-DIMENSION) has an external input of dimensional feature that a stationary wave makes permanent*

- *The ANGLE-DIMENSION allows the emergence of matter, forces, etc.*

For the record, here cyclicity is a stationary gravitational wave between the axis of the same orientation of 2 IBOZOO brings out a permanent entity: matter, forces, etc.). The "half-shadow-point," "half-point-shadow" dimensional deca, (so to speak!) the IBOZOO has a permanent dependence (with another IBOZOO, because it does not exist alone).

Let us not be impressed by this mathematically modellable literature.

My current reading is:

I = otherness, difference,

B = contribution,

O = dimensional reality

What gives IBO - "dimensional reality with different contribution" is the definition of a point portion of space that is "separated" from its neighbor by its "difference of contribution" to the weaving of the Universe, in accordance with the Ummite definition of the point or node of the network found in other contexts,

Z = DS , that is,

D = manifestation, form,

S = cyclicity, circularity

O = dimensional reality

Double - permanent, stable

Or "(with) circular form of permanent dimensional realities." In a model, the only permanent dimensional realities (whose existence is stable) are the dimensions themselves.

UU - stable, permanent dependence

In my reading, the IBOZOO UU is like:

"a dimensional reality with a different contribution with a circular shape of permanent and permanently dependent dimensional realities".

This simply expresses that the global system is angular (by the Z-DS S), that the IBOZOO UU is assimilated to a point, and that it is permanently dependent. (cannot be considered alone)

4.2. The transcription of IBOZOO UU with the ideophone dictionary.

*The **IBO** segment expresses "difference, other, distinct, separate, varied (I) contribution (B) entity, creature, being, existence, dimensional reality (O)", i.e., "separate contribution entity" or "dimensional reality with a distinct participation". This is the definition of "point" from the Ummite perspective, the smallest part of space, characterized by a separate contribution (B)(I). The **ZOO** segment, which is to be read **DSOO (Z=DS, see phonetics)** expresses "manifestation, form (D) round, circle, turn, cycle, repetition (S) entity, existence, being, creature, constituting, component (O) in symmetry, balance, equality, equity, reciprocity (O)", i.e., "a balance of components".*

The full term refers to "a dimensional reality with a distinct participation [point] with a circular form of equality of entities."

Full explanations given by Jean Pollion in the idiophonic dictionary:

IBOZOO This is one of the most commonly cited terms (almost equal to OEMII and WOA), especially in the expression **IBOZOO UU**. Quoted by Moya, in ref 133 "Point or node of a network", in ref 135 in the expression **IBOZOO DAO** "Node", in ref 137 in the expression **IBOZOO WOO** "Instant positions occupied by electrons at each subatomic level", and in ref 136 in the expression **IBOZOO UU** "Elementary physical entity model". The vast majority comes from the text D59, which attempts to present the concept that this term covers in terms of the "fundamental physics" of universal space-time and the general implications attached to it. The **IBO** segment expresses "difference, other, distinct, separate, varied (**I**) contribution (**B**) entity, creature, being, existence, dimensional reality (**O**)", i.e., "separate contribution entity" or "dimensional reality with a distinct participation". This is the definition of "point" from the Ummite perspective, the smallest part of space, characterized by a separate contribution (**B**)(**I**). The **ZOO** segment, which is to be read **DSOO** (**Z=DS**, see phonetics) expresses "manifestation, form (**D**) round, circle, turn, cycle, repetition (**S**) entity, existence, being, creature, constituting, component (**O**) in symmetry, balance, equality, equity, reciprocity (**O**)", i.e., "a balance of components". Since the **IBOZOO UU** is the lower-level subatomic expression, the constituents are the "dimensional axes" themselves. The full term refers to "a dimensional reality with a distinct participation [point] with a circular form of equality of entities." These constituents of the ultimate "frame" constitutive of the Universe "communicate" to each other, in "in pairs" relationships. **IBOZOO** does not create energy, nor does it store it: it transmits it. All dimensional variations are thus "reflected" either in stationary or "open" form, at least "identically" in the form of "constant" or "comparable". This is what the **OO** segment expresses. This is the dynamic part of the denomination. It takes two IBs for any event in the Universe. Each pair (combined IB) can materialize a particle. The "pair" consideration refers to them as **UU** interdependent, conjugated, correlated, etc. The adjective used by the "adjacent" Ummites is extraordinarily evocative and would require development alone.

This first transcription was innovative, but it required extensive explanations made by Jean Pollion to find the overall description of pages 299 to 309 of his work.

Moreover, neither in the transcript nor in Jean Pollion's explanation did the fundamentally "identifying" nature of the *ANGLE-DIMENSION* of an **IBOZOO UU** appear explicitly.

This is normal and I still claim it today: nothing in the term IBOZOO UU evokes any concept of "angle-size". It has nothing to identify: if I give you a pi/8 angle between the two-time values of two related IBOZOO UU (time angle according to the reading proposed here), it allows you to identify what? Surely not to say which it is, which would be, here, a real identification.

What we can find, on the other hand, is the expression of evaluation of a dimensional difference at an angle "IOAWOO", which allows to define well the concept carried by "I" (nothing is directly measurable, since the axes do not cut, and the difference goes far beyond the simple "gap"!) by comparing it to what we commonly call an angle.

The concept of angle between dimensional axes, called "angle-dimension" in the reading that is presented here, is an idea with educational purposes in Ummite texts, without affecting the consistency of the model.

4.3. Transcript of UUWUUA IES.

Basically, it's Ummites mathematics. We must find in the transcript of the words something of this order. According to the method we have functional and conceptual construction: [(((**"dependence, stable, permanent"**) "a" **"effectiveness"**)] **"a"** [(((**"identification concept"**) "a" **"mental representative"**) "a" **"cyclicity"**)].

| Relationships Between Phonemes | Transcript for the Relationship Between Functional Concepts | Literal Synthesis |
|--------------------------------|--|---|
| UU "a" W | "dependence, stable, permanent" "a" "information" | Permanent addiction has an informative nature a) A permanent, informative addiction b) Information such as "algorithm," "calculable," "law" (permanent dependence) c) Computable information The progress of fitness is spectacular, not in the sense of simplicity, but to go from "permanent dependence on information to "computable information". With this method we make say what we want to find ... Not only is it logically indefensible, but it is also no simpler than my system of expression, because it takes three steps, even if they would be justified, which is questionable. |
| UUW "a" UU | "Calculable information" "a" "dependence, stable, permanent" | Computable information has a permanent dependence |
| UUWUU "a" A | "Computable information has a permanent | a) Computable information that is permanently dependent has an effectiveness |

| Relationships Between Phonemes | Transcript for the Relationship Between Functional Concepts | Literal Synthesis |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| | dependence "a" "effectiveness" | <i>b) Computable information that is permanently dependent is verifiable</i> |

A transcript of UUWUUA is:

- *Computable information that has a permanent dependency is verifiable*

And what does that mean? Sounds like a Lapallice evidence, though....?

Fascinating:

- *Computable and verifiable information*

The expression of permanent dependence and the condition of "verifiability" attached to it in the definition "un-francized" has been lost. This method of reading is the guarantee of the loss of information... and the ability to get anything to be said about anything.

Enthusiastic?

For IES:

| Relationships Between Phonemes | Transcript for the Relationship Between Functional Concepts | Literal Synthesis |
|--------------------------------|---|---|
| I "a" E | "identification concept" "a" "mental representing" | a) identification concept that has a mental representation b) identification |
| IE "a" S | "Identification" "a" "cyclicity" | c) identification with a cyclicity The idea of mental representation has been completely lost here. Why this one rather than that of identification which has also lost its quality as a system, cumbersome here? d) <i>Recognition by recurrence</i> There would also be much to be said about the conceptual difference between cyclicity and recurrence.... |

A transcript of IES is:

- *recognition by recurrence*

You are right: A transcript... Is. But the problem: is this THE transcription of the authors' thinking? Because that's what we're looking for, isn't it?

The full transcript table is:

| Relationships Between Phonemes | Transcript for the Relationship Between Functional Concepts | Literal Synthesis |
|--------------------------------|---|---|
| UUWUUA "a" IES | Computable and verifiable information "a" "recognition identification" | a) Computable and verifiable information that has a recurrence identification b) Computable and verifiable information that has an identifier value by recurrence c) <i>Computable and verifiable information, inspectable by recurrence</i> Ah! good. Now "a" can be transcribed by "instantiable" now! |

A transcript of UUWUUA IES is:

- *Computable and verifiable information, instantiable by recurrence*

Could you give us a definition of what you put in the word "instantiable" that does not exist in my dictionary?

Reminder: the universe is made up of IBOZOO. It is discontinuous, discrete, so so-called transcendental functions (such as mathematics) are applicable by recurrence on all IBOZOO.

Let's stick to the simple and understandable things.

The term UUWUUA IES is used in the D59 to refer to the mathematical logic of tetravalence:

"In our WUUA WAAM this assumption must be rejected. We then resort to a type of Multivalent Logic that our specialists call UUWUUA IES (LOGIC MATHEMATIC

TETRAVALENT) according to which any proposal will indiscriminately adopt four values:..."

I read today that the repetition of the UU segment invites reading multiple attributes (see my book) according to UU - (W and A), i.e.:

UU = permanent dependency,

The variations,

A = effectiveness,

That is, "the permanent dependence on actual variations"

I = difference, otherness,

E = Mental image, perception, ideas

S = Cycle, rotation, alternation, and we have contexts for which IES designates the numerical value four.

IES refers to "the alternation of different ideas" and there are four, the ones that follow in the text.

The term UUWUUA IES now means to me "[The logic of] permanent dependence on actual variations according to the alternation of different ideas".

This transcript first captures the tetravalent context through the list of announced ideas and is consistent with the other term WUUA for mathematics.

4.4. Transcript of the sentence "IIAS IBOZOO UU AIOOYEDOO".

'II' beginning modification 1 - 2/09/03

As I have already pointed out strongly, the functional idea expressed in the Ummites descriptions must be found in the transcription of the words.

Here is a sentence containing "II" in **"IIAS IBOZOO II AIOOYEDOO"** following in the letter D59 on IBOZOO UU:

"But you can observe that this reference system was chosen arbitrarily within the Euclidian Space that you imagined. IT IS VERY IMPORTANT THAT YOU DO THIS DIFFERENCE in relation to IBOZOO UU. IT IS NOT POSSIBLE TO CHOOSE IN the IBOZOO UU a referential system. Such a REAL SYSTEM MUST BE BROUGHT BY ANOTHER IBOZOO UU, arbitrarily chosen. Thus (in Figure 11, right), if we assume two IBOZOO UU (P) and (H), it would be nonsense to refer to the cosines director's $\cos(\text{Alpha}) - \cos(\text{Beta}) - \cos(\text{Gamma})$ that the OAWOO UU would form with an ideal trihedra, whose origin would be the "CENTRE" of THE HYPERSPHER. So, we can only refer to the ANGLE Theta IOAWOO that U r (U arrowed) of H form with the OAWOO (RAYON VECTEUR) U has P.

It is precisely this IOAWOO Theta (ANGLE-DIMENSION) that gives the IBOZOO UU its transcendent meaning. You will need to make a mental effort now to achieve a psychological translation in such a way that every time in physics we talk about GREAT, the image of a SCALARY does not touch your consciousness instead of the IOAWOO (ANGLE that the hypothetical vector rays of TWO IBOZOO UU form between them).

It is a nonsense of ISOLATING, in an effort of mental abstraction, an IBOZOO UU to study it. We CAN EXPRESS IN ESPAGNOL, translating the POSTULAT known to our physicists:

IIAS IBOZOO II AIOOYEDOO (THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NO ISOLATED IBOZOO UU)"

Sorry, but my quote from the text is not this one. The real phrase in the original, which I quoted, is "IIAS IBOZOO UU AIOOYEDOO", which you have appropriately quoted as "in title". Where did you extract this quote from?

It is a fundamental candidate of Ummite physics. It was transcribed by the Ummites and then translated into French as: *"IT DOES NOT EXIST A ONLY IBOZOO UU ISOLE"* or *"IT DOES NOT EXIST IN THE ABSOLU ONE IBOZOO UU ISOLE."* It would seem more logical to simply say that *"IT DOES NOT exist IBOZOOONLY"*. In any case, this idea must be found in the transcript.

It is true, except that the Ummites did not transcribe but dictated the little sentence in their language, and that they dictated the context directly in Spanish.

In the idiophonic dictionary Jean Pollion directly transcribes the "II" by "isolated":

EA: "(THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NO SINGLE IBOZOO UU ISOLATES)". D59.17

ST: Isolated effective from a series [alone] (IIAS), a dimensional reality with a distinct participation [point] with a circular, angular form of equality of entities (IBOZOO) dependence equal or reciprocal, or continuous or stable (UU) a subset, mental image of a stable form, of various dimensional balances (AIOOYEDOO)

I do not deny this quotation, but it is global (from the dictionary of expressions that refers for each term to that of the words) and it would have been better to refer to the detailed transcription of each word offered by the latter.

Let's see what the method gives for IIAS which is a short segment, but apparently difficult to transcribe in detail:

According to the method we have functional and conceptual construction: {{{("concept identification is stable" "a" effective") "a" cyclicity") "a" [IBOZOO UU]} "a" [AIOOYEEDOO]}

| Relationships Between Phonemes | Transcript for the Relationship Between Functional Concepts | Literal Synthesis |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| I "a" I | stable identification concept | a) stable, permanent identifier system (between 2 media or repositories) b) Common ID system for 2 distinct things |
| II "a" A | "common identifier system for 2 distinct things" "a" effectivity | The common identifier system for 2 separate things is verifiable |
| IIA "a" S | "The common identifier system for two distinct things is verifiable" "a" a cyclicity | a) The common identifier system for 2 separate things is cyclically verifiable b) The common identifier system for 2 separate things is repeatedly verifiable <i>c) The common identifier system for 2 separate things is verifiable by recurrence</i> |

A transcript of IIAS is:

- *The common identifier system for 2 separate things is verifiable by recurrence*

In the case of IBOZOO, the "ANGLE-DIMENSION" identifier is common.

We have seen above that the concept of "angle-identifying" has absolutely nothing identifying, concept "object" that does not exist in functional thinking. This expression is not used as such by the Ummites. On the contrary, they express (from the quote above):

"... IOAWOO (ANGLE that the hypothetical vector rays of TWO IBOZOO UU form among them)."

This angle is not identifying, as was predictable.

In fact, we seem to be here, on the occasion of the IBOZOO UU in an interpretation of the text (it would be necessary to make a survey of the exegesis of the text) which leads to the integration of misconceptions in the concepts.

We are here, faced with a new formulation resulting from the modification of the concept "I". So, let's go back a little bit to the postulate and the very concept of the IBOZOO. This is to clearly understand why a **"common identifier system for two distinct things" is a single, isolated IBOZOO.**

As already cited for the transcript of IBOZOO UU, the letter D59-2 states: *"It is NOT POSSIBLE TO CHOOSE IN the IBOZOO UU a referential system. Such a REAL SYSTEM MUST BE BROUGHT BY ANOTHER IBOZOO UU, arbitrarily chosen. and "It is precisely this IOAWOO Theta (ANGLE-DIMENSION) that gives the IBOZOO UU its transcendent meaning."*

An IBOZOO is therefore identified by its ANGLE-DIMENSION.

The transcendent meaning brought is that of another "relative by nature" modeling system, expressed here by the term I-OAWOO or "dimensional difference-axis". It is the definition of a fundamental concept, but not its expression.

Take I0 a reference IBOZOO and I1 an IBOZOO which is identified by an *ANGLE-DIMENSION A*. Take I0 a reference IBOZOO and I2 an IBOZOO which is also identified by an *ANGLE-DIMENSION A*.

So I1 and I2 have the same **angular identifier** system, the **ID system is common to the 2 IBOZOO**, so it is the same and unique **IBOZOO**.

The IBOZOO is isolated, alone.

It can **be verified by recurrence for all IBOZOO**, that if there is a system identifying common to 2 IBOZOO, it is necessarily that it is the same and unique IBOZOO.

It's hard to be more alone!

So, if the ID system is that of an IBOZOO, we have:

| Relationships Between Phonemes | Transcript for the Relationship Between Functional Concepts | Literal Synthesis |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| IAS "a" IBOZOO | "The common 2-thing identifier system is verifiable by recurrence" "a" IBOZOO | b) The angular identifier system is common to 2 IBOZOO is verifiable by recurrence c) An isolated IBOZOO, only is verifiable by recurrence. d) An isolated IBOZOO |
| IBOZOO "a" UU | "An isolated IBOZOO" "has" a permanent dependence | e) An isolated IBOZOO has a permanent dependence (f) <i>an isolated IBOZOO UU</i> |

A transcript of **IIAS IBOZOO UU** is:

- *an isolated IBOZOO UU*

In my reading today, the term **IIAS** is of construction similar to **IAS** which means "one, unity":

I = other, different, separate

IAS = one, unit

That is: [a] separate unit, which can be rendered by "isolated"

I arrive at the same transcript directly, without two pages of explanations on the "angle-dimension" that seem to me a detour intended to integrate a personal vision.

Really simpler method?

Regarding the term **AIOOYEEDOO** in the idiophonic dictionary the raw reading without explanation gives:

"importance, truth, action, effectivity (A)[with possible OA for underlying, permanent] different, other, distinct, varied, separate, (I), inter entities, entities in reciprocity or indiscriminately, in balance (OO) package, together, group (Y) coding, model, mental construction (EE) manifestation, form (D) inter entities, entities in reciprocity or without distinction, which leads to "a differentiated texture of balanced entities (OAIIOOY) models (EE) of balanced feature forms (DOO)".

Let me rephrase by "there are sets of stable components with differentiated textures that are mental constructs of forms of entities in continuity."

With my method we obtain for **AIOOYEEDOO** the functional and conceptual construction:

(((("effectiveness" "a" "concept identification") "a" a permanent dimensional entity) "a" assembly) "a" mental model) "a" form) "a" permanent dimensional entity).

| Relationships Between Phonemes | Transcript for the Relationship Between Functional Concepts | Literal Synthesis |
|--------------------------------|---|---|
| A "a" I | "Effectiveness" "a" "concept of identification" | a) an effectiveness that has a concept of identification b) Identifiable effectiveness |
| AI "a" OO | "identifiable effectiveness " "a" a permanent dimensional entity | a) identifiable effectivity that has a permanent dimensional entity b) effectiveness identified as real |

| Relationships Between Phonemes | Transcript for the Relationship Between Functional Concepts | Literal Synthesis |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| AIOO "a" Y | effectivity identified as "real" "a" assembly | a) effectiveness identified as being real that has an assembly, a set b) effectiveness identified as being real that has a set of... |
| AIOOY "a" EE | "effectiveness identified as being real that has a set... "A" mental model | a) effectiveness identified as being real that has a set of mental models b) effectivity identified as being real has a mental model |
| AIOOYEE "a" D | "effectiveness identified as being real to a mental model" "a" manifestation, form | effectivity identified as being real has a mental model. This mental model has the shape... |
| AIOOYEED "a" OO | "effectiveness identified as being real has a mental model. This mental model has the form..." "a" permanent dimensional entity | Effectivity identified as being real has a mental pattern. This mental model has the form of a permanent dimensional entity. |

A transcript of AIOOYEEDOO is:

- Effectivity identified as being real has a mental model. This mental model has the form of a permanent dimensional entity.

In English:

- Mental representation is identified for a dimensional entity
- We take an idea for a reality
- What we believe to be real is an idea without dimensional reality
- **False idea of reality**

This final formulation, reduced to 3 ideas and intended to correspond to the overall idea expressed in the context of tetravalence, has lost all the semantic content of the original term, which assembles 9 or 10 ideas.

How can we claim to allow access to the understanding of the authors' thinking, the very objective of reading?

I translate today the word AIOOYEEDOO by

- A = effectiveness, "is" (in sentence)
- I = difference, variety, variety
- O = dimensional reality, entity, elements
- O = permanence, stability (by doubling)
- Y = together, gathering
- EE = registration, model
- D = manifestation, form
- OO = entities, elements, permanent or continuous components

As can be seen in all documents, the manifestation of continuity of entities (DOO) is their "memory", which assures the entities, elements of all kinds, a "form of continuity" of their existence.

The term AIOOYEEDOO expresses, in my reading, "is a variety of stable elements bringing together models of forms of component continuity" .

It will be noted that in the above rendering, 9 conceptual ideas are rendered, directly, without modification or addition/withdrawal, reflecting all the ideas that the word contains 9 instead of 10, because the double EE is rendered by a single equivalent idea in our thinking, that of "model".

So, we have for: IIAS IBOZOO UU AIOOYEEDOO

| Relationships Between Phonemes | Transcript for the Relationship Between Functional Concepts | Literal Synthesis |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| IIAS IBOZOO UU "a" AIOOYEEDOO | "an isolated IBOZOO UU is verifiable by recurrence" "a" "False idea of reality" | a) "An isolated IBOZOO UU is verifiable by recurrence" has a "false idea of reality" b) An isolated IBOZOO UU is a false concept |

A transcript of "IIAS IBOZOO UU AIOOYEEDOO" is:

- *An isolated IBOZOO UU is a fake concept*

Either by introducing a negation (which does not exist in the Ummite language) for the following fascination:

- *There is no isolated IBOZOO UU*

We will compare with my current transcription: An IBOZOO UU actually separated from a series is a variety of stable elements bringing together models of component continuity forms. As I explained: a view of the mind.

I pointed out every expression of the concepts (phonemes) transcribed in writing.

End amendment 1 - 2/09/03

4.5. Conclusion on the transcript of the sentence "IIAS IBOZOO UU AIOOYEDOO".

We see that this transcription of the words is still quite simple [we see that it is far too simplified, and in a way left to the reader's initiative], even for concepts difficult to grasp for us (tetravalence). It therefore requires minimal knowledge to find logical equivalencies. Moreover, this transcription of the words is stable and very detailed.

We saw that this is not true at all, since 9 ideas expressed we arrive at 3! A little reductive method!!

The perfect consistency [it looks a lot like the Coué method, because the consistency is far from perfect!] Ummites descriptions clearly show the value of the general concept of identifying the "I" concept. **We saw how false and logically inconsistent this was. Review my explanations I and W.**

5. Conclusion on the Complementary Elements for Understanding UMMITE Semantics.

These transcripts show an astonishing stability and consistency, both of the method and the transcription with the modification of the concept "I". **No stability, no consistency, we have seen with regard to the terms examined so far. The proposed transcript of the "I" is inconsistent.**

The method is simple and usable with a minimum of knowledge. **Pretending to understand what the words convey without confrontation with the context, without confrontation with the other logic of formulation is a decoy.**

The results of the final French transcription are fairly stable. **We saw that no, and that if the transcripts are stable (by the way what does that mean?), it is at the cost of abandoning a certain number of ideas each time ...**

This method allows us to detail the meaning of the words.

Certainly not the meaning that the authors have expressed, as I have demonstrated. Now every reader is free to make his "little cinema": this is the price of "collective dispersion" to pay for the same reality.

The system presented does not appear to me to be a method of reading, but a method authorizing the freedom of self-suggestion.

It is very plausible that this method actually corresponds to the actual way in which the Ummite language actually works. But the most important thing is that it gives new light to the general understanding of Ummites texts.

I have shown why this method does not seem to me to be consistent with the Ummite expression system: adding logical inconsistencies under the I and the W, partial and non-systematic addition of concepts to the level of basic phonemic ideas, and systematic distortions and/or losses of expressed ideas.

Lighting again, there is certainly, but from there to find it in accordance with the ideas expressed....

The understanding that emerges from it is UNQUESTIONABLY alien, at least in part, to what is expressed.

This new reading of the words, which allows us to reconsider the detail of Ummite concepts, will probably bring positive challenges, which are likely to evolve our knowledge on these subjects.

This opinion only engages its author.

I guarantee that the system of interpretation, because it cannot be a matter of reading, presented here will lead to damaging distortions to a deeper understanding of the exotic and innovative ideas expressed in the documents.

We will see some examples of that for the words I would use in the following documents on the presentation of some hypotheses. With this new definition of the concept "I" I was also able to verify the consistency of my hypotheses compared to the words. **I have no doubt about that, because the system has shown how transcripts are adapted to the desired end result. It would be surprising if there was no consistency at this level. But are these assumptions a reflection of the truth expressed? This does not, of course, prove that they are fair, but it is very encouraging, at least for the direction of reflection. In light of my remark above, I urge the author to be more careful about the validity of the hypothetical ways of thinking.**

www.ummo-sciences.org