ARTICLE *3: June 2002 (copy of editorial 32 of the website "Sapiens")*

UMMITE: No, it's not Chinese anymore!

The Demonstration of the Origin of the Letters

Translated to English and Edited by Jeff Demmers

A major book for me is coming out this month. It will be followed in September by a new book by Jean-Pierre Petit that his fans are looking forward to. Both relate, near or far, to the "Ummo case".

This is especially the first one that will be discussed below. **"UMMO - real extraterrestrials"** published by Éditions Aldane (28 euros) , by Jean Pollion. (This is obviously a pseudonym)

Over 460 pages, the book consists of two parts:

A Panorama (historical and clarification of different points of the case) and a precise of the system according to which the Ummite language works - it is the great discovery of Jean Pollion that he explains step by step, so that we can follow him in the path of his approach.

A third part could not be included in this book (for volume issues (about 500 A4 pages!). These are dictionaries (proper names, common names, phrases and phrases) that are only available on CD-ROM (sold separately as an option for 15 euros).

You can order this book (with or without the dictionary CD, but it would be unfortunate to do without it) from Aldane Editions- C.P. 100 - CH - 1216 Cointrin - Switzerland. The total price with the shipping fee of 5 euros is therefore 48 euros.

Or by e-mail: editionsaldane@worldonline.ch

I have only one fear is that the distribution of this book remains very limited, given the price and the method of dissemination, but above all, that it is classified "intellectually" (or in the shelves of the libraries) in the category "esotericism" or "various UFOs". In fact, it is not his place; it is a true doctoral thesis, which J. Pollion is also willing to support with any university that would accept it (as far as I know, J. Pollion is "already" Doctor of Science). Ph.D. thesis not only on the decoding of language, but also supplemented by an in-depth analysis of a civilization (way of life, beliefs, technology, cosmology, physics, etc.) whose only analyzable "traces" are represented by more than a thousand descriptive and analytical pages, in the same way that one could analyze the ancient Egyptian civilization from the moment it was possible to decode its writing.

These two books are "linked." On the one hand in J-P Petit's book by an appendix concerning the discovery, by J. Pollion, of the "Rosetta stone" of the Ummite language, and by several quotations from the scientific work of JPP in the book of Pollion. Each of these works validates the other.

You will have to wait a little for the book of Petit whose manuscript I could read, but both are to be discovered with the same interest.

_____

Those who know me know my interest for many years in the "Ummo case". Some of those who do not know me were able to make the link between the site "SAPIENS" and the site "Letters Ummites".

Without wanting to repeat the genesis of this case that paid off the media at one time, I quickly recall what it is all about.

A group of Spaniards said that they had received letters from extra-terrestrial from 1966 on a mission to study and observe on Earth since 1950. A significant part of these letters has probably reached us through different "channels", and those of which we have been aware (more than 1000 pages) have been translated into French.

In spite of their remarkable content, there was still a debate about the "validity" of these, no absolute proof could be brought, either by one side or the other... to this day. Each, whether an informed ufologist (are there any among them?) or just curious, remained on positions, less scientific (because in fact the "negationists" had most often "overlooked" these letters without "actually reading" them), that intuitive and I'm not talking about the completely irrational underlying irony "what, my poor sir, you're going to make us believe that extraterrestrials have written". Understood: "extraterrestrials cannot exist, you know well that man is the most evolved creature in the universe, and even so, you know that travel times would be too long, given the limit due to the speed of light...". There was (and still exists) an "effect of rejection", as it can exist in a person who is told that he is condemned by a disease, because by intellectually validating these letters and their contents, it is a fundamental questioning in the way of thinking and the "beliefs" to which one must resolve. No, we are not "alone" and yes, evolution does "make sense" ... we're not "here" by chance. For my part, a thorough reading of these letters had made me lean towards a very high probability of the most "exotic" origin.

So, there was no evidence missing. It could have happened on the validation of the scientific data, in biology as well as in cosmology or physics, which enameled the pages of these letters. Probably too soon, but I think we are approaching, given our analytical capabilities and the technological limitations of our observation capabilities ("vision" at the atomic or nuclear level, for example). It is from the "Ummite language" that it came today, because J. Pollion, after a considerable work of 5 years, brings it to us by a brilliant analysis of the words "Ummites" that dot the letters whose content itself is credible by the very structure of this language.

Of course, this "decoding" had already been attempted by linguists. Some had come to the conclusion that these words contained roots or earthly origins, and their conclusions therefore affirmed that it was a "manipulation". The last study concluded a "manufacturing" from Mandarin Chinese (hence the title of this article) ... .

If ufologists (and scientists, and others) want to show intellectual honesty and above all rationality, won't they have to either acknowledge their previous mistake, their instinctive "rejection", and if they want to "demolish" the demonstration of J. Pollion, I wish them courage, but it will be essential anyway that they reread (attentively) the letters Ummites , with the "lighting" given by J. Pollion, except to appear biased.

But it is now also desirable that information on various scientific disciplines that are widely developed in these letters should be studied - with all due caution, but without a priori, in the various scientific fields (including sociology, environment, health, linguistics, logic, religion, evolution, etc.).

The impact on our entire civilization (and I weigh my words) could also tip the rejection of everything related to UFOs and, let's say, the "extra-terrestrial" because despite more than 10,000 cases of validated observations (including more than 1,000 by airmen), out of a few million probably, those who refuse to see it as a reality (especially the vast majority of the media that influence collective thought) will also have to , except to appear of obvious bad faith, take this subject seriously, do not "make the ostriches".

Some time ago, an "honorable correspondent" confided to me that the various "services" around the world estimated a range of 6 to 50 the number of alien races that roam (or have wandered) on Earth for the last 5 decades .... But how can this message be conveyed "officially" without creating panic, without questioning the "modes of thought" and thus significantly disrupting a large majority of the population that is not ready to hear this?

Let's get to J. Pollion's work, which is considerable because it is close to 1000 pages long.

The third part on CD-ROM "Precise of the Idiophonic language system" is a dictionary of translations of 1345 words found in the letters Ummites , terms also "exotic" as for example "IBOZOO UU, YIE, UAMIIXAABI, WUA, GOODAA, XEE, YUYISAA " whose translations in Spanish were generally given in parenthesis. But on the other hand, several Ummite letters pointed to the difficulties of translating their "words", our own words being too limited in the "representation" of their thought... "*... we are obliged, in our reports, to use earthly comparisons, mutilated and narrow proposals that hinder the whole informative richness of our dialectical expressions. Already the only use of the verb BE limiting all our possibilities. All the ontology of the Earth's thinkers is saturated with expressions like "Be," "I'M NOT," "I'M EXISTE," with no choice for other forms of distinct content.*" (letter excerpt 77) -

This short summary that follows can only be very partial since it is a scientific work, argued, demonstrated, validated at more than 99% and which extends over several hundred pages in which Pollion also tells us about the "method" and intuitions that were his, all preceded by a very fine

analysis of the whole Ummite thought. That is why it is essential to get his book (and I say this although J. Pollion was not very kind to me in this book :-)...).

What does this analysis tell us?

We had tried to understand the Ummite language by making a parallel with our languages. That is, in subject-verb-object-adjective structure, or in ideograms, and in trying to find common "roots". What Pollion discovered was that the "words" are not from common roots, but from common letters, each letter, corresponding to a sound, written transcription of a phoneme, expressing a "concept". In the different "words" that we find in the letters we had until now thought to see "roots" in them, but in fact a series of several letters are represented only because the concepts that designate this or that assemblage of letters (and corresponding sounds) are similar between them.

He therefore logically called each of these letters "soncept," decoding their meaning.

And what is quite surprising is that, except one, it is not a "concept object" but a concept of relationship, of abstraction, i.e., a perception or an idea *[1]*.

I'll give you an example. In our case, words most often refer to objects (to which we add adjectives that define them), but there are exceptions. Example "hat" is a "word-object," while "head cover" is a word "concept."

Each letter used by the Ummites corresponds to a concept of thought, not a description of an object. The position of each letter within a word thus formed determines the meaning of the word, the repetition of a letter brings symmetry, equality, balance, continuity, stability.

What is (also) brilliant in this language is that there is no limit to the making of words, that the word, which it expresses, thus becomes infinitely richer than an "object" translation, all the nuances that can be included without the need to add periphrases or series of adjectives.

To fully understand why the Ummite language is not a "descriptive" language but a "relational" language we must keep in mind that the object (which we touch, see, feel, etc.) is a "reality" accessible to our senses, which is part of one of the facets of the Universe, that of sensory space. Seen in other wave ranges, this object would present itself differently. But we have a tendency to think that the mental construction that we associate (form) with the reception of our "senses" represents THE reality, whereas Ummites consider that it is only a mental representation. But I let Pollion explain this (from his book p 401 and following):

"The Ummites say they reject the principle of the excluded third party and practice a tetravalent logic, and whose language is independent (see quote from D43 below). Therefore, denial cannot exist in this language, and this is one of the major difficulties we face in understanding it. I was very quickly astonished at the wording of the Ummite language corresponding to what the authors "translated" to us by a negation. It was always a paraphrase, in which any negative character did not appear clearly.

Let's take an example. I have a stool in front of me, which I declare "my stool." My language, whether it is French, Spanish or Japanese, allows me to describe the whole world around me, i.e.,

that is noticeable to me, directly or through thought. My language, and its associated Aristotelian logic, tell me that any object cannot "be" and be "something else" simultaneously (the principle of identity of the excluded third party). This leads me to declare that the world around me is made up of two entities on the one hand "my stool", and on the other hand "everything that is not my stool". When I formulate this thought, I include in the "everything" I perceive and perceptions that I can imagine. The list may be endless, but it is "limited" since its definition boils down to a concept "everything that does.. not," i.e., that of denial. This is possible because the world I perceive has only one reality: experimental or through thought, but it is the expression of the same representation. The object, evoked in thought, remains the object. The representation is unique, experimental or thought-on.

What about the Ummite? For him, whatever the "point" considered of space, it can be seen, lived, imagined (including in transcendence) under an infinite facet, modalities that are the infinity of the universes of the multi-cosmos. That is to say that the mental image that its senses give rise to in its brain is only one point of view among an infinity. The "point" considered (although the point in the geometric sense we give it does not make sense for the Ummite) has an infinite number of possible realities, more or less different. (See the chapter "Another Vision of the Universe") on this subject. There can be no meaning in denote all the realities that are not the one he perceives when he speaks. If he has a stool in front of him, even after he has designated it "his stool", he knows that in other three-dimensional spaces, it can no longer be a stool. There is no need to designate anything that is not "his stool". On the other hand, the multiple forms that each "point" can take in the different spaces, are not experienced by the Ummite, nor by the Earthling who would adhere to this form of thought, as "normal" sensations. So why give them a designation?"

So, what did Pollion discover when he simplified it? 17 "soncepts" (from his book p 406 and **following):**

"Relational and abstract phonemes: soncepts.

Indeed, if I take the basic soncepts of the language, one by one, by studying them in this aspect, I make the following observations:

*è Soncept **A** expresses "truth, effectivity action". This is the idea of the realization of reality by consequences, action, or "effects". The idea is already functional. Let's take an example of trees moving under the action of the wind. The trees are A (numbers, you can see and touch them) and the wind is A, since its effect is t noticeable. This soncept is relational, functional. It expresses the relationship between a supposed reality and its effects [...]. It is above all the only concept of action, and it takes one at a minimum, otherwise the discourse becomes purely fixed. He cannot, without him, convey the idea of "acting."*

*è Soncept **B** or its Spanish equivalent **V** expresses "contribution, participation". It's a functional, relationship idea. Contribution is not an object; it is an expression of the relationship between the contributor and the recipient. It's a word-relationship....*

*è Soncept **D** expresses "manifestation, appearance, form". It is not an "object" but the relationship between "a reality" [not necessarily perceptible] and the perception we have of it. Let's take the*

example of gravitation. Universal attraction exists. The fall of the bodies is a "demonstration". A reality can have multiple manifestations, but a demonstration can be common to several realities. So, it's a word-relationship.... This phoneme is especially important: it authorizes the implicit formulation of Multicosmos, declaring that the same "dimensional reality" can have several manifestations (D), especially "one per cosmos considered", but exclusive.

*è Soncept **E** expresses "mental image, perception, sensation". It's not an object, it's a concept. It conveys the functional relationship between a reality "physically or mentally perceived" and its presence to consciousness. I would say that in the pair "dimensional reality observed or perceived" and "observer", the soncept D translates the perceptual deformation related to "dimensional reality" while the soncept E translates the perceptual deformation reported to the observer. In any case, these are "information relations" [...]. A stimulus, a mental image, or an idea, by the way it is considered.*

*è Soncept **G** expresses "organization," "arrangement." It is not an object. The organization is the observation of all the relationships that are established between the "dimensional realities". [...] . An organization has "n" relationships.*

*The soncept **I** express "difference," "otherness." This is clearly a relationship since there can be no difference without at least 2 terms to compare. The soncept I imply a comparison relationship. It's usually a binary relationship....*

*è Soncept **K** expresses "mix." It is not an object. It's an expression of relationship. There can be no mixing without at least 2 constituents.*

*è Soncept **L** expresses "equivalence, correspondence." They are not objects, they're relationship ideas. This is the expression of the relationship by itself, since in its general definition a relationship is a "correspondence" or an "equivalence" [...].*

*è Soncept **M** expresses "union, coupling, relationship". Obviously is not an object since it does not make sense to unite an object! It takes at least two! The coupling, the union is therefore the expression of a relationship of 'link' [...]. Several constituents can be brought together to obtain only a single grouping. The union is more durable than the mixture.*

*è Soncept **N** expresses "flow, transfer." It is not an object, but the idea of a relationship since it reflects the "movement" of an origin to a destination. The relationship involves movement (at least energetic, because of radiation) [...].*

*è Soncept **O** expresses "Entity, being, dimensional reality". <u>It is the only soncept that evokes what we call object.</u> It will be noted that the "object" or "word-object", in the Russellian sense, corresponds to a physical reality or its idea, in our system of thought. In Ummite thought, the soncept O evokes all that is dimensional, i.e., expressible in equations, even very complex, and not necessarily perceptible. I mean not limited to our sensory universe. As an object, it will often be the linchpin of the practical expression of relationships. It is also a relationship, except when it expresses "the dimension itself". Indeed, any result of equation(s), and this is the definition of the present soncept, is the result of one or more successful relationships (equations). The soncept O conveys the "descriptive" relationship of its justification: its relationships to its components.*

Dimensional reality is the expression in general material, but it may not be, of the more or less numerous and complex "gravitational" relationships that constitute it [...]. It is the only sound that could be rendered (restrictively) by a family of our words-objects: being, individual, subject, creature, object, gadget, thing, thing, trick, etc. .. I find that here we have the only "concept-object" of this language. It does not refer to perception. But it is an abstraction that reflects "materiality" or possible perception [...].

*è Soncept **R** expresses "imitation." It is not an object, but an idea of relationship. Depending on the meaning, the cardinality changes, simply because the original is by definition, unique [...].*

*è Soncept **S** expresses "round, circle, turn, cycle, repetition". The idea is not that of the round object, but much more that of the loop, of the closed course with return to the origin. What "tower" or "cycle" or "repetition" means. In this sense, it is a relationship of consecutive, therefore temporal, in addition to the functional expression of a logical path with a return to the initial conditions, possibly repeatable [...].*

*è Soncept **T** expresses "becoming, evolution." It is not an object, but an idea. It also expresses a relationship: that of reality (dimensional or not) to itself, through time [...].*

*è Soncept **U** expresses "addiction." It is clearly a relationship: one cannot envisage dependency without specifying what the "subject" "is dependent on [...].*

*è Soncept **W** expresses "variation, change, event, novelty, information". It is also a relational idea: that of presence in relation to the absence that preceded it, or vice versa. This relationship must indeed be envisaged in addition to the "becoming" because the "becoming" is that of an existing reality. The "nothing" can't "become." On the other hand, a "dimensional reality" can manifest itself "in place" of "nothing", it is the relationship of "appearance" in its consequent dynamics, which makes it the basis of the term "time" [...].*

*è Soncept **Y** expresses "group, together, package, volume." The relationship here is that of "gathering, grouping", collective, global consideration, but without involving links expressed by Mr. To be more precise, if you take a bag and put 3 balls in bulk, you get a set of balls: it is the Y sound and if the balls are different, either in size, color or any other differentiator you want to evoke, you say **YI**. If, on the other hand, you attach these 3 balls by screws or glue, you will also have a set of balls but **OM** [united, or united] and if they are different, according to criteria comparable to those mentioned above, you will say according to your willingness to emphasize the differences or the coupling **YIM or IMO.***

***The doubling of the soncept** (which must be added to this list) expresses "symmetry, equality, balance, continuity, stability". These are relationships that express either a function between two or more objects (equality, balance), or an intrinsic function of non-modification, of constancy (continuity, stability: [...]).*

This leads to the realization that the semantics of this language are built almost exclusively on relational concepts, by definition, independent of any repository. These bricks are the "ideal" constituents of a "functional" thought. Indeed, any function is at least a relationship. Objects or concepts "do not exist" as such: they are described as combinations of relationships. There is no

repository such as a dictionary or a list of "words," since they are composed according to the needs of the ideas to be expressed."

Examples of duplicates:

AA: symmetry, stability, equality

DD: Permanent form or "enslaved response."

EE: Schematic consisting of mental images, pattern, plan, model, concept of "continuity of mental image", codification, engram.

I I: Border, symmetry "on both sides of the border," confinement

MM: in interrelation.

NN: exchanges

OO: Set of components in balance.

UU: mutually dependent.

You can now, at this point, bring the contradiction following "yes, very well, but there is no evidence that it was not an earthly (or) earthly man who invented this language".

Pollion's book is full of arguments, I'm going to extract two.

The **first**:

Earth languages are all agglutinating languages, with more or less bending or insulating dominance.

As far as the Ummite language is concerned, the phoneme is the smallest possible element of expression. There is no accessible lower level to prioritize meaning "modulators" (except by possible accents that have never been mentioned).

Similarly, in the case of a bending language, the words of binding should be expressed by isolated phonemes. However, these are by definition, already bearing a "fundamental" meaning. This possibility would be a contradiction with the relational logic of the contents of signifiers, which requires at least two assembled units. The Ummite language therefore has no bending characteristics.

On the other hand, the significant units being the phonemes, these are invariant. It is a consequence of their definition. Pollion was able to see that the position of the phoneme was of key importance in the meaning of the whole. It is even the only option offered to the speaker to "compose" or "adapt" his speech. At least in the available sample. The Ummite language has all the characteristics of an insulating language. The Ummite language system cannot therefore be linked to agglutinating languages.

The Ummite language is not like any earthly language because of its completely insulating typology.

But Pollion gives us a **second** argument, by the absurd and the statistics this time (snippets P 443 and following):

"The deeply reasoned and largely justified allusion to Russell's work indicates in the authors of the documents a definite interest in problems, not linguistic, but fundamental to the structure of language, semantic.

This work was therefore completely assimilated, most likely in English since no translation was yet available. Their hermetic, difficult, and abstract character did not stand in the way of the conclusion of the "necessary revision" of our formulation systems. At this level of reflection and given the difficulty of Russell's work, I consider the probability of finding, in our populations, the capable man or team, at 1 in 10,000, which on the scale of France, gives a population of potential authors of about 6,000 people.

Concluding is one thing. Deciding to take action, and doing so, is another.

I put here the probability of finding the man of the decision and action at 1 for 10.

Our authors then undertook and completed the construction of a new linguistic system, completely beyond our usual references, to satisfy the "necessary revision of language".

I think I am generous in attributing a probability of 1 in 10,000 to the successful creative capacity of the language. (which represents 6,000 people supposedly capable on a France scale!) In fact, we agree that no one has ever made any known attempt to create this semantic logic. And this one is "successful" the first time! [Let us remember, for the record, that Russell himself with Whitehead, a unique pair, attempted this creation in the theory of types, limiting the object to mathematical language. And that the result has not achieved its ambitions.]

The probability of finding on Earth the man capable of carrying out the Ummites linguistic project can therefore amount to:

- conclusion of revision of semantics 10^{-4}

- decision to take action 10^{-1}

- creation of the original language system 10^{-4}

or an overall probability of 10^{-9} or one in a billion.

Since a language cannot exist as a vehicle of expression without having objects or ideas to describe, the authors have thus found themselves obliged to create Ummite civilization from scratch. So that they could justify the language.

This is where the study becomes exciting. Creating the description of a civilization is probably within the reach of (almost) any science fiction author, as long as this description remains general and does not go into too much detail. We have seen Jules Verne, Aldous Huxley, Asimov, and many others. Let us imagine that in France there are roughly 600 capable French authors, which seems to me to be very largely generous, that is 600 out of 60,000,000, or 1 per 100,000, or 10^{-5}

The description of civilization of the Ummites meets on the whole this criterion, If one does not take into account the "technical" records, which belong to the documents. I remember 4, starting with the design of the universe with the IBOZOO UU. This part, although superficially addressed, is already strong of a solid basis of reflection, with the ambition to present a unitary theory (consistent with the discourse). I'm sorry, I'm sorry. All the explanations about the technology of their daily lives are beautifully and very homogeneous. Our knowledge is re-established there.

Then there is the extraordinary creativity of the description of intragalactic naves, with the technical coherences of the language.

There is still the technical description, very sharp, of the altimeter-accelerometer to mercury thiocyanate.

Finally, there is the description of cameras or recorders of images with gas lenses, which is just as rich in very interesting technical details.

Having had the capacity to develop all this technological creation and to have inserted it into a discourse, whose initial desire is, let us remember, to build a new semantics, I attribute the probability again to 100,000 which is very generous, because it corresponds to 600 people on the scale of France, or still 10^{-5}

By neglecting all other aspects, and in particular metaphysics (!), religion and tetravalent logic with their integration into all Ummite thought, I find an overall probability under civilization of $10^{-5} \times 10^{-5} = 10^{-10}$

By taking all the points examined, I come to the resulting probability, $10^{-9} \times 10^{-10} = \mathbf{10^{-19}}$. That is, the whole represented by:

· *a masterful understanding of the semantic limits of our languages,*

· *The design of a new language built around an original semantics that meet the needs*

· *its actual creation*

· *the correlative creation of the society that justifies this language,*

· *with the multiple technological precisions that are provided, in a magnificent linguistic coherence at the level of intimate details,*

· *and without taking into account the original creations in the field of metaphysics, logic and religion described, has **a one in ten billion chance of** having been realized by one or more men.*

With 6 billion people on our planet, or 6. ^{10}, we see that if a man on Earth could be able to do so, he would have only 10^{-10} chances to carry out his project. That's one in 10 billion. Suffice to say none.

That is why I can say, at the end of this reasoning, that the earthly origin of the whole file is infinitely improbable and at the level of the "impossible statistic".

And again, I did not take into account the length of time the documents were received, close to 30 years.

I also noticed psychological contradictions.

You don't create a language to leave it in a drawer, especially if its new architecture has been designed to deal with deficiencies in our language systems. Otherwise, there is a contradiction from the first level of reasoning, between the objective sought and the means implemented.

So, we're starting to broadcast it.

The realization of this new language and its profound osmosis with the civilization described are the result of an enormous creative and generously fruitful work, including in unitary theory. And this work will be presented, to receive consecration and recognition, to a tiny sample of 34 Spanish people, honestly average level, nothing more, and some of whom seem to be "notorious enlightened". Above all, they will be told that if they communicate these findings to other people, they will be deprived of the rest of the information! As a method of dissemination, it seems to me that there is more suitable! In fact, retention has been very effective overall.

I therefore see this as a first contradiction to the initial hypothesis of human and earthly sources, built on the observation of the "Russell remark."

Assuming the desire to restrict the target population in quantity, in the name of the test, why not propose the use of this language precisely to try it? Why describe it so "hidden" that it will take more than 30 years for a man to understand some of it? This is a very serious contradiction with the necessary initial assumption of a desire to renovate language. It completely discredits it.

If the intention of the documents were to carry out a psychosociological study, why did you get tired of reading Russel and creating from scratch a language that fits perfectly into the civilization presented, but whose characteristics of coherence and novation have completely escaped the target (rather small, for a study!) of the 34 contacted? Any gibberish could have done the trick. Why a real language, ideally responding to Bertrand Russell's objections, in a chimera? What contribution can we expect [...]?. "

To now image everything we have seen below, let's take an "Ummite expression" as decoded by Jean Pollion: "UAMII GOODAA" which refers to "liquid foods".

UAMII: translated as "food," "food"

> **U:** A dependency:
> **A:** truth, action effectivity.
> **==> UA:** Verified dependence.
> **M:** union, coupling, relationship.
> **II:** Border, symmetry "on both sides of the border," confinement.

It is therefore the food, food as a necessity (AU - verified dependence, coercion), attached (M) to isolation (II). The first manifestation of the human body, OEMII, in isolation, is the need for energy materialized by hunger or thirst.

GOODAA: translated as "liquid".
G: "organization," "arrangement."
OO: Set of components in balance.
==> GOO therefore expresses the organization, the structure of dimensional entities, between them, on an ongoing or stable basis, which evokes the type of links that we would say "intermolecular".
D: manifestation, appearance, form.
AA: effectively symmetrical.
==> DAA therefore expresses the form in balance and effective symmetry, as are all liquids that always present horizontally, which is a form of perfect balance. Contrary to our definition, it is not a question of fluidity or flow.

For the Ummite GOODAA means "a stable organization of components (GOO) presenting itself in balance, in symmetry (DAA) ".

Does this example seem too "far-fetched"? Let's take two more:

OEMII is one of the most frequently used words that is translated as "man (in the human sense), associated with the soul and the collective spirit". It includes:

The soncept **O** expresses "Entity, being, dimensional reality".
The soncept **E** expresses "mental image, perception, sensation".
The soncept **M** expresses "union, coupling, relationship".
The soncept **I** express "difference," "otherness" *but doubled it means* "isolation," "confinement".

So: "a creature with mental images related to its (planetary) isolation".

NOA that the Ummites translated us as "pupil".

The soncept **N** expresses "flow, transfer." This is the idea of a relationship since it reflects the "movement" of an origin to a destination.
The soncept **O** expresses "Entity, being, dimensional reality".
The soncept **A** expresses "truth, activity."

The OA torque means weft, substrate, canvas, weaving, foundation. For what makes the "truth" of being is its "canvas" (its plot). For students, (information) flows are "texturing".

We can even now form a new word Ummite (which does not exist in the letters): **OEMIINOA**. **Translation**: "the human being in all its visible and invisible complexity who, receiving teachings, learns the truth of "what he is" and "what is", and is weaving".

We will now have to reread the Ummite letters through the "keys" given to us by J. Pollion and draw the "substantial marrow". The analysis of the writing (written symbols) Ummite becomes probably also possible now. Will we be able to lose some of our pride and become "OEMMIIOA"?

A J H

June 2002

[1] We also imagined symbolic "concepts" is the mathematical language, the language of chemistry, but also what Internet users call "smileys" ... the **series:, -,),** meaning for example: "smile, do not take me seriously, take this sentence in the second degree, etc.", to give the often-unused style of e-mail messages the "way" to hear it, without having to explain it by a long digression ...

www.ummo-sciences.org