

THE MYSTERIOUS "UMMO" AFFAIR—PART 4

Antonio Ribera

Translation from the Spanish by Gordon Creighton

THIS part contains a further selection of the remarkable UMMO documents which were sent to selected recipients in various parts of the world by beings, allegedly extraterrestrial, who said they had journeyed from the planet UMMO to Earth, where they landed in France, at La Javie, in the Department of the Basses Alpes in 1950.

[*New readers of FSR are strongly recommended to obtain and read the first three parts of this article — in FSR Vol.20, Nos. 4 and 5, and Vol.21, No.1 — as without them they will be unable to pick up the thread of these strange events and communications—*EDITOR].

Our EAAIODI GOO (Ontological Bases)

"Since you, Senor Ribera Jorda, are not a specialist in EARTH philosophy, we shall try to use a more familiar and more comprehensible terminology, with a vocabulary having affinity with this discipline.

"The problem of 'BEING', such as it has been regarded by the thinkers of EARTH, received a radically different formulation on UMMO. Our forebears did not doubt for one moment as to reality external to one's own conscience. "Things" existed for them "outside of me," but their real essence was masked for us by the codification of our sensorial channels. This principle remained a constant, until such time as new forms of dialectic enriched the original schematology.

"A synthesis of our present-day EAYODI GOO (Ontology) could be formulated as follows:

"It is not possible to define the concept of BEING in a primary state. 'FOR-ME', who am pure consciousness of my IGIO UALEEXII (I) and of the 'things' which AIOOYA (exist dimensionally) around me, I am sure submerged in a WAAM (Universe) which transcends towards me.

" 'Things,' the objects of my mental *processus*, no doubt "are not" as I perceive them, as I process them by means of a very complex rationalizing mechanism. Casual relationships are 'IN-ME' relationships processed according to an order drawn up by such mechanisms. A vegetable is apprehended by 'me' with certain characteristics which symbolize its 'real' attributes. 'My' sensorial impression conformable to the field of consciousness is doubtless an illusion based on certain external constants. Thus, colour will be the psychological impression of a stimulus of electro-magnetic nature, and the concept of mass impressed upon my consciousness is very far indeed from being identical with the real physical attribute that has given rise to it. Thus far, Senor Ribera, such ideas agree with the thinking of EARTH philosophers.

"But although the 'BEINGS' assume masks when

they draw near to our 'I,' and although it would be impossible for us to know how they really ARE, is their EXTERIOR-TO-'ME' constant? I can be ignorant of how a molecule of camphor (which stimulates my olfactory sense-organ and causes the sensation of which I am conscious) really 'IS'. But, every time that I perceive such an aroma, can I be sure that it is an attribute solely of camphor, or indeed not an illusion or a hallucination?

"Expressed in another fashion: Although I cannot know how 'the WAAM really is,' is the WAAM 'THERE,' dynamic or static, changing or rigid, generating ideas which are reflected in my consciousness without my 'I' being capable of changing its essence, its true 'BEING'?

"Our answer is NO.

"*The OEMMII with a definite neurological and mental structure (i.e. you EARTH men, we UMMO men, and all the similar beings in the WAAM) can never arrive at the truth, at the essence of the WAAM, not because the WAAM "does not exist", and not because there is a barrier preventing us from arriving at the truth, but because WHEN WE THINK OF BEING, WE MODIFY ITS ESSENCE.* A homely simile will illustrate this proposition: for example, when a physicist on your Planet wants to observe a micrometallographic specimen in order to test its optical properties, he brings about an alteration in the process by using light in his observation. This is his obstacle that he cannot overcome since the very act of observing itself changes the true nature of what is observed. Now, something like this occurs with BEING or EXISTENCE:

IT 'IS LIKE THIS' SO LONG AS IT IS NOT THOUGHT ABOUT AND THE IDEA OF IT DOES NOT EXIST IN MY CONSCIOUSNESS.

"As regards the fashion in which we THINKING BEINGS direct our influences to bear upon EXISTENCE, the latter already neither IS nor IS-NOT. (Here your logic offers us no informative formula for development of this concept.)

"We OEMMII thus 'create' the WAAM when we think of it, the Cosmos presents itself to us with a configuration of IBOZOO-UU (model of elemental physical entity). (See below on the physical concept of the WAAM.)

"We have then here a sort of "SYMBIOSIS" between *External Reality and ourselves*. The External Reality is bent in conformity with our mental process, is modified so soon as we focus our consciousness upon it. In this manner we fashion a binary model of the WAAM, consisting of certain IBOZOO-UU, physical factors, and which is our "CREATION," and in its turn this Reality forms, creates, generates our own I. Arriving at this point

you may think that our system is a sort of Pantheism which excludes the idea of a 'NECESSARY BEING' or WOA (GOD) TRANSCENDANT-TO-THE-COSMOS. Such is not the case, as you will be able to verify further on.

"Let us imagine other 'thinking' beings distinct from ourselves (EESEEOEMI). (We are not referring to other beings with a different physiological structure, but to other 'I's' whose mental concepts are configurated differently.) Undoubtedly 'they' will try to THINK-OF-THE-COSMOS (the process of 'THINKING' naturally must not be interpreted anthropomorphically) but, in 'doing so,' they will change its BEING. So that THEIR WAAM WILL NOT BE OUR WAAM. (N.B: THIS IS IMPORTANT: that we are not saying the WAAM will not be OBSERVED, or FELT, or PERCEIVED, or SCHEMATIZED in a different manner — that is obvious, Clearly the image of the Cosmos will be a different one, just as, for you, the optical image captured by the eye of a dipterous insect is different from the image perceived by the human retina.)

"No, it is not merely that the *image of the WAAM* is different when mental processes having a different configuration from our own processes are involved. It is that BEING itself, EXISTENCE itself, the very ESSENCE OF THE WAAM, will thereby be modified. This relativity of BEING, this polyvalence of BEING, is reflected in our UMMO logic, which we term AAIODI AYUU (gamut or network of forms of BEING).

"Let us suppose we set out symbolically all the ontological possibilities regarding 'SOMETHING' transcendental to my "I" (for this purpose you should abstain from the Aristotelian principle of excluding the middle term):—

(IS A BEING)₁ (IS NOT A BEING)₂
 (☺ IS A BEING)₃ (☹ IS A BEING)₄
 (☹ IS A BEING)_n

"This is an aggregate or series of non-tautological possibilities which we may formulate still more concisely thus:

S₁; S₂; S₃; S₄; S₅ S_n.

"We arrive thus at the meaning of AIOOYA, the rendering of which into a terrestrial language is impossible. AIOODI is 'that' which is susceptible of adopting infinite possibilities of "existence". (S₁, S₂, S₃.....S_n.) Thus for example an IBOAYA OU (energy quantum, photon, can S₁ (BE) or S₂ (NOT BE; in the case of its transformation into mass) but both possibilities are deformations of and AIOOYA which have been brought about by my 'I' (thinking being.)

"We OEMMII thus can see the WAAM and its constituent factors under the possibilities S₁; S₁; S₂;.....S_k. You men of EARTH accept for the time being only possibilities S₁ and S₂.

"Still other hypothetical thinking-beings will apprehend the AIOODI under other possibilities again different from ours, such as S_{k+1}; S_{k+2}.....S_m.

"The drama of the OEMMII and of other EESEEOEMI has its basis in their search for truth. Their search for the AIOODI will be fruitless, since it will always present itself to them under the characteristics of S₁, S₂, S₃,S_n.

"My judgements, my actions, which are regulated by the objectives attainable and by the means to be utilized, constitute moreover, "ON THEIR OWN ACCOUNT," a further series of S₁, S₂, S_k deformed by one's own thinking process."

The Concept of WOA

"You have a beautiful myth: about Tantalus, the King of Lydia, who was condemned never to have his appetite satisfied despite the presence of the food within his reach. Likewise any EESEOEMI IGIO (THINKING BEING) also has to suffer the consequences of his own essence. The WAAM is inaccessible. The WAAM that he sees, that he touches, that he feels thermically, that, in sum, he thinks, is itself transformed by him in this very process of thinking.

"But the AAIODI with its multiple forms of 'BEING': IS-HERE-IN-MY-WAAM. Can anything or anyone approach it, or 'think of it' without changing its form? Can anyone or anything penetrate the AAIIOYA without its permuting into S₁, S₂, S₃,..... S_n? YES! *This something or somebody is WOA, or THE GENERATOR, and is what you folk on EARTH would call GOD, if the 'GOD' of your theological schools were less anthropomorphic than our concept of 'NECESSARY BEING.'*

"WOA, say we, generates the WAAMWAMM (MULTIPLE COSMOS.) We use the word 'generates' arbitrarily, not as a strict synonym for the verb 'CREATE', but as a transcription of our phoneme IWOAE. I have said to you that WOA is the sole 'thinking entity' that does not distort or alter the AIIODI. Employing EARTH terms and still running the risk of anthropomorphizing the concept which we are endeavouring to explain to you, we will say that WOA co-exists with AIIODI, that AIIODI does not transcend WOA. AIIODI is the 'ACT' of WOA, it is generated without WOA's having potentized it beforehand. Thus 'WOA's THOUGHT' has no connexion with our thinking processes as dimensional beings.

"So we declare that BEING is not IMMANENT, that it is not a term of our subjective consciousness, despite the fact that it is this consciousness that shapes it by distorting a reality (AIIODI) which is hidden behind our distorting intellectual vision of BEING. Thus WOA generates all the possible forms of S₁, S₂, S₃..... S_n, and its sub-groups constitute so many other WAAMS. Or, to put it in another way, WOA generates infinite numbers of cosmoses by generating infinite types of thinking beings, but the proposition 'THERE ARE INFINITE WAAMS' is valid only for us, EESEOEMII (thinking beings), inasmuch as, when we distort the AIIOYAA as many times as there are categories of us 'THINKING 'I'S,' we are creating the illusion of a vastly rich gamut of ontological possibilities.

(continued on page 27)

AN INFORMED SPECULATION

John M. Lade

VISITING us is an old friend who, one fine morning in May, 1973, was with her daughter in a car being driven by her son-in-law from Inverness towards Drumnadrochit. She was observing a fishing boat moving in the same direction out in the middle of Loch Ness, leaving a long wake, when she noticed another wake between the boat and their car, apparently caused by two dark humps in tandem, going the same way. They stopped to watch and saw the humps suberge, but the wake continued; then, the humps reappeared, dark and glistening like two rocks on the move. Finally, the humps submerged and the wake disappeared.

I have holidayed in Drumnadrochit and spoken with Mr. Menzies, of the local garage and the Temple Pier where the Caledonian steamships used to call several times a day. His brother, with a bus-load of people, once stopped to watch "Nessie" for a quarter of an hour. There is thought to be a whole colony of the monsters (who have never harmed anyone) in the loch and residents have seen what are believed to be young ones. A sonar picture obtained underwater last year and analysed in Sweden, the U.S. and England, shows the outline of a four-limbed creature with five digits and a neck nine feet long; our Natural History Museum consider it resembles a plesiosaurus.

What, you may ask, has this to do with flying saucers? The reply is: Nothing at all! Why, then, do some people see association between them; also, other lake monsters and strange creatures of land and air, fairies and little people? All are phenomena on the fringe of human awareness and consciousness.

I did not want to write again about flying saucers until I could contribute substantially to a solution of the problem of what they are; but, it is time to call a halt to attempts at linking the phenomenon to other as yet unsolved mysteries. Knowledge is discovery and it is absence of knowledge which leads to scientific theories described by Dr. Grattan-Guinness (FSR Vol.19 No.5) as explaining the known in terms of the unknown. Frustration in the search for knowledge leads to explaining the unknown in terms of the unknown, adding mystery to mystery, and this is occultism. In the early years after Kenneth Arnold's 1947 sighting it was thought that flying saucers, if they existed, were space-craft from other worlds. Soon, people were claiming contacts and messages; mediums began to receive communications from commanders of spacefleets. Much of this concerned the future of humanity and the dangers of atomic explosions. One felt that kindly beings were on hand to help us, if we would only listen. But in this respect frustration set in, too. Now we have healings and miraculous performances more or less associated with the saucers. This is the road to sorcery and witchcraft.

It was in 1952 that I read one of Keyhoe's books and saw no reason to doubt his sincerity; moreover, I remembered the flying lights during the war, which were also reported in the press in 1943, called *foofighters* by the Americans: after the war it was discovered that they were not partially developed enemy missiles and that they had puzzled both sides on several fronts, including the Far East. Why should not extraterrestrial beings visit us at this time, when we on earth plan to emerge, first to the moon? I felt sure this was so and wanted to help publicize flying saucers and what they could mean to all the world. I joined the Company founded by writers and journalists to publish *Flying Saucer Review* and I corresponded with George Adamski, eventually arranging his lecture tour in Britain. He was not after money or personal fame, but it did seem strange that he showed so little interest in practical details of his experiences with the Brothers; it seemed that he was primarily concerned to propound a philosophy, in which there was nothing necessarily extraterrestrial. I decided to remain with *Flying Saucer Review*, which I knew to have no philosophy to put across and no axe to grind other than the hope of publishing a profitable magazine.

Even before it became evident that Adamski was wrong about the moon, there was one statement (in *Inside the Space Ships*): that every solar system has twelve planets, which repelled me as being contrary to the infinite variety of nature. There were likewise flaws in the verisimilitude of a number of reported sightings, such as repetition at regular intervals, after a day or a week or a month (eg. the Brush Creek incident); appearance at convenient moments (audiences at George Hunt Williamson's lectures filed out to see saucers cavorting aloft); haunting a neighbourhood for a period (eg. Rio Vista, Solano County, Cal. 1965 and many other instances) and a pattern of contactees being told that they would be visited again (so far as we know, they never were). Even from the beginning of the subject, from Kenneth Arnold's attempt to investigate the Maury Island affair, there were supernatural aspects and these multiplied as time went on, so that eventually nothing comes as a surprise any more.

Yet, there is a hard core of genuine experience. I know a farm labourer who saw a pencil-like object drift across the face of an October full moon twenty years ago and I verified his story with the farm manager who was talking to him. I have seen, shortly after noon one Saturday, from the A 232 near Sutton; a large aluminium-coloured disc apparently hanging just above the house on my right as I drove westwards. I have been interested in our subject for several years, but I said only "That's not a flying saucer, anyway." My wife, beside me, said she could see another one, but we were late for some event at our daughter's school and I did not turn