



October 9, 2022

The UMMO Typewritten Texts

On Ummo-ciencias.org, there are scans of 20 original letters from the early period in which you can see the typewritten text, handwritten corrections, and drawings. These letters are D51, D52, D57-1, D57-2, D57-3, D57-4, D57-5, D58-2, D58-3, D58-4, D58-5, D59-1, D59-2, D59-3, D59-4, D59-5, D60, D68-1, D68-2, and D69-3.

All the letters are typewritten, bear the famous UMMO stamp, and contain handwritten corrections.

Generally, there is always a header that indicates, first, the institutional origin of UMMOAELEWEE, the language of the letter (Spanish), and the number of copies sent to other recipients along with their languages. They almost always send only one copy, except for D51, of which they send two copies—one to Enrique Villagrasa and the other to Alfonso Paso Gil; D57-1, of which they make two copies in French and four in Spanish; and D60, which is the major announcement of the San José de Valderas sighting, of which they send three copies in Spanish, four in English, two in French, one in Czech, and one in Italian.

The letters are personalized and address the recipient directly. Only in D51 is there a clear signature and a very important note:

It was dictated to the typist by DA 3, son of EYEA 502, registered in Spain to DEII 98, son of DEII 97, subordinate to YU 1, daughter of AIM 368 in Australia.

DEII 98 is believed to have been the head of the UMMO expedition in Spain, although in principle the coordination of the entire Earth mission was carried out from Australia. What is important is that explicit mention of the typist.

It is interesting to note that the letterhead alternates between the spellings UMMOAELEWE (8 instances) and UMMOAELEWEE (5 instances).

It should also be noted that letters continuing the same topic do not have a header, as if they had been drafted at the same time as the others and the division into several letters were solely due to a desire to spread out the receipt of these documents over time.

The typewriters used (at least two) have the “ñ” key and are Spanish models.

It's not clear to me why the pages are typed on both sides, even though the ink sometimes bleeds through to the other side. I typed thousands of pages before the year 2000—I even took typing lessons when I was a child—and I don't recall anyone ever typing on both sides of a page. The only reason I I can think of is to save on postage, because once a sheet reaches a certain weight, it has to be sent as a package rather than a letter.

Handwritten corrections:

The first thing that catches the eye are the numerous handwritten corrections, which are due not only to the typist's errors but also to the fact that virtually all the documents were written without accents, except for a few minor instances, likely due to an inadvertent mistake.

But what those instances demonstrate is that the typewriters were capable of typing accents—they weren't broken. Why, then, weren't they included, and why do they always appear later in very fine black marker? To me, the most straightforward explanation is that the person who typed the letters was one person, and the person who corrected them with the marker was another.

Obviously, the person in charge of the letters didn't trust the typist's spelling skills and asked them not to include those accents, because the proofreader would add them later. Younger people may not remember that, on those machines, once a key was pressed, the letter was already printed, and correcting a mistake was quite a hassle—you had to use Tipp-Ex sheets, press the same incorrect key again, and then type the correct one, but it never looked quite right.

The same goes for hyphens in words that are cut off at the end of a line; almost all of them are added by hand.

It's true that the typist makes almost no spelling mistakes, except when it comes to punctuation, where there's a certain degree of laxity. Typos are very few and are usually corrected with a black marker as well.

Some mathematical symbols that obviously could not be typed on the machine have also been added by hand.

The two typewriters:

The most important point is the use of several different typewriters. At least two typewriters are used: one with a standard-sized Times New Roman font (Typewriter A) and the other with a small font (Typewriter B).

The machine with the small font is used less frequently; it appears in letters D52, D57-5, D58-2, D58-5, and D59-3. These are not supplementary letters; they are part of the most important series: the D57 series recounts the early days on Earth, the D58 series covers the biogenetic foundations of the Cosmos, and the D59 series deals with the IBOZOO UU. The two typewriters are never alternated on the same page, but they are used in the same letter.

For example, in D52, machine A is used for the first page, and the next three pages are typed on machine B. The section typed on machine B has fewer handwritten corrections, many accents are missing, and a period is placed after the closing question mark. The portion typed on machine A, on the other hand, has more handwritten corrections and almost no errors.

Letter D57-5 is typed entirely on typewriter B, and is also in landscape format (the only letter formatted this way), which indicates that it was a large, professional-grade typewriter, not a home typewriter.

In D58-2, typewriter A is used for the entire letter and typewriter B for the appendix.

In D58-5, four pages were typed on typewriter A and five pages on typewriter B. The pages typed on typewriter A end abruptly, leaving almost an entire page blank, and then typewriter B continues on a new page until the letter is complete.

D59-3 is typed entirely on typewriter B.

All of this already suggests that two different typists were involved, even though the vocabulary used, the syntax, the style, and, of course, the central thread of the explanations are exactly the same.

But there is also a crucial detail in all of this: the fact that Machine B always places a period after the closing question mark, while Machine A never does this, although it adds a space between the question marks and the letters of the sentence—something Machine B never does.

The correct practice is not to place that period after the closing question mark, nor to add any extra spaces, but why does this same pattern repeat on each machine and never on both? Who makes a spelling error while typing on one machine and then stops making it simply because they're typing on the other?

Take, for example, letter D52, in which both machines appear. Machine A transcribes a rhetorical question as follows:

Si una persona es capaz de verse al espejo invertida su derecha e izquierda ¿ Por que no ve invertidos los extremos ABAJO ARRIBA y se contempla en el espejo con los pies en la parte superior ?

But two pages later, Machine B transcribes:

¿Que es la MASA?. ¿Todo corpusculo, todo cuerpo posee MASA INERTE ?. ¿Que naturaleza real tienen esas misteriosas FUERZAS?. Cuando cogemos un objeto sabemos que tiene un volumen y al mismo tiempo "pesa" "posee masa". ¿Es que MASA y VOLUMEN ó ESPACIO son una misma cosa ó al menos están ligados íntimamente ambos conceptos sin que pueda concebirse un objeto voluminosos sin masa y viceversa?.

This pattern continues to repeat in Machine B's subsequent entries. For example, in D58-2, both machines appear again. Machine A writes on the first page:

A menudo algunos hombre de la Tierra nos interrogan sobre los rasgos politicos de nuestra estructura social ¿ Presenta ésta las características de un Estado democrático de derecho ? ¿ Es acaso un Estado Social de Derecho ? ¿ Se trata de una estructura Socialista peculiar ? ¿ Presenta las notas clásicas de una Sociedad liberal o por el contrario su andamiaje rígido recuerda a los totalitarismos de la Alemania de Hitler la Union soviética de Stalin o la España del General Franco o la Republica Dominicana de Trujillo ? ¿ Podría parecerse si no es así al antiguo Estado teocrático del Tíbet o el hecho de ser regido UMMO por cuatro OEMII inducira a pensar que se trata de una forma peculiar de Oligocracia o Policracia ?

But Machine B, a little further on, transcribes:

¿ Como esta programación se traduce en fabricación de proteínas?. El proceso no es del todo ignorado por ustedes. Dos cadenas de (UOUORAA) ácido ribonucleico (DNA). Cuya estructura es parecida al del Desoxirribonucleico aunque menos compleja.

And a little further down:

ta de grandes membranas pa
ia. ¿ Que ha ocurrido?.

The typist at machine B is very clear on this; he thinks you have to put that period after the question mark, while the other knows it shouldn't be there.

Other examples appear in letter D59-3:

¿ En que consiste el fluir del TIEMPO? ¿ Es una ilusión este fluir?.

Cuando medimos en nuestro reloj un intervalo de un microsegundo. ¿ La manzana que tenemos en nuestra mano es idéntica a la que teníamos antes? ¿ Es la misma?. Un químico de TIERRA dirá: En realidad no es la misma, puesto que en su seno, en sus células, el proceso de metabolismo ha modificado sus características.

This last example is interesting because there was a typo on the second line, and the proofreader added the question mark with a black marker, but never added the period, which reinforces the idea that this is a different person.

I can provide more examples where Machine A never makes that mistake, such as letters D59-2 and D59-5:

zaciones van desentrañando paso a paso las bases reales de nuestra vida.
¿ Hasta que punto lo han conseguido ustedes ? ¿ El modelo matemático de Universo presentado por los Físicos de TIERRA con su Teoría Relativista, la Mecánica Cuántica y Mecánica Estadística, es un fiel reflejo de la VERDAD ?

En efecto: ¿ A quien se le ocurriría destrozarse los propios muebles de su dormitorio sabiendo que son instrumentos que le rodean, útiles para su servicio ? El Oemii que aprovecha su inteligencia y su cultura para herir a sus hermanos circundantes, imponerles sus propias ideas por la fuerza o mantenerles en la ignorancia para así poder descollar él sobre los demás egoístamente, colabora incongruentemente a crear a su alrededor un marco social hostil y poco grato que a la larga redundará en contra suya haciéndolo desgraciado ¿ Concebirían por ejemplo que un hombre fuese feliz viviendo muchos años rodeado de niños mongólicos retrasados mentales, con la única satisfacción de sentirse superior a ellos ?

Another detail to note is that Machine A exhibits fluctuations in the ink level of the ink cartridge; for example, in D57-1, the first page prints the letters with a lot of ink, but then the second page shows a fainter print, as if the ink were running out, yet pages 3 through 6 once again have a lot of ink. To me, this may indicate that this machine was used to type many documents besides the UMMO ones—for example, because it belonged to a typist who received many other assignments. An ink cartridge lasted for hundreds of pages.

The margins also vary, even though changing them required adjusting the machine. One example is the D59 series: in the first letter, there is a wide margin; in the second, the margin narrows; in the third, a different machine is used; in the fourth, the wide margin returns; and in the fifth, the margin narrows slightly. So it may not be enough to speak of just two machines—there may have been more.

On the first page of letter D51, there is a very curious situation: the last line is written in a downward slant, until the sheet literally runs out. It's possible that the sheet came loose as the lines were being printed, but I find this strange, because the machines had a guide with two small rollers that always held the sheet in place.

Foreign postmarks:

There is a report by J.J. Benítez that analyzes this aspect. The letters arrived with postmarks from a wide variety of countries, some as exotic as Indonesia; the problem is that those envelopes have not been preserved, or I cannot find them, and J.J.

Benítez only shows much later examples, when counterfeiters were already proliferating. I'd like to see the envelope in which the up until 1969—I don't know if anyone has it.

Be that as it may, the statements by Rafael Farriols, Antonio Ribera, Enrique Villagrasa, and other key recipients always mention postmarks from different countries, and as far as I'm concerned, there's no way they would have colluded to lie. Javier Sierra has recently suggested that Jordán Peña might simply have bought pre-postmarked envelopes at a stamp shop in Madrid and then have dropped the envelopes into the mailboxes of each recipient himself. This is absurd, because Rafael Farriols and Antonio Ribera were in Catalonia and the other recipients were in Madrid, so considering the

Given the weekly volume of letters, Jordán Peña had neither the budget nor the time to go and slip in the little envelope just to play a prank. It's not as if stamp shops actually sell officially postmarked envelopes; sometimes they might apply a fake postmark, but that would have been detected.

Jordán Peña's Authorship:

The part of the letters where Jordán Peña's hand is clearly evident is in the drawings. Jiménez del Oso pointed out from the very beginning that those drawings looked like his own, and he told this to Jordán himself, who was collaborating with him on the shows. Jordán dodged the question.

Those drawings are placed in the spaces left by the typist, and it is clear that some of them do not fit. I think that if the same person who wrote the letters had also drawn them, he or she would have paused while writing to place them carefully and then continued writing. This is not scientific proof, but it is a clue.

We must also take into account that on the back of one of the letters there were some sketches that had nothing to do with the content, as if the sheet had been reused due to a lack of paper:

33 1

Sr D. RAFAEL FARRIOLS CALVO
C 10
a)

MUY CONFIDENCIAL Madrid 16 de abril 1993

Queridos Rafael y Carmela:

Fue tanta la publicidad que les dio al asunto de Ummo que rompieron todo contacto con nosotros. Es el riesgo que corrimos por los informes publicados con tal profusión por Ribera y Aguirre. Ahora es tarde. Se han cortado todas las relaciones con el Grupo.

Es por eso que me decidí a contar MI versión de los hechos. Atosigado por la propaganda contraria. Sobre todo en Francia. Algún día sabremos toda la verdad auténtica del asunto. Por lo pronto debes saber que todos los informes que recibas son falsos con toda certeza.

Especialmente los últimas en el que involucran a Gorbachov y el ex-presidente Reagan con la paz del mundo. Y el que relataban la Guerra en el Golfo. Ten cuidado con las convocatorias apócrifas, pues han falsificado perfectamente el sello. Es de lamentar la falsificación pero es así.

Lo mejor es que creiais el asunto tal como lo contaré en la prensa. Es lo mejor. Olvidaros en lo posible que hubo un asunto llamado Ummo tan perfecto que verán los lectores que todo es falso.

Te ruego que no me preguntes mas, pues es lo que puedo decir. Te ruego que leas este informe confidencial a Barrenechea A Jiménez Marhuenda, a Lu y el padre Pilón.

Un abrazo muy fuerte. Lamento la dificultad de Expresarme con la voz.

JOSE LUIS JORDAN PEÑA



There, one can see Jordán Peña's true syntactic and typing skills. You can see how the syntax of the first sentence is already flawed, and his tendency to use very short phrases interspersed with more rhetorical sentences.

In the second paragraph, he places the predicate complement of the subject from the first sentence in a separate sentence, which is a very clear error. I mean that after "version of the facts," you can't put a period if you're

then go on to say “harassed by opposing propaganda.” I cannot find, in any of the UMMO letters, such a clear syntactic error.

In the first sentence of the third paragraph, it says: “Especially the latest ones involving Gorbachev.” There, he’s already made three errors; I can attribute the first one to a typo, but if you’re going to use a relative clause, the relative pronoun must agree in number with its antecedent—you should write “in which.” I don’t find this in the UMMO letters either.

And in the second sentence of that third paragraph, he persists in his syntactic chaos and says: “And the one that recounted the Gulf War.”

In the fourth paragraph, I can forgive the use of “creíais,” but the sentence “to forget as much as possible that there was such a perfect UMMO affair that readers will see that everything is false” makes no sense; I don’t know what he’s referring to. Besides, he returns to syntactic chaos and ignores the verb form of “olvidarse,” which requires the preposition “de” before the complement.

So, Jordán Peña wouldn’t pass a 9th-grade syntax exam, and he’s supposed to have been the author of the entire UMMO corpus—even though I’ve been unable to detect almost any errors in those letters.

As I’ve said from the beginning, I’m saving the question of authorship for the final article in this series; I’ll stop here for now.

Conclusions:

In my view, following this documentary analysis, four things have been demonstrated clearly, conclusively, and definitively:

1. There are at least two different typists for the UMMO letters.
2. The letters were written either under dictation or by copying from a draft.
3. Neither of the two typists is the author of the letters, because the style is the same in all of them.
4. The letters were sent from different countries and at almost the same time.

Furthermore, I would add two facts with a very high degree of probability:

1. There is a fourth person, who is the proofreader.
2. There is an illustrator—who may or may not be the same person as the proofreader—named Jordán Peña.

12:05 CEST -----

© A. Noguera