

## Can We Ever See A Chair?

### Synopsis

Ayad Gharbawi - writer unifying the laws of the constituents of the mind with the laws of the quantum sub-atomic particles. In this article, I seek to evidence that no observer can ever see the totality of any observed object.



The short answer is - no.

When we say, 'seeing a chair', we imply that can see the totality of the reality of the chair. But that is not possible. We can only see parts or portions of the chair and never the entirety of the chair.

Why?

1. Visual perception of any observed entity is dependent on what *species* the Observer is. If we introduce a bee, an eagle, a human, and a worm seeing the chair, so each

will see differing Visions given their different optical anatomies. Each species has a vision that is unlike what any other species sees. Furthermore, with each species, viewing the chair will also differ since Vision itself depends entirely on factors that are to be listed below.

2. We now focus only on humans. Visual perception of any observed entity is dependent on the fixed and/or the changing *optical accuracies and/or changing deficiencies* of the Observer.
3. Visual perception of any observed entity is dependent on the changing and/or fixed emotion/s, mood/s of the Observing agent.
4. Visual perception of any observed entity is dependent on the changing and/or fixed olfactory system of the observing agent.
5. Visual perception of any observed entity is dependent on *the* changing and/or fixed *age and health* [or lack thereof] of the observing agent.
6. Visual perception of any observed entity is dependent on the stationary and/or the changing *speeds* within which the Observer observes the observed entity. There are two velocities here. First, the velocity of the

body of the observer and second, the velocity or speed of his eye movements.

7. Visual perception of any observed entity is dependent on the stationary and/or the changing state of physical fitness. For example, if one is tired or obese, they are more likely to see distances that may seem further than they are.
8. Visual perception of any observed entity is dependent on the stationary and/or the changing *distance/s* between Observer and the observed entity.
9. Visual perception of any observed entity is dependent on the stationary and the changing *angle and/or height/elevation* from which the Observer observes the observed entity.
10. Visual perception of any observed entity is dependent on the stationary and/or the changing *degree of awareness and unawareness* the observing individual has as he/she observes the observed entity.
11. Visual perception of any observed entity is dependent on the stationary and/or the changing *mood/s* of the observing agent. For example, if one is in a bad mood, a hill may look steeper than if a person were in a happy mood.

12. Visual perception of any observed entity is dependent on the stationary and/or the changing temperature in the observing agent and in his surroundings.
13. Visual perception of any observed entity is dependent on the stationary and/or the changing degree of hunger of the observing agent.
14. There is also the physical fact that no human can see any object in its entirety since the Observer, stationary or moving, can only see one image or only one angle at any given moment in time of the observed object and never the totality of the observed object. We can only see an observed object in one image and from one specific angle at a time.
15. Finally, we said we see an object depending on our visual acuity. Suppose science allows us someday to have stronger eyes. So, we will then see the observed object down to its atomic level. But then that image will be entirely different from the image seen when we had our 'normal' eyesight. And if we go deeper into this subject matter, suppose our eyes can now see sub-atomic particles. We are now, of course, in the realm of quantum physics and with it comes all of the uncertainties of the

precise definition of the sub-atomic particle, as per its momentum, position, nature [wave or particle or both] and so on. This adds even more to the question of seeing the reality of what an observed object is.

Let us simplify matters.

The Observer is looking at a chair. Suppose he is five feet away from the chair and is standing left of the chair in the room, in question. He now sees one image of the chair that is specifically a vision represented by being five feet away and to the left of the chair, relative to the room.

The same Observer is now ten feet away from the chair and is standing to the right of the chair. He now sees a different image of the same chair. And, of course, these changing circumstances are endless and that is why it is impossible for any Observer to see the 'totality' of the chair.

We can only see multiplicities of the intricately interwoven and changing variables for the sight of any one object in any timeframe which thereby renders the latter vision unable to have a definitive one state of vision that can be beholden. That is not to say one cannot have a definitive and everlasting one image of a vision - not at all.

Indeed, everyone has lasting images in their mind and memories of specific incidents enduring throughout their lifetime and that, more importantly, they do not change. Usually, such cases are in dramatic, traumatic, or vivid situations and experiences. *But the majority of what we see is not fixed in our minds, precisely because they are unimportant.* But these are little more than visual biases in our minds. We may choose to believe they are real or not; either way, they have nothing to do with the totality of the image of the chair.

But seeking to perceive the totality of any image becomes even more difficult given the following points.

Neuroscientists generally classify Volitional Movements as part of our conscious minds, meaning we will them. But that is not always accurate because -

1. Any conscious act can be uniquely conscious, that is it is an act that is entirely chosen and willed by the person in question.
2. On the other hand, such acts can also be influenced by innumerable other known and unknown mental and external factors that can affect the way the individual acts and responds.

Our vision does not see 'everything' because that would create an overload. The brain picks and chooses what it thinks is necessary for our daily survival - a consequence of evolution favoring our safety over reality. The saccades thus only catch glimpses the brain believes are necessary and then unify the disparate visions into a recognisable whole for the individual in question. But, of course, that is not the 'reality' that faces the individual, it is rather, a creation of the optical faculty in our brain and so not only do we see a synthesised vision, but our vision science or our visual perception is also *not* always accurate, just as is the case with our other senses.

Furthermore, our visual cortex only sees the outside world hundreds of milliseconds ago. But then, you may ask, how do we catch a fastball that is being pitched to us if we see images hundreds of milliseconds before? Again, our brain creates a 'reality' that seeks to help us see where and how fast the ball is approaching us. In other words, it is a *construction, and not the reality of the real ball.*

These inaccuracies further undermine the accuracy we see and thus lessen the quality of the notion of us seeing any 'reality' before us.

Therefore, it is understandable how difficult it is for any human to observe the entirety of any

observed object precisely because of the given variables that are so changeable.

Therefore, each individual image is itself continually changing, contrasting, and conflicting at each observed moment and at other times, they are similar in their appearance, depending on the factors mentioned above.

Hence, we can say *there is no one unified, united, single Vision* of our observed chair.

One can say that an Observer only sees Images - that is, stationary and/or changing representations or impressions of the observed entity within a specific timeframe, given the physiological and mental conditions of the Observer in question.

Therefore, one can say there can be *no unity* in the observed Vision by any Observer of any observed entity in question.