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This essay is on Man's limitations as per his perceptions of his reality, given his physiology and given his mind's attributes.

Of course, not many people think or care much about this matter, moving on through their daily chores, doing, serving, and buying their specific necessities for life. That fact does not change the truth that what all human beings experience, feel, endure and remember as their reality is a vastly complex fabrication woven by our minds, ultimately creating, designing a cohering ‘reality’ that makes our ‘reality’ recognizable enough such that, as stated, we can go on ignoring the unreality of our reality and get on with the necessities for our daily sustenance.

Thus, each day, we believe in all that we did, spoke, and in the ways, we acted and interacted with whomsoever we performed and interacted with. We live each day believing, feeling, experiencing ‘our consciousness’ as being real; believing our memories are real; believing in all that we experience, witnessed, and/or participated in specific events. Now the point here is this; rare is the Man who pauses a while, contemplating the truth of all his beliefs, considering the vastness of the falsities of much of these beliefs. And, apart from such a few introspective, the fact of the matter is most human beings live and die believing they have genuinely experienced the entirety of all that they have experienced, considering, in effect, the entire film of their life was ‘real.’

In this essay, I retort that most of what we know of ourselves; most of all that which we experience during our lives; most of what our senses tell us – in other words, most of what we think is ‘our reality’ is nothing but are a minuscule percentage of the overall ‘reality’[[1]](#footnote-1) of what really occurred, experienced or endured.

Now I alluded to the fact only a few pauses to think on this question, and we must ask of the ‘Why?’ Why do most human beings not accept the above-stated proposition? Why? Because were we to appreciate not only the question, not only the answer but more importantly were we to grasp the consequences it could mean we are de facto denigrating and minimizing the essential, fundamental centrality of our sense of the ‘I,’ or of our crucial individuality that we are playing throughout the days of our lives, That can separate our aforementioned sense of identity, disconnecting whoever we are from our previous understanding of our sense of humanity, our Free Will. Furthermore, if we know much of ‘our reality is not reality,’ that can lessen the feeling of our lives' relevance and importance. As stated, the consequences can entirely be denigrating our sense of humanity as some may feel they are not much more than a partial automaton. These are pertinent questions to think about since what this essay does in truth divest much Of man’s qualities, attributes, and independence into a messy, unrecognizable mishmash of the senses and other such-like mental attributes.[[2]](#footnote-2) Naturally, who celebrates when learning on such matters as how minuscule we know of our lives, selves and perhaps most disturbingly, on our cherished sense of our personal, unique identity?[[3]](#footnote-3)

I hear your question, “How else can I, you, or anybody relate, feel, relish, enjoy, remember, experience, and endure our life and all its acts and deeds if everything is not what it ‘really’ is? The answer is disquietingly simple – we experience everything - life – visa the medium of our brain. Meaning we experience our life through our senses - vision/optics, sound/hearing, memory, touch, instincts, impulses, needs, desires, hatreds, aspirations, feelings, emotions.

Let us provide brief examples. Color. You see a red strawberry. You believe strawberries are red and since most humans have the same optical frequency wavelengths, so do most other people see the redness in question. Comfort in numbers and so it is must be true.[[4]](#footnote-4) But any scientist will tell you what we humans see is limited within a limited and narrow. We can only ‘see’ wavelengths about 380 to 750 [nanometres](https://www.wikiwand.com/en/Nanometers), and in terms of frequency, this corresponds to a band in the vicinity of 400–790 [THz](https://www.wikiwand.com/en/Hertz#SI_prefixed_forms_of_hertz). Beyond that range, we are blind. That means other organisms with different optical anatomies may see the strawberry in an entirely different light. Of course, the question is – so what the ‘reality’ of the color of the strawberry? Suddenly you notice there is no such thing as one, united, universal color of a strawberry. Reality depends on the observer in question. This is, of course, a brief introduction on vision, since there are many more studies to discuss here, but for the moment and purposes of this essay, we merely not the relevant fact for our purposes; namely, there is no ‘one’ color for all observing organisms.

But it gets worse. The Observer sees with whatever visual acuity he has. We know human visual acuity is not the best of perceptions. Can the Observer see his surroundings on a microscopic level? No, he cannot. Can he see the atoms and molecules that make up the room? No, he cannot. Can he see any of the sub-atomic particles? No, he cannot. Never mind not knowing or seeing the trillions of microscopic organisms in your room. At some point in time, mathematicians will tell us what percentage we see and/or are aware of in any situation, and no doubt that invigorates this force of this argument. We can never be aware nor recognize most of our surrounding reality.

$$\~$$

Here is a Thought Experiment. Think of yourself sitting in your bedroom. Suppose you do not move your head, nor you’re eyeballs. You just stare at any point in your bedroom. There are no distractions – such as other noises or different feelings, memories, thoughts, et al. entering your mind. How long? Say, five full minutes.

Our essay's question is this: *How much of this specific reality of the room do you see and/or are you aware of?*

I propose that the Observer sees not only a minute fragment of the observed room's reality; ultimately, the truth is he sees nothing that anyone can relate except for himself and only himself.

Next, once I show will show you, as I just stated, that the poor Observer sees nothing, we must then ask, “How does that then define the role of human beings in their daily lives, given what we just noted?”

However, because the brain needs a semblance of Sanity to continue behaving normally, it patches up false [though related] images and creates a ‘reality’ for the Observer. Hence in his mind, he sees the entirety of the reality, the bedroom. But in truth, his ‘reality’ that his brain creates for him is artificial, though it makes him feel his sensations reflect ‘real’ images before him.[[5]](#footnote-5)

Let us now begin in detail this Thought Experiment of this Observer sitting in a stationary manner and looking at his room. Well, how much of his surroundings does he see?

$$\~$$

**Awareness Factor**

As he sits perfectly still in this specific bedroom, his vision depends entirely on what I call the ***‘Awareness Factor.’*** In other words, if one were one hundred percent fully concentrating on his task, then we assume he is not being distracted by anything. However, in time, most human beings become distracted by numberless factors – boredom, inattentiveness, memories, etc. Therefore. I can say the Awareness Factor is hardly going to be 100% for the full-time period of five minutes. Already we note that he cannot constantly look at the room due to his minds’ distractions. In other words, there will inevitably be gaps during the 5-minute timeframe during which he will think of other matters than the physicality of the room. That detracts from the totality of his vision of the room. Thus, it is clear to what extent our cognition of ourselves and our surroundings is complicated due to the constant fluctuations of the Awareness Factor, which increases or decreases how accurately we are conscious of ourselves in any situation.

$$\~$$

**Limitations of Sensory Perceptions**

Let us now look at the realities surrounding our Observer and examine what he can and what he cannot know –

Memory Limitations. The Observer can remember what he saw and recognized as a fraction of his surroundings in ant timeframe. Why? Because of his physiological and anatomical limitations, he would not re-call every object in the room. Nor can he know where they are. If we asked him to leave the bedroom and draw every item therein, would you be surprised to know as to how many objects he omits and how many objects he drew but misplaced entirely? Thus, using his memorized, it is clear, our Observer sees but a fraction of the room in question.

Visual Limitations: We have already discussed this above.

Olfactory Limitations: Can he sense the scents of all that exists in the room? No, he cannot, given the limitations of his senses of scent.

Gustatory Limitations: To what extent can he feel or sense tastes in the room? Not much, given he is a human, unlike other organisms such as dogs and snakes whose gustatory systems maps out an entirely different topographical reality before and surrounding them.

Mechanoreceptor Limitations: Can he feel the changes in physical and movement? No, he cannot because no human can feel these sensations. Can he ‘see’ the field forces surrounding him, such as the electro-magnetic fields and gravitational fields? No, he cannot.

Thermoreceptor Limitations [temperature]: Can he feel the varying and changing temperatures in the room, including within his person? No, he cannot – not, of course, an extreme change occurs. and

Hearing Limitations: Can our Observer hear every sound in the room? No, he cannot, and again that is because of his auditory system's organic limitations.

Somatosensory Systems Limitations: To what extent can our Observer feel all the neuro-chemical, electrical interactions going on inside his body?

That is what I mean in saying that, while our Observer’s visual limitations are entirely ‘natural’ to him, given the limits of his sensory perceptions, however, the truth is that it is precisely because of his clouded perceptions, so it is evident that his knowledge of the fundamental reality is entirely diluted.

This concludes one more example of the limitations of any human, Observer observing his surroundings, thinking he sees a full sense of the reality when, as we have seen, he is sensing a tiny degree of his surroundings.

$$\~$$

**AN ANATOMICAL ODDITY – WE DO NOT SEE OURSELVES**

There is another extraordinarily peculiar fact in our anatomy – given the *location* of our eyeballs, we rarely see ourselves.

Now, is that not an oddity of evolution? At most, we see blurry images of our nose. In contrast, we certainly see fragmented images of parts of our bodies, arms, and legs et al. However, in an excited, agitated, or excited state of mind, we tend to lose those visions precisely because of the surge of adrenalin.

However, for the moment, this paper is far more interested in the odd location of our eyeballs because, as a direct consequence of that anatomical fact, we human beings can never see the totality of our face in motion or a static phase. The consequences of this peculiarity are immense and a grave loss, specifically when we try to conduct ourselves in a decent, civil, and seemly manner, precisely because we are, in effect, de facto, *blinded humans* in our daily lives.

When we interact with people, we simply do not know how we look. Is that not a prodigious defect that wanes our abilities to act and interact? Furthermore, this is explicitly one reason for all sorts of social, conversational, and behavioral problems, thereby stimulating the deepening of misunderstandings – great and small – between ourselves and those with whom we interact. How many times are you genuinely stunned hearing friends, spouses, family members, colleagues, strangers, friends – or whoever – tell you, “You look at me with utter contempt, and for that reason, I cannot accept your behavior?” Or “Your smirking face annoys me, and I am not prepared to continue talking with you when misbehaving in that contemptuous manner?” Again, you may be astonished at those claims – unless, of course, if you directly and intentionally did mean to express spiteful looks. However, in many cases, the speaker or the Observer in question has no idea how his facial appearances say this or that attitude, be they spiteful sarcasm or disgust. That is why he is astonished or surprised at such accusations. Of course, this is all a direct result of the fact we do not see our faces, no matter where we are. Were we able to somehow see ourselves while we interact – in situ, so to speak – we can see a nasty glare in our eyes. We can next immediately modulate our expressions, in this case, by suppressing the harsh glare in question. But, alas, that is for the moment beyond our ability to do so.

I mention this anatomic fact because it is yet another gigantic limitation in our attempts to understand ourselves as we interact with others. Now, who can say that it is not only the physiologically blind who are blind? The fact is we, the so-called ‘seeing people,’ are entirely blind to our face. That diminishes our abilities in making progress while interacting with others. It also dramatically restricts our sense of the reality surrounding us and that which is also part of our body.

$$\~$$

Defining ‘Image’ Concerning Vision – There Is No ‘One’ Vision for Any Perceived Object

Let us now change out Thought Experiment, being more realistic. After all, a human Observer rarely sits in a catatonic state for lengthy periods. Let us now discuss how other natural factors definitively affect any Observer as per his Visual perceptions of any observed entity -

1. Visual perception of any observed entity is dependent on what *Species* the Observer is.
2. Visual perception of any observed entity depends on the differing and changing optical accuracy*/deficiencies* of the Observer’s eyeball’s acuity.
3. Visual perception of any observed entity is dependent on *the age and health* [or lack thereof] of the observing agent.
4. Visual perception of any observed entity is dependent on the *changing and/or unchanging mood* of the observing agent.
5. Visual perception of any observed entity depends on changing awareness, alertness, and the observing agent's concentration.
6. Visual perception of any observed entity is dependent on the *stationary and changing speeds* within which the Observer follows the observed entity.
7. Visual perception of any observed entity is dependent on the *stationary and changing distance/s* between Observer and the monitored entity.
8. Visual perception of any observed entity is dependent on the stable and changing *temperature* that prevails now of perception.
9. Visual perception of any observed entity is dependent on the fixed and changing *angle and height/elevation* from which the Observer observes the observed entity.
10. Visual perception of any observed entity is dependent on the stationary and changing *degree of awareness and unawareness* the observing individual has as he/she follows the observed entity.
11. Visual perception of any observed entity is dependent on the stationary and/or changing *mood/s* of the observing agent.

Therefore, we say ‘image’ because there is no ‘one vision’ of any observed entity since countless visions or images exist for any observed entity.

We see a myriad of what is, in effect, numberless factors affecting the Observer’s vision of any observed entity. That reduces the status of the monitored entity by diluting the visual accuracy of the latter.

Thus, if we allow a bee[[6]](#footnote-6), an eagle[[7]](#footnote-7), a human, and a worm to see our cat, they will each see an immeasurable number of differing Visions, noting that they are all unlike Visions in each instance.

Why?

As stated, each species sees differently; secondly, each Observing agent will always see differing visions given their different anatomies.[[8]](#footnote-8) Plus, add the other factors that we mentioned above – changing distances, speed, and so on - so each image continually changes, contrasting, and conflicting at each observed moment. They are similar in their appearance, depending on the factors mentioned above; therefore, we postulate *there is no unified, united, single Vision* of the observed cat.

That is why I say one can say that an Observer only sees changing *Images*–that is, an infinite number of representations or impressions of an observed entity within a specific timeframe, taking into account the particular state of the attributes of the physiological and mental conditions of the Observer in question. There is no ‘One Reality’ of any perceived object.

But why is it when we see our cat, we tend to see the ‘same appearance’ of the cat? Our awareness factor is not always high, nor is our level of thought particular in picking up the nuances in the differences in the cat's appearance. In other words, it is out of simple biological necessity born out of convenience that our mind and vision ignore the differences, and so the brain ‘creates’ the same appearance. Moreover, this makes sense; otherwise, our mind would get overloaded with too many images, and the human brain cannot suffer so much excitation on anyone's perceived entity.[[9]](#footnote-9) This is a well-known fact that the brain creates and concludes fragmentary images, thereby giving the Observer a comprehensible vision.

$$\~$$

**Viewing A Chair**

Let me offer an example showing why it is impossible to view any object's *totality.* Take a chair and observe it. Let us assume nothing in your mind perturbs you or distracts you. Furthermore, you can successfully concentrate on the object before you, that is, the chair. As said, let us simplify matters by allowing only three factors to affect our Vision of the chair, namely - you can only see the chair from where you are standing, that is, from a specific angle, height, and distance. Now, we start our Thought Experiment. You are sitting at a fixed point at a certain fixed length and height from the chair. What do you see? The chair. However, saying ‘the chair’ is entirely useless, in that it says nothing to us. Why? Because you are, in truth, seeing one tremendously small slice of the chair. Let us label what you see as Vision One [V1]. Now walk to another point from the chair. Again, you are only looking at the chair from a different height, angle, and distance[[10]](#footnote-10). What do you see? You will see a different vision of the chair. Because it looks different, we must call this new Vision of the chair [V2] to differentiate its identity from [V1]. What if you float several feet from the ground and distance, say, some twenty feet from the chair? What will you then see? Again, it will be a different vision. So, we call it [V3].

Now, these acts of viewing an object from different angles, heights, distances, etc. can be continued ad infinitum, precisely because as far as I can tell, there must be an infinite number of different angles, distances, heights, speeds from which your eyes will see the humble chair. Why? Since [V1 ≠ V2 ≠ V3 …] In each instance, what you see will be a different view of the chair; that is why I call these visions ‘Images’ because they are not the final word or say on the ultimate ‘vision of the chair.’[[11]](#footnote-11) There is no singular, last, ultimate picture of any observed object.

Furthermore, apart from employing only three factors in this thought experiment[[12]](#footnote-12), remember that vision also depends on the viewing eyeball's acuity. We see the chair given the strength of the acuity of our eyeballs. But if we imagine that our visual strength gradually strengthens, you will see the chair in the microscopic form. If we keep on with this thought experiment, soon we shall see the chair's atoms. And we know atoms are not the so-called ‘final’ reality of the observed chair. As we go on with our ever-strengthening vision, no doubt, we shall see the electrons, protons, and neutrons. Next, we see the sub-atomic particles. We can stop here since we need not go any further for our purposes after those elements. So now, I ask you the same question, “What do you now see?” Moreover, unsurprisingly, you will describe a realm no one has seen, but one thing is sure – it will look nothing like the chair than when we first began the experiment. Again, the question is, “What is the ‘real’ appearance of the chair?” Answer – none. Why? Because there is an infinite number of visions – which I call images – and therefore, there can be no one coherent vision or appearance of the object.

One can still scrape the bottom of the barrel, suggesting what if we take a photo of the chair from every angle, height, and all the other conditions and every level of optical accuracy? That means there will be as many photos as the number of atoms and sub-atomic particles. It is a physical impossibility for any human to see the presumed ‘totality’ of any object due to our brain and visual systems' mental and physiological limitations.

In sum, given the infinite number of appearances of any object and given what any Observer sees within a specified timeframe, it is not tricky in understanding what we see is the smallest portion of the observed object. In other words, when given the totality of the various appearances of the chair and what we see – we are almost blind as bats.

$$\~$$

Reality is Whatever It Is We See, Feel, Experience

So, what am I getting at? How often have we heard of the so-called ‘binary’ or dualistic world divided neatly between the physical and the metaphysical realms? Chairs, people, cats, trees are ‘physical entities’ while imaginations, memories, thoughts, needs, impulses, dreams, and feelings are defined as ‘metaphysical entities.’

In this essay, I have attempted to illustrate the pointless arguments that supposedly divide the physical from the metaphysical, since the former is no different in its constituents that the latter – while it all depends on the degree with which the Observer in question chooses, consciously or not, to scrutinizes the entities we have thus is far mentioned. In other words, everything, every phenomenon in our world is ultimately metaphysical if we choose to examine the thing-in-itself studiously.

‘Scrutinise’? If we think of that which we observe, no matter if it is a chair in front of [physical] or a thought [metaphysical], we shall discover that both are made of the same materials.

When I see a table in front of me, I can see that:

1. I recognize I see a table.
2. I can approximate the size and the distance of the table from me.
3. I recognize the colors, I can feel the table's textures because I can touch it, I can smell the table if it has a scent, and so on.

These are properties that I call relatable properties between the observer and that which is being observed. The observer can sense the perceived object as per his/her senses and mind. Never mind, the observer only sees an approximation of the table given his eyesight and position. If we ask the observer to stare at specific points on the table and ask him ‘What do you now see?’ that is when the table's abstraction appears, for he will see nothing as per functionality in terms of meaningfulness. As the observer stares at the constituents of the table, he will see nothing. Thus, the abstract nature of the table. You may say that is a dysfunctionality of the human eyeball, and you would be correct in saying that. But that is that not the remit of us humble human beings? Whichever way you see this question, the truth is unalterable. For it is from voids that we ultimately know the totality of a recognizable table. Thus, the paradox for us human beings in that numberless nothingness[[13]](#footnote-13) evolves into a recognizable vision.

Now let us observe a metaphysical phenomenon – say an image in our mind, an orange. Here we find that if we try to ‘see’ the image, we fail. If we try to approximate the size and the distance of the image from myself, we fail. I think you can guess the rest. Hence, we can say the properties of an image in our mind are more ‘abstract’ than an appearance before our eyes. That, then, is the fundamental difference between physical and metaphysical entities – degrees of abstraction.

Why does our body move when we did not order it to move? Who moves our muscles? It is our unconscious. What is this ‘unconscious’? Psychiatrists tell us tediously that the sub-conscious is that which is unknown to the conscious mind. And that seems perfectly obvious. But who/what controls/activates/manages the unconscious? And here we are talking of trillions of acts, not one. Every second, our body moves in a thousand-fold-ways, does it not? Who orders or arranges these movements?

Now, never mind the elusive unconscious mind, what about the supposedly knowable conscious part of our mind? Well, we can similarly ask, *who* consciously orders our bodily functions to do what we want them to do? The answer is our conscious mind. Very well. But what is this ‘conscious mind’? We do not know. That is the stark answer. We like to think we know, but we don't know anything about our mind, exactly as we don't know anything about our physical appearance. Who governs our mind and body? How many times have you and I spoken words we did not ever think of saying? But there they came out. Call them Freudian Slips. That is good linguistic camouflage.

Someone, something produced them, or do we think randomness created them? That, too, is possible, and I judge on neither side. However, the fact remains unknown about who or what is the ‘thing’ or the ‘mental entity’ that directs our mind and body activities. You may say, the ‘I,’ my ‘Self’ orders what I do. Again, that is linguistic camouflage. What is ‘I’? You may answer, “The ‘I’ is me at this moment,” and I retort, “What/who is this ‘you’ at this moment?”

We want to know reality. Isn’t that one essential quest for scientists, philosophers, and artists? To see the totality of existence is impossible because our brains cannot upload that mass of information. Not even any computer has so far described it – though, in theory, reality can be defined. We have to number, qualify and quantify every atom, sub-atomic particle in the universe plus every force, field, entropy, temperature, energy, plasma, and the distances between entities, from the micro-nano scale to the cosmological scales too. We must number every living and non-living entity on earth, such as animals, plants, doors, water, rocks, cars, houses, lamps, books – everything. That would only be a still picture; next, we must describe every movement for every entity that moves from the galaxies down to the sub-atomic particles. So, in theory, one can write an equation describing reality in a specified timeframe. But going back to us humans – we cannot understand reality simply because the truth is unknowable because of its incomprehensible dimensions.

There are other barriers to our understanding of reality. What is red? We do not know. We can never know. Is there free-will? Do concepts such as evil, good, honor exist? Why is time elastic for human beings depending on their circumstance and mood?

Several highly famous scientists believe science can answer every question. I think we know who these people are. Science is the answer. The end. But this hubristic attitude is no different from the assured confidence of murderous religious fanatics. Humans are limited in understanding reality; we are severely limited in understanding or even recognizing our minds and bodies. Ourselves. We know nothing of our minds, brain, and all its metaphysical contents. Psychologists think they ‘know’ truisms, but nothing they say is provable. Today, neuroscientists can only tell us where brain functions occur, what neurochemicals do, act, react – but they do not know how the brain functions. No neuroscientist has any idea as to how neurochemicals do what they do. Why and how does low dopamine create negative mental attributes?[[14]](#footnote-14)

It is time for people, all of us, to realize some matters and/or truths in this cosmos are unknowable. Period. Just as medieval philosophers supposedly argued about how many angels can spin on the tip of a needle, so too, scientists have to cease chasing after that which is unknowable only on account of the limitations of our brain’s cognitive capacities.

More importantly, we human beings must understand the dysfunctionalities of our beingness. We must understand the severe limitations of our intelligence in the way we fashion our lives and how we treat those around us.

We think we are ‘masters of our life,’ but that is far from the case. We are as unknowing actors thrust in a play or a field of sport, wherein we do not know the rules, nor the script we are meant to play and say.

Here, for some, we are brutally ‘thrown’ [in the Heideggerian sense] in a world wherein guidance is void. In either case, it will repeatedly happen during the stretches of time, wherein some strong-willed, extroverted types of people create their ‘reality,’ believing their creations were created our of cold logic entirely, when in fact, they are nothing more than mixtures of their consciousness, their semi-conscious and their unconsciousness. A

Regrettably, there are far too many of such humans who will emotionally enforce their unethical and/or criminal will, their dictums unto others, be they murderous or not.

I am, of course, thinking of spousal abuse in the West, while in the East, dictatorial rulerships are the norm.

$$\~$$

1. Yes, ‘reality’ is deliberately ensconced with inverted commas, and we shall soon discuss this matter. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Of course, it is precisely these mishmash of Man’s mental qualities we shall be discussing in a moment. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. All these matters naturally hurt us because we are, in effect being told, much of what we experience during our lives, are fractionally correct. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. WebMD. ‘What Is Color Blindness?’ There are in fact two types of color blindness; Red-Green Color Blindness, segmented into four color variations, while the other type is called Blue-Yellow Color Blindness, which is segmented into two variations. ‘When the cones have all the various pigments -- called photopigments -- your [eye](https://www.webmd.com/eye-health/ss/slideshow-eye-conditions-overview) sees all possible colors. If there’s a problem with the pigments, you won’t see colors the way you should. This is called color deficiency or color blindness. If just one pigment is missing, you might only have trouble with seeing certain colors.’ [https://www.webmd.com/eye-health/color-blindness#](https://www.webmd.com/eye-health/color-blindness). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. David G. Ritchie. ‘What is Reality?’ The Philosophical Review, May, 1892, Vol. 1, No. 3 (May, 1892), pp. 265-283 Published by: Duke University Press on behalf of Philosophical Review Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2175783>. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Hempel de Ibarra, N et al. “Mechanisms, functions and ecology of colour vision in the honeybee” *Journal of comparative physiology. A, Neuroethology, sensory, neural, and behavioral physiology* vol. 200,6 (2014): 411-33. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Purdue University. "Genome yields insights into golden eagle vision, smell." *ScienceDaily*. ScienceDaily, 24 April 2014. <www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2014/04/140424141015.htm>. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Since Vision itself depends entirely on the aforementioned factors mentioned above. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. More Than the Useful Field: Consider Peripheral Vision in Driving. [Benjamin Wolfe](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0003687017301631?via%3Dihub" \l "!), [Jonathan Dobres](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0003687017301631?via%3Dihub#!), [Ruth Rosenholtz](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0003687017301631?via%3Dihub#!), [Bryan Reimer](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0003687017301631?via%3Dihub#!). *Applied Ergonomics*. Science Direct. [Volume 65](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/00036870/65/supp/C), November 2017, pp. 316-325. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Your height remains the same in this case. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Some materialists no doubt say there must be a finite number of positions, angles, heights, distances a person can see the chair, but for practical purposes ion our daily lives, these beliefs are entirely irrelevant. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. We only used height, distance and angle of Observer to Observed. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. ‘Nothingness’ here needs to be pluralized but there is no plural in the English language for ‘nothingness’. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Bethany Cadman, reviewed by Suzanne Falck, Dopamine deficiency: what you need to know, Medical News Today, 17 January 2018, <https://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/320637.php>. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)