

# On Electromagnetic Rays and Visual Perception

A. Halliday

ON ELECTROMAGNETIC RAYS AND VISUAL PERCPETION. All rights reserved. The reader may not reproduce, or by any means copy, electronically or mechanically, this text. Neither may it be transmitted, in any form, either in part or in its entirety, without the written permission of the author.

Copyright — A. Halliday July 2024

**Abstract:** This paper reflects my thinking on the electromagnetic wave—what is usually thought of as light. I have already attempted to argue against the existence of light, however, after one thought, experience shows that it is often followed by one or more other related concepts. In the case against light, a series of realisations arrived over a period of several months.

General thinking on visual perception highlights the role played by electromagnetic rays; those EM rays emitted and absorbed by objects. Although the Sun is thought of as a natural source of 'light', all objects emit EM-rays. There is no such entity as 'light' that fills the sky, and that sensory creatures process to perceive real world 'objects'. Instead, EM-rays enter the eye and these, at the culmination of much processing, result in visual perception. 'Light', is the common word that refers to particular, visual appearances. Light is not a physical entity and it cannot be otherwise. If EM rays only, then the ramifications are multiple. It reveals that appearances, images of the perceived 'world'—the content field—are in the head of the perceiver. Although that is now more fully understood, further explanation is necessary to fill-out the concept of EM-rays, so that their role in visual perception is more clearly understood.

Therefore, while in a room looking out through a window, across a landscape, the viewer sees fields, trees, hills and a river. The standard argument is that the perceiver looks outward, through the broad pane of glass to the landscape beyond. But, if EM-rays, are emitted from all objects—including grass and water—then it follows that they travel to the eye of the perceiver. EM-rays pass through the glass into the room, and then into the eye. If it is not possible for perceivers to look outward, then EM-rays must travel to the perceiver, fulfilling a double role: they carry a potential that initiates perception, and make perceivers visible to other perceivers. Glass is not transparent to the eye. Further, it is logically sound that the argument applied to glass also applies to all so-called 'transparent' objects. Although the popular understanding is that the perceiver looks through water to the riverbed below, the natural direction of EM-rays demands that they carry the properties of the 'riverbed' to the eye. The argument, then, is that the direction of EM-rays determines that all visual perceivers, irrespective of species, look 'out' at phenomena.

More interesting, if EM-rays bring the physical world to all who turn to look toward it, then that potential is always 'here'. It can be argued that on looking toward the Moon, that the speed of its emitted EM-rays travel so fast that they close that distance almost instantly. On looking toward it, it is perceived almost immediately. But, if EM-rays are continually emitted by objects, then they do so whether a perceiver is looking toward it or not. Therefore, on turning to look at external, real objects, their emitted EM-rays are here already. EM rays fill the ambient space that surrounds the perceiver. That argument can be applied to all emitting objects—even remote suns and galaxies? EM-rays have reached the perceiver prior to looking.

Finally, if EM-rays travel vast distances through space at 'light' speed, then the leading point of each EM-ray becomes increasingly remote from its emitting object. (The standard argument is that no physical object can travel at, or faster than, the speed of light.) It should follow that objects have no subsequent effect on previously-emitted EM-rays. If those leading points are remote from its object, then any change in the characteristics of leading points happens naturally, and is not caused by its object. If so, then change in the colour of an EM-ray, such as under the Doppler Effect, happens naturally. Therefore, can a change in the colour of an EM-ray indicate that its emitting object, such as a remote galaxy, is approaching or receding? My argument suggests no.

All arguments and concepts are open to change and revision. If the direction of travel of EM rays is one-way, then the visually perceived is determined prior to looking toward the physical world. The general concept of the environment in which perceivers exist, that of an ambient space, cannot be ignored. Although it cannot determine what appears in the content field, colour is the result of cognitive processing, it determines what is looked toward. The carriers of sight, smell and hearing, EM rays and air, arrive prior to perceiving. Over time, nature becomes simpler—not complex.