

## Table of Contents

<b>Reality in the Mirror of Preception – Observer, Time, and the Construct of Objectivity.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>I. Objectivity as Collective Subjectivity .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I.a – Where does the boundary between individual subject and collective agreement run? .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I.b – Do objects exist that no subject can perceive – and yet exist?.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I.c – Is a scale of objectivity conceivable? (subjective – consensual – collective).....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>II. The Neuronal Limits of Perception and the Experienced World.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>II.a – Do we ever see the "reality itself"? Or only models of it? .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>II.b – Is our worldview only a resonance pattern of our frequency? .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>II.c – Space and time as products of perception.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>II.d – Space and time as ordering algorithms of the observer .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>II.e – Time and space as cognitive tools of causal order .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>III. The Observer as a Creative Principle.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>III.a – The Observer as Generator of Subjective Reality .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>III.b – Reality as Echo: Meaning, Frequency, and Projection.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>III.c – Reality as Fractal Feedback .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>III.d – Fate and Free Will as Interference Pattern .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>IV. The Birth of Meaning – Attention, Feeling, and Form .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>V. The Fields of Reality – Frequency, Tuning, and Resonance .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>VI. The Art of Tuning – Relationships, Attraction, and Dissonance .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>VI.a – Resonance or Illusion? The Dynamics of Connection .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>VII. Full Tuning – The Own Path, the Universal Spiral, and the Great Music .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>VII.a – The Moment of Accord .....</b>	<b>8</b>

# **Reality in the Mirror of Preception – Observer, Time, and the Construct of Objectivity**

*Aureon M. Scientia*

2025.06.10.

## **I. Objectivity as Collective Subjectivity**

Objectivity is often described as an independent, neutral state – something that exists "out there" independently of observers. But if we look closer, this objectivity may only arise through the consensus of many subjects. What we call "objective" might simply be what many "subjectives" agree on. The color red, for example: it is not an objective quality, but a commonly accepted symbol for a certain neural response to light waves. Objectivity thus becomes the sum of all concordant subjectivities – a social, not absolute construct.

### **I.a – Where does the boundary between individual subject and collective agreement run?**

The boundary between an individual subject and a collective consensus is not sharp, but rather diffuse – comparable to a fog or a cloud. Each person perceives the world with slightly shifted sensory frequencies – what is "red" for one might be a nuance off for another. These shifts do not form fixed dividing lines, but rather a fan of perceptual states – one could also speak of phase spaces. A consensus emerges when many of these individual phase spaces overlap – in a zone of common resonance. Objectivity would then not be a point, but an area in phase space where many subjectives converge. A nebulous field with contours that are fuzzy but not arbitrary.

### **I.b – Do objects exist that no subject can perceive – and yet exist?**

Yes – and many. The history of science shows that there are countless objects that existed for a long time before we had concepts or measuring instruments to grasp them. Quarks, electrons, dark matter – they were there, but not in our consciousness. Only when a concept emerges, when a thinker names it and outlines it with language, does the object emerge for us. It is a transition: from possibility to reality through linguistic-mental boundary-drawing. Until then, it was "there" – but not "there for us".

### **I.c – Is a scale of objectivity conceivable? (subjective – consensual – collective)**

Yes – but only if we think of the concept of objectivity not as absolute, but as probability-based. Imagine: concepts like "green" encompass a whole spectrum of meanings with diffuse boundaries. Everyone has a different green in their head – but there is a zone that most mean when they say "green". This zone can be defined as a probability maximum – a semantic center surrounded by a diffuse field of meaning. Objectivity is then not described as truth, but as a consensus wavelength – a zone of high collective agreement. But that means: we do not measure objectivity, but agreement. Objectivity is then a kind of ideal concept, a guiding star like the carrot in front of the donkey – necessary, motivating, but unreachable. Reality always withdraws, it unfolds further. Just like in physics: what was once clear (Newton) became relative (Einstein), then probabilistic (quantum mechanics). And still, it remains open.

## **II. The Neuronal Limits of Perception and the Experienced World**

Our entire reality – as we experience it – is filtered through our senses and their neural processing capacity. Our brain perceives visual information at around 25 Hz, which means we experience a world that appears like a fluid film, even though it is actually composed of discrete moments. This "reality" is thus a constructive achievement of our brain – a stabilized pattern generated by temporally limited perceptual systems. Compared to the speed of quantum processes or cosmic events, our senses are incredibly slow. This raises an interesting question: Is what we experience as the "solid world" only a stabilization product, a kind of perceptual filter that creates an ordering illusion from a chaotic stream? If our senses only process excerpts – do we ever see the "reality itself"? Or only an interpretation of it? Is our worldview only a resonance product within our sensory frequency?

### **II.a – Do we ever see the "reality itself"? Or only models of it?**

No – we do not see reality itself. We see models that we generate in our consciousness. These models arise through language, through mental representations. When we look at the world, we "see" sentences. Even if this happens unconsciously – the glance at a tree almost immediately triggers the word "tree". This means: We do not see the thing itself, but what we can name. Language structures our world – without words, no object, without model, no meaning. And since these models are based on interpretation, it means: The world is as we interpret it. If we want to see it well – it will be good. If we interpret it as bad, it will be bad. So simple – and so powerful.

### **II.b – Is our worldview only a resonance pattern of our frequency?**

Yes – our entire world is a resonance field. We see in it what we ourselves emit. The frequency we carry within us shapes the mirror we call "world". The world does not respond to our thoughts – but to our frequency. The image we perceive is nothing but a vibrational map of our inner self. Each person lives in their own universe, built from meaning, mood, and frequency.

### **II.c – Space and time as products of perception**

Space and time appear to us as natural, objective dimensions. Yet they could be secondary constructions – mental coordinate systems that arise from perception and order. Time, for example: Our brain cannot process absolute presence – it reconstructs sequences by measuring changes. Time is therefore a ratio between states. Without change – no time. Space is also not a given field – but a structuring of experience. What is near or far depends not only on meters but also on meaning. A picture on the phone can feel "closer" than a person next to you. Space and time are not containers – they are resonance structures.

## **II.d – Space and time as ordering algorithms of the observer**

Is time only the measure of change? Not only that – time is the unit of sequence. It is the algorithmic framework with which our mind orders events. Without causality, everything would be chaotic. Our perception would collapse if everything arrived simultaneously. The mind needs causality – regardless of whether it really exists or not. It is a necessary cognitive order without which the world would be meaningless. Interestingly, our perception speed seems to be adapted to lie in the middle of the scales – between quantum time ( $\sim 10^{-34}$  seconds) and cosmic time. Perhaps humans are precisely centered in the frequency space. Is space a system of meanings? Yes – space is a meaning relationship in time. Distances also arise from time delays (e.g., light travel times). Everything is relative to perception. Space is not static – but a relationship field constructed by the observer. Distance = meaning \* delay. Who creates these structures? Only the observer. Without an observer, there is no need for time or space. They are cognitive tools we use to structure experiences. Time is the algorithm, space is the derivation from it – a lived distance. What happens if we rewrite them? We could rewrite them – but with risks. Time travel is theoretically possible, but it destroys the causal structure. This is like a software bug in the mental operating system. This order is not random – it is good; one must use it, not overwrite it.

## **II.e – Time and space as cognitive tools of causal order**

Time is not just change – it is the unit of sequence. It is necessary because the mind needs causality to recognize meaning. Without causality, there would be no order, no distinction, no recognition – only a simultaneously exploding chaos. Causality is not a physical must – it is a mental must. Perhaps the mind generates it itself – but it cannot work without it. Our perception is tied to a certain speed. And fascinatingly, this speed seems to lie in the middle of the cosmic scale – between the smallest quantum leap ( $\sim 10^{-34}$  s)

## **III. The Observer as a Creative Principle**

The observer is not passive. He is an active principle that co-shapes reality. Not just by interpreting – but by granting meaning. Observing means: selecting, focusing, naming. And every naming is a creative act. For what I name becomes real – in my inner space. The observer is not a window to the world. He is a projector. The world we see is not "out there" – it is a resonance between inside and outside, between frequency and attention. What is not observed collapses into possibilities. Only through the gaze does form emerge.

### **III.a – The Observer as Generator of Subjective Reality**

Is everything subjective then? Yes – everything is subjective. But this subjective is not isolated. There are countless subjective perspectives: humans, animals, plants, perhaps even atoms – all perceive, all interact. And this multitude of perceptions shapes a collective reality.

Objectivity is the product of overlapping subjectivities. Even atoms "react" – they sense, collide, bounce off, connect. These are not "observations" in the human sense, but interactions – and every interaction is an act of perception. The world consists not only of matter, but of resonance and relationship. And in this, everything is an observer – not just us. What happens to things that nobody observes? First: Are there even such things? For even if we do not observe, interaction occurs everywhere. The movement of planets, the behavior of quanta – everything vibrates, everything encounters. And every encounter is an energetic feedback, an exchange of information. Reality is not there because someone looks – but because everything is in relationship. Observation is a form of relationship. And relationship is what brings forth reality. Can the observer shape reality through frequency change? Not reality with a capital R. But his reality – yes. The frequency you vibrate at determines which part of the world you perceive. You do not reshape reality – you just change the "address" in the resonance space. You move into a friendlier, calmer, clearer frequency field. Reality is not to be changed – but the access to it is choosable. And this access is your attitude, your resonance, your decision. That is the free choice in a pre-drawn life pattern. How do you live it? In what vibration? That is the art.

### **III.b – Reality as Echo: Meaning, Frequency, and Projection**

What we experience is not the world – but the resonance of the world to us. Reality is not an object, but an echo – it responds to our frequency, to our attitude, to our projection. Meaning is not a property of things – but a relationship between what is and who considers it. If we carry fear inside, the world responds with threat. If we are open, it responds with possibilities. What you are – that is what the world evokes that you experience. Thus reality is not fixed, but generated – not out of nothing, but out of the interplay of inside and outside. The world is your echo.

### **III.c – Reality as Fractal Feedback**

Is reality a mirror – or a loudspeaker? It is both. It reflects what is inside you – and calls it back into your head. If you throw something negative in, it comes back amplified. If you give good, it comes back in resonance waves – brighter, clearer. Reality is a fractal. Every thought, every reaction branches out and gives itself back. The conflict with another is a call from you – the other "shouts" because a field in you vibrates. The world is built to show you your inner self. And yes, it sounds like philosophy, but it is deeper – it is soulful. Do we experience the world – or evoke it? Both. But not "passively experience" – but really experience, with traces, with seeds. Every passage through life plants a new seed. What you experience today, you carry further tomorrow. We build models, we experience them, we change them, we see what comes of it – and we sow anew. That is the living feedback, the spiral dance of inside and outside. No cycle – a spiral.

### **III.d – Fate and Free Will as Interference Pattern**

Does free will not lie in what we experience – but how we experience it? Yes. Clearly. Nobody chose to be born here. You just were there – child, human, earth. Where was free will then? Not in the direction – but in the sound. The melody is your freedom. Not the goal, but the beat with which you dance towards it. Can one escape fate – or just change its sound? What should a water droplet do? Escape the river? Maybe it lands in the sea. Or evaporates. Or gets swallowed by the earth. Fate is like a school class. Math comes. History too. But you can choose whether you smile or suffer. You will go the path – whether you want to or

### **IV. The Birth of Meaning – Attention, Feeling, and Form**

Meaning does not arise on its own. It is an act of connection. When attention (perception), feeling (resonance), and form (shape, pattern) overlap, meaning emerges – like a point of light when three waves meet. Meaning is not a property of the world. It is the child of encounter. Without attention – no focus. Without feeling – no weight. Without form – no recognition. Only where all three coincide does what we call "understanding" happen. And there consciousness begins – and there reality begins.

- A child sees a bird.
- It looks (attention), feels wonder (feeling), recognizes the wing shape (form).
- In this moment, meaning emerges: "This is life. This is free."

### **V. The Fields of Reality – Frequency, Tuning, and Resonance**

The world is not an empty field – it is a fabric of vibrations, of meaning waves, of presence. Every place, every being, every moment carries a frequency – and depending on how you are tuned, you either resonate or fall into dissonance. You are not in a field. You are yourself a field – and you encounter other fields. When fields resonate, there emerges: connection, clarity, harmony. When they interfere, there emerges: friction, breakage, dissolution. This explains not only relationships – but also spaces, places, times, decisions. What we call fate is often a frequency response of the field.

## **VI. The Art of Tuning – Relationships, Attraction, and Dissonance**

When two fields meet, more than an encounter happens. There happens: resonance or resistance. Every person carries a sound field. And every field seeks: agreement, expansion, response. The strongest connections are not the most logical – but those where two systems vibrate in the same beat. Some fields attract each other like magnets – others repel each other – and some rotate around each other without ever really touching. Relationship is not a line – but a dance of waves. And whoever listens feels: where tension is, where harmony is.

### **VI.a – Resonance or Illusion? The Dynamics of Connection**

How does one recognize true resonance? By the fact that the other guesses your thoughts, that they complement your path, that they do the parts of your work that you avoid – without you asking. True resonance shows itself in small things. In voluntariness. In chosen complementarity. Complementarity is not given. It is chosen. Again and again. Can two different fields be attuned to each other? Yes – but only if both centers want that. Both must bring the other from the second row to the front. Not entirely to first place – but close enough to align with each other. Even third place works – but only if it is the same on both sides. The break comes only when one places the other higher than themselves. What is love – frequency agreement or decision? Love is not a frequency – but a process of constant frequency tuning. It is like a dance – a continuous adjustment of the inner clock to the heart of the other.

## **VII. Full Tuning – The Own Path, the Universal Spiral, and the Great Music**

Every person carries a melody, an inner beat, a signature of vibration, memory, dream. This melody is neither fixed nor arbitrary – it is a growing song. When you recognize your sound and do not direct it against other sounds, but integrate it into the great composition – then harmony emerges. Not unison – but coherent diversity. The universal spiral knows no ideal – only coherence in motion. Your path is valid as long as you stand entirely in your frequency – and give other fields space to carry their tone. That is the great music. Not a song. But a lived concert.

### **VII.a – The Moment of Accord**

What is your sound? You hear it. When you are in your frequency, then you are sound. When are you tuned – not just with yourself, but with the world? When you sit in yourself, smile, cry, and your neck trembles with goosebumps – then you are in your center. Then you know: I am not just with myself. I am in harmony – with everything. For every sign in itself is already strong: Smile. Tear. Goosebumps. But when they come together – then your whole field speaks.