

Project Unity

Chapter 5

Optical Perceptions

If we take a hand held magnifying glass and focus it in such a manner as to clearly distinguish the characters on this page, the characters and the paper on which they are printed will appear closer to the eye and larger in size.

To most people this would not be considered a very sophisticated experiment, but if we consider the implications of this simple procedure we might find it interesting.

In that the printed characters and the paper on which they are printed have not changed in any appreciable manner, it must be assumed that the lens changed something. Yet the lens is nothing more than a curved piece of transparent glass.

It is generally assumed that the lens distorts the light passing through the glass in a manner corresponding to the curvature of the lens, but such an assumption is based upon one very critical point, which concerns the linear motion of light, in that the linear motion of light should be possible.

If the field in which the light exists is in motion, why would it be necessary or even possible for the light to be in motion independent of the field in which it exists? If the field in which the light exists remained static or stationary you would have to assume it was the light which was in motion, but you would still have quite a time attempting to explain how and why the light itself would be in motion.

It is an accepted fact that the field in which we exist is not static or stationary. The field in which we exist is in motion and that motion represents an accelerating rate of outward expansion remaining relative to the system of reference. Consequently the rate of acceleration associated with the field in which the light exists remains relative to the value of (c) , which is itself accelerating in a non-absolute manner remaining relative to the system of reference.

Therefore it is a bit of a stretch to consider the light to be in linear motion and traveling at a speed exceeding the value of (c) , as this is what would be

Project Unity

required in order for the light itself to be in linear motion independent of the field in which it exists. Such a thing represents a mission impossible.

So if the light itself is not in linear motion and the light does not linearly pass through the curved glass lens and linearly enter your eye, it would seem fair to ask what it is that is taking place?

The lens did something quite amazing, as it actually modulated the condition of field existing relative to it, in such a manner as to affect the space and motion existing relative to the lens, without affecting the relative condition of the field in which the experiment was conducted. Now this, to me at least, rates as a very interesting experiment because it implies something very important.

If a simple hand held magnifying glass can accomplish this, imagine what a properly constructed lens could do which was capable of existing independent of the field in which we presently exist. If it was constructed in such a manner as to allow us to climb inside and modulate the condition of field remaining relative to the lens craft, would it not be possible to travel in time and space? Most certainly it would.

Equally, it should be possible to equip a telescope with a field frequency modulator, whereby we could modulate the field existing relative to our telescope in such a manner as to provide for an astronomical microscope allowing us to distinguish individual particles of sand on the surface of the moon or mars. I must admit that the simplicity of the concept is a little overwhelming, but nonetheless a very real consideration.

As I am convinced that light is not in linear motion or capable of linear motion, it is critical that we consider the linear bending of light, which I believe to be equally impossible.

Einstein predicted that light passing in close proximity to the sun would be bent outward and away from the sun by the sun's space/time curve. And sure enough this prediction was confirmed during a solar eclipse, which provided Einstein's work with quite a boost in popularity.

However, the perceived success of the experiment was based upon a perception of that which was anticipated, in terms of the observed effect.

Project Unity

It was not necessary for the light to pass in close proximity to the sun, in relation to the perceived linear motion of light in order to observe the apparent bending of light. It was only necessary for the field of view to be directed toward the sun, whereby a distortion of field would be noted.

It was the non-uniform differential in (ntffa) existing between the earth and the sun that caused this effect to be observed, in that the differential in non-uniformity increases toward the sun. And as the observation involved the field of view existing very close to the surface of the sun, in relation to a star situated beyond the sun, the star appeared to be shifted away from the sun in an outward manner.

As the field of view existed relative to the earth the distortion affecting the field of view increased toward the sun, whereby the distortion appeared most noticeable close to the surface curve of the sun.

This might seem confusing, but the sun exists relative to the earth in that the sun exists as a non-uniform field of frequency remaining relative to the earth, with the degree of non-uniformity increasing toward the sun. So the point where you will find the greatest observable distortion of field is the area adjacent to the sun's surface curve.

Consequently, the recorded effects of Einstein's prediction had nothing whatever to do with the linear bending of light, but had to do with a distortion of field being caused by a non-uniform differential in (ntffa) existing between the earth and the sun, with the sun as the point of focus.

A similar situation exists between the moon and the earth, with the earth as the point of focus. In this respect a non-uniform differential corresponding to a non-uniform differential in (ntffa) existing between the moon and the earth distorts the field of the earth in a manner which we associate with tidal motion.

To carry this further a similar non-uniform differential exists between the moon and the sun, but as the non-uniform differential in (ntffa) is not identical to that corresponding to the relative condition of the sun and the earth, the degree of observable distortion, as observed from the moon, is going to be somewhat less than the degree of distortion observed from the earth, by a very slight amount.

Project Unity

Consequently, there exists an effect of distortion existing between all systems in motion, in that every system affects every other system in relation to varying degrees of distortion corresponding to the various differentials in (ntffa), in that the observed optical effects of distortion remain relative to the point from which the observation is made. But it must be kept in mind that regardless of where the observation is made the relative condition of that location remains relative to your system of reference, which is the field condition in which you exist.

It is somewhat ironic that we have allowed our modern world to unfold without adequate consideration being given to the condition of field affecting light, especially in view of the various modern systems which are based upon an elementary factor of light.

Credit should be given where credit is due and in this respect I refer to the experiment designed to stop light dead in its tracks. And as it would otherwise be impossible to stop light if it were not itself in linear motion this experiment would certainly suggest that light was in linear motion. But again we have an experiment which is subject to the perception of the observer who anticipates a specific result.

I would hope it might be realized as to just how important one's perception of the basic principles must be before one can proceed in attempting to define all manner of observation, as our perceptions of observation are determined by those basic principles of understanding to which we adhere.

As light is not in linear motion the apparent slowing of light, thought to occur when light enters the atmosphere, results from the condition of the field in which the light exists. A further slowing of light is thought to occur when light enters water, but the light does not linearly enter the water or the atmosphere. Both circumstances are an effect of the underlying dynamics associated with the field in which the light exists, which directly affects the light itself. The light cannot be directly affected as light is a relative dynamic response to the condition of field, as it is the field itself which is affected by variations in (ntffa).

Where this becomes obvious is at the point where light is said to be stopped completely, as this would indicate the possibility of an absolute condition existing within a relative non-absolute universe.

Project Unity

In as much as the relative non-linear value of (c) is continuously accelerating in a non-absolute manner and continuously decelerating in an inversely non-absolute manner we can anticipate there to be no absolute upper or lower limit to the value of (c). Therefore it would be impossible to linearly slow light, linearly speed it up or linearly stop it.

So what happened to the frozen light?

Nothing at all happened to the light itself, but something very interesting happened to the field in which the light existed. The field itself was distorted relative to the system of reference in such a manner as to make a light pulse appear to be stopped, as the field itself was modulated in such a manner as to increase the rate of (ntffa) beyond the non-absolute value of (c) remaining relative to the system of reference.

It is important to note that each element has a different (ntffa) rate determining the form and function of its field structure.

In the case of the frozen light experiment sodium atoms were employed in the form of a frozen sodium cloud, which was intended to slow the light pulse down to a full stop. But it is equally important to realize that the upper and lower non-absolute limit of (c) corresponding to the field structure of sodium is unique to sodium.

So the non-absolute value of (c) corresponding to the field in which the experiment was conducted, the environment of the laboratory, is not equal to the non-absolute value of (c) corresponding to the frozen sodium atoms.

Consequently the field inside the cloud chamber containing the frozen sodium atoms was distorted beyond the non-absolute relative limit corresponding to the non-simultaneous condition of universe existing relative to the environment of the lab, in terms of the non-absolute present moment.

In other words, the experiment caused a non-uniform distortion in (ntffa) to occur, whereby the light pulse vanished and remained invisible for one millisecond before being restored to a visible condition. And during this one millisecond the light pulse itself remained quite unaffected by the process, as the light pulse exists as a relative dynamic response corresponding to the condition of field.

Project Unity

This experiment known as the Frozen Light Experiment by Lene Vestergaard Hau failed to stop the linear motion of light, but succeeded in transforming the non-simultaneous condition of field to a simultaneous condition existing beyond the non-absolute present moment. And in the simplest of terms this is time travel. This is the real deal which provides experimental evidence indicating the potential viability of time travel.

If we accept the fact that light is not in linear motion or that the linear motion of light is impossible we are immediately faced with an apparent crisis, as we have based so many of our scientific ideas on the constancy of light speed.

Also, we have determined the approximate size and age of universe on the basis of light speed, which means our calculations are invalid, so what are we to do?

We can begin by realizing that a linear perception of the universe is not of any real value to us anyway, as it is quite impossible to cross the seemingly vast expanse of space calculated in billions of light years by any method based on a system of linear propulsion.

It is important to realize that our perception of universe corresponds to the familiar space in which we ourselves exist. In other words, we generally view universe in the same manner as we view the distance from one city to another or the distance from our home to our place of work. This is of course quite ludicrous as it would be impossible for us to walk or drive to the nearest star, but this is the way we perceive space travel.

It would therefore seem rational to devise a new method of appraisal, one that might actually allow us to access universe. It would appear that some new tools might also be in order, as the rockets have to go. We have to give up on the idea of developing a process allowing us to explore space in a linear manner.

This would mean we give up on the idea of nuclear powered space craft or any system requiring a linear based fuel supply, whether in the form of solids, liquids or gases, as they simply will not do the job.

Project Unity

The only process which will allow us a viable access to universe, involves time travel, which employs a simple process affecting a distortion in (ntffa). And of course this sounds very radical, but not nearly as radical as those ideas determining the existing limitations confining not only our bodies to the field of the earth, but our minds and spirits as well.

In terms of optical affects we look through a telescope and perceive remote and distant stars in terms of ancient history and we refer to those times past in terms of billions of years, yet the actual idea of time being involved seems to escape us as we insist that we must determine a linear distance corresponding to the number of meters light travels during one second.

This is completely nuts, as there are no linear light years or any billions of linear years, it's a lot of mumbo jumbo. Time is simply not a linear condition nor can time be described in terms of linear durations other than as an abstract idea. It's all a shell game, an illusion designed to hide the truth, whereby allowing the few to the control the many.

To make the point clearly understood the concept of light years is no different than suggesting that yesterday or last week is so many meters from the non-absolute present moment. Twist and turn it anyway you like, but that is exactly what we are attempting to convey with our linear interpretation of time, space and motion.

In terms of a relative universe there are no light years, nor can the earth's geological history be determined in millions and billions of years. Furthermore it is utter rubbish to talk about the emergence of man so many million years ago or the evolution of the human species from some primitive biological entity so many million years ago.

Time is an accelerating force and as such does not correspond to clocks and watches. Time moves fast and time moves slow, but it is in a constant state of non-linear motion, which is either accelerating or decelerating in terms of a relative condition of universe remaining relative to the system of reference.

On the basis of our present understanding it is quite impossible for us to determine whether we exist in a future condition or a past condition of the earth's existence. Equally it is impossible for us to determine our origins, in relation to how or why we are what we are in terms of our humanity by digging in the dirt.

Project Unity

We assume that the apparent constancy of something means that it has always been constant, in that if something is this way or that way it must have always been this way or that way. Of course it can be argued that science is simply attempting to make sense out of the physical evidence, but this is not completely true.

Science is attempting to define the physical evidence in a manner whereby it might be made to jive with the basic linear concept of universe, which in turn maintains the existing system of single unit measure.

Space is merely an effect of a dynamic non-linear value corresponding to (ntffa) and has no corresponding proportion of linearization, in terms of linear time, linear space and linear motion.

The linear concept of universe is an illusion based upon a perception of thought corresponding to an abstract idea, which allows the linear illusion to maintain our rational basis of logic, whereby linearity remains the drunken master of our material reality, which in turn impairs our ability to perceive the universe on its own terms.

I believe that we should at least attempt to employ an element of honesty in our approach to science, in that self-deception is not a valid means by which to determine a definitive evaluation of universe.

In relation to optical effects we have a lot of catching up to do as we have yet to realize that our biological vision is the product of a purely dynamic process. A process which is not dependent upon the linear motion of light, but a process capable of modulating field frequency, in terms of focus and dynamically processing the field of view into discernible mental images. And when you consider visual sight in terms of non-linear field dynamics you have to be impressed by the simplistic perfection of such an amazing process.

Light does not enter the eye, the eye modulates the field of view relative to the lens of the eye and communicates the field frequency to the brain, as the brain is a field frequency receiver/sender relay.

The continuance of field, in terms of (ntffa) continuously accelerating allows for the perceived fabrication of physical structure. But it is important to

Project Unity

realize that the physical structure of universe, including the physical structure of our bodies, is the product of (ntffa), in terms of those uniform and non-uniform effects determining the form and function of all physical structure.

There is no linear fabric or linear material involved, as all physical structure corresponds to fields of frequency. And it is a uniform continuance of (ntffa) which provides for the relative consistency of our physical existence.

Therefore the process of sight and the discernible mental images of sight involve the processing of field frequency in the context of (ntffa), which involves (ntffa) receptors and modulators. In other words, the sensory experience is far from being mechanical in nature, as it involves purely dynamic responses to a purely dynamic condition of field.

To understand this more clearly we can consider the non-uniform differential existing between the earth and the sun, in that the sun warms the surface of the earth without warming the intervening space existing between the earth and the sun.

It is due to the differential in dynamic potential existing between the earth and the sun, which determines the degree of warming, as the factor of non-uniformity increases toward the sun. If this situation were reversed we would quickly be burned to a crisp.

The energy potential is focused toward the sun and not away from the sun, which is quite fortunate, but we perceive the sun radiating energy in an outward manner. What is radiated outward is resistance and not energy, and as the potential of resistance increases outwardly from the sun it prevents the earth from accelerating to the center of the solar field.

But of equal importance is the fact that this also prevents the energy of the sun from escaping into space, thus allowing for the prevailing circumstance of the solar field system to remain relatively stable.

Our biological vision functions in a similar manner, as our field of vision exists relative to the lens of the eye, therefore there is a differential in dynamic potential existing between the lens and the objective of our view. This allows the eye to respond to the field of view in a purely dynamic manner.

Project Unity

The eye does not absorb light or anything else, unless of course you get dust or dirt in your eye, it merely responds to the condition of field corresponding to a differential in dynamic potential.

The eye modulates the field of view whereby (ntffa) receptors transfer the various fields of frequency into discernible mental images of field frequency. And in this respect the range of (ntffa) modulation is restricted to those levels of frequency allowing for a perception of field adequate to our survival.

Of course there is more involved, but the idea presented is merely attempting to explain how vision is possible without the linear motion of light.

Without the relatively uniform dynamic continuance of field frequency we would not be capable of accurately discerning the relative conditions of space and motion. But because we are capable of discerning conditions of space and conditions of motion we assume that those conditions correspond to our linearized perception of reality.

Unfortunately we are limited to the biological constraints of our physical existence, but even so, it is still possible to understand the nature of form and function existing beyond the limitations of those physical requirements necessary for our survival. In other words, we can think past the linear barriers which have been imposed upon us as learned limitations.

The sole function of an optical lens is to modulate the field of frequency existing relative to the modulating medium, which in itself is an amazing process.