

Analysis of the question ‘Is the Moon there when nobody looks?’Abstract

In brief, the usefulness of the analysis. Two questions are asked about the meaning of the starting question. Each of those questions is addressed in turn. Further evidence of unseen and unmeasured existence is given.

Analysis of the question ‘Is the Moon there when nobody looks?’

The following question and its examination is relevant to the concept of existing things and of object permanence. Concepts with relevance to identifying the incompleteness of Relativity theory and Quantum mechanics, explaining why there is paradox and strangeness associated with both theories.

Is the Moon there when nobody looks? A question of Einstein's.

There are two questions that can be asked about the question, which is ambiguous.

1. What is meant by, ‘the Moon?’

It could be referring to the observer independent materially existing Moon. Or the observer generated relative observation products called the Moon too. There are also other perceptions related to the mental concept of the Moon. That may be ‘in mind’ without observing the Moon.

There is also potential sensory data emitted by the Moon but not yet received by an observer, so neither existing moon nor yet observation product.

2. What is meant by ‘there’?

It could mean within the configuration of existing things independent of observation? But it doesn't mean that because the questioner was Einstein and he didn't differentiate observer independent existing things from observer relative semblances of existing things.

He wants to know if the existing Moon is in Spacetime when not observed.

It is not there, in space time. The seen Moon is seen as an Image semblance of the existing Moon which is a spacetime image. It is not formed if potential sensory data (electromagnetic signals) are not received and processed into the observation product called the Moon.

The existing material Moon is an observer independent actualization. We know from the idea of object permanence that it is likely the Moon still exists when not seen. Existing in an absolute configuration of existing things which is not in observation product spacetime, but elsewhere.

Further evidence

*Not existing and not being seen are not the same situation.* The fun of peekaboo is in the ‘magical’ reappearance of an object, often a face, that had disappeared from view. Older children are not amused by the game, having awareness that objects obscured from view probably still exist unseen. Coming into and out of view is ordinary.

“Psychologist [Jean Piaget](#) conducted experiments with infants which led him to conclude that this awareness was typically achieved at eight to nine months of age.” “He claimed that infants before this age are too young to understand object permanence.” Wikipedia peekaboo,

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peekaboo>

*Where is the unseen existing object located?* If the child observer isn’t constructing an observation product semblance in ‘observation product spacetime’.

The observation independent existing thing exists in *another space than the products of observation*. A space that is not relative to an observer, (*there is no reason for it to be relative*), but absolute. Here things are existing in relation to other existing things forming a unitary pattern of all existing.

Further evidence of continued existing unseen and unmeasured is; Appearing and transformation illusions, using concealed objects, such as fire into doves using doves concealed within the magician’s dove pan, and rabbit from an ‘empty’ hat.