

R B Duncan Press

Scientific Letter

A Forum for Independent Voices

January, 27, 2004 Edition

([R B Duncan Press homepage](#))

"Lost in Translation" Message 427 Wave Structure of Matter

(Reprinted with permission)

What was "Lost in Translation" was the fact that Heisenberg proved that angular momentum is a wave function and position is not. . There is a warning here that when using angular momentum you must ALSO take into consideration the frequency of the surroundings, which present science is not doing at all.

"Lost in Translation" is the name of the movie that won several Golden Globe awards a few days ago.

"Lost in Translation" also pertains to this letter.

Gabriel gave you his important statement and now I'll give you mine.

I hope that Sue, Medium, Norm and all the others in TOE group will also read this.

I'm going to quote from something Bill Arnold wrote in the "Official Bulletin of the Foundation for the Study of Cycles" Vol. XXX 1979, No.4

"Heisenberg's principle of uncertainty postulates that if you measure the "physical" particle then you cannot ascertain orbital or wave data. . ."

Yes, I read the original German and I distinctly remember reading "*in betrieb sein*" which accurately translates to (wave) function and not simply *Betrieb*, which means motion.

Heisenberg's most accurate statement was "Lost in Translation".

You will find Heisenberg's uncertainty principle explained thusly: "You cannot determine both an electron's position and its motion "

This is NOT an accurate translation of what Heisenberg said.

1. The electron is either in a steady orbital (standing wave function).
2. Or it changes to an orbital closer to the nucleus while emitting energy (standard waves).
3. Or it changes to an orbital further from the nucleus by absorbing energy (standard waves).

So we are concerned, here, not with motion but with those above three wave functions (*and eigenstates*).

Heisenberg showed us that angular momentum is a wave function and position is not and these two can not be used together in the same reference frame. . We treat light this way - sometimes as a wave and sometimes as a particle. . We MUST treat everything this way.

We see that Heisenberg has given us a universal law that can be used in both the microcosm and macrocosm. Believe me! There are few of these universal laws.

As Bill Arnold points out in the same text: If we look at the solar system, as formed of particles, then Heisenberg is telling us we will not be able to see the wave operation **IN THE SAME REFERENCE FRAME**

You will have to use another entirely different mathematical reference frame such as Bodes Law or Arnold's Law to clearly see any wave function in the macrocosm.

I wondered how Gabriel could put this all together and not believe in general relativity.

Last night I figured out why:

Heisenberg told me.

You MUST forget the particle picture **ENTIRELY** if you are dealing with waves.

General relativity deals with particles and the accumulated mass of these particles. Therefore you must **NOT** mix it in with wave functions and you MUST explain it **ALL** using waves.

OR you can take **ONLY** a mechanistic view and try to explain it **ALL** by using particles and motion with Fitzpatrick's A Laws:

[Aufbau Laws](#) short version

[The A Laws](#) long version

Gabriel seems to understand how to switch into each of these distinctly **DIFFERENT** views while completely discarding the opposite view as Heisenberg has clearly shown us **MUST** be done.

[Return to RB Duncan Press homepage](#)

© 2004 RB Duncan Press

All rights reserved

Comments or complaints about anything on this site???

post to: [Robert B. Duncan](#)

This site is a member of WebRing.
To browse visit [Here](#).