

Hugh Everett, III
8114 Touchstone Terrace
McLean, Va. 22102
(703-356-8931)

April 7, 1980

L. David Raub
2559 Brandon Road
Columbus, OH 43221

Dear Mr. Raub,

In answer to your letter of March 31, 1980, I offer the following comments. I certainly still support all of the conclusions of my thesis. I definitely agree with you that it still is the only completely coherent approach to explaining both the contents of quantum mechanics and the appearance of the world. To this day, all other attempts to come to grips with the apparent paradoxes of the measurement process seem to me to be far more artificial and unsatisfactory.

Dr. Wheeler's position on these matters has never been completely clear to me (perhaps not to John either). He is, of course, heavily influenced by Bohr's position (he was a student of Bohr) which essentially regards the entire formalism as merely a calculating device, and does not worry any further about "reality". It is equally clear that, at least sometimes, he wonders very much about that mysterious process, "the collapse of the wave function". The last time we discussed such subjects at a meeting in Austin several years ago he was even wondering if somehow human consciousness was a distinguished process and played some sort of critical role in the laws of Physics.

I, of course, do not believe any such special processes are necessary, and that my formulation is satisfactory in all respects. The difficulties in finding wider acceptance, I believe, are purely psychological. It is abhorrent to many individuals that there should not be a single unique state for them (in their world view), even though my interpretation explains all subjective feelings quite adequately and is consistent with all observations.

I have encountered a number of other scientists who "subscribe" to my view, but have no list. By and large they seem to be the younger crop who did not start with preconceived ideas. Perhaps Wheeler has a list of such persons.

Page 2

April 7, 1980

The only other work I did on this subject was a much fuller exposition, which predates (1955) the shorter paper, and which has recently been published by P.U. Press. I enclose a copy with my complements.

Sincerely,

Hugh Everett, III