which yields the equations

$$-dy + cz = 0$$
$$cx - by = 0$$
$$dx - bz = 0.$$

This linear system has the nontrivial solution (b, c, d) and the matrix of this system is

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -d & c \\ c & -b & 0 \\ d & 0 & -b \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $(b, c, d) \neq (0, 0, 0)$, this matrix always has a 2×2 submatrix which is nonsingular, so it has rank 2, and consequently its kernel is the one-dimensional space spanned by (b, c, d). Therefore, r_q has the eigenvalue 1 with multiplicity 1. If we had $\det(r_q) = -1$, then the eigenvalues of r_q would be either (-1, 1, 1) or $(-1, e^{i\theta}, e^{-i\theta})$ with $\theta \neq k2\pi$ (with $k \in \mathbb{Z}$), contradicting the fact that 1 is an eigenvalue with multiplicity 1. Therefore, r_q is a rotation; in fact, its axis is determined by (b, c, d).

In summary, $q \mapsto r_q$ is a map r from SU(2) to SO(3).

Theorem 16.3. The map $r: SU(2) \to SO(3)$ is a homomorphism whose kernel is $\{I, -I\}$.

Proof. This map is a homomorphism, because if $q_1, q_2 \in SU(2)$, then

$$r_{q_2}(r_{q_1}(x, y, z)) = \varphi^{-1}(q_2\varphi(r_{q_1}(x, y, z))q_2^*)$$

$$= \varphi^{-1}(q_2\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(q_1\varphi(x, y, z)q_1^*))q_2^*)$$

$$= \varphi^{-1}((q_2q_1)\varphi(x, y, z)(q_2q_1)^*)$$

$$= r_{q_2q_1}(x, y, z).$$

The computation that showed that if $(b, c, d) \neq (0, 0, 0)$, then r_q has the eigenvalue 1 with multiplicity 1 implies the following: if $r_q = I_3$, namely r_q has the eigenvalue 1 with multiplicity 3, then (b, c, d) = (0, 0, 0). But then $a = \pm 1$, and so $q = \pm I_2$. Therefore, the kernel of the homomorphism $r : \mathbf{SU}(2) \to \mathbf{SO}(3)$ is $\{I, -I\}$.

Remark: Perhaps the quickest way to show that r maps SU(2) into SO(3) is to observe that the map r is continuous. Then, since it is known that SU(2) is connected, its image by r lies in the connected component of I, namely SO(3).

Proposition 16.2 showed that if $u = (b, c, d) \neq (0, 0, 0)$, then r_q is a rotation whose axis is determined by u = (b, c, d). The angle θ of this rotation can also be determined. The following result is proven in Gallier [72] (Chapter 9).