

Vectors as displacements; a slicing problem

Math 275 Multivariable Calculus

September 10, 2014

What is “change in position”?

- If I move from $(2, 3)$ to $(-3, 1)$, what is the most natural way to express this change?

What is “change in position”?

- ▶ If I move from $(2, 3)$ to $(-3, 1)$, what is the most natural way to express this change?
- ▶ In everyday English, we separate it into two changes: a change in the east–west direction, and a change in the north–south direction.

Two changes in one

“Five blocks south and two blocks west” is a pretty natural way to express the move from $(2, 3)$ to $(-3, 1)$.

- ▶ Notice: it's not a sensible *address* in any city or town. Why not?
- ▶ It is a *displacement*, not a *location*.
- ▶ These are different notions!

Universality of displacement

- ▶ If the town is laid out on a square grid (as opposed to rectangles, some other kind of parallelograms, or worse) ...
- ▶ ... walking from $(2, 3)$ to $(-3, 1)$ feels the same as walking from $(2013, 2013)$ to $(2008, 2010)$.

We call this displacement the *vector* $\langle -5, -2 \rangle$. Observe the following naïve “equations”:

$$(2, 3) + \langle -5, -2 \rangle = (-3, 1)$$

$$(2013, 2013) + \langle -5, -2 \rangle = (2008, 2010)$$

- ▶ You should now be pretty convinced that the intersection of a sphere and a plane is a circle (provided the intersection contains more than one point). It certainly seems *plausible* enough.

- ▶ You should now be pretty convinced that the intersection of a sphere and a plane is a circle (provided the intersection contains more than one point). It certainly seems *plausible* enough.
- ▶ But is it completely, unambiguously obvious that it's impossible to get an elliptical cross-section?

- ▶ You should now be pretty convinced that the intersection of a sphere and a plane is a circle (provided the intersection contains more than one point). It certainly seems *plausible* enough.
- ▶ But is it completely, unambiguously obvious that it's impossible to get an elliptical cross-section?
- ▶ How would we *prove* it?

Brute force

- Solve with coordinates?

Brute force

- ▶ Solve with coordinates?
- ▶ A completely coordinatized approach to this problem involves choosing a sphere with arbitrary center and radius and an arbitrary plane.

Brute force

- ▶ Solve with coordinates?
- ▶ A completely coordinatized approach to this problem involves choosing a sphere with arbitrary center and radius and an arbitrary plane.
- ▶ One then solves a system of two simultaneous nonlinear equation in eight variables:

$$\begin{aligned}(x - a)^2 + (y - b)^2 + (z - c)^2 &= r^2 \\ Ax + By + Cz &= D\end{aligned}$$

- ▶ This approach is easy to set up, if you are familiar with the process.

- ▶ This approach is easy to set up, if you are familiar with the process.
- ▶ Working out the details is horrendous and not very illuminating.

- ▶ This approach is easy to set up, if you are familiar with the process.
- ▶ Working out the details is horrendous and not very illuminating.
- ▶ Instead, we'll unleash the kung fu of symmetry to deal with this complicated geometric situation.

Symmetry arguments

Symmetry argument: a “special” case that isn’t really all that special.

For us, the special case will be:

The sphere is the unit sphere and the plane is of the form $z = A$.

Close to generic

- It seems very special.

Close to generic

- ▶ It seems very special.
- ▶ After all, there are many, many spheres other than the unit sphere, and many planes that are not horizontal.

Close to generic

- ▶ It seems very special.
- ▶ After all, there are many, many spheres other than the unit sphere, and many planes that are not horizontal.
- ▶ But think of it like a videographer: the right angle and zoom turns any situation into this special one.

WLOG

That's what we mean by symmetry, or the mathematical abbreviation WLOG. This stands for **W**ithout **L**oss **O**f **G**enerality. The phrase signifies the idea encapsulated above: that what appears to be a special case is in fact sufficiently general.