Introduction to 21st-century physics

Luca

26 May 2023; updated 16 January 2024

Lecture notes on introductory mechanics and thermodynamics (ING175)

0 Introduction

The loss implied in such an acquisition can be estimated only by those who have been compelled to unlearn a science that they might at length begin to learn it.
J. C. Maxwell 1878

Until some decades ago, the 18th-century physical notions typically taught in introductory Bachelor physics courses were enough to prepare an engineer for future specializations and jobs. Students who wanted to venture into modern theories, such as Relativity, were required to **re-learn** some of the most important physical notions – *Energy*, mass, time, entropy above all – which in these theories are quite different from the 18th-century ones. But at that time the modern theories still mostly had only theoretical, not practical, importance. So the re-learning efforts of the curious students could perhaps be justified.

That situation has changed today. Modern theories are an essential part of many everyday technologies, like nuclear reactors and the Global Positioning System[1]; and they are required for developing new technological possibilities, from quantum computers[2] to solar sails[3]. An engineering student (including communication and data engineering) may likely end up in a job that requires an understanding of modern physical notions. The diffusion of large language models[4] will moreover require future engineers who actually **understand** those physical notions, not little monkeys who have been trained to manipulate some equations and to throw some technobabble around. Automated large language models are faster, cheaper, and more precise in doing the latter kind of monkey activities. So why should one hire a human to do the same?

"The achieved performances of atomic clocks and time transfer techniques imply that the definition of time scales and the clock comparison procedures must be considered within the framework of general relativity" – Petit & Wolf 2005

[1] https://www.gps.gov; see the entertaining discussion in Taylor & Wheeler 2000 Project A; and also Petit & Wolf 2005; Fliegel & DiEsposti 1996; Ashby 2002; Müller et al. 2008. [2] https://www.ibm.com/topics/quantum-computing. [3] see for instance https://www.planetary.org/sci-tech/lightsail, https://www.cubesail.us. [4] https://www.ibm.com/topics/large-language-models.

While moving from the older to the newer notions often requires re-learning efforts and conceptual re-orientations, the move in the opposite direction is less demanding. The modern physical notions are more encompassing than their 18th-century parents. Their understanding leads to an understanding of their older counterparts as approximate and special cases. Students, moreover, have often been hearing quite early from mass media about the new notions; for instance about the equivalence of mass and energy. Owing to this early exposure, students sometimes ask very intelligent questions – "*should the mass of the body be included in its internal energy?*" – when exposed to the old notions.

It is therefore high time that introductory Bachelor physics courses be based on modern physical notions. Students should not be required to waste time and mental effort to learn something that they must unlearn and re-learn, only because of academia's and teachers' inertia.

Some teachers say "it would be too difficult for students to understand modern ideas, because they are too familiar with the old ones. This is why we need to teach the old and slightly incorrect ideas first, and correct them later". I think that this kind of reasoning is scientifically unacceptable and leads to a vicious circle. Students are unfamiliar with new notions only because they were raised by a generation who was taught the old. New notions become familiar after a couple of generations learn them early. This is obvious if you consider that notions such as "energy", "electromagnetic field", "vector" are very familiar today, but were absolutely *un*familiar a couple centuries ago. If we had always taught what's familiar, then we would still be teaching about the elements *air, earth, water, fire*, and that the Sun revolves around the Earth. Arguments in favour of teaching old notions are just pretexts for laziness.

The present lecture notes are an experiment and attempt to introduce classical mechanics and thermodynamics from modern physical notions. The core equations remain the same, but the students should have a broader conception of their meaning and of the symbols that appear in them.

1 Physics?

If you think about it, many things we ordinarily do every day are just some sort of magic. Think of how you can instantaneously see and speak with a person living on another continent, in real time, using just a small widget in the palm of your hand. Think of how you can instantaneously see where you are on the Earth, using the same widget. Think of how fast you can go to another country, by flying in a huge metal thing. Think of how you can command and interact with a purely fictitious animated world when you play on your computer. The list can go on forever. Other things are luckily less ordinary, but still inspire a lot of awe: think of the devastating power unleashed by something roughly as small as a tennis ball, in an atomic bomb.

We can do these astonishing things thanks to our understanding of how the world works. That's Physics.

Many things can be said and have been said about science and physics. Rather than repeating what's been already written in many excellent books, I invite you to take a break here and go read their introductions. Choose as you please; don't limit yourself to popular books; compare what they say.

. . . .

1.1 Several possible languages

Welcome back! The only thing about physics that I need to say here is that physics can be expressed and written from wildly different points of view, using wildly different principles. Let's call these "different physics languages" (don't take this expression too literally, or as one in common use; I'm just using it for the present discussion). One may approach a physics phenomenon or problem in terms of *Lagrangeans*, or *Hamiltonians*, or *fibre bundles*, or *categories*, or *action principles*, or many other points of view. These languages are not completely separated; we know how to translate among them. In "doing" physics, one may jump among languages, because some ideas may be easier to express, or some results easier to find, in one language than

$$\delta\int L\,\mathrm{d}t = 0 \quad L = \frac{1}{2}m\,v^2$$

$$\boldsymbol{F} = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}m\,\boldsymbol{v} \quad \boldsymbol{F} = 0$$

Example of two different languages expressing the same physical phenomenon another. No matter which physics language you choose, the results and the concrete applications are still the same. The choice is to a great extent subjective, based on your aesthetic tastes. You see that in "doing" physics you can express your personality and put your own artistic touch; this is why it's such a cool subject (and other subjects are like this too).

In these notes I'm choosing one particular language: the one that for me is the most easily *visualizable*; because I believe that visualization can be beneficial in learning new things. Or maybe I'm choosing it just because I like it best. I encourage you to explore how the physics you've learned is expressed in other physics languages; maybe you'll like another physics language better.

The language we'll be using might be called "field theory". Roughly speaking it takes as starting point the ideas of space and time, or better spacetime, in which there are different kinds of "stuff". It expresses the regularity and patterns that we observe in physical phenomena as "budgets" about the different kinds of stuff, and of relations between these kinds. Please don't take the description just given too literally; it's just meant to give you a very vague idea of the field-theoretical viewpoint.

It goes without saying that all these "physics languages" are to a great extent mathematical.

"this grand book, the universe, which stands continually open to our gaze. But the book cannot be understood unless one first learns to comprehend the language and read the letters in which it is composed. It is written in the language of mathematics" – Galilei 1623

One reason is that numbers allow us to convey information in a concise and precise way. Imagine you have to tell someone, who doesn't know Bergen, where in Bergen you are right now, to within 10 m. You can do that with a description, "... and there's a building called so-and-so which looks like so-and-so...", which would be lengthy and tricky. Or you can just give two numbers: latitude and longitude:

$$60.369\,40,\ 5.3518\ .$$

And in these two numbers all digits are important; for instance, the latitude is not 60.369 **47**.

But the most important reason is that mathematics allows us to describe and follow the patters and variety of physical phenomena in a greatly concise and precise way. And to develop

"There is nothing that can be said by mathematical symbols and relations which cannot also be said by words. The converse, however, is false. Much that can be and is said by words cannot successfully be put into equations, because it is nonsense." – Truesdell 1966

their relationships in a rigorous way. All our present technology would have been impossible to discover, and would be impossible to realize, without the mathematical language of physics.

In Bergen, a distance of 10 m corresponds to a difference of 0.000 1 ° in latitude or longitude

1.2 Primitive and derived notions

2 Time, space, “stuff”

3 The Seven Wonders of the world

4 Thermodynamics

4.1 Notes on "quasi-static" processes

In general, none of the statements "reversible $\Rightarrow$ quasi-static" or "quasi-static $\Rightarrow$ reversible" is true.

A counterexample to the second implication are systems with internal state variables, which cannot be made non-dissipative, no matter how slowed-down they are. See the discussion and mathematical analysis in Astarita § 2.5.

A counterexample to the first implication is a system of spins in a crystal lattice. It is possible to *reversibly* bring the system form an equilibrium state to another with opposite temperature by reversing the external magnetic field *as fast as possible* – and therefore *not* through a quasi-static process. In fact it is key here that the process be *not*-quasi-static, but as fast as possible, because a slow change of the external magnetic field would lead to an irreversible process with dissipation. For more details see the discussion in Buchdahl, Lecture 20.

The point is that for some systems a *fast* change can actually prevent the onset of dissipative phenomena, and so the process needs to be fast if we want it to be reversible. Adiabatic processes often also need to be fast (as a curious historical fact, Truesdell & Bharatha, Preface p. xii, remark that "In introducing what we today call an 'adiabatic process', Laplace called it 'a sudden compression', in which he was followed by Carnot").

In fact, clearly non-quasi-static phenomena such as *explosions* can in some circumstances be described by *reversible* processes! This is possible if the explosion involves many shock waves, as explained by Oppenheim, chap. 1 p. 63:

> If there is more than one shock, the losses in available energy are diminished, so that in the limit, with an infinite number of shocks, they become negligible, and the process acquires the character of a thermodynamically optimal, i.e., reversible, change of state. The study of explosion processes reveals that, indeed, they are associated not with one but with a multitude of shocks.

For explosions see also the mathematical analysis by Dunwoody: *Explosion and implosion in a mixture of chemically reacting ideal gases*, where again reversible-process equations are used.

A caveat about reversible and quasi-static associations is given by Ericksen (§ 1.2):

> Some tend to associate nearly reversible processes with those taking place very slowly – the "quasi-static" processes. This probably stems, at least in part, from experience with classical theories of heat conduction, viscosity, and so on. However, a ball made of silly putty behaves almost reversibly when bounced rapidly and various other high polymers have similar predilections. So, it seems prudent to be open-minded in considering what may be reversible processes for particular systems.

He later discusses (§ 3.1) the case of bars subjected to dead loads, for which we can have reversible processes under sudden jumps in elongation. He concludes (p. 46) that "the sudden jump provides an example of a process that is reversible but not reasonably considered to be quasi-static".

But there's an important question that underlies our discussion: what do we actually mean by "quasi-static"? We need to specify a time scale, otherwise the term is undefined. For example, a geological process (say, tectonic motion) can be considered as quasi-static – or even completely static – on time scales of minutes or days; but it is not quasi-static on time scales of millions of years.

Whether a process is reversible or not, within any tolerance needed, is an experimental question. We can measure any relevant quantities, say pressure p and exchanged heat q, under the process, and compare them with those, p^* and q^*, determined by the equations for a reversible process. We may find for example that at all times

$$\left|\frac{p-p^*}{p^*}\right| < 0.001\ , \quad \left|\frac{q-q^*}{q^*}\right| < 0.001$$

and conclude that the process is reversible, if relative discrepancies of 0.1% or less are negligible in our concrete application.

But suppose that someone tells us "if you want the process to be reversible, you must make sure that it is quasi-static". Alright, but how much is "quasi-static"? is it OK if the piston moves with a speed of 1 cm/s? or is that too much? How about 1 mm/s? – In fact we may find that for some kind of fluid 1 cm/s is absolutely acceptable for the process to be reversible, whereas for another kind of fluid that speed would lead (at the same temperature) to an irreversible process.

You see how this imprecise situation can lead to circular definitions: "if the process is irreversible, then it means it isn't quasi-static" – but then we are actually *defining* "quasi-static" in terms of "reversible"! Any statement of the kind "reversible $\Rightarrow$ quasi-static" or "quasi-static $\Rightarrow$ reversible" then becomes not a matter of experimental verification, but of pure *semantics*. At this point we can simply get rid of "quasi-static" terminology since it doesn't bring any new physics to the table. This circularity is admitted for example by Callen in discussing irreversible gas expansion (Problem 4.2-3 p. 99):

> The fact that $dS > 0$ whereas $dQ = 0$ is inconsistent with the presumptive applicability of the relation $dQ = T\,dS$ to all quasi-static processes. We define (by somewhat circular logic!) the continuous free expansion process as being "essentially irreversible" and *non-quasi-static*.

A similar criticism can be read in Astarita, § 2.9, p. 62, where he also provides a mathematical quantification of quasi-static, similar to the one given above for reversibility:

> Often this point is circumvented by bringing in another difficult concept, that of a quasi-static transformation, which proceeds "through a sequence of equilibrium states." Quasi-static is an impressive word, but the only meaning which can be attached to it is the less impressive word "slow" – and how can one speak of slowness without implying the concept of time? How slow is slow enough? If one chooses to develop a thermodynamic theory (rather than a thermostatic one), the answer is easy. For instance, in the case of a system where the state is $V, T, \dot{V}$ [the latter is the rate of change of V], one needs to assume that [the non-equilibrium pressure]

$p(V,T,\dot{V})$ is a Taylor-series expandable at $\dot{V} = 0$ to obtain [that

$$p = p^* + \left.\frac{\partial p}{\partial \dot{V}}\right|_{\dot{V}=0} \dot{V} + \mathrm{O}(\dot{V}^2) ,$$

where $p^* = p(V,T,0)$ is the pressure at equilibrium]. One then reaches the conclusion that if the condition

$$\dot{V} \ll \frac{p^*}{\partial p/\partial \dot{V}|_{\dot{V}=0}}$$

is satisfied, then indeed the difference between p and p^* is negligibly small as compared to p^*, and thus the process can be regarded as a quasi-static one.

Criticisms against the fuzzy notion of "quasi-static" have appeared in many other works. Truesdell & Bharatha (Preface p. xii), make the historical remark that "the 'quasi-static process' was barely mentioned for the first time in 1853 and was altogether foreign to the early work [in thermodynamics]". See also the mathematical analysis by Serrin: *On the elementary thermodynamics of quasi-static systems and other remarks*.

I also want to point out that "quasi-static" in some works has specific meanings somewhat unrelated to the discussion above. For example that the rate of increase of the total kinetic energy K of the system is negligible, so that the law of energy balance, which in its full generality is

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}(U+K)}{\mathrm{d}t} = Q + W$$

(that is, the rate of increase of internal energy U and kinetic energy is equal to the heat rate Q and work rate W provided to the system) can be approximated by

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}U}{\mathrm{d}t} = Q + W .$$

Or that similar inertial terms in the motion of the system are negligible. See for example the book by Day, chap. 2.

But note that such definitions of "quasi-static" have, again, *no* a-priori relation with reversibility.

Finally, the equation $\mathrm{d}S = Q/T$ is only valid for a process that is:

- reversible (by definition),

- closed (no exchange of mass),
- with a homogeneous surface temperature,
- without bulk heating (such as instead happens in a microwave oven).

Under the last three conditions we have in general that $\mathrm{d}S \geqslant Q/T$; when the equality sign is satisfied, then the process is *defined* as reversible. See Astarita, § 1.5, or Müller & Müller, for the different forms of the second law under different circumstances. This equation may be valid in quasi-static and non-quasi-static processes, as explained above.

Bibliography

("de *X*" is listed under D, "van *X*" under V, and so on, regardless of national conventions.)

Ashby, N. (2002): *Relativity and the global positioning system*. Phys. Today **55**[5], 41–47. doi:10.1063/1.1485583.

Fliegel, H. F., DiEsposti, R. S. (1996): *GPS and relativity: an engineering overview*. PTTI Proc. **28**, 189–200. https://ui.adsabs.harvard.edu/link_gateway/1997ptti.conf..189F/ADS_PDF, https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/citations/ADA516975.

Galilei, G. (1623): *Il Saggiatore*. http://www.liberliber.it/biblioteca/g/galilei/il_saggiatore/html/index.htm; parts transl. in Seeger (1966).

Maxwell (Clerk Maxwell), J. (1878): *Tait's "Thermodynamics"*. Nature **17**[431, 432], 257–259, 278–280. doi:10.1038/017257a0. Repr. in Maxwell (2010) doc. XCI pp. 660–671.

— (2010): *The Scientific Papers of James Clerk Maxwell. Vol. 2*, repr. (Cambridge University Press, New York). Ed. by W. D. Niven. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511710377, https://archive.org/details/scientificpapers02maxwuoft. First publ. 1890.

Müller, J., Soffel, M., Klioner, S. A. (2008): *Geodesy and relativity*. J. Geod. **82**[3], 133–145. doi:10.1007/s00190-007-0168-7.

Petit, G., Wolf, P. (2005): *Relativistic theory for time comparisons: a review*. Metrologia **42**[3], S138–S144. doi:10.1088/0026-1394/42/3/S14, http://geodesy.unr.edu/hanspeterplag/library/geodesy/time/met5_3_S14.pdf.

Seeger, R. J., ed. (1966): *Galileo Galilei, His life and His Works*. (Pergamon, Oxford).

Taylor, E. F., Wheeler, J. A. (2000): *Exploring Black Holes: Introduction to General Relativity*. (Addison Wesley Longman, San Francisco).

Truesdell III, C. A. (1966): *Six Lectures on Modern Natural Philosophy*. (Springer, Berlin).