Lecture 1 Rapid course in special relativity; Key ideas! Principle of relativity [TW 3,1,3,2,3,3 (1,3)] Inertial (Free Float) Frames [TW 2,2,2,3,2.4 (1,2,1,4); MTW Fig. 1.7] So tropy of Space [TW (1.3), 3.12] Note: [TW 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 (1.3)] means sections 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 in the Znd (NEW!) edition of E. Taylor & J.A. Wheeler, Spacetone Physics (1992)

The (1.3) refers to section (1.3) in the 1st (61) edition (1966)

| 11× | |
|---|--|
| | - Relativity is composed of () linear spacetime |
| Thus, the inductive structure of | geometry, which is Special Relativity |
|) A | - and (2) curvilinear spacetime geometry |
| Moth 5 756 is as follows | which is General Relativity. We shall |
| | - develop both of them. First we consider |
| Moving Frames! | linear spacetime geometry. |
| Moving frames! Cartan's Structural Equations | Thus we start with A RAPID COURSE IN SPECIAL RELATIVITY |
| | WRAPID COURSE IN SPECIAL RELATIVITY |
| Multilinear algebra | The face ideas of special relativity and |
| Multivariable calculus on steroids | The key ideas of special relativity are: |
| | - (1) the Principle of Robotivity T-W1,3, 31-3,3 |
| Special Relativity | (2) Inartial (Free Floor) Frame MTW Fig. 1.7; T-4/2 2.21-24 |
| | in a company of the c |
| Please note that the conceptual basis, the | (3) I so tropy of Space in every Frame. 3.12 - (4) Invariance of the Interval 1.5 1.2. 3.6-3.8 |
| 1 | |
| root-the fountainhead- of modern | (5) Relativity of Simultancity, 3.4 |
| II | |
| differential geometry is observation: | |
| special relativity, i.e physics, | |
| | -) |
| | |
| | - |

how did we arrive at it, and where did it come from?

The P. of R. is a generalization which, in its positive form, is stated as follows:

"All laws of physics are the same on every inertial reference frame".

2. The P. of R. was arrived at by induction

Induction is the process of infering generalizations from particular instances.

The Structure of Inductive Reasoning is explicated in Chap 1 of "The Logical Leap: Induction in Physics" by David Harriman.

3. The P. of R. comes from

(1) observational evidence plus

(ii) the relevant conceptual framework.

II.)

For our context the conceptual framework consists of the laws of physics:

- 1. Newton's three laws of motion
- 2. Lorentz's law of motion for a charge in an e, m, field.
- 3. Maxwell's laws of electromagnetism,

4. Thermodynamics, etc.

on a comparison between the outcomes of experiments in different inertial frames.

More explicitly, consider two experiments in two different inestial reference frames. Suppose that these experiments are the same,

i.e. one has 1. identical instructions

2. same experimental setup

3, same procedure

4. same data set

5, same data reduction

Then, within experimental errors (!) one will observe the same result.

From this particular pair of experiments one

infers the following generalization

In different inertial frames, the same experiments yield within experimental errors the same observed results,

This finding is the same regardless of whether the two experiments involve Newtonian mechanics electricity and magnetism the smodynamics or any combination of these. laws of physics.

Laws of Physics: 1. Newton's 3 laws of motion: -1.8 3. Maxwell's electrodynamics
2. Loventz's Law of motion for a charge in an e.m. field The finding, therefore, applies to all laws, and one has! All laws of physics are the same in every inertial reference frame a) the form of these laws is the same in every inertial frame and b) the numerical values of the physical constants which these Caws contain are the same w. T. T. every inertial frame Restated negatively one has; The laws of physics cannot provide a way of distinguishing one inertial reference frame from another. Each of those statements is called the Principle of Relativity.

nertial Frames -1.9-The relativity principle is a statement about the behaviour of things on different inestral reference frames, How can one tell such frames from non-inertial frames? Within the framework of classical (i.e. non-quantum) mechanics the answer can be given by examining the measured infinitely sharp trajectories of free particles. Compare the recorded trajectories in the following two frames Non-inertial Inertial ("free float") prame frame Inertial frame of reference > Newton's 1st law of motion

(As an aside, we shall see that these two pictures illustrate what Einstein collect the "happiest thought of his life)

.....

(2) An inertial frame is defined by Newton's

first law of motion (free particles remain in a

tate of rest or in a state of uniform straightline

motion remain in such states); in other words,

a frame is said to be inertial (or "free float")

to the extent that all free particles in it

comply with Newton's first law of motion.

 (2) Inertial Frame: Definition.

More precisely, one has the following

Definition (Inertial Frame)

Siven: i) a region of space and an interval

of time

1i) any setoffice floating particles in

this spacetime region

Then: A free float (inertial) frame,

(contid on next page)

-1.12is that region of space time as coordinatized by a lattice work of clocks and measuring rods in such a way that - within some specified accuracy the free particles travel a) along straight lines b) with constant velocity for each and every particle in that region of spacetime. tusort (3) (3)/sotropy of Soace One of the most counter intuitive manifestations of the Frinciple of Relativity is the isotropy of light propagating in different inertial reference frames. To appreciate this manifestation compare the propagation of sound waves with electromagnetic waves in different inertial frames.

Light Sound 150 TROPY 2 wave fronts There is no propagation medium = airt.

Propagation of Propagation of sound wave relative to electromagnetic waves railroad car.

"medium" (v +0) sound waves propagate non-isotropically (different speedin different directions") while e. m., waves still propagate iso tropically (same speed inall directions)

Thus we have a far reaching result: Isotropy of space is frame independent This principle is contained in the Maxwell field equations and it also expresses result of the Michelson-Morley experiment (for an interesting discussion see Ex. 3.12 us T-W) Isotropy of all inertial frames says nothing about the numerical value of the speed of light. The result of the Kennedy -Thorndike experiment (see problem 3.13 in T-W for an interesting discussion) says that even the magnitude of the velocity of light is frame independent.