

## THE SPLICE OF A UNIQUE CONCEPTION OF PHYSICS

FUNDAMENTAL THEORIES OF  
CAT'S PHYSICS

FIFTH EDITION OF RED CATS  
Sunday, August 11, 2024

JOSEPH FÉLIX MAXIM THIBODEAU

## INDEX

PREFACE.....	4
ETHER.....	6
A SYSTEM WITH FOUR STATES.....	7
ONCE UPON THE TIME: THE MATTER.....	9
THE CAT'S RAY.....	12
THE SUN, OUR STAR.....	13
QUESTIONS ?.....	16
ETHER ELECTRONS.....	23
HUMAN BIOLOGY.....	28
THE INDIVIDUAL PERTUBARTION SHIELD.....	33
NANOTECHNOLOGICAL DETECTORS.....	38
TRAVEL IS IMPOSSIBLE.....	40
EDA DEFORMABLE SPACE.....	42
GRAVITONS.....	44
ANTI-GRAVITY CLOCK.....	46
ENERGY CONSERVATION PRINCIPLES.....	47
MADE IN THIBODEAU-CATS.....	50
THE TILT-SUZANNE-CHAT.....	51
TRANSPORT OF CATS.....	55
QUANTIFICATION OF CAT FLOW.....	57
MECHANICS OF SPICE DROPS.....	58
PLAYING WITH NEUTRINO.....	60
PRACTICAL CONCEPTS: PSYCHOLOGICAL WAR.....	61
ARMAGEDDON.....	63
THE CAT-PLUS HOLDING LIFE ATLUS.....	64
THE BIDULE DETECTOR of ARMAGEDDON.....	66
3-D GRAVITONIC CAMERA OF THE SUPREME SMALL APES.....	68
POSSIBLE QUARKS SEPARATION EXPERIMENT.....	70
PROPERTIES RELEASE.....	70
FIRST CRITERIA.....	70
SECOND CRITERIA.....	70
PARTICLES REORGANIZATION.....	70
ELECTRICAL FIELD.....	70
MAGNETIC FIELD.....	70
GRAVITY FIELD.....	70
3D ROTATING SHIELD EA PRINCESS SUPREME GODDESS KITTENS.....	71
ONCE UPON THE TIME AN OSCILLATOR.....	73
THE ENEMY.....	74
ARRAY OF DEATHSPOT ATTACK.....	74
LOCALIZE ATTACK ON KNOWN POSITION.....	75
IMPROVED BUNKER POSITION: SPICES CITY.....	76
THE 1-CHAT ATOMIC MODEL.....	78
THE CLOWNS SUBPLANEET.....	79
THE ETHER / REAL RATIO.....	82
MAXWELL'S LIFE CONCLUSION.....	83


GALACTIC PUMP TYPE EA VERONIC PRINCESSES.....	86
THE CONSTANT THIBODEAU-CHAT.....	89
THERMODYNAMIC.....	96
THE FOURTH LAW OF THERMODYNAMICS.....	96
THE FIFTH LAW OF THERMODYNAMICS.....	96
INFINITE CATTLE-TURTLE ENERGY.....	97
DÉTECTION DES ANOMALIES INTER MATRICES DE DIMMENSIONS DIFFÉRENTES.....	98
PHASE-1: CONVOLUTION N-D.....	99
THE RE-CREATION OF THE UNIVERSE.....	100
SHAME ON ALL.....	102
CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS.....	103
AMERICA.....	105
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	108
ANNEXES I.....	108
ANNEXES II.....	112

## PREFACE

We are in the year 2020, and it is just over 100 years ago that the theory of relativity was discovered by Albert Einstein. True revolution, his thesis, for those who read it, will never be forgotten, but it is now time to temper the volcano and the eruption of concepts which then sprang up. The new object of my work, which I present to you here, is the result of a long reflection that I started a long time ago. It is with this heavy secret that I have lived all my life, and I am happy to offer you a new, more moderate version, again, to you Humanity ...

You will notice that I overuse the colour red, in my work, it's always a question of personal revolt, to attack your retina :)

The author:






## ETHER

This concept has been around for a long time, but I'm going to show it to you in a new light. I cannot describe the absolute model of space, time and matter to you, but I will try to show you my hypothesis, without pointing the finger at it :()

The Matrix, or the Aether, would be a bearing substance which would allow the existence of observable concept, such as the stars, the planets, thus the matter. Without it, the laws of Physics, as defined in this book, would not exist. The Matrix itself has its origins in the coexistence of the stars and the black hole:

### Black hole and a star system



## A SYSTEM WITH FOUR STATES

Several light-years apart, the stars would interact with the black hole, to form the four-state system:

- 1- Ether-matter
- 2- Ether-antimatter

- 3- Real-matter
- 4- Real-antimatter


According to this specific conception, electromagnetic energy is the key concept between the real and the ether, and in a certain way, matrix temporarily, is the key concept between matter and anti-matter. But what can I mean by matrix temporarily? It is simply the absence of a concept which should have its place in a specific localization of the matrix, which by a lack of time, cannot be resolved by it. In all cases that come to mind, "inertia" is responsible. We could consider the angle between the radiation from the black hole and the star, related to the distance between the star and the black hole, and the density, connected, to the distance between the studied position and the star, the source of fusion.

In this possible version of my hypothesis, because there are several possibilities, the vacuum between the stars and the black hole is covered by the black hole, but not by the stars, by the same reasoning, the vacuum between the galaxies is not maybe not covered by black holes, depending on the gap in question :)

This gives rise to the following questioning: Can matter, as currently defined, exist in these voids? What is certain is that light can pass through, at least partially or indirectly (see another chapter), because we can observe it on our planet, the Earth and its surroundings :)





ONCE UPON THE TIME: THE MATTER

This, in the case of the teleportation of matter, where the Ether would transmit the properties of neutrons and protons, thanks to the inertia of particles and electromagnetic energy. A surprising fact about this hypothetical phenomenon, is that the matter which is exposed to light energy, would be disintegrated and reintegrated periodically, and this at high frequencies. The exact frequency of this operation remains unknown to me, and would be, possibly, directly linked to the speed of light in the medium, which would be linked to the spatial location relative to our star, the Sun, therefore, to the Matrix .

- In this frame of reference, the speed of light is not constant. Because of this, the precise position of the stars would still not be known :(
- The quasi particle that I named Ray "K", or Ray Cat, would reverse the Ether-Real property of matter :)
- The oscillatory separation of light energy makes it possible to obtain this quasi-particle.
- Light, could therefore be represented by two quasi particles which follow one another in space, where the distance between them is less than the distance which separates the couples, this in our angle of the Matrix, therefore of the Sun, our star and the black hole of our galaxy, let's call him Robert Leduc :)

- In this perspective, we can face an object of real or ethereal type :()
- By these hypotheses, it is possible that the real anti-matter or not, can annihilate its opponent when it meets it, this having as result as result the emission of something imprecise, like the emission of light in the case electrons, but 1837X more energy in mass.
- If, in this case, something more imposing than a hair, can be destroyed by this process, we face an effective means of producing this matter in four states, do not underestimate anything, for now :)
- It may also be that the real can propagate through the ethereal, or vice versa, to produce a perforation, much further, after being re-transmuted into the appropriate substance.

..... will then cease for ever.


786.] The quantity  $V$ , in Art. 793, which expresses the velocity of propagation of electromagnetic disturbances in a non-conducting medium is, by equation (9), equal to  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{K\mu}}$ .

If the medium is air, and if we adopt the electrostatic system of measurement,  $K = 1$  and  $\mu = \frac{1}{v^2}$ , so that  $V = v$ , or the velocity of propagation is numerically equal to the number of electrostatic units of electricity in one electromagnetic unit. If we adopt the electromagnetic system,  $K = \frac{1}{v^2}$  and  $\mu = 1$ , so that the equation  $V = v$  is still true.

On the theory that light is an electromagnetic disturbance, propagated in the same medium through which other electromagnetic actions are transmitted,  $V$  must be the velocity of light, a quantity the value of which has been estimated by several methods. On the other hand,  $v$  is the number of electrostatic units of electricity in one electromagnetic unit, and the methods of determining this quantity have been described in the last chapter. They are quite independent of the methods of finding the velocity of light. Hence the agreement or disagreement of the values of  $V$  and of  $v$  furnishes a test of the electromagnetic theory of light.

The work of Maxwell, volume II



THE CAT'S RAY

To successfully separate the light, we should use a medium change, which I think can only happen in a translucent solid. But, it would be possible to obtain the same result with a gaseous stellar object, however, the directional field would probably be random. And with the proper oscillation frequency, connected to the angle, be able to get two constituents. I remind the reader that ordinary light has a frequency of the order of Gigahertz, but that electromagnetic waves can theoretically be between zero and a very large number.

Perhaps the limitation of the Human brain, from the point of view of conceptualization, limited to three dimensions, prevents me from fully understanding the problem. If, for example, the bearing substance that is the Matrix, is fixed in space-time, and that the propagation of light is only a wave inside its properties, which would not be related to the three-dimensional space, but only to a kind of energy conceptualization. In this case, we are allowed to set the separation distance of these components in a fixed space-time.

THE SUN, OUR STAR

Incredibly smart, these Incas were able to calculate many facts about our supreme and only star, the Sun. In fact, they were certainly able to calculate the phenomenon in question, but today, who can predict the next breakthrough in solar technology... Will your next door neighbor do this face when you will teach him these facts? From your mouth?



THE ROYAL CAT




## QUESTIONS ?

The questions are difficult to answer, because the truth does not exist in other places than in the Human mind, and is always subject to an interpretation based on our personal beliefs. But having said that, let's now consider some of mine:

- Why are galaxies two-dimensional? The matter that we rub shoulders with cannot exist as it is in these interstices, because the angle is too small. We were talking about dark matter a while ago ... Everyone wants to know, so there is a need to send an experience there :) I admit it's a bit far for now :) I could try some explanations, but why? For me nothing can be left to chance :) :) :)




- Why is the sky not entirely white due to the light emitted from the stars? From my point of view, I don't understand why, because if we take a small portion of the sky, with a star in the middle, there should be another star right next to it, because of the density and the volume of the universe. And why, this adjacent star which emits radially, does not add its own light to the first on the eye or the telescope which looks at it? An extremist possibility would be that we see the results of point sources that have passed through Young's slits, without us seeing them directly. Because, I do not believe that I see halos of light, when I look at stars. In addition, telescopes cannot oscillate over such a long distance, especially in space, so if we do not apply a solid circle on point sources captured by optics, something is wrong. Let's not go so far as the 3-D network of Cats which would be the result of some optical process, but questions emerge, to be seen in the next edition ...





- What can explain the fact that we have seen the stars from almost infinity? And why, our best thinker has hypothesized that we are at the centre of the Universe (This reminds me of the theory of the earth at the center of the solar system). Could it be because we cannot reach the end of our Universe by electromagnetic interactions, and that our dear thinkers must protect the Holy Grail from their theories ... Theories that want us to be in a spherical Universe at the fixed limit, according to Einstein's initial thought, as described in his thesis. And that we are in a slightly ellipsoidal Universe would make all the currently accepted theories and knowledge about space-time obsolete. If there was indeed a propagation of matter, this propagation (explosion: Big-Bang), thanks to the random distribution should depend on unknown factors, but probably spherical. However, if it is indeed a propagation due to the creation of matter by the process presented in this book, the three-dimensional representation could be very different. The laws governing this representation are unknown to me, but over time should tend toward a three-axis expansion. However, unlike the great thinkers, I will not make this error, I do not know, we could be, in the limit, in one of the many toroidal Universes that here :)



If the different substances that are the four states, have this process as their origin, what can produce the first strain of these? I don't believe in the Big Bang, as described in the current scientific literature: no Quarks soup or anything like that exploding. Let us forget this first strain a little, and we can easily conceptualize, based on practical data, that the Universe is expanding, by the propagation of an extraordinary quantity of matter. But, for me, it is not due to an explosion, but indeed to a propagation of matter related to this concept :)

It is clear that this is only a hypothesis, from your narrator, but, as far as current theory is concerned, it is even worse. In addition, the theory is based on incorrect equations and inadequate concepts, I will in the future elaborate further ... But, based on these new facts, it is now possible to reposition and recalibrate the distances and angles, where this find these substances, which are the stars and other stellar objects made of matter and antimatter, real or etheric ... But will we accept such an atrocity?

The same goes for Big Crunch. In the event of a mass collapse, which cannot be demonstrated, will we be able to escape from our Universe? Is there a more fundamental Matrix that will be discovered in the future? The questions are numerous, and the quantity of concepts to develop and explain, makes me dizzy and is beyond my individual reach. Anyway, I will continue to think about it, while developing practical experiences, to let us imagine the whole that always eludes us! Together, unprovable, in the human spirit of today, at the very least, without experiences whose cost would exceed the imagination ...






TI-MOUSSE THE CAT



## ETHER ELECTRONS


One aspect of reality, which has affected me a lot during my life, is the use of Ether for the transmission of electrons. Ether-electron being involved in the mechanism of Human thought. All thanks to Helium-3, an isotope of natural Helium with a single neutron, as follows:

- For me, there are at least two possible reactions to destabilize an atom. The one that applies in the case of a radioactive atom isolated in a vacuum :) And the one caused by an external energy source on any atom. It is not a fact, but the stable aluminum found on the Moon, can be transmuted into Helium-3, in time, by something other than the traditional neutrons, protons, photons of high energy...
- It is possible to extract this isotope from the Earth's atmosphere and its subsoil.
- The use of conventional methods, such as contact-less magnetic centrifugation, may not be enough to meet global demand. There just isn't enough of this spice in the air for everyone. The use of an additional operation such as freezing the substrate, could provide us with a little more. We could use methods such as gas diffusion or the cyclotron. The disintegration of heavier atoms or the confinement of alpha radiation (ejection of residual He-3 to another atomic reaction). Or the natural transmutation of a plasma exposed to an oscillating magnetic field (hypothesis only).
- This helium isotope must be used, during an application aiming to produce a beam which, like a laser, would propagate in a straight line without diverging, all at equilibrium temperature Thermodynamic ether of atom in question.
- A chemical bond with a partner is also required to accomplish this feat. This is because the free electron is going to have to place itself, most of the time, at the "geometric" opposite of its partner maintaining the link in question.
- At the position of the thermodynamic Aether equilibrium, to generate an operation on the Aether, it suffices to apply a punctual and repeated heat source. In this way, the trajectory of the axis of the two electrons will be in surplus or in deficits, and will be available on this trajectory, a reverse operation with the same considerations, "Inertia".
- Finally, if you want, a matter-antimatter separation operation (angular lateral oscillation, for example), to obtain a non-temporally annihilated result, on the Human brain, among others ...



This image is meant to be a modelled representation of the ideal concept designed by myself, which is practically impossible to achieve. Helium is very difficult to domesticate, to work at equilibrium temperature, everything would be extremely expensive ... See below, for a democratization of the process, at the cost of lower efficiency ...






My interest in the colonization of other planets, forces me to analyze, in more depth, the Matrix and its components. By indirect reasoning, I conclude that the distance between planets and stars could be of primary importance, "the density". Perhaps the speed of light can be influenced by the density, as shown above. Therefore, the capacity of the brain of the Human being, to reflect correctly. So a density generator (or angle), a simple fusion reactor, could be necessary for the colonization of other planets ...

THE COMMANDER GENERAL, CAT FIRST




## HUMAN BIOLOGY




OHSU (Tractography)

- I. The origin of the lower capacity of thought of the Human being, lies in the bilateral symmetry of the body.
- II. From the bilateral symmetry of the brain itself comes the absolute necessity of the hemispheres to communicate with each other.
- III. Because of the anatomy of the brain, it comes to my mind that the central systems are at the seat of what is called "advanced" thought, but which is not (in humans).
- IV. An "evolved" thought includes the electrochemical network of the neuron system as well as the individual capacity of said neurons to interact with the ether resonance of the central seat of the brain of the Human individual.
- V. The science of Human biology teaches us that cells are made up, among other things, of complex molecules assembled from amino acids, some of which could, using their resonant cycles, produce a sufficiently quantifiable operation on the matrix, must to the inertial load of the electronic displacement.
- VI. The study of the genetic code of the Human being, by its nature which, among other things, includes the original recipe of the amplifying system of the ether waves, which must be protein and which certainly acts as a cascade of electro-chemical potential toward other parallel systems related these to the networking nature of the neural system, could certainly point us to the protein (s) in question.
- VII. Due to their almost random positioning, the individual receivers as well as those of the central system, transmit and receive in all directions.
- VIII. A disconnection of the two hemispheres, aiming to remain alone in the head, would therefore lead to an almost total inability of the brain to act as seat of the central system (which could be beneficial from a global point of view).






Alfred Anwander: Diffusion Tractography produces a dense reconstruction of fiber pathways. The representation of thin slices of transparent streamlines allows new and aesthetic insights in a probabilistic reconstruction of the brain connectivity.



All these images are not absolute proof that the corpus callosum is the only part of the brain involved in this phenomenon of reception and emission of ether-electronic wave, but, for me, it is an indication that it certainly helps control the information that can be transferred. Also, the coincidence of the evolutionary strategic positioning of this organ, and the need to communicate from different other parts of the brain, places it at the top of the list, to be at the root of this phenomenon.

So when the subject analyzes the information coming from his eyes, the electro-chemical flow, coming from the front of the head, goes toward the back of the cortex to be analyzed, and there is probably a small quantity of links which lead to the corpus callosum, to undergo a translation toward the electron ether there, which would serve the evolutionary mechanism to cut the priority of certain systems on others, with the ultimate objective of improving effectiveness of the selective mode of these so-called brain functions.

Is a new type of IQ test born? Is it possible to take measurements of the frequency of selection of the different systems to obtain a number between 0-100, to better diagnose new deficiencies of the Human genus. Could the number of brain functions that can be generated simultaneously, be part of this new calibration system of Homo Sapiens thought?





## THE INDIVIDUAL PERTUBARTION SHIELD

Wikipedia:

1. *The axon, or nerve fiber, is the extension of the neuron which conducts the electrical signal from the cell body to the synaptic areas. Along the axon, this signal consists of action potentials. The other extensions of the neuron are the dendrites which carry the signal from the synapses to the cell body. Neurons most often have a single axon and several dendrites. However, the termination of the axon is very branched - we speak of terminal arborization - which allows it to contact several other neurons with the same information.*
2. *In some species, including vertebrates, the axons may be surrounded by a myelin sheath. This is synthesized by Schwann cells in the peripheral nervous system and by oligodendrocytes in the central nervous system. The myelin sheath improves the electrical properties of the axon and allows a higher signal conduction speed (up to 120 m / s).*

So, it is understood that the neurons do not reset at the speed of 120 m / s, and that if I stimulate a neuron, it cannot be useful until the next "cycle". Therefore, I allow myself to affirm that the random stimulation at high frequencies of the neurons of the Corpus callosum, will involve the cessation of the capacity to maintain a link with the generalized etheric waves.

However, the brain would be non-functional during this cut-off period. I allow myself to pursue this reasoning in greater depth in the next edition.

This day has arrived, currently, I no longer believe that the brain would be deactivated by this shield. The only way to shut down the brain is through a so-called excessive level of radiation, when the so-called normal brain cells are affected, outside of the parallel network system. Therefore, without this natural synchronism, it is not possible to reach normal cells other than those which in themselves have this function, therefore *inter alia* the nerve cells of the corpus callosum. Therefore, so-called light radiation, would have no side effect other than cutting off interactions with the generalized network.

Secondly, the physical form that this protective helmet could take is rather simple to implement. The beams will not have to be mobile, nor very precise except to target the corpus callosum ...

The production of such beams will be discussed a little later, with the oscillo-suzanne and the Helium incorporated in the C-60.



Rest assured, this item will be used for peaceful purposes :)



HIS VERY HIGH FINAL HIGHNESS "LA SENTINEL VIGOUREUSE"






## NANOTECHNOLOGICAL DETECTORS

When an ether-electron beam hits a phenylalanine molecule, a little thermal energy is produced. With the power of a helium weapon attack, a small amount of this very common amino acid (table of St-Hubert BBQ: sugar without sugar), in a small capsule, would be enough to determine the position of origin of such an attack, thanks to a network of oscillating transistors. With the help of an electronic choke, a network like this, will draw a straight line, toward the origin of the ray.

We can admire one of these models, below. It does not need to be spherical, but has been illustrated in this way by myself, for the sake of simplicity of graphic modelling. We could already rule on the dimensions of this one: 10,000 amino acid molecules, which would give 10,000,000 angstrom<sup>3</sup>, for an area of 222,286 angstrom<sup>2</sup>, for 12 transistors. There is no upper limit, but let's consider the smallest size possible. In the case of an atmospheric deployment, 365 billion billion detectors at 1000 km altitude, would give us a good detection rate. But for that, we would need a technology of the "Cat Ray" type. A process, resulting from material immortality (See my book on biology), would be prohibitive, for encapsulation, at least ...

In practical, these attacks are aimed at people or strategic objects, therefore, a localized deployment (a few walls and ceiling), would do the trick very well. Regardless, vigorous testing should be in place to calibrate and obtain reliable units of measurement.



MAJOR SMALL CAT



## TRAVEL IS IMPOSSIBLE

The title of this chapter is ironic. Because, everyone knows, In practical, displacement is possible! However, this statement is still correct. It is hard to believe, but the matter made of small leaps move in it, and the dimension of these leaps is related to the Matrix. The Matrix can be distorted under the action of gravitons. Therefore, the time required to make a move can be altered by energy interference.


Between two points of the matrix, we can consider that matter becomes ether, like two worlds which would be intimately linked. At each point in space, the proportion of these two worlds can vary, with a function related to the angle formed by the star and the black hole.

In fact, this is why the galaxy is almost planar.



## EDA DEFORMABLE SPACE

If we consider the transport system by magnetic tube. The EVA CHAT, does a 180° rotation in several stages, give a better conservation of energy, than a simple rebound? When a magnet falls on another, it bounces, if we put other system of magnets juxtaposed to the first, we will create a wave in these, the limit is not the friction of the air. If, we decrease the size of these magnet systems, as small as possible, will we observe something else? If at each mesh of the matrix, we could withdraw a quantum of energy by a change of direction, a rotation of 180°, in several stages would mean, more interactions with the Ether. Because based on my theory, nothing is perfectly round, it's N-gonal, up to the dimensional limit of the matrix. Could this fact be linked to the wave theory of light?



If we launch an inertial distortion in space, to arrive at a static position, inside the matrix, we could perhaps obtain a chain reaction which would not be resolved by time, because the speed of dissipation of the matrix would not have time to operate a stabilization, and droppings, a matrix detonation could appear ... But, all this is only theoretical, what magnitude and ...

THE GREAT CAT PHYSICIAN WHO SLEEPS




## GRAVITONS


This image is intended as a concept that could perhaps produce beams of gravitons. A system capable of producing gravitons would be an important asset in our search for the truth, certainly in a theoretical framework.

Warning! Like all the experience in this book, you must beware of the results ...

This concept is based on the same assumptions as the previous experiments, the energy of a lap will be added to that of the previous lap. Unfortunately, like all the experiments in this book, I don't have the capacity to execute them myself, because the rotation speed may be prohibitive :)






ANTI-GRAVITY CLOCK

This clock should not waste time on its twin, as defined in previous experiments, if it is built and launched correctly.

Next, a brief reasoning on time itself, I am almost certain, that it cannot be variable according to other concepts. Time is only a unit of measurement, and used as such, it can only be constant from one unit of measurement to the next, the second, if and only if, itself is defined correctly in the matrix space where the radiation used to measure it took place. All this, so as not to end up in a temporal anarchy, in a system where there are no longer any units of measurement. Because at the end of the day it's just a matter of perspective, the old system could stay in place indefinitely, until we clearly exceeded the speed of light :)

## ENERGY CONSERVATION PRINCIPLES

It is certain that the laws of physics will be interpreted differently in the future, but certain facts remain.



duo24.me

Each operation on the matrix must interact with the Sun, our star. So I doubt that we can abuse this concept. We probably cannot create a death star without paying the cost: our own work.



Mini Chat: Suzanne the rose, Final Princess of the known and eternal Universe, and further ...





MADE IN THIBODEAU-CATS

## OBJECTIVE

## I. Get spices:

- Helium-3 (2nd spice)
- Tritium (3rd spice): I bring to your attention that the half-life of Tritium is 12 years. US \$ 30,000 per gram, I believe this value will increase :)
- Translucent crystal (4th spice): shouldn't be a problem, \$ 0.01 per gram :)

## II. Get a solvent :(

III. Mixing and centrifugation: We need the smallest possible layer, it could be prohibitive in time :)

IV. Build an oscillator, with a split crystal: The deviation does not need to be huge, but at the right frequency :(

V. Operate the reaction in the centre of the device, with the Chat department.

VI. Burn the gas, and hope for a value close to  $9.8 \text{ m} / \text{s}^2$  :()

Simple recipe :), but possibly very dangerous :( :() :)




It is possible that by the creation of anti matter, this object is destroyed by itself, in the presence of light, therefore I consider to divide the whole into two shells, which would be more voluminous, only if the matter of the vessel has tendency to disappear :( :());

## THE TILT-SUZANNE-CHAT


But, let us first consider the absolute necessity of some experiments: For electrons, neutrons and protons. The smaller the machine, the less dangerous it will be :) Let's forget the efficiency of the curvature a bit, and think of spatial linearity. Can a flux of matter with 4 states of linear neutrons, create a destabilization on a nucleus of matter? The same for protons and electrons? Is a linear flow of antimatter going to dig into matter by causing energy to arise? These amounts have been obtained in regular science through several years of experimentation. Over a hundred years, and we have trouble measuring standard radiation correctly :( It would be a shame to dig tunnels in our scientists!

A regular capacitor will do the trick, with modulations at the appropriate speed. The thickness of the spice layer should be as thin as possible to allow measurements. The separating oscillation must be consistent with the oscillation of the oscillo-suzanne-1 frequency. An atom should not produce more than one ether radiation per field oscillation.



So, in the case of a neutron beam, the target which would be a solution of Na-OH, would probably transmute to modify the acidity level of said solution. With a color indicator or a more sophisticated means, we could attempt a quantification of the "flux". The Sodium will be increased, subsequently the fission of the nucleus will transform it into Magnesium-24, which has a half-life of 15 hours. All this taking into account the concept of the "K" ray, which in our matrix space, gives us real matter. Many problems which will lead us, using Barn's surface, to a good approximation of the "flux" of neutrons in question.





## THE OSCILLO-SUZANNE-CHAT SERIES:


- $L \frac{\partial^2 i}{\partial^2 t} + R \frac{\partial i}{\partial t} + 1/C i = \omega * A \cos(\omega * t)$
- $Q = \int i * dt$
- $\sigma = Q / \text{surface}$
- $E = \sigma / (2 * \epsilon)$ ;  $\epsilon = 1$  (air)
- $F = E * q$ ;  $q = 1.6 \times 10^{-19} C$
- $F = m * a$ ;  $m = 1.6 \times 10^{-27} \text{ kg}$ ;  $m = 9.1 \times 10^{-31} \text{ kg}$  (électron: 1750X)
- $t = \frac{1}{2} * 1 / f$
- $s = \int \int a * dt = \frac{1}{2} * a * t^2$
- $\frac{1}{2} * \text{kernel de He-3} < s < \text{kernel de He-3} \dots \dots$

GREAT SPY CARAMEL SUPREME



Jane Burton website

## TRANSPORT OF CATS



This is a Buckminsterfullerene, a few atoms of He-3 could be put inside for a period of 340 hours, because over time, outside of an atmosphere of He, they decompose, but enough time , to put it in a glue, which will solidify, to keep everything much longer. This process has several advantages:

- Inert substances
- Easily soluble in toluene
- Toluene will also dissolve the glue
- The toluene will evaporate to leave a solid frozen in time
- An almost good distribution of Helium-3
- On a very thin layer :)

Helium can form intercalation compounds with fullerites, in particular Buckminsterfullerene C60 and C70. In the solid C60, there are spaces between the balls of the C60, of tetrahedral or octahedral shape. Helium can diffuse into solid fullerite even at atmospheric pressure. Helium enters the network in two stages. The first quick step takes a few days and expands the network by 0.16% (2.2 hours) by filling the largest octahedral sites. The second stage takes thousands of hours to absorb more helium and expands the network twice as much (0.32%) by filling the tetrahedral sites. However, the solid C60 + 3He is not stable and loses helium on a time scale of 340 hours when it is not under a helium atmosphere. When the fullerite interposed with helium is cooled, its orientation phase transition is 10K higher than that of the pure C60 solid. The discontinuous change in actual volume at this point is smaller, but there are more rapid changes near the transition temperature, perhaps due to the variation in the occupancy of voids by helium. Yagotintsev, K.A. ; Strzhemechny, M.A. ; Stetsenko, Yu.E. ; Legchenkova, I.V. ; Prokhvatilov, A.I.




## QUANTIFICATION OF CAT FLOW

If, one does not open an infinite energy channel, towards the target, the "flow" of matter with four states, should be connected to the numbers of oscillations of the Oscillo-Suzanne-Chat. With, a layer density  $\hat{I}^C$  atom /  $m\text{\AA}^3$  for He-3, a surface of  $D-$   $m\text{\AA}^2$ , a thickness of  $\hat{a}^H$  m, and a frequency of  $\hat{a}, \frac{1}{4}$  Hertz, we could obtain a theoretical outgoing "flux" matter of fourfold material states, unit /  $(m\text{\AA}^2 * s)$ .

$$\hat{a}^H = \hat{a}, \frac{1}{4} * \hat{I}^C / \hat{a}^H * D-$$

gold

$$\hat{I}^C = 1100 \text{ units} / \text{proposed thickness of } 100 \text{ E-6 m} * \text{proposed surface of } 1 \text{ E-3 } m\text{\AA}^2$$



Unfortunately, the theoretical LASER will not be reached. There will be a deviation in the order of the ratio of the orbital energy and the electric field that we will apply :(


However, we will only get electrons or neutrons, most likely ...

## MECHANICS OF SPICE DROPS

The nature of the drops of cement that will contain the spice should follow these data:


Solvent	C60 mg/mL	C70 mg/mL
1-chloronaphthalene	51	ND
1-methylnaphthalene	33	ND
1,2-dichlorobenzene	24	36,2
1,2,4-trimethylbenzene	18	ND
tetrahydronaphthalene	16	ND
carbon disulfide	8	9,875
1,2,3-tribromopropane	8	ND
chlorobenzene	7	ND
p-xylene	5	3,985
bromoform	5	ND
cumene	4	ND
toluene	3	1,406
benzene	1,5	1,3
carbon tetrachloride	0,447	0,121
chloroform	0,25	ND
n-hexane	0,046	0,013

Insufficient to determine the precise nature of the cement in question, these data nevertheless indicate some clues. The more Fullerene there is in solution, the better. Also, it is necessary that the drop can evaporate by itself. But, a value of 51 mg / ml, is there something to evaporate?  $1.18 \text{ g} / \text{cm}^3$  at  $162.62 \text{ g} / \text{mole}$ , gives  $7.26E-3 \text{ mole} / \text{ml}$ , and for the C60:  $720.66 \text{ g} / \text{mole}$  at  $1.72 \text{ g} / \text{cm}^3$  (solid), gives  $2.39E-3 \text{ mole} / \text{ml}$ , a final ratio of 1/3. This is too much, will consider a smaller amount of C-60. Look at this beautiful drop drawing :)





## PLAYING WITH NEUTRINO



By a beta decay those reactions interact with neutrino by a Boson exchange.

The Pm-Nd reaction is self sustain for a serious long time, if kept under low energy exposure. My best dreams, allowed me to expect a possible modulation of the flux, with the help of electric fields, between a capacitor, as per example. In the worst case scenario, an oriented modulation base on geometric orientation to the target.

The H-He reaction is not self sustain, but the trace of tritium, everywhere, allowed me to imagine an amplification chain of chemical reaction that can be eradicate by the reception of the anti electron neutrino receive by the first reaction. Would suffice a concentrator of H<sup>3</sup>, like for plutonium in cotton protein... And a energy reserve like in Ranvier nodes, with Ca-Na pumps. So a modulation can occur(being transpose :) )... Level of tritium is varying in different material, too :( Its, this time difficult to predict how precise the detector will be with 1E-(±10) ratio.

Those two reactions let me think to many device:

- Telescopes
- Communications devices
- Others...

## PRACTICAL CONCEPTS: PSYCHOLOGICAL WAR

Every being could be destroyed, only the mad will survived: How a society could survived ?

- Physicals activation:
  - Physical pain
  - Mutilations
  - Nerves stapling
  - Neurotransmitters and control proteins
- Neurological patterns:
  - Love
  - Fear
  - Haste

The questioning about the most profitable use of the available weapons, won't be achieved here, because it's about the good selection of the physicals activation and neurological patterns, in the correct situation relative to the subject, the fucked ass, that will gives us the optimal use of energy :() :(:)



## ARMAGEDDON


Following some reasoning and experimentation, you may discover that exposure to the Aether-Electron can, if the flux is large enough, put beings who possess this so-called advanced mechanism of selection of neural groups, in danger of death.

The principle is that all cells with this mechanism can be "triggered" following the reception of such radiation. That's when the cerebellum, the brain organ that controls heart rate, could be turned off. Unfortunately, this action would translate into an inability of the Human body to survive for more than a few minutes, that's clear.

The tool to get there would be, a sphere, to scatter the radiation everywhere on Earth. It is not absolutely necessary to use such a geometric shape, but this is the easiest thing to operate :)

The number of C-6Os which would contain Helium-3 atoms, which could be put on this sphere would be all the more impressive as the sphere itself would be large; ()

The main principle being that the electric field of the spherical condenser would limit the thickness of the splice layer to "only" a few centimeters;) So a lot of Ether-electron ...



**THE CAT-PLUS HOLDING LIFE ATLUS**

To keep alive despite this fact, it would suffice to put in place a few tools ...



## THE BIDULE DETECTOR of ARMAGEDDON

In an objective of constant evolution, it comes to my mind to be able to locate the widgets of Armageddon which could be put into operation on our planet. It is clear that without a certain emission of energy, it is not possible to detect them by a network of detector with phenylalanine. But, by creating a vacuum of energy, inside a 3-D network of detectors, it would be possible to draw a line towards the origin. So, with multiple networks, we would have an exact location :)

But, what can imply by a vacuum: A ray of ether-electron, seeks are opposing to be annihilated, and once he found it, it can not be propagated any more, therefore creates a vacuum, in a point, on a complete surface, created by the origin ...

In a hallucinatory context, we could deploy a fleet of ADMIRABLE EA ETERNAL PRINCESSES GALACTIC SUPREME 6 (see the Canadian post industrial army, the book edition RED CATS).




## 3-D GRAVITONIC CAMERA OF THE SUPREME SMALL APES


This hypothesis based on other concepts which cannot also be fully demonstrated by your narrator, is a way of representing matter, by its density, at a distance and through other matter.

Based on the assumption that matter stops ether-electron, but little, so it is possible to create holes and cumulative gravity points, inside it. In my opinion, it would be possible to create emissions of etheric particles by creating oscillating dipoles, the frequency of which would be intimately linked to the constituent atom in question. These dipoles would be teleported, by gravitic waves, as described in the graviton chapter. A relative plus and minus, alternating, should create this phenomenon ...

Thereafter, it would suffice to capture, by standard means, the types of atoms, at the right time, to know the element in question, because the emission source would be gradually increased, in a repeated cycle ...

In this way, with a lot of "Gun", it would be possible to scan the planet, looking for something like Armageddon tool. Because, it suffices from distant puncture to realize the presence of an unnatural object, and not a reflection of all the atoms constituting it :)





## POSSIBLE QUARKS SEPARATION EXPERIMENT

### ***PROPERTIES RELEASE***

#### **FIRST CRITERIA**

Temperature close to absolute zero:

#### **SECOND CRITERIA**

Pressure close to vacuum:


### ***PARTICLES REORGANIZATION***


#### **ELECTRICAL FIELD**

#### **MAGNETIC FIELD**

#### **GRAVITY FIELD**

## 3D ROTATING SHIELD EA PRINCESS SUPREME GODESS KITTENS





## ONCE UPON THE TIME AN OSCILLATOR

I'm expecting to build for this device, an extremely fast oscillator, with the ultimate capacity of 10E21 Hz.

With an mother wave of a lot less frequency, to hold the finest wave achievable with an Einstein device by an electromagnetic wave in the order of the gamma ray.

## THE ENEMY

How to destroyed an hypothetical enemy,

### **ARRAY OF DEATHSPOT ATTACK**

By implementing an attack on everything except where there are some citizen, any secret bunker should be destroyed. The problem of the power of the flux of Aether beam will be resolve by translating the minimal power to kill a group of person in an dot, in a certain manner, around the globe. So let's say a cubic cm of C-60 with Helium-3 inside per sub dot, that will kill one head, cross enough width to forbidden a person to translate his head out of the beam in a dot. With at least three initial location of those beam dot, around the planet at a certain distance from each other:




If the diameter of the ray is sufficiently small, the other persons, located over the surface, won't die :) An alliance of nations will kill a lot more rapidly, than a single one :(

## **LOCALIZE ATTACK ON KNOWN POSITION**

With the help of the 3D camera of the little monkeys, of course it's easier, you only have to target the known location with a multi array of beam !


## IMPROVED BUNKER POSITION: SPICES CITY





## THE 1-CHAT ATOMIC MODEL

The next atomic models that follow should include these developments, and this one is no exception. By a curious chance, as usual, I discovered this astonishing reasoning. And, as it should be, preserves the practical data of the old model: The average of the distances, between each nucleus, of a spherical body, gives the value of a half diameter + 3.9%. In contrast, the average distance between each nucleus and the surface of the sphere is half a diameter. In the last model of the atom, we calculate the probability of atomic interactions, with the number of nucleus to be exceeded, now it is no longer necessary to pass through an atom, we can jump a little further, to get interaction. This magic fact corresponds to my new theory, while preserving the practical data of the old one :)



I worked out an algorithm, to calculate this two percent, it comes to me from my project of Mars (see the book: Conquest of the planet Mars and appendix 1 of this document).

## THE CLOWNS SUBPLANEET

I rarely think, but let's look at some facts that contribute to my mental instability. Who invented the Quarks? Is it a diabolical conspiracy, as I have seen so much in my life, or is it a coincidence that so much to demonstrate our scientific inferiority.

In the case of colonization of our galaxy, it is of great importance to be able to cope with dangerous radiation which could penetrate an inhabited vessel. But the energy which extrapolated from the existence of your sub particles should not be taken into account, in the calculation, as is currently the case in detectors.

A conspiracy: Wikipedia

*A conspiracy theory is an explanation of an event or situation that invokes an unwarranted conspiracy, usually an illegal or harmful act committed by the government or other powerful actors. Conspiracy theories often produce hypotheses that contradict the prevailing understanding of history or simple facts. The term is often derogatory.*

*According to political scientist Michael Barkun, conspiracy theories are based on the idea that the universe is governed by design and embody three principles: nothing happens by accident, nothing is as it seems and everything is connected. Another common feature is that conspiracy theories evolve to incorporate all the existing evidence against them, so that they become, as Barkun writes, a falsifiable closed system, and therefore "a matter of faith rather than evidence".*





But, if this state of affairs was induced by the ignorance of a group of people, who are trying to manipulate the truth, as described by Plato and Socrates (two pederasts). All to solve a problem that occupies them, such as a mouse trap, to catch good thinkers who will certainly find clues to their problem.

Chance: Wikipedia

*Chance is the lack of structure or predictability in events. A random sequence of events, symbols or steps has no order and does not follow an intelligible pattern or combination. Random individual events are by definition unpredictable, but in many cases the frequency of different results over a large number of events (or "trials") is predictable. For example, when rolling two dice, the result of a particular roll is unpredictable, but a sum of 7 will be multiplied by two. 4. From this perspective, randomness is a measure of the uncertainty of the outcome rather than chance. to the concepts of chance, probability and entropy of information.*

Yes ? I'm still there. Chance with an etymology which recalls the danger, this is why I will not extrapolate on the stinking species of which we are part.

The truth: my own definition


What a person considers the best thing, so as not to get caught in the next conspiracy.

In conclusion, for the moment there are no Quarks, gluons, involved in these phenomena, only protons, neutrons and electrons, real or not, anti or not, as described by your narrator who is not very humble, and this, until the next conspiracy, which will not be a coincidence, in our best of worlds.

## THE ETHER / REAL RATIO

The refractive index of a material, in my opinion, could be variable in two ways:

- I. On the other hand, its matrix density, therefore related to the distance from the Sun, our star.
- II. By hand, the speed of light inside it, so the angle with the black hole.



According to Maxwell, it was not clear at the time whether Ether existed or not. But, according to his work, the ratio of the speed of propagation of the magnetic field versus the electric field, could vary. This fact could explain the deflection of light in a solid. You could read the book of Maxwell Tome II, at the conclusion, there is a reference to an Italian mathematician, Enrico Betti, who mentioned that light could be connected to two successive components :) Maxwell Tome II

Surprisingly, perhaps it will be possible to take measurements on the black hole, by comparing these values over time.

## MAXWELL'S LIFE CONCLUSION

436 ACTION AT REMOTE. [864.

... by Clausius, in which the propagation is like that of light. There is, on the contrary, the greatest possible difference between the transmission of potential, according to Neumann, and the propagation of light. A luminous body sends forth light in all directions, the intensity of which depends on the luminous body alone, and not on the presence of the body which is enlightened by it. An electric particle, on the other hand, sends forth a potential, with the value of which depends not only on it: the emitting particle, but on the receiving particle, and on the distance  $r$  between the particles at the instant of emission. In the case of light the intensity diminishes as the light is propagated further from the luminous body the emitted potential flows to the body on which it acts without the slightest alteration of its original value. The light received by the illuminated body is in general only a fraction of that which falls on it; the potential as received by the attracted body is identical with, or equal to, the potential which arrives at it. Besides this, the velocity of transmission of the potential is not, like that of light, constant relative to the Aether or to space, but rather like that of a projectile, constant relative to the velocity of the emitting particle at the instant of emission. It appears, therefore, that in order to understand the theory of Neumann, we must form a very different representation of the process of the transmission of potential from that to which we have been accustomed in considering the propagation of light. Whether it can ever be accepted as the "construible Vorstellung" of the process of transmission, which appeared necessary to Gauss, I cannot say, but I have not myself been able to construct a consistent mental representation of Neumann's theory. Professor Betti \*, of Pisa, has treated the subject in a different way. He supposes the closed circuits in which the electric currents flow to consist of elements each of which is polarized periodically, that is, at equidistant intervals of time. These polarized elements act on one another as if they were little magnets whose axes are in the direction of the tangent to the circuits. The periodic time of this polarization is the same in all electric circuits. Betti supposes the action of one polarized element on an- \* *Nuovo Cimento*, xxvii (1868).

866.] A MEDIUM NECESSARY. 437

other at a distance to take place, not instantaneously, but after a time proportional to the distance between the elements. In this way he obtains expressions for the action of one electric circuit on another, which coincides with those which are known to be true. Clausius, however, has, in this case also, criticized some parts of the mathematical calculations into which we shall not here enter. 865.] There appears to be, in the minds of these eminent men, some prejudice, or *a priori* objection, against the hypothesis of a medium in which the phenomena of radiation of light and heat, and the electric actions at a distance take place. It is true that at one time those who speculated as to the causes of physical phenomena, were in the habit of accounting for each kind of action at a distance by means of a special ethereal fluid, whose function and property it was to produce these actions. They filled all space three and four times over with Aether of different kinds, the properties of which were invented merely to save appearances, so that more rational enquirers were willing rather to accept not only Newton's definite law of attraction at a distance, but even the dogma of Cotes \*\*, that action at a distance is one of the primary properties of matter, and that no explanation can be more intelligible than this fact. Hence the undulatory theory of light has met with much opposition, directed not against its failure to explain the phenomena, but against its assumption of the existence of a medium in which light is propagated. 866.] We have seen that the mathematical expressions for electrodynamics action led, in the mind of Gauss, to the conviction that a theory of the propagation of electric action in time would be found to be the very key-stone of electrodynamics. Now we are unable to conceive of propagation in time, except either as the flight of a material substance through space, or as the propagation of a condition of motion or stress in a medium already existing in space. In the theory of Neumann, the mathematical conception called Potential, which we are unable to conceive as a material substance, is supposed to be projected from one particle to another, in a manner which is quite independent of a medium, and which, as Neumann has himself pointed out, is extremely different from that of the propagation of light. In the theories of Riemann and Betti it would appear that the action is supposed to be propagated in a manner somewhat more similar to that of light. But in all of these theories the question naturally occurs: If

\* Preface to Newton's *Principia*, 2nd edition.

438 ACTION AT REMOTE. [866.

something is transmitted from one particle to another at a distance, what is its condition after it has left the one particle and before it has reached the other? If this something is the potential energy of the two particles, as in Neumann's theory, how are we to conceive this energy as existing in a point of space, coinciding neither with the one particle nor with the other? In fact, whenever energy is transmitted from one body to another in time, there must be a medium or substance in which the energy exists after it leaves one body and before it reaches the other, for energy, as Torricelli \* remarked, is a quintessence of so subtle a nature that it cannot be contained in any vessel except the inmost substance of material things. Hence all these theories lead to the conception of a medium in which the propagation takes place, and if we admit this medium as an hypothesis, I think it ought to occupy a prominent place in our investigations, and that we should endeavor to construct a mental representation of all the details of its action, and this has been my constant aim in this treatise.

\* *Lezioni Accademiche* (Firenze, 1715), p. 25.


SUPREME DUCK BABY COUPLE





## GALACTIC PUMP TYPE EA VERONIC PRINCESSES

The flatness of our galaxy puzzles me ... What can generate a mass with geometric properties like this?



The galaxy does not revolve around the black hole, but around its own center of mass. So, to correct the fact that an agglomeration of matter by collision, should give a system in rotation, such as an ellipsoid, we must use matter "invisible" to the telescope. This invisible material should therefore oscillate between two components of the ellipsoid, is not well illustrated in the drawing. This mass should therefore be small proportionally in point density, otherwise there would be stars, so visible matter ...

Or there are visible stars which are not visible from Earth, due to the transmission properties of the matrix which would be linked to the angle between the perpendicular of the black hole and the tangent formed by the juxtaposition of the star. ... But in my opinion, this is not the case. Perhaps the pumping effect is damped by something, and that over time, billions of years, the accelerated mass is found on the galactic disc mostly in its center :) Relative angular displacement of the vector of gravity as a function of centripetal force :()

This magic hypothesis would explain the points and the geometric density of the spiral galaxy, without using ultra-magnificent and hypothetical properties of black holes ...

The maximum speed as well as the time required to pass from the invisible to the main plane of rotation of the galaxy would be of the order of: radius = 7.1 E20 m, if the mass of the galaxy is 2 E42 kg (see below):  $d = 0.5 * a * t^2$ , and  $F = G * m1 * m2 / r^2 \Rightarrow 6.674 \times 10^{-11} \times 1.99 \times 10^{30} \times 2 \times 10^{42} / 3.6 \times 10^{40} = 7.38 \times 10^{21} \text{ N} \Rightarrow a = F / m = 3.7 \times 10^{-9}$

With such an acceleration, the time required for a star located half a radius from the disk to reach the plane of rotation would be 13.9 Million years and its speed 0.05 m / s. This is not an exact representation of reality, because if you think about it, the matter in question should adopt a spiral movement, on both sides of the disc, while reducing the radius of said movement as a function of time ...



## THE CONSTANT THIBODEAU-CHAT

Following recent reasoning, I begin a process about the quantification of the energy contained in the radiation of electron Aether (or particles, as you want!). As it was the case, in the search for "Quantum" of energy, in the light, we are faced with many problems.

Quantum (Wikipedia):

In physics, a quantum (plural: quanta) is the minimum quantity of any physical entity (physical property) involved in an interaction. The basic notion that a physical property can be "quantified" is called the "quantification assumption". This means that the magnitude of the physical property can only take discrete values made up of integer multiples of a quantum.


For example, a photon is a single quantum of light (or any other form of electromagnetic radiation), and can be called a "quantum of light" or a particle of light. Likewise, the energy of an electron linked inside an atom is quantified and can only exist in certain discrete values. (Indeed, atoms and matter in general are stable, because electrons can only exist at distinct energy levels within an atom.) Quantification is one of the foundations of much more physics broad of quantum mechanics. The quantification of energy and its influence on the interaction between energy and matter (quantum electrodynamics) are part of the fundamental framework for understanding and describing nature.

Etymology and discovery (Wikipedia):

The word quantum comes from the Latin *quantus*, which means "how big". "Quanta", acronym for "quanta of electric" (electrons), is used in a 1902 article on the photoelectric effect by Philipp Lenard, who attributes to Hermann von Helmholtz the word used in the field of electricity. However, the word quantum in general was well known before 1900. It was often used by doctors, as in the term *quantum satis*. Helmholtz and Julius von Mayer were both doctors and physicists. Helmholtz used the word quantum in reference to heat in his article on Mayer's work, and the word quantum can be found in the formulation of the first law of thermodynamics by Mayer in his letter of July 24, 1841.

In 1901 Max Planck used the terms *quanta* to refer to "the quanta of matter and electricity", gas and heat. In 1905, in response to Planck's work and Lenard's experimental work (who explained his results using the term *quantum of electricity*), Albert Einstein suggested that radiation existed in packets localized in the space he called "quanta of light" ("Lichtquanta").

The concept of quantifying radiation was discovered in 1900 by Max Planck, who was trying to understand the emission of radiation from heated objects, called black body radiation. Assuming that energy can only be absorbed or released in tiny, differential and discrete packets (which he called "packets" or "elements of energy"), Planck explained that some objects change color when they were heated. On December 14, 1900, Planck reported his discoveries to the German Physical Society and introduced the idea of quantification for the first time as part of his research into the radiation of the black body. Following his experiments, Planck deduced the numerical value of  $h$ , called Planck's constant, and reported more precise values for the unit of electric charge and the number of Avogadro - Loschmidt, the number of real molecules in a mole, at the German Physical Society. Once his theory has been validated, Planck is awarded the Nobel Prize in Physics for his discovery in 1918.




In fact, light does not interact much with Electron Aether, as we can achieve in life :) But, if a photon strikes an electron, in its etheric phase, it will instantly react with its medium (in our matrix localization).

If someone finds a way to stop these electrons, I will immediately give them a "piastre". But, meanwhile, we could study this phenomenon more carefully this way:

- I. Benzene, with its oscillating cycle, interacts with Ether
- II. This action is non-conservative, in energy
- III. The energy contained in a volume of Benzene varies according to the distance from our star, the Sun
- IV. This self-sustaining heat reaction, must be analyzed according to a budget in \$
- V. On Earth, we could send a LASER in a volume of Benzene, for analysis
- VI. By varying the position of the LASER on the faces of the cube, obtain a measurement
- VII. By using the CAT model
- VIII. To arrive at a Thibodeau-Chat constant, with the heat differential produced






This is the experiment by itself, with the LASER beam centered in the middle of the cube, thereafter, it is enough to modify the position of the beam towards a corner, and this in a few steps, to draw a curve of the temperature in function of time, for each position. The derivative function of the curve, will give the power, the product of the temperature difference with the thermal capacity and the Avogadro number, the energy included. The ratio of theoretical energy emitted by 100% of collisions, will give a quantum of electron Aether, if we obtain a percentage of emission also ...

I found some tips, on the internet, this experiment could be carried out within the limit of a budget of 500 USD, with a LASER of 500 mW, and a thermometer of a smaller measurement of 0.0001 Å° K, the accuracy is more or less important :)

I hope these values will be detectable, within the range of these specifications :()

Also, we could come to the conclusion, that the Sun, our star, and the energy contained in it, does not obey the following relation:  $E = mc^2$ . For example, 1000 kg of benzene \* 3600 s / h \* 24 h / day \* 365 day \* 6.022E23 atom / mol / 0.078 g / mol = 2.43E35 reactions at 100% efficiency, multiplied by 1E-3 Joules / potential neuronal (minimum energy to trigger a neuron) divided by 1E6 reactions / triggered neurons => 2.43E26 kg of Sun per year. Mass of the Sun: 1.99E30 kg, at less than an efficiency rate of the order of 1 / 1,000,000, we have a problem or the black hole keeps us from it:)



This is my last list of tests, on the subject, a cube made of glass or crystal with this cylindrical space in the middle, so that the LASER will be able to cross, without touching benzene or phenylalanine, among others ...

THE VERY GREAT HIGHNESS, MAJOR-GENERAL, BABY CAT





## THERMODYNAMIC

### THE FOURTH LAW OF THERMODYNAMICS

- A closed system cannot be considered as such, only and only if the Matrix is included :)


### THE FIFTH LAW OF THERMODYNAMICS

- The entropy is relative to the dimensional space of the Matrix, in angle and density, this for the resonant matter :)

École Polytechnique	Glasgow school	Berlin school	Edinburgh school
			
<u>Sadi Carnot</u> (1796-1832)	<u>William Thomson</u> (1824-1907)	<u>Rudolf Clausius</u> (1822-1888)	<u>James Maxwell</u> (1831-1879)
Vienna school	Gibbsian school	Dresden school	Dutch school
			
<u>Ludwig Boltzmann</u> (1844-1906)	<u>Willard Gibbs</u> (1839-1903)	<u>Gustav Zeuner</u> (1828-1907)	<u>Johannes der Waals</u> (1837-1923)

## INFINITE CATTLE-TURTLE ENERGY

Once again, using my overflowing imagination, I conceptualized a new type of reactor that will, I hope, have more than a one in ten chance of working :)



The principle is as follows: At the right gas density, the atoms will oscillate as illustrated above, and oscillating from reality to ether, will periodically push on the others, thus creating more heat (heat = internal oscillation of the gas). The energy thus created will come from the star-black-hole interaction and not from the fusion reactor. If the ether-real ratio comes from the density and not from the angle, we could vary the real-ether ratio with the fusion reactor. Otherwise, we could use the current Earth ratio. It would take little to create an almost unlimited source, but can be self-destructive, as I believe it, we can observe it in the solar ejections which would be caused by this phenomenon inside the Sun, our star..

## DÉTECTION DES ANOMALIES INTER MATRICES DE DIMMENSIONS DIFFÉRENTES

Notre conception de la Physique est liée à la matrice de propagation des ondes électromagnétique et son interprétation dans notre cerveau. Cependant, les diverse matrices de notre Univers ne sont pas toutes identiques. Comment expliquer des phénomènes qui à première vue sont incohérent avec la Physique. En analysant la matrice de transfère entre la matrice électromagnétique et la matrice du phénomène analysé. La conception spatiale pouvant être localisé sur la dimension  $1n-3n-5n$  d'une matrice possèdant au moins 5 dimensions. Une convolution  $n$ -D, pouvant donnée un espace vectoriel localisé sur un point précis de l'interface entre deux matrices différentes. Je veux dire qu'il n'y aurait pas une loi constante dans les  $n$ -Dimensions entre deux matrices et qu'il faille des approximation locale, pour un transfer situé dans l'espace souche à une location précise.  $(1,5,3,8,9) = 1/2mv^2$ , mais à  $(2,8,2,5,9) = m^3/v$ , par exemple, très simpliste :)

Donc, dans le cas qui nous interesse, la lumière resterait droite, mais serait percu par delta matriciel, comme étant courbe dans les  $n$ -Dimensions spatiales. Somme matriciel de  $A, B, C = 0.2*A + 0.7*B + 0.1 * C$ , où  $C$  est une force gravitationnelle, la matrice Gravitationnelle(1-D, par exemple) disparaît en puissance inversement à sa distance de la source.

Dans cette conception interressante, tout serait propagation intra matricielle :)) :))

**PHASE-1: CONVOLUTION N-D**

Prennons comme exemple, une transmission de données. Les "0" et "1" qui constituent la transmission, peuvent être regroupés en une base "n" qui constituerait un ensemble de symboles. Si, par exemple il faille un algorithme de correction automatique de détection d'erreurs(possible structure se propagant dans l'appareil... :)).

Donc, une convolution de dimensions équivalentes aux nombres de répliques de la structure linéaire des données initiales à transmettre. Les erreurs apparaîtraient par translation de la convolution additive, car cette somme serait constante dans la transmission n-D, par l'insertion de valeurs tampons. Il ne suffirait qu'une matrice de résolution de systèmes d'équations linéaires, dans une convolution additive non-linéaire, qui donnerait une solution à n-1 équations pour n variables...

Un peu long à coder, mais très rapide à décoder de l'autre côté. Tout dépendant des divers paramètres, et surtout de la quantité de données. Mais, ce n'est pas l'objectif que nous nous donnerons ici :)

Revenons à nos moutons.

Nous avons adéquatement instantié des équations avant et après Newton pour décrire le monde où nous vivons. Équations algébriques, je crois que la complexité de la situation ne permette plus de procéder ainsi. Peut-être, des séries magiques, issues de matrices n-D, pourraient servir de base au regroupement fonctionnel de nombres décrit par certains concepts à exprimer.

J'ai découvert, par exemple, que les nombres premiers pouvaient avantageusement être exprimé comme n'appartenant pas à la série dimensionnelle des indices descriptifs des dimensions d'un sous-espace vectoriel constitué de dimensions à longueur variable non identique. Nous pourrions définir de nombreuses séries magiques ou magnifiques qui par appariements pourraient décrire des sous-ensembles de nombres fonctionnellement réunis depuis la complexité d'une convolution n-D sur la réalité.

Créant ainsi, une branche des mathématiques se voulant l'expression de fonctions primordiales de la matrice véritable.

## THE RE-CREATION OF THE UNIVERSE

What a fun chapter name :)


This opportunity that is given to me and to you should not be lost. We the human race need to grow within the true limits of science. I shared my experience ... it's up to you to share too!

The refraction of light, can possibly create new matter, using the inertial oscillation of existing matter, in an extraordinary process which needs to be extracted from the darkness of the Universe, but certainly that of the Human spirit. We are probably not alone in this infinite space. As described, with my incredible sense of humor in my other work: *The Galactic Conquest and Post Modern Armaments*, we will need to be prepared for this new level of consciousness. The laws of nature, another of my books, cannot be transgressed, and we will have to fight for our survival, and hope, with a little evolution, in our nature at least, to succeed to the best of our ability.



Source unknown :)




SHAME ON ALL

The cause: Lorentz, with the following fraudulent reasoning:

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \beta^2}} = \frac{dt}{d\tau}$$

Speed (units of c)	Lorentz factor	Reciprocal
0	1	1
0.05	1.001	0.999
0.1	1.005	0.995
0.15	1.011	0.989
0.2	1.021	0.98
0.25	1.033	0.968
0.3	1.048	0.954
0.4	1.091	0.917
0.5	1.155	0.866
0.6	1.25	0.8
0.7	1.4	0.714
0.75	1.512	0.661
0.8	1.667	0.6
0.866	2	0.5
0.9	2.294	0.436
0.99	7.089	0.141
0.999	22,366	0.045
0.99995	100	0.01



If I have a speed of more than 300,000 km / s, my atoms too!

## CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS

We are in October 2019, and I was born in June 1977. This may seem a pretentious vision, but I will try to tell you this story. First of all, I almost always lived in the Montreal region, a city in the province of Quebec, in Canada. My parents were not wealthy, but of the middle class, which means that I lacked nothing during my childhood. What really represents a competitive advantage, on the terrestrial average, one could say ...

The first moment of my life when I believe I was put in contact with ethers, was after my operation for repeated ear infections in one ear. I think I felt something akin to what I later felt like targeting my head with ether-electron rays. I believe that this isolated event took place around the year 1980, on the ramp of highway 132 near the Longueuil Metro. But it's just a flash, this could be the result of many things.


I really did realize that someone else was in my head only in elementary school, at Gentilly school, during a music lesson where I played some flute. I think they even managed to make me play some wrong notes, which revolted me to the extreme. So these weapons probably existed around the year 1984, and this is not a reference to the work of George Orwell ...



I think I gradually had my first complete hypothesis during elementary school. It consisted, I remember very well, in disintegrating the Sun to cut the medium of transmission of electron ethers. Subsequently, at the start of secondary school, I hypothesized that a Tokamak could prevent some from falling to the ground by this phenomenon. I think it was around this time that I stopped conceptualizing my theories by verbalizing them in my head, in order to hide them from others. Because I believed, at the time as well as today, that I was getting ahead of the conception of these phenomena, a fact which cannot be demonstrated beyond any doubt, that is certain ...

It was during a trip to Virginia, USA, that I believe I had my first proof of the existence of the second and third splices, i.e. Helium-3 as well as Tritium, used as defined in the origin of the mater. I have not been shown the use of the fourth and last splice, that which materializes the Real Ether. It was after my visit to the space museum in Washington, where I became aware of the real functioning of the brain, at the sight of the imposing protective device of the lunar rock that I witnessed this phenomenon.

I woke up later towards the end of the reign of George W. Bush, in the middle of World War III in my head. There are certain facts in this space, but I will come back to this in another edition, perhaps ...



AMERICA

When I was living on the Maronniers street in Montreal, I was about 12 years old, the image of the ultimate stupid appeared to me: Adolf Hitler Jr. Was it a fact or an hallucination ?



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- **ANTITHESIS:**
  - Albert Einstein relativity PDF
  - Stephen Hawking PDF

## ANNEXES I

Programme qui permet d'Ã©valuer la distance moyenne entre chaque noyau constituant d'une sphÃ¨re, et d'en relier le rÃ©sultat avec la thÃ©orie des interactions nuclÃ©aires, donc des rÃ©sultats pratiques: codÃ© en c# avec un formulaire non reprÃ©sentÃ©, contenant 3 zones de textes, un Panel et un bouton de commande. Valeurs recommandÃ©es sous 35, car il devient incalculable de mettre des nombres trop Ã©levÃ©s.



```

using System;
using System.Collections.Generic;
using System.Threading.Tasks;

using System.Drawing;
using System.IO;

namespace Algo_1_CHAT
{
    public partial class Form1 : Form
    {

        Bitmap I = new Bitmap(1024, 1024);

        public Form1()
        {
            InitializeComponent();
        }

        private void button1_Click(object sender, EventArgs e)
        {
            List<string> data = new List<string>();
            for (int o = 15; o < 35; o++)
            {
                Collection<Collection<Collection<bool>>> sphere = Create_Sphere(o);
                int part = o;
                //int rayon = int.Parse(textBox1.Text);

                Long cntr1 = 0;

                {
                    for (int k = 0; k < sphere[i][j].Count; k++)
                    {
                        {
                            tt[i] += Get_moyenne_distance(1, sphere, i, j, k);
                            cntr1++;
                        }
                    }
                });
                double ttf = 0;
                for (int i = 0; i < part+1; i++)
                {
                    ttf += tt[i];
                }
                double distance_moyenne = (ttf / cntr1);

                textBox5.Text = ((distance_moyenne - part / 2.0f) / (part / 2.0f)).ToString();
            }
        }

        private double Get_moyenne_distance(double step, Collection<Collection<Collection<bool>>> sphere, int x, int y, int z)
        {
            double cntr = 0;

            for (int i = 0; i < sphere.Count; i++)
            {
                for (int j = 0; j < sphere[i].Count; j++)
                {
                    if (sphere[i][j][k] == true)
                    {
                        float distance = (float) Math.Sqrt(Math.Pow(x - i, 2) + Math.Pow(y - j, 2) + Math.Pow(z - k, 2));
                        cntr += distance;
                    }
                }
            }
            return cntr;
        }
    }
}

```



```

        }
    }

    return cntr / cntr2;
}

private Collection<Collection<Collection<Collection<bool>>> Create_Sphere(int parts)

//double step = 2 * rayon / parts;

for (int i = (int)(-parts / 2.0f); i <= (int)(parts / 2.0f); i++)
{
    Collection<Collection<bool>> tmp2 = new Collection<Collection<bool>>();
    for (int j = (int)(-parts / 2.0f); j <= (int)(parts / 2.0f); j++)
    {
        Collection<bool> tmp = new Collection<bool>();
        for (int k = (int)(-parts / 2.0f); k <= (int)(parts / 2.0f); k++)
        {
            bool test = false;
            float distance = (float)Math.Sqrt(Math.Pow(i, 2) + Math.Pow(j, 2) + Math.Pow(k, 2));
            if (distance <= parts / 2.0f)
            {
                int iy = (int)((i + parts / 2.0f) / (Math.Sqrt(i + parts / 2.0f)));
                {
                    tmppt++;
                    tmpy = iy;
                }
                I.SetPixel((j + 9 + (int)(i + parts / 2.0f) * 25), 512 + k, Color.Red);
            }
            tmp.Add(test);
        }
        tmp2.Add(tmp);
    }
}

panel1.Refresh();
return sphere;
}

private void panel1_Paint(object sender, PaintEventArgs e)
{
    e.Graphics.DrawImage(I, new Point(0, 0));
}
}

```

ANNEXE II



ANNEXES II**RELATIVITY**  
THE SPECIAL AND GENERAL THEORY

ALBERT EINSTEIN

DIGITAL REPRINT

Elegant Ebooks

## COPYRIGHT INFORMATION

Book: *Relativity: The Special and General Theory*  
 Author: Albert Einstein, 1879–1955  
 First published: 1920

The original book is in the public domain in the United States. However, since Einstein died in 1955, it may still be under copyright in many other countries, for example, those that use the life of the author + 60 years or life + 70 years for the duration of copyright. Readers outside the United States should check their own countries' copyright laws to be certain they can legally download this ebook. The Online Books Page has an FAQ which gives a summary of copyright durations for many other countries, as well as links to more official sources.


This PDF ebook was  
 created by José Menéndez.

## NOTE ON THE TEXT

The text used in this ebook is from the first English translation published in 1920 as *Über die spezielle und die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie*. A few misprints in the original text have been corrected, but to preserve all of the book, the original misprints are included in footnotes enclosed in square brackets and signed "J.M."

In addition, the line breaks and pagination of the original book have been reproduced, and the PDF's page numbers are linked to page images of the book from the Google Books Library Project for easy comparison. Please note: Google's images may not be available to people outside the U.S. and may be unavailable to U.S. residents at times.

Retaining the original pagination made it possible to include a fully functional (clickable) copy of the original index.

**RELATIVITY**  
THE SPECIAL AND GENERAL THEORYBY  
ALBERT EINSTEIN, Ph.D.  
PROFESSOR OF PHYSICS IN THE UNIVERSITY OF BERLINTRANSLATED BY  
ROBERT W. LAWSON, M.Sc.  
UNIVERSITY OF SHEFFIELDNEW YORK  
HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY  
1920COPYRIGHT, 1920  
BY  
HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY

## PREFACE

THE present book is intended, as far as possible, to give an exact insight into the theory of Relativity to those readers who, from a general scientific and philosophical point of view, are interested in the theory, but who are not conversant with the mathematical apparatus<sup>1</sup> of theoretical physics. The work presumes a standard of education corresponding to that of a university matriculation examination, and, despite the shorness of the book, a fair amount of patience and force of will on the part of the reader. The author has spared himself no pains in his endeavour to present the main ideas in the simplest and most intelligible form, and on the

<sup>1</sup>The mathematical fundaments of the special theory of relativity are to be found in the original papers of H. A. Lorentz, A. Einstein, H. Minkowski, published under the title *Das Relativitätsprinzip* (The Principle of Relativity) in B. G. Teubner's collection of monographs on applied mathematics and physics (Teubner's Advances in the Mathematical Sciences), also in M. Laue's exhaustive book *Das Relativitätsprinzip* — published by Friedr. Vieweg & Son, Braunschweig. The general theory of relativity, together with the necessary parts of the theory of invariants, is treated in the author's book *Die Grundlagen der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie* (The Foundations of the General Theory of Relativity) — Joh. Amb. Barth, 1916; this book assumes some familiarity with the special theory of relativity.

v  
[<sup>1</sup> Minkowski] — J.M.]

vi

## RELATIVITY

whole, in the sequence and connection in which they actually originated. In the interest of clearness, it appeared to me inevitable that I should repeat myself frequently, without paying the slightest attention to the elegance of the presentation. I adhered scrupulously to the precept of that brilliant theoretical physicist, L. Boltzmann, according to whom matters of elegance ought to be left to the tailor and to the cobbler. I make no pretence of having withheld from the reader difficulties which are inherent to the subject. On the other hand, I have purposely treated the empirical physical foundations of the theory in a "step-motherly" fashion, so that readers unfamiliar with physics may not feel like the wanderer who was unable to see the forest for trees. May the book bring some one a few happy hours of suggestive thought!

A. EINSTEIN

December, 1916

## NOTE TO THE THIRD EDITION

IN the present year (1918) an excellent and detailed manual on the general theory of relativity, written by H. Weyl, was published by the firm Julius Springer (Berlin). This book, entitled *Raum — Zeit — Materie* (Space — Time — Matter), may be warmly recommended to mathematicians and physicists.

## BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

ALBERT EINSTEIN is the son of German-Jewish parents. He was born in 1879 in the town of Ulm, Württemberg, Germany. His schooldays were spent in Munich, where he attended the *Gymnasium* until his sixteenth year. After leaving school at Munich, he accompanied his parents to Milan, whence he proceeded to Switzerland six months later to continue his studies.

From 1896 to 1900 Albert Einstein studied mathematics and physics at the Technical High School in Zurich, as he intended becoming a secondary school (*Gymnasium*) teacher. For some time afterwards he was a private tutor, and having meanwhile become naturalised, he obtained a post as engineer in the Swiss Patent Office in 1902, which position he occupied till 1909. The main ideas involved in the most important of Einstein's theories date back to this period. Amongst these may be mentioned: *The Special Theory of Relativity*, *Inertia of Energy*, *Theory of the Brownian Movement*, and the *Quantum-Law of the Emission and Absorption of Light* (1905). These were followed some years later by the

vii

## viii RELATIVITY

*Theory of the Specific Heat of Solid Bodies*, and the fundamental idea of the *General Theory of Relativity*.

During the interval 1909 to 1911 he occupied the post of Professor *Extraordinarius* at the University of Zurich, afterwards being appointed to the University of Prague, Bohemia, where he remained as Professor *Ordinarius* until 1912. In the latter year Professor Einstein accepted a similar chair at the *Polytechnikum*, Zurich, and continued his activities there until 1914, when he received a call to the Prussian Academy of Science, Berlin, as successor to Van't Hoff. Professor Einstein is able to devote himself freely to his studies at the Berlin Academy, and it was here that he succeeded in completing his work on the *General Theory of Relativity* (1915-17). Professor Einstein also lectures on various special branches of physics at the University of Berlin, and, in addition, he is Director of the Institute for Physical Research of the *Kaiser Wilhelm Gesellschaft*.

Professor Einstein has been twice married. His first wife, whom he married at Berne in 1903, was a fellow-student from Serbia. There were two sons of this marriage, both of whom are living in Zurich, the elder being sixteen years of age. Recently Professor Einstein married a widowed cousin, with whom he is now living in Berlin.

R. W. L.

[<sup>1</sup> Institute — J.M.]

## CONTENTS

## PART I

## THE SPECIAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

PAGE

I. Physical Meaning of Geometrical Propositions . . . . .	1
II. The System of Co-ordinates . . . . .	5
III. Space and Time in Classical Mechanics . . . . .	9
IV. The Galilean System of Co-ordinates . . . . .	12
V. The Principle of Relativity (in the Restricted Sense) . . . . .	14
VI. The Theorem of the Addition of Velocities employed in Classical Mechanics . . . . .	19
VII. The Apparent Incompatibility of the Law of Propagation of Light with the Principle of Relativity . . . . .	21
VIII. On the Idea of Time in Physics . . . . .	25
IX. The Relativity of Simultaneity . . . . .	30
X. On the Relativity of the Conception of Distance . . . . .	34
XI. The Lorentz Transformation . . . . .	36
XII. The Behavior of Measuring-Rods and Clocks in Motion . . . . .	42

xi

## xii RELATIVITY

PAGE

XIII. Theorem of the Addition of Velocities. The Experiment of Fizeau . . . . .	45
XIV. The Heuristic Value of the Theory of Relativity . . . . .	50
XV. General Results of the Theory . . . . .	52
XVI. Experience and the Special Theory of Relativity . . . . .	58
XVII. Minkowski's Four-dimensional Space . . . . .	65

## PART II

## THE GENERAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

XVIII. Special and General Principle of Relativity . . . . .	69
XIX. The Gravitational Field . . . . .	74
XX. The Equality of Inertial and Gravitational Mass as an Axiom for the General Principle of Relativity . . . . .	78
XXI. In what Respects are the Foundations of Classical Mechanics and of the Special Theory of Relativity unsatisfactory? . . . . .	84
XXII. A Few Inferences from the General Theory of Relativity . . . . .	87
XXIII. Behaviour of Clocks and Measuring-Rods on a Rotating Body of Reference . . . . .	93
XXIV. Euclidean and Non-Euclidean Continuum . . . . .	98
XXV. Gaussian Co-ordinates . . . . .	103
XXVI. The Space-time Continuum of the Special Theory of Relativity considered as a Euclidean Continuum . . . . .	108

[<sup>1</sup> Relativity — J.M.][<sup>2</sup> "Theory" was changed to "Principle" in later editions. — J.M.]

## RELATIVITY

## PART I

## THE SPECIAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

1

## PHYSICAL MEANING OF GEOMETRICAL PROPOSITIONS

IN your schooldays most of you who read this book made acquaintance with the noble building of Euclid's geometry, and you remember — perhaps with more respect than love — the magnificent structure, on the lofty staircase of which you were chased about for uncounted hours by conscientious teachers. By reason of your past experience, you would certainly regard every one with disdain who should pronounce even the most out-of-the-way proposition of this science to be untrue. But perhaps this feeling of proud certainty would leave you immediately if some one were to ask you: "What, then, do you mean by the assertion that these propositions are true?" Let us proceed to give this question a little consideration.

Geometry sets out from certain conceptions such as "plane," "point," and "straight line," with

1

## 2 SPECIAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

which we are able to associate more or less definite ideas, and from certain simple propositions (axioms) which, in virtue of these ideas, we are inclined to accept as "true." Then, on the basis of a logical process, the justification of which we feel ourselves compelled to admit, all remaining propositions are shown to follow from those axioms, *i.e.* they are proven. A proposition is then correct ("true") when it has been derived in the recognised manner from the axioms. The question of the "truth" of the individual geometrical propositions is thus reduced to one of the "truth" of the axioms. Now it has long been known that the last question is not only unanswerable by the methods of geometry, but that it is in itself entirely without meaning. We cannot ask whether it is true that only one straight line goes through two points. We can only say that Euclidean geometry deals with things called "straight lines," to each of which is ascribed the property of being uniquely determined by two points situated on it. The concept "true" does not tally with the assertions of pure geometry, because by the word "true" we are eventually in the habit of designating always the correspondence with a "real" object; geometry, however, is not concerned with the relation of the ideas involved in it to objects of experience, but only with the logical connection of these ideas among themselves.

## TRANSLATOR'S NOTE

IN presenting this translation to the English-reading public, it is hardly necessary for me to enlarge on the Author's prefatory remarks, except to draw attention to those additions to the book which do not appear in the original.

At my request, Professor Einstein kindly supplied me with a portrait of himself, by one of Germany's most celebrated artists. Appendix III, on "The Experimental Confirmation of the General Theory of Relativity," has been written specially for this translation. Apart from these valuable additions to the book, I have included a biographical note on the Author, and, at the end of the book, an Index and a list of English references to the subject. This list, which is more suggestive than exhaustive, is intended as a guide to those readers who wish to pursue the subject further.

I desire to tender my best thanks to my colleagues Professor S. R. Milner, D.Sc., and Mr. W. E. Curtis, A.R.C.Sc., F.R.A.S., also to my friend Dr. Arthur Holmes, A.R.C.Sc., F.G.S.,

ix

## x RELATIVITY

of the Imperial College, for their kindness in reading through the manuscript, for helpful criticism, and for numerous suggestions. I owe an expression of thanks also to Messrs. Methuen for their ready counsel and advice, and for the care they have bestowed on the work during the course of its publication.

ROBERT W. LAWSON

THE PHYSICS LABORATORY  
THE UNIVERSITY OF SHEFFIELD  
June 12, 1920

I. Physical Meaning of Geometrical Propositions . . . . .	1
II. The System of Co-ordinates . . . . .	5
III. Space and Time in Classical Mechanics . . . . .	9
IV. The Galilean System of Co-ordinates . . . . .	12
V. The Principle of Relativity (in the Restricted Sense) . . . . .	14
VI. The Theorem of the Addition of Velocities employed in Classical Mechanics . . . . .	19
VII. The Apparent Incompatibility of the Law of Propagation of Light with the Principle of Relativity . . . . .	21
VIII. On the Idea of Time in Physics . . . . .	25
IX. The Relativity of Simultaneity . . . . .	30
X. On the Relativity of the Conception of Distance . . . . .	34
XI. The Lorentz Transformation . . . . .	36
XII. The Behavior of Measuring-Rods and Clocks in Motion . . . . .	42

XIII. Theorem of the Addition of Velocities. The Experiment of Fizeau . . . . .	45
XIV. The Heuristic Value of the Theory of Relativity . . . . .	50
XV. General Results of the Theory . . . . .	52
XVI. Experience and the Special Theory of Relativity . . . . .	58
XVII. Minkowski's Four-dimensional Space . . . . .	65

[<sup>1</sup> Relativity — J.M.][<sup>2</sup> "Theory" was changed to "Principle" in later editions. — J.M.]

## CONTENTS

xiii

PAGE

XVIII. The Space-time Continuum of the General Theory of Relativity is not a Euclidean Continuum . . . . .	111
XVIII. Exact Formulation of the General Principle of Relativity . . . . .	115
XIX. The Solution of the Problem of Gravitation on the Basis of the General Principle of Relativity . . . . .	119

## PART III

## CONSIDERATIONS ON THE UNIVERSE AS A WHOLE

XXX. Cosmological Difficulties of Newton's Theory . . . . .	125
XXXI. The Possibility of a "Finite" and yet "Unbounded" Universe . . . . .	128
XXXII. The Structure of Space according to the General Theory of Relativity . . . . .	135

## APPENDICES

I. Simple Derivation of the Lorentz Transformation . . . . .	139
II. Minkowski's Four-dimensional Space ("World") [Supplementary to Section XVIII] . . . . .	146
III. The Experimental Confirmation of the General Theory of Relativity . . . . .	148
(a) Motion of the Perihelion of Mercury . . . . .	150
(b) Deflection of Light by a Gravitational Field . . . . .	152
(c) Displacement of Spectral Lines towards the Red . . . . .	155
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	161
INDEX . . . . .	165

BIBLIOGRAPHY

INDEX

## GEOMETRICAL PROPOSITIONS 3

IT is not difficult to understand why, in spite of this, we feel constrained to call the propositions of geometry "true." Geometrical ideas correspond to more or less exact objects in nature, and these last are undoubtedly the exclusive cause of the genesis of those ideas. Geometry ought to refrain from such a course, in order to give to its structure the largest possible logical unity. The practice, for example, of seeing in a "distance" two marked positions on a practically rigid body is something which is lodged deeply in our habit of thought. We are accustomed further to regard three points as being situated on a straight line, if their apparent positions can be made to coincide for observation with one eye, under suitable choice of our place of observation.

If, in pursuance of our habit of thought, we now supplement the propositions of Euclidean geometry by the single proposition that two points on a practically rigid body always correspond to the same distance (line-interval), independently of any changes in position to which we may subject the body, the propositions of Euclidean geometry then resolve themselves into propositions on the possible relative position of practically rigid bodies.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It follows that a natural object is associated also with a straight line. Three points *A*, *B* and *C* on a rigid body thus lie in a straight line when the points *A* and *C* being given, *B* is chosen such that the sum of the distances *AB* and *BC* is as short as possible. This incomplete suggestion will suffice for our present purpose.

## 4 SPECIAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

Geometry which has been supplemented in this way is then to be treated as a branch of physics. We can now legitimately ask as to the "truth" of geometrical propositions interpreted in this way, since we are justified in asking whether these propositions are satisfied for those real things we have associated with the geometrical ideas. In less exact terms we can express this by saying that by the "truth" of a geometrical proposition in this sense we understand its validity for a construction with ruler and compasses.

Of course the conviction of the "truth" of geometrical propositions in this sense is founded exclusively on rather incomplete experience. For the present we shall assume the "truth" of the geometrical propositions, then at a later stage (in the general theory of relativity) we shall see that this "truth" is limited, and we shall consider the extent of its limitation.



## II

## THE SYSTEM OF CO-ORDINATES

**O**n the basis of the physical interpretation of distance which has been indicated, we are also in a position to establish the distance between two points on a rigid body by means of measurements. For this purpose we require a "distance" (rod  $S$ ) which is to be used once and for all, and which we employ as a standard measure. If, now,  $A$  and  $B$  are two points on a rigid body, we can construct the line joining them according to the rules of geometry; then, starting from  $A$ , we can mark off the distance  $S$  time after time until we reach  $B$ . The number of these operations required is the numerical measure of the distance  $AB$ . This is the basis of all measurement of length.<sup>1</sup>

Every description of the scene of an event or of the position of an object in space is based on the specification of the point on a rigid body (body of reference) with which that event or object coincides.

<sup>1</sup> Here we have assumed that there is nothing left over, *i.e.* that the measurement gives a whole number. This difficulty is got over by the use of divided measuring-rods, the introduction of which does not demand any fundamentally new method.

5

## III

## SPACE AND TIME IN CLASSICAL MECHANICS

**T**HE purpose of mechanics is to describe how bodies change their position in space with time." I should load my conscience with grave sins against the sacred spirit of lucidity were I to formulate the aims of mechanics in this way, without serious reflection and detailed explanations. Let us proceed to disclose these sins.

It is not clear what is to be understood here by "position" and "space." I stand at the window of a railway carriage which is travelling uniformly, and drop a stone on the embankment, without throwing it. Then, disregarding the influence of the air resistance, I see the stone descend in a straight line. A pedestrian who observes the misdeed from the footpath notices that the stone falls to earth in a parabolic curve. I now ask: Do the "positions" traversed by the stone lie "in reality" on a straight line or on a parabola? Moreover, what is meant here by motion "in space"? From the considerations of the previous section the answer is self-evident. In the first place, we entirely shun the vague word "space,"

9

## 6 SPECIAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

This applies not only to scientific description, but also to everyday life. If I analyse the place specification "Trafalgar Square, London,"<sup>1</sup> I arrive at the following result: The earth is the rigid body to which the specification of place refers; "Trafalgar Square, London" is a well-defined point, to which a name has been assigned, and with which the event coincides in space.<sup>2</sup>

This primitive method of place specification deals only with places on the surface of rigid bodies, and is dependent on the existence of points on this surface which are distinguishable from each other. But we can free ourselves from both of these limitations without altering the nature of our specification of position. If, for instance, a cloud is hovering over Trafalgar Square, then we can determine its position relative to the surface of the earth by erecting a pole perpendicularly on the Square, so that it reaches the cloud. The length of the pole measured with the standard measuring-rod, combined with the specification of the position of the foot of the pole, supplies us with a complete place specification. On the basis

<sup>1</sup> I have chosen this as being more familiar to the English reader than the "Postdamer Platz, Berlin," which is referred to in the original. (R. W. L.)

<sup>2</sup> It is not necessary here to investigate further the significance of the expression "coincidence in space." This conception is sufficiently obvious to ensure that differences of opinion are scarcely likely to arise as to its applicability in practice.

## 10 SPECIAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

of which, we must honestly acknowledge, we cannot form the slightest conception, and we replace it by "motion relative to a practically rigid body of reference." The positions relative to the body of reference (railway carriage or embankment) have already been defined in detail in the preceding section. If instead of "body of reference" we insert "system of co-ordinates," which is a useful idea for mathematical description, we are in a position to say: The stone traverses a straight line relative to a system of co-ordinates rigidly attached to the carriage, but relative to a system of co-ordinates rigidly attached to the ground (embankment) it describes a parabola. With the aid of this example it is clearly seen that there is no such thing as an independently existing trajectory (*lit.* "path-curve"<sup>1</sup>), but only a trajectory relative to a particular body of reference.

In order to have a *complete* description of the motion, we must specify how the body alters its position *with time*; *i.e.* for every point on the trajectory it must be stated at what time the body is situated there. These data must be supplemented by such a definition of time that, in virtue of this definition, these time-values can be regarded essentially as magnitudes (results of measurements), capable of observation. If we take our stand on the ground of classical mecha-

<sup>1</sup> That is, a curve along which the body moves.

## THE SYSTEM OF CO-ORDINATES 7

of this illustration, we are able to see the manner in which a refinement of the conception of position has been developed.

(a) We imagine the rigid body, to which the place specification is referred, supplemented in such a manner that the object whose position we require is reached by the completed rigid body.

(b) In locating the position of the object, we make use of a number (here the length of the pole measured with the measuring-rod) instead of designated points of reference.

(c) We speak of the height of the cloud even when the pole which reaches the cloud has not been erected. By means of optical observations of the cloud from different positions on the ground, and taking into account the properties of the propagation of light, we determine the length of the pole we should have required in order to reach the cloud.

From this consideration we see that it will be advantageous if, in the description of position, it should be possible by means of numerical measures to make ourselves independent of the existence of marked positions (possessing names) on the rigid body of reference. In the physics of measurement this is attained by the application of the Cartesian system of co-ordinates.

This consists of three plane surfaces perpendicular to each other and rigidly attached to a rigid

## 8 SPECIAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

body. Referred to a system of co-ordinates, the scene of any event will be determined (for the main part) by the specification of the lengths of the three perpendiculars or co-ordinates ( $x$ ,  $y$ ,  $z$ ) which can be dropped from the scene of the event to those three plane surfaces. The lengths of these three perpendiculars can be determined by a series of manipulations with rigid measuring-rods performed according to the rules and methods laid down by Euclidean geometry.

In practice, the rigid surfaces which constitute the system of co-ordinates are generally not available; furthermore, the magnitudes of the co-ordinates are not actually determined by constructions with rigid rods, but by indirect means. If the results of physics and astronomy are to maintain their clearness, the physical meaning of specifications of position must always be sought in accordance with the above considerations.<sup>1</sup>

We thus obtain the following result: Every description of events in space involves the use of a rigid body to which such events have to be referred. The resulting relationship takes for granted that the laws of Euclidean geometry hold for "distances," the "distance" being represented physically by means of the convention of two marks on a rigid body.

<sup>1</sup> A refinement and modification of these views does not become necessary until we come to deal with the general theory of relativity, treated in the second part of this book.

## SPACE AND TIME 11

chanics, we can satisfy this requirement for our illustration in the following manner. We imagine two clocks of identical construction; the man at the railway-carriage window is holding one of them, and the man on the footpath the other. Each of the observers determines the position on his own reference-body occupied by the stone at each tick of the clock he is holding in his hand. In this connection we have not taken account of the inaccuracy involved by the finiteness of the velocity of propagation of light. With this and with a second difficulty prevailing here we shall have to deal in detail later.

## IV

## THE GALILEIAN SYSTEM OF CO-ORDINATES

**A**S is well known, the fundamental law of the mechanics of Galilei-Newton, which is known as the *law of inertia*, can be stated thus: A body removed sufficiently far from other bodies continues in a state of rest or of uniform motion in a straight line. This law not only says something about the motion of the bodies, but it also indicates the reference-bodies or systems of co-ordinates, permissible in mechanics, which can be used in mechanical description. The visible fixed stars are bodies for which the law of inertia certainly holds to a high degree of approximation. Now if we use a system of co-ordinates which is rigidly attached to the earth, then, relative to this system, every fixed star describes a circle of immense radius in the course of an astronomical day, a result which is opposed to the statement of the law of inertia. So that if we adhere to this law we must refer these motions only to systems of co-ordinates relative to which the fixed stars do not move in a circle. A system of co-ordinates of

12

## THE GALILEIAN SYSTEM 13

which the state of motion is such that the law of inertia holds relative to it is called a "Galileian system of co-ordinates." The laws of the mechanics of Galilei-Newton can be regarded as valid only for a Galileian system of co-ordinates.

## V

## THE PRINCIPLE OF RELATIVITY (IN THE RESTRICTED SENSE)

**I**n order to attain the greatest possible clearness, let us return to our example of the railway carriage supposed to be travelling uniformly. We call its motion a uniform translation ("uniform" because it is of constant velocity and direction, "translation" because although the carriage changes its position relative to the embankment yet it does not rotate in so doing). Let us imagine a raven flying through the air in such a manner that its motion, as observed from the embankment, is uniform and in a straight line. If we were to observe the flying raven from the moving railway carriage, we should find that the motion of the raven would be one of different velocity and direction, but that it would still be uniform and in a straight line. Expressed in an abstract manner we may say: If a mass  $m$  is moving uniformly in a straight line with respect to a co-ordinate system  $K$ , then it will also be moving uniformly and in a straight line relative to a second co-ordinate system  $K'$ , provided that

14

## THE PRINCIPLE OF RELATIVITY 15

the latter is executing a uniform translatory motion with respect to  $K$ . In accordance with the discussion contained in the preceding section, it follows that:

If  $K$  is a Galileian co-ordinate system, then every other co-ordinate system  $K'$  is a Galileian one, when, in relation to  $K$ , it is in a condition of uniform motion of translation. Relative to  $K'$  the mechanical laws of Galilei-Newton hold good exactly as they do with respect to  $K$ .

We advance a step further in our generalisation when we express the tenet thus: If, relative to  $K$ ,  $K'$  is a uniformly moving co-ordinate system devoid of rotation, then natural phenomena run their course with respect to  $K'$  according to exactly the same general laws as with respect to  $K$ . This statement is called the *principle of relativity* (in the restricted sense).

As long as one was convinced that all natural phenomena were capable of representation with the help of classical mechanics, there was no need to doubt the validity of this principle of relativity. But in view of the more recent development of electrodynamics and optics it became more and more evident that classical mechanics affords an insufficient foundation for the physical description of all natural phenomena. At this juncture the question of the validity of the principle of relativity became ripe for discussion, and it did not appear

impossible that the answer to this question might be in the negative.

Nevertheless, there are two general facts which at the outset speak very much in favour of the validity of the principle of relativity. Even though classical mechanics does not supply us with a sufficiently broad basis for the theoretical presentation of all physical phenomena, still we must grant it a considerable measure of "truth," since it supplies us with the actual motions of the heavenly bodies with a deficiency of detail little short of wonderful. The principle of relativity must therefore apply with great accuracy in the domain of mechanics. But that a principle of such broad generality should hold with such exactness in one domain of phenomena, and yet should be invalid for another, is *a priori* not very probable.

We now proceed to the second argument, to which, moreover, we shall return later. If the principle of relativity (in the restricted sense) does not hold, then the Galileian co-ordinate systems  $K$ ,  $K'$ ,  $K''$ , etc., which are moving uniformly relative to each other, will not be *equivalent* for the description of natural phenomena. In this case we should be constrained to believe that natural laws are capable of being formulated in a particularly simple manner, and of course only on condition that, from amongst all possible Galileian



## THE PRINCIPLE OF RELATIVITY 17

co-ordinate systems, we should have chosen *one* ( $K_0$ ) of a particular state of motion as our body of reference. We should then be justified (because of its merits for the description of natural phenomena) in calling this system "absolutely at rest," and all other Galilean systems  $K$  "in motion." If, for instance, our embankment were the system  $K_0$ , then our railway carriage would be a system  $K$ , relative to which less simple laws would hold than with respect to  $K_0$ . This diminished simplicity would be due to the fact that the carriage  $K$  would be in motion (*i.e.* "really") with respect to  $K_0$ . In the general laws of nature which have been formulated with reference to  $K$ , the magnitude and direction of the velocity of the carriage would necessarily play a part. We should expect, for instance, that the note emitted by an organ-pipe placed with its axis parallel to the direction of travel would be different from that emitted if the axis of the pipe were placed perpendicular to this direction. Now in virtue of its motion in an orbit round the sun, our earth is comparable with a railway carriage travelling with a velocity of about 30 kilometres per second. If the principle of relativity were not valid we should therefore expect that the direction of motion of the earth at any moment would enter into the laws of nature, and also that physical systems in their behaviour would be dependent on the orientation in space

## VII

### THE APPARENT INCOMPATIBILITY OF THE LAW OF PROPAGATION OF LIGHT WITH THE PRINCIPLE OF RELATIVITY

**T**HREE is hardly a simpler law in physics than that according to which light is propagated in empty space. Every child at school knows, or believes he knows, that this propagation takes place in straight lines with a velocity  $c = 300,000$  km/sec. At all events we know with great exactness that this velocity is the same for all colours, because if this were not the case, the minimum of emission would not be observed simultaneously for different colours during the eclipse of a fixed star by its dark neighbour. By means of similar considerations based on observations of double stars, the Dutch astronomer De Sitter was also able to show that the velocity of propagation of light cannot depend on the velocity of motion of the body emitting the light. The assumption that this velocity of propagation is dependent on the direction "in space" is in itself improbable.

In short, let us assume that the simple law of the constancy of the velocity of light  $c$  (in vacuum)

21

## 22 SPECIAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

is justifiably believed by the child at school. Who would imagine that this simple law has plunged the conscientiously thoughtful physicist into the greatest intellectual difficulties? Let us consider how these difficulties arise.

Of course we must refer the process of the propagation of light (and indeed every other process) to a rigid reference-body (co-ordinate system). As such a system let us again choose our embankment. We shall imagine the air above it to have been removed. If a ray of light be sent along the embankment, we see from the above that the tip of the ray will be transmitted with the velocity  $c$  relative to the embankment. Now let us suppose that our railway carriage is again travelling along the railway lines with the velocity  $v$ , and that its direction is the same as that of the ray of light, but its velocity of course much less. Let us inquire about the velocity of propagation of the ray of light relative to the carriage. It is obvious that we can here apply the consideration of the previous section, since the ray of light plays the part of the man walking along relatively to the carriage. The velocity  $W$  of the man relative to the embankment is here replaced by the velocity of light relative to the embankment,  $w$  is the required velocity of light with respect to the carriage, and we have

$$w = c - v.$$

## VIII

### ON THE IDEA OF TIME IN PHYSICS

**L**IGHTNING has struck the rails on our railway embankment at two places  $A$  and  $B$  far distant from each other. I make the additional assertion that these two lightning flashes occurred simultaneously. If now I ask you whether there is sense in this statement, you will answer my question with a decided "Yes." But if I now approach you with the request to explain to me the sense of the statement more precisely, you find after some consideration that the answer to this question is not so easy as it appears at first sight.

After some time perhaps the following answer would occur to you: "The significance of the statement is clear in itself and needs no further explanation; of course it would require some consideration if I were to be commissioned to determine by observations whether in the actual case the two events took place simultaneously or not." I cannot be satisfied with this answer for the following reason. Supposing that as a result of ingenious considerations an able meteorologist were to dis-

22

## 26 SPECIAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

cover that the lightning must always strike the places  $A$  and  $B$  simultaneously, then we should be faced with the task of testing whether or not this theoretical result is in accordance with the reality. We encounter the same difficulty with all physical statements in which the conception "simultaneous" plays a part. The concept does not exist for the physicist until he has the possibility of discovering whether or not it is fulfilled in an actual case. We thus require a definition of simultaneity such that this definition supplies us with the method by means of which, in the present case, he can decide by experiment whether or not both the lightning strokes occurred simultaneously. As long as this requirement is not satisfied, I allow myself to be deceived as a physicist (and of course the same applies if I am not a physicist), when I imagine that I am able to attach a meaning to the statement of simultaneity. (I would ask the reader not to proceed farther until he is fully convinced on this point.)

After thinking the matter over for some time you then offer the following suggestion with which to test simultaneity. By measuring along the rails, the connecting line  $AB$  should be measured up and an observer placed at the mid-point  $M$  of the distance  $AB$ . This observer should be supplied with an arrangement (*e.g.* two mirrors inclined at 90°) which allows him visually to ob-

## VI

### THE THEOREM OF THE ADDITION OF VELOCITIES EMPLOYED IN CLASSICAL MECHANICS

**L**ET us suppose our old friend the railway carriage to be travelling along the rails with a constant velocity  $v$ , and that a man traverses the length of the carriage in the direction of travel with a velocity  $w$ . How quickly, or, in other words, with what velocity  $W$  does the man advance relative to the embankment during the process? The only possible answer seems to result from the following consideration: If the man were to stand still for a second, he would advance relative to the embankment through a distance  $v$  equal numerically to the velocity of the carriage. As a consequence of his walking, however, he traverses an additional distance  $w$  relative to the carriage, and hence also relative to the embankment, in this second, the distance  $w$  being numerically equal to the velocity with which he is walking. Thus in total he covers the distance  $W = v + w$  relative to the embankment in the second considered. We shall see later that this result, which expresses the theorem of the addi-

19

## 23 THE PROPAGATION OF LIGHT

The velocity of propagation of a ray of light relative to the carriage thus comes out smaller than  $c$ .

But this result comes into conflict with the principle of relativity set forth in Section V. For, like every other general law of nature, the law of the transmission of light *vacuo* must, according to the principle of relativity, be the same for the railway carriage as reference-body as when the rails are the body of reference. But from our above consideration, this would appear to be impossible. If every ray of light is propagated relative to the embankment with the velocity  $c$ , then for this reason it would appear that another law of propagation of light must necessarily hold with respect to the carriage — a result contradictory to the principle of relativity.

In view of this dilemma there appears to be nothing else for it than to abandon either the principle of relativity or the simple law of the propagation of light *in vacuo*. Those of you who have carefully followed the preceding discussion are almost sure to expect that we should retain the principle of relativity, which appeals so convincingly to the intellect because it is so natural and simple. The law of the propagation of light *in vacuo* would then have to be replaced by a more complicated law conformable to the principle of relativity. The development of theoretical

## 20 SPECIAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

tion of velocities employed in classical mechanics, cannot be maintained; in other words, the law that we have just written down does not hold in reality. For the time being, however, we shall assume its correctness.

## 24 SPECIAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

physics shows, however, that we cannot pursue this course. The epoch-making theoretical investigations of H. A. Lorentz on the electrodynamical and optical phenomena connected with moving bodies show that experience in this domain leads conclusively to a theory of electromagnetic phenomena, of which the law of the constancy of the velocity of light *in vacuo* is a necessary consequence. Prominent theoretical physicists were therefore more inclined to reject the principle of relativity, in spite of the fact that no empirical data had been found which were contradictory to this principle.

At this juncture the theory of relativity entered the arena. As a result of an analysis of the physical conceptions of time and space, it became evident that in reality there is not the least incompatibility between the principle of relativity and the law of propagation of light, and that by systematically holding fast to both these laws a logically rigid theory could be arrived at. This theory has been called the *special theory of relativity* to distinguish it from the extended theory, with which we shall deal later. In the following pages we shall present the fundamental ideas of the special theory of relativity.

## 28 SPECIAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

but a *stipulation* which I can make of my own free-will in order to arrive at a definition of simultaneity."

It is clear that this definition can be used to give an exact meaning not only to two events, but to as many events as we care to choose, and independently of the positions of the scenes of the events with respect to the body of reference (here the railway embankment). We are thus led also to a definition of "time" in physics. For this purpose we suppose that clocks of identical construction are placed at the points  $A$ ,  $B$  and  $C$  of the railway line (co-ordinate system), and that they are set in such a manner that the positions of their pointers are simultaneously (in the above sense) the same. Under these conditions we understand by the "time" of an event the reading (position of the hands) of that one of these clocks which is in the immediate vicinity (in space) of the event. In this manner a time-value is associated with every event which is essentially capable of observation.

This stipulation contains a further physical consequence. We know further that, when three events  $A$ ,  $B$  and  $C$  take place at different points in space simultaneously, if  $A$  and  $B$  is simultaneous with  $C$  (simultaneity in the sense of the above definition), then the criterion for the simultaneity of the pair of events  $A$ ,  $C$  is also satisfied. This assumption is a physical hypothesis about the law of propagation of light; it must certainly be fulfilled if we are to maintain the law of the constancy of the velocity of light *in vacuo*.




IDEA OF TIME IN PHYSICS 29

hypothesis, the validity of which will hardly be doubted without empirical evidence to the contrary. It has been assumed that all these clocks go at the same rate if they are of identical construction. Stated more exactly: When two clocks arranged at rest in different places of a reference-body are set in such a manner that a particular position of the pointers of the one clock is simultaneous (in the above sense) with the same position of the pointers of the other clock, then identical "settings" are always simultaneous (in the sense of the above definition).

IX

THE RELATIVITY OF SIMULTANEITY

Up to now our considerations have been referred to a particular body of reference, which we have styled a "railway embankment." We suppose a very long train travelling along the rails with the constant velocity  $v$  and in the direction indicated in Fig. 1. People travelling in this train will with advantage use the train as a rigid reference-body (co-ordinate system); they regard all events in reference to



the train. Then every event which takes place along the line also takes place at a particular point of the train. Also the definition of simultaneity can be given relative to the train in exactly the same way as with respect to the embankment. As a natural consequence, however, the following question arises:

Are two events (e.g. the two strokes of lightning A and B) which are simultaneous with reference to

30

RELATIVITY OF SIMULTANEITY 31

the railway embankment also simultaneous relatively to the train? We shall show directly that the answer must be in the negative.

When we say that the lightning strokes A and B are simultaneous with respect to the embankment, we mean: the rays of light emitted at the places A and B, where the lightning occurs, meet each other at the mid-point M of the length A → B of the embankment. But the events A and B also correspond to positions A and B on the train. Let M' be the mid-point of the distance A → B on the travelling train. Just when the flashes of lightning occur, this point M' naturally coincides with the point M, but it moves towards the right in the diagram with the velocity  $v$  of the train. If an observer sitting in the position M' in the train did not possess this velocity, then he would remain permanently at M, and the light rays emitted by the flashes of lightning A and B would reach him simultaneously, i.e. they would meet just where he is situated. Now in reality (considered with reference to the railway embankment) he is hastening towards the beam of light coming from B, whilst he is riding on ahead of the beam of light coming from A. Hence the observer will see the beam of light emitted from B earlier than he will see that emitted from A. Observers who take the railway train as their reference-body

<sup>1</sup> As judged from the embankment.

32 SPECIAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

must therefore come to the conclusion that the lightning flash B took place earlier than the lightning flash A. We thus arrive at the important result:

Events which are simultaneous with reference to the embankment are not simultaneous with respect to the train, and vice versa (relativity of simultaneity). Every reference-body (co-ordinate system) has its own particular time; unless we are told the reference-body to which the statement of time refers, there is no meaning in a statement of the time of an event.

Now before the advent of the theory of relativity it had always tacitly been assumed in physics that the statement of time had an absolute significance, i.e. that it is independent of the state of motion of the body of reference. But we have just seen that this assumption is incompatible with the most natural definition of simultaneity; if we discard this assumption, then the conflict between the law of the propagation of light *in vacuo* and the principle of relativity (developed in Section VII) disappears.

We were led to that conflict by the considerations of Section VI, which are now no longer tenable. In that section we concluded that the man in the carriage, who traverses the distance *w per second* relative to the carriage, traverses the same distance also with respect to the embank-

RELATIVITY OF SIMULTANEITY 33

ment in each second of time. But, according to the foregoing considerations, the time required by a particular occurrence with respect to the carriage must not be considered equal to the duration of the same occurrence as judged from the embankment (as reference-body). Hence it cannot be contended that the man in walking travels the distance *w* relative to the railway line in a time which is equal to one second as judged from the embankment.

Moreover, the considerations of Section VI are based on yet a second assumption, which, in the light of a strict consideration, appears to be arbitrary, although it was always tacitly made even before the introduction of the theory of relativity.

X  
ON THE RELATIVITY OF THE CONCEPTION OF DISTANCE

LET us consider two particular points on the train<sup>1</sup> travelling along the embankment with the velocity  $v$ , and inquire as to their distance apart. We already know that it is necessary to have a body of reference for the measurement of a distance, with respect to which body the distance can be measured up. It is the simplest plan to use the train itself as the reference-body (co-ordinate system). An observer in the train measures the interval by marking off his measuring-rod in a straight line (e.g. along the floor of the carriage) as many times as is necessary to take him from the one marked point to the other. Then the number which tells us how often the rod has to be laid down is the required distance.

It is a different matter when the distance has to be judged from the railway line. Here the following method suggests itself. If we call A' and B' the two points on the train whose distance apart is required, then both of these points are

<sup>1</sup> e.g. the middle of the first and of the hundredth carriage.

34

THE RELATIVITY OF DISTANCE 35

moving with the velocity  $v$  along the embankment. In the first place we require to determine the points A and B of the embankment which are just being passed by the two points A' and B' at a particular time  $t$ —judged from the embankment. These points A and B of the embankment can be determined by applying the definition of time given in Section VIII. The distance between these points A and B is then measured by repeated application of the measuring-rod along the embankment.

*A priori* it is by no means certain that this last measurement will supply us with the same result as the first. Thus the length of the train as measured from the embankment may be different from that obtained by measuring in the train itself. This circumstance leads us to a second objection which must be raised against the apparently obvious consideration of Section VI. Namely, if the man in the carriage covers the distance *w* in a unit of time—*measured from the train*,—then this distance—*as measured from the embankment*—is not necessarily also equal to *w*.

XI

THE LORENTZ TRANSFORMATION

THE results of the last three sections show that the apparent incompatibility of the law of propagation of light with the principle of relativity (Section VII) has been derived by means of a consideration which borrowed two unjustifiable hypotheses from classical mechanics; these are as follows:

- (1) The time-interval (time) between two events is independent of the condition of motion of the body of reference.
- (2) The space-interval (distance) between two points of a rigid body is independent of the condition of motion of the body of reference.

If we drop these hypotheses, then the dilemma of Section VII disappears, because the theorem of the addition of velocities derived in Section VI becomes invalid. The possibility presents itself that the law of the propagation of light *in vacuo* may be compatible with the principle of relativity, and the question arises: How have we to modify the considerations of Section VI in order to remove

36

THE LORENTZ TRANSFORMATION 37

the apparent disagreement between these two fundamental results of experience? This question leads to a general one. In the discussion of Section VI we have to do with places and times relative both to the train and to the embankment. How are we to find the place and time of an event in relation to the train, when we know the place and time of the event with respect to the railway embankment? Is there a thinkable answer to this question of such a nature that the law of transmission of light *in vacuo* does not contradict the principle of relativity? In other words: Can we conceive of a relation between place and time of the individual events relative to both reference-bodies, such that every ray of light possesses the velocity of transmission  $c$  relative to the embankment and relative to the train? This question leads to a quite definite positive answer, and to a perfectly definite transformation law for the space-time magnitudes of an event when changing over from one body of reference to another.

Before we deal with this, we shall introduce the following incidental consideration. Up to the present we have only considered events taking place along the embankment, which had mathematically to assume the function of a straight line. In the manner indicated in Section II we can imagine this reference-body supplemented laterally and in a vertical direction by means of a

38 SPECIAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

framework of rods, so that an event which takes place anywhere can be localised with reference to this framework. Similarly, we can imagine the train travelling with the velocity  $v$  to be continued across the whole of space, so that every event, no matter how far off it may be, could also be localised with respect to the second framework. Without committing any fundamental error, we can disregard the fact that in reality these frameworks would continually interfere with each other, owing to the impenetrability of solid bodies. In every such framework we imagine three surfaces perpendicular to each other marked out, and designated as "co-ordinate planes" ("co-ordinate system"). A co-ordinate system  $K$  then corresponds to the embankment, and a co-ordinate system  $K'$  to the train. An event, wherever it may have taken place, would be fixed in space with respect to  $K$  by the three perpendiculars  $x, y, z$  on the co-ordinate planes, and with regard to time by a time-value  $t$ . Relative to  $K'$ , the same event would be fixed in respect of space and time by corresponding values  $x', y', z', t'$ , which of course are not identical with  $x, y, z, t$ . It has already been set forth in detail how these magnitudes are to be regarded as results of physical measurements.

Obviously our problem can be exactly formulated in the following manner. What are the

THE LORENTZ TRANSFORMATION 39

values  $x', y', z', t'$  of an event with respect to  $K'$ , when the magnitudes  $x, y, z, t$ , of the same event with respect to  $K$  are given? The relations must be so chosen that the law of the transmission of light *in vacuo* is satisfied for one and the same ray of light (and of course for every ray) with respect to  $K$  and  $K'$ . For the relative orientation in space of the co-ordinate systems indicated in the diagram (Fig. 2), this problem is solved by means of the equations:

$$x' = \frac{x - vt}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}}$$

$$y' = y$$

$$z' = z$$

$$t' = \frac{t - \frac{v}{c^2} \cdot x}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}}$$

This system of equations is known as the "Lorentz transformation."<sup>1</sup>

If in place of the law of transmission of light we had taken as our basis the tacit assumptions of the older mechanics as to the absolute character

<sup>1</sup> A simple derivation of the Lorentz transformation is given in Appendix I.

40 SPECIAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

of times and lengths, then instead of the above we should have obtained the following equations:

$$x' = x - vt$$

$$y' = y$$

$$z' = z$$

$$t' = t$$

This system of equations is often termed the "Galilei transformation." The Galilei transformation can be obtained from the Lorentz transformation by substituting an infinitely large value for the velocity of light  $c$  in the latter transformation.

Aided by the following illustration, we can readily see that, in accordance with the Lorentz transformation, the law of the transmission of light *in vacuo* is satisfied both for the reference-body  $K$  and for the reference-body  $K'$ . A light-signal is sent along the positive  $x$ -axis, and this light-stimulus advances in accordance with the equation

$$x = ct$$

*i.e.* with the velocity  $c$ . According to the equations of the Lorentz transformation, this simple relation between  $x$  and  $t$  involves a relation between  $x'$  and  $t'$ . In point of fact, if we substitute for  $x$  the value  $ct$  in the first and fourth equations of the Lorentz transformation, we obtain:

$$x' = \frac{c - vt}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}}$$





GENERAL RESULTS OF THEORY 53

ions; for other motions the variations from the classical mechanics are too small to make themselves evident in practice. We shall not consider the motion of stars until we come to speak of the general theory of relativity. In accordance with the theory of relativity, the kinetic energy of a material point of mass  $m$  is no longer given by the well-known expression

$$m \frac{v^2}{2},$$

but by the expression

$$\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}.$$

This expression approaches infinity as the velocity  $v$  approaches the velocity of light  $c$ . The velocity must therefore always remain less than  $c$ , however great may be the energies used to produce the acceleration. If we develop the expression for the kinetic energy in the form of a series, we obtain

$$mc^2 + m \frac{v^2}{2} + \frac{3}{8} m \frac{v^4}{c^2} + \dots$$

When  $\frac{v^2}{c^2}$  is small compared with unity, the third of these terms is always small in comparison with the second, which last is alone considered in classical mechanics. The first term  $mc^2$  does not contain the velocity, and requires no consideration if we

$$1' \sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}} - J.M.$$

GENERAL RESULTS OF THEORY 57

interpretation of electromagnetic action at a distance resulted in physicists becoming convinced that there are no such things as instantaneous actions at a distance (not involving an intermediary medium) of the type of Newton's law of gravitation. According to the theory of relativity, action at a distance with the velocity of light always takes the place of instantaneous action at a distance or of action at a distance with an infinite velocity of transmission. This is connected with the fact that the velocity  $c$  plays a fundamental rôle in this theory. In Part II we shall see in what way this result becomes modified in the general theory of relativity.

54 SPECIAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

are only dealing with the question as to how the energy of a point-mass depends on the velocity. We shall speak of its essential significance later.

The most important result of a general character to which the special theory of relativity has led is concerned with the conception of mass. Before the advent of relativity, physics recognised two conservation laws of fundamental importance, namely, the law of the conservation of energy and the law of the conservation of mass; these two fundamental laws appeared to be quite independent of each other. By means of the theory of relativity they have been united into one law. We shall now briefly consider how this unification came about, and what meaning is to be attached to it.

The principle of relativity requires that the law of the conservation of energy should hold not only with reference to a co-ordinate system  $K$ , but also with respect to every co-ordinate system  $K'$  which is in a state of uniform motion of translation relative to  $K$ , or, briefly, relative to every "Galileian" system of co-ordinates. In contrast to classical mechanics, the Lorentz transformation is the deciding factor in the transition from one such system to another.

By means of comparatively simple considerations we are led to draw the following conclusion from these premises, in conjunction with the

GENERAL RESULTS OF THEORY 55

fundamental equations of the electrodynamics of Maxwell. A body moving with the velocity  $v$ , which absorbs<sup>1</sup> an amount of energy  $E_0$  in the form of radiation without suffering an alteration in velocity in the process, has, as a consequence, its energy increased by an amount

$$\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}.$$

In consideration of the expression given above for the kinetic energy of the body, the required energy of the body comes out to be

$$\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}.$$

Thus the body has the same energy as a body of mass  $\left(m + \frac{E_0}{c^2}\right)$  moving with the velocity  $v$ . Hence we can say: If a body takes up an amount of energy  $E_0$ , then its inertial mass increases by an amount  $\frac{E_0}{c^2}$ ; the inertial mass of a body is not a constant, but varies according to the change in the energy of the body. The inertial mass of a system of bodies can even be regarded as a measure

<sup>1</sup>  $E_0$  is the energy taken up, as judged from a co-ordinate system moving with the body.

$$1' \sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}} - J.M.$$

56 SPECIAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

of its energy. The law of the conservation of the mass of a system becomes identical with the law of the conservation of energy, and is only valid provided that the system neither takes up nor sends out energy. Writing the expression for the energy in the form

$$\frac{mc^2 + E_0}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}},$$

we see that the term  $mc^2$ , which has hitherto attracted our attention, is nothing else than the energy possessed by the body<sup>1</sup> before it absorbed the energy  $E_0$ .

A direct comparison of this relation with experiment is not possible at the present time, owing to the fact that the changes in energy  $E_0$  to which we can subject a system are not large enough to make themselves perceptible as a change in the inertial mass of the system.  $\frac{E_0}{c^2}$  is too small in comparison with the mass  $m$ , which was present before the alteration of the energy. It is owing to this circumstance that classical mechanics was able to establish successfully the conservation of mass as a law of independent validity.

Let me add a final remark of a fundamental nature. The success of the Faraday-Maxwell

<sup>1</sup> As judged from a co-ordinate system moving with the body.

GENERAL RESULTS OF THEORY 57

interpretation of electromagnetic action at a distance resulted in physicists becoming convinced that there are no such things as instantaneous actions at a distance (not involving an intermediary medium) of the type of Newton's law of gravitation. According to the theory of relativity, action at a distance with the velocity of light always takes the place of instantaneous action at a distance or of action at a distance with an infinite velocity of transmission. This is connected with the fact that the velocity  $c$  plays a fundamental rôle in this theory. In Part II we shall see in what way this result becomes modified in the general theory of relativity.

XVI

EXPERIENCE AND THE SPECIAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

TO what extent is the special theory of relativity supported by experience? This question is not easily answered for the reason already mentioned in connection with the fundamental experiment of Fizeau. The special theory of relativity has crystallised out from the Maxwell-Lorentz theory of electromagnetic phenomena. Thus all facts of experience which support the electromagnetic theory also support the theory of relativity. As being of particular importance, I mention here the fact that the theory of relativity enables us to predict the effects produced on the light reaching us from the fixed stars. These results are obtained in an exceedingly simple manner, and the effects indicated, which are due to the relative motion of the earth with reference to those fixed stars, are found to be in accord with experience. We refer to the yearly movement of the apparent position of the fixed stars resulting from the motion of the earth round the sun (aberration), and to the influence of the radial

58

EXPERIENCE AND RELATIVITY 59

components of the relative motions of the fixed stars with respect to the earth on the colour of the light reaching us from them. The latter effect manifests itself in a slight displacement of the spectral lines of the light transmitted to us from a fixed star, as compared with the position of the same spectral lines when they are produced by a terrestrial source of light (Doppler principle). The experimental arguments in favour of the Maxwell-Lorentz theory, which are at the same time arguments in favour of the theory of relativity, are too numerous to be set forth here. In reality they limit the theoretical possibilities to such an extent, that no other theory than that of Maxwell and Lorentz has been able to hold its own when tested by experience.

But there are two classes of experimental facts hitherto obtained which can be represented in the Maxwell-Lorentz theory only by the introduction of an auxiliary hypothesis, which in itself — *i.e.* without making use of the theory of relativity — appears extraneous.

It is known that cathode rays and the so-called  $\beta$ -rays emitted by radioactive substances consist of negatively electrified particles (electrons) of very small inertia and large velocity. By examining the deflection of these rays under the influence of electric and magnetic fields, we can study the law of motion of these particles very exactly.

60 SPECIAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

In the theoretical treatment of these electrons, we are faced with the difficulty that electrodynamic theory of itself is unable to give an account of their nature. For since electrical masses of one sign repel each other, the negative electrical masses constituting the electron would necessarily be scattered under the influence of their mutual repulsions, unless there are forces of another kind operating between them, the nature of which has hitherto remained obscure to us.<sup>1</sup> If we now assume that the relative distances between the electrical masses constituting the electron remain unchanged during the motion of the electron (rigid connection in the sense of classical mechanics), we arrive at a law of motion of the electron which does not agree with experience. Guided by purely formal points of view, H. A. Lorentz was the first to introduce the hypothesis that the particles constituting the electron experience a contraction in the direction of motion in consequence of that motion, the amount of this contraction being proportional to the expression

<sup>1</sup>  $\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}$ . This hypothesis, which is not justifiable by any electrodynamical facts, supplies us then with that particular law of motion which has been confirmed with great precision in recent years.

<sup>1</sup> The general theory of relativity renders it likely that the electrical masses of an electron are held together by gravitational forces.

$$1' \sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}} - J.M.$$

EXPERIENCE AND RELATIVITY 61

The theory of relativity leads to the same law of motion, without requiring any special hypothesis whatsoever as to the structure and the behaviour of the electron. We arrived at a similar conclusion in Section XIII in connection with the experiment of Fizeau, the result of which is foretold by the theory of relativity without the necessity of drawing on hypotheses as to the physical nature of the liquid.

The second class of facts to which we have alluded has reference to the question whether or not the motion of the earth in space can be made perceptible in terrestrial experiments. We have already remarked in Section V that all attempts of this nature led to a negative result. Before the theory of relativity was put forward, it was difficult to become reconciled to this negative result, for reasons now to be discussed. The inherited prejudices about time and space did not allow any doubt to arise as to the prime importance of the Galilei transformation for changing over from one body of reference to another. Now assuming that the Maxwell-Lorentz equations hold for a reference-body  $K$ , we then find that they do not hold for a reference-body  $K'$  moving uniformly with respect to  $K$ , if we assume that the relations of the Galileian transformation exist between the co-ordinates of  $K$  and  $K'$ . It thus appears that of all Galileian co-ordinate

62 SPECIAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

systems one ( $K$ ) corresponding to a particular state of motion is physically unique. This result was interpreted physically by regarding  $K$  as at rest with respect to a hypothetical ether of space. On the other hand, all co-ordinate systems  $K'$  moving relatively to  $K$  were to be regarded as in motion with respect to the ether. To this motion of  $K'$  against the ether ("ether-drift" relative to  $K$ ) were assigned the more complicated laws which were supposed to hold relative to  $K'$ . Strictly speaking, such an ether-drift ought also to be assumed relative to the earth, and for a long time the efforts of physicists were devoted to attempts to detect the existence of an ether-drift at the earth's surface.

In one of the most notable of these attempts Michelson devised a method which appears as though it must be decisive. Imagine two mirrors so arranged on a rigid body that the reflecting surfaces face each other. A ray of light requires a perfectly definite time  $T$  to pass from one mirror to the other and back again, if the whole system be at rest with respect to the ether. It is found by calculation, however, that a slightly different time  $T'$  is required for this process, if the body, together with the mirrors, be moving relatively to the ether. And yet another point: it is shown by calculation that for a given velocity  $v$  with reference to the ether, this time  $T'$  is different


EXPERIENCE AND RELATIVITY 63

when the body is moving perpendicularly to the planes of the mirrors from that resulting when the motion is parallel to these planes. Although the estimated difference between these two times is exceedingly small, Michelson and Morley performed an experiment involving interference in which this difference should have been clearly detectable. But the experiment gave a negative result — a fact very perplexing to physicists. Lorentz and FitzGerald rescued the theory from this difficulty by assuming that the motion of the body relative to the ether produces a contraction of the body in the direction of motion, the amount of contraction being just sufficient to compensate for the difference in time mentioned above. Comparison with the discussion in Section XII shows that from the standpoint also of the theory of relativity this solution of the difficulty was the right one. But on the basis of the theory of relativity the method of interpretation is incomparably more satisfactory. According to this theory there is no such thing as a "specially favoured" (unique) co-ordinate system to occasion the introduction of the ether-idea, and hence there can be no ether-drift, nor any experiment with which to demonstrate it. Here the contraction of moving bodies follows from the two fundamental principles of the theory without the introduction of particular hypotheses; and as the

64 SPECIAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

prime factor involved in this contraction we find, not the motion in itself, to which we cannot attach any meaning, but the motion with respect to the body of reference chosen in the particular case in point. Thus for a co-ordinate system moving with the earth the mirror system of Michelson and Morley is not shortened, but it is shortened for a co-ordinate system which is at rest relatively to the sun.





MINKOWSKI'S FOUR-DIMENSIONAL SPACE

THE non-mathematician is seized by a mysterious shuddering when he hears of "four-dimensional" things, by a feeling not unlike that awakened by thoughts of the occult. And yet there is no more common-place statement than that the world in which we live is a four-dimensional space-time continuum.

Space is a three-dimensional continuum. By this we mean that it is possible to describe the position of a point (at rest) by means of three numbers (co-ordinates)  $x, y, z$ , and that there is an indefinite number of points in the neighbourhood of this one, the position of which can be described by co-ordinates such as  $x_1, y_1, z_1$ , which may be as near as we choose to the respective values of the co-ordinates  $x, y, z$  of the first point. In virtue of the latter property we speak of a "continuum," and owing to the fact that there are three co-ordinates we speak of it as being "three-dimensional."

Similarly, the world of physical phenomena which was briefly called "world" by Minkowski

65

66 SPECIAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

is naturally four-dimensional in the space-time sense. For it is composed of individual events, each of which is described by four numbers, namely, three space co-ordinates  $x, y, z$  and a time co-ordinate, the time-value  $t$ . The "world" is in this sense also a continuum; for to every event there are as many "neighbouring" events (realised or at least thinkable) as we care to choose, the co-ordinates  $x_1, y_1, z_1, t_1$  of which differ by an indefinitely small amount from those of the event  $x, y, z, t$  originally considered. That we have not been accustomed to regard the world in this sense as a four-dimensional continuum is due to the fact that in physics, before the advent of the theory of relativity, time played a different and more independent rôle, as compared with the space co-ordinates. It is for this reason that we have been in the habit of treating time as an independent continuum. As a matter of fact, according to classical mechanics, time is absolute, i.e. it is independent of the position and the condition of motion of the system of co-ordinates. We see this expressed in the last equation of the Galileian transformation ( $t' = t$ ).

The four-dimensional mode of consideration of the "world" is natural on the theory of relativity, since according to this theory time is robbed of its independence. This is shown by the fourth equation of the Lorentz transformation:

FOUR-DIMENSIONAL SPACE 67

$$t' = \frac{t - \frac{v}{c^2} x}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}}$$

Moreover, according to this equation the time difference  $\Delta t'$  of two events with respect to  $K'$  does not in general vanish, even when the time difference  $\Delta t$  of the same events with reference to  $K$  vanishes. Pure "space-distance" of two events with respect to  $K$  results in "time-distance" of the same events with respect to  $K'$ . But the discovery of Minkowski, which was of importance for the formal development of the theory of relativity, does not lie here. It is to be found rather in the fact of his recognition that the four-dimensional space-time continuum of the theory of relativity, in its most essential formal properties, shows a pronounced relationship to the three-dimensional continuum of Euclidean geometrical space.<sup>1</sup> In order to give due prominence to this relationship, however, we must replace the usual time co-ordinate  $t$  by an imaginary magnitude  $\sqrt{-1}ct$  proportional to it. Under these conditions, the natural laws satisfying the demands of the (special) theory of relativity assume mathematical forms, in which the time co-ordinate plays exactly the same rôle as the three space co-ordinates. Formally, these four co-ordinates

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the somewhat more detailed discussion in Appendix II.

68 SPECIAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

correspond exactly to the three space co-ordinates in Euclidean geometry. It must be clear even to the non-mathematician that, as a consequence of this purely formal addition to our knowledge, the theory performs gained clearness in no mean measure.

These inadequate remarks can give the reader only a vague notion of the important idea contributed by Minkowski. Without it the general theory of relativity, of which the fundamental ideas are developed in the following pages, would perhaps have got no farther than its long clothes. Minkowski's work is doubtless difficult of access to anyone inexperienced in mathematics, but since it is not necessary to have a very exact grasp of this work in order to understand the fundamental ideas of either the special or the general theory of relativity, I shall at present leave it here, and shall revert to it only towards the end of Part II.

PART II

THE GENERAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

XVIII

SPECIAL AND GENERAL PRINCIPLE OF RELATIVITY

THE basal principle, which was the pivot of all our previous considerations, was the *special principle of relativity*, i.e. the principle of the physical relativity of all *uniform* motion. Let us once more analyse its meaning carefully.

It was at all times clear that, from the point of view of the idea it conveys to us, every motion must only be considered as a relative motion. Returning to the illustration we have frequently used of the embankment and the railway carriage, we can express the fact of the motion here taking place in the following two forms, both of which are equally justifiable:

- (a) The carriage is in motion relative to the embankment.
- (b) The embankment is in motion relative to the carriage.

In (a) the embankment, in (b) the carriage, serves as the body of reference in our statement

69

70 GENERAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

of the motion taking place. If it is simply a question of detecting or of describing the motion involved, it is in principle immaterial to what reference-body we refer the motion. As already mentioned, this is self-evident, but it must not be confused with the much more comprehensive statement called "the principle of relativity," which we have taken as the basis of our investigations.

The principle we have made use of not only maintains that we may equally well choose the carriage or the embankment as our reference-body for the description of any event (for this, too, is self-evident). Our principle rather asserts what follows: If we formulate the general laws of nature as they are obtained from experience, by making use of

- (a) the embankment as reference-body,
- (b) the railway carriage as reference-body,

then these general laws of nature (e.g. the laws of mechanics or the law of the propagation of light in *vacuo*) have exactly the same form in both cases. This can also be expressed as follows: For the physical description of natural processes, neither of the reference-bodies  $K, K'$  is unique (lit. "specially marked out") as compared with the other. Unlike the first, this latter statement need not of necessity hold *a priori*; it is not contained in the conceptions of "motion" and "reference-

SPECIAL AND GENERAL PRINCIPLE 71

body" and derivable from them; only *experience* can decide as to its correctness or incorrectness.

Up to the present, however, we have by no means maintained the equivalence of *all* bodies of reference  $K$  in connection with the formulation of natural laws. Our course was more on the following lines. In the first place, we started out from the assumption that there exists a reference-body  $K$ , whose condition of motion is such that the Galileian law holds with respect to it: A particle left to itself and sufficiently far removed from all other particles moves uniformly in a straight line. With reference to  $K$  (Galileian reference-body) the laws of nature were to be as simple as possible. But in addition to  $K$ , all bodies of reference  $K'$  should be given preference in this sense, and they should be exactly equivalent to  $K$  for the formulation of natural laws, provided that they are in a state of *uniform rectilinear and non-rotatory motion* with respect to  $K$ ; all these bodies of reference are to be regarded as Galileian reference-bodies. The validity of the principle of relativity was assumed only for these reference-bodies, but not for others (e.g. those possessing motion of a different kind). In this sense we speak of the *special principle of relativity*, or *special theory of relativity*.

In contrast to this we wish to understand by the "general principle of relativity" the following

72 GENERAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

statement: All bodies of reference  $K, K'$ , etc., are equivalent for the description of natural phenomena (formulation of the general laws of nature), whatever may be their state of motion. But before proceeding farther, it ought to be pointed out that this formulation must be replaced later by a more abstract one, for reasons which will become evident at a later stage.

Since the introduction of the special principle of relativity has been successful, every intellect which strives after generalisation must feel the temptation to venture the step towards the general principle of relativity. But a simple and apparently quite reliable consideration seems to suggest that, for the present at any rate, there is little hope of success in such an attempt. Let us imagine ourselves transferred to our old friend the railway carriage, which is travelling at a uniform rate. As long as it is moving uniformly, the occupant of the carriage is not sensible of its motion, and it is for this reason that he can reluctantly interpret the facts of the case as indicating that the carriage is at rest, but the embankment in motion. Moreover, according to the special principle of relativity, this interpretation is quite justified also from a physical point of view.

If the motion of the carriage is now changed into a non-uniform motion, as for instance by a

SPECIAL AND GENERAL PRINCIPLE 73

powerful application of the brakes, then the occupant of the carriage experiences a correspondingly powerful jerk forwards. The retarded motion is manifested in the mechanical behaviour of bodies relative to the person in the railway carriage. The mechanical behaviour is different from that of the case previously considered, and for this reason it would appear to be impossible that the same mechanical laws hold relatively to the non-uniformly moving carriage, as hold with reference to the carriage when at rest or in uniform motion. At all events it is clear that the Galileian law does not hold with respect to the non-uniformly moving carriage. Because of this, we feel compelled at the present juncture to grant a kind of absolute physical reality to non-uniform motion, in opposition to the general principle of relativity. But in what follows we shall soon see that this conclusion cannot be maintained.

XIX

THE GRAVITATIONAL FIELD

**I**F we pick up a stone and then let it go, why does it fall to the ground?" The usual answer to this question is: "Because it is attracted by the earth." Modern physics formulates the answer rather differently for the following reason. As a result of the more careful study of electromagnetic phenomena, we have come to regard action at a distance as a process impossible without the intervention of some intermediary medium. If, for instance, a magnet attracts a piece of iron, we cannot be content to regard this as meaning that the magnet acts directly on the iron through the intermediate empty space, but we are constrained to imagine — after the manner of Faraday — that the magnet always calls into being something physically real in the space around it, that something being what we call a "magnetic field." In its turn this magnetic field operates on the piece of iron, so that the latter strives to move towards the magnet. We shall not discuss here the justification for this incidental conception, which is indeed a somewhat arbitrary one.

74

THE GRAVITATIONAL FIELD 75

trary one. We shall only mention that with its aid electromagnetic phenomena can be theoretically represented much more satisfactorily than without it, and this applies particularly to the transmission of electromagnetic waves. The effects of gravitation also are regarded in an analogous manner.

The action of the earth on the stone takes place indirectly. The earth produces in its surroundings a gravitational field, which acts on the stone and produces its motion of fall. As we know from experience, the intensity of the action on a body diminishes according to a quite definite law, as we proceed farther and farther away from the earth. From our point of view this means: The law governing the properties of the gravitational field in space must be a perfectly definite one, in order correctly to represent the diminution of gravitational action with the distance from operative bodies. It is something like this: The body (e.g. the earth) produces a field in its immediate neighbourhood directly; the intensity and direction of the field at points farther removed from the body are thence determined by the law which governs the properties in space of the gravitational fields themselves.

In contrast to electric and magnetic fields, the gravitational field exhibits a most remarkable property, which is of fundamental importance

76 GENERAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

for what follows. Bodies which are moving under the sole influence of a gravitational field receive an acceleration, which does not in the least depend either on the material or on the physical state of the body. For instance, a piece of lead and a piece of wood fall in exactly the same manner in a gravitational field (*in vacuo*), when they start off from rest or with the same initial velocity. This law, which holds most accurately, can be expressed in a different form in the light of the following consideration.

According to Newton's law of motion, we have

$$(\text{Force}) = (\text{inertial mass}) \times (\text{acceleration}),$$

where the "inertial mass" is a characteristic constant of the accelerated body. If now gravitation is the cause of the acceleration, we then have

$$(\text{Force}) = \frac{(\text{gravitational mass})}{(\text{inertial mass})} \times (\text{intensity of the gravitational field}),$$

where the "gravitational mass" is likewise a characteristic constant for the body. From these two relations follows:

$$(\text{acceleration}) = \frac{(\text{gravitational mass})}{(\text{inertial mass})} \times (\text{intensity of the gravitational field}).$$

If now, as we find from experience, the acceleration is to be independent of the nature and the condition of the body and always the same for a



## THE GRAVITATIONAL FIELD 77

given gravitational field, then the ratio of the gravitational to the inertial mass must likewise be the same for all bodies. By a suitable choice of units we can thus make this ratio equal to unity. We then have the following law: The gravitational mass of a body is equal to its inertial mass.

It is true that this important law had hitherto been recorded in mechanics, but it had not been interpreted. A satisfactory interpretation can be obtained only if we recognise the following fact: *The same quality of a body manifests itself according to circumstances as "inertia" or as "weight" (lit. "heaviness").* In the following section we shall show to what extent this is actually the case, and how this question is connected with the general postulate of relativity.

## XX

### THE EQUALITY OF INERTIAL AND GRAVITATIONAL MASS AS AN ARGUMENT FOR THE GENERAL POSTULATE OF RELATIVITY

WE imagine a large portion of empty space, so far removed from stars and other appreciable masses that we have before us approximately the conditions required by the fundamental law of Galilei. It is then possible to choose a Galilean reference-body for this part of space (world), relative to which points at rest remain at rest and points in motion continue permanently in uniform rectilinear motion. As reference-body let us imagine a spacious chest resembling a room with an observer inside who is equipped with apparatus. Gravitation naturally does not exist for this observer. He must fasten himself with strings to the floor, otherwise the slightest impact against the floor will cause him to rise slowly towards the ceiling of the room.

To the middle of the lid of the chest is fixed externally a hook with rope attached, and now a "being" (what kind of a being is immaterial to

78

## INERTIAL AND GRAVITATIONAL MASS 79

us) begins pulling at this with a constant force. The chest together with the observer then begin to move "upwards" with a uniformly accelerated motion. In course of time their velocity will reach unheard-of values — provided that we are viewing all this from another reference-body which is not being pulled with a rope.

But how does the man in the chest regard the process? The acceleration of the chest will be transmitted to him by the reaction of the floor of the chest. He must therefore take up this pressure by means of his legs if he does not wish to be laid out full length on the floor. He is then standing in the chest in exactly the same way as anyone stands in a room of a house on our earth. If he release a body which he previously had in his hand, the acceleration of the chest will no longer be transmitted to this body, and for this reason the body will approach the floor of the chest with an accelerated relative motion. The observer will further convince himself that the acceleration of the body towards the floor of the chest is always of the same magnitude, whatever kind of body he may happen to use for the experiment.

Relying on his knowledge of the gravitational field (as it was discussed in the preceding section), the man in the chest will thus come to the conclusion that he and the chest are in a gravitational field which is constant with regard to time. Of

## 80 GENERAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

course he will be puzzled for a moment as to why the chest does not fall in this gravitational field. Just then, however, he discovers the hook in the middle of the lid of the chest and the rope which is attached to it, and he consequently comes to the conclusion that the chest is suspended at rest in the gravitational field.

Ought we to smile at the man and say that he is in his conclusion? I do not believe we ought if we wish to remain consistent; we must rather admit that his mode of grasping the situation violates neither reason nor known mechanical laws. Even though it is being accelerated with respect to the "Galilean space" first considered, we can nevertheless regard the chest as being at rest. We have thus good grounds for extending the principle of relativity to include bodies of reference which are accelerated with respect to each other, and as a result we have gained a powerful argument for a generalised postulate of relativity.

We must note carefully that the possibility of this mode of interpretation rests on the fundamental property of the gravitational field of giving all bodies the same acceleration, or, what comes to the same thing, on the law of the equality of inertial and gravitational mass. If this natural law did not exist, the man in the accelerated chest would not be able to interpret the behaviour of

## INERTIAL AND GRAVITATIONAL MASS 81

the bodies around him on the supposition of a gravitational field, and he would not be justified on the grounds of experience in supposing his reference-body to be "at rest."

Suppose that the man in the chest fixes a rope to the inner side of the lid, and that he attaches a body to the free end of the rope. The result of this will be to stretch the rope so that it will hang "vertically" downwards. If we ask for an opinion of the cause of tension in the rope, the man in the chest will say: "The suspended body experiences a downward force in the gravitational field, and this is neutralised by the tension of the rope; what determines the magnitude of the tension of the rope is the gravitational mass of the suspended body." On the other hand, an observer who is poised freely in space will interpret the condition of things thus: "The rope must perform take part in the accelerated motion of the chest, and it transmits this motion to the body attached to it. The tension of the rope is just large enough to effect the acceleration of the body. That which determines the magnitude of the tension of the rope is the inertial mass of the body." Guided by this example, we see that our extension of the principle of relativity implies the necessity of the law of the equality of inertial and gravitational mass. Thus we have obtained a physical interpretation of this law.

## 82 GENERAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

From our consideration of the accelerated chest we see that a general theory of relativity must yield important results on the laws of gravitation. In point of fact, the systematic pursuit of the general idea of relativity has supplied the laws satisfied by the gravitational field. Before proceeding farther, however, I must warn the reader against a misconception suggested by these considerations. A gravitational field exists for the man in the chest, despite the fact that there was no such field for the co-ordinate system first chosen. Now we might easily suppose that the existence of a gravitational field is always only an apparent one. We might also think that, regardless of the kind of gravitational field which may be present, we could always choose another reference-body such that no gravitational field exists with reference to it. This is by no means true for all gravitational fields, but only for those of quite special form. It is, for instance, impossible to choose a body of reference such that, as judged from it, the gravitational field of the earth (in its entirety) vanishes.

We can now appreciate why that argument is not convincing, which we brought forward against the general principle of relativity at the end of Section XVIII. It is certainly true that the observer in the railway carriage experiences a jerk forwards as a result of the application of the

## MECHANICS AND RELATIVITY 85

ence-bodies (or their states of motion) are given priority over other reference-bodies (or their states of motion)? *What is the reason for this preference?* In order to show clearly what I mean by this question, I shall make use of a comparison.

I am standing in front of a gas range. Standing alongside of each other on the range are two pans so much alike that one may be mistaken for the other. Both are half full of water. I notice that steam is being emitted continuously from the one pan, but not from the other. I am surprised at this, even if I have never seen either a gas range or a pan before. But if I now notice a luminous something of bluish colour under the first pan but not under the other, I cease to be astonished, even if I have never before seen a gas flame. For I can only say that this bluish something will cause the emission of the steam, or at least possibly it may do so. If, however, I notice the bluish something in neither case, and if I observe that the one continuously emits steam whilst the other does not, then I shall remain astonished and dissatisfied until I have discovered some circumstance to which I can attribute the different behaviour of the two pans.

Analogously, I seek in vain for a real something in classical mechanics (or in the special theory of relativity) to which I can attribute the different behaviour of bodies considered with respect to

## 86 GENERAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

the reference-systems  $K$  and  $K'$ . Newton saw this objection and attempted to invalidate it, but without success. But E. Mach recognised it most clearly of all, and because of this objection he claimed that mechanics must be placed on a new basis. It can only be got rid of by means of a physics which is conformable to the general principle of relativity, since the equations of such a theory hold for every body of reference, whatever may be its state of motion.

<sup>1</sup> The objection is of importance more especially when the state of motion of the reference-body is of such a nature that it does not require any external agency for its maintenance, e.g. in the case when the reference-body is rotating uniformly.

<sup>1</sup> The word "theory" was changed to "principle" in both places in later editions. — [M.]

THE considerations of Section XX show that the general theory<sup>1</sup> of relativity puts us in a position to derive properties of the gravitational field in a purely theoretical manner. Let us suppose, for instance, that we know the space-time "course" for any natural process whatsoever, as regards the manner in which it takes place in the Galilean domain relative to a Galilean body of reference  $K$ . By means of purely theoretical operations (i.e. simply by calculation) we are then able to find how this known natural process appears, as seen from a reference-body  $K'$  which is accelerated relatively to  $K$ . But since a gravitational field exists with respect to this new body of reference  $K'$ , our consideration also teaches us how the gravitational field influences the process studied.

For example, we learn that a body which is in a state of uniform rectilinear motion with respect to  $K$  (in accordance with the law of Galilei) is executing an accelerated and in general

87

<sup>1</sup> The word "theory" was changed to "principle" in both places in later editions. — [M.]


## 88 GENERAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

curvilinear motion with respect to the accelerated reference-body  $K'$  (chest). This acceleration or curvature corresponds to the influence on the moving body of the gravitational field prevailing relatively to  $K'$ . It is known that a gravitational field influences the movement of bodies in this way, so that our consideration supplies us with nothing essentially new.

However, we obtain a new result of fundamental importance when we carry out the analogous consideration for a ray of light. With respect to the Galilean reference-body  $K$ , such a ray of light is transmitted rectilinearly with the velocity  $c$ . It can easily be shown that the path of the same ray of light is no longer a straight line when we consider it with reference to the accelerated chest (reference-body  $K'$ ). From this we conclude, *that, in general, rays of light are propagated curilinearly in gravitational fields*. In two respects this result is of great importance.

In the first place, it can be compared with the reality. Although a detailed examination of the question shows that the curvature of light rays required by the general theory of relativity is only exceedingly small for the gravitational fields at our disposal in practice, its estimated magnitude for light rays passing the sun at grazing incidence is nevertheless 1.7 seconds of arc. This ought to manifest itself in the following way.





## INFERENCES FROM RELATIVITY 89

As seen from the earth, certain fixed stars appear to be in the neighbourhood of the sun, and are thus capable of observation during a total eclipse of the sun. At such times, these stars ought to appear to be displaced outwards from the sun by an amount indicated above, as compared with their apparent position in the sky when the sun is situated at another part of the heavens. The examination of the correctness or otherwise of this deduction is a problem of the greatest importance, the early solution of which is to be expected of astronomers.

In the second place our result shows that, according to the general theory of relativity, the law of the constancy of the velocity of light *in vacuo*, which constitutes one of the two fundamental assumptions in the special theory of relativity and to which we have already frequently referred, cannot claim any unlimited validity. A curvature of rays of light can only take place when the velocity of propagation of light varies with position. Now we might think that as a consequence of this, the special theory of relativity and with it the whole theory of relativity would be laid in the dust. But in reality this is not the

<sup>1</sup> By means of the star photographs of two expeditions equipped by the Joint Committee of the Royal and Royal Astronomical Societies, the existence of the deflection of light demanded by theory was confirmed during the solar eclipse of 29th May, 1919. (Cf. Appendix III.)

## 90 GENERAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

case. We can only conclude that the special theory of relativity cannot claim an unlimited domain of validity; its results hold only so long as we are able to disregard the influences of gravitational fields on the phenomena (e.g. of light).

Since it has often been contended by opponents of the theory of relativity that the special theory of relativity is overthrown by the general theory of relativity, it is perhaps advisable to make the facts of the case clearer by means of an appropriate comparison. Before the development of electrodynamics the laws of electrostatics and the laws of electricity were regarded indiscriminately. At the present time we know that electric fields can be derived correctly from electrostatic considerations only for the case, which is never strictly realised, in which the electrical masses are quite at rest relatively to each other, and to the co-ordinate system. Should we be justified in saying that for this reason electrostatics is overthrown by the field-equations of Maxwell in electrodynamics? Not in the least. Electrostatics is contained in electrodynamics as a limiting case; the laws of the latter lead directly to those of the former for the case in which the fields are invariable with regard to time. No fairer destiny could be allotted to any physical theory, than that it should of itself point out the

## INFERENCES FROM RELATIVITY 91

way to the introduction of a more comprehensive theory, in which it lives on as a limiting case.

In the example of the transmission of light just dealt with, we have seen that the general theory of relativity enables us to derive theoretically the influence of a gravitational field on the course of natural processes, the laws of which are already known when a gravitational field is absent. But the most attractive problem, to the solution of which the general theory of relativity supplies the key, concerns the investigation of the laws satisfied by the gravitational field itself. Let us consider this for a moment.

We are acquainted with space-time domains which behave (approximately) in a "Galilean" fashion under suitable choice of reference-body, i.e. domains in which gravitational fields are absent. If we now refer such a domain to a reference-body  $K'$  possessing any kind of motion, then relative to  $K'$  there exists a gravitational field which is variable with respect to space and time.<sup>1</sup> The character of this field will of course depend on the motion chosen for  $K'$ . According to the general theory of relativity, the general law of the gravitational field must be satisfied for all gravitational fields obtainable in this way. Even though by no means all gravitational fields

<sup>1</sup> This follows from a generalisation of the discussion in Section XX.

## 92 GENERAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

can be produced in this way, yet we may entertain the hope that the general law of gravitation will be derivable from such gravitational fields of a special kind. This hope has been realised in the most beautiful manner. But between the clear vision of this goal and its actual realisation it was necessary to surmount a serious difficulty, and as this lies deep at the root of things, I dare not withhold it from the reader. We require to extend our ideas of the space-time continuum still farther.

## XXIII

## BEHAVIOUR OF CLOCKS AND MEASURING-RODS ON A ROTATING BODY OF REFERENCE

**H**ITHERTO I have purposely refrained from speaking about the physical interpretation of space- and time-data in the case of the general theory of relativity. As a consequence, I am guilty of a certain slovenliness of treatment, which, as we know from the special theory of relativity, is far from being unimportant and pardonable. It is now high time that we remedy this defect; but I would mention at the outset, that this matter lays no small claims on the patience and on the power of abstraction of the reader.

We start off again from quite special cases, which we have frequently used before. Let us consider a space-time domain in which no gravitational field exists relative to a reference-body  $K$  whose state of motion has been suitably chosen.  $K$  is then a Galilean reference-body as regards the domain considered, and the results of the special theory of relativity hold relative to  $K$ . Let us suppose the same domain referred to a

93

## 94 GENERAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

second body of reference  $K'$ , which is rotating uniformly with respect to  $K$ . In order to fix our ideas, we shall imagine  $K'$  to be in the form of a plane circular disc, which rotates uniformly in its own plane about its centre. An observer who is sitting eccentrically on the disc  $K'$  is sensible of a force which acts outwards in a radial direction, and which would be interpreted as an effect of inertia (centrifugal force) by an observer who was at rest with respect to the original reference-body  $K$ . But the observer on the disc may regard his disc as a reference-body which is "at rest"; on the basis of the general principle of relativity he is justified in doing this. The force acting on himself, and in fact on all other bodies which are at rest relative to the disc, he regards as the effect of a gravitational field. Nevertheless, the space-distribution of this gravitational field is of a kind that would not be possible on Newton's theory of gravitation.<sup>1</sup> But since the observer believes in the general theory of relativity, this does not disturb him; he is quite in the right when he believes that a general law of gravitation can be formulated—a law which not only explains the motion of the stars correctly, but also the field of force experienced by himself.

<sup>1</sup> The field disappears at the centre of the disc and increases proportionally to the distance from the centre as we proceed outwards.

## BEHAVIOUR OF CLOCKS AND RODS 95

The observer performs experiments on his circular disc with clocks and measuring-rods. In doing so, it is his intention to arrive at exact definitions for the signification of time- and space-data with reference to the circular disc  $K'$ , these definitions being based on his observations. What will be his experience in this enterprise?

To start with, he places one of two identically constructed clocks at the centre of the circular disc, and the other on the edge of the disc, so that they are at rest relative to it. We now ask ourselves whether both clocks go at the same rate from the standpoint of the non-rotating Galilean reference-body  $K$ . As judged from this body, the clock at the centre of the disc has no velocity, whereas the clock at the edge of the disc is in motion relative to  $K$  in consequence of the rotation. According to a result obtained in Section XII, it follows that the latter clock goes at a rate permanently slower than that of the clock at the centre of the circular disc, i.e. as observed from  $K$ . It is obvious that the same effect would be noted by an observer whom we will imagine sitting alongside his clock at the centre of the circular disc. Thus on our circular disc, or, to make the case more general, in every gravitational field, a clock will go more quickly or less quickly, according to the position in which the clock is situated (at rest). For this reason is not

## 96 GENERAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

possible to obtain a reasonable definition of time with the aid of clocks which are arranged at rest with respect to the body of reference. A similar difficulty presents itself when we attempt to apply our earlier definition of simultaneity in such a case, but I do not wish to go any farther into this question.

Moreover, at this stage the definition of the space co-ordinates also presents unsurmountable difficulties. If the observer applies his standard measuring-rod (a rod which is short as compared with the radius of the disc) tangentially to the edge of the disc, then, as judged from the Galileian system, the length of this rod will be less than 1, since, according to Section XII, moving bodies suffer a shortening in the direction of the motion. On the other hand, the measuring-rod will not experience a shortening in length, as judged from  $K$ , if it is applied to the disc in the direction of the radius. If, then, the observer first measures the circumference of the disc with his measuring-rod and then the diameter of the disc, on dividing the one by the other, he will not obtain as quotient the familiar number  $\pi = 3.14 \dots$  but a larger number,<sup>1</sup> whereas of course, for a disc which is at rest with respect to  $K$ , this operation

<sup>1</sup> Throughout this consideration we have to use the Galileian (non-rotating) system  $K$  as reference-body, since we may only assume the validity of the results of the special theory of relativity relative to  $K$  (relative to  $K$  a gravitational field prevails).

## EUCLIDEAN AND NON-EUCLIDEAN 99

little testing-rod. To this square we add similar ones, each of which has one rod in common with the first. We proceed in like manner with each of these squares until finally the whole marble slab is laid out with squares. The arrangement is such, that each side of a square belongs to two squares and each corner to four squares.

It is a veritable wonder that we can carry out this business without getting into the greatest difficulties. We only need to think of the following. If at any moment three squares meet at a corner, then two sides of the fourth square are already laid, and as a consequence, the arrangement of the remaining two sides of the square is already completely determined. But I am now no longer able to adjust the quadrilateral so that its diagonals may be equal. If they are equal of their own accord, then this is an especial favour of the marble slab and of the little rods about which I can only be thankfully surprised. We must needs experience many such surprises if the construction is to be successful.

If everything has really gone smoothly, then I say that the points of the marble slab constitute a Euclidean continuum with respect to the little rod, which has been used as a "distance" (line-interval). By choosing one corner of a square as "origin," I can characterise every other corner of a square with reference to this origin by means

of two numbers. I only need state how many rods I must pass over when, starting from the origin, I proceed towards the "right" and then "upwards," in order to arrive at the corner of the square under consideration. These two numbers are then the "Cartesian co-ordinates" of this corner with reference to the "Cartesian co-ordinate system" which is determined by the arrangement of little rods.

By making use of the following modification of this abstract experiment, we recognise that there must also be cases in which the experiment would be unsuccessful. We shall suppose that the rods "expand" by an amount proportional to the increase of temperature. We heat the central part of the marble slab, but not the periphery, in which case two of our little rods can still be brought into coincidence at every position on the table. But our construction of squares must necessarily come into disorder during the heating, because the little rods on the central region of the table expand, whereas those on the outer part do not.

With reference to our little rods—defined as unit lengths—the marble slab is no longer a Euclidean continuum, and we are also no longer in the position of defining Cartesian co-ordinates directly with their aid, since the above construction can no longer be carried out. But since

## 100 GENERAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

of two numbers. I only need state how many rods I must pass over when, starting from the origin, I proceed towards the "right" and then "upwards," in order to arrive at the corner of the square under consideration. These two numbers are then the "Cartesian co-ordinates" of this corner with reference to the "Cartesian co-ordinate system" which is determined by the arrangement of little rods.

By making use of the following modification of this abstract experiment, we recognise that there must also be cases in which the experiment would be unsuccessful. We shall suppose that the rods "expand" by an amount proportional to the increase of temperature. We heat the central part of the marble slab, but not the periphery, in which case two of our little rods can still be brought into coincidence at every position on the table. But our construction of squares must necessarily come into disorder during the heating, because the little rods on the central region of the table expand, whereas those on the outer part do not.

With reference to our little rods—defined as

unit lengths—the marble slab is no longer a Euclidean continuum, and we are also no longer in the position of defining Cartesian co-ordinates directly with their aid, since the above construction can no longer be carried out. But since

of two numbers. I only need state how many rods I must pass over when, starting from the origin, I proceed towards the "right" and then "upwards," in order to arrive at the corner of the square under consideration. These two numbers are then the "Cartesian co-ordinates" of this corner with reference to the "Cartesian co-ordinate system" which is determined by the arrangement of little rods.

By making use of the following modification of this abstract experiment, we recognise that there must also be cases in which the experiment would be unsuccessful. We shall suppose that the rods "expand" by an amount proportional to the increase of temperature. We heat the central part of the marble slab, but not the periphery, in which case two of our little rods can still be brought into coincidence at every position on the table. But our construction of squares must necessarily come into disorder during the heating, because the little rods on the central region of the table expand, whereas those on the outer part do not.

With reference to our little rods—defined as

unit lengths—the marble slab is no longer a Euclidean continuum, and we are also no longer in the position of defining Cartesian co-ordinates directly with their aid, since the above construction can no longer be carried out. But since

of two numbers. I only need state how many rods I must pass over when, starting from the origin, I proceed towards the "right" and then "upwards," in order to arrive at the corner of the square under consideration. These two numbers are then the "Cartesian co-ordinates" of this corner with reference to the "Cartesian co-ordinate system" which is determined by the arrangement of little rods.

By making use of the following modification of this abstract experiment, we recognise that there must also be cases in which the experiment would be unsuccessful. We shall suppose that the rods "expand" by an amount proportional to the increase of temperature. We heat the central part of the marble slab, but not the periphery, in which case two of our little rods can still be brought into coincidence at every position on the table. But our construction of squares must necessarily come into disorder during the heating, because the little rods on the central region of the table expand, whereas those on the outer part do not.

With reference to our little rods—defined as

unit lengths—the marble slab is no longer a Euclidean continuum, and we are also no longer in the position of defining Cartesian co-ordinates directly with their aid, since the above construction can no longer be carried out. But since

of two numbers. I only need state how many rods I must pass over when, starting from the origin, I proceed towards the "right" and then "upwards," in order to arrive at the corner of the square under consideration. These two numbers are then the "Cartesian co-ordinates" of this corner with reference to the "Cartesian co-ordinate system" which is determined by the arrangement of little rods.

By making use of the following modification of this abstract experiment, we recognise that there must also be cases in which the experiment would be unsuccessful. We shall suppose that the rods "expand" by an amount proportional to the increase of temperature. We heat the central part of the marble slab, but not the periphery, in which case two of our little rods can still be brought into coincidence at every position on the table. But our construction of squares must necessarily come into disorder during the heating, because the little rods on the central region of the table expand, whereas those on the outer part do not.

With reference to our little rods—defined as

unit lengths—the marble slab is no longer a Euclidean continuum, and we are also no longer in the position of defining Cartesian co-ordinates directly with their aid, since the above construction can no longer be carried out. But since

of two numbers. I only need state how many rods I must pass over when, starting from the origin, I proceed towards the "right" and then "upwards," in order to arrive at the corner of the square under consideration. These two numbers are then the "Cartesian co-ordinates" of this corner with reference to the "Cartesian co-ordinate system" which is determined by the arrangement of little rods.

By making use of the following modification of this abstract experiment, we recognise that there must also be cases in which the experiment would be unsuccessful. We shall suppose that the rods "expand" by an amount proportional to the increase of temperature. We heat the central part of the marble slab, but not the periphery, in which case two of our little rods can still be brought into coincidence at every position on the table. But our construction of squares must necessarily come into disorder during the heating, because the little rods on the central region of the table expand, whereas those on the outer part do not.

With reference to our little rods—defined as

unit lengths—the marble slab is no longer a Euclidean continuum, and we are also no longer in the position of defining Cartesian co-ordinates directly with their aid, since the above construction can no longer be carried out. But since

of two numbers. I only need state how many rods I must pass over when, starting from the origin, I proceed towards the "right" and then "upwards," in order to arrive at the corner of the square under consideration. These two numbers are then the "Cartesian co-ordinates" of this corner with reference to the "Cartesian co-ordinate system" which is determined by the arrangement of little rods.

By making use of the following modification of this abstract experiment, we recognise that there must also be cases in which the experiment would be unsuccessful. We shall suppose that the rods "expand" by an amount proportional to the increase of temperature. We heat the central part of the marble slab, but not the periphery, in which case two of our little rods can still be brought into coincidence at every position on the table. But our construction of squares must necessarily come into disorder during the heating, because the little rods on the central region of the table expand, whereas those on the outer part do not.

With reference to our little rods—defined as

unit lengths—the marble slab is no longer a Euclidean continuum, and we are also no longer in the position of defining Cartesian co-ordinates directly with their aid, since the above construction can no longer be carried out. But since

of two numbers. I only need state how many rods I must pass over when, starting from the origin, I proceed towards the "right" and then "upwards," in order to arrive at the corner of the square under consideration. These two numbers are then the "Cartesian co-ordinates" of this corner with reference to the "Cartesian co-ordinate system" which is determined by the arrangement of little rods.

By making use of the following modification of this abstract experiment, we recognise that there must also be cases in which the experiment would be unsuccessful. We shall suppose that the rods "expand" by an amount proportional to the increase of temperature. We heat the central part of the marble slab, but not the periphery, in which case two of our little rods can still be brought into coincidence at every position on the table. But our construction of squares must necessarily come into disorder during the heating, because the little rods on the central region of the table expand, whereas those on the outer part do not.

With reference to our little rods—defined as

unit lengths—the marble slab is no longer a Euclidean continuum, and we are also no longer in the position of defining Cartesian co-ordinates directly with their aid, since the above construction can no longer be carried out. But since

of two numbers. I only need state how many rods I must pass over when, starting from the origin, I proceed towards the "right" and then "upwards," in order to arrive at the corner of the square under consideration. These two numbers are then the "Cartesian co-ordinates" of this corner with reference to the "Cartesian co-ordinate system" which is determined by the arrangement of little rods.

By making use of the following modification of this abstract experiment, we recognise that there must also be cases in which the experiment would be unsuccessful. We shall suppose that the rods "expand" by an amount proportional to the increase of temperature. We heat the central part of the marble slab, but not the periphery, in which case two of our little rods can still be brought into coincidence at every position on the table. But our construction of squares must necessarily come into disorder during the heating, because the little rods on the central region of the table expand, whereas those on the outer part do not.

With reference to our little rods—defined as

unit lengths—the marble slab is no longer a Euclidean continuum, and we are also no longer in the position of defining Cartesian co-ordinates directly with their aid, since the above construction can no longer be carried out. But since

of two numbers. I only need state how many rods I must pass over when, starting from the origin, I proceed towards the "right" and then "upwards," in order to arrive at the corner of the square under consideration. These two numbers are then the "Cartesian co-ordinates" of this corner with reference to the "Cartesian co-ordinate system" which is determined by the arrangement of little rods.

By making use of the following modification of this abstract experiment, we recognise that there must also be cases in which the experiment would be unsuccessful. We shall suppose that the rods "expand" by an amount proportional to the increase of temperature. We heat the central part of the marble slab, but not the periphery, in which case two of our little rods can still be brought into coincidence at every position on the table. But our construction of squares must necessarily come into disorder during the heating, because the little rods on the central region of the table expand, whereas those on the outer part do not.

With reference to our little rods—defined as

unit lengths—the marble slab is no longer a Euclidean continuum, and we are also no longer in the position of defining Cartesian co-ordinates directly with their aid, since the above construction can no longer be carried out. But since

of two numbers. I only need state how many rods I must pass over when, starting from the origin, I proceed towards the "right" and then "upwards," in order to arrive at the corner of the square under consideration. These two numbers are then the "Cartesian co-ordinates" of this corner with reference to the "Cartesian co-ordinate system" which is determined by the arrangement of little rods.

By making use of the following modification of this abstract experiment, we recognise that there must also be cases in which the experiment would be unsuccessful. We shall suppose that the rods "expand" by an amount proportional to the increase of temperature. We heat the central part of the marble slab, but not the periphery, in which case two of our little rods can still be brought into coincidence at every position on the table. But our construction of squares must necessarily come into disorder during the heating, because the little rods on the central region of the table expand, whereas those on the outer part do not.

With reference to our little rods—defined as

unit lengths—the marble slab is no longer a Euclidean continuum, and we are also no longer in the position of defining Cartesian co-ordinates directly with their aid, since the above construction can no longer be carried out. But since

of two numbers. I only need state how many rods I must pass over when, starting from the origin, I proceed towards the "right" and then "upwards," in order to arrive at the corner of the square under consideration. These two numbers are then the "Cartesian co-ordinates" of this corner with reference to the "Cartesian co-ordinate system" which is determined by the arrangement of little rods.

By making use of the following modification of this abstract experiment, we recognise that there must also be cases in which the experiment would be unsuccessful. We shall suppose that the rods "expand" by an amount proportional to the increase of temperature. We heat the central part of the marble slab, but not the periphery, in which case two of our little rods can still be brought into coincidence at every position on the table. But our construction of squares must necessarily come into disorder during the heating, because the little rods on the central region of the table expand, whereas those on the outer part do not.

With reference to our little rods—defined as

unit lengths—the marble slab is no longer a Euclidean continuum, and we are also no longer in the position of defining Cartesian co-ordinates directly with their aid, since the above construction can no longer be carried out. But since

of two numbers. I only need state how many rods I must pass over when, starting from the origin, I proceed towards the "right" and then "upwards," in order to arrive at the corner of the square under consideration. These two numbers are then the "Cartesian co-ordinates" of this corner with reference to the "Cartesian co-ordinate system" which is determined by the arrangement of little rods.

By making use of the following modification of this abstract experiment, we recognise that there must also be cases in which the experiment would be unsuccessful. We shall suppose that the rods "expand" by an amount proportional to the increase of temperature. We heat the central part of the marble slab, but not the periphery, in which case two of our little rods can still be brought into coincidence at every position on the table. But our construction of squares must necessarily come into disorder during the heating, because the little rods on the central region of the table expand, whereas those on the outer part do not.

With reference to our little rods—defined as

unit lengths—the marble slab is no longer a Euclidean continuum, and we are also no longer in the position of defining Cartesian co-ordinates directly with their aid, since the above construction can no longer be carried out. But since

of two numbers. I only need state how many rods I must pass over when, starting from the origin, I proceed towards the "right" and then "upwards," in order to arrive at the corner of the square under consideration. These two numbers are then the "Cartesian co-ordinates" of this corner with reference to the "Cartesian co-ordinate system" which is determined by the arrangement of little rods.

By making use of the following modification of this abstract experiment, we recognise that there must also be cases in which the experiment would be unsuccessful. We shall suppose that the rods "expand" by an amount proportional to the increase of temperature. We heat the central part of the marble slab, but not the periphery, in which case two of our little rods can still be brought into coincidence at every position on the table. But our construction of squares must necessarily come into disorder during the heating, because the little rods on the central region of the table expand, whereas those on the outer part do not.

With reference to our little rods—defined as

unit lengths—the marble slab is no longer a Euclidean continuum, and we are also no longer in the position of defining Cartesian co-ordinates directly with their aid, since the above construction can no longer be carried out. But since

of two numbers. I only need state how many rods I must pass over when, starting from the origin, I proceed towards the "right" and then "upwards," in order to arrive at the corner of the square under consideration. These two numbers are then the "Cartesian co-ordinates" of this corner with reference to the "Cartesian co-ordinate system" which is determined by the arrangement of little rods.

By making use of the following modification of this abstract experiment, we recognise that there must also be cases in which the experiment would be unsuccessful. We shall suppose that the rods "expand" by an amount proportional to the increase of temperature. We heat the central part of the marble slab, but not the periphery, in which case two of our little rods can still be brought into coincidence at every position on the table. But our construction of squares must necessarily come into disorder during the heating, because the little rods on the central region of the table expand, whereas those on the outer part do not.

With reference to our little rods—defined as

unit lengths—the marble slab is no longer a Euclidean continuum, and we are also no longer in the position of defining Cartesian co-ordinates directly with their aid, since the above construction can no longer be carried out. But since

of two numbers. I only need state how many rods I must pass over when, starting from the origin, I proceed towards the "right" and then "upwards," in order to arrive at the corner of the square under consideration. These two numbers are then the "Cartesian co-ordinates" of this corner with reference to the "Cartesian co-ordinate system" which is determined by the arrangement of little rods.

By making use of the following modification of this abstract experiment, we recognise that there must also be cases in which the experiment would be unsuccessful. We shall suppose that the rods "expand" by an amount proportional to the increase of temperature. We heat the central part of the marble slab, but not the periphery, in which case two of our little rods can still be brought into coincidence at every position on the table. But our construction of squares must necessarily come into disorder during the heating, because the little rods on the central region of the table expand, whereas those on the outer part do not.

With reference to our little rods—defined as

unit lengths—the marble slab is no longer a Euclidean continuum, and we are also no longer in the position of defining Cartesian co-ordinates directly with their aid, since the above construction can no longer be carried out. But since

of two numbers. I only need state how many rods I must pass over when, starting from the origin, I proceed towards the "right" and then "upwards," in order to arrive at the corner of the square under consideration. These two numbers are then the "Cartesian co-ordinates" of this corner with reference to the "Cartesian co-ordinate system" which is determined by the arrangement of little rods.

By making use of the following modification of this abstract experiment, we recognise that there must also be cases in which the experiment would be unsuccessful. We shall suppose that the rods "expand" by an amount proportional to the increase of temperature. We heat the central part of the marble slab, but not the periphery, in which case two of our little rods can still be brought into coincidence at every position on the table. But our construction of squares must necessarily come into disorder during the heating, because the little rods on the central region of the table expand, whereas those on the outer part do not.

With reference to our little rods—defined as

unit lengths—the marble slab is no longer a Euclidean continuum, and we are also no longer in the position of defining Cartesian co-ordinates directly with their aid, since the above construction can no longer be carried out. But since

of two numbers. I only need state how many rods I must pass over when, starting from the origin, I proceed towards the "right" and then "upwards," in order to arrive at the corner of the square under consideration. These two numbers are then the "Cartesian co-ordinates" of this corner with reference to the "Cartesian co-ordinate system" which is determined by the arrangement of little rods.

By making use of the following modification of this abstract experiment, we recognise that there must also be cases in which the experiment would be unsuccessful. We shall suppose that the rods "expand" by an amount proportional to the increase of temperature. We heat the central part of the marble slab, but not the periphery, in which case two of our little rods can still be brought into coincidence at every position on the table. But our construction of squares must necessarily come into disorder during the heating, because the little rods on the central region of the table expand, whereas those on the outer part do not.

With reference to our little rods—defined as

unit lengths—the marble slab is no longer a Euclidean continuum, and we are also no longer in the position of defining Cartesian co-ordinates directly with their aid, since the above construction can no longer be carried out. But since

of two numbers. I only need state how many rods I must pass over when, starting from the origin, I proceed towards the "right" and then "upwards," in order to arrive at the corner of the square under consideration. These two numbers are then the "Cartesian co-ordinates" of this corner with reference to the "Cartesian co-ordinate system" which is determined by the arrangement of little rods.

By making use of the following modification of this abstract experiment, we recognise that there must also be cases in which the experiment would be unsuccessful. We shall suppose that the rods "expand" by an amount proportional to the increase of temperature. We heat the central part of the marble slab, but not the periphery, in which case two of our little rods can still be brought into coincidence at every position on the table. But our construction of squares must necessarily come into disorder during the heating, because the little rods on the central region of the table expand, whereas those on the outer part do not.

With reference to our little rods—defined as

unit lengths—the marble slab is no longer a Euclidean continuum, and we are also no longer in the position of defining Cartesian co-ordinates directly with their aid, since the above construction can no longer be carried out. But since

of two numbers. I only need state how many rods I must pass over when, starting from the origin, I proceed towards the "right" and then "upwards," in order to arrive at the corner of the square under consideration. These two numbers are then the "Cartesian co-ordinates" of this corner with reference to the "Cartesian co-ordinate system" which is determined by the arrangement of little rods.

By making use of the following modification of this abstract experiment, we recognise that there must also be cases in which the experiment would be unsuccessful. We shall suppose that the rods "expand" by an amount proportional to the increase of temperature. We heat the central part of the marble slab, but not the periphery, in which case two of our little rods can still be brought into coincidence at every position on the table. But our construction of squares must necessarily come into disorder during the heating, because the little

EUCLIDEAN AND NON-EUCLIDEAN 101

there are other things which are not influenced in a similar manner to the little rods (or perhaps not at all) by the temperature of the table, it is possible quite naturally to maintain the point of view that the marble slab is a "Euclidean continuum." This can be done in a satisfactory manner by making a more subtle stipulation about the measurement or the comparison of lengths.

But if rods of every kind (*i.e.* of every material) were to behave in the same way as regards the influence of temperature when they are on the variably heated marble slab, and if we had no other means of detecting the effect of temperature than the geometrical behaviour of our rods in experiments analogous to the one described above, then our best plan would be to assign the distance *one* to two points on the slab, provided that the ends of one of our rods could be made to coincide with these two points; for how else should we define the distance without our proceeding being in the highest measure grossly arbitrary? The method of Cartesian co-ordinates must then be discarded, and replaced by another which does not assume the validity of Euclidean geometry for rigid bodies.<sup>1</sup> The reader will notice that

<sup>1</sup> Mathematicians have been confronted with our problem in the following form: If we are given a surface (*e.g.*, an ellipsoid) in Euclidean three-dimensional space, then there exists for this surface a two-dimensional geometry, just as much as for a plane surface.

102 GENERAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

the situation depicted here corresponds to the one brought about by the general postulate of relativity (Section XXIII).

Gauss undertook the task of treating this two-dimensional geometry from first principles, without making use of the fact that the surface belongs to a Euclidean continuum of three dimensions. If we imagine connections to be made with rigid rods in the surface (similar to that above), the matter is, we see, that the different laws will hold for these from those resulting on the basis of Euclidean plane geometry. The surface is not a Euclidean continuum with respect to the rods, and we cannot define Cartesian co-ordinates in the surface. Gauss indicated the principles according to which we can define Gaussian co-ordinates. In this way he also pointed out the way to the method of Riemann of treating multi-dimensional, non-Euclidean continua. Thus it is that mathematicians long ago solved the formal problems to which we are led by the general postulate of relativity.

XV  
GAUSSIAN CO-ORDINATES

ACCORDING to Gauss, this combined analytical and geometrical mode of handling the problem can be arrived at in the following way. We imagine a system of arbitrary curves (see Fig. 4) drawn on the surface of the table. These we designate as *u*-curves, and we indicate each of them by means of a number. The curves  $u=1$ ,  $u=2$  and  $u=3$  are drawn in the diagram. Between the curves  $u=1$  and  $u=2$  we must imagine an infinitely large number to be drawn, all of which correspond to real numbers lying between 1 and 2. We have then a system of *u*-curves, and this "infinitely dense" system covers the whole surface of the table. These *u*-curves must not intersect each other, and through each point of the surface one and only one curve must pass. Thus a perfectly definite value of *u* belongs to every point on the surface of the marble slab. In like manner we




FIG. 4

104 GENERAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

imagine a system of *v*-curves drawn on the surface. These satisfy the same conditions as the *u*-curves, they are provided with numbers in a corresponding manner, and they may likewise be of arbitrary shape. It follows that a value of *u* and a value of *v* belong to every point on the surface of the table. We call these two numbers the co-ordinates of the surface of the table (Gaussian co-ordinates). For example, the point *P* in the diagram has the Gaussian co-ordinates  $u=3$ ,  $v=1$ . Two neighbouring points *P* and *P'* on the surface then correspond to the co-ordinates

$$P: \quad u, v$$

where  $du$  and  $dv$  signify very small numbers. In a similar manner we may indicate the distance (line-interval) between *P* and *P'*, as measured with a little rod, by means of the very small number  $ds$ . Then according to Gauss we have

$$ds^2 = g_{11}du^2 + 2g_{12}dudv + g_{22}dv^2,$$

where  $g_{11}$ ,  $g_{12}$ ,  $g_{22}$  are magnitudes which depend in a perfectly definite way on *u* and *v*. The magnitudes  $g_{11}$ ,  $g_{12}$  and  $g_{22}$  determine the behaviour of the rods relative to the *u*-curves and *v*-curves, and thus also relative to the surface of the table. For the case in which the points of the surface considered form a Euclidean continuum with reference to the measuring-rods, but only in this case, it is possible to draw the *u*-curves and

GAUSSIAN CO-ORDINATES 105

*v*-curves and to attach numbers to them, in such a manner, that we simply have:

$$ds^2 = du^2 + dv^2.$$

Under these conditions, the *u*-curves and *v*-curves are straight lines in the sense of Euclidean geometry, and they are perpendicular to each other. Here the Gaussian co-ordinates are simply Cartesian ones. It is clear that Gauss co-ordinates are nothing more than an association of two sets of numbers with the points of the surface considered, of such a nature that numerical values differing very slightly from each other are associated with neighbouring points "in space."

So far, these considerations hold for a continuum of two dimensions. But the Gaussian method can be applied also to a continuum of three, four or more dimensions. If, for instance, a continuum of four dimensions be supposed available, we may represent it in the following way. With every point of the continuum we associate arbitrarily four numbers,  $x_1$ ,  $x_2$ ,  $x_3$ ,  $x_4$ , which are known as "co-ordinates." Adjacent points correspond to adjacent values of the co-ordinates. If a distance  $ds$  is associated with the adjacent points *P* and *P'*, this distance being measurable and well-defined from a physical point of view, then the following formula holds:

$$ds^2 = g_{11}dx_1^2 + 2g_{12}dx_1dx_2 + \dots + g_{44}dx_4^2,$$

106 GENERAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

where the magnitudes  $g_{11}$ , etc., have values which vary with the position in the continuum. Only when the continuum is a Euclidean one is it possible to associate the co-ordinates  $x_1$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $x_4$  with the points of the continuum so that we have simply

$$ds^2 = dx_1^2 + dx_2^2 + dx_3^2 + dx_4^2.$$

In this case relations hold in the four-dimensional continuum which are analogous to those holding in our three-dimensional measurements.

However, the Gauss treatment for  $ds^2$  which we have given above is not always possible. It is only possible when sufficiently small regions of the continuum under consideration may be regarded as Euclidean continua. For example, this obviously holds in the case of the marble slab of the table and local variation of temperature. The temperature is practically constant for a small part of the slab, and thus the geometrical behaviour of the rods is *almost* as it ought to be according to the rules of Euclidean geometry. Hence the imperfections of the construction of squares in the previous section do not show themselves clearly until this construction is extended over a considerable portion of the surface of the table.

We can sum this up as follows: Gauss invented a method for the mathematical treatment of continua in general, in which "size-relations"

GAUSSIAN CO-ORDINATES 107

("distances" between neighbouring points) are defined. To every point of a continuum are assigned as many numbers (Gaussian co-ordinates) as the continuum has dimensions. This is done in such a way that only one meaning can be attached to the assignment, and that numbers (Gaussian co-ordinates) which differ by an indefinitely small amount are assigned to adjacent points. The Gaussian co-ordinate system is a logical generalisation of the Cartesian co-ordinate system. It is also applicable to non-Euclidean continua, but only when, with respect to the defined "size" or "distance," small parts of the continuum under consideration behave more nearly like a Euclidean system, the smaller the part of the continuum under our notice.

XVII

THE SPACE-TIME CONTINUUM OF THE SPECIAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY CONSIDERED AS A EUCLIDEAN CONTINUUM

WE are now in a position to formulate more exactly the idea of Minkowski, which was only vaguely indicated in Section XVII. In accordance with the special theory of relativity, certain co-ordinate systems are given preference for the description of the four-dimensional, space-time continuum. We called these "Galileian co-ordinate systems." For these systems, the four co-ordinates  $x$ ,  $y$ ,  $z$ ,  $t$ , which determine an event or — in other words — a point of the four-dimensional continuum, are defined physically in a simple manner, as set forth in detail in the first part of this book. For the transition from one Galileian system to another, which is moving uniformly with reference to the first, the equations of the Lorentz transformation are valid. These last form the basis for the derivation of deductions from the special theory of relativity, and in themselves they are nothing more than the expression of the universal

108

SPACE-TIME CONTINUUM 109

validity of the law of transmission of light for all Galileian systems of reference.

Minkowski found that the Lorentz transformations satisfy the following simple conditions. Let us consider two neighbouring events, the relative position of which in the four-dimensional continuum is given with respect to a Galileian reference-body *K* by the space co-ordinate differences  $dx$ ,  $dy$ ,  $dz$  and the time-difference  $dt$ . With reference to a second Galileian system we shall suppose that the corresponding differences for these two events are  $dx'$ ,  $dy'$ ,  $dz'$ ,  $dt'$ . Then these magnitudes always fulfill the condition,<sup>1</sup>

$$dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2 - c^2 dt^2 = dx'^2 + dy'^2 + dz'^2 - c^2 dt'^2.$$

The validity of the Lorentz transformation follows from this condition. We can express this as follows: The magnitude

$$ds^2 = dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2 - c^2 dt^2,$$

which belongs to two adjacent points of the four-dimensional space-time continuum, has the same value for all selected (Galileian) reference-bodies. If we replace  $x$ ,  $y$ ,  $z$ ,  $\sqrt{-1}ct$ , by  $x_1$ ,  $x_2$ ,  $x_3$ ,  $x_4$ , we also obtain the result that

$$ds^2 = dx_1^2 + dx_2^2 + dx_3^2 + dx_4^2$$

is independent of the choice of the body of reference.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Appendices I and II. The relations which are derived there for the co-ordinates themselves are valid also for co-ordinate differences, and thus also for co-ordinate differentials (indefinitely small differences).

$$ds^2 = dx_1^2 + dx_2^2 + dx_3^2 + dx_4^2 - J.M.]$$

110 GENERAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

ence. We call the magnitude  $ds$  the "distance" apart of the two events or four-dimensional points.

Thus, if we choose as time-variable the imaginary variable  $\sqrt{-1}ct$  instead of the real quantity  $t$ , we can regard the space-time continuum — in accordance with the special theory of relativity — as a "Euclidean" four-dimensional continuum, a result which follows from the considerations of the preceding section.

XVIII

THE SPACE-TIME CONTINUUM OF THE GENERAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY IS NOT A EUCLIDEAN CONTINUUM

IN the first part of this book we were able to make use of space-time co-ordinates which allowed of a simple and direct physical interpretation, and which, according to Section XXVI, can be regarded as four-dimensional Cartesian co-ordinates. This was possible on the basis of the law of the constancy of the velocity of light. But according to Section XXII,<sup>1</sup> the general theory of relativity cannot retain this law. On the contrary, we arrived at the result that according to this latter theory the velocity of light must always depend on the co-ordinates when a gravitational field is present. In connection with a specific illustration in Section XXIII, we found that the presence of a gravitational field invalidates the definition of the co-ordinates and the time, which led us to our objective in the special theory of relativity.

In view of the results of these considerations we are led to the conviction that, according to

111

[XXI — J.M.]

112 GENERAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

the general principle of relativity, the space-time continuum cannot be regarded as a Euclidean one, but that here we have the general case, corresponding to the marble slab with local variations of temperature, and with which we made acquaintance as an example of a two-dimensional continuum. Just as it was there impossible to construct a Cartesian co-ordinate system from equal rods, so here it is impossible to build up a system (reference-body) from rigid bodies and clocks, which shall be of such a nature that measuring-rods and clocks, arranged rigidly with respect to one another, shall indicate position and time directly. Such was the essence of the difficulty with which we were confronted in Section XXIII.

But the considerations of Sections XXV and XXVI show us the way to surmount this difficulty. We refer the four-dimensional space-time continuum in an arbitrary manner to Gauss co-ordinates. We assign to every point of the continuum (event) four numbers,  $x_1$ ,  $x_2$ ,  $x_3$ ,  $x_4$  (co-ordinates), which have not the least direct physical significance, but only serve the purpose of numbering the points of the continuum in a definite but arbitrary manner. This arrangement does not even need to be of such a kind that we must regard  $x_1$ ,  $x_2$ ,  $x_3$ ,  $x_4$  as "space" co-ordinates and  $x_4$  as a "time" co-ordinate.



SPACE-TIME CONTINUUM 113

The reader may think that such a description of the world would be quite inadequate. What does it mean to assign to an event the particular co-ordinates  $x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4$ , if in themselves these co-ordinates have no significance? More careful consideration shows, however, that this anxiety is unfounded. Let us consider, for instance, a material point with any kind of motion. If this point had only a momentary existence without duration, then it would be described in space-time by a single system of values  $x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4$ . Thus its permanent existence must be characterised by an infinitely large number of such systems of values, the co-ordinate values of which are so close together as to give continuity; corresponding to the material point, we thus have a (uni-dimensional) line in the four-dimensional continuum. In the same way, any such lines in our continuum correspond to many points in motion. The only statements having regard to these points which can claim a physical existence are in reality the statements about their encounters. In our mathematical treatment, such an encounter is expressed in the fact that the two lines which represent the motions of the points in question have a particular system of co-ordinate values,  $x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4$ , in common. After mature consideration the reader will doubtless admit that in reality such encounters con-

114 GENERAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

stitute the only actual evidence of a time-space nature with which we meet in physical statements. When we were describing the motion of a material point relative to a body of reference, we stated nothing more than the encounter of this point with particular points of the reference-body. We can also determine the corresponding values of the time by the observation of encounters of the body with clocks, in conjunction with the observation of the encounter of the hands of clocks with particular points on the dials. It is just the same in the case of space-measurements by means of measuring-rods, as a little consideration will show.

The following statements hold generally: Every physical description resolves itself into a number of statements, each of which refers to the space-time coincidence of two events  $A$  and  $B$ . In terms of Gaussian co-ordinates, every such statement is expressed by the agreement of their four co-ordinates  $x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4$ . Thus in reality, the description of the time-space continuum by means of Gauss co-ordinates completely replaces the description with the aid of a body of reference, without suffering from the defects of the latter mode of description; it is not tied down to the Euclidean character of the continuum which has to be represented.

XXVIII  
EXACT FORMULATION OF THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE OF RELATIVITY

We are now in a position to replace the provisional formulation of the general principle of relativity given in Section XVIII by an exact formulation. The form there used, "All bodies of reference  $K, K'$ , etc., are equivalent for the description of natural phenomena (formulation of the general laws of nature), whatever may be their state of motion," cannot be maintained, because the use of rigid reference-bodies, in the sense of the method followed in the special theory of relativity, is in general not possible in space-time description. The Gauss co-ordinate system has to take the place of the body of reference. The following statement corresponds to the fundamental idea of the general principle of relativity: "All Gaussian co-ordinate systems are essentially equivalent for the formulation of the general laws of nature."

We can state this general principle of relativity in still another form, which renders it yet more clearly intelligible than it is when in the form of

115

GENERAL PRINCIPLE OF RELATIVITY 117

Certain considerations suggest that we should refer to the same Galilean domains to non-Galilean reference-bodies also. A gravitational field of a special kind is then present with respect to these bodies (cf. Sections XX and XXIII).

In gravitational fields there are no such things as rigid bodies with Euclidean properties; thus the fictitious rigid body of reference is of no avail in the general theory of relativity. The motion of clocks is also influenced by gravitational fields, and in such a way that a physical definition of time which is made directly with the aid of clocks has by no means the same degree of plausibility as in the special theory of relativity.

For this reason non-rigid reference-bodies are used which are as a whole not only moving in any way whatsoever, but which also suffer alterations in form *ad lib.* during their motion. Clocks, for which the law of motion is of any kind, however irregular, serve for the definition of time. We have to imagine each of these clocks fixed at a point on the non-rigid reference-body. These clocks satisfy only the one condition, that the "readings" which are observed simultaneously on adjacent clocks (in space) differ from each other by an indefinitely small amount. This non-rigid reference-body, which might appropriately be termed a "reference-mollusk," is in the main equivalent to a Gaussian four-dimensional co-ordinate sys-

118 GENERAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

tem chosen arbitrarily. That which gives the "mollusk" a certain comprehensibility as compared with the Gauss co-ordinate system is the (really unqualified) formal retention of the separate existence of the space co-ordinates as opposed to the time co-ordinate. Every point on the mollusk is treated as a space-point, and every material point which is at rest relatively to it as at rest, so long as the mollusk is considered as reference-body. The general principle of relativity requires that all these mollusks can be used as reference-bodies with equal right and equal success in the formulation of the general laws of nature; the laws themselves must be quite independent of the choice of mollusk.

The great power possessed by the general principle of relativity lies in the comprehensive limitation which is imposed on the laws of nature in consequence of what we have seen above.

[<sup>1</sup> The word "unqualified" was correctly changed to "unjustified" in later editions. — J.M.]

XXIX  
THE SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM OF GRAVITATION ON THE BASIS OF THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE OF RELATIVITY

If the reader has followed all our previous considerations, he will have no further difficulty in understanding the methods leading to the solution of the problem of gravitation.

We start off from a consideration of a Galilean domain, *i.e.* a domain in which there is no gravitational field relative to the Galilean reference-body  $K$ . The behaviour of measuring-rods and clocks with reference to  $K$  is known from the special theory of relativity, likewise the behaviour of "isolated" material points; the latter move uniformly and in straight lines.

Now let us refer this domain to a random Gauss co-ordinate system or to a "mollusk" as reference-body  $K'$ . Then with respect to  $K'$  there is a gravitational field  $G$  (of a particular kind). We learn the behaviour of measuring-rods and clocks and also of freely-moving material points with reference to  $K'$  simply by mathematical transformation. We interpret this behaviour as the

119

120 GENERAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

behaviour of measuring-rods, clocks and material points under the influence of the gravitational field  $G$ . Hereupon we introduce a hypothesis: that the influence of the gravitational field on measuring-rods, clocks and freely-moving material points continues to take place according to the same laws, even in the case when the prevailing gravitational field is *not* derivable from the Galilean special case, simply by means of a transformation of co-ordinates.

The next step is to investigate the space-time behaviour of the gravitational field  $G$ , which was derived from the Galilean special case simply by transformation of the co-ordinates. This behaviour is formulated in a law, which is always valid, no matter how the reference-body (mollusk) used in the description may be chosen.

This law is not yet the general law of the gravitational field, since the gravitational field under consideration is of a special kind. In order to find out the general law-of-field of gravitation we still require to obtain a generalisation of the law as found above. This can be obtained without caprice, however, by taking into consideration the following demands:

- (a) The required generalisation must likewise satisfy the general postulate of relativity.
- (b) If there is any matter in the domain under consideration, only its inertial mass, and

122 GENERAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

velocities which are small compared with the velocity of light, we then obtain as a first approximation the Newtonian theory. Thus the latter theory is obtained here without any particular assumption, whereas Newton had to introduce the hypothesis that the force of attraction between mutually attracting material points is inversely proportional to the square of the distance between them. If we increase the accuracy of the calculation, deviations from the theory of Newton make their appearance, practically all of which must nevertheless escape the test of observation owing to their smallness.

We must draw attention here to one of these deviations. According to Newton's theory, a planet moves round the sun in an ellipse, which would permanently maintain its position with respect to the fixed stars, if we could disregard the motion of the fixed stars themselves and the action of the other planets under consideration. Thus, if we correct the observed motion of the planets for these two influences, and if Newton's theory be strictly correct, we ought to obtain for the orbit of the planet an ellipse, which is fixed with respect to the fixed stars. This deduction, which can be tested with great accuracy, has been confirmed for all the planets save one, with the precision that is capable of being obtained by the delicacy of observation

123 SOLUTION OF GRAVITATION

attainable at the present time. The sole exception is Mercury, the planet which lies nearest the sun. Since the time of Leverrier, it has been known that the ellipse corresponding to the orbit of Mercury, after it has been corrected for the influences mentioned above, is not stationary with respect to the fixed stars, but that it rotates exceedingly slowly in the plane of the orbit and in the sense of the orbital motion. The value obtained for this rotary movement of the orbital ellipse was 43 seconds of arc per century, an amount ensured to be correct to within a few seconds of arc. This effect can be explained by means of classical mechanics only on the assumption of hypotheses which have little probability, and which were devised solely for this purpose.

On the basis of the general theory of relativity, it is found that the ellipse of every planet round the sun must necessarily rotate in the manner indicated above; that for all the planets, with the exception of Mercury, this rotation is too small to be detected with the delicacy of observation possible at the present time; but that in the case of Mercury it must amount to 43 seconds of arc per century, a result which is strictly in agreement with observation.

Apart from this one, it has hitherto been possible to make only two deductions from the theory

124 GENERAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

which admit of being tested by observation, to wit, the curvature of light rays by the gravitational field of the sun,<sup>1</sup> and a displacement of the spectral lines of light reaching us from large stars, as compared with the corresponding lines for light produced in an analogous manner terrestrially (*i.e.* by the same kind of molecule'). I do not doubt that these deductions from the theory will be confirmed also.

<sup>1</sup> Observed by Eddington and others in 1919. (Cf. Appendix III.)

[<sup>2</sup> The word "molecule" was correctly changed to "atom" in later editions. Cf. Appendix III, pg. 157. — J.M.]

SOLUTION OF GRAVITATION 121

thus according to Section XV only its energy is of importance for its effect in exciting a field.

(c) Gravitational field and matter together must satisfy the law of the conservation of energy (and of impulse).

Finally, the general principle of relativity permits us to determine the influence of the gravitational field on the course of all those processes which take place according to known laws when a gravitational field is absent, *i.e.* which have already been fitted into the frame of the special theory of relativity. In this connection we proceed in principle according to the method which has already been explained for measuring-rods, clocks and freely-moving material points.

The theory of gravitation derived in this way from the general postulate of relativity excels not only in its beauty; nor in removing the defect attaching to classical mechanics which was brought to light in Section XXI; nor in interpreting the empirical law of the equality of inertial and gravitational mass; but it has also already explained a result of observation in astronomy, against which classical mechanics is powerless.

If we confine the application of the theory to the case where the gravitational fields can be regarded as being weak, and in which all masses move with respect to the co-ordinate system with

### PART III CONSIDERATIONS ON THE UNIVERSE AS A WHOLE

XXX

## COSMOLOGICAL DIFFICULTIES OF NEWTON'S THEORY

**A** PART from the difficulty discussed in Section **XXI**, there is a second fundamental difficulty attending classical celestial mechanics, which, to the best of my knowledge, was first discussed in detail by the astronomer Seeliger. If we ponder over the question as to how the universe, considered as a whole, is to be regarded, the first answer that suggests itself to us is surely this: As regards space (and time) the universe is infinite. There are stars everywhere, so that the density of matter, although very variable in detail, is nevertheless on the average everywhere the same. In other words: However far we might travel through space, we should find everywhere an attenuated swarm of fixed stars of approximately the same kind and density.

125

## UNIVERSE — FINITE YET UNBOUNDED 129

sidered in Section **XXIV**. In contrast to ours, the universe of these beings is two-dimensional; but, like ours, it extends to infinity. In their universe there is room for an infinite number of identical squares made up of rods, *i.e.* its volume (surface) is infinite. If these beings say their universe is "plane," there is sense in the statement, because they mean that they can perform the constructions of plane Euclidean geometry with their rods. In this connection the individual rods always represent the same distance, independently of their position.

Let us consider now a second two-dimensional existence, but this time on a spherical surface instead of on a plane. The flat beings with their measuring-rods and other objects fit exactly on this surface and they are unable to leave it. Their whole universe of observation extends exclusively over the surface of the sphere. Are these beings able to regard the geometry of their universe as being plane geometry and their rods without as the realisation of "distance"? They cannot do this. For if they attempt to realise a straight line, they will obtain a curve, which we "three-dimensional beings" designate as a great circle, *i.e.* a self-contained line of definite finite length, which can be measured up by means of a measuring-rod. Similarly, this universe has a finite area, that can be compared with the area of a

## 126 CONSIDERATIONS ON THE UNIVERSE

This view is not in harmony with the theory of Newton. The latter theory rather requires that the universe should have a kind of centre in which the density of the stars is a maximum, and that as we proceed outwards from this centre the group-density of the stars should diminish, until finally, at great distances, it is succeeded by an infinite region of emptiness. The stellar universe ought to be a finite island in the infinite ocean of space.<sup>1</sup>

This conception is in itself not very satisfactory. It is still less satisfactory because it leads to the result that the light emitted by the stars and also individual stars of the stellar system are perpetually passing out into infinite space, never to return, and without ever again coming into interaction with other objects of nature. Such a finite material universe would be destined to become gradually but systematically impoverished.

<sup>1</sup> *Proof.* — According to the theory of Newton, the number of "lines of force" which come from infinity and terminate in a mass  $m$  is proportional to the mass  $m$ . If, on the average, the mass-density  $\rho_0$  is constant throughout the universe, then a sphere of volume  $V$  will enclose the average mass  $\rho_0 V$ . Thus the number of lines of force passing through the surface  $F$  of the sphere into its interior is proportional to  $\rho_0 V$ . For unit area of the surface of the sphere the number of lines of force which enters the sphere is thus proportional to  $\rho_0 \frac{V}{F}$  or  $\rho_0 R$ . Hence the intensity of the field at the surface would ultimately become infinite with increasing radius  $R$  of the sphere, which is impossible.

[ $\Gamma \rho_0 \frac{V}{F} = J.M.$ ]

## 130 CONSIDERATIONS ON THE UNIVERSE

square constructed with rods. The great charm resulting from this consideration lies in the recognition of the fact that the *universe of these beings is finite and yet has no limits*.

But the spherical-surface beings do not need to go on a world-tour in order to perceive that they are not living in a Euclidean universe. They can convince themselves of this on every part of their "world," provided they do not use too small a piece of it. Starting from a point, they draw "straight lines" (arcs of circles as judged in three-dimensional space) of equal length in all directions. They will call the line joining the free ends of these lines a "circle." For a plane surface, the ratio of the circumference of a circle to its diameter, both lengths being measured with the same rod, is, according to Euclidean geometry of the plane, equal to a constant value  $\pi$ , which is independent of the diameter of the circle. On their spherical surface our flat beings would find for this ratio the value

$$\pi \left( \frac{r}{R} \right),$$

*i.e.* a smaller value than  $\pi$ , the difference being the more considerable, the greater is the radius of the circle in comparison with the radius  $R$  of the "world-sphere." By means of this relation

## UNIVERSE — FINITE YET UNBOUNDED 133


of  $r, F$  increases from zero up to a maximum value which is determined by the "world-radius," but for still further increasing values of  $r$ , the area gradually diminishes to zero. At first, the straight lines which radiate from the starting point diverge farther and farther from one another, but later they approach each other, and finally they run together again at a "counter-point" to the starting point. Under such conditions they have traversed the whole spherical space. It is easily seen that the three-dimensional spherical space is quite analogous to the two-dimensional spherical surface. It is finite (*i.e.* of finite volume), and has no bounds.

It may be mentioned that there is yet another kind of curved space: "elliptical space." It can be regarded as a curved space in which the two "counter-points" are identical (indistinguishable from each other). An elliptical universe can thus be considered to some extent as a curved universe possessing central symmetry.

It follows from what has been said, that closed spaces without limits are conceivable. From amongst these, the spherical space (and the elliptical) excels in its simplicity, since all points on it are equivalent. As a result of this discussion, a most interesting question arises for astronomers and physicists, and that is whether the universe in which we live is infinite, or whether it is finite

## 134 CONSIDERATIONS ON THE UNIVERSE

in the manner of the spherical universe. Our experience is far from being sufficient to enable us to answer this question. But the general theory of relativity permits of our answering it with a moderate degree of certainty, and in this connection the difficulty mentioned in Section **XXX** finds its solution.



## NEWTON'S THEORY 127

In order to escape this dilemma, Seeliger suggested a modification of Newton's law, in which he assumes that for great distances the force of attraction between two masses diminishes more rapidly than would result from the inverse square law. In this way it is possible for the mean density of matter to be constant everywhere, even to infinity, without infinitely large gravitational fields being produced. We thus free ourselves from the distasteful conception that the material universe ought to possess something of the nature of a centre. Of course we purchase our emancipation from the fundamental difficulties mentioned, at the cost of a modification and complication of Newton's law which has neither empirical nor theoretical foundation. We can imagine innumerable laws which would serve the same purpose, without our being able to state a reason why one of them is to be preferred to the others; for any one of these laws would be founded just as little on more general theoretical principles as is the law of Newton.

XXXI

## THE POSSIBILITY OF A "FINITE" AND YET "UNBOUNDED" UNIVERSE

**B**UT speculations on the structure of the universe also move in quite another direction. The development of non-Euclidean geometry led to the recognition of the fact, that we can cast doubt on the *infinity* of our space without coming into conflict with the laws of thought or with experience (Riemann, Helmholtz). These questions have already been treated in detail and with unsurpassable lucidity by Helmholtz and Poincaré, whereas I can only touch on them briefly here.

In the first place, we imagine an existence in two-dimensional space. Flat beings with flat implements, and in particular flat rigid measuring-rods, are free to move in a *plane*. For them nothing exists outside of this plane; that which they observe to happen to themselves and to their flat "things" is the all-inclusive reality of their plane. In particular, the constructions of plane Euclidean geometry can be carried out by means of the rods, *e.g.* the lattice construction, con-

128

## UNIVERSE — FINITE YET UNBOUNDED 131

## UNIVERSE — FINITE YET UNBOUNDED 131

the spherical beings can determine the radius of their universe ("world"), even when only a relatively small part of their world-sphere is available for their measurements. But if this part is very small indeed, they will no longer be able to demonstrate that they are on a spherical "world" and not on a Euclidean plane, for a small part of a spherical surface differs only slightly from a piece of a plane of the same size.

Thus if the spherical-surface beings are living on a planet of which the solar system occupies only a negligibly small part of the spherical universe, they have no means of determining whether they are living in a finite or in an infinite universe, because the "piece of universe" to which they have access is in both cases practically plane, or Euclidean. It follows directly from this discussion, that for our sphere-beings the circumference of a circle first increases with the radius until the "circumference of the universe" is reached, and that it thenceforward gradually decreases to zero for still further increasing values of the radius. During this process the area of the circle continues to increase more and more, until finally it becomes equal to the total area of the whole "world-sphere."

Perhaps the reader will wonder why we have placed our "beings" on a sphere rather than on another closed surface. But this choice has its

## 132 CONSIDERATIONS ON THE UNIVERSE

justification in the fact that, of all closed surfaces, the sphere is unique in possessing the property that all points on it are equivalent. I admit that the ratio of the circumference  $c$  of a circle to its radius  $r$  depends on  $r$ , but for a given value of  $r$  it is the same for all points of the "world-sphere"; in other words, the "world-sphere" is a "surface of constant curvature."

To this two-dimensional sphere-universe there is three-dimensional analogy, namely, the three-dimensional spherical space which was discovered by Riemann. Its points are likewise all equivalent. It possesses a finite volume, which is determined by its "radius"  $(2\pi R)$ . Is it possible to imagine a spherical space? To imagine a space means nothing else than that we imagine an epitome of our "space" experience, *i.e.* of experience that we can have in the movement of "rigid" bodies. In this sense we *can* imagine a spherical space.

Suppose we draw lines or stretch strings in all directions from a point, and mark off from each of these the distance  $r$  with a measuring-rod. All the free end-points of these lengths lie on a spherical surface. We can specially measure up the area ( $F$ ) of this surface by means of a square made up of measuring-rods. If the universe is Euclidean, then  $F = 4\pi r^2$ ; if it is spherical, then  $F$  is always less than  $4\pi r^2$ . With increasing values

XXXII

## THE STRUCTURE OF SPACE ACCORDING TO THE GENERAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

**A**CCORDING to the general theory of relativity, the geometrical properties of space are not independent, but they are determined by matter. Thus we can draw conclusions about the geometrical structure of the universe only if we base our considerations on the state of the matter as being something that is known. We know from experience that, for a suitably chosen co-ordinate system, the velocities of the stars are small as compared with the velocity of transmission of light. We can thus as a rough approximation arrive at a conclusion as to the nature of the universe as a whole, if we treat the matter as being at rest.

We already know from our previous discussion that the behaviour of measuring-rods and clocks is influenced by gravitational fields, *i.e.* by the distribution of matter. This in itself is sufficient to exclude the possibility of the exact validity of Euclidean geometry in our universe. But it is conceivable that our universe differs only slightly

135

## 136 CONSIDERATIONS ON THE UNIVERSE

from a Euclidean one, and this notion seems all the more probable, since calculations show that the metrics of surrounding space is influenced only to an exceedingly small extent by masses even of the magnitude of our sun. We might imagine that, as regards geometry, our universe behaves analogously to a surface which is irregularly curved in its individual parts, but which nowhere departs appreciably from a plane; something like the rippled surface of a lake. Such a universe might fittingly be called a quasi-Euclidean universe. As regards its space it would be infinite. But calculation shows that in a quasi-Euclidean universe the average density of matter would necessarily be *nil*. Thus such a universe could not be inhabited by matter everywhere; it would present to us that unsatisfactory picture which we portrayed in Section **XXX**.

If we are to have in the universe an average density of matter which differs from zero, however small may be that difference, then the universe cannot be quasi-Euclidean. On the contrary, the results of calculation indicate that if matter be distributed uniformly, the universe would necessarily be spherical (or elliptical). Since in reality the detailed distribution of matter is not uniform, the real universe will deviate in individual parts from the spherical, *i.e.* the universe will be quasi-spherical. But it will be



## THE STRUCTURE OF SPACE 137

necessarily finite. In fact, the theory supplies us with a simple connection<sup>1</sup> between the space-expansive of the universe and the average density of matter in it.

<sup>1</sup> For the "radius"  $R$  of the universe we obtain the equation

$$R^2 = \frac{2}{\kappa \rho}$$

The use of the C.G.S. system in this equation gives  $\frac{2}{\kappa} = 108 \cdot 10^{17}$ ;  $\rho$  is the average density of the matter.

 APPENDIX I  
SIMPLE DERIVATION OF THE LORENTZ TRANSFORMATION [SUPPLEMENTARY TO SECTION XI]

FOR the relative orientation of the co-ordinate systems indicated in Fig. 2, the  $x$ -axes of both systems permanently coincide. In the present case we can divide the problem into parts by considering first only events which are localised on the  $x$ -axis. Any such event is represented with respect to the co-ordinate system  $K$  by the abscissa  $x$  and the time  $t$ , and with respect to the system  $K'$  by the abscissa  $x'$  and the time  $t'$ . We require to find  $x'$  and  $t'$  when  $x$  and  $t$  are given.

A light-signal, which is proceeding along the positive axis of  $x$ , is transmitted according to the equation

$$x = ct$$

or

$$x - ct = 0 \quad \dots \dots \dots \quad (1).$$

Since the same light-signal has to be transmitted relative to  $K'$  with the velocity  $c$ , the propagation

139

## 140 APPENDIX I

relative to the system  $K'$  will be represented by the analogous formula

$$x' - ct' = 0 \quad \dots \dots \dots \quad (2).$$

Those space-time points (events) which satisfy (1) must also satisfy (2). Obviously this will be the case when the relation

$$(x' - ct') = \lambda(x - ct) \quad \dots \dots \dots \quad (3)$$

is fulfilled in general, where  $\lambda$  indicates a constant; for, according to (3), the disappearance of  $(x - ct)$  involves the disappearance of  $(x' - ct')$ .

If we apply quite similar considerations to light rays which are being transmitted along the negative  $x$ -axis, we obtain the condition

$$(x' + ct') = \mu(x + ct) \quad \dots \dots \dots \quad (4).$$

By adding (or subtracting) equations (3) and (4), and introducing for convenience the constants  $a$  and  $b$  in place of the constants  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$  where

$$a = \frac{\lambda + \mu}{2}$$

$$b = \frac{\lambda - \mu}{2},$$

we obtain the equations

$$\begin{cases} x' = ax - bct \\ ct' = act - btx \end{cases} \quad \dots \dots \dots \quad (5).$$

We should thus have the solution of our problem, if the constants  $a$  and  $b$  were known. These result from the following discussion.

For the origin of  $K'$  we have permanently  $x' = 0$ , and hence according to the first of the equations (5)

## THE LORENTZ TRANSFORMATION 141

$$x = \frac{bc}{a} t.$$

If we call  $v$  the velocity with which the origin of  $K'$  is moving relative to  $K$ , we then have

$$v = \frac{bc}{a} \quad \dots \dots \dots \quad (6).$$

The same value  $v$  can be obtained from equations<sup>1</sup> (5), if we calculate the velocity of another point of  $K'$  relative to  $K$ , or the velocity (directed towards the negative  $x$ -axis) of a point of  $K$  with respect to  $K'$ . In short, we can designate  $v$  as the relative velocity of the two systems.

Furthermore, the principle of relativity teaches us that, as judged from  $K$ , the length of a unit measuring-rod which is at rest with reference to  $K'$  must be exactly the same as the length, as judged from  $K'$ , of a unit measuring-rod which is at rest relative to  $K$ . In order to see how the points of the  $x$ -axis appear as viewed from  $K$ , we only require to take a "snapshot" of  $K'$  from  $K$ ; this means that we have to insert a particular value of  $t$  (time of  $K$ ), e.g.,  $t = 0$ . For this value of  $t$  we then obtain from the first of the equations (5)

$$x' = ax.$$

Two points of the  $x$ -axis which are separated by the distance  $\Delta x = l^1$  when measured in the  $K'$  system are thus separated in our instantaneous photograph by the distance

$$\Delta x = \frac{1}{a} \quad \dots \dots \dots \quad (7).$$

[<sup>1</sup> tion — J.M.] [<sup>1</sup> e.g. — J.M.] [<sup>1</sup>  $x' = 1 - JM$ ]

## 142 APPENDIX I

But if the snapshot be taken from  $K'$  ( $t' = 0$ ), and if we eliminate  $t$  from the equations (5), taking into account the expression (6), we obtain

$$x' = a \left( 1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2} \right) x.$$

From this we conclude that two points on the  $x$ -axis and separated by the distance  $l$  (relative to  $K$ ) will be represented on our snapshot by the distance

$$\Delta x' = a \left( 1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2} \right) l \quad \dots \dots \dots \quad (7a).$$

But from what has been said, the two snapshots must be identical; hence  $\Delta x$  in (7) must be equal to  $\Delta x'$  in (7a), so that we obtain

$$a^2 = \frac{1}{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}} \quad \dots \dots \dots \quad (7b).$$

The equations (6) and (7b) determine the constants  $a$  and  $b$ . By inserting the values of these constants in (5), we obtain the first and the fourth of the equations given in Section XI.

$$\begin{aligned} x' &= \frac{x - vt}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}} \\ t' &= t - \frac{v}{c^2} x \quad \dots \dots \dots \quad (8). \end{aligned}$$

$$\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}$$

The equations (6) and (7b) determine the constants  $a$  and  $b$ . By inserting the values of these constants in (5), we obtain the first and the fourth of the equations given in Section XI.

$$x' = \frac{x - vt}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}} \quad \dots \dots \dots \quad (8).$$

$$t' = t - \frac{v}{c^2} x \quad \dots \dots \dots \quad (8).$$

$$\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}$$

$$\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^$$

EXPERIMENTAL CONFIRMATION 149

general, is built up logically from a small number of fundamental assumptions, the so-called axioms. We call such a system of thought a *theory*. The theory finds the justification for its existence in the fact that it correlates a large number of single observations, and it is just here that the "truth" of the theory lies.

Corresponding to the same complex of empirical data, there may be several theories, which differ from one another to a considerable extent. But as regards the deductions from the theories which are capable of being tested, the agreement between the theories may be so complete, that it becomes difficult to find such deductions in which the two theories differ from each other. As an example, a case of general interest is available in the province of biology, in the Darwinian theory of the development of species by selection in the struggle for existence, and in the theory of development which is based on the hypothesis of the hereditary transmission of acquired characters.

We have another instance of far-reaching agreement between the deductions from two theories in Newtonian mechanics on the one hand, and the general theory of relativity on the other. This agreement goes so far, that up to the present we have been able to find only a few deductions from the general theory of relativity which are

150 APPENDIX III

capable of investigation, and to which the physics of pre-relativity days does not also lead, and this despite the profound difference in the fundamental assumptions of the two theories. In what follows, we shall again consider these important deductions, and we shall also discuss the empirical evidence appertaining to them which has hitherto been obtained.

(a) MOTION OF THE PERHELION OF MERCURY

According to Newtonian mechanics and Newton's law of gravitation, a planet which is revolving round the sun would describe an ellipse round the latter, or, more correctly, round the common centre of gravity of the sun and the planet. In such a system, the sun, or the common centre of gravity, lies in one of the foci of the orbital ellipse in such a manner that, in the course of a planetary year, the distance sun-planet grows from a minimum to a maximum, and then decreases again to a minimum. If instead of Newton's law we insert a somewhat different law of attraction into the calculation, we find that, according to this new law, the motion would still take place in such a manner that the distance sun-planet exhibits periodic variations; but in this case the angle described by the line joining sun and planet during such a period (from perihelion — closest

EXPERIMENTAL CONFIRMATION 151

proximity to the sun — to perihelion) would differ from  $360^\circ$ . The line of the orbit would not then be a closed one, but in the course of time it would fill up an annular part of the orbital plane, viz. between the circle of least and the circle of greatest distance of the planet from the sun.

According also to the general theory of relativity, which differs of course from the theory of Newton, a small variation from the Newton-Kepler motion of a planet in its orbit should take place, and in such a way, that the angle described by the radius sun-planet between one perihelion and the next should exceed that corresponding to one complete revolution by an amount given by

$$+ \frac{24\pi^2 a^2}{T^2 c^3 (1 - e^2)}.$$

(N.B. — One complete revolution corresponds to the angle  $2\pi$  in the absolute angular measure customary in physics, and the above expression gives the amount by which the radius sun-planet exceeds this angle during the interval between one perihelion and the next.) In this expression  $a$  represents the major semi-axis of the ellipse,  $e$  its eccentricity,  $c$  the velocity of light, and  $T$  the period of revolution of the planet. Our result may also be stated as follows: According to the general theory of relativity, the major axis of the ellipse rotates round the sun in the same

152 APPENDIX III

sense as the orbital motion of the planet. Theory requires that this rotation should amount to 43 seconds of arc per century for the planet Mercury, but for the other planets of our solar system its magnitude should be so small that it would necessarily escape detection.<sup>1</sup>

In point of fact, astronomers have found that the theory of Newton does not suffice to calculate the observed motion of Mercury with an exactness corresponding to that of the delicacy of observation attainable at the present time. After taking account of all the disturbing influences exerted on Mercury by the remaining planets, it was found (Leverrier — 1859 — and Newcomb — 1895) that an unexplained perihelical movement of the orbit of Mercury remained over, the amount of which does not differ sensibly from the above-mentioned +43 seconds of arc per century. The uncertainty of the empirical result amounts to a few seconds only.

(b) DEFLECTION OF LIGHT BY A GRAVITATIONAL FIELD

In Section XXII it has been already mentioned that, according to the general theory of relativity, a ray of light will experience a curvature of its

<sup>1</sup> Especially since the next planet Venus has an orbit that is almost an exact circle, which makes it more difficult to locate the perihelion with precision.

EXPERIMENTAL CONFIRMATION 153

path when passing through a gravitational field, this curvature being similar to that experienced by the path of a body which is projected through a gravitational field. As a result of this theory, we should expect that a ray of light which is passing close to a heavenly body would be deviated towards the latter. For a ray of light which passes the sun at a distance of  $\Delta$  sun-radii from its centre, the angle of deflection ( $\alpha$ ) should amount to

$$\alpha = \frac{1.7}{\Delta} \text{ seconds of arc.}$$

It may be added that, according to the theory, half of this deflection is produced by the Newtonian field of attraction of the sun, and the other half by the geometrical modification ("curvature") of space caused by the sun.

This result admits of an experimental test by means of the photographic registration of stars during a total eclipse of the sun. The only reason why we must wait for a total eclipse is because at every other time the atmosphere is so strongly illuminated by the light from the sun that the stars situated near the sun's disc are invisible. The predicted effect can be seen clearly from the accompanying



154 APPENDIX III

diagram. If the sun (S) were not present, a star which is practically infinitely distant would be seen in the direction  $D_1$ , as observed from the earth. But as a consequence of the deflection of light from the star by the sun, the star will be seen in the direction  $D_2$ , i.e. at a somewhat greater distance from the centre of the sun than corresponds to its real position.

In practice, the question is tested in the following way. The stars in the neighbourhood of the sun are photographed during a solar eclipse.

In addition, a second photograph of the same stars is taken when the sun is situated at another position in the sky, i.e. a few months earlier or later. As compared with the standard photograph, the positions of the stars on the eclipse-photograph ought to appear displaced radially outwards (away from the centre of the sun) by an amount corresponding to the angle  $\alpha$ .

We are indebted to the Royal Society and to the Royal Astronomical Society for the investigation of this important deduction. Undaunted by the war and by difficulties of both a material and a psychological nature aroused by the war, these societies equipped two expeditions — to Sobral (Brazil) and to the island of Principe (West Africa) — and sent several of Britain's most celebrated astronomers (Eddington, Cottingham, Crommelin, Davidson), in order to obtain

EXPERIMENTAL CONFIRMATION 155

photographs of the solar eclipse of 29th May, 1919. The relative discrepancies to be expected between the stellar photographs obtained during the eclipse and the comparison photographs amounted to a few hundredths of a millimetre only. Thus great accuracy was necessary in making the adjustments required for the taking of the photographs, and in their subsequent measurement.

The result of the measurements confirmed the theory in a thoroughly satisfactory manner. The rectangular components of the observed and of the calculated deviations of the stars (in seconds of arc) are set forth in the following table of results:

Number of the Star	First Co-ordinate.		Second Co-ordinate.	
	Observed	Calculated	Observed	Calculated
11	-0.19	-0.22	+0.16	+0.02
5	+0.29	+0.31	+0.46	+0.43
4	+0.11	+0.10	+0.83	+0.74
3	+0.20	+0.12	+1.00	+0.87
6	+0.10	+0.04	+0.57	+0.40
10	-0.08	+0.09	+0.35	+0.32
2	+0.95	+0.85	-0.27	-0.09

(c) DISPLACEMENT OF SPECTRAL LINES TOWARDS THE RED

In Section XIII it has been shown that in a system  $K'$  which is in rotation with regard to a Galileian system  $K$ , clocks of identical construc-

156 APPENDIX III

tion, and which are considered at rest with respect to the rotating reference-body, go at rates which are dependent on the positions of the clocks. We shall now examine this dependence quantitatively. A clock, which is situated at a distance  $r$  from the centre of the disc, has a velocity relative to  $K$  which is given by

$$v = \omega r,$$

where  $\omega$  represents the velocity of rotation of the disc  $K'$  with respect to  $K$ . If  $v_0$  represents the number of ticks of the clock per unit time ("rate" of the clock) relative to  $K$  when the clock is at rest, then the "rate" of the clock ( $v$ ) when it is moving relative to  $K$  with a velocity  $v$ , but at rest with respect to the disc, will, in accordance with Section XII, be given by

$$v = v_0 \sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}},$$

or with sufficient accuracy by

$$v = v_0 \left( 1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2} \right)^{1/2}.$$

This expression may also be stated in the following form:

$$v = v_0 \left( 1 - \frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\omega^2 r^2}{2} \right)^{1/2}.$$

If we represent the difference of potential of the centrifugal force between the position of the clock and the centre of the disc by  $\phi$ , i.e. the work,

[<sup>1</sup> The word "angular" was inserted here in later editions. — J.M.]

EXPERIMENTAL CONFIRMATION 157

considered negatively, which must be performed on the unit of mass against the centrifugal force in order to transport it from the position of the clock on the rotating disc to the centre of the disc, then we have

$$\phi = -\frac{\omega^2 r^2}{2}.$$

From this it follows that

$$v = v_0 \left( 1 + \frac{\phi}{c^2} \right)^{1/2}.$$

In the first place, we see from this expression that two clocks of identical construction will go at different rates when situated at different distances from the centre of the disc. This result is also valid from the standpoint of an observer who is rotating with the disc.

Now, as judged from the disc, the latter is in a gravitational field of potential  $\phi$ , hence the result we have obtained will hold quite generally for gravitational fields. Furthermore, we can regard an atom which is emitting spectral lines as a clock, so that the following statement will hold:

An atom absorbs or emits light of a frequency which is dependent on the potential of the gravitational field in which it is situated.

The frequency of an atom situated on the surface of a heavenly body will be somewhat less than the frequency of an atom of the same

158 APPENDIX III

element which is situated in free space (or on the surface of a smaller celestial body).

Now  $\phi = -K \frac{M}{r}$ , where  $K$  is Newton's constant of gravitation, and  $M$  is the mass of the heavenly body. Thus a displacement towards the red ought to take place for spectral lines produced at the surface of stars as compared with the spectral lines of the same element produced at the surface of the earth, the amount of this displacement being

$$\frac{v_0 - v}{v_0} = -\frac{K}{c^2} \frac{M}{r}.$$

For the sun, the displacement towards the red predicted by theory amounts to about two millionths of the wave-length. A trustworthy calculation is not possible in the case of the stars, because in general neither the mass  $M$  nor the radius  $r$  is known.

It is an open question whether or not this effect exists, and at the present time astronomers are working with great zeal towards the solution. Owing to the smallness of the effect in the case of the sun, it is difficult to form an opinion as to its existence. Whereas Grebe and Bachem (Bonn), as a result of their own measurements and those of Evershed and Schwarzschild on the cyanogen bands, have placed the existence of the effect almost beyond doubt, other investigators, par-

EXPERIMENTAL CONFIRMATION 159

ticularly St. John, have been led to the opposite opinion in consequence of their measurements.

Mean displacements of lines towards the red are certainly revealed by statistical investigations of the fixed stars; but up to the present the examination of the available data does not allow of any definite decision being arrived at, as to whether or not these displacements are to be referred in reality to the effect of gravitation. The results of observation have been collected together, and discussed in detail from the standpoint of the question which has been engaging our attention here, in a paper by E. Freundlich entitled "Zur Prüfung der allgemeinen Relativitäts-Theorie" (*Die Naturwissenschaften*, 1919, No. 35, p. 520; Julius Springer, Berlin).

At all events, a definite decision will be reached during the next few years. If the displacement of spectral lines towards the red by the gravitational potential does not exist, then the general theory of relativity will be untenable. On the other hand, if the cause of the displacement of spectral lines is definitely traced to the gravitational potential, then the study of this displacement will furnish us with important information as to the mass of the heavenly bodies.





- TRAJECTORIES SPECIAL EDITION
- MANAGEMENT SPECIAL EDITION
- ATOMIC SPECIAL EDITION
- MARSONAUTS SELECTION SPECIAL EDITION
  - INTERSTELLAR MOON BASES
  - GALACTIC CONQUEST AND POST MODERN WEAPONS
  - THE MOSCOW-VLADIVOSTOK
  - 
  - 
  -
- LE SITE WEB:
- 

MON AUTEUR PRÃ‰FÃ‰RÃ‰ ET MOI-MÃŠME

“If you want to **keep a secret**,  
you must also **hide it** from yourself..”

George Orwell

Goalcast

