

SPATIAL COORDINATE SYSTEMS AND RELATIVISTIC TRANSFORMATION EQUATIONS

J. H. FIELD

Departement de Physique Nucléaire et Corpusculaire
Université de Genève
24, quai Ernest-Ansermet
CH-1211 Genève 4
Switzerland
e-mail: john.field@cern.ch

Abstract

Constants of integration appearing in Lorentz transformation equations relating an event (x, y, z, t) in an inertial frame S to the corresponding event (x', y', z', t') in another inertial frame S' are considered. It is shown that in the usual application of the Lorentz transformations, different x -coordinate systems are used to specify the positions of two spatially-separated objects. The 'length contraction' and 'relativity of simultaneity' effects of conventional relativity theory are a consequence of this trivial mathematical error.

The history of space-time transformation equations may be said to have begun in 1887 when Voigt [1] noticed that, by modifying the definition of time according to the equation: $t' = t - vx/V^2$, the wave equation: $\partial^2\phi/\partial x^2 = (1/V^2)\partial^2\phi/\partial t^2$ has the same characteristic speed, V , both in an arbitrary inertial frame, and in another

Keywords and phrases: Lorentz transformations, spatial coordinate systems, time dilation.

Received August 12, 2014

© 2014 Fundamental Research and Development International

such frame moving with speed v relative to it. Later Lorentz identified the epoch, t , with that recorded by a clock at rest relative to the aether (the frame in which light is postulated to propagate isotropically with speed c), and t' , which he called 'local time', with that recorded by a clock moving with speed v relative to the aether [2]. In the same paper, he showed, by applying the transformation to local time, that, to first order in v/c , Maxwell's electromagnetic equations are the same in the aether frame and the frame moving with speed v relative to it.

Later first Larmor [3, 4], then both Lorentz [5] and Poincaré [6], discovered that Maxwell's equations are the same, to all orders in v/c , in the aether, and any other inertial frame, providing that the space and time coordinates appearing in them are transformed according to the 'Lorentz Transformation' (LT) equations:

$$x' = \gamma(x - vt), \quad t' = \gamma(t - vx/c^2), \quad y' = y, \quad z' = z, \quad (1)$$

where the space-time coordinates: (x, y, z, t) refer to the aether frame and (x', y', z', t') to a frame moving with speed v relative to the aether and $\gamma \equiv 1/\sqrt{1 - (v/c)^2}$. A corollary of this result is that, if light is identified with the electromagnetic waves of Maxwell's theory, as discovered by Hertz [7], the speed of light must be the same in all inertial frames.

The same invariance of Maxwell's equations under the transformations (1) was shown by Einstein in 1905 in the seminal paper on Special Relativity (SpR) [8] where the LT equations were also derived by *postulating* that the speed of light is the same in all inertial frames. In [8], Einstein introduced another interpretation of the LT. For Lorentz and Poincaré, as well as for Larmor, they were a purely mathematical ansatz that had the interesting property of leaving invariant the form of Maxwell's equations. In this calculation no consideration was given to the operational physical meaning of the coordinate symbols in the equations. Einstein assumed that also the LT connected an 'event' (x, y, z, t) observed in one frame to the *same event* (x', y', z', t') as observed in another frame. The very different nature of these two interpretations was pointed out and discussed by Swann [9]. It is the

second interpretation, as ‘event transformation’, that is the subject of the present paper.

The event (x, y, z, t) is observed in an inertial frame S, while the corresponding event (x', y', z', t') is observed in an inertial frame S' moving with speed v along the common x, x' axis of the two frames. It is further assumed that the event lies on the world line of an object (for example a clock) that is at rest in S'. The epoch t' is that recorded by such a clock, while t is recorded by an identical clock at rest at an arbitrary position in the frame S. These definitions give immediately strong constraints on both the positions of coordinate origins and the possible values of the spatial coordinates in the LT (1).

Since the object is at rest in S', x' must be independent of time. The right side of the space transformation equation $x' = \gamma(x - vt)$ vanishes, for any value of x , at a certain time $t = x/v$. Since it must also vanish for any other value of t , due to the time-independence of x' on the left side of the equation, the equation *is only valid if both $x' = 0$ and $x = vt$* . These equations are simply the (correlated) equations of the world lines of the object in the frames S' and S, respectively. It is then also clear that the physical meaning of the space transformation equation in (1) is the same as that of any equation of the form: $x' = g(x - vt) = 0$, where g is any finite constant or function of v . Setting $g = 1$ gives the ‘Galilean’ transformation $x' = x - vt = 0$. An alternative way to show that $x' = 0$ in the space LT in (1) is by consideration of the differential form: $dx' = \gamma(dx - vdt) = 0$. The interval dx' vanishes since the object is at rest in S'. Integration of the differential form gives, in general:

$$x'(t) - x'(t_0) = \gamma[x(t) - x(t_0) - v(t - t_0)] = 0. \quad (2)$$

In this expression, the x, x' coordinate origins as well as the clock offset, t_0 , are arbitrary. This reduces to the standard form $x'(t) = \gamma(x(t) - vt)$ if, and only if,

$$x'(t_0) = x(t_0) = 0, \quad t_0 = 0$$

in which case, as previously shown, $x'(t) = 0$ and $x(t) = vt$. The standard form of

the coordinate space LT then corresponds to a particular position, in the frame S', of the object described: at the origin of x' coordinates, and of coordinate system in the frame S: the object is at the x coordinate origin at time $t = 0$.

In the standard text book derivation of 'length contraction' from the LT (originally due to Einstein in [8]) it is assumed that for some object: $x'(t) \neq 0$, $x'(t_0) = x(t_0) = 0$, i.e., that:

$$x'(t) = \gamma[x(t) - vt] \neq 0. \quad (3)$$

These initial conditions already contain a contradiction. Since x' is time-independent it is impossible that (see Equation (2) above) simultaneously $x'(t_0) = 0$ and $x'(t) \neq 0$ as assumed in (3). It is also clear that (3) is incompatible with the completely general expression (2). Nevertheless, subtracting $x'(0) = x'(t)$ from both sides of (3) gives:

$$x'(t) - x'(0) = [x(t) - x(0) - vt] = 0, \quad (4)$$

where $x(0) = x'(0)/\gamma$. This means (see Figure 1a) that in (4), at $t = 0$, the x -coordinate origin is shifted in the positive x -direction by $(\gamma - 1)x'(0)/\gamma$ relative to the x' origin. Notice that, in the above, only coordinate systems, not the spatial separation of discrete objects, have been discussed. However, it is essential that in order to measure correctly the spatial separation of two objects *the same coordinate system must be used to specify the position of both objects*. As will now be shown it is the failure to respect this necessary condition that is the origin of the spurious 'length contraction effect' (LCE) of conventional SpR.

As shown in Figure 1b a second object, labelled A, is placed at $x' = 0$ in the frame S'. The object with $x' \neq 0$ considered above is labelled B. Applying the coordinate space LT to an event on the world line of A gives the relation:

$$x'(A) = \gamma[x_A(A, t) - vt] = 0 \quad (5)$$

so that at $t = 0$, $x_A(A, 0) = 0$. Thus the x -coordinate x_A specifying the position of A has its origin at the position of the object at $t = 0$. In contrast (see Figure 1a) the

x -coordinate $x_B(B, t)$ specifying the position of the object B has, at $t = 0$, its origin at distance $x'(B)/\gamma$ from B in the negative x -direction. This means that (see Figure 1b) at $t = 0$, $x_B(B, 0) = x'(B)/\gamma$. In the calculation of the spatial separation, L , of A and B in the frame S, the same coordinate system must be employed for both objects. Choosing x_A , setting $t = 0$, and dropping the time label of the coordinates, it is found, as shown in Figure 1b, that

$$L_A \equiv x_A(B) - x_A(A) = x_A(B) = x'(B) = x'(B) - x'(A) \equiv L' \quad (6)$$

while if the coordinate x_B is employed:

$$\begin{aligned} L_B \equiv x_B(B) - x_B(A) &= \frac{x'(B)}{\gamma} + \frac{(\gamma - 1)x'(B)}{\gamma} \\ &= x'(B) = x'(B) - x'(A) \equiv L'. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Thus $L_A = L_B = L'$. The separation of A and B in the frame S is the same as that in the frame S' that is moving with speed v relative to it - there is no LCE. The LCE found in conventional SpR results from the erroneous assumption that the correct spatial transformation equations for the world lines of A and B are:

$$x'(B) = \gamma[x(B) - vt] \neq 0, \quad (8)$$

$$x'(A) = \gamma[x(A) - vt] = 0. \quad (9)$$

Subtracting (9) from (8) gives, for any value of t :

$$L' \equiv x'(B) - x'(A) = \gamma(x(B) - x(A)) \equiv \gamma L. \quad (10)$$

This is the putative LCE. The calculation is equivalent to replacing $x_B(A) = -(\gamma - 1)x'(B)/\gamma$ in Equation (7) by $x_B(A) = 0$ to yield the result of Equation (10). It is then clear that, in Equation (10) *a different coordinate system in the frame S is being used to specify the position of B to that used for A* - a mathematically nonsensical manner to calculate the separation of the objects in this frame.

Integrating the differential form of the time LT: $dt' = \gamma(dt - vdx/c^2)$ gives a formula, analogous to (2) for the space LT:

$$t' - t'_0 = \gamma \left[t - t_0 - \frac{[v(x(t) - x(t_0))]}{c^2} \right]. \quad (11)$$

Employing the coordinate system x_A of Figure 1b and substituting clocks C_A, C_B indicating epochs $t'(A), t'(B)$ for the objects A and B, then the particular choice of integration constants: $t'_0(A) = t'_0(B) = t_0 = 0, x_A(A, t_0) = 0, x_A(B, t_0) = L$ in (11) yields the equations:

$$t'(B, t(B)) = \gamma \left[t(B) - v \frac{(x_A(B) - L)}{c^2} \right], \quad (12)$$

$$t'(A, t(A)) = \gamma \left[t(A) - v \frac{x_A(A)}{c^2} \right]. \quad (13)$$

The same choice of integration constants in the solutions of the differential equation of motion $dx = vdt$ of either clock in the frame S gives:

$$x_A(B) = vt(B) + L, \quad (14)$$

$$x_A(A) = vt(A). \quad (15)$$

Combining (12) with (14) and (13) with (15), so as to eliminate the spatial coordinates, yields the time dilation relations:

$$t'(B, t(B)) = \frac{t(B)}{\gamma}, \quad (16)$$

$$t'(A, t(A)) = \frac{t(A)}{\gamma}. \quad (17)$$

Since then $t'(B, t) = t'(A, t) = t/\gamma$ when $t(B) = t(A) = t$ it is clear that the synchronisation of the clocks C_A and C_B described by (12) and (13) when $t(B) = t(A) = 0$ is valid for all later values of t - there is no 'relativity of simultaneity' effect (RSE). Since the synchronisation of C_A and C_B at any

particular instant is a purely mechanical or electronic procedure¹ there is no practical difficulty in setting up clock offsets and coordinate systems to obtain an experimental configuration with initial conditions described by Equation (12) and (13).

The RSE arises when it is assumed that the ‘standard’ time LT: $t' = \gamma(t - vx/c^2)$ is equally applicable to both clocks C_A and C_B . In this case, Equation (12) above is replaced by:

$$\tilde{t}'(B, t(B)) = \gamma \left[t(B) - v \frac{x_A(B)}{c^2} \right]. \quad (18)$$

For comparison of this equation with (12) and the general transformation time Equation (11), the quantity $\tilde{t}'_0 \equiv -\gamma v L / c^2$ is subtracted from both sides of (18) to give:

$$\tilde{t}'(B, t(B)) - \tilde{t}'_0 = \gamma \left[t(B) - v \frac{(x_A(B) - L)}{c^2} \right]. \quad (19)$$

When $t(B) = 0$ then, as shown in Figure 1b, $x_A(B) = L$, which implies, according to (19) that $\tilde{t}'(B, 0) = \tilde{t}'_0 = -\gamma v L / c^2$. Since, from Equations (13) and (15), $t'(A, 0) = 0$, it is clear that the clock C_A as described by (13) and C_B as described by (18) are *unsynchronised by construction*:

$$\tilde{t}'(B, 0) - t'(A, 0) = -\frac{\gamma v L}{c^2}. \quad (20)$$

The standard text book derivation of the RSE is obtained by setting $t(A) = t(B) = t$ (simultaneous events in the frame S) and subtracting Equation (13) from Equation (18) to yield:

$$\tilde{t}'(B, t) - t'(A, t) = -\frac{\gamma v}{c^2} [x_A(B) - x_A(A)] = -\frac{\gamma v L}{c^2}. \quad (21)$$

¹A discussion of different methods to synchronise spatially-separated clocks, without employing light signals, may be found in [10].

The comparison of (20) and (21) shows that the right side of (21), which is conventionally interpreted as a physical RSE effect, is in fact a trivial consequence of the fact that the initial conditions corresponding to Equation (18) for the clock C_B necessarily, in conjunction with Equation (13) for the clock C_A , imply that the two clocks are unsynchronised.

The transformation Equations (12)-(15) correctly describing synchronised, spatially separated, clocks are related to the ‘standard’ LT Equations (1) by including additive constants on the right sides of the latter equations:

$$x' = \gamma(x - vt) + X, \quad (22)$$

$$t = \gamma\left(t - \frac{vx}{c^2}\right) + T, \quad (23)$$

where with coordinates x', x_A as in Figure 1b:

$$X(A) = 0, \quad T(A) = 0, \quad X(B) = L(1 - \gamma), \quad T(B) = \frac{\gamma v L}{c^2}.$$

As discussed in [11], the necessity to include additive constants such as X and T to correctly describe a synchronised clock, not situated at the origin of coordinates in the frame S' , was clearly stated by Einstein in the original SpR paper but this was never done, to the best knowledge of the present writer, before the work presented in [12].

Arguments similar to those of the present paper were previously given in [13].




Figure 1. (a) Coordinate systems in the frame $S(x)$ and $S'(x')$ specifying the position, at $t = 0$, of an object, with $x' > 0$, $y' = z' = 0$, at rest in the frame S' , according to Equation (3) or (4). (b) Coordinate systems in frame S and S' specifying the position of an object A (at $x' = y' = z' = 0$) and B at the position: $x' = L'$, $y' = z' = 0$, at $t = 0$. The system x_A has origin coincident with object A, corresponding to the transformation Equation (5); the system x_B is the same as that shown in (a).

References

- [1] W. Voigt, Goett. Nachr., 1887, p. 41.
- [2] H. A. Lorentz, Collected Papers, Vol. 5, p. 1, E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1895.
- [3] J. Larmor, Philos. Trans. Roy. Soc. London 190A (1897), 205.
- [4] C. Kittel, Am. J. Phys. 42 (1974), 726.
- [5] H. A. Lorentz, Proc. K. Ak. Amsterdam 6 (1904), 809.
- [6] H. Poincaré, Compte rendu hebdomadaires des seances de l'Academie des Sciences, Paris, 1905, Vol. 140, p. 1504; Rend. del Circ. Mat. di Palermo 21 (1906), 129-146, 166-175.

- [7] H. Hertz, *Electric Waves*, Dover, New York, 1962.
- [8] A. Einstein, *Ann. Physik* 17 (1905), 891; English translation by W. Perrett and G. B. Jeffery in *The Principle of Relativity*, Dover, New York, 1952, p.37, or in Einstein's *Miraculous Year*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1998, p.123.
- [9] W. F. G. Swann, *Am. J. Phys.* 28 (1960), 55.
- [10] J. H. Field, *The physics of space and time I: The description of rulers and clocks in uniform translational motion by Galilean or Lorentz transformations*, arXiv preprint: <http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/physics/0612039> v4.
- [11] J. H. Field, *Fundamental J. Modern Physics* 2(2) (2011), 139, arXiv pre-print: <http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/1210.2270>.
- [12] J. H. Field, *The local space-time Lorentz transformation: a new formulation of special relativity compatible with translational invariance*, arXiv pre-print: <http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/physics/0501043>v1.
- [13] J. H. Field, *Translational invariance and the space-time Lorentz transformation with arbitrary spatial coordinates*, arXiv pre-print: <http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/physics/0703185>v3.