

response to ARK

[from the original email]

> Hi

> I thought ARK understood the Action of the Lie derivative on forms.

> \*\*

[ARK SAID]

He does

> For details see

> <http://www22.pair.com/pdf/maxwell.pdf>

> \*\*\*

[ARK SAID]

He has better sources.

[RMK says]

Evidently your sources are different from mine.

But it is evident that you did not bother to look

(Pity – For if you had looked, this conversation would have been moot)

> in email notation.

> on  $(x,y,z,t)$

> Let  $A = A_x dx + A_y dy + A_z dz - \phi dt$ .

> Let  $V = [V_x, V_y, V_z, 1]$

[ARK SAID]

Why the fourth component of  $V$  must be 1? But

it is not important for our problem.

[RMK SAYS]

relative to  $t$  it seems to be a tradition.

> Then

>  $L(V)A = i(V)dA + d(i(V)A) = W + dU = Q$

[ARK SAID]

In coordinates this is the same as my formula, because

$i(V)dA$  has two terms,  $d(i(V)A)$  has two terms, altogether

four terms, but two of them cancel!

Do you want to see it?

[RMK SAYS] (grin)

I have better sources.

[ARK SAID]

Here it is:

Compute the first term:

$$1) (dA)_{ij} = d_i A_j - d_j A_i$$

[RMK would write]

$$A = A_x dx + A_y dy + A_z dz - \phi dt$$

$$dA = \{\partial A_k / \partial x^j - \partial A_j / \partial x^k\} dx^j \wedge dx^k = F_{jk} dx^j \wedge dx^k = \mathbf{B}_z dx \wedge dy \dots + \mathbf{E}_x dx \wedge dt \dots$$

where in usual engineering notation,

$$\mathbf{E} = -\partial \mathbf{A} / \partial t - \text{grad} \phi, \quad \mathbf{B} = \text{curl } \mathbf{A}.$$

[ARK CONTINUES]

Therefore

$$2) [i(V)dA]_{ij} = V^i (dA)_{ij} = V^i d_i A_j - V^i d_j A_i$$

Compute the second term (using Leibniz rule)

[RMK would write]

$$\begin{aligned} W &= i(V)dA = \mathbf{B}_z \mathbf{V}^x \wedge dy - \mathbf{B}_z \mathbf{V}^y \wedge dx \dots + \mathbf{E}_x \mathbf{V}^x \wedge dt \dots \\ &= (\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{V} \times \mathbf{B})_x dx + \dots - (\mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{V}) dt \end{aligned}$$

[ARK CONTINUES]

$$3) d(i(V)A)_{ij} = d_j [V^i A_i] = d_j (V^i) A_i + V^i d_j A_i$$

[RMK would write]

$$U = i(V)dA = A \cdot V - \phi$$

and

$$L(V)A = W + dU \tag{1}$$

The Lorentz force term "falls out" from the virtual work 1-form component  $W$  of the Lie derivative. **It does not involve derivatives of  $V$ .**

[ARK continues]

Now, when you add 2) and 3) , you see that second terms cancel and we get simple

$$(L(V)A)_{-j} = V^i d_i A_{-j} + d_{-j} (V^i) A_{-j}$$

Which was my formula. Thus, as you see, Ark knows about Lie derivative. Ark even wrote a paper (with Daniel Kastler) "Graded Lie-Cartan pairs", and "Graded Lie-Cartan Pairs II" Annals of Physics (NY) 179, No 2 (1987), 169-200

[RMK SAYS]

Wonderful, Now you know something more.

> For details of Cartan's magic formula see Marsden and Riatu

> and my website.

> \*\*

[ARK SAID]

It is not necessary

> Recall that  $dA$  generates  $E$  and  $B$  as components of an  $4 \times 4$  anti-symmetric

> matrix based on  $A$ . Sommerfeld's 6 vector. \*\* evaluate virtual work 1-form

>  $W = i(V)dA$ , get  $W = (E + V \times B) \cdot dr - (E \cdot V) dt$

> = Lorentz force times differential distance - (power) dt

> \*\*\*\*

[ARK SAID]

THis does not matter. Lie derivative of  $A$  with respect  $V$  does contain partial derivatives of  $V$  while Lorentz term does not have them.

[RMK SAYS]

But it is the virtual Work component, the non-exact component, of the Lie derivative which does **indeed** give the format of the Lorentz force.

- > For currents of the type  $J = \rho V$
- > Evaluate  $L(J) A = W + dU$
- > with virtual work evaluated as
- >  $W = \int (J \cdot dA) = (\rho E + J \times B) \cdot dr - (E \cdot J) dt$

[ARK SAID]

THIS does not matter. Lie derivative of A with respect V does contain partial derivatives of V while Lorentz term does not have them!!!!

AGREE??? Or should I be even more clear?

ark

[RMK says]

The important point is that the non-exact component of Lie derivative yields the Lorentz format precisely.

My original statement was:

*By asking for how the 1-form of A and the 2-form F propagate along a direction field*

$L(V) A = > Q,$

*the Lorentz Force law pops out automatically*

*as a derived quantity. IT is NOT added into the theory, it falls out from the definition of the Lie derivative.*

THIS DOES NOT SAY THE THE LORENTZ FORCE IS EQUAL TO THE LIE DERIVATIVE

The Lorentz force IS NOT equal to the Lie derivative acting on forms, unless the U term is an evolutionary constant. However, the format of the Lorentz force law comes from the virtual Work 1-form, W in all cases.

HOW CAN I BE MORE CLEAR?

regards

RMK