Quantum Mechanics_Celestial mechanics

Celestial mechanics is the branch of<u>astronomy</u> that deals with the <u>motions</u> of<u>celestial</u> <u>objects</u>. The field applies principles of<u>physics</u>, historically <u>Classical mechanics</u>, to astronomical objects such as <u>stars</u> and <u>planets</u>to produce <u>ephemeris</u> data. <u>Orbital</u> <u>mechanics</u>(astrodynamics) is a subfield which focuses on the <u>orbits</u> of <u>artificial</u> <u>satellites</u>. <u>Lunar theory</u> is another subfield focusing on the <u>orbit of the Moon</u>.

History of celestial mechanics

For early theories of the causes of planetary motion, see <u>Dynamics of the celestial</u> <u>spheres</u>.

Modern analytic celestial mechanics started over 300 years ago with <u>Isaac</u> <u>Newton's Principia</u> of 1687. The name "celestial mechanics" is more recent than that. Newton wrote that the field should be called "rational mechanics." The term "dynamics" came in a little later with <u>Gottfried Leibniz</u>, and over a century after Newton, <u>Pierre-Simon Laplace</u> introduced the term "celestial mechanics." Prior to Kepler there was little connection between exact, quantitative prediction of planetary positions, using <u>geometrical</u> or <u>arithmetical</u> techniques, and contemporary discussions of the physical causes of the planets' motion.

Johannes Kepler

For detailed treatments of how his laws of planetary motion can be used, see <u>Kepler's</u> <u>laws of planetary motion</u> and <u>Keplerian problem</u>.

Johannes Kepler (27 December 1571-15 November 1630) was the first to closely integrate the predictive geometrical astronomy, which had been dominant from Ptolemy to <u>Copernicus</u>, with physical concepts to produce a <u>New Astronomy</u>, <u>Based upon Causes</u>, <u>or Celestial Physics...</u>. His work led to the <u>modern laws of planetary orbits</u>, which he developed using his physical principles and the<u>planetary</u> observations made by <u>Tycho Brahe</u>. Kepler's model greatly improved the accuracy of predictions of planetary motion, years before <u>Isaac Newton</u>developed his law of gravitation. **Isaac Newton** Isaac Newton (4 January 1643-31 March 1727) is credited with introducing the idea that the motion of objects in the heavens, such as planets, the Sun, and the Moon, and the motion of objects on the ground, like cannon balls and falling apples, could be described bv the same set of <u>physical laws</u>. In this sense he unified *celestial* and *terrestrial* dynamics. Using <u>Newton's law of universal gravitation</u>, proving Kepler's Laws for the case of a circular orbit is simple. Elliptical orbits involve more complex calculations, which Newton included in hisPrincipia.

Joseph-Louis Lagrange

After Newton, <u>Lagrange</u> (25 January 1736–10 April 1813) attempted to solve the threebody problem, analyzed the stability of planetary orbits, and discovered the existence of the <u>Lagrangian points</u>. Lagrange also reformulated the principles of<u>Classical</u> <u>mechanics</u>, emphasizing energy more than force and developing a<u>method</u> to use a single polar coordinate equation to describe any orbit, even those that are parabolic and hyperbolic. This is useful for calculating the behaviour of planets and <u>comets</u> and such. More recently, it has also become useful to calculate<u>spacecraft trajectories</u>.

Simon Newcomb

<u>Simon Newcomb</u> (12 March 1835–11 July 1909) was a Canadian–American astronomer who revised <u>Peter Andreas Hansen</u>'s table of lunar positions. In 1877, assisted by <u>George William Hill</u>, he recalculated all the major astronomical constants. After 1884, he conceived with A. M. W. Downing a plan to resolve much international confusion on the subject. By the time he attended a standardisation conference in <u>Paris</u>, France in May 1886, the international consensus was that all ephemerides should be based on Newcomb's calculations. A further conference as late as 1950 confirmed Newcomb's constants as the international standard.

Albert Einstein

<u>Albert Einstein</u> (14 March 1879–18 April 1955) explained the anomalous <u>precession of</u> <u>Mercury's perihelion</u> in his 1916 paper *The Foundation of the General Theory of Relativity.* This led astronomers to recognize that <u>Newtonian mechanics</u> did not provide the highest accuracy. <u>Binary pulsars</u> have been observed, the first in 1974, whose orbits not only require the use of <u>General Relativity</u> for their explanation, but whose evolution proves the existence of <u>gravitational radiation</u>, a discovery that led to the 1993 Nobel Physics Prize.

Examples of problems

This section does not cite any references or sources. Please help improve this section

by <u>adding citations to reliable sources</u>. Unsourced material may be challenged and <u>removed</u>. (April 2011)

Celestial motion without additional forces such as <u>thrust</u> of a <u>rocket</u>, is governed by gravitational acceleration of masses due to other masses. A simplification is the <u>n-body</u> <u>problem</u>, where the problem assumes some number *n* of spherically symmetric masses. In that case, the integration of the accelerations can be well approximated by relatively simple summations.

Examples:

- 4-body problem: spaceflight to Mars (for parts of the flight the influence of one or two bodies is very small, so that there we have a 2- or 3-body problem; see also <u>the patched conic approximation</u>)
- 3-body problem:
 - <u>Quasi-satellite</u>
 - Spaceflight to, and stay at a Lagrangian point

In the case that n=2 (two-body problem), the situation is much simpler than for larger *n*. Various explicit formulas apply, where in the more general case typically only numerical solutions are possible. It is a useful simplification that is often approximately valid.

Examples:

- A <u>binary star</u>, e.g., <u>Alpha Centauri</u> (approx. the same mass)
- A <u>binary asteroid</u>, e.g., <u>90 Antiope</u> (approx. the same mass)

A further simplification is based on the "standard assumptions in astrodynamics", which include that one body, the <u>orbiting body</u>, is much smaller than the other, the <u>central body</u>. This is also often approximately valid.

Examples:

- <u>Solar system</u> orbiting the center of the <u>Milky Way</u>
- A planet orbiting the Sun
- A moon orbiting a planet
- A spacecraft orbiting Earth, a moon, or a planet (in the latter cases the approximation only applies after arrival at that orbit)

Either instead of, or on top of the previous simplification, we may assume <u>circular</u> <u>orbits</u>, making distance and <u>orbital speeds</u>, and potential and kinetic energies constant

in time. This assumption sacrifices accuracy for simplicity, especially for high <u>eccentricity</u> orbits which are by definition non-circular.

Examples:

- The orbit of the <u>dwarf planet</u> <u>Pluto</u>, ecc. = 0.2488
- The orbit of <u>Mercury</u>, ecc. = 0.2056
- Hohmann transfer orbit
- <u>Gemini 11</u> flight
- <u>Suborbital flights</u>

Perturbation theory

<u>Perturbation theory</u> comprises mathematical methods that are used to find an approximate solution to a problem which cannot be solved exactly. (It is closely related to methods used in <u>numerical analysis</u>, which <u>are ancient</u>.) The earliest use of <u>Perturbation theory</u> was to deal with the otherwise unsolveable mathematical problems of celestial mechanics: <u>Newton</u>'s solution for the orbit of the <u>Moon</u>, which moves noticeably differently from a simple <u>Keplerian ellipse</u> because of the competing gravitation of the <u>Earth</u> and the <u>Sun</u>.

<u>Perturbation methods</u> start with a simplified form of the original problem, which is carefully chosen to be exactly solvable. In celestial mechanics, this is usually a<u>Keplerian ellipse</u>, which is correct when there are only two gravitating bodies (say, the <u>Earth</u> and the <u>Moon</u>), or a circular orbit, which is only correct in special cases of two-body motion, but is often close enough for practical use. The solved, but simplified problem is then *"perturbed"* to make its starting conditions closer to the real problem, such as including the gravitational attraction of a third body (the <u>Sun</u>). The slight changes that result, which themselves may have been simplified yet again, are used as corrections. Because of simplifications introduced along every step of the way, the corrections are never perfect, but even one cycle of corrections often provides a remarkably better approximate solution to the real problem.

There is no requirement to stop at only one cycle of corrections. A partially corrected solution can be re-used as the new starting point for yet another cycle of perturbations and corrections. The common difficulty with the method is that usually the corrections progressively make the new solutions very much more complicated, so each cycle is much more difficult to manage than the previous cycle of corrections. <u>Newton</u> is

reported to have said, regarding the problem of the <u>Moon</u>'s orbit *"It causeth my head to ache."*[1]

This general procedure – starting with a simplified problem and gradually adding corrections that make the starting point of the corrected problem closer to the real situation – is a widely used mathematical tool in advanced sciences and engineering. It is the natural extension of the "guess, check, and fix" method <u>used anciently with numbers</u>.

References

- <u>Asger Aaboe</u>, *Episodes from the Early History of Astronomy*, 2001, Springer-Verlag, <u>ISBN 0-387-95136-9</u>
- Forest R. Moulton, Introduction to Celestial Mechanics, <u>1984</u>, Dover, <u>ISBN 0-</u> <u>486-64687-4</u>
- John E.Prussing, Bruce A.Conway, *Orbital Mechanics*, 1993, Oxford Univ.Press
- William M. Smart, *Celestial Mechanics*, <u>1961</u>, John Wiley.
- J. M. A. Danby, *Fundamentals of Celestial Mechanics*, 1992, Willmann-Bell
- Alessandra Celletti, Ettore Perozzi, *Celestial Mechanics: The Waltz of the Planets*, 2007, Springer-Praxis, <u>ISBN 0-387-30777-X</u>.
- Michael Efroimsky. 2005. *Gauge Freedom in Orbital Mechanics*. <u>Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences</u>, Vol. 1065, pp. 346-374
- Alessandra Celletti, *Stability and Chaos in Celestial Mechanics*. Springer-Praxis 2010, XVI, 264 p., Hardcover <u>ISBN 978-3-540-85145-5</u>

Source: http://wateralkalinemachine.com/quantum-mechanics/?wikimaping=Celestial%20mechanics