This course is called "Particle Physics" but really it should be called "Physics at the fundamental frontiers with which we are currently confident". I say that because not only will be find that the notion of "particles" as we usually understand then is not part of it, but also because the subject itself has underiable hints at physics beyond what it is currently capable of describing.
Let's start with some high-level nomenclastice; Fratiework (Mechanics) - a francwork for describing the evolution of a system contrast SR W/GR Theory - a francwork applied to a particular context Model - an effective theory, that requires some inputs that are not predicted by the theory itself, but are selected to noteh desired behavior
* Note, not everyone agons on the use of those terms, but then again this is not natheratics!
Let's start by establishing the appropriate nechanics for our purposes.
·

Relativistic Mechanics Non-relativistic (Newtonian) Mechanics - valid for low speeds - 3D space + absolute time - Galilean relativity V = V+ u as seen in 5 as seen in 5 · valid for any speeds · 3+1 D specifice V+u · Special relativity V= 1+viv/cd give constancy of c Correspondence principle: If vu<<<2 > U= 1+ vu = v'+u But do we need to work with relativity? Well to compare w/ experiment where speeds approach 0.9999999 < (7 mph < c) But nove importantly, if we want a fundamental description, we want one that is right in any & Huation.

Non-relativistic (Newtonian) Mechanics

- · valid for large decoherent systems
- deterministic, i.e. given initial conditions and dynamics, solution is unique behavior
- · Hor L ⇒ e.o.h. w/ b.c.s ⇒ x(t)

Non-relativistic Quentum Acchanics

- · valid for all systems
- · probabilistic, i.e. given initial

 conditions and dynamics, solution


 is probability distribution for possible


 behaviors (initial conditions on not complete).
- ; th = H+ w/ b.c.s => +(x,+)

Correspondence principle: harder to pose because the 'questions" change, but generally when 5=5Ldt >> k, we get classical behavior dominating.

Do we need QM? Well we are studying a small number of hella small things, so yeah! But again, to be turdenestal the description should always work.

Of course we are then led to ask, "What about small things at high speeds?"
The arsver raively would be [Relativistic Quantum Mechanics], but this is slightly problematic.
organity proof cratic.
The particle how to be somewhere!
But
Relavity allows particles to be created and destroyed!
To get around this we could introduce a Fock space of particle states to allow particle creation/anihilation in QM. This does work to some degree, but it is combersome and incomplete!
porticle creation / aminimation in cert. This does work to some digree, but it
TO CLAMETS ONE 220 THEORPHELE.
50 wh tedo we we?





	Outline of course.
	Develop systematic approach to transformations and symmetries
	· Review special relativity
	Fornalism Review Lagrangian mechanics
	· Develop Lagransian Mechanies of scalar, spinor and vector fields
	Introduce interactions through local gauge invariance
	· Discuss SSB and Hisgs · Special topics
	poc. 21 Topics
	Layout en approach to calculations
	- Review perturbation theory
(Calculations / Develop and apply Feynman calculus
	· Review classie calculations
	Renormalization
	Special topics