Article

Not peer-reviewed version

Einstein's Second Postulate: Sufficient but Not Necessary

Michael Aaron Cody *

Posted Date: 1 October 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202510.0018.v1

Keywords: special relativity; physics education; Lorentz transformation; symmetry principles; Einstein postulates; pedagogy

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 1 October 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0018.v1

Article

Einstein's Second Postulate: Sufficient but Not Necessary

Michael Cody

Independent Researcher, USA; mac92contact@gmail.com

Abstract

Traditional presentations of special relativity introduce Einstein's second postulate, the constancy of light speed, as a fundamental axiom. This commonly creates student confusion, since synchronization procedures appear to rely on the very assumption they are meant to establish. This difficulty parallels student misconceptions documented in physics education research. A symmetry-based approach avoids this difficulty by deriving the Lorentz transformations from fundamental symmetry principles: Relativity, homogeneity, isotropy, reciprocity, and closure under composition. A four-step modular derivation leads to generalized k-Lorentz transformations with an invariant speed parameter k. The standard Lorentz form follows once experiment identifies this parameter with the measured signal speed, c. This framing clarifies that Einstein's second postulate is sufficient but not logically necessary. The result separates logical structure from empirical identification, offering a compact method for classroom use. Students benefit from a clear progression, reduced circularity, and a structured pathway for understanding relativity as a consequence of symmetry principles.

Keywords: special relativity; physics education; Lorentz transformation; symmetry principles; Einstein postulates; pedagogy

1. Introduction

Einstein's 1905 formulation of special relativity rested on two postulates. The relativity principle and the constancy of the speed of light [1]. This presentation has remained the standard in widely adopted textbooks [2–4]. However, physics education research has shown that students often struggle with this formulation, particularly because the synchronization procedure appears to assume the very constancy it intends to establish [5–8]. The result is a perception of circularity that undermines conceptual clarity in introductory courses. Alternative approaches, beginning with Ignatowsky's group-theoretic work in 1910 [9] and developed later by Berzi and Gorini [10], Lévy-Leblond [11], and Mermin [12], have shown that Lorentz transformations can be derived without directly postulating light-speed constancy. These approaches emphasize symmetry principles such as homogeneity, isotropy, reciprocity, and closure. Despite their conceptual clarity, such derivations have remained relatively rare in physics education practice. Contributing factors include their mathematical sophistication, lack of compact presentation suitable for early courses, and limited coverage in mainstream teaching texts.

Recent literature reviews confirm the persistence of student difficulties with relativity concepts, including frames of reference, postulate comprehension, and relativistic kinematics [13,14]. Calls for new approaches highlight the need to present special relativity in ways that reduce logical confusion while remaining mathematically rigorous and classroom-implementable. The present work addresses this need by framing Einstein's second postulate as sufficient but not logically necessary, and by presenting a modular four-step derivation of Lorentz kinematics from symmetry principles. The distinction between sufficiency and necessity clarifies the role of empirical identification, offering instructors a compact and student-accessible teaching method.

2. Four-Step Modular Derivation

The purpose of this section is to present a compact, classroom-ready derivation of the Lorentz transformations using only symmetry principles. The argument is divided into four steps, each motivated by a clear physical idea and expressed in a form accessible to students. By proceeding in this modular fashion, the logical structure remains transparent. Assumptions are introduced first, a general linear form is established, reciprocity and group properties are applied in sequence, and the invariant interval emerges at the conclusion. This progression highlights that the constancy of the speed of light is not required as an initial postulate, but instead appears empirically once the invariant speed parameter k is identified with c.

2.1. Step 1: Physical Assumptions

The derivation rests on four fundamental symmetry principles that characterize the structure of spacetime without reference to any specific physical phenomena. These assumptions are more basic than Einstein's postulates because they make no claims about light or electromagnetism, they concern only the geometric relationships between inertial frames.

The derivation rests on four fundamental symmetry principles:

1. **Relativity principle**: All inertial frames are equivalent for describing physical laws.
2. **Homogeneity**: Space and time are uniform, requiring that transformations between inertial frames are linear in coordinates.
3. **Isotropy**: Space has no preferred directions, ensuring rotational symmetry.
4. **Reciprocity**: If frame S' moves with velocity v relative to S, then S moves with velocity $-v$ relative to S'.

These principles avoid any explicit reference to light or electromagnetic phenomena, focusing purely on spacetime structure. The goal is to determine what coordinate transformations are consistent with these requirements.

2.2. Step 2: General Linear Form

Consider two inertial frames S and S' in standard configuration, with S' moving at velocity v along the positive x-axis. Homogeneity requires that the transformation be linear in the coordinates. The most general form consistent with the setup is

$$x' = A(v)\,x + B(v)\,t, \tag{1}$$

$$t' = C(v)\,x + D(v)\,t. \tag{2}$$

Physical reasoning constrains these coefficients:

- The origins coincide at $t = 0$: along the worldline of the moving origin $x = vt$, the condition $x' = 0$ requires $B(v) = -A(v)v$. Thus

$$x' = A(v)\,(x - vt).$$

- The y and z coordinates are unaffected: $y' = y$, $z' = z$, consistent with isotropy.

It is convenient to define $\gamma(v) \equiv A(v)$. The transformation then reduces to

$$x' = \gamma(v)(x - vt), \tag{3}$$

$$t' = C(v)\,x + D(v)\,t. \tag{4}$$

At this stage the two unknown functions are $\gamma(v)$ and $C(v)$. Their structure will be fixed by reciprocity and group composition in the following steps.

2.3. Step 3: Reciprocity and Parity Properties

Reciprocity requires that the inverse transformation, obtained by exchanging $v \to -v$ and interchanging S and S', has the same functional form. The inverse reads

$$x = A(-v)(x' + vt'), \qquad t = C(-v)\,x' + D(-v)\,t'.$$

Composing the forward and inverse transformations and demanding identity yields two constraints:

$$D(v) = A(v) \equiv \gamma(v), \tag{5}$$
$$\gamma(v)\,\gamma(-v)\,\big(1 + v\,\alpha(v)\big) = 1, \tag{6}$$

where I define

$$\alpha(v) \equiv \frac{C(v)}{\gamma(v)}.$$

Further, reciprocity forces

$$\alpha(-v) = -\alpha(v), \qquad \gamma(-v) = \gamma(v).$$

Thus $\alpha(v)$ is an odd function of v and $\gamma(v)$ an even function. Constraint (6) then simplifies to

$$\gamma(v)^2\,\big(1 + v\,\alpha(v)\big) = 1. \tag{†}$$

Equation (†) establishes the parity structure and the functional relation between γ and α, which will be resolved in Step 4.

2.4. Step 4: Group Property

The group property requires that two successive colinear boosts compose to a single boost of the same form. Let S' move at velocity u relative to S, and S'' move at velocity v relative to S'. Because this step involves functional equations and coefficient matching, the method is best suited to modern physics or advanced undergraduate courses where students are comfortable with algebraic consistency arguments.

The group property requires that two successive colinear boosts compose to a single boost of the same form. Let S' move at velocity u relative to S, and S'' move at velocity v relative to S'. From Step 2,

$$x' = \gamma(u)\,(x - ut), \qquad t' = \gamma(u)\,\big(t - \alpha(u)\,x\big), \tag{7}$$
$$x'' = \gamma(v)\,(x' - vt'), \qquad t'' = \gamma(v)\,\big(t' - \alpha(v)\,x'\big). \tag{8}$$

Compose the boosts (no prior form for α assumed): Substitute (7) into (8):

$$x'' = \gamma(u)\gamma(v)\,\Big[(x - ut) - v\,\big(t - \alpha(u)\,x\big)\Big] = \gamma(u)\gamma(v)\,\Big[\big(1 + v\,\alpha(u)\big)\,x - (u+v)\,t\Big], \tag{9}$$

$$\begin{aligned} t'' &= \gamma(u)\gamma(v)\,\Big[\big(t - \alpha(u)\,x\big) - \alpha(v)\,(x - ut)\Big] \\ &= \gamma(u)\gamma(v)\,\Big[\big(1 + u\,\alpha(v)\big)\,t - \big(\alpha(u) + \alpha(v)\big)\,x\Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Match to a single boost: Closure demands a single boost with velocity w of the same form,

$$x'' = \gamma(w)\,(x - wt), \qquad t'' = \gamma(w)\,\big(t - \alpha(w)\,x\big). \tag{11}$$

Equate coefficients between (9)–(10) and (11):

$$\gamma(w) = \gamma(u)\gamma(v)\,\big(1 + v\,\alpha(u)\big), \tag{12}$$

$$\gamma(w)\,w = \gamma(u)\gamma(v)\,(u+v), \tag{13}$$

$$\gamma(w) = \gamma(u)\gamma(v)\,\big(1 + u\,\alpha(v)\big), \tag{14}$$

$$\gamma(w)\,\alpha(w) = \gamma(u)\gamma(v)\,\big(\alpha(u) + \alpha(v)\big). \tag{15}$$

Form of α. From (12) and (14),

$$1 + v\,\alpha(u) = 1 + u\,\alpha(v) \quad \Rightarrow \quad v\,\alpha(u) = u\,\alpha(v).$$

For arbitrary nonzero u, v this implies

$$\frac{\alpha(v)}{v} = \frac{\alpha(u)}{u} = \text{constant.}$$

Hence

$$\boxed{\alpha(v) = \frac{v}{k^2}},$$

with $k > 0$ a universal constant with units of speed. (This is obtained here from closure, not assumed.)

Velocity addition: Insert $\alpha(u) = u/k^2$ into (13) and use (12) to eliminate $\gamma(w)$:

$$w = \frac{u+v}{1 + \frac{uv}{k^2}}.$$

Functional equation for γ: With $\alpha(u) = u/k^2$, equation (12) becomes

$$\gamma(w) = \gamma(u)\gamma(v)\left(1 + \frac{uv}{k^2}\right).$$

This is the group functional equation for γ evaluated at the composed velocity w.

Solve for γ. From Step 3, reciprocity gave

$$\gamma(v)^2\,\big(1 - v\,\alpha(v)\big) = 1.$$

Substitute $\alpha(v) = v/k^2$:

$$\gamma(v)^2\left(1 - \frac{v^2}{k^2}\right) = 1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \boxed{\gamma(v) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - v^2/k^2}}}.$$

Result: The k-Lorentz transformations follow:

$$x' = \gamma(v)\,(x - vt), \tag{16}$$

$$t' = \gamma(v)\left(t - \frac{v}{k^2}\,x\right), \tag{17}$$

with

$$\gamma(v) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - v^2/k^2}}, \qquad \alpha(v) = \frac{v}{k^2}, \qquad w = \frac{u+v}{1 + uv/k^2}.$$

Parameter k is an invariant speed common to all inertial frames. The Galilean limit appears for $k \to \infty$; finite k gives Lorentzian kinematics.

3. Sufficiency vs Necessity

Einstein's second postulate, the constancy of the speed of light, is traditionally introduced as a fundamental axiom of special relativity. This formulation is historically accurate and pedagogically straightforward, but it carries the risk of appearing logically circular. Synchronization of clocks and measurement of signal speed seem to rely on the very postulate being asserted, creating conceptual unease for many students [5,8].

The derivation presented in Section 2 demonstrates that the constancy of light speed is sufficient but not logically necessary. The sufficiency claim means that Einstein's approach works and yields the correct theory. The lack of necessity means that alternative starting points, based solely on symmetry principles, also lead to the same kinematics. Relativity, homogeneity, isotropy, reciprocity, and group closure imply the existence of a universal invariant speed k, which is later identified empirically with c [9–11]. The light postulate is therefore repositioned from an axiom to an empirical identification.

The distinction has pedagogical significance. Treating the light postulate as sufficient emphasizes that Einstein's formulation is valid and effective, while showing that it is not the only possible starting point clarifies the logical structure of the theory. Students can separate the deductive framework from experimental input, reducing confusion about circular reasoning. This modular approach also highlights the Galilean limit ($k \to \infty$) as a natural alternative within the same framework, reinforcing the continuity between Newtonian and relativistic kinematics. Instructors gain flexibility from this distinction. The derivation can be presented either as a symmetry-based argument leading to an invariant speed k, or as Einstein's original postulate-based derivation. Both paths converge to the same physical theory, but the modular approach separates logical deduction from empirical determination and avoids conflating the two. The contribution here is pedagogical clarity and classroom utility, not new physical content.

4. Classroom Implementation

The modular derivation lends itself naturally to integration into an introductory modern physics or relativity course. A suggested sequence is three short modules:

- **Module 1: Assumptions and Setup.** Present the physical assumptions of relativity, homogeneity, isotropy, and reciprocity. Emphasize that these are symmetry principles, not specific to light or electromagnetism.
- **Module 2: Reciprocity and Group Property.** Work through the algebra leading to the velocity addition law and the k-Lorentz transformations. Highlight the emergence of an invariant speed without assuming its identity.
- **Module 3: Experimental Identification.** Connect the invariant speed k to empirical measurement of the speed of light c. Contrast the Galilean limit ($k \to \infty$) with the relativistic case ($k = c$).

Exercises can reinforce each module. A concrete example is the velocity addition of two cars: one at 30 m/s and the other at 40 m/s in the same direction. The Galilean result is 70 m/s, while the k-Lorentz result with $k = c$ is

$$w = \frac{30 + 40}{1 + (30)(40)/c^2} = \frac{70}{1 + 1.3 \times 10^{-14}} \approx 70\ \mathrm{m/s},$$

where the relativistic correction is negligible at such low speeds. Extending the exercise to relativistic values (e.g., $0.8c$ and $0.8c$) illustrates the non-linear structure of velocity addition.

A second useful exercise explores the invariance of the spacetime interval. In full generality the invariant is

$$\Delta s^2 = k^2 \Delta t^2 - \Delta x^2 - \Delta y^2 - \Delta z^2,$$

but for simplicity of classroom calculation the problem can be restricted to one spatial dimension,

$$\Delta s^2 = k^2 \Delta t^2 - \Delta x^2.$$

Students can verify that the interval remains unchanged under transformation, reinforcing the geometric interpretation and highlighting why k functions as a universal invariant speed. A variant of this exercise can also probe simultaneity by comparing whether two spatially separated events occur at the same time in different frames.

Assessment can combine conceptual and computational tasks. One effective prompt is: *Show how Einstein's light-speed postulate leads to the same Lorentz transformations as the symmetry-based derivation. Explain why this means the postulate is sufficient but not logically required.* A complementary exercise can ask students to compute the interval for a pair of events in two frames and show explicitly that it remains invariant. Implementation requires algebra, the ability to solve simultaneous equations, and comfort with simple functional reasoning; no advanced linear algebra is needed. The structure allows instructors to adapt the material to course level and time constraints. A brief treatment can focus on the logical outline, while a more detailed version can expand on exercises and applications. The goal is to give students a transparent framework that separates symmetry principles, mathematical derivation, and empirical identification.

5. Conclusions

The derivation presented here offers a compact and classroom-ready complementary presentation to the traditional postulate-based introduction of special relativity. By separating the logical deduction of Lorentz kinematics from the empirical identification of the invariant speed, the approach clarifies that Einstein's second postulate is sufficient but not logically necessary. Symmetry principles alone establish the mathematical framework, while experiment determines that the invariant speed k equals c.

The pedagogical value lies in clarity. Students can follow a transparent progression from physical assumptions to transformation equations while avoiding potential confusion about circularity. The modular design allows instructors to adjust the depth of treatment, from a brief logical outline to a full worked sequence with exercises. The framework highlights the continuity between Galilean and relativistic kinematics and reinforces the conceptual role of invariance in modern physics. The contribution is explicitly pedagogical rather than physical. The aim is to support instruction, reduce common sources of student confusion, and encourage clearer distinctions between deduction and experiment. Extensions could include connections to spacetime geometry, rapidity parameters, and four-vectors in more advanced courses. Feedback from classroom implementation could help refine the method further, but the essential message is that special relativity can be introduced with both rigor and clarity without relying on the constancy of light speed as a starting axiom.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Data Availability Statement: Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analyzed in this study.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflicts of interest related to this work.

References

1. Einstein, A. (1905). Zur Elektrodynamik bewegter Körper. *Annalen der Physik*, 17, 891–921.
2. Taylor, E. F., & Wheeler, J. A. (1966). *Spacetime Physics*. W. H. Freeman.
3. French, A. P. (1968). *Special Relativity*. W. W. Norton.
4. Griffiths, D. J. (1999). *Introduction to Electrodynamics*, 3rd ed. Prentice Hall. (SR appendix).
5. Scherr, R. E., Shaffer, P. S., & Vokos, S. (2001). Student understanding of time in special relativity: Simultaneity and reference frames. *American Journal of Physics*, 69(7), S24–S35.
6. Scherr, R. E., & Vokos, S. (2007). Student difficulties with relative motion concepts. *Physics Education Research Conference Proceedings*, 883, 85–88.
7. Singh, C. (2010). Student understanding of quantum mechanics and special relativity. *Proceedings of the Physics Education Research Conference*, 1289, 47–50.

8. Baugé, C., & Viennot, L. (2018). Students' difficulties with Einstein's postulates in learning special relativity. *European Journal of Physics*, 39(5), 055702.
9. Ignatowsky, W. (1910). Einige allgemeine Bemerkungen zum Relativitätsprinzip. *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, 11, 972–976.
10. Berzi, V., & Gorini, V. (1969). Reciprocity principle and the Lorentz transformations. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 10, 1518–1524.
11. Lévy-Leblond, J.-M. (1976). One more derivation of the Lorentz transformation. *American Journal of Physics*, 44(3), 271–277.
12. Mermin, N. D. (1984). Relativity without light. *American Journal of Physics*, 52(2), 119–124.
13. Brown, M., & Salgado, J. (2011). Teaching relativity in introductory physics courses: A review. *Physical Review Special Topics – Physics Education Research*, 7(2), 020106.
14. Simpson, E., & Craton, L. (2021). Teaching and learning special relativity in secondary and undergraduate education: A literature review. *Physical Review Physics Education Research*, 17(2), 023101.