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- This equation is precisely what we have been dealing with. The key lies in finding solutions to
- Suppose a particle of mass 1 is under the influence of a potential $V(x)$. Suppose it is at stable equilibrium at $x=0$. What will happen if we perturb it? $V(x) \approx V(0)+\frac{k^{2}}{2} x^{2}$. Since $F=-V^{\prime}, F=-k^{2} x$.
- Thus $x^{\prime \prime}=-k^{2} x$. This equation can be solved to yield $x=A \cos (k t)+B \sin (k t)$. This is a Harmonic Oscillator.
- What if the particle is subject to air resistance? Stokes' law says that the viscous drag is $F=-2 c x^{\prime}$.
- Thus $x^{\prime \prime}+2 c x^{\prime}+k^{2} x=0$. Further, what if we apply another external time-dependent force $F(t)$ on it? Then $x^{\prime \prime}+2 c x^{\prime}+k^{2} x=F(t)$.
- This equation is precisely what we have been dealing with. The key lies in finding solutions to the homogeneous problem.

