

放射反作用之古典單磁極理論

Classical Lagrangian Theory with Radiative Reaction: Extension of Rohrlich Two-Field Formalism to Include Monopoles

鄭國順 Kuo-Shung Cheng*

Department of Applied Mathematics, N. C. T. U.

(Received June 3, 1977)

Abstract — We give an action integral $L(x, X, A_\mu, a_\mu)$. The stabilities of L against the variations $\delta A_\mu(\xi)$, $\delta a_\mu(\xi)$, $\delta x^\mu(\theta)$ and $\delta X^\mu(\tau)$, give us the coupled Maxwell equations and the Lorentz-Dirac equation for the positron and monopole.

I. Introduction

It was Dirac who introduced the concept of magnetic monopole [1] in 1931. Then he came back in 1948 to the question [2] of the classical action principle. In Dirac's formulation, it was necessary to introduce the concept of strings attached to monopoles, because his vector potential for a static magnetic monopole is singular along a semi-infinite line in three-space. Not until recently were Wu and Yang [3] able to formulate this classical problem without introducing the Dirac strings. The key points in Wu-Yang's formulation are (1) dividing the space-time into many overlapping regions and (2) introducing the potential A_μ in each region such that one of the Maxwell equations becomes kinematic equation. But in their formulation, Wu and Yang did not take the classical radiative reaction into consideration, so that the equations they obtained from the variation of the action integral can only be regarded as formal equation and possess no finite solution.

It is the purpose of this paper to find a classical Lagrangian theory of positrons and magnetic monopoles including the radiative reaction. The essential point that enables a solution of this problem is the realization [4] that one is dealing with not only one electromagnetic field, but with two such fields. One satisfies the homogeneous Maxwell equations. The other satisfies the inhomogeneous Maxwell equations. They are mathematically and physically entirely different. Although the separation of total electromagnetic field into the abovementioned two parts is not unique, it can be made unambiguous [4] by the proper boundary conditions.

We will write down the action integral in section II and study the Euler-Lagrange equations for this action integral in section III. Finally we will give some concluding remarks.

II. The Action Integral

We will use the same notations as in reference 3, in which x^μ is the space-time coordinates, $x^\mu(\theta)$ is the world line of a positron with electric charge e and $X^\mu(\tau)$ is the world line of a magnetic monopole with magnetic charge g . Here θ and τ are respectively the proper times of positron and monopole. The metric used is $\eta_{\mu\nu} = (-1, 1, 1, 1)$, the relation between the EM field $F_{\mu\nu}$ and its dual $\bar{F}_{\mu\nu}$ is

$$\bar{F}_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} F^{\alpha\beta}, F_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \bar{F}^{\alpha\beta} \quad (1)$$

* Work partially supported by the National Science Council of Taiwan, Republic of China.

where $\epsilon^{0123} = -1$ and $\epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}$ = complete antisymmetric tensor.

The action integral L is

$$\begin{aligned} L = & -mf d\theta - Mf d\tau - 1/16 \pi f F_{\mu\nu}(\xi) F^{\mu\nu}(\xi) d^4\xi - 1/8 \pi f F_{\mu\nu}(\xi) h_{\mu\nu}^{\mu\nu}(\xi) d^4\xi \\ & - 1/8 \pi f F_{\mu\nu}(\xi) f_{\mu\nu}^{\mu\nu}(\xi) d^4\xi - 1/8 \pi f h_{\mu\nu}^{\mu\nu}(\xi) f_{\mu\nu}^{\mu\nu}(\xi) d^4\xi \\ & + e f A_{\mu}(x(\theta)) dx^{\mu} + e f b_{\mu}(x(\theta)) dx^{\mu}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where

$$F_{\mu\nu}(\xi) = \frac{\partial A_{\nu}(\xi)}{\partial \xi^{\mu}} - \frac{\partial A_{\mu}(\xi)}{\partial \xi^{\nu}}, \quad h_{\mu\nu}^{\mu\nu}(\xi) = \frac{\partial a_{\mu}(\xi)}{\partial \xi^{\nu}} - \frac{\partial a_{\nu}(\xi)}{\partial \xi^{\mu}} \quad (3)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\mu\nu}^{\mu\nu}(\xi) &= 1/2 \xi_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \bar{f}_{\alpha\beta}^{\alpha\beta}(\xi), \\ \bar{f}_{\alpha\beta}^{\alpha\beta}(\xi) &= \frac{\partial \bar{b}^{\alpha}(\xi)}{\partial \xi^{\beta}} - \frac{\partial \bar{b}^{\beta}(\xi)}{\partial \xi^{\alpha}} = 1/2 (\bar{f}_{\text{ret}}^{\alpha\beta} + \bar{f}_{\text{adv}}^{\alpha\beta}), \\ \bar{b}^{\alpha}(\xi) &= g f \dot{X}^{\alpha}(\tau) \delta((\xi - X)^2) d\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Hence

$$f_{\mu\nu}^{\mu\nu}(\xi) = 0, \quad \bar{f}_{\mu\nu}^{\mu\nu}(\xi) = -4\pi g f \dot{X}^{\mu} \delta^4(\xi - X) d\tau. \quad (5)$$

The last term of the action integral L requires some explanations. As in reference 3, the world lines $x(\theta)$ and $X(\tau)$ are constrained to be time-like. Furthermore, they must not cross. That is, $\vec{x}(t) - \vec{X}(t) \neq 0$ for all t . The reasons can be found in reference 3. Now, since world lines $x(\theta)$ and $X(\tau)$ do not cross, we can always find a three-dimensional surface S , which divides the space-time into two regions E_1 and E_2 , where E_1 contains the positron world line only and E_2 contains the monopole world line only. The field $b_{\mu}(\xi)$, which appears in the last term of L, satisfies the following equation

$$\frac{\partial b_{\mu}(\xi)}{\partial \xi^{\nu}} - \frac{\partial b_{\nu}(\xi)}{\partial \xi^{\mu}} = f_{\mu\nu}^{\mu\nu}(\xi), \quad \xi \in E_1. \quad (6)$$

Since in region E_1 , $\bar{f}_{\mu\nu}^{\mu\nu}(\xi) = 0$, and region E_1 is a simple connected region, so that there exists a function $b_{\mu}(\xi)$ satisfying Eq. (6). We only need to know that $b_{\mu}(\xi)$ exists and need not to write down the explicit form of $b_{\mu}(\xi)$. The independent dynamical variables for the action integral L are $x_{\mu}(\theta)$, $X_{\mu}(\tau)$, $A_{\mu}(\xi)$ and $a_{\mu}(\xi)$.

III. Stability of the action integral L

It is easy to show that the stabilities of L against the variations δA_{μ} , δa_{μ} , and $\delta x_{\mu}(\theta)$ give us respectively

$$(F^{\mu\nu}(\xi) + h_{\mu\nu}^{\mu\nu}(\xi) + f_{\mu\nu}^{\mu\nu}(\xi))_{,\nu} = -4\pi e f \dot{x}^{\mu}(\theta) \delta^4(\xi - x) d\theta, \quad (7)$$

$$(F^{\mu\nu}(\xi) + f_+^{\mu\nu}(\xi))_{,\nu} = 0, \tag{8}$$

and $m\ddot{x}^\mu(\theta) = -e F^{\mu\nu}(x)\dot{x}_\nu(\theta) - e f_+^{\mu\nu}(x)\dot{x}_\nu(\theta).$ (9)

Since $f_{+,\nu}^{\mu\nu}(\xi) = 0$, Eqs. (7) and (8) become

$$h_{+,\nu}^{\mu\nu}(\xi) = -4\pi e \int \dot{x}^\mu(\theta) \delta^4(\xi-x) d\theta \tag{10}$$

and $F_{+,\nu}^{\mu\nu}(\xi) = 0.$ (11)

Using the boundary conditions in reference 4 to separate the total EM field into free part and singular part, we will get

$$a^\mu(\xi) = e \int \dot{x}^\mu(\theta) \delta((\xi-x)^2) d\theta, \tag{12}$$

$$h_+^{\mu\nu}(\xi) = \frac{\partial a^\nu(\xi)}{\partial \xi_\nu} - \frac{\partial a^\mu(\xi)}{\partial \xi_\mu} = \frac{1}{2}(h_{ret}^{\mu\nu}(\xi) + h_{adv}^{\mu\nu}(\xi)) \tag{13}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} F_{total}^{\mu\nu} &= F^{\mu\nu} + f_+^{\mu\nu} + h_+^{\mu\nu} \\ &= F_{in}^{\mu\nu} + f_{ret}^{\mu\nu} + h_{ret}^{\mu\nu} = F_{out}^{\mu\nu} + f_{adv}^{\mu\nu} + h_{adv}^{\mu\nu}. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

The notations in Eq. (14) are self-evident. From Eq. (14), we get

$$F^{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2}(F_{in}^{\mu\nu} + F_{out}^{\mu\nu}) = F_{in}^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2}(f_{ret}^{\mu\nu} - f_{adv}^{\mu\nu}) + \frac{1}{2}(h_{ret}^{\mu\nu} - h_{adv}^{\mu\nu}). \tag{15}$$

Thus Eq. (9) becomes

$$m\ddot{x}^\mu(\theta) = -e F_{in}^{\mu\nu} \dot{x}_\nu(\theta) - e \frac{1}{2}(h_{ret}^{\mu\nu} - h_{adv}^{\mu\nu}) \dot{x}_\nu - e f_{ret}^{\mu\nu} \dot{x}_\nu. \tag{16}$$

One can show [2] that $\frac{1}{2}(h_{ret}^{\mu\nu} - h_{adv}^{\mu\nu})$ is regular at the positron world line $x(\theta)$. This term is the radiative reaction term which is generally accepted.

Now let us consider the stability of L against the variation $\delta X^\mu(\tau)$. The original form of the action integral L is not convenient to take the variation with respect to $X^\mu(\tau)$. We proceed as follows:

(A) Let L_0 = extremum of L with respect to the variations $\delta A_\mu(\xi)$, $\delta a_\mu(\xi)$, $\delta x_\mu(\theta)$. Thus $L_0(X, \dot{X})$ is equal to the value of L evaluated at those functions $A_\mu(\xi)$, $a_\mu(\xi)$ and $x_\mu(\theta)$ which satisfy the equations of motion, Eqs. (10), (11) and (16). Now consider the term

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{8\pi} \int F_{\mu\nu}(\xi) f_+^{\mu\nu}(\xi) d^4\xi &= \frac{1}{8\pi} \int \bar{F}_{\mu\nu}(\xi) \bar{f}_+^{\mu\nu}(\xi) d^4\xi \\ &= \frac{1}{8\pi} \int (\bar{A}_{\mu,\nu} - \bar{A}_{\nu,\mu}) \bar{f}_+^{\mu\nu}(\xi) d^4\xi \\ &= -\frac{1}{4\pi} \int \bar{A}_{\mu} \bar{f}_{+,\nu}^{\mu\nu}(\xi) d^4\xi + \text{terms at infinite} \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

$$= g \int \bar{A}_\mu(X) \dot{X}^\mu d\tau + \text{terms at infinite.} \quad (17)$$

Because $F^{\mu\nu}(\xi) = 0$, there always exists $\bar{A}_\mu(\xi)$, such that

$$\bar{A}_{\mu,\nu}(\xi) - \bar{A}_{\nu,\mu}(\xi) = \bar{F}_{\mu\nu}(\xi).$$

Now consider the term

$$-\frac{1}{8\pi} \int h_{\mu\nu}(\xi) f_+^{\mu\nu}(\xi) d^4\xi + e \int b_\mu(x) dx^\mu.$$

As before, let S be a three-dimensional surface which divides the space-time into regions E_1 and E_2 . Then

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{1}{8\pi} \int h_{\mu\nu}(\xi) f_+^{\mu\nu}(\xi) d^4\xi + e \int b_\mu(x) dx^\mu \\ &= -\frac{1}{8\pi} \int_{E_1 + E_2} h_{\mu\nu}(\xi) f_+^{\mu\nu}(\xi) d^4\xi + e \int b_\mu(x) dx^\mu \\ &= \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{E_1} h_{\mu\nu,\nu}(\xi) b^\mu d^4\xi - \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{SE_1} h_{\mu\nu} b^\mu d\sigma^\nu(\xi) \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{SE_2} \bar{a}_\mu(\xi) \bar{F}_+^{\mu\nu}(\xi) d\sigma_\nu(\xi) - \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{E_2} \bar{a}_\mu(\xi) \bar{F}_+^{\mu\nu}(\xi) d^4\xi \\ & \quad + e \int b_\mu(x) dx^\mu \\ &= g \int \bar{a}_\mu(X) dX^\mu + (\text{surface terms}) + (\text{terms at infinite}). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Here the existence of $\bar{a}_\mu(\xi)$ is ensured by the condition

$$h^{\mu\nu}{}_{,\nu}(\xi) = 0$$

in E_2 .

One can show [3] that the two terms in Eq. (18) can be combined and are equal to terms at infinite. Thus

$$L_0 = -M \int d\tau + g \int \bar{A}_\mu(X) dX^\mu + g \int \bar{a}_\mu(X) dX^\mu$$

+ terms which are irrelevant + terms at infinite.

(B) The stability of L against the variation $\delta X(\tau)$ is the same as stability of L_0 against the variation $\delta X(\tau)$, thus we get

$$\begin{aligned} M\ddot{X}^\mu(\tau) &= -g\bar{F}^{\mu\nu}(X)\dot{X}_\nu - g\bar{h}_+^{\mu\nu}(X)\dot{X}_\nu \\ &= -g\bar{F}_{\text{in}}^{\mu\nu}(X)\dot{X}_\nu - \frac{1}{2}g(\bar{F}_{\text{ret}}^{\mu\nu} - \bar{F}_{\text{adv}}^{\mu\nu})\dot{X}_\nu - g\bar{h}_{\text{ret}}^{\mu\nu}\dot{X}_\nu \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

In conclusion, we find out that the stabilities of the action integral L against the variations δA_μ , δa_μ , δx and δX give respectively Eqs. (7), (8), (9) and (19).

IV. Concluding Remarks

1. We get an action integral L. The stabilities of L against the variations of independent dynamical variables give us the Maxwell equations and the equations of motion for the positron and monopole including the radiative reaction.
2. The essential point to make this possible is to separate the EM field into free part and singular part unambiguously. (See reference 4)
3. Although we need only to know the existence of $b_\mu(\xi)$ in E_1 and $a_\mu(\xi)$ in E_2 and need not to write down the explicit forms for $b_\mu(\xi)$ and $a_\mu(\xi)$, there are many solutions for $b_\mu(\xi)$ in E_1 . Different solutions may give different values of the action integral L. In fact, L is a multivalued functional [3].
4. Interesting discussions with Profs. Ni Wei-Tou and Shaw Jin-Chang are deeply appreciated by the author.

References

1. P. A. M. Dirac, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) A133, 60 (1931).
2. P. A. M. Dirac, Phys. Rev. 74, 817 (1948).
3. Tai Tsun Wu and Chen Ning Yang, Phys. Rev. D14, 437 (1976).
4. F. Rohrlich, Phys. Rev. Lett. 12, 375 (1964).

$$\ddot{x}^\mu = \frac{2}{3c^3} \dot{x}^\nu \ddot{x}^\nu \dot{x}^\mu + \frac{1}{3} (\ddot{x}^\nu)^2 \cdot \frac{1}{2} \dot{x}^\mu \dot{x}^\nu \dot{x}^\mu \quad (1)$$

is usually accepted to describe the classical motion of a charged particle in a force field including the radiative reaction. Here $1/c^3$ is equal to $2/3(\pi^2/mc^3)$, \dot{x}^μ is the proper time derivative of the position $x^\mu = X^\mu - ct$ and $\ddot{x}^\mu = \frac{d^2 x^\mu}{dt^2}$. Eq. (1) is a third-order differential equation. For given initial values of $x^\mu(0)$ and $\dot{x}^\mu(0)$, Eq. (1) has infinitely many solutions. To ensure an acceptable physical solution, one usually regards the initial acceleration $\ddot{x}^\mu(0)$ as a parameter and imposes the additional constraint [1]

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \ddot{x}^\mu(t) = 0 \quad (2)$$

to implicitly determine the initial acceleration parameter $\ddot{x}^\mu(0)$ and assume that one and only one such physical solution exists. In [3], Fliss made rather extensive studies to determine the physical solution of Eqs. (1) and (2). He concluded that if the force field satisfies some general conditions, then there always exists a unique physical solution to Eqs. (1) and (2) for given initial values of $x^\mu(0)$ and $\dot{x}^\mu(0)$. He then argued that one should accept the equation of motion including the force of radiative reaction, Eqs. (1) and (2), as an exact equation for a charged point particle within the framework of classical theory. But recently, Baylis and Huschilt [4] pointed out that there are at least two solutions for a specific problem. The second solution of [4] exists only when the distance between the test particle and the force field region is very small or the force field strength is very strong. Although we can argue that in the case of such a small distance or such a strong field strength, the classical description is no longer valid, we should also note that, as in the case of classical mechanics, when we consider the complete classical equation of motion, we always assume that the equation of motion is valid for all distances no matter how small and for all the force field strengths no matter how strong. We further assume that the solution if it exists is unique, that is, we assume that the mathematical description of classical theory is complete up to any small distance and any strong field strength in spite of the fact that in such a case the classical description is no longer adequate to describe the actual physical situation. Thus we should reexamine the constraint condition to determine whether it is complete or not.

* Work partially supported by the National Science Council of Taiwan.