

## Conflict of conservation laws in cyclotron radiation

This article has been downloaded from IOPscience. Please scroll down to see the full text article.

1983 J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 16 L669

(<http://iopscience.iop.org/0305-4470/16/17/007>)

View [the table of contents for this issue](#), or go to the [journal homepage](#) for more

Download details:

IP Address: 129.252.86.83

The article was downloaded on 31/05/2010 at 06:35

Please note that [terms and conditions apply](#).

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

**Conflict of conservation laws in cyclotron radiation**

R Lieut†, D A Leahy† and A J Evans‡

† Department of Physics, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada

‡ Standard Telecommunications Laboratory, Imperial College, London SW7 2BZ, UK

Received 15 August 1983

**Abstract.** Cyclotron radiation carries a continuous flux of energy, momentum and angular momentum. Current theory cannot explain how such quantities are derived from the emitting particles (electrons).

For an electron undergoing cyclotron emission in a uniform and constant magnetic field ( $z$  direction by convention) the following basic conservation laws must hold as a result of the configurational symmetry of the Hamiltonian.

*Energy conservation.* The total Hamiltonian of an interacting system of radiation and an electron does not have explicit time dependence. Energy is conserved. We may write

$$dE_e/dt = -dE_\gamma/dt \tag{1}$$

where

$$dE_e/dt = d(\frac{1}{2}mr_1^2\omega_c^2)/dt \tag{2}$$

( $r_1$  is the radius of the electron orbit,  $\omega_c$  is the cyclotron frequency) and  $dE_\gamma/dt$ , the rate of energy loss to radiation, is given in the appendix.

*Angular momentum conservation.* In the absence of radiation, the gauge-invariant generator of infinitesimal rotation about the  $z$  axis is given for the electron as (Johnson and Lippmann 1949)

$$L_z^e = \frac{1}{2}m\omega_c(r_1^2 - r_0^2) \tag{3}$$

where  $r_0^2 = x_0^2 + y_0^2$  is the radial position of the electron guiding centre.  $L_z^e$  is conserved because of azimuthal symmetry. In the presence of radiation, the symmetry property remains in the Hamiltonian. The total angular momentum of (electron + radiation) is conserved, i.e.

$$dL_z^e/dt = -dL_z^\gamma/dt. \tag{4}$$

In cyclotron emission, the vector potential for the radiation at the  $m$ th harmonic is given in cylindrical polar coordinates as

$$(\mathbf{A})_m = [\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_+ J_{m-1}(k_\perp \rho) e^{i(m-1)\phi} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_- J_{m+1}(k_\perp \rho) e^{i(m+1)\phi}] \exp[i(k_z z - \omega t)]$$

where  $J_m(x)$  is the Bessel function,  $k_\perp^2 = k_x^2 + k_y^2$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_\pm$  are polarisation vectors describing circularly polarised radiation. For such fields we have  $L_z^\gamma = m$ . More

importantly, there exists a definite relationship between the energy and angular momentum carried away by the  $m$ th harmonic radiation (Jackson 1975)

$$(dL_z^\gamma/dt)_m = (m/\omega)(dE_\gamma/dt)_m$$

and since  $m/\omega = 1/\omega_c$  is a constant, the following equation holds between the total energy and angular momentum:

$$dL_z^\gamma/dt = \omega_c^{-1} dE_\gamma/dt. \quad (5)$$

Equations (1), (4) and (5) then imply

$$dL_z^e/dt = \omega_c^{-1} dE_e/dt.$$

This, together with (2) and (3), would give

$$dr_0^2/dt = 0 \quad (6)$$

as a consequence of energy and angular momentum conservation. The physical meaning is that, during radiation, there is no systematic drift in the radial position of the guiding centre.

*Linear momentum conservation.* In the absence of radiation, the Hamiltonian for the electron

$$H = (2m)^{-1}[\mathbf{p} + (e/c)\mathbf{A}]^2$$

(where  $A_z = 0$  for the field  $H = H_z$ ) is translationally invariant. Thus the corresponding generators of infinitesimal translation (Lieu 1980, Herold *et al* 1981)

$$P_x^e = m\omega_c y_0, \quad P_y^e = -m\omega_c x_0, \quad P_z^e = p_z,$$

are conserved. Moreover, they all have gauge-invariant meanings.  $P_x^e$  and  $P_y^e$  are respectively proportional to the  $y$  and  $x$  coordinates of the guiding centre.

During interaction with radiation, the conserved quantity is no longer the electron momentum  $P_e$ , but the total electron and radiation field momentum  $\mathbf{\Pi} = \mathbf{P}_e + \mathbf{P}_\gamma$ . This has been demonstrated explicitly (Avron *et al* 1978). Ignoring  $\Pi_z$  and dropping the suffix  $\gamma$  for radiation, we may write down the components of  $\mathbf{\Pi}$  as

$$\Pi_x = m\omega_c y_0 + P_x, \quad \Pi_y = -m\omega_c x_0 + P_y. \quad (7)$$

For the purpose of the present paper it is important to enter cylindrical geometry and construct the following quantity for the electron,

$$r_0^2 = x_0^2 + y_0^2 = (m\omega_c)^{-2}[\Pi^2 - 2(\Pi_x P_x + \Pi_y P_y) + P^2] \quad (8)$$

where  $\Pi^2 = \Pi_x^2 + \Pi_y^2$  etc. We now take time derivatives of (7) and (8) to yield

$$\frac{dy_0}{dt} = -\frac{1}{m\omega_c} \frac{dP_x}{dt}, \quad \frac{dx_0}{dt} = \frac{1}{m\omega_c} \frac{dP_y}{dt}, \quad (9a)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} r_0^2 = (m\omega_c)^{-2} \left[ \frac{d}{dt} P^2 - 2 \left( \Pi_x \frac{dP_x}{dt} + \Pi_y \frac{dP_y}{dt} \right) \right]. \quad (9b)$$

Now we interpret (9) physically.  $dP_x/dt$  and  $dP_y/dt$  are respectively the rates in which  $x$  and  $y$  momentum are carried away by the radiation. Owing to azimuthal symmetry, such quantities must be zero (as will be justified in the appendix). However,  $(dP^2/dt)$  is the rate in which radial ( $\rho$ ) momentum is dissipated. That is, in general, finite.

Thus we have from (9b)

$$dr_0^2/dt = (m\omega_c)^{-2} dP^2/dt. \quad (10)$$

Demonstration of the finiteness of  $(dP^2/dt)$  will also be given in the appendix. But the crucial point is to realise that (10) implies an 'outward drift' of the guiding centre, and is *fundamentally incompatible* with (6).

Within the scope of current knowledge there appears no simple way of resolving the paradox.

Part of the work was done while RL and AJE were at the Blackett Laboratory, Imperial College, London. We thank Professor T W B Kibble FRS, and Drs N Rivier, J J Quenby and G Wunner for helpful discussions. The work was supported by NSERC (Ottawa) grants 69-0366 to D Leahy and 69-1565 to Professor D Venkatesan.

### Appendix

The linear momentum terms  $dP_x/dt$ ,  $dP_y/dt$  and  $dP^2/dt$  of the radiation may be calculated directly from the Maxwell stress tensor (see Jackson 1975, p 239). A simpler way of arriving at the main conclusions in the text is to start from the known formula of the energy radiated in a given harmonic  $m$ , per unit solid angle and per unit time (Bekefi 1966)

$$j(\omega, \theta) = (e^2\omega^2/8\pi^2\epsilon_0c)[\cot^2\theta J_m^2(m\beta\sin\theta) + \beta^2 J_m'^2(m\beta\sin\theta)]$$

where  $\beta = v/c$  and  $v$  is the (transverse) velocity of the electron,  $\theta$  is the pitch angle of radiation propagation, and  $\omega = m\omega_c$ . Multiplication of  $j(\omega, \theta)$  by  $(1/c)\sin\theta\cos\phi$ ,  $(1/c)\sin\theta\sin\phi$ , followed by integration over  $d\Omega = \sin\theta d\theta d\phi$  and summation over all harmonics, gives respectively the expressions  $dP_x/dt$  and  $dP_y/dt$ , namely

$$\frac{dP_x}{dt} = \frac{e^2}{8\pi^2\epsilon_0c^2} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \omega^2 \int d\theta d\phi [\cos^2\theta \cos\phi J_m^2(m\beta\sin\theta) + \beta^2 \sin^2\theta \cos\phi J_m'^2(m\beta\sin\theta)],$$

$$\frac{dP_y}{dt} = \frac{e^2}{8\pi^2\epsilon_0c^2} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \omega^2 \int d\theta d\phi [\cos^2\theta \sin\phi J_m^2(m\beta\sin\theta) + \beta^2 \sin^2\theta \sin\phi J_m'^2(m\beta\sin\theta)].$$

The  $\phi$  integration reveals immediately that  $dP_x/dt = dP_y/dt = 0$ . Concerning the finiteness of  $dP^2/dt$ , it is sufficient to show that  $dP/dt \neq 0$ . The latter is obtained from the multiplication of  $j(\omega, \theta)$  and  $(1/c)\sin\theta$ , and summing over solid angle and cyclotron harmonics as before:

$$\frac{dP}{dt} = \frac{e^2}{4\pi\epsilon_0c^2} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \omega^2 \int_0^\pi d\theta [\cos^2\theta J_m^2(m\beta\sin\theta) + \beta^2 \sin^2\theta J_m'^2(m\beta\sin\theta)].$$

We will not proceed to complete the calculation because it appears sufficiently evident that  $dP/dt$  is positive definite, as expected in the text.

**References**

- Avron J E, Herbst J W and Simon B 1978 *Ann. Phys.* **114** 431  
Bekefi G 1966 *Radiation Processes in Plasmas* (New York: Wiley) p 180  
Herold H, Ruder H and Wunner G 1981 *J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Phys.* **14** 751  
Jackson J D 1975 *Classical Electrodynamics* (New York: Wiley) p 750  
Johnson M H and Lippmann B A 1949 *Phys. Rev.* **76** 828  
Lieu R 1980 *Astrophys. Space Sci.* **73** 481