

O(3) INVARIANCE OF THE AHARONOV BOHM EFFECT

by

Petar K. Anastasovski¹, T. E. Bearden², C. Ciubotariu³, W. T. Coffey⁴, L. B. Crowell⁵,
G. J. Evans⁶, M. W. Evans^{7,8}, R. Flower⁹, A. Labounsky¹⁰, B. Lehnert¹¹, M. Mészáros¹²,
P. R. Molnár¹², S. Roy¹³, and J. P. Vigiér¹⁴

Institute for Advanced Study, Alpha Foundation, Institute of Physics,
11 Rutafa Street, Building H, Budapest H-1165, Hungary

Also at:

¹Faculty of Technology and Metallurgy, Department of Physics,
University of Skopje, Republic of Macedonia

²CEO, CTEC Inc., 2311 Big Cove Road, Huntsville, AL 35801-1351.

³Institute for Information Technology, Stuttgart University, Stuttgart, Germany

⁴Department of Microelectronics and Electrical Engineering,
Trinity College, Dublin 2, Ireland.

⁵Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of New Mexico,
Albuquerque, New Mexico

⁶Ceredigion County Council, Aberaeron, Wales, Great Britain

⁷former Edward Davies Chemical Laboratories, University College of Wales,
Aberystwyth SY23 1NE, Wales, Great Britain

⁸sometime JRF, Wolfson College, Oxford, Great Britain

⁹CEO, Applied Science Associates, and Temple University,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA.

¹⁰The Boeing Company, Huntington Beach, California.

¹¹Alfvén Laboratory, Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, S-100 44, Sweden.

¹²Alpha Foundation, Institute of Physics, 11 Rutafa Street, Building H, H-1165, Hungary.

¹³Indian Statistical Institute, Calcutta, India.

¹⁴Labo de Gravitation et Cosmologie Relativistes, Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Tour
22-12, 4 ème étage, BP 142, 4 Place Jussieu, 75252 Paris Cedex 05, France.

KEYWORDS: Aharonov Bohm effect; O(3) invariant electrodynamics

ABSTRACT

It is shown that the Aharonov Bohm effect is not consistently described in the received view. A self-inconsistency is demonstrated in the U(1) gauge theory applied to electrodynamics that is the basis of the effect. A self-consistent description of the effect is suggested using a novel O(3) invariant form of electrodynamics, a form which also reproduces the experimental data available on the effect.

1 INTRODUCTION

The Aharonov Bohm effect[1]-[3] has been frequently discussed in the literature of the past forty years and has been the catalyst for several important developments[4]-[6]. In this paper it is shown that there is a self-inconsistency in the received theoretical view of the effect, which is based on U(1) gauge theory applied to electrodynamics[7]. The inconsistency is discussed in section 2. In section 3 a novel O(3) invariant electrodynamics[8]-[17] is applied in order to remove the self-inconsistency and to achieve agreement with the available experimental data on the effect. The result is conclusive evidence that the Aharonov Bohm effect is O(3) invariant, i.e. stems from an O(3) invariant lagrangian density in electrodynamics. The effect is therefore another piece of evidence in support of the thesis[8]-[17] that electrodynamics is in general an O(3) invariant gauge field theory.

2 INCONSISTENCY IN THE U(1) INVARIANT GAUGE THEORY

In the U(1) invariant electrodynamics[7] which are usually applied to explain the Aharonov Bohm effect, it is convenient to illustrate the self-inconsistency with reference to the experiment where a solenoid is placed between the apertures of a Young interferometer, causing a shift in the interference pattern of matter waves, for example electron waves[7]. It is well known that the magnetic field \mathbf{B} in this case is confined to the solenoid, but that the vector potential \mathbf{A} is non zero outside the solenoid. In the U(1) invariant electrodynamics:

$$\mathbf{B} = \nabla \times \mathbf{A} \tag{1}$$

The received view[7] of the Aharonov Bohm effect proceeds by noting that outside the solenoid:

$$\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{0}; \quad \nabla \times \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{0} \tag{2}$$

so that

$$\mathbf{A} := \nabla \chi \tag{3}$$

The observable phase shift difference for different electron wave paths is therefore given by:

$$\Delta\delta = \frac{e}{\hbar} \oint \nabla\chi \cdot d\mathbf{r} = \frac{e}{\hbar} [\chi]_0^{2\pi} = \frac{e}{\hbar} \int \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S} \quad (4)$$

where χ is a periodic function. However, the received description[7] also uses the result:

$$\Delta\delta = \frac{e}{\hbar} \int \nabla \times \mathbf{A} \cdot d\mathbf{S} = \frac{e}{\hbar} \int \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S} \quad (5)$$

This is clearly self-inconsistent from eqn.(2), which gives the result:

$$\Delta\delta = \frac{e}{\hbar} \int \nabla \times \mathbf{A} \cdot d\mathbf{S} = 0 \quad (6)$$

Barrett[17] has succinctly described this self-inconsistency as being due to the fact that there is no magnetic field present at the point of contact with the electron wave.

3 O(3) INVARIANT DESCRIPTION OF THE AHARONOV BOHM EFFECT

This description is based on the concept of phase factor[15]-[17] and the general theorem[18] that the phase factor is due to parallel transport for any internal gauge field symmetry such as U(1)[7] or O(3)[8]-[17]. The parallel transport occurs in a closed loop and gives the general theorem[14]:

$$\mathbf{g} \oint D_\mu dx^\mu = -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{g} \int [D_\mu, D_\nu] d\sigma^{\mu\nu} \quad (7)$$

where \mathbf{g} is a topological charge and where D_μ is a covariant derivative. In a U(1) invariant electrodynamics eqn.(7) becomes the Stokes Theorem:

$$\oint \mathbf{A} \cdot d\mathbf{r} = \int \nabla \times \mathbf{A} \cdot d\mathbf{S} = \int \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S} \quad (8)$$

which is the basis for the U(1) invariant description of the Aharonov Bohm effect, i.e. eqn.(4).

Recently it has been demonstrated by several authors[8]-[17] that electrodynamics can be O(3) invariant, and that such an electrodynamics has several advantages over the received U(1) invariant version. In the O(3) invariant version there exists an internal gauge space of O(3) symmetry, a space which can be described by the complex basis ((1), (2), (3))[11]-[14]. There occurs[14] an additional O(3) invariant Stokes Theorem:

$$\oint A_Z^{(3)} dZ = \int B_Z^{(3)} dA_r \quad (9)$$

and O(3) invariant phase factor:

$$\exp\left(ig \oint A_Z^{(3)} dZ\right) = \exp\left(ig \int B_Z^{(3)} dAr\right) \quad (10)$$

If $\mathbf{B}^{(3)}$ of the O(3) invariant gauge theory is identified with the magnetic field of the solenoid, then the change in phase difference equivalent to eqn.(4) of the U(1) invariant gauge theory is given in the O(3) invariant gauge theory by;

$$\Delta\delta = \frac{e}{\hbar} \oint \mathbf{A}^{(3)} \cdot d\mathbf{r} = \frac{e}{\hbar} \int \mathbf{B}^{(3)} \cdot d\mathbf{S} \quad (11)$$

An O(3) gauge transformation produces[8]-[17]:

$$\mathbf{A}^{(3)} \rightarrow \mathbf{A}^{(3)} + \frac{1}{g} \frac{\partial\alpha}{\partial Z} \mathbf{e}^{(3)} \quad (12)$$

and

$$\mathbf{B}^{(3)} \rightarrow \mathbf{S} \mathbf{B}^{(3)} \mathbf{S}^{-1} = \mathbf{B}^{(3)} \quad (13)$$

where \mathbf{S} is an exponential operator defined by:

$$\mathbf{S} = \exp\left(iM^a \Lambda^a(x^\mu)\right) \quad (14)$$

where Λ^a are angles and M^a are generators of the O(3) group. In areas outside the solenoid therefore the O(3) invariant Aharonov Bohm effect is given by the observed[7]:

$$\Delta\delta = \frac{e}{\hbar} \int \mathbf{B}^{(3)} \cdot d\mathbf{S} := \frac{e}{\hbar} \Phi \quad (15a)$$

$$\Delta\delta = \frac{e}{\hbar} \frac{1}{g} \oint \frac{\partial\alpha}{\partial Z} \mathbf{e}^{(3)} \cdot d\mathbf{r} \quad (15b)$$

and there is a magnetic field present at the point of contact with the matter wave as required[17]. The term on the right hand side of eqn.(15b) is a physical term because the generator \mathbf{S} consists of physical angles in a physical internal space of O(3) symmetry in the basis ((1), (2), (3))[14]. Therefore an O(3) invariant theory gives a straightforward explanation of the Aharonov Bohm effect whereas the U(1) invariant explanation is self contradictory.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The U. S. Department of Energy is acknowledged for funding in the form of supercomputer time and the website:

<http://www.ott.doe.gov/electromagnetic/>

Various sources of funding for individual member laboratories of AIAS are acknowledged with thanks.

References

- [1] Y. Aharonov and D. Bohm, Phys. Rev., 115, 484 (1959).
- [2] R. G. Chambers, Phys. Rev. Lett., 5, 3 (1960).
- [3] R. P. Feynman, R. B. Leighton and M. Sands, “The Feynman Lectures in Physics”, vol. 2, section 15.5 (Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass., 1964).
- [4] T. T. Wu and C. N. Yang, Phys. Rev. D, 12, 3845 (1975).
- [5] D. Bohm and B. J. Hiley, Il Nuovo Cimento, 52A, 295 (1979).
- [6] L. O’Raighartaigh, Rep. Prog. Phys., 42, 159 (1979).
- [7] L. H. Ryder, “Quantum Field Theory” (Cambridge, 1987, 2nd. Ed.).
- [8] B. Lehnert and S. Roy, “Extended Electromagnetic Theory” (World Scientific, Singapore, 1998).
- [9] M. W. Evans and L. B. Crowell, “Classical and Quantum Electrodynamics and the $\mathbf{B}^{(3)}$ Field” (World Scientific, Singapore, 2000).
- [10] M. W. Evans et al., AIAS Group Papers, Found. Phys. Lett., 12, 187, 579 (1999); L. B. Crowell and M. W. Evans, Found. Phys. Lett., 12, 373, 475 (1999); L. B. Crowell et al., AIAS Group paper, Found. Phys. Lett., in press (2000); M. W. Evans et al., Found. Phys. Lett. and Found. Phys., in press (2000).
- [11] M. W. Evans et al., AIAS Group papers, Phys. Scripta, 61, 79, 287 (2000); in press (2000).
- [12] M. W. Evans et al., AIAS Group paper Optik, 111, 53 (2000).
- [13] Special Issue of J. New Energy (2000).
- [14] M. W. Evans (ed.), “Contemporary Optics and Electrodynamics” a special topical issue in three parts of I. Prigogine and S. A. Rice (series eds.), “Advances in Chemical Physics” (Wiley, New York, 2001, in prep.), vol. 114, second edition of M. W. Evans and S. Kielich (eds.), “Modern Nonlinear Optics”, a special topical issue in three parts of I. Prigogine and S. A. Rice (series eds.), “Advances in Chemical Physics” (Wiley, New York, 1992, 1993, 1997 (softback)), vol. 85.
- [15] T. W. Barrett in A. Lakhtakia (ed.), “Essays on the Formal Aspects of Electromagnetic Theory” (World Scientific Singapore, 1993).
- [16] T. W. Barrett and D. M. Grimes (eds.), “Advanced Electromagnetism” (World Scientific, Singapore, 1995).
- [17] T. W. Barrett in M. W. Evans (ed.), “Apeiron”, 7, 3 (2000).
- [18] B. Simon, Phys. Rev. Lett., 51, 2167 (1983).