



Barnett, S.M. (2013) Comment on “Trouble with the Lorentz Law of Force: Incompatibility with Special Relativity and Momentum Conservation”.  
Physical Review Letters, 110 (8). 089402. ISSN 0031-9007

Copyright © 2013 American Physical Society.

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge

The content must not be changed in any way or reproduced in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holder(s)

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details must be given

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/89039/>

Deposited on: 10 Jan 2014

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of Glasgow  
<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

**Comment on “Trouble with the Lorentz law of force: Incompatibility with special relativity and momentum conservation.”**

The recent claim that the Lorentz law of force is incompatible with the requirements of special relativity [1], essentially that the Lorentz force law is incompatible with the Lorentz transformations, was based on treating only the spatial part of the Lorentz force. Including the rates of change for both the energy and the momentum restores compatibility. We work throughout in the natural system of units:  $\epsilon_0$ ,  $\mu_0$  and  $c$  are all set equal to unity.

We first review, briefly, the argument given in [1]. The Lorentz force law describes the force exerted by the electric and magnetic fields on charges and currents. Expressed as a force density it becomes

$$\mathbf{F} = \rho\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{J} \times \mathbf{B}. \quad (1)$$

The objection under consideration deals with the action of a charge on a magnetic dipole. We were asked to restrict our attention to bound charges so as to rewrite the force density in terms of the polarization and magnetisation:

$$\mathbf{F} = -(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{P})\mathbf{E} + (\dot{\mathbf{P}} + \nabla \times \mathbf{M}) \times \mathbf{B}. \quad (2)$$

Consider a charge  $q$  at the origin of a primed coordinate system and a magnetic dipole oriented in the  $x'$  direction placed a distance  $d$  from the charge along the  $z'$  axis. Naturally, the charge exerts neither a force nor a torque on the dipole in this frame, as may readily be verified using the magnetization

$$\mathbf{M} = m_0 \hat{\mathbf{x}}' \delta(x') \delta(y') \delta(z' - d) \quad (3)$$

and the force density (1). Consider now the situation as viewed from an unprimed frame in which the charge and the dipole are moving at speed  $V$  in the positive  $z$  direction. In this frame the charge is moving and so produces a magnetic field. The moving magnetic dipole, moreover, acquires some electric dipole character by virtue of its motion. It follows, therefore, that the force given in Eq. (2) will include electric and magnetic fields and also both a magnetization and a polarization centered on the magnetic dipole. The net force exerted by the charge on the dipole remains zero but there is a torque,  $\mathbf{T} = (Vqm_0/4\pi d^2)\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ , suggesting that the charge coerces the dipole to spin about its axis and, moreover, that the torque inducing this is proportional to the velocity at which the charge and the dipole are seen to be moving. Were this to induce a rotation of the dipole then there would indeed be a conflict between the Lorentz force law and special relativity.

The problem with this analysis is that the Lorentz force law is not a three-vector but a *four-vector* [2]. The time-component of this is  $\mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E}$ , which gives the rate of change

of the dipole’s energy. The integral of  $\mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E}$  over space is zero and there is no net transfer of energy just as there is no net force. If we consider the torque, however, then the  $\mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E}$  term produces a change to the moment of inertia of the dipole, just as the force density (1) contributes to the torque. When combined, these two effects result in an angular acceleration:

$$\mathbf{a}_{\text{angular}} = \frac{1}{I} \int d^3r \mathbf{r} \times [\rho\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{J} \times \mathbf{B} - \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E})], \quad (4)$$

where  $I$  is the moment of inertia of the dipole. For the situation just described, this angular acceleration is *zero* as expected.

The  $-\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E})$  term in (4) is reminiscent of that found when calculating the acceleration of a particle with charge  $Q$  and rest-mass  $m$ , moving with velocity  $\mathbf{v}$  [3]:

$$\mathbf{a} = \frac{Q}{m\gamma} [\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B} - \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{E})], \quad (5)$$

where  $\gamma = (1 - v^2)^{-1/2}$  is the usual Lorentz factor. We can associate the additional,  $\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{E}$ , term with the change in energy of the particle caused by its change in speed. In Mansuripur’s magnetic-dipole thought experiment there is no change in the velocity of the dipole because there is no net force acting on it, but there is a change in the moment of inertia and this balances exactly the torque derived from (1). This effect is simply the angular analog of Mansuripur’s own argument for resolving the apparent conflict with relativity for the force on a current carrying wire [1].

Finally, we note that there are related treatments in the literature [4].

I am grateful to Colin Baxter and Alison Yao for helpful comments and to Masud Mansuripur for helpful discussions. This work was supported by the UK EPSRC, the Royal Society and the Wolfson Foundation.

Stephen M. Barnett

Department of Physics, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow G4 0NG, UK.

- 
- [1] M. Mansuripur, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 193901 (2012).  
[2] W. Rindler, *Essential Relativity* 2nd ed. (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1977).  
[3] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *The Classical Theory of Fields* 4th ed. (Butterworth Heinemann, Oxford, 1973).  
[4] D. Bedford and P. Krumm, *Am. J. Phys.* **54**, 1036 (1986); V. Namias, *Am. J. Phys.* **57**, 171 (1989); L. Vaidman, *Am. J. Phys.* **58**, 978 (1990); G. Spavieri, *Found. Phys. Lett.* **3**, 291 (1990); D. J. Griffiths and V. Hnizdo, arXiv: 1205.4646; K. A. Milton and G. Meille, arXiv: 1208.4826. I am grateful to all those who kindly brought these to my attention.