

# Conservation of Momentum and Energy in the Lorentz-Abraham-Dirac Equation of Motion

Arthur D. Yaghjian

*Electromagnetics Research, Concord, MA 01742, USA (a.yaghjian@comcast.net)*

## Abstract

After a brief review of the modified causal Lorentz-Abraham classical equation of motion for an extended charged sphere and its limit to the mass-renormalized modified causal Lorentz-Abraham-Dirac equation of motion as the radius of the charged sphere approaches zero, a streamlined derivation is given for the conditions on the external force required for these modified equations of motion to satisfy conservation of momentum and energy.

## Index Terms

Causality, charged sphere, LAD equation of motion, LA equation of motion, momentum-energy conservation.

## I. INTRODUCTION

In the book titled “Relativistic Dynamics of a Charged Sphere” with subtitle “Updating the Lorentz-Abraham Model” [1], the equation of motion of the classical model of a relativistically rigid surface-charged spherical insulator of radius  $a$  and total charge  $e$  is rigorously derived from Maxwell’s equations, the relativistic generalization of Newton’s second law of motion, and Einstein’s mass-energy relation. The derivation takes into account that the Lorentz-Abraham power-series for the electromagnetic self-force is not valid for the time durations  $\Delta t_a = O(a/c)$  after nonanalytic points in time of the velocity of the charged sphere, such as when the external force is first applied and terminated. These transition time intervals are approximately equal to the time  $2a/c$  that it takes light to traverse the diameter of the rest-frame sphere (with  $c$  the free-space speed of light). Although the fields and self-force cannot be evaluated in detail during these transition time intervals because the precise equation of motion is unknown during the transition intervals, there are transition forces during (and only during) the transition intervals that maintain causality of the resulting equation of motion.

Thus, under the condition that the charged sphere is relativistically (Born) rigid (remains a sphere in every instantaneous rest frame), which implies that the change in the magnitude of the three-vector velocity  $|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^0|$  across the  $n$ th transition interval in the rest frame (denoted by superscript  $0$ ) that starts at its nonanalytic point in time  $t_n$  satisfies the inequality [1, eq. (8.273)]

$$\frac{|\Delta \mathbf{u}_n^0|}{c} < \alpha_n^0 \quad (1)$$

with the positive constant  $\alpha_n^0 \ll 1$ , the extended charge has a causal relativistically covariant equation of motion given in four-vector form as [1, eq. (8.270)]

$$F_{\text{ext}}^i + f_a^i = (m_{\text{es}} + m_{\text{ins}})c^2 \frac{du^i}{ds} - \frac{e^2}{6\pi\epsilon_0} \left( \frac{d^2 u^i}{ds^2} + u^i \frac{du_j}{ds} \frac{du^j}{ds} \right) + O(a). \quad (2)$$

The  $m_{\text{es}} = e^2/(8\pi\epsilon_0 ac^2)$  and  $m_{\text{ins}}$  are the electrostatic mass of the charge and the mass of the spherical insulator, respectively,  $u^i(t)$  is the four-velocity of the center of the sphere,  $ds$  is the differential space-time interval, and  $\epsilon_0$  is the free-space permittivity.  $F_{\text{ext}}^i(t)$  is the four-vector total external force applied to the charged sphere, and  $f_a^i(t) = \sum_{n=1}^N f_{an}^i(t)$  is the sum of the four-vector effective transition forces in the  $N$  transition intervals with  $f_a^i(t)$  zero outside of the transition intervals. ( $N = 2$  for an external force that is analytic in time except for when it turns on and off.) The modified Lorentz-Abraham (LA) equation of motion in (2) is derived in [1, sec. 8.3].

The  $O(a)$  in (2) denotes order- $a$  terms in the forces that approach zero as  $a$  approaches zero. However, there is a problem with letting the radius  $a$  of the charged sphere approach zero, namely the electrostatic mass  $m_{\text{es}}$  in (2) increases without bound as  $a \rightarrow 0$ , a result that doesn’t correspond to the finite mass of a fundamental point (or extremely small) particle like the electron. A fairly obvious way around this undesirable unbounded electrostatic mass is to assume, as Dirac does [2], that a fundamental particle like the electron is more complicated than the classical model of a charged insulator and simply renormalize the mass ( $m_{\text{es}} + m_{\text{ins}}$ ) to a fixed finite value  $m$  equal to the measured rest mass of the fundamental particle (such as the electron) as  $a$  is allowed to approach zero. Then the  $O(a)$  terms in (2) vanish and this modified Lorentz-Abraham equation of motion becomes equal to the modified Lorentz-Abraham-Dirac (LAD) equation of motion [1, eq. (8.274)]

$$F_{\text{ext}}^i + f_a^i = mc^2 \frac{du^i}{ds} - \frac{e^2}{6\pi\epsilon_0} \left( \frac{d^2 u^i}{ds^2} + u^i \frac{du_j}{ds} \frac{du^j}{ds} \right). \quad (3)$$

The relativistic (Born) rigidity condition in (1) is still required for the validity of this modified LAD equation of motion in (3).

It is shown that the transition forces  $f_a^i$  in (3) do not approach zero as  $a \rightarrow 0$  but are equal to (for rectilinear motion in the  $n$ th transition interval) [1, eq. (8.67)]

$$\frac{f_{an}(\tau)}{m} = [\Delta\mathcal{V}_n - \tau_e \Delta\mathcal{V}'_n] \delta(\tau - \tau_{n+}) - \tau_e \Delta\mathcal{V}_n \delta'(\tau - \tau_{n+}) \quad (4)$$

which, along with the requirement for causality [1, eq. (8.60)]

$$\int_0^{\Delta t_a} f_{an}(\tau + \tau_n) \exp^{-\tau/\tau_e} d\tau = - \int_0^{\infty} [F_n(\tau + \tau_n) - F_{n-1}(\tau + \tau_n)] \exp^{-\tau/\tau_e} d\tau \quad (5a)$$

implies the asymptotic relation

$$\Delta\mathcal{V}_n = O(\tau_e^2) \quad (5b)$$

where  $\tau = s/c$  is the proper time,  $\mathcal{V}_n$  is the proper velocity (rapidity) [ $u_n/c = \tanh(\mathcal{V}_n/c)$ ],  $\tau_e = e^2/(6\pi\epsilon_0 mc^3)$ , and  $\tau_{n+}$  is the proper time an infinitesimal time after the beginning  $\tau_n$  of the  $n$ th transition interval. The prime indicates the proper time derivative.  $F_n(\tau)$  is the external force analytically continued from  $\tau_n < \tau < \tau_{n+1}$ . The jump in the proper acceleration  $\Delta\mathcal{V}'_n$  across the transition interval, which is given explicitly in [1, eq. (8.72a)] in terms of the externally applied force on either side of the  $n$ th transition interval, can be shown to behave asymptotically as

$$\Delta\mathcal{V}'_n = O(\tau_e). \quad (6)$$

The jump  $\Delta\mathcal{V}_n$  in rapidity, given from (4) as  $\Delta\mathcal{V}_n = (1/m) \int_{\Delta\tau_n} f_{an}(\tau) d\tau + \tau_e \Delta\mathcal{V}'_n$ , remains an unknown because  $f_{an}$  is unknown even though  $\Delta\mathcal{V}'_n$  is given in terms of the applied external force on either side of the  $n$ th transition interval. Choosing  $\Delta\mathcal{V}_n = 0$  leaves only the delta function in (4) and makes the velocity function continuous. Choosing  $\Delta\mathcal{V}_n = \tau_e \Delta\mathcal{V}'_n$  leaves only the doublet function in (4). *Note from (5b) and (6) that the jump in proper velocity is order  $a^2$ , that is,  $\Delta\mathcal{V}_n = O(a^2)$ , and the jump in proper acceleration  $\Delta\mathcal{V}'_n = O(a)$ , if, as in (2), the mass is not renormalized so that  $m = O(1/a)$  and  $\tau_e = O(a)$ .*

The delta and doublet functions in (4) allow the transition force to change drastically over its transition interval. Such dramatic changes are compatible with the contributions from the self-force integral in [1, eq. (8.32)] when the velocity and its time derivatives are changing rapidly during the transition intervals following nonanalytic points in time of the externally applied force. *Moreover, the transition forces must be allowed to change rapidly in order to compensate for the same form of the equation of motion on the right-hand sides of (2) and (3) (with its first and second time derivatives of velocity) being used within the transition intervals as outside the transition intervals.*

Despite the attractive features of the modified LAD equation of motion in (3), its validity requires, in addition to the Born rigidity condition in (1), the inequality

$$\frac{\tau_e |\Delta\mathbf{F}_{\text{ext}}^n|}{mc} \ll 1 \quad (7)$$

where the three-vector proper-frame difference force  $\Delta\mathbf{F}_{\text{ext}}^n$  is closely related to the change in the external force on either side of the  $n$ th transition interval and given explicitly in [1, eq. (8.73)] for rectilinear motion. We prove this required inequality in the next section, which is a streamlined version of [1, secs. 8.3.5 and 8.3.6].

## II. CONSERVATION OF MOMENTUM-ENERGY IN THE CAUSAL EQUATION OF MOTION

The transition forces  $f_a^i(t) = \sum_{n=1}^N f_{an}^i(t)$  ensure that the solution to the modified equation of motion in (2) obeys causality while allowing the solution to remain free of pre-acceleration/deceleration. However, these transition forces can change the momentum and energy of the charged particle. In particular, consider the modified LA force and power equations of rectilinear motion obtained from (2), namely

$$\frac{F_{\text{ext}}(t) + f_a(t)}{m} = \frac{d(\gamma u)}{dt} - \tau_e \left\{ \frac{d}{dt} \left[ \gamma \frac{d}{dt} (\gamma u) \right] - \frac{\gamma^6}{c^2} \dot{u}^2 u \right\} + \frac{O(a)}{m} \quad (8a)$$

$$\frac{[F_{\text{ext}}(t) + f_a(t)]u}{mc^2} = \frac{d\gamma}{dt} - \tau_e \left[ \frac{d}{dt} \left( \gamma \frac{d\gamma}{dt} \right) - \frac{\gamma^6}{c^2} \dot{u}^2 \right] + \frac{O(a)}{mc^2} \quad (8b)$$

where  $u(t)$  is the rectilinear velocity,  $\gamma = (1 - u^2/c^2)^{-1/2}$ ,  $\tau_e = e^2/(6\pi\epsilon_0 mc^3)$ , and  $m = m_{\text{es}} + m_{\text{ins}}$ . If  $m$  is replaced by  $m_{\text{es}}$ , then  $\tau_e = 4a/(3c)$ . The external power  $F_{\text{ext}}u$  in (8b) (supplied to the charged sphere) integrated over any one transition interval gives the change in kinetic energy, plus the change in Schott acceleration energy, plus the integral

$$\int_{t_n}^{t_n + \Delta t_a} \left( \frac{e^2}{6\pi\epsilon_0 c^3} \gamma^6 \dot{u}^2 - f_{an} u \right) dt. \quad (9)$$

Thus, this integral is the irreversible energy radiated across the  $n$ th transition interval.

Letting  $W_{\text{TI},n}$  denote the energy radiated across the  $n$ th transition interval, that is, from  $t = t_n$  to  $t = t_n + \Delta t_a = t_n^+$  as  $a/c$  and thus  $\Delta t_a$  becomes small, we see from (8b) that  $W_{\text{TI},n}$  is given by

$$\frac{W_{\text{TI},n}}{mc^2} = \frac{1}{mc^2} \int_{t_n}^{t_n^+} \left( \frac{e^2}{6\pi\epsilon_0 c^3} \gamma^6 \dot{u}^2 - f_{an} u \right) dt = \tau_e [\gamma(t_n^+) \dot{\gamma}(t_n^+) - \gamma(t_n) \dot{\gamma}(t_n)] - [\gamma(t_n^+) - \gamma(t_n)]. \quad (10)$$

The integral of the external force does not appear in the second equality of (10) because the work done by the finite external force during the transition interval is of  $O(a)$ , which becomes negligible as  $a/c$  and thus  $\Delta t_a$  becomes small. Since the acceleration of the extended charge can contain delta functions in the transition intervals as  $a$  becomes small, the power radiated by the extended charge during the transition intervals is no longer given by just  $[e^2/(6\pi\epsilon_0 c^3)] \gamma^6 \dot{u}^2$  but must include  $f_{an} u$  as well. The right-hand side of the second equality in (10) contains the change in Schott acceleration energy minus the change in kinetic energy across the transition interval.

It is not surprising that the energy radiated during a transition interval involves  $f_{an} u$  because [1, eq. (8.41)] shows that  $f_{an}$  depends on both the external force  $F_{\text{ext}}$  and the acceleration  $\dot{u}$  in the transition interval. Moreover,  $f_{an}$  has to contribute significantly to the equation of motion even as  $a \rightarrow 0$  because it is responsible for maintaining the same form of the right-hand sides of the causal LA and LAD equations of motion in (2) and (3), respectively. In other words, in order to keep the same  $\dot{u}^2$  term on the right-hand side of the rectilinear power equation of motion (8b) during the transition intervals, there has to be an effective transition force  $f_a(t)$  that does work on the charged sphere during the transition intervals and adds a contribution to the  $\dot{u}^2$  power term radiated during the transition intervals.<sup>1</sup>

Noting that  $\dot{\gamma} = \gamma^3 u \dot{u}/c^2$ , the Schott energy in (10) can be rewritten as

$$\tau_e [\gamma(t_n^+) \dot{\gamma}(t_n^+) - \gamma(t_n) \dot{\gamma}(t_n)] = \frac{\tau_e}{c^2} [\gamma^4(t_n^+) u(t_n^+) \dot{u}(t_n^+) - \gamma^4(t_n) u(t_n) \dot{u}(t_n)]. \quad (11)$$

From the relativistic transformation of velocity, we have  $\dot{u} = \gamma^3 \dot{u}^0$ , where  $\dot{u}^0$  is the acceleration in the instantaneous rest frame. Thus, the equation in (11) can be re-expressed as

$$\tau_e [\gamma(t_n^+) \dot{\gamma}(t_n^+) - \gamma(t_n) \dot{\gamma}(t_n)] = \frac{\tau_e}{c^2} [\gamma(t_n^+) u(t_n^+) \dot{u}^0(t_n^+) - \gamma(t_n) u(t_n) \dot{u}^0(t_n)]. \quad (12)$$

As explained in [1] and proven in [5], relativistic (Born) rigidity requires that in order to characterize the motion of the charge that remains spherical in its instantaneous rest frame in terms of its center velocity, and for the validity of the equations essential in the derivation of the LA equation of motion, the inequality for the three-vector acceleration

$$|\dot{\mathbf{u}}(t)| \ll \frac{c^2}{a}, \quad \text{for all } t \quad (13)$$

must be satisfied in the instantaneous rest frame of the charged sphere. Applied to  $\dot{u}_n^0$ , the rest-frame acceleration in the  $n$ th transition interval for rectilinear motion, (13) becomes

$$|\dot{u}_n^0(t)| \ll \frac{c^2}{a}, \quad \text{for all } t. \quad (14)$$

When (14) is integrated over the transition interval  $\Delta t_a \approx \tau_e = 4a/(3c)$ , one obtains

$$\frac{1}{c} \int_{t_n}^{t_n + \tau_e} |\dot{u}_n^0(t)| dt \ll 1 \quad (15a)$$

which implies

$$\left| \frac{1}{c} \int_{t_n}^{t_n + \tau_e} \dot{u}_n^0(t) dt \right| = \frac{|\Delta u_n^0|}{c} \ll 1 \quad (15b)$$

<sup>1</sup>If the mass is not renormalized as  $a \rightarrow 0$  so that  $m \rightarrow \infty$  as  $1/a$  and  $\tau_e \rightarrow 0$  as  $a$ , (5b) and (6) show that  $\Delta \mathcal{V}_n = O(a^2)$  and  $\Delta \mathcal{V}'_n = O(a)$ . Thus the  $\dot{u}^2$ -term energy radiated across the transition interval as determined by the Liénard-Wiechert fields applied to the extended charged sphere can be shown to approach zero as  $a \rightarrow 0$ . Similarly, the energy radiated by the  $f_{an} u$  term approaches zero as  $a \rightarrow 0$ . However, if the mass is renormalized to a finite value  $m$ , the equation of motion allows a finite jump in velocity in (5b) across a limitingly short transition interval. Such a jump in velocity means that the acceleration will contain a delta function  $\Delta \mathcal{V}_n \delta(t)$ . A naive application of the point-charge Liénard-Wiechert potentials containing only the  $\dot{u}^2$  term would then predict infinite-energy  $[\Delta \mathcal{V}_n^2 \int \delta^2(t) dt = \infty]$  radiation fields. This infinite energy would require an infinite external force applied to the point charge. Both these unphysical results have been avoided by applying the Liénard-Wiechert fields to a classically realistic extended charged sphere of radius  $a$  to obtain the radiation force, then modifying the resulting power series in  $a$  with transition forces where the power series become invalid after nonanalytic points in time of the applied external field, and finally letting  $a \rightarrow 0$  while renormalizing the mass to a finite value. Such a procedure leads to the energy in (9)-(10) radiated across a transition interval. Even as  $a \rightarrow 0$  and  $\dot{u}$  approaches a delta function, this energy radiated by a mass renormalized charged sphere as its radius approaches zero remains finite. That is, the renormalization from an infinite mass to a finite mass also changes the fields and power radiated across the transition intervals so that during the transition intervals they are not given by the textbook Liénard-Wiechert fields and power of a point charge. Exactly how the fields and power radiated during the transition intervals of the mass-renormalized point charge are generated remains uncertain even though the total energy radiated during the transition intervals is known and given by (9)-(10) for rectilinear motion. This uncertainty during the transition intervals is largely a consequence of mass renormalization, which is an ad hoc revision of the classical equation of motion that does not derive from the fundamental classical physics of Maxwell's equations, Newton's relativistic laws of motion, and the Einstein mass-energy relation; see Section III.

since  $|\Delta u_n^0| = |\int_{t_n}^{t_n+\tau_e} \dot{u}_n^0(t) dt| \leq \int_{t_n}^{t_n+\tau_e} |\dot{u}_n^0(t)| dt$ , where  $\Delta u_n^0$  is the change in velocity of the center of the charged sphere across the transition interval in the initial rest frame of the sphere. (Since  $|\Delta u_n^0|/c \ll 1$ , the inequality in (15b) holds for any rest frame chosen within the transition interval.) Also, (15b), which is stated for a general direction in (1), is a required condition for the validity of the LA equation of motion modified by the transition forces even as  $a \rightarrow 0$ .

Writing  $\gamma(t_n^+)u(t_n^+) = \gamma(t_n)u(t_n) + \Delta(\gamma u)_n$ , where  $\Delta(\gamma u)_n$  is the change in  $\gamma u$  across the  $n$ th transition interval, (12) becomes

$$\tau_e[\gamma(t_n^+)\dot{\gamma}(t_n^+) - \gamma(t_n)\dot{\gamma}(t_n)] = \frac{\tau_e}{c^2}[\gamma(t_n)u(t_n)\Delta\dot{u}_n^0 + \Delta(\gamma u)_n\dot{u}^0(t_n^+)] \quad (16)$$

with  $\Delta\dot{u}_n^0$  denoting the change in the proper-frame acceleration across the  $n$ th transition interval.

Similarly, writing  $u(t_n^+) = u(t_n) + \Delta u_n$ , where  $\Delta u_n$  is the change in  $u$  across the  $n$ th transition interval, allows  $\gamma(t_n^+)$  to be expanded as

$$\gamma(t_n^+) = \frac{1}{[1 - \frac{(u(t_n) + \Delta u_n)^2}{c^2}]^{\frac{1}{2}}} = \gamma(t_n)[1 + u(t_n)\gamma^2(t_n)\Delta u_n/c^2 + O(\gamma^2 u \Delta u_n/c^2)^2]. \quad (17)$$

From the Lorentz transformation of velocities [6, sec. 11.4] (or simply from  $\dot{u}^0 = \gamma^3 \dot{u}$  and the time dilation  $\Delta t = \gamma \Delta t^0$ ), it can be shown that  $\Delta u_n^0/c = \gamma^2(t_n)\Delta u_n/c + O(\Delta u_n^0/c)^2$ , where, as defined above,  $\Delta u_n^0$  is the rest-frame change in the velocity across the  $n$ th transition interval. Therefore,  $\gamma(t_n^+)$  in (17) can be recast as

$$\gamma(t_n^+) = \gamma(t_n)[1 + u(t_n)\Delta u_n^0/c^2 + O(\Delta u_n^0/c)^2] \quad (18)$$

and we have

$$\gamma(t_n) - \gamma(t_n^+) = -\gamma(t_n)[u(t_n)\Delta u_n^0/c^2 + O(\Delta u_n^0/c)^2]. \quad (19)$$

The addition of (19) and (16) inserted into (10) yields the energy radiated across the  $n$ th transition interval as

$$\frac{W_{\text{TI},n}}{mc^2} = \frac{1}{c^2} \{ \gamma(t_n)u(t_n)[\tau_e\Delta\dot{u}_n^0 - \Delta u_n^0] + \tau_e\Delta(\gamma u)_n\dot{u}^0(t_n^+) \} + \gamma(t_n)O(\Delta u_n^0/c)^2. \quad (20)$$

Expanding  $\Delta(\gamma u)_n$  for  $\Delta u_n^0/c \ll 1$  (as required by Born rigidity in (15b)) shows that

$$\Delta(\gamma u)_n = \gamma(t_n)\Delta u_n^0 [1 + O(\Delta u_n^0/c)] . \quad (21)$$

With this substitution, and writing  $\dot{u}^0(t_n^+) = \dot{u}^0(t_n) + \Delta\dot{u}_n^0$ , (20) becomes

$$\frac{W_{\text{TI},n}}{mc^2} = \gamma(t_n) \left[ \frac{u(t_n)}{c} \left( \tau_e \frac{\Delta\dot{u}_n^0}{c} - \frac{\Delta u_n^0}{c} \right) + \tau_e \frac{\Delta u_n^0}{c} \left( \frac{\dot{u}_n^0}{c} + \frac{\Delta\dot{u}_n^0}{c} \right) + O\left(\frac{\Delta u_n^0}{c}\right)^2 \right]. \quad (22)$$

If we choose  $\Delta u_n^0$  (the rest-frame change in velocity of the center of the charged sphere across the transition interval) as

$$\Delta u_n^0/c = \tau_e \Delta\dot{u}_n^0/c + \alpha \quad (23)$$

that is, approximately equal to  $\tau_e$  times the change in the proper-frame acceleration across the transition interval, where  $\alpha = o(\Delta u_n^0/c)$  denotes a quantity that approaches zero faster than  $\Delta u_n^0/c$ , then

$$\frac{W_{\text{TI},n}}{mc^2} = \gamma(t_n) \left[ \tau_e \frac{\dot{u}^0(t_n)}{c} \frac{\Delta u_n^0}{c} - \alpha \left( \frac{u(t_n)}{c} + \frac{\Delta u_n^0}{c} \right) + O\left(\frac{\Delta u_n^0}{c}\right)^2 \right]. \quad (24)$$

From (14), we have that  $\tau_e|\dot{u}^0(t_n)|/c \ll 1$ . Thus,  $\alpha = o(\Delta u_n^0/c)$  can be chosen to make  $0 \leq W_{\text{TI},n}/(mc^2) \ll 1$ . Moreover, it follows from (22) and (23) that with

$$\Delta u_n^0/c = \tau_e \Delta\dot{u}_n^0/c + o(\Delta u_n^0/c) \approx \tau_e \Delta\dot{u}_n^0/c \quad (25)$$

then

$$\frac{W_{\text{TI},n}}{mc^2} = \gamma(t_n) \{ u(t_n) [\tau_e \Delta\dot{u}_n^0 - \Delta u_n^0] / c^2 + o(\Delta u_n^0/c) \} \approx \gamma(t_n)u(t_n) [\tau_e \Delta\dot{u}_n^0 - \Delta u_n^0] / c^2 \quad (26)$$

that is,  $\Delta u_n^0/c = \tau_e \Delta\dot{u}_n^0/c$  makes  $W_{\text{TI},n}/(mc^2) \approx 0$  and there may exist an  $o(\Delta u_n^0/c)$  in (25) that makes  $W_{\text{TI},n}/(mc^2) = 0$  in (26). In fact, it can be shown from (35)-below that there are  $\Delta u_n^0/c \ll 1$  for  $\tau_e \Delta\dot{u}_n^0/c \ll 1$  that give exactly zero radiated energy across the transition intervals of a charge moving through a charged parallel-plate capacitor. However, this exactly zero radiated transition energy does not have an associated radiated momentum in (36)-below that is zero (for a finite mass-renormalized  $m$ ), as Maxwell's equations require for source-free radiation fields. *Of course, if the mass  $m$  is not renormalized to a finite value but goes as  $1/a$  as  $a \rightarrow 0$ , then  $\Delta\dot{u}_n^0 \sim O(a)$ ,  $\Delta u_n^0/c \sim O(a^2)$ , and both  $W_{\text{TI},n}$  and  $G_{\text{TI},n}$  approach zero as  $a \rightarrow 0$ .*

We see from (15b) that relativistic (Born) rigidity for the spherical charge in the derivation of the Lorentz-Abraham equation of motion requires that  $|\Delta u_n^0|/c \ll 1$ . Thus, the energy equation in (26) reveals that if  $\tau_e|\Delta\dot{u}_n^0|/c \ll 1$  and  $u\Delta\dot{u}_n^0$  has a negative value, no value of  $|\Delta u_n^0|/c \ll 1$  may allow a non-negative value for the radiated energy  $W_{\text{TI},n}$ . In other words, the

general requirement of a non-negative radiated energy across the transition intervals, along with the Born rigidity requirement of  $|\Delta u_n^0|/c \ll 1$ , imply that the rest-frame acceleration jumps across the transition intervals satisfy the inequality

$$\frac{\tau_e |\Delta \dot{u}_n^0|}{c} \ll 1 \quad (27)$$

which, for  $\tau_e = 4a/(3c)$ , also follows from the primary Born rigidity inequality in (13)-(14). The inequality in (27) is equivalent to the following inequality on the externally applied proper-frame force difference

$$\frac{\tau_e |\Delta F_{\text{ext}}^n|}{mc} \ll 1 \quad (28)$$

where, as mentioned in connection with (7),  $\Delta F_{\text{ext}}^n$  is closely related to the change in the external force on either side of the  $n$ th transition interval and given explicitly in [1, eq. (8.73)]. The equivalent inequalities in (27) and (28) do not imply the relativistic (Born) rigidity inequalities in (13)-(15) but (27)-(28) are implied by the inequality in [1, eq. (8.24b)] that requires

$$\frac{a |\dot{u}^0|}{c^2} \ll 1 \quad (29)$$

in every rest frame outside the transition intervals in order for the  $O(a)$  terms in the LA equation of motion to be negligible.

We note that if the radius  $a$  of the charged sphere is allowed to approach zero, then the inequality in (29), which comes from [1, eq. (8.24b)], is always satisfied, whereas, if the mass is renormalized to a finite fixed value  $m$ , the inequalities in (27)-(28) remain necessary (to maintain non-negative radiated energy under relativistic (Born) rigidity,  $|\Delta u_n^0|/c \ll 1$ ) because  $\tau_e = e^2/(6\pi\epsilon_0 mc^3)$  in these inequalities remains nonzero for a fixed renormalized mass  $m$ . This remaining restriction for the mass-renormalized modified (Lorentz-Abraham-Dirac) equation of motion is discussed further in Section III.

If the Born rigidity condition ( $|\Delta u_n^0|/c \ll 1$ ) were not required, then the restrictions on acceleration and force changes in (27)-(28) across the transition intervals would also not be required as  $a \rightarrow 0$  and the mass is renormalized. However, there appears to be no adequate alternative to relativistic (Born) rigidity, that is, no reasonable physics to replace the assumption that the moving sphere remains a sphere in every instantaneous rest (proper) frame.

The momentum ( $G_{\text{TI},n}$ ) radiated by the charged particle across the  $n$ th transition interval is determined from (8a) by evaluating the impulse imparted by the external force to the charged sphere across the transition interval and noting that it approaches zero as  $\Delta t_a$  becomes small. We then find

$$\frac{G_{\text{TI},n}}{mc} = \frac{1}{mc} \int_{t_n}^{t_n^+} [m\tau_e \gamma^6 \dot{u}^2 u/c^2 - f_{an}] dt = \frac{\tau_e}{c} \left\{ \gamma(t_n^+) \frac{d}{dt} [\gamma(t_n^+) u(t_n^+)] - \gamma(t_n) \frac{d}{dt} [\gamma(t_n) u(t_n)] \right\} - \frac{1}{c} [\gamma(t_n^+) u(t_n^+) - \gamma(t_n) u(t_n)]. \quad (30)$$

Applying a procedure to the right-hand side of (30) similar to the one applied to  $W_{\text{TI},n}/(mc^2)$ , we find that with  $\Delta u_n^0/c$  in (25)

$$\frac{G_{\text{TI},n}}{mc} = \gamma(t_n) [(\tau_e \Delta \dot{u}_n^0 - \Delta u_n^0)/c + o(\Delta u_n^0/c)] \approx \gamma(t_n) (\tau_e \Delta \dot{u}_n^0 - \Delta u_n^0)/c \quad (31)$$

which confirms that there is a  $\Delta u_n^0/c = \tau_e \Delta \dot{u}_n^0/c + o(\Delta u_n^0/c)$  that will make  $G_{\text{TI},n}/(mc) = 0$ . Although  $\Delta u_n^0/c$  can be chosen to make  $G_{\text{TI},n} = 0$ , as mentioned above, it cannot in general be chosen to make both  $W_{\text{TI},n}$  and  $G_{\text{TI},n}$  equal to zero, if the mass is renormalized to a finite value as  $a \rightarrow 0$ .

Since  $W_{\text{TI},n}$  and  $G_{\text{TI},n}$  are limitingly short pulses of electromagnetic energy and momentum propagating in free space once they are released by the accelerating charge during the transition interval, they are the energy and momentum of source-free electromagnetic fields propagating in free space. Thus,  $(cG_{\text{TI},n}, W_{\text{TI},n})$  is a contravariant four-vector [7, sec. 21-2], with conserved electromagnetic momentum and energy as the source-free fields propagate, that satisfies the Lorentz transformation of momentum-energy [7, p. 315], [8, sec. 2.4]

$$G' = \gamma_v (G - \frac{v}{c^2} W) \quad (32a)$$

$$W' = \gamma_v (W - vG) \quad (32b)$$

where  $\gamma_v = (1 - v^2/c^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  is the velocity of a  $K'$  inertial reference frame with respect to the original laboratory frame  $K$ . Because the exact behaviour of  $f_{an}$  and  $u$  within the transition interval is unknown, we do not know the exact relationship between  $W_{\text{TI},n}$  and  $G_{\text{TI},n}$ . However, since Maxwell's equations require that  $G = 0$  if  $W = 0$  for source-free fields, one can assume a simple linear relationship like

$$W_{\text{TI},n} = u_n^e G_{\text{TI},n} \quad (33a)$$

$$W'_{\text{TI},n} = u_n^{e'} G'_{\text{TI},n} \quad (33b)$$

where  $u_n^e$  and  $u_n^{e'}$  are effective velocities (loosely related to the transition-interval velocities of the charged sphere) in the  $K$  and  $K'$  frames, respectively, such that  $u_n^e$  and  $u_n^{e'}$  obey

$$u_n^{e'} = \frac{u_n^e - v}{1 - \frac{u_n^e v}{c^2}} \quad (34)$$

the Lorentz transformation for velocities [6, sec. 11.4], [8, sec. 1.11].

For the parallel-plate capacitor example of the charged sphere in a uniform electric field  $E_0$  that turns on at time  $t_1$  and off at time  $t_2$  (discussed in [1, sec. 8.3.4]), we have for the energy radiated across each of the two transition intervals

$$\frac{W_{\text{TI},1}}{mc^2} = \frac{1}{mc^2} \int_0^{t_1^+} [m\tau_e \gamma^6 \dot{u}^2 - f_{a1} u] dt = 1 - \cosh\left(\frac{\Delta\mathcal{V}_1}{c}\right) + \frac{eE_0\tau_e}{mc} \sinh\left(\frac{\Delta\mathcal{V}_1}{c}\right) \quad (35a)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{W_{\text{TI},2}}{mc^2} = \frac{1}{mc^2} \int_{t_2}^{t_2^+} [m\tau_e \gamma^6 \dot{u}^2 - f_{a2} u] dt = & \cosh\left(\frac{eE_0\tau_2}{mc} + \frac{\Delta\mathcal{V}_1}{c}\right) - \cosh\left(\frac{eE_0\tau_2}{mc} + \frac{\Delta\mathcal{V}_1}{c} + \frac{\Delta\mathcal{V}_2}{c}\right) \\ & - \frac{eE_0\tau_e}{mc} \sinh\left(\frac{eE_0\tau_2}{mc} + \frac{\Delta\mathcal{V}_1}{c}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (35b)$$

where  $\mathcal{V}'(\tau)$  and  $\mathcal{V}(\tau)$  are the proper acceleration and proper velocity (rapidity), respectively, and the  $\Delta\mathcal{V}_1$  and  $\Delta\mathcal{V}_2$  are the jumps in rapidity across the beginning and end transition intervals.

Similarly, the momentum radiated across the two transition intervals for the parallel-plate capacitor problem is given by

$$\frac{G_{\text{TI},1}}{mc} = \frac{1}{mc} \int_{t_1}^{t_1^+} [m\tau_e \gamma^6 \dot{u}^2 u/c^2 - f_{an}] dt = -\sinh\left(\frac{\Delta\mathcal{V}_1}{c}\right) + \frac{eE_0\tau_e}{mc} \cosh\left(\frac{\Delta\mathcal{V}_1}{c}\right) \quad (36a)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{G_{\text{TI},2}}{mc} = \frac{1}{mc} \int_{t_2}^{t_2^+} [m\tau_e \gamma^6 \dot{u}^2 u/c^2 - f_{an}] dt = & \sinh\left(\frac{eE_0\tau_2}{mc} + \frac{\Delta\mathcal{V}_1}{c}\right) - \sinh\left(\frac{eE_0\tau_2}{mc} + \frac{\Delta\mathcal{V}_1}{c} + \frac{\Delta\mathcal{V}_2}{c}\right) \\ & - \frac{eE_0\tau_e}{mc} \cosh\left(\frac{eE_0\tau_2}{mc} + \frac{\Delta\mathcal{V}_1}{c}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (36b)$$

Computations show that many  $u_{1,2}^e$  in (33a) can be chosen to keep  $W_{\text{TI},1} \geq 0$  and  $W_{\text{TI},2} \geq 0$  in the parallel-plate capacitor solution in (35) for  $eE_0\tau_e/(mc) \ll 1$  and  $|\Delta\mathcal{V}_{1,2}|/c \ll 1$ . For example, with  $\Delta\mathcal{V}'_{1,2}/c = eE_0/(mc)$ , the choices  $\Delta\mathcal{V}_1/c = eE_0\tau_e/(2mc)$ ,  $\Delta\mathcal{V}_2/c = 1.9eE_0\tau_e/(mc)$ , and  $\tau_2 > 2\tau_e$  give  $u_1^e \ll 1$ ,  $u_2^e \ll 1$ , and  $W_{\text{TI},1,2} > 0$  with  $eE_0\tau_e/(mc) < 0.5$ . The transition forces in (4) are

$$\frac{f_1}{mc} = -\frac{eE_0\tau_e}{2mc} [\delta(\tau - 0^+) + \tau_e \delta'(\tau - 0^+)] \quad (37a)$$

$$\frac{f_2}{mc} = -\frac{eE_0\tau_e}{mc} [0.9\delta(\tau - \tau_2^+) - 1.9\tau_e \delta'(\tau - \tau_2^+)]. \quad (37b)$$

**Consequently, it has been shown that the rectilinear classical equation of motion in (8) of the extended charged sphere of radius  $a$ , modified by transition forces in the transition intervals following the nonanalytic points of the externally applied force, is a consistent causal classical equation of motion satisfying momentum-energy conservation with a non-negative radiated energy across the transition intervals under relativistic (Born) rigidity. Since (8) is a special case of the general modified equation of motion in (2), which is causal and relativistically covariant, this special case merely confirms the causality and momentum-energy conservation of the general modified equation of motion.** The only restriction (other than the Born rigidity condition in (15b) and the transition intervals not overlapping) on this demonstration of causality and momentum-energy conservation of the modified rectilinear equation of motion are the inequalities in [1, eqs. (8.24)] (which include (27)-(28)) required for the  $O(a)$  terms in the equation of motion to be negligible, which is always satisfied as  $a \rightarrow 0$  since the mass is not renormalized in (2) and (8). If the mass is renormalized as  $a \rightarrow 0$ , the Born rigidity condition ( $|\Delta u_n^0|/c \ll 1$ ) and (27)-(28) remain as the two inequalities required for the validity of the modified LAD equation of motion in (3).

### III. CONCLUDING DISCUSSION

There is some justification, even in classical physics, for renormalizing the mass  $m_{\text{es}} + m_{\text{ins}}$  of the charged spherical insulator to a finite value  $m$  as  $a \rightarrow 0$  (to remedy  $m_{\text{es}} = e^2/(8\pi\epsilon_0 ac^2) \rightarrow \infty$ ) in order to obtain the equation of motion of a finite-mass point (or extremely small) charge. The mass of the insulator  $m_{\text{ins}}$  may actually be negative because it can include gravitational and other attractive formation energies [9], [10] within the sphere. Thus, as  $a \rightarrow 0$  it is conceivable, even classically, that  $m_{\text{ins}} \rightarrow -\infty$  and that  $\lim_{a \rightarrow 0}(m_{\text{es}} + m_{\text{ins}}) = m$ , the measured rest mass of the charged particle. It is, therefore, disconcerting that for the modified causal LAD equation of motion in (3), the restriction in (7) on the magnitude of the changes in the externally applied force across transition intervals is needed to ensure that the modified causal LAD equation of motion satisfies conservation of momentum-energy while keeping the value of the energy radiated during the transition intervals equal to or greater than zero under the relativistic (Born) rigidity condition in (1).

For the extended charged sphere, the restriction corresponding to (7), namely  $\tau_e \Delta \dot{u}_n^0 / c \ll 1$  with  $\tau_e = 4a/(3c)$ , is a consequence of the condition in [1, eq. (8.24b)] needed to make negligible the  $O(a)$  terms in the proper-frame equation of motion, a condition that is satisfied perfectly as  $a \rightarrow 0$  if the mass is not renormalized. This condition merely implies that the  $O(a)$  terms may not be negligible if the speed of the charged sphere changes by an appreciable fraction of the speed of light in the time it takes light to cross the sphere.

Even as the mass is renormalized to a finite value  $m$  as  $a \rightarrow 0$ , the conditions in [1, eq. (8.24)] are all satisfied and one might expect that the resulting modified causal LAD equation of motion (3) would remain valid regardless of the magnitude of the changes in the externally applied force across the transition intervals. This is not always the case, however, if the change in the external force across a transition interval is large enough to disobey (7) [with  $m$  renormalized to a finite value and  $\tau_e = e^2/(6\pi\epsilon_0 mc^3)$ ] because then we have shown that, for a charged sphere obeying the relativistic (Born) rigidity condition in (1), the value of the energy radiated during the transition interval can become negative and the momentum-energy of the mass-renormalized charged particle is not conserved. ***Renormalization of the modified causal classical LA equation of motion in (2), an equation consistent with momentum-energy conservation, changes the scale factor between the Newtonian acceleration term and the radiation reaction term such that the renormalized modified causal classical LAD equation of motion in (3) does not always satisfy momentum-energy conservation under the relativistic (Born) rigidity condition in (1) if the change in the externally applied force across a transition interval is large enough.***

For an electron encountering an abrupt change  $\Delta \mathbf{E}_{\text{ext}}$  in the externally applied proper-frame electric field across a transition interval, the inequality in (7) is satisfied unless  $|\Delta \mathbf{E}_{\text{ext}}| \not\ll mc/(e\tau_e) = 6\pi\epsilon_0 m^2 c^4 / e^3 = 2.7 \times 10^{20}$  Volts/meter, an enormously high electric field that is about 200 times greater than the Schwinger critical electric field that can produce electron-positron pairs from the quantum vacuum. Thus, (7) is a restriction that is violated only if the eternally applied Lorentz force is so large that quantum effects could dominate and the classical equation of motion may no longer apply. Nonetheless, a classical equation of motion of a relativistically rigid mass-renormalized point charge that is both causal and conserves momentum-energy, no matter how large the changes in the external force are across the transition intervals, does not result by simply equating the sum of the point-charge radiation reaction force and the externally applied force to the relativistic Newtonian acceleration force (measured rest mass times relativistic acceleration) and inserting the necessary delta-function transition forces at the nonanalytic points in time of the external force to obtain (3). A causal classical equation of motion of a relativistically rigid mass-renormalized point charge that also conserves momentum-energy with a non-negative radiated energy during the transition intervals for arbitrarily large changes in the external force across transition intervals, if it exists, must involve a more complicated combining of the Newtonian and radiation reaction forces with the externally applied force than just a simple summation.

It seems prudent, therefore, to either accept (3) as the classical causal equation of motion of a relativistically rigid (obeying (1)) mass-renormalized point charge ( $a \rightarrow 0$ ) under the restriction in (7) on the magnitude of the changes in the externally applied force across transition intervals, or to tolerate the noncausality in the original LAD equation of motion given by (3) without the transition intervals/forces and thus without the restrictions in (1) and (7). Practically, the pre-acceleration/deceleration of the LAD equation of motion unmodified by the transition forces is generally too small to have a significant bearing on the solution except during extremely short time intervals on the order of  $\tau_e$  near nonanalytic points of time of the external force such as when it is first applied and when it is terminated. Also, power series solutions like the Landau-Lifshitz approximate solution to the LAD equation of motion do not display the pre-acceleration/deceleration that exists in the exact solution to the LAD equation of motion unmodified by transition forces [1, secs. 8.4-8.6].

Ultimately, a fully satisfactory equation of motion of a mass-renormalized point charge requires the introduction of quantum effects and possibly a unified theory of inertial/gravitational and electromagnetic forces as well. Renormalization of the mass of the charged sphere as its radius shrinks to zero is an attempt to extract the equation of motion of, for example, the electron from the classical self electromagnetic forces of an extended charge distribution. Such attempts, as Dirac wrote [2], “bring one up against the problem of the structure of the electron, which has not yet received any satisfactory solution.”

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The research was supported in part under the U.S. Air Force Office of Scientific Research (AFOSR) Grant # FA9550-22-1-0293 through A. Nachman.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A.D. Yaghjian: *Relativistic Dynamics of a Charged Sphere: Updating the Lorentz-Abraham Model*, 3rd edn (Springer, New York, NY 2022).
- [2] P.A.M. Dirac: Classical theory of radiating electrons. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **167**, pp 148–169 (1938).
- [3] M. Abraham: *Theorie der Elektrizitat, Vol II: Elektromagnetische Theorie der Strahlung* (Teubner, Leipzig 1905).
- [4] P. Hertz: Uber Energie und Impuls der Roentgenstrahlen. *Physikalische Zeitschrift* **4**, pp 848–852 (1903).
- [5] A.D. Yaghjian: Absence of a consistent classical equation of motion for a mass-renormalized point charge. *Phys. Rev. E* **78**, pp 046606(1–12) (2008).
- [6] J.D. Jackson: *Classical Electrodynamics*, 3rd edn (Wiley, New York 1999).
- [7] W.K.H. Panofsky, M. Phillips: *Classical Electricity and Magnetism*, 2nd edn (Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA 1962).
- [8] J. Van Bladel: *Engineering Relativity* (Springer, New York, NY 1984).
- [9] A. Arnowitt, S. Deser, C.W. Misner: Gravitational-electromagnetic coupling and the classical self-energy problem. *Phys. Review* **120**, pp 313–320 (1960).
- [10] A.D. Yaghjian: A classical electro-gravitational model of a point charge with finite mass. *Proc. URSI Symp. on Electromagnetic Theory*, pp 322–324 (1989).