

PLASMA INSTABILITIES AND MAGNETIC FIELD GROWTH IN CLUSTERS OF GALAXIES

A. A. SCHEKOCIHIN,¹ S. C. COWLEY,² R. M. KULSRUD,³ G. W. HAMMETT,³ AND P. SHARMA³
 October 1, 2018

ABSTRACT

We show that under very general conditions, cluster plasmas threaded by weak magnetic fields are subject to very fast growing plasma instabilities driven by the anisotropy of the plasma pressure (viscous stress) with respect to the local direction of the magnetic field. Such an anisotropy will naturally arise in any weakly magnetized plasma that has low collisionality and is subject to stirring. The magnetic field must be sufficiently weak for the instabilities to occur, viz., $\beta \gtrsim \text{Re}^{1/2}$. The instabilities are captured by the extended MHD model with Braginskii viscosity. However, their growth rates are proportional to the wavenumber down to the ion gyroscale, so MHD equations with Braginskii viscosity are not well posed and a fully kinetic treatment is necessary. The instabilities can lead to magnetic fields in clusters being amplified from seed strength of $\sim 10^{-18}$ G to dynamically important strengths of $\sim 10 \mu\text{G}$ on cosmologically trivial time scales ($\sim 10^8$ yr). The fields produced during the amplification stage are at scales much smaller than observed. Predicting the saturated field scale and structure will require a kinetic theory of magnetized cluster turbulence.

Subject headings: galaxies: clusters: general — instabilities — magnetic fields — MHD — plasmas — turbulence

Plasma in clusters of galaxies is likely to be in a turbulent state. Cluster mergers produce bulk flows at scales $L \sim 1$ Mpc with velocities $U \sim 10^2 \dots 10^3$ km s⁻¹. Assuming an intracluster medium (ICM) with temperatures $T \sim 10^7 \dots 10^8$ K, these bulk velocities are comparable to the thermal (or sound) speed $v_{\text{th}} = (T/m_i)^{1/2}$ (here m_i is the ion mass and, for simplicity, we take the ICM to be made of hydrogen plasma with equal electron and ion temperatures). Flows of this magnitude can drive turbulence in the ICM. The characteristic time for the turbulence to be established is $L/U \sim 10^9$ yr. Numerical simulations of cluster evolution (Norman & Bryan 1999; Roettinger et al. 1999; Ricker & Sarazin 2001) support this qualitative picture. In recent years there has been a rising interest in measuring the cluster turbulence both with future instruments (*Astro-E2*; see Inogamov & Sunyaev 2003) and with present ones (*XMM-Newton*; see Schuecker et al. 2004).

The ICM is fully ionized. The ion kinematic viscosity is $\nu \sim \nu_{\text{th}}^2/\nu_{ii}$, where $\nu_{ii} = 4\pi n e^4 \ln \Lambda m_i^{-1/2} T^{-3/2}$ is the ion-ion collision frequency, $n \sim 10^{-2} \dots 10^{-3}$ cm⁻³ is the ion number density (for cluster cores), e is the electron charge, and $\ln \Lambda \sim 20$ is the Coulomb logarithm (e.g., Helander & Sigmar 2002). This gives Reynolds numbers in the range $\text{Re} \sim 10^2 \dots 10^3$. As the turbulent velocities at the outer scales are $\lesssim v_{\text{th}}$, the turbulence in the inertial range will be subsonic. It is natural to assume that Kolmogorov's dimensional theory should apply at least approximately. Then the viscous scale of the turbulence is $l_\nu \sim L \text{Re}^{-3/4} \sim 10 \dots 30$ kpc. These numbers appear to agree quite well with observations of turbulence in the Coma cluster via pressure maps (Schuecker et al. 2004).

If we estimate the magnetic diffusivity of the ICM using the standard Spitzer (1962) formula $\eta \sim T^{-3/2} m_e^{1/2} e^2 c^2 \ln \Lambda / 4\pi$, we find an extremely small value leading to enormous magnetic Reynolds numbers $\text{Rm} \sim 10^{29} \dots 10^{31}$. The magnetic Prandtl number $\text{Pm} = \text{Rm}/\text{Re}$ for the ICM can, therefore, be as large as 10^{29} . From theory and numerical simulations of isotropic

MHD turbulence with large Prandtl numbers, we know that under these conditions a small-scale dynamo operates: magnetic fluctuations are amplified by random stretching of the field lines (Jaffe 1980; Roland 1981; Ruzmaikin et al. 1989, see a recent account of the theory and simulations of small-scale dynamo by Schekochihin et al. 2004 and references therein). The magnetic energy grows exponentially at the turnover rate of the viscous-scale eddies: the exponentiation time is $(L/U)\text{Re}^{-1/2} \sim 10^8$ yr. The resulting fields have a folded structure: they are organized in long thin flux sheets (or ribbons) with direction reversals at the resistive scale and field lines remaining relatively straight up to the viscous scale or, in the nonlinear regime, even to the outer scale of the turbulence.

This picture is hard to reconcile with the observed magnetic fields in clusters. The dynamo-generated fields are expected to have reversals on subviscous scales down to the resistive scale, which is $l_\eta \sim \text{Rm}^{-1/2} L \sim 10^4 \dots 10^5$ km in clusters, a tiny distance. Published rotation measure (RM) data for clusters suggest tangled fields with $B \sim 1 \dots 10 \mu\text{G}$ and a typical reversal scale on the order of 1 kpc (Feretti et al. 1995; Clarke et al. 2001; Taylor et al. 2002). Recently, Vogt & Enßlin (2003) used RM measurements from extended radio sources in several clusters to extract magnetic-energy spectra. The spectra peak at ~ 1 kpc and decrease at smaller scales, so one can reasonably take 1 kpc to be the resolved characteristic scale of field variation. While this is about an order of magnitude below the viscous scale, it is certainly much larger than the resistive scale.

These apparent inconsistencies between theory and observations are a serious problem. The generation of direction-reversing folded fields is a fundamental property of random shear. It does not depend on the particular character of the turbulent flow and does not require very large Re . Even if the cluster fields originally owe their existence to some external mechanism (e.g., Kronberg et al. 2001) rather than to in situ generation by turbulence, any magnetic field introduced into the

¹ Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics, University of Cambridge, Wilberforce Road, Cambridge CB3 0WA, UK; as629@damtp.cam.ac.uk.

² Department of Physics and Astronomy, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1547; and Plasma Physics Group, Imperial College London, Blackett Laboratory, Prince Consort Road, London SW7 2BW, UK.

³ Plasma Physics Laboratory, Princeton University, P. O. Box 451, Princeton, NJ 08543.

ICM is tangled by turbulence and rendered indistinguishable from a small-scale-dynamo-generated field on the timescale of $\sim 10^8$ yr.

The discrepancy between the predictions of MHD models and the observed cluster turbulence has prompted us to reexamine the MHD approximation and to recognize that it is not, in fact, appropriate for the ICM. For the cluster plasma, the ion mean free path greatly exceeds the resistive scale: $\lambda_{\text{mfp}} \sim v_{\text{th}}/\nu_{ii} \sim \text{Re}^{-1/4} l_\nu \sim 1..10$ kpc. Collisionless effects are important at scales below λ_{mfp} , and the fluid MHD description is not valid. This fundamentally alters the dynamics of both velocity and magnetic fields at these scales.

It can be shown that at frequencies below the ion cyclotron frequency $\Omega_i = eB/cm_i$ and scales above the ion gyroradius $\rho_i = v_{\text{th}}/\Omega_i$, the equations for the fluid velocity \mathbf{u} and magnetic field \mathbf{B} have the following general form

$$\rho \frac{d\mathbf{u}}{dt} = -\nabla \left(p_\perp + \frac{B^2}{8\pi} \right) + \nabla \cdot [\hat{\mathbf{b}}\hat{\mathbf{b}}(p_\perp - p_\parallel)] + \frac{\mathbf{B} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{B}}{4\pi}, \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{d\mathbf{B}}{dt} = \mathbf{B} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{B} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}, \quad (2)$$

where $d/dt = \partial/\partial t + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla$, p_\perp and p_\parallel are the perpendicular and parallel plasma pressures, respectively, and $\hat{\mathbf{b}} = \mathbf{B}/B$. We have dropped the diffusion term in Eq. (2). Equation (1) is valid provided the ions are magnetized, i.e., $\rho_i \ll \lambda_{\text{mfp}}$. For the ICM, this requirement is satisfied if $B \gg 10^{-18}$ G, which is far below the observed field strengths of $1..10 \mu\text{G}$. The lower limit for dynamically important fields is the field strength corresponding to the energy of the viscous-scale eddies ($\sim \rho v_{\text{th}}^2 \text{Re}^{-1/2}$), which gives $B \sim 10 \mu\text{G}$. Thus, the ICM would be very well magnetized already for dynamically weak fields.

In such a plasma, the fundamental property of charged particles moving in a magnetic field is the conservation of the first adiabatic invariant $\mu = mv_\perp^2/2B$. When $\lambda_{\text{mfp}} \gg \rho_i$, this conservation is only weakly broken by collisions. As long as μ is conserved, any change in B must be accompanied by a proportional change in p_\perp . Thus, the emergence of the pressure anisotropy is a natural consequence of the changes in the magnetic field strength and vice versa. The following heuristic argument reveals the connection. Summing up the first adiabatic invariants of all particles, we get $p_\perp/B = \text{const}$. Then

$$\frac{1}{p_\perp} \frac{dp_\perp}{dt} \sim \frac{1}{B} \frac{dB}{dt} - \nu_{ii} \frac{p_\perp - p_\parallel}{p}, \quad (3)$$

where we have assumed that $\rho = \text{const}$ and the pressure anisotropy $p_\perp - p_\parallel$ is relaxed by collisions at the rate ν_{ii} and remains small compared with the total pressure $p = \rho v_{\text{th}}^2$. From Eq. (2), the field strength evolves according to

$$\frac{1}{B} \frac{dB}{dt} = \hat{\mathbf{b}}\hat{\mathbf{b}} : \nabla \mathbf{u} \quad (4)$$

(assuming incompressibility $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0$ in accordance with the earlier observation that the inertial-range motions are subsonic). Using this and Eq. (3), we get $p_\perp - p_\parallel \sim (\rho v_{\text{th}}^2/\nu_{ii}) \hat{\mathbf{b}}\hat{\mathbf{b}} : \nabla \mathbf{u}$.

A more formal kinetic calculation of the pressure anisotropy can be done starting from the kinetic equation for the magnetized ions (to the lowest order in $k\rho_i$; see Kulsrud 1983)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{df}{dt} + v_\parallel \nabla_\parallel f + \frac{v_\perp}{2} \left(\hat{\mathbf{b}}\hat{\mathbf{b}} : \nabla \mathbf{u} - \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} + v_\parallel \frac{\nabla_\parallel B}{B} \right) \frac{\partial f}{\partial v_\perp} \\ - \left[\hat{\mathbf{b}} \cdot \left(\frac{d\mathbf{u}}{dt} + v_\parallel \nabla_\parallel \mathbf{u} \right) + \frac{v_\perp^2}{2} \frac{\nabla_\parallel B}{B} \right] \frac{\partial f}{\partial v_\parallel} = C[f, f], \quad (5) \end{aligned}$$

where $\nabla_\parallel = \hat{\mathbf{b}} \cdot \nabla$, v_\perp and v_\parallel are velocities perpendicular and parallel to \mathbf{B} and the right-hand side is the collision term. A perturbation theory is constructed under the assumption that the fluid velocity is much smaller than the thermal speed and varies at scales much longer than the mean free path. This is appropriate for the viscous range of Kolmogorov turbulence in cluster-type plasmas. Assuming Kolmogorov scaling, the velocity at the viscous scale is $u \sim \text{Re}^{-1/4} v_{\text{th}}$. The wave number associated with the viscous scale is $k_\nu \sim \text{Re}^{3/4} L^{-1} \sim \text{Re}^{-1/4} \lambda_{\text{mfp}}^{-1}$. We introduce the small parameter $\epsilon \sim k_\nu \lambda_{\text{mfp}} \sim u/v_{\text{th}} \sim \text{Re}^{-1/4}$. In cluster plasmas, $\epsilon \sim 0.1..0.3$ — while this is not really very small, it is convenient to order all terms in Eq. (5) with respect to ϵ , which we believe to be the essential physical small parameter in the problem. Namely, we assume $k_\parallel \lambda_{\text{mfp}} \sim \epsilon$ and $d/dt \sim \nabla u \sim \epsilon^2 v_{\text{th}}/\lambda_{\text{mfp}}$ (this orders out compressible motions, so $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0$) and take the zeroth-order distribution function f_0 to be a Maxwellian. For simplicity, we use the Lorentz pitch-angle-scattering form of the linearized collision operator $C[f_0, f] = (1/2)\nu_{ii}(v_{\text{th}}/v)^3 (\partial/\partial \xi)(1 - \xi^2) \partial f/\partial \xi$, where $\xi = v_\parallel/v$ and the derivatives are at constant $v = (v_\perp^2 + v_\parallel^2)^{1/2}$ (e.g., Hellander & Sigmar 2002). Then the anisotropic ion distribution function up to order ϵ^2 is

$$f(v_\perp, v_\parallel) = \frac{n \exp(-v^2/2v_{\text{th}}^2)}{(2\pi v_{\text{th}}^2)^{3/2}} \left[1 + \frac{\hat{\mathbf{b}}\hat{\mathbf{b}} : \nabla \mathbf{u}}{\nu_{ii}} \frac{v^3(v^2 - 3v_\parallel^2)}{3v_{\text{th}}^5} \right]. \quad (6)$$

Computing p_\perp and p_\parallel , we obtain the result that is the lowest order (in $k\rho_i$) term in the plasma pressure tensor first derived by Braginskii (1965) (who used a somewhat different ordering in his perturbation scheme)

$$p_\perp - p_\parallel = 3\rho\nu_B \hat{\mathbf{b}}\hat{\mathbf{b}} : \nabla \mathbf{u} \equiv \rho\nu_{\text{th}}^2 \Delta, \quad (7)$$

where $\Delta \sim \epsilon^2$ is the dimensionless measure of the pressure anisotropy and ν_B is the Braginskii ion viscosity, which is analogous to the ordinary viscosity for the unmagnetized case: $\nu_B \sim v_{\text{th}} \lambda_{\text{mfp}} \sim v_{\text{th}}^2/\nu_{ii}$. It is this viscosity that we used in our definition of Re and the viscous scale. For simplicity, $T_e = T_i \equiv T$, so the electron contribution to the pressure anisotropy is subdominant by a factor of $(m_e/m_i)^{1/2} \simeq 0.02$.

Equations (1), (2), and (7), together with $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0$, are a closed set. The Braginskii viscosity has two key properties. First, the velocities that it dissipates are those that change the strength of the magnetic field [Eq. (4)], so the small-scale dynamo action is associated only with velocities above the viscous scale. Second, velocity gradients transverse to the magnetic field (e.g., shear-Alfvén-polarized fluctuations) are undamped. Velocity fluctuations can now penetrate below the viscous cut-off. In what follows, we will show that the Braginskii viscosity not only fails to damp all kinetic energy at the viscous scale but triggers fast-growing instabilities at subviscous scales.

It has, in fact, been known for a long time that anisotropic distributions lead to instabilities (Rosenbluth 1956; Chandrasekhar et al. 1958; Parker 1958; Vedenov & Sagdeev 1958). A vast literature exists on these instabilities and their (mostly space physics) applications, which we do not attempt to review. The standard approach is to postulate a bi-Maxwellian equilibrium distribution with $T_\perp \neq T_\parallel$ (e.g., Gary 1993; Ferrière & André 2002, and references therein). We do not need to adopt such a description because Eqs. (1), (2), and (7) incorporate the pressure anisotropy in a self-consistent way.

Let us imagine a turbulent cascade that originates from the large-scale driving, extends down to the viscous scale, and gives

rise to velocity and magnetic fields \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{B} that vary on time scales $\gtrsim (\nabla u)^{-1}$ and on spatial scales $\gtrsim k_\nu^{-1}$. We study the stability of such fields. The presence of turbulent shear (velocity gradients) gives rise to the pressure anisotropy given by Eq. (7). We now look for linear perturbations $\delta\mathbf{u}$, $\delta\mathbf{B}$, δp_\perp , and δp_\parallel that have frequencies $\omega \gg \nabla u$ and wavenumbers $k \gg k_\nu$. With respect to these perturbations, the unperturbed rate-of-strain tensor $\nabla\mathbf{u}$ can be viewed as constant in space and time.⁴ Linearizing Eq. (1) and neglecting temporal and spatial derivatives of the unperturbed quantities, we get

$$-i\omega\rho\delta\mathbf{u} = -i\mathbf{k}\delta\left(p_\perp + \frac{B^2}{8\pi}\right) + \left(p_\perp - p_\parallel + \frac{B^2}{4\pi}\right)\delta(\hat{\mathbf{b}} \cdot \nabla\hat{\mathbf{b}}) + \hat{\mathbf{b}}\delta\left[\nabla_\parallel(p_\perp - p_\parallel) - \left(p_\perp - p_\parallel - \frac{B^2}{4\pi}\right)\frac{\nabla_\parallel B}{B}\right], \quad (8)$$

where $\delta(\hat{\mathbf{b}} \cdot \nabla\hat{\mathbf{b}}) = ik_\parallel\delta\hat{\mathbf{b}}$ and from the linearized Eq. (2), $\delta\hat{\mathbf{b}} = -(k_\parallel/\omega)\delta\mathbf{u}_\perp$ and $\delta B/B = \mathbf{k}_\perp \cdot \delta\mathbf{u}_\perp/\omega$. In the resulting dispersion relation, it is always possible to split off the part that corresponds to the modes that have shear-Alfvén-wave polarization, $\delta\mathbf{u} \propto \mathbf{k}_\perp \times \hat{\mathbf{b}}$,

$$\omega^2 = k_\parallel^2 v_{\text{th}}^2 (\Delta + 2\beta^{-1}), \quad (9)$$

where $\beta = 2v_{\text{th}}^2/v_A^2 = 8\pi\rho v_{\text{th}}^2/B^2$. When the magnetic energy is larger than the energy of the viscous-scale eddies, $\beta \ll |\Delta|^{-1} \sim \text{Re}^{1/2}$, Eq. (9) describes shear Alfvén waves. In the opposite limit, $\beta \gg |\Delta|^{-1}$, and if $\Delta < 0$, an instability appears with the growth rate $\gamma = k_\parallel v_{\text{th}} |\Delta|^{1/2} \sim \epsilon k_\parallel v_{\text{th}}$. Since $k_\parallel \gg k_\nu$, the instability is faster than the rate of strain, $\gamma \gg \nabla u \sim \epsilon k_\nu v_{\text{th}}$, in accordance with the assumption made in the derivation of Eq. (9). This instability, triggered by $p_\parallel > p_\perp$, is called the firehose instability. It does not depend on the way the pressure perturbations are calculated because it arises from the perturbation of the field-line curvature $\hat{\mathbf{b}} \cdot \nabla\hat{\mathbf{b}}$ in Eq. (8): to linear order, it entails no perturbation of the field strength and therefore does not alter the pressure.

In order to determine the stability of perturbations with other polarizations, δp_\perp and δp_\parallel have to be computed. We retain the assumption that $\omega \gg \nabla u$ and consider scales smaller than the mean free path, $k\lambda_{\text{mfp}} \gg 1$. At these scales a fully kinetic description must be used. It is sufficient to look for ‘‘subsonic’’ perturbations such that $\omega \ll k v_{\text{th}}$ because the high-frequency perturbations are subject to strong collisionless damping and cannot be rendered unstable by a small anisotropy. We linearize Eq. (5) around the distribution function (6) and calculate δp_\perp and δp_\parallel from the perturbed distribution function while neglecting terms of order $(\omega/k_\parallel v_{\text{th}})^3$ and higher. This leads to

$$\omega^2\delta\mathbf{u} = k_\parallel^2 v_{\text{th}}^2 (\Delta + 2\beta^{-1})\delta\mathbf{u}_\perp - \hat{\mathbf{b}}\frac{\omega^2}{k_\parallel}\mathbf{k}_\perp \cdot \delta\mathbf{u}_\perp + \mathbf{k}_\perp \left[2(-\Delta + \beta^{-1})v_{\text{th}}^2 - i\omega\sqrt{2\pi}\frac{v_{\text{th}}}{|k_\parallel|} + 2\frac{\omega^2}{k_\parallel^2} \right] \mathbf{k}_\perp \cdot \delta\mathbf{u}_\perp. \quad (10)$$

For the modes with shear-Alfvén-wave polarization, we recover Eq. (9). If we now dot Eq. (10) with $\hat{\mathbf{b}}$, we get $\delta u_\parallel = -\mathbf{k}_\perp \cdot \delta\mathbf{u}_\perp/k_\parallel$. Therefore, the perturbations with $\delta u_\parallel \neq 0$ are incompressible and slow-wave polarized. For these perturbations,

⁴ Balbus (2004) recently considered an instability triggered by Braginskii viscosity when the unperturbed $\nabla\mathbf{u}$ consists of rotation and radial shear in a Keplerian disk (see also Sharma et al. 2003). His instability had a growth rate $\gamma \sim |\nabla\mathbf{u}|$. In contrast, we are interested in instabilities that are much faster than the rate of strain and arise when turbulent stretching is present.

$\delta\mathbf{u}_\perp \propto \mathbf{k}_\perp$, and the dispersion relation is

$$\left(1 - \frac{2k_\perp^2}{k_\parallel^2}\right)\omega^2 + i\omega\sqrt{2\pi}\frac{k_\perp^2 v_{\text{th}}}{|k_\parallel|} - \left[\left(k_\parallel^2 - 2k_\perp^2\right)\Delta + 2k^2\beta^{-1}\right]v_{\text{th}}^2 = 0. \quad (11)$$

In the weak-field limit ($\beta \gg |\Delta|^{-1}$), the third term leads to instability. If $k_\perp^2/k_\parallel^2 \ll |\Delta|^{1/2}$ (the case of parallel or nearly parallel propagation), the second term is negligible and, for $\Delta < 0$, we get $\gamma \simeq k_\parallel v_{\text{th}} |\Delta|^{1/2}$, as in the case of the firehose instability.

When k_\perp is not small (oblique propagation), the second term in Eq. (11) dominates the first. It contains the effect of the collisionless kinetic damping due to resonant wave-particle interactions (Barnes 1966) (a physical discussion of the role of resonant and nonresonant particles in the mirror instability can be found in Southwood & Kivelson 1993). The growth rate is

$$\gamma = \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^{1/2} |k_\parallel| v_{\text{th}} \left[\Delta \left(1 - \frac{k_\perp^2}{2k_\parallel^2}\right) - \beta^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{k_\perp^2}{k_\parallel^2}\right) \right]. \quad (12)$$

Modes with $k_\parallel > \sqrt{2}k_\perp$ are unstable if $\Delta < 0$ (slow-wave-polarized firehose instability); modes with $k_\perp > k_\parallel/\sqrt{2}$ are unstable if $\Delta > 0$ (mirror instability). The growth rate in either case is $\gamma \sim k_\parallel v_{\text{th}} |\Delta| \sim \epsilon^2 k_\parallel v_{\text{th}}$.

The instabilities described above have growth rates proportional to k_\parallel . Thus, MHD equations with Braginskii viscosity do not constitute a well-posed problem. This means, for example, that any numerical simulation of these equations will blow up at the grid scale unless a small additional isotropic viscosity is introduced. The linear-in- k_\parallel behavior of the growth rate is only modified if the finiteness of the gyroradius ρ_i is taken into account. This is done using the general plasma dispersion relation (e.g., Davidson 1983) with the equilibrium distribution function (6). The growth rate of slow-wave-polarized instabilities [Eq. (12)] peaks at $k\rho_i \sim 1$ with $\gamma_{\text{max}} \sim \Delta\Omega_i$. For the shear-Alfvén-polarized firehose, the fastest growth is for $k_\perp/k_\parallel \simeq \sqrt{2/3}$, and the peak growth rate $\gamma_{\text{max}} \sim |\Delta|^{1/2}\Omega_i$ is achieved at $k\rho_i \sim 1$. We omit the derivation of these results.

We have shown that, given sufficiently high β , firehose and mirror instabilities occur in the regions of decreasing ($\Delta < 0$) and increasing ($\Delta > 0$) magnetic field strength, respectively. The viscous-scale motions associated with the turbulent cascade from large scales will stretch the magnetic field and thereby produce regions of both types: the typical field structure resulting from random stretching is folded flux sheets (or ribbons) with field amplification regions containing relatively straight direction-alternating fields and curved corners where the field is weaker (the field curvature and strength are anti-correlated; see Schekochihin et al. 2004). If $B \gtrsim 10^{-18}$ G, the plasma is magnetized ($\rho_i < \lambda_{\text{mfp}}$) and this structure is intrinsically unstable: straight growing fields to the mirror, curved weakening fields to the firehose instability. Since the instabilities are much faster than the turbulent stretching, their growth and saturation will have a profound effect on the structure of the field. We do not yet have a detailed theory of this process and only give a qualitative discussion of what can plausibly happen.

When turbulent stretching acts on some initial weak field B_0 , pressure anisotropies arise, $\Delta_0 \sim (1/\nu_{ii})d \ln B_0/dt$ [see Eq. (3)], and drive mirror and firehose instabilities. Both produce fluctuating fields $\delta\mathbf{B}$ curved at scale $\rho_{i,0} \sim 3 \times 10^3 (10^{-18} \text{ G}/B_0)$ pc. Let us concentrate on the mirror instability as it amplifies

field strength in the linear order. The amplification rate is $\gamma_0 \sim \Delta_0 \Omega_{i,0} \sim 10^{-8} (B_0/10^{-18} \text{ G}) \text{ yr}^{-1}$. Suppose for a moment that the instability does not saturate until the field strength increases to some value $B_1 \sim B_0 + \delta B$, where $\delta B/B_0 \sim 1$. Then the field at scale $\rho_{i,0}$ is unstable to perturbations at scale $\rho_{i,1} \sim (B_0/B_1)\rho_{i,0} < \rho_{i,0}$. This is a secondary mirror instability that feeds on the pressure anisotropy due to the increasing field B_1 excited by the primary. Braginskii theory cannot be used to calculate this anisotropy because the field B_1 is curved on a collisionless scale $\rho_{i,0}$. However, μ is still conserved at this scale (conservation is broken at scale $\rho_{i,1}$) and we can adapt the estimate (3) to the collisionless regime by assuming that pressure anisotropy is relaxed in the time particles streaming along the field line need to cover the distance $\rho_{i,0}$: we replace ν_{ii} in Eq. (3) by $v_{\text{th}}/\rho_{i,0} = \Omega_{i,0}$ and write $\Delta_1 \sim (1/\Omega_{i,0}) d \ln B_1 / dt \sim \gamma_0 / \Omega_{i,0} \sim \Delta_0$. Thus, the pressure anisotropies driving the secondary and the primary instabilities are the same. The growth rate of the perturbations at scale $\rho_{i,1}$ is then $\gamma_1 \sim \Delta_0 \Omega_{i,1} \sim (B_1/B_0)\gamma_0$. This argument can be iterated. As the growth rate $\gamma_{\text{max}} \propto B$, magnetic field grows explosively, $dB/dt \propto B^2$, until it is strong enough to cancel the pressure anisotropy and shut down the instabilities: $\beta \sim \Delta^{-1} \sim \text{Re}^{1/2}$. This gives $B \sim 10 \mu\text{G}$, which is the lower bound for dynamically important fields and is comparable to the observed field strength in clusters. Thus, a seed field of order 10^{-18} G (attainable by primordial mechanisms; see, e.g., Gnedin et al. 2000) can be amplified to dynamical strength in about 10^8 yr .

The above argument depends on the assumption that fluctuating fields would grow to $\delta B/B_0 \sim 1$. What if the saturation of the instabilities is quasilinear, with $|\delta \mathbf{B}|^2/B_0^2 \ll 1$? In the quasilinear theory, small fluctuations scatter particles and effectively increase their collision frequency to $\nu_{\text{QL}} \sim (|\delta \mathbf{B}|^2/B_0^2) \gamma_{\text{max}}$. The pressure is isotropized and the instabilities are quenched. Since the effective viscosity ($\sim v_{\text{th}}^2/\nu_{\text{QL}}$) of the plasma is reduced, the Reynolds number increases $\text{Re}_{\text{QL}} \sim (L/v_{\text{th}}) \nu_{\text{QL}} \propto B$ and the turbulent cascade extends to smaller scales, giving rise to faster field stretching (by the viscous-scale eddies at the rate $\propto \text{Re}_{\text{QL}}^{1/2}$) and to pressure anisotropy $\Delta \sim \text{Re}_{\text{QL}}^{-1/2}$. This argument can be formalized somewhat and gives explosive growth

of both Re_{QL} and B until $\beta \sim \text{Re}_{\text{QL}}^{1/2}$. At this point the instabilities should start shutting down with Re dropping back to its original value based on particle collisions and magnetic field following up so that $\beta \sim \text{Re}^{1/2}$. The characteristic time for this process to complete itself is $\sim 10^8 \text{ yr}$. Thus, both the quasilinear scenario ($\delta B/B_0 \ll 1$) and the case of $\delta B/B_0 \sim 1$ appear to produce a fast amplification stage with similar end results.

After this stage, $\beta \lesssim \text{Re}^{1/2}$, the field can be stretched without going unstable and the folded structure could finally be set up. However, differences remain between the MHD model with isotropic viscosity (Schekochihin et al. 2004) and the ICM. First, the Braginskii viscosity implies that a cascade of shear Alfvén waves may exist between the viscous scale and the ion gyroscale. The properties of this cascade remain to be understood. Second, even when the rms field strength B_{rms} is sufficient to quench the instabilities, there will always be regions where the field is weak. For the folded fields, these are the bending regions (curved field). They can become unstable unless the field-line curvature there is larger than $1/\rho_{i,\text{bend}}$, where $\rho_{i,\text{bend}}$ is the gyroradius computed with the local field strength $B_{\text{bend}} \ll B_{\text{rms}}$ and, therefore, is larger than ρ_i based on B_{rms} by a factor of $B_{\text{rms}}/B_{\text{bend}}$. Based on the idea that all characteristic scales are fixed by equating the curvature in the bending regions to $1/\rho_{i,\text{bend}}$, we have constructed a field-reversal-scale estimate of order 10 pc (Schekochihin et al. 2005). However, our argument assumed that the field structure is exactly the same as in the case of isotropic viscosity with just the magnetic cutoff scale undetermined. In order to justify this assumption, or to learn otherwise, we will need a more quantitative theory.

Thus, while it is not hard to envision how magnetic fields in clusters can reach observed strengths on a fairly short timescale, the full understanding of field structure requires more work.

We would like to thank E. Quataert for useful discussions. This work was supported by a UKAFF Fellowship (A.A.S.), the Department of Energy (DOE) contract DE-AC02-76CH03073 (G.W.H. and P.S.), the NSF grant AST 00-98670, and the DOE Center for Multiscale Plasma Dynamics.

REFERENCES

- Balbus, S. A. 2004, *ApJ*, 616, 857
 Barnes, A. 1966, *Phys. Fluids*, 9, 1483
 Braginskii, S. I. 1965, *Rev. Plasma Phys.*, 1, 205
 Chandrasekhar, S., Kaufman, A. N., & Watson, K. M. 1958, *Proc. R. Soc. London Ser. A*, 245, 435
 Clarke, T. E., Kronberg, P. P., & Böhringer, H. 2001, *ApJ*, 547, L111
 Davidson, R. C. 1983, in *Handbook of Plasma Physics*, Vol. 1, ed. A. A. Galeev & R. N. Sudan (Amsterdam: North-Holland), 519
 Ferretti, L., Dallacasa, D., Giovannini, G., & Tagliani, A. 1995, *A&A*, 302, 680
 Ferrière, K. M. & André, N. 2002, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 107, 1349
 Gary, S. P. 1993, *Theory of Space Plasma Microinstabilities* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press)
 Gnedin, N. Y., Ferrara, A., & Zweibel, E. 2000, *ApJ*, 539, 505
 Helander, P. & Sigmar, D. J. 2002, *Collisional Transport in Magnetized Plasmas* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press)
 Inogamov, N. A. & Sunyaev, R. A. 2003, *Astron. Lett.*, 29, 791
 Jaffe, W. 1980, *ApJ*, 241, 925
 Kronberg, P. P., Dufton, Q. W., Li, H., & Colgate, S. A. 2001, *ApJ*, 560, 178
 Kulsrud, R. M. 1983, in *Handbook of Plasma Physics*, Vol. 1, ed. A. A. Galeev & R. N. Sudan (Amsterdam: North-Holland), 115
 Norman, M. L. & Bryan, G. L. 1999, *Lecture Notes in Physics 530, The Radio Galaxy Messier 87*, ed. H.-J. Röser & K. Meisenheimer (New York: Springer), 106
 Parker, E. N. 1958, *Phys. Rev.*, 109, 1874
 Ricker, P. M. & Sarazin, C. L. 2001, *ApJ*, 561, 621
 Roettinger, K., Stone, J. M., & Burns, J. O. 1999, *ApJ*, 518, 594
 Roland, J. 1981, *A&A*, 93, 407
 Rosenbluth, M. N. 1956, Los Alamos Laboratory Report LA-2030
 Ruzmaikin, A., Sokoloff, D., & Shukurov, A. 1989, *MNRAS*, 241, 1
 Schekochihin, A. A., Cowley, S. C., Taylor, S. F., Maron, J. L., & McWilliams, J. C. 2004, *ApJ*, 612, 276
 Schekochihin, A. A., Cowley, S. C., Kulsrud, R. M., Hammett, G. W., and Sharma, P. 2005, in *The Magnetized Plasma in Galaxy Evolution*, ed. K. T. Chyzy et al. (Cracow: Jagiellonian Univ.), 86 (astro-ph/0411781)
 Schuecker, P., Finoguenov, A., Miniati, F., Böhringer, H., & Briel, U. G. 2004, *A&A*, 426, 387
 Sharma, P., Hammett, G. W., & Quataert, E. 2003, *ApJ*, 596, 1121
 Southwood, D. J. & Kivelson, M. G. 1993, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 98, 9181
 Spitzer, L. 1962, *Physics of Fully Ionized Gases* (New York: Wiley)
 Taylor, G. B., Fabian, A. C., & Allen, S. W. 2002, *MNRAS*, 334, 769
 Vedenov, A. A. & Sagdeev, R. Z. 1958, *Soviet Phys.—Dokl.*, 3, 278
 Vogt, C. & Enßlin, T. A. 2003, *A&A*, 412, 373