

Charge non-conservation, dequantisation, and induced electric dipole moments in varying- α theories

Douglas J. Shaw,

*DAMTP, Centre for Mathematical Sciences, University of Cambridge,
Wilberforce Road, Cambridge CB3 0WA, UK*

Abstract

We note that in extensions of the Standard Model that allow for a varying fine structure constant, α , all matter species, apart from right-handed neutrinos, will gain an intrinsic electric dipole moment (EDM). In a large subset of varying- α theories, all such particle species will also gain an effective electric charge. This charge will in general not be quantised and can result in macroscopic non-conservation of electric charge.

Key words: varying fine-structure constant, electroweak theory, charge non-conservation

PACS: 98.80.Cq, 06.20.Jr, 98.80.Es

1 Introduction

Motivated by the studies of fine-structure in the absorption lines of dust-clouds about quasars by Webb *et al.*, [1], recent years have seen a growing interest in the possibility that the fine-structure constant, $\alpha_{em} = e^2/\hbar c$, can vary in space and time. The observations of Webb *et al.* favour a value of α_{em} at redshifts 1-3.5 that is lower than it is today: $\Delta\alpha_{em}/\alpha_{em} \equiv [\alpha_{em}(z) - \alpha_{em}(0)]/\alpha_{em}(0) = -0.57 \pm 0.10 \times 10^{-5}$. A similar observational study using a different data set did not however see a variation in α_{em} , [2]. There is no shortage of other astrophysical, geological, and experimental bounds on the time-variation of α_{em} . An excellent review of these matters has been given by Uzan in ref. [4]. There has also been a great deal of effort concentrated on constructing and

Email address: D.Shaw@damtp.cam.ac.uk (Douglas J. Shaw).

constraining a self-consistent theoretical framework to explain α_{em} 's apparent cosmological change [5,6]. It has been noted by several authors that, if α_{em} can vary, then other Standard Model gauge coupling 'constants' should also be able to change, [3]. Indeed, as a result of electroweak unification a change in α_{em} implies that at least one of the weak coupling constants, g_W and g_Y , must also change, [7,9]. In this letter we will show that, with the exception of the cases where the ratio $g_Y/g_W := \tan \theta_W$ is a true constant, charge non-conservation, dequantisation and a charged neutrino are generic features of almost all varying-coupling electroweak theories. Such theories will ensure that all matter species gain an electric dipole moment (EDM).

2 General theory

The electroweak couplings, g_W and g_Y , are made spacetime dependent by the definitions: $g_W := e^\varphi$ and $g_Y := e^\chi$; $\varphi(x)$ and $\chi(x)$ are scalar fields. We do not exclude the possibility that they may be functions of each other. In general we assume $\nabla_\mu \varphi \neq 0$ and $\nabla_\mu \chi \neq 0$. It is not necessary for what follows to say anything more specific about the dynamics of the dilaton fields, χ and φ . Gauge-invariance fixes the gauge-kinetic sector of such a theory to be:

$$\mathcal{L}_g = -\frac{1}{4} \text{tr} \mathcal{F}_W{}_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{F}_W{}^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{4} \mathcal{F}_Y{}_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{F}_Y{}^{\mu\nu} \quad (1)$$

where the field strengths, $\mathcal{F}_W{}^{\mu\nu}$ and $\mathcal{F}_Y{}^{\mu\nu}$ are given by:

$$\mathcal{F}_W{}^{\mu\nu} = \mathbf{F}_W{}^{\mu\nu} + \partial^\mu \varphi \mathbf{W}^\nu - \partial^\nu \varphi \mathbf{W}^\mu, \quad (2)$$

$$\mathcal{F}_Y{}^{\mu\nu} = F_Y{}^{\mu\nu} + \partial^\mu \chi Y^\nu - \partial^\nu \chi Y^\mu. \quad (3)$$

The $\mathbf{F}_W{}^{\mu\nu}$ and $F_Y{}^{\mu\nu}$ are respectively given by standard expressions for the $SU(2)$ and $U(1)$ Yang-Mills field strengths; \mathbf{W}^μ and Y^μ are the gauge fields. In all but the special case where $\varphi \equiv \chi + \text{const}$, the ratio of g_W and g_Y , and hence $\theta_W := \arctan(g_Y/g_W)$ will not be constant. Moreover, as a result of renormalisation, even if θ_W is spacetime independent at one particular energy scale it will not be at all others. The fine structure constant is given by:

$$\alpha = g_W^2 \sin^2 \theta_W := e^{2\phi}; \quad \phi = \phi(\varphi, \chi). \quad (4)$$

3 Charge non-conservation and simple varying- α theories

It follows from Noether's principle that any gauge-invariant varying-alpha theory contains a conserved current. The class of theories described above is symmetric under modified $U(1)_{em}$ gauge transformations $A_\mu \rightarrow A_\mu + e^{-\phi} \nabla_\mu \Lambda$, where $\alpha = e^{2\phi}$. The rest of the gauge symmetry must be broken by a Higgs sector if it is to describe our universe. The conserved current however is not the one conjugate to A_μ , i.e. $J^\mu(x) := \frac{\delta \mathcal{S}_{matter}}{\delta A_\mu(x)}$ (with \mathcal{S}_{matter} being the matter action). Noether's principle says $\nabla_\mu (e^\phi J^\mu) = 0$ so it is $j^\mu := e^\phi J^\mu$ that is conserved. The question of which of J^μ and j^μ should be considered physical rests in the form of the dilaton-to-matter coupling. Refs. [8] and [9] respectively take different stances on the issue. In ' j^μ -physical' theories charge is clearly conserved.

If J^μ is naturally interpreted as the physical current then there is a form of non-conservation of charge. The total charge, Q , in a volume V is:

$$\begin{aligned} Q &:= \int_V j_0 e^{\phi(t,\mathbf{x})} dV = \int_V j_0 \left(e^{\phi(t,\mathbf{0})} + \mathbf{x} \cdot \vec{\nabla} e^{\phi(t,\mathbf{0})} + \dots \right) \\ &= e^{\phi(t,\mathbf{0})} q + \vec{\nabla} e^{\phi(t,\mathbf{0})} \cdot \mathbf{d} + \dots + \vec{\nabla}^i \vec{\nabla}^j \dots \vec{\nabla}^k e^{\phi(t,\mathbf{0})} d_{ij..k}^{(n)} + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $d_{ij..k}^{(n)}$ is the n^{th} electric multipole moment w.r.t. to the conserved current j^μ . A collection of neutral particles cannot develop an electric charge in such theories. Similarly an initially electrically neutral, perfect fluid (containing a mixture of negatively and positively charged components) cannot become charged since all multipole moments will vanish for such a fluid. This implies that cosmologically, at least, charge will be conserved to a very good approximation. The universe cannot develop a non-negligible overall charge in this way. Particle level interactions will also conserve charge at each vertex as a result of the conservation of j^μ .

We will now show that when θ_W and α vary then a stronger form of non-conservation of charge arises in ' J^μ -physical' theories, and that even in ' j^μ -physical' theories the fermions develop an EDM.

4 A new interaction from varying- θ_W

A Higgs sector must break the $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ symmetry down to the $U(1)$ of electromagnetism. The physically propagating fields, the photon, A^μ , and the Z-boson, Z^μ , are given in terms of Y^μ and W_3^μ in the usual way. Their field strengths are:

$$F_A^{\mu\nu} = 2e^{-1}\partial^{[\mu}(eA^{\nu]}), \quad (6)$$

$$F_Z^{\mu\nu} = 2(g_W \cos \theta_W)^{-1}\partial^{[\mu}(g_W \cos \theta_W Z^{\nu]}), \quad (7)$$

where $e = g_W \sin \theta_W := e^\phi$ is the fundamental electric charge. The kinetic terms for W^3 and Y now become:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{Z,A} := & -\frac{1}{4}F_{W^3}^2 - \frac{1}{4}F_Y^2 = -\frac{1}{4}F_A^2 - \frac{1}{4}F_Z^2 \\ & + 2F_A^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu\theta_W Z_\nu - 2\tan\theta_W F_Z^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu\theta_W Z_\nu \\ & - \frac{2}{\sin^2\theta_W \cos^2\theta_W} [(\partial\theta_W)^2 Z^2 - \partial_\mu\theta_W\partial_\nu\theta_W Z^\mu Z^\nu] \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The first two terms are the standard kinetic terms for the photon and Z -boson. The term in square brackets and the one before provide only minor corrections to the Z -boson propagator. The third term, $2F_A^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu\theta_W Z_\nu$, is the one that interests us. It produces a coupling between the photon and the Z boson that was not previously present. It means that all particle species with weak neutral charge will induce an electric current density.

5 Induced currents

At energies well below the Z -boson mass, $M_Z \sim 91$ GeV, $Z^\mu \approx J_N^\mu/M_Z^2$; J_N^μ the weak neutral current density. The interaction term of section 4 therefore produces an effective electromagnetic current density, \hat{J}^μ , given by:

$$\hat{j}^\mu \equiv e^\phi \hat{j}^\mu := 2e^\phi \nabla_\nu \left(\frac{\nabla^\mu \theta_W J_N^\nu - \nabla^\nu \theta_W J_N^\mu}{e^\phi M_Z^2} \right). \quad (7)$$

The nature of the physical electric potential depends on whether J^μ or j^μ is the physical current density. When the magnetic field vanishes, $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{0}$, the physical potential is defined by the condition that the electric field \mathbf{E} should vanish if and only if the potential is constant. When $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{0}$, the modified Maxwell equations are:

$$e^\phi \vec{\nabla} \cdot (e^{-\phi} \mathbf{E}) = \rho := J^0 \quad (8)$$

$$\vec{\nabla} \times (e^\phi \mathbf{E}) = \mathbf{0} \quad (9)$$

So long as the gradients in ϕ varying only very slightly within the region of space where $\rho(x)$ has support, then $\mu = (\vec{\nabla}\phi)^2 - \nabla^2\phi \approx \text{const}$. The electric field is given by $\mathbf{E} := e^{-\phi} \vec{\nabla} (e^\phi \Psi)$ where:

$$\Psi(x) = -\frac{1}{4\pi} \int d^3x' \operatorname{Re} \left(\frac{e^{-\sqrt{\mu}|x-x'|}}{|x-x'|} \right) \rho(x') \quad (10)$$

This case is the one that corresponds to J^μ being the physical current density. Here, $\Phi := e^\phi \Psi(x)$ is deemed to be the physical potential.

This is not the only possibility. If the ϕ equation of motion is such that $\vec{\nabla} \phi \times \mathbf{E} = \mathbf{0}$ whenever $\mathbf{B} = 0$, then $\mathbf{E} = e^\phi \vec{\nabla} \Upsilon$ with:

$$\Upsilon(x) = -\frac{1}{4\pi} \int d^3x' \frac{e^{-\phi} \rho(x')}{|x-x'|}. \quad (11)$$

It is clear that here $e^{-\phi} \rho(x) = j^0$ is the physical charge density; $\Upsilon(x)$ is identified as the physical potential. The requirement that $\vec{\nabla} \phi \times \mathbf{E} = 0$ might seem quite contrived. It might, however, arise as an integrability condition for the ϕ -equation of motion; for example as in ref. [8]. This condition defines how the mass of any charged particle should depend on α . All charged particles must develop this α -dependent mass through photon and dilaton loop corrections. Chiral fermions are protected against becoming massive in this way, therefore all viable ' j^μ -physical' theories cannot contain charged chiral fermions. This statement applies equally to all charges associated with varying-gauge couplings. Weakly charged neutrinos must therefore be massive in ' j^μ -physical' varying- α theories.

Consider a point particle, weak neutral charge Q_N , at $\mathbf{x} = 0$. In a ' J^μ -physical' theory the new interaction term described above makes the following contribution to the physical electric potential $\Phi(x)$:

$$\Phi(x) \approx \left(-\frac{Q_N \vec{\nabla} \theta_W \cdot \vec{\nabla} \phi}{M_Z^2} \right) \frac{e^{\phi(x)}}{2\pi r} + \frac{Q_N \vec{\nabla} \theta_W}{M_Z^2} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{x} e^{\phi(x)}}{2\pi r^3}, \quad (12)$$

where $r = |\mathbf{x}|$. The first term in Φ represents a point electric charge $q_{eff} = \frac{2Q_N \vec{\nabla} \theta_W \cdot \vec{\nabla} \phi}{M_Z^2}$. The second term is the potential of an electric-dipole moment $\mathbf{d}_{eff} = -\frac{2Q_N \vec{\nabla} \theta_W}{M_Z^2}$. In ' J^μ -physical' theories all weak neutrally-charged particles will become effectively electrically charged when θ_W varies. Such particles will also develop an effective EDM. The form of q_{eff} means that it will not be quantised in units of e . There is effective dequantisation of electric charge in these theories. In ' j^μ -physical' theories we do not see an induced charge effect. Weak neutrally-charged particles will still develop an EDM. The electric potential, $\Upsilon(x)$, is:

$$\Upsilon(x) = \frac{Q_N \vec{\nabla} \theta_W}{e^{\phi(0)} M_Z^2} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{x}}{2\pi r^3}. \quad (13)$$

The induced EDM is

$$\mathbf{d}'_{eff} := -\frac{2Q_N \vec{\nabla} \theta_W}{e^{\phi(0)} M_Z^2}. \quad (14)$$

Order of magnitude estimates for q_{eff} , \mathbf{d}_{eff} and \mathbf{d}'_{eff} are given in the section 6 below.

6 Discussion

The weak neutral current, J_N^μ , is not conserved. In general, massive bodies such as our Sun, and the universe as a whole, have a large net weak-neutral charge density compared to their net electric charge density. In ‘ J^μ -physical’ electroweak theories of varying- α , particles develop an electric charge proportional to their weak-neutral charge. It is possible then to have non-conservation of electric charge. The universe develops a non-negligible overall charge in this way. The charges that are induced are in general not quantised in units of the fundamental charge e . Spatial variations in θ_W also induce EDMs on the fundamental fermion species. The EDMs all point in the direction of $\vec{\nabla} \theta_W$. In a region where $\vec{\nabla} \theta_W \approx const$, therefore, these EDMs will line up and produce an overall macroscopic EDM. Numerically the sizes of the effective charges and EDMs are:

$$q_{eff} \sim 10^{-31} e \left(\|\nabla \theta_W\| \cdot \|\nabla \ln \alpha\| \text{ cm}^2 \right) \quad (15)$$

$$d_{eff} \approx d'_{eff} \sim 10^{-31} e\text{-cm} \left(\|\nabla \theta_W\| \text{ cm} \right) \quad (16)$$

In many varying- α theories one finds $\vec{\nabla} \ln \alpha \approx \zeta_\alpha \vec{\nabla} \phi_N$, $\vec{\nabla} \theta_W \approx \zeta_\theta \vec{\nabla} \phi_N$, where $\phi_N = GM/r^2$ is the Newtonian gravitational potential. We expect $\zeta_\alpha, \zeta_\theta \ll 1$. Near the surface of Earth such theories would induce $q_{eff} \sim \zeta_\alpha \zeta_\theta 10^{-66} e$, $d_{eff} \approx d'_{eff} \sim \zeta_\theta 10^{-48} e\text{-cm}$.

Any physically viable, varying- α and varying- θ_W theory must satisfy all relevant bounds on the neutrino and neutron charges and on the EDMs of the fundamental particles. The most restrictive upper bound on the electron-neutrino charge, q_ν , has been given by Caprini and Ferreira in ref. [12]. They considered the isotropy of the Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) and found: $q_\nu < 4 \times 10^{-35} e$. In the same way they also bounded the charge difference between a proton and an electron: $q_{e-p} < 10^{-26} e$. An upper bound on the neutron charge, $q_n < -0.4 \pm 1.1 \times 10^{-21}$, is given by Baumann *et al.* in [10].

The Particle Data Group, see ref. [11], gives the upper bound on the electron EDM as $d_e < 6.9 \pm 7.4 \times 10^{-28}$ e-cm. Experiments are planned that would be able to detect any electron EDM at the 10^{-31} e-cm level, [13]. Ref. [11] also gives upper bounds on the EDMs of the proton, $d_p < 0.54 \times 10^{-23}$ e-cm, and the neutron, $d_n < 0.63 \times 10^{-25}$ e-cm. It is clear that all current bounds will be easily satisfied by most varying- α theories.

It is normally the case that intrinsic EDMs on Dirac fermions are indicators of CP-violation. In varying- α theories we have seen that it possible to induce such EDMs without adding any explicit CP-violating term to the Lagrangian and that varying- α theories generically result in some manner of charge non-conservation and effective dequantisation of charge without breaking the $U(1)_{em}$ symmetry. These effects, if detectable in the context of a given theory, could provide us with a new way of probing the rate of spatial variation in θ_W and α .

Acknowledgements DS is supported by a PPARC studentship. I would like to thank J. D. Barrow for reading a preprint of this letter and for making helpful suggestions, and to thank J. Magueijo for helpful discussions.

References

- [1] J.K. Webb, V.V. Flambaum, C.W. Churchill, M.J. Drinkwater and J.D. Barrow, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 884 (1999); J.K. Webb, M.T. Murphy, V. Flambaum, V. Dzuba, J.D. Barrow, C. Churchill, J. Prochaska, and A. Wolfe, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 091301 (2001); M.T. Murphy *et al.*, Mon. Not. R. astron. Soc.. **327**, 1208 (2001).
- [2] H. Chand *et al.*, Astron. Astrophys. **417**, 853 (2004); R. Srikanand *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 121302 (2004).
- [3] M.J. Drinkwater, J.K. Webb, J.D. Barrow and V.V. Flambaum, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **295**, 457 (1998); W.J. Marciano, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52**, 489 (1984).
- [4] J.P. Uzan, Rev. Mod. Phys. **75**, 403 (2003); J.-P. Uzan, astro-ph/0409424.
- [5] J.D. Bekenstein, Phys. Rev. D **25**, 1527 (1982).
- [6] H. Sandvik, J.D. Barrow and J. Magueijo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 031302 (2002); J.D. Barrow, H. Sandvik, and J. Magueijo, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 063504 (2002); J.D. Barrow, H. Sandvik, and J. Magueijo, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 123501 (2002); J.D. Barrow, J. Magueijo and H. Sandvik, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 043515 (2002); J. Magueijo J.D. Barrow and H. Sandvik, Phys. Lett. B **549** 284 (2002); J.D. Barrow, J. Magueijo and H. Sandvik, Phys. Lett. B **541**, 201 (2002).
- [7] D. Kimberly and J. Magueijo, Phys. Lett. B **584**, 8 (2004).

- [8] J.D. Bekestein, Phys Rev D **66**, 123514 (2002).
- [9] D.J. Shaw and J.D. Barrow, Phys. Rev. D. **71**, 063525 (2005).
- [10] J. Baumann, J. Kalus, R. Gahler and W. Mampe, Phys. Rev. D **37**, 3107 (1988).
- [11] Particle Data Group, S. Eidelman, K. G. Hayes, K. A. Olive, M. Aguilar-Benitez, C. Amsler, D. Asner, K. S. Babu, R. M. Barnett, J. Beringer *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B. **592**, 31-88 (2004)
- [12] C. Caprini, S. Biller and P. G. Ferreira, JCAP **0502**, 006 (2005)
- [13] D. Kawall, F. Bay, S. Bickman, Y. Jiang and D. DeMille, AIP Conf. Proc. **698**, 192 (2004) .