

Magnetic Weibel field generation in thin collisionless current sheets in reconnection in space plasma

R. A. TREUMANN^{1,2} (a)

¹ Department of Geophysics and Environmental Sciences, Munich University, Munich, Germany

² Department of Physics and Astronomy, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH 03755

PACS 94.20.wj – Weibel fields in thin current sheets
 PACS 94.30.cp – Guide field generation in reconnection
 PACS 94.30.Aa – Magnetospheric substorms

Abstract. - In collisionless reconnection in space plasma like the magnetospheric tail or magnetopause current layer, magnetic fields can grow from thermal level by the action of the non-magnetic Weibel instability driven in thin ($\Delta < \text{few } \lambda_i$) current layers by the counter-streaming electron inflow from the ‘ion diffusion’ (ion inertial Hall) region into the inner current (electron inertial) region from where the ambient magnetic fields are excluded when released by the inflowing electrons which become non-magnetic on scales $< \text{few } \lambda_e$. It is shown that under magnetospheric tail conditions it takes ~ 40 e-folding times (~ 20 s) for the Weibel field to reach observable amplitudes $|\mathbf{b}_W| \sim 1$ nT. In counter-streaming inflows these fields are predominantly of guide field type. In non-symmetric inflows the field may possess a component normal to the current which would be capable of initiating reconnection onset.

Introduction. – Space observations *in situ* [1–4] and kinetic numerical simulations [5–7] unambiguously prove that magnetic reconnection in the collisionless space plasma proceeds under the following two conditions:

- The first condition is that the current sheets – that separate the involved oppositely directed (‘anti-parallel’) magnetic fields $\pm \mathbf{B}$ to both sides of the current – become ‘thin enough’, where under ‘thin enough’ it is understood that the effective half-widths $\frac{1}{2}\Delta \lesssim \lambda_i$ of the current sheets fall (approximately) below the ion inertial scale-length $\lambda_i = c/\omega_{pi}$ (with c velocity of light, $\omega_{pi} = e(N/\epsilon_0 m_i)^{1/2}$ ion plasma frequency, e elementary charge, N plasma number density, m_i ion mass). In fact the real limit on the width is not precisely known. Observations [4] suggest for instance that the width can reach values up to $\Delta \lesssim 4\lambda_i$. This condition is commonly (for example in [8, 9]) taken as sole indication that one is dealing with reconnecting collisionless current sheets.
- The second condition is that plasma must flow in into the current sheet from both sides along the normal to the current sheet at a finite (though possibly low) velocity $\pm V_n$. This condition is frequently ignored or is taken for granted without explicit consideration. In numerical simulations it

is usually taken care of by starting the simulation with a prescribed reconnection configuration which is either assumed an X-point or by locally imposing an electric field or resistance for sufficiently short time in order to ignite reconnection.

From the first condition it follows that ions in the current sheet become inertia-dominated and are demagnetised, while electrons remain magnetised. Since magnetised electrons are tied to the magnetic field, it follows that in the ion inertial region the magnetic field is carried along by the electrons becoming a region of Hall current flow [11].

From the second condition it is clear that reconnection cannot proceed continuously on time scales shorter than inflow time $\tau_{in} \simeq \Delta/V_n \sim \text{few } \lambda_i/V_n$. If reconnection turns out to be faster, it will necessarily be non-stationary and probably pulsed.

These conditions just represent *necessary* conditions still being insufficient to describe the onset of reconnection. A mechanism is missing so far that either demonstrates, in which way the electrons become scattered away from the magnetic field in order for letting the oppositely directed magnetic field components slide from the electrons and reconnect, or that forces reconnection to occur in some other way.

Quite generally, any model that scatters electrons away from the magnetic field turns out to be in trouble because of the following reason: Assume that the electrons have transported the

(a) Visiting the International Space Science Institute, Bern, Switzerland




Fig. 1: Sketch of a homogeneous thin collisionless current sheet with plasma inflow from both sides and central electron inertial region. The magnetic field piles up at the boundary of the electron inertial region giving rise to a broad (of size of a few electron inertial lengths $\lambda_e = c/\omega_e$ field-free central current layer of sheet current \mathbf{J} which is crossed by two (symmetric counter-streaming) electron flows which are Weibel unstable. On the right the pile-up deformed Harris profile is shown. It exhibits two shoulders in the regions where the magnetic field piles up at the boundaries of the broad field-free central electron inertial region. Here the Weibel instability may generate magnetic guide fields.

magnetic field from both sides some distance across the ion inertial region into the current sheet. During this transport the magnetic field lines have become bent locally thereby *enhancing* the magnetic tension. However, magnetic fields are massless and therefore have no inertia. Once the electrons release the magnetic field lines, the field lines will react to the magnetic strains and will, hence, *rebound to their initial straight configurations* stopping moving further in for meeting their oppositely directed partner-field lines and merging with them. This behaviour will keep the internal section of the current sheet free of magnetic fields. (The stationary kinetic Harris equilibrium does not cover this effect; it prescribes a tanh-shape for the magnetic field and does not distinguish between ion and electron inertial regions.) Clearly, the rebounding field lines will again become loaded with electrons when returning into the ‘ion diffusion’ region being unable to regain their initial positions. Thus magnetic field lines should accumulate near the boundary of the electron inertial region.

In this respect it is of interest that very few of the magnetic profiles across a presumably reconnecting current sheet at Earth’s magnetopause (cf. e.g. [12–14]) or also in the magnetospheric plasma sheet [15] exhibit the canonical Harris tanh-shapes; most of them show the evolution of either a magnetic plateau across the current sheet or regions along the profile where the magnetic field spatially undulates. The latter behaviour is sometimes attributed to waves passing along the boundary [14] referring to related changes in the boundary normal. It might also be explained quite naturally by the above effect.

Reconnection will happen only, when the oppositely directed magnetic field lines are brought into direct physical contact to (partially) cancel each other. This, however, requires some mechanism that acts even deep inside the electron inertial region on scales $\lesssim \lambda_e = c/\omega_{pe}$ (with $\omega_{pe} = e\sqrt{N}/\epsilon_0 m_e \approx 56.42\sqrt{N}$ rad/s angular electron plasma frequency, m_e electron mass, and N is in m^{-3}) transporting the magnetic field further

in. It is not known in which way non-magnetic electrons could cause further inward transport of the magnetic field. In quantum plasma such a transport is related to the celebrated quantum Hall effect [16]. However, space plasmas are classical, and presumably no similar possibility opens up there.

In this Letter we demonstrate that the Weibel instability [17] is capable of generating a magnetic field sufficiently fast in the centre of the thin current layer. This field could become comparably strong; however, it is directed along the current and thus plays the role of a guide field, suggesting that collisionless reconnection in narrow current sheets self-consistently generates weak guide fields of strength $B_g/B_0 < 1$ where B_0 is the magnetic field strength in the inflow region.

The Weibel scenario. – The above remark that a bent released field line will rebound to its initial position is quite serious, because this must necessarily happen inside the electron inertial region where the electrons become completely demagnetised and no forces do anymore act on the magnetic field lines to push them forward into the centre of the current sheet. One might argue that the rebounding field line gets into conflict with subsequent inflowing field lines outside the electron inertial region. This is correct, however the effect is then that a magnetic wall is built up that ultimately stops the further inflow of electrons and fields but cannot lead to the onset of reconnection. At the contrary one needs the magnetic field to be pushed in ahead of the electrons into the non-magnetic centre of the current sheet.

Such a mechanism could possibly be provided by the Weibel instability [17]. This instability is driven either by electrons or ions with the ion instability being much weaker than the electron instability. The original proposal by Weibel [17] referred to a temperature anisotropy in the unmagnetised electron distribution providing the free energy for a very low frequency $\omega \sim 0$ magnetic instability. Various variants of this instability have been investigated in the past two decades [18–24] both in the non-relativistic and relativistic domains, unmagnetised and

magnetised plasmas, cold and hot plasmas, and for temperature as well as beam instabilities, beams effectively faking a temperature anisotropy. Application of this instability was mostly intended in either laser (inertial) plasma fusion or astrophysical systems. As we will show below, reconnection provides one of the simplest and most interesting classical applications of the Weibel instability.

Figure 1 sketches the collisionless reconnection site, conventionally called the ‘ion-diffusion region’ (even though there is no diffusion). The ions just become non-magnetic here. The frozen-in electrons have sufficient momentum to continue their inward $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}$ -drift motion transporting the magnetic field to the centre of the thin current sheet. Close to the centre the electrons become demagnetised and release the magnetic field which snaps back as explained above. In the narrow electron inertial region of size of few λ_e perpendicular to the current sheet the collisionless inert electrons still maintain their inward velocity $\mathbf{V} = \pm V_b \hat{\mathbf{z}}$ (with $V_b \lesssim V_n$) on both sides of the current sheet. Since the electrons are completely collisionless, the two flows pass across each other without (direct) interaction thereby realising a *non-magnetic* counter-streaming electron beam configuration which according to [17] may become electromagnetically unstable.

The Weibel instability generates a *non-oscillating* ($\omega \sim 0$) transverse magnetic field \mathbf{b} with \mathbf{k} -vector about perpendicular to the electron beams ($k_\perp \gg k_\parallel$, the subscripts refer to the direction of \mathbf{V}). In space plasma this instability is non-relativistic, and one might suspect that it is too slow to cause any effect. We will, however, show below that its effect is not negligible. Investigating instability we work in the fluid approximation of cold ($T_b \approx 0$) beams of density N_b , for simplicity assuming that the plasma is also cold, even though the centre of the reconnecting current layer contains a denser $N > N_b$ thermal plasma of temperature $T = T_e + T_i$ (to which we will return when estimating the thermal fluctuation level of the instability). Under *unmagnetised* plasma conditions in the presence of beams the Weibel instability grows. It has been investigated mostly in the relativistic limit. In reconnection in space plasmas inclusion of relativistic effects is unnecessary. The inflow Mach numbers are small, and beam velocities $V_b \ll c$ are small as well.

The two symmetric counterstreaming electron beams in the central electron-inertial region have roughly same density N_b , a condition that applies primarily to the magnetospheric tail-current sheet; at the magnetopause the beams are non-symmetric. At very low frequencies the electromagnetic dispersion relation factorises [17] (see also the more elaborate papers of, e.g., [18, 24] and many others where non-symmetric, thermal and kinetic corrections are given and also external magnetic fields are obtained, the latter acting stabilising). In slab geometry, the factor describing plane *electromagnetic* fluctuations of frequency $\omega \approx 0$ becomes

$$D_{xx}D_{zz} - |D_{xz}|^2 = 0 \quad (1)$$

where D_{ij} are the components of the dispersion tensor $D(\omega, \mathbf{k}) = k^2 c^2 \mathbf{I} - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\omega, \mathbf{k})$ (with plasma dielectric tensor function $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\omega, \mathbf{k})$). Under the assumed symmetric conditions $D_{xz} \equiv$

0, and the dispersion relation simplifies to

$$D_{zz} = n^2 - 1 + \sum_s {}^s \chi_{zz} = 0, \quad n^2 = k^2 c^2 / \omega^2 \quad (2)$$

where n is the refraction index, \mathbf{k} wave number, ω wave frequency, and ${}^s \chi_{ij}$ the susceptibility tensor of species s which, in a symmetric electron/electron-beam plasma, is given by

$$\chi_{zz} = \frac{k^2 V_b^2 \omega_b^2}{\omega^2} \left[1 + \frac{\omega_b^2}{\omega_b^2 + \omega_e^2 (1 + m_e/m_i)} \right] \quad (3)$$

The subscripts e and b indicate background and beam parameters, respectively, and in the denominator the (negligibly small) quasi-neutral ion contribution to the plasma frequency is taken into account for correctness in the electron-to-ion mass ratio term m_e/m_i . When the background plasma is at rest, the ‘wave’ becomes non-oscillating with $\omega = \pm i\gamma_W$ (otherwise when the plasma moves at velocity \mathbf{V}_0 the wave frequency will as usual be Doppler shifted by the amount $\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{V}_0$).

Solving the above dispersion relation for $\gamma_W > 0$ yields the growth rate of the non-evanescent growing mode

$$\frac{\gamma_W}{\omega_b} = \frac{V_b}{c} \left\{ 1 + \frac{\omega_b^2}{k^2 c^2} \left[1 + \frac{N}{N_b} \left(1 + \frac{m_e}{m_i} \right) \right] \right\}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad (4)$$

Again, N is the quasi-neutral background density. Maximum growth rates are obtained when the second term in the braced expression becomes small, which is the case at relatively *short* wavelengths

$$k\lambda_{eb} \gg [1 + (N/N_b)]^{\frac{1}{2}} > 1 \quad (5)$$

The Weibel instability will thus lead to magnetic field small-scale magnetic structures populating the beam-electron inertial range of size $\lambda \sim 2\pi\lambda_{eb} = 2\pi c/\omega_b$. Such structures are not purely transverse because $kc/\omega > 1$. They contain a longitudinal electric ‘wave’ field component $\mathbf{e}_\ell \parallel \mathbf{k}$ which in the symmetric beam case is small. The main transverse electric field component \mathbf{e}_T is along the electron beams. Since the ‘wave’ magnetic field \mathbf{b} satisfies the solenoidal condition $\mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{k} = 0$, $\mathbf{k} \perp \mathbf{V}_b$, and $\omega\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{e}_T$ (with \mathbf{e}_T the transverse component of the electric field), the Weibel magnetic field lies in the plane that is perpendicular to the plasma inflow into the current sheet (cf. Figure 2). In an extended two-dimensional current sheet the Weibel magnetic field is directed either parallel or anti-parallel to the sheet current while being confined to the electron inertial zone around the non-magnetic centre of the current sheet. Such a field is what is called a guide field. Since it cannot be stronger than the magnetic field B_0 in the external inflow region the Weibel instability generates weak guide fields satisfying $b_W/B_0 < 1$. The above smallness condition on its wavelength implies that the Weibel guide field forms a short-scale wavy magnetic structure perpendicular to the sheet current in this case. In addition it has a transverse electric field $\mathbf{e}_\perp \parallel \mathbf{V}_b$ component along the electron beam inflow direction that is confined to the electron inertial region, while the longitudinal electric field is in the direction $\mathbf{e}_\ell \perp \mathbf{V}_b$.

The case that the inflow is not homogeneous either along the current or transverse to it is of particular interest. In this case




Fig. 2: Conditions inside a local electron inertial region. The external magnetic field accumulates at the boundary of the inertial region. Electron flow is perpendicular to the magnetic field. Inside the inertial region the electron components form two oblique beams. The Weibel instability generates a magnetic vortex of field \mathbf{b}_w with wavenumber $\mathbf{k} \perp \mathbf{V}_b$ perpendicular to the beam configuration. These vortices close in the current plane (x, y) and have wavelengths of the order of $\sim \lambda_{eb}$. The sense of the magnetic vortices alternates along the current direction. Shown is the part of the lowest order vortex where the field is along the sheet current \mathbf{J} . At a phase of $\pi/2$ along the current the Weibel fields point along the ambient magnetic field causing wobbling of the current layer. Under non-symmetric beam conditions the wave vector and Weibel fields may become tilted against the current sheet. This could give rise to the local production of a normal magnetic field component b_z which may possibly initiate reconnection.

the wave vector \mathbf{k}_\perp rotates in the (x, y)-plane perpendicular to the inflowing electron beam. The condition that the magnetic field be free of divergence forces the Weibel magnetic field to form closed magnetic vortices in this plane. Such a magnetic vortex causes a magnetic asymmetry along the sheet current by periodically amplifying and weakening the external magnetic field on one side of (above or below) the current layer. This produces a spatial oscillation around the symmetry plane of the current layer of wavelengths of the Weibel magnetic vortices.

Thermal Weibel level. – So far we have been dealing with linear growth of the Weibel instability. In order to obtain its saturation level one needs to investigate the nonlinear evolution of the Weibel instability. This will be left for a future communication. Here we ask for how long it takes the Weibel instability to grow for reaching any measurable magnetic field strength growing from thermal fluctuation level.

To estimate the thermal Weibel level we refer to non-magnetic thermal fluctuation theory [25]. [Working in the Weibel low frequency fluid limit implies that in the general kinetic expressions Eq. (11.2.5.1-5.2) of Ref. [25] their variable z must be set to zero.] Then, according to thermal fluctuation theory in the classical limit the spectral representation of magnetic field fluctuations near real frequency $\omega \approx 0$ will be given by

$$\frac{\langle \mathbf{b}^2(\mathbf{k}, \omega) \rangle}{8\mu_0} \approx \frac{\sqrt{8\pi^3} n^2 T k \lambda_D \omega_e}{(n^2 - 1)^2 \omega \omega} \quad (6)$$

where $T = T_e + T_i$ is the temperature of the plasma (in energy

units), and $\lambda_D = v_e/\omega_e$ is the Debye length. The term $n^2 - 1$ in the denominator is just the susceptibility χ_{zz} allowing us to evaluate the right hand side in Eq. (6). Because $n^2 = k^2 c^2/\omega^2$, the frequency in the denominator in the factor on the right hand side of Eq. (6) cancels, and any frequency dependence survives only inside of χ_{zz} , where it must be replaced by $\omega = +i\gamma\omega$ for the growing Weibel instability case. This then yields

$$\frac{\langle \mathbf{b}^2(\mathbf{k}, \omega) \rangle}{8\mu_0} \approx \frac{\sqrt{8\pi^3} T \lambda_D}{\omega_e k \lambda_e \lambda_e} \left(1 - \frac{N_b}{N}\right)^{-2} \quad (7)$$

The fluctuation level of the Weibel magnetic field is obtained by integrating this approximate expression over frequency and wave number space. Since the real frequency is zero, the frequency integral must be taken with weight $2\pi\delta(\omega/\omega_e)$. Moreover, the restrictions on the wave number imply that the wave number volume element becomes $dk^3 = 2\pi k^2 dk \sin\theta d\theta$, where $\theta \approx 90^\circ$ is the angle between the beam velocity and wave number. This angle is close to $\pi/2$ such that $\sin\theta \approx 1$ and $\int d\theta \approx \Delta\theta$. With $\lambda_D/\lambda_e = v_e/c$ we then have

$$\frac{\langle \mathbf{b}^2 \rangle}{2\mu_0} \approx \frac{4T\Delta\theta v_e}{\sqrt{2\pi} c} \int \frac{d\omega}{\omega_e} \delta\left(\frac{\omega}{\omega_e}\right) \int_{1/\lambda_b}^{1/\lambda_e} k \frac{dk}{\lambda_e} \left(1 - \frac{N_b}{N}\right)^{-2} \quad (8)$$

For our rough order-of-magnitude estimate the lower limit on the k -integral can be put to zero. The thermal level of the Weibel instability in this approximation is then given by

$$\frac{\langle \mathbf{b}^2 \rangle}{2\mu_0} \approx \frac{2\Delta\theta v_e T}{\sqrt{2\pi} c \lambda_e^3} \left(1 - \frac{N_b}{N}\right)^{-2} \quad (9)$$

which depends only on the ratio of electron beam to plasma density, the electron inertial length, plasma temperature, ratio of electron thermal to light velocity, and the propagation cone angle of the Weibel ‘wave’ spectrum. Clearly this will turn out a small number – as it must be. However, it gives us the tool at hand of estimating the time of how long it would take the Weibel instability to generate measurable magnetic field strengths under observable conditions.

Weibel growth time in magnetotail reconnection. – We are interested in the time required for the Weibel instability under conditions in the magnetotail reconnection region to grow. The conditions in this region are approximately given by the following plasma parameters: density $N \approx 10^6 \text{ m}^{-3}$, electron ‘beam’ density $N_b \approx 10^5 \text{ m}^{-3}$, plasma temperature $T \approx (0.1 - 1) \text{ keV}$ (depending on the ion contribution with electron temperature $T_e \approx 10^2 \text{ eV}$), angular size $\Delta\theta \approx 10^\circ$. With these values in mind we find that the thermal level of the Weibel instability is indeed low, yielding a Weibel magnetic field pressure

$$\frac{\langle \mathbf{b}^2 \rangle_{\text{th}}}{2\mu_0} \approx 6 \times 10^{-30} \text{ J m}^{-3} \quad (10)$$

This corresponds to a Weibel thermal magnetic field strength of $\langle \mathbf{b}^2 \rangle_{\text{th}}^{1/2} \sim 4 \times 10^{-18} \text{ T}$. This is the level where from the Weibel instability starts to grow according to the linear instability prescription

$$\mathbf{b}^2(t) \approx \langle \mathbf{b}^2 \rangle_{\text{th}} \exp(2\gamma_w t) \quad (11)$$

If we assume that the instability can freely grow until reaching observable values before nonlinear effects come into play, the typical growth time for the magnetic field becoming observable is

$$\tau_w \approx \frac{1}{2\gamma_w} \ln \frac{\mathbf{b}^2(\tau_w)}{\langle \mathbf{b}^2 \rangle_{\text{th}}} \quad (12)$$

With our above parameters and an electron inflow ‘beam’ velocity of $V_b \approx 30$ km/s we find that the growth rate of the Weibel instability amounts to $\gamma_w \approx 2$ Hz. If we now demand that $|\mathbf{b}(\tau)| \approx 1$ nT in order to be observable in the magnetospheric tail plasma sheet, we find a typical growth time of $\tau_w(1 \text{ nT}) \approx 20$ s, which corresponds to ~ 40 e-folding times. During this time the plasma flows roughly a distance of 600 km. The effect thus is finite though seems marginal which, however, is not an argument against this mechanism as the time of the electron flow across the electron inertial region is independent of the growth time of the Weibel magnetic field. For the latter it is required only that the counter-streaming beam flow is realised.

Discussion. – The result of this investigation is that inside the magnetic field-free electron inertial region (of transverse size of a few λ_e) in the centres of thin – possibly reconnecting – current sheets, the inflow of electrons into the sheet from its two sides is capable of self-consistently generating a *weak magnetic guide* field via the non-magnetic Weibel instability. Giving sufficient time, such weak guide fields will evolve in the very centre of the current sheet only. (Similar weak – quadrupolar – guide fields are caused in the ion inertial zone by the Hall effect, but these fields are found outside the current sheet centre.) Such a Weibel guide field is limited to be weaker than the external ambient magnetic field. In the symmetric magnetospheric tail current sheet we find that it may reach up to $\sim 10\%$ of the ambient field in strength in a reasonably short linear e-folding time unless nonlinear effects set on earlier to saturate the field on a much lower level.

Guide fields are important in the dynamics of the current sheet and in particular for reconnection because they act re-magnetising the plasma in the central current region which is practically free of magnetic fields. Pointing along the electric field that drives the current, they cause particle acceleration, which amplifies the current, generates energetic particles, and generates a number of secondary effects that affect the stability of the plasma in the current sheet. The role of guide fields in collisionless magnetic reconnection and the various effects it may cause have in the past years been thoroughly investigated in numerical simulations both for guide fields perpendicular (e.g., [26–28]) and parallel (e.g., [29–33]) to the sheet current. We may therefore refer to the published literature where the existence of guide field has been imposed.

The interesting point we make here is that the Weibel instability provides a self-consistent mechanism for producing such guide fields in the field free current region. These fields are comparably small-scale forming magnetic vortices of alternating polarity. On the scale of their wavelength they cause a modulation of the magnetic field and consequently a spatial modulation of the current sheet. In the general case when the cur-

rent sheet is not homogeneous the guide fields cause a three-dimensional structuring of the current sheet.

The calculations presented here applied to the case when the conditions are homogeneous along the current, such that $\mathbf{b} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{z}} = 0$. In the general case, when homogeneity is not given, the Weibel magnetic field may possibly develop a non-zero field component $\mathbf{b}_z = b_n \hat{\mathbf{z}}$ in the direction normal to the current sheet. Such a local normal magnetic field component is equivalent to a seed-X-point field and may ignite reconnection in a similar way as assumed for initial condition in numerical simulations.

This research is part of a Visiting Scientist Programme at ISSI, Bern. Hospitality of the ISSI staff and directors is thankfully recognised.

REFERENCES

- [1] M FUJIMOTO ET AL, *Geophys Res Lett* **24** (1997) 2893-2896.
- [2] T NAGAI ET AL, *J Geophys Res* **103** (1998) 4419; *J Geophys Res* **106** (2001) 25929
- [3] M ØIEROSET ET AL, *Nature* **412** (2001) 414.
- [4] A VAIVADS ET AL, *Phys Rev Lett* **93** (2004) 105001.
- [5] J J RAMOS, F PORCELLI and R VERÁSTEHUI, *Phys Rev Lett* **89** (2002) 055002, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.89.055002.
- [6] J F DRAKE ET AL, *Science* **299** (2003) 873.
- [7] J F DRAKE, M A SHAY, W THONGTHAI and M SWISDAK, *Phys Rev Lett* **94** (2005) 095001, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.94.095001.
- [8] RETINÒ A ET AL, *Nature Phys* **3** (2007) 236, doi: 10.1038/nphys574.
- [9] SUNDQVIST D, RETINÒ A, VAIVADS A and BALE S D, *Phys Rev Lett* **99** (2007) 025004, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.99.025004.
- [10] J F DRAKE ET AL, *Nature* **443** (2006) 553, doi: 10.1038/nature05116.
- [11] B U Ö SONNERUP, *Solar System Plasma Physics* Vol III, edited by L T LANZEROTTI, C F KENNEL and E N PARKER (North-Holland, New York, 1979), p. 45.
- [12] S E HAALAND ET AL, *Ann Geophysicae* **22** (2004) 1347-1365.
- [13] S E HAALAND ET AL, *Geophys Res Lett* **31** (2004) L10804, doi: 10.1029/2004GL020001.
- [14] G PASCHMANN ET AL, *Ann Geophysicae* **23** (2005) 1481-1497.
- [15] A RUNOV ET AL, *Geophys Res Lett* **30** (2003) 1579.
- [16] Z F EZAWA, *Quantum Hall Effects* (World Scientific, Singapore 2000).
- [17] E S WEIBEL, *Phys Rev Lett* **2** (1959) 83, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.2.83.
- [18] P H YOON and R C DAVIDSON, *Phys Rev A* **35** (2003) 2718.
- [19] M V MEDVEDEV and A LOEB, *Astrophys J* **526** (1999) 697.
- [20] F CALIFANO, T CECCHI and C CHIUDERI, *Phys Plasmas* **9** (2002) 451.
- [21] L O SILVA ET AL, *Phys Plasmas* **9** (2002) 2458.
- [22] R A FONSECA ET AL, *Phys Plasmas* **10** (2003) 1979.
- [23] P H YOON, *Phys Plasmas* **14** (2007) 02454.
- [24] A ACHTERBERG and J WIERSMA, *Astron Astrophys* **475** (2007) 1, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361:20065365.
- [25] A I AKHIEZER ET AL, *Plasma Electrodynamics*, Vol. **2 Non-Linear Theory and Fluctuations** (Pergamon Press, Oxford 1975), pp. 116-142.

- [26] P RICCI, G LAPENTA and J U BRACKBILL, *Phys Plasmas* **10** (2003) 3554, doi: 10.1063/1.1598207.
- [27] P RICCI, J U BRACKBILL, W. DAUGHTON and G LAPENTA, *Phys Plasmas* **11** (2004) 4101, doi: 10.1063/1.1768552.
- [28] P RICCI, J U BRACKBILL, W. DAUGHTON and G LAPENTA, *Phys Plasmas* **11** (2004) 4489, doi: 10.1063/1.1778744.
- [29] P L PRITCHETT, *Phys Plasmas* **12** (2005) 062301, doi: 10.1063/1.1914309.
- [30] P L PRITCHETT, *J Geophys Res* **111** (2006) A10212, doi: 10.1029/2006JA011793.
- [31] P A CASSAK, J F DRAKE and M A SHAY, *Phys Plasmas* **14** (2007) 054502, doi: 10.1063/1.2734948.
- [32] J EGEDAL ET AL, *J Geophys Res* **113** (2008) A12207, doi: 10.1029/2008JA013520.
- [33] A LE ET AL, *Phys Rev Lett* **102** (2009) 085001, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.102.085001.