

The Reactive Energy of Transient EM Fields

Gerald Kaiser *

Center for Signals and Waves

Austin, TX

kaiser@wavelets.com

I. THE REACTIVE ENERGY DENSITY $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{r}, t)$

We give a physically compelling definition of the *instantaneous reactive energy density* associated with an arbitrary time-domain electromagnetic field in vacuum [1]. In *Heaviside-Lorentz units*, where $\varepsilon_0 = \mu_0 = 1$, it is given in terms of the energy density $U(\mathbf{r}, t)$ and the Poynting vector $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{r}, t)$ by

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{r}, t) = \sqrt{U(\mathbf{r}, t)^2 - \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{r}, t)^2}. \quad (1)$$

This is a field-theoretic version of the *rest energy of a relativistic point particle* with total energy E and momentum \mathbf{p} ,

$$E_0 = \sqrt{E^2 - c^2 \mathbf{p}^2}.$$

We may interpret (1) as follows: at space-time points (\mathbf{r}, t) where $|\mathbf{S}| < U$, the energy flow is insufficient to carry away *all* of the energy in the form of radiation. The (momentarily) abandoned ‘rest’ energy is reactive.

In terms of the electric and magnetic fields (\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{B}) , we have

$$U = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{E}^2 + \mathbf{B}^2), \quad \mathbf{S} = \mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}$$

and \mathcal{R} reduces to the simple expression

$$\mathcal{R} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{4}(\mathbf{E}^2 - \mathbf{B}^2)^2 + (\mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{B})^2} \geq 0. \quad (2)$$

This shows that at each space-time point (\mathbf{r}, t) we have

$$\mathcal{R} = 0 \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{E}^2 - \mathbf{B}^2 = 0 \text{ and } \mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0, \quad (3)$$

which are precisely the conditions for a *pure radiation field*. For a *generic* EM field, \mathcal{R} is *strictly positive almost everywhere*¹ in space-time and approaches zero, as it must, *only in the far zone*. Fields for which \mathcal{R} vanishes identically, called *null fields*, consist of pure radiation. The simplest null fields are traveling plane waves. An interesting example of null fields with sources, resembling a spinning black hole in general relativity, was constructed in [2]. It was this example that inspired the general study of reactive energy density in [1].

Just as the rest energy E_0 defines the *mass* m of the point particle by $E_0 = mc^2$, so does \mathcal{R} define the *electromagnetic inertia density* \mathcal{I} by

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{r}, t) = \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{r}, t)c^2.$$

*Supported by AFOSR Grant #FA9550-08-1-0144.

¹Here *almost everywhere* means that \mathcal{R} can vanish only on lower-dimensional hypersurfaces of space-time. If $\mathbf{E}^2 - \mathbf{B}^2$ and $\mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{B}$ are *independent*, (3) implies that $\mathcal{R} = 0$ on a 2D space-time surface whose time slices are, in general, time-dependent curves in space. For the standing plane wave in Example 2 below, $\mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{B} \equiv 0$, so (3) reduces to one condition and \mathcal{R} vanishes on the traveling planes (6), which form 3D hypersurfaces in space-time whose time slices are snapshots of the planes at a given time t .

Whereas m and E_0 measure *impedance to acceleration*, \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{R} measure *impedance to radiation*. Like E_0 , \mathcal{R} is *Lorentz invariant*, i.e., it has identical values in all uniformly moving (inertial) coordinate frames. For *narrowband* fields, the time average of \mathcal{R} is expected to reduce to the known, stationary reactive energy density. Thus \mathcal{R} is a transient or ‘ultra-wideband’ version of the latter, local in *time* as well as space.

We compute $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{r}, t)$ explicitly for two fields representing the extremes of space-time localization:

- 1) A general time-dependent electric dipole field. This is *local* in space-time.
- 2) A standing plane wave obtained by adding two plane waves of frequency $\omega > 0$ traveling along $\pm \hat{\mathbf{z}}$. This is localized at two points in the 4D frequency-wavenumber domain, hence *highly nonlocal* in space-time.

In Example 1, we find that the reactive energy oscillates around the dipole, as shown in Figure 1, and decays to zero in the far zone as expected.




Fig. 1. For a frequency-modulated Gaussian electric dipole, the near-field pattern of the reactive energy density oscillates between the two forms shown above; see [1] for details.

In Example 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} U &= E^2[\cos^2(kz - \omega t) + \cos^2(kz + \omega t)] \\ \mathbf{S} &= \hat{\mathbf{z}}E^2[\cos^2(kz - \omega t) - \cos^2(kz + \omega t)], \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $k = \omega/c$ and E is the amplitude of the electric fields of the traveling plane waves. This gives

$$\mathcal{R} = 2E^2|\cos(kz - \omega t)\cos(kz + \omega t)|. \quad (5)$$

Thus \mathcal{R} vanishes on the *traveling nodal planes* $z = z_\ell^\pm(t)$, where

$$z_\ell^\pm(t) = \frac{(2\ell + 1)\pi}{2k} \pm ct, \quad \ell = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots, \quad (6)$$

and $\mathcal{R} > 0$ elsewhere. This is shown in Figure 2.




Fig. 2. The reactive energy density $\mathcal{R}(z, t)$ of the standing plane wave in Example 2, showing the moving nodes (6) where $\mathcal{R} = 0$.

The two plane waves traveling along $\pm \hat{z}$ are *null*, *i.e.*, their reactive energy densities vanish. Hence the reactive energy of their sum, the standing wave, is due entirely to the *interference* between the two traveling waves. That is, the invariants in (3) consist only of the cross-terms. Furthermore, since every *globally sourceless* field is a Fourier superposition of null plane waves with $\omega = ck$, it follows that *the reactive energy of every globally sourceless EM field is due entirely to self-interference*. This gives a *partial* intuitive explanation of EM rest energy, as seen most clearly in the standing wave example. However, the rest energy of fields *with* sources need *not* be entirely due to self-interference since their Fourier synthesis also requires plane waves with $\omega \neq ck$, which are not null. (Such plane waves represent ‘virtual photons,’ which have positive mass.)

II. THE ENERGY FLOW VELOCITY $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}, t)$

The correspondence between the rest energy E_0 of a relativistic point particle and the reactive energy density $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{r}, t)$ of an EM field in vacuum can be extended to include the *velocity* of the point particle,

$$\mathbf{v} = \frac{c^2 \mathbf{p}}{E}, \quad (7)$$

whose field-theoretic version is

$$\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}, t) = \frac{c \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{r}, t)}{U(\mathbf{r}, t)}. \quad (8)$$

Poynting’s theorem $\partial_t U + c \nabla \cdot \mathbf{S} = -\mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E}$ then becomes

$$\partial_t U + \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{v}U) = -\mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E}, \quad (9)$$

which shows that U behaves like the density of a compressible fluid with source $-\mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E}$, flowing at velocity $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}, t)$. Note that

$$\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}, t) \equiv |\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}, t)| = c \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{r}, t) = 0. \quad (10)$$

Thus, while the *field* (\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{B}) propagates at c , its *energy* generally flows at $v < c$ almost everywhere.

For the standing plane wave of Example 2, (4) shows that $|\mathbf{v}| \leq c$ as expected, and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0} &\Leftrightarrow \cos^2(kz - \omega t) = \cos^2(kz + \omega t) \\ &\Leftrightarrow kz + \omega t = \pm(kz - \omega t) + n\pi. \end{aligned}$$

Hence \mathbf{v} has *fixed nodes in both space and time*:

$$\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0} \Leftrightarrow z = \frac{n\pi}{2k} \equiv z_n \text{ or } t = \frac{n\pi}{2\omega} \equiv t_n \quad (11)$$

where n is any integer. Since \mathbf{v} changes sign at z_n and t_n , the energy is *totally reflected* at these nodes.

The energy oscillates back and forth between the nodal planes $z = z_n$, and $v(z, t) \equiv \hat{z} \cdot \mathbf{v}$ oscillates between $\pm c$ at any z .

The conflict between the moving nodes (6), where $v = \pm c$, and the stationary nodes (11), where $v = 0$, is resolved by noting that $v(z, t)$ is *undefined* when $U = 0$ and $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{0}$, so

$$\cos(kz - \omega t) = \cos(kz + \omega t) = 0.$$

This gives $\cos kz \cos \omega t = 0$ and $\sin kz \sin \omega t = 0$, hence

$$z = z_n \text{ and } t = t_m \text{ with } m + n \text{ odd.}$$

These planes are the *intersections* of the traveling and stationary nodes. Intuitively, the reason why $v(z, t)$ is undefined at these events is that *perfect reflection* there requires it to change *instantaneously* between the values $\pm c$. At all other values of z , $v(z, t)$ still oscillates between $\pm c$ but does so in a continuous manner; see Figure 6 in [1].

III. A HISTORICAL NOTE

The fact that the energy of an EM field in vacuum generally flows at speeds less than c was noted almost a century ago by Bateman [3, page 6]. To the best of my knowledge, this important insight has remained undeveloped and largely unappreciated.² I believe this phenomenon, and its relation to reactive energy as detailed in [1], are fundamental features of electromagnetic fields which ought to be studied both theoretically and experimentally.

REFERENCES

- [1] G Kaiser, [Electromagnetic inertia, reactive energy, and energy flow velocity](#). *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* 44 (2011) 345206.
- [2] G Kaiser, [Coherent electromagnetic wavelets and their twisting null congruences](#). Preprint, 2011. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1102.0238>
- [3] H Bateman, *The Mathematical Analysis of Electrical and Optical Wave-Motion*, Cambridge University Press, 1915; Dover, 1955

²For a *time-harmonic* field of frequency ω , the *energy transport velocity* is commonly defined as $\mathbf{v}_\omega(\mathbf{x}) = c \mathbf{S}_\omega(\mathbf{x}) / U_\omega(\mathbf{x})$, where $\mathbf{S}_\omega(\mathbf{x})$ and $U_\omega(\mathbf{x})$ are the *time averages* of $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{r}, t)$ and $U(\mathbf{r}, t)$ over one period $2\pi/\omega$. In general, $|\mathbf{v}_\omega(\mathbf{x})| < c$ almost everywhere. However, time-averaging is lossy and the ratio of two averages is not the average of the ratio. Hence \mathbf{v}_ω is not a time average of the *exact, instantaneous* energy flow velocity $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}, t)$. I thank Professor Andrea Alu for pointing this out.