

Rational paradigm of plasma physics

V.I. Erofeev

Institute of Automation & Electrometry
Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences
1 Koptyug Prosp., 630090, Novosibirsk, RUSSIA

Abstract.

In recent studies we have multiply envisioned the irrationality of the traditional plasma kinetics [1–5]. Its basic false cornerstone was shown to be the substitution of real plasmas by plasma probabilistic ensembles [1–3]. We have created culture of plasma studies with refrain from an ensemble substitution [1–8]. We discovered intense decay of Langmuir quanta, as opposite to traditional deduction of their conservation [1–3]. The quanta decay prevents formation of Langmuir condensate in a weak Langmuir turbulence [1, Appendix], suppresses long-wavelength plasma modulational instability [3], precludes Langmuir wave collapses [1–3]. Besides, it helped to highlight the uselessness of hydrodynamic modelling of plasma nonlinear phenomena [2–3], to state an inadequateness of modelling collisionless plasma by the Vlasov equation [3], to state of inadequateness of “Particle in Cell” method of numerical plasma simulation to the plasma nature [3]. Finally, it was shown that existed theory undervalued notably the intensity of induced scattering of short Langmuir waves [4] and distorted physics of the electron distribution evolution during this scattering [8]. With this, an extensive revision of the plasma physics and of the theoretical physics in general are needed.

1. Introduction.

Many branches of modern theoretical physics were created within tradition of *studies of statistics of physical system ensembles*. Particularly, this can be said about *all* the current plasma physical theory. An appear of the given tradition was *conditioned* by the culture of theorizing that was developed in physics at the end of XIX-th century: Theorists tried then to substantiate empirical laws of thermodynamics by means of *a classical analytical mechanics*. Having absolutized notion of a *a mechanical system*[†], they attempted to unravel the establishing of a heat macrophysics within a microdynamic evolution of the system. This path was fraught with insuperable difficulties, wherefore single finite systems were ultimately substituted by probabilistic system ensembles[‡]. This substitution was a basic idea that has led Gibbs to creation

[†] This term denotes an object possessing by finite total number of “degrees of freedom” and hence permitting formally the full integration of motion equations

[‡] As a first important system ensemble study we can mention renown equation by Boltzmann [9]. His concept of *distribution function* supposes indirectly the substitution of a real mixture of discrete gas

of a *statistical thermodynamics (mechanics)* [11]. In view of the success of his theory, the scientific community have rather quickly accepted corresponding ideas as a basis for physical theoretical studies. They have exerted an important influence on the development of quantum mechanics, they were successfully applied to problem of electric conductivity of metals, to some items of solid state physics, physics of dielectrics, physics of magnetic materials, *etc.* The highest point in this motion consisted of developing of a *nonequilibrium statistical mechanics* and of a *physical kinetics* [12–15]. It can be ultimately said that during the lapsed century the idea of the ensemble substitution has been gradually recognized as one of the most important conjectures of human genius regarding the concealed microscopic beginnings of macrophysical phenomena in nature. *However, the latter is far not the case.*

The intention of the given our paper consists of the informing the reader about appear of a number of plasma kinetic studies that visualized the *senselessness* of plasma ensemble considerations and hence the *irrationality* of the earlier general tradition. (Correspondingly, the modern theoretical physics should be subjected to an extensive revision, and *the reader is invited to this challenging and blessed mission.*)

Our motion is organized as follows. In the next section we narrate the basis of our former arguing. In Section 3 we list results that we developed after perceiving the irrationality of the ensemble method and creating alternative culture of plasma studies. Finally, Conclusions contain extra comments to the essence of statistical mechanics and some proposals for reorganization in theoretical physics.

2. Senselessness of plasma ensemble studies.

First vague suspicion of the irrationality of the ensemble method was perceived by the given author even in years of scholarship: *The ease* was confusing with that the plasma theorists had always spoken about the plasma ensembles and had implemented the ensemble averaging in their calculations. Especially in studies of plasma evolution: The Universe do not contain any evolving probabilistic plasma ensembles. In view of this, the author created new culture of plasma kinetic studies, one with refraining from the plasma ensemble substitution [5, 6]. Applying it to problems of plasma turbulence theory, the author has found first important illustration of the inconsistency of the ensemble substitution: The physics of collisionless wave dissipation. It was a common belief that quanta of Langmuir wave field can decay in a collisionless plasma only due to the Landau damping [16], whereas new calculations visualized intense decay of Langmuir wave quanta due to *the nonresonant electron diffusion in momentums* (it is called also *the stochastic electron acceleration*).

Trials to publish corresponding calculations have met an immense scepticism of many plasma theorists. Even the pointing at a respective contradiction within the very body atoms by a continuous probabilistic ensemble of such mixtures. Boltzmann himself had no perception of this fact, although afterwards he explicitly spoke about the desirability of substituting system ensembles for real systems [10]

of traditional plasma theory did not had an adequate effect[§]. This forced the author to seek for experimental confirmation of his conclusions. This confirmation was found in existing reports on beam-plasma experiments with “strong” Langmuir turbulence. Following widespread belief there should have been observed Langmuir wave collapses, whereas the anew deduced Langmuir quanta decay precluded their initiation. The author have thoroughly analyzed three independent series of reported “experimental collapse observations” and have proven that they evidenced not for the collapse but just against it [1–3]. This ultimately helped to affirm the key idea: *Laws of physical evolution of statistics of a plasma ensemble depend on the ensemble content*. Correspondingly, one should not hope on approaching the objective picture of the plasma physical phenomena when he substitutes a real plasma by an imaginary plasma ensemble.

We have discussed in this section the most important of currently developed illustrations of inappropriateness of the ensemble method in plasma studies: The physics of Langmuir turbulence dissipation constituted one of the cornerstones in the former plasma turbulence theory. In the next section we supplement this illustration with other our results that have also visualized the *uselessness* of plasma ensemble considerations. Besides, we present there an outline of some more general consequences of our discoveries for the current practice of plasma theoretical studies.

3. List of achievements in studies of “single” plasmas.

Development of a real physical picture of the collisionless Langmuir turbulence dissipation that we mentioned above has permitted us to discover three important consequences. First, the dissipation impedes the formation of the Langmuir wave condensate (see Appendix in Ref. [1])^{||}. Second, it suppresses the Zakharov’s short -wavelength plasma modulational instability [2]. This instability was originally rendered as an initial stage of Langmuir wave collapse [17], hence its absence just highlights the impossibility of the collapse initiation[¶]. Third, the real turbulence collisionless dissipation prevents the development of Vedenov -Rudakov’s long-wavelength plasma modulational instability [3]⁺. It is worth emphasizing that the concepts of the Langmuir

§ We mean the following. Rigorous recognized calculations of former ensemble-oriented weak plasma turbulence theory comprised not the conclusion of the Langmuir quanta conservation only but equally the deduction of their intense decay, see details in Refs. [1, 2]

|| The reader is reminded that the Langmuir condensate was believed to form due to the wave scattering induced by plasma particles: waves should have been ultimately transferred to the long-wavelength region of the turbulence spectrum. The puzzle of dissipation of the condensate energy has motivated large body of former theoretical plasma turbulence studies

¶ Note that the “collapse science” was a rather opulent branch of former plasma turbulence theory, and its contributors developed pictures of collapse scenarios even without the above short -wavelength modulational instability. For this reason we have supplemented the earlier study by thorough analyzes of diverse items of that science and ultimately affirmed the total inconsistency of the collapse concept [3]. Some conclusions of the corresponding analyzes we mention in this paper further on

+ The reader is reminded that corresponding paper by Vedenov and Rudakov, see Ref. [18], was one of the most stimulating plasma theory publications

condensate, of the Vedenov -Rudakov's plasma modulational instability and of the Zakharov's short-wavelength plasma modulational instability constituted the kern of the former Langmuir turbulence theory. Their failures illustrate rather well the senselessness of plasma ensemble considerations.

The irrationality of the ensemble method was highlighted also by our results on wave scattering induced by plasma electrons [4, 8]. On the one side, we have shown that formerly accepted Tsytovich's picture of the phenomenon (see Ref. [19]) undervalued substantially the intensity of induced scattering of short Langmuir waves [4]. In full accord with the common sense, the plaster of ensemble averaging has veiled the genuine fresco of the phenomenon. On the other side, it was found that corresponding vision of the process does not simply veil substantially the genuine evolution of electron distribution during the scattering, but entirely distorts its picture [8].

In such a way, our plasma kinetic considerations have multiply envisioned *the senselessness* of plasma ensemble studies. Note that this means an *inappropriateness* of the recipes of *nonequilibrium statistical mechanics* for the plasma studies. The latter theoretical discipline is *absolutely useless* for revealing objective laws of plasma physical behavior.

We reinforce that the nonequilibrium statistical mechanics had exerted a *key* influence on formation of the most basic of the plasma physical theoretical notions: It underlies the plasma kinetics after Bogoliubov [12] — Born — Green [20] — Kirkwood [21] — Yvon [22] (that is collectively known as the BBGKY kinetics), it is hidden behind any hydrodynamic plasma modelling, *etc.* Further, it was always rendered as a basis for many other physical theories apart from the plasma theory. Plasma phenomena are surely not the exclusion from the common rule, hence our observations unravelled *an absolute truth* of a *scientific inconsistency* of the nonequilibrium statistical mechanics: Its scenarios have generally no correlation with real pictures of physical system evolutions. Note that the current gas kinetic theory seems to contain an independent item that might have been shown to confirm this conclusion. It is the above mentioned Boltzmann equation: We suspect that real gas kinetic evolution deviate from scenarios given by the equation. On the one side, some serious problems with the Boltzmann equation were enlightened even in 1876: consistent critical comments regarding the equation are known after Loshmidt [23], Zermelo [24] and Ehrenfests [25]. On the other side, it was recently discovered by Alekseev [26] that assumption of finite (nonzero) duration of a pair atom collision results in corrections to the Boltzmann equations that notably modify the usual terms of the equation.

In the given paper we cannot discuss details of our above mentioned studies: The reader is addressed to original papers [1–8] for more expanded description of our ideas, approaches and achievements. We complete this section by returning to plasma physics and mentioning of some more of our deductions relevant to the practice of plasma theoretical studies.

Consider the BBGKY kinetics. Outline of generic defects of the given theory the reader can find in Conclusions of paper [7]. The main of them is that the conceptions

of this kinetics acquired some sense of constructive theory only within the practice of the plasma ensemble considerations. Correspondingly, its recipes cannot help one in the exploring the objective physics of plasma phenomena.

Consider the practice of hydrodynamic plasma studies. In any hydrodynamic plasma description the plasma ensemble is usually not directly referred to but factually implied, since hydrodynamics do not distinguishes any real plasma from many others with slightly varied positions and momentums of individual plasma particles and hence from many of plasma ensembles. With this, the currently popular hydrodynamic modelling of nonlinear plasma phenomena has no much sense for explaining plasma physical realities: The degree of correspondence of any hydrodynamic model to plasma realities is always doubtful. Both theoretical predictions of new physical effects and trials to explain experimental observations, with exclusive appeal to a certain nonlinear hydrodynamic plasma model, are scientifically unsound. These positions are rather well illustrated by failure of Zakharov's plasma hydrodynamics with its prediction of the Langmuir wave collapse, and also by failure of Vedenov -Rudakov's hydrodynamic plasma model with its prediction of the long-wavelength plasma modulational instability.

Finally, exploration of problems of “collapse science” has inspired the author on

- A) showing the impossibility of wave energy accumulation in plasma density cavities via nucleation [3]*,
- B) stating of inadequateness of modelling the collisionless plasma by the Vlasov equation instead of the Klimontovich -Dupree's one [3]‡,
- C) stating of inadequateness of the “Particle in Cell” method of numerical plasma simulation to the plasma nature [3].

4. Conclusions

Following deductions reported in preceding sections, the practice of plasma theoretical studies (and hence also the practice of interpreting of experimental plasma observations) requires an extensive revision. The reader is invited to explore our approaches from original papers [1–8] and then to join us in the activity of reestablishing the plasma physics.

As we are persistently reiterating, our findings are extremely important not for the plasma physics only but for all the theoretical physics. Having visualized the irrationality of the ensemble method, we restored common sense that was always ignored during its erection. Note that in Conclusions of Ref. [3] we have rather thoroughly commented the history of ensemble studies and their trend in physics. Particularly, we

* For the first time the misconception of *nucleation* was advanced by Doolen [27], on a basis of one-dimensional simulation of Zakharov's (nonlinear) plasma hydrodynamics [17]

‡ Correspondingly, we developed more adequate understanding of applicability area of the Vlasov equation in plasma considerations. One of the equation applications that is conceptually acceptable for the nonlinear plasma studies the reader can reveal in intermediate calculations of Ref. [7]

have commented there the reasons for the success of the gibbsian statistical mechanics. This time we will not repeat respective comments: We supplement them with a number of natural final conclusions.

First, the reader should understand that the statistical mechanics is a mere artificial theory that *emulates* only, although rather successfully, the laws of thermodynamics. The appropriateness of the gibbsian ensemble substitution can be rationally justified only for homogeneous thermodynamically equilibrium spatially extensive physical medium whereat the mutually remote pieces might be rendered as “independent ensemble realizations”^{††}. With this, it is not only that the nonequilibrium statistical mechanics should be ejected off the building of modern physics, but also the basic positions of *the equilibrium statistical mechanics* should be thoroughly revised, at least in the sense of their interpretations. Particularly, we can say that existing pretension of the statistical mechanics on revealing of the hidden essence of thermodynamical entropy is far not sound. Really, the entropy of statistical mechanics is defined as a characteristic of a system ensemble, and its non-lessening during the ensemble evolution is postulated. But laws of the system ensemble evolution depend on the ensemble content and cannot provide one with the objective picture of the certain system physical evolution. (For instance, of the thermalization of initially nonequilibrium gas in a fixed volume.) Correspondingly, the growth of the statistical mechanical entropy has generally no correlation with the corresponding growth of the thermodynamical entropy. Moreover, while the latter is well measurable and hence is always definite, the former depend on the content of the artificially introduced gas ensemble. In short, the sole virtue of the statistical mechanical entropy is that its changes in *a reversible thermodynamic gas process* coincides with the respective changes of the thermodynamical entropy, provided one discusses either the gibbsian canonical, the big canonical or the microcanonical gas ensembles. It was just due to this property that creators of the statistical mechanics absolutized the corresponding entropy.

Second, by the earlier set of deductions regarding the plasma physical theory we have visualized a necessity of creation *a physics of discrete media* that should supersede the existing *physics of continuous media*. Following the traditional culture of plasma physics, researches are suggested to render plasmas as continuous media: Key notions of plasma theory were originally created within the physics of continuous media and then adjusted to peculiar problems of plasma studies. Particularly, common notion of *a wave*, plasma natural oscillation, suggests attitude to a plasma as a continuous medium. This attitude was embodied by the concept of *a Vlasov plasma*:

^{††}Note also that for thermodynamic phenomena the idea of a single system is rather inadequate abstraction: One can theorize at best about subsystem that is a part of a larger subsystem and that constantly exercises an influence from the side of remaining part of the latter. Naturally, corresponding detailed influence of one on another never can be deduced, but even this do not justifies the substitution of a certain subsystem by a probabilistic ensemble of subsystems. Besides, even the very notion “subsystem” is speculative a bit. Really, some portions of atoms (or molecules, or electrons, *etc.*) do inevitably leave the subsystem each moment, others enter it from the surroundings, whereas the beginnings of statistical mechanics do not yield this permanent renewal of the subsystem

Vlasov equation comprises imaginary electron and ion liquids that fill without gaps the 6-dimensional phase space. Having imagined a Vlasov plasma, one substitutes indirectly the real mixture of individual charged particles, known as a “Klimontovich -Dupree” plasma, by an ensemble of such mixtures. It was an understanding of drastic distinction in physics of these two objects that have ultimately helped us in developing of earlier impressive paradigmatic deductions. We suppose that the visualized substantial distinction between the physics of the Vlasov plasma and that of the Klimontovich -Dupree one exemplifies the general distinction between the objective physical pictures of discrete medium (to be developed) and their images from the physics of continuous media. Besides, we propose to create the methodology of earlier physics of discrete media by an analogy with approaches of our plasma kinetics.

Finally, our discoveries have highlighted the necessity of revision of the *physical kinetics*. This science was always assumed to include the traditional plasma kinetics as a daughter branch, whereas we have multiply demonstrated the falseness of the basis of the latter.

- [1] V.I. Erofeev, *Physics of Plasmas* **9**, 1137 (2002).
- [2] V.I. Erofeev, *J. Plasma Phys.* **68**, 1 (2002).
- [3] V.I. Erofeev, *Physics of Plasmas* **11** (6), 3284 (2004).
- [4] V.I. Erofeev, *Journal of Fusion Energy* **19**, 99 (2000).
- [5] V.I. Erofeev, *J. Plasma Phys.* **57** (2), 273 (1997).
- [6] V.I. Erofeev, *Australian Journ. Phys.* **51** (5), 843 (1998).
- [7] V.I. Erofeev, *J. Plasma Phys.* **70** (3), 251 (2004).
- [8] V.I. Erofeev, Influence of Langmuir turbulence on plasma electron distribution during the induced wave scattering. *Journal of Fusion Energy*, Accepted.
- [9] L. Boltzmann, *Wiener Berichte* **66**, 275 (1872).
- [10] L. Boltzmann, *Vorlesungen über theorie der Gases* (Wien, 1886); *Vorlesungen über Gastheorie* (Leipzig, 1896) [*Lectures on Gas Theory* (S. Brush transl., Berkeley, Univ. California Press, 1964)].
- [11] J.W. Gibbs, *Elementary principles in statistical mechanics, developed with especial reference to the rational foundation of thermodynamics* (Yale Univ. Press, New York, 1902).
- [12] N.N. Bogoliubov, *Problems of a Dynamical Theory in a Statistical Physics* (State Tech. Press, Moscow, 1946); English translation in *Studies in Statistical Mechanics* edited by J. deBoer and G.E. Uhlenbeck, (North-Holland Publ., Amsterdam, 1962), Vol. 1.
- [13] I. Prigogine, *Non-Equilibrium statistical mechanics* (Wiley -Interscience, New York, 1962).
- [14] L.V. Keldysh, *Zh. Exp. Teor. Fiz.* **47**, 1515 (1964).
- [15] R. Balescu, *Equilibrium and nonequilibrium statistical mechanics* (Wiley -Interscience, New York, 1975).
- [16] L.D. Landau, *Journ. Phys. (U.S.S.R.)* **10**, 25 (1946); *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **16**, 574 (1946).
- [17] V.E. Zakharov, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **62**, 1745 (1972) [*Sov. Phys. JETP* **35**, 908 (1972)].
- [18] A.A. Vedenov and L.I. Rudakov, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **159**, 767 (1964) [*Sov. Phys. Dokl.* **9**, 1073 (1965)].
- [19] V. N. Tsyтович, *Uspehi Fiz. Nauk* **90** (3), 435 (1966) [*Sov. Phys. Uspekhi* **9**, 805 (1967)].
- [20] M. Born, and H.S. Green, *A General Kinetic Theory of Liquids* (Cambridge University Press, London, 1949).
- [21] J.G. Kirkwood *Journ. Chem. Phys.* **44**, 188 (1986).
- [22] J. Yvon, *La théorie des fluides et l'équation d'état: actualités, scientifiques et industrielles* (Hermann and Cie, Paris, 1935).

- [23] J. Loshmidt, *Wien Ber.* **73**, 139 (1876); **75**, 67 (1877).
- [24] E. Zermelo, *Ann. Phys.* **57**, 485 (1896).
- [25] P. Ehrenfest, T. Ehrenfest, *Enzyklopaedie d math. Wiss.* Bd IV, Tl. 32, Leipzig, 1911.
- [26] B.V. Alekseev, *Physics -Uspekhi* **170** (6).
- [27] G.D. Doolen, D.F. DuBois and H.A. Rose, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **54**, 804 (1985).