

# The road not considered ... the question of photon mass

**Palash B. Pal**

Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, 1/AF Bidhan-Nagar, Calcutta 700064, INDIA

November 2005

It is well-known that a conflict between Galilean relativity and Maxwell equations of electromagnetic equations was apparent by the end of the 19th century. Equally well-known is the fact that Einstein resolved the conflict by pointing out that the principle of relativity and Maxwell equations can both be correct if the notion of absolute time is abandoned. The rest is history. The purpose of this article is not to recount that history. Rather, we wonder about a question which, it seems, should have been asked in the process, but apparently was not.

Newtonian formulation of dynamics was firmly established by the nineteenth century, proving its worth in all sorts of questions that were addressed within its framework. Einstein's introduction of Special Theory of Relativity required a reformulation of the laws of dynamics. Newtonian dynamics became only an approximation, valid in the regime of small speeds. Maxwell equation of electrodynamics, however, remained unaffected.

And this is where the question comes. In the times of great upheavals, it is natural to re-examine everything conventional. Newtonian dynamics was indeed re-examined and replaced by a more sophisticated alternative with the advent of special relativity. Why wasn't there any serious discussion about any modification or reformulation of Maxwell equations at the same time?

It almost seems like a vain question. Wasn't the entire conflict created by the presence of the quantity  $c$  in Maxwell equations, implying that the speed of electromagnetic waves in the vacuum is independent of the observer? And didn't Einstein absorb this statement as a postulate in his system, thus assuming the immutability of Maxwell equations in the basic structure of his Special Theory?

Yes, it is undeniable that the Maxwell equations contained a fundamental quantity which has the dimension of velocity. This is most apparent if we write the equations in Gaussian units, where the electric and the magnetic fields are assumed

to have the same dimension. In this system of units, the equations are:

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{E} = 0, \quad (1)$$

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0, \quad (2)$$

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{E} + \frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial \mathbf{B}}{\partial t} = 0, \quad (3)$$

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{B} - \frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial \mathbf{E}}{\partial t} = 0. \quad (4)$$

Note that we have written the equations in absence of any source, which is all that we will need in this article. The constant  $c$ , carrying the dimension of velocity, explicitly appears even in the absence of sources.

In other systems of units, this constant may be hidden. For example, if we write down the Maxwell equation involving the sources in SI units, the equations apparently contain two “fundamental” constants  $\varepsilon_0$  and  $\mu_0$ , called respectively the permittivity and permeability of free space, and none of them have the dimension of velocity. However, there is nothing fundamental about the ratio  $\varepsilon_0/\mu_0$ : it merely serves to set the relative units between the charge density and the current density. If no source is present, only the combination  $\varepsilon_0\mu_0$  appears in the Maxwell equations, and it is easily seen that this combination has the dimension of inverse velocity squared. In fact, it equals the quantity  $1/c^2$ , where  $c$  appears in Eqs. (3) and (4) written in the Gaussian system of units.

It therefore follows that this quantity  $c$  is a fundamental constant, and it should therefore be observer-independent, and Einstein boldly recognized this fact by extending the Galilean principle of relativity to it. But should this  $c$  be the speed of the electromagnetic waves?

The answer is ‘yes’ if one accepts Eqs. (1–4) without any modification anywhere, as we all learn from textbooks on electromagnetic theory. This is trivial to see. We merely have to take the curls of the last two equations, applying the vector calculus identity

$$\nabla \times (\nabla \times \mathbf{V}) = \nabla(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{V}) - \nabla^2 \mathbf{V} \quad (5)$$

which holds for any differentiable vector field  $\mathbf{V}$ . After that, using Eqs. (1) and (2), we readily obtain

$$\frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{E}}{\partial t^2} - \nabla^2 \mathbf{E} = 0, \quad (6)$$

$$\frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{B}}{\partial t^2} - \nabla^2 \mathbf{B} = 0, \quad (7)$$

which are wave equations, with the speed of the waves equal to  $c$ . Since  $c$  is a universal constant, Eqs. (6) and (7) imply that the speed of electromagnetic waves is independent of its wavelength. In other words, the vacuum must be a dispersion-free background for the propagation of electromagnetic waves.

This is where the question comes. Didn't that look awkward to anyone in the beginning of the twentieth century? The phenomenon of dispersion was known since Newton's famous experiment with prism, and in the long experience since then, no one has ever encountered a medium that is dispersion-free. So, why didn't the idea of a dispersion-free vacuum appear outrageous? Instead, wouldn't it have been more natural to suppose that the quantity  $c$  that appears in the Maxwell equations is invariant, but it is not the speed of the electromagnetic waves, and that the Maxwell equations somehow have to be modified so that Eqs. (6) and (7) do not follow from them?

The question becomes more poignant in the light of the fact that in 1905, Einstein also worked with the hypothesis of light quanta or photons. From his pioneering paper on the special theory of relativity, he already knew that for a particle of mass\*  $m$ , the relation between energy and momentum is given by

$$E^2 = \mathbf{p}^2 c^2 + m^2 c^4. \quad (8)$$

Using Hamilton's dynamical equations, one can then easily deduce that for a given momentum, the velocity of the particle is given by

$$\mathbf{v} = \frac{\partial E}{\partial \mathbf{p}} = \frac{\mathbf{p}c}{\sqrt{\mathbf{p}^2 + m^2 c^2}}. \quad (9)$$

This shows two things about the magnitude of velocity. First, it depends on the magnitude of momentum, which means that there is dispersion. Second, the magnitude of velocity is less than  $c$  for any non-zero value of the mass. In order to agree with the dispersionless speed of electromagnetic waves obtained from Eqs. (6) and (7), one therefore has to conclude that  $m = 0$ , i.e., the photons are massless.

A century has passed since the publication of Einstein's papers on special relativity and light quanta. In these hundred years, we have grown so accustomed to this statement about the masslessness of the photon that we seldom realize that it must have been a mysterious statement in those days, and is no less mysterious now. All known material particles have some mass. The speed of any particle depends on its momentum. Any particle can be at rest with respect to a given observer. If we want to think of photons as particles, it is natural to assign the same set of properties to them. And yet, this supposedly "natural" road was never considered. Why not? We discuss possible answers to this question in the rest of this article.

Certainly the phenomenological success of the electromagnetic theory was not the reason behind the supposed immutability of Maxwell's equations. After all, Newtonian mechanics also had tremendous phenomenological success, and was in

---

\*In older texts on relativity, this quantity was called the "rest mass", in order to distinguish it from the ratio  $E/c^2$  of a moving particle. I will follow the modern use of the term "mass", which signifies a Lorentz invariant property, equal to  $E_0/c^2$ , where  $E_0$  is the energy of the particle at rest.

fact tested for a much longer time in history. So, if Newtonian mechanics could have been modified, Maxwellian electrodynamics could have been challenged as well.

One might be tempted to think that the Maxwell equations embodied the beautiful structure of gauge invariance, and no one would have tried to modify the equations and spoil the gauge invariance. This seems to be a very unlikely explanation. In 1905, the idea of the photon was just coming into light (no pun intended). Quantum electrodynamics (QED) was still a few decades away into the future. There was no way to guess that gauge invariance would play an important role in QED. As far as classical physics was concerned, gauge invariance was only a mathematical curiosity, which was useful only in solving the differential equations of electrodynamics with less trouble. There was no big physical significance attached to the idea of gauge invariance, and therefore no physicist treasured the idea as something very fundamental.

A third guess would be the following. Einstein had to use the idea of the constancy of the speed of light, because he used it to develop the entire structure of special relativity, starting from the relativity of simultaneity. This is the basic reason why he, and others of his time, did not want to disturb the equation for electromagnetic wave given in Eqs. (6) and (7). The sentiment is understandable, but this was not the only logical possibility. As we emphasized earlier, Maxwell's equations necessarily contained one constant which has the dimension of velocity. It was a bold decision to acknowledge that this fundamental quantity must be observer-independent, and this was the big step taken by Einstein. Once this step is taken, it is trivial to argue from there that the concept of time must be observer-dependent, and this was the second step that Einstein took. But after that, one can just use the principle of relativity, and some basic axioms like that of the homogeneity of space and time, to arrive at [1] the Lorentz transformation equations and the relativistic velocity addition rule. One needs to use the fact that  $c$  is a constant, but nowhere one has to identify it with the speed of light in the vacuum.

Let us then explore how Maxwell's equation could have been modified. We will assume that the modified equation would still be linear in the electric and magnetic fields, and we will keep considering the sourceless equations. One possibility is to keep the divergence equations, Eqs. (1) and (2), unchanged, and modify the curl equations:

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{E} = -\frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial \mathbf{B}}{\partial t} + \eta_1 \mathbf{E} + \xi_1 \mathbf{B}, \quad (10)$$

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{B} = \frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial \mathbf{E}}{\partial t} + \eta_2 \mathbf{E} + \xi_2 \mathbf{B}, \quad (11)$$

where  $\eta_1, \eta_2, \xi_1, \xi_2$  are constants which cannot be independent, as will be discussed soon. Taking the curls of these two equations and using Eq. (5), we obtain

$$-\nabla^2 \mathbf{E} = -\frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \nabla \times \mathbf{B} + \eta_1 \nabla \times \mathbf{E} + \xi_1 \nabla \times \mathbf{B}. \quad (12)$$

Using Eqs. (10) and (11) for the curls of the electric and magnetic fields on the right hand side and rearranging the terms, we get

$$\frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{E}}{\partial t^2} - \nabla^2 \mathbf{E} = \frac{\xi_1 - \eta_2}{c} \frac{\partial \mathbf{E}}{\partial t} - \frac{\xi_2 + \eta_1}{c} \frac{\partial \mathbf{B}}{\partial t} + (\eta_1^2 + \xi_1 \eta_2) \mathbf{E} + \xi_1 (\eta_1 + \xi_2) \mathbf{B}. \quad (13)$$

This is a mess, and a similar mess occurs if we try to find the equation containing second derivatives of the magnetic field. First, the equations are coupled in electric and magnetic fields. Second, they contain first order time derivative terms, which would produce damped solutions which should not occur in absence of any dissipation. Fortunately, curing the second problem is easily done by choosing

$$\xi_1 = \eta_2, \quad \xi_2 = -\eta_1. \quad (14)$$

And then we note that it automatically cures the first problem. However, even after this, the equation turns out to be

$$\frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{E}}{\partial t^2} - \nabla^2 \mathbf{E} = (\eta_1^2 + \eta_2^2) \mathbf{E}. \quad (15)$$

Since the electric and magnetic fields are real, the constants  $\eta_1, \eta_2$  must also be real. In this case, Eq. (15) gives unphysical solutions. For example, if a field is homogeneous, Eq. (15) says that its magnitude must be exponentially increasing or decreasing in the vacuum. This does not make any sense.

So let us try something different. Again, we will modify two of the four equations of Eqs. (1–4), but this time we choose a different grouping. If we introduce the sources, it would affect only two of the four equations. The other two, viz., Eqs. (2) and (3), are just constraint equations that the electric and magnetic fields must satisfy. Let us keep these constraints equations undisturbed, but modify the other two by writing

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{E} = f, \quad (16)$$

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{B} = \frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial \mathbf{E}}{\partial t} + \mathbf{F}, \quad (17)$$

where obviously  $f$  is a scalar and  $\mathbf{F}$  is a vector. Note that these are not the sources. We have written the equation in the vacuum, where there are no sources, and we assumed that even then there are some other terms in the equation. We will soon comment on the nature of these terms.

We can take the curl of both sides of Eq. (17), use the identity of Eq. (5) and then Eq. (2) to write

$$\frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{B}}{\partial t^2} - \nabla^2 \mathbf{B} = \nabla \times \mathbf{F}. \quad (18)$$

What needs to be done if we want to obtain a meaningful wave equation for the magnetic field? Obviously, we want the right hand side to be proportional to  $\mathbf{B}$ .

The proportionality constant must have the dimension of inverse length squared. If this constant is positive, we get into the kind of problems discussed in connection with Eq. (15). Therefore, we want

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{F} = -\frac{1}{\ell^2} \mathbf{B}, \quad (19)$$

where  $\ell$  is a constant carrying the dimension of length, and the equation for the magnetic field in the vacuum becomes

$$\frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{B}}{\partial t^2} - \nabla^2 \mathbf{B} = -\frac{1}{\ell^2} \mathbf{B}. \quad (20)$$

The same equation would be satisfied by the electric field as well, provided we identify

$$-\nabla f - \frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial \mathbf{F}}{\partial t} = -\frac{1}{\ell^2} \mathbf{E}. \quad (21)$$

Purely within the purview of classical physics, this would have opened a new Pandora's box. It would seem that now we are in the need of a fundamental quantity with the dimension of length. But since Einstein already possessed the idea of a light quantum, that was not really necessary. In fact, with the help of Planck's constant, one could have written

$$\ell = \frac{\hbar}{mc}, \quad (22)$$

where  $m$  is something with the dimension of mass. And this mass need not have been any fundamental constant: it could have been interpreted as the mass of the photon.

So, to come back to the question: why wasn't this modification of Maxwellian electrodynamics put to test? Although there is no way to be sure about the answer, one can make a strong guess. Remember that the homogeneous Maxwell equations have been kept unchanged in this formulation, so we can define the potentials through the usual relations:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{B} &= \nabla \times \mathbf{A}, \\ \mathbf{E} &= -\nabla \varphi - \frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial \mathbf{A}}{\partial t}. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Now, looking back at Eqs. (19) and (21), we realize that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{F} &= -(mc/\hbar)^2 \mathbf{A}, \\ f &= -(mc/\hbar)^2 \varphi. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Thus the modified Maxwell equations would contain the scalar and the vector potentials.

This is something that would have seemed like a complete catastrophe for a physicist in 1905. As we already said, the potentials were supposed to be only

mathematical constructs which could help solve the dynamical equations. They were not supposed to enter any equation of physical significance. And maybe that is why modification of Maxwell equations in the line described above was never considered.

This is not to say that no modification of Maxwellian electrodynamics was at all considered at the time when special relativity was introduced. Indeed, there was the emission theory of Ritz [2] and others. But they violated Lorentz transformation equations. And it is understandable that, having obtained the Lorentz transformation equations and having them justified by Einstein's effort, it was psychologically not easy to discard them altogether. We raise the question about a milder alternative: the Lorentz transformation equations are not disturbed, but the quantity  $c$  that appears in them is not the speed of light in the vacuum.

The reader must have noticed that we have always stuck to the principles and the machinery available to a physicist of 1905, and not any hindsight that has developed since that time. For example, the modification attempted in Eqs. (10) and (11) can easily be discarded today, by noting that the modified equations cannot be expressed in a covariant 4-dimensional notation. On the other hand, the modification introduced through Eqs. (16) and (17) do have a simple representation in 4-dimensional notation, and are indeed the field equations derived from the Proca Lagrangian [3]. In modern day language, the question raised in this article can be summarized in this form: why was the Proca equation introduced as late as in 1930? Why didn't one start from the Proca equations right in 1905 and allowed the photon mass to be determined by experiments? Of course, even at the outset anyone would have known that the photon mass must be very small, and further experiments could have been designed to know the mass better. Indeed, a very similar path has been pursued for neutrinos. Though at first it was proposed that neutrinos are massless, soon after the possibility of its mass was taken seriously, experiments were performed to determine the mass, and through decades of effort we now know that neutrino mass, albeit very small compared to all other known fermion masses, is indeed non-zero. This program, which seemed very logical and pragmatic, was not undertaken for the photon at the beginning of the twentieth century, when a lot of thought went into the nature of light and electromagnetic theory. Of course, data collected for other reasons were used later to put bounds on photon mass [4].

There is an interesting irony in these set of events. Quantum theory developed quite independently of special relativity. We can fantasize over things that could have happened if, instead of beginning their journeys almost at the same time in the hands of Einstein, quantum theory had started much before the theory of relativity. What if relativity flourished after the Aharanov-Bohm theory and the experiments to confirm it, which showed that electromagnetic potential, even in the absence of electromagnetic field, can affect outcomes of physical experiments? Probably in such circumstances, no one would consider the presence of potentials in equations

of motion outrageous, and the question of photon mass would have been raised with the advent of relativity theory.

On hindsight, however, it seems good that things happened the way they did. With the advent of quantum theory, it was recognized that gauge invariance might serve as a crucial ingredient in constructing the quantum theory of electromagnetic interactions or QED. Even later, it was recognized that the same principle, suitably generalized, holds the key to the construction of gauge theories, which now describe the theories of strong and weak interactions as well. It would have been a pity if gauge invariance, present in Maxwell's equations, was sacrificed by introducing the possibility of a photon mass.

I thank P. DasGupta for discussions and suggestions for improvement.

## References

- [1] See, e.g.,  
N. D. Mermin: *Relativity without light*, Am. J. Phys. 52 (1984) 119;  
P. B. Pal: *Nothing but Relativity*, Eur. J. Phys. 24 (2003) 315.
- [2] W. Ritz: Ann. Chim. Phys. 13 (1908) 145. For reviews and references, see, e.g., J. G. Fox: Rev. Mod. Phys. 33 (1965) 1.
- [3] A. Proca: Compt. Rend. 190 (1930) 1377; 191 (1930) 26.
- [4] For a review and references, see, e.g., A. S. Goldhaber and M. M. Nieto: Rev. Mod. Phys. 43 (1971) 277.