

The energy conservation law in classical electrodynamics

E.G.Bessonov

Abstract

In the framework of the classical Maxwell-Lorentz electrodynamics the energy conservation law is reconsidered.

1 Introduction

The Poynting theorem has been a corner-stone of electromagnetic theory since its publication in 1884. Its success have been so many that its limitations have been denied. The classical electrodynamics is considered to be the consistent relativistic theory. It was emphasized that some difficulties which appear e.g. when the concept of particles is introduced or when the equation of motion of particles in view of radiation reaction force is derived are non-principal. In addition everybody refers to the Poynting theorem that is to the laws of conservation of energy, linear and angular momentum of the combined system of particles and fields.

In the present paper we pay attention to a typical logical mistake made by founders of classical electrodynamics and adopted by repetition by authors of textbooks on classical electrodynamics in the case when the law of conservation of energy is derived for a system consisting of electromagnetic field and charged particles. The violation of the law is displayed when the energy of particles of the system is changed. It means that this law should be treated as a new open question of classical electrodynamics and references to this law are incorrect when any difficulties are discussed.

Below we will present the detailed and typical proof of the Poynting's theorem in the framework of Maxwell electrodynamics and the law of the energy conservation in the electrodynamics of Maxwell-Lorentz for a system consisting of an electromagnetic field and charged particles. Then we will specify a logic error in the last proof.

2 The laws of conservation in electrodynamics

Let us consider the matter of charged particle is a continuous media. Then from the Maxwell equations an equation follows

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int_V \frac{|\vec{E}|^2 + |\vec{H}|^2}{8\pi} dV + \oint \vec{S} d\vec{f} = - \int_V \vec{j} \vec{E} dV \quad (1)$$

where \vec{E} , \vec{H} are vectors of an electric and magnetic field strengths, $\vec{j} = \rho \vec{v}$ vector of a current density, ρ a charge density, \vec{v} vector of velocity of motion of the given element of volume of the charge, $\vec{S} = (c/4\pi)[\vec{E} \vec{H}]$ the Poynting vector, c a velocity of light, $d\vec{f} = \vec{n} df$, \vec{n} the unit vector normal to the surface limiting some volume V , df the element of the

area of the surface (see Appendix 1) [1]. The value $w = |\vec{E}|^2 + |\vec{H}|^2/8\pi$ in the Eq(1) is the density of the energy of the electromagnetic field. If the integration in the Eq(1) will be made over the whole infinite space than the term with the Poynting's vector can be omitted. In this case the electromagnetic fields emitted by particles in the form of electromagnetic waves will not go out of the space.

The Eq(1) is derived from the microscopic Maxwell equations. If we replace in the Eq(1) the values $|\vec{E}|^2$ and $|\vec{H}|^2$ by $|\vec{E}||\vec{D}|$ and $|\vec{H}||\vec{B}|$, where $|\vec{D}|$ and $|\vec{B}|$ are the vectors of the electric and magnetic inductions then we will have the modified equation for the macroscopic electrodynamics [2]. In this case the modified equation is the statement of conservation of energy or the well-known Poynting's theorem written in the integral form: the time rate of change of electromagnetic energy within a certain volume plus the energy flowing out through the boundary surfaces of the volume per unit time, is equal to the negative of the total work per unit time $dQ/dt = \int_V \vec{j}\vec{E} dV$ done by the fields on the sources within the volume. The energy $\varepsilon^{nem} = \int_{-\infty}^t (dQ/dt)dt$ can be treated through the non-electromagnetic energy liberated in the volume V by the exited currents (heat energy or mechanical energy of neutral atoms movement in the heated material bodies). It does not include any energy of the electromagnetic origin. All electromagnetic energy is included in the first term.

The Poynting's theorem based on the Maxwell equations and the definition of the work done by the electric fields on currents had led to the concept of the energy density of the electromagnetic field w and to the concept of the Poynting vector \vec{S} representing the energy flow. It emphasised the consistency of the Maxwell electrodynamics.

Later the Poynting theorem was generalized in reference to the case of a combined system of particles and fields. A set of Maxwell equations for the electromagnetic fields and Lorentz equations for the particles were used. The way of generalization we can get e.g. from the textbook [2]: "The emphasis so far has been on the energy of the electromagnetic fields. The work done per unit time per unit volume by the fields ($\vec{j} \cdot \vec{E}$) is a conversion of electromagnetic into mechanical or heat energy. Since matter is ultimately composed of charged particles (electrons and atomic nuclei), we can think of this rate of conversion as a rate of the charged particles energy increase per unit volume. Then we can interpret Poynting's theorem for the microscopic fields (\vec{E}, \vec{H}) as a statement of the energy conservation in the combined system of particles and fields. If we denote the total energy of the particles within the volume V as ε^{mech} and assume that no particles move out of the volume, we have $d\varepsilon^{mech}/dt = \int_V (\vec{j} \cdot \vec{E})dV$. Then Poynting's theorem expresses the conservation of energy for the combined system as

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\varepsilon^{mech} + \varepsilon^{em}) = - \oint_S \vec{S} d\vec{f}. \quad (2)$$

where the total energy of the electromagnetic fields within the volume V is

$$\varepsilon^{em} = \int_V w dV = \frac{1}{8\pi} \int_V (|\vec{E}|^2 + |\vec{H}|^2) dV. \quad (3)$$

The value ε^{mech} is the sum of energies of particles ε_i and the value ε^{em} the total

energy of the electromagnetic field in the volume V . If the volume V is infinitely large then $\oint_S (\vec{n} \cdot \vec{S}) = 0$ (the emitted energy never reach the boundary surface of the volume V) and the expression (2) can be written in the form $d\varepsilon_\Sigma/dt = 0$ or [1]¹

$$\varepsilon_\Sigma = \sum_i \varepsilon_i + \frac{1}{8\pi} \int_V (|\vec{E}|^2 + |\vec{H}|^2) dV = const. \quad (4)$$

According to (4) the total energy ε_Σ of the combined system of particles and fields in the whole space is constant. This expression is treated as the integral form of the law of conservation of energy in the electrodynamics of Maxwell-Lorentz for the case when the system is located in the whole space. This treatment has a logical error and will be discussed below.

The first term in (4) is the sum of the energies of particles ε_i . It is considered that the energy of a particle is the value $\varepsilon_i = m_i c^2 \gamma_i$, where m_i is a mass, $\gamma_i = 1/\sqrt{1 - v_i^2/c^2}$ is the relativistic factor and v_i a velocity of a particle. The dependence of the particle's energy on velocity is determined by the requirements of the special theory of relativity. At introducing of the concept of particles in electrodynamics it is usually postulated, that the energy of a particle consists partially of the self-energy (or "inertial energy") of the electromagnetic origin ε_i^{em} and partially from the field energy of the non-electromagnetic origin ε_i^{nem} ($\varepsilon_i = \varepsilon_i^{em} + \varepsilon_i^{nem}$) [1].

Vectors \vec{E} , \vec{H} in (4) represent the total electromagnetic field created by a system of particles and independent fields. Volume integral of the energy density of the electromagnetic field in the second term of the expression (4) represents the electromagnetic energy of the system. In the simplest case, when the independent fields are absent the electromagnetic field strengths can be presented in the form $\vec{E} = \sum \vec{E}_i$, $\vec{H} = \sum \vec{H}_i$ and the electromagnetic energy of the system can be presented in the form $\varepsilon^{em} = \sum W_i^{em} + \sum W_{ij}^{em}$, where the energy $W_i^{em} = (1/8\pi) \int (|\vec{E}_i|^2 + |\vec{H}_i|^2) dV$ corresponds to the energy of fields produced by a particle i and the energy $W_{ij}^{em} = (1/4\pi) \int (|\vec{E}_i \vec{E}_j| + |\vec{H}_i \vec{H}_j|) dV$ corresponds to the mutual energy (generalized "interaction energy" or "potential energy") of the electromagnetic fields.

After these remarks we can see that the energy of particles included in the expression (4) twice in a different forms: the mass term $\sum \varepsilon_i$ represents the total energy of particles and the field term $\sum W_i^{em}$ includes the energy of particles of the electromagnetic origin (after the interaction when the particles will move with a constant velocity for a long time the value $W_i^{em} = \varepsilon_i^{em}$)². From the other hand if we will treat the total energy of a particle as the sum of energies of non-electromagnetic and electromagnetic origin [1] then it will mean that the energy of particles of the electromagnetic origin will be included in the expression (4) twice. All that means that the standard treatment of the expression (4) is

¹We refer to the most popular textbooks [1], [2]. One can see that another textbooks both written long ago or recently have the same presentation of this topic.

²In general case the energy W_i^{em} includes both the self-energy ε_i^{em} and the energy of the spontaneous incoherent radiation of the particle which can be selected only in a wave zone. The generalized "interaction energy" W_{ij}^{em} have sense of the potential energy only in statics.

incorrect.³ The expression (4) derived from the Maxwell equations and Lorentz equations contradicts them. It does not present the energy conservation law [3], [4].

The error in the presented proof consists of the unification of the physically inconsistent Maxwell and Lorentz equations in one system. According to Lorentz equation the total energy of a charged particle is included in the term $\varepsilon_i = m_i c^2 \gamma_i$ of the Eq(4). At the same time according to the Maxwell equations a part of the energy of the particle of the electromagnetic origin will appear in the term ε_i^{em} of the same equation. Just this fact leads to the logic error in the proof of the energy conservation law and because of which the equation (4) conflicts with the initial equations. Now we will illustrate this conclusion by the next example.

2.1 Example

An immovable large conducting sphere with a charge q and a particle with a charge e and mass m are separated by a distance a . At some moment the particle start to move and, being accelerated, leaves to infinity. Let us compare the energy of the particle calculated from the law of the energy conservation (4) and from the equations of motion.

Let us write down the expression (4) for an initial and a final states of the system and equate received expressions. Then we will determine the kinetic energy of the particle

$$T = mc^2(\gamma - 1) = \frac{eq}{a} - \varepsilon_{rad}^{em} - (\varepsilon_e^{em} - \varepsilon_{e0}^{em}), \quad (5)$$

where eq/a is the initial potential energy of the particle, ε_{rad}^{em} the independent energy of an electromagnetic field radiated by the particle, ε_e^{em} and ε_{e0}^{em} the inertial energy of the moving particle and the particle at rest respectively.

Calculation of a kinetic energy of the particle by the solution of the equation of motion of the particle in the given field of the charge q will lead to an expression

$$T = \frac{eq}{a} - \varepsilon_{rad}^{em}. \quad (6)$$

As was to be expected, an extra term in (5) is equal to a difference between inertial energies of electromagnetic fields of accelerated and motionless particles. For the spherically symmetric distribution of particle's charge the value $\varepsilon_e^{em} - \varepsilon_{e0}^{em} = \varepsilon_{e0}^{em} [\gamma(1 + v^2/3c^2) - 1] \neq 0$ [5], [6]. We can see that the solution (5) of the problem based on the Eq(4) is incorrect. It differs from the correct solution (6) by the difference between the field energies of moving particle and the particle at rest. It's just what has to be expected when we use the Eq(4).

2.2 Discussion

It is not difficult to understand the reasons according to which the logic error was not exposed for a so prolonged time. The way of the electrodynamics development was the next. According to the special theory of relativity the energy and momentum of particles

³The expression (4) is incorrect in the case of one particle as well.

should have certain transformation properties regardless to their nature. The relativistic mass is a coefficient between vectors of the momentum and velocity of particles. In this case the Newton's second law and the Lorentz force govern the dynamics of particles. The joint solution of the equations of motion of fields and particles reduces to the expression (4) which is treated as the energy conservation law. At that it is postulated that the value w is the energy density of the electromagnetic field. After this postulate was accepted the authors do not notice that at the same time this postulate leads to the appearance of the additional unwanted energy of particles of the electromagnetic origin which is hidden in the total field energy of the system and violate the sense of the received equation. The nature of mass, energy and momentum of particles are discussed later, after the Eq(4) is received and interpreted. They are discussed after the electromagnetic fields and the corresponding to these fields energy and momentum of the electromagnetic origin created by a uniformly moving particles are calculated. It turned out that these values have not correct transformation properties following from the special theory of relativity⁴. In order to give the correct transformation properties and with the purpose of keeping of the particle charge in equilibrium the attraction fields of non-electromagnetic origin are introduced. It is postulated that the energy and momentum of these fields have wrong transformation properties of such a form that the sum of the energies of the fields of the electromagnetic and non-electromagnetic origin are reduced to experimentally observable values of energy and momentum of particles⁵. Again, after these in word only assumptions there is no discussion of the necessity of taking into account the presence of the fields of the non-electromagnetic energy in the equations of motion of particles and fields and there is no connection of this discussion with any reference to the conservation law (4) and its revision. After all, the equations are not changed. Observable mass m_i accepted in word only. It is finite even in the case of point particles. Both the inertial and radiation electric fields of the electromagnetic origin that is the first ($\sim \vec{v}$) and higher terms of the Abraham-Lorentz self-force [2] was kept and work but the corresponding forces of the non-electromagnetic origin were not introduced and that is why they do not compensate the corresponding part of the energy and momenta of the field term of the Eq(4) (specifically, among their number the field energy term $\varepsilon_e^{em} - \varepsilon_{e0}^{em}$ in the example 1).

Unfortunately the laws of conservation, as a rule, were proved only to emphasize the consistency of the electrodynamics, its perfection. They were not used on practice since on the basis of the laws it is possible to solve a small number of simple problems not

⁴In the case of the spherically symmetrical particles besides the correct factor γ there are the incorrect factors $(1 + v^2/3c^2)$ in energy and $(4/3)$ in the momentum of particles [5]. In the case of a the non-symmetrical particles these factors are more complicated and depend on the orientation of the particles to the direction of their velocity. These factors are changing in time when the particles are in state of rotation. The corresponding change in time of the energy and momentum of the particles of the electromagnetic origin caused by their rotation can be compensated only by the fields of non-electromagnetic origin but this compensation does not work in the case of the short-range fields.

⁵In the case of a non-uniform motion the concepts of the energy and momentum of particles of the electromagnetic origin were not discussed. Non-obviously they are taken equal to the appropriate values for the particles moving uniformly with the same velocity.

representing practical interest⁶. Therefore the error in the proof, which would be possible to establish by a comparison of the solutions following from the laws of conservation and from the equations of motion, on particular examples was not discovered.

We have shown that the energy conservation law (4) in the case when the kinetic energy of particles is changed lead to the solution of the problems which differ from the solutions derived from the equations of motion of particles in the electromagnetic fields. The considered example and the paper [7] have demonstrated this result. At the same time in the case when the problem deal with the initial and final states of the system we can remove the kinetic energy of the particle of the electromagnetic origin (similar to the last term in the expression (5)) by hands and such a way to come to a correct solution. But such solution of the problem (renormalization by hands) means that the Maxwell-Lorentz electrodynamics is not correct. Moreover this solution is not universal. The last affirmation was demonstrated in [4] where the problem of two identical charged particles was considered. In this problem the particles were brought close to each other with equal constant velocities by extraneous forces along an axis x up to a distance a_1 . Then the extraneous forces are switched off and particles where being decelerated continued to be brought closer by inertia until they were stopped on a distance $a_2 < a_1$. After the stop of particles the extraneous forces where switched on again to keep particles in the state of rest. It was shown that contrary to the law of conservation of energy the energy of the considered system in the final state is higher than the energy spent by extraneous forces on acceleration of particles and their further bringing closer. The idea of this example was the next. The electrical field of a uniformly moving charged particle is flattened in the direction of motion such a way that on the axis of motion at a distance a its value $E_{||}$ is γ^2 times less then the electrostatic field of the particle at rest being at the same distance from the observation point [1]. As the repulsive forces between moving particles $eE_{||}^{mov}$ are weakened γ^2 times in comparison with a static case then on a principle of bringing close the particles to each other with relativistic velocities and subsequent separation them under non-relativistic velocities one could construct the perpetum mobile⁷. This problem means that either possible form of fields of non-electromagnetic origin must be restricted or Maxwell-Lorentz equations must be changed.

2.3 Remarks

1. The electric and magnetic field strengths in the expressions for the Lorentz force, ε^{em} and $(\vec{j} \cdot \vec{E})$ according to Maxwell equations include both the external fields and self-fields

⁶It is possible to point out only on the paper [7] and comment to this paper [8] and close questions connected, for example, with renormalization of mass in a classical electrodynamics (see [1], § 37, § 65, Problem 1). The term "renormalization procedure" was appeared first in the quantum theory where the energy field term similar to the field term in (4) was introduced in the Hamiltonian and where the removal of divergences was done by veiling the problem by some artifices [9]. At that there was no reference on the validity of the energy conservation law (4) after such artifices were introduced."

⁷In the approximation $(v/c)^2$ this problem can be solved without introduction of the extraneous forces (Usual solution of the equations of motion or Darwin Lagrangian can be used [1], [2]). The result will be the same.

produced by charged particles. That is why the radiation reaction force was taken into account in (2), (4). The energy conservation law was derived without any assumptions on the value of the external fields or distances. This statement and the discussion of the particle nature we can see e.g. in [1] in the form: "One can raise the question of how the electrodynamics, which satisfies the law of conservation of energy, can lead to the absurd result that a free charge increases its energy without limit. Actually the roots of this difficulty lie in the earlier remarks (Section 5-2) concerning the infinite electromagnetic "intrinsic mass" of elementary particles. When in the equations of motion we write a finite mass for the charge, then in doing this we essentially assign to it formally an infinite negative "mass" of non-electromagnetic origin, which together with the electromagnetic mass should result in a finite mass for the particle. Since, however, the subtraction of one infinity from another is not entirely correct mathematical operation, this leads to a series of further difficulties, among which is the one mentioned here". It means that the authors consider the statement "the electrodynamics, which satisfies the law of conservation of energy" as the fundamental law of the electrodynamics. They explain the difficulties of the "runaway" solutions by the not entirely correct mathematical operation connected with pointlike dimensions of particles.

2. In the textbooks the energy conservation law has the form $d\varepsilon_{\Sigma}/dt = 0$ that is expressed through the change of the total energy. Maybe this fact was the reason of the fact that the divergence of the value ε_{Σ} was not discussed with the reference to the energy conservation law in the case of the pointlike particles in spite of such particles were considered in [1] and other textbooks.

3. In the electrodynamics of Maxwell-Lorentz there could not be a model of particles with pure electromagnetic nature of mass. Differently all energy would have electromagnetic nature and the first term in (4) should be absent. On the other hand the energy of charged particle ε_i cannot have pure non-electromagnetic nature since in the case, for example, of one particle the energy of extraneous forces applied to a particle will be transformed not only to the value ε_i and to the energy of the emitted radiation but also to the electromagnetic self-energy ε^{em} of the particle.

4. For the case of one uniformly moving particle the value ε_{Σ} depends on a velocity by the law which differs from the relativistic law. In this case the change of the total energy of the particle determined by the Eq(4) $\varepsilon_{\Sigma} \neq \gamma\varepsilon_{\Sigma 0}$ as the correct transformation properties has the first but has not the second term of this expression representing the electromagnetic self-energy of the particle [5]. The similar statement is valid for the beam of charged particles where the situation is intensified in addition by the circumstance that besides the electromagnetic self-energy of particles the second term in (4) will include the electromagnetic energy of interactions of particles which have incorrect and more complicated transformation properties as well.

3 Conclusion

In electrodynamics there are many "open" or "perpetual" problems such as the problem of the self-energy and momentum of particles, the nature of the particle's mass, the problem of the runaway solutions. There is a spectrum of opinions concerning the importance and the ways of finding of the answers on these questions [4]. Unfortunately the efforts of the majority of the authors are directed to avoid similar questions but not to solve them (see e.g. [1], [2], [5], [9], [10], [11]). In addition they base themselves on the laws of conservation ostensibly following from the electrodynamics in the most general case and presenting electrodynamics as the consistent theory. In such stating the arising questions by their opinion do not have a physical subject of principle and the difficulties in their solution are on the whole in the field of the mathematicians. Of course there is an opinion that the classical electrodynamics of Maxwell-Lorentz must be changed [11]. Another Non-Maxwellian Electrodynamics were suggested but none was survived [11]⁸. All open questions are now remain unsolved.

It is shown in the present work that contrary to the universal opinion the relation (4) does not express the energy conservation law in electrodynamics of Maxwell-Lorentz. The error in the treatment of this expression is the consequence of the insufficiently precise definitions of the basic concepts of the theory and its logically inconsistent construction. It follows that in the process of any discussion of the existing difficulties of the classical electrodynamics it is impossible to refer to the energy conservation law in the form, which was done, for example, in the textbook [1], and the paper [10]. The same confirmation is valid for the linear and angular momentum conservation laws as well.

We would like to have classical electrodynamics on a level with classical mechanics in the form of consistent theory. Let the theory doesn't agree with experiment which require the quantum mechanical generalization. The generalization of the consistent classical theory will lead to the consistent quantum theory. There are difficulties associated with the ideas of Maxwell's theory which are not solved by and not directly associated with quantum mechanics [11], [12]. This difficulties including the problem of the violation of the energy conservation law for a system of particles and electromagnetic fields must be widely presented in the textbooks devoted to the foundations of classical electrodynamics. We hope for the more comprehensive analysis and further developments of the classical and quantum electrodynamics.

4 Appendix

The electromagnetic field in vacuum is described by the Maxwell equations

$$\operatorname{rot}\vec{E} = -\frac{\partial\vec{H}}{\partial t}, \tag{7}$$

$$\operatorname{div}\vec{H} = 0, \tag{8}$$

⁸Nothing changed in the electrodynamics up to this time.

$$\text{rot}\vec{H} = \frac{4\pi}{c}\vec{j} + \frac{1}{c}\frac{\partial\vec{E}}{\partial t} \quad (9)$$

$$\text{div}\vec{E} = 4\pi\rho \quad (10)$$

The typical proof of the law of conservation of energy in electrodynamics is derived according to the following scheme [1].

Let us multiply both parts of the equation (7) by \vec{H} and both parts of the equation (9) by \vec{E} and subtract the received equations term by term

$$\frac{1}{c}(\vec{E}\frac{\partial\vec{E}}{\partial t}) + \frac{1}{c}(\vec{H}\frac{\partial\vec{H}}{\partial t}) = -\frac{4\pi}{c}\vec{j}\vec{E} - (\vec{H}\text{rot}\vec{E} - \vec{E}\text{rot}\vec{H}). \quad (11)$$

Using the known formula of the vector analysis $\text{div}[\vec{a}\vec{b}] = \vec{b}\text{rot}\vec{a} - \vec{a}\text{rot}\vec{b}$ we rewrite this relation in the form

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \frac{|\vec{E}|^2 + |\vec{H}|^2}{8\pi} = -\vec{j}\vec{E} - \text{div}\vec{S}, \quad (12)$$

where $\vec{S} = (c/4\pi)[\vec{E}\vec{H}]$ is the Poynting vector.

Let us integrate (12) through some volume and apply the Gauss theorem to the second term from the right. Then we will receive the equation (1). If the system consists of charged particles then the integral $\int \vec{j}\vec{E}dV$ can be written down in the form of a sum corresponding to all particles of the system of a form $\sum e\vec{v}_i\vec{E}(\vec{r}_i) = \sum d\varepsilon_i/dt$. In this case the equation (1) is transformed into the equation

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left(\int \frac{|\vec{E}|^2 + |\vec{H}|^2}{8\pi} dV + \sum_i \varepsilon_i \right) = - \oint \vec{S} d\vec{f}. \quad (13)$$

which is equivalent to (2).

The value $\oint \vec{S} d\vec{f}$ is a flow of the energy of the electromagnetic field through a surface limiting the volume. If the integration is made through the whole volume of the space i.e. if a surface of integration is withdrawn to infinity then the surface integral is disappeared (all particles and fields remain in space and do not go outside of the limits of the surface of integration) [1]. In this case the Eq(13) will be transformed into the Eq(4).

We can see that the deduction of the equations (1)-(4), (13) was done at an arbitrary reference system. It means that the values w , \vec{S} are described by the same form independently on reference frame. The vector \vec{S} is included in the operator div and that is why the Poynting vector \vec{S} is determined with the accuracy to a rot of an arbitrary vector \vec{A} . But such ambiguity of \vec{S} do not lead to some significant physical consequence as the value $\oint \text{rot}\vec{A}d\vec{f} = 0$. We have presented this remark in detail because of the erroneous papers appeared where the form of the values w and \vec{S} depends on the reference system (see e.g. the paper [13] which unfortunately was cited without any criticism in some papers (e.g. [12]) and in the textbook [2]).

References

- [1] Landau, L. D., and E. M. Lifshitz, *The Classical Theory of Fields*, 3rd Revised English edition, Pergamon, Oxford and Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass. (1971).
- [2] J. D. Jackson, *Classical Electrodynamics*, John Wiley & Sons, 1975.
- [3] E. G. Bessonov, Preprint FIAN No 96, Moscow, 1980.
- [4] E. G. Bessonov, Preprint FIAN No 35, Moscow, 1997;
<http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/physics/9708002>.
- [5] D. Ivanenko, A. Sokolov, *Klassicheskaya teoriya polya*, Gostechizdat, M.-L., 1951; *the Classische Feldtheorie*, Akademie-Verlag, Berlin (1953).
- [6] A. O. Barut, *Electrodynamics and classical Theory of fields and particles*, Macmillan, New York (1964).
- [7] B. M. Bolotonskii, S. N. Stoliarov, *Uspekhi Fizicheskich Nauk*, v.162, No 3, p.195, 1992).
- [8] E. G. Bessonov, *Uspekhi Fizicheskich Nauk* (presented);
<http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/physics/9801049>.
- [9] M. A. Markov, *Uspekhi Fiz. Nauk*, v.29, (3-4), p.269, (1946).
- [10] V. L. Ginzburg, *Uspekhi Fiz. Nauk*, v.98,(3), p.569 (1969).
- [11] R. P. Feynman, *Lectures on Physics: Mainly Electromagnetism and Matter*, (Addison-Wesley, London, 1964).
- [12] Julian Schwinger, *Foundations of Physics*, v.13, No 3, p. 373, 1983.
- [13] F. Rohrlich, *American Journal of Physics*, v.38, No 11, p. 1310, 1970.