In what sense uniformly accelerated charges radiate for inertial observers but do not for Rindler ones; – a simplified discussion.

George E. A. Matsas

Instituto de Física Teórica, Universidade Estadual Paulista

Rua Dr. Bento Teobaldo Ferraz 271, Bl. II

01140-070, São Paulo

Abstract

We revisit the long-standing question of whether or not uniformly accelerated sources radiate for coaccelerating observers; we keep our discussion as down-to-Earth as possible to avoid unphysical issues that mystify the problem. We end up explaining in what conditions observing Larmor radiation reflects the existence of the Unruh thermal bath.

1. In 1992 it was shown [1] that the emission of a usual photon from a uniformly accelerated charge in the Minkowski vacuum corresponds to either the absorption from or the emission to the Unruh thermal bath of a zero-energy Rindler photon.

2. We recall that zero-energy Rindler modes have, in general, nonzero transverse momenta and so are nontrivial. We recall in addition, that Rindler frequency and transverse momenta are independent of each other being linked by no dispersion relation.

3. Because zero-energy Rindler photons concentrate on the horizon, (physical) Rindler observers do not have any access to them. This harmonizes the fact that uniformly accelerated charges radiate for inertial observers but do not for coaccelerating (Rindler) ones, who only see a distorted Coulomb field.

4. Perhaps because the concept of zero-energy Rindler photons may be unfamiliar or maybe because of the regularization procedure used there, the resolution given in [1] to the question whether or not uniformly accelerated sources radiate with respect to coaccelerating observers does not seem widely accepted yet.

5. Our primary aim here is to render the original argument given in [1] in terms of Unruh-DeWitt detectors which are more familiar to most of the people. Our secondary aim is to enumerate recent spin-offs, which hopefully will be discussed in more detail further in this workshop.

6. Cautionary remark: Rendering a piece of work to a more familiar language, many times like in poetry, leads to the impoverishment of the original message. I apologize in advance to my collaborators if they find this is what I did here. I hope this may be compensated by leading more people to visit the original papers. The paragraphs will be enumerated to make easier the discussion for the audience. Natural units are assumed $\hbar = c = k = 1$.

7. Let us begin considering the usual Unruh-DeWitt two-level pointlike detector represented by the monopole operator $\hat{m}(\tau)$. It acts on the detector energy eigenstates

$|E_\pm\rangle$ as

$$\hat{m}(0)|E_\pm\rangle = |E_\mp\rangle, \quad (E_+ > E_-, \ \langle E_\pm|E_\mp\rangle = 0, \ \langle E_\pm|E_\pm\rangle = 1). \tag{1}$$

8. The detector is minimally coupled to a massless scalar field $\hat{\phi}$ through the interaction action

$$\mathcal{S}_I = \int d\tau c(\tau)\hat{m}(\tau)\hat{\phi}[x^\mu(\tau)], \tag{2}$$

where $x^\mu = x^\mu(\tau)$ is the detector worldline and τ is its proper time. The switching function $c = c(\tau)$ is assumed to be at least C^1 (to avoid unphysical divergencies [2]). The detector is kept switched on only for a finite amount of proper time T.

9. You may think of the detector as follows:

   (a) It enters the Rindler wedge inertially when it is still switched off,

   (b) Then, an external agent puts it into a uniformly accelerated trajectory with proper acceleration a,

   (c) Once the detector is uniformly accelerated, it is switched on,

   (d) The detector stays so (uniformly accelerated and switched on) for proper time T,

   (e) After this, the process is reversed back; firstly, it is switched off, and, next, it is set inertial before leaving the wedge.

10. Obviously, what the detector does while it is switched off will not affect our calculations; still, it is conceptually useful to have the whole physical picture in mind. We want to preclude our massive detector (it has internal energy; so it has mass) to asymptotically approach the speed of light: $v \to c$. A real parameter α regulates how fast the detector is switched on/off: the larger the α the faster the detector is switched on/off (i.e., the larger the α the smaller the switching time).

11. We stress that we want to keep out from this presentation the (interesting but academic) discussion about whether or not eternally accelerated electric charges

(if it were possible to accelerate a charge forever) would radiate according to inertial observers themselves. *We assume that we all agree that accelerated charges with physical trajectories do radiate according to the Larmor formula for inertial observers.* Indeed, this is used as a benchmark in the discussion below.

12. It is much easier to calculate the excitation rate of a uniformly accelerated detector using Rindler observers since the detector is static for them; then, all calculations next are performed by these observers. (We will follow here Ref. [2].)

13. We assume that we are in the Minkowski vacuum. Then, Rindler observers must use the fact that they are in a thermal state with the Unruh temperature [3].

14. According to the action (2), the detector can excite by absorbing or emitting a Rindler particle with Rindler frequency ω_R and transverse momentum $k_\perp$. (In the latter case, the external agent switching on/off the detector is the one who provides the energy to allow such a process.)

15. The detector excitation probability with simultaneous absorption of a Rindler particle from the Unruh thermal bath is

$$\mathcal{P}_{abs}^{exc} = \int dW_{abs}^{exc} \frac{1}{e^{\omega_R/T_U} - 1}, \tag{3}$$

where $T_U = a/(2\pi)$,

$$dW_{abs}^{exc} \equiv |\mathcal{A}_{abs}^{exc}|^2 d^2\mathbf{k}_\perp d\omega_R, \tag{4}$$

and

$$\mathcal{A}_{abs}^{exc} = \langle 0_R| \otimes \langle E_+|\mathcal{S}_I|E_-\rangle \otimes |\omega_R\mathbf{k}_\perp\rangle, \tag{5}$$

where $|0_R\rangle$ is the Rindler vacuum.

16. Analogoulsly, the excitation probability with simultaneous emission of a Rindler particle into the Unruh thermal bath is given by

$$\mathcal{P}_{em}^{exc} = \int dW_{em}^{exc} \left(1 + \frac{1}{e^{\omega_R/T_U} - 1}\right), \tag{6}$$

where

$$dW_{em}^{exc} = |\mathcal{A}_{em}^{exc}|^2 d^2\mathbf{k}_\perp d\omega_R. \tag{7}$$

and

$$\mathcal{A}_{em}^{exc} = \langle \omega_R \mathbf{k}_\perp| \otimes \langle E_+| \, \mathcal{S}_I \, |E_-\rangle \otimes |0_R\rangle. \tag{8}$$

The two terms in the parentheses in Eq. (6) are associated with spontaneous and induced emissions, respectively.

17. Thus, according to Rindler-observers' calculations, the total excitation probability will be

$$\mathcal{P}^{exc} = \mathcal{P}_{em}^{exc} + \mathcal{P}_{abs}^{exc}. \tag{9}$$

This is also precisely what inertial observers measure since the excitation probability of a detector is an observable which depends only on the detector properties and field state. This can be explicitly verified by a direct inertial frame calculation.

18. So far so good. However, we are interested in radiation emission rather than on detector excitation. It lacks, thus, to calculate the emission and absorption of Rindler particles associated with *detector deexcitation*. If we aim to look at radiation emission, we must eventually trace out on the detector internal state. The corresponding results are expressed below.

19. Deexcitation probability with simultaneous absorption of a Rindler particle from the Unruh thermal bath:

$$\mathcal{P}_{abs}^{deexc} = \int dW_{abs}^{deexc} \frac{1}{e^{\omega_R/T_U} - 1}, \tag{10}$$

where

$$dW_{abs}^{deexc} \equiv |\mathcal{A}_{abs}^{deexc}|^2 d^2\mathbf{k}_\perp d\omega_R, \tag{11}$$

with

$$\mathcal{A}_{abs}^{deexc} = \langle 0_R| \otimes \langle E_-|\mathcal{S}_I|E_+\rangle \otimes |\omega_R \mathbf{k}_\perp\rangle \tag{12}$$

20. Deexcitation probability with simultaneous emission of a Rindler particle into the Unruh thermal bath

$$\mathcal{P}_{em}^{deexc} = \int dW_{em}^{deexc} \left(1 + \frac{1}{e^{\omega_R/T_U} - 1} \right), \tag{13}$$

where

$$dW_{em}^{deexc} = |\mathcal{A}_{em}^{deexc}|^2 d^2\mathbf{k}_\perp d\omega_R. \tag{14}$$

with

$$\mathcal{A}_{em}^{deexc} = \langle \omega_R \mathbf{k}_\perp | \otimes \langle E_- | \, \mathcal{S}_I \, | E_+ \rangle \otimes | 0_R \rangle. \tag{15}$$

21. The switching on/off process was only introduced to keep our problem as physical as possible. Notwithstanding, we do not want our conceptual message to depend on T or α. Hence, we will focus on the regime where (i) the detector stays switched on for a time interval T larger than any other time scale in the problem and (ii) the time scales defined by a^{-1} and ΔE^{-1} are both large compared with the switching on/off time scale α^{-1} (keeping in mind that the switching on/off cannot be instantaneous in order to avoid ultraviolet divergencies):

$$T \gg (a^{-1}, \Delta E^{-1}) \gg \alpha^{-1}, \tag{16}$$

where $\Delta E \equiv E_+ - E_- > 0$.

22. In the regime (16), the leading term for the transition rates

$$\Gamma_{em/abs}^{exc/deexc} \equiv P_{em/abs}^{exc/deexc}/T$$

will only depend on a and ΔE (see, e.g., Ref. [2] for more details).

23. The combined absorption and emission rates associated with either excitation or deexcitation is simplified in the regime (16):

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma^L &\equiv \Gamma_{em}^{exc} + \Gamma_{em}^{deexc} + \Gamma_{abs}^{exc} + \Gamma_{abs}^{deexc} \\
&\approx \Gamma_{em}^{deexc} + \Gamma_{abs}^{exc}
\end{aligned}$$

We note that Γ_{em}^{exc} and Γ_{abs}^{deexc} were dismissed because in the regime (16) *energy conservation* leads to $\mathcal{A}_{em}^{exc}, \mathcal{A}_{abs}^{deexc} \propto \delta(\omega_R + \Delta E)$.

24. Now, a straightforwad calculation allows us to cast Γ^L as

$$\Gamma^L \approx c_0^2 \left[\frac{\Delta E}{2\pi} + 2 \times \frac{\Delta E}{2\pi} \frac{1}{e^{\Delta E/T_U} - 1} \right] \int_0^\infty d\omega_R \delta[\omega_R - \Delta E], \tag{17}$$

where $c_0 = \text{const}$ was "hidden" in $c(\tau)$ and should be interpreted as the coupling constant between the detector and field.

25. The integral is maintained to make explicit that in the regime (16) energy conservation only allows the detector to interact with particles of the thermal bath with $\omega_R = \Delta E$.

26. Now, suppose that the energy gap is small with respect to the Unruh thermal bath, $\Delta E \ll T_U = a/(2\pi)$. In this case Eq. (17) reduces to

$$\Gamma^L|_{\Delta E \ll a} \approx \frac{c_0^2}{\pi} \frac{\Delta E}{e^{2\pi \Delta E/a} - 1} \int_0^\infty d\omega_R \delta[\omega_R - \Delta E]. \tag{18}$$

Clearly, such a detector is only able to interact with infrared Rindler particles $\omega_R = \Delta E \ll a$.

27. Think, now, of the physical situation where ΔE is so small that the detector inner structure cannot be resolved by current technology. Then, it is natural (i) to perform the integral in Eq. (18) and next (ii) to take the $\Delta E \to 0$ limit:

$$\Gamma^L|_{\Delta E \ll a} \approx \frac{c_0^2 a}{2\pi^2}. \tag{19}$$

This is, thus, the combined absorption and emission rates of (infrared) Rindler particles associated with our detector with an unresolved inner structure.

28. Because each *absorption* or *emission* of a Rindler particle uniquely corresponds to the *emission* of a Minkowski particle [4], Eq. (19) is also precisely the emission rate of usual Minkowski particles radiated by our detector as seen by inertial observers. This can be verified through a usual inertial-frame calculation.

29. We call attention to the fact that a straightforward inertial-frame calculation for the emission rate of Minkowski particles radiated by a (*structureless*) pointlike classical scalar source $j(x)$ differs from Eq. (19) by a factor 2 [5]:

$$\Gamma^L|_{\Delta E=0} \approx \frac{c_0^2 a}{4\pi^2}, \tag{20}$$

30. In order to recover the result above for a classical structureless source from our results, one must take $\Delta E \to 0$ (structureless limit) in Eq. (18) and next perform the integral using $\int_0^\infty d\omega_R \delta(\omega_R) = 1/2$.

31. Thus, the usual Minkowski particle emission from a classical source (known as Larmor radiation in classical electrodynamics) following a uniformly accelerated trajectory for a long time [regime (16)] is linked to the absorption and emission of zero-energy Rindler particles – note the $\delta(\omega_R)$ above.

32. Translating this to electric charges one can say that [1]: *the emission of a usual (finite-energy) Minowski photon from a uniformly accelerated charge as defined by inertial observers corresponds to either the absorption or emission of a zero-energy Rindler photon as defined by Rindler observers.*

33. Now it is easy to understand why inertial observers do see radiation from a uniformly accelerated source, while Rindler observers do not. One way to understand it is to recall that zero-energy Rindler modes concentrate on the horizon, where physical Rindler observers do not have access.

34. Recently the relationship above between zero-energy Rindler particles and finite-energy Minkowski particles was strengthened even more by explicitly showing how *the usual classical Larmor radiation can be entirely built from the zero-energy Rindler modes* [6].

35. Because zero-energy Rindler modes present in the Unruh thermal bath are crucially used to build Larmor radiation, we claim that **under proper conditions** the observation of Larmor radiation is circumstantial evidence for the Unruh thermal bath. The link between the classical Larmor radiation and the quantum Unruh

effect requires the use of a simple extra quantum ingredient, namely the Planck-Einstein relation $E = h\nu$ [7].

36. The proper conditions we refer above are discussed in [8]-[9] and are mostly related to the fact that the charge must have enough time to thermalize in the Unruh thermal bath. Although the experiment is feasible under present technology, it was not realized yet to the best of our knowledge.

37. Larmor radiation may be seen as a shadow of the Unruh thermal bath in Plato's cave. It reveals some thing about the true thing but not the whole thing. Anyway, is not that always the case?

References

[1] A. Higuchi, G. E. A. Matsas and D. Sudarsky, *Bremsstrahlung and Fulling-Davies-Unruh thermal bath,* Phys. Rev. D **45**, R3308 (1992); ibid, *Bremsstrahlung and zero-energy Rindler photons,* Phys. Rev. D **46**, 3450 (1992).

[2] A. Higuchi, G. E. A Matsas, and C. B. Peres, *Uniformly acelerated finite-time detectors,* Phys. Rev. D **48**, 3731 (1993).

[3] W. G. Unruh, *Notes on black-hole evaporation,* Phys. Rev. D **14**, 870 (1976).

[4] W. G. Unruh and R. M. Wald, *What happens when an accelerating observer detects a Rindler particle,* Phys. Rev. D **29**, 1047 (1984).

[5] H. Ren and E. J. Weinberg, *Radiation from a moving scalar source,* Phys. Rev. D **49**, 6526 (1994).

[6] A. G. S. Landulfo, S. A. Fulling, and G. E. A. Matsas, *Classical and quantum aspects of the radiation emitted by a uniformly accelerated charge: Larmor-Unruh reconciliation and zero-frequency Rindler modes,* Phys. Rev. D **100**, 045020 (2019).

[7] A. Higuchi and G. E. A. Matsas, *Fulling-Davies-Unruh effect in classical field theory,* Phys. Rev. D **48**, 689 (1993).

[8] G. Cozzella, A. G. S. Landulfo, G. E. A. Matsas, and D. A. T. Vanzella, *Proposal for observing the Unruh effect using classical electrodynamics,* Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, 161102 (2017);

[9] G. Cozzella, A. G. S. Landulfo, G. E. A. Matsas, and D. A. T. Vanzella, *A quest for a "direct" observation of the Unruh effect with classical electrodynamics: in honnor of Atsushi Higuchi 60th anniversary,* Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **27**, 1843008 (2018).