

Identity of the van der Waals Force and the Casimir Effect and the Irrelevance of These Phenomena to Sonoluminescence

Iver Brevik*

Division of Applied Mechanics, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, N-7491 Trondheim, Norway

Valery N. Marachevsky†

Department of Theoretical Physics, St. Petersburg University, 198 904 St. Petersburg, Russia

Kimball A. Milton‡

Department of Physics and Astronomy, The University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma 73019

(Received 12 October 1998)

We show that the Casimir, or zero-point, energy of a dilute dielectric ball, or of a spherical bubble in a dielectric medium, coincides with the sum of the van der Waals energies between the molecules that make up the medium. That energy, which is finite and repulsive when self-energy and surface effects are removed, may be unambiguously calculated by either dimensional continuation or by zeta-function regularization. This physical interpretation of the Casimir energy seems to be unambiguous evidence that the bulk self-energy cannot be relevant to sonoluminescence. [S0031-9007(99)09132-2]

PACS numbers: 12.20.Ds, 03.70.+k, 78.60.Mq, 42.50.Lc

The Casimir effect has been recognized as a fundamental aspect of quantum field theory for 50 years [1]. This phenomenon, first presented as an attractive force between parallel perfectly conducting plates, may be thought of as a result of changes in the electromagnetic field fluctuations induced by the presence of boundaries. Recently, it has been confirmed to good accuracy by direct measurements [2,3], although the closely related Lifshitz theory [4] was confirmed experimentally 25 years ago [5].

Actually, the history of the effect goes back a bit farther. Casimir and Polder worked out the retarded dispersion force between molecules in 1947 [6], the long range part of the van der Waals force. Bohr shortly thereafter suggested to Casimir that zero-point energy was relevant to the effect [7], and subsequently Casimir presented a derivation of the force between molecules, and between a molecule and a conducting plate, based on such considerations [8]. The derivation of the force between parallel plates followed shortly [1]. It was thus clear from the outset that there was an intimate tie between the van der Waals forces and the Casimir effect.

Identity of van der Waals and Casimir forces.—The explicit demonstration of the identity of these two forces was given in the case of dilute parallel dielectric slabs, where the Lifshitz formula for the Casimir energy may be easily seen to be equal, if dispersion is neglected, to the sum of pairwise long range van der Waals energies [4]:

$$V = -\frac{23\alpha_1\alpha_2}{4\pi r^7}, \quad (1)$$

the Casimir-Polder retarded dispersion potential [6] (see also Ref. [9]). Here the connection between dielectric constant ϵ and polarizability α is $\epsilon = 1 + 4\pi N\alpha$, N being the number density of molecules. The simple geometry makes this calculation easy and unambiguous.

The corresponding calculation for a spherical geometry is fraught with more difficulty. The sum of van der Waals interactions (1) for a spherical ball has been given in Ref. [10]. A sensible procedure for carrying out the calculation is dimensional continuation, which has been advocated in Ref. [11]. That is, we evaluate the integral

$$E_{\text{vdW}} = -\frac{23}{8\pi}\alpha^2 N^2 \int d^D r d^D r' \times (r^2 + r'^2 - 2rr'\cos\theta)^{-\gamma/2} \quad (2)$$

by first regarding $D > \gamma$ so that the integral exists. The integral may be done exactly in terms of gamma functions, which, when evaluated at $D = 3$, $\gamma = 7$ yields [10]

$$E_{\text{vdW}} = \frac{23}{1536\pi a}(\epsilon - 1)^2. \quad (3)$$

[Note that the expression (2) is formally negative or attractive, while the continued result is positive or repulsive. Further note that the same result is obtained for a bubble in a dielectric medium, which may be seen by the replacement $\epsilon - 1 \rightarrow 1 - \epsilon$, which is here without effect.]

Of course, the above calculation in three dimensions is divergent. These divergences are of two kinds: “volume” and “surface.” The volume divergence is a self-energy effect that would be present if the medium filled all space, and makes no reference to the interface, and therefore is quite unobservable. If the divergences are regulated by inserting a point-splitting cutoff, and the divergent terms are simply omitted, the same result (3) is again obtained.

Now we turn to the Casimir effect. For the case of the dielectric sphere this was first worked out in Ref. [12]. That result has been rederived, for the more general case of a spherical bubble, of radius a , having permittivity ϵ' and permeability μ' , surrounded by an infinite medium of

permittivity ϵ and permeability μ , in Ref. [13]. Here the volume effect, corresponding to the intrinsic self-energy of either medium, was explicitly removed; a more detailed justification of that procedure is given in Ref. [10]. The general result is rather complicated:

$$E_C = -\frac{1}{4\pi a} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dy e^{iy\delta} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (2l+1) \times \left\{ x \frac{d}{dx} \ln D_l + 2x' [s_l'(x')e_l'(x') - e_l(x')s_l''(x')] - 2x [s_l'(x)e_l'(x) - e_l(x)s_l''(x)] \right\}, \quad (4)$$

where

$$D_l = [s_l(x')e_l'(x) - s_l'(x')e_l(x)]^2 - \xi^2 [s_l(x')e_l'(x) + s_l'(x')e_l(x)]^2, \quad (5)$$

which uses the abbreviation

$$\xi = \frac{(\frac{\epsilon'}{\epsilon} \frac{\mu}{\mu'})^{1/2} - 1}{(\frac{\epsilon'}{\epsilon} \frac{\mu}{\mu'})^{1/2} + 1}. \quad (6)$$

The integration variables are $x = \sqrt{\mu\epsilon}|y|$ and $x' = \sqrt{\mu'\epsilon'}|y|$, and the Riccati-Bessel functions are

$$s_l(x) = \left(\frac{\pi x}{2}\right)^{1/2} I_{l+1/2}(x), \quad (7)$$

$$e_l(x) = \left(\frac{2x}{\pi}\right)^{1/2} K_{l+1/2}(x).$$

The formula (4) has been regulated by a time-splitting parameter, $\delta = \tau/a \rightarrow 0$, where τ is a Euclidean time separation between field points.

The general expression (4) is rather opaque. Therefore, we consider a dilute dielectric ball, which was already considered in Ref. [12]. (That is, we consider $\mu = 1$ everywhere, and $\epsilon = 1$ outside of the ball.) The formula, which still admits of dispersion, becomes in that case

$$E_C \approx -\frac{1}{8\pi a} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (2l+1) \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dy e^{iy\delta} [\epsilon(y) - 1]^2 \times x \frac{d}{dx} F_l(x), \quad (8)$$

where

$$F_l(x) = x^2 \left(1 + \frac{l(l+1)}{x^2}\right) - \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{d}{dx} e_l s_l\right)^2 - x^2 \left[2 \left(1 + \frac{l(l+1)}{x^2}\right) e_l s_l - \frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2}{dx^2} e_l s_l\right]. \quad (9)$$

[The same result evidently holds if we consider a dielectric bubble, the general dilute effect being proportional to $(\epsilon - \epsilon')^2$.] The integrand here may be approximated by

the uniform asymptotic approximation [14]:

$$e_l(x)s_l(x) \sim \frac{1}{2} z t \left(1 + \frac{a_1(t)}{\nu^2} + \frac{a_2(t)}{\nu^4} + \dots\right), \quad (10)$$

where $\nu = l + 1/2$, $x = \nu z$, and $t = (1 + z^2)^{-1/2}$. The coefficients $a_k(t)$ are polynomials in t of degree $3k$. If we ignore dispersion, and set the time-splitting parameter $\delta = 0$, we obtain [15] the leading uniform asymptotic approximation to Eq. (8),

$$E_C \sim \frac{(\epsilon - 1)^2}{64a} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left\{ \nu^2 - \frac{65}{128} + \frac{927}{16384\nu^2} + O(\nu^{-4}) \right\}. \quad (11)$$

The first two terms are formally divergent, but may be evaluated by the zeta-function definition, $\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \nu^{-s} = (2^s - 1)\zeta(s) - 2^s$. [That is, we may replace the overall $2l + 1$ factor in Eq. (8) by $(2l + 1)^{1-\eta}$, and continue from $\text{Re } \eta > 3$ to $\eta = 0$.] Note that, if only the leading term were kept, the result given in Ref. [13] would be obtained, $E_1 = -(\epsilon - 1)^2/(256a)$, while including two terms reverses the sign and hardly changes the magnitude [15]: $E_2 = +33(\epsilon - 1)^2/(8192a)$. This would seem to resolve the conundrum found in Ref. [13], the apparent sign disparity between the Casimir effect and the van der Waals energy. It is important to recognize that the same finite result is achieved if the point-split regularization is retained, as detailed in Ref. [13]. There seems to be no ambiguity in the procedure [16].

Indeed, let us do the result exactly. (Probably it is possible to do the integrals analytically, but we have not immediately seen how to do this.) We simply add and subtract the two leading asymptotic terms from the integrand in Eq. (8), so that $E_C = E_2 + E_R$, where the remainder is

$$E_R = \frac{(\epsilon - 1)^2}{4\pi a} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \nu^2 \times \int_0^{\infty} dz \left[F_l(\nu z) - \frac{t^4}{4} + \frac{t^{10}}{8\nu^2} \times (1 + 8z^2 - 5z^4 + z^6) \right], \quad (12)$$

According to the third term in Eq. (11), the z integral here is asymptotic to $927\pi/262144\nu^4$; we evaluate the l sum by doing the integral numerically for the first ten terms, and using the asymptotic approximant thereafter. The result is

$$E_C = (\epsilon - 1)^2 \frac{0.004767}{a}. \quad (13)$$

This agrees precisely with the van der Waals result (3) [18]. [The approximation E_2 is 15% too low, whereas if the first three terms in Eq. (11) are kept, the estimate is 1.8% high.]

Irrelevance to sonoluminescence.—There has recently been considerable controversy concerning the possible

relevance of the Casimir effect to sonoluminescence [20]. The idea that the “dynamical Casimir effect” might be relevant to sonoluminescence originated in the work of Schwinger [21]. Recently, a series of papers strongly advocated Schwinger’s point of view [22,23]. This view has been criticized elsewhere [10]. However, now that we clearly see that the Casimir energy may be identified with van der Waals interactions, it seems perfectly plain that the volume effect they consider, proportional to $\epsilon - 1$, simply cannot be present, because such cannot arise from pairwise interactions. (This point was already made in Ref. [12].) Our interpretation stands vindicated: An effect proportional to the volume represents a contribution to the mass density of the material, and cannot give rise to observable effects. (A discussion of the photon production calculation of Ref. [23] has appeared elsewhere [24].)

More subtle is the role of surface divergences [13]. The zeta-function regularization calculation we presented above simply discards such terms, but they appear in more physical regularization schemes. For example, if the time-splitting parameter in Eq. (4) is retained, we get from the leading asymptotic expansion the following:

$$E_{\text{div}} = -\frac{(\epsilon - 1)^2}{4a} \frac{1}{\delta^3}, \quad (14)$$

and if a simple model for dispersion is used, with characteristic frequency ω_0 , the same result is obtained with $1/\delta \rightarrow \omega_0 a/4$ [13]. (A very similar result is given in Ref. [15].) We believe these terms are probably also unobservable, for they modify the surface tension of the liquid, which, like the bulk energy, is already phenomenologically described. (That surface tension has its origin in the Casimir effect was proposed in Ref. [9].) In any case, this surface energy is probably too small, and definitely of the wrong sign, to be relevant to sonoluminescence. (The flash of light is emitted at the minimum radius.)

We note that Barton in his recent paper [19] seems to concur with our assessment: The terms “proportional to V [the volume] and to S [the surface] would be combined with other contributions to the bulk and to the surface energies of the material, and play no further role if one uses the measured values.”

It is truly remarkable that however the (true) divergences in the theory are regulated, and subsequently discarded, the finite result is unchanged. That is, in the van der Waals energy, we can simply omit the point-split divergences, or proceed through dimensional continuation, where no divergences are explicit; in either case, the same result (3) is obtained. Likewise, the same result is obtained for the Casimir energy using either a temporal point splitting or an exponential wave-number cutoff [19], and omitting the divergent terms, or through the formal trick of zeta-function regularization. It is worth reemphasizing that we are not claiming that the Casimir effect for a dielectric ball is finite, unlike the classic case of a spherical conducting shell [25]. It is merely that those divergent terms serve

to renormalize phenomenological parameters in the condensed matter system.

So, finally, we are left with the finite term, which in the dilute approximation is given by Eq. (3) or (13). For a bubble of minimum radius $\sim 10^{-4}$ cm, the corresponding Casimir energy is only $E_C \sim 10^{-3}$ eV. This is 10 orders of magnitude too small to be relevant to sonoluminescence, where about one million optical photons are emitted per flash, and again the sign is wrong. (As to the relevance of a static calculation to the dynamical regime of sonoluminescence, we note that the adiabatic approximation seems favorable, since the time scale for the flash, $\sim 10^{-11}$ s is far longer than the time scale for optical photons, $\sim 10^{-15}$ s.)

We are indebted to Gabriel Barton for discussions in Leipzig, and for sharing a draft of his paper with us. We are grateful to H. B. G. Casimir and H. Rechenberg for conversations on the history of the Casimir effect. We thank Michael Bordag for discussions, and for his organization of the Fourth Workshop on Quantum Field Theory Under the Influence of External Conditions in Leipzig, which allowed this collaboration to take place. This work was supported in part by a grant from the U.S. Department of Energy.

*Electronic address: iver.h.brevik@mtf.ntnu.no

†Electronic address: root@vm1485.spb.edu

‡Electronic address: milton@mail.nhn.ou.edu

- [1] H. B. G. Casimir, Proc. K. Ned. Akad. Wet. **51**, 793 (1948).
- [2] S. K. Lamoreaux, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 5 (1997).
- [3] U. Mohideen and A. Roy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 4549 (1998).
- [4] E. M. Lifshitz, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **29**, 894 (1955) [Sov. Phys. JETP **2**, 73 (1956)]; I. D. Dzyaloshinskii, E. M. Lifshitz, and L. P. Pitaevskii, Usp. Fiz. Nauk **73**, 381 (1961) [Sov. Phys. Usp. **4**, 153 (1961)]; L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Electrodynamics of Continuous Media* (Pergamon, Oxford, 1960), pp. 368–376.
- [5] E. S. Sabisky and C. H. Anderson, Phys. Rev. A **7**, 790 (1973).
- [6] H. B. G. Casimir and D. Polder, Phys. Rev. **73**, 360 (1948).
- [7] H. B. G. Casimir, in Proceedings of the Fourth Workshop on Quantum Field Theory Under the Influence of External Conditions, Leipzig, 1998 (to be published).
- [8] H. B. G. Casimir, in Colloque sur la theorie de la liaison chimique, Paris, 1948 (unpublished).
- [9] J. Schwinger, L. L. DeRaad, Jr., and K. A. Milton, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **115**, 1 (1978).
- [10] K. A. Milton and Y. J. Ng, Phys. Rev. E **57**, 5504 (1998).
- [11] C. M. Bender and K. A. Milton, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 6547 (1994); K. A. Milton, *ibid.* **55**, 4940 (1997).
- [12] K. A. Milton, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **127**, 49 (1980).
- [13] K. A. Milton and Y. J. Ng, Phys. Rev. E **55**, 4207 (1997).
- [14] M. Abramowitz and I. A. Stegun, *Handbook of Mathematical Functions* (National Bureau of Standards, Washington, DC, 1964), p. 378.
- [15] I. Brevik and V. N. Marachevsky, hep-th/9901086.

- [16] Zeta-function regularization is a simple and effective method of capturing the finite part of the Casimir energy. It yields the same result as isolating the divergent part with a physical cutoff, such as the time-splitting parameter $\delta \neq 0$, and removing that term through the process of renormalization. (For more details see, for example, Ref. [17].) If we directly evaluate Eq. (8) as $\delta = \tau/a \rightarrow 0$, we obtain $E_C = A_{1/2} \frac{a^2}{\tau^3} + A_{3/2} \frac{1}{\tau} + E$, where, for example, $A_{1/2}$ is exhibited in Eq. (14), and E is given by Eq. (13).
- [17] M. Bordag, K. Kirsten, and D. Vassilevich, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 085011 (1999).
- [18] As this paper was being written, we received a manuscript from Barton [19], in which exactly the same identity between the van der Waals and Casimir forces was noted. He uses an elementary method of summing zero-point energies directly in powers of $(\epsilon - 1)$, using ordinary perturbation theory. Of course, our approach is, in principle, more general, in that it allows for arbitrary ϵ and permits inclusion of dispersion.
- [19] G. Barton, J. Phys. A **32**, 525 (1999).
- [20] B. P. Barber, R. A. Hiller, R. Löfstedt, S. J. Putterman, and K. Weniger, Phys. Rep. **281**, 65 (1997).
- [21] J. Schwinger, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **90**, 958 (1993); **90**, 2105 (1993); **90**, 4505 (1993); **90**, 7285 (1993); **91**, 6473 (1994).
- [22] C. E. Carlson, C. Molina-París, J. Pérez-Mercader, and M. Visser, Phys. Lett. B **395**, 76 (1997); Phys. Rev. D **56**, 1262 (1997); C. Molina-París and M. Visser, Phys. Rev. D **56**, 6629 (1997). Apparently, this work grew out of the suggestion that gamma ray bursters have their origin in the Casimir effect [C. Carlson, T. Goldman, and J. Pérez-Mercader, Europhys. Lett. **36**, 637 (1996)].
- [23] S. Liberati, M. Visser, F. Belgiorno, and D. W. Sciama, quant-ph/9805023; S. Liberati, F. Belgiorno, M. Visser, and D. W. Sciama, quant-ph/9805031.
- [24] K. Milton, hep-th/9811174.
- [25] T. H. Boyer, Phys. Rev. **174**, 1764 (1968); B. Davies, J. Math. Phys. **13**, 1324 (1972); R. Balian and B. Duplantier, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **112**, 165 (1978); K. A. Milton, L. L. DeRaad, Jr., and J. Schwinger, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **115**, 388 (1978).