DERIVING AMPÈRE'S LAW
FROM WEBER'S LAW

*A. K. T. Assis**

RELATÓRIO TÉCNICO Nº 29/90

Abstract. We correct some misconceptions in the literature regarding Weber's law and show: (A) with it Ampère's law of force between current elements can be derived with the modern current element, (B) what are the correct expressions for the relative velocity and acceleration between point charges, (C) why the acceleration terms in Weber's law are essential and so we have arguments to show that Ritz's law is untenable, and (D) how to develop the energy of interaction between two modern current elements.

Universidade Estadual de Campinas
Instituto de Matemática, Estatística e Ciência da Computação
IMECC – UNICAMP
Caixa Postal 6065
13.081 – Campinas – SP
BRASIL

O conteúdo do presente Relatório Técnico é de única responsabilidade do autor.

Setembro – 1990

* Note: Professor do Departamento de Raios Cósmicos e Cronologia, Instituto de Física, UNICAMP, Caixa Postal 6165, Campinas, SP, Brazil, e Professor colaborador do Departamento de Matemática Aplicada, IMECC, UNICAMP.

INTRODUCTION

In the last 10 years there has been a revival of interest in Ampère's law of force between current elements [1-6] and in Weber's law of force between point charges [7-9]. The main reason for this fact is that some recent experiments with a single circuit can only be explained by Ampère's law and not by Grassmann's law of force (sometimes known as Biot-Savart's law) [1-9]. Ampère's law states that the force which a usual current element $I_2 dl_2$ exerts in another current element $I_1 dl_1$ is given by [10]

$$dF = \frac{-\mu_0}{4\pi} I_1 I_2 \frac{\widehat{r}}{r^2} [2 dl_1 \cdot dl_2 - 3(\widehat{r} \cdot dl_1)(\widehat{r} \cdot dl_2)], \tag{1}$$

where $\widehat{r} = (r_1 - r_2)/|r_1 - r_2|$, $r = |r_1 - r_2|$.

Historically Weber's law appeared twenty years after this law. Weber's goal was to derive this law based in a law of force between point charges like Coulomb's, but modified when the charges have a relative velocity and acceleration. In this respect he was following the suggestion that Gauss gave in a letter to him [11]. Following also Fechner's hypothesis on the nature of the electric current, according to which it consists of a current of positive electricity in one direction combined with an exactly equal current of negative electricity in the opposite direction (equal as respects the quantity of electricity in motion and the velocity with which it is moving), Weber arrived at the formula [12]:

$$F = \frac{q_1 q_2}{4\pi\varepsilon_0} \frac{\widehat{r}}{r^2} \left[1 - \frac{\dot{r}^2}{2c^2} + \frac{r\ddot{r}}{c^2} \right]. \tag{2}$$

In this formula $\dot{r} = dr/dt$, $\ddot{r} = d^2r/dt^2$, F is the force that q_2 exerts on q_1, and c is a constant with the same magnitude as the velocity of light, as Weber determined experimentally. With this equation and Fechner hypothesis Weber derived Eq. (1).

Nowadays one knows that Fechner's assumption regarding the nature of electric currents is wrong. In fact we have positive ions fixed in the lattice of a metal and only electrons are responsible for the current. Our aim is to show that even with this present model for the current we can derive Eq. (1) with Weber's force, Eq. (2). In this way we want

2

to clear up some misunderstandings regarding Weber's law as this one expressed by P. Graneau in an excellent review article [13]: "Weber argued the forces on the charges were passed on to the metal but failed to explain how, at the same time, the charges could move freely through the conductor. This inconsistency and the subsequent discovery of the immobility of the lattice ion made Weber's current element untenable". As we will see, what is untenable is Fechner's current element, but not Weber's law.

In order to do so we first of all write each neutral current element in the form

$$
\left.
\begin{array}{l}
I_1 dl_1 = q_{1+} v_{1+} + q_{1-} v_{1-} = q_{1+} \left(v_{1+} - v_{1-} \right), \\[2ex]
I_2 dl_2 = q_{2+} v_{2+} + q_{2-} v_{2-} = q_{2+} \left(v_{2+} - v_{2-} \right).
\end{array}
\right\} \tag{3}
$$

In these expressions we assumed $q_{i-} = -q_{i+}$ because we are considering only neutral current elements. Since v_{1+} and v_{2+} are arbitrary, Fechner hypothesis corresponds to a special case ($v_{i+} = -v_{i-}$), and now it can also be shown that Ampère's law can be applied to plasma physics where usually one has a neutral fluid with electrons and ions moving relative to the laboratory. Anyway, if we wish to particularize to metallic currents, we only need to put $v_{1+} = v_{2+} = 0$.

According to Weber the net force of $I_2 dl_2$ on $I_1 dl_1$ will be given by a sum of four terms: the force of q_{2-} on q_{1+} and q_{1-}, plus the force of q_{2+} on q_{1+} and q_{1-}. Since

$$
\dot{r} \equiv \frac{dr}{dt} = \frac{d}{dt} \sqrt{(r_1 - r_2) \cdot (r_1 - r_2)}
$$

$$
= \frac{(r_1 - r_2) \cdot (v_1 - v_2)}{|r_1 - r_2|} = \hat{r} \cdot (v_1 - v_2), \tag{4}
$$

$$
\ddot{r} \equiv \frac{d^2 r}{dt^2} = \frac{1}{r} [(v_1 - v_2) \cdot (v_1 - v_2) + (r_1 - r_2) \cdot (a_1 - a_2) - \dot{r}^2] \tag{5}
$$

we have that the force of one of the charges q_2 on one of the charges q_1

3

(according to Eq. (2)), will be given by,

$$F = -\frac{q_1 q_2}{4\pi\varepsilon_0}\frac{\hat{r}}{r^2}\left\{1 - \frac{1}{2c^2}[(\hat{r}\cdot v_1)^2 - 2(\hat{r}\cdot v_1)(\hat{r}\cdot v_2) + \right.$$

$$+ (\hat{r}\cdot v_2)^2] + \frac{1}{c^2}[v_1\cdot v_1 - 2v_1\cdot v_2 + v_2\cdot v_2 + (r_1 - r_2)\cdot a_1 -$$

$$\left. - (r_1 - r_2)\cdot a_2 - (\hat{r}\cdot v_1)^2 + (\hat{r}\cdot v_1)(\hat{r}\cdot v_2) - (\hat{r}\cdot v_2)^2]\right\}. \qquad (6)$$

When we add F of q_{2+} on q_{1+} with F of q_{2+} on q_{1-} we get:

$$F_+ = \frac{q_{1+}q_{2+}}{4\pi\varepsilon_0}\frac{\hat{r}}{r^2}\left\{\frac{-3}{2c^2}[(\hat{r}\cdot v_{1+})^2 - (\hat{r}\cdot v_{1-})^2 - \right.$$

$$- 2(\hat{r}\cdot(v_{1+} - v_{1-}))(\hat{r}\cdot v_{2+})] + \frac{1}{c^2}[v_{1+}\cdot v_{1+} - v_{1-}\cdot v_{1-} -$$

$$\left. - 2(v_{1+} - v_{1-})\cdot v_{2+} + (r_1 - r_2)\cdot(a_{1+} - a_{1-})]\right\}. \qquad (7)$$

Adding F of q_{2-} on q_{1+} with F of q_{2-} on q_{1-} yields:

$$F_- = \frac{q_{1+}q_{2-}}{4\pi\varepsilon_0}\frac{\hat{r}}{r^2}\left\{\frac{-3}{2c^2}[(\hat{r}\cdot v_{1+})^2 - (\hat{r}\cdot v_{1-})^2 - \right.$$

$$- 2(\hat{r}\cdot(v_{1+} - v_{1-}))(\hat{r}\cdot v_{2-})] + \frac{1}{c^2}[v_{1+}\cdot v_{1+} - v_{1-}\cdot v_{1-} -$$

$$\left. - 2(v_{1+} - v_{1-})\cdot v_{2-} + (r_1 - r_2)\cdot(a_{1+} - a_{1-})]\right\}. \qquad (8)$$

Adding Eqs. (7) and (8) yields

$$dF = \frac{q_{1+}q_{2+}}{4\pi\varepsilon_0}\frac{\hat{r}}{r^2}\left\{\frac{-3}{2c^2}[\hat{r}\cdot(v_{1+} - v_{1-})][(\hat{r}\cdot(v_{2+} - v_{2-})] - \right.$$

$$\left. - \frac{2}{c^2}(v_{1+} - v_{1-})\cdot(v_{2+} - v_{2-})\right\}. \qquad (9)$$

4

Using (3) we can see straight away that Eq.(9) reduces to Eq. (1). As we let v_{1+} and v_{2+} completely arbitrary this completes the proof that Weber's law yields Ampère's law even without Fechner assumptions.

Some remarks must be made at this point. When deducing Weber's law from Ampère's law (the opposite path we followed in this paper) Maxwell supposed constant in magnitude velocities (that is $|v_i|$ = constant), [14]. As we showed here, this restriction is not necessary.

Another aspect worth to note is that in the final expression, Eq. (9), the accelerations of the charges don't appear. Although each charge can have arbitrary acceleration, at the end this won't matter, in so far as Ampère's law is concerned. This is the reason why Gauss' law [14] can also yields Ampère's law, as it only differs from Weber's law in the acceleration terms:

$$F_{\text{Gauss}} = \frac{q_1 q_2}{4\pi\varepsilon_0} \frac{\hat{r}}{r^2}\left[1 + \frac{(v_1 - v_2)\cdot(v_1 - v_2)}{c^2} - \frac{3}{2}\frac{\dot{r}^2}{c^2}\right]. \qquad (10)$$

Using Eqs. (4) and (5) in Eq. (2) we can show that Weber's law is equivalent to Gauss' law with $(r_1 - r_2)\cdot(a_1 - a_2)/c^2$ inside the square brackets of Eq. (10). As is well known, [14], despite this success Gauss' law is untenable because it is not consistent with the principle of conservation of energy and also because we can't derive Faraday's law of induction with it. To derive this induction law and to conserve energy the acceleration terms of Weber's law are essential.

With this in mind we can understand why Ritz's law [15, 16] is also untenable. The main reason is that Ritz's law for the force that q_2 exerts on q_1 depends only on the acceleration of q_2, but not at all on the acceleration of q_1. As we showed in another paper, [8], the acceleration of q_1 or m_1 in Weber's law is essential in order to derive an equation of motion similar to Newton's second law and the proportionality between inertial and gravitational masses, so that we need it in order to implement Mach's principle.

We should mention here another misconception regarding Weber's law, this time related to the relative velocity and acceleration between two charges. The correct expressions are those given by Weber, Eqs. (4) and (5). These are truly relational quantities as they have the same value for any observer, even for moninertial observers. On the other hand some

5

authors, for instance see [17, 18], when discussing Weber's law and some modifications of it talk of the relative velocity between two charges as

$$u \equiv |v_1 - v_2| = \sqrt{(v_1 - v_2) \cdot (v_1 - v_2)}. \qquad (11)$$

But this is not the correct expression for the relative velocity in Weber's sense because the value of u depends on the observer. To see it, consider two charges at rest in the laboratory separated by a distance r, one of them being at the origin and the other on the x axis. To an observer at the origin spinning with a constant angular velocity $w\hat{z}$, the values he will find are: $\dot{r} = \hat{r}_{12} \cdot v_{12} = 0$ as in the laboratory frame, but $u = |v_{12}| = wr$ while in the laboratory frame $u = 0$. This simple example illustrates the relational character of $\dot{r}$ while it shows that $|v_1 - v_2|$ has not always the same value for any observer. Concerning the relative acceleration, the correct expression is that given by Eq. (5), which, in general, is different from $\hat{r} \cdot (a_1 - a_2)$ and also from $|a_1 - a_2|$.

Another aspect to be touched upon refers to Ampère's law, Eq. (1). It is often claimed that Ampère's law has a weakness because it doesn't predict a torque between two current elements (as it is a central force). For instance, in Whittaker's classical book one reads [19], p. 86: *The weakness of Ampère's work evidently lies in the assumption that the force is directed along the line joining the two elements; for in the analogous case of the action between two magnetic molecules, we know that the force is not directed along the line joining the molecules*". And in the next page (p. 87): *"Helmholtz assumes that the interaction between two current elements is derivable from a potential, and this entails the existence of a couple in addition to a force along the line joining the elements"*. In our opinion, this is not a fair statement relative to Ampère's law. Each current element Idl has, besides its location in space, a special direction, namely, that of the electric current. As such it has a vectorial character and is not a scalar quantity. So, even when a force between two current elements is directed along the line joining them we can have a torque between the current elements. This can be

6

seen from Eq.(1) which involves the angle between the current elements and also the angle between each current element and the line joining them. This torque has received a special name by P. Graneau, namely: Alpha-torque forces, [20]. Its action has been seen in many experiments performed by Graneau. He states the origin of these torques in this way: "If the stored energy changes when one of the circuits is rotating with respect to the other, then there must exist a mutual torque between the circuits". Another way of understanding the origin of these torques is to remember that each current element cannot be a material point since it has a direction in space. So, we can imagine each one of them with a linear dimension dl (small but not negligible). In this view the torque arises because the force on the tip of the current element will be different from the force on the tail of it and so a torque can be produced.

It is also of interest here to generalize, without making resort to Fechner's assumptions, the energy of interation between two current elements according to Weber's law. The mutual energy of two moving charges is, according to Weber:

$$U = \frac{q_1 q_2}{4\pi\varepsilon_0 r}\left(1 - \frac{\dot{r}^2}{2c^2}\right). \tag{12}$$

Weber showed that his force law, Eq. (2), could be derived from this velocity - dependent potential energy and that it was consistent with the principle of conservation of energy. As in the derivation of Ampère's law we must add four terms to get the mutual energy between $I_1 dl_1$ and $I_2 dl_2$, namely $U_{2+,1+}$, $U_{2+,1-}$, $U_{2-,1+}$ and $U_{2-,1-}$. Neglecting the energy of formation of each current element (the self–energy) we get for this mutual energy:

$$dU = \frac{\mu_0}{4\pi}\frac{I_1 I_2}{r}(\hat{r}\cdot dl_1)(\hat{r}\cdot dl_2), \tag{13}$$

where $I_1 dl_1$ and $I_2 dl_2$ are given by (3). If we put $v_{1+} = v_{2+} = 0$ this result will remain valid. It must be emphasized that this is not the same

energy as that given by F. Neumann [19], which is

$$dU_N = \frac{\mu_0}{4\pi} \frac{I_1 I_2}{r}(d\mathbf{l}_1 \cdot d\mathbf{l}_2). \quad (14)$$

But it has been proved elsewhere that these two expressions give the same result when integrated round either closed circuit [19], p. 233. The same considerations are valid for the vector potential which in Neummann's and Weber's theories are given by, respectively , [19]:

$$\left. \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{A}_N = \dfrac{\mu_0}{4\pi} I_2 \displaystyle\int \dfrac{d\mathbf{l}_2}{r}, \\[3mm] \mathbf{A}_w = \dfrac{\mu_0}{4\pi} I_2 \displaystyle\int \dfrac{(\hat{r} \cdot d\mathbf{l}_2)}{r}\hat{r}, \end{array} \right\} \quad (15)$$

where $I_2 d\mathbf{l}_2$ in Weber's case is given by (3).

This completes the revision of Weber's law and its correct interpretation and use.

In conclusion, we can say that even with the modern current element (fixed positive ions and free electrons being the responsible for the current), we can derive Ampère's law from Weber's law. Also the mutual energy between two current elements, Eq. (13), can be obtained with this modern current element, expression (3). To do so we only need to use the correct relative velocity and acceleration between two point charges, Eqs. (4) and (5).

8

References

[1] P. Graneau, Nature **295**, 311 (1982).

[2] P. Graneau, J. Appl. Phys. **53**, 6648 (1982).

[3] P. T. Pappas, Nuovo Cimento B **76**, 189 (1983).

[4] P. Graneau, Ampère–Neumann Electrodynamics of Metals (Hadronic Press, Nonantum, 1985).

[5] P. Graneau and P. N. Graneau, Nuovo Cimento D **7**, 31 (1986).

[6] P. T. Pappas, Phys. Lett. **111** A, 193 (1985).

[7] J. P. Wesley, Spec. Sci. Technol. **10**, 47 (1987).

[8] A. K. T. Assis, Found. Phys. Lett. **2**, 301 (1989).

[9] A. K. T. Assis, Phys. Lett. A **136**, 277 (1989).

[10] A. M. Ampère, Theorie Mathematique des Phenomenes Electro–Dynamiques (Albert Blanchard, Paris, 1958).

[11] C. F. Gauss' Werke, **5**, p. 629 (Göttingen edition, 1867). Letter from March 19, 1845.

[12] Wilhelm Weber's Werke, Vols. 1-6 (Springer, Berlin, 1893).

[13] P. Graneau, Fortschr. Phys. **34**, 457 (1986).

[14] J. C. Maxwell, A Treatise on Electricity and Magnetism, Vol.2, Ch. XXIII (Dover, New York, 1954).

[15] W. Ritz, Ann. Chim. Phys. **13**, 145 (1908), W. Ritz, Oeuvres (Gauthier-Villars, Paris, 1911).

[16] A. O'Rahilly, Electromagnetic Theory (Dover, New York, 1965), 2 volumes, pp. 504 and 520.

[17] V. Bush, J. Math. Phys. **5**, 129 (1926).

[18] R. A. Waldron, The Radio and Electronic Engineer **51**, 553 (1981).

[19] E. T. Whittaker, A History of the Theories of Aether and Electricity – The Classical Theories (Humanities Press, New York, 1973).

[20] P. Graneau, Electronics & Wireless World **95**, 556 (1989).

RELATÓRIOS TÉCNICOS — 1990

01/90   Harmonic Maps Into Periodic Flag Manifolds and Into Loop Groups — *Caio J. C. Negreiros.*

02/90   On Jacobi Expansions — *E. Capelas de Oliveira.*

03/90   On a Superlinear Sturm–Liouville Equation and a Related Bouncing Problem — *D. G. Figueiredo* and *B. Ruf.*

04/90   F– Quotients and Envelope of F–Holomorphy — *Luiza A. Moraes, Otília W. Paques* and *M. Carmelina F. Zaine.*

05/90   S-Rationally Convex Domains and The Approximation of Silva-Holomorphic Functions by S–Rational Functions — *Otília W. Paques* and *M. Carmelina F. Zaine.*

06/90   Linearization of Holomorphic Mappings On Locally Convex Spaces — *Jorge Mujica* and *Leopoldo Nachbin.*

07/90   On Kummer Expansions — *E. Capelas de Oliveira.*

08/90   On the Convergence of SOR and JOR Type Methods for Convex Linear Complementarity Problems — *Alvaro R. De Pierro* and *Alfredo N. Iusem.*

09/90   A Curvilinear Search Using Tridiagonal Secant Updates for Unconstrained Optimization — *J. E. Dennis Jr., N. Echebest, M. T. Guardarucci, J. M. Martínez, H. D. Scolnik* and *C. Vacchino.*

10/90   The Hypebolic Model of the Mean × Standard Deviation "Plane" — *Sueli I. R. Costa* and *Sandra A. Santos.*

11/90   A Condition for Positivity of Curvature — *A. Derdzinski* and *A. Rigas.*

12/90   On Generating Functions — *E. Capelas de Oliveira.*

13/90   An Introduction to the Conceptual Difficulties in the Foundations of Quantum Mechanics a Personal View — *V. Buonomano.*

14/90   Quasi-Invariance of product measures Under Lie Group Perturbations: Fisher Information And L^2-Differentiability — *Mauro S. de F. Marques* and *Luiz San Martin.*

15/90   On Cyclic Quartic Extensions with Normal Basis — *Miguel Ferrero, Antonio Paques* and *Andrzej Solecki.*

16/90   Semilinear Elliptic Equations with the Primitive of the Nonlinearity Away from the Spectrum — *Djairo G. de Figueiredo* and *Olimpio H. Miyagaki.*

17/90   On a Conjugate Orbit of G_2 — *Lucas M. Chaves* and *A. Rigas.*

18/90   Convergence Properties of Iterative Methods for Symmetric Positive Semidefinite Linear Complementarity Problems — *Álvaro R. de Pierro* and *Alfredo N. Iusem.*