The generalized spin-orbit interaction: a microscopic origin of the Ørsted magnetic field
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This work introduces a generalization of the form of the spin-orbit interaction, the generalized spin-orbit interaction (GSOI). It expresses the magnetic field induced by two charged particles moving with a non-zero relative velocity as a field defined at all points in space, and exists in the reference frames of both particles. This is in contrast to spin-orbit interaction theory, in which the generated magnetic field is defined at only one point in space, and exists in the reference frame of one of the two particles. At the macroscopic scale, it is shown that the GSOI theory implies the same form of the Ørsted magnetic field produced by a current-carrying wire. However, the theory is incompatible with the microscopic form of the Biot-Savart equation that implies that a charged particle induces a magnetic field by having a non-zero velocity. The implications of the GSOI theory on the nature of the electromagnetic wave, and the properties of the Ørsted magnetic field in current-carrying atomically thin two-dimensional materials, such as graphene, are discussed. The framework established in this paper aims at re-imagining classical physical concepts in light of an advanced microscopic understanding.

INTRODUCTION

The Ampere’s circuital law (ACL) describes the phenomenon of the creation of the Ørsted magnetic field due to the flow of an electric current through a current carrying wire, and is described by the equation \( J = \nabla \times B \) [1, 2]. This law has been verified numerous times and has become deeply entwined in the fabric of fundamental and applied physics. It is an essential ingredient of our present understanding of the connection between the Ørsted magnetic field and the electric current. With Maxwell’s addition of the displacement field term to the ACL equation, the resulting equation, Maxwell-Ampere equation, in addition to the Maxwell-Faraday equation, form a closed (yet over-determined) set of equations that constitute the classical theory of electromagnetism. ACL is even used for the definition of the ampere in terms of the displacement field.

The Ampere’s circuital law (ACL) was shown to suffer a logical deficiency, which is known as the Ampere tension [6–8]: for an electric current flowing through a solid conductor, the application of ACL to a conductor will divide the conductor into longitudinal current elements. Each such element induces the Ørsted magnetic field, and therefore applies a repulsive force on the neighboring elements. For any amount of current, this repulsion should lead to longitudinal forces between the current elements, or Ampere tension, that would cause the explosion of the solid conductor. This obviously defies observation. While Graneau [8] reasoned that this tension is the cause of explosion of solid conductors under very high current, and that the size of the smallest possible partitioning of the wire should be that of the crystal lattice unit cell, the existence of an Ampere tension necessitates the existence of lattice strain in the wire during the passage of electric current, no matter how small the current is. This, however, has never been reported experimentally. With the large supercurrent densities in superconductors, the Ampere tension would certainly entail the explosion of any superconductor.

The microscopic reduction of ACL is obtained by the Biot-Savart equation. This is derived by taking the current density \( J \) as representing the velocity of a single
charged particle, $q\mathbf{v}$, where $q$ is the charge. For a non-
magnetostatic systems, we obtain the Jefimenko equations [9]. These two equations were never verified for the
case of an electron beam in vacuum. This is surprising,
given that electron beams with varying potential differences have been, and still are, fundamental elements to
many devices. The Ampere tension applies to the electrons flowing in an electron beam: the Jefimenko mag-
netic field induced by each electron will repel the field induced by the neighboring electrons, which would imply
that electrons in an electron beam will deflect sideways, which again defies observation. The idea that the Ørsted
field exists due solely to moving charges in vacuum is so pervasive that lightning, which constitutes a massive
discharge of electrons through an insulating medium, the atmosphere, is also believed to induce a magnetic field.
However, there is no direct measurement of such field. Instead, there are theories that tie the existence of mag-
etized rocks to lightning strikes, such as the lightning-induced remnant magnetism in archaeology [10].

This work attempts to establish a relationship between current and the Ørsted magnetic field from first princi-
ules, based on the spin-orbit interaction (SOI) theory. The SOI is a relativistic effect [1] in which a magnetic
field couples to the spin of two charged particles when they move relative to each other. The application of SOI
to a two-dimensional electron gas by Dresselhaus [11] and Rashba [12] has unraveled the implications of
SOI on electronic transport in semiconductors, giving rise to the anomalous Hall effect (AHE) [13], the spin Hall ef-
fect (SHE) [14, 15] and current-induced spin polarization (CISP) [16]. SOI also gives rise to interesting transport
properties in metals, such as the anisotropic magnetoresistance in ferromagnets [17] and the SHE in metals [18].
A critical ingredient in these technological advances has been the development of accurate theoretical models for
describing the SOI in various systems, such as Rashba’s phenomenological model and the incorporation of SOI
into density-functional theory (DFT) implementations. Here, I present a generalization of the SOI, the general-
ized SOI (GSOI), which extends the applicability of the SOI theory beyond the field of spintronics. The GSOI
theory can explain the induction of a magnetic field in conducting wires due to the passage of an electric cur-
ett, and is applicable to the macroscopic as well as the microscopic scales.

THE SPIN-ORBIT AND THE SPIN-OTHER-ORBIT INTERACTION

For two charged particles, $A$ and $B$, with different ve-
locity vectors $\mathbf{v}_A$ and $\mathbf{v}_B$, the SOI, as derived from the special theory of relativity, is the interaction between the
velocity of $A$ and the magnetic field that $A$ experiences in its own rest frame. This induced magnetic field will
couple with the spin of $A$, $\mu_A$, according to the spin-orbit coupling energy,

$$H_{\text{SOI}} = -\mu_A \cdot \mathbf{B}_A.$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

The induced magnetic field in the rest frame of particle
$i \ (i = A, B)$, $\mathbf{B}_i$, is given by

$$\mathbf{B}_{\text{SOI},i} = -\frac{1}{c^2} (\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{v}_j) \times \mathbf{E}$$

$$= -\frac{1}{c^2} (\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{v}_j) \times \frac{\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j}{|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|}$$

where $\mathbf{v}_i$ is the velocity of particle $i$ and $c$ is the speed of
light. For illustration, the schematic in Fig. 1(a) shows
the direction of the field induced in the reference frame of an electron moving next to an atom, as well as the
field induced in the reference frame of the atom due to the motion of the electron.

The magnitudes and directions of $\mathbf{B}_{\text{SOI},A}$ and $\mathbf{B}_{\text{SOI},B}$
depend on the charges of the two particles, $q_A$ and $q_B$. If
$q_A = q_B$, then $\mathbf{B}_{\text{SOI},A} = \mathbf{B}_{\text{SOI},B}$, such as for the case
of two electrons moving relative to each other. For an
electron moving with respect to an ion and experiencing
its effective nuclear charge, the two fields are opposite in
direction, and the magnitude of the field acting at the
position of the electron will be larger than that acting at the
position of the ion.

The field $\mathbf{B}_{\text{SOI},A}$ has no source, and there are no field lines except the field vectors defined at the positions
of particle $A$ and $B$. The theory of the SOI only accounts
for the effect of the transformed field at the position of
the particles, but does not aim at establishing a vector
field in the reference frames of the particles.

The SOI coupling hamiltonian in Eq. 1 can be derived from the solution of the Dirac equation up to $1/c^2$ or-
der. The Dirac hamiltonian was then extended by Breit
[19] to account for the effect of retardation on two Dirac
particles. Of interest to the present work is the spin-
other-orbit interaction (SOOI) in the Breit hamiltonian
$H_{\text{SOOI}}$ for two particles $A$ and $B$, which is given by [20]

$$-\frac{e^2}{m^2 c^2 4 \pi \varepsilon_0} \frac{|\mathbf{p}_i - \mathbf{p}_j|}{|\mathbf{r}_A - \mathbf{r}_B|^3}$$

(3)

where $\mathbf{p}_i$ is the particle’s momentum vector, $i = A, B,$
$\mathbf{r}_i$ is its position vector, and $\mu_i$ is its spin operator vector.
This terms can be interpreted as the energy required to
align the spin operator vector of each particle with the
magnetic field induced by the other particle (that is why
it is called spin-other-orbit interaction).

This property makes $H_{\text{SOOI}}$ fundamentally different from $H_{\text{SOI}}$ in Eqs. 1 and 3. In SOI, the induced magnetic
field at the reference frame of particle $A$ couples with the
spin of particle $A$, $\mu_A$ but this field is not observable in
the reference frame of particle $B$. In the case of $H_{\text{SOOI}}$ in
Eq. 3, the magnetic field induced in the reference frame of particle $A$ couples with the spin of particle $B$, $\mu_B$. This means that the Breit interaction theory implicitly makes the induced SOI magnetic field observable in the reference frames of both particles.

Based on the above, I propose a generalization for the form of the magnetic field induced by the SOI, the generalized spin-orbit interaction (GSOI) theory.

**THE GENERALIZED SPIN-ORBIT INTERACTION THEORY**

In the GSOI theory, the magnetic field vector induced by the motion of a charged particle relative to another charged particle, $B_{GSOI}$, is a magnetic field that exists in the reference frame of each of the two particles. That is, the field $B_{GSOI}$ in the reference frame of one particle, $A$, is observable in the reference frame of the other particle, $B$. I propose the following form for the field $B_{GSOI}$:

\[
B_{GSOI}(r)_i = -\frac{\mu_0}{4\pi} q_j (v_i - v_j) \times \frac{r_i - r_j}{|r_i - r_j|^2 |r - r_i|} \quad (4)
\]

for any point in space $r$, where $q_j$ is the charge of particle $j$, and the rest of the vector quantities are depicted in Fig. 1(a). The total magnetic field in the system of two particles $A$ and $B$ is $B_{GSOI}(r)_A + B_{GSOI}(r)_B$.

This form is constructed such that it satisfies the following two conditions:

1. At the positions $r_A$ and $r_B$ of two charged particles $A$ and $B$ moving with non-zero relative velocity, $B_{GSOI}(r)_i$ takes the form of Eq. 3 by substituting $r = r_i$. That is, the GSOI field reduces to the SOI field at the positions of the two particles inducing the field.

2. For positions in space other than $r_A$ and $r_B$, $B_{GSOI}(r)_i \sim 1/r$, where $r = |r|$. The summation of the $B_{GSOI}(r)_i$ for all $i$ is still $\sim 1/r$.

Equation 4 is illustrated by the schematic diagram in Figs. 1(b), showing electrons moving due to the application of an electric potential along the conductor’s axis. The motion of the various electrons, labeled as $e_1$, $e_2$ and $e_3$, generates the GSOI field. The $e_1$ electron moves in the charge cloud surrounding the surface of the conductor, $e_2$ moves right below the surface while $e_3$ moves close to the center of the current-carrying wire. The $e_1$ electron experiences an interaction with the ions on the surface of the current-carrying wire, thus generating the GSOI field. The $e_3$ electron, on the other hand, does not contribute to the GSOI field because the generated field due to interactions with ions above it cancels out the GSOI field generated due to its interaction with ions below it. This cancellation becomes weaker as we approach the surface of the conductor, such as the case of $e_2$. Therefore the motion of the $e_2$ electron generates a non-negligible GSOI field. Thus, the closer an electron is to the surface of the conductor, the larger is the $B_{GSOI}$ field it creates; the closer it is to the center, the weaker is the $B_{GSOI}$ field it creates. Fig. 1(f) displays a calculation of the magnitude of $B_{GSOI}$ along the diameter of the wire. The field is larger as we go closer towards the wire surface. The Orsted field due to current flow in a narrower conducting wire is displayed in Fig. 1(g) for comparison.

For the conducting structures displayed in Fig. 1, the total GSOI field of the conductor is the sum of the contributions of the conduction electrons on the surface of the conductor. We assume that the surface is composed of unit cells, where each unit cell is composed of an electron $r_i$ and an ion $R_i$, such that the vector $n = r_i - R_i$, shown in Fig. 1(d), is the same for all electrons in the unit cells. Each unit cell is a square with side length $L$. We calculate the total GSOI field at point $r$ in Fig. 1(d) as follows:

\[
-\sum_m \frac{\mu_0}{4\pi} \frac{q v \times n}{|r_i - R_i| |r - r_i - mL|},
\]

where $m = (m_1, m_2, 0)$, where $m_1$ and $m_2$ are integers. All of the effective nuclear charges $q_j$ in Eq. 4 are equal, such that $q = q_j$ for all $j$. The velocity vector $v$ is the velocity of the conduction electrons $v_i$, which are assumed here to be equal, while the velocities of the ions are all zero. The proper summation in Eq. 5 requires the application of the Ewald summation procedure [21]. The resulting equation decays as $\sim 1/r$, which agrees with the form of the Orsted magnetic field induced by a current-carrying conductor.

Next, the implications of the GSOI theory on the magnetic induction of nanostructures are examined.

**APPLICATION TO NANOMATERIALS**

For an infinitely large slab to which the $z$-axis is normal, in which a uniform current density $J$ is flowing along the $x$-axis, and with a thickness $d$, the induced magnetic field outside the slab can be derived as $B_x = B_z = 0, \quad B_y = \pm \mu_0 jd/\pi$, where the non-vanishing field component $B_y$ is uniform along the $z$-axis. A more sophisticated model that calculates the magnetic field due to a conducting slab starts by considering that the current density vector $J$ is two-dimensional: $J = J(x, y)$, as reported by Roth et al. [5]. The field is then calculated by substituting this current density into the Biot-Savart equation, and integrating out the $z$ axis. This assumes that, for any value of $z$ within the thickness of the slab, $J(x, y)$ is exactly the same.
As mentioned in the introduction, the scheme employed by Tetienne et al. [4] which is based on that of Roth et al. yields inconsistent solutions of an over-determined set of simultaneous equations. If, however, we seek an alternative derivation by dividing the volume of the conducting slab into an infinite number of conducting wires with zero radius, where the field induced by each wire is \( B = \mu_0 I / 4\pi r \), we run into the logical inconsistency, the Ampere tension, discussed in the introduction. Finally, the model utilized in Ref. [4] assumes that the linear current density is perfectly uniform across the width of the nanoribbon, although the conduction current in the nanoribbons mainly flows through the edge carbon atoms via edge states [22].

Here I show how the application of GSOI theory yields a robust theory of magnetic induction. Fig. 1(e) displays the slab structure of a graphene nanoribbon, and Fig. 1(h,i) show the application of the Eq. 4 to determine the GSOI field of the that structure. In a graphene nanoribbon that is suspended in vacuum, there are two conducting systems.

1. The two infinitely-thin conducting slabs, which are the \( \pi \) bond networks above and below the hexagonal carbon atoms and both are two-dimensional: These two networks are filled by electrons occupying the p\(_z\) orbital of the carbon atoms, and therefore a p\(_z\) electron is equally likely to occupy either \( \pi \) bond network, the top or the bottom. Only the p\(_z\) orbitals of graphene are the ones that contribute to the calculation of the SOI in graphene [23]. Therefore, only the \( \pi \) bond networks will contribute to the GSOI field generation.

2. The nanoribbon edge which is one-dimensional: as discussed above, the edge supports a persisting edge state that sustains the nanoribbon conduction current.

For a graphene sheet to which the z-axis is normal and through which a current flows along the +z direction, the two \( \pi \)-bond layers each induce a \( B_{GSOI,t/b} \) (where \( t \) stands for top, \( b \) for bottom) that is strictly in the direction of the +y-axis. The superposition of the top and bottom \( B_{GSOI} \) results in the total induced \( B_{GSOI,y} \) component of the field, as displayed in Fig. 1(i), that is less than the \( B_{GSOI,y} \) component induced by each \( \pi \)-bond network alone. The \( B_{GSOI,z} \) component of the field, however, is enhanced by the superposition of the GSOI field across the width of the nanoribbon, as is displayed in Fig. 1(h). \( B_{GSOI,z} \) is also enhanced by the larger linear current density flowing through the edge of the nanoribbon.

A MICROSCOPIC ORIGIN OF AMPERE’S CIRCUITAL LAW

A discussion of a possible microscopic origin for the Ørsted magnetic field actually took place in the years following Ampere’s publication of the Ampere force law (AFL) [24]. AFL proposes an empirical action-at-a-distance formula between the electric current passing through two wires, the distance between the wires and the force induced by each wire on the other. In spite of its simplicity and experimental validation, its interpretation was problematic ever since it was published. While Ampere believed that his equation describes a fundamental law of the nature of the electric current, which he generalized to state that magnetism in magnetic materials arises due to the presence of microscopic currents, Biot and Savart proposed an alternative interpretation, the wire magnetization hypothesis (WMH) [25–27]. According to the WMH, the magnetic field in the current-carrying conductor arises because the wire itself becomes magnetized. Thus, the magnetic field does not arise from a moving charge, but instead arises from the lining up of microscopic magnetic particles around the circumference of the wire. This interpretation was criticized by Ampere [24], and was not endorsed by the physics community. If that interpretation was true, however, the idea that a moving charge induces a magnetic field would have to be dropped, since that induction is only a result of the response of the material in the current-carrying conductor to the passing electric current.

The WMH is solely based on the alignment of microscopic magnetic dipoles through the current-carrying conductor is in fact problematic because the resulting force between two current-carrying conductors scales as \( r^{-6} \), which is the force between two dipoles separated by distance \( r \), whereas the observed magnetic force between two current-carrying conductors scales as \( r^{-2} \).

The GSOI theory proposed in this work derives the Ørsted magnetic field from a first principles theory, as demonstrated in Eq. 5. GSOI therefore presents a correction to the WMH. That is, the GSOI theory proposes that the Ørsted magnetic field is a material, rather than a field property; the field only emerges when an electric current passes through a conducting medium, not solely due to the motion of charge. The GSOI can have several consequences on modern physics.

One of the consequences is splitting the strongly held coupling between the electric and magnetic fields in electromagnetic wave propagation. That is, according to the present theory, a propagating light wave is composed of an electric component only, rather than coupled electric and a magnetic component, because the oscillating electric field will not sustain a perpendicular magnetic
field. The magnetic component of the electromagnetic wave was only introduced as a corollary by Maxwell, after adding the displacement field to the ACL. Thus, what is known as an electromagnetic wave is, according to the GSOI theory, an electric field wave. It might be thought that the magneto-optical effect [28] contradicts with this conclusion because this effect emerges from applying a magnetic field to a medium in which light propagates, and is a manifestation of the magnetic component of the electromagnetic wave. However, the application of the magnetic field induces these effects only by changing the dielectric matrix of the medium [29].

Without the Maxwell-Ampere equation, the equation of the electromagnetic wave cannot be formally derived. An equation system should be sought in order to close the Maxwell equations. It would also be of benefit if the resulting equation system is free from the gauge freedom that introduces arbitrariness in the solutions of the Maxwell equations.

For a light wave, without the Maxwell-Ampere equation, how is it possible to restore the sinusoidal oscillation of the electric field carrying the light energy in vacuum? The sinusoidal form of the light wave, shown in the present analysis to be carried by only an oscillating electric field, does not require closing the Maxwell equations using the Maxwell-Ampere equation. Quantum optics establishes the formalism for a beam of light as a stream of photons, instead of a classical electromagnetic wave [30]. The photons are quantum mechanical states which are the solutions of the massless Dirac equation based on Einstein’s kinematics [31]. As for the theory of field-particle interaction, the theory presented here does not suggest any changes to it. This is because the interaction term, $q \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{A}$, where $q$ is the particle’s charge, $\mathbf{p}$ is the particle momentum and $\mathbf{A}$ is the vector potential, is fully derivable by constructing the wave-particle Lagrangian based on three ingredients, the Maxwell-Faraday equation, the relationship $\mathbf{B} = \nabla \times \mathbf{A}$ and the Lorentz force equation. None of these ingredients depend on the Maxwell-Ampere equation.

**CONCLUSION**

The generalized spin-orbit interaction (GSOI) theory is proposed. It expresses the magnetic field induced by two charged particles moving with a non-zero relative velocity as a field defined at all points in space. This is in contrast to spin-orbit interaction theory, in which the generated magnetic field is defined at only one point in space, and is observable in the reference frame of only one of the two particles. When applied to a current-carrying wire, the GSOI theory can reproduce the Biot-Savart form of the Ørsted magnetic field. Hence, GSOI can potentially replace the Maxwellian conception of Ørsted magnetic induction, in which a single moving point charge induces a magnetic field.

The GSOI theory has several practical consequences. It implies that an oscillating dipole in vacuum induces an electric field wave that will not be accompanied by a perpendicular magnetic field wave, contrary to the classical picture in electromagnetic wave propagation theory. It also has consequences on the formulations of magnetic induction at the microscopic scale in research fields such as plasma physics, superconductivity, and spintronics. The microscopic understanding of the Ørsted magnetic field will enhance the application of magnetometry for material surface characterization, and engineering of micro- and nano-electromechanical devices. The application of the theory to the spin-Hall effect and the current-induced spin polarization, as well as the incorporation of the GSOI field into density-functional theory, are currently in progress.
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FIG. 1: (a) A schematic illustration of the direction of the magnetic field induced by the standard SOI. (b-h) A schematic illustration of the GSOI theory. (b) The GSOI theory as applied to a either current-carrying conducting wire or a conducting slab. The motion of the free electrons relative to the stationary ions, as well as the relative direction of the two electrons with respect to each other (as indicated by the arrow on the line connecting them) generates the GSOI magnetic field according to Eq. 4. In the top layer, the GSOI field lines are pointing into the page, whereas in the bottom layer, the lines are pointing out of the page. The GSOI field is generated by the interaction between the conduction electron and the surface electrons closest to it. The contribution of the electrons $e_1$, $e_2$ and $e_3$ to the GSOI field are different, as elaborated in the text. (c) The GSOI field induced by an electric current flowing through an atomically thin conductor, such as an atomic wire or a two-dimensional atomic layer. The cancellation between the GSOI fields on either sides of the conductor leads to the drop of magnetic induction in these conductors. (d) Point $P$ is a point in vacuum where the total GSOI field due to multiple electrons is calculated. (e) A schematic of a conducting slab, showing the direction of the injected current density and the induced GSOI field. (f) A cross section of a conducting wire, where Eq. 4 is calculated. The width of each of the peaks represent the strength of the $B_{GSOI}$ at the positions of the free valence electrons in the wire. (g) Similar to (f) but for the case of the conductor in (c). (h,i) Same as (f,g), respectively, but applied to the conducting slab in (d).