Neutron star magnetic eld evolution,

crust m ovem ent and glitches

Malvin Ruderman, Tianhua Zhu and Kaiyou Chen

Physics Department and Columbia Astrophysics Lab

Columbia University

538 W 120th Street, New York, NY 10027

_;

Received _

accepted _

ABSTRACT

Spinning super uid neutrons in the core of a neutron star interact strongly with co-existing superconducting protons. One consequence is that the outward (inward) motion of core super uid neutron vortices during spindown (up) of a neutron starm ay alter the core's magnetic eld. Such core eld changes are expected to result in movem ents of the stellar crust and changes in the star's surface magnetic eld which re ect those in the core below. O bærved m agnitudes and evolution of the spin-down indices of canonical pulsars are understood as a consequence of such surface eld changes. If the growing crustal strains caused by the changing core magnetic eld con guration in canonical spinning-down pulsars are relaxed by large scale crust-cracking events, special properties are predicted for the resulting changes in spin-period. These agree with various glitch observations, including glitch activity, perm anent shifts in spin-down rates after glitches in young pulsars, the intervals between glitches, fam ilies of glitches with di erent magnitudes in the same pulsar, the sharp drop in glitch intervals and magnitudes as pulsar spin-periods approach 0.7s, and the general absence of glitching beyond this period.

Subject headings: dense matter | pulsars | stars: magnetic | stars: neutron

1. Introduction

A canonical neutron star consists mainly of super uid neutrons, superconducting protons (with an abundance a few percent that of the neutrons) and an equal number of relativistic degenerate electrons (Ferm i energy 10^6 M ev). In the outer kilom eter the protons clum p into a lattice of neutron-rich nuclei (the stellar \crust") with the neutron super uid lling the space between. A spinning neutron star's super uid neutrons rotate at an angular rate only by establishing an array of quantized vortex lines parallel to the stellar spin axis, with an area density

$$n_V = 2m_n = h = 10^4 = P (sec) cm^2$$
: (1)

Any magnetic eld which passes through the star's superconducting protons must become very inhom ogeneously structured. In a type II superconductor, expected to be the case below the crust and perhaps all the way down to the central core, the magnetic eld becom es organized into

$$n = B = 0$$
 $10^{9}B_{12} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ (2)

quantized ux tubes per unit area, with

$$_{0} = hc = 2 \quad 10^{7} \text{ G auss cm}^{2}$$
 (3)

the ux in each tube. Unlike the quasi-parallel neutron vortex line array, the ux tube array is expected to have a complicated twisted structure following that of the much smoother toroidal plus poloidal magnetic eld which existed before the transition into superconductivity (at about 10^9 K).

A spinning-down (up) neutron star's neutron super uid vortex array must expand (contract). Because the core of a neutron vortex and a ux tube interact strongly as they pass through each other, the moving vortices will push on the proton's ux tube array (Sauls 1989, Srinivasan et al. 1990, Ruderm an 1991), forcing it either (a) to move together with the vortices, or (b) to be cut through if the ux tube array cannot respond fast enough to partake in the vortex motion. Section 2 discusses possible relationships among a pulsar's , B, and rate of change of spin (-), which discriminate between these two behaviors. In case (a) the evolution of the magnetic eld at the core-crust interface is well determined by the initial magnetic eld con guration and subsequent changes in stellar . In case (b) the core-crust interface eld would evolve more slow ly relative to changes in , although qualitative features of the evolution should be similar to those of case (a). Som emicrophysics and observations, considered in sections 2 and 3, support case (a) behavior for pulsars whose spin-down (or up) ages, $T_s = j = 2$ –j are not less than those of Vela-like radiopulsars (T_s 10^d years) and case (b) behavior for the much more rapidly spinning-down C rab-like radiopulsars (T_s 10^d years)

Between the stellar core and the world outside it is a solid crust with a very high electrical conductivity. If the crust were absolutely rigid and a perfect conductor then its response to changes in the core magnetic eld would be limited to rigid crust rotations. Of course neither is the case.

A high density of core ux tubes merges into a smooth eld when passing through the crust. Because of the alm ost rigid crust's high conductivity, it, at least tem porarily, freezes in place the capitals of the core's ux tubes. As these ux tube capitals at the crust-core interface are pushed by a moving core neutron vortex array, a large stress builds up in the crust. This stress will be relaxed when the crust is stressed beyond its yield strength, or, if the build-up is slow enough, by dissipation of the crustal eddy currents which hold in place the magnetic eld as it passes from the core through the crust. The shearm odulus of a crust is well described quantitatively, but not the maximum crust strain before yielding (and the associated yield strength). Rough estim ates have suggested a maximum yield strain, max,

between 10 4 and 10 3 (Ruderm an 1991). Nor is it known how the stellar crust moves when its yield strength is exceeded. By plastic ow (creep)? By crumbling? By cracking? The answer is likely to depend on the crust tem perature. A crust's eddy current dissipation 10^{10} years depending upon how the crust was time could be anywhere in the range 10^6 m ade. A young solitary pulsar was probably born with a tem perature $k_B T$ 10 M eV.Asit cooled the form ation of crust nuclei and their crystallization into a crustal lattice occurred at about the same tem perature, $k_{\rm B}T = 1 \, \text{M eV}$. The in purity fraction (the probability that neighboring nuclei have di erent proton num bers) has not been calculated quantitatively and this allows a very wide latitude in the possible range for the \impurity" contribution to crustal resistivity. In addition, the crust of an accreting neutron star spun-up to a period of a few milliseconds in a LMXB has had a very di erent history from that of a solitary spinning-down radiopulsar. The LM XB neutron star ultim ately accretes more than 10² times the mass of the nuclei in its crustal lattice, mainly as He or H.C rust is continually pushed into the core by the loading, and replaced. As the accreted H and He are buried with growing density a series of nuclear reactions ultimately fuse them into heavier m agic num ber nuclei (Z = 40, 5032) (Negele and Vautherin 1973). This is probably not accomplished without some explosive nuclear burning. The resulting reform ed crust may well have an impurity fraction, electrical conductivity, and crust thickness very di erent from that of a canonical young solitary radiopulsar.

There seems to be considerable observational, as well as theoretical, support for the hypothesis that the surface magnetic elds of neutron stars slow ly spun-up to become millisecond pulsars by accretion in LM XB's do indeed reject the expected core eld evolution at the crust-core interface (Chen, Ruderm an and Zhu 1997, Chen and Ruderm an 1993). The core eld there does appear to have had a case (a) history : the core's magnetic ux tubes were moved in to the spin-axis by the contracting neutron super uid vortex array. Here the spin-up time scales (10⁶ years) are so very long that crustal shielding of core

m agnetic eld changes is expected to be relatively easily defeated. Rough estim ates of crust properties (Ruderm an 1991) indicate that, generally, crustal yielding in the younger much more rapidly spinning-down pulsars also causes the surface eld of such neutron stars to be strongly correlated with the con guration of the core ux which enters the crust at the core-crust interface. (See, however, the exception for the very slow ly spinning X-ray pulsars.) Strati cation in the crust (because the Z of the most stable nucleus varies with depth) allows mainly only two-dimensional crustal movement on surfaces of constant gravitational (plus centrifugal) potential. Where the surface eld is strongest, and crustal stresses from moving crust-anchored core ux greatest, crustal matter would be expected to move with the core's moving ux, accompanied by the back ow ofmore weakly magnetized regions of the crust. Below, except for the special case of the very slow X-ray pulsars, we shall sim ply assume that shielding by the crust of changes in the core ux emerging into it, is, at best, temporary and unim portant even on the spin-down time scales of solitary radiopulsars.

In section 3 we review the expected pulsar magnetic dipole moment evolution caused by neutron star spin-down or spun-up. It gives young radiopulsar spin-down indices which do not disagree with observations. These results are not sensitive to details of just how a crust relaxes the growing stresses on it from the moving core magnetic ux tubes below it. In Section 4 we consider particular consequences when that relaxation is accomplished by large scale crust cracking events, which cause pulsar timing glitches. A permanent (i.e. unhealed) jump in spin-down rate should remain after almost all glitches. The calculated glitch spin-period jump magnitude is closely related to it. Both depend upon how much crust stress relaxation is accomplished in each such cracking event. This can be estimated very roughly at best. However, the glitch model does lead to predictions for the magnitudes of small glitches in C rab-like pulsars and of giant ones in Vela-like pulsars, for the intervals between such glitches, for a drop in glitch magnitudes in long period pulsars and maximum pulsar period beyond which large glitches should disappear. These predictions are not in

{6{

con ict with glitch observations. O ne in portant consequence of the model is that som e parts of the core neutron super uid can spin-up very slow ly after the beginning of a glitch because of the large drag in rapidly moving core vortices embedded in a dense ux tube array. If so the canonical assumption (A lpar and Sauls 1988) of an unobservably tight coupling between all of a core's neutron super uid and the charged components of the pulsar should be reassessed.

2. Core Flux Tube M ovem ents in Pulsars

During neutron star spin-down (e.g., in a solitary radiopulsar) or spin-up (e.g., by accretion in a Low M ass X-ray B inary) neutron super uid vortices a vector distance $r_{?}$ from the stellar spin-axis m ove with a radial velocity

$$v_V = \mu P = 2P$$
 : (4)

As a result of this motion a force density (F) will build up on the ux tube array in which these vortex lines are embedded until the ux tubes move with, or are cut through by, the moving vortices. The core electron-proton plasma is almost incompressible and its abundance relative to the core neutrons varies with radius. Because of the extrem ely weak conversion rate for the transform ations $n ! p + e + \sim$ and p + e ! n + needed to maintaina large bulk electron-proton sea transport across stellar radii, non-dissipative motions inwhich the electron-proton plasma and its embedded ux tubes move together are restricted.We consider below mainly the alternative where ux tubes in response to the force on themfrom a changing neutron vortex array move through the proton-electron sea with somerelative velocity v .

Magnetic eld movem ent by eddy di usion in an ordinary conductor is driven by the

self-stress force density of a non-force-free B - eld con guration:

$$F = \frac{J \quad B}{C} : \tag{5}$$

This F forces ux to move through the conductor with a characteristic velocity

$$\mathbf{v} = \frac{\mathbf{F} \, \mathbf{c}^2}{\mathbf{B}^2} \, ; \tag{6}$$

where is the electrical conductivity of the medium. Here the force density F is mainly a consequence of large scale inhom ogeneity in the eld distribution,

$$F = \frac{(r \quad B) \quad B}{4} : \tag{7}$$

The time for B to be pushed out of a stationary stellar core of radius R would then be the usual eddy di usion time

$$\frac{R}{v} = \frac{4}{c^2} \frac{R^2}{c^2}$$
(8)

The resistivity 1 in a non-superconducting degenerate electron-proton sea is dominated by electron-phonon scattering (Baym, Pethick and Pines 1969):

$$_{\text{eph}}^{1} = 7 \quad 10^{46} \quad \frac{10^{13} \text{g cm}^{3}}{p} T^{2} \text{ s :}$$
 (9)

with T the temperature and $_{p}$ the proton density. From the resistivity of Equation 9 with plausible neutron star parameter and the F of Equation 7 with jr B j $\beta = R$ j, greatly exceeds 10^{10} years. The v of Equation 6 would then be too small to be of interest for observable ux changes in a spinning-down (or up) neutron star. However, when the proton sea becomes superconducting, the v of Equation 6 can become very much greater. This is because of the sub-microscopic bunching of B into the huge density of quantized ux tubes. This has two consequences. First, a randomized electron scattering comes not only from collisions with phonons, but also from collisions with the ux tubes them selves. The latter contributes a much larger resistivity than that of Equation 9. Second, the contribution

to the force F that drives the ux tube motion which is caused by the push of moving super uid neutron vortex-lines on ux tubes can very greatly exceed that of Equation 7, the self-stress calculated from the large scale variation of a classically smooth eld. Flux tube motion in response to some F is possible only if the necessary energy dissipation accompanying it equals the work done by F, then

$$v = \frac{v + \hat{B}n_{0}}{c}^{2} + n + v^{2};$$
 (10)

where the locally average $B = n_0 \hat{B}$. The rst term on the RHS is the dissipation from the current ow caused by the sinultaneous motion of very many ux tubes (It has typically been neglected in the literature. Its importance was emphasized by P.G oldreich (1993).). In writing Equation 10 we make the implicit assumption that the original array of ux tubes moves but no new ux loops are created or existing ones reconnected and destroyed. They may not be valid except in the limit of very small v. The conductivity is that for (electron) current ow in the $E = v_0 = B = c$ direction, i.e. perpendicular to B. For a given B this contribution to dissipation is not sensitive to details of ux tube radii or the magnitude $_0$ except through the dependence of upon both of them.

The second term on the RHS is from the direct drag force (along v) on individual ux tubes pushing through the electron sea. The drag coe cient (force per unit length of ux tube = v) on an isolated solitary ux tube (Jones 1987, Harvey, Ruderm an and Shaham 1986),

$$=\frac{3}{64}\frac{2}{6}e^{2}n_{e}}{E_{f}};$$
(11)

with E_f the electron sea Fermi energy and the radius of a ux tube (10¹¹ cm). [= $(m_p m_p c^2 = 4 e^2_p)^{1=2}$ with m_p the elective proton mass and p the proton plasma density.]

The electron resistivity, ¹, now has two contributions. One is the contribution from electron-phonon scattering of Equation 9; the other is from scattering of electrons on the

ux tubes them selves. Because the magnetic ux is bundled into intensely magnetized ux tubes at each of which electrons are scattered through a nite angle (), there is a drag along the electron velocity proportional to ()² at each scattering. (Equivalently the circular trajectory of an electron in a \uniform "B is replaced by a polygon with a random scattering component $\overline{[()²]}^{1=2}$ at each vertex.) Because the separation between scatters ($(_0=B)^{1=2}$ 3 $10^{10}B_{12}^{-1}$ cm) is very large compared to hc=E f 10^{13} cm, there is negligible interference between scattering at di erent vertices.) The drag along the electron velocity is just that from Equation 11. It contributes a resistivity

$$e^{1} = \frac{n}{e^{2}n_{e}^{2}};$$
 (12)

with n_e the number density of electrons. The contribution of Equation 12 to

$${}^{1} = {}_{e}{}^{1} + {}_{eph}{}^{1}$$
 (13)

is generally much more important than that of Equation 9. (For typical neutron star parameters $_{\rm p}$ 10³ g cm ³ and T = 10⁸K, $_{\rm eph}^{1}$ 10²⁹ s while $_{\rm e}^{1}$ 10²⁷B₁₂.) If we neglect it we can approximate a very small ux tube velocity in the direction of a F perpendicular to B by the exact analogue of Equation 6

$$\mathbf{v} = \frac{\mathbf{F} \, \mathbf{c}^2}{\mathbf{n}^2 \, \mathbf{c}_0^2}; \tag{14}$$

with an e ective conductivity

$$= \frac{e^2 n_e^2}{1} + \frac{c^2}{\frac{2}{0}} n^{-1} :$$
 (15)

We note that $v \ ! \ 0$ when $\ ! \ 0$ because of in nite electron conductivity, and also when

! 1 because of the in nite drag on a solitary moving (with respect to the e -p sea) ux tube. The contribution of the second term on the RHS of Equation 15 to is generally negligible in typical pulsars. To evaluate the maximum jy jbefore the cutting through of a ux tube array by a moving vortex array we must now consider the maximum F just before cutting through begins. From Appendix A, this is, roughly,

$$F_{max}' - \frac{n_V}{8} B B_V \quad ln - ;$$
 (16)

!

with n_v the vortex area density of Equation 2, B $_0=^2$ the magnetic eld within a ux tube, B_v B the magnetic eld within a vortex line, and (<) the BCS correlation length of the Cooper pairs in the superconducting proton sea. [The force density of Equation 16 greatly exceeds that from ux line curvature (Harvey, Ruderm an and Shaham 1986) or ux tube buoyancy (Muslim ov and T sygan 1985).] From Equations 14, 15, and 16 the maximum velocity (v_c) with which a moving vortex array can push a ux tube array through the electron-proton sea in which it is embedded would be

$$v_c = \frac{10^{12}G}{100} = \frac{10^{12}G}{B} = 10^{-6} \text{ cm s}^{-1};$$
 (17)

i.e. v_c is proportional to the ratio of vortex line density to ux tube density. The proportionality constant, , is independent of and B but does depend upon properties of neutron starm atter below the crust:

$$= 0.4 \quad \ln - \frac{!}{10^{15} G} \quad \frac{B_{V}}{10^{15} G} \quad \frac{60M \text{ ev}}{E_{f}} \quad \frac{10^{36} \text{ cm}^{3}}{n_{e}} \quad : \qquad (18)$$

The constant depends upon imprecise estimates of the vortex ux-tube interaction, the ux-tube spacing along moving vortex lines, the angle between local B and , etc. However the main problem with applying Equations 17 and 18 to ux tube motion may be the implicit assumption that v is so small that n (and thus local B) in it is qualitatively una ected by the electric currents induced by the ux tube motion, i.e. that the e ect of F is only to move the preexisting ux tubes which remain locally straight and uniform ly distributed. Further, the geometrical distribution and motion of ux tubes may, in reality, be quite complicated with ux tubes, the electron-proton seas, and neutron vortex lines m oving together without cutting-through in m any regions and with vortices cutting through ux tubes in others. We emphasize that for two dimensional motions of the electron-proton sea in the spherical layer just below the crust (the only core layer which directly a ects the surface eld) stratication does not restrict ux tube crowns in the most magnetized regions from being moved by vortex push from initial positions near the spin-axis all the way down to the equator during spin-down. We shall, therefore, consider Equation 17 as a phenom enological one for the behavior of magnetic ux tubes in the stellar core layer just below the crust-core interface with B the pulsar dipole eld strength inferred from spin-down. We take 1, about the value expected from Equation 18, but even more because Equation 17 then leads to a good description of various observed properties of young spinning-down radiopulsars.

The velocity v_v as a function of $r_?$ and v_c of Equation 17 with = 1 is sketched in Figure 1 for a Vela-like pulsar with ' 100s⁻¹, and B = 10^{12} G.For $r_? < r_c$ the neutron super uid vortex expansion velocity (proportional to $r_?$) is slow enough to carry all ux tubes with the expanding vortex array, at least in the core layer just below the crust; ux tube cut through occurs for $r_? > r_c$. From Equations 4 and 17

$$r_{c}' \frac{T_{s}}{10^{4} yrs} \frac{2}{B_{12}} 10^{6} cm;$$
 (19)

with T_s the pulsar spin-down time scale (age). Then for $T_s \ _2=B_{12}$ 10 yrs, i.e. for Vela-like pulsars and those much older, $r_c \ 10^6$ cm, i.e. r_c the stellar radius R and all ux would move out with the v_v of the vortex array. For C rab-like pulsars with T_s an order of magnitude smaller than that for the Vela pulsar most of the ux array (except that within $r_2 \ 10^{-1}$ R of the spin-axis) would move out much more slow by than the neutron vortices. A sindicated in Figure 1, however, it is not yet known how fast that cut-through ux tube outward ow should be. 3. Surface magnetic eld evolution and spin-down indices

Based upon the above assumptions and estimates about the interaction between a pulsar core's arrays of super uid neutron vortices and superconducting proton ux tubes, we consider below consequences of a greatly simplied model for the evolution of magnetic elds in spinning-down pulsars:

- 1. The crust and core magnetic elds will be described as if they were axially symmetric around the spin axis (clearly in contradiction to what is required for a pulsar's rotating radio beam s). The important consequence is that core ux tubes can then move outward only by pushing through the core's electron-proton sea, even if their actualmotion is more complicated (and might not involve such push through in many regions).
- 2. When $r < r_c$ of Equation 19 with = 1, ux tubes move outward with the velocity v_v of Equation 4.
- 3. When $r > r_c$ ux tubes are moved outward with the smaller velocity v_c of Equation 17. For example in the Vela pulsar v ' v_v for alm ost all ux tubes, but in the C rab pulsar most ux tubes would not keep up with the core's neutron vortices. Rather,

v (Crab)
$$v_v$$
 (Vela): (20)

4. The surface elds of the neutron star re ect those of the core at the core-crust interface. (This, probably, would not be accomplished for exact axial symmetry. In a more realistic model it would be expected only for the most strongly magnetized regions since some crustal back ow (where B is weakest) would be expected to allow the strongly forced crust movement where B is largest.)

W e consider next a comparison of the predictions of such a model to observations of P;P, and P for som e of the younger pulsars.

In this model the core and surface magnetic eld con gurations of a neutron star depend not only on the star's spin history, but also on its (quite unknown) initial eld con guration. It is offen convenient in calculations to assume the surface eld to be that of a central dipole but there are no physical arguments supporting this special con guration as there is, for example, for the earth's surface eld where the surface is very far from the core dynam o currents. M ore plausible might be some (random) mixture of higher m om ents (Barnard and A rons 1982), or a strongly o -center dipole from a toroidal eld (originally amplied by initial di erential rotation) which has pushed out through the stellar surface in some region. An initial \sunspot-like" surface eld con guration seem s needed to describe the evolution of some neutron stars which are spun-up to become every fast millisecond pulsars (C hen and R uderm an 1993): most of the magnetic ux from each of these stars spin-hem ispheres returns to the star in the same hem isphere as that from which it originates.

W ith an axially symmetric magnetic eld con guration the spin-down rate of a solitary neutron star depends almost entirely on its net dipole moment () which can vary and its moment of inertia. The expected evolution of such a dipole moment is shown in Figure 2 together with inferred moments (from observed spin-down rates) of radiopulsars. Three common evolutionary stages are predicted for all pulsars:

Stage a - b) In young C rab-like pulsars, r_c is much smaller than the 10^6 cm stellar radius. In most of the core $r_2 > r_c$. Super uid vortices there cut through magnetic ux tubes and jy j < jy_v j. Because -/ ² ³=Ic² (essentially from dimensional arguments)

{ 14 {

{ 15 {

TABLE 1.

Pulsar spin-down indices

P SR	T _s (yr)	n	$n_{\rm M \ odel}$	Ref.
C rab	1300	2.5	2.6	Lyne, Pritchard and Sm ith 1988
1509-58	1500	2.8	3	Kaspietal. 1994
0540-69	1700	2.0	2.7	M anchester and Peterson 1989
Vela	11000	1.4	2	Lyne et al. 1993

with I the star's m om ent of inertia, the spin-down index

n
$$-\frac{1}{2} = 3$$
 $T_s - \frac{4}{2} = 2\frac{1}{1}$; (21)

M easured values of n are given in Table 1. Plausible I=I (A lpar 1996) seem too small to be a promising explanation of the large 3 n of Vela, and we neglect its contribution to Equation (21). The model of Section 2 suggests

$$j_{j} = j \frac{j y_{j}}{j v_{v} j} (4T_{s})^{-1}$$
 (22)

with $_=$ > 0 for a \sunspot"-like eld con guration, as long as magnetic ux has not yet been pushed out of the core at the (spin) equator. Then, for such (shorter period) pulsars

$$3 n v = v_V$$
: (23)

Insofar as $r_c > R$ in Vela, $v = v_V$ for that pulsar. W ith this approximation the model predicts n=2 for Vela. In the more general case the assumption -/²³ is replaced by -/ ($\frac{2}{2} + \frac{2}{k}$)³ where $_2$ is the component of perpendicular to and $_k$ is the parallel component. For time independent and

$$n = 3 + \binom{0}{k} + \frac{2}{-\binom{2}{2} + \binom{2}{k}} + \frac{1}{\frac{v}{v_{V}}}$$
(24)

For a spinning dipole in a vacuum, = 0 and equation 23 is recovered with n=2 for Vela. For much more rapidly spinning C rab-like pulsars with much smaller spin-down ages, but with v still the same as that of Vela because of the cut-through of their magnetic ux tubes by their more rapidly expanding vortex-arrays, the model gives

$$3 \quad n = (3 \quad n)_{\text{vela}} \quad \frac{T_s}{B} \quad \frac{T_s}{B} \quad \frac{1}{2} : \qquad (25)$$

Equation 25 is used to give the other spin-down indices in the $n_{m \text{ odel}}$ column of Table 1. C on parisons with observations are satisfactory except for PSR 0540-69. However, it has been suggested (O gelm an and H asinger 1990) that the braking index of PSR 0540-69 could be 2.7 instead of 2.0 because of a glitch just before their period m easurements of this pulsar. If this is indeed the case the agreement would be satisfactory here also. For pulsars older than 10^4 years but not very much older, ux tubes are predicted to move outward with the same velocity as vortices. For them jv j jv jand n 2. [If \m agnetars" (Thom pson and D uncan 1993), pulsars born with huge (B 10^{15} G) m agnetic elds, exist they would spin-down so rapidly (P 10 s after 10^4 yrs) that v v_v. Then form ost of their early lives n 3 and would not be much diminished by the spin-down.]

Stage b - c) Until an age T_s 10⁶ years is exceeded, movement of the most strongly magnetized surface patches toward the spin equator is predicted to be much slower than that of the core's neutron vortex lines. In much older pulsars, with ux tubes and vortices moving together, a signi cant fraction of the ux should begin to reach the spin-equator and be pushed out through the crust-core interface region into the deep crust. Subsequently, the core's vortex array no longer controls the movement of that ux. The movement of a typical ux tube is sketched in Figure 3 (for an initial non-sunspot con guration). When enough ux is expelled from the core, the huge stresses that build up in the crust (whose rigidity alone prevents rapid reconnection between north and south polar regions of core ejected ux) can become large enough to exceed the yield strength of the crust. Then reconnection allowed by crust breaking and Eddy dissipation begin. [The magnetic stress on the crust could reach or even exceed $BB_c=8$, with B_c 10^{15} G the magnetic eld within a ux tube. The yield strength of a neutron star's crust when stressed over a surface area of radius R is $m_{ax} = R$ where is the deep crust shear modulus,

the crust thickness, and max the maximum strain before yielding by breaking or plastic ow. (This crust strength is about 10 1 the \yield stress" of crustal matter.) Because max depends upon uncalculated details of crustal dislocations and in purities, its value is uncertain. Typical estimates for it give $_{max}$ < 10 3 . Then $m_{ax} = R$ 10²⁵ dyne cm². In addition, and perhaps 10^6 dyne am 2 B B _=8 of greater signi cance the time scale for reconnection because of Eddy di usion through the thin crust is diminished because of the special core-expelled magnetic eld geom etry : radial eld B is much smaller than tangetial eld B_c. The relevant $^{2}=c^{2}$) (4 (crust conductivity). The unknown impurity Eddy di usion time contribution to crust conductivity makes quantitative estimates of the di usion time quite uncertain. It is not implausible that it can be less than the 10⁶ year lifetime of most radiopulsars.] The surface eld evolution of a spinning-down star after most north and south pole regions reach the core's spin-equator and ultim ately reconnect is sketched in Figure 4. The unreconnected ux still left in the stellar core is roughly proportional to . Then / and Equation (21) gives n = 5. This predicted decline with increasing spin-period P in the dipole component of the surface eld is shown as seem ent (b - c - d) in Figure 2. We see no reason for those strongly magnetized north and south polar surface regions (magnetized \platelets") which have been pushed to the spin-equator after some xed time to contain exactly equal amounts of ux. Any excess in the equatorial zone not canceled by reconnection would be connected

to some other magnetized region which has not yet reached that zone (e.g., because it started much closer to the spin axis and, therefore, has moved away from it much more slow ly). This is sketched as the region N^0 in Figure 4. The direction of the remaining dipole depends on details of the initial con guration; only its diminished magnitude is a robust prediction.

O bærvations are not in con ict with the model curve segment b - c of Figure 2. We note especially the eight 10^4 year old radio-pulsars still in supernova remnants. Unless strong reduction does indeed begin, similar to that indicated as segment b - c, there is a puzzle in trying to understand the Figure 2 data. Where will the descendants of these 8 Vela-like pulsars in SNR's be observed ? If is constant the number of pulsars in any fractional period interval P = P should be proportional to P^{-2} . Thus there should then be of order 10^3 pulsars with P^{-1} is with a dipole moment similar to that of these 8 Vela-like pulsars. Where are they? The total number of slow er pulsars actually observed does not particularly contradict this expectation but their inferred is clearly diminished. With the observed n 1.4 in Vela, this absence of a very large number of descendants of Vela-like pulsars with the same as that of Vela or even a greater one would be even more dram atic.

Stage c - d) M ost radio-pulsars die before their spin-periods exceed several seconds. H ow ever, som e will be in binaries where interaction with a companion (via winds, accretion disks, comm on envelopes) m ay spin the neutron stars down to very much greater periods. The core magnetic eld would continue to drop, but ultimately a lower limit would be reached where a crust's strength and high conductivity freezes the crust eld even after alm ost all ux has been expelled from the core. Because of quantitative uncertainties about the crust's yield strength it is not known just when this will occur. Segment (d) in Figure 2, where crust ux freezing is assumed to become e ective, is, therefore, mostly a plausible guess. The magnetic moments

of slow X -ray pulsars should retain such a value until crustal eddy currents decay even though for some of them P 10° s. One characteristic of the surface eld of such spun-down pulsars should re ect the special way in which their dipole eld was diminished. Initially separated strongly magnetized \platelets" were rst pulled away from each other and, if they had opposite polarity, later had their elds reconnected after they reach the spin-equatorial zone. However, each strongly magnetized platelet is much less likely to become stressed in a way which would have caused it to fragment: wherever signicant eld remains on the surface of a spun-down pulsar it should still tend to have the same strong value that much of the entire stellar surface had originally. Consequently, in slow ly spinning pulsars, polar cap m agnetic elds measured by cyclotron resonance features in X-ray spectra should give a very considerably higher magnetic eld strength than that inferred from observations which are sensitive only to the stellar magnetic dipole moment (e.g., (PP-)¹⁼² in radio-pulsars and X-ray pulsars). This may already be implied in observations of the accreting binary which contains the P = 12 s X -ray pulsar Her X -1. Its X -ray 10G (Trum per et al. 1978), but accretion cyclotron resonance feature gives B 5 10^{12} G (G hosh and Lamb 1979). Stages disk modeling is best t for a dipole B def and deg for spun-up pulsars and their relation to millisecond pulsar observations have been discussed elsewhere (Chen and Ruderm an 1993, Chen, Ruderm an and Zhu 1997).

4. Glitches

The surface magnetic eld evolution in the pulsars considered above is not sensitive to details of the associated crust movements. For the warm crusts of very young radiopulsars most of the crustal stress from spin-down induced motion of core-ux should be relaxed

by plastic ow (\creep"). For cooler crusts, this is no longer expected to be the case. The transition to a more brittle crust response has been estimated to be at temperatures of a few 10⁸ K (Ruderman 1991), about that in the deep crustal layers of 10³ year old pulsars like the C rab. In cooler spinning-down neutron stars the forced movement of the most strongly magnetized surface patches may be accomplished by large scale crust cracking. The sudden crustal movement might itself be the cause of crustal neutron super uid vortex line unpinning or it might trigger a hydrodynamically supported unpinning avalanche (A lpar et al. 1993). Either would cause sudden changes in the stellar spin-period which suggest various features of observed spin-period \glitches", but they seem to dier in their predictions about perminent changes in spin-down rates.

Figure 5 shows the magnitudes of the 34 glitches (sudden fractional jumps in pulsar spin frequency) reported by Lyne, Pritchard and Shem er (1995) vs. the spin-down age j=2 -jof the glitching pulsars. Figure 6 shows their estim ated \glitch activity" (the sum of all detected = devided by the total observation time) as a function of pulsar spin-down age . These observed glitch activity rates support the proposal (Anderson and Itoh 1975, A lpar et al. 1984, A lpar et al. 1993, Ruderm an 1976) that the main cause of the jumps in pulsar spin rate in a glitch is a sudden spin-down of the crust's inter-nuclear neutron super uid. Because that super uid's vortex lines can be strongly pinned to the lattice of crust nuclei, the crust neutron super uid may not spin-down smoothly with the rest of the star. If crust neutron vortex lines move outward from the spin-axis only in discrete events (glitches), sudden spin-up glitches will be observed for the rest of the star. If the spin-axis do not move from their pinning sites between glitches, the part of the crust super uid neutron angular momentum (J_{csf}) which is not diminished during the spin-down intervals between glitches ($_{\alpha}$) is

$$J_{csf} = I_{csf} - g :$$
 (26)

 I_{csf} is the moment of inertia of the crustal super uid neutrons whose spin is determined by those vortex lines which do not unpin between glitches. During one or after many glitches the drop J_{csf} is accomplished and balanced by spin-up of the other parts of the neutron star. Then the glitch activity is

$$---\frac{1}{q} = \frac{I_{csf}}{I} -; \qquad (27)$$

where = is the observed glitch m agnitude, I I_{sf} (I I_{csf}) is the moment of inertia of all the parts of the star which, before a spin-period glitch is resolved, share that angular momentum increase which balances the sudden glitch associated decrease in that of crust neutron super uid. Table 2 gives the model result of Equation (27) for I_{sfc} '1:5 10²I (a typical value of the moment of inertia of crustal neutron super uid from neutron star models) with the glitch activity rates of those young pulsars which have been observed to glitch more than once and thus allow an estimate of their glitch activity. The comparison between Equation 27 and observations is also shown in Figure 6. The agreement with Equation 27 is satisfactory except for the young C rab family. The cause of this discrepancy will be discussed below.

A quantitative calculation of I is complicated because the core's neutron super uid vortices are in mersed in and push on the core's ux tube array. All of the core neutron super uid vortices would not be able to move inward quickly in response to the sudden glitch associated spin-up of the core's electron-proton plasma (tied to the crust lattice by the strong internal magnetic eld) (D ing, Cheng and Chau 1993). It would not include the core neutron super uid whose vortex lines would have to push ux tubes through the electron-proton sea or to cut through their surrounding ux tubes in a time too short to be observed in a glitch. I would then be very signi cantly less than the totalm om ent of inertia of the star. The straight line in Figure 6, Equation (27) with $I_{csf}=I = 15$ 10², ts observations except for the very young Crab-like fam ily and the oldest pulsars

{ 22 {

TABLE 2

	A ge	Post-glitch healing fraction	G litch acti	vity(10 ⁷ yr ¹)
P SR	log (age (yr))	for = (bserved 1	Equation 27.
0531+21	3.10	80%	01	62
1509-58	3.19	?	0	51
0540-69	3.22	?	?	47
0833-45	4.05	13%	7	7
1338-62	4.08	1.1%	7	7
1800-21	4.20	7%	?	5
1706-44	4.24	11%	?	4
1737–30	4.31	3%	4	4
1823–13	4.33	7%	4	4
1727–33	4.41	4%	?	3
1758–23	4.77	0.1%	1	1

Pulsar activity in Young Pulsars

Note: All data are taken from Shem ar and Lyne (1996)

 $(T_s > 3 \quad \text{f0years})$. If I were to equal the total stellar m on ent, this ratio gives a relatively large I_{csf} implying a sti core equation of state to give a thick enough crust. On the contrary, an important softening m ay be a consequence of a K-m eson condensate (B rown et al. 1994). In the absence of a quantitative calculation of I = I, which would probably also need detailed know ledge of the core's ux tube array to support a calculation of the tim e history for core neutron vortex response, it m ay be premature to draw quantitative conclusions about neutron star structure from ts of $I_{csf}=I$ to pulsar glitch data.

Equation (27) is not a unique consequence of any one among various glitch theories

based upon the discontinuous spin-down of crust neutron super uid. It holds, for example, as long as each crust cracking event shakes free only some fraction of the crust neutron super uid's pinned vortex lines so that a typical pinned vortex line survives several glitches before it is ultimately unpinned (or even if there is no glitch vortex unpinning but only a shift in their position because of a sudden movem ent of the pinning sites (Ruderm an 1976)). It would also hold if the repeated crust neutron vortex unpinning events have a purely hydrodynam ic origin and developm ent (A lpar et al. 1993), and m ay well remain valid for other kinds of glitch m odels (Link and Epstein 1996). There are, how ever, other glitch observations which m ay discriminate among glitch m odels, in particular, those which are based only on spin-up vs. those which also have glitch associated crust breaking displacements.

We consider below the interpretation of glitch features within the fram ework of the crust cracking model in which some relaxation of the crustal stresses from core ux tube movem ent is the prime cause of a glitch.

a) The Crab pulsar's dipole magnetic eld appears to jump in each major Crab glitch. The glitch history of the Crab pulsar is shown in Figure 7 for spin-rate changes relative to a prediction extrapolated from initial observations for P, P, and P. A fler each of the two major glitches there is a permanent change in P-indicating a crust spin-up rate change -= -4 10⁴. Each repeated -is much too large to be understood as coming from a plausible sudden shape change. There are two much more credible interpretations for the -jumps: the spin-down torque might have suddenly increased in the glitch, or the elective crustal neutron super uid's spin-down moment of inertia might have decreased because of som e rearrangement of crustal vortex pinning (A lpar 1996). This jump is a relatively huge elect; it can be seen to be very much greater than the relatively tiny = of the glitch (most of which is also quickly healed).

The rst explanation is a natural and necessary consequence of local crust cracking causing a sudden movement of a strongly magnetized platelet. We note that the sign of -would then imply a sudden, unhealed increase in the dipole moment for each major C rab glitch; this is consistent with the sign of _ for more gradual changes inferred from the C rab spin-down index (Table 1). The presumed fractional dipole increase corresponds, roughly, to a sudden magnetized surface patch displacement (toward the equator) of s 2 10⁴ R. This is does not seem in plausible when compared with rough estimates of how large a healing crack displacement (if any) could be expected when the crustal yield strength is exceeded (a s=R som ewhat less than the maximum yield strain). We assume below that this is (and the associated

-= -) value is common to all major glitches in rapidly spinning pulsars since it depends only on the properties of a pulsar's crust, not on its period, magnetic eld, or spin-history. Unfortunately, it is di cult to know from present data if this is the case. It is, however, not inconsistent with Vela pulsar glitch data (cf. b)).

b) The glitch interval for the Vela pulsar is 3 years. A coording to Equation 4 strongly m agnetized platelets on Vela's crust should move toward the spin equator at an angular rate T_s^{-1} . If this is accomplished by repeated crust breaking glitch events a time g apart, then g (s=R)T_s 2 yr. This is close to what is observed for Vela. The related question of whether there is an unhealed = -4 10⁴ in Vela after each glitch is not answered directly because, in distinction to C rab glitches, a new Vela glitch occurs before healing from the previous glitch is complete enough. However, Vela's observed 1.4 spin-down index could be interpreted solely as the consequence of an unhealed $= -= (3 - n)=2 \ {}_{g}T_{s}^{-1} - 0 \ {}_{g}T_{s}^{-1} - 2 - 10^{6}$ after each glitch, i.e., the near 100% grow th in magnetic moment during a spin-down time implied by n = 1.4 m ight indeed be accomplished in discrete jumps at glitches. This is not the case, how ever, for C rab glitches which are too infrequent to contribute signi cantly to the Crab's 3 n 0:5. We note that in the Vela-like group it would also follow from Equation 27 that such glitches have a magnitude

$$--- \frac{g}{2T_s} = 10^2 = 10^6;$$
 (28)

near what is observed.

c) The major C rab glitches are only a few times 10 2 as strong as the giant ones in the older pulsars. G litches have not been seen at all in PSR's 1509-58 and 0540-69. The de ning characteristic of a glitch is the jump in the spin-rate of the pulsar crust presum ed to be caused by the sudden sm all spin-down of some crustal neutron super uid. The crust is a layered structure. The deep crust where such vortex pinning is relevant consists of three layers, some of whose physical properties are estimated in Table 3. The nuclear charge of the most stable nucleus (Z) and the number density of nuclei (n_z) are taken from the calculations of N egele and Vautherin (1973). In the deep crust these nuclei form a coulom b lattice (i.e. the electron sea has a negligible polarization). The crustal lattice melting tem perature (T_m) is then well approximated by $k_B T_m$ (Z e $g^2 n_Z^{1=3}$ =180. The T_b column of Table 3 is 10 1 the calculated crust lattice melting tem perature at which crystal lattices usually become brittle and yield to excessive stress by breaking instead of by plastic

TABLE 3.

Ρ	roperties	ofD	æp	C rust	Layers
---	-----------	-----	----	--------	--------

layer	Z	Т _ь (К)	I _{csf} =I _{star}	
a	32	2 1°0	2 1Ô	
b	40	3 1°0	3 1Õ	
С	50	4 1º0	6 1ð	

ow (creep) (Ruderm an 1991). (A crust's \Coulom b lattices" have no natural scale

so that the ratio of brittle onset tem perature to melting tem perature should not be sensitive to density if the inpurity fraction is xed.) The last column is a very rough estimate of the moment of inertia of inter-nuclear super uid neutrons in each crustal layer (I_{csf}) relative to the moment of inertia of the star (I). It is extrapolated, very roughly, from the nuclear physics calculations of Negele and Vautherin at arbitrarily selected densities by assuming layer changes occur halfway between those densities at which there is a calculation indicating di erent most stable nuclei. P inning does not exist in all of layer c, and the I_{csf} for layer c only includes the pinning part of it. The T_b are near the estim ated deep crust tem peratures for the 10^3 year old C rab (and for PSR's 1509-58 and 0540-69). As a pulsar cools, the st crust layer to become brittle (c) contains only $I_c = (I_a + I_b + I_c) = 3 = 1\hat{0}$ of the total neutron super und within the brittle crust of older colder pulsars (e.g., Vela). Because the C rab pulsar would plausibly be just such a pulsar, i.e. one with a partly brittle crust, its largest glitches 10² ratio. PSR 1509-58 and 0540-69 crusts could could be smaller by just this 3 be su ciently warm that their crusts are now here brittle enough for glitches. [Since the supernova rem nant around PSR 1509-58 has an age of 20,000 years, much longer than the pulsar's spin-down age, it has been suggested that the pulsar m ight have been born with a smaller magnetic eld 20,000 years ago and became a pulsar only about 10³ years ago when its magnetic eld grew to su cient strength (Blandford, Applegate and Herquist 1983). However, if this is the case, this pulsar should have a much stronger glitch activity. The fact that this pulsar has never been observed to glitch (Kaspi, et al. 1994) is strong support for the presum ption that its spin down age is near its true age.]

d) In addition to giant Vela-like glitches the much weaker fam ily of C rab-like glitches, is also often observed in Vela-like and older pulsars (C ordes 1988). The spread in

observed = within a fam ily is generally less than the separation between fam illes. As a pulsar cools, crust magnetic stress from the pull of spin-down induced ux tube motion in the core is rst relieved by plastic ow (PSRs 1509-58 and 0540-69). At this stage there is no crust cracking and thus no glitching. In the slightly cooler C rab, crust layer c has become brittle and glitching begins in that layer. A fter 10^4 yr the crust is cool enough that all three layers, a, b, and c, are brittle and we can now recognize several glitch fam illes with relative magnitudes for = proportional to the I_a , I_b , and I_c of their respective neutron super uid moments of inertia (I_{csf} of Table 3). (This explanation makes the assumption that the shearing stress needed to slide two layers with respect to each other, is less than the stress which would crack either one.)

e) G litch magnitudes, =, decrease with increasing pulsar period, and glitching essentially ceases at P = 0.7 s regardless of pulsar age. This is shown in Figure 8 where the data of Fig. 5 are replotted as a function of pulsar period. No account is taken of the reduced probability for seeing a glitch in any one pulsar or of the larger number of longer period pulsars. The one reported very small pulsar glitch (D owns 1982) beyond this cut o is anom alous in various ways, e.g., in its post-glitch healing.) From Equation (27) drops in = must come from decreases in $_{g}=T_{s}$. Such decreases are expected when the glitching rate is proportional to the speed of the movem ent through the crust of the crust anchored moving core ux tubes. This tangential speed (s) is related to the outward radial velocity of core vortex lines ($v_{2} = v_{V}$ of Equation 4) by

$$\underline{\mathbf{s}} = \frac{\mathbf{v}_{?} \mathbf{R}}{(\mathbf{R}^{2} \quad \underline{\mathbf{f}}_{?}^{2})^{1=2}} :$$
(29)

Since g s= $\underline{s}_{,}$ both g and = (from Equation (27)) approach zero as the core's ux tubes reach the core radius at $r_{?} = R$. However, a more quantitative calculation

of the r_2 at which glitching should stop must not ignore the nite yield strength of the crust. Because of it, crust yielding as well as glitching should cease som ewhat before $r_2 = R$ is reached.

The three dashed curves of Figure 8 are the predicted = from Equation (27) and Equation (29) for the three deep crust layers of Table 3 with their di erent I_{sfn} . The r_{2} are related to pulsar spin-periods by

$$r_{2} = r_{2} (0) \frac{P}{P_{0}}^{1=2};$$
 (30)

where r_{2} (0) is the distance from the spin-axis of the most important magnetized surface platelets when the spin period $P = P_{0}$. The plotted curves are for $r_{2} = r_{2}$ (0) = 0.4R when $P = P_{0} = 0.1$ s; P_{0} is the spin-period of the Vela pulsar fam ily where $v = v_{0}$ is nally achieved and r_{2} (0) is taken as a plausible estimate. (An r_{2} (0) of order half R, corresponds to P = 0.5 s for canonical large glitch cessation.) The magnitude of the giant glitches in Vela is determined by using the assumed pulsar and glitch independent s = 2 = 10 cm crust displacement in C rab glitches together with the (calculated) ratio of crust super uid moment of inertia to I I. The smaller glitch magnitudes are then xed by the relative moments $I_{a,b,c}$. The ts of the model curves in Figure 8 seem suggestive of present glitch data.

f) C rab glitches occur at intervals larger than those between Vela glitches (3 years). M ost m odels predict (in agreem ent with observations of other glitching pulsars) that the glitching rate is roughly proportional to a pulsar's spin-down rate. This would im ply that the C rab should glitch at alm ost 10 tim es the rate for Vela. However in the m odel of Section 2, the glitch rate determ ined by core ux tube m ovem ent, is proportional only to the core ux array expansion velocity. It will no longer be proportional to the spin-down rate when super uid neutron vortices cut through core ux tubes as is expected to be the case for the C rab pulsar (cf. Figure 1). R ather

$$g = \frac{4T_s s}{R} \frac{jv_v j}{jv j}$$
(31)

With $j_{r} = j_{v_{v}} j$

g) At least one C rab pulsar glitch has a resolvable initial rise in spin-rate (Lyne, Sm ith and P ritchard 1992, 1993). A fler any sudden motion of the crust there can be some glitch-like spin-up even in the absence of any spin-down of crustal neutron super uid. The positions of vortices in the expanding core vortex array are determined by a balance between the M agnus forces which push the vortices outward and the 10¹⁵ ux tubes per vortex line which encom pass each of them and restrain their outward m ovem ent. These ux tubes are anchored by the quasi-rigid highly conducting crust. W herever that crust breaks to relax som e of the resulting stress, the restraining forces on the vortices are dim inished and the vortices m ay m ove outward to new positions. How quickly they will do this is (cf. Section 2) still unclear and m ay di er greatly am ong the super uid regions. W hen the new steady state is nally accom plished there is an increase in , the spin of the rest of the star, of roughly

$$----\frac{\max_{n}I_{n}^{0}}{I_{n}R^{2}}\frac{1}{R}\cdot\frac{s}{R}$$
(32)

where m_{ax} is the yield stress of crustal matter, l is the crust thickness, s is the crust shift in a cracking event (Section 4a), and I_n^0 is the moment of inertia of those

core neutrons whose spin-down decrement is fast enough to contribute to a glitch observation. For a typically assumed $_{max}$ 10⁶ dyne cm² (corresponding to a yield strain 3 10⁶), and s 10² cm from Section 4a,

$$--- \frac{10^{9} I_{n}^{0}}{\frac{2}{2} I} :$$
 (33)

This is too small and has the wrong dependence to be a signi cant addition to the = of giant glitches, but it may be signi cant for the Crab-like glitch family. It would dier in its initial time-dependence from that expected from sudden crustal vortex unpinning: instead of an initial (still unresolved) spin-down as angular momentum is transferred to core neutrons there would be an initial spin-up as angular momentum ows in the opposite directions. This may be suggestive of the Crab 1989 glitch but more observations and analyses of the beginning of a Crab-like glitch are needed.

5. Problem s

In this section we discuss special problems associated with the proposed model which need further investigation. The rst is that the total heat generation predicted by the simplied version of the model seems too large compared to the upper bound to it from x-ray observations; the second is that the time scale for angular momentum sharing between neutron star-crust and some of its core neutrons given by the model seems very much longer than the conventional irresolvably short one used in glitch analyses (e.g. A lpar and Sauls 1988).

5.1. Heat generation during neutron star spin-down

To move outward during spin-down, core vortex lines must either push ux tubes through the core e p sea or cut through them. Either would generate heat which must be compared to bounds on it from therm al X-ray observations of pulsars. W hen there is no ux-tube cutting and all ux tubes are pushed through a core's stationary electron-proton sea, the heat production rate would be

$$Q_{-} = {}^{Z} F \quad vd^{3}r \quad \frac{B^{2}R^{5}}{30c^{2}T_{s}^{2}} \quad 10^{35} \quad \frac{B}{10^{12}G} \quad \frac{R}{10^{6}cm} \quad \frac{5}{T_{s}} \quad \frac{10^{4}yr}{T_{s}}^{2} \text{ erg s}^{1} \text{ (34)}$$

But soft X -ray observations of Vela seem to give a bound of Q-' 10^{33} erg s⁻¹ (O gelm an, F in ley and Z im m erm an 1993). This large discrepancy suggests that understanding how m oving core vortex lines m ove with, or through, the extraordinarily dense ux tube array in which they are embedded, without an unacceptably large Q-, m ay be an important question for alm ost all spin-down m odels of strongly m agnetized pulsars. Below we list various possibilities for resolving this problem while still preserving essential features of the m odel proposed in Section 2.

- a) A most obvious failure of the idealized model is its (obviously false) assumption that the core magnetic eld of a pulsar can be approximated as one with enough axial symmetry around so that outward moving ux tubes must always move through the electron-proton sea in which they are embedded. However, this is probably not at all the case in regions with inhom ogeneously distributed strong core magnetic ux densities. Magnetic ux tube, vortex lines and e -p plasm a might all move together where n is very large without heat generation. In that case the integration volum e of Equation 34 and the relevant B² could be much smaller.
- b) In Equation (34) it has been assumed that vortices are moving together with ux tubes everywhere in the core. This might not hold for the Vela pulsar. If the critical radius

of Equation 19 is only, say, about one-third of the radius of the Vela pulsar core, the average velocity of ux tubes would be roughly three times smaller than that of vortices and the total heat generated could be almost an order of magnitude smaller.

- c) A key assumption of the analysis of ux tube drag in being pushed through the e-p sea plasm a is that magnetic ux tubes are relatively uniform ly distributed at least on the microscopic level. If this is not the case and som e clumping instabilities among ux tubes develops during spin down, the drag force on the moving ux tubes could be much smaller and thus give smaller heat generation. F lux tubes may tend to clump around the moving vortex lines (about 10⁻² cm away from each other) while e-pback ow occurs in between where there are almost no ux tubes. As in a) a relative motion between ux tubes and the electron-proton sea could be restricted to very weak B- eld regions.
- d) A type I superconductor might be formed by protons in most of a neutron star core. From an estimate of the core proton gap energy of 1M eV, it had been argued (e.g. Baym, Pethick and Pines 1969) that core protons form a type II superconductor. However a subsequent calculation (W am bach, A insworth and P ines 1990) which took account of the nuclear interaction between protons and neutrons gave a much sm aller 0:3M eV). It is then som ew hat less clear whether the core 02 gap energy (protons form a type II or a type I superconductor. For a sti equation of state part of the core protons m ay well form a type I superconductor, while for a soft equation of state it is probable that only the type II superconductor exists in the core protons of a neutron star. Evidence supporting an intermediately sti or a sti equation of state (Link, Epstein and Van Riper 1992) suggests protons might indeed form a type I superconductor in part of the core. There, magnetic eld would be in a mixed state in which B becomes large enough (10^{15} G auss) to quench superconductivity in some

sm all slab-like regions, and essentially vanishes in between them. The typical size of such eld-free regions is about $(L_{})^{1=2}B_{c}=B_{}$ 1 cm with L 10 cm the assumed scale size of the type I superconducting region. The type I region can also in uence ux tubes in type II region to bunch together on a similar 1 cm scale. This could signi cantly reduce drag forces and thus Q-.

e) Som e Q-m ight escape from the star's near environm ent as hard unobserved UV that the soft X-ray observation bound for Q- is signi cantly exceeded. In young -ray pulsars such as Vela there are plausible mechanisms for the generation of e clouds all around the near environm ent of the pulsar. Because of the huge e⁺ =e cyclotron resonant scattering of X-ray photons of energy ehB =m c, an energy which extends from 20K eV to 20 eV within 10 stellar radii, this e atm osphere would be optically thick to therm al X-rays for plausible e densities (Zhu and Ruderm an 97). M uch of the em itted soft X-rays m ight then be degraded to hard UV before escaping through this magnetized lepton \blanket".

A m ong all of the above possibilities a) would appear m ost likely to be important, i.e. a fundam ental inadequacy of the idealized m odel for core ux tube m otion (especially in layers not ad jacent to the crust core interface).

5.2. The initial glitch time scale

The time scale ($_{spin}$ $_{up}$) for a suddenly spun-up crust, in a glitch, sharing its tiny angular momentum jump with the core's much heavier super uid neutrons is usually taken to be unobservably short (A lpar et al. 1993). Because it is not resolved in Vela pulsar this time scale is presumed to be less than 10^2 s (M cC ulloch et al. 1990; F lanagan 1990). The value estimated from our proposed model or any model which involves ux-tube drag or cutting-through can give a very di erent result. Because of the drag on the 10¹⁴ ux tubes that must be carried inward or cut through by each of Vela's core vortex lines to accomplish a small rapid increase in core neutron angular rotation speed, the response of these super uid neutrons may be very sluggish.

For Vela's core's super uid neutrons very quickly to share in the angular momentum given up by crustal super uid neutrons in a glitch, the core neutrons' vortices must move inward about 1cm in less than 10²s. Before this occurs the core vortex array rst increases its rotational speed in response to the sudden spin-up of the core's ux tubes with which these vortices interact. This causes an increm ental inward push (M agnus force) on the core neutron vortices. This force density

$$F \qquad p \frac{h}{m_n} \quad R = n R \tag{35}$$

where 10^4 is the initial (unresolved) giant glitch spin-up before there is any transfer of angular m on entum to core super uid neutrons. If the subsequent inward vortex m otion involves pushing ux tubes through the electron proton sea, Equation 14 gives a m aximum inward ux tube speed

$$v = \frac{{}_{n}Rc^{2}}{n {}_{0}^{2}} = 10^{11} \text{cm s}^{1} :$$
 (36)

To move inward by 1cm would then take

$$\int_{\text{spin up}}^{0} 10^{1} \text{s} \quad \text{I}_{\text{s}}$$
(37)

W here ux tube cut-through by moving vortices occurs rst the time scale ${}^{0}_{\rm spin\ up}$ 10²s for B 10²G (D ing, Cheng and Chau 1993). A lm ost all of the possibilities in Section 5.1 for reducing Q-would also reduce ${}_{\rm spin\ up}$, but for some, or perhaps all, core neutrons the needed reduction seems so large that it is hard to see how ${}_{\rm spin\ up}$ can become unobservably short for all of the core neutron super uid. O ne possibility for resolving this problem

may be to accept the model result that where vortices must push ux tubes through the electron-proton sea or cut through them, $_{\rm spin}$ up is unresolved because it is too long, i.e. far longer than the interval between glitches ($_{\rm g}$). W ith the possible resolution suggested in Section 5.1a), those vortex lines whose surrounding ux tubes move with their embedding e -p sea may quickly adjust ($_{\rm spin}$ up < 10² s) and also generate little Q, while only a very sm all m inority of vortex lines with the ux tubes they carry actually move through their local charged sea. If this is the case, although the I of Equation (27) would not include all core super uid neutrons, it still might be nearly the entire I of the star. This would also be the case if the core is mainly a K-condensate or quark matter, superconductors with no purely neutral super uids to be spun-up in a glitch. (The charged ones are easily spun-up by any magnetic eld which couples them to the crust.) It should be noted that a large reduction of $_{\rm spin}$ up for some parts of the core neutron super uid could put the time scale in the range where it should contribute to glitch \healing" analyses.

It is a pleasure to thank A. A lpar, K S Cheng, P. Goldreich, F. Graham -Sm ith, A. Lyne, and D. Pines for inform ative conversations. This work was supported in part by NASA grants NAG 5-2016.

A. Super uid-superconductor interactions

Because magnetic eld inside neutron stars are usually not aligned along the spin axis when neutron stars spin-down (-up) the outward (inward) moving super uid neutron vortices run into proton ux tubes. The interaction between super uid neutron vortices and proton superconductor magnetic ux tubes as they try to cross through each other can thus play an important part in determining the motion of both vortices and ux tubes. Srinivasan et al. (1990) proposed that the proton density perturbation in the center of a ux tube would give rise to an interaction energy per intersection

$$E_{int} = n_{h} \frac{\frac{2}{p}}{E_{F_{p}}^{2}} \frac{\frac{2}{n}}{E_{F_{n}}} \left(\frac{2}{n} \right) ' \quad 0 \text{:IM eV} ; \qquad (A1)$$

where n_{p} are the neutron, proton BCS correlation lengths, p_{pn} are the respective gap energies, $E_{F_{p,n}}$ the Ferm i energies and n_n the neutron number density. An even more important contribution to the interaction energy comes from the magnetic interaction between neutron vortex lines and proton ux tubes and from the velocity dependence of the nuclear interaction between the neutrons in a vortex and the protons in a ux tube, which is also the ultimate cause of the neutron vortex line ux. Both can be taken into account using an elective G inzburg-Laudau (GL) free energy (f_{GL}) for an interacting mixture of super uid neutrons and superconducting neutrons (A lpar, Langer and Sauls, 1984)

$$f_{GL} = f_{u} + \frac{1}{2} s^{pp} v_{p}^{2} + \frac{1}{2} s^{nn} v_{n}^{2} + s^{pn} v_{p} s^{N} + \frac{B^{2}}{8}; \qquad (A2)$$

where f_u is the condensation energy density, s^{pp}_{s} and s^{nn}_{s} are the bare" densities of superconducting protons and super uid neutrons respectively, s^{pn}_{s} is the coupling density, and v_p and v_n are the super uid velocities de ned by

$$v_{p} = \frac{h}{2m_{p}}r_{p} \frac{e}{m_{p}c}A; \qquad (A3)$$

$$v_n = \frac{h}{2m_n} r_n : \qquad (A 4)$$

The super uid electric current is

$$\dot{J}_{s} = \frac{c}{4} (r = B) = \frac{e}{m_{p}} [s^{pp} v_{p} + s^{pn} v_{n}]:$$
 (A5)

From Equations (A 5) and (A 3), (A 4) we obtain London's equation

$$r^{2}A = \frac{A}{2} = \frac{2 eh}{m_{p}^{2}c} [s^{pp}r_{p} + s^{pn}\frac{m_{p}}{m_{n}}r_{n}]$$
 (A 6)

with $= (m_p^2 c^2 = 4 e^2 \frac{pp}{s})^{1=2}$ the elective London penetration depth. For a pure proton ux tube with $r_p = \frac{1}{r}$ and $r_n = 0$, the above equations give

$$v_n = 0;$$
 (A7)

$$v_{p} = \frac{m_{p}}{\frac{pp}{s}e8} \frac{c}{8} - \frac{0}{2}K_{1} - \frac{r}{s}$$
; (A8)

$$B = \frac{0}{2 - 2} K_0 - \frac{r}{2};$$
 (A9)

with $_0 = hc=e$ the ux quantum and K₀ and K₁ Bessel functions of order zero and one with in aginary argument. The solutions for a pure neutron vortex line with r_p = 0 and r_p = \hat{r} or a superposition of a neutron vortex line and a proton ux tube with r_p = \hat{r} and r_p = \hat{r} can be obtained similarly.

$$\mathbf{v}_{n} = \frac{h}{2m_{n}} \hat{\mathbf{r}}; \qquad (A 10)$$

$$v_{p} = \frac{m_{p}}{s} \frac{c}{e^{2}} \frac{c}{2} K_{1} \frac{r}{2} \frac{h_{s}^{pn}}{2m_{n}} \frac{h_{s}^{pn}}{r}; \qquad (A11)$$

$$B = \frac{r}{2^{2}} K_{0} - \frac{r}{2}$$
 (A 12)

with the total ux in a single ux tube. For an isolated neutron vortex line $= _0 (m_p {}_s^{pn} = m_n {}_s^{pp})$. For a superimposed vortex line and ux tube $= _0 [1 + m_p {}_s^{pn} = m_n {}_s^{pp}]$.

The energy for each case can be estimated from Equation (A 2). The extra energy (per unit length) of the superposition of a ux tube and a vortex line relative to a distantly separated ux tube and a vortex line is

$$E' \frac{0}{8} \frac{0}{2} \frac{2^{m_p}}{m_n} \frac{m_p}{m_s} \frac{m_p}{m_s} \ln \frac{1}{m_s}$$
 (A13)

There are m any m ore ux tubes than vortices. We assume that just before cutting through the typical distance between two consecutive ux tubes pushed by the same m oving vortex is about , i.e. ux tubes are swept up by a moving vortex but not cut through. The m agnetic repulsion between ux tubes limits their density. This repulsion is not e ective until the inter-ux tube separation approaches \therefore Then the maximum force density on a ux tube array would be roughly estimated as E = or

$$F_{max}' \frac{n_V}{8} \frac{0}{2} \frac{m_p}{2} \frac{m_p}{m_n} \frac{m_p}{s} \ln \frac{1}{10} = \frac{n_V}{8} B_V B \ln \frac{1}{10};$$
 (A14)

with n_V the number density of vortex lines, $B = {}_0 = {}^2$ the characteristic magnetic eld in the cores of ux tubes and $B_V = ({}_0 = {}^2) (m_p {}_s^{pn} = m_n {}_s^{pp})$ the eld within the cores of neutron vortex lines which are embedded in the stellar core's superconducting proton sea.

{ 39 {

REFERENCES

- Alpar, M.A. 1977, ApJ, 213, 527
- A lpar, M.A. 1996, Proc.COSPAR Meeting, Birmingham 1996, to be published in Advances in Space Research.
- Alpar, M., Anderson, P., Pines, D., & Shaham, J. 1984, ApJ, 278, 791
- Alpar, M., Chau, H.F., Chang, K.S., & Pines, D., 1993, ApJ, 409, 345
- Alpar, M.A., Langer, S.A. and Sauls, J.A., 1984, ApJ, 282, 433
- Alpar, M.A., & Sauls, J.A. 1988, ApJ, 327,723
- Anderson, P.W., & Itoh, N. 1975, Nature, 256, 25
- Bamard, J., & Arons, J. 1982, ApJ, 254, 713
- Baym, G., Pethick, C.J. & Pines, D. 1969, Nature, 224, 674
- Baym G., Pethick, C., Pines, D. & Ruderman, M. A. 1969, Nature, 224, 872
- Blandford, R.D., Applegate, J.H. & Hemquist, L. 1983, MNRAS, 204, 1025
- Brown, G.E., Lee, C.H., Rho, M., & Thorsson, V. 1994, Nucl. Phys. A, 567,937
- Chao, N.C., Clark, J.W. & Yang, C.H. 1972, Nucl. Phys. A, 179, 320
- Chen, K., & Ruderman, M.A. 1993, ApJ, 408, 179
- Chen, K., Ruderman, M.A., & Zhu, T. 1997, submitted to ApJ
- Cordes, J.M. 1988, ApJ, 330, 847
- Dem iansky M., & Proszynski, M. 1983, MNRAS, 202, 437

- Ding, K.Y., Cheng, K.S. & Chau H.F. 1993, ApJ, 408, 167
- Downs, G.S. 1982, ApJ, 257, L67
- Flanagan, C.S. 1990, Nature, 345, 416
- Ghosh, P.& Lamb, F.1979, ApJ, 234, 296
- Goldreich P.1993, private com munication
- Harvey, J.A., Ruderman, M.A.& Shaham, J.1986, Phys. Rev. D 33, 2084
- Jones, P.B. 1987, MNRAS, 228, 513
- Kaspi, V.M., Manchester, R.N., Siegman, B., Johnston, S., & Lyne, A.G. 1994, ApJ, 422, L83
- Link, B.& Epstein, R. 1996, ApJ, 457, 844
- Link, B., Epstein, R. I. & Van Riper, K. A. 1992, Nature, 359, 616
- Lyne A.G., Pritchard R.S., & Shemer, S. 1995, J.A strophys. Astr., 16, 179
- Lyne A.G., Pritchard R.S., & Sm ith F.G. 1988, MNRAS, 233, 667
- Lyne A.G., Pritchard R.S., & Sm ith F.G. 1993, MNRAS, 265, 1003
- Lyne A.G., Pritchard R.S., Sm ith F.G., & Cam ib F. 1996, Nature, 381, 497
- Lyne, A.G., Sm ith, F.G., & Pritchard, R.S. 1992, Nature, 359, 706
- Manchester R. & Peterson B. 1989, ApJ, 342, L23
- M cCulloch, P., Ham ilton, P., M cConnell, D. & King, E. 1990, Nature, 346, 822
- M cK enna T , & Lyne A . G . 1990, Nature, 343, 349

Muslim ov, A.G., & Tsygan, A.I. 1985, Ap& SS, 115, 43

- Negele, J., & Vautherin, D. 1973, Nucl. Phys. A, 207, 298
- Ogelm an, H., Finley, J.P., & Zimmerm an, H.U. 1993, Nature, 361, 136
- Ogelm an, H., & Hasinger, G. 1990, ApJ, 353, L21
- Pines D., Shaham J., & Ruderm an M.A. 1972, Nature Phys. Sci., 237, 83
- Ruderman, M.A. 1976, ApJ, 203, 213
- Ruderman, M.A. 1991a, ApJ, 366, 261, 1991b, 382, 587
- Sauls, J.A., in T im ing Neutron Stars, eds. H.O gelm an and E.van den Heuvel (D ordrecht: K luwer) 1989
- Srinivasan, G., Bhattacharya, D., Muslim ov, A., Tsygan, A., 1990, Current Science, 59, 31

Thom pson, C. & Duncan, R., 1993, ApJ, 408, 194 and 1995, MNRAS, 275, 255

- Trum per, J., Piketsch, W., Reppin, C., Voges, W., Stubert, R., & Kendziorra, E., 1978, ApJ, 219, L105
- W am bach, J., A insworth, T.L., & Pines, D. 1990, in Proc. Neutron Stars: Theory and Observation, ed. Ventura, J., and Pines, D. (NATO ASI Series)
- Zhu, T. & Ruderman, M., 1997, ApJ, 1997, 478, 701

This manuscript was prepared with the AAS $\mathbb{P}T_EX$ macros v4.0.

Figure Captions

Fig. 1. Radial vortex line speed v_v and induced ux tube radial speed v vs. the radial distance to the spin-axis (r_r). For $r_r < r_c$; $v = v_v$; for $r_r > r_c$; $v < v_v$. It is not yet known how far v drops below v_v when $r_r > r_c$ and two linear possibilities are indicated.

Fig. 2. Model evolution of magnetic dipole elds of radiopulsars. Star-like designations indicate radio pulsars found in SNRs. In the model solitary spinning-down radio pulsars follow the path (a{b(c). The path (a{b) corresponds to the rst and second stages discussed in Section 3. Spin-down follows the path (b{c{d}} when eld-pulled parts of the crust move toward the spin-equator where reconnection can begin after core ux expulsion. The region (d) would not be reached by a solitary pulsar, but may be by some neutron stars in binaries. Further spin-down beyond (d) would not be e ective in reducing B because the crust would no longer be stressed above its yield strength. (Subsequent accretion induced spin-up could return the neutron star to (c) if the magnetic eld con guration mainly connects the two spin hem ispheres.)

Fig. 3. Model for movement of a single magnetic ux tube in a spinning-down neutron star core. (a) Side view of initial ux tube path (thicker line). In the crust and beyond, the magnetic eld is not con ned to quantized ux tubes. Neutron super uid vortex lines are indicated as un lled tubes. Because the core eld would be expected to have had toroidal as well as poloidal components before the superconducting transition, the ux tube path is probably quite tortured while the vortex array is quasi-uniform. (b) Top view of (a) from along the spin axis direction. (c) Top view of the ux tubes in the equatorial zone after long spin-down. A conducting crust platelet moves with the ux tube capitals, pushed beyond the crust's yield strength in part by the crust's own pinned vortex lines and , crucially, by the pull of core ux tubes. A s core neutron vortex motion moves an entrained ux tube, that tube is ultim ately pushed into the crust core boundary for alm ost any initial ux tube

con guration.

Fig. 4. Movement of magnetized patches (\platelets") on the surface of a spinningdown pulsar: a) initial surface magnetic eld con guration; b) after substantial spin-down the main (most strongly magnetized) patches have reached the spin-equatorial zone where reconnection can occur; c) remaining magnetized patches after reconnection. The magnitude of B at the patch N⁰ remains about the same as its initial one in a), but the dipole moment () has become much smaller and its orientation is changed.

Fig. 5. Fractional jumps in pulsar spin-rate () in glitches as a function of the spin-down age (P = 2P) of the glitching radio-pulsars (Lyne et al. 1995).

Fig. 6. Pulsar glitch activity vs. pulsar spin age from Lyne et al. (1995). The dots are PSRs 0833, 1338, 1737, 1823, 1758. The diagonal line is the glitch activity from Equation (18) with $I_s=I = 1.5 \quad 10^2$.

Fig. 7. The rotation frequency of the C rab pulsar over a 23-year period after subtracting an extrapolation from the rst few years of data (Lyne et al. 1992).

Fig. 8. Observed glitch m agnitudes (Lyne et. al. 1995) vs. pulsar period.















