

The Casimir zero-point radiation pressure

Yoseph Imry

Dept. of Condensed-Matter Physics, the Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot 76100, Israel
(Dated: April 1, 2022)

We analyze some consequences of the Casimir-type zero-point radiation pressure. These include macroscopic "vacuum" forces on a metallic layer in-between a dielectric medium and an inert ($\epsilon = 1$) one. Ways to control the sign of these forces, based on dielectric properties of the media, are thus suggested. Finally, the large positive Casimir pressure, due to surface plasmons on thin metallic layers, is evaluated and discussed.

PACS numbers: 42.50.Ct, 03.70.+k, 12.20.-m, 12.20.Fv

Imagine polarizable bodies that are placed in vacuum. Their interaction with the electromagnetic field (which can often be described by boundary conditions on the latter at the surfaces of the bodies) may produce a change in the zero-point energy of the field. Should that energy depend, for example, on the distance between two of these bodies, forces between these two bodies will follow. This can be regarded as the origin of the van der Waals molecular forces [1], which change at large separations due to retardation effects [2]. For the simpler case of two large parallel conducting plates, the Casimir force [3] (cf. Eq. 4 below) results at large separations (where retardation is important) between the plates, and becomes the Lifshitz force [4, 5] at small separations (where quasistationarity applies). The crossover between the short- and long-distance behaviors occurs for distances on the order of the velocity of light divided by the characteristic excitation frequency of the bodies (i.e. about 200 Å for $\hbar\omega = 10\text{eV}$). Even for a single body, volume- and shape [6]-dependent forces will arise when the field energy depends on these parameters. The Casimir force has by now been amply confirmed by experiment [7]. Corrections due to finite temperatures, realistic surfaces, etc. are becoming relevant [8]. The Casimir effect may be crucial to nanomechanical devices [9]. Its relevance is not limited to the electromagnetic field only. It should exist with any physical bosonic field that interacts with matter.

Besides its general interest *vis à vis* the observability of (only changes of) the vacuum energy [10] and genuine relevance to molecular and colloidal forces, the Casimir effect touches upon several fundamental questions of Physics. These range from "vacuum friction" to the value of the cosmological constant and the modifications of classical Newtonian gravitation on small scales. The reader is referred to several books and review articles, which discuss them in any aspects of the Casimir effect [11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16].

A problem of principle which arises in the calculation of Casimir-type forces is the well-known UV divergence of the electromagnetic vacuum energy. This divergence is clearly physically irrelevant here, since what matters are only differences of energies. For a good discussion of the

cuto procedure see [17]. Ordinary metals are basically transparent at high frequencies, above the characteristic plasma frequency ω_p which is therefore a natural cutoff. It is clear that waves with $\omega > \omega_p$ do not "see" the bodies and therefore are irrelevant. In his original calculation Casimir in fact first employed a soft cutoff as above and then made a judicious subtraction of a large energy to obtain a finite, universal and cutoff-independent result. This subtraction procedure is rather tricky. Although various physical interpretations for it have been suggested in the literature (see below), none of them is truly satisfactory. We shall start by physically analyzing Casimir's subtraction procedure. Before that, we remark that cutoff-dependence can be allowed when the cutoff is based on physical considerations. For example, the Lifshitz forces in the static limit do depend on the cutoff ω_p , where ω_p is the plasma frequency of the metals. Another example of cutoff-dependence will be discussed in this paper.

In 1948, Casimir [3] considered the force between two large metallic plates placed parallel to the x-y plane, with a distance d along the z axis between their internal faces, and $d \ll \lambda_p$. The zero-point energy of the field between the plates is

$$E_0(d) = \frac{\hbar c}{2} \sum_{(c)} \int_0^\infty dk_z \int_0^\infty \frac{k_\perp^2}{(n^2 \frac{k_\perp^2}{d^2} + k_z^2)^{1/2}}; \quad (1)$$

where $R_{(c)}$ means that the integrand is multiplied by a soft cutoff-function which vanishes smoothly around and above $k_\perp = \omega_p/c$, and $\sum_{(c)}$ means that the $n=0$ term is multiplied by $1/2$. The corresponding subtracted quantity is:

$$E_0^0(d) = E_0(d) - \text{subtraction}; \quad (2)$$

The force between the plates is given by

$$F = - \frac{\partial E_0^0(d)}{\partial d}; \quad (3)$$

where positive F means repulsion between the plates. Casimir chose to subtract in Eq. 2 the same expression but with the sum over n converted to an integral, as appropriate for very large d . Thus, the subtraction is that of the energy for the plates "at infinity" (questions such as whether the plates have a finite thickness, and if so what happens beyond them, are left open). Evaluating the difference between the sum and the integral over n with the Euler-Maclaurin formula, he arrived at the celebrated result:

$$P_c = F/L^2 = -\frac{\hbar c}{240 d^4} \quad (4)$$

For the unretarded, quasistationary limit, $d \ll \lambda_p$, a length λ_p replaces one power of d in the denominator of Eq. 4, as found by Lifshitz [4].

A clear physical justification for the subtraction procedure is clearly called for. It is immediately suggested [18] (and in fact hinted in Casimir's original paper) that the physical significance of the above subtraction is in obtaining the difference between the radiation pressures of the zero-point fields between the plates, and outside of the plates. This idea was advocated and followed up in Ref. [18]. The purpose of this paper is to analyze some new consequences of this interpretation of the subtraction. Neither it nor the other regularization procedures are truly satisfactory. Therefore, it is of interest to compare the new results following from this interpretation of the subtraction procedure with experiments to come.

We follow Ref. [18] in calculating the pressure of the zero-point EM field, but present here a somewhat different derivation. We take a large vessel [19] with reflecting walls. The vessel is taken to be a box with dimensions $L_x, L_y, L_z, V = L_x L_y L_z$. The pressure in the z -direction is given by the momentum imparted to the wall per unit area per unit time [18]:

$$P_0 = \hbar \sum_{k_x, k_y, k_z}^{(c)} c(k) \frac{k_z^2}{k} = V; \quad (5)$$

where $k_x = n_x \pi/L_x$, etc. and $c(k)$ is the light velocity as a function of $k = \sqrt{k_x^2 + k_y^2 + k_z^2}$, slightly generalizing the result of Ref. [18]. The symbol (c) above the summation sign signifies an upper cutoff around the plasma frequency of the walls, necessary to control the divergence, as discussed above. To derive this result, one may calculate [22] $\frac{\hbar}{L_y L_z} \frac{\partial \langle \epsilon k \rangle}{\partial L_z} = \frac{\hbar c k^2}{k V}$ and sum over the levels. The possible volume dependence of $c(k)$ is neglected.

For a large system, the sum can be replaced by an integral, we perform the angular integrations and change variables from k to frequency (ω) , obtaining:

$$P_0 = \frac{\hbar}{6} \frac{1}{2c^3} \int_0^\infty \omega^3 d\omega \quad (6)$$

where the factor of $1/2$ in the zero point energy and the degeneracy of each k mode cancelled and we used the frequency-dependent (ϵ) via $c(\omega) = c/(\epsilon)^{1/2}$. The superscript (c) signifies an upper cutoff around the plasma frequency of the walls, as above. Denoting \bar{c} as a suitable average of $c(\omega)$, (i.e. $\frac{1}{\bar{c}^3} = \frac{\int_0^\infty \omega^3 d\omega}{\int_0^\infty \omega^3 d\omega}$), one obtains

$$P_0 = \frac{\hbar^4}{24} \frac{1}{2\bar{c}^3} \quad (7)$$

We used an approximate equality, since we gave the result for a sharp cutoff and a soft cutoff may change it somewhat.

One might [20] try to use here (as in Eq. 3, based on [3]) the thermodynamic relationship, for a system which is in equilibrium at $T = 0$ (see also Ref. 21):

$$P_0 = \frac{\partial E_0}{\partial V} = \frac{\partial}{\partial V} \sum_{\omega} \frac{1}{2} \hbar \omega = \frac{1}{2} \hbar \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial V} \quad (8)$$

This would produce a negative pressure. However [20], this relationship is valid only for a closed system. But the present system exchanges energy with the continuum levels above λ_p , when its volume varies, via zero-point photon levels moving through the cutoff. Interestingly, Casimir used the same relationship to calculate the net pressure on each plate. We believe that this may be justified for pressure differences, but only when the media on the two sides of each metallic plate are equivalent. This point will be more fully discussed elsewhere.

The pressure of Eq. 7 is not-so-large but quite significant. It is convenient to express it in terms of a Bohr (or Fermi) pressure $P_B \sim 10 \text{ eV} \cdot \text{\AA}^{-3} \sim 1.5 \cdot 10^{10} \text{ N} \cdot \text{cm}^{-2}$. For $\hbar \lambda_p = 10 \text{ eV}$, we find $P_0 \sim 1.5 \cdot 10^8 P_B \sim 0.2 \text{ N} \cdot \text{cm}^{-2}$. For comparison, the ordinary Casimir force/unit area at a distance of 100 nm is on the order of $10^{-3} \text{ N} \cdot \text{cm}^{-2}$.

Since the ordinary Casimir force is the result of the near-cancellation of much larger quantities, its sign is notoriously difficult to predict, except via detailed calculations [23]. We suggest that some control of the sign can be achieved [24] by employing polarizable materials as the electromagnetic vacuum in some part of the system. For a material with a dielectric constant (ϵ) , Eq. 6 suggests that if the suitably averaged value, $\bar{\epsilon} > 1$ (where $\bar{c} = c/\bar{\epsilon}^{1/2}$), which should often happen, the pressure of the dielectric will exceed that of the vacuum by P :

$$P = \frac{\hbar^4}{24} \frac{1}{2\bar{c}^3} \left(\frac{1}{\bar{\epsilon}^3} - \frac{1}{c^3} \right) \quad (9)$$

Thus, for example, a metallic wall having a dielectric medium with such an (ϵ) on one side and a medium with $\epsilon = 1$ on the other, both having the same mechanical pressure, will be attracted into the vacuum [25]. As a weak example we take $(\epsilon) = 2$ up to 0.05 of the metallic

ϵ_p , this will give a net force per unit area of 10^{-6} N/cm^2 . In addition, one may think about macroscopic vessels either filled with or immersed in a dielectric fluid with the same mechanical pressure as the inert, $\epsilon = 1$, material outside/inside. It appears possible to observe, in principle with an interferometric method, the small changes of their macroscopic dimensions between these two situations, for example. This would constitute a macroscopic version of the Casimir effect.

Things become rather interesting also for the ordinary, mesoscopic-scale, Casimir effect. A good check of the present interpretation of the Casimir subtraction is the following:

Consider the case where the medium outside the plates is "inert" ($\epsilon = 1$) and the medium between them has an $\epsilon(\omega)$, with $\epsilon^- > 1$. The conventional calculations treat the case in which these two media are identical (with the same $\epsilon(\omega)$). Let us then start with both the inside and outside media identical and having an $\epsilon(\omega)$. The Casimir pressure in this case was calculated in Ref. [5]. We denote it by $P_c(\epsilon)$. In the case of interest to us the medium outside is inert, so we have to subtract the pressure of the vacuum rather than the pressure of the dielectric medium. We then find that the net Casimir pressure is, in our case:

$$P_c(1 \text{ inside; } \epsilon \text{ outside}) = P_c(\epsilon) - P_0(\epsilon = 1) + P_0(\epsilon); \quad (10)$$

Therefore, for sufficiently large $\epsilon(\omega)$ the sign of the force will change and it will push the plates away! For the aforementioned example, considered below Eq. 9, this repulsion will win against the Casimir attraction around a distance of about 0.6 \AA . For larger distances, the full Casimir force should ideally be repulsive; see however [25]. This change of sign is due to the larger "volume force" due to the dielectric inside.

At distances below $\epsilon = \epsilon_p$, where quasistationarity holds, the outside pressure P_0 may again be smaller than the inside Lifshitz pressure. Interesting effects due to dielectric media placed between or outside of the plates are possible and will be discussed elsewhere.

We conclude this note by examining the Casimir vacuum forces on a single flat metallic plate of thickness d . For large thicknesses, we simply have the two pressures, P_0 , from the two sides of the metallic layer. These will slightly decrease the thickness of the layer, a very interesting effect which can be increased with dielectric materials as discussed above and might be observable some day. In addition to the ordinary electromagnetic modes considered so far, there will be surface plasmons [28, 29], [4, 5, 27] running on the two interfaces of the layer. For a thick layer, the energy of these modes will be independent of d , but once d becomes comparable to the decay-lengths of the modes, their energies will depend on d and lead to a significant further positive pressure on the metallic plate.

To calculate that pressure, we consider a metallic slab with a dielectric constant $\epsilon(\omega) = 1 - \frac{\epsilon_p}{\omega^2}$ and of thickness $d = 2a$, larger than atomic dimensions, between the planes $z = \pm a$. Following Ref. [27], we approximate in the quasistationary limit the full wave equation by the Laplace one for the electrostatic potential ϕ . We take without loss of generality a wave propagating in the x direction, $\phi(x; z) = \exp(ikx)u(z)$, and find $u'' = ku$. Thus $u = A \exp(-kz)$ inside the film and u is exponentially decaying in the two vacua (with $\epsilon = 1$) on the two sides of the film. On the surfaces of the film and $\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial z}$ are continuous. By symmetry, we choose even and odd solutions with respect to $z = 0$, and find the surface plasmons' dispersion relations:

$$\epsilon(\omega) = \frac{\epsilon_p}{2} \frac{1 \pm e^{-kd}}{1 - e^{-kd}}; \quad (11)$$

where the upper/lower sign is for the even/odd modes. In the extreme quasistationary limit, $d \ll \epsilon_p$, we may neglect the polariton effect { the coupling of the above modes with the "light modes" $\omega = ck$. The dispersion of the latter is extremely steep and intersects the $\epsilon(\omega)$ dispersion only at very small values of k .

To obtain the force one needs the derivative with respect to d of the d -dependent total zero-point energy of these plasmons. One may either directly take the derivative with respect to d or first integrate the energies subtracting from each branch an infinite d -independent constant, which is the $k \rightarrow 1$ limit of both dispersion curves:

$$E_0(d) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \hbar \left(\frac{L}{2} \right)^2 \int_0^{\infty} dk \left(\epsilon(\omega) - \frac{\epsilon_p}{2} \right); \quad (12)$$

$$F(d) = - \frac{\partial}{\partial d} E_0(d); \quad (13)$$

In both ways, we find for the pressure (which turns out to be positive) exerted by the vacua on the metallic film, a result resembling the Lifshitz pressure in the non-retarded regime [4, 5]:

$$P(d) = \frac{F(d)}{L^2} = 0.0078 \frac{\hbar \epsilon_p}{d^3}; \quad (14)$$

This pressure is quite substantial and increases markedly with decreasing d . It is on the order of $2 \times 10^{-6} \text{ N/cm}^2$ for a 1 \AA thin film { almost approaching the Fermi pressure scale for atomic thicknesses. The Fermi (including the Coulomb) pressure will eventually stabilize the very thin layer against squeezing by the vacuum pressure. These considerations are clearly relevant for the Physics of very thin films. More work is needed to check their relevance elsewhere.

To summarize, we considered the radiation pressure of bulk zero-point EM modes. The dependence of the force on the dielectric constant of the electromagnetic vacuum leads to a novel type of force in asymmetric situations where the conducting slab has different dielectrics

on its two sides. Options for controlling the sign in the Casimir-type geometry are suggested. Finally, the substantial positive pressure, associated with the surface plasmons, exerted by the electromagnetic vacuum on a thin metallic film was evaluated and discussed.

Acknowledgements

The author thanks M. Aizenman, A. Aharony, T. Emig, O. Entin-Wohlman, U. Gavish, Y. Levinson, S. Rubin, A. Schimmer, A. Stern and Z. Vager, and especially W. Kohn and M. Milgrom, for discussions and comments on the manuscript. This work was supported by a Center of Excellence of the Israel Science Foundation and by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF), within the framework of the German-Israeli Project Cooperation (DIP).

-
- [1] F. London, *Z. Phys.* 63, 245 (1930).
 - [2] H. B. G. Casimir and D. Polder, *Phys. Rev.* 73 (1948) 360.
 - [3] H. B. G. Casimir, *Proc. Kon. Ak. Wet.* 51, 793 (1948).
 - [4] E. M. Lifshitz, *Sov. Phys. JETP* 2, 73 (1956).
 - [5] I. E. Dzyaloshinskii and L. P. Pitaevskii, *Sov. Phys. JETP* 9, 1282 (1959); I. E. Dzyaloshinskii, E. M. Lifshitz and L. P. Pitaevskii, *Sov. Phys. JETP* 10, 161 (1960) and *Adv. Phys.* 10, 165 (1961).
 - [6] R. Balian and B. Duplantier, *Geometry of the Casimir Effect*, quant-ph/0408124.
 - [7] B. V. Deriaguin and I. I. Abrikosova, *Sov. Phys. JETP* 3, 819 (1957); M. J. Spamaay, *Physica XXXIV*, 751 (1957); A. Anderson, S. Haroche, E. A. Hinds, W. Jhe and D. Meschede, *Phys. Rev. A* 37, 3594 (1988); S. K. Lamoreaux, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 78, 5 (1997); Erratum in *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 81, 5475 (1998); U. Mohideen and A. Roy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 81, 4549 (1998); B. W. Harris, F. Chen and U. Mohideen, *Phys. Rev. A* 62, 052109 (2000); G. Bressi, G. Carugno, R. Onofrio and G. Ruoso, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 88, 041804 (2002).
 - [8] S. Reynaud, A. Lambrecht, C. Genet, *The Casimir force between real mirrors at non zero temperature*, quant-ph/0312224.
 - [9] H. B. Chan, V. A. Aksyuk, R. N. Kleiman, D. J. Bishop and F. Capasso, *Science* 291, 1941 (2001); E. Buks and M. L. Roukes, *Europhys. Lett.* 54, 220 (2001).
 - [10] The very existence of the Casimir effect still seems provocative to some. It might be useful to point out that it is not really that different from, for example, including the dependence of the ground state energy of the electrons in a molecule on the nuclear coordinates, in the potential energy of the latter. This follows from the basic principles of quantum mechanics, as long as the Born-Oppenheimer conditions hold, including the fermionic case. An interesting example for a fermionic Casimir effect and its modification by Andreev reflection was recently treated by A. Bulgac, P. Magierski and A. W. Irzba, *cond-mat/0406255*.
 - [11] P. W. Milonni, *The quantum vacuum* (Academic, 1994).
 - [12] V. M. Mostepanenko and N. N. Trunov, *The Casimir effect and its applications* (Clarendon, 1997).
 - [13] M. Bordag, U. Mohideen and V. M. Mostepanenko, *Phys. Rep.* 353, 1 (2001).
 - [14] Y. S. Barash and V. Ginzburg, *Sov. Phys. Usp.* 143, 467 (1984).
 - [15] G. Plunien, B. Müller and W. Greiner, *Phys. Rep.* 134, 87 (1986).
 - [16] K. A. Milton, *The Casimir Effect: Physical Manifestations of Zero-point Energy*, World Scientific, Singapore (2001).
 - [17] H. W. J. Blöte, J. L. Cardy, and M. P. Nightingale, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 56, 742 (1986).
 - [18] P. W. Milonni, R. J. Cook and M. E. Goggin, *Phys. Rev. A* 38, 1621 (1988).
 - [19] On the right-hand side (RHS) of the Casimir geometry this vessel is usually taken to consist of the RHS infinite plate and another parallel infinite plate very far away on the right.
 - [20] This was used in a previous, unpublished, version of this work. The author thanks M. Milgrom for pointing out the error in this method.
 - [21] G. Barton, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* 34, 4083 (2001); R. L. Jaffe hep-th/0307014.
 - [22] For the n 'th photon eigenstate of an infinite square well of size L along the z axis, a momentum $\frac{2\pi n}{L}$ is given to each wall in each period $2L=c$. This is identical, as it should, to (minus) the derivative with respect to L of the energy $\frac{hcn}{L}$.
 - [23] T. H. Boyer, *Phys. Rev.* 174, 1764 (1968).
 - [24] A change of sign, due to different signs of dielectric function differences with the middle layer, has been found in ref. [5] in the asymmetric three-layer situation. It appears to be due to a different physical origin from the change of sign discussed here in the symmetric five-layer situation.
 - [25] This force will lead to a finite displacement of the slab, balanced by the elasticity of the medium. See also [4, 5, 26]. It may be possible to observe the displacement of the slab's position and interfaces by changing the dielectrics.
 - [26] L. P. Pitaevskii, *cond-mat/0505754*.
 - [27] N. G. van Kampen, B. R. A. Nijboer, and K. Schram, *Phys. Lett.* 26A, 307 (1968).
 - [28] E. A. Stern and R. A. Ferrel, *Phys. Rev.* 120, 130 (1960).
 - [29] H. Raether, *Surface Plasmons*, Springer Verlag, Berlin, vol 111 (1988).