

# M E C H A N I C A L E F F E C T S O F R A D I A T I O N P R E S S U R E Q U A N T U M F L U C T U A T I O N S

M arc-Thierry Jaekely and Serge Reynaudz

yLaboratoire de Physique Theorique de l'Ecole Norm ale Superieure<sup>1</sup> (CNRS),  
24 rue Lhom ond, F 75231 Paris Cedex 05, France

zLaboratoire Kastler-Brossel<sup>2</sup> (UPM C-ENS-CNRS), case 74,  
4 place Jussieu, F 75252 Paris Cedex 05, France

## A b s t r a c t

A s revealed by space-time probing, mechanics and eld theory  
com e out as complementary descriptions for motions in space-time.  
In particular, quantum elds exert a radiation pressure on scatter-  
ers which results in mechanical effects that persist in vacuum . They  
include mean forces due to quantum eld uctuations, like Casim ir  
forces, but also uctuations of these forces and additional forces linked  
to motion. A s in classical electron theory, a moving scatterer is sub-  
m itted to a radiation reaction force which modi es its motional re-  
sponse to an applied force. W e brie y survey the mechanical effects of  
quantum eld uctuations and discuss the consequences for stability  
of motion in vacuum and for position uctuations.

P A C S num bers: 12.20.Ds 03.70 42.50.Lc

LPTENS 95/5

M ay 1995

P roceedings of NATO -A S I C onference "E lectron Theory and Q uantum  
E lectrodynam ics - 100 years later", September 5-16, 1994, Edime, Turkey.

---

<sup>1</sup>Unite propre du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique,  
associee a l'Ecole Norm ale Superieure et a l'Universite de Paris Sud.

<sup>2</sup>Unite de l'Ecole Norm ale Superieure et de l'Universite Pierre et Marie Curie,  
associee au Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

## 1 Introduction

Lorentz electron theory [1] was an early unification of fields and particles, in that case electromagnetic fields and charged particles, in a common and universal description. This framework played a determinant role in a consistent development of classical field theory and relativistic mechanics [2]. This close connection was deeply perturbed by the advent of quantum formalisms, which ultimately emphasize the primary role of quantum fields. Within the framework of quantum electrodynamics, mechanical effects on charged particles, although obtainable in principle, are usually derived with difficulties [3].

When taking into account physical limits in space-time probing, field theory and mechanics emerge as complementary representations in space-time. Fields are measured by their mechanical effects on test particles, while particle positions are measured through probe fields. Space-time measurements are determined by energy-momentum exchanges between fields and particles. In the same way as radiation of test particles affects field measurements, mechanical effects of the probe field radiation pressure affect position measurements, and hence the determination of motions in space-time.

Quantum fluctuations impose ultimate limitations which affect both particle positions and field values in space-time [4]. As a consequence of Heisenberg inequalities, oscillators have fluctuations which subsist in their ground states. Quantum field fluctuations persist in vacuum, and those vacuum fluctuations result in fundamental limitations on the determination not only of fields, but also of positions and motions in space-time [5]. The presence of ultimate quantum fluctuations must then be taken into account in a consistent development of mechanics.

Macroscopic objects feel the effects of quantum field fluctuations, even in vacuum. A well-known example is that of Casimir forces between macroscopic conductors or dielectrics [6]. Casimir forces can be seen as a mechanical signature of the radiation pressure of quantum field fluctuations. But radiation pressure itself presents quantum fluctuations, which result in further mechanical effects. When moving in a fluctuating environment, a scatterer radiates and experiences a radiation reaction force [7]. There results a typical quantum Brownian motion which is determined by radiation pressure fluctuations and which persists in vacuum. We shall here briefly survey these effects, and also discuss the fundamental consequences for stability of motion in vacuum and for ultimate fluctuations of position.

## 2 Radiation pressure of quantum field fluctuations

Receptors which are immersed in a fluctuating field, like conductors or dielectrics in a fluctuating electromagnetic field for instance, feel the effects of field fluctuations. Even at the limit of zero temperature, i.e. in a field

which does not contain any photon, that is in the vacuum state, effects of quantum field fluctuations persist. Vacuum fluctuations are responsible for a mean force, the so-called Casimir force, between reflectors. Two plane infinite perfect mirrors in the electromagnetic vacuum are submitted to a mean attractive pressure (force per unit area), which decreases like the fourth power of the mirrors' distance  $q$  ( $h$  is Planck constant,  $A$  the area, light velocity is equal to 1):

$$F_c = \frac{h^2}{240 q^4} A \quad (1)$$

Although very weak, Casimir forces between macroscopic plates have effectively been observed [6]. As a useful simple illustration, we shall also discuss in the following the similar system made of two perfect mirrors in two-dimensional space-time, in the vacuum of a scalar field. In that case, the mean force decreases like the second power of the mirrors' distance:

$$F_c = \frac{h}{24 q^2} \quad (2)$$

For perfect mirrors, the mean Casimir force can easily be derived, using the following simple argument [6]. The field can be considered as a set of free oscillators in each of the space domains delimited by the mirrors. Each of these oscillators possesses (zero-point) quantum fluctuations in its ground state, with a corresponding energy of  $\frac{1}{2}h\nu$  ( $\nu$  the oscillator's frequency). The mirrors play the role of boundary conditions for the field, modifying the spectrum of mode frequencies allowed in the cavity they form. The total zero-point energy of the field ( $\sum_n \frac{1}{2}h\nu_n$ ) varies with the mirrors' distance, and results in the mean force (1) between the mirrors. Although it clearly exhibits the role of vacuum field fluctuations, this simple interpretation in terms of vacuum energy leads to problems. Because of its high frequency dependence, the mode spectrum results in a total zero-point energy which is infinite, or which at least corresponds to a high energy density that induces problematic gravitational and cosmological consequences [8]. On another hand, when comparing different physical situations, variations of vacuum energy (with the distance for instance) produce finite and observable effects. Moreover, realistic mirrors must clearly be transparent to sufficiently high field frequencies, whose fluctuations should then have no incidence on the effect.

An alternate and more consistent derivation of Casimir forces uses a local description in terms of the radiation pressure exerted by field fluctuations on the mirrors [9]. We briefly recall this derivation in the case of the simple model of mirrors in two-dimensional space-time ( $(x)_{x=0,1} = (t; x)$ ) (2). Each mirror determines two regions of space where the scalar field can be decomposed on two components which propagate freely (Figure 1):

$$(t; x) = \phi(t - x) + \psi(t + x)$$

A perfect mirror corresponds to a boundary condition for the field, saying that the field vanishes at the mirror's position in space ( $q$ ):

$$\psi_{\text{out}}(t+q) = \psi_{\text{in}}(t+q) \quad \psi_{\text{out}}(t-q) = -\psi_{\text{in}}(t-q) \quad (3)$$

From now on, we shall use the following notation for Fourier transforms:

$$f(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} e^{i\omega t} f[\omega]$$

In a more realistic model, the mirror partially reflects and transmits both components of the field and is described by a scattering matrix [10]:

Figure 1

$$\begin{pmatrix} \psi_{\text{out}}[\omega] \\ \psi_{\text{out}}[\omega] \end{pmatrix} = S[\omega] \begin{pmatrix} \psi_{\text{in}}[\omega] \\ \psi_{\text{in}}[\omega] \end{pmatrix} \quad S[\omega] = \begin{pmatrix} s[\omega] & r[\omega] e^{2i\omega q} \\ r[\omega] e^{2i\omega q} & s[\omega] \end{pmatrix} \quad (4)$$

The mirror is assumed to be very heavy when compared with the field energy, so that under reflection momentum is transferred to the field while its energy is preserved (the mirror's recoil is neglected).  $s$  and  $r$  are frequency dependent transmission and reflection amplitudes, and must obey the general analyticity and unitarity conditions of scattering matrices which correspond to causality of field scattering and conservation of probabilities. In addition, we shall assume high frequency transparency, i.e. that reflection coefficients vanish sufficiently rapidly when frequency goes to infinity.

Two mirrors form a Fabry-Perot cavity which divides space into three domains where the field propagates freely (Figure 2).

Figure 2

All fields are determined by input fields and the mirrors' scattering matrices. On each side of each mirror, the radiation pressure exerted by the field is provided by the field stress tensor ( $T$ ):

$$\begin{aligned} T^{00} &= T^{11} = \frac{1}{2} (\partial_t^2 + \partial_x^2) \\ T^{01} &= T^{10} = \partial_t \partial_x \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

The force is given by the flux of stress tensor component  $T^{11}$  through the mirrors (difference between left and right sides; a dot stands for time derivative):

$$\begin{aligned} F_1 &= f'_{\text{in}}(t - q_1)^2 + \dot{\gamma}_{\text{out}}(t + q_1)^2 g - f'_{\text{cav}}(t - q_1)^2 + \dot{\gamma}_{\text{cav}}(t + q_1)^2 g \\ F_2 &= f'_{\text{cav}}(t - q_2)^2 + \dot{\gamma}_{\text{cav}}(t + q_2)^2 g - f'_{\text{out}}(t - q_2)^2 + \dot{\gamma}_{\text{in}}(t + q_2)^2 g \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

$\langle F_1 \rangle = \langle F_2 \rangle = F_c$  is the mean radiation pressure, or Casimir force, felt by the mirrors [10].

In vacuum state, the two input field components are uncorrelated and have identical auto-correlations:

$$\langle f'_{\text{in}}[\omega] f'_{\text{in}}[\omega'] \rangle = \langle \dot{\gamma}_{\text{in}}[\omega] \dot{\gamma}_{\text{in}}[\omega'] \rangle = \frac{2}{\omega^2} (\omega + \omega') \left( \frac{1}{2} \hbar \omega \right) \quad (7)$$

( $\theta$  is Heaviside's step function). Although the corresponding vacuum mean energy density is infinite (the spectral energy density increases linearly with frequency), the mean forces exerted on the mirrors (6) are finite, as the reflection coefficients of the mirrors ( $r_1$  and  $r_2$ ) satisfy high frequency transparency ( $q = q_2 - q_1$ ):

$$\begin{aligned} F_c &= \int_0^\infty \frac{d\omega}{2} \hbar \omega f_1(\omega) g(\omega) \\ g(\omega) &= \frac{1}{j_1 - r_1} \frac{j_1^2}{e^{2i\omega q}} \quad r[\omega] = r_1[\omega] r_2[\omega] \end{aligned}$$

$g$  describes the field spectral energy density inside the cavity. At the limit of perfect mirrors ( $r = 1$ ),  $g$  becomes a sum of delta functions at frequencies equal to the modes of the cavity ( $n \frac{\pi}{q}$ ) and the Casimir force between the two mirrors identifies with (2).

### 3 Quantum fluctuations of radiation pressure

The radiation pressure exerted on a scatterer is related to the field stress tensor, so that it is a function of fields (in general a quadratic form, see (5) for instance). Consequently, quantum fluctuations of fields also induce quantum fluctuations of stress tensors and radiation pressures. The fluctuations of Casimir forces exerted on mirrors, due to quantum fluctuations of electromagnetic fields, have recently been studied [11]. We shall just discuss some general properties of stress tensor and radiation pressure fluctuations in vacuum.

Electromagnetic fields  $F$  and stress tensor components  $T$  can be derived from electromagnetic potentials  $A$  ( $F = \partial A - \partial A$ , is Minkowski metric  $\text{diag}(1; -1; -1; -1)$ ):

$$T = F F - \frac{1}{4} F F$$

Vacuum correlations of electromagnetic potentials are determined from propagation equations (in Feynman gauge):

$$\langle A_\mu(\mathbf{x}) A_\nu(0) \rangle = \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} e^{ik \cdot x} C_{A_\mu A_\nu}[\mathbf{k}]$$

$$C_{A_\mu A_\nu}[\mathbf{k}] = 2 \hbar (k_0)^{-1} (k^2)^{-1}$$

These expressions exhibit translation and Lorentz invariances, and a spectrum limited to light-like momenta with positive frequencies (as vacuum is the state of minimum energy, transitions only have positive frequencies). In vacuum, correlations of stress tensors are determined from field correlations using Wick's rules:

$$\langle T_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{x}) T_{\alpha\beta}(0) \rangle = \langle T_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{x}) \rangle \langle T_{\alpha\beta}(0) \rangle + \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} e^{ik \cdot x} C_{T_{\mu\nu} T_{\alpha\beta}}[\mathbf{k}]$$

$$C_{T_{\mu\nu} T_{\alpha\beta}}[\mathbf{k}] = \frac{\hbar^2}{40} (k_0)^{-1} (k^2)^{-1} (k^2)^2$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \left( \delta_{\mu\alpha} \delta_{\nu\beta} + \delta_{\mu\beta} \delta_{\nu\alpha} - \delta_{\mu\nu} \delta_{\alpha\beta} \right) \frac{1}{3}$$

$$= \frac{k_\mu k_\nu k_\alpha k_\beta}{k^2}$$

Stress tensor correlations are gauge independent and are in fact completely determined, up to a numerical factor, by general symmetries that are satisfied by correlation functions in vacuum. Translation and Lorentz invariances imply that correlations in momentum domain are tensors built from  $k$  and  $\delta$  only. Correlations of stress tensors  $T_{\mu\nu}$  and  $T_{\alpha\beta}$  decompose on tensors which are symmetric in indices  $(\mu, \nu)$ ,  $(\alpha, \beta)$  and exchange of these pairs, and which are transverse because of energy-momentum conservation ( $\partial_\mu T^{\mu\nu} = 0$ ). As Maxwell stress tensor is moreover traceless, this leaves only one such tensor. In momentum domain, stress tensor correlations are obtained as convolutions of field correlation functions in vacuum, so that they only contain time-like momenta (given by adding two light-like momenta of positive frequencies), and thus a factor  $(k_0)^{-1} (k^2)^{-1}$ . Quite generally, as discussed at the end of this section, such factor can also be seen as a consequence of fluctuation-dissipation relations characteristic of vacuum, and of Lorentz invariance. By dimensionality, these correlations are proportional to  $(k^2)^2$ . Explicit computation provides the remaining numerical factor.

When seen as a boundary condition for the field, a perfect mirror determines a relation between outgoing and incoming fields, which allows one to derive the fluctuations of radiation pressure exerted on the mirror from those of incoming fields. Explicit computations have been performed for mirrors of different shapes [11, 12].

We shall briefly discuss the model of partially transmitting mirror in two-dimensional space-time. The force exerted on the mirror is given by the difference of field energy densities between the two sides of the mirror (6). For a single mirror and vacuum input fields, its mean value vanishes. However, the radiation pressures exerted on both sides of the mirror have independent fluctuations, and the resulting force still fluctuates. Force fluctuations on a mirror at rest are stationary and determined by the mirror's scattering matrix (4) and input field correlations (7) [13]:

$$\langle F(t)F(t^0) \rangle = C_{FF}(t - t^0)$$

$$C_{FF}[\omega] = 2\hbar^2 \int_0^{\omega} \frac{d\omega'}{2} \omega' (\omega - \omega') \text{Re} f_{11}[\omega'] s[\omega'] s[\omega - \omega'] + r[\omega'] r[\omega - \omega'] g \quad (8)$$

Force correlations are positive and always finite. They vanish as  $\omega^3$  around zero frequency (energy-momentum is conserved in vacuum). In particular for a perfect mirror, they are directly related to correlations of momentum densities of incoming free fields (see (3)):

$$C_{FF}[\omega] = \frac{\hbar^2}{3} (\omega)^3 \quad (9)$$

Correlation spectra in vacuum contain positive frequencies only. Force correlations can similarly be derived for thermal fields. In thermal equilibrium, a fluctuation-dissipation relation relates commutators and anticommutators [14]:

$$2\hbar_{FF}(t) = \langle [F(t); F(0)] \rangle$$

$$2\hbar_{FF}(t) = \langle fF(t); F(0)g \rangle$$

$$2\hbar_{FF}[\omega] = (1 - e^{-\frac{\hbar\omega}{T}}) C_{FF}[\omega] \quad (10)$$

$$\hbar_{FF}[\omega] = \coth \frac{\hbar\omega}{2T} \hbar_{FF}[\omega]$$

( $T$  is the temperature). This fluctuation-dissipation relation, which was first studied for Nyquist noise in electric circuits [15], allows to determine fluctuations in a state of thermal equilibrium from the commutator only. As discussed in next section, the commutator also identifies with the dissipative part of the linear response of the system to an external perturbation [14]. At the limit of zero temperature, that is in vacuum, the fluctuation-dissipation relation leads to a fluctuation spectrum which is limited to positive frequencies:

$$C_{FF}[\omega] = 2\hbar [\omega]_{FF}[\omega] \quad (11)$$

The factor  $[\omega]$  explicitly shows that correlations (8) are not symmetric under exchange of time arguments and thus exhibits the non-commutative character (i.e. the quantum nature) of fluctuations in vacuum.

#### 4 Radiation reaction force

As first discussed by Einstein, a scatterer immersed in a fluctuating field undergoes a Brownian motion [7]. The fluctuating force exerted by the field leads to a diffusion process for the scatterer's momentum  $P$ , which spreads in time according to:

$$\langle P^2 \rangle = 2D t$$

The momentum distribution being constant at thermal equilibrium, the effect of the fluctuating force must be exactly compensated by the effect of a further cumulative force which appears when the scatterer moves (with velocity  $q$ ):

$$\langle F \rangle = -\gamma q$$

This implies a relation between the momentum diffusion coefficient  $D$  which characterises force fluctuations and the friction coefficient  $\gamma$  which characterises the mean dissipative force:

$$D = T \gamma \quad (12)$$

( $T$  is the temperature). In the general quantum case, when small displacements of the scatterer are considered, a relation still holds between force fluctuations exerted on the scatterer at rest and the mean dissipative force exerted on the moving scatterer, i.e. the imaginary part of the force susceptibility  $\chi_{FF}$ :

$$\langle F[\omega] \rangle = -\chi_{FF}[\omega] q[\omega] \quad (13)$$

Indeed, according to linear response theory [14], the susceptibility of a quantity under a perturbation is related to the correlations, in the unperturbed state, of this quantity with the generator of the perturbation. More precisely, fluctuation-dissipation relations identify the imaginary (or dissipative) part of the susceptibility of a quantity with its commutator with the generator of the perturbation. In the case of displacements, the generator is given by the force itself:

$$\text{Im } \chi_{FF}[\omega] = \frac{1}{2} \langle [F, F^\dagger] \rangle \quad (14)$$

In a thermal state, according to fluctuation-dissipation relations (10) and (14), force fluctuations are connected with the mean motional force:

$$2\text{Im } \chi_{FF}[\omega] = \frac{1}{\hbar} (1 - e^{-\frac{\hbar\omega}{T}}) C_{FF}[\omega]$$

At the limit of high temperature, Einstein's relation is recovered (see 12):

$$2\text{Im } \chi_{FF}[\omega] = \frac{1}{T} C_{FF}[\omega]$$

At the limit of zero temperature, force fluctuations subsist on a scatterer at rest and imply that, when moving in vacuum, a scatterer is submitted to a



dissipative force. The motional susceptibility of the force is then determined by force correlations in vacuum (8) and fluctuation-dissipation relation (14). For a perfect mirror, at first order in the mirror's displacement, the mean dissipative force is proportional to the third time derivative (see (9)):

$$\langle F(t) \rangle = \frac{\hbar}{6} \dddot{q}(t) \quad (15)$$

More recently, effects of moving boundaries on quantum fields have been discussed to study the influence of classical constraints on quantum fields, and in particular as an analogy for quantum fields in a classical curved space [16]. A perfect mirror moving in vacuum has been shown to radiate and hence to undergo a radiation reaction force. In two-dimensional space-time, and for scalar fields in vacuum, the radiation reaction force is proportional to the two-dimensional version of Abraham vector [17], and identifies with (15) in linearised and non relativistic limits. The radiation reaction force for partially transmitting mirrors can also be obtained following this approach. A moving mirror induces a motional modification of the field scattering matrix (4). Using a coordinate transformation to the mirror's proper frame, the modification of the scattering matrix is easily obtained up to first order in the mirror's displacement [13]:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \phi_{\text{out}} \\ \phi_{\text{out}}' \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_{\text{in}} \\ \phi_{\text{in}}' \end{pmatrix} \quad (16)$$

For general motions of the mirror, vacuum incoming fields are transformed into outgoing fields whose correlations do not correspond to vacuum. Then, energy-momentum is radiated by the moving mirror. As the mean stress tensor of outgoing fields differs from that of incoming fields, the radiation pressure exerted by scattered fields does not vanish and the mirror is submitted to a radiation reaction force (13). The radiation pressure exerted by scattered fields (see (6)) can be obtained using the modified scattering matrix (16) [13]:

$$T_{FF} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left( \dot{\phi}^2 + \dot{\phi}'^2 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left( \phi^2 + \phi'^2 \right) \quad (17)$$

As expected, this expression and (8) satisfy fluctuation-dissipation relation (14). As a consequence of Lorentz invariance of vacuum, the radiation reaction force vanishes for uniform motion; expression (17) leads to (15) for a perfect mirror and also vanishes for uniformly accelerated motion:

$$T_{FF}^0 = T_{FF}^\infty = 0$$

The radiation reaction force felt by a plane perfect mirror in four-dimensional space-time has been obtained for motions in scalar field [18] and in electromagnetic [19] vacua. Direct comparison between radiation pressure fluctuations and the dissipative force shows that fluctuation-dissipation relations are satisfied in these cases.

## 5 Stability of motion and position fluctuations in vacuum

It is well-known from classical electron theory [20], that a radiation reaction force proportional to Abraham-Lorentz vector (15) leads to motions which are either unstable (the so-called "runaway solutions") or violate causality. Perfect mirrors, and in particular mirrors treated as field boundaries, have motions in vacuum which are affected by the same stability and causality problems. However, as we briefly show in the following, partially transmitting mirrors can avoid these difficulties [21].

When a scatterer is submitted to an applied external force  $F(t)$ , its motion is determined by an equation which also takes into account the force induced by motion (13). It will be sufficient for our purpose to consider small displacements only, so that the equation of motion reads (we generally consider a mirror of mass  $m_0$ , bound with a proper frequency  $\omega_0$ ; a free mirror is recovered for  $\omega_0 = 0$ ):

$$m_0(q(t) + \omega_0^2 q(t)) = F(t) + \int_{-\infty}^t dt' \chi_{FF}(t-t')q(t') \quad (18)$$

The motional response is best characterised in the frequency domain, by a mechanical impedance  $Z[\omega]$  which relates the resulting velocity to the applied force:

$$i\omega Z[\omega]q[\omega] = F[\omega] \quad Z[\omega] = im_0\omega + i\frac{m_0\omega_0^2}{\omega} + \frac{\chi_{FF}[\omega]}{i\omega} \quad (19)$$

From analytic properties of the scattering matrix (4), it is easily derived that  $\chi_{FF}$  is also analytic in the upper half plane ( $\text{Im}(\omega) > 0$ ), showing that the induced force is a causal function of the scatterer's motion. The mechanical impedance of a perfect mirror is obtained from (15):

$$Z[\omega] = im_0\omega + i\frac{m_0\omega_0^2}{\omega} + \frac{\hbar}{6}\omega^2 \quad (20)$$

As easily seen, the mechanical admittance ( $Y[\omega] = Z[\omega]^{-1}$ ) is no longer analytic but has a pole in the upper half plane. Such a pole corresponds to unstable motions, i.e. "runaway solutions" in the free mirror case. If supplementary boundary conditions are imposed (at large time for instance) to exclude such solutions, then the resulting motions violate the causal dependence on the applied force.

A partially transmitting mirror is characterised by a force susceptibility of the general form :

$$\chi_{FF}[\omega] = i\frac{\hbar}{6}\omega^3 + [\omega]$$

High frequency transparency and analyticity lead to a better behaviour of the susceptibility [21]:

$$[\omega] \sim i\frac{\omega_c}{\omega} \quad \text{for } \omega \gg \omega_c$$

where  $\omega_c$  defines a high frequency cut-off. Characteristic relations in vacuum derived from (11) and (14) furthermore imply:

$$\text{Im} \left( \frac{\chi_{FF}(\omega)}{\omega} \right) \geq 0 \quad \text{for} \quad \text{Im}(\omega) \geq 0 \quad (21)$$

This property means that the force susceptibility is related to a positive function [22]. The mechanical impedance defined by (19) corresponds to a positive function as long as its pole at infinity satisfies:

$$m_1 = m_0 - \frac{\hbar \omega_c}{6} \geq 0 \quad (22)$$

The inverse of a positive function is still a positive function, and furthermore causality follows from positivity [22]. When inequality (22) is satisfied, the mechanical admittance is also a causal function, and no "runaway solutions" can appear (see (19)).  $m_0$  and  $m_1$  can be seen as describing a low and a high frequency mass for the mirror, their difference being a mass correction induced by the field interacting with the mirror. Stability in vacuum is insured as long as the free mass of the mirror  $m_1$  is positive, or else as long as the quasistatic mass of the mirror  $m_0$  is larger than the induced mass. Realistic mirrors certainly satisfy this condition, contrarily to perfect mirrors. This discussion also shows the incompatibility between stability in vacuum and mass renormalisation, since  $m_1$  is infinitely negative in that case (see [23] for a similar discussion for electrons).

While motion of the mirror modifies the scattered field, the radiation pressure exerted by the field also perturbs the mirror's motion. Equations of the coupled system, mirror and vacuum field radiation pressure, when treated linearly, can be solved to obtain fluctuations for the interacting system in terms of input fluctuations only [24]. In particular, equation (18) provides the mirror's position fluctuations in terms of input force fluctuations. As a consequence of consistency relations satisfied by linear response formalism, position fluctuations of the mirror coupled to vacuum fields also satisfy fluctuation-dissipation relations, which relate the position commutator to the dissipative part of the mechanical admittance (the mirror's response to an applied force):

$$\begin{aligned} Y(\omega) &= \frac{i\omega}{m_0(\omega_0^2 - \omega^2) - \chi_{FF}(\omega)} \\ C_{qq}(\omega) &= \text{Re} Y(\omega) \hbar \omega \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Fluctuations of the coupled system also satisfy the relations characteristic of vacuum :

$$C_{qq}(\omega) = 2\hbar \omega \text{Im} Y(\omega)$$

The mechanical admittance completely determines position fluctuations in vacuum. As shown by expression (23), position fluctuations consist of two

main parts. One part corresponds to a resonance peak at the oscillator's proper frequency  $\omega_0$ . These fluctuations subsist at the limit of decoupling between mirror and field and can be seen as proper position fluctuations of the mirror; they identify with the fluctuations associated with Schrodinger equation for a free oscillator. The other part is a background noise spreading over all frequencies. These are position fluctuations induced by the fluctuating radiation pressure of vacuum fields and are dominant outside resonance peaks; they describe ultimate position fluctuations and correspond to a quantum limit on the sensitivity of an optimal position measurement performed at such frequencies [5, 24].

## 6 Conclusion

Quantum field fluctuations in vacuum exert a fluctuating radiation pressure on scatterers. In agreement with fluctuation-dissipation relations, a scatterer moving in vacuum experiences an additional force depending on its motion. Like in classical electron theory, it generally modifies the scatterer's motional response to an applied force. For realistic mirrors, which are transparent to high frequencies, motions can be shown to remain stable and causal in vacuum, a property which is violated by mass renormalisation.

The quantum Brownian motion induced on the mirror's position by its coupling to vacuum field radiation pressure can be described consistently within linear response formalism. Position fluctuations are determined from the mechanical susceptibility of the mirror through fluctuation-dissipation relations. Vacuum field fluctuations then lead to ultimate quantum fluctuations for positions in space-time.

## References

- [1] H.A. Lorentz, "The Theory of Electrons" (Leipzig, 1915) [reprinted by Dover, New York, 1952]
- [2] A. Einstein, Ann. Physik 18 (1905) 639, (1906) 627; Jahrb. Radioakt. Elektron. 4 (1907) 411; 5 (1908) 98 [translated in English and commented by H.M. Schwartz, Am. J. Phys. 45 (1977) 512, 811, 899].
- [3] H. Grotch and E. Kazes, in "Foundations of Radiation Theory and QED", A.O. Barut ed. (Plenum Press, New York, 1980).
- [4] N. Bohr and L. Rosenfeld, Phys. Rev. 78 (1950) 794.
- [5] V.B. Braginsky and F.Ya. Khalili, "Quantum Measurement" (Cambridge, 1992);  
M.T. Jaekel and S. Reynaud, Europhys. Lett. 13 (1990) 301; Phys. Lett. A 185 (1994) 143.

- [6] H.B.G. Casimir, *Proc. K. Ned. Akad. Wet.* 51 (1948) 793;  
G. Plunien, B. Muller and W. Greiner, *Phys. Rep.* 134 (1986) 87.
- [7] A. Einstein, *Ann. Physik* 17 (1905) 549; *Phys. Z.* 10 (1909) 185, 18 (1917) 121.
- [8] P.S. Wesson, *Astrophys. J.* 378 (1991) 466.
- [9] L.S. Brown and G.J. MacLay, *Phys. Rev.* 184 (1969) 1272.
- [10] M.T. Jaekel and S. Reynaud, *J. Phys. I France* 1 (1991) 1395.
- [11] G. Barton, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* 24 (1991) 991, 5533; in "Cavity Quantum Electrodynamics" (Supplement: Advances in Atomic, Molecular and Optical Physics) P. Bernan ed. (Academic Press, 1994).
- [12] C. Eberlein, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* 25 (1992) 3015, 3039.
- [13] M.T. Jaekel and S. Reynaud, *Quantum Optics* 4 (1992) 39.
- [14] R. Kubo, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* 29 (1966) 255.  
L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifschitz, *Cours de Physique Theorique, Physique Statistique, premiere partie* (Mir, Moscou, 1984) ch. 12.
- [15] H.B. Callen and T.A. Welton, *Phys. Rev.* 83 (1951) 34.
- [16] B.S. de Witt, *Phys. Rep.* 19 (1975) 295.  
N.D. Birrell and P.C.W. Davies, "Quantum Fields in Curved Space" (Cambridge, 1982);  
S.A. Fulling, "Aspects of Quantum Field Theory in Curved Spacetime" (Cambridge, 1989).
- [17] S.A. Fulling and P.C.W. Davies, *Proc. R. Soc. A* 348 (1976) 393.
- [18] L.H. Ford and A.Vilenkin, *Phys. Rev. D* 25 (1982) 2569.
- [19] P.A. Maia Neto, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* 27 (1994) 2167.
- [20] F. Rohrlich, "Classical Charged Particles" (Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1965).
- [21] M.T. Jaekel and S. Reynaud, *Phys. Lett. A* 167 (1992) 227.
- [22] J. Meixner, in "Statistical Mechanics of Equilibrium and Non-Equilibrium" J. Meixner ed. (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1965).
- [23] H. Dekker, *Phys. Lett.* 107 A (1985) 255.  
*Physica* 133 A (1985) 1.
- [24] M.T. Jaekel and S. Reynaud, *J. Phys. I France* 3 (1993) 1.