# $N93 - Y7319$

1992

# NASMASEE SUMMER FACULTY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

### **MARSHALL SPACE FLIGHT CENTER THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA**

## **THE KAPPA DISTRIBUTION AS A VARIATIONAL SOLUTION FOR AN INFINITE PLASMA**

Prepared **By:**

Academic Rank:

**Institution** and Department:

NASA/MSFC:

**Office:** Division: **Branch:**

MSFC Colleagues:

Michael **J.** Pangia, Ph.D.

*Assistant* Professor

Georgia Southwestern College Department of *Geology* and Physics

**Space Science** Laboratory **Solar-Terrestrial** Physics Magnetospheric Physics

Dennis **L. GaUagher,** Ph.D. Craig J. Pollock, Ph.D. Thomas **E.** Moore, Ph.D.

 $\overline{1}$ 

**The basis for this research is the** 1991 **Summer Faculty Fellowship work by** the **present author. In review,** *Pangia* **[1992] postulated that** the preferred state of a **single component infinite plasma is** the one **that** will change the least when perturbed. The plasma distribution of such a state would maximize the plasma wave **damping rate, or, minimizing** y where negative **y is** the **damping** rate. **This explained** the tendency **for** low **values of g:, when fitting plasma distributions to a** K-distribution, **which is**

$$
\frac{A_{\kappa}}{(1 + \nu^2/(2\kappa \nu_{\kappa}^2))^{\kappa}} \tag{1}
$$

where  $A_x$  and  $v_x$  are the overall normalization factor and thermal speed parameter, respectively. A more compelling question is why a  $\kappa$ -distribution works so well in fitting both electron and ion distributions. *Hasegawa et al.* [1985] derived that the electron distribution subject to a superthermal radiation field is given by [1], but that the ion distribution is Maxwellian for speeds less than the electron thermal speed. It is also desirable to calculate  $\kappa$ , which is not readily doable from the result of *Hasegawa et al.* [1985]. The present study continues from the ideas developed by *Pangia* [1991] to determine what distribution function maximizes the damping rate. A k-distribution will be the outcome for either electrons or ions, with  $\kappa$  tending toward 3/2.

**It is necessary** to **extend** the **work of** the **author** to include the general case of **a** multi-component plasma. For the sake of completeness, this presentation will reproduce also the **arguments** of the previous work. For a 1-dimensional, collisionless plasma with electrostatic field, E(t,x), the Vlasov **and** Maxwell equations are

$$
\frac{\partial f_s}{\partial t} + v \frac{\partial f_s}{\partial x} + \frac{q_s}{m_s} E \frac{\partial f_s}{\partial v} = 0
$$
 [2]

$$
\frac{\partial E}{\partial x} = \sum_{s} 4\pi q_s \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dv f_s
$$
 [3]

$$
\frac{\partial E}{\partial t} = -\sum_{s} 4\pi q_s \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dv \, v \, f_s \tag{4}
$$

where  $f_s(t,x,v)$  is the reduced distribution function for particles of type *s*. In use is the normalization that the number of particles of type s that are between x and x+dx with velocities ranging from v to v+dv is f<sub>s</sub>dx dv. Particles of type s have charge q<sub>s</sub> and mass m<sub>s</sub>.

In the absence of any external field, the steady state solution to the Vlasov-Maxwell equations is  $f_s =$  $F_s(v)$  and  $E = 0$ , where  $F_s$  is any positive function normalized to the number density. One might then infer that, in equilibrium, **a plasma** distribution **is virtually likely** to be anything. **However,** the response **of** the **plasma** to **a** perturbation from equilibrium will greatly depend **on** the function **Fs(v).** Since **plasmas evolve** to equilibrium **under** the influence **of plasma** waves, a particular **steady state** could be **favored over all** the **others** based on its response to **a** perturbation. **In** an **actual plasma,** waves **are usually present,** indicating **some** sort **of** evolution **of** the distribution function. Although equilibrium may never be fully obtained, the plasma should be at least tending toward it. Changes in the background distribution function should diminish as equilibrium is approached. Change can possibly be used as the criterion for identifying the preferred steady state of a plasma, because a steady state that appreciably changes **after** having been **perturbed** is expected to evolve to a different steady state which is more stationary. Therefore, it will be postulated that the plasma will tend toward the steady state which changes the least when perturbed from equilibrium.

**Since** the **steady state** distribution in **a plasma where** external forces **are absent is spatially** uniform, each distribution function will be expressed as a sum of a spatially uniform part,  $f_s(t,v)$ , and the deviation from uniformity,  $f'_{s}(t, x, v)$ , with a similar expression for the electric field

$$
f_{s}(t,x,v) = f_{s}(t,v) + f'_{s}(t,x,v)
$$
\n[5]  
\n
$$
E(t,x) = E(t) + E'(t,x)
$$
\n[6]

The **unif\_n electric** field, E(t), may **be** zero, **but,** in general, it **will exist if a** zero **wave number** mode is part **of** the **perturbation or** if it develops in **time.** A **spatial average over all space will be used to** formally **define the uniform part of any function Y(x); namely,**

$$
\langle Y \rangle_{\mathbf{x}} = \lim_{L \to \infty} \int_{-L}^{L} \frac{dx}{2L} Y(x)
$$

The subscript x on the angular bracket is used to identify it as a spatial average. In regard to [5] and [6],  $f_s(t,v) =$  $\langle f_s(t,x,v) \rangle_x$  and  $E(t) = \langle E(t,x) \rangle_x$ . Taking the spatial average, [2] through [4] become

$$
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} f_s(t,v) + \frac{q_s}{m_s} \frac{\partial}{\partial v} \left\{ E(t) f_s(t,v) + \left\langle E' \right| f_s \right\} = 0
$$
\n(8)

$$
0 = \sum_{s} 4\pi q_s \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dv f_s(t, v)
$$
 [9]

$$
\frac{d}{dt}E(t) = -\sum_{s} 4\pi q_{s} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dv \, v \, f_{s}(t,v) \tag{10}
$$

**Subtracting [8] through [10]** from [2] **through** [4], respectively, gives

 $\mathbf{I}$ 

$$
\frac{\partial f'_s}{\partial t} + v \frac{\partial f'_s}{\partial x} + \frac{q_s}{m_s} \frac{\partial}{\partial v} \left\{ E(t) \, f'_s + E' \, f_s(t, v) + E' \, f'_s \cdot \langle E' \, f'_s \rangle_x \right\} = 0 \tag{11}
$$

$$
\frac{\partial E'}{\partial x} = \sum_{s} 4\pi q_s \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dv \, f'_s \tag{12}
$$

$$
\frac{\partial E'}{\partial t} = -\sum_{s} 4\pi q_{s} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dv \, v \, f'_{s} \tag{13}
$$

Equations **[8] through [13]** are **basically** the **starting equations** for **quasi-linear theory [see** for **example,** Swanson, 1989], **just extended** to include a **uniform electric field.** Derivable from **[8]** through **[13]** are the conservation laws for the **system,** which are written

$$
\frac{d}{dt} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dv f_s(t,v) = 0
$$
 [14]

$$
\frac{d}{dt} \sum_{s} m_s \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dv \, v \, f_s(t, v) = 0 \tag{15}
$$

$$
\frac{d}{dt} \left( \sum_{s} m_{s} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dv \ v^{2} f_{s}(t, v) + \frac{1}{4\pi} E^{2}(t) + \frac{1}{4\pi} \left\langle E^{2} \right\rangle_{x} \right) = 0
$$
\n[16]

Due to **the quadratic non-linearity present in** the Vlasov equation, an **additional** simplifying **assumption will** be **made in order to** derive a **result. Having** perturbed a **system from** equilibrium, it **will** be **assumed that, eventually** in **its evolution,** the **predominant wave modes that** remain **are** k--0 and k **nearly zero, where** k is **the wave** number, **all other** modes having **been** depleted. *This* assumption is **made even** if an instability **exists** for **some** particular **range of** modes. **The** rationale is that **non-linear effects** will **channel** wave **energy** to **other** modes,

most of which damp away. To understand the basic effect of the quadratic non-linearity, consider the spatial dependence of any mode k at some time t. It will have the basic form  $e^{ikx} \pm e^{-ikx}$ . The product of two modes.  $k_1$  and  $k_2$ , will result in modes  $k_1 + k_2$ , and  $k_1 - k_2$ . In particular, if  $k_1 = k_2$ , there will be mode conversion to  $2k_1$  and 0, and if  $k_1$  and  $k_2$  are nearly equal, the nearly zero wave mode will result. If  $k_1$  is unstable, the process **will convert it** to **stable modes. Modes that find** their **way** to **the** instability **will have been damped** beforehand, **amplified during** the **instability,** and, finally, **converted back to stable modes.** Therefore, **all wave activity** will experience some **damping,** either **directly or indirectly, during** some **time in the system's** evolution except **for the k--0 mode. Due** to the **initial perturbation** having **a small** amount **of** total **wave** energy **distributed over all the** modes, **it is** being assumed **that** even an **unstable mode would** be **depleted of its field** intensity **through** the eventual conversion **of all modes** to **k=0.** There **comes a stage** in the **plasma** evolution **when only** the **undamped** mode, **k=0, and the least damped mode, k nearly** zero, have **survived.**

**When** the **plasma** reaches the stage **of predominantly k=0** and **nearly zero wave modes, further amplification of** the **k=0** mode **will** be **negligible, because only** the **nearly** zero **mode, which is decaying, is available** to convert to **k=0. At this point, E(t), which is** the **k=0 mode, is well-approximated** as **an oscillation at** the plasma frequency. From [10],  $f_s(t,v)$  will oscillate with opposite phase to  $E(t)$ . Therefore, on a time average, the effects **of** the **k=0 mode on changing the distribution function will** be **zero. Defining a time average for any function Y(t) by**

$$
\langle Y \rangle_t = \int_t^t \frac{dt'}{T} Y(t')
$$
 (17)

**where T** is the **plasma** period, the time **average of** [8] is

$$
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \langle f_s(t, v) \rangle_t = -\frac{q_s}{m_s} \frac{\partial}{\partial v} \langle E^{\dagger} f_s \rangle_{x, t} \tag{18}
$$

**where** the **combined subscript** x,t on the angular bracket indicates **a** double **average over** space and time.

The **nearly zero** mode, **which** is given by **E'(t,x),** will be in **a** regime **where its** evolution and effects are describable by quasi-linear theory. In the quasi-linear approximation, products of E' and f's **are** retained in [8], but neglected in [11]. In search of the distribution that changes the least, a restriction will be made to distributions that **change only slightly.** Such **a subclass of** distributions can be insured to **exist** by **making** the perturbation small enough. **Specifically, based on [16],** the initial **wave field** must satisfy the condition

$$
E^{2}(t) + \langle E^{2} \rangle_{x} \propto 4\pi \sum_{s} m_{s} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dv \ v^{2} f_{s}(t, v)
$$
 [19]

at t=0. Then  $E(t)$  will be small, and the term  $E(t)$  f'<sub>s</sub> will be negligible in [11], reducing it to

$$
\frac{\partial f's}{\partial t} + v \frac{\partial f's}{\partial x} + \frac{q_s}{m_s} E' \frac{dF_s}{dv} = 0
$$
 (20)

where  $f_s(t, v)$  was replaced by  $F_s(v)$  since it only slightly varies. Equations [12] and [20] are the common linearized equations for electrostatic waves. The solution is that, for a stable mode of wave number k, E' oscillates with frequency  $\omega$  and exponential decays with damping rate M (negative  $\gamma$  corresponds to damping) given by [Nicholson, 1983]

$$
\varepsilon(\omega + i\gamma, k) = 1 - \sum_{s} 4\pi q_s^2 / (k^2 m_s) \int_C dv \frac{dF_s dv}{v - \frac{\omega + i\gamma}{k}} = 0
$$
 [21]

**where the integration is** in **the complex v-plane along** the **Landau** contour, **and** ¢ **is the dielectric function. With** E' exponentially decaying at a damping of  $\mathcal{M}$ , [18] says that, on the average, the change in  $f_s(t,v)$  decays at least **as fast.** Consequently, **the distribution that changes** the **least will be** the **one that damps** the **nearly zero wave** mode the most. From [21], one seeks the  $F_s$  that maximizes  $M$ , or minimizes  $\gamma$ . Mathematically, the problem at hand is under the classification of Calculus of Variations, where  $F_s$  is varied slightly and a minimum in  $\gamma$  is **sought.**

**The functions about which one varies have to be physical. To insure** this, **constraints must be** imposed. The conservation **laws, [14] through [16], require that**

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dv \ F_s = n_s ; \ \sum_{s} m_s \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dv \ v \ F_s = n \ P ; \ \sum_{s} m_s \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dv \ v^2 \ F_s = n \ T
$$
 [22]

**where, ns, n, P,** and **T are,** respectively, the **number density of particle type s,** the total **number** density **of** all **particle types,** the total **plasma momentum,** and **the** total **plasma** temperature,all **of which are constants.** The **existence** of these velocity moments imply that the high speed dependence of  $F_s$  must be less than  $1/|v|^3$ . This puts a limit on damping rate, because, for small k,  $\gamma$  is proportional to the dFs/dv evaluated at high velocity **co/k [Nicholson, 1983].** Therefore, the **damping is maximized for the function** that **has the steepest descending** slope, which is when the high speed dependence of  $F_s$  tends to  $1/\nu\beta$ . In regard to [1],  $\kappa$  tending to 3/2 would **maximize damping.**

To **find** the **function for** all **velocity, additional** constraints **must** be **imposed** to **keep Fs physical. One** condition is that  $F_s$  must be positive. Another condition arises from the fact that each distribution function  $F_s$ will consist of a definite number of plasma components,  $\Lambda_s$ , which is determined by the origin of the plasma. **Therefore, it is a fixed property of** the **system. Defining Fs,c** as the distribution **function for component c of particle type s,** the total distribution **for particle type s is**

$$
F_s = \sum_{c=1}^{\Lambda_s} F_{s,c}
$$
 [23]

The **number** of components,  $\Lambda_s$ , is determined by counting the humps in  $F_s$ . By constraining  $F_{s,c}$  to be positive **with only one** hump, **Fs is** insured to **be physical.** This **is done by maximizing** the **following integral**

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dv \, (F_{s,c})^r
$$
 [24]

where the exponent  $r$  has to be determined, where  $r \neq 1$ , so that maximizing [24] is independent from the first equation in [22]. The problem is now well defined, whereby  $\gamma$  is minimized in [21] subject to the constraints in [22] while maximizing [24]. *A* solution for arbitrary and small **variations** in Fs,c only exists if k approaches zero. The answer is that each component is given by a  $\kappa$ -distribution with appropriate flow speed, where  $\kappa = 1/(1-\kappa)$ r) with  $3/2 < \kappa < \infty$ , and  $\kappa$  tending to  $3/2$  gives the absolute minimum in  $\gamma$ .

#### References

Hasegawa, *A.,* K. Mima, and M. Duong-van, "Plasma distribution function in a superthermal radiation **field,"** *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **54,** 2608, 1985.

Nicholson, D. R., *Introduction to Plasma Theory,* John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1983.

Pangia, M. J., **"A** theoretical study of the steady state of a space plasma, "1991 NASA/ASEE Summer Faculty Fellowship Program, N92-15850, 1991.

Swanson, *D.* G., *Plasma Waves,* Academic Press Inc., London, 1989.