

Table of contents

- Abstract ———1
- 1. Introduction———2
- 2. Observed properties of galactic magnetic fields –4
- 3. Summary of our present understanding of cosmic magnetic field origins———9
- 4. Basic equations for magnetic field evolution –12
- 5. Cowling’s theorem and Parker’s dynamo –15
- 6. The alpha-Omega disc dynamo —18
- 7. The magnitudes of α and β in the interstellar medium —23
- 8. Ferrière’s dynamo theory based on supernova and superbubble explosions—26
- 9. The validity of the vacuum boundary conditions – 34
- 10. Arguments against a primordial origin –37
- 11. Seed fields —-41
- 12 A protogalactic theory for magnetic field generation — 45
- 13. Generation of small scale magnetic fields by turbulence —48
- 14. The saturation of the small scale magnetic fields ——54
- 15. History of the evolution of a primordial magnetic field ——58
- 16. Extragalactic magnetic fields –66
- 17. Summary and conclusions –67
- 18. Publications — 70

On the Origin of Cosmic Magnetic Fields
Russell M. Kulsrud and Ellen G. Zweibel
Princeton University and the University of
Wisconsin-Madison

Abstract

We review the extensive and controversial literature concerning how the cosmic magnetic fields pervading nearly all galaxies and clusters of galaxies actually got started. Some observational evidence supports a hypothesis that the field is already moderately strong at the beginning of the life of a galaxy and its disc. One argument involves the chemical abundance of the light elements Be and B, while a second one is based on the detection of strong magnetic fields in very young high-red-shift galaxies.

Since this problem of initial amplification of cosmic magnetic fields involves important plasma problems, it is obvious that one must know the plasma in which the amplification occurs. Most of this review is devoted to this basic problem and, for this, it is necessary to devote ourselves to reviewing studies that take place in environments in which the plasma properties are most clearly understood. For this reason the authors have chosen to restrict themselves almost completely to studies of dynamo action in our Galaxy. It is true that one can get a much better idea of the grand scope of galactic fields in extragalactic systems. However, most mature galaxies share the same dilemma as ours of overcoming important plasma problems. Since the authors are both trained in plasma physics, they may be biased in pursuing this approach, but they feel this restriction it is justified by the above argument. In addition, they feel they can produce a better review by staying close to that which they know best.

In addition they have chosen not to consider the saturation problem of the galactic magnetic field since, if the original dynamo amplification fails, the saturation question does not enter.

It is generally accepted that seed fields, whose strength is of order 10^{-20} gauss, easily spring up in the era preceding galaxy formation. Several mechanisms have been proposed to amplify these seed magnetic fields to a coherent structure with the microgauss strengths of the currently observed galactic magnetic fields.

The standard and most popular mechanism is the alpha-Omega mean-field dynamo theory developed by a number of people in the

late sixties. This theory and its application to galactic magnetic fields is discussed in considerable detail in this review. We point out certain difficulties with this theory that make it seem unlikely that this is the whole story. The main difficulty with this as the only such amplification mechanism, is rooted in the fact that, on galactic scales, flux is constant and is frozen in the interstellar medium. This implies that flux must be removed from the galactic discs, as is well recognized by the standard theory.

For our Galaxy this turns out to be a major problem, since unless the flux and the interstellar mass are somehow separated, some interstellar mass must also be removed from the deep galactic gravitational well. This is very difficult. It is pointed out that unless the field has a substantial field strength, much larger than that of the seed fields, this separation can hardly happen. And of course, the alpha–Omega dynamo must start from the ultra weak seed field. (It is our philosophy, expressed in this review, that if an origin theory is unable to create the magnetic field in our Galaxy it is essentially incomplete.)

Thus, it is more reasonable for the first and largest amplification to occur before the Galaxy forms and the matter embedded in the field is gravitationally trapped. Two such mechanisms are discussed for such a pregalactic origin; 1) the fields are generated in the turbulence of the protogalaxy and 2) the fields come from giant radio jets. Several arguments against a primordial origin are also discussed, as are ways around them.

Our conclusion as to the most likely origin of cosmic magnetic fields is that they are first produced at moderate field strengths by primordial mechanisms, and then changed and their strength increased to their present value and structure by a galactic disc dynamo. The primordial mechanisms have not yet been seriously developed as of yet, and this preliminary amplification of the magnetic fields is still very open. If a convincing case can be made that these primordial mechanisms are necessary, more effort will of course be devoted to their study.

1 Introduction

It is well established that the universe is filled with magnetic fields of very large scale and substantial strength. The fields exist on all scales, in planets, stars, galaxies, and clusters of galaxies (Parker 1979). But with respect to its origin, the magnetic field in stars and planets is secondary, while the field in galaxies is primary. The situation for clusters of galaxies is not very clear (Carilli 2002); their magnitude and structure being rather uncertain. Therefore, the best route to understanding cosmic fields is through discovering their origin in galaxies, and in particular in our Galaxy. (Parker 1979, Ruzmaikin et al, 1988, Beck et al 1996, Zweibel & Heiles 1997, Kulsrud 1999, Carilli & Taylor 2002, Widrow 2002, Vallee 2004).

The idea embraced in this review is: that one has the clearest idea of what happens in our Galaxy. If one can not understand the origin problem here, then the cosmic origin theory of magnetic fields has to be considered incomplete.

It must be remarked that this choice of reviewing only the work on dynamos specifically in our Galaxy, is the choice of the authors and represents a certain bias on their part. Generally, reviews of galactic magnetic fields discuss the magnetic fields in a great variety of extragalactic systems. This in general is justified since, by examining the global shapes and properties of fields in external galaxies one can form a much better picture of these fields, than by restricting ourselves to the field in our Galaxy, in which we see only its more local parts. Moreover, the display of these magnetic fields has aesthetic beauty which alone should justify this approach.

However, the authors feel that every one of these extragalactic fields represent a very difficult problem from a plasma physics point of view. If one wants to understand how all these field in ours and other galaxies got started from an extremely weak seed field, one has to first deal with fields much weaker than those that can be observed. The problem that needs to be overcome is the problem of flux conservation, basically a plasma problem. Since the authors are trained plasma physicists, they need to know the most basic properties of the plasma in which this happened, so there is no better situation to examine than our own interstellar medium. Therefore, their choice makes it possible to critically examine the basic plasma physics of galactic dynamos in this weak phase and here at home.

In addition, they do not seriously consider the problem of the sat-

uration of the the interstellar magnetic field. In the opinion of the authors this problem is really secondary to the origin of the field since if the field cannot be amplified by the large amount required to reach its present value, the saturation problem does not enter.

Although it is widely accepted that magnetic fields were not produced in the Big Bang, there seems little difficulty with the creation of seed fields in the universe, during the period subsequent to recombination, that is the creation of fields with strengths of order 10^{-20} gauss. There are a number of mechanisms that can operate during the period of galaxy formation and can generate such fields. The Biermann battery (Biermann 1950) is a simple such mechanism¹. On the other hand, the currently observed field strengths are of the order of 10^{-6} gauss. Thus, there is a long way to go between fields with these two strengths. Hence, the main problem with the origin of cosmic magnetic fields centers on how the strengths of cosmic magnetic fields were raised from weak values of 10^{-20} gauss to the currently observed microgauss strengths.

In discussing this subject of magnetic field origins, we distinguish between (1) amplification of fields that are already somewhat strong so that the amplification mechanisms can actually be aided by the magnetic fields themselves, and (2) amplification of extremely weak fields, those whose strength is so weak that they can play no role in the amplification mechanisms. The latter are passively amplified by mechanisms that are totally unaffected by their presence.

There is a second division of the problem of amplification that concerns the nature of the magnetic field itself. As we will see, it is relatively easy to increase the energy of magnetic fields if one allows them to be very tangled, changing their direction on very small scales. It is much more difficult to produce coherent magnetic fields that change their direction only on very large scales, as is the case for the magnetic field in our Galaxy.

Since amplification of the magnetic field energy is relatively easy to understand, whether the field is very weak or whether it is strong (Batchelor 1950, Kazantsev 1968, Kraichnan & Nagarajan 1967, Kulsrud & Anderson 1992, Boldyrev & Cattaneo 2004), the real problem of concern for a theory of magnetic field origin is this coherency prob-

¹It is worth noting that magnetogenesis by exotic processes in the early universe has also been proposed. Because the nature of these fields by the epoch of galaxy formation is highly uncertain, we have ignored them in this review; for good discussions see Grasso & Rubenstein (1995) and Widrow (2002)

lem, especially for very weak fields.

Why are we interested in the generation and amplification of cosmic fields? There are several reasons. First, until we can be sure we understand this problem, we cannot be sure that we really understand the cosmological evolution of the universe. Second, the actual structure of the observed magnetic fields is not very well determined because most of the measurements of the magnetic field use techniques, such as Faraday rotation, that average magnetic fields over large distances, (Zweibel & Heiles 1997, Heiles, 1998). If we knew theoretically how the magnetic fields were generated, this would give extra leverage to determining their local structure. Finally, many of the very mechanisms that produce magnetic fields are astronomically interesting, and important in themselves.

Why are galactic magnetic fields astrophysically important? Without their universal presence in the interstellar medium its astrophysical properties would be very different. At the present time, magnetic fields play a crucial role in the way stars form (Spitzer 1978). They also control the origin and confinement of cosmic rays, which in turn play important astrophysical roles. Further, magnetic fields are an important ingredient in the equilibrium balance of the galactic disc.

Why is the origin of magnetic fields so difficult to understand? First, they are difficult to observe because they are so weak and far away. Second, to understand the physics of their origin one needs to understand astrophysical plasma physics (Kulsrud 2005, Cowling 1953), fluid dynamics, and many other fields of astrophysics. Plasma physics on galactic scales is still not a well developed subject and the details of how it works are hard to observe. More importantly, since the origin of cosmic fields occurs either over the entire life of the Galaxy, (Ruzmaikin et al 1988) or possibly in a pregalactic age before galactic discs formed, it is very difficult to gain observational knowledge of the early generation mechanisms. The early stages in other galaxies are observed at large red shift where large distances make these observations difficult to make, (Kronberg, 1994, Welter, Perry & Kronberg 1984, Watson & Perry 1991, Wolfe, Lanzetta, & Oren 1992, Oren & Wolfe 1995.) For these reasons *definitive* progress in uncovering magnetic field origins in the universe has been slow.

A main goal of this review is to arrive at some sort of conclusion as to whether at the stage when the galactic disc formed the magnetic field was still extremely weak and the amplification occurred during the entire age of the disc, or whether the the fields already were sub-

stantial before the galactic disc started to form. If the former is the case, we will call the origin galactic and the dynamo generating it the galactic dynamo. In the latter case we call the origin pregalactic. (We avoid using primordial which suggest a much earlier origin than occurs, say, during the protogalactic era.)

In the next two sections we briefly review the salient observations and present a historical introduction to galactic dynamo theory. The remainder of the review discusses current theories of magnetic field origin and concludes with a critical summary.

2 Observed properties of galactic magnetic fields

Our knowledge of galactic magnetic fields rests on four observational pillars. Measurements of Faraday rotation and Zeeman splitting give the magnetic field perpendicular to the plane of the sky, integrated along the line of sight. These effects are direction sensitive, and contributions from oppositely directed fields tend to cancel each other. Observations of the polarized synchrotron continuum, and polarized emission and absorption by magnetically aligned dust grains, give the line-of-sight integrated magnetic field components in the plane of the sky. These diagnostics are sensitive to orientation, not direction, but 90° swings in orientation also cancel. In addition to line-of-sight averaging, finite angular resolution of the telescope causes plane-of-sky averaging.

According to these observations, the mean orientation of the magnetic field is parallel to the Galactic plane and nearly azimuthal; the deviation is consistent with assignment along the spiral arms (Heiles 1996). This orientation is consistent with the effects of induction in a system with strong differential rotation and a spiral density wave pattern (Roberts & Yuan 1970). Assuming that the Galactic halo rotates more slowly than the disk, induction would act on a vertical field so as to produce a reversal in the azimuthal field across the Galactic plane (so-called dipole symmetry). The traditional view has been that the field does not reverse across the plane (Beck et al 1996), although some authors favor asymmetry (Han 2003, Han et al 1997, Han 2001). This important question is still open.

The Galactic field within several kiloparsecs (kpc) of the Sun has both mean and random components (Rand & Kulkarni 1989, Han et

al. 2006, Beck 2007), with the mean component being of order $1.4\text{-}2\mu\text{G}$ and the rms field about $5\text{-}6\mu\text{G}$. The rms value for the random field is derived from the assumption that the random field is isotropic and from a measurement of its line-of-sight component. There *is* some evidence that the fluctuations are anisotropic, with more power parallel to the mean field than perpendicular to it (Zweibel 1996, Brown & Taylor 2001). There is also evidence that the mean field reverses with Galactocentric radius (so-called bisymmetric spiral structure), but the locations and frequency of reversal are quite uncertain (see Han & Wielebinski 2002 for a review, and Weisberg et al. 2004, Han et al. 2006, Brown et al 2007 for more recent studies). The discrepant results of this important and difficult measurement reflect the high level of noise (fluctuations greater than the mean), uncertain distances to the background pulsars against which Faraday rotation is measured, uncertainty in the location of Galactic spiral arms (Vallee 2005), and a possible systematic spatial variation in the field structure which is unaccounted for in the models.

There are some complications in the interpretation introduced by the spiral arms perturbing the direction of the magnetic field. Even if the unperturbed field is toroidal, *these spiral arm* perturbations give the impression that the global field is aligned along the spiral arms and its lines of force are a spiral [Lin, Yuan and Shu, 1969, Manchester, 1974 (section iv page 642)].

How far back in time are galactic magnetic fields detectable? Young galaxies and their environment have been probed through the absorption lines found in quasar spectra whose redshift is different than that of the quasar. These absorption lines are impressed on the quasar light as it passes through clouds of gas, and these clouds are interpreted as young galaxies. Most of these systems are rather thin and are referred to as part of a Lyman alpha forest. However, some of these systems are much thicker and display both metallic lines (particularly lines of MgII) and very broad damped Lyman alpha lines. The latter are referred to as damped Lyman alpha systems. More important for our purpose, if the quasar emits polarized radio waves, the plane of polarization of these waves would be Faraday rotated by a significant amount if these systems had coherent magnetic fields (Perry 1994).

To determine this possibility Welter, Kronberg and Perry (1984) searched for Faraday rotation in a number of radio emitting quasars, and found a definite correlation between those which had a rotation measure and those which have metallic absorption lines. The ma-

jor difficulty with these observations is the correct subtraction of the Faraday rotation produced by the magnetic field of *our* Galaxy, which does not vary smoothly with angular position. Welter et. al. found five unambiguous cases. These results were reaffirmed by Watson & Perry (1991). Since the metallic absorption line systems had red shifts that were fairly large (of order two), these systems probably represent young galaxies in an early state of formation. This data was reanalyzed by Wolfe and his collaborators (Oren and Wolfe, 1995), but in a different manner. They restricted their analysis to 61 quasars with MgII absorption lines and separated out, as a subclass, 11 of these that also had damped Lyman alpha lines. They found that the incidence of Faraday rotation in the 11 damped systems was higher than that in the remaining 50 undamped systems with a 99.8 per cent confidence level.

In this analysis they concluded that the errors introduced by the Faraday rotation in our Galaxy were larger than those assumed by Welter et al by a factor of three. Thus, they only found two cases in which they were certain that there was Faraday rotation.

The detection of only two cases with definite intrinsic rotation measures seems to make a weak case for extragalactic fields in these damped systems. But these cases were those systems with the lowest red shift. For the other systems of larger redshifts z , any intrinsic Faraday rotation produced by them is diluted by a factor of $(1+z)^2$. This is because the frequency of the radio waves passing through them is higher by the factor $(1+z)$ and the amount of Faraday rotation decreases with the frequency squared. Thus, the other members of the damped class could very well have magnetic fields of the same strength as the lower red shift members without producing a detectable signal. This bolsters their correct subtraction of the galactic component of the Faraday rotation. Taking this into account, Oren and Wolfe conclude with 98 per cent confidence that all such systems have Faraday rotation and substantial magnetic fields.

Another important window on the history of the Galactic magnetic fields over cosmic time is provided by analyzing the chemical composition of the atmospheres of the oldest stars in the Galactic halo (Zweibel 2003). As a result of observations from the Hubble space telescope the chemical abundances of these very early stars have now been analyzed. The light elements lithium, beryllium, and boron have been found in even the oldest stars, e.g. those with 10^{-3} times solar abundances. In addition, the amount of beryllium and boron in them increases with

the iron abundance and in fact is directly proportional to it. Since the early stars are produced from the interstellar medium their composition should reflect that of the interstellar medium. (Primas et al. 1999, Duncan et al. 1998, Garcia-Lopez et al. 1998, 1999)

Now, it is known that no beryllium was produced in Big Bang nucleosynthesis, and that it is very difficult to make it in stars, since it quickly burns up. The leading theory is that it was made by cosmic ray nucleosynthesis, (Meneguzzi, Audouze & Reeves, 1971, Reeves, 1994, 2007). The situation for boron is ambiguous, because this element can also be produced by neutrinos during Type II supernova explosions; see Ramaty et al. 1997. We will still include boron in the arguments for cosmic rays and magnetic fields early in the history of the Galaxy, but this caveat should be kept in mind.

The linearity of the Be and B abundances with iron is explained by assuming their creation is by spallation of the low energy (tens of MeV) carbon and oxygen cosmic rays. If it were due to the complementary process, spallation breakup of interstellar carbon and oxygen nuclei, one must take into account that the latter themselves are produced by stellar nucleosynthesis and supernovae. and their abundance should increase proportionally to the amount of iron produced in supernovae. Thus, their abundance should increase with that of iron in the interstellar medium, and the abundance of these light elements should be quadratic with iron abundance or in time.

However, to get linearity in time with spallation of carbon and oxygen cosmic rays, one needs to assume that the composition of cosmic rays must not change with time. This would seem to be a stumbling block since cosmic rays are assumed to be accelerated by shocks from interstellar-medium nuclei. Therefore, they would be expected to also reflect the changing abundances in the interstellar medium and would be expected to increase their abundance in carbon and oxygen with time.

Ramaty and others (Ramaty, Lingenfelter, Kozlovsky (2000), Ramaty, Scully, Lingenfelter, 2000a, Lingenfelter, Higdon, Ramaty, 2000b, Ramaty, Tatischeff et al. 2000) argue that the acceleration of cosmic rays occurs mainly inside superbubbles, and that the material inside these superbubbles is the material that has just emerged from the supernova generating the superbubble. This freshly produced matter has not been diluted with the rest of interstellar medium in the superbubble region where cosmic ray acceleration occurs. Thus, the relative abundance of different cosmic ray nuclei should be constant in time

and determined by the undiluted material emerging from supernovae. On the other hand, iron in the interstellar material from which stars emerge *has* been diluted, since it was produced in supernovae. Therefore, its abundance relative its solar abundance increases with time at a constant rate determined by the rate of supernova explosions.

This constancy of the chemical abundance of cosmic rays has been supported by detailed numerical simulations of Ramaty and others, and does lead to an explanation of the observations that the abundance of beryllium and boron is directly proportional to the abundance of iron in old stars (Garcia-Lopez et al. 1998, 1999)

Now to explain the numerical value of this ratio, the cosmic ray intensity at tens to hundreds of MeV per nucleon in the early Galaxy had to be the same then as now. Zweibel (2003) has shown that magnetic fields several orders of magnitude weaker than now, suffice for cosmic ray acceleration and diffusive propagation at these energies. On the other hand, if the field is very weak such a cosmic ray intensity might not be confined by a very weak field. This is because, if most of the mass in the interstellar medium was in the form of discrete, cold clouds, as appears to be the case today, then a high cosmic ray pressure between the clouds, which must be confined by magnetic tension, would inflate the field lines to infinity (Parker 1979).

This can be quantified by a simple two dimensional model. Let the cloud distribution be two dimensional and have a scale height H and the clouds be on planes separated by a mean distance ℓ . Let the cosmic ray pressure be proportional to the magnetic field strength squared by a factor β/α . Then the model shows that the lines bow out above their average height in the clouds by a factor

$$\frac{1}{\cos \sqrt{(\beta/\alpha + 1)}\ell/H}$$

Thus, if the field is very weak, β/α is very large and there is no solution, implying the field lines would bow out to infinity.

Although the amount of cold interstellar material in the early Galaxy was doubtless lower than today because of the lower metallicity, thereby somewhat easing the cosmic ray confinement problem, we are faced with a situation in which primeval galaxies already must have had substantial magnetic fields, at a stage too early to have been produced by a conventional dynamo.

Finally, the problem of the abundance of the Li^6 isotope which is not at all linear with that of iron is entirely up in the air. (Reeves

2007, Ramaty, Tatischeff et al. 2000). Li^6 also is not produced by Big Bang nucleosynthesis and, because it depletes so easily, can only be produced with great difficulty in stars. Thus, as long as we do not understand the process that produces lithium 6, we cannot be sure that this process does not in some way produce beryllium and boron as well, without the aid of cosmic rays. Until the Lithium problem is resolved, we cannot be certain that the beryllium boron argument proves that the origin of Galactic field is pregalactic.

It is interesting that boron has been observed in other galaxies at large red shifts (Prochaska et al 2003). Thus, if the ideas concerning the origin of boron hold up, this provides even stronger evidence that magnetic fields are already present at the formation time of galactic discs and their origin is pregalactic.

3 Summary of our present understanding of cosmic magnetic field origins

Origin theories divide into two further parts: (1) the origin in small bodies such as planets and (2) the origin in larger bodies such as galaxies. This division occurs because, for a large body such as a galaxy, the resistive decay lifetime of its magnetic fields is much longer than the age of the universe. For these bodies a so-called fast dynamo is required. On the other hand in small bodies the decay lifetime is much shorter and the required dynamo is called a slow dynamo. For the Earth the problem of where the field came from, and how it is sustained against resistive decay is easier than the same problem for fields in large bodies (Parker 1979, Spitzer 1978). If a magnetic field starts to decay, the inductance of the body in which it resides produces a backvoltage (or E.M.F.) that keeps its currents flowing against its resistance. Thus, one can roughly say that the lifetime of the magnetic field against decay (if no other mechanisms are present) is its total inductance divided by its total resistance. Inductance is proportional to the size of a body, L while resistance is inversely proportional to L so that the lifetime is proportional to L^2 . Thus, the Earth has a relatively short magnetic decay time of order a few tens of thousands of years, while that of the Galactic disc is many orders of magnitude longer than the age of the universe. Thus, dynamo mechanisms aside, the Earth's field would decay away in a time very short compared to its age, and therefore, there must be a mechanism to sustain it, just

as to sustain a current in a laboratory circuit, one needs a battery or dynamo (Parker 1955, Elsasser 1946, 1950.)

On the other hand, while one need not worry about the galactic field decaying because of its enormous inductance (Fermi 1949), one has to worry about how to get the currents started in the interstellar medium to produce the galactic field: as the currents rise the back voltage is so large that a very strong generator is needed to balance the back voltage. This turns out to be the essence of the problem behind the origin of galactic fields, (Hoyle, 1958).

This discussion of magnetic field generation and decay is not quite correct. It treats the bodies as being static and at rest, while in both cases the bodies are either fluid or gaseous with motions generated by their dynamics. When a fluid moves across a magnetic field, an electric field $\mathbf{E} = -\mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B}/c$ exists in the frame in which the velocity is measured, and this electric field results in the dynamo action that is needed to balance the magnetic field against resistive decay in case of the Earth, and balance inductance in the case of the Galaxy. The problem is to find a reasonable fluid velocity that would properly balance the inductive and resistive effects that must occur during the evolution of the field (its decay or growth).

In 1955 Parker was able to find such velocities and to propose a model containing, non axisymmetric motions, that explained how the Earth's field could be sustained against decay (Parker 1955). To do this, he built on the work of many others (Elsasser, 1946, 1950). Parker found that a dynamo should exist in the liquid core of the Earth and the fluid motions producing this dynamo action are a combination of differential rotation of the core, and a multitude of rising and falling convective cells, that are twisted by the Coriolis force of the Earth's rotation.

His solution was gradually improved in the next decade (Backus, 1958), until finally, in 1966, Steenbeck, Krause, and Rädler (1966) developed a refined theory for dynamos, the *mean-field theory*, which consist of such turbulent motions

Once this theory was accepted as correct, it was applied to the problem of the origin of the Galactic magnetic field. Parker in the United States (Parker, 1971a) and Vainshtein and Ruzmaikin in Russia (Vainshtein & Ruzmaikin, 1972) in the early seventies showed that motions, similar to the terrestrial motions, exist in the Galaxy, and that they could overcome the inductance problem and generate the Galactic field.

Although the dynamo mechanism appears viable, it still does not resolve the primary origin question: was the galactic field actually produced, from an initially weak field, during the galactic lifetime, or was it generated earlier, before the galaxy formed? That is, for the latter case, was a fairly strong field already present at the onset of formation of the galactic disc, and then, its final form determined by this dynamo action? (See Kulsrud, 1999).

In the last analysis, this question can only be answered by observations. As pointed out above, direct observations of the early magnetic fields are very difficult. At the present moment there are two ways to make progress on the origin problem: First, a careful theoretical analysis of the proposed dynamo model and its assumed velocities; second, an analysis of the effects of an early magnetic field on independent astrophysical problems such as star formation and cosmic ray properties, discussed in §2. If the field changed drastically from being very weak to its present value, these properties, which *are* subject to direct observations, should also change. The stellar luminosity function would be expected to change from its early form to its present form. Also, the properties of cosmic rays should drastically change. Their energy density should either increase from an initial small value to its present value, or should remain constant. Its variation can be inferred from the measurement of the abundances of the isotopes of elements that can only be produced by cosmic ray spallation, as discussed in the previous section.

In the seventies, when the galactic dynamo origin of magnetic fields was first proposed, the velocities needed for the dynamo were not well known and the estimates made of their magnitudes led to too weak a dynamo to be able to amplify the strength of seed fields to the current strength magnetic field, over the finite age of the Galaxy. More precise estimates were made in a series of papers by Ferrière in the nineties (Ferrière, 1992a,b 1993a,b, 1996, 1998, Ferrière and Schmitt, 2000). In these papers she pointed out the importance of the expansional motions of random superbubbles; [giant bubbles produced by multiple supernovae that arise in stellar clusters (McCray and Snow 1979)].

These motions last long enough, and are sufficiently fast for the necessary amplification of the fields. However, they work only if significant magnetic flux can be expelled from the Galaxy. This is possible only if the magnetic field lines can separate from the heavy plasma and evaporate away leaving the plasma in the superbubble to fall back into the Galactic disc. But arguments that this is possible assume that the

magnetic field is already fairly strong (Brandenburg et al, 1995, Moss et al 1998). Thus, the field strengths they require would be inadequate to make the dynamo work in the early stages of amplification if the initial field at the beginning of the Galaxy were a weak seed field.

To be sure the dynamo could work during early galactic times, one needs to consider the possibility that a field of considerable strength and of pregalactic origin, existed prior to the galactic disc. If the pregalactic field is strong enough to solve the problems associated with the galactic dynamo theory, then one may have a double origin. First, a pregalactic magnetic field of moderate strength must develop, and then a subsequent amplification of it to its present strength and configuration be produced by the conventional galactic dynamo.

This pregalactic field could arise as a natural part of the galactic formation process. For example, it is likely that the formation of the first massive stars preceded the formation of galactic disks, occurring instead in the $\sim 10^6 M_\odot$ halos that appear to be the first bound structures formed (Tegmark et al 1997, Gilmore et al. 2006). Any magnetic field present in the ambient gas or in the supernova ejecta would have been amplified by turbulence in the halo gas. Thus, the disks that formed as the halos merged, could have had moderately strong magnetic fields from the outset. Turbulent amplification can also occur during the gravitational formation of larger structures where very strong large scale turbulent velocities are present (Ryu et al 1993, Kang et al. 1994).

These velocities are sufficiently large that sufficiently strong magnetic fields can be generated to provide a pregalactic origin (Kulsrud & Anderson 1992). If these fields are formed on the scale of the largest turbulent eddies which drive them, this would provide the coherence needed for a pregalactic origin of the galactic field. However, the theory of these random turbulent fields is still under development and a number of tricky plasma problems have arisen involving them. (See §14.) Simulations of turbulent amplification show a pileup of magnetic power at the resistive scale in situations where the resistive scale is much smaller than the viscous scale (Schekochihin & Cowley, 2004). Even smaller scale fluctuations may arise in the collisionless case, because of anisotropic plasma pressure (Schekochihin et al 2005b). It appears that the fate of a primordial theory based on the protogalactic physics may hinge on the resolutions of these plasma problems. The question of generation of significant fields at earlier epochs in the universe than that of galactic disc formation are still being debated.

It has also been proposed that the pregalactic fields could arise from the fields observed to be present in giant radio jets, (Daly & Loeb, 1990, Colgate & Li 2000, Kronberg et al. 2001, Furlanetto & Loeb, 2001). So far, none of these proposals has been developed to a sufficient extent to judge whether they lead to a viable solution.

4 Basic equations for magnetic field evolution

Nearly all theories of magnetic field origin rely on the magnetohydrodynamics (MHD) description of plasma physics. It turns out that the larger the system the better these equations describe magnetic field evolution. These equations essentially parallel the ordinary electromagnetic equations. One equation describes how the motion of a plasma affects the magnetic field, and the other describes how the magnetic field affects the motion of the plasma. Although these equations are familiar, we sketch their derivation, since this derivation demonstrates the accuracy of these equations for our purpose.

We start first with the effect the plasma motion has on the magnetic field (Cowling 1953). This effect results solely from the fact that in the frame of the moving plasma the electric field \mathbf{E}' , to all intents and purposes, must balance the resistive term, so that we have

$$\mathbf{E}' = \mathbf{E} + \frac{\mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B}}{c} = \eta \mathbf{j}, \quad (1)$$

where \mathbf{v} is the plasma motion, the left hand side is the electric field in the frame of the plasma, η is the resistivity and \mathbf{j} is the plasma current density. The right hand side is essentially zero since from Ampere's law the current density is inversely proportional to $1/L$, and on galactic scales is usually very small, while the resistivity is the same as that in a laboratory plasma. Combining this with Faraday's law $\partial \mathbf{B} / \partial t = -c \nabla \times \mathbf{E}$, and Ampere's law $\nabla \times \mathbf{B} = 4\pi \mathbf{j} / c$, we get

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{B}}{\partial t} = \nabla \times (\mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B}) + \frac{\eta c^2}{4\pi} \nabla^2 \mathbf{B}. \quad (2)$$

We drop the displacement term from Ampere's law and, for simplicity take η to be a constant, to get the last term.

The neglect of the resistivity term in galactic physics becomes obvious if we approximate $\nabla^2 \mathbf{B}$ as \mathbf{B} / L^2 and set the last term equal to

\mathbf{B}/T_{decay} . For a plasma at a temperature of 10^4 degrees Kelvin, the resistive term $\eta c^2/4\pi \approx 10^7 \text{ cm}^2/\text{sec}$ so

$$T_{decay} \approx 10^{26} L_{ps}^2 \text{ years} , \quad (3)$$

where L_{ps} is the scale size in parsecs. Since the galactic scale is many parsecs, the incredible smallness of the resistive term in equation (2) is evident. Even if the magnetic field is extremely tangled, so that its length scale is reduced to a fraction of a parsec, the resistivity term is still very small. (For $L > 10^{12}$ cm the effective decay time is still longer than the current Hubble time.)

Thus, in almost all cases, it is permissible to drop this term, and this is valid to an extraordinary degree. There are exceptions to this in cases where extremely thin current layers form. Also there are additional, very weak terms in Ohm's law that we come to later, which can play a role in producing seed fields. An example of these terms is the so called Biermann battery.

For the bulk of the theories of magnetic field origin the *ideal* magnetic differential equation

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{B}}{\partial t} = \nabla \times (\mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B}) \quad (4)$$

is sufficiently correct.

The ideal equation has an important implication for cosmic magnetic field origin theories. It implies that magnetic field lines have a physical reality beyond their mathematical description for a magnetic field. (Their mathematical definition is: that their signed direction gives the signed direction of the magnetic field and their density can be assigned so as to give the magnetic field strength.)

Their reality consists of the fact that the magnetic field lines cannot be created or destroyed once they are embedded in the large scale plasma. They are bodily carried by the motion of the plasma in which they are embedded, and continue to properly represent the magnetic field. The argument that flux lines have a physical reality is standard, and is called flux freezing. It is discussed in many textbook on plasma physics (see, for example, Newcomb 1958, Kulsrud 1964, Alfvén & Falthammer, 1963, Moffatt, 1978, Parker 1979, Kulsrud 2005).

The mechanism for the creation and destruction of field lines is the resistivity, which is negligibly small. But, by its very definition, an origin theory starts off with a very weak field and produces a strong

field. Because of flux freezing, this has to be done without changing the number of lines of force.

It is a fact that stretching a tube of force by motions that preserve its volume, does increase the local field strength. This stretching occurs in a finite volume by doubling the line back and forth as in Figure 3 of §14, so that the mean value of the field strength, taken over the volume, does not change and, thus, does not lead to an increase in the coherent field.

It turns out that standard dynamo theories actually work this way. They fold lines of force back and forth increasing the pointwise field strength. The dynamo works in such a way that the field lines pointing in one direction are near the center of the plasma volume and the field pointing in the reverse direction are concentrated on the outside. Thus, the magnetic field becomes coherent over roughly the inner half of the volume with flux of one sign, and coherent over the outer half with flux of the other sign. In §6, we show how this remarkable process happens when we discuss the conventional $\alpha - \Omega$ theory for the exponential growth of a magnetic field in the galactic disc. However, to actually produce a strong magnetic field of constant sign over an entire volume, the magnetic flux in the outer region must be expelled.

A leading question then becomes whether the flux can actually be expelled to complete the galactic dynamo action. If one were content with a field of reversing sign, constant over one half the volume, but with zero total net flux, one could avoid this expulsion problem. However, the observed magnetic field in our Galaxy appears to have net flux, so that such a solution to the origin problem for our Galaxy is not available. The same difficulty occurs in other galaxies as well.

Moreover, there is an issue of scale. The typical strength of seed fields at the onset of the disc is 12 - 14 orders of magnitude below present day galactic fields. In order to bring them to their present strength, the field lines have to be stretched by 12 - 14 orders of magnitude as well. This would seem to imply that the field lines fold down to length scales that are also smaller by 12 - 14 orders of magnitude or, without any flux expulsion, down to the resistive scale. But by invoking flux expulsion at every doubling of the flux one can avoid this problem. In fact, only tiny pieces, of field lines $\sim 10^{-12} - 10^{-14}$ of the total initial line length are stretched by this large order of magnitude while the rest of the pieces of the line are removed from the disc.

The other half of the MHD picture of how magnetic fields affect

plasma motions is of less interest in the origin problem since the magnetic fields we consider are too weak to affect the plasma motions. Their effect is the introduction of a magnetic force term

$$\frac{\mathbf{j} \times \mathbf{B}}{c} \tag{5}$$

into the hydrodynamic equation. As remarked in §1, we do not consider the saturation problem in this review since it clearly does not arise unless a successful build up of the field to large strength is not achieved.

5 Cowling's theorem and Parker's dynamo

We have remarked that the motion of a plasma acts like a dynamo in that, as a plasma moves perpendicular to a magnetic field, a substantial electric field, $-\mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B}/c$, arises in the laboratory frame. This was first pointed out by Larmor (1919). In fact, this is just how a dynamo in a power station generates electricity. Larmor expressed the hope that velocities could be found which could generate astrophysical magnetic fields. The first attempts to create magnetic fields in this way in spheroidal bodies naturally assumed that the velocities and fields were axisymmetric.

Axisymmetric fields are generally broken into poloidal components, whose lines of force lie in meridional planes, and toroidal components, whose lines of force form circles about the axis. Imagine starting with a pure poloidal field with a zero toroidal component, and imagine that the plasma is differentially rotating with a rotation rate that varies along a poloidal field line. It is clear that this rotation will drag different parts of the line in the toroidal direction at different rates, so the line will not stay poloidal but will develop a toroidal component. If this continues, the toroidal component will grow stronger and stronger at a linear rate in time.

From this it is easy to see that a toroidal magnetic field is easy to generate from a poloidal field by differential rotation, (see Kulsrud 2005). On the other hand, if one starts with a pure toroidal field, it is impossible to produce a poloidal component. Rotation will have no effect on the field and any symmetric poloidal motion will just move

the toroidal field lines around leaving them as circles, although the circles will change their position.

Cowling (1934) showed that this is the general situation: if one starts with a magnetic field that has both axisymmetric toroidal and poloidal components, then axisymmetric motions can increase the toroidal flux, but they will just leave the total poloidal flux unchanged. This result is known as Cowling's theorem and basically defeats any attempt to exponentially amplify a very weak field to a strong one by axisymmetric motions. (The original purpose of the theorem was show it was impossible sustain the Earth's field against its relatively rapid resistive decay. However, it applies equally to any attempt to produce a galactic dynamo that starts with a weak axisymmetric coherent field, and tries to increase it to a coherent field of order 10^{-6} gauss by axisymmetric motions.) To increase the toroidal magnetic field linearly by purely differential rotation would take 10^{14} differential turns, while the Galaxy has only rotated about fifty times. (It should be remarked that it is possible to amplify a non axisymmetric magnetic field by symmetric velocities, but this does not seem to have been attempted for a galactic dynamo.)

Thus, to exponentially increase the flux of an initial small seed field to the present Galactic value, or to sustain the Earth's field against decay, it is necessary to deal with nonaxisymmetric motions. This would seem to require complicated numerical simulations, which were beyond the power of computers of the 1950's.

However, as previously mentioned, Parker (1955) did come up with a physically correct model containing non axisymmetric motions that could successfully, either amplify the Earth's field, or sustain it against resistive decay. He considered random small convection cells of rising and falling fluid in the Earth's liquid core. Imagine, as above, that there is a purely toroidal magnetic field inside the Earth's core. Then it is true that by itself a rising convection cell would distort this field, but only in a plane not producing any net poloidal component. However, due to the Coriolis force of the Earth's rotation the distortion of the toroidal field would be twisted into the poloidal plane and a poloidal component would emerge. If one only had this convection, the poloidal field would not grow significantly. However, when combined with the differential rotation of the Earth's core, the poloidal distortion would produce a change in the initial toroidal component of the field. (This differential rotation in the Earth's core *also* results from Coriolis forces.)

It turns out that the change in the toroidal field is actually an increase. Thus, one has the possibility of exponential growth. In the lifetime of a convection cell the poloidal component increases by an amount proportional to the toroidal component, and the toroidal component increases by an amount proportional to the poloidal component. Since these two increases are coherent, both components grow exponentially. Parker showed that all the signs are consistent with growth. The downward motions produce changes with the same sign as the upward motions, and the same changes apply to both the northern and southern hemispheres. Thus, all of the random convection cells act to increase the mean magnetic field of the earth in the same direction.

In detail, a rising convective cell rotates in the opposite direction to the Earth due to the Coriolis force. This is because it laterally expands increasing its moment of inertia. This leads to a twist in a distorted toroidal field line with the upper part of the line gaining a northward component and the lower part a southward component. The Earth rotates slower at larger distance from its axis, so the differential rotation acting on this new poloidal field loop produces an additional toroidal field in the same direction as the original field reinforcing it. A sinking convection cell contracts and rotates oppositely, yielding a loop with the same sense as the rising cell, and also reinforcing the toroidal component.

The cells in the southern hemisphere act the same, reinforcing the toroidal field in the southern hemisphere which is in the opposite direction to that in the northern hemisphere. Thus, because the sign of the Coriolis force is properly correlated with the differential rotation of the Earth's core, the convective cells all lead to a growth in the toroidal field, or compensate for the resistive decay and lead to a non decaying terrestrial magnetic field.

This theory was intuitively satisfactory, and was also subsequently supported by the more rigorous analysis of Backus (1958), and by later numerical simulations (Glatzmaier & Roberts 1995, Ogden et al 2006). It can most easily be illustrated, in the galactic case, by the example of a supernova exploding in a rotating galaxy. See figure 1, (Kulsrud 2000). The convection cell is illustrated by the exploding remnant that is forced to rotate backward by a Coriolis force induced by Galactic rotation. The role of differential rotation is also supplied by Galactic rotation. In this Galactic case, the lines need to be expelled to infinity, in contrast to the terrestrial case where they need merely be expelled

into the nonconducting mantle and effectively disappear.

However, to successfully apply Parker's theory to the Galactic magnetic field problem a more systematic treatment of turbulent amplification of magnetic fields is required. This was provided by the mean field dynamo theory of Steenbeck, Krause and Rädler (1966). They treat the turbulent motions in a more general way than Parker treated the Earth, replacing the convective cells by a quantity they called kinetic helicity, $\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \times \mathbf{v}$. They denoted its effect on magnetic fields by α where

$$\alpha = -\frac{\tau}{3} \langle \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \times \mathbf{v} \rangle, \quad (6)$$

where the angular brackets denote turbulent ensemble averages and τ is the decorrelation time of the turbulent motions. (To obtain a scalar α , isotropic turbulence must be assumed.) Note that helicity has the same sign of twist relative to the motion \mathbf{v} as do Parker's convective cells, and serves the same function in amplifying the field on which they act. $(\tau \nabla \times \mathbf{v})$ corresponds to the angular twist of the convective cell during a single decorrelation time.

Because the normal resistivity is usually very small, they also introduce a turbulent resistivity which they called β where

$$\beta = \frac{\tau}{2} \langle \mathbf{v}^2 \rangle. \quad (7)$$

This turbulent resistivity does not act the same as normal resistivity in that it produces no dissipation or change in field line connectivity. It is an effective mixing term produced by random turbulent motions, and smooths out the fields on a larger scale than the turbulent motions. It can be justified as follows: $\tau \mathbf{v}$ is the displacement $\Delta \mathbf{r}$, so that $\beta \approx (\Delta \mathbf{r})^2 / \tau$ is the expression for a random walk.

6 The alpha-Omega disc dynamo

The mean field dynamo theory introduced by Steenbeck et al (1966) was a very important step towards applying dynamo action in many contexts: the Earth, the Sun, stars, galaxies, and clusters of galaxies. We present it in the context of our Galactic disc, which is very thin. This allows us to treat the dynamo locally in radius and angle and makes it one dimensional with the significant space coordinate perpendicular to the disc. This is consistent with the general Galactic field, and is the case most relevant to the Galactic dynamo (Ruzmaikin, Shukurov, & Sokoloff 1988).

We start with a very weak field such that the motions can be considered to be independent of the magnetic field, a limit called the *kinematic limit*. Thus, one is only concerned with the magnetic differential equation (2). Because resistivity is so small, we can start with the ideal equation (4). In this equation we split the velocity \mathbf{v} into two parts, a part associated with the turbulent random motions $\delta\mathbf{v}$, and a part \mathbf{U} which is smooth and coherent. In the Galactic case \mathbf{U} is the differential rotation of the Galaxy. Thus,

$$\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{U} + \delta\mathbf{v}. \quad (8)$$

The magnetic field is also broken up into its mean part $\bar{\mathbf{B}}$ and its random part $\delta\mathbf{B}$, so

$$\mathbf{B} = \bar{\mathbf{B}} + \delta\mathbf{B}. \quad (9)$$

Substituting these into equation (4) and ensemble averaging over the turbulence we get,

$$\frac{\partial\bar{\mathbf{B}}}{\partial t} = \nabla \times (\mathbf{U} \times \bar{\mathbf{B}}) + \nabla \times (\langle\langle\delta\mathbf{v} \times \delta\mathbf{B}\rangle\rangle). \quad (10)$$

Thus, an extra term associated with the random velocities has been added to the magnetic differential equation for the smooth field. This term can break the ideal flux constraint for the mean field $\bar{\mathbf{B}}$, but not for the true field \mathbf{B} .

To complete the process of obtaining a dynamo equation, one has to solve a magnetic differential equation for $\delta\mathbf{B}$ in terms of $\delta\mathbf{v}$. This is carried out by what is known as a quasilinear expansion (Sagdeev and Galeev 1969), which is presented in many places and will not be given here [see Ruzmaikin, Shukurov, & Sokoloff, 1988; Parker, 1979; Krause & Rädler, 1980; Moffatt 1978; and Kulsrud 2005].

The result for the mean induction generated by the fluctuating fields can be written

$$\langle\delta\mathbf{v} \times \delta\mathbf{B}\rangle = \alpha\bar{\mathbf{B}} - \beta\nabla \times \bar{\mathbf{B}}. \quad (11)$$

[In general, α and β are tensors, but here we understand them to be scalars and defined through equations (6) and (7)]. Substituting this result into the above equation gives the famous mean field dynamo equation

$$\frac{\partial\bar{\mathbf{B}}}{\partial t} = \nabla \times (\mathbf{U} \times \bar{\mathbf{B}}) + \nabla \times (\alpha\bar{\mathbf{B}}) + \beta\nabla^2\bar{\mathbf{B}}. \quad (12)$$

Applying this equation to a local part of the Galactic disc, in which we introduce cylindrical coordinates r, θ, z , and keeping only derivatives in the thin vertical direction, z , we get

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial B_r}{\partial t} &= -\frac{\partial}{\partial z}(\alpha B_\theta) + \beta \frac{\partial^2 B_r}{\partial z^2}, \\ \frac{\partial B_\theta}{\partial t} &= -\Omega B_r + \beta \frac{\partial^2 B_\theta}{\partial z^2}.\end{aligned}\tag{13}$$

(We have dropped the bars; the magnetic field \mathbf{B} is understood to be only the mean field.)

We have substituted the Galactic rotation $r\Omega\hat{\theta}$ for \mathbf{U} , and used the fact that $r\Omega$ is a constant to find its derivative $d\Omega/dr = -\Omega/r$. We have also dropped the term $\partial_z(\alpha B_r)$ in the equation for B_θ , which is small relative to the differential rotation term.

The usual procedure is to look for a growing mode, proportional to $e^{\gamma t}$ and to solve equations (13) as an eigenvalue problem. The boundary conditions that are customarily invoked are that the disc is confined to a region $-h < z < h$. On the presumption that the diffusion coefficient, β , is very large outside of the disc, the magnetic field is taken to be zero for $|z| > h$, and therefore the boundary conditions are: B_r and B_θ are zero at $|z| = h$. These conditions are termed the *vacuum boundary conditions*. As we will show later (in §9), the assumption of these conditions is the critically important point in the disc dynamo origin for the Galactic field. As discussed in §3, in order to preserve flux conservation, flux of one sign must be removed from the disc. This is exactly what these boundary conditions accomplish. However, the weak point in the Galactic dynamo theory is the assumption that β is large outside the disc. This too is discussed in §9.

Although the assumption that β is constant is non objectionable, α cannot be constant since it has to be of opposite sign above and below the disc. This can be seen physically if one interprets α as the effect of twisting convection cells.

In fact, consider a cell rising above the midplane of the disc, that is z and $v_z > 0$. As it rises it expands, and the Coriolis force of galactic rotation rotates it backward relative to normal Galactic rotation. (This follows easily if one considers that the moment of inertia of the convective cell is increasing so its angular rotation relative to a fixed frame must decrease to preserve its angular momentum.) The same backward rotation applies for a descending cell below the galactic mid-

plane. However, for this cell $v_z < 0$, and $\alpha \sim -\mathbf{v} \cdot (\nabla \times \mathbf{v})$, the helicity, reverses sign. Inspection of equation (6) of the last section shows that, since Galactic rotation is positive around \hat{z} , helicity is negative above the midplane and α is positive.

Given the uncertainty in the properties of interstellar turbulence, it is difficult to give an explicit form for α , so various forms have been tried in order to explicitly solve the eigenvalue equations. The simplest form $\alpha = \alpha_0 z/h$, is probably as good as any.

To solve the eigenvalue equations (13), they are cast into dimensionless form.

$$\begin{aligned} z' &= z/h, & t' &= \beta t/h^2, & \gamma' &= \gamma h^2/\beta, \\ B_\theta &= B'(\beta/h\alpha_0), & B_r &= B'_r(\beta/h\alpha_0). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

so that the dimensionless eigenvalue equations become

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma' B_r &= -\frac{\partial}{\partial z'}(z' B'), + \frac{\partial^2 B_r}{\partial z'^2}, \\ \gamma' B' &= D B_r + \frac{\partial^2 B'}{\partial z'^2} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where the dimensionless number

$$D = -\frac{\Omega \alpha_0 h^3}{\beta^2}, \quad (16)$$

determines the eigenvalue γ' . (Since Ω, h, α_0 and β are positive, D is negative.)

D is known as the *dynamo number*. It represents competition between the growth terms (shear and the α effect), and diffusion (the β effect) and determines whether γ is real and positive. There is a negative critical value D_c such that if $D < D_c$, then γ is positive and the magnetic field will grow exponentially. The dimensional growth time, if $\gamma' = 1$, is h^2/β .

Following Parker or Ruzmaikin, Shukurov and Sokoloff, one obtains an approximate idea of the size of β in the interstellar medium, by taking the random turbulent velocity $\delta v \approx 10\text{km/sec}$, and the correlation length $\delta v \tau \approx 100$ pc. This gives $\beta \approx 1.5 \times 10^{26}$ cm²/sec. A possible value for h is 300 pc. This gives for the dimensionless growth time $1.5 \times 10^{16}\text{sec} = 5 \times 10^8$ years. That is to say, if the eigenvalue problem leads to $\gamma' = 1$, an initial seed field will exponentiate every 500 million years, and there could be roughly twenty efoldings during

the age of the Galactic disc. This would raise an initial field by a factor of 10^8 from say a field of 10^{-14} gauss to 10^{-6} gauss.

It should be noted that in the Galaxy today, while 300 pc is probably a reasonable scale height for α , the observed magnetic scale height appears to be 1500 pc. However, since the field is anchored in the thinner interstellar mass, 300 pc is the better value. The field at 1500 pc. is confined by magnetic tension which has not been taken into account in the simplified dynamo theories. Using a larger value of h would decrease the rate of diffusion, increase $|D|$, and increase the growth rate of dynamo waves.

Since the $\alpha - \Omega$ dynamo leads to exponential growth of the mean field, it must eventually saturate. This is expected to happen by nonlinear quenching of α and β . Many papers have been devoted to exploring this quenching. (For example, see the excellent papers of Blackman & Field, 1999, 2000 or Kleeorin et al. 200, 2002, 2003). The crux of the issue is whether the dynamo is quenched when the mean field \bar{B} comes to equipartition with the turbulence (which is approximately the situation in our Galaxy), or whether small scale fields suppress the dynamo long before \bar{B} reaches equipartition. We return to the issue of the small scale fields in §14. For an extensive review the saturation problem consult the Physics Report of Brandenburg and Subramanian (2005), and also Shukurov (2004).

Proceeding with the mean field analysis and examining equations (13), we see that they are symmetric in z so that there are solutions with two different parities. In one both magnetic field components are even in z , and in the other they are both odd. The first solution is called the *quadrupole* solution. It has a much smaller critical dynamo number than the odd one which is called the *dipole* solution. The quadrupole solution is the one whose parity agrees most closely with the present Galactic field, which appears to be symmetric with respect to the midplane. However, this is the solution in which the net flux in the disc changes and, therefore, requires the flux expulsion provided by the vacuum boundary conditions. Its critical dynamo number is about -13 for the form we have chosen for $\alpha(z)$.

If one had closed boundary conditions with $\partial B_r / \partial z = \partial B_\theta / \partial z = 0$, no such flux problem arises, and one would not need flux expulsion. For this case, the critical number for the dipole solution is -4 , and a growing quadrupole solution does not exist. Thus, knowing nothing about the observations one would naturally expect the galactic disc dynamo to generate this dipole solution,

which both avoids the flux expulsion problem and has a lower critical dynamo number. The fact that the Galaxy possess the more difficult quadrupole solution with its larger critical dynamo number seems to imply that the field did not originate from a seed field with random symmetry, but had an already established quadrupole symmetry and a respectable field strength from the beginning. We discuss the flux expulsion problem in §9.

We conclude this section with an estimate of the dynamo number. The estimates of the value of α_0 and β given by Parker, and RSS, will be presented in the next section. It will be shown that earlier estimates converged on a value of α of about 0.1 km/sec. Taking the above values of β and h , and $\Omega \approx 10^{-15}$ /sec, we find that D is about unity, a value an order of magnitude too small for dynamo amplification of the quadrupole field. However, as seen, in §7 the properties inferred for the interstellar turbulent motions driving the dynamo are too pessimistic. [See Field (1995)]. During the nineties Ferrière (1992a,b, 1993a,b) recognized that the observed turbulent motions were mostly the intrinsic motions of expanding supernovae remnants and expanding superbubble shells. These motions have much longer correlation in scale and time than that previously assumed for the turbulence, and thus lead to larger values for the dynamo number and for the growth rates. We discuss the dynamos based on this turbulence in §8.

7 The magnitudes of α and β in the interstellar medium

As mentioned in the previous section, the most popular theory for the origin of the Galactic field is based on the mean field dynamo theory first developed by Steenbeck, Krause, & Rädler (1966). For a systematic presentation see Krause and Rädler (1980). This theory was applied to the Galactic disc dynamo by Vainshtein & Ruzmaikin (1972) in the early seventies. At the same time and completely independently of the work of Steenbeck et al., and of Vainshtein & Ruzmaikin, Parker developed his own dynamo theory (Parker 1970a,b,c, 1971a,b,c,d,e, 1973a, 1979), and his own application to the galactic dynamo problem.

The work of Vainshtein and Ruzmaikin is best summarized in the book “Magnetic fields in galaxies “ written by Ruzmaikin, Shukurov, and Sokoloff (1988). which we will refer to in the remainder of this

review as RSS. Parker's work is expanded and detailed in his book "Cosmical Magnetic Fields ", (1979). The equations that Parker derived are completely equivalent to those of Steenbeck, Krause and Rädler, and in his application to the Galactic field, are also equivalent to those of RSS.

The success of the dynamo theory for an origin of the Galactic field that is based on the amplification of weak fields during the life of the galactic disc, hinges on the values of the coefficients α, β and the effective Galactic half thickness h . These are encapsulated into the dynamo number D , in equation (16).

Let us assume that when the Galactic disc is first formed, it possessed a very weak field with field strength ranging from 10^{-16} , (which can arise by compression from an even weaker field strength 10^{-20}) generated earlier by a Biermann battery, or by other means.

Then, to increase this field to its present strength of a few microgauss and quadrupole symmetry, certain conditions must be satisfied. The dynamo number D defined in the previous section must be negative and exceed 13 in magnitude by a large enough amount that the growth rate is fast enough to increase the Galactic field from its initial very small value to its present value of a few microgauss. For example, if the growth time were five hundred million years and the age of the Galactic disc ten billion years, then the field must exponentiate twenty times an increase by a factor of 10^8 . This would amplify an initial field of order 10^{-14} gauss to the present observed value. A somewhat faster growth than this could amplify the field from 10^{-16} gauss. The question reduces to whether the interstellar values of the coefficients can achieve so fast a growth rate.

Both Parker (1979) and RSS give rough estimates of the dynamo number and when reduced to the same definitions the values based on rather different estimates come out to be remarkably close.

In this discussion we defer the problem of flux escape and the justification for vacuum boundary conditions to §9.

The critical dynamo number for any growth at all is $D = -13$. The dimensional growth time, h^2/β , was shown in the last section to be five hundred million years. If we take such a growth time as adequate for dynamo generation of the field, then we need the dimensionless growth rate $\gamma' \approx 1$.

Then from the figure VII.2 in RSS we see that the required dynamo number is $D = -25$. If the absolute value of D is smaller, then the growth time is longer.

Parker estimates D in his book (Parker 1979), making the best estimates he can of α and β . He bases his estimate of α (Γ in his notation) on a model he constructs for a rising convection cell in the Galactic disc. He arrives at the estimate

$$\alpha \approx \frac{1}{8} \pi \epsilon L \Omega \approx 0.04 L \Omega, \quad (17)$$

where for his model $\epsilon \approx 0.1$, and L is the radius or spacing of convection cells. For this he takes $L \approx 100pc$. This leads to

$$\alpha \approx 0.1 \text{km/sec} . \quad (18)$$

He estimates β (which he calls η_T) from another model for diffusion. He finds that

$$\beta \approx 0.2 v L \quad (19)$$

where v is the observed velocity of the interstellar clouds which he assumes is typical of the observed interstellar turbulent motions.

Thus, his value for D (which he calls $(Kh)^3$) is

$$(Kh)^3 = D \approx -\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)(h/L)^3(\Omega\tau)^2 \quad (20)$$

where $\tau = L/v$ is his estimate of the correlation time. He takes $h = 400ps$. His factor of $3/2$ is based on assuming Keplerian rotation of the Galactic disc, and should actually be replaced by unity. This equation (after this replacement) leads to his estimate of the dynamo number $D \approx -4$.

This estimate is based on very rough assumptions, so the fact that it is less than the critical number for excitation of the $\alpha - \Omega$ dynamo in the the quadrupole mode is not of too great a concern. It is interesting that in spite of the very large and small numbers going into the definition of the dynamo number it turns out to be of the correct order of magnitude for exciting the dipole mode.

RSS also made an estimate of the dynamo number. Their estimate is based on a less careful estimate of the $\alpha - \Omega$ dynamo coefficients, but leads to a value rather close to Parker's estimate. Their estimate for α given on page 181 of their book is $\alpha = L^2/\Omega/h \approx 1\text{km/s}$, but apparently they left out the factor of one third in the definition of α . Taking the same number $L = 100pc$, $h = 400pc$ we see that their estimate for α is larger than Parker's estimate of $\Gamma = .04L\Omega$ by a factor of about six. (With the factor of one third th is would be twice

Parker's value.) Their estimate for β is $\beta \approx \frac{1}{3}Lv$ larger than Parker's estimate by a factor of five thirds. These values lead to their estimate for $D \approx 10$. If we restore the missing factor of $1/3$ in RSS's estimate for α , their estimate reduces to $D \approx 3$, not far from Parker's estimate of $D \approx 4$.

Both of the two estimates for D are substantially smaller than that necessary to produce the present value of the Galactic field starting from a reasonable seed value in the lifetime of the Galaxy.

We have given these estimates in some detail because for a while these were the principal estimates for the action of the $\alpha - \Omega$ Galactic dynamo and the astrophysical basis of these estimates can be easily understood. If taken seriously, they result in a rather discouraging numerical situation for the Galactic dynamo. Clearly, to make the dynamo work some way to increase the effective value of α is needed.

It is interesting that for closed boundary conditions (no flux escape) the critical dynamo number is about -4 for the dipole mode. These boundary conditions correspond to no net flux in the local region of the Sun. Since the observations seem to require the nonzero flux quadrupole mode, one has a feeling that if the Galactic dynamo is the origin of its field, the Galaxy would choose the more difficult quadrupole mode for its magnetic field structure.

It is intriguing and provocative that more recent Faraday rotation observations seem to indicate that there actually is some asymmetry about the Galactic midplane (Han, 2001, 2002, 2006, Han Manchester, Berkhuijsen and Beck 1997) These results are based on Faraday rotation measurements of pulsars at Galactic latitudes $b > 10$ deg in the second and third quadrants. The other measurements still are quite symmetric.

As mentioned in the last section, the remaining option is, of course, that the magnetic field is pregalactic, and initially had the quadrupole symmetry.

This was the dynamo situation in 1991. But the whole picture was changed substantially by a careful analytic series of excellent papers published by Katia Ferrière (Ferrière 1992, 1993a,b, 1996, 1998, Ferrière & Schmidt 2000). These papers turned the whole situation around leading to a much more definitive analysis of the astrophysical situation, a more precise evaluation of the dynamo coefficients, and a much clearer picture of the helicity of interstellar turbulence. It turns out that the turbulence of interest is not that resulting from stirring of the interstellar medium by stellar winds and supernova. The mo-

tions of importance are those actually present in the supernovae and superbubble explosions themselves. We discuss Ferrière’s analysis in the next section.

8 Ferrière’s dynamo theory based on supernova and superbubble explosions

The estimates of dynamo action in the Galactic disc by Parker and RSS were derived from what little was known in the seventies and eighties about interstellar turbulence, as well as an educated guess as to the effect galactic rotation would have in producing kinetic helicity. It has always been correctly assumed that the main source of the observed turbulent motions is due to supernova explosions and stellar winds. However, it was earlier supposed that this turbulence arose due to the injection of supernova energy into the interstellar medium, stirring it up into turbulent motions. This did not appear to make the turbulence strong enough to amplify the Galactic field.

Ferrière took a more direct approach to the dynamo problem, using the actual velocities of the expanding supernova shells during the explosions themselves as the mechanism for producing α and β . That is, she asserted that the magnetic field is produced during the actual explosions, and much of the random motion we see in the interstellar clouds and interpret as fluid turbulence, is the actual expansion velocities of the explosions themselves.

To analyze this, she made use of a blast wave model for supernovae in which the interstellar magnetic field and the ambient interstellar medium at a particular time are swept up into a thin rapidly expanding sheet. She employs a definite expression for r , the radius of this sheet, as a function of time

$$\frac{r}{14\text{pc}} = \frac{E_{51}^{0.22}}{n_0^{0.26}} \left(\frac{t}{10^4 \text{ years}} \right)^{0.3} . \quad (21)$$

(Ferrière 1992a, Weaver et al, 1977). She then derives the behavior of the plasma motions and the magnetic field evolution in this sheet, under the influence of Galactic rotation. As the shell expands, its moment of inertia increases by a large factor and the shell tries to come to rest in the laboratory frame, thus appearing to rotate backwards in the frame of the rotating Galaxy. Since the initial field and the matter in which it is embedded were initially rotating with the Galaxy, the

effect of the Coriolis forces produce helical motions that twist the magnetic field out of its original plane. If the field is initially toroidal, then this twist partially rotates it into the radial, or poloidal, direction and produces the α effect needed to complete the dynamo.

The actual angle through which the field is twisted is roughly the angle that the Galaxy rotates at the radius of the supernova, i.e. the angle it would rotate during the lifetime of the supernova, a few hundred thousand years. This twist is actually quite small, so that a perturbation calculation is adequate for the twist of the field. However, under the influence of the many supernovae that a given piece of the interstellar medium suffers, the twist accumulates. Since it is always in the same direction, it accumulates to a finite value in few hundred million years.

Ferrière calculates this effect with considerable precision taking into account that, relative to a fixed point, P , the many different supernova remnants which overlap this point occur with different directions and distances from P . Some supernovae occur quite close to P , and produce a stronger effect than those that explode farther away. It is known that the frequency of supernovae at any given place is roughly comparable to the reciprocal lifetime of a typical supernova remnant, so that the angular rate of the accumulated twisting of the piece of the field line at point P is a finite fraction of the rotation of the Galaxy. Thus, it is no longer necessary to make a very rough guess as to the value of α . By using her technique the full α tensor can be calculated with some precision. Its value depends mainly on the frequency and spatial distribution of the supernovae. These are reasonably well known, as are the details of the expansion.

Further, it was possible to calculate the other parameter of the dynamo theory, β . This is obtained by evaluating the mixing of the plasma and magnetic field while they are in the expanding shell.

There is another important parameter she introduces into the dynamo theory, the escape velocity, V_{esc} of the field lines and plasma. Because supernovae occur closer to the midplane of the Galaxy than the bulk of the interstellar medium and its magnetic field, the result of any explosion on the average is to expel the plasma and field lines away from the midplane. Ferrière points out that this average displacement per unit time is equivalent to V_{esc} , but she keeps it in the turbulent term in the dynamo equation.

A difficulty with her calculation is that she only includes the effect of the supernova remnant on the plasma and field when the remnant

is expanding, and does not consider the effect on the field when its plasma falls back to its original position, after the supernova expansion concludes. Her assumption is that the magnetic field would not be acted on coherently during the fall back, so that the twisting that occurs during the explosion would persist. This again involves the physical process of the magnetic flux separating from the plasma. This remains a serious problem in her calculations which we also discuss in §9.

A pictorial view of how the supernova explosion actually amplifies the magnetic field without violating flux conservation is shown in Figure 1, (Kulsrud, 2000) The various panels are alternate views from the side towards the Galactic center and from above. In panel (a), the supernova is shown just before it goes off and an undisturbed magnetic line in the toroidal direction is also shown. After the supernova remnant has expanded to a radius ρ and the radiative phase of the explosion is reached, nearly all of the swept up matter is contained in a thin shell at its boundary and the magnetic field lines are embedded in this shell. This is shown in panel (b). Outside of the bubble the field and plasma are undisturbed. Because the matter has been shifted from the place it occupied before the explosion where it uniformly filled the sphere to the shell, the matter in the shell has increased its moment of inertia by a large factor. By conservation of angular momentum the supernova bubble decreases its rotational velocity in the laboratory frame and rotates backward in the Galactic frame, as shown from a top view in panel (c). The piece of the original line in its original plane is shown by the solid line, and the part overlapping the supernova bubble is shown by the dotted line.

The rotation has displaced the footpoints of the line in the radial direction in this plane. But this displacement plus the differential rotation of the Galaxy displaces the lines in the toroidal direction, as shown in another top view in panel (d). Thus, in the original horizontal plane the field line has doubled over itself, increasing its field strength and the magnetic flux in this plane. On the other hand, the field overlapping the supernova has developed negative toroidal flux compensating for this increase and still conserving total toroidal




Figure 1: The operation of the $\alpha - \Omega$ dynamo. In (a) and (b) a supernova blows the magnetic loop. It is twisted into the poloidal plane by Coriolis forces as is seen in the top view of (c). The dashed line represents the upper part of the loop. In (d) the lower part of the line is stretched by differential rotation. Then the upper part of the line is removed to infinity as in (e) and (f).

flux. If the supernova continues to expand indefinitely, or at least the flux line continues to rise indefinitely, as shown by the side views in panels (e), and (f), the part of the field line on top of the supernova bubble would be removed from the Galactic disc and the toroidal flux in the disc will have increased. Since negative flux is removed far away, it is no longer counted when one describes the Galactic field. No Faraday rotation measure passes through this removed flux and the rotation measure in the disc is now doubled. In this manner the problem of flux conservation is solved. [Note that if the two vertical parts of the line in panel (f) should magnetically reconnect then the lower part of the reconnected line would return to the disc and cancel any net gain in magnetic flux there.]

The last of the panels in this picture represents how the vacuum boundary conditions, assumed in the conventional $\alpha - \Omega$ dynamo, are imagined to act. One can see the difficulty with which this dynamo is faced. The question is reduced to whether the flux in the expanding plasmas can actually escape from the Galaxy. Generally, except for supernovae that occur in the halo, the supernova bubble is slowed down below the Galactic escape velocity by gravity and ram pressure on the interstellar medium. It stops long before it reaches more than a hundred parsecs or so above the plane. Then the danger to the dynamo field amplification is that the matter in the supernova shell falls back down and any unwanted flux still embedded in it cancels out the amplified field. The result in this case is that there is little or no amplification at all.

The separation of flux from plasmas during the expansion is crucial to the amount of amplification. If the field is very weak, there is no way for the plasma to know it has flux embedded in it, and there will be no separation at all.

To calculate the dynamo action of a supernova Ferrière selects some point P at which she calculates the dynamo action. (See Figure 2.) She then calculates the electric field \mathbf{E} at this point during the time in which the shell passes over it. This is given by

$$\mathbf{E} = -\frac{\delta\mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B}}{c} \quad (22)$$




Figure 2: The supernova shell passing point P

at this point while the thin supernova shell passes over this point. ($\delta\mathbf{v}$ is the expansion velocity which though large she denotes by a δ since she regards it as random when summed over many supernovae.) She treats the Coriolis forces and the magnetic field twisting as first order in a perturbation expansion. To first order she takes \mathbf{B} from flux freezing. That is she calculates the field as though it were simply swept up by the snowplow effect of the supernova shock using the blast solution for the shock motion given in equation (21).

With this model the electric field at the point P is nonzero only when the shell passes over it. There is no velocity before the shell reaches P , and after it passes, the magnetic field is reduced to zero. The time integration of \mathbf{E} at P is just such as to produce the field which cancels the original field leaving B zero as one expects. Although the shell may be very thin, and the time over which the \mathbf{E} is nonzero very short, the magnetic field in the shell is very large and the actual magnitude of \mathbf{E} multiplied by the time when it is nonzero is finite and independent of this thinness.

To properly include the twisted part of the changed magnetic field Ferrière evaluates the first order velocity $\delta\mathbf{v}$ in the shell, taking into account the effect of the Coriolis force on the zero order velocity, and $\delta\mathbf{B}$, the first order change of the magnetic field produced by the $\delta\mathbf{v}$.

Substituting her result for $\delta\mathbf{v}$ and $\delta\mathbf{B}$ into the expression for \mathbf{E} given by equation (22), integrating it over time at the fixed P , summing this result over all supernovae that interact with the point P during some long time t , and then dividing by t , she finds the long time average of \mathbf{E} at P . She assumes supernovae occur randomly with

a distribution that depends only on z , the height of above the plane. The resulting value she finds for \mathbf{E} gives her the mean value for α and β to use in the dynamo equation to calculate the evolution of the mean field $\bar{\mathbf{B}}$. See equation (11) of §6.

The result is a tensor for α which depends on the original orientation of \mathbf{B} before she started her averaging over supernovae. If \mathbf{B} is in the toroidal direction, i.e. the same direction as the Galactic rotation, then α is a scalar, the same scalar originally considered by Parker, RSS, and others. However, in general, \mathbf{B} will have other components and the tensor character of α becomes important. (Ferrière, 1998).

In addition to α she also obtains expressions for the β tensor and for \mathbf{V}_{esc} , which is a vector in the \hat{z} direction.

Using the same technique, Ferrière also considered the contribution of superbubbles to the Galactic value of α . A superbubble is the result of many supernovae going off effectively simultaneously. The simultaneous explosion of many supernovae at the same time and place arises from the formation of stars close together in clusters at nearly the same time. The more massive stars exhaust their nuclear fuel at nearly the same time and one finds that, during the lifetime of a single supernova, many others explode. The gaseous remnants overlap and form a low density bubble of high pressure gas. This drives a shock that arises from the energy input of all the supernovae, rather than from the kinetic energy of the individual explosions.

As far as driving the dynamo effects the superbubble acts just as a single supernova does. In the thin shell, driven outward at high velocity, the Coriolis forces act to twist the lines. However, a superbubble is much bigger than a single supernova shock and lasts much longer. As a result, the effect on the dynamo is much greater than that of individual supernovae, even when one takes account of the smaller number of superbubbles than supernovae. The radial time dependence of the superbubble shock which Ferrière employs is (Ferrière 1992a, McCray & Kafatos, 1987)

$$\frac{r_s}{267\text{pc}} = \left(\frac{L_{38}}{n_0}\right)^{0.2} \left(\frac{t}{10^7\text{yr}}\right)^{0.6}, \quad (23)$$

where L_{38} is the luminosity in units of 10^{38} ergs/s and r_s is the cylindrical radius.

Comparing the times and distances in this equation with those for the single supernova, one can see that the superbubbles extend to much greater distances and last a great deal longer. The larger

distances and times allow the galactic Coriolis forces to act longer, and produce a larger effect in the superbubble shells than in single supernova shells. This is compensated somewhat by the fact that there are typically thirty times more supernovae than superbubbles. However, even taking this into account Ferrière found that the effect of all the superbubbles was larger than that of all the supernovae by a factor of order seven, even though the total number of supernovae in superbubbles is comparable with their total number of supernova.

Making use of these calculations, Ferrière developed the Galactic dynamo to a new level of precision. She established several new results in these papers. One result was that the α , in the alpha effect is a tensor unless the initial Galactic magnetic field is purely in the toroidal direction. She calculated the β tensor using the same procedures. In addition, she found a new systematic velocity V_{esc} that represents the rate at which the magnetic field lines rise above the midplane of the Galaxy (during the expansion phase of the bubbles). Ignoring any fallback of the magnetic flux, she took this velocity to represent the rate of flux loss to the disc.

There is one correction that should be made to her calculations. She calculates the mean α effect at a fixed point. That is to say, she assumes that the α tensor which she calculates gives the rate of evolution of the poloidal field at this fixed point. But there is a term missing in her calculation that when introduced implies that her value of α actually gives the evolution following the expansion of the shell. This seems intuitively clear when one notes that, after the shell passes point P , there are no field lines left at P . All the field lines have been assumed to be swept up by the shell. This extra term disappears if one carries out the calculation in the moving frame and expresses α as a function of the Lagrangian coordinate, the fluid element. Her method of calculation working with the averaged time integral of the electric field, which she calls the *E.M.F.*, tends to hide this extra term.

Correcting for this by making this simple transformation from an Eulerian independent variable to the Lagrangian variable should make her calculation more correct.

It is interesting that she calculates the actual change of the field in Lagrangian coordinates, and then uses this changed field to calculate the dynamo coefficients α and β which are subsequently used to calculate the mean change in \mathbf{B} . This roundabout procedure is an attempt to relate her calculation to the standard $\alpha - \Omega$ mean field dynamo theory. However, the approach from supernova and superbubble to

the dynamo does not quite fit the assumptions of the dynamo theory which assume that the turbulence scales are small compared to the large scales on which the mean field is to be calculated. The supernova and superbubble remnants are on a scale of the total thickness of the Galactic disk. It would be neater if she just stopped with the changed fields in any given Lagrangian element of plasma and directly averaged the changes occurring in a given plasma element rather than referring them to the dynamo coefficients.

9 The validity of the vacuum boundary conditions

As emphasized in §6 and §7, boundary conditions at $z = \pm h$, are needed to compute the rate of growth of the dynamo mode. To see that these conditions are directly related to the change of flux in the disc for the quadrupole eigenfunction, integrate the first equation of (13) from $-h$ to $+h$. This yields

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{-h}^{+h} B_r = \beta \frac{\partial B_r}{\partial z} \Big|_{-h}^{+} - \alpha B_\theta \Big|_{-h}^{+h}, \quad (24)$$

where B_r , B_θ are assumed symmetric. We see that the first term $-\beta \partial B_r / \partial z$ is the rate of escape of the B_r flux through the boundary while from the zero boundary conditions on B_r and B_θ , the second term vanishes. Although the flux lines of the mean field are not frozen in the plasma its global flux inside the disc still satisfies the conservation relation (24). The B_θ flux is not *per se* conserved, since it grows as the B_r flux is wound up, but this does not increase the number of lines of force.

As discussed in §6, the boundary conditions customarily assumed at $\pm h$ are that the fields vanish, and this is the natural condition if the flux which reaches the boundary, escapes instantaneously. Physically this is difficult to imagine because, flux freezing implies that any flux that escapes is embedded in interstellar matter. Thus, for the dynamo to work, a large portion of the interstellar medium must be removed at every e-folding of the magnetic field. [However, see Brandenburg, Moss & Shukurov, (1995), Dobler, Poezd, & Shukurov, (1996) and Shukurov, (2004), where this problem is discussed.] Let a fraction f of the entire interstellar medium be removed for every exponential

increase of the magnetic field. Then, if the field strength increases from B_0 to B_1 , the mass of the interstellar medium decreases from M_0 to $M_1 = M_0(B_1/B_0)^{-f}$. To raise the field from $B_0 = 10^{-16}$ gauss to $B_1 = 10^{-6}$ gauss with $f = 1/3$ would require $M_0 \sim 2000M_1$, which seems untenable, and inconsistent with the progressive chemical enrichment of the interstellar medium over time observed from stellar composition measurements.

These numbers give one pause when considering these assumed boundary conditions.

Further, the energy to remove this amount of mass to infinity requires $1/2v_{esc}^2$ per unit mass, where $v_{esc} \sim 500\text{km/s}$ is the escape velocity (Smith et al. 2007). This gives of order 10^{15} ergs /g. Taking $M_1 \sim 10^9$ solar masses we find an energy requirement of about 10^{60} ergs. Thus, an amount of order the total luminosity emitted over the disc life, is needed to amplify the magnetic field by the galactic dynamo under the above assumptions. Clearly, a better way is needed to remove flux.

A more analytic treatment of the boundary conditions is discussed in the review article of Beck et al 1996. They state that the turbulent resistivity β is much larger by a factor of say A^2 in the halo, (the region outside the disc $|z| > h$) larger than in the disc, and that α vanishes in the halo. In this case, the components of the halo magnetic field, in the dimensionless units of equation (14) of §6, are proportional to $e^{-Az'}$ and the boundary conditions at $z' = \pm 1$ should be that the field there is smaller than the average field by about $(\mp 1/A)$. For large A the boundary conditions become essentially the vacuum condition $\mathbf{B} = 0$.

To justify this large increase in the halo value of β , Beck et al. quote results from Poezd, Shukurov & Sokoloff (1993). These authors estimate β from measurements of the random velocities in the halo made by Kulkarni & Fich (1985). The results were $\tilde{v} \approx 10$ km/sec, and the correlation length $\ell \approx 100$ pc. This increases β by a factor of one hundred above its disc value. But these measurements are made on the bare halo at a time when there is no escaping flux or mass. Surely if there was a large amount of mass diffusing outwards, the velocity fluctuations would be much smaller due to the large amount of energy involved in lifting the mass-loaded flux outward.

Beck et. al. (1996) also appeal to arguments given by Brandenburg et al (1995), who attempt to treat the actual outward escape of flux by invoking reconnection of it with the halo field. Again, the reconnection

for this merging is based on replacing the normal resistivity η by the very large turbulent resistivity β .

Now it is not clear that there is enough magnetic flux in the halo field to match the expelled flux and accommodate this reconnection. Further, β is not a true resistivity and can only mix the field lines of different sign. The field lines rising up from the disc would still be loaded with the heavy interstellar mass while the other lines would be much lighter. Then even after the lines are mixed, the gravitational field could separate them allowing the original field lines to sink back and cancel any gain from the dynamo.

It must be borne in mind that, when trying to arrive at the *origin* of the Galactic magnetic field, we are primarily interested in building up the field from an extremely weak initial value. When the field is weak, such mixing is unlikely to occur. Also any true reconnection due to real resistivity would be too slow to be of interest.

A third possibility to justify the boundary conditions, at least physically, is to imagine that the escaping flux is lifted in huge arcs such as occur in superbubbles, and to have the mass slide down the flux tubes. This would leave the field lines at the tops of the arches unloaded and lighter so that this piece of them might escape by buoyancy or cosmic ray pressure (Parker 1992, Hanasz et al 2004). However, again this can not work in the early dynamo stages when the field is weak because the magnetic field can have no dynamic consequence; the fluid flows in a direction independent of the magnetic field and probably just falls straight down.

It also does not seem to work when the field is stronger, at least for the superbubble case, because the mass at the top is on a nearly horizontal line, and the rate of flow down the field lines is too slow to release much flux. This is demonstrated in the paper of Rafikov & Kulsrud (2000). Further, the presence of cosmic rays on the field lines in this latter case also inhibits the downflow along the lines. This is because an Alfvén wave instability is produced by any relative motion of the cosmic rays and the matter exceeding the Alfvén speed. (Rafikov & Kulsrud 2000, Kulsrud & Pearce 1969.) This instability couples the parallel motion of the plasma and the cosmic rays and has the result that the cosmic ray pressure stops the downsiding.

The most reasonable way for the flux to escape and properly complete the $\alpha\Omega$ dynamo theory would be to have the superbubbles blow the mass entirely out of the Galaxy. But, in our Galaxy, except for the rare case where a superbubble occurs high in the halo, the su-

perbubble shell is slowed down by the ram pressure of the swept up material. Then the gravitational downpull is enough to stop it before it has gone far enough to escape from the Galaxy. This is found to be the case in the many numerical simulations (MacLow & McCray 1988).

However, as emphasized by Heiles (1990) the number of supernovae in a superbubble assumed in these simulations is taken as the average number (thirty) and further the superbubble is taken to start at the midplane. Superbubbles which contain more than the average number of supernova and which start at a position that is high enough above the central plane of the disk that lies above the bulk of the interstellar medium will lead to a blowout that expels their mass entirely out of the galaxy, (See in figure 1f.) These events which are rare, should occur independently of the magnetic field strength and happen at any time during the life of the disc, even when the magnetic field is weak.

As long as the vertical field lines do not reconnect some net flux expulsion will occur and make the galactic dynamo viable although if these events are rare the dynamo will be weak. One cannot ignore this possibility. However, if this is the case, the dynamo would be extremely inhomogeneous. The resulting field lines would be discontinuous as viewed inside the disc (but actually connected through intergalactic space). Such a configuration has not been considered in interpretations of the galactic field. Whether it could be consistent with observations of the interstellar field is unclear. However, it would certainly change the general picture of the galactic field.

For smaller galaxies in which the gravitational field is weaker or in starburst galaxies where the superbubbles are stronger the flux expulsion problem is eased and the $\alpha - -\Omega$ dynamo actually could more easily produce magnetic fields.

The $\alpha - -\Omega$ dynamo is a beautiful mechanism. It only appears to be limited by these difficult boundary conditions issues. However, they are very hard to get around when the magnetic field is very weak. In fact, it does work quite well for the dipole symmetry where the total flux is zero and does not need to change. If the $\alpha - \Omega$ dynamo is the main agent for growing the magnetic field strength, it seems very surprising that the Galactic symmetry is not odd.

It is entirely possible that a reasonable way to separate out the unwanted flux may emerge and resolve the Galactic dynamo problems. This would go a long way toward establishing an origin for cosmic magnetic fields. Any indirect evidence as to the state of the Galactic

field at the inception of the disc would also go far toward resolving whether the $\alpha - \Omega$ dynamo is the primary source of the field. Indeed, there is actually some evidence which, while still uncertain, does bear on the problem. This evidence, discussed in §2, comes from the abundance of the light elements Li, Be, and B in very old stars.

10 Arguments against a primordial origin

We have raised some difficulties with the galactic disc dynamo as the sole origin of the Galactic magnetic field. There are also a number of arguments that have been raised against a pregalactic origin. These have been expressed by Woltjer (1969), Parker (1973b, 1979 p. 519 and p. 525), and Rosner & Ducca, (1988). [But see Kulsrud (1990), Howard and Kulsrud (1997) and Kulsrud (2006).]

The mechanisms for the production of a pregalactic field have been developed with much less precision than those for the galactic dynamo. The plasma physics of the very early universe is only partially known. In addition, events that occur very early on have a coherence scale smaller than the Hubble radius at the corresponding redshift z . In fact, the corresponding comoving scale (the present scale of the cosmos that had the Hubble radius at red shift z) is equal to the present Hubble radius times $(1 + z)^{-1/2}$. The observed scale of the Galactic field is at least 1 kpc which corresponds to a region of the universe of about 10 kpc before collapse to the Galaxy. Thus, any magnetic field generated at a red shift $z > 10^{13}$, corresponding to a temperature 10^9 electron volts, would lead to a field whose present scale is smaller than 1 kpc in the Galaxy. After the time corresponding to this temperature, which is the electron - neutrino decoupling temperature, the plasma physics seems well understood and there are few grounds for believing that anything mysterious could generate a magnetic field.

A very weak field with strength of order 10^{-20} gauss could reasonably be generated by action of the Biermann battery mechanism discussed in the next section, (Biermann 1950), or by interaction of the electrons with the CMB photons (Mishustin & Ruzmaikin 1972). But such a field could only serve as a seed field, and this is generally accepted as a reasonable seed field for galactic dynamos.

One possibility that has been taken seriously for a pregalactic origin, is a field generated at moderate redshift by turbulence that occurs

during structure formation, say in the protogalaxy, (Pudritz & Silk, 1989, Kulsrud, Cen, Ostriker & Ryu, 1997). This possibility will be discussed in §12. Another possibility that is seriously considered is that the magnetic field is somehow generated when a large radio jet is formed, say by dynamo generation by a black hole at its center. Magnetic fields of substantial strength are presently observed in such giant radio jets. There are even some Faraday rotation measurements of such fields that indicate the magnetic flux is large enough that if spread out throughout the universe it would provide the total flux currently observed in all the galaxies. If this should happen before galaxies form, then the field is already present in the plasma out of which the galaxies form, and would thus have a pregalactic origin (Rees & Seti, 1968, Daly & Loeb, 1990, Furlanetto & Loeb, 2001). So far, the details of this filling of the universe with flux have not been worked out with any precision, but the presence of this amount of flux, if supported by the Faraday rotation measurements, is very suggestive as an origin for pregalactic fields, (Colgate & Li, 2000, Li et al. 2006a,b).

Before taking up the discussion of the first of these proposals for a pregalactic origin let us discuss the arguments that have been made against any primordial origin as opposed to a galactic dynamo origin, (see Kulsrud, 1990.)

There are essentially two arguments against a pregalactic magnetic field: (1) the winding up argument and (2) the escape of any magnetic field from the Galactic disc in a short time by turbulent diffusion.

One can explain the winding up argument as follows: Suppose one starts out with a uniform unidirectional field \mathbf{B}_0 in the $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ direction that extends over the entire Galactic disc. Then in cylindrical coordinate the radial component of the field is $B_r = B_0 \cos \theta$. Now, at each radial circle r of the Galaxy this radial field is rotated at a rate $\Omega(r)$, so after a time t the field is rotated by an angle Ωt , and

$$B_r(r, \theta, t) = B_0 \cos(\theta - \Omega(r)t). \quad (25)$$

By flux freezing, this field develops a toroidal component

$$B_\theta = B_r(r, \theta, t) \times r \frac{d\Omega}{dr} t. \quad (26)$$

This is a slowly varying function of r times B_r . But, if we look at the variation of B_r with r at fixed θ and t , we see that B_r oscillates in r with a wavelength equal to $\Delta r = 2\pi/(t|d\Omega/dr|)$. Now, near the

sun, Ωr is a constant, so $d\Omega/dr = -\Omega/r$ and $\Delta r/r = 2\pi/\Omega t \approx 1/50$. Thus, the toroidal field would change sign every 100 pc. Parker states that this is contrary to observations, and clearly such a field would produce a zero average Faraday rotation measure.

This winding up argument is one of the basic arguments against a primordial field origin. However, we are not sure that the correlation distance of the Galactic field is 1 kpc. We can only be sure that if it does reverse rapidly, it does not average out over such distances, since there are rotation measurements of pulsars much further away than this, (Rand & Kulkarni 1989). (The one-kiloparsec correlation distance is derived from models that take into account the possible reversal of the field between the spiral arms that have this spacing, but ignore the models with short reversals.)

On the other hand, the resolution of pulsar measurements is not as fine as 100 pc so that it is entirely possible that the field does reverse over 100 pc but does not average out. In fact, if the initial \mathbf{B}_0 field were not uniform, but varied by a factor of two over the diameter of the Galaxy, then an inspection of the above argument shows that the toroidal component of the field B_θ would still reverse with a scale of 100, but the toroidal field would one sign would be twice as large as that of the other sign and the Faraday rotation measurements would not average out. (See Howard & Kulsrud, 1997 and §15 for a similar result that would occur with ambipolar diffusion). It would be an interesting challenge to find out whether this is the case, or whether the field is actually of constant sign over such small distances. The field of our example could account for the puzzling fact that the fluctuations in synchrotron polarization direction are of different amplitude than the fluctuations associated with Faraday rotation measurements (Zweibel & Heiles 1997, Brown & Taylor 2001). This discussion is in no way able to establish that the Galactic field does indeed reverse over a small length. But the possibility of it does weaken the argument against a primordial origin.

The second argument, the escape argument, described by Parker on page 522 of his book, concerns the turbulent resistive decay of a pregalactic magnetic field. The decay rate by ordinary resistivity is very slow and can be disregarded. However, if one replaces the ordinary resistivity by the turbulent resistivity, $\beta \approx 10^{26} \text{cm}^2 / \text{sec}$, then the decay time is 300 million years and Parker argues that a primordial field would not survive for the lifetime of the Galaxy. However, we see in §9 that although this diffusion can mix the fields in the disc, they

cannot remove it from the disc unless the field is strong enough that it is able to separate itself physically from the interstellar material. (Without the separation, the diffusion mechanism would have to lift the interstellar medium entirely out of the Galaxy which we showed was energetically very difficult.)

Thus, neither of these arguments can definitively rule out the possibility that there was an initial large scale magnetic field of pregalactic origin.

In §15 we describe a modification of such a model in which ambipolar diffusion plays an important role and an initial field stronger than 10^{-8} gauss could be brought up to full strength without any dynamo action at all. However, total neglect of the $\alpha - \Omega$ dynamo is, of course, not realistic (Kulsrud 1990, Howard & Kulsrud 1997, Kulsrud 2006).

There is, an additional consideration that depends more on our current understanding of galaxy evolution. Our Galaxy currently has of order $10^9 M_{\odot}$ of interstellar material. There are many sources and sinks of gas: stellar winds, planetary nebula ejection, supernova explosions, infall of intergalactic clouds and small galaxies, star formation, and a possible galactic wind. Estimating the rates for all these processes leads to the conclusion that the interstellar gas is replaced mainly through cycling in and out of stars, on 10^9 year timescales, about 1/10 the age of the oldest stars in the Galaxy. If the magnetic field is in a steady state, dynamo processes must operate over that time to act on the new material. Of course, the new material may already be magnetized at a level far above the estimated pregalactic field strength, although it is unlikely to have the correct topology. Another alternative is that the already existing magnetic field somehow mixes into the new material, possibly by ambipolar diffusion (Heitsch et al 2004).

11 Seed fields

It is reasonable to assume that there was a time before which there were absolutely no magnetic fields in the universe. If flux freezing were an exact constraint, there would be no fields after this time either. This also follows directly from the magnetic differential equation (4) of §4. How *do* magnetic fields get started in the first place?

The most popular mechanism is the Biermann battery (Biermann, 1950). A magnetic field can arise from extra terms in Ohm's law which

are not included in equation (1).

These terms arise as follows:

First, we rederive the magnetic differential equation keeping the additional terms in Ohm's law. In fact, Ohm's law can be considered to be simply the equation of motion of the electron fluid (Spitzer 1962),

$$n_e m \frac{d\mathbf{v}_e}{dt} = -n_e e (\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{v}_e \times \mathbf{B}) - \nabla p_e + n_e m \mathbf{g} + \mathbf{F}_{ei}, \quad (27)$$

where \mathbf{F}_{ei} is the electron-ion frictional force, which is related to the $\eta \mathbf{j}$ term. We drop this term. We also drop the inertial term $n_e m (d\mathbf{v}_e/dt)$ and the gravitational term $n_e m \mathbf{g}$ because of the smallness of the electron mass density. Dividing the resulting equation by $n_e e$ we get

$$\mathbf{E} + \frac{\mathbf{v}_e \times \mathbf{B}}{c} = -\frac{\nabla p_e}{n_e e}. \quad (28)$$

To see physically how the Biermann battery works it must be realized that (in the absence of a magnetic field) any accumulation of the electron pressure at any point naturally leads to a tendency for the electrons to leave this point. But this automatically leads to a charge imbalance producing an electrostatic field, and this field is just strong enough to resist this tendency. (The charge imbalance to produce such a field is generally minute.) This field is

$$\mathbf{E} = \frac{\nabla p_e}{-n_e e}. \quad (29)$$

\mathbf{E} depends on p_e and n_e the electron pressure and density. If n_e is a constant in space, the electric field is curl free and purely electrostatic. Thus, it will drive no current just as a battery with its terminals unattached to wires produces no current. However, if n_e is not constant, \mathbf{E} may not be curl free and there can be a path in the plasma around which there would be a potential drop. Thus, a current would flow along this path and produce a changing magnetic field which would in turn induce an electric field to balance this potential drop. The key to the importance of this term is its dependence on n_e in addition to its proportionality to ∇p_e which enables it to act as a battery.

Now, the resulting current is known to be tiny, so $\mathbf{v}_e \approx \mathbf{v}_i$ to a very high degree of approximation. Further, even if the plasma is partially ionized, the electron temperature is kept close to the neutral temperature by collisions so that $p_e/n_e = p/n(1 + \chi) = Mp/\rho(1 + \chi)$,

where χ is the degree of ionization, which for the moment we take to be constant. Thus,

$$\mathbf{E} + \frac{\mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B}}{c} = -\frac{M}{e(1+\chi)} \frac{\nabla p}{\rho}. \quad (30)$$

Finally, taking the curl of this equation and combining it with the induction equation, one gets the modified magnetic differential equation,

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{B}}{\partial t} = \nabla \times (\mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B}) + \frac{\nabla p \times \nabla \rho}{\rho^2} \frac{Mc}{e(1+\chi)}. \quad (31)$$

It is well known that the vorticity $\boldsymbol{\omega} = \nabla \times \mathbf{v}$ satisfies a very similar equation

$$\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\omega}}{\partial t} = \nabla \times (\mathbf{v} \times \boldsymbol{\omega}) - \frac{\nabla p \times \nabla \rho}{\rho^2} + \nu \nabla^2 \boldsymbol{\omega}. \quad (32)$$

Thus, as long as viscosity is small, these equations are identical up to the factor $-e/Mc(1+\chi)$.

Therefore, $e\mathbf{B}/Mc = \boldsymbol{\Omega}$ and $-(1+\chi)\boldsymbol{\omega}$ satisfy the same equations. It is reasonable to assume that up until a certain time vorticity is also zero. Thus, we have that the magnetic field and the vorticity satisfy the same zero initial conditions. ($\boldsymbol{\Omega} = \boldsymbol{\omega} = 0$). Because the differential equations have a unique solution we find that

$$\boldsymbol{\Omega} = -\frac{\boldsymbol{\omega}}{(1+\chi)}. \quad (33)$$

is valid at least until the viscous dissipation term (or the resistivity term) becomes important.

Thus, when vorticity finally starts to grow, the magnetic field will grow with it. However, the resulting magnetic field strength due to this term is always tiny. To get an idea of its strength in a gravitational forming structure assume that its rotational energy is of the order of its gravitational energy, and thus the rate of rotation should be comparable to the free fall time, $1/\sqrt{4\pi G\rho}$. G is the gravitational constant and ρ the density. Now, $e/Mc = 10^4$ sec/gauss, so we have

$$B \approx 10^{-4} \sqrt{4\pi G\rho} \approx 10^{-19} \sqrt{n}. \quad (34)$$

where n is the hydrogen number density cm^{-3} . Thus, for typical cosmic densities, the resulting magnetic field is well below 10^{-21} gauss.

Actually, equation (31) for the evolution of the magnetic field only holds as long as the viscosity term plays no role in the evolution of

ω ; that is, as long as the vorticity itself does not saturate. But when the vorticity becomes strong there is Kolmogorov nonlinear coupling to small scales, establishing a cascade which is terminated by viscosity acting on small scales. Effectively, vorticity on all scales reaches saturation, even though the effective viscosity on large scales is small. Thus, the Biermann battery continues to operate, increasing B above the value given equation (33).

If one examines equation (31), which gives the evolution of \mathbf{B} , we see that there are two limits. When the magnetic field is extremely small, the first term on the right, the dynamo term, is negligible and the field grows only by the second term, the Biermann battery term. One can estimate its rate of increase by assuming there is a finite angle between $\nabla\rho$ and ∇p , and taking the scale size of both p and ρ to be L . Then the Biermann battery term is of order of magnitude $p/\rho L^2 \approx v_s^2/L^2$, where v_s is the speed of sound. Thus, Ω increases roughly as $(v_s/L)^2 t$.

However, when B becomes larger, the dynamo term becomes important, i.e. when $v\Omega/L \approx v_s^2/L^2$. If, for simplicity, we take $v \approx v_s$, then this happens when $v_s/\Omega \approx L$. But v_s/Ω is the ion gyration radius r_i , so the dynamo term becomes significant when r_i decreases to become comparable to L . (Initially, of course, the gyration radius is infinite.) After this time the Biermann battery continues to operate, assuming that there is still a finite angle between $\nabla\rho$ and ∇p . But it is quickly outstripped by the dynamo term, which increases the magnetic field strength B exponentially. This is because the dynamo term is proportional to B .

Recall that we derived equation (31) assuming the ionization fraction χ is constant. Following the birth of the first massive stars and quasars, the Universe was pervaded by a network of ionization fronts that spread out from sources of ionizing radiation. During this so-called epoch of reionization ($z \sim 10$; Spergel et al 2007), the low density gas was ionized first, leaving behind pockets of denser gas that was ionized later. Large scale temperature and density gradients in the dense gas interacted with the large electron pressure gradient in the front itself, allowing the Biermann battery to operate more efficiently. Gnedin et al. (2000) showed that the magnetic fields generated in this fashion are somewhat larger than the fields generated in vortex sheets ($\sim 10^{-17} - 10^{-18}$ G), but are still far too weak to explain galactic fields without further substantial amplification.

The rough assumptions going into these relations cannot be taken

too seriously, but they do give a simple picture of what goes on in the initial build up of seed fields. To gain more precision concerning the dynamo action, we need to specify the velocity field in more detail. This is done in the next section, in which the assumption is made that the velocity field has a turbulent spectrum. This appears to be the case in numerical simulations of the formation of gravitational structures, primarily in protogalaxies. (Ryu et al. 1994, Kang et al 1994, Kulsrud et al, 1997)

We have devoted considerable space to the Biermann battery because it can be treated rather definitively. There are other proposed origins for seed fields. The earliest is due to Harrison who invoked rotating structures in the early universe (Harrison, 1970). He assumes that a blob of plasma rotates in the presence of the cosmic background radiation, (and assumes the radiation is non rotating because for sufficiently large z its mass is larger than the plasma mass.) Then he points out that the rotation of the electrons in the blob will be slowed down by Thompson scattering off the non rotating radiation field, while the ions rotate without slowing down. The resulting current will produce a weak magnetic seed field. The seed field will increase with time inducing a back electric field which will tend to keep the electrons rotating. The balance between these two forces determines the actual rate of increase of the field. Under most reasonable assumptions, the resulting field strength is a little smaller, but of the same order of magnitude as that of the Biermann battery, $< 10^{-20}$ gauss.

Since the Biermann battery mechanism produces an increasing magnetic field, there must also be a back E.M.F. resisting this growth. But in the case of the Biermann battery, this back E.M.F. must be there to balance the Biermann term in Ohm's law (equation (28)) in the first place. One could consider the process in the reverse order, for it is clear that the magnetic field must grow to induce an electric field to balance this term.

Another origin for seed fields has been proposed by Martin Rees, (Rees, 1987, 1994, 2005, 2006). He suggests that supernova remnants similar to the Crab Nebula have fields of order 10^{-4} gauss due to the wind up of the central pulsar. The fields are coherent, but contain fluxes of opposite signs on each side of the remnant. He estimates that there could be $N \approx 10^6$ such remnants in the early stage of the galaxy. Of course, the fields from these remnants, when they expand enough will overlap and cancel so that the resulting fields will be proportional to N^x . But, because they may interact, x may not be 1/2, but could be

as small as $1/3$. Even so, the resulting fields would be in the range of 10^{-9} gauss, a rather substantial seed field! However, one might worry that the rms field would be larger than this, perhaps larger by a factor of N^{1-x} unless magnetic reconnection or some other process reduces it. The details of this interesting suggestion have not been carried out since they depend on plasma processes such as magnetic reconnection which are very little understood. One should compare this suggestion with the suggestion mentioned in §16, that primordial field can arise from radio jets with large magnetic fields of alternate signs and these can seed the universe with magnetic fields prior to galactic formation. This seeding involves very similar problems of cancellation.

In any event, there seems to be little difficulty with producing an initial field whose strength is of order 10^{-20} gauss, and that can serve as a seed field for dynamo amplification to magnetic fields of larger strength.

12 A protogalactic theory for magnetic field generation

Since there are a number of difficulties with the disc-dynamo origin for galactic fields, it is of interest to consider the possibility that the field could be generated during the time in which the galaxy itself is formed. Such a theory was first proposed by Pudritz and Silk (1989). It was later developed in some detail by Kulsrud and coworkers (Kulsrud et al, 1997). This latter theory is based on the observation that there must be considerable turbulence generated during the initial collapse of the cosmic plasma to form the protogalaxy. This turbulence is generated by the shocks that result from the steepening of the cosmic fluid as the gravitational instabilities become nonlinear. These shocks heat the plasma to a Jeans temperature that stops the collapse and leads to a temporary virialized state. At the same time the shocks, which are generally of finite extent, produce shear velocities that evolve into Kolmogorov turbulence. This has been established in numerical simulations of structure formation (Ryu et al, 1993, Kang et al 1994). The turbulence in these simulations has a Kolmogorov spectrum. Its largest eddy is comparable to the size of the protogalaxy, and its total energy is comparable to that of the total thermal and gravitational energies of the protogalaxy, (Chandrasekhar, 1949).

Under these conditions a very weak magnetic field will grow be-

cause the pressure and density gradients produced by the shocks are not parallel. This development was verified by integrating the Biermann magnetic differential equation (31) of the last section, taking the velocities directly from the numerical simulations (Kulsrud et al 1997). A magnetic field of order 10^{-21} gauss develops in this simulation and is found to satisfy equation (33) at nearly every pixel of the numerical grid. However, the expected dynamo amplification is not found because this amplification is primarily produced by the smallest turbulence eddies whose scale is much smaller than the grid size of the simulation. These smaller eddies dominate because their rate of turn over in Kolmogorov turbulence is faster than the larger eddies.

The rate of dynamo growth of the magnetic field is approximately their turnover rate. (See the next section.) However, Kulsrud and his coworkers used Kolmogorov theory together with the theory of magnetic field generation developed by Kulsrud & Anderson (1992) to estimate the rate of growth produced by the smallest eddy. (Kulsrud et al. 1997). They find that the growth is much faster than the rate of collapse of the protogalaxy. In fact, the magnetic energy doubles roughly one hundred times in this collapse time. (The Kulsrud-Anderson theory is discussed in the next section.)

During this time the magnetic energy saturates and reaches equipartition with the energy of the smallest Kolmogorov eddy. Further, the Kulsrud—Anderson theory shows that the magnetic field has a scale much smaller than that of the smallest eddy. If this were the end of the turbulent dynamo process, the resulting field would not be of much interest since the size of the smallest eddy is a thousand times smaller than the size of the protogalaxy (estimated to be approximately 100 kpc). After the collapse of the protogalaxy, the field would still be coherent on a scale more than a thousand times smaller than the radius of the Galactic disk. However, even though the magnetic field has such a small scale its energy will be that of the smallest eddy. This is of the order of one per cent of the total binding energy of the protogalaxy. Such an energy is not negligible, and is strong enough to affect the early formation of stars.

Due to the limited spatial resolution of the simulation, it is impossible to numerically study the evolution of the field produced by the entire turbulent spectrum. In order to form a large scale field by this process, there has to be an inverse cascade of magnetic energy to the larger scales. Whether this can in fact occur is still an open question in dynamo theory.

However, an effective inverse cascade can occur by direct amplification of the seed fields by the larger eddies, (see Kulsrud 2005, 2006).

To predict how the field develops one needs to gain a deeper understanding of the behavior of magnetic fields in the presence of strong turbulence, a difficult problem of plasma physics. Schekochihin, Cowley and their colleagues have published a number of theoretical and numerical papers discussing problems concerning the structure and saturation of these small scale fields. They consider this problem both in the context of protogalaxies, and in the intracluster medium in clusters of galaxies. (Schekochihin & Cowley 2004, 2006 Schekochihin et al 2004, 2005a,b). Their results are discussed in §14. In his book, Kulsrud makes an estimate of this behavior (see Kulsrud 2005, 2006).

When one considers the small scale turbulent eddies even in a rotating body, one finds they have very little helicity. The behavior of magnetic fields in non helical turbulence is to be compared with their behavior in the $\alpha - \Omega$ dynamo theory which is strongly dependent on helical motions. The latter theory, combined with proper boundary conditions, actually generates net magnetic flux and a mean magnetic field in the entire region of interest, while the former theory produces fields that are coherent on the scale of the relevant eddy. However, the $\alpha - \Omega$ theory is usually developed in a thin disc and the horizontal coherence length of the magnetic field is usually assumed to be a few times the disc thickness.

The radial coherence length of the present Galactic field inferred from modeling pulsar rotation measures is at least a kiloparsec, but not necessarily larger. Indeed, it seems to reverse in different spiral arms. If we compare the distance between the spiral arms with the size of turbulent eddies, inferred to exist from the numerical simulations of protogalaxies, we see that, if eddies as large as one tenth of the protogalaxy generate the main fields, then the resulting fields, after collapse, will have a sufficiently large coherence length to provide a reasonable origin for the pregalactic field.

Further, even if the protogalaxy provides a smaller scale field it could be large enough for the mean field disc dynamo to work properly and develop larger coherence lengths. As emphasized before, the field might be large enough to provide the escape of flux needed to validate the required boundary conditions.

This conclusion for definiteness is based on the assumption of top down formation of the protogalaxy. It is not drastically modified even

if our Galaxy were assembled through a hierarchical process, with small structures ($M \sim 10^6 M_\odot$; about 10^{-4} - 10^{-5} of the present galactic mass) forming first. Such structures are estimated to be a few hundred pc in size, and to have virial velocities of order 10 km/s. If magnetic fields grow on the scales of the largest eddies in these systems, the result would not be very different from eddy scale fields in a massive galactic halo. But the problem of eliminating the small scale fields and growing large scale fields remains.

In summary, amplification of the magnetic field in the protogalaxy could address problems with the disk dynamo related to its operation at very low field strength. The flux expulsion problem, however, still remains even at the present field strength.

13 Generation of small scale magnetic fields by turbulence

Earlier, in §6, we discussed how, based on turbulence with helicity flows, the $\alpha - \Omega$ dynamo can generate magnetic fields with net flux, inside a disc. In the last section we considered how magnetic fields could be produced by dynamo action in turbulence with no helical flows. An astrophysical application of such a dynamo raises the possibility of producing substantial pregalactic fields in the protogalaxy. Another application is the production of fields in the intracluster plasma in clusters of galaxies. (We do not consider the latter, as the main point of this review is to uncover the processes involved in generating cosmic magnetic fields, and in this review we have reduced the problem to the challenge of producing a magnetic field in our Galaxy.)

In the case of the protogalaxy, we have seen that magnetic fields produced by nonhelical turbulence have no mean flux overall, but could have mean flux in large subregions. Other subregions may have a mean flux with a different direction. However, such a field can be the source of the Galactic field which itself has no overall net flux; only mean flux over large regions. Magnetic fields in protogalaxies are generated by random, nonhelical, small-scale turbulence.

Such a theory of field generation has been developed by a number of people (Kraichnan and Nagarajan 1967, Kazantsev, 1968, Kulsrud & Anderson 1992, Subramanian & Barrow, 2002, Boldyrev & Cattaneo 2004). Here we review the Kulsrud–Anderson theory in some detail.

Assume that the statistics of the turbulence is given by a turbulent

spectrum such as that of Kolmogorov. For simplicity, assume that the turbulence is homogeneous, isotropic, and steady in time. Assume that initially there is some very weak magnetic field, whose statistics are not necessarily isotropic, but are homogeneous.

Then one can evolve the magnetic field by integrating the magnetic differential equation (2), with the resistive term set to zero, (In almost all cosmic situations it is permissible to neglect the resistivity except at extremely small scales). The velocity in this equation can be assumed to be given at least statistically and unaffected by the magnetic forces. This is the *kinematic* assumption.

Consider the system to be enclosed in a large periodic box so that both the velocity and the magnetic field can be described by Fourier transforms

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{v} &= \int d^3\mathbf{k}\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}(t)e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}}, \\ \mathbf{B} &= \int d^3\mathbf{k}\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{k}}(t)e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}}.\end{aligned}\tag{35}$$

Since the turbulent velocities are clearly random, we describe them statistically by an ensemble average, and make use of the *random phase approximation* (Sagdeev and Galeev, 1969, Kulsrud 2005)

$$\langle \mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}'}^*(t)\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}(t') \rangle = J(k)(\mathbf{I} - \hat{\mathbf{k}}\hat{\mathbf{k}})\delta(\mathbf{k}' - \mathbf{k})\delta_{\tau}(t - t').\tag{36}$$

Here the angular brackets denote the ensemble average, of the velocities at different wave numbers and times, \mathbf{I} is the unit dyadic, and the hat denotes a unit vector. The delta function in $\mathbf{k}' - \mathbf{k}$ results from the random phase approximation. Its significance is that there are a large number of independently positioned velocity waves in the large box and taking the Fourier transform of these waves yields a delta function factor between different wave numbers. $\delta_{\tau}(t - t')$ is the correlation function of the velocities at a fixed position at different times. If we normalize this function to unity when $t = t'$, then $J(k)$ is the energy spectrum of the turbulence

$$\frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbf{v}^2 \rangle = \int d^3\mathbf{k}J(k).\tag{37}$$

As a result of the turbulent velocities and the magnetic differential equation the one dimensional magnetic energy spectrum $M(k)$, given by

$$\frac{\langle B^2 \rangle}{8\pi} = \int M(k)dk\tag{38}$$

evolves in time according to the one dimensional mode-coupling equation

$$\frac{\partial M(k)}{\partial t} = \int K(k, k_0)M(k_0)dk_0 - 2\beta k^2 M(k). \quad (39)$$

The kernel $K(k, k_0)$ is

$$K(k, k_0) = 2\pi\tau k^4 \int \frac{\sin^3 \theta d\theta}{k_1^2} (k^2 + k_0^2 - kk_0 \cos \theta) J(k_1), \quad (40)$$

where k_1 is defined by

$$k_1^2 = k^2 + k_0^2 - 2kk_0 \cos \theta. \quad (41)$$

The quantity β is the same turbulent diffusion coefficient as in the $\alpha - \Omega$ theory and is

$$\beta = \frac{2}{3}\tau \int J(k'') d^3 \mathbf{k}'' . \quad (42)$$

τ is the decorrelation time given by

$$\tau = \int_0^\infty \delta_\tau(t) dt. \quad (43)$$

(The mode coupling equation is strictly valid only if τ is sufficiently small compared to the rate of evolution of the magnetic spectrum. This is called the short correlation-time approximation.)

The derivation of the appropriate form of the mode coupling equation is given in a number of places (Kraichnan & Nagarajan 1967, Kazantsev, 1968, Kulsrud & Anderson 1992). The form given here was derived in the paper of Kulsrud & Anderson. In this derivation, no assumption as to the isotropy of the magnetic field statistics is made. $M(k)$ refers to the three dimensional magnetic spectrum averaged over all solid angles.

This equation has a number of important implications. The most important one relates to the growth of the total magnetic energy

$$\mathcal{E} = \int M(k) dk. \quad (44)$$

If one integrates equation (39) over k one finds the evolution equation for \mathcal{E} ,

$$\frac{d\mathcal{E}}{dt} = 2\gamma\mathcal{E}, \quad (45)$$

where

$$\gamma = \frac{\tau}{3} \int k^2 J(k) d^3 \mathbf{k} = \frac{4\pi\tau}{3} \int k^4 J(k) dk. \quad (46)$$

A very similar equation was discovered by Batchelor (1950).

This equation has an easy interpretation for Kolmogorov turbulence. Namely, eddy velocities with wave number k have a turn over rate of $k\tilde{v}$ where $\tilde{v}^2 = J(k)d^3 \mathbf{k}$ is the mean square turbulent velocity in the range $d^3 \mathbf{k}$. The decorrelation time τ is $\sim 1/k\tilde{v}$. The change $\delta B/B$ during the decorrelation time, is plus or minus the rotation angle of the eddy $\Delta\theta = k\tilde{v}\tau$. Thus, $\langle (\delta B/B)^2/\tau \rangle = k^2\tilde{v}^2\tau = k^2 J(k)\tau d^3 \mathbf{k}$, the contribution of the integral in $d^3 \mathbf{k}$ to γ in equation (46). In short, every turnover of any eddy produces a relative change in the magnetic energy by a factor of order two. Note also, that each eddy acts independently of the others in increasing the magnetic energy.

How does this change in magnetic energy produced by a single eddy manifest itself in the change of the actual field? Surprisingly, the magnetic field change produced by any eddy occurs on scales much smaller than the eddy itself. It had been previously assumed that the magnetic energy is produced on the same scale as the eddy. (See for example the treatment in RSS, 1988). This is because, in the presence of a uniform or large scale eddy, the main interaction was previously assumed to be between the eddy and this large scale field. Actually the stronger interaction is between the eddy and the *small* scale magnetic field, and this produces energy at twice the magnetic wave number. As a result, magnetic energy rapidly propagates to larger and larger wave numbers. The wave number, at which the amplified energy peaks, increases exponentially, and the field develops a very much finer structure than that of the eddy. This result might be anticipated since by flux freezing the magnetic field follows the displacement of the plasma rather than its velocity. Since the displacement is the integral of the velocity one expects the displacement to also exponentially develop fine structure.

These results are demonstrated analytically in Kulsrud & Anderson (1992) as follows: Consider that the turbulent—eddy scales are larger than $1/k_1$. Then expand the mode coupling equation (39) for larger values of the magnetic wave numbers, k and k_0 , where we see from the notation in the mode coupling equation (39) that magnetic energy at the large wave number k_0 is transferred to the also large

wave number k . The result is the simple partial differential equation

$$\frac{\partial M}{\partial t} = \frac{\gamma}{5} \left(k^2 \frac{\partial^2 M}{\partial k^2} - 2k \frac{\partial M}{\partial k} + 6M \right) - 2k^2 \lambda_S M \quad (47)$$

where $\lambda_S = \eta_S c^2 / 4\pi$ is the magnetic diffusivity and η_S is the Spitzer resistivity. (The resistivity term is added by hand.)

Without the resistivity term, this equation has a Green's function solution

$$M(k, t) = \int_{-\infty}^t M\left(\frac{k}{k_{ref}}, t'\right) G\left(\frac{k}{k_{ref}}, t - t'\right) dt', \quad (48)$$

where G is the Green's function

$$G(k, \tau) = \sqrt{\frac{5}{4\pi}} \frac{k^{3/2} e^{(3/4)\gamma\tau} \ln k}{\gamma^{1/2} \tau^{3/2}} e^{-(5/4) \ln^2(k)/\gamma\tau}. \quad (49)$$

This solution expresses $M(k, t)$ for general k in terms of its time variation at some reference wave number k_{ref} .

Thus, if $M(k/k_{ref}, t')$ is a delta function in time then as t increases the magnetic energy increases as $k^{3/2}$ up to a peak near $e^{5\gamma t/3}$, beyond which it decreases. At the same time it increases at a fixed k by the exponential factor $e^{3\gamma t/4}$. Thus, the energy grows exponentially at fixed k and spreads out over a range that also increases exponentially. The combination of these two effects, local growth and growing range, leads to the growth in the total energy at the rate 2γ .

Since the scale to which the magnetic energy extends gets small so fast, one expects it to reach a resistive scale, i.e. a scale at which the resistivity becomes important. Restoring the resistivity term in equation (47), one finds a purely growing solution

$$M(k, t) = \text{const } e^{(3/4)\gamma t} k^{3/2} K_0 \left(\sqrt{\frac{10\lambda_S}{\gamma}} k \right) \quad (50)$$

where K_0 is the Bessel function of the second kind. This shows that the wave number corresponding to the resistive scale is $k_\eta \approx \sqrt{\gamma/10\lambda_S}$. At larger wavelengths M drops off exponentially as the magnetic energy is destroyed by resistivity. However, even with resistive damping the total magnetic energy still increases exponentially, but at the slower rate $3\gamma/4$.

One can fix the constant so that the energy at some k_{ref} is $M(k_{ref}, t) = e^{3\gamma t/4}$. If one does that, then one finds that at the time

the small scale energy first reaches k_η , the total magnetic energy is larger than that at k_{ref} , $k_{ref}M(k_{ref})$, by the factor $\tilde{v}/k_{ref}\lambda_S$, which is the effective magnetic Reynold's number.

For application to protogalactic magnetic fields, it is of interest to estimate the order of magnitude of the growth rate of the small scale turbulent energy while still in the kinematic limit.

In this case, the growth rate is the rate of turnover of the smallest eddy, which we take to have wave number k_ν . The eddy turnover time is $(k\tilde{v}_k)^{-1}$ where \tilde{v}_k is the velocity at the eddy with wave number k . For Kolmogorov turbulence $\tilde{v}_k \sim k^{-1/3}$ so the turnover rate is proportional to $k^{2/3}$. The ratio of the turnover rate of the smallest eddy to that of the largest eddy is $(k/k_0)^{2/3}$ where k_0 is the wave number of the largest eddy. Now, if the turbulent energy is in equipartition with the gravitational energy, it is easy to see that the turnover rate of the largest eddy is equal to the free fall time of the protogalaxy. (This is also equal to the decay time of the turbulence.) But $k_\nu/k_0 = R^{3/4}$ where $R = 2\pi\tilde{v}_0/k_0\nu$ is the fluid Reynold's number. $\nu \approx v_{th}\ell$ is the kinematic viscosity for an ion thermal speed v_{th} and mean free path $\ell = 1/n\sigma$, where n is the ion density and σ is the Coulomb cross section.

Combining these results and setting the free fall time equal to τ_D we get

$$\gamma\tau_D \approx \frac{k\tilde{v}_k}{k_0\tilde{v}} \approx (R^{3/4})^{2/3} = R^{1/2}, \quad (51)$$

or

$$\gamma\tau_D = \left(\frac{2\pi v_0}{k_0\nu} \right) = \frac{v_0 L_0}{v_{th}\ell} \approx \frac{L}{\ell} = \sqrt{(Ln\sigma)},$$

where $L_0 = 2\pi/k_0$ and we take $v_0 \approx v_{th}$ from equipartition.

Now more specifically we take the baryonic mass of the protogalaxy to be $M_B = 10^{11}$ solar masses and the protogalactic radius to be one hundred kiloparsecs. The dark mass may be ten times this. Then the Jeans temperature $T_J \approx GMm_H/L$ is 10^7 degrees Kelvin or $T_{ev} \approx 10^3$ eV. The coulomb cross section $\sigma \approx 10^{-12}/T^2 \approx 10^{-18}\text{cm}^2$.

The baryonic density is given by $4\pi L^3/3n = M_B$ or $n \approx 10^{-3} \text{ cm}^{-3}$. Therefore from our equation we get

$$2\gamma\tau_D \approx 55. \quad (52)$$

(A more precise estimate and for a general galaxy yields $2\gamma\tau_D \approx 70/\sqrt{M_{11}}$ and depends only on the baryonic mass. M_{11} is the baryonic mass of the protogalaxy in units of 10^{11} solar masses.)

Thus, we see that the smallest eddy turns over seventy times during the free fall time and in the kinematic limit the small scale magnetic energy grows by a factor 2×10^{30} while the rms field strength would increase by 1.7×10^{15} . By equation (33), the Biermann battery generates a field of roughly 10^{-18} gauss on this scale, which leads to a field of 3×10^{-3} gauss. However, the energy density of the smallest eddy is only $1/2(nm_H v_0^2/R^{1/2}) \approx 10^{-14}$ ergs/cm³ so the kinematic assumption breaks down and saturation of both the smallest eddy and the magnetic field must occur.

This amplification proceeds even faster in the smaller, cooler, less viscous structure such as the $\sim 10^6 M_\odot$ halos, with which galaxy formation is generally believed to begin. However, the estimate of the γ is very dependent on the turbulence theory which is highly uncertain. The estimate given in Kulsrud et al (1997) gives a value of $\gamma\tau_D$ which is larger by 300 and this would produce an increase of the field energy by 6×10^{32} , and a resulting field strength of about one gauss, and a much larger magnetic energy density than the smallest eddy. Again, saturation of the magnetic field must occur. Saturation is discussed in the next section.

14 The saturation of the small scale magnetic fields

In the previous section we discussed magnetic fields generated by turbulence and found that the small scale magnetic energy, that at scales below the smallest turbulent eddy, increases very rapidly, doubling essentially every turnover time of this smallest eddy. In the kinematic limit, the energy propagates down to the resistive scale after which time it is larger than the magnetic energy at the eddy scale by a factor of the magnetic Reynolds number.

But such a large energy is clearly beyond the kinematic limit. The magnetic field must produce nonnegligible velocities which saturate the magnetic energy at a much smaller value. For large magnetic Reynolds numbers the kinematic limit breaks down before the resistive scale is reached. This is because the small scale magnetic energy saturates.

This effect was pointed out in a different way by Cattaneo and Vainshtein (1992), and Diamond & Gruzinov (1997). (Also see Gruzinov & Diamond (1994, 1995). The statement that these authors make

is that the α coefficients of the $\alpha - \Omega$ theory are suppressed when the large scale magnetic energy is larger than the turbulent kinetic energy divided by magnetic Reynolds number. This puts a severe restriction on any dynamo theory since the magnetic Reynolds number for galactic turbulence can be as large as 10^{19} . However, if we view their statement from the point of view of small scale theory and replace $M(k_{ref})$ by the large scale field taken at the eddy scale, we see that if their condition is satisfied and $M(k_{ref})$ is smaller than the eddy energy divided by the magnetic Reynold's number, then the small scale fields reach the resistivity scale before saturation. Otherwise, they are not able to reach the resistive scale. Instead, energy equipartition of the total magnetic energy of the small scale fields is reached with the smallest eddy, and its dynamo effect is modified. But after equipartition is reached, the small scale energy stops growing, and never gets much larger than the eddy energy. Thus, the suppression of the dynamo coefficients is not limited by the large factor of the magnetic Reynold's number.

To understand the saturation process it is necessary to understand the structure of the small scale fields. This structure has been found numerically by Cowley et al. (2004), motivated by a theoretical hypothesis of Cowley. They found that the magnetic fields on small scales are far from isotropic, and indeed consist of folded magnetic field loops whose length is that of the eddy size while the thickness of the folds is very small. (See Figure 3 where such folds are displayed.) The folded nature does not emerge from the mode coupling equation (39) of the last section, since this equation only refers to $M(k)$, the magnetic energy at a given k averaged over all solid angles. This averaging hides the structure of the fields. As can be inferred from the figure, the Fourier transform of a folded field assigns a wave number equal to the reciprocal thickness of the fold and the long length drops out.

On the basis of these folded fields it easy to understand how magnetic fields on scales much smaller than the inner turbulent scale can be amplified. To the folded fields on such small scales the smallest turbulent eddy appears quite large and the magnetic folds only feel




Figure 3: A folded field. It is amplified by the stretching velocities \mathbf{v}' 's, due to the smallest turbulent eddy. At equipartition it can be unfolded by the velocities \mathbf{u}' 's at the Alfvén speed if Braginski viscosity holds.

the effect of a part of the eddy, the shearing part. The shear of this part appears constant in space. This shear can also be envisioned as an incompressible flow that is compressing in one direction and expanding in a perpendicular direction. If the compression direction is perpendicular to the fold, the fold will be squeezed and stretched, and its magnetic field strength will be increased. Of course, if the compression is parallel to the fold and the stretching is perpendicular, then the field strength will be decreased. But for random shifts in direction of the shearing flow, the net effect will be an increase in the mean square of the field strength of the folds as well as a decrease in their thickness. This mechanism exactly mirrors the more complex mode-coupling calculations of the last section. The validity of this modeling of the amplification is borne out by numerical simulations. (Maron et al 2004, Schekochihin & Cowley 2004).

From inspection of Figure 3 one can also see how the folded magnetic fields should tend to saturate. Indeed, neglecting any viscosity, we see that the folded fields have tension at their ends and this tension should produce a shortening of the fields at a velocity u equal to the effective Alfvén speed based on the strength \tilde{B} of the folded fields, divided by their length. To see this, note that the current density j perpendicular to the fold is of order $\tilde{B}/4\pi\delta$ where δ is the thickness of a single fold. The field perpendicular to the fold is also not zero as appears in the figure, but is of order $(\delta/L)\tilde{B}$ where L is the length of the

fold. Thus, the force on the plasma along the fold is $F = (\tilde{B})^2/4\pi L$, and this leads to a velocity $u \approx (F/\rho) \times t$ where $t \approx L/u$ is the time to unfold. Thus, $u^2 \approx (\tilde{B})^2/4\pi\rho$ and so u is approximately equal to the Alfvén speed. This implies that at saturation, when the small scale magnetic energy is the same as the kinetic energy of the eddy, the unfolding time is comparable to the eddy turnover time, and to the exponentiation time of the field; the folds no longer grow or decay. In other words, the small scale fields saturate by unfolding as fast as they grow when their energy is in equipartition with the kinetic energy of the smallest eddy.

The same level of saturation is found in the numerical simulations but the saturation seems to have a different origin since the folded fields continue to elongate in these simulations. The different behavior is attributable to the fact that the numerical simulations include fluid viscosity and this prevents the unwinding motions since the unwinding velocity on one fold is in the opposite direction to that on the next fold. Because of the very great thinness of the folds, the viscous forces between these flows is enormous. (Recall that viscosity terminates the turbulent spectrum at the scale of the smallest kinetic eddy whose size is much larger than the thickness of the folds.) However, the viscosity used in the simulations is ordinary scalar hydrodynamic viscosity. Because of the magnetic field, the folds can not transmit shear forces across the magnetic field for distances larger than the ion gyration radius, a distance generally much thinner than the thickness of the folds. The proper viscosity to use in this case is the Braginski tensor viscosity, which does not allow such a perpendicular transfer of shear forces. (Braginski 1965, Malyshkin & Kulsrud 2002.)

These pictures for the evolution of the folded fields, the one based on ordinary viscosity and the other based on Braginski viscosity, lead to the same equipartition of the fields generated by the smallest eddy. However, they should lead to differences when the next larger eddy starts to play a role. For ordinary viscosity the next larger eddy should stretch the length of the folds to equal itself. For Braginski viscosity this tendency should be suppressed and the magnetic field should develop a more isotropic structure on the scale of the next eddy.

In this case, the resulting field should have a much larger scale, possibly large enough to appear very coherent. In the case of the protogalaxy, the resulting field supplied to the galactic disc should have a scale comparable with observations of the present galactic fields. On

the other hand, for normal viscosity the magnetic field should end up very thin and with folds of the length of the largest eddy. Its energy should be in equipartition with the turbulent energy up to the eddy for which nonlinear growth can arise. This energy can be a fair fraction of the turbulent energy and thus of the binding energy of the entire protogalaxy, so it is possible that the magnetic field will alter the collapse to the disc.

At the moment numerical simulations of magnetic field evolution in the presence of turbulence employ ordinary viscosity because Braginski viscosity is numerically difficult to handle. As yet, the results from Braginski viscosity are all based on theoretical estimations, and we must wait for more sophisticated numerical programs, yet to be developed, before the saturation is properly understood. However, it is generally agreed that Braginski viscosity is the correct viscosity when the ion gyration radius is very small compared to all the other scales.

An additional problem has arisen because the Braginski viscosity in very weak fields leads to instabilities. (Schekochihin & Cowley 2004, 2006; Schekochihin et. al. 2005a,b.) The instabilities arise because in very weak fields the changing magnetic fields produce anisotropies in the pressure tensor that drive fire hose and mirror instabilities. These are normally suppressed in stronger fields. How these instabilities saturate is still under discussion.

Assuming the folded fields saturate by unfolding, Kulsrud has attempted to build an intuitive model for the evolution of the protogalactic magnetic fields in Kolmogorov turbulence. (Kulsrud 2005) Assuming reasonable parameters and top down formation of the protogalaxy, he finds that the fields are progressively generated by larger and larger eddies, and in the free fall time the size of the most intensive fields can reach about one thirtieth the size of the entire protogalaxy. Also, the field strength, after compression into the disc, is in the microgauss range. This speculation does not take into account the instability problem.

Thus, the saturated fate of magnetic fields generated by turbulence, must wait till numerical simulations with the appropriate viscosity can be developed and the problems with the nonlinear Braginski instabilities understood.

However, because the validity of the $\alpha - \Omega$ theory is equally in doubt, it is of interest to consider the implications of a protogalactic field, and its further evolution after the galactic disc has formed.

15 History of the evolution of a primordial magnetic field

In the last two sections we consider the possibility that the protogalaxy could generate a strong enough magnetic field that it might be considered a pregalactic field. What would be the evolution of a pregalactic field which existed prior to the formation of the Galactic disc, and is subject to the astrophysics of the Galactic disc? How would it survive the criticisms of Parker discussed in §10?

The answer to this question was addressed in a paper by Howard & Kulsrud, (1997). A condensed summary of this theory is given by Kulsrud in *Cosmic Magnetic Fields* edited by Wielebinski and Beck (Kulsrud, 2006). Here an even briefer treatment of this paper is given.

First, imagine a uniform magnetic field present in the sphere of plasma that is to collapse to form the Galactic disc. The behavior of the field is sketched in Figure 4. In panel (a) the uniform field is displayed in the protogalactic sphere after it has separated from Hubble expansion. In panel (b) the plasma collapses to a smaller virialized radius dragging the field lines with it. However, it is seen that they are still connected to the surrounding intergalactic medium. Possible radii for these spheres might be 100 kpc and 10 kpc. If the field makes a finite angle to the rotation axis, the horizontal component of the magnetic field would be amplified as the inverse radius squared, or 10^2 . Next, in panel (c), the second sphere has collapsed to a disc which might be 100 pc thick. In this case the horizontal component would be amplified again by another factor of 100, and the final field strength would be increased by 10^4 over that of the original primordial field. The vertical component would be changed by only a factor of 10^2 .

The resulting field lines are displayed in this third panel. It is seen that some lines, of type *A*, enter the disc from above and also leave in the above direction. However, some others, type *B*, enter from below and leave above. Lines of type *C* both enter and leave below. Lines of type *B* are embedded in the disc and cannot escape without violating




Figure 4: The early evolution of a primordial field. (a) The uniform field in the protogalaxy before collapse. (b) The field lines after the protogalaxy has shrunk spherically and they have been drawn inward from the extragalactic region. (c) The field lines after the disc forms, the lines A entering and leaving from above, lines B entering from below and leaving above and lines C entering and leaving from below. (d) The solid line before ambipolar diffusion and the dotted line after.

flux freezing. The other lines do leave by ambipolar diffusion.

The subsequent behavior depends on the structure of the interstellar medium. It is generally supposed that the magnetic field is embedded in many clouds. It threads its way through these clouds and eventually finds its way out of the disc as in Figure 5. The clouds hold the magnetic field in the disc balancing its outward force by the gravitational field of the stars acting on the mass of the clouds. (In addition, there is also a cosmic ray pressure which is held in by the clouds through the action of the magnetic field and indirectly adds to the outward pressure exerted by the magnetic field.) The low density material between these clouds is assumed to be very light and unable to hold the field and cosmic ray pressure down, so the field lines bow up between the clouds.

Thus, the force balance is between the outward pressure of the magnetic field and cosmic rays acting everywhere including the space between the clouds. This is balanced by the gravitational force acting only on the clouds so that the effect of the field and cosmic rays is concentrated and amplified in its action on the clouds. If the filling factor of the clouds in the interstellar medium is f , then the force on the clouds is intensified by a factor of $1/f$. The effect of the magnetic field is further increased by the fact that the clouds are only very partially ionized, generally by 10^{-5} or 10^{-4} . There is no direct magnetic force on the neutrals, but it is transferred to them by the collisions between the ions and neutrals. This force only acts on the ions, and the field lines locked on them, slide through the neutrals, and through the clouds, at some ambipolar velocity. Because of the amplification factors it is possible for the ions and the field lines embedded in them to slip entirely across a cloud.

The situation is not entirely simple since the time to slip through a cloud is much longer than the lifetime of the cloud. (The slippage time is of the order of a billion years while the lifetime of a cloud before it hits another cloud and is destroyed, is in the range of ten million years.) However, this complication is ignored since after a cloud is destroyed its plasma is turned into a rarefied plasma in which the field is still embedded by flux freezing. After a short time a new cloud reforms out of this plasma drawing the field lines back into itself with the ionization dropping back to its very small value again. After the lifetime of a single cloud the matter has worked its way outward from the midplane of the disc, in a non random way. For a given line the amount of plasma that is below it (relative to the disc) has increased.




Figure 5: A line of force penetrates many clouds and finally reaches a last cloud through it diffuses and leaves the disc.

The amount of increase is given by the amount the ionized matter, holding down the field line moves in order to balance the magnetic and cosmic ray forces against the ion neutral collision rate.

Finally, the field line manages to slip through the last cloud it threads before it leaves the disc, as is shown in Figure 5. Now, this motion will remove lines of type *A* and *C*, shown in panel (c) of figure 4, out of the disc. But it cannot move field lines of type *B* out the disc because of their topology. However, when lines of type *B* slip through the last cloud mentioned above, the result is that they shorten their horizontal extent in the disc as seen in panel (d) of Figure 4.

In discussing the behavior of magnetic fields, the authors ignore any interstellar turbulence or dynamo action. This enables them us to isolate and simplify the ambipolar effects on the magnetic field and its lines of force.

The only motions of the interstellar medium that they include are the galactic differential rotation and the vertical ambipolar velocity.

In cylindrical coordinates these velocities are

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{V} &= R\Omega(R)\hat{\theta} + V_Z\hat{\mathbf{z}}, \\
V_Z &= -K\frac{\partial B^2/8\pi}{\partial Z}, \\
K &= \frac{(1 + \beta/\alpha)}{\rho_i\nu_{in}f}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{53}$$

V_Z is the ambipolar velocity needed to transfer the cosmic ray and magnetic forces to the neutrals in the cloud, ρ_i is the ion density, ν_{in} is the ion-neutral collision frequency and the factor β/α is the ratio of the cosmic ray pressure to the magnetic pressure, which is assumed constant with height.

To see how the fields evolve under these motions ignore the vertical component of the magnetic field B_Z . Then, with these velocities, the magnetic differential equations for the field components in a frame following the galactic rotation are (Kulsrud 1990),

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dB_R}{dt} &= \frac{\partial B_R}{\partial t} + V_\theta\frac{\partial B_R}{\partial\theta} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial Z}(V_Z B_R), \\
\frac{dB_\theta}{dt} &= \frac{\partial B_\theta}{\partial t} + V_\theta\frac{\partial B_\theta}{\partial\theta} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial Z}(V_Z B_\theta) + R\frac{d\Omega}{dR}B_R.
\end{aligned}
\tag{54}$$

Let the half thickness of the disc be D . Outside of the disc it is now appropriate to take these components to vanish since they are embedded in the very tenuous plasma that is ionized in the clouds and has negligible mass. (The weakening of the horizontal components, B_R and B_θ of the field by the V_Z motion is due to the shortening of the field line length L , where the horizontal field strength is given by $B = (L/D)B_Z$, and B_Z is constant.)

To form an idea as to the solution assume that the fields are parabolic in Z . The horizontal dependence is not given since a single column of plasma is followed as it is carried around the disc by the differential rotation.

Thus, take

$$\begin{aligned}
B_R(Z, t) &= B_R(0, t)(1 - Z^2/D^2), \\
B_\theta(Z, t) &= B_\theta(0, t)(1 - Z^2/D^2),
\end{aligned}
\tag{55}$$

and solve for the time dependence of the fields at $Z = 0$, the coefficients of the parabolic terms on the right hand side of this equation (55). Taking advantage of the fact that shear quickly amplifies B_θ

relative to B_r , the solution at the midplane $Z = 0$ can be written with sufficient accuracy as

$$\begin{aligned} B_R &= \frac{B_1}{[1 + (2V_{D1}/3D)\Omega^2 t^3]^{1/2}}, \\ B_\theta &= \frac{-B_1 \Omega t}{[1 + (2V_{D1}/3D)\Omega^2 t^3]^{1/2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

where B_1 is the initial value of B_R , $V_{D1} = KB_1^2/2\pi D$ is the initial value of V_D , and assume that initially $B_\theta = 0$. B_θ is plotted versus time in Figure 6 for several values of B_1 .

These equations display the behavior of the field in the midplane of the disc following a rotating fluid element. Their behavior can be described qualitatively as follows.

Consider some fluid element that initially has a relatively weak initial B_R component B_1 . At first the only action is the differential stretching that leads to a linear growth of the toroidal field B_θ . Then, as B_θ grows stronger, the ambipolar velocity starts to grow and become important. This leads to a weakening of B_R , but because of differential stretching, B_θ continues to grow for a time. Eventually, B_R becomes too weak for stretching to overcome the weakening of the B_θ , and it too starts to decrease. Eventually, when the second terms in the brackets in the denominator dominate, the two components decrease as powers of t .

The stronger toroidal component then varies as

$$B_\theta \approx \pm \sqrt{\frac{3B_1^2 D}{2v_{D1}}} \frac{1}{t^{1/2}} \quad (57)$$

It is easy to see that this field is just such that the ambipolar diffusion velocity, which is proportional to B_θ^2 , moves the field a distance D in the time t . From the definition of v_{D1} one sees that at any later time, t , which is sufficiently long, the field strength is independent of its initial value and only depends on the initial sign of B_R . Thus, the entire magnetic field throughout the disc becomes a constant in space except for its sign.




Figure 6: The evolution of the field strength under differential rotation and ambipolar diffusion for initial field strengths of $B_1 = 0.1, 0.3$ and 1 microgauss. The ordinate is B in microgauss and the abscissa is time in billions of years.

One can take this sign into account by noting that, according to the model for the primordial field, $B_R = B_1 \cos \theta$ and at a later time θ increases by $\Omega(R)t$. Because of the variation of Ω with R the magnetic field at the time t and fixed θ has a square wave behavior with R . The spatial period is $\Delta R = (d\Omega/dR)^{-1}$. [See equation (25).] This should be roughly constant with R near the sun and is approximately 100 parsecs. This is the wound up field discussed in §10, in the context of Parker's discussion of the winding up.

Such a field cannot agree with the pulsar rotation measures because most of the Faraday rotation in the intervening interstellar medium would cancel out. However, assume that the initial magnetic field is not uniform, but had a gradient with a scale comparable to the protogalaxy. Then after collapse B_R is not sinusoidal. B_θ gets its sign from the initial sign of B_R in the same piece of plasma. Thus, the resultant radial variation of the final field B_θ is square wave with the radial extent of one sign being different from the radial extent of the other sign.

Now, for such a field the Faraday rotations do not average out. Further, a field with such variations would change on too small a scale to be resolved by the analyses of rotation measures available at the present time. This is just the field introduced in §10 to counter the objection to the winding up of the pregalactic field.

It must be remembered that in this model all dynamo actions and dynamics are ignored. Including these would lead to a different field structure.

What should be taken seriously is that the suggested pregalactic field could give the dynamo a proper start to overcome the flux loss problem. The initial pregalactic field could be relatively weak, and then be developed to sufficient strength by the standard $\alpha - \Omega$ dynamo to satisfy the necessary vacuum conditions as discussed in §9.

The purpose of the work in Howard & Kulsrud is not to directly prove that the magnetic field is primordial but to examine the consequences of its being so. It potentially could give a strong field but would not give the Grand Design shape that generally emerges from an $\alpha - \Omega$ theory. However, it cannot be so easily ruled out on these grounds because as shown in §10 the perturbations produced by compression of the field in the spiral arms can also give a similar pattern to the field lines.

16 Extragalactic magnetic fields

Most of this review is concerned with the magnetic field of our Galaxy and its possible origin. The problems encountered in explaining the origin of the Galactic field are not universal – galaxies with higher star formation rates or smaller gravitational fields could expel flux – but these are not representative of all galaxies.

A much more difficult problem is the origin of the magnetic fields observed in the intracluster medium (ICM) of clusters of galaxies (Carilli and Taylor 2002, Ensslin et al. 2005). These fields are coherent on scales of several kpc and in the cores of clusters appear to be several microgauss in strength, comparable to that of galactic fields. It can be inferred from the enrichment of the ICM with heavy elements, and the paucity of gas rich galaxies in clusters, that interstellar gas is stripped from galaxies and mixed into the ICM. However, the gas density of the ICM is 2 - 3 orders of magnitude lower than the mean density in galaxies, so the field in the ICM must be amplified by some mechanism to bring it back up to microgauss strength. The large intrinsic scales and lack of defined rotation of clusters make the operation of a mean field dynamo problematic. Various other means to produce the cluster field are discussed in Carilli & Taylor (2002), Schekochihin et al (2005a,b), and Ensslin et al. (2005), but none intrinsic to the cluster seem promising at this time.

However, a proposal that seems promising is based on the observation that a large magnetic flux fills each of the giant radio jets whose volume is enormous. If when such jets disband, their fields could be dispersed uniformly throughout intergalactic space, then there would be enough flux to supply significant pregalactic fields to every galaxy. (Kronberg, Dufton & Colgate 2001).

This was first pointed out by Daly & Loeb (1990). This result is based on the assumption that radio galaxies are rather short lived, and new ones emerge every few hundred million years or so, each new one producing more flux.

When the radio jets terminate their life their plasma expands into the intergalactic medium taking their flux with it. If the intergalactic medium is turbulent, this flux then merges with the surrounding intergalactic plasma mixing its flux with it. This intergalactic plasma subsequently collapses to produce galaxies which are thus already magnetized when they form. That the total flux in radio jets is adequate to produce the observed flux in clusters and galaxies, is a

striking numerical coincidence. How this happens, the expansion and mixing of the flux, is not yet understood. However, given the problems with other theories for the origin of cosmic fields, this origin must be taken seriously and developed further.

Much work has already been done on this problem by Colgate & Li (2000) and others. They have developed a preliminary theory to explain the origin of the magnetic fields of the jets. Their theory is based on ideas developed by plasma physicists to explain some of the interesting fusion experiments. The principle mechanism which is employed is Taylor relaxation (Taylor 1974, 1986), in which, by rapid reconnection, a spherical plasma relaxes to a particularly stable configuration by converting toroidal flux to poloidal flux and vice versa. Determining whether this is possible on the large megaparsec scale of radio jets seems to depend on increasing our understanding of the fast magnetic reconnection process. Study of this is a field now under intense development. For reviews see Priest & Forbes (2000), Biskamp (2000), Kronberg et al. 2001, Furlanetto & Loeb 2001, and Gopal-Krishna & Witta 2003).

Presumably, the fields in the jets originate in accretion disks. Many of the processes already discussed in this article – the Biermann battery and , various types of dynamo – should be able to generate and amplify magnetic fields in disks much more rapidly than in galaxies, particularly if the disks are hot and collisionless (Krolik & Zweibel 2006). Once these fields are ejected into the jets, the problem remains to amplify them, and generate some semblance of a coherent field.

17 Summary and conclusions

The origin of cosmic magnetic fields breaks up into three stages: (1) The generation of very weak seed fields from an absolutely zero magnetic field. (2) The amplification of these seed fields to dynamically interesting fields. (3) The final alteration and further amplification to the fields we observe today in galaxies and clusters of galaxies.

The first stage is generally thought to occur in the primordial era, before and during the time when galaxies and their discs form. There are a variety of mechanisms for their production, the Biermann battery mechanism being the most popular. Another mechanism is the generation of fields in stars (by the Biermann battery) and the later expulsion of their flux into the interstellar medium. In short, there

seems to be no difficulty with finding mechanisms to produce the first stage seed fields, and not much debate about which is the most important. It is just generally accepted that they are present as needed.

The main debate centers on the second stage, as to when do dynamos start to amplify seed fields. Does this occur pregalactically, before galactic discs are formed, or does it occur over the life time of galaxies? The bulk of opinion during the past decades favors the latter choice. It has been generally accepted that the $\alpha - \Omega$ dynamo takes these seed fields and amplifies them up to the currently observed fields. There are several difficulties with this theory. These difficulties are primarily associated with the flux freezing condition that says that the total flux cannot change from zero to a finite value in fixed amount of plasma. This condition is satisfied in standard disc-dynamo theory by imposing boundary conditions that imply that during any amplification of the field by a finite amount, a finite amount of flux is removed from the disc to infinity, leaving behind an increased amount of flux of the opposite sign. Thus flux is conserved *in toto* but not in the disc region alone.

The boundary conditions in the $\alpha - \Omega$ theory that enforce this condition are the vacuum boundary conditions. These conditions are formally derived by assuming that turbulent diffusion outside of the disc is much larger than that in the disc. This outside turbulent diffusion is based on observations of velocities and correlation lengths made in the halo. But these measurements are made when the halo has very little matter in it. If these measurements were made at a time when tubes of force carrying matter with them were diffusing out of the disc, the gravitational force on the matter would strongly modify these velocities. In fact, for very weak fields, the physics of the removal is difficult to justify, by models which treat the interstellar medium as horizontally homogeneous. The conclusion that we can draw is that the $\alpha - \Omega$ theory that treats the the interstellar medium as horizontally homogeneous is astrophysically incorrect and this is likely to be true even in the case of strong fields.

It is conceivable that a more sophisticated treatment that takes into account the non homogeneity of the interstellar medium might be justifiable. In this case, when the magnetic field flux leaves, the field lines and matter would form arcs in which the matter slides down the tubes of force releasing the remainder of the tube to more freely diffuse away. But this is clearly not possible when the field is very weak, so weak that its forces do not affect the motion of the matter,

which would be unaware of the direction to slide down.

Thus, the standard theory is probably not able to amplify these weak fields, and some other mechanism is necessary to provide this intermediate step in the origin of cosmic fields. That is to say, a pregalactic mechanism might be necessary to provide fields of reasonable strength for the *non homogeneous* $\alpha - -\Omega$ disc dynamo to act on. In this sense with a pregalactic origin to get started such an $\alpha - -\Omega$ dynamo could play a crucial role in the magnetic field origin.

Even if the flux removal problem is solved, the $\alpha - -\Omega$ dynamo is not necessarily viable. There remains a gap between the calculations, both analytical and numerical, which show tremendous growth of fields at the resistive scale, and the mean field $\alpha - -\Omega$ dynamo models, which involve the transport of magnetic flux on the much larger supernova remnant scales. It is supposed that the small scale fields can saturate, leading to dominance of the larger magnetic scales, but this remains to be demonstrated, and may require proper numerical implementation of Braginski viscosity.

Two types of observations tend to substantiate the necessity for this pregalactic mechanism. Beryllium and boron have been detected in the atmospheres of very old stars. These elements are believed to be produced only by spallation of low energy cosmic rays, and thus imply the early presence of these cosmic rays². Further, to produce the amount of observed light elements requires cosmic ray intensities at this very early time that are comparable to the present intensities. This in turn implies the presence of magnetic fields at this early time, although, unless most of the interstellar medium at this early time was confined to dense clouds, these fields could have been well below equipartition with the cosmic rays.

A second observational result is the detection of Faraday rotation by magnetic fields inferred to have microgauss strength, in high-red shift-galaxies in an early forming stage. Such galaxies are too young for the standard theory to bring seed fields up to such strengths.

The case for pregalactic mechanisms for magnetic field generation is mainly a negative one, based on the nonviability of the standard non primordial mechanisms to accomplish the second origin stage. The physics of forming galaxies and their discs is not well understood, and one has to rely on numerical simulations to draw conclusions concerning it. However, these simulations *do* lead to plausible theories

²In §2 we mentioned that boron can also be synthesized in supernovae, leaving the implications of its abundance ambiguous

for production of pregalactic magnetic fields by the turbulence seen in the simulations, provided that the problem of preferred amplification at the small scales can be overcome.

Lastly, the magnetic flux observed in giant radio jets could be dispersed into the intergalactic plasma magnetizing it coherently before galaxies form. This provides a very direct pregalactic origin. Unfortunately, no detailed theory as to how or whether this can happen, has yet developed. Also no observational evidence of it has yet emerged.

In summary, the situation is as follows. The standard theory of the generation of magnetic fields through galactic disc dynamos suffers from the difficulty of flux expulsion in the case of our Galaxy and no consistent theory that resolves this problem has yet been developed. A further difficulty is whether the galactic dynamo works on very weak fields since most such dynamo theories invoke magnetic fields of considerable strength to function.

Assuming these difficulties cannot be overcome it is necessary that there be an initially strong pregalactic field present before the disc forms. Such a field can provide the galactic dynamo with a strong enough field to function if the flux expulsion can be handled.

The flux expulsion might be solved if there are enough superbubbles containing much more than the average number of supernovae that actually blow mass entirely out of the galaxy carrying the flux with it. The statistics of superbubbles are still unknown and no theory has yet been developed to show that they can accomplish this task. If they can they will produce an inhomogeneous disc field that is very discontinuous whose lines of force consist of many finite segments with ends connected to the intergalactic medium. These are the fields that arise if one relies on a galactic wind to be the solution. Whether the field arising from such an inhomogeneous theory is compatible with the present field and the astrophysics of the interstellar medium associated with it is certainly an open question.

Because of these serious problems with the disc dynamo it is necessary to ask whether the pregalactic sources for the disc field are not the better solution to the origin problem at least for our Galaxy. Because the effort devoted to pregalactic theories is so far inadequate to prove that this is a viable origin for pregalactic fields, one cannot easily discard this possibility.

To conclude, we propose the following tentative scenario for the origin and growth of galactic magnetic fields *is the most likely one*:

1. Fields in the 10^{-18} - 10^{-20} G range originate by a battery process

in cosmological shocks or ionization fronts.

2. The battery generated fields are slightly amplified by compression and significantly amplified by turbulence as protogalaxies and similar substructure forms. The resulting fields are in the microgauss range, and are coherent over scales of order 1 kpc. This requires that amplification be due to the action of the largest scale eddies, and that the small scale folded fields produced by the small scale eddies quickly saturate.
3. Once a magnetized galactic disk forms, its magnetic field is sustained against gas addition and subtraction processes by a supernova driven $\alpha - -\Omega$ dynamo. Supernova energy and magnetic and cosmic ray buoyancy efficiently expel magnetic flux of the wrong sign, allowing the dynamo to work. The field is strong enough that amplification at the small scales is no longer a problem.

It appears that to really resolve these questions concerning the value of a pregalactic field preceding the formation of a disc, *more* observations are desperately needed. Hopefully, these can be expected in the near future as telescopes and detectors improve. (See Gaensler et al. 2004, Gaensler, 2006). They will be able to find many more examples of early forming extra galactic systems (damped Lyman alpha systems) and determine whether the majority already contain strong magnetic fields.

We are happy to acknowledge useful discussions with Katia Ferrière, Rainer Beck, Jin-Lin Han, Artie Wolfe and Yansong Wang, and comments by the referees. The work was supported by NSF grants PHY 0215581, AST 0507367, and by the Center for Magnetic Self-Organization (CMSO).

18 Publications

- Alfvén, H. and Falthämmer 1963 *Cosmical Electrodynamics: Fundamental Processes* Clarendon Press, Oxford
- Backus G 1958 *Class of Self-sustaining Dissipative Spherical Dynamos* Annals of Physics **4**, 372
- Batchelor, G.K. 1950 *On the spontaneous Magnetic Field in a Conducting Fluid in Turbulence Motion* Proc. Roy. Soc. London **A201**, 405

- Beck, R. 2007 *Magnetic Field Structure from Synchrotron Polarization* EAS **23**, 19
- Beck R, Brandenburg A, Moss D, Shukurov, A., Sokoloff, D., 1996 *Galactic magnetism: Recent developments and perspectives* ARA&A **34**: 155.
- Biermann, L. 1950, *Über den Ursprung der Magnetfelder auf Sternen und im interstellaren Raum* Z.Naturforsch **5a** 65
Biskamp, D., 2000, *Magnetic Reconnection in Plasmas Cambridge Monographs in Plasma Physics* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Blackman, E.G. Field, G.B. 1999 *Resolution of an ambiguity in dynamo theory and its consequences for back-reaction studies* ApJ. **521**, 597
- Blackman, E.G. Field, G.B. 2000 *Constraints on the magnetic of α in dynamo theory* ApJ **524**, 984
- Boldyrev, S. & Cattaneo, F. 2004 *Magnetic field generation in Kolmogorov turbulence* Phys Rev Lett **92**, 144501
- Braginski, 1965 *Transport Processes in a Plasma* in *Reviews of Plasma Physics* Vol I, p 105 ed. M.A. Leontovitch, trans. H. Lashinsky, Consultants Bureau, New York
- Brandenburg, A.; Moss, D.; Shukurov, A., 1995 *Galactic Fountains as Magnetic Pumps* MNRAS. **276** ,651
- Brandenburg, A.; Subramanian, K., 2005 *Astrophysical magnetic fields and nonlinear dynamo theory* Phys. Reports **417**, 1
- Brown, J.C. & Taylor, A.R. 2001 *The structure of the magnetic field in the outer galaxy from rotation measure observations through the disk* ApJ **563**, 31
- Carilli, C. L.; Taylor, G. B. 2002 *Cluster Magnetic Fields* ARA&A..**40**, 319
- Chandrasekhar, S. 1949 *Turbulence - a Physical Theory of Astrophysical Interest.* ApJ...**110**, 329
- Colgate, S. A.; Li, H. 2000 *The Magnetic Fields of the Universe and Their Origin in Highly Energetic Physical Processes and Mechanisms for Emission from Astrophysical Plasmas, Proceedings of IAU Symposium 195* , 255

- Cowling, T.G. 1934 *Magnetic Fields of Sunspots* MNRAS **94** , 39
- Cowling, T.G. 1953 *Solar Electrodynamics* in *The Sun* edited by G. P. Kuiper University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 532
- Dobler W, Poezd AD, Shukurov A 1996 *Galactic dynamos have movable boundaries* A & A **312** , 663
- Daly, R. A.; Loeb, A 1990 *A possible origin of galactic magnetic fields* ApJ...**364**, 451
- Diamond, P.H., Gruzinov, A.V. 1997 *Suppression of Cross-Field Turbulent Transport of Passive Scalar concentration in Two Dimensional Magnetohydrodynamics* Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 3306
- Duncan, D. K.; Primas, F.; Rebull, L. M.; Boesgaard, A. M.; Deliyannis, C.; Hobbs, L. M.; King, J. R.; Ryan, S. 1998 *The Evolution of Galactic Boron and a New Site for the Production of the Light Elements* ASPC..**143** 354
- Elsasser, W. M. 1946 *Inductive effects in Terrestrial Magnetism* Phys. Rev. **69**, 106
- Elsasser, W. M. 1950 *The Earth's Interior and Geomagnetism* Rev. Mod. Phys. **22**, 1
- Ensslin, T., Vogt, C., & Pfrommer, C. 2005 *Magnetic fields in clusters of galaxies*, in *The Magnetized Plasma in Galaxy Evolution*, eds. K. Chyzy, K. Otmianowska-Mazur, M. Soida, & R. Dettmar, Jagellonian University, Krakow, p. 231
- Fermi, E., 1949 *On the Origin of Cosmic Radiation* Phys. Rev. **75**, 1169
- Ferrière, K. 1992a *Effect of an ensemble of explosions on the Galactic dynamo. I - General formulation* ApJ **389** ,286
- Ferrière, K. 1992b *Effect of the explosion of supernovae and superbubbles on the Galactic dynamo* ApJ.**389**, 3891992ApJ...391..188F
- Ferrière, K. 1993a *The full alpha-tensor due to supernova explosions and superbubbles in the Galactic disk* ApJ **404**, 162
- Ferrière, K. 1993b *Magnetic diffusion due to supernova explosions and superbubbles in the Galactic disk* ApJ **409**, 248
- Ferrière, K. 1996 *Alpha-tensor and diffusivity tensor due to supernovae and superbubbles in the Galactic disk near the Sun.* A&A, **310**, 438

- Ferrière, K. 1998 *Alpha-tensor and diffusivity tensor due to supernovae and superbubbles in the Galactic disk* A&A, **335**, 488
- Ferrière, K. and Schmitt, D 2000 *Numerical models of the galactic dynamo driven by supernovae and superbubbles* A&A, **358**, 125
- Field, G. 1995 *Is the Dynamo Theory of the Galactic Magnetic Field Wrong?* in *The Physics of the Interstellar Medium and the Intergalactic Medium* ed. A.Ferrara, C.F. McKee, C. Heiles, P.R. Shapiro, Astron. Soc. Pac. Conf. Ser.**80**,1
- Furlanetto, S. R.; Loeb, A. 2001 *Intergalactic Magnetic Fields from Quasar Outflows* ApJ.**55**, 619
- Gaensler, B. M., Beck, R., and Feretti, L. 2004 *The origin and evolution of cosmic magnetism (About the kilometer square array and its use to find primordial fields)* New Astronomy Reviews 48 1008-12
- Gaensler, B.M. 2006 *The Square Kilometre Array: a new probe of cosmic magnetism* Astron Nach. **327**, 387
- Garcia-Lopez, R J.; Lambert, D L.; Edvardsson, B; Gustafsson, B; Kiselman, D; Rebolo, R 1998 *Boron in Very Metal Poor Stars* ApJ.**500** 241
- Garca-Lpez, R J. 1999 *Consistent Analysis of Oxygen, Lithium, Beryllium, and Boron Abundances in Metal-Poor Stars* ASP Conference Series,**171** ,77
- Gilmore, G; Wilkinson, M; Kleyna, J; Koch, A; Wyn Evans, N.; Wyse, R. F. G.; Grebel, E. K., 2006 *Observed Properties of Dark Matter: dynamical studies of dSph galaxies*, astro-ph/0608528
- Glatzmaier, G.A. & Roberts, P.H. 1995 *A three-dimensional self-consistent computer simulation of a geomagnetic field reversal* Nature, **377**, 203
- Gopal-Krishna, Witta, P.J., 2003 *Radio Galaxies and the Magnetization of the IGM in Radio Astronomy at the Fringe* ASP 300th Conference eds. J.A. Zensus, M.H. Cohen, E. Rosner, R
- Gnedin, N.Y.; Ferrara, A. & Zweibel, E., 2000 *Generation of the Primordial Magnetic Fields during Cosmological Reionization* ApJ **539**, 505
- Grasso, D. & Rubenstein, H.R. 1995, *Astropart. Phys.*, **3**, 95

- Gruzinov, A.V., Diamond,P.H. 1994 *Self-Consistent Theory of Mean Field Electrodynamics* Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 1651
- Gruzinov, A.V., Diamond,P.H. 1995 *Self-consistent mean field electrodynamics of true dynamos* Phys. Plasmas , 1941
- Han, J.L. 2001 *Magnetic Fields in our Galaxy: How Much Do We Know?*, Ap&SS **278**, 181
- Han J.L. 2002 *Magnetic fields in our Galaxy: How much do we know? (II) Halo fields and the global field structure*, AIP Conference Proceedings, **609**, 96
- Han, J.L.,2003 *The Global Structure Magnetic Fields in our Galaxy*, Supplement Issue, Acta Astronomica Sinica, **44** 148
- Han, J.L. 2006 *Magnetic fields in our Galaxy: How much do we know? III. Progress in the last decade*, astro-ph0603512
- Han, J.L., Manchester, R.N., Berkhuijsen, E.M., Beck, R., 1997 *Antisymmetric rotation measures in our Galaxy: Evidence for an A0 dynamo* , A & A, **322**, 98
- Han, J. L.; Manchester, R. N.; Qiao, G. J. 1999 *Pulsar rotation measures and the magnetic structure of our Galaxy*, MNRAS **306**, 371
- Han, J.L.; Manchester, R.N.; Lyne, A.G.; Qiao, G.J.; van Straten, W. 2006 *Pulsar Rotation Measures and the Large-Scale Structure of the Galactic Magnetic Field*, ApJ **642**, 868
- Han, J.L., Wielebinski, R., 2002 *Milestones in the observations of cosmic magnetic fields* Chinese J.F Astron. and Ast **2293**
- Hanasz, M.; Kowal, G.; Otmianowska-Mazur, K.; Lesch, H., 2004 *Amplification of Galactic Magnetic Fields by the Cosmic-Ray-Driven Dynamo* ApJ **605L**, 33
- Harrison, E.R. 1970 *Generation of Magnetic Fields in the Radiation Era*, MNRAS **147**, 279
- Heiles, C. 1990 *Clustered supernovae versus the gaseous disk and halo*, ApJ **354**, 483
- Heiles, C. 1996 *The local direction & curvature of the Galactic magnetic field derived from starlight polarization*, ApJ **462**, 316
- Heiles C, 1998 *Zeeman splitting opportunities and techniques at Arecibo* , Ast. Lett. and Comm. **37**, 85

- Heitsch, F., Zweibel, E.G., Slyz, A., & Devriendt, J.E.G. 2004 *Turbulent Ambipolar Diffusion: Numerical Studies in Two Dimensions*, ApJ **603**, 165
- Howard, A. M.; Kulsrud, R. M., 1997 *The Evolution of a Primal Galactic Magnetic Field*, ApJ **483**, 648
- Hoyle, F. 1958 *the steady state theory in La structure et L'evolution de L'univers: conseil de Physique Solvay Bruxelles*, 53
- Kang, H.; Cen, R.; Ostriker, J. P.; Ryu, D. 1994 *Hot gas in the cold dark matter scenario: X-ray clusters from a high-resolution numerical simulation*, ApJ **428**, 1.
- Kazantsev, A.P., 1968 *Enhancement of a Magnetic Field by a Conducting Fluid*, Sov. Phys. Sov. Phys. JETP **26**, 1031
- Kleeorin, N.; Moss, D.; Rogachevskii, I.; Sokoloff, D. 2000 *Helicity balance and steady-state strength of the dynamo generated galactic magnetic field*, A & A **361L** 5
- Kleeorin, N.; Moss, D.; Rogachevskii, I.; Sokoloff, D. 2002 *The role of magnetic helicity transport in nonlinear galactic dynamos*, A & A **387**, 453
- Kleeorin, N.; Moss, D.; Rogachevskii, I.; Sokoloff, D. 2003 *Non-linear magnetic diffusion and magnetic helicity transport in galactic dynamos*, A & A **400**, 9
- Kraichnan, R.H., Nagarajan, S., 1967 *Growth of Turbulent Magnetic Fields*, Phys. Fluids **19**, 859
- Krause, F., Rädler, K.-H. 1980 *Mean Field Magnetohydrodynamics and Dynamo Theory*, Pergamon Press, Oxford
- Krolik, J.H. & Zweibel, E.G. 2006 *The weak field limit of the magnetorotational instability*, ApJ **644**, 651
- Kronberg, P.P. 1994 *Extragalactic Magnetic Fields*, Rep. Prog. Phys. **57**, 325
- Kronberg, P.P., Dufton, Q.W., Li, H., & Colgate, S.A. 2001 *Magnetic Energy of the Intergalactic Medium from Galactic Black Holes*, ApJ **560**, 178
- Kulkarni, S. R.; Fich, M. 1985 *The fraction of high velocity dispersion H I in the Galaxy* ApJ **289**, 792

- Kulsrud, R.M. 1964 *General Stability Theory in Plasma Physics* Lecture Notes from Course XXV, *Advanced Plasma Theory*, International School of Physics, Enrico Fermi, Varenna, Italy, 1962 ed. M.N. Rosenbluth, Academic Press, New York
- Kulsrud, R.M. 1990 *The present state of a primordial galactic field*, in *Galactic and intergalactic magnetic fields*, Proceedings of the 140th Symposium of IAU, Heidelberg, 1989. , Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Netherlands, 527
- Kulsrud, R.M. 1999 *A Critical Review of Galactic Dynamos*, *ARA&A*.**37** 37
- Kulsrud, R.M. 2000 *The Origin of Magnetic Fields*, Proceedings of the International School of Physics, Enrico Fermi, Course CXLII, *Plasmas in the Universe* ed. B. Coppi, A. Ferrari, IOS Press, Amsterdam, 107
- Kulsrud, R.M. 2005 *Plasma physics for astrophysics Princeton series in astrophysics* Princeton University Press, Princeton
- Kulsrud, R.M. 2006 *The Origin of Galactic Magnetic Fields*, in *Cosmic Magnetic Fields*, eds. R. Wiełebinski, R. Beck, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 69
- Kulsrud, R. M.; Anderson, S. W. 1992 *The spectrum of random magnetic fields in the mean field dynamo theory of the Galactic magnetic field*, *ApJ*.**396**, 606
- Kulsrud, R. M.; Cen, R.; Ostriker, J. P.; Ryu, D. 1997 *The Protogalactic Origin for Cosmic Magnetic Fields*, *ApJ*. **480**, 481
- Kulsrud, R; Pearce, W. P., 1969 *The Effect of Wave-Particle Interactions on the Propagation of Cosmic Rays*, *ApJ*. **156**, 445
- Larmor, J. 1919 *How could a rotating body Such as the Sun become a Magnet?*, *Rep. 87th Meeting Brit. Assoc. Adv. Sci, 1919* John Murray, London
- Li, H; Lapenta, G; Finn, J M.; Li, S; Colgate, S A. 2006a *Modeling the Large-Scale Structures of Astrophysical Jets in the Magnetically Dominated Limit*, *ApJ* **643**, 92
- Li, H.; Nakamura, M.; Li, S. 2006b *3D MHD Simulations of Large-Scale Structures of Magnetic Jets*, American Physical Society Meeting April 2006, abstract D1.092

- Lin, C. C.; Yuan, C.; Shu, Frank H., 1969 *On the Spiral Structure of Disk Galaxies. III. Comparison with Observations*, ApJ. **155** 721L
- Lingenfelter, J.C. , Higdon, J. C. , Ramaty, R. 2000 *Cosmic Ray Acceleration in Superbubbles and the Composition of Cosmic Rays*, astro-ph 0004166
- MacLow, M. and McCray, R. 1988 *Superbubbles in disk galaxies* ApJ.**324**, 776
- Malyshkin, L. M.; Kulsrud, R. M., 2002 *Magnetized Turbulent Dynamo in Protogalaxies* ApJ...**571**, 619
- Manchester, R. N., 1974 *Structure of the Local Galactic Magnetic Field*, ApJ.**188**, 637
- Maron, J, Cowley, S., McWilliams, 2004 *The Nonlinear Cascade*, ApJ **603**, 569
- McCray, R. & Kafatos, M. 1987 *Supershells & Propagating Star Formation*, ApJ **317**, 190
- McCray, R.; Snow, T. P., Jr. 1979, *The violent interstellar medium*, ARA&A **17**, 213
- Meneguzzi, M.; Audouze, J.; Reeves, H. 1971 *The production of the elements Li, Be, B by galactic cosmic rays in space and its relation with stellar observations*, Astron. & Astrophys. **15** , 337
- Mishustin, I.M. , Ruzmaikin, A.A. 1972 *Occurrence of “Priming” Magnetic Fields During the Formation of Protogalaxies*, Sov. Physics Sov. Phys. JETP **34** 233
- Moffatt, H. K. 1978 *Magnetic Field Generation in Electrically Conducting Fluids*, Cambridge University Press, England
- Moss D, Shukurov A, Sokoloff D, 1998 *Boundary effects and propagating magnetic fronts in disc dynamos* , Geoph. Ast. Fluid Dynamics **89**, 285
- Newcomb, W.A. 1958 *Motion of Magnetic Field Lines*, Ann. Phys. **4**, 372
- Ogden, D.E., Glatzmaier, G.A., & Coe, R.S. 2006 *The effects of different parameter regimes in geodynamo simulations*, GAFFD, **100**, 107

- Oren, A. L., & Wolfe, A.M., 1995 *A Faraday-rotation search for magnetic fields in quasar damped Ly- α absorption systems* ApJ **445**, 624
- Parker, Eugene N. 1955 *Hydromagnetic Dynamo Models*, ApJ. **122**, 293
- Parker, E. N. 1970a *The Origin of Solar Magnetic Fields*, ARA&A **8**, 1
- Parker, E. N. 1970b *The Origin of Magnetic Fields*, ApJ **160**, 383
- Parker, E. N. 1970c *The Generation of Magnetic Fields in Astrophysical Bodies. I. The Dynamo Equations*, ApJ **162**, 665
- Parker, E. N. 1971a *The Generation of Magnetic Fields in Astrophysical Bodies. II. The Galactic Field*, ApJ **163** 255
- Parker, E. N. 1971b *The Generation of Magnetic Fields in Astrophysical Bodies. III. Turbulent Diffusion of Fields and Efficient Dynamos*, ApJ **163**, 279
- Parker, E. N. 1971c *The Generation of Magnetic Fields in Astrophysical Bodies. V. Behavior at Large Dynamo Numbers*, ApJ **165**, 139
- Parker, E. N. 1971d *The Generation of Magnetic Fields in Astrophysical Bodies. VI. Periodic Modes of the Galactic Field*, ApJ **166**, 295
- Parker, E. N. 1971e *The Generation of Magnetic Fields in Astrophysical Bodies. VII. Dynamical Considerations*, ApJ **168**, 239
- Parker, E. N. 1973a *The Generation and Dissipation of Solar and Galactic Magnetic Fields*, A&SS **22**, 279
- Parker, E. N., 1973b *Extragalactic Cosmic Rays and the Galactic Magnetic Field*, Ap&SS, **24**, 279
- Parker, E. N. 1979 *Cosmical magnetic fields: Their origin and their activity*, Oxford, Clarendon Press; New York, Oxford University Press, 1979
- Parker, E. N. 1992 *Fast dynamos, cosmic rays, and the Galactic magnetic field*, ApJ **401**, 137
- Perry J.J. 1994 *Magnetic Fields at High Redshift in Cosmical Magnetic Fields: Contributed Papers in Honor of Professor L. Mestel*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 144

- Poezd, A.; Shukurov, A.; Sokoloff, D. 1993 *Global Magnetic Patterns in the Milky-Way and the Andromeda Nebula*, MNRAS, **264**, 285
- Priest, E., Forbes, T. 2000 *Magnetic Reconnection* , Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Primas, F.; Duncan, D. K.; Peterson, R. C.; Thorburn, J. A. 1999 *A new set of HST boron observations. I. Testing light elements stellar depletion*, A&A, **343**, 545
- Prochaska, J. X.; Howk, J. C.; Wolfe, A. M. 2003 *The elemental abundance pattern in a galaxy at $z = 2.626$* , Nature, **423**, 57
- Pudritz, R. E.; Silk, J., 1989 *The origin of magnetic fields and primordial stars in protogalaxies* ApJ **342**, 650
- Rafikov, R. R.; Kulsrud, R. M. 2000 *Magnetic flux expulsion in powerful superbubble explosions and the $\alpha - \Omega$ dynamo*, MNRAS **314**, 839
- Ramaty, R., Kozlovsky, B., Lingenfelter, R.E., & Reeves, H. 1997 *Light elements and cosmic rays in the early Galaxy*, ApJ **488**, 730
- Ramaty, R.; Lingenfelter, R. E.; Kozlovsky, B. 2000 *LiBeB Evolution: Three Models in The Light Elements and their Evolution, Proceedings of IAU Symposium 198*, Edited by L. da Silva, R. de Medeiros, & M. Spite, 51
- Ramaty, R; Scully, S T.; Lingenfelter, R E.; Kozlovsky, B, 2000 *Light-Element Evolution and Cosmic-Ray Energetics*, ApJ **534** 747
- Ramaty, R; Tatischeff, V; Thibaud, J. P.; Kozlovsky, B; Mandzhav, N, 2000 *6Li from Solar Flares*, ApJ.**534L** 207
- Rand, R. J.; Kulkarni, S. R. 1989 *The local Galactic magnetic field* ApJ **343**, 760
- Rees, M. 1987 *the Origin and Cosmogonic Implications of Seed Fields*, Q. J. Roy. Ast. Soc. **28**, 197
- Rees, M., 1994 *Orig of the Seed Magnetic Field for a Galactic Dynamo*, in *Cosmical Magnetism* ed. D. Lynden-Bell Kluwer Academic Publishers, Netherlands, 155
- Rees, M. 2005 *Magnetic Fields in the Early Universe*, in *Cosmic Magnetic Fields* eds. R. Wielebinski, R. Beck, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1

- Rees, M. 2006 *Origin of cosmic magnetic fields*, Astron. Nachr. **327**, 395
- Rees, M. J.& Setti, G., 1968 *Model for the Evolution of Extended Radio Sources*, Nature, **219**, 127.
- Reeves, H 1994 *On the Origin of the Light Elements (Z_{j6})*, Rev Mod Phys **66**, 193
- Reeves, H. 2007 *The Origin of Early 6Li and the Reionization of the Universe*
- Reeves, H. 2005 *Element stratification in Stars, 40 years of atomic diffusion*, eds G. Alecian, O. Richard and S. Vauclair EAS Publication Series **9** astro-ph 0509380
- Roberts, W.W. & Yuan, C. 1970 *Application of the density wave theory to the spiral structure of the Milky Way system. III. Magnetic field: hydromagnetic shock formation*, ApJ **161**, 887
- Rosner, R & Deluca, E 1988 *On the Galactic Dynamo in The Center of the Galaxy*, IAU Symposium **136**, ed M. Morris, 319
- Ruzmaikin, A. A.; Sokoloff, D.D.; Shukurov, A. M., 1988 *Magnetic fields of galaxies*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht
- Ryu, D.; Ostriker, J. P.; Kang, H.; Cen, R. 1993 *A cosmological hydrodynamic code based on the total variation diminishing scheme*, ApJ. **414**, 1
- Ryu, D., Ostriker, J. P., Kang, H., Cen, R. 1994, *Hot gas in the cold dark matter scenario: X-ray clusters from a high-resolution numerical simulation*, ApJ. **428**, 1
- Sagdeev, R.Z., Galeev, A.A. 1969 *Nonlinear Plasma Theory*, edited by T.M. O'Neill and D.L. Book W.A. Benjamin, New York
- Schekochihin, A. A.; Cowley, S. C. 2005 *Turbulence and Magnetic Fields in Astrophysical Plasmas*, astro-ph/0505686
- Schekochihin, A. A.; Cowley, S. C.; Maron, J. L.; McWilliams, J. C. 2004 *Self-Similar Turbulent Dynamo*, Phys. Rev. Lett., **92**, 4501
- Schekochihin, A.; Cowley, S.; Kulsrud, R.; Hammett, G.; Sharma, P. ,2005a *Magnetized plasma turbulence in clusters of galaxies*, in the Magnetized Plasma in galaxy Evolution Krakow Poland eds K.T. Chyzy. K. Otmianowska, M, Soida, R.-J. Dettmar, 86

- Schekochihin, A. A.; Cowley, S. C.; Kulsrud, R. M.; Hammett, G. W.; Sharma, P. 2005b *Plasma Instabilities and Magnetic Field Growth in Clusters of Galaxies*, ApJ., **629**, 139
- Schekochihin, A. A.; Cowley, S. C. 2006 *Fast growth of magnetic fields in galaxy clusters: a self-accelerating dynamo*, Astron. Nachr. **327**, 599
- Shukurov, A. 2004 *Introduction to galactic dynamos*, astro-ph 0411739
- Smith, M.C. & 22 coauthors 2007 *The RAVE survey: constraining the local Galactic escape speed*, MNRAS **379**, 755
- Steenbeck, M., Krause, F., and Rädler, Ke-H 1966 *Berechnung der mittleren Lorentz-Feldstärke $\mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B}$ für ein elektrisch leitendes Medium in turbulenter, durch Coriolis-Kräfte beeinflusster Bewegung*, Z. Naturforsch **21a** 369.
- Spergel, D. N.; Bean, R.; Dor, O.; Nolta, M. R.; Bennett, C. L.; Dunkley, J.; Hinshaw, G.; Jarosik, N.; Komatsu, E & Page, L.; and 12 coauthors, 2007 *Three-Year Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) Observations: Implications for Cosmology*, ApJS **170**, 335
- Spitzer, L. 1962 *Physics of fully Ionized gases* Interscience publishers
- Spitzer, L 1978 *Physical processes in the interstellar medium* New York Wiley-Interscience, 1978. 333
- Subramanian K.; Barrow J D, 2002 *Small-scale cosmic microwave background polarization anisotropies due to tangled primordial magnetic fields*, MNRAS.**335**, 57
- Taylor, J.B. 1974 *Relaxation of toroidal plasma and generation of reversed magnetic fields* Phys. Rev. Lett. **33** 1139
- Taylor, J.B. 1986 *Relaxation and magnetic reconnection in plasmas*, Rev Modern Phys. **58**, 741
- Tegmark, M., Silk, J., Rees, M.J., Blanchard, A., Abel, T., & Palla, F. 1997 *How small were the first cosmological objects?* ApJ, **474**, 1
- Vainshtein, S.I. & Ruzmaikin, A.A., 1972 *Generation of the Large Scale Galactic Magnetic Field* Sov. Astron. **15**, 714
- Vallee JP, 2004 *Cosmic magnetic fields - as observed in the Universe, in galactic dynamos, and in the Milky Way*, New Astron. Rev. **48** 763

- Watson, A. & Perry, J. 1991 *QSO absorption lines and rotation measures*, MNRAS **248** 58
- Weaver, R.; McCray, R.; Castor, J.; Shapiro, P.; Moore, R., 1977 *Interstellar bubbles. II - Structure and evolution*, ApJ **218**. 377
- Weisberg, J.M., Cordes, J.M., Kuan, B., Devine, K.E., Green, J.T., & Backer, D.C., 2004 *Arecibo 430 MHz pulsar polarimetry: Faraday rotation measures & morphological classifications*, ApJS **150**, 317
- Welter, G. L.; Perry, J. J.; Kronberg, P. P. 1984 *The rotation measure distribution of QSOs and of intervening clouds - Magnetic fields and column densities*, ApJ, **279**, 19
- Widrow L.M. 2002 *Origin of galactic and extragalactic magnetic fields* , Rev. Mod Phys **74** 775
- Wolfe, A M , Lanzetta, K.M., Oren, A.L. 1992 *Magnetic Fields in Damped Ly α Systems*, ApJ **388**, 17
- Woltjer, L, 1969 *Remarks on the galactic magnetic field in the Galactic system* edited by Hugo van Woerden, Academic Press, p. 1967
- Zweibel, E.G. 1996 *Polarimetry and the theory of the Galactic magnetic field*, in *Polarimetry of the Interstellar Medium*, eds. W. G. Roberge & D.C.B. Whittet, A.S.P. Conference Series Volume 97, p. 486
- Zweibel, E.G. 2003 *Cosmic-Ray History and its Implications for Galactic Magnetic Fields* ApJ. **587**, 625
- Zweibel, E.G., Heiles, C., 1997 *Magnetic fields in galaxies and beyond* Nature, **385**, 131