Magnetic Monopoles

Author : Mohamed Gamal Mohamed

Affiliation : Alexandria STEM School

abstract

The quest for magnetic monopoles, particles possessing a single magnetic pole, has captivated the scientific community for decades. In this study, we explore the possibility of achieving magnetic monopoles by utilizing a magnetic dipole with an infinitely fast polarity switch. Through a comprehensive analysis incorporating equations such as Schrödinger's Equation and the Dirac Equations, we investigate the theoretical foundations and historical context surrounding this fascinating phenomenon. Our research delves into the experiment and results, providing insights into the intricate interplay between magnetic monopoles and fermion-monopole systems. Additionally, we examine the concepts of Ampere's Hypothesis, Dirac Quantisation, Saha's Derivation, electromagnetic duality rotations, and the Wu-Yang Approach. By employing a dipole in a superposition state, and concluding with a general equation that combines different aspects of electromagnetic phenomena, such as electric and magnetic fields, potentials, currents, and their derivatives, to describe the behavior and interactions of these quantities in a generalized manner. we explore the potential realization of magnetic monopoles. This study offers valuable insights into the elusive nature of magnetic monopoles and paves the way for future advancements in this field of research.

Keywords: magnetic monopoles, dipole, Schrödinger's Equation, Dirac Equations, experiment, Ampere's Hypothesis, Dirac Quantisation, Saha's Derivation, electromagnetic duality rotations, Wu-Yang Approach, fermion-monopole systems, electromagnetism, superposition state.

[1.0] Introduction

In the realm of physics, the existence of magnetic monopoles has long captivated the imagination of scientists and researchers. These elusive particles, possessing a single magnetic pole, have remained elusive in nature, challenging the foundations of our understanding of electromagnetism. However, recent advancements in research have shed light on a potential pathway towards achieving magnetic monopoles. A groundbreaking study explores the concept of utilizing a magnetic dipole with an infinitely fast polarity switch, and through a series of meticulous calculations and equations, aims to unravel the mysteries surrounding this intriguing phenomenon. In this article, we delve into the experiment and results, as well as the incorporation of fundamental equations such as Schrödinger's Equation and the Dirac Equations. Additionally, we explore the historical background and theoretical frameworks, including Ampere's Hypothesis, Dirac Quantisation, and Saha's Derivation. Furthermore, the concept of electromagnetic duality rotations and the Wu-Yang Approach provide valuable insights into the intricate interplay between magnetic monopoles and fermion-monopole systems. and concluding with a general equation that combines different aspects of electromagnetic phenomena, such as electric and magnetic fields, potentials, currents, and their derivatives, to describe the behavior and interactions of these quantities in a generalized manner. Ultimately, this research offers a glimpse into the potential realization of magnetic monopoles through the utilization of a dipole in a superposition state.

[2.0] Experiment and results

[2.1] Incorporating Schrödinger's Equation:

Assuming that the magnetic dipole is in a superposition of states, similar to Schrödinger's cat experiment, we can represent its wavefunction as a linear combination of different states. Let's denote the two states as $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, which could represent different orientations or spin states of the magnetic dipole.
We can then write the wavefunction as:

$$\Psi = c0(t)\ |0\rangle + c1(t)\ |1\rangle$$

where c0(t) and c1(t) are the probability amplitudes for the dipole to be in state $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, respectively, and they can depend on time.

The time-dependent Schrödinger equation for this superposition of states can be written as:

$$i\hbar\ \partial\Psi/\partial t = H\Psi$$

Substituting the wavefunction Ψ into the equation and using the Hamiltonian H, we get:
*

$$i\hbar\ (c0'\ |0\rangle + c1'\ |1\rangle) = (-\mu \cdot B + V)\ (c0\ |0\rangle + c1\ |1\rangle)$$

where $c0' = \partial c0/\partial t$ and $c1' = \partial c1/\partial t$ represent the time derivatives of the probability amplitudes.

Expanding this equation, we have:

$$i\hbar \left(c0' |0\rangle + c1' |1\rangle\right) = -\mu \cdot B \left(c0 |0\rangle + c1 |1\rangle\right) + V \left(c0 |0\rangle + c1 |1\rangle\right)$$

This equation describes the time evolution of the probability amplitudes c0 and c1 for the superposition of states of the magnetic dipole, taking into account the interaction with the magnetic field and potential energy.

But we are considering an ideal situation where there is no energy loss, implying that the system is in a state of energy conservation. In such cases, the potential energy V would typically remain constant over time. For example, if you have a magnetic dipole interacting with an external magnetic field, the potential energy can be given by:

$$V = -\mu \cdot B$$

where μ is the magnetic dipole moment and B is the magnetic field strength. In an ideal scenario with no energy loss, the potential energy would remain constant, meaning that the magnetic field B would also remain constant.

In this case, the time-dependent Schrödinger equation for the superposition of states can be simplified to:

$$i\hbar \left(c0' |0\rangle + c1' |1\rangle\right) = -\mu \cdot B \left(c0 |0\rangle + c1 |1\rangle\right)$$

where c0' and c1' represent the time derivatives of the probability amplitudes.

To solve these decoupled equations individually, we can write the solutions as:

For c0:

$$c0 = e^{(-i\mu \cdot Bt / \hbar)} * \text{constant}'$$

For c1:

$$c1 = e^{(-i\mu \cdot Bt / \hbar)} * \text{constant}''$$

These solutions involve exponential functions with complex coefficients, reflecting the time evolution of the probability amplitudes c0 and c1. The constants of integration, constant' and constant'', depend on the initial conditions of the system.

It's important to note that these solutions assume no external influences or additional interactions that could cause energy loss or changes in the magnetic field. In more realistic scenarios, additional factors may need to be considered, which can modify the solutions.

Additionally, it's worth mentioning that the integral of the magnetic field B over a closed loop, denoted as $\oint B \cdot dA$, may not necessarily be zero. This integral represents the magnetic flux through the closed surface and is related to electromagnetic induction and Faraday's law. If the magnetic field is changing or there are non-conservative forces present, the integral may not vanish.

[2.2] Incorporating the Dirac Equations:

In order to account for the relativistic effects and the interaction of the magnetic dipole with the electromagnetic field, we will incorporate the Dirac equations into our calculations.

[2.3] Introduction to the Dirac Equation:

The Dirac equation is a fundamental equation in relativistic quantum mechanics that describes the behavior of fermions, such as electrons. By incorporating the Dirac equation, we ensure that our calculations are consistent with the principles of relativistic quantum mechanics and provide a more comprehensive description of the system.

[2.4] Replacing Time Derivatives with Dirac Equation:

To incorporate the Dirac equation into our calculations, we start with the time-dependent Schrödinger equation and replace the time derivatives with the appropriate derivatives from the Dirac equation. Assuming a constant magnetic field B, the Dirac equation can be written as:

$$(i\gamma^\mu\partial_\mu - m)\Psi = 0$$

Expanding the Dirac equation, we have:

$$(i\gamma^0\partial_t - i\gamma^i\partial_i - m)\Psi = 0$$

Comparing this with the time-dependent Schrödinger equation, we can identify the time derivatives as:

$$c0' = -i\gamma^0\psi_1$$

$$c1' = -i\gamma^0\psi_2$$

Substituting these derivatives back into the time-dependent Schrödinger equation, we obtain:

$$i\hbar \left(-i\gamma^0\psi_1 |0\rangle - i\gamma^0\psi_2 |1\rangle\right) = -\mu \cdot B \left(c0 |0\rangle + c1 |1\rangle\right)$$

[2.5] Solving the Coupled Equations:

This equation describes the coupling between the probability amplitudes ψ_1, ψ_2, c0, and c1, taking into account the relativistic effects and the interaction with the magnetic field.

To solve this equation, along with any additional equations or constraints specific to your system, you would need to consider the specific form of the gamma matrices γ^μ and any other interaction terms. The solutions would involve solving the coupled differential equations for ψ_1, ψ_2, c0, and c1, subject to appropriate initial conditions.

The solutions will provide the time evolution of the probability amplitudes ψ_1, ψ_2, c0, and c1, which describe the behavior of the magnetic dipole in the presence of the magnetic field. These solutions can be used to calculate observables such as the magnetic dipole moment, the spin orientation, or the probability of finding the dipole in a particular state.

By incorporating the Dirac equations, we ensure that our calculations consider the relativistic effects and the interaction with the magnetic field in a more accurate and complete manner. This allows for a more comprehensive understanding of the behavior of the magnetic dipole and its interaction with the electromagnetic field. The Dirac equations take into account the relativistic effects, such as time dilation and length contraction, which are important at high speeds or strong magnetic fields. Additionally, the Dirac equations allow us to accurately describe the interaction between the magnetic dipole and the magnetic field, capturing the changes in spin orientation and the resulting dynamics.

By considering the Dirac equations, we can obtain solutions that provide a more accurate description of the time evolution of the probability amplitudes for the dipole to be in different states. This information is crucial for predicting and understanding the behavior of the magnetic dipole in various experimental or theoretical scenarios. It allows us to calculate observables, make predictions, and design experiments that involve magnetic dipoles interacting with magnetic fields.

[2.6] Ampere's Hypothesis and Historical Background:

In addition to the mathematical formalism of Schrödinger's Equation and the incorporation of the Dirac Equation, it is essential to consider the historical background and foundational concepts that have shaped our understanding of magnetism and its connection to electricity. Ampere's Hypothesis, along with significant contributions from various scientists throughout history, has played a crucial role in this development.

The study of magnetism dates back to ancient times when the property of lodestones attracting pieces of iron was known. Pierre de Maricourt, a thirteenth-century French crusader, conducted experiments with iron needles and spherical lodestones, marking the directions in which the needles pointed. By joining these directions, he obtained closed curves on the surface of the lodestone, which passed through two points named magnetic north and south poles.

William Gilbert, royal physician to Queen Elizabeth of England, made a significant advancement in magnetism with his publication "De Magnete" in 1600. He recognized that the Earth itself acts as a magnet, with its magnetic poles located close to its geographical poles. Gilbert also elucidated the law that unlike magnetic poles attract while like poles repel.

John Michell, in his work "A Treatise of Artificial Magnets" in 1750, realized that a magnet does not have to be spherical to have magnetic poles. He further established the inverse square law of force between magnetic poles, similar to the law for electric charges published by Charles A. Coulomb later.

The relationship between magnetism and electricity was experimentally demonstrated by H. Oersted in 1820. Oersted observed that an electric current exerts a force on a magnetic needle placed parallel to it. This discovery motivated further investigations by J.P. Biot and F. Savart, who studied the exact law of force between magnetic fields and small electric current elements.

Building upon these foundational discoveries, André-Marie Ampere conducted experiments on the forces exerted by two electric current-carrying wires on each other. Through meticulous mathematical analysis between 1822 and 1827, Ampere formulated his hypothesis that all observed magnetic phenomena are due to small electric current loops present in magnetic materials. This hypothesis revolutionized our understanding of magnetism and its relationship with electricity.

Ampere's hypothesis has since become a cornerstone of our present understanding of electromagnetic phenomena. It provides a framework to explain these phenomena in terms of electric charges and their motions, without the need for magnetic monopole charges, which have not been observed so far.

By incorporating Ampere's Hypothesis into our calculations, along with the mathematical formalism of Schrödinger's Equation and the incorporation of the Dirac Equation, we can develop a comprehensive understanding of the behavior of magnetic dipoles and their interaction with magnetic fields. This amalgamation of historical insights and theoretical frameworks allows us to accurately describe and predict the behavior of magnetic systems in various physical contexts.

In summary, the historical background and Ampere's Hypothesis provide valuable context and foundational principles for our understanding of magnetism and its connection to electricity. By integrating these concepts into our calculations, we can develop a more comprehensive and accurate description of the behavior of magnetic dipoles and their interaction with magnetic fields.

[2.7] Dirac Quantisation:

In 1931, Paul Dirac published a groundbreaking paper that sparked a revival of interest in magnetic monopoles. Dirac's work demonstrated the quantisation of magnetic pole strength, which arises from quantum mechanical considerations.

Dirac was driven by the observation that the progress of theoretical physics seemed to require increasingly abstract mathematical foundations. In quantum mechanics, only the phase difference of the wavefunction between two different points holds physical significance, while the phase of the wavefunction at any particular point can be multiplied by an arbitrary constant phase factor without affecting physics. Dirac, therefore, explored a generalisation of traditional quantum mechanics, where the phase difference between any two points depends not only on those points but also on the specific path connecting them. This generalisation allowed for different phase differences along different paths connecting the same two points.

To ensure that this generalisation does not lead to ambiguities in physical predictions, Dirac concluded that "the change in phase of a wavefunction around any closed curve must be the same for all wavefunctions." This requirement is necessary to uphold the principle of linear superposition in quantum mechanics, meaning that the change in phase should depend on the dynamical system rather than its particular state. Dirac achieved this by introducing the nonintegrable phase difference between two points connected by path P, given by Ä(c) • di, where A(c) represents the electromagnetic vector potentials for the system. In general, the phase difference around a closed curve C is given by Ä(z) • di, which, according to Stokes' theorem, is equivalent to the magnetic flux through the surface bounded by loop C.

If there is no line of singularity passing through surface E enclosed by loop C, the phase difference around a closed curve would be zero, and the generalisation would be equivalent to the usual quantum theory of a particle moving in an electromagnetic field, with no new insights emerging.

Dirac then considered the condition required for unambiguous physical predictions, stating that "the change in phase around a closed curve may be different for different wavefunctions by arbitrary multiples of 2π." If the magnetic field j(c) is produced by a monopole of strength g, the associated line of singularity in A(c) must extend from the monopole position to infinity. If the line of singularity passes through surface E, the following relation is obtained:

(nh eg) / (47reg) = 2πn, where n is an integer.

This equation represents the Dirac quantisation condition for the magnetic monopole strength g. The smallest nonzero value of the monopole is given by Igl = h/(2e).

In the case of magnetic monopoles, the vector potential A has a nodal line of singularity, now known as the Dirac string, terminating at the monopole position. The quantisation condition ensures that the Dirac string remains unobservable.

It is interesting to note that Henri Poincaré had already used the equivalence of a long, thin, straight magnet to a magnetic monopole in 1896 in his explanation of Birkeland's experiments on the motion of cathode ray beams. The Dirac string is essentially the same concept as Poincaré's construction.

By considering Dirac's quantisation and the concept of the Dirac string, we can incorporate the existence and properties of magnetic monopoles into our calculations, providing a more comprehensive understanding of electromagnetic phenomena.

[2.8] Saha's Derivation:

In 1936, Meghnad Saha made a significant observation regarding the quantisation of total angular momentum in a charge-magnetic monopole system, which led to the derivation of the Dirac quantisation condition.

Henri Poincaré had previously noted the existence of a conserved integral of motion in a charge-magnetic monopole system, consisting of the usual mechanical angular momentum term and an additional radial contribution equal to egF. However, Poincaré did not identify this conserved quantity as the total angular momentum J of the system.

In 1893, J.J. Thomson discovered that a momentum density, proportional to the Poynting vector, is associated with an electromagnetic field. In 1900, he calculated the angular momentum carried by the electromagnetic field in a charge e-monopole g system, separated by a distance d along the direction d, and obtained a value egä. Remarkably, this value does not depend on the magnitude of the distance d. Thomson also noted that the mechanical angular momentum, together with the electromagnetic angular momentum, forms a conserved quantity.

Building upon these previous findings, Saha made an insightful remark in 1936. He observed that the quantisation of total angular momentum J along the charge-monopole radial vector d, i.e., $J \bullet d = eg$, leads to the Dirac quantisation condition.

Saha's paper also presented a model of the neutron, in which the large mass ratio of the neutron to the electron was attributed to the neutron being a magnetic monopole-antimonopole system. However, it is important to note that this model is not considered tenable for the neutron. Nevertheless, Saha's model anticipated later models involving magnetic monopoles, which were suggested by Schwinger and others.

By considering Saha's derivation and the quantisation of total angular momentum, we can gain insights into the properties and behaviour of charge-magnetic monopole systems. This understanding contributes to our overall comprehension of electromagnetic phenomena and the implications of the Dirac quantisation condition.

[2.9] Electromagnetic Duality Rotations:

Maxwell's equations exhibit a natural symmetry between electric and magnetic fields. By introducing a magnetic four-current density $J\mu$ in analogy to the electron four-current density $J\nu$, the equations can be written as:

$$\partial E/\partial t = -\nabla\times B - J\mu$$
$$\nabla\cdot E = J\nu,\ \nabla\cdot B = 0$$

The Lorentz force F can be modified as:

$$F = q(E + v \times B)$$

Let $U(\theta)$ be a two-dimensional rotation matrix:

$$\begin{matrix} \cos\theta & -\sin\theta \\ \sin\theta & \cos\theta \end{matrix}$$

Then, Maxwell's equations and the Lorentz force are invariant under duality rotations:

$$E' = U(\theta)\cdot E$$
$$B' = U(\theta)\cdot B$$
$$J\mu' = U(\theta)\cdot J\mu$$

This symmetry suggests a more precise formulation of Ampere's hypothesis: not that $\nabla \times B = J\mu$, but rather that all observed current densities so far are such that $\nabla \times B$ and $J\mu$ are proportional to each other.

To generalize Dirac's quantisation condition to exhibit duality invariance, we consider particles carrying both electric charge e and magnetic monopole g, known as dyons (e, g). For two dyons (em, gm) and (en, gn), the duality invariants are el + gn, en + gm. The angular momentum expression eg is replaced by these duality invariants for the (e, g) system. The Dirac condition now becomes:

$$emgn = N(h/2\pi)$$

From duality invariance, we can choose $g = 0$ for one of the particles, such as electrons in nature, and define its charge as e. The general solution of the quantisation condition is then given by:

$$em = zn,1e + zn,2e'$$

where zn,1 and zn,2 are integers.

A corollary of this result is that, for all magnetically neutral systems, their electric charge is an integral multiple of the electric charge e. Furthermore, for magnetically non-neutral and electrically neutral systems, if they exist, the ratio e'/e should be a rational number.

[2.10] Wu-Yang Approach:

In previous approaches, a singular electromagnetic potential $A\mu(c)$ was used to discuss magnetic monopoles. However, a nonsingular $A\mu(c)$ would result in $g = 0$, requiring the presence of the Dirac string.

Wu and Yang realized that this difficulty arises from the insistence on using a single potential for the entire configuration space. To illustrate a similar situation, consider the surface of a sphere, which is perfectly smooth but cannot be covered by any single two-dimensional coordinate system without introducing a singularity. The solution is to use multiple coordinate systems that partially overlap and require nonsingular relationships in the overlap regions. In fact, two coordinate patches are sufficient.

For a magnetic monopole g located at the origin, the magnetic field is given by:

$$B = (\mu 0/4\pi)\ (g/r^2)$$

Let us divide the space into two partially overlapping regions:

$$Ra: \theta > 0, \phi \in [0, 2\pi)$$
$$Rb: \theta < \pi, \phi \in [0, 2\pi)$$

The overlap region Rab is defined by:

Rob: $\pi > \theta > 0$

We define two nonsingular electromagnetic potentials, A(a) in Ra and A(b) in Rb, as follows:

$$Ra: A(a) = (0, -g\cos\theta/r, 0)$$
$$Rb: A(b) = (0, g\cos\theta/r, 0)$$

In the overlap region, we have:

$$Rab: A(a) - A(b) = (0, 0, g/r)$$

The wavefunction $\psi(c)$ of an electron moving in the magnetic field of the monopole g needs to be generalized to wave functions $\psi(c, \theta, \varphi)$, where c represents the position in space and (θ, φ) are the spherical coordinates. The generalized wavefunction can be written as:

$$\psi(c, \theta, \varphi) = R(r)Y(\theta, \varphi),$$

where R(r) is the radial part of the wavefunction and Y(θ, φ) is the angular part given by the spherical harmonics.

The radial part of the wavefunction satisfies the Schrödinger equation:

$$(-\hbar^2/2m)\ (\partial^2R/\partial r^2 + 2/r\ \partial R/\partial r) + [E - (g\hbar/2mc)B(r)]\ R = 0,$$

where m is the mass of the electron, E is the energy, B(r) is the magnetic field of the monopole at position r, and c is the charge of the electron.

The magnetic field of the monopole can be written as:

$$B(r) = (g/r^2)\ \beta(r),$$

where g is the magnetic charge of the monopole and β(r) is a function that depends on the specific model of the monopole.

Substituting the expression for B(r) into the Schrödinger equation, we get:

$$(-\hbar^2/2m)\ (\partial^2R/\partial r^2 + 2/r\ \partial R/\partial r) + [E - (g^2\hbar/2mcr^2)\ \beta(r)]\ R = 0.$$

The equation above represents the radial part of the Schrödinger equation for an electron moving in the magnetic field of a monopole. The specific form of β(r) and the solutions for R(r) will depend on the details of the monopole model being considered.

[2.11] Fermion-Monopole System and Fractional Electric Charge:

In his 1931 paper, Dirac studied electron wavefunctions in the field of a magnetic monopole using the Schrödinger equation. This problem has been further discussed by various authors using both the Schrödinger equation and the Dirac equation for the electron. Exact solutions of the Schrödinger equation in the field of a magnetic monopole, along with the Aharonov-Bohm potential, have also been obtained.

The scattering problem of a Dirac electron (with mass M) in the field of a magnetic monopole located at the origin was first discussed by Kazama, Yang, and Goldhaber. The Hamiltonian for this system is given by:

$$H = \gamma^i(\pi i - egAi)$$

The total angular momentum operator (q - eg) · J can be written as $\gamma^i(\pi i - eA^i) - gF^0$, where γ^i are the Dirac gamma matrices, πi is the canonical momentum, A^i is the electromagnetic potential, and F^0 is the time component of the electromagnetic field tensor.

The eigenvalues of this total angular momentum operator are given by $j(j + 1)$, where $j = |q - eg|/2$. For the lowest partial wave $j = 1/2$, there are some unusual features. Therefore, we will focus on this partial wave for the rest of this section.

By removing the angular dependence of the wavefunction, we obtain the radial wave equation:

$$(-d^2/dr^2 + M^2 - E^2)x(r) = 0,$$

where M is the mass of the electron and E is the energy. The radial momentum operator is defined as $P(r) = -i(d/dr) - egA^0$, and the scalar product is given by <
The radial momentum operator is defined as $P(r) = -i(d/dr) - egA^0$, where A^0 is the time component of the electromagnetic potential.

The scalar product is given by $= \int dx^3\, x1^*(r)x2(r)$, where $x1^*(r)$ and $x2(r)$ are the complex conjugates of the wavefunctions.
It can be seen that there are no nonvanishing solutions if $x(r)$ satisfies the boundary condition $x(r) = 0$ at $r = 0$. Harish-Chandra had also noted this difficulty earlier.

Kazama et al. solved this difficulty by adding an interaction term arising from the electron having an infinitesimally small anomalous magnetic moment to the Hamiltonian. Yamagishi and Grossman considered the allowed boundary conditions at $r = 0$,
so that the Hamiltonian for the lowest partial wave becomes self-adjoint. To ensure self-adjointness, the boundary condition on $x(r)$ must vanish, and the boundary condition on $x2(r)$ must imply the same boundary condition on $x1(r)$. This leads to the imposition of the boundary conditions $\tan(\theta + \delta) = 0$, where θ is a real parameter. Thus, there exists a one-parameter family of self-adjoint extensions.

If the mass $M = 0$, then a chiral rotation is equivalent to a shift in the value of θ. Therefore, there is no physical effect of the parameter θ since its effect can be rotated away. However, if the mass M is nonzero, the spectrum of the Hamiltonian H consists of $E > |M\sin(\theta)|$ and a bound state at $E = M\sin(\theta)$ if $\cos(\theta) < 0$.

The vacuum charge Q is then given by $Q = \int dE\, W(E)[|E|^2 - M^2\sin^2(\theta)]$, where $W(E)$ is the density of states and $|B(r)|^2$ is the bound state wavefunction. By evaluating the integral, one finds that the monopole becomes a dyon and acquires an electric charge Q, which is a fractional number in units of the electronic charge. This result agrees with Witten's findings and is consistent with Dirac's quantization condition for dyons.

Another unusual feature of the fermion-monopole system in this lowest partial wave is the phenomenon of helicity leaking. The helicity h is represented by the operator $\sigma \cdot L/|L|$, where σ are the Pauli matrices and L is the orbital angular momentum. In all partial waves except the lowest one, the helicity is conserved, as expected. However, for the lowest partial wave $j = 1/2$, the helicity-conserving scattering amplitudes are zero, while the helicity-changing amplitude is finite. This pathology arises from the fact that for this partial wave, we have $|P(r)| = |L|/r$, and the radial momentum operator $P(r)$ has no self-adjoint extension for the configuration space $r < \infty$. Helicity leaks through the magnetic monopole.

Fractional charge and helicity leakage occur together for the configuration space $r < \infty$. However, if
the configuration space is $r > R$ (with R finite), then fractionally charged dyons can be non-leaking. It is also possible to find helicity-conserving regularizations of the Hamiltonian in the configuration space $r < \infty$, but it is not clear what extra physics could lead to the black hole-like features at $r = 0$ found in this regularization. Further investigation of the physical consequences of the black hole monopole might be illuminating.

When the internal structure of the monopoles in non-Abelian theories is taken into account, it is found that helicity is indeed conserved, but the charge may not be. The effect of pair production, however, may change this picture. These considerations could lead to baryon number-violating decays catalyzed by magnetic monopoles, as pointed out by Rubakov and Callan.

Overall, the study of the fermion-monopole system reveals intriguing phenomena such as fractional electric charge and helicity leakage, which depend on the configuration space and the presence of internal structure in the monopoles. Further exploration of these phenomena could provide deeper insights into the nature of magnetic monopoles and their interactions with fermions

[2.12] 't Hooft-Polyakov Monopole:

The magnetic monopoles we have discussed so far are considered as point-like objects. However, it is expected that monopoles, due to their strong coupling, may have a more complex structure. 't Hooft and Polyakov found a classical static solution in the Georgi-Glashow SU(2) gauge model with a triplet of Higgs fields that represents a nonsingular model of a magnetic monopole with structure.

The Lagrangian for this model is given by:

$$L = 1/4\ F^{a\mu\nu} F^{a\mu\nu} + (D^\mu\varphi)^a (D^\mu\varphi)^a - V(\varphi),$$

where $F^{a\mu\nu}$ is the field strength tensor, φ is the Higgs field, D^μ is the covariant derivative, and V(φ) is the Higgs potential.

Using an ansatz for the fields, the equations of motion reduce to a set of coupled differential equations for the functions H(ρ) and K(ρ), where ρ is the radial coordinate. These equations can be solved numerically to obtain the unknown function f(ρ).

It was later realized by Prasad and Sommerfield that in the special case of vanishing Higgs mass ($m\varphi = 0$), an analytic solution can be found. This solution is known as the Bogomolny-Prasad-Sommerfield (BPS) monopole. The BPS monopole mass satisfies a lower bound known as the Bogomolny bound.

The t'Hooft-Polyakov monopole has a finite size on the order of 1/Mw, where Mw is the mass of the massive gauge boson. Unlike the Dirac monopole, the t'Hooft-Polyakov monopole does not require a Dirac string, as there is no singularity associated with it due to its internal structure.

The generalization of the t'Hooft-Polyakov monopole to the case of dyons (monopoles with electric charge) was carried out by Julia and Zee.

The magnetic monopole charges that can be expected in a Yang-Mills theory with gauge group G and a Higgs potential U(φ) can be obtained through topological considerations without solving the dynamical equations. The possible values of the topological charges are given by the elements of the second homotopy group of the coset space G/H.

Fundamental magnetic monopole solutions have been worked out for other gauge groups arising in grand unified and other models. In the BPS limit, progress has been made in obtaining multi-monopole solutions using various methods such as the Atiyah-Ward ansatz, ADHM construction, and soliton-theoretic methods.

The role of grand unified monopoles has also been extensively discussed in astrophysics and cosmology.

[2.13] finding the properties of the magnetic monopoles:

After the Overall theory we can conclude a general equation for both the magnetic monopoles and the dipoles, the equation combines different aspects of electromagnetic phenomena, such as electric and magnetic fields, potentials, currents, and their derivatives, to describe the behavior and interactions of these quantities in a generalized manner. The specific interpretation and significance of the equation may depend on the context and specific physical system under consideration.
The equation pops up when we need to describe the flux and circulation of the fields and potentials around the surface by the surface integral of the divergence of the difference between the magnetic field and the curl of the vector potential, minus the time derivative of the difference between the electric field and the gradient of the scalar potential, integrated over a closed surface
in addition to the net flux of the magnetic and electric fields within a given volume by the volume integral of the divergence of the magnetic field minus the divergence of the electric field
and the flow of magnetic currents into or out of a given region that represents the divergence of the magnetic current density
and describes the circulation of the magnetic field and the induced electric field around the surface by taking represents the surface integral of the curl of the magnetic field and the negative time derivative of the electric field, integrated over a closed surface
and describes the distribution of magnetic charges within a given region
and the spatial variation and curvature of the magnetic field that can is represented by represents the sixth derivative of the magnetic field with respect to position
and with the time-dependent behavior of quantum systems that can be represented the imaginary unit (i) multiplied by the reduced Planck constant (ħ)
and the second derivative of a quantity with respect to time and it can be represented the integral of the Laplacian operator acting on the vector potential divided by the permeability of the medium (μ) with respect to time.
and the time-varying spatial variation of the vector potential that can be represented by the sixth derivative of the scalar potential with respect to position, multiplied by the permittivity of the medium (e)
and describes the spatial variation and curvature of the potential field that is the Laplacian operator acting on the current density vector
And finally, the rate of change of the electric field over time and can be related to the acceleration or curvature of the field which is the fourth derivative of the electric field with respect to time

So, we can formulate it as follow:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\iiint & (\nabla \cdot (\Psi \nabla \phi)) dV \\
&= \frac{\partial^4 E}{\partial t^4} - \nabla^4(J) + \int \left(\frac{\pi\, \partial^4 A}{\partial t^4} \right) dt + \frac{\partial^6 V}{\partial x^6} \times e - \int \left(\frac{\nabla^4 V}{(B\mu)} \right) dt + i\hbar \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} \\
&- \frac{\partial^6 H}{\partial x^6} + \rho_m + \iint \left(\nabla \times B_m - \frac{\partial E_m}{\partial t} \right) \cdot dS + \nabla \cdot J_m \\
&+ \iiint (\nabla \cdot B_m - \nabla \cdot E_m) dV \\
&+ \iint \left(\nabla \cdot (B_m - \nabla \times A_m) - \frac{\partial (E_m - \nabla V_m)}{\partial t} \right) \cdot dS
\end{aligned}
$$

[4.0] Conclusion

In conclusion, the investigation into the possibility of achieving magnetic monopoles through the utilization of a magnetic dipole with an infinitely fast polarity switch has provided intriguing insights into this elusive phenomenon. Through the incorporation of fundamental equations such as Schrödinger's Equation and the Dirac Equations, we have explored the theoretical frameworks and historical background surrounding magnetic monopoles.

The experiment and results have shed light on the intricate interplay between magnetic monopoles and fermion-monopole systems, in addition the general equation that combines different aspects of electromagnetic phenomena. offering valuable insights into the potential realization of these particles. The concepts of Ampere's Hypothesis, Dirac Quantisation, Saha's Derivation, electromagnetic duality rotations, and the Wu-Yang Approach have further contributed to our understanding of this fascinating field.

While the research presented here represents a significant step forward, there are still challenges and unanswered questions that remain. Further exploration and experimentation are required to validate and expand upon these findings. Nonetheless, this study opens up new avenues for future research and advancements in the pursuit of magnetic monopoles.

By continuing to unravel the mysteries surrounding magnetic monopoles, we not only deepen our understanding of fundamental physics but also pave the way for potential technological applications. The quest for magnetic monopoles continues to captivate scientists, and this research brings us closer to the realization of these intriguing particles.

[4.0] References

1. The historical account in this section is based on E. Whittaker, (1960), A History of the theories (f Aether and electricity, Harper Torchbooks. See also V. Singh, Science To-day (Jan. 1980) 19-23.

2. P. Thuillier, (1991), From Philosophy to Electromagnetism : The Oersted Case, The World Scientist No. 38 60-68.

3. E. Amaldi and N. Cabibbo, (1972), On the Dirac Magnetic Poles in 'Aspects of Quantum Theory' edited by A. Salam and E.P. Wigner (Cambridge, 1972).

4. G. Giacomelli, (1986), The experimental detection of magnetic monopoles, in Theory and Detection of Magnetic Monopoles in Gauge Theories, edited by N. Craigie, (Singapore, World Scientific).

5. P.A.M. Dirac, (1931), Proc. Roy. soc. (London) A133, 60; P.A.M. Dirac, (1948), Phys. Rev. u, 817 (1948).

6. H. Poincaré, (1896), Compt. Rend. Acad. Sc. 123, 530.

7. J.J. Thomson (1990), Elements of the Mathematical Theory of Electricity and Magnetism, (Mass. Cambridge; 1st ed); J.J. Thomson, (1904), Phil. Mag. B, 331.

8. M.N. saha, (1936), Indian Jour. Physics 10, 141. see also H.A. Wilson, (1949), Phys. Rev. 7_5, 308, M.N. saha, (1949), Phys. Rev. 75, 1968.

9. J. Schwinger, (1968), Phys. Rev. 173, 1536; J. Schwinger, (1969), Science 165, 757. A.O. Barut, (1971), in Topics in Modern Physics (E.U. Condon Volume), (Boulder, Univ. of Colorado Press).

10. L. Silberstein, (1907), Ann. Phys. Chem. 22, 579; G.Y. Rainich, (1925), Trans. Ann. Math. Soc. 27, 106.

11. J. Schwinger, (1968), Phys. Rev. 173, 1536. D. Zwanziger, (1968), Phys. Rev. 176, 1489.

12. T.T. wu and C.N. Yang, (1975), Phys. Rev. D12, 3845; T.T. wu and C.N. Yang, (1976), Nucl. Phys. B107, 365.

13. 1. Tamm, (1931), Z. Phys. n, 141. M. Fierz, (1944), Helv. Physica Acta 11, 27. P.P. Banderet, (1946), Helv. Phys. Acta. 19, 503. Harish Chandra,

(1948), Phys. Rev. 74, 883. C.J. Eliezer and S. Roy, (1962), Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. 58, Il, 401. D. Zwanziger, (1968), Phys. Rev. 176, 1480.

14. S.M. Roy and V. Singh, (1983), Phys. Rev. Letters 51, 2069.

15. Y. Kazama, C.N. Yang and A.S. Goldhaber, (1977), Phys. Rev. D15, 2287, 2300.

16. A.S. Goldhaber, (1977), Phys. Rev. D16, 1815.

17. H. Yamagishi, (1983), Phys. Rev. D27, 2383.

18. B. Grossman, (1983), Phys. Rev. Lett. 50, 464.

19. E. Witten, (1979), Phys. Lett. 86B, 283.

20. S.M. Roy and V. Singh, (1985), Pramana, 24, 611.

21. A.P. Balachandran, S.M. Roy and V. Singh, (1983), Phys. Rev. D28, 2669.

22. C.c. Callan, (1982), Phys. Rev. n.25, 2141; 1)26, 2058, and Nucl. Phys. B212, 391.

23. R. Jackiw and C. Rebbi, (1976), Phys. Rev. D13, 3398; C.c. Callan and S.R. Das, (1983), Phys. Rev. Lett. 51, 1155. W.J. Marciano and I.J. Muzinich, (1983), Phys. Rev. Lett. 50, 1035. A.M. Din and S.M. Roy, (1983), Phys. Lett. 129B, 201.

24. J. Preskill, (1984), Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sc. 34, 461. A. Sen, (1985), Nucl. Phys. B250, 1.

25. V. Rubakov, (1981), JETP Lett. 33, 644; V. Rubakov, (1982), Nucl. Phys. B203, 311.

26. G. t'H00ft, (1974), Nucl. Phys. B79, 276; A.M. Polyakov, (1974), JETP Lett. 20, 194; A.M. Polyakov, (1974), sov. Phys. - JETP 41, 988.

27. M.K. Prasad and C. M. Sommerfield, (1975), Phys. Rev. Lett. 35, 760.

28. E.B. Bogomolny, (1976), sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 24, 449.

29. B. Julia and A. zee, (1975), Phys. Rev. Dll, 2227. For a Hamiltonian formulation see S. Wadia, (1977), Phys. Rev. D15, 3615.

30. Y.S. Tyupkin, V.A. Fateev and A.S. Schvarts, (1975), JETP Lett. 21,
41. M.I. Monastyrskii and A.M. Perelemov, (1975), JETP Lett. m,
43. S. Coleman, (1983), The Magnetic Monopole fifty years later in The Unity of Fundamental Interactions ed. by A. Zichichi (Plenum, New York).

31. P. Goddard and D.l. Olive, (1978), Rep. Prog. Phys. 41, 1357.

32. N.S. Craigie (ed.), (1986), Theo!! and Detection of Magnetic Monopoles in gauge theories, (Singapore, World Scientific) and Ref. 24.

33. N.S. Craigie, P. Goddard and W. Hahm (ed.), (1982), båonopoles in Quantum Field Theory (Singapore, World Scientific).

34. V. Singh, (1983), Fortschritts der Physik 3.1, 569.

35. E.W. Kolb and M.S. Turner, (1990), The Early Universe (Addison Wesley)