

# Special Relativity and Quantum Theory

# **Fundamental Theories of Physics**

*An International Book Series on The Fundamental Theories of Physics: Their Clarification, Development and Application*

**Editor:** ALWYN VAN DER MERWE  
*University of Denver, U.S.A.*

## **Editorial Advisory Board:**

ASIM BARUT, *University of Colorado, U.S.A.*

HERMANN BONDI, *Natural Environment Research Council, U.K.*

BRIAN D. JOSEPHSON, *University of Cambridge, U.K.*

CLIVE KILMISTER, *University of London, U.K.*

GÜNTER LUDWIG, *Philipps-Universität, Marburg, F.R.G.*

NATHAN ROSEN, *Israel Institute of Technology, Israel*

MENDEL SACHS, *State University of New York at Buffalo, U.S.A.*

ABDUS SALAM, *International Centre for Theoretical Physics, Trieste, Italy*

HANS-JÜRGEN TREDER, *Zentralinstitut für Astrophysik der Akademie der Wissenschaften, G.D.R.*

# Special Relativity and Quantum Theory

*A Collection of Papers on the Poincaré Group*

dedicated to Professor Eugene Paul Wigner on the 50th  
Anniversary of His Paper on Unitary Representations of  
the Inhomogeneous Lorentz Group (completed in 1937  
and published in 1939)

*edited by*

M. E. Noz

*Department of Radiology,  
New York University, U.S.A.*

and

Y. S. Kim

*Department of Physics and Astronomy,  
University of Maryland, U.S.A.*



**KLUWER ACADEMIC PUBLISHERS**

DORDRECHT / BOSTON / LONDON

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Special relativity and quantum theory : a collection of papers on the Poincaré group / edited by M.E. Noz, Y.S. Kim.

p. cm. -- (Fundamental theories of physics)

"Dedicated to Professor Eugene Wigner on the 50th anniversary of his paper on unitary representations of the inhomogeneous Lorentz group (completed in 1937 and published in 1939)."

Includes bibliographies.

ISBN-13: 978-94-010-7865-8

1. Quantum field theory--Congresses. 2. Special relativity (Physics)--Congresses. 3. Poincaré series--Congresses. 4. Lorentz groups--Congresses. 5. Wigner, Eugene Paul, 1902- . I. Noz, Marilyn E. II. Kim, Y. S. III. Wigner, Eugene Paul, 1902- . IV. Series.

QC174.46.S64 1988

530.1'2--dc19

88-13278

ISBN-13: 978-94-010-7872-6

e-ISBN-13: 978-94-009-3051-3

DOI: 10.1007/978-94-009-3051-3

CIP

---

Published by Kluwer Academic Publishers,  
P.O. Box 17, 3300 AA Dordrecht, The Netherlands.

Kluwer Academic Publishers incorporates  
the publishing programmes of  
D. Reidel, Martinus Nijhoff, Dr W. Junk and MTP Press.

Sold and distributed in the U.S.A. and Canada  
by Kluwer Academic Publishers,  
101 Philip Drive, Norwell, MA 02061, U.S.A.

In all other countries, sold and distributed  
by Kluwer Academic Publishers Group,  
P.O. Box 322, 3300 AH Dordrecht, The Netherlands.

All Rights Reserved

© 1988 by Kluwer Academic Publishers

No part of the material protected by this copyright notice may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical including photocopying, recording or by any information storage and retrieval system, without written permission from the copyright owner.

## Table of Contents

Preface	ix
Introduction	xi
Chapter I: Perspective View of Quantum Space-Time Symmetries	
1. E. P. Wigner, <i>Relativistic Invariance and Quantum Phenomena</i> , Rev. Mod. Phys, 29, 255 (1957).	3
2. P. A. M. Dirac, <i>The Early Years of Relativity</i> , in <i>Albert Einstein: Historical and Cultural Perspectives: The Centennial Symposium in Jerusalem</i> , edited by G. Holton and Y. Elkana (Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1979).	17
Chapter II: Representations of the Poincaré Group	
1. E. Wigner, <i>On Unitary Representations of the Inhomogeneous Lorentz Group</i> , Ann. Math. 40, 149 (1939).	31
2. V. Bargmann and E. P. Wigner, <i>Group Theoretical Discussion of Relativistic Wave Equations</i> , Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. (U.S.A.) 34, 211 (1948).	103
3. P. A. M. Dirac, <i>Unitary Representations of the Lorentz Group</i> , Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) A183, 284 (1945).	118
4. S. Weinberg, <i>Feynman Rules for Any Spin</i> , Phys. Rev. 133, B1318 (1964).	130
5. Y. S. Kim, M. E. Noz, and S. H. Oh, <i>Representations of the Poincaré Group for Relativistic Extended Hadrons</i> , J. Math. Phys. 20, 1341 (1979).	145
6. Y. S. Kim, M. E. Noz, and S. H. Oh, <i>A Simple Method for Illustrating the Difference between the Homogeneous and Inhomogeneous Lorentz Groups</i> , Am. J. Phys. 47, 892 (1979).	149

## Chapter III: The Time-Energy Uncertainty Relation

1. P. A. M. Dirac, *The Quantum Theory of the Emission and Absorption of Radiation*, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) *A114*, 243 (1927). 157
2. P. A. M. Dirac, *The Quantum Theory of Dispersion*, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) *A114*, 710 (1927). 180
3. E. P. Wigner, *On the Time-Energy Uncertainty Relation*, in *Aspects of Quantum Theory*, in Honour of P. A. M. Dirac's 70th Birthday, edited by A. Salam and E. P. Wigner (Cambridge Univ. Press, London, 1972). 199
4. P. E. Hussar, Y. S. Kim, and M. E. Noz, *Time-Energy Uncertainty Relation and Lorentz Covariance*, Am. J. Phys. *53*, 142 (1985). 210

## Chapter IV: Covariant Picture of Quantum Bound States

1. P. A. M. Dirac, *Forms of Relativistic Dynamics*, Rev. Mod. Phys. *21*, 392 (1949). 219
2. H. Yukawa, *Quantum Theory of Non-Local Fields. Part I. Free Fields*, Phys. Rev. *77*, 219 (1950). 227
3. H. Yukawa, *Quantum Theory of Non-Local Fields. Part II. Irreducible Fields and Their Interaction*, Phys. Rev. *80*, 1047 (1950). 235
4. H. Yukawa, *Structure and Mass Spectrum of Elementary Particles. I. General Considerations*, Phys. Rev. *91*, 415 (1953). 241
5. H. Yukawa, *Structure and Mass Spectrum of Elementary Particles. II. Oscillator Model*, Phys. Rev. *91*, 416 (1953). 244
6. G. C. Wick, *Properties of the Bethe-Salpeter Wave Functions*, Phys. Rev. *96*, 1124 (1954). 247
7. Y. S. Kim and M. E. Noz, *Covariant Harmonic Oscillators and the Quark Model*, Phys. Rev. D *8*, 3521 (1973). 258
8. M. J. Ruiz, *Orthogonality Relation for Covariant Harmonic-Oscillator Wave Functions*, Phys. Rev. D *10*, 4306 (1974). 265
9. F. C. Rotbart, *Complete Orthogonality Relations for the Covariant Harmonic Oscillator*, Phys. Rev. D *23*, 3078 (1981). 268
10. D. Han and Y. S. Kim, *Dirac's Form of Relativistic Quantum Mechanics*, Am. J. Phys. *49*, 1157 (1981). 272

## Chapter V: Lorentz-Dirac Deformation in High Energy Physics

1. R. Hofstadter and R. W. McAllister, *Electron Scattering from the Proton*, Phys. Rev. 98, 183 (1955). 279
2. K. Fujimura, T. Kobayashi, and M. Namiki, *Nucleon Electromagnetic Form Factors at High Momentum Transfers in an Extended Particle Model based on the Quark Model*, Prog. Theor. Phys. 43, 73 (1970). 282
3. R. P. Feynman, *The Behavior of Hadron Collisions at Extreme Energies in High Energy Collisions*, Proceedings of the Third International Conference, Stony Brook, New York, edited by C. N. Yang *et al.* (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1969). 289
4. J. D. Bjorken and E. A. Paschos, *Inelastic Electron-Proton and  $\gamma$ -Proton Scattering and the Structure of the Nucleon*, Phys. Rev. 185, 1975 (1969). 305
5. Y. S. Kim and M. E. Noz, *Covariant Harmonic Oscillators and the Parton Picture*, Phys. Rev. D 15, 335 (1977). 313
6. P. E. Hussar, *Valons and Harmonic Oscillators*, Phys. Rev. D 23, 2781 (1981). 317

## Chapter VI: Massless Particles and Gauge Transformations

1. S. Weinberg, *Feynman Rules for Any Spin II. Massless Particles*, Phys. Rev. 134, B882 (1964). 323
2. S. Weinberg, *Photons and Gravitons in S-Matrix Theory: Derivation of Charge Conservation and Equality of Gravitational and Inertial Mass*, Phys. Rev. 135, B1049 (1964). 338
3. D. Han, Y. S. Kim, and D. Son,  *$E(2)$ -Like Little Group for Massless Particles and Neutrino Polarization as a Consequence of Gauge Invariance*, Phys. Rev. D 26, 3717 (1982). 346

## Chapter VII: Group Contractions

1. E. Inonu and E. P. Wigner, *On the Contraction of Groups and Their Representations*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. (U.S.A.) 39, 510 (1953). 357
2. D. Han, Y. S. Kim, M. E. Noz, and D. Son, *Internal Space-Time Symmetries of Massive and Massless Particles*, Am. J. Phys. 52, 1037 (1984). 372
3. D. Han, Y. S. Kim, and D. Son, *Eulerian Parametrization of Wigner's Little Groups and Gauge Transformations in Terms of Rotations in Two-Component Spinors*, J. Math. Phys. 27, 2228 (1986). 379

4. Y. S. Kim and E. P. Wigner, *Cylindrical Group and Massless Particles*, J. Math. Phys. 28, 1175 (1987). 387

#### Chapter VIII: Localization Problems

1. T. D. Newton and E. P. Wigner, *Localized States for Elementary Systems*, Rev. Mod. Phys. 21, 400 (1949). 395
2. A. S. Wightman, *On the Localizability of Quantum Mechanical Systems*, Rev. Mod. Phys. 34, 845 (1962). 402
3. D. Han, Y. S. Kim, and M. E. Noz, *Uncertainty Relations for Light Waves and the Concept of Photons*, Phys. Rev. A 35, 1682 (1987). 430

#### Chapter IX: Lorentz Transformations

1. V. Bargmann, L. Michel, and V. L. Telegdi, *Precession of the Polarization of Particles Moving in a Homogeneous Electromagnetic Field*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 2, 435 (1959). 443
2. J. Kupersztych, *Is There a Link Between Gauge Invariance, Relativistic Invariance, and Electron Spin?*, Nuovo Cimento 31B, 1 (1976). 447
3. L. Parker and G. M. Schmieg, *Special Relativity and Diagonal Transformations*, Am. J. Phys. 38, 218 (1970). 458
4. L. Parker and G. M. Schmieg, *A Useful Form of the Minkowski Diagram*, Am. J. Phys. 38, 1298 (1970). 463
5. B. Yurke, S. L. McCall, and J. R. Klauder, *SU(2) and SU(1,1) Interferometers*, Phys. Rev. A 33, 4033 (1986). 468
6. D. Han, Y. S. Kim, and D. Son, *Thomas Precession, Wigner Rotations and Gauge Transformations*, Class. Quantum Grav. 4, 1777 (1987). 490
7. D. Han, Y. S. Kim, and M. E. Noz, *Linear Canonical Transformations of Coherent and Squeezed States in the Wigner Phase Space*, Phys. Rev. A 37, 807 (1988). 497

## Preface

Special relativity and quantum mechanics are likely to remain the two most important languages in physics for many years to come. The underlying language for both disciplines is group theory. Eugene P. Wigner's 1939 paper on the Unitary Representations of the Inhomogeneous Lorentz Group laid the foundation for unifying the concepts and algorithms of quantum mechanics and special relativity. In view of the strong current interest in the space-time symmetries of elementary particles, it is safe to say that Wigner's 1939 paper was fifty years ahead of its time. This edited volume consists of Wigner's 1939 paper and the major papers on the Lorentz group published since 1939.

This volume is intended for graduate and advanced undergraduate students in physics and mathematics, as well as mature physicists wishing to understand the more fundamental aspects of physics than are available from the fashion-oriented theoretical models which come and go. The original papers contained in this volume are useful as supplementary reading material for students in courses on group theory, relativistic quantum mechanics and quantum field theory, relativistic electrodynamics, general relativity, and elementary particle physics.

This reprint collection is an extension of the textbook by the present editors entitled "**Theory and Applications of the Poincaré Group.**" Since this book is largely based on the articles contained herein, the present volume should be viewed as a continuation of and supplementary reading for the previous work.

We would like to thank Professors J. Bjorken, R. Feynman, R. Hofstadter, J. Kuperzstych, L. Michel, M. Namiki, L. Parker, S. Weinberg, E.P. Wigner, A.S. Wightman, and Drs. P. Hussar, M. Ruiz, F. Rotbart, and B. Yurke for allowing us to reprint their papers. We are grateful to Mrs. M. Dirac and Mrs. S. Yukawa for giving us permission to reprint the articles of Professors P.A.M. Dirac and H. Yukawa respectively.

We wish to thank the *Annals of Mathematics* for permission to reprint Professor Wigner's historic paper. We thank the American Physical Society, the American Association of Physics Teachers, The Royal Society of London, *il Nuovo Cimento* and *Progress in Theoretical Physics* for permission to reprint the articles which appeared in their journals and for which they hold the copyright. The excerpt from *Albert Einstein: Historical and Cultural Perspective: The Centennial Symposium in Jerusalem* is reprinted with permission of Princeton University Press; that from

*High Energy Collisions* is reprinted with permission of Gordon and Breach Science publisher, Inc. and that from *Aspects of Quantum Theory* with permission of Cambridge University Press.

## Introduction

One of the most fruitful and still promising approaches to unifying quantum mechanics and special relativity has been and still is the covariant formulation of quantum field theory. The role of Wigner's work on the Poincaré group in quantum field theory is nicely summarized in the fourth paragraph of an article by V. Bargmann *et al.* in the commemorative issue of the Reviews of Modern Physics in honor of Wigner's 60th birthday [Rev. Mod. Phys. 34, 587 (1962)], which concludes with the sentences:

“Those who had carefully read the preface of Wigner's great 1939 paper on relativistic invariance and had understood the physical ideas in his 1931 book on group theory and atomic spectra were not surprised by the turn of events in quantum field theory in the 1950's. A fair part of what happened was merely a matter of whipping quantum field theory into line with the insights achieved by Wigner in 1939”.

It is important to realize that quantum field theory has not been and is not at present the only theoretical machine with which physicists attempt to unify quantum mechanics and special relativity. Indeed, Dirac devoted much of his professional life to this important task, but, throughout the 1950's and 1960's, his form of relativistic quantum mechanics was overshadowed by the success of quantum field theory. However, in the 1970's, when it was necessary to deal with quarks confined permanently inside hadrons, the limitations of the present form of quantum field theory become apparent. Currently, there are two different opinions on the difficulty of using field theory in dealing with bound-state problems or systems of confined quarks. One of these regards the present difficulty merely as a complication in calculation. According to this view, we should continue developing mathematical techniques which will someday enable us to formulate a bound-state problem with satisfactory solutions within the framework of the existing form of quantum field theory. The opposing opinion is that quantum field theory is a model that can handle only scattering problems in which all particles can be brought to free-particle asymptotic states. According to this view we have to make a fresh start for relativistic bound-state problems.

These two opposing views are not mutually exclusive. *Bound-state models developed in these two different approaches should have the same space-time symmetry.* It is quite possible that independent bound-state models, if successful in

explaining what we see in the real world, will eventually complement field theory. One of the purposes of this book is to present the fundamental papers upon which a relativistic bound-state model that can explain basic hadronic features observed in high-energy laboratories could be built in accordance with the principles laid out by Wigner in 1939.

Wigner observed in 1939 that Dirac's electron has an  $SU(2)$ -like internal space-time symmetry. However, quarks and hadrons were unknown at that time. Dirac's form of relativistic bound-state quantum mechanics, which starts from the representations of the Poincaré group, makes it possible to study the  $O(3)$ -like little group for massive particles and leads to hadronic wave functions which can describe fairly accurately the distribution of quarks inside hadrons. Thus a substantial portion of hadronic physics can be incorporated into the  $O(3)$ -like little group for massive particles.

Another important development in modern physics is the extensive use of gauge transformations in connection with massless particles and their interactions. Wigner's 1939 paper has the original discussion of space-time symmetries of massless particles. However, it was only recently recognized that gauge-dependent electromagnetic four-potentials form the basis for a finite-dimensional non-unitary representation of the little group of the Poincaré group. This enables us to associate gauge degrees of freedom with the degrees of freedom left unexplained in Wigner's work. Hence it is possible to impose a gauge condition on the electromagnetic four-potential to construct a unitary representation of the photon polarization vectors.

Wigner showed that the internal space-time symmetry group of massless particles is locally isomorphic to the Euclidian group in two-dimensional space. However, Wigner did not explore the content of this isomorphism, because the physics of the translation-like transformations of this little group was unknown in 1939. Neutrinos were known only as "Dirac electrons without mass", although photons were known to have spins either parallel or antiparallel to their respective momenta. We now know the physics of the degrees of freedom left unexplained in Wigner's paper. Much more is also known about neutrinos today than in 1939. For instance, it is firmly established that neutrinos and anti-neutrinos are left and right handed respectively. Therefore, it is possible to discuss internal space-time symmetries of massless particles starting from Wigner's  $E(2)$ -like little group. Recently, it was observed that the  $O(3)$ -like little group becomes the  $E(2)$ -like group in the limit of small mass and/or large momentum.

Indeed, group theory has become the standard language in physics. Until the 1960's, the only group known to the average physicist had been the three-dimensional rotation group. Gell-Mann's work on the quark model encouraged physicists to study the unitary groups, which are compact groups. The Weinberg-Salam model enhanced this trend. The emergence of supersymmetry in the 1970's has brought the space-time group closer to physicists. These groups are non-compact, and it is difficult to prove or appreciate mathematical theorems for them.

The Poincaré group is a non-compact group. Fortunately, the representations of this group useful in physics are not complicated from the mathematical point of view.

The application of the Lorentz group is not restricted to the symmetries of elementary particles. The  $(2 + 1)$ -dimensional Lorentz group is isomorphic to the two-dimensional symplectic group, which is the symmetry group of homogeneous linear canonical transformations in classical mechanics. It is also useful for studying coherent and squeezed states in optics. It is likely that the Lorentz group will serve useful purposes in many other branches of modern physics.

This reprint volume contains the fundamental paper by Wigner, and the papers on applications of his paper to physical problems. This book starts with Wigner's review paper on relativistic invariance and quantum phenomena. The reprinted papers are grouped into nine chapters. Each chapter starts with a brief introduction.

## Chapter I

### Perspective View of Quantum Space-Time Symmetries

When Einstein formulated his special theory of relativity in 1905, quantum mechanics was not known. Einstein's original version of special relativity deals with point particles without space-time structures and extension. These days, we know that elementary particles can have intrinsic space-time structure manifested by spins. In addition, many of the particles which had been thought to be point particles now have space-time extensions.

The hydrogen atom was known to be a composite particle in which the electron maintains a distance from the proton. Therefore, the hydrogen atom is not a point particle. The proton had been regarded as a point particle until, in 1955, the experiment of Hofstadter and McAllister proved otherwise. These days, the proton is a bound state of more fundamental particles called the quarks. We still do not know whether the quarks have non-zero size, but assume that they are point particles. We assume also that electrons are point particles. However, it is clear that these particles have intrinsic spins. The situation is the same for massless particles. For intrinsic spins, the Wigner's representation of the Poincaré group is the natural scientific language.

As for nonrelativistic extended particles, such as the hydrogen atom, the present form of quantum mechanics with the probability interpretation is quite adequate. If the proton is a bound state of quarks within the framework of quantum mechanics, the description of a rapidly moving proton requires a Lorentz transformation of localized probability distribution. In addition, this description should find its place in Wigner's representation theory of the Poincaré group.

This Chapter consists of one article by Wigner on relativistic invariance of quantum phenomena, and one article by Dirac. As he said in his 1979 paper, Dirac was concerned with the problem of fitting quantum mechanics in with relativity, right from the beginning of quantum mechanics. Dirac suggests that the ideal mechanics should be both relativistic and deterministic. It would be too ambitious to work with both the relativistic and deterministic problem at the same time. Perhaps the easier way is to deal with one aspect at a time. Then there are two routes to the ideal mechanics, as are illustrated in Figure 1. The current literature indicates that it would be easier to make quantum mechanics relativistic than deterministic. In this book, we propose to study the easier problem first.




FIG. 1. Two different routes to the ideal mechanics. Covariance and determinism are the two main problems. In approaching these problems, there are two different routes. In either case, the Poincaré group is likely to be the main scientific language.

Reprinted from REVIEWS OF MODERN PHYSICS, Vol. 29, No. 3, 255-268, July, 1957  
 Printed in U. S. A.

## Relativistic Invariance and Quantum Phenomena\*

EUGENE P. WIGNER

*Palmer Physical Laboratory, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey*

### INTRODUCTION

THE principal theme of this discourse is the great difference between the relation of special relativity and quantum theory on the one hand, and general relativity and quantum theory on the other. Most of the conclusions which will be reported on in connection with the general theory have been arrived at in collaboration with Dr. H. Salecker,<sup>1</sup> who has spent a year in Princeton to investigate this question.

The difference between the two relations is, briefly, that while there are no conceptual problems to separate the theory of special relativity from quantum theory, there is hardly any common ground between the general theory of relativity and quantum mechanics. The statement, that there are no conceptual conflicts between quantum mechanics and the special theory, should not mean that the mathematical formulations of the two theories naturally mesh. This is not the case, and it required the very ingenious work of Tomonaga, Schwinger, Feynman, and Dyson<sup>2</sup> to adjust quantum mechanics to the postulates of the special theory and this was so far successful only on the working level. What is meant is, rather, that the concepts which are used in quantum mechanics, measurements of positions, momenta, and the like, are the same concepts in terms of which the special relativistic postulate is formulated. Hence, it is at least possible to formulate the requirement of special relativistic invariance for quantum theories and to ascertain whether these requirements are met. The fact that the answer is more nearly *no* than *yes*, that quantum mechanics has not yet been fully adjusted to the postulates of the special theory,

is perhaps irritating. It does not alter the fact that the question of the consistency of the two theories can at least be formulated, that the question of the special relativistic invariance of quantum mechanics by now has more nearly the aspect of a puzzle than that of a problem.

This is not so with the general theory of relativity. The basic premise of this theory is that coordinates are only auxiliary quantities which can be given arbitrary values for every event. Hence, the measurement of position, that is, of the space coordinates, is certainly not a significant measurement if the postulates of the general theory are adopted: the coordinates can be given any value one wants. The same holds for momenta. Most of us have struggled with the problem of how, under these premises, the general theory of relativity can make meaningful statements and predictions at all. Evidently, the usual statements about future positions of particles, as specified by their coordinates, are not meaningful statements in general relativity. This is a point which cannot be emphasized strongly enough and is the basis of a much deeper dilemma than the more technical question of the Lorentz invariance of the quantum field equations. It pervades all the general theory, and to some degree we mislead both our students and ourselves when we calculate, for instance, the mercury perihelion motion without explaining how our coordinate system is fixed in space, what defines it in such a way that it cannot be rotated, by a few seconds a year, to follow the perihelion's apparent motion. Surely the *x* axis of our coordinate system could be defined in such a way that it pass **through** all successive perihelions. There must be some assumption on the nature of the coordinate system which keeps it from following the perihelion. This is not difficult to exhibit in the case of the motion of the perihelion, and it would be useful to exhibit it. Neither is this, in general, an academic point, even

\* Address of retiring president of the American Physical Society, January 31, 1957.

<sup>1</sup> This will be reported jointly with H. Salecker in more detail in another journal.

<sup>2</sup> See, e.g., J. M. Jauch and F. Rohrlich, *The Theory of Protons and Electrons* (Addison-Wesley Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1955).

though it may be academic in the case of the mercury perihelion. A difference in the tacit assumptions which fix the coordinate system is increasingly recognized to be at the bottom of many conflicting results arrived at in calculations based on the general theory of relativity. Expressing our results in terms of the values of coordinates became a habit with us to such a degree that we adhere to this habit also in general relativity where values of coordinates are not *per se* meaningful. In order to make them meaningful, the mollusk-like coordinate system must be somehow anchored to space-time events and this anchoring is often done with little explicitness. If we want to put general relativity on speaking terms with quantum mechanics, our first task has to be to bring the statements of the general theory of relativity into such form that they conform with the basic principles of the general relativity theory itself. It will be shown below how this may be attempted.

#### RELATIVISTIC QUANTUM THEORY OF ELEMENTARY SYSTEMS

The relation between special theory and quantum mechanics is most simple for single particles. The equations and properties of these, in the absence of interactions, can be deduced already from relativistic invariance. Two cases have to be distinguished: the particle either can, or cannot, be transformed to rest. If it can, it will behave, in that coordinate system, as any other particle, such as an atom. It will have an intrinsic angular momentum called  $J$  in the case of atoms and spin  $S$  in the case of elementary particles. This leads to the various possibilities with which we are familiar from spectroscopy, that is spins  $0, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{3}{2}, 2, \dots$  each corresponding to a type of particle. If the particle cannot be transformed to rest, its velocity must always be equal to the velocity of light. Every other velocity can be transformed to rest. The rest-mass of these particles is zero because a nonzero rest-mass would entail an infinite energy if moving with light velocity.

Particles with zero rest-mass have only two directions of polarization, no matter how large their spin is. This contrasts with the  $2S+1$  directions of polarization for particles with nonzero rest-mass and spin  $S$ . Electromagnetic radiation, that is, light, is the most familiar example for this phenomenon. The "spin" of light is 1, but it has only two directions of polarization, instead of  $2S+1=3$ . The number of polarizations seems to jump discontinuously to two when the rest-mass decreases and reaches the value 0. Bass and Schrödinger<sup>3</sup> followed this out in detail for electromagnetic radiation, that is, for  $S=1$ . It is good to realize, however, that this decrease in the number of possible polarizations is purely a property of the Lorentz transformation and holds for any value of the spin.

There is nothing fundamentally new that can be said

<sup>3</sup> L. Bass and E. Schrödinger, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) **A232**, 1 (1955).

about the number of polarizations of a particle and the principal purpose of the following paragraphs is to illuminate it from a different point of view.<sup>4</sup> Instead of the question: "Why do particles with zero rest-mass have only two directions of polarization?" the slightly different question, "Why do particles with a finite rest-mass have more than two directions of polarization?" is proposed.

The intrinsic angular momentum of a particle with zero rest-mass is parallel to its direction of motion, that is, parallel to its velocity. Thus, if we connect any internal motion with the spin, this is perpendicular to the velocity. In case of light, we speak of transverse polarization. Furthermore, and this is the salient point, the statement that the spin is parallel to the velocity is a relativistically invariant statement: it holds as well if the particle is viewed from a moving coordinate system. If the problem of polarization is regarded from this point of view, it results in the question, "Why can't the angular momentum of a particle with finite rest-mass be parallel to its velocity?" or "Why can't a plane wave represent transverse polarization unless it propagates with light velocity?" The answer is that the angular momentum *can* very well be parallel to the direction of motion and the wave *can* have transverse polarization, but these are not Lorentz invariant statements. In other words, even if velocity and spin are parallel in one coordinate system, they do not appear to be parallel in other coordinate systems. This is most evident if, in this other coordinate system, the particle is at rest: in this coordinate system the




FIG. 1. The short simple arrows illustrate the spin, the double arrows the velocity of the particle. One obtains the same state, no matter whether one first imparts to it a velocity in the direction of the spin, then rotates it ( $R(\theta)A(0, \varphi)$ ), or whether one first rotates it, then gives a velocity in the direction of the spin ( $A(\theta, \varphi)R(\theta)$ ). See Eq. (1.3).

<sup>4</sup> The essential point of the argument which follows is contained in the present writer's paper, Ann. Math. **40**, 149 (1939) and more explicitly in his address at the Jubilee of Relativity Theory, Bern, 1955 (Birkhauser Verlag, Basel, 1956), A. Mercier and M. Kervaire, editors, p. 210.




FIG. 2. The particle is first given a small velocity in the direction of its spin, then increasing velocities in a perpendicular direction (upper part of the figure). The direction of the spin remains essentially unchanged; it includes an increasingly large angle with the velocity as the velocity in the perpendicular direction increases. If the velocity imparted to the particle is large (lower part of the figure), the direction of the spin seems to follow the direction of the velocity. See Eqs. (1.8) and (1.7).

angular momentum should be parallel to nothing. However, every particle, unless it moves with light velocity, can be viewed from a coordinate system in which it is at rest. In this coordinate system its angular momentum is surely not parallel to its velocity. Hence, the statement that spin and velocity are parallel cannot be universally valid for the particle with finite rest-mass and such a particle must have other states of polarization also.

It may be worthwhile to illustrate this point somewhat more in detail. Let us consider a particle at rest with a given direction of polarization, say the direction of the  $z$  axis. Let us consider this particle now from a coordinate system which is moving in the  $-z$  direction. The particle will then appear to have a velocity in the  $z$  direction and its polarization will be parallel to its velocity (Fig. 1). It will now be shown that this last statement is nearly invariant if the velocity is high. It is evident that the statement is entirely invariant with respect to rotations and with respect to a further increase of the velocity in the  $z$  direction. This is illustrated at the bottom of the figure. The coordinate system is first turned to the left and then given a velocity in the direction opposite to the old  $z$  axis. The state of the system appears to be exactly the same as if the coordinate system had been first given a velocity in the  $-z$  direction and then turned, which is the operation illustrated at the top of the figure. The state of the system appears to be the same not for any physical reason but because the two coordinate systems are identical and they view the same particle (see Appendix I).

Let us now take our particle with a high velocity in the  $z$  direction and view it from a coordinate system which moves in the  $-y$  direction. The particle now will appear to have a momentum also in the  $y$  direction, its velocity will have a direction between the  $y$  and  $z$  axes (Fig. 2). Its spin, however, will not be in the

direction of its motion any more. In the nonrelativistic case, that is, if all velocities are small as compared with the velocity of light, the spin will still be parallel to  $z$  and it will, therefore, enclose an angle with the particle's direction of motion. This shows that the statement that the spin is parallel to the direction of motion is not invariant in the nonrelativistic region. However, if the original velocity of the particle is close to the light velocity, the Lorentz contraction works out in such a way that the angle between spin and velocity is given by

$$\tan(\text{angle between spin and velocity}) = (1 - v^2/c^2)^{1/2} \sin\vartheta, \quad (1)$$

where  $\vartheta$  is the angle between the velocity  $v$  in the moving coordinate system and the velocity in the coordinate system at rest. This last situation is illustrated at the bottom of the figure. If the velocity of the particle is small as compared with the velocity of light, the direction of the spin remains fixed and is the same in the moving coordinate system as in the coordinate system at rest. On the other hand, if the particle's velocity is close to light velocity, the velocity carries the spin with itself and the angle between direction of motion and spin direction becomes very small in the moving coordinate system. Finally, if the particle has light velocity, the statement "spin and velocity are parallel" remains true in every coordinate system. Again, this is not a consequence of any physical property of the spin, but is a consequence of the properties of Lorentz transformations: it is a kind of Lorentz contraction. It is the reason for the different behavior of particles with finite, and particles with zero, rest-mass, as far as the number of states of polarization is concerned. (Details of the calculation are in Appendix I.)

The preceding consideration proves more than was intended: it shows that the statement "spin and velocity are parallel for zero mass particles" is invariant and that, for relativistic reasons, one needs only *one* state of polarization, rather than *two*. This is true as far as proper Lorentz transformations are concerned. The second state of polarization, in which spin and velocity are antiparallel, is a result of the reflection symmetry. Again, this can be illustrated on the example of light: right circularly polarized light appears as right circularly polarized light in all Lorentz frames of reference which can be continuously transformed into each other. Only if one looks at the right circularly polarized light in a mirror does it appear as left circularly polarized light. The postulate of reflection symmetry allows us to infer the existence of left circularly polarized light from the existence of right circularly polarized light—if there were no such reflection symmetry in the real world, the existence of *two* modes of polarization of light, with virtually identical properties, would appear to be a miracle. The situation is entirely different for particles with

nonzero mass. For these, the  $2S+1$  directions of polarization follow from the invariance of the theory with respect to proper Lorentz transformations. In particular, if the particle is at rest, the spin will have different orientations with respect to coordinate systems which have different orientations in space. Thus, the existence of all the states of polarization follow from the existence of one, if only the theory is invariant with respect to proper Lorentz transformations. For particles with zero rest-mass, there are only two states of polarization, and even the existence of the second one can be inferred only on the basis of reflection symmetry.

#### REFLECTION SYMMETRY

The problem and existence of reflection symmetry have been furthered in a brilliant way by recent theoretical and experimental research. There is nothing essential that can be added at present to the remarks and conjectures of Lee, Yang, and Oehme, and all that follows has been said, or at least implied, by Salam, Lee, Yang, and Oehme.<sup>5</sup> The sharpness of the break with past concepts is perhaps best illustrated by the cobalt experiment of Wu, Ambler, Hayward, Hoppes, and Hudson.

The ring current—this may be a permanent current in a superconductor—creates a magnetic field. The Co source is in the plane of the current and emits  $\beta$  particles (Fig. 3). The whole experimental arrangement, as shown in Fig. 3, has a symmetry plane and, if the principle of sufficient cause is valid, the symmetry plane should remain valid throughout the further fate of the system. In other words, since the right and left sides of the plane had originally identical properties, there is no sufficient reason for any difference in their properties at a later time. Nevertheless, the intensity of the  $\beta$  radiation is larger on one side of the plane than the other side. The situation is paradoxical no matter what the mechanism of the effect is—in fact, it is most paradoxical if one disregards its mechanism and theory entirely. If the experimental circumstances can be idealized as indicated, even the principle of sufficient cause seems to be violated.

It is natural to look for an interpretation of the experiment which avoids this very far-reaching conclusion and, indeed, there is such an interpretation.<sup>6a</sup> It is good to reiterate, however, that no matter what interpretation is adopted, we have to admit that the symmetry of the real world is smaller than we had thought. However, the symmetry may still include reflections.

<sup>5</sup> Lee, Yang, and Oehme, *Phys. Rev.* **106**, 340 (1957).

<sup>6a</sup> The interpretation referred to has been proposed independently by numerous authors, including A. Salam, *Nuovo cimento* **5**, 229 (1957); L. Landau, *Nuclear Phys.* **3**, 127 (1957); H. D. Smyth and L. Biedenharn (personal communication). Dr. S. Deser has pointed out that the "perturbing possibility" was raised already by Wick, Wightman, and Wigner [*Phys. Rev.* **88**, 101 (1952)] but was held "remote at that time." Naturally, the apparent unanimity of opinion does not prove its correctness.




FIG. 3. The right side is the mirror image of the left side, according to the interpretation of the parity experiments<sup>6a</sup> which maintains the reflection as a symmetry element of all physical laws. It must be assumed that the reflection transforms matter into antimatter: the electronic ring current becomes a positronic ring current, the radioactive cobalt is replaced by radioactive anticobalt.

If it is true that a symmetry plane always remains a symmetry plane, the initial state of the Co experiment could not have contained a symmetry plane. This would not be the case if the magnetic vector were polar—in which case the electric vector would be axial. The charge density, the divergence of the electric vector, would then become a pseudoscalar rather than a simple scalar as in current theory. The mirror image of a negative charge would be positive, the mirror image of an electron a positron, and conversely. The mirror image of matter would be antimatter. The Co experiment, viewed through a mirror, would not present a picture contrary to established fact: it would present an experiment carried out with antimatter. The right side of Fig. 3 shows the mirror image of the left side. Thus, the principle of sufficient cause, and the validity of symmetry planes, need not be abandoned if one is willing to admit that the mirror image of matter is antimatter.

The possibility just envisaged would be technically described as the elimination of the operations of reflection and charge conjugation, as presently defined, as true symmetry operations. Their product would still be assumed to be a symmetry operation and proposed to be named, simply, reflection. A few further technical remarks are contained in Appendix II. The proposition just made has two aspects: a very appealing one, and a very alarming one.

Let us look first at the appealing aspect. Dirac has said that the number of elementary particles shows an alarming tendency of increasing. One is tempted to add to this that the number of invariance properties

also showed a similar tendency. It is not equally alarming because, while the increase in the number of elementary particles complicates our picture of nature, that of the symmetry properties on the whole simplifies it. Nevertheless the clear correspondence between the invariance properties of the laws of nature, and the symmetry properties of space-time, was most clearly breached by the operation of charge conjugation. This postulated that the laws of nature remain the same if all positive charges are replaced by negative charges and vice versa, or more generally, if all particles are replaced by antiparticles. Reasonable as this postulate appears to us, it corresponds to no symmetry of the space-time continuum. If the preceding interpretation of the Co experiments should be sustained, the correspondence between the natural symmetry elements of space-time, and the invariance properties of the laws of nature, would be restored. It is true that the role of the planes of reflection would not be that to which we are accustomed—the mirror image of an electron would become a positron—but the mirror image of a sequence of events would still be a possible sequence of events. This possible sequence of events would be more difficult to realize in the actual physical world than what we had thought, but it would still be possible.

The restoration of the correspondence between the natural symmetry properties of space-time on one hand, and the laws of nature on the other hand, is the appealing feature of the proposition. It has, actually, two alarming features. The first of these is that a symmetry operation is, physically, so complicated. If it should turn out that the operation of time inversion, as we now conceive it, is not a valid symmetry operation (e.g., if one of the experiments proposed by Treiman and Wyld gave a positive result) we could still maintain the validity of this symmetry operation by reinterpreting it. We could postulate, for instance, that time inversion transforms matter into *meta*-matter which will be discovered later when higher energy accelerators will become available. Thus, maintaining the validity of symmetry planes forces us to a more artificial view of the concept of symmetry and of the invariance of the laws of physics.

The other alarming feature of our new knowledge is that we have been misled for such a long time to believe in more symmetry elements than actually exist. There was ample reason for this and there was ample experimental evidence to believe that the mirror image of a possible event is again a possible event with electrons being the mirror images of electrons and not of positrons. Let us recall in this connection first how the concept of parity, resulting from the beautiful though almost forgotten experiments of Laporte,<sup>6</sup>

appeared to be a perfectly valid concept in spectroscopy and in nuclear physics. This concept could be explained very naturally as a result of the reflection symmetry of space-time, the mirror image of electrons being electrons and not positrons. We are now forced to believe that this symmetry is only approximate and the concept of parity, as used in spectroscopy and nuclear physics, is also only approximate. Even more fundamentally, there is a vast body of experimental information in the chemistry of optically active substances which are mirror images of each other and which have optical activities of opposite direction but exactly equal strength. There is the fact that molecules which have symmetry planes are optically inactive; there is the fact of symmetry planes in crystals.<sup>7</sup> All these facts relate properties of right-handed matter to left-handed *matter*, not of right-handed matter to left-handed *antimatter*. The new experiments leave no doubt that the symmetry plane in this sense is not valid for all phenomena, in particular not valid for  $\beta$  decay, that if the concept of symmetry plane is at all valid for all phenomena, it can be valid only in the sense of converting matter into antimatter.

Furthermore, the old-fashioned type of symmetry plane is not the only symmetry concept that is only approximately valid. Charge conjugation was mentioned before, and we are reminded also of isotopic spin, of the exchange character, that is multiplet system, for electrons and also of nuclei which latter holds so accurately that, in practice, parahydrogen molecules can be converted into orthohydrogen molecules only by first destroying them.<sup>8</sup> This approximate validity of laws of symmetry is, therefore, a very general phenomenon—it may be *the* general phenomenon. We are reminded of Mach's axiom that the laws of nature depend on the physical content of the universe, and the physical content of the universe certainly shows no symmetry. This suggests—and this may also be the spirit of the ideas of Yang and Lee—that all symmetry properties are only approximate. The weakest interaction, the gravitational force, is the basis of the distinction between inertial and accelerated coordinate systems, the second weakest known interaction, that leading to  $\beta$  decay, leads to the distinction between matter and antimatter. Let me conclude this subject by expressing the conviction that the discoveries of Wu, Ambler, Hayward, Hoppes, and Hudson,<sup>9</sup> and of Garwin, Lederman, and Weinreich<sup>10</sup> will not remain isolated discoveries. More likely, they herald a revision of our concept of invariance and possibly

<sup>7</sup> For the role of the space and time inversion operators in classical theory, see H. Zocher and C. Török, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S. 39, 681 (1953) and literature quoted there.

<sup>8</sup> See A. Farkas, *Orthohydrogen, Parahydrogen and Heavy Hydrogen* (Cambridge University Press, New York, 1935).

<sup>9</sup> Wu, Ambler, Hayward, Hoppes, and Hudson, Phys. Rev. 105, 1413(L) (1957).

<sup>10</sup> Garwin, Lederman, and Weinreich, Phys. Rev. 105, 1415(L) (1957); also, J. L. Friedman and V. L. Telegdi, *ibid.* 105, 1681(L) (1957).

<sup>6</sup> O. Laporte, Z. Physik 23, 135 (1924). For the interpretation of Laporte's rule in terms of the quantum-mechanical operation of inversion, see the writer's *Gruppentheorie und ihre Anwendungen auf die Quantenmechanik der Atmospektren* (Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn, Braunschweig, 1931), Chap. XVIII.