

Geometry and Localization, a metaphorically related pair

Bert Schroer

CBPF, Rua Dr. Xavier Sigaud 150

22290-180 Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

and Institut fuer Theoretische Physik der FU Berlin, Germany

June 2009

Abstract

It is often overlooked that local quantum physics has a built in quantum localization structure which may under certain circumstances disagree with (differential, algebraic) geometric ideas. String theory originated from such a spectacular misinterpretation of a source-target embedding in which an inner symmetry of the source object becomes the Lorentz symmetry of the target space. The quantum localization reveals however that the resulting object is an infinite component pointlike field.

There are also other areas in QFT which suffered from having followed geometrical metaphors and payed too little attention to the autonomous localization properties. This will be illustrated in the concrete context of three examples. We also show that "modular localization", i.e. the intrinsic localization theory of local quantum quantum physics, leads to a radical new way of looking at (nonperturbative) QFT. For the first time in the history of QFT there are now existence theorems for a class of strictly renormalizable (i.e. not superrenormalizable) factorizable QFTs which are based on these new concepts.

The paper ends with some worrisome sociological observations about the state of particle physics and the direction in which it is heading.

1 Introductory remarks

There is the widespread belief that geometric ideas, in their differential or algebraic form, are always beneficial for particle physics. In view of the autonomous localization concept in QFT, the correctness of this opinion can be tested by asking whether the arguments based on quantum localization confirm or refute what could have been obtained on intuitive geometric reasons.

The main theme of this note is the presentation of various cases, all of high actual interest in particle theory, for which substitution (or confusion) of quantum localization with naive geometric expectations has led to misinterpretations

with spectacular consequences. These results confirm that localization of states and observables is an autonomous issue of local quantum physics. Its mathematical backup requires a new mathematical theory which unlike any other area of mathematics was discovered and developed to a large extent by physicists: modular localization and the modular theory of operator algebras.

Luckily the knowledge of these fine points concerning localization was not important in dealing with the QFT "as we know it" since the Lagrangian quantization carries the pointlike classical fields into pointlike singular quantum objects (operator-valued distributions). The intrinsic way to check that this was the correct interpretation is independently verified by checking the pointlike support of the commutator of spacelike separated quantum fields.

The principle purpose of the Lagrangian approach, which aims directly at pointlike fields, is to obtain the perturbative series. Since the latter *always diverges*, one cannot be sure whether any of those models exists. The first existence proofs [1] (still limited to so-called factorizing models) make heavy use of nonlocal generating fields [2] which applied to the vacuum have much simpler properties than the pointlike fields (whose application to the vacuum always comes with interaction-caused infinite vacuum polarization clouds). Modular localization theory is heavily used in these constructions. In the presence of interactions, gauge theories have in addition to the local observables, which are in the range of the BRST or any other ghost formalism, also important physical objects (as e.g. charged fields) whose sharpest possible localization is semiinfinite stringlike. Furthermore there is among the free fields a rather large class of semiinfinite string fields which are associated with Wigner's famous infinite spin representations. The localization property of this class was only recently discovered just because the intrinsic nature of quantum localization was overruled by imposing a pointlike localization.

The problematic relation between classical geometric and intrinsic quantum properties is of course not new, it was the main subject of the great debates at the beginning of QM (involving such iconic names as Bohr and Heisenberg) around the concept of "observable" and state.

The problematic aspects are compounded if one moves from QM to QFT, because the latter possesses two important but very different localization concepts [3]. On the one hand there is the "Born localization" of quantum mechanical wave functions adapted to the relativistic normalization by Newton and Wigner; it comes with the notion of *projection operators*, the ensuing probabilities and associated subspaces. This shared localization between QM and QFT is only *Lorentz covariant between asymptotically timelike separated events* i.e. for the S-matrix and related on-shell quantities, whereas its use in QM is unrestricted.

The localization inherent in causal fields on the other hand holds for all distances, but it has *no position operators*. It permits a completely intrinsic formulation (known as "modular" localization, see below) i.e. a formulation which does not depend on which representative in the local equivalence class consisting of infinitely many (composite) fields one uses.

Instead of subspaces associated with projectors it encodes *spacetime localization into the domain of certain unbounded operators*. This latter property

of encoding localization directly into domain and range properties in Hilbert space creates a much more intimate connection between spacetime and quantum theory. Its total intrinsicness permits to distinguish whether the degrees of freedom of a chiral conformal current in the embedding process following the source-target prescription are going into a *stringlike extension* or into the internal degree of freedom of an *infinite component field*; the pointlike form of the c-number commutator of an embedded field (e.g. the sigma model field associated with the conformal currents) clearly selects the second possibility and rejects the first; the application of the field-coordinatization-independent method confirms this. This will be explained in detail in the next section.

The Born localization is unable to distinguish between a string-like object in spacetime or in internal space. This makes the relation between geometry in the mathematical sense and physical spacetime localization fraught with pitfalls.

The problem starts already with the "euclideanization" or "Wick-rotation" of a realtime QFT. The vacuum expectation in every QFT can be seen as the distribution theoretical boundary values of multivariable analytic functions in a rather large domain (the Bargman-Hall-Wightman domain). Under special circumstances (studied by Osterwalder and Schrader) the family of analytic functions at the special euclidean points coming from (and hence leading back to) the realtime Wightman functions encode all the properties of the realtime theory. A subclass of these euclidean correlations can be associated with a continuous form of statistical mechanics and permits to be perturbatively accessed with functional integrals¹.

Geometry is, as any mathematical disciplines, indifferent to its use. For example the theory of Riemann surfaces does not require the backup of geometric surfaces, it can originate in group theory (Fuchsian groups) or for that matter in chiral conformal QFT, where it plays the role of the (what in higher dimensional QFT is called the Bargman-Hall-Wightman) analyticity domain but is never the region of localization for chiral QFT.

Modular theory which is very specific for local quantum physics may lead to geometric properties, but as the above embedding problem shows, geometric properties alone cannot decide on matters of interpretation. A mathematician could not care less about the context in which geometry is realized. Whether it is spacetime or the internal symmetry space of a field-like objects makes no difference to him. In physics the context is however essential.

The content of this paper is as follows.

In the next section it will be shown that the intrinsic localization of the source-target embedding map which led from the dual model to string theory is pointlike i.e. there is no stringlike object in target space. Almost all "surreal" consequences of string theory have their origin in this misinterpretation.

The third section will focus attention on three other important issues for

¹Lagrangians and their role in presenting euclidean action are examples of highly useful metaphoric tools. They do not only baptize the subclass of models whose perturbation theory starts with a polynomial interaction between free fields, but used with some hindsight they also help in the process of renormalization. It does not matter whether the resulting correlation functions fulfill the starting functional integral representation or not (they do not).

which the geometric treatment hasn't done much good. In the last section we will present some thoughts on how the large scale conceptual derailment of certain area of particle theory is related to the formation of globalized communities. These observations on the scientific side completely agree with what has recently been described in a kind of insider essay of a young string theorists [10] which underline the thesis that at no time before was the coupling of the content and style of research in particle theory to the Zeitgeist as strong as in recent times.

2 The worldsheet saga

Between the phenomenological ideas which supported the onshell dual model and its string theoretic reformulation there was an interesting mathematical-conceptual link which actually led to string theory. This was the "embedding" of a chiral conformal theory into its internal symmetry space which is the target space of the embedding. In case the chiral theory is a multi-index abelian current and the inner symmetry space is a Minkowski spacetime with Lorentz-symmetry acting on it, the geometric expectation was that the conformal current becomes embedded as a one-dimensional object in target space. This metaphoric idea led to a quite extensive terminology; the conformal theory, whose living space is one-dimensional, was thought of as the source theory which then becomes embedded into the higher dimensional spacetime with the embedded string-like extended object tracing out a worldsheet in the target spacetime.

But what happens in reality is very different, *the embedded object is not a string (worldsheet) in target space but rather an infinite component pointlike object (tracing a worldline)* [4]. The same happens in the Lagrangian string re-formulation (N-G string or its supersymmetric extension).

Of course string theory nowadays is mathematically much more sophisticated than those models with which everything began, but the nonexistence of a string/worldsheet is inherited like the biblical original sin even by the recent most sophisticated versions of superstrings, including all their derivatives. Let us briefly sketch the argument.

The worldsheet saga started with an "embedding" of a multi-component chiral conformal current; the embedding process was envisaged as a map of the conformal current which lives on a circle into an object which lives on a one-dimensional subspace in the target space which is the (from the point of view of the conformal theory) n -dimensional space corresponding to the internal indices of the current. Hence the inner symmetry group of the source theory becomes the spacetime symmetry in target space. The requirement that the target space is noncompact is not a serious restriction since the spectrum of charges of the current (which defines the momenta) is continuous. But the requirement that the target space has a Lorentzian inner product is highly restrictive. We will come back to this point below.

Let us now formalize the embedding [5][4]. Let $j_i(z)$, $i = 1...n$, $z \in S^1$, be a multicomponent abelian current. The dimension of the embedding space is n and hence we are seeking a unitary representation of an $d=1+(n-1)$ Lorentz

group. The Fourier decomposition of each current component defines an infinite dimensional quantum mechanical system consisting of oscillator variables which carry the target index $i = 1 \dots n$. The space of wave functions is evidently a subspace² $H_{sub} \subset L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \otimes H_{QM}$ where the first (quantum mechanical particle) factor is associated with the null-mode (the c.m. in the N-G case) and the quantum mechanical oscillator space H_{QM} is the representation space of all oscillator modes $a_i(l)^\#$, $i = 1 \dots \infty$.

The steps which lead to a unitary representation are well known and there is no point in presenting them in detail. The first step consists in obtaining a semidefinite subspace H_{sub} whereas the second step consists in the formation of equivalence classes

$$\begin{aligned} U(a, \Lambda) |p; \varphi\rangle &= e^{ipa} |\Lambda p; u(\Lambda)\varphi\rangle, \quad \varphi \in H_{QM} \\ U(a, \Lambda) |p; \varphi\rangle_{H_{sub}} &= e^{ipa} |\Lambda p; u(\Lambda)\varphi\rangle_{H_{sub}} + nullvector \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Hence the physical Hilbert space is of the form $H = H_{sub}/H_{null}$. These two steps can only be taken for $n = 26$ or 10 in the supersymmetric case. The surprise is not that it works for these dimensions, but rather that there exist any solution: we will return to this point in a moment after adding some technical remarks. If we would have started from the Nambu-Goto Lagrangian the result would have been the same and as a result of the bilinear structure of the Lagrangian (after the Polyakov bilinearization) means that there is an associated free field. This was computed by string theorists and the result was that the (graded) commutator is pointlike. But being committed to an incorrect embedding metaphor (the string "religion") they [6][5] called a point an "invisible string" or a "string of which only one point can be seen".

At this point one can either refer to a theorem about localization properties of a unitary representation space of the Poincaré group or, less elegant just compute

Any wave function space with pointlike generating covariant wave functions³ leads in a canonical manner to a Fock space in which a pointlike field (operator-valued distribution) acts. For the wave function space at hand this is an infinite component field with a mass- and spin tower spectrum. A lot of the things explained here would be superfluous if the inventors of the dual model had noticed that the result of their ideas had little to do with the crossing property of the prior bootstrap approach, but instead the more with the search for "dynamical" infinite component free field⁴ which came to a halt only several years before the discovery of the dual model.

²It cannot be the full space because the finite dimensional representation of the L-group would not be unitary (see the treatment of vectorpotentials in QED).

³As a result of their singular pointlike nature they are actually wave function-valued distributions.

⁴This was a popular (in terms) program which involved people as Fronsdaal, Barut, Kleinert and others, an account about the aims and the involved persons can be found in [7]. As a result of restricting the search to (noncompact) groups rather than (oscillator) QM, the search remained without success..

To be more precise it is "an infinite component field" or ic wave function. Only 5 years before the birth of string theory there was a search for infinite component fields in analogy to the infinite $O(4, 2)$ symmetry of the hydrogen spectrum; the magic word was "dynamical symmetries".

If those dynamical symmetry partisans would have extended their search by permitting the generation of the internal structure of their infinite component fields to infinite degree of freedom quantum mechanics (like those oscillators coming from Fourier decomposition of chiral currents on the circle), they would have arrived at the dual model and string theory without the misleading analogy to the field theoretic crossing⁵ and without that misleading name "string".

We will also mention the more elegant method since it involves a theorem in which the causal localization of QFT ("modular localization") which is radically different from that of QM (the Born localization) plays a crucial role in the proof. We will have to say more about this theory in the next section.

Theorem 1 (*Brunetti-Guido-Longo,[8]*) *The representation space of a standard unitary (in general highly reducible) positive energy representation of the Poincaré group which does not contain components of Wigner's class of "infinite spin representation" is pointlike generated in terms of a covariant infinite component wave function.*

This theorem requires a comment. Every unitary finite energy representation of the Poincaré group can be decomposed into (a direct integral or sum) of irreducible representation. There is one class of unitary representations which is not pointlike generated and the use of the adjective "standard" means that such representations are absent. It is well known that standard representations have (non-unique) covariant pointlike generating wave functions whose Fourier transforms $u(p, s_3)$ and their charge conjugates $v(p, s_3)$ have been explicitly computed and can be found in the books [9].

There is a theory, the modular localization theory, which allows to introduce the localization concept directly into Wigner's representation setting⁶, but most particle physicists want to see covariant wave functions $\hat{u}(x, s_3), \hat{v}(x, s_3)$ in which the localization spacetime point appears explicitly. Each unitary standard representation can be associated with a pointlike generalized free field; the relation between pointlike covariant wave functions and pointlike covariant free fields is one-to-one. But this wavefunction-field connection has only a physical content if there is no interaction. In the Lagrangian construction of the string theory this comes from the bilinear structure whereas in the source-target embedding approach this is related to the fact that the currents in the source theory have c-number commutators.

The infinite component fields which are the result of either construction are point-localized and their "wiggling" (due to fluctuations in the vacuum or in

⁵The crossing property is an intricate analytic property of the S-matrix and formfactors in which the interplay of one-particle with higher particle states plays an important role.

⁶The representation theory of the Poincaré group does not use any spacetime x , but modular localization theory allows to identify subspaces describing localization in arbitrary small spacetime regions [2][8].

any other state) does not increase with the number of components but depends on the (infinite component) smearing functions together with the chosen state. The objects themselves are pointlike localized in the sense of causal localization in QFT. Operations which act on the oscillator degrees of freedom in H_{sub} would cause transformations in the inner structure (component space) and leave the localization point unchanged. In particular the only role of these internal oscillators is to create the mass-spin tower, their fluctuations are void of any physical meaning.

The chiral conformal theory must have generating fields with vector- or (in the supersymmetric case) spinorial- indices which refer to the target space, i.e. which are internal symmetry indices for the chiral theory and therefore refer to a noncompact inner symmetry group.

Once's first reaction would be to say that this is impossible because an inner symmetry group is always a compact group⁷. There is indeed a deep theorem in spacetime dimensions ≥ 4 stating that the internal symmetry must be a compact group (and each compact group can occur as an internal symmetry). But this theorem does not hold for low dimensional QFT (in particular for chiral models). One knows from the appearance of braid group statistics that there is no sharp distinction between spacetime- and internal- symmetries.

This explains why an embedding, in which the target spacetime is created via the component indices of a chiral current is the arena of a Lorentz group is a rather difficult requirement and makes it palatable that if such an identification of an inner source symmetry with a spacetime target symmetry is possible at all, it can only happen under extremely restrictive circumstances i.e. for very special inner symmetries of chiral theories. But this kind of "dimensional selection", rather than offering a deep insight into the nature of spacetime, points toward an perhaps unexpected properties of high component chiral current models. That one can find a 26 component chiral current (or with 10 spinorial instead of only vector components) which permit the target spacetime interpretation maybe surprising, but target spacetime and spacetime symmetry are only words for certain surprising properties of particular conformal models; in shifting this surprise to the spacetime and a metaphoric string living in this spacetime one opens the floodgates for mysticism and a new age setting for particle physics.

The values of the *momenta* of the target theory are identical to the value of the *multicomponent* charge in the source theory. This is consistent since the spectrum of abelian chiral charges is the full real line. Assuming that string theorists have made no mistakes in the derivation of the dual model/string properties from the source-target relation using the potentials of a multicomponent abelian chiral current, *all properties including the 26 or 10 dimensions of the target space must be fully accounted for on the chiral current side*. One must also be able to identify the different type of strings (By changing the spinorial indexing of the currents) as well as any possible M-theory relation on the level

⁷This is the main result of the DHR theory which shows that $d \geq 4$ QFT leads necessarily to the Fermi/Bose statistics alternative and multicomponent fields which transform under a compact symmetry group (every such group can be realized). The emergence of new statistics opens the possibility to find more general symmetries.

of inner symmetries of suitable currents.

Understanding this point would liberate particle theory from all those mysticisms and poltergeists which have plagued parts of particle physics for almost 3 decades. It would perhaps also generate some new interest to seriously look at adjacent problems as that of the *intrinsic conceptual status of the classical Kaluza-Klein idea in the context of local quantum physics done in an intrinsic manner*. This has only been done by analogies, but, and this is the main message of this note, these aspects *must be investigated by autonomous methods* and not by metaphors and analogies.

There are two totally different kind of interactions which one may introduce, using the particles in the target representation. On the one hand one may use the infinite component field Φ and interpret the graphical drawings of the dual model as an invitation to write a trilinear interaction (symbolically). This would be in the logic of standard (finite component) QFT. It is only superficially what Witten pursued under the name of String Field Theory for a long time.

The other method consists in leaving field theory aside, and *inventing prescriptions for transition amplitudes* directly in terms of the generating wave functions. This method offers more "freedom" since there is no restrictive locality principle. This has some resemblance to the Stueckelberg's "tinkering" which led him to the Feynman rules without knowing their operator representation.

But there are two differences to the present case. On the one hand Stueckelberg had a helping hand from *macrocausality*, his tinkering consisted in extending the asymptotically known Feynman form of the propagator to all distances and idealizing the interaction regions by pointlike vertices. On the other hand the Feynman rules were vindicated in terms of operators and states i.e. the step from the metaphoric to the intrinsic was accomplished. Every statement in quantum physics ultimately must admit such a representation, otherwise it has nothing to do with QT.

The second problem arises from the string theorists use of Feynman-like pictures with lines replaced by world sheets. They proposed that one should use tube rules to compute transition amplitudes which should then be interpreted as approximations (with some new systematics) of an S-matrix between multi-string incoming and outgoing states. But of course the pointlike nature of the infinite component fields do not support such picture and fact they contradict them. Returning to the before mentioned Φ^3 in the sense of Witten, his cubic interaction has been modified with rules which have been cooked up in such a way as to agree with the rules from the Feynman worldsheet picture. So this far removed from any operator understanding of the tube rules, mocked up operator rules whose connection with the known principles do not resolve this problem.

After having abandoned the above idea of a local Φ^3 interaction (which would fit into the QFT framework and lead via LSZ scattering theory to an S-matrix), the only remaining way is to work by prescriptions, analogies and a prayer.

A tube pictures could make sense for genuine spacetime strings, but not for would-be string degrees of freedom which have gone into the infinite component

enrichment of a pointlike fields⁸.

This state of affairs does not surprise anybody who has critically watched the discourse of the string community and in particular from recent observations on the strange way how facts are obtained from conjectures [10]. Where normally one would need mathematical-conceptual argument, string theorists invent analogies and metaphors. It may be interesting to illustrate this by the following example.

One such analogy, a rather prominent one which one finds in the initial chapters of almost every book on string theory, is the claim that one obtains a relativistic one-particle presentation by reading Wigner's representation theoretical classification of particles back into classical physics and then re-obtain the quantum one particle space by the use of the classical action in a functional integral representation which contains the square root of the line element ds^2 . Not only did anybody before try to replace Wigner's cristal-clear and *complete* representation theoretical approach by such a weird and ill-defined method⁹; No wonder that this analogy supports the wrong picture of a wiggling spacetime string instead of an infinite component pointlike object; it was invented to do precisely that; i.e. it is a perfect act of voluntary self-delusion.

The main purpose of this geometric classical particle description is to support the string tube (worldsheet) rules i.e. to give the impression that string theory is as (or even more) fundamental than particle theory. The incorrect world-sheet interpretation unfortunately also entered other areas of particle physics which have nothing to do with string theory, but were touched by string theorists as e.g. the temperature duality of chiral theory on S^1 in a KMS thermal state¹⁰. The analytic continuation of this theory gives another thermal state on the same chiral theory. There is a connecting toroidal region in which the correlation functions (but never the operators) can be analytically continued, but in order to make contact with physics one has to decide (by the correct physical $i\epsilon$ boundary prescription) which theory one wants, it is either the one or its "dual". Only the boundary values have a physical interpretation of an object being localized on a circle, there is absolutely in interpretation of the two dimensional analytic interpolations region in terms of a sheet localization.

This is in some sense analogous to *KMS states on massive 2-dimensional models on a circle (periodic b.c.)*; but whereas the simpler massive case can be explained in terms of the "classical" Symanzik-Osterwalder-Schrader setting between a real time theory and its euclidean counterpart, the chiral euclideanization relation requires the full power of the modular localization setting¹¹ which is the cause of the appearance of the Verlinde-Rehren mixing matrix and shows that the "modular euclideanization" is much deeper than that arising from the

⁸To interpret the tube pictures as referring to an interaction in an inner symmetry space would be far fetched.

⁹This method would not work for higher spin particles even if one tolerates is unmathematical and unphysical aspects which are already present for scalar particles.

¹⁰The duality relation actually involves all superselected charge sectors which mix with the Verlinde-Rehren matrix S , but these details are not necessary for the present argument.

¹¹For a discussion of the relation between Osterwalder-Schrader euclideanization and modular euclideanization see [11].

Osterwalder-Schrader setting.

The only important point to be made here is that the theory and its dual are linked by analytic continuation and it would be incorrect to interpret this *analytic connecting region* as a space-worldsheet of a string in a target space; there is simply no spacetime interpretation of that region. This affects also the interpretation of T-duality. Its autonomous content is "temperature duality" (fortunately the same letter) which becomes a temperature self-duality (relation within the same theory) in chiral models.

As a contrast program, it may be interesting to explain how *real strings* (i.e. *not* the objects of string theory) look like. The simplest way to construct a string in a Minkowski spacetime of any dimension is to smear a pointlike field along the desired contour. This is not very interesting since one can easily see that such a string had a more basic *pointlike generator*. Free strings can be obtained by a combination of Wigner representation theory with modular localization theory [12]. One finds that there exists a rather large class of representations which do not admit sharper localized generators than semiinfinite stringlike. These strings can be seen in the c-number commutator of two such strings.

All other strings belong to interacting theories (massive or massless). A well known example are electrically charged fields (not the gauge dependent auxiliary quantities as e.g. the pointlike covariant Dirac field in QED (not the state space before eliminating the ghosts). Pure *massive* semiinfinite string generators can only occur in interacting theories, and although some people have firm convictions about their existence no model theories in which one expects the necessary present of semiinfinite stringlike generating fields as well a local subalgebras corresponding to local observables has been proposed.

String-localized generating fields are extremely important for the progress in the understanding and extension of the standard model and it is a pity that the string terminology has been used for a theory which is not string-localized. The construction of all genuine string-localized objects uses either directly or indirectly the concept of modular localization. The failed source-target embedding is based on a too naive geometric embedding and shows the borderline between geometry and physical localization of objects in spacetime. The attempt to embed a higher than one-dimensional QFT into a larger target space would fail for the same reasons; actually it fails already on the impossibility to have a noncompact group as the Lorentz group acting on the inner symmetry indices of the source theory.

The main general message of this note is that there are significant differences between analyzing a problem from a viewpoint of metaphoric intuition or developing appropriate mathematical method which allow an intrinsic understanding. String theory is an extreme illustration of the metaphoric side.

Problems which involve localization are the most subtle in QT. Many physicists have a classical understanding which is sufficient for Lagrangian quantization. This is limited to pointlike fields and becomes unreliable if the problems involve further going localization structures. In more recent times a general

intrinsic¹² causal localization theory was discovered, the modular localization which was mentioned before on several occasions¹³. Together with Wigner's representation theory this leads to theorems as the one above. String theory is not the only area in particle physics in which misunderstanding of localization led to calamities. There have been also some deep misunderstandings due to the naive identification of geometry with localization properties in spacetime¹⁴ but this is a topic which goes much beyond the rather limited aim of this note.

It is well-known there is a geometric association of the analytically continued expectation values of chiral conformal fields in certain states with certain Riemann surfaces e.g. chiral conformal fields in the compact (angular) description in a KMS state live on a circle. They can be analytically continued into a torus such that the boundary value (with the correct $i\varepsilon$ prescription) on the other cycle of the torus becomes another theory on a circle with a different KMS temperature. A closer examination reveals that the second theory is (after application of a stretching implemented by the dilation) is the same theory in two different KMS states whose temperatures are "dual" to each other. There is no QFT in any material (non-metaphoric) sense which lives *on* the Riemann surface; quantum localization is however possible on the circular boundaries. This is in a nut-shell the correct meaning of temperature duality. As it is easily verified this temperature duality can be used in the "source-target embedding" of appropriately indexed conformal currents. But unfortunately only the before explained metaphoric (string theoretic) interpretation leads to the T duality of the books.

Even though some of the refined instruments as the modular localization theory are of a more recent vintage, the number of conceptual errors committed in the heydays of Nelson-Symanzik-Guerra-Osterwalder-Schrader euclideanization is negligible because this was a subject of mathematical physics and not of metaphoric speculation. The deterioration started with the unbridled use of geometric ideas in QFT. In the next section this will be illustrated in the context of two typical cases which, though having nothing to do with string theory, yet contributed to prepare the ground for the increasing distance between geometry and physical localization.

3 Three illustrative examples

One example where research on an interesting and important physical problem has been derailed by geometric methods is the problem of constructing "free" fields¹⁵ for anyons/plektons (which are massive particle in $d=1+2$). The asso-

¹²Here intrinsic means that it does not depend on which "field coordinatization" among the infinitely many possibilities one uses.

¹³For some recent physical applications of that theory see [13][14].

¹⁴Fortunately the standard model does not present opportunities for running into conceptual traps

¹⁵The quotation marks around free refer to the fact that unlike free bosons and fermions the application of a "free" plekton to the vacuum creates a one plekton state with an unavoidable admixture of an infinite vacuum polarization cloud.

ciated fields are covariant fields which satisfy braid group commutation relation in the simplest possible way i.e. no interactions beyond those which support the braid group structure. They are expected to provide the operator formalism behind Laughlin's phenomenological wave function Ansatz.

The intrinsic approach using the modular localization concept for anyonic one particle states is well-known. The modular localization method leads to a substitute of the covering of the 3-dim. Minkowski spacetime by strings which keep track of the sheet the field coordinate resides. The modular localization construction leads also to a preempted form of the spin statistic connection within the one-particle space; it generates all this structural richness on the level of the one particle Wigner theory. The next step, namely the recognition that the result of this more sophisticated Wigner representation theory leads to Zamolodchikov-Faddeev structure and that generators of compactly localized subalgebras in that modular covering space are the sought for "free" fields has not been carried out.

The geometric approach starts from the Chern-Simon action; it does not need an explanation since there is an enormous number of papers. This geometric approach ignores the quantum prerequisites of euclideanization which consists in the requirement of reality and the reflection property, one closes one's eyes and goes ahead, hoping for a saving grace. This enforcement of Chern Simons geometry over modular localization has not led to anything tangible in the physical sense and an idea about how to extract correlations for "free" anyons is not clear even in principle.

The second illustration is the program to extract from generalized (multi-parameter, multi-component) Thirring type models those points or regions in coupling constant space at which the model becomes conformal i.e. falls into the range of validity of the representation theory of better understood conformal current algebras. This research project had a nice start started around 1970 but progress was slow because only very few people worked on it.

Then came the renaming of these $SU(N)$ current models into Wess-Zumino-Witten theory because Witten proposed a Lagrangian formulation in terms of a group-valued sigma model field. The Lagrangian was of a topological kind which made it unsuitable for perturbation theory, not to speak of rigorous mathematical physics use. When it comes to computations everybody until today still uses current algebras and representation theory. For physics its introduction was a pyrrhic victory because Lagrangians are usually introduced for their practical use for perturbative construction of models. The addition of the name Novikov made it clear that this unusual Lagrangian description became a valuable enrichment of mathematics. The old ideas were later on continued by physicists whose solid state background sometimes did not quite cover the conceptual profoundness which even such low dimensional QFT require.

A third area of QFT where localization plays a pivotal role is conformal QFT. Already in the 70s it was seen [15] that local fields within a conformal theory can be subdivided into two kinds, such which fulfill the Huygens principle and those which do not i.e. for which the (graded) commutator does not vanish for timelike distances. The former define the (sub)algebra of observables

and the latter are the anomalous dimension carrying fields which turn out to transform according to a reducible representation of the covering group allow a further-going conformal block decomposition with respect to the center of the universal covering $\widetilde{SO(4,2)}$. This center is generated by $e^{2\pi i H_{conf}}$ where the conformal Hamiltonian H_{conf} describes the movement through the Dirac Weyl compactified Minkowski spacetime or more precisely through its universal covering $\widetilde{M_{comp}}$. A CFT with anomalous dimension lives necessarily in a covering and the most interesting part of its dimensional spectrum¹⁶, namely the scale dimensions modulo integers (the anomalous part) enters into a decomposition theory of local fields (the conformal sector/block decomposition theory). Local covariant fields which are transforming according to an irreducible representation of the conformal group in the neighborhood of the identity are not necessary irreducible with respect to the global group. The block (central) decomposition reads [15]

$$A_d(x) = \sum_{\xi} A_d^{\xi}(x), \xi = \frac{1}{2}(d + d_b - d_c) \bmod(1) \quad (2)$$

$$A_d^{\xi} \neq 0 \leftrightarrow \exists B_{d_b}, C_{d_c} \text{ s.t. } \langle B_{d_b} A_d C_{d_c} \rangle \neq 0$$

The central spectrum is given by the numbers $e^{2\pi i \xi}$ where ξ runs through the above numbers (2) involving the scale dimensions. The situation simplifies considerably in $d=1+1$ where the covering group factors into two Moebius groups and the study of the two-dimensional situation can be reduced to that of chiral theories which "live" on a compactified line (circle) and its covering. For chiral theories spacelike and timelike collapse into lightlike. This has the consequence that the issue of anomalous dimensions coalesces with that of statistics in the sense of commutation relations between pointlike fields. It is known that the most general form of statistics is governed by the braid group and its unitary representation (which links up with the Vaughn Jones subfactor theory). In the typical case the spectrum of the center is finite (rational models). The counterpart of the circle is the Einstein universe. The observation that the universal cover of M , the Einstein universe $\widetilde{M} = R \times S_{d-1}$ (for $d = 4$), which admits a globally causal structure, is locally indistinguishable from M for large R has been emphasized over 40 years ago by Irvine Segal [16]. It is interesting that by putting a KMS state on such a model one gets a very nice analog of the temperature duality.

The decisive shot in the arm for the construction of nontrivial chiral models came from the impressive BPZ work [17] which brought valuable structures from Kac-Moody algebras into the fray. The DHR view of QFT, which starts from an observable algebra and classifies its superselection sectors [18] and amalgamates finally everything into a big field algebra underlies all these constructions. The observable algebras for the case at hand are those generated by currents or by the energy-stress tensor which have self-closing commutation relations.

¹⁶Since the local observables which live on M_{comp} , the higher superselection sectors (which are labeled by the spectrum of the center) their contribution to the spectrum is repetitive.

This two-step approach was extremely successful and has led to the complete mathematical control of many chiral field algebras i.e. the solution of the field theoretic existence problem for a large class of chiral models [19].

A head-on attempt to unravel the algebraic structure of the irreducible components in higher dimensions gave some interesting insights but no conclusive solution. Whereas the anomalous dimensional spectrum in chiral theories (as the spin and statistics of $d+1+2$ plektons) is set by the braid group structure, the algebraic structure which may be behind that spectrum in higher space-time dimensions is still not known¹⁷, although it is believed that a finite central spectrum ("rationality") as in chiral models with braid group statistics cannot occur. For this reason a group of mathematical physicists has used the strategy of observable algebras and their local superselection sectors which was so successful in the chiral case. In $d=1+3$ the observables are by definition generated by fields which obey the Huygens principle of vanishing timelike commutators. Although there is as yet no closure, there are some very interesting intermediate results [20] about the structure of observable in higher dimensions.

Very recently this issue of higher dimensional conformal theories gained popularity through the Maldacena conjecture which relates the allegedly conformal $N=4$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theories on one side of a correspondence to a lesser defined kind supersymmetric gravity theory[21]. According to papers written in the 80s, the beta function of these models vanish. But these old attempts [22] did not even fulfill the standards set by the technology in 70s which was used to prove the vanishing of the beta functions (in the massive Thirring model) and the absence of radiative corrections in all orders.

Since the knowledge of these elegant and convincing methods seemed to have gotten lost in the maelstrom of time, let me briefly indicate how this was done. The trick was to use the (perturbatively well established) Callen-Symanzik equation together with the Ward identities in the setting of Zimmermann's Normal product formalism. In the case of the vanishing of the beta function for the massive Thirring model [23] the application of these two relations led to an equation of the kind

$$\beta(g) \frac{\partial h(g)}{\partial g} = 0 \quad (3)$$

where h is a ratio of mass and wave function renormalization. One only has to show that h vanishes in lowest order (which is easily established). Then β vanishes in the sense of power series. The absence of radiative corrections for the anomaly of the pseudovector current in QED (the Schwinger-Adler-Bell-Jackiw anomaly) is shown in the same manner[24]. In that case one obtains an equation for the coefficient r in front of the anomaly contribution $\frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}$ which has the following form

$$\frac{\beta}{e} \left(e \frac{\partial}{\partial e} - 2 \right) r = 0 \quad (4)$$

since β is nonvanishing in third order, r receives only a second order contribution.

¹⁷I acknowledge many discussions with K-H. Rehren with some interesting but incomplete results.

If it is necessary to resort to order by order calculations i.e. if the Callen Symanzik equations and Ward identities within the elegant Zimmermann formalism for composite fields do not lead to the desired result, then the claimed $\beta = 0$ property or the absence of radiative correction in other quantities has no basis. The vanishing of some low order contributions in supersymmetric theories could come from low order compensations which are always present in supersymmetric theories because of compensations between Fermion and Boson contributions.

For gauge theories in which all gauge invariant quantities are composite, the Zimmermann formalism becomes indispensable. The conformal side of the Maldacena conjecture is not yet out of the swamplands. As mentioned before, the references for the vanishing of the beta function in the N=4 SUYM on which the string theorists base their arguments are not up to the standards set for such proofs in the 70s [23][24].

Recently it has been conjectured that the algebraic structure of the $A_d^\xi(x)$ in the Huygens region is (at least in the case of N=4 SUYM¹⁸) given by integrable spin chains, i.e. that the anomalous dimension spectrum is set by spin chains instead of braid group representations for chiral theories. This certainly would satisfy the bias in favor a nonrational spectrum (using the terminology use for chiral models). Presently I do not see any convincing argument but, neither do I have an argument against; I only fear that this will be like looking for a needle in a haystack, in particular if one uses such step for step archaic perturbation methods as in the current literature [25]. What will happen is presumably the same that happened with the Maldacena conjecture, there will be myriads of papers without any closure and at the end the project will peter out by exhaustion.

Assuming that there is really a nontrivial conformal N=4 SUYM or for that matter any nontrivial (anomalous dimension) conformal theory in $d=1+3$ at all, one can immediately conclude that there exists a corresponding $d=1+4$ AdS theory which not only share the symmetry group $\widetilde{SO}(4,2)$, but there is also a correspondence between double-cone-like subregions D on $\widetilde{M}_4$ and wedge-like regions W in $\widetilde{AdS}_5$, although there is no pointwise relation in both directions between these different manifolds. The knowledge of the family of wedge algebras suffices to obtain the family of all double cone algebras and all their generating fields¹⁹. There is no mystery whatsoever in this correspondence, what happens is that the spacetime ordering of quantum matter (but not the kind of quantum matter) is radically changed. All this has been amply documented in a theorem by one of the leading mathematical physicists [26]. There is no place

¹⁸The idea that there is a special algebraic structure for a special model contradicts all experience from chiral model (where the braidgroup structure is general with different models being in different braid group representations). The anomalous spectrum of rational conformal QFT following from such representations is finite. The claim that integrable spin chains set the algebraic structure for a particular conformal QFT holds either for all 4-dimensional conformal theories or for none.

¹⁹To work directly with fields in holographic maps is not a good idea for reasons which have been explained in [3].

for a conjecture on top of a theorem unless the conjecture is in agreement with the result of the structural theorem. There is however a worrisome discrepancy because the two sides cannot be simultaneously "physical". Already on intuitive reasons one expects that the degrees of freedom in a standard 4-dim. QFT as e.g. a gauge cannot fill a higher-dimensional AdS spacetime, the resulting theory will be too anemic (e.g. no Lagrangian,...) in order to be of more use than serving as the AdS counterpart of a gauge theory. One can see this by sending free conformal theories to the AdS side but this idea is also backed up by a structural aspect of the theorem. So a conjecture which places a 5-dim. physical theory on the AdS side is in plain contradiction with the theorem and to speculate about what kind of anemic theory appears as the image of an $N=4$ SUYM is quite risky, but the correct anemic theory is whatever the application of the theorem to the (unfortunately scarcely known) $N=4$ SUYM leads to, a problem which hardly merits the attention of more than 6000 publications.

As we have seen, the attraction of string theory rests on the incorrect geometric idea that the result of the chiral current embedding map leads to string localization in target space; the correct reading as an infinite component field is much more prosaic. It seems therefore that (from the point of view of a conceding string theorist) all the drama and the surreal flavor emanating from string theory is gone and one has to return to the boring standard model stuff and add here and there an argument or lookout for experimental results which show discrepancies with the theory. This may lead to the incorrect conclusion that in order to encounter drama, suspense, adventure and surprises in particle theory you have to go outside QFT, a way of thinking which probably played a large role in the decision-making of young newcomers, because this is the impression which is spread by propagandists of ST. It is certainly true that the very successful standard model has been obtained with a slight extension of those déjà vu concepts which led to QED and the more than 40 year stalemate seems to indicate that this area is not of the kind where one can expect exciting new challenges and earn fame. The message of contemporary string theory goes far beyond just viewing string theory as an off-spring of QFT. Rather the latter is declared as old particle physics, a closed issue of mainly historical interest.

However this impression is wrong. The best way to see this is to look at some consequences of that intrinsic localization concept which corrected the above metaphoric (classical) embedding. Whereas in the above case modular localization could be avoided in favor of conventional methods of taking (graded) commutators of fields or looking at generating wave functions (the u and v intertwiners in Weinberg's book), the following statement requires the full power of the field-coordinatization independent method known under the name modular localization.

First some important terminology, The local operator algebras $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{O})$ (i.e. the algebra generated by all operators localized in the spacetime region $\mathcal{O}$) are of a very different kind than quantum mechanical algebras. Independent of the shape of the causally complete region $\mathcal{O}$, it is always a copy of a unique algebra, shortly referred to as *the monad* (the hyperfinite type III_1 von Neumann factor). A single such algebra is like a point in geometry, in the sense that it has no

individuality (according to the motto: if one has seen one, one knows them all). However unlike with points, one can with these monads form inclusions $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{O}) \subset \mathcal{A}(\tilde{\mathcal{O}})$ if $\mathcal{O} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{O}}$. Furthermore each monad $\mathcal{A}$ together with a state $(\mathcal{A}, \Omega)$ on which it acts in a "standard" way²⁰ has an associated modular theory, i.e. a canonically associated one-parametric modular group Δ^{it} and a modular reflection (generalized TCP operator) J . An inclusion with a joint state Ω in which the modular group of the bigger algebra "compresses" for $t > 0$ or $t < 0$ the smaller algebra into itself is called a *modular inclusion*.

Using these concepts one can come to a new insight into what constitutes a QFT. Namely a QFT is completely characterized (including its quantum matter content and its spacetime symmetry) by the *abstract positioning of a finite number of monads in a joint Hilbert space*. For two-dimensional QFT one needs two monads, for d=1+2 four and for d=1+3 six etc. The spacetime symmetries originate from the abstract modular groups of the positioned monads. An equivalent formulation is in terms of only one monad (interpreted as a wedge-localized algebra), but in this case one needs to know the action of the Poincaré group on this monad. This viewpoint has already shown its clout by leading to the first existence proof for strictly renormalizable QFT²¹ within the class of 2-dim. factorizing models.

These new insights have opened a new panorama of local quantum physics with unexpected and even somewhat mysterious structures. But in contrast to string theory this mysterious aspects come from a profound use of the localization structure i.e. just on those structures on which string theory erred. In addition this "modular mystery" is backed up by a mathematical theory and is only transient i.e. will disappear as soon as sufficiently many consequences of this theory have been unraveled.

4 Concluding remarks, sociological aspects

In case it is not already evident from the previous two sections, I should state clearly that my critical view of string theory and all its derivatives is quite different from that of others, notably Woit and Smolin, although I do support the legitimacy of theirs. I defend the point of view that a theoretical idea which extends the existing physical principles (i.e. is not just the result of tinkering as the dual model) *must be explored independent of its observational status, even if at the end it has to be abandoned because of a hidden conceptional inconsistency*. Contrary to Woit I do not criticize string theory because of its incapacity to relate with observations, but rather because it has fundamental conceptual flaws which are *inherited by all its derivatives*. This could have been noticed right at

²⁰This means that the space $\mathcal{A}\Omega$ is dense in H and that $\mathcal{A}$ contains no elements which annihilate Ω . In most local quantum physical applications the state Ω is the vacuum.

²¹The existence proofs of Glimm and Jaffe are limited to superrenormalizable theories. The new existence proofs [1] are based on the existence of rather simple generators of wedge-localized algebras [2] and apply to models with a more realistic renormalizable short distance behaviour.

the time when it was reconstituted from the ashes of the S-matrix bootstrap. If such a flawed theory explains the real world this would be a real calamity.

The incorrectness of the conformal embedding picture could have been established with the means available at that time. Unfortunately those physicists with profound knowledge of local quantum physics and a passion to engage themselves to maintain clarity in particle theory who had directed their criticism already against the S-matrix bootstrap (as e.g. Res Jost) were already tired playing the conceptual nanny and may even have thought that such tinkering proposals will run out of steam all by themselves; little did they know how wrong they were.

In pursuing such a goal I would (possibly in variance with Smolin's democratic position of giving everybody a slice of the cake) plead to use resources for that proposal which fulfills the mentioned requirements best. But string theory never was in this category, it came from nowhere and it will hopefully end before having converted the heritage of all the pioneers of QFT into a wasteland.

It may very well be that the past ideal of maintaining a critical balance between speculative ideas and the counterweight of a conceptually anchored profound criticism has reached its end; perhaps it cannot be realized any more because it is incompatible with the changed Zeitgeist which did not spare science. The latter has moved away from individual contributors who's critical adversaries were also individuals, towards that of large globalized communities with one or several guru-like leaders who also serve as role models.

This globalized community form of organization seems to be only capable to produce young scientists with that rather limited knowledge which one needs in order to be productive within that community. There is simply no time nor incentive to go beyond. The result is the creation of a horde of halfway educated community members who, with the growing influence of the community and in particular of its leading members, get into an editorial or referee position and pose a serious threat to particle theory. How can a halfway educated person who only internalized the community physics judge the content of a paper which uses concepts which are not part of the community catechism? It will be rejected because in his view the methods used outside are just confusing and in addition inappropriate. The worst scenario for the future of particle theory progress in particle theory are referees who are half-educated but, as members of a half-educated community, they do not know that they are half educated. The danger that particle physics in this community setting where half educated members in anticipatory obedience to the community spirit and its leaders make sure that there will be no ideas which could threaten the catechism of the community, this danger is very real. The university system with the time limitations favours half-education and those people who have a general education in particle physics are dying out.

To illustrate the seriousness of the particle theory situation one only has to look at the sociological situation of the Maldacena conjecture is let me give an example. It is known to some people that at the same place of the Maldacena AdS-CFT conjecture there is a rigorous proof of a theorem on the $\text{AdS}_{n+1}\text{-CFT}_n$ (inner symmetries suppressed) correspondence by one of the leading mathemat-

ical physicists. The theorem is of a structural kind i.e. independent of with what model one starts on either side. But it is concrete enough to create a serious problem with the Maldacena conjecture in that it confirms the naive expectation that one side must be a purely mathematical object without physical relevance because either the lower dimensional theory has way too many degrees of freedom or the higher dimensional has is too anemic in its degree of freedom content in order to be connectable to a Lagrangian or to be of physical use.

To ignore such a theorem to the extent of not even mentioning its existence would have been unimaginable at pre-string physics. As an individual researcher one may forget to cite an important paper either because of personal ignorance or of the result of some Freudian slip. But after such an occurrence one would feel ashamed and at the next possibility correct such a faux pas. Not so as a member of a string community where the only utterances were made verbally and amount to something like: "this is not what I mean" or "that German AdS-CFT correspondence". The apparent lack of knowledge of the string community about the spacetime origin of the anomalous dimension spectrum in higher dimensional conformal QFTs is another point which underlines my very dim view of this new community sociology of particle theory.

Under these circumstances I am very pessimistic about the future of particle physics. There is a saying about the raven in the tower of London: if the raven in the tower of London ever leave, the British crown and the British kingdom will fall. An adaptation to the present situation in particle theory would be something like this : if geometric contributions as those about the Langlands program ever disappear from hep-th then the reign of string theory will have ended²².

Here Langlands stand symbolically for all attempts to impose additional geometrical structures on the quite restrictive intrinsic modular localization structures of local quantum physics. String theory is, as was explained before, the result of such a geometric interpretation of the source-target embedding picture.

But one would stand accused of blindness if one would negate the success which metaphoric physical ideas had on mathematics as a fountain for new mathematical ideas.

I appologize to all the readers of the general physics section who probably will be taken by surprise that this highly technical mathematical-conceptual paper which requires substantial knowledge of QFT was posted in general physics instead of hep-th. Indeed this work does not belong here, it was against my will (and despite warnings about the nature of its content and my more than 40 years experience on the frontiers of QFT) removed from the hep-th section by the hep-th moderator and placed here without any reasoning. Apparently the physics section of the arXiv is some penal camp where renitent hep-th authors who disagree with the direction in which particle theory is heading and have been in the field of vision of a moderator for some time can be banned without giving any reasons in writing because their written down form would go against

²²One might add: *and hep-th contributors (including myself) would cease to be the laughing stock of the other archive sections.*

the freedom of research.

References

- [1] G. Lechner, *An Existence Proof for Interacting Quantum Field Theories with a Factorizing S-Matrix*, Commun. Mat. Phys. **227**, (2008) 821, arXiv.org/abs/math-ph/0601022
- [2] B. Schroer, Nucl.Phys. B **499**, (1997) 519, see also Ann. Phys. **275**, (1999) 190
- [3] B. Schroer, *A critical look at 50 years particle theory from the perspective of the crossing property*, arXiv:0905.4006
- [4] B. Schroer, *String theory and the crisis of particle physics or the ascent of metaphoric arguments*, arXiv:0805.1911
- [5] J. Dimock, *Locality in Free String Field Theory-II*, Annales Henri Poincare **3** (2002) 613, math-ph/0102027
- [6] E. Martinec, Class. Quant. Grav. **10**, (1993) 187
- [7] N.N. Bogolubov, A.A. Logunov, A.I. Oksak and I.T. Todorov, *General Principles of Quantum Field Theory*, Kluwer 1990
- [8] R. Brunetti, D. Guido and R. Longo, Rev.Math.Phys. **14**, (2002) 759
- [9] S. Weinberg, *The Quantum Theory of Fields I*, Cambridge University Press 1995
- [10] O. Zapata Marin, *On Facts in Superstring Theory. A Case Study: The AdS/CFT Correspondence*, arXiv:0905.1439, see also: Spinning the superweb, essays on the history of string theory, <http://www.spinningthesuperweb.blogspot.com/>
- [11] B. Schroer, *Positivity and Integrability (Mathematical Physics at the FU-Berlin)*, arXiv:hep-th/0603118
- [12] J. Mund, B. Schroer and J. Yngvason, *String-localized quantum fields and modular localization*, CMP **268** (2006) 621, math-ph/0511042
- [13] B. Schroer, *Localization and the interface between quantum mechanics, quantum field theory and quantum gravity*, arXiv:0711.4600
- [14] B. Schroer, *BMS symmetry, holography on null-surfaces and area proportionality of "light-slice" entropy*, arXiv:0905.4435
- [15] B. Schroer and J. A. Swieca, Phys. Re. D **10**, (1974) 480
- [16] I.E. Segal, *Covariant chronogeometry and extreme distances III*, Macro-micro relations, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **21** (1982) 851

- [17] A. A. Belavin, A. M. Polyakov and A. B. Zamolodchikov, Nucl. Phys.B **241**, (1984) 333
- [18] R. Haag, *Local Quantum Physics*, Springer, second edition, 1996
- [19] Y. Kawahigashi, R. Longo, U. Pennig and K.-H. Rehren, Commun.Math.Phys.**271**, (2007) 375
- [20] N. M. Nikolov, K.-H. Rehren and I. Todorov, Polstructure and biharmonic fields in conformal QFT in four dimensions, in Lie theory and its applications in physics VII, ed. V. K. Dobrev et al., Heron Press Sofia 2008
- [21] J. A. Maldacena, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2**, (1998) 231
- [22] S. Mandelstam, Nucl. Phys. B **213**, (1983) 149
- [23] M. Gomes and J. H. Lowenstein, Phys. Rev. D **7**, (1973) 550
- [24] J. H. Lowenstein and B. Schroer, Phys. Rev. D **7**, (1973) 1929
- [25] N. Beisert, Fortschr. Physik **57**, (2009) 329
- [26] K.-H. Rehren, *A Proof of the AdS-CFT Correspondence*, In: Quantum Theory and Symmetries, H.-D. Doebner et al. (eds.), World Scientific (2000), pp. 278, hep-th/9910074, see also *QFT Lectures on AdS-CFT*, hep-th/0411086