

# Matter and antimatter: the two arrows of time

*Massimo Villata*

*Istituto di Fisica Generale dell'Università, Via Pietro Giuria 1, I-10125 Torino, Italy*

*Osservatorio Astronomico di Torino, I-10025 Pino Torinese, Italy*

*April 1994*

Antiparticles may be interpreted as ordinary particles travelling backwards in time and the two descriptions are considered equivalent, at least in special relativity and relativistic quantum mechanics. It is suggested that, vice versa, the discovery of antimatter should be the confirmation that our world is “endowed” with two opposite time-arrows and such a description could be more useful and convenient from the point of view of the understanding of the world itself, at least for a simple reason: whenever phenomena are observed from a “reference frame” from which the world appears more symmetric, it is easier to understand the physical laws which regulate it. If, in the future, it is possible to discover how a macroscopic system of antimatter behaves, it will be also possible to confirm (or not) the “reality” of the two arrows of time.

It is well known that, in the special theory of relativity<sup>1</sup>, the class of reference frames (RFs) for the description of mechanical and electromagnetic phenomena equivalent to a given inertial RF can be obtained by means of the so-called Lorentz transformations (LTs):

$$x'^{\mu} = \Lambda^{\mu}_{\nu} x^{\nu} . \quad (1)$$

These transformations are requested to leave invariant the quadratic form

$$\eta_{\mu\nu} dx^{\mu} dx^{\nu} = \eta'_{\alpha\beta} dx'^{\alpha} dx'^{\beta} \quad (2)$$

and, from the requirement of linearity (for transforming inertial motion into inertial motion), it follows that

$$\eta_{\mu\nu} = \eta'_{\alpha\beta} = \text{diag} (+1, -1, -1, -1) . \quad (3)$$

The above equations imply that

$$\det \Lambda^2 = 1 , \quad (\Lambda^0_0)^2 \geq 1 . \quad (4)$$

Disregarding the case of the non-proper ( $\det \Lambda = -1$ ) LTs, we are left with the subgroup of the proper ( $\det \Lambda = +1$ ) LTs

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}^{\uparrow} \cup \mathcal{L}^{\downarrow} \equiv \{\Lambda^{\uparrow}\} \cup \{\Lambda^{\downarrow}\} , \quad (5)$$

where  $\Lambda^{\uparrow}$  are the orthochronous ( $\Lambda^0_0 \geq +1$ ) LTs and  $\Lambda^{\downarrow}$  are the antichronous ( $\Lambda^0_0 \leq -1$ ) ones, which do not preserve the sign of time. Usually, besides the non-proper LTs, also the antichronous LTs are regarded as devoid of physical meaning. Some authors<sup>2-10</sup> have shown, on the contrary, that such LTs can be related to the existence of antimatter. We want to reconsider this issue from a slightly different point of view, in order to clarify some concepts which may lead to a new understanding of antimatter. At first sight, this different interpretation might seem insignificant in the today's physical perspective, but it is, instead, important in view of future developments of physical theories.

Consider first the quadratic form (speed of light in vacuum  $c = 1$ )

$$d\tau^2 = dx^{\mu} dx_{\mu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} dx^{\mu} dx^{\nu} = dt^2 - d\mathbf{x}^2 \quad (6)$$

and its canonically conjugated form

$$m_0^2 = p^\mu p_\mu = \eta_{\mu\nu} p^\mu p^\nu = E^2 - \mathbf{p}^2. \quad (7)$$

As is well known, they are invariant quantities (scalars) of the theory. We also know that particles travelling with speed  $v = c = 1$  (invariant in any RF) have, consequently,  $d\tau^2 = m_0^2 = 0$ ; moreover they have also the peculiarity that they cannot be considered at rest in any RF (their speed is always equal to  $c$ ). In any other case, particles (travelling with subluminal speeds) have  $d\tau^2 > 0$  and  $m_0^2 > 0$ , and, in particular,  $d\tau > 0$  and  $m_0 > 0$ . We can infer that, for symmetry, particles endowed with negative proper time and rest mass should exist too. In fact, we can see them as antiparticles, the meaning of these negative quantities will be clarified in the following.

Consider now the particular antichronous transformation  $-\mathbf{1} \equiv \text{diag}(-1, -1, -1, -1)$  named “total inversion”. It changes the sign of all components of all four-vectors. Thus it would give the description of a particle as seen by an observer travelling backwards in time and with the space axes inverted, or, *vice versa*, it would provide the description of a particle having the opposite “time-arrow” and seen through a mirror with respect to us. Hence we should see such a hypothetical particle as endowed with negative energy and opposite momentum direction, but it has been pointed out that we *are not able* to “see” such a situation, because *we* are constrained to go in *our* time direction and can see only objects which go from *our* past to *our* future. At this point we are faced with the so-called “switching” or “reinterpretation” procedure (or principle)<sup>11–17</sup>. In order to make the subject intuitive, consider a particle which is going from a given point A (on our left) to another point B (on the right) and imagine that we see the projection of such a simple phenomenon on a semitransparent screen. Now imagine that we are viewing this travel from a RF having the time and space axes inverted, i.e. we put ourselves at the back of the screen and reproject the film backwards: we shall see a particle going from B to A, but again from left to right. What has happened? We “know” that the particle is in a state of motion backwards in time with negative energy and opposite momentum, but we see a particle moving forward in time, whose sign of the velocity is unchanged, and which is now travelling from B to A. This is the effect of the “reinterpretation”: the scalars ( $d\tau$ ,  $m_0$  and, as is known, all additive charges) have changed their signs, so that we observe

$$dt = u_0 d\tau > 0, \quad d\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{u} d\tau > 0, \quad E = m_0 u_0 > 0, \quad \mathbf{p} = m_0 \mathbf{u} > 0, \quad (8)$$

having all the right hand sides changed sign two times: first owing to the inversion of the velocity four-vector  $u_\mu$  by the operation  $-1$  and then because of the change in the scalars. We have also, as observed,

$$\mathbf{v} = \frac{d\mathbf{x}}{dt} = \frac{\mathbf{u}}{u_0} > 0. \quad (9)$$

What about a particle endowed with electric charge (or any other additive charge)? It is well known that, if in the first “time reference frame” (TRF) it is, for instance, an electron carrying negative charge from A to B, in the other TRF (after reinterpretation) we shall deal with an *antiparticle* of opposite charge, i.e. we observe a *positron* going from B to A. Eventually this is the “confirmation” that this theory including antichronous LTs and reinterpretation is not only a mathematical speculation but has its clear physical meaning, corresponding to observable phenomena. In other words, the theory of special relativity, once based on the whole proper group (5) of both orthochronous and antichronous LTs, describes a Minkowski space-time populated by both particles and antiparticles and, hence, the existence of the latter could have been predicted, in purely relativistic, classical terms, even since 1905, exactly with the properties they actually exhibited when later discovered, provided that recourse to the switching procedure had been made. Moreover, some authors<sup>2-5</sup> have shown that the combination of the operation  $-1$  with the switching procedure in special relativity corresponds to the CPT transformation in relativistic quantum mechanics, where the covariance of physical laws under such an operator is stated by the so-called CPT theorem.

Hence, the particle which in the first TRF carried positive energy and momentum from A to B (defining “left-to-right” as the positive space direction), from the other TRF is seen as a particle bearing positive energy and momentum from B to A, as requested to a “normal” particle travelling forward in time from left to right. However, such a particle has, at least formally, *negative rest mass and proper time* and *opposite additive charges*: this is the price to pay for having “forced” the particle to travel with us in time. What about this negative rest mass? How does such a particle behave in a gravitational field, for example? We should expect that it is repulsed by “normal” matter of positive rest mass (i.e. moving forward in time), so as a positron is attracted by negative electric charges; this issue could explain the scarcity of antimatter in the universe: if an “antiuniverse” made of antimatter exists, it would be gravitationally repulsed by our own. In this sense, rest mass looks very much like baryonic and leptonic numbers, and also like any other additive charge: indeed it would behave, at least in pair annihilation and production processes, as a quantity

conserved in time. Opening a parenthesis, we like to think that the “big bang” in which space-time and mass were created was nothing but the production of a universe-antiuniverse pair from a “non-space-time state” of zero mass [just like a photon which is not proper to our space-time (indeed it has no rest RF) can create a pair], or, without reinterpretation, a universe which, by interacting with a “big photon”, reverses its time-arrow. Perhaps, in turn, this “non-space-time state” derives from a universe which has returned to the “past”. Eventually our universe might reannihilate with its counterpart (i.e. return to its past and to the big bang, for starting again), or, maybe, because of the gravitational repulsion, they will never meet. In this case, our universe might end by a “thermal death” in a maximum entropy state, from which the only way for being regenerated would be to reverse its time-arrow passing through a non-space-time state, thus giving rise to another big bang, and so on. However, this is pure speculation, and we close the parenthesis.

Returning to our particles: what about the “reality” of the phenomenon? Is antimatter something moving forward in time with us, as we effectively see it, or is it normal matter going towards our past? Someone might say that such a question is meaningless, since the two descriptions (particle travelling backwards in time with negative energy and given additive charges, and antiparticle with negative mass and opposite charges going forward in time with positive energy) are physically equivalent, *at least* in special relativity and quantum field theory, and there are no means (*in the ambit of these theories*) of distinguishing the two situations. This is true, it is only a question of “interpretation”. It is also true, as some authors pointed out<sup>2-10</sup>, that we are constrained to “explore” space-time in a given time direction and, hence, it *seems* reasonable to perform the reinterpretation procedure, “forcing” thus all the world to go with us. We want to make a brief note about this, with the help of an analogy.

Imagine a situation in which an observer is constrained to explore his world on board of a boat unprovided with oars which is thus compelled to go downstream on a river or a canal. He is also bound to watch forward for some strange reason. This man understands that he is not at rest with respect to the surrounding world because the landscape does change as time goes by. He can thus perform a measure of his position and momentum with respect to the dry land, regarded as at rest with zero momentum. This situation is analogous to our own when we exchange the concept of space for that of proper time and momentum for rest mass. Indeed we know that we are not at rest in time and this situation “produces” our mass,

whereas the “terra firma” state (photons) has constant proper time and zero mass. Suppose now that our observer meet another gentleman who is going in the opposite direction (for instance on a parallel canal with opposite stream), he too on his boat. Remember that our dull-witted man cannot, because of some trouble, turn his head and follow the motion of the stranger. Therefore he can do nothing but look at the queer customer in the rearview-mirror with which his boat is providentially equipped, reflecting thus before himself that inconceivable backward motion; here is everything straight: also the other wayfarer travels in the “right” direction, as requested by the stream of the canal, even though, unfortunately, he who is observed in such a way turns out to be irremediably left-hand, right-hearted and with “*Aquatic Club*” written from right to left, i.e. member of another species, in a word, an “antigentleman”. This is the price to pay for having wanted to force that man to travel with him on the river, in the “positive” space direction and with positive momentum. All this is analogous (exchanging space for time and momentum for energy) to the reinterpretation procedure we usually perform when dealing with antimatter. Other gentlemen travelling “forward” but along directions forming an angle with that of the observer are easily “projectable” on it (orthochronous LTs). Moreover, another strange direction exists: the “non-projectable” perpendicular one, i.e. the one corresponding to the terra firma, where gentlemen have not momentum (mass) and are out of the (time) flow, so that it can provide a useful passage for inverting direction, just like, for instance, an electron, for changing its time-arrow, has to deal with a massless and timeless photon (absorbed or emitted, depending on the TRF from which it is observed) that represents the exchange of energy (momentum) between the electron (gentleman) which has impinged on the non-space-time state (dry land) before starting again in the opposite time (space) direction, where it has been already observed as an antielectron.

What we mean with this analogy is that it seems more useful and reasonable not to stop our knowledge at the appearance of phenomena, i.e. not to consider them only from our RF or TRF. It is true that we are not able, at least for now, to change our time direction, but this does not mean that we cannot imagine to see things from another point of view, e.g. from the “terra firma”, which could provide a more convenient and symmetric description. We think that none prefer, when going by car, to describe the motorway as something where cars and anticars exist, being anticars visible only in the rearview-mirror: it could be a misleading description of reality, even though we are aware that we are forbidden to reverse our direction.

In other words, the Copernican revolution has been effected without any need to go onto the Sun, i.e. into the most convenient RF for the understanding of the physical laws which regulate planets motions. The description of the retrograde motions as seen from the Earth is equivalent but has been misleading up to few centuries ago, because it strengthened (or did not allow to get over) the prejudice of the Earth at the centre of the universe, which, in turn, prevented from discovering the celestial mechanics laws. Also the ancient Egyptians passed through a crisis when reaching the Euphrates which flows from north to south, since, before its discovery, they knew only the Nile and its tributaries, that, on the contrary, all flow in the opposite direction, so that, for them, the words (and concepts) “north” (“south”) and “downstream” (“upstream”) had become merged. [In fact, in their writing, “go downstream (north)” was represented by a boat without sails, and “go upstream (south)” by a boat with sails.] Their confusion is recorded in the stele of Tuthmosis I, in the reference to “that inverted water which goes downstream (north) in going upstream (south)”<sup>18,19</sup>. In other words, the ancient Egyptians discovered a sort of “antiwater”. We mean that it could be misleading to name antimatter (which travels forward in time) that normal matter which is going backwards in time, even though we seem constrained to follow our time-arrow and, consequently, such a description could seem more appropriate and simpler. On the contrary, we think that a description wherein we need a lower number of kinds of particles and in which the world is more symmetric should be the most convenient from the point of view of the understanding of the world itself (just like to put, ideally, ourselves on the Sun, i.e. in the more symmetric situation, was so useful and fruitful).

As an example of what we mean when speaking of not considering phenomena only from our TRF and of imagining to see things from another point of view, consider for a moment the well known Wheeler–Feynman absorber theory<sup>20–23</sup> (which proposes that an accelerated charge will not radiate unless there is to be absorption at some other distant place and future time) and, in particular, the pertaining Lewis’ paradox<sup>21</sup>: “The light coming from a distant star is absorbed, let us say, by a molecule of chlorophyl which has recently been produced in a living plant. We say that the light from the star was on its way toward us a thousand years ago. What rapport can there be between the emitting source and this newly made molecule of chlorophyl?”. Namely, the *future* behaviour of a distant absorber seems to determine the *past* event of radiation. The conflict between this view and common sense (Lewis wrote: “Such an idea is repugnant to

all our notions of causality and temporal sequence.”) is due only to the fact that we do not consider the “viewpoint” of the photon itself: it has constant proper time and any distance and time interval are reduced to zero for it; somehow it “occupies” the whole space at every time in a sort of single event; it does not need to know where and when it will be absorbed, since all happens here and now. It is just our misleading space-time view which is affected by the paradox. In the same way even the wave-particle dualism can be seen as a “distortion” due to our different point of view: since the photon (or the electromagnetic wave) “pervades” all the space, we can describe it as something expanding spherically around the emitter when considering its propagation in space, but it is more convenient to deal with a particle when it is absorbed somewhere. Again, all this does not matter to the photon which not even knows it is travelling with an oddly invariant speed that is only due to our necessity of splitting its existence in space and time at a rate inherent in the space-time itself.

Moreover, the long standing problem of advanced and retarded radiations<sup>22–30</sup> acquires new significance. The advanced solutions to Maxwell equations could merely be the retarded ones as seen from the other TRF, so as the positrons are the backward-running electrons: what is emitted in a TRF is seen as being absorbed in the other one. Another possibility is that we “see” only the retarded radiations just because we are travelling forward in time and the advanced ones are those which would be seen from the other TRF. Otherwise the backward-moving matter could not be visible, since its emitted photons becomes absorbed ones, and a hypothetical “antistar” would appear as a sort of black hole sucking radiation in rather than supplying it...but this is another odd and complicated story. On the contrary, if the advanced solutions to Maxwell equations have this meaning, the backward-travelling observers can see the star emitting the usually unobserved advanced radiation which, for them, becomes a retarded one. In this case, the antistar would appear, instantaneously, as a normal star, but, as time goes by, we could see its backward evolution in a universe which is going towards a big crunch.

The photon, in its “single-event interaction”, does not distinguish between future and past, and we, as space-time observers, must “spread” such an interaction over finite space and time intervals, towards the future, since we are going there, and towards *our* future when the emission comes from “antimatter”, by means of its advanced radiation, since we see this one as endowed with positive energy. In few words,



the advanced radiation would be the one absorbed by backward-running receivers and this could be the explanation of why we do not usually see it.

We want to conclude with a question. Is it completely true that the two alternative descriptions (antimatter and backward-going matter) are equivalent at all? It is true in the ambit of special relativity and quantum field theories, but... what about thermodynamics? We are not able to see (or to produce) large collections of antiparticles, up to now we only “see” elementary objects. Maybe, in the future, we shall be able to observe an isolated macroscopic system of antimatter (e.g. an “antigas” made of “antimolecules”) and to discover how it behaves. If we observe, for instance, an increase of its entropy, we shall be allowed to forget this discussion. If the entropy, on the contrary, happens to decrease, at least, we shall not cut the figure of the ancient Egyptians.

## REFERENCES

1. Einstein, A. *Ann. Phys. (Leipzig)* **17**, 891–921 (1905).
2. Recami, E. & Mignani, R. *Riv. Nuovo Cimento* **4**, 209–290 (1974); Erratum, **4**, 398 (1974).
3. Mignani, R. & Recami, E. *Nuovo Cimento A* **24**, 438–448 (1974).
4. Mignani, R. & Recami, E. *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **12**, 299–320 (1975).
5. Recami, E. & Ziino, G. *Nuovo Cimento A* **33**, 205–215 (1976).
6. Recami, E. *Found. Phys.* **8**, 329–340 (1978).
7. Caldirola, P. & Recami, E. in *Italian Studies in the Philosophy of Science* (ed Dalla Chiara, M. L.) 249–298 (Reidel, Boston, 1980).
8. Recami, E. & Rodrigues, W. A. *Found. Phys.* **12**, 709–718 (1982); Erratum, **13**, 553 (1983).
9. Pavšič, M. & Recami, E. *Lett. Nuovo Cimento* **34**, 357–362 (1982); Erratum, **35**, 352 (1982).
10. Recami, E. *Riv. Nuovo Cimento* **9**, No. 6, 1–178 (1986).
11. Dirac, P. A. M. *Proc. R. Soc. London, Ser. A* **126**, 360 (1930).
12. Stückelberg, E. C. G. *Helv. Phys. Acta* **14**, 588–594 (1941).
13. Stückelberg, E. C. G. *Helv. Phys. Acta* **15**, 23–37 (1942).
14. Feynman, R. P. *Phys. Rev.* **74**, 939–946 (1948).
15. Feynman, R. P. *Phys. Rev.* **76**, 749–759 (1949).
16. Bilaniuk, O. M., Deshpande, V. K. & Sudarshan, E. C. G. *Am. J. Phys.* **30**, 718–723 (1962).
17. Bilaniuk, O. M. & Sudarshan, E. C. G. *Nature* **223**, 386–387 (1969).
18. Stele of King Tuthmosis I, translated in Breasted, J. H. *Ancient Records of Egypt* Vol. 2, 31 (Russel & Russel, Inc., New York, 1906).
19. Csonka, P. L. *Phys. Rev.* **180**, 1266–1281 (1969).
20. Tetrode, H. *Z. Phys.* **10**, 317–328 (1922).
21. Lewis, G. N. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **12**, 22–29 (1926).
22. Wheeler, J. A. & Feynman, R. P. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **17**, 157–181 (1945).
23. Wheeler, J. A. & Feynman, R. P. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **21**, 425–433 (1949).
24. Stratton, J. A. *Electromagnetic Theory* 428 (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1941).

25. Popper, K. *Nature* **177**, 538 (1956).
26. Hoyle, F. & Narlikar, J. V. *Proc. R. Soc. London, Ser. A* **277**, 1–23 (1964).
27. Aichelburg, P. C. & Beig, R. *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **98**, 264–283 (1976).
28. Stephenson, L. M. *Found. Phys.* **8**, 921–926 (1978).
29. Cramer, J. G. *Found. Phys.* **13**, 887–902 (1983).
30. Anderson, J. L. *Am. J. Phys.* **60**, 465–467 (1992).