

Immanuel Kant on Supersymmetry: A Practical Evaluation

Alexander Unzicker

Pestalozzi-Gymnasium München, Germany

aunzicker@web.de

October 30, 2018

Abstract

A short review of the motivations for supersymmetry in astrophysics and particle physics is given. Despite the amount of theoretical research conducted in the past decades, no observational evidence for supersymmetry has yet been found. While a large part of the community is expecting supersymmetry to be discovered in the Large Hadron Collider (LHC), some of the basic arguments in favor are disputed here. Since it is not excluded that the author's view may be biased by his research, he proposes a bet on the discovery of supersymmetric particles: According to the philosopher Immanuel Kant, the bet marks the difference between persuasion and conviction.

Supersymmetric particles as dark matter candidates. The Swiss astronomer Fritz Zwicky observed as early as 1933 that the velocities of individual galaxies in clusters were much higher than expected. The gravitational potential of the visible matter would have been insufficient to keep them within the cluster - the first hint towards the existence of 'dark matter'. In the meantime, numerous observations indicate that only a small part of matter in the universe is visible. Flat rotation curves of galaxies, overly hot gas in clusters detected by X-rays, lensing results, and the homogeneity of the cosmic microwave background, which cannot account for the observed structure formation. In the latter case, even an extra assumption about fluctuations of dark matter had to be invoked.

From a general perspective, many results are contradictory, and still do not fit into the common picture [1]. Even the celebrated discovery of dark energy is sometimes considered as a post-hoc-fix involving a new free parameter [2]. In particular, the issue of small accelerations has received some attention: can we be sure about the validity of the law of gravitation for accelerations in the regime $10^{-10}ms^{-2} \approx \frac{c}{T_u}$ (T_u being the age of the universe) ? The Pioneer anomaly [3, 1, 4, 5] hints in that direction, as well as velocity dispersions in globular clusters [6]. Many experts on galaxy dynamics claim that their observations cannot be explained by particles whatsoever [7, 8, 9]. The greatest obstacle for dark matter theories is the successful phenomenological description of rotation curves by MOND [10, 2, 11]. Although this theory is not convincing at all, the appearance of the enigmatic acceleration of $10^{-10}ms^{-2}$ allows only two conclusions: either more than 1000 spiral galaxies agreed on fooling today's astronomers or gravity is not yet understood on a fundamental level. To summarize, the astrophysical evidence for the existence of supersymmetric particles seems to be much less than commonly assumed. A closer look at the details reveals that such an explanation is somewhat naive.

Tired of the standard model. Some parameters of the standard model of particle physics vary with energy; this phenomenon is called 'running constants'. Though the energy range of the observations, considering logarithmic scales, is not large, the trend of the coupling constants of the basic interactions can be extrapolated. [12] Unfortunately, the three straight lines do not cross in one point. According to supersymmetric models, this crossover can be achieved by a particle in the range of $\sim 1 TeV$. In that case, one may hope for a 'unification' of the interactions at high energies. Though

this paradigm requires further assumptions like the ‘desert hypothesis’ (nothing interesting happens in the energy range in between), this type of extrapolation seems ambitious, if not ridiculous: 11 orders of magnitude, and a justification by error analysis is still missing.

Theoretical reasons. The standard model claims a unification of the electromagnetic, the weak and the strong force by means of the symmetry group $U(1) \times SU(2) \times SU(3)$. However, this is merely a framework of analogies, in which many elements are still missing. Sheldon Glashow, Nobel prize winner for the standard model, said [13]:

This theory is an ad hoc construction, we had to insert a couple of things which are still mysterious. For instance, why do the particle masses have the values we observe ?

More drastically, this was emphasised by Richard Feynman [14]:

‘Three theories. Strong interactions, weak interactions, and the electromagnetic. . . . The theories are linked because they seem to have similar characteristics. . . . Where does it go together? Only if you add some stuff we dont know. There isnt any theory today that has $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ whatever the hell it is that we know is right, that has any experimental check... Now, these guys are all trying to put all this together. They’re *trying* to. But they havn’t. Okay?’

Given this, it seems that theoreticians do not sufficiently reflect whether the symmetry group approach can satisfactory be filled with physics. Howard Georgi, who dealt with great unified theories and therefore not a suspect of fundamentalists’s criticism, said:

‘Symmetry is a tool for finding the underlying dynamics, which subsequently has to explain the success (or failure) of the symmetry arguments. Group theory is a useful method, but does not substitute physics.’

Such reflections seem to die out, and despite Wolfgang Pauli’s harsh expression ‘group pest’, group theory has become the dominant language of particle physics.

Since the group $SU(5)$ beautifully embraces the glue-construct $U(1) \times SU(2) \times SU(3)$, supersymmetry had been considered as a natural extension of the standard model. According to that hypothesis, to every boson (integer spin) there should exist a partner fermion (half-integer spin), and vice versa. The partners are named with a s-prefix or suffix -ino. But how do a ‘selectron’ and a ‘sproton’ form a ‘satom’, since the hydrogen atom is a boson? It seems somehow naive to believe that nature just doubles its properties, though a prominent precursor for such a process exists: Paul Dirac had predicted the positron and the antiproton before their discovery. However, these partners have - besides their opposite charge - otherwise identical properties, in particular masses, while the necessarily different masses of superpartners are usually explained by a ‘broken symmetry’. But how beautiful is a symmetry that breaks as soon as it meets the facts ?

Open issues. The problem that the standard model of particle physics is unable to calculate masses, is not ameliorated by supersymmetry, even worse: while for the Higgs boson, the desired but missing ingredient of the standard model, at least an energy range is predicted. Supersymmetry, on the other hand, does not predict masses at all. If a particle is discovered, it is fine, if not, the theory will survive at higher energies. According to the fairplay rules of scientific methodology given by Karl Popper, this is dangerously close to non-falsifiability: the theory behaves like someone who likes winning, but not loosing.

Richard Feynman stresses the same point in his sarcastic fashion [15]:

‘Somebody makes up a theory: The proton is unstable. They make a calculation and find that there would be no protons in the universe any more! So the fiddle around with their numbers, putting a higher mass into the new particle, and after much effort they predict that the proton will decay at a rate slightly less than the last measured rate the proton has shown not to decay at.’

Last but not least, postulating about 100 freely adjustable constants, supersymmetry reminds us from an erosion of scientific theories described by the philosopher Thomas Kuhn: such an increase of unexplained numbers was the characteristic attribute of the geocentric view of the world which led to the well-known epicycles of the Ptolemaic theory.

Kant, conviction and the bet. To summarize, we find that a mixture of physically motivated aspirations and purely mathematical reasoning led to > 40000 publications in the past decades, according to SPIRES [16]. Given that up to now there is no experimental verification of any prediction made, this could lead to sociological considerations, but given that such a strong conviction of the existence of supersymmetry lives on,

one should try to measure it. The German philosopher Immanuel Kant wrote in his most famous work, *The Critique of Pure Reason*:

The usual test, whether that which any one maintains is merely his persuasion, or his subjective conviction at least, that is, his firm belief, is a bet. It frequently happens that a man delivers his opinions with so much boldness and assurance, that he appears to be under no apprehension as to the possibility of his being in error. The offer of a bet startles him, and makes him pause. Sometimes it turns out that his persuasion may be valued at a ducat, but not at ten. For he does not hesitate, perhaps, to venture a ducat, but if it is proposed to stake ten, he immediately becomes aware of the possibility of his being mistaken - a possibility which has hitherto escaped his observation. If we imagine to ourselves that we have to stake the happiness of our whole life on the truth of any proposition, our judgement drops its air of triumph, we take the alarm, and discover the actual strength of our belief. Thus pragmatical belief has degrees, varying in proportion to the interests at stake.

Nicholas Wethington, in an article in *Universe Today* [17], commented:

If you haven't had the fortune (as have I) of four years studying philosophy, this passage from Kant can be neatly summed up with the old adage, 'Put your money where your mouth is.'

A modern possibility how to realize Kant's proposal are prediction markets like Intrade.com. Contracts on the discovery of supersymmetric particles can be traded there like stock options, which allows bet both on the discovery and the non-discovery. Since the first results from the LHC are expected soon, it is time for the 'pragmatical belief' to be evaluated.

How to bet on a supersymmetric particle at a prediction market. ¹

A prediction market like Intrade is based on the trade of contracts on given events. The idea is that the actual price is a measure of the probability that the event will happen. If you believe for instance that a supersymmetric particle will be discovered until the end of 2011, you may buy the contract SUSY.PARTICLE.DEC11. It is noteworthy that you may even *sell* contracts that you do not hold, in case you do not believe the event will happen.

After opening an account and uploading a deposit one may start betting immediately. Contracts have a nominal value of \$10 corresponding to 100 points. You may buy one of the contracts SUSY.PARTICLE.DEC10 or even SUSY.PARTICLE.DEC13 if you believe the discovery will occur within the period ² or sell, if you don't believe. As in a stock market, there is a bid and an ask price.³ If the event happens, the contract achieves the value 100, if not, zero. This relates the current rate directly to the percent probability that the event will happen. All other technical details how to bet there can be found in [18] which describes a corresponding bet on the Higgs boson.

It is suggested that the use of prediction markets in science can enhance the evaluation of research.

¹A corresponding description for the Higgs boson is given at the site www.Bet-On-The-Higgs.com

²The relevant date is the date of publication.

³http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ask_price

References

- [1] A. Unzicker. Why do we Still Believe in Newton's Law ? Facts, Myths and Methods in Gravitational Physics. *ArXiv: gr-qc/0702009*, 2007.
- [2] A. Aguirre et.al. TOPICAL REVIEW: Astrophysical constraints on modifying gravity at large distances. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 18:223–+, December 2001, hep-ph/0105083.
- [3] J. D. Anderson et.al. Study of the anomalous acceleration of Pioneer 10 and 11. *Physical Review D*, 65(8):082004–+, April 2002, gr-qc/0104064.
- [4] C. Lämmerzahl et.al. Is the physics within the solar system really understood ? *arXiv*, gr-qc/0604052, 2006.
- [5] S. G. Turyshev and V. T. Toth. The Pioneer Anomaly. *ArXiv: 1001.3686*, 2010.
- [6] R. Scarpa et.al. Using globular clusters to test gravity in the weak acceleration regime. *The Messenger*, 128:41–+, 2007, arXiv:0707.2459.
- [7] G. Gentile et.al. NGC 3741: the dark halo profile from the most extended rotation curve. *Monthly Notices of the Roy. Astr. Soc.*, 375:199–212, 2007, arXiv:astro-ph/0611355.
- [8] N. W. Evans. No Need for Dark Matter in Galaxies? In N. J. C. Spooner and V. Kudryavtsev, editors, *Identification of Dark Matter*, pages 85–+, 2001, astro-ph/0102082.
- [9] J. A. Sellwood and A. Kosowsky. Does Dark Matter Exist? In J. E. Hibbard, M. Rupen, and J. H. van Gorkom, editors, *Gas and Galaxy Evolution*, volume 240 of *Astronomical Society of the Pacific Conference Series*, pages 311–+, astro-ph/0009074, 2001.
- [10] J. Bekenstein and M. Milgrom. Does the missing mass problem signal the breakdown of Newtonian gravity? *Astrophysical Journal*, 286:7–14, November 1984.
- [11] R. H. Sanders and S. S. McGaugh. Modified Newtonian Dynamics as an Alternative to Dark Matter. *ArXiv:astro-ph/0204521*, 2002.
- [12] U. Amaldi et.al. Comparison of grand unified theories with electroweak and strong coupling constants measured at lep. *Physics Letters B*, 260:447–455, 1991.
- [13] P. Davies and R. Brown. *Superstrings*. Cambridge niversity Press, Cambridge, 1988.
- [14] James Gleick. *Genius - The Life and Science of Richard Feynman*. Pantheon, New York, 1992.
- [15] R. P. Feynman. *QED - a Strange Theory of Light and Matter*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1985.
- [16] P. Woit. *Not Even Wrong: The Failure of String Theory and the Search for Unity in Physical Law*. Jonathan Cape, 2006.
- [17] Nicholos Wethington. The LHC Will Discover the Higgs. Wanna Bet? *Universe Today*, Dec 2nd, 2010.
- [18] A. Unzicker. How to Determine the Probability of the Higgs Boson Detection. *ArXiv: 0912.0443*, 2009.