

Massless Electron and Fractional Spin as Electronic Charge

S.C. Tiwari

Institute of Natural Philosophy

1, Kusum Kutir, Mahamanapuri, Varanasi - 221 005, India

email: vns_sctiwari@yahoo.com

Abstract

The standard model (SM) of particle physics has been supported by several experimental findings, the most remarkable of them being the discovery of the weak gauge bosons , W and Z. It is expected that the Higgs boson could show up by 2007 at LHC, CERN. In spite of this, the unsatisfactory features of the SM at conceptual level, and exclusion of gravity from the unification scheme have led to explore 'the physics beyond the SM'.

A critique and comprehensive review of the contemporary fundamental physics was presented in a monograph completed in the centenary year,1997 of the discovery of the electron. A radically new approach to address foundational problems was outlined: masslessness of bare electron ,interpretation of the squared electronic charge in terms of the fractional spin, e^2/c ; new physical significance of the electromagnetic potentials, 2+1 dimensional internal structure of electron and neutrino, and composite photon are some of the ideas proposed. Though the monograph was reviewed by E. J. Post(Physics Essays, June1999), it has remained largely inaccessible. I believe some of these unconventional ideas have a potential to throw light on the fundamental questions in physics, and therefore deserve a wider dissemination.

The reader may find illuminating to supplement Sec. 3 on the weak gauge bosons with a candid,graceful and personal recollection by Pierre Darriulat(CERN Courier, April 2004, p.13).

1 Introduction

Reality is simple and comprehensible to the human mind. Or is it complex and beyond intellect? It would seem that if it is simple then it is not interesting, and the claim of

the perception of the reality would be viewed with disbelief. Paradoxically, however, it is the search of the ultimate reality whether in the form of the elementary constituents of the matter or a unified theory of nature which has been the prime goal of science. Is this goal attainable? I think a scientist can glimpse the reality as a personal subjective experience, however, a fundamental scientific theory for the ultimate reality or its representation in a physical form will never be possible. Quite often, the most intense and fruitful debate in science has occurred due to the conflicting beliefs of the original minds. Certitude in their beliefs may have some relationship with their transcendental experiences to perceive the reality. Pathways to such experiences influence one's mind so strongly that one is led to view everything within that framework. Doubts and reexamination of such beliefs dispassionately are necessary to free them from the transcendental elements. Rarely do we find also the liberated minds who are not attached to their ideas. The writings of Henry Poincare give an impression of his being such a liberated thinker [1]. It may be pointed out that detachment should not be viewed as sterile and inactive mind; a passionate enquirer may afford to be a liberated mind. Excessive attachment may hamper creativity and originality of an individual, and may harm scientific discourses on the fundamental problems. The role of unobservables and metaphysical elements in a physical theory seem to be related; the Bohr-Einstein debate on the interpretation and foundations of quantum mechanics, and the nature of time are discussed in [2] from this viewpoint. In this monograph I will adopt thus outlook both for the criticisms of the established theories and for alternative propositions.

The subject matter of this study, the electron, discovered a hundred years ago, may appear obsolete, and give the impression of moving backward in time. In the light of the vast knowledge accumulated since the discovery of the electron, announced on 29 April, 1897 in a Friday Evening Discourse at the Royal Institution by J.J. Thomson, my aim is to analyze the fundamental problems related with the electron in a modern perspective, and to propound a radically new alternative approach. This book is, therefore, not a historical treatise or a popular account of the discovery of the electron. It is worth explaining the necessity and the significance of this work.

In the Review of Particle Physics [3], the electron is listed as just one amongst hundreds of elementary particles, and precise measured values of its physical properties

are given. So, what else is there to discuss? A discomforting feature is immediately obvious: the periodic table of the elements has 112 entries, while the number of the elementary particles is very large as compared to this. Not only this, the much acclaimed unified gauge theory does not explain the physical meaning of the elementary properties like charge, mass, and spin of, let us say the electron, while at the same time many more new quantum numbers are introduced. A brief non-technical discussion on the elementary particle physics may be helpful to appreciate these remarks.

From the extract of M. Ampere's proposition given in the Source Book by Magie (M. p.114) we learn that the name particle is given to an infinitely small portion of a body of the same nature as the body; the particles are made up of molecules, and a molecule is an assemblage of atoms. In contrast to this the modern treatment postulates elementary particles as the constituents of atoms. Initially the idea that atoms are composite structures of elementary particles was indeed quite attractive as there were very few such constituent particles, e.g. electron, proton and neutron. As for the interaction between them, amongst the four fundamental forces of nature, the gravitational force and the electromagnetic force have been known since long, and both are long range forces. The gravitational force is so weak that it does not seem to be important in elementary particle interactions, to be precise at the practical energy scales. The other two forces are short range forces with highly different strengths, termed as weak and strong forces. The advent of quantum theory led to a new language and description for the forces: field quanta and their exchange during interactions. For quite some time there were only the electromagnetic field quantum: photon, and Yukawa's hypothesized strong field quanta : mesons. Binding of nucleons (neutron and proton) in the nuclei of atoms is explained by postulating strong force, and the beta-decay by the weak force. Later discoveries of new particles necessitated the classification of them as leptons which are not sensitive to the strong force, and rest of them as hadrons. The scheme that atoms and nuclei are composite objects of the elementary building blocks i.e. neutron, proton and electron was extended to the newly discovered hadrons. Fermi and Yang suggested pion (π -meson) as a bound nucleon-antinucleon state. Sakata accounted for strange hadrons in terms of the triplet of proton, neutron and lambda particles with the symmetry group SU(3). Baryon is a hadron obeying the Fermi-Dirac statistics i.e. a fermion, and meson is a

hadron obeying the Bose-Einstein statistics i.e. a boson.

G. Zweig and M. Gell-Mann in 1964 independently proposed the quark model for hadrons. In the earliest version of the triplet model, three types of basic building blocks called quarks are postulated possessing spin half, and fractional electric charge and baryon numbers. The mesons are quark-antiquark bound states, and baryons have three quarks as their constituents. Now we have quarks characterized by six flavors, and each flavor comes in three colors. The color is strong interaction charge, analogous to the electric charge in electromagnetic interactions. There is a difference, however, the strong field quanta called gluons carry color unlike the photon which is neutral. The hadrons are postulated to be colorless composite particles. Even the quarks and leptons as elementary particles are not small in number. Speculating sub-leptons and sub-quarks exotic models also exist in the literature. The question arises: Is this philosophy satisfactory? I do not think in this way we may know the ultimate constituents of the matter. An alternative view-point could be that the space-time structure itself is the most elementary entity, and the matter is a manifestation of the geometry of the space-time. This idea makes physical sense if there is a viable scheme for the elementary particle model. Amongst the known elementary particles the stable ones are electron (positron), neutrinos, photon and proton. Excluding the heavy particle proton, it is possible that massless particles and electron could be the elementary constituents of matter. To explore this idea we need to understand them at a basic level, and direct our attention on the electron because it is distinct from neutrinos and photon since it has charge and mass.

Related to the elementary constituents, there is the question of fundamental interactions and their unification. The interaction between the quarks and the leptons is believed to be described by the Standard Model (SM) which is a gauge theory of strong, weak and electromagnetic interactions. The principle of gauge symmetry, and formal structure of quantum electrodynamics have played pivotal role in the development of the SM. The gauge group in QED is $U(1)$ while the SM has the gauge group $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$. The gauge theory of strong interaction in color space is called quantum chromodynamics (QCD) with the gauge group $SU(3)$. The effective coupling constant in QCD is energy dependent decreasing with increasing energy. This phenomenon is known as asymptotic freedom. Unified theory of weak

and electromagnetic interactions i.e. the electroweak theory is described by the gauge group $SU(2) \times U(1)$. Besides photon, there are weak vector gauge bosons, W^+ , W^- and Z in this theory. Both QCD and the electroweak theory have been proved to be renormalisable theories. Wider symmetry groups like $SU(5)$ for grand unification in view of the opposite energy dependence of the coupling constants of QCD and electroweak theory have been proposed. Supersymmetric generalizations of the SM using the supersymmetry which relates bosons and fermions have also been made. Discovery of neutral weak current, weak gauge bosons and quarks signatures in high energy collisions, and precision measurements in particle physics give confidence in the SM. Weaknesses of the SM have also been noted by the physicists, and incorporation of gravitational force is considered as one of the most outstanding problems in the unification scheme. In the next chapter, we will discuss some of the questions related with the Standard Model, here we point out the most unsatisfactory aspect of the SM: it does not explain the meaning of charge and mass (of the electron). The electroweak theory is hailed as a great synthesis in the spirit of the Maxwell theory of electromagnetism. Unfortunately, none of the foundational problems are solved: structure of the electron, duality of the source and the field, incurable infinities in point field theory, the meaning of charge, mass and spin.

Postulating unobservable particles like quarks and gluons, and introducing many more quantum numbers or charges in abstract internal spaces in a theory aimed at unification indicate fundamental flaw in the approach. Most of the elementary particles are inferred from the expected indirect signatures (like decay modes). T.D. Lee has remarked [4] that “The progress of particle physics is closely tied to the discovery of resonances, which started at the Chicago Cyclotron. Yet even the great Enrico Fermi, when he proposed the machine, did not envisage this at all. After the discovery of the first nucleon resonance, for almost a year Fermi expressed doubts whether it was genuine”. Proliferation of new particles in the laboratory, and the remote methods of their observations which include arbitrariness in the fitting parameters at least call for a cautious approach in attributing them the physical reality. The words of William Crookes [5] are probably quite relevant today : “I hope I may be allowed to record some theoretical speculations which have gradually formed in my mind during the progress of these experiments. I put them forward only as working hypotheses,

useful, perhaps necessary, in first dawn of new knowledge, but only to be retained as long as they are of assistance; for experimental research is necessarily and slowly progressive, and one's early provisional hypotheses have to be modified, adjusted, perhaps altogether abandoned in deference to later observations". It is true that the quark model which is now one of the basic ingredients of the Standard Model, was not acceptable to the physicists when it was first proposed. Kendall mentions the story how Zweig's paper could not be published until the mid 1970s [6]. But the current dogmatic faith in the SM is also unwarranted; the dissatisfaction with the trends in particle physics is best summed up by Dirac [7]: "Still, that was the situation in those days; people were very reluctant to postulate a new particle. The situation is quite different nowadays, when people are only too willing to postulate a new particle on the slightest evidence, either theoretical or experimental".

Experience in particle physics so far has unambiguously shown that understanding the ultimate constituents of matter by performing high energy scattering experiments and the current paradigm for developing a "theory of everything" are proving to be mirages. There is, therefore, a need to look for an alternative approach to deal with the fundamental problems in physics. I think understanding the electron and the electromagnetism may throw light in this direction. We know that the gauge theories in various forms have underlying guiding theory that of the electromagnetic fields, and the development of quantum theory was inspired by the "radical revision of classical dynamics for the electron". The existing reviews or discussions adopt the viewpoint dividing the problems at classical or quantum level. But the theories are the descriptions of the phenomena, not the phenomena, therefore, this separation is artificial obscuring the physical origin of the problems. In this monograph, an integrated and constructive critique on the structure and dynamics of the electron is presented. The classical electromagnetism was developed based on the macroscopic experimental laws, and the discovery of the electron and the postulate of light quantum (or photon) historically took place at a later time. It is by tradition that electric and magnetic fields are associated with the electron and the photon. Could this be the source of the foundational problems? The answer in affirmative is provided in the present work. Similarly, it is argued that endowing rest mass (nonzero) to the electron is by definition; one can account for the electron dynamics assuming it to

be massless. Thus the proposed elementary objects or particles are massless electron and neutrino, and the photon is considered a composite structure with neutrinos as its constituents. The fundamental entity is postulated to be space-time bounded structure. The charge and interaction should be explained in terms of space-time symmetries. Pondering over the meaning of electronic charge, e and the fine structure constant, $\alpha = e^2/\hbar c = 1/137$ (where $\hbar = h/2\pi$, h is the Planck's constant, and c is the velocity of light) it occurred to me that e^2/c has the dimension of the angular momentum. Does this indicate a relationship between charge and spin or rotation? Explaining charge in this way also brings us closer to our goal of reducing everything to the space-time. Here it must be mentioned that recently I discovered that the curious dimension of e^2/c was noticed by Einstein as early as 1907 [8]. This monograph thus deals with very unconventional ideas, and suggests radical paradigm shift for the fundamental physics [9]. Photon-fluid, two dimensional space + one dimensional time physics and knot theory are identified deserving serious attention of the experts with a new perspective presented here.

2 Speculation and experimental philosophy

Speculation is the lifestream of the experimental science, without speculation and hypotheses the empirical data is merely an information directory. Speculative ideas serve the purpose of bringing deeper secrets on the horizon, and quite often stimulate meaningful experimentation and theoretical investigations. The quote above from the Bakerian Lecture of Crookes [5], hypotheses proposed by Issac Newton despite his claim 'hypotheses non fingo' [10] and Poincare's influential work 'La Science et l'Hypothese' [1] quite convincingly illustrate the importance of speculation in science. However, it is also an equally important fact that almost always new ideas have been rejected or resisted by the scientists who themselves have been responsible for original work. G.P. Thomson, son of J.J. Thomson notes [11] : "In looking back at it, one is impressed by the extent to which a theory long held can blind even first-rate minds to new ideas and by how easy it is to explain almost anything in terms of a favorite theory". J.J. Thomson himself recollects [12]: "At first there were very few who believed in the existence of these bodies smaller than atoms. I was even

told long afterwards by a distinguished physicist who had been present at my lecture at the Royal Institution that he thought I had been ‘pulling their legs’. I was not surprised at this, as I had myself come to this explanation of my experiments with great reluctance ...”. The Thomsons are referring to the controversy regarding the nature of the cathode rays whether they were some form of aetherial waves or material particles. New arguments and experiments were put forward to support one belief or the other. The famous debate on the interpretation of quantum mechanics between Einstein and Bohr shows that to support one’s beliefs scientists continue to invent newer arguments. I have attempted to understand this psychology of scientists or rather original minds in terms of subtle transcendental experiences which lead them to form quite often a rigid world outlook [2]. It is only unequivocal experiments which force them to dilute their beliefs arising from their transcendental experiences. In the absence of such experiments if the philosophical or the logical arguments are the deciding factors they are most likely to stick to their beliefs. In the case of the cathode rays, experiments clinched the issue in favour of material particle interpretation, while the debate on the quantum mechanics has not ceased due to the undecidable nature of the outcome of the most sophisticated experiments performed till date.

I think resistance to new ideas inspired by the philosophical beliefs based on certain experiences is natural, unavoidable, and most of the time proves fruitful in the quest for the knowledge. Since late 1970s, an unfortunate trend has gained prominence : it is not so much the scientific beliefs as the nonscientific factors like marketism and emergence of ‘big science’ that unconventional simple alternatives are blocked. Do the words like ‘Theory of Everything’ or the ‘Standard Model’ reflect humility and openness expected with the ever expanding knowledge? Superstring theory, termed as the ‘theory of everything’ by John Ellis [13], has remained unconnected with the physical world; Frank Wilczek has rightly remarked that ‘I don’t like that term (theory of everything), It’s very, very arrogant and misleading’. Not only this, the high energy experimental results are also presented in such a manner that they have acquired an aura of the ultimate knowledge. Such a faith in a specific world-view is certainly not good for the endeavour of scientific truth, I believe the basic philosophy of experimental science demands serious rethinking on the direction and the value of contemporary science.

3 Wherefore high energy physics?

The particle accelerators and the collision experiments have certainly led to landmark discoveries, and have stimulated new and interesting physics. The question arises : should we build the accelerators for higher and higher energies? It would be illuminating to begin the discussion with a quotation from an article written in 1970 by Freeman J. Dyson [14], “there are two main ways of doing high energy physics. The rich man’s way is to build accelerators, which give high-intensity beams of particles with accurately controlled energy. The poor man’s way is to use the cosmic rays, which descend like the rain from heaven upon poor and rich alike, but have very low intensity and completely uncontrolled energy. I think there is a better-than-even chance that the major discoveries of the next 30 years in high energy physics will be made with cosmic rays. That is why I venture to say that it may be good for us, scientifically speaking to be poor.” Though Dyson’s forecast proved wrong, it is worth asking: Will it be true for the next 30 years i.e. first three decades of 21st century? I think, if we leave aside the hope for new discoveries with cosmic rays, it is fairly reasonable to expect that going for higher energies in laboratory will not be scientifically productive.

Historical importance of Rutherford scattering is well documented; in 1909 H. Geiger and E. Marsden performed alpha ray scattering experiments [15] in Rutherford’s laboratory. Thin foils of gold, approximately 0.5 micron thick were used as targets for the α -particle beams which as we know today are positively charged helium nuclei. Experimental results showed that most of the α -particles were deflected within an angle of 1 or 2 degree, while occasionally scattering at large angles of more than 45° and backward scattering also took place. Rutherford in 1911 proposed an atomic model using these experiments [15] in which the positively charged nucleus is concentrated in a radius of about 10^{-12} cm surrounded by negatively charged electrons. The earlier theoretical contributions for a planetary model of atom include those of Johnstone Stoney, J.P. Perrin and H. Nagaoka [16]. To probe deep into the structure of matter using scattering processes has been the basic approach since then in electron-atom collisions and elementary particle physics. I will discuss two important experiments in high energy physics and contrast their significance : deep

inelastic electron-proton scattering (MIT-SLAC experiment) and high energy proton-antiproton collision (CERN SPS UA1 and UA2 experiment).

Let us first discuss the meaning of high energy in particle physics. The total energy available for the production of new or additional particles in the scattering process is the center of mass energy. If the four-momenta of two particles in the collision are p_1 and p_2 (four-vector $p = (E, \mathbf{p})$ with masses m_1 and m_2 then the Lorentz-invariant scalar

$$s = (p_1 + p_2)^2 = (E_1 + E_2)^2 - (\mathbf{p}_1 + \mathbf{p}_2)^2 \quad (1)$$

determines the center of mass energy. In the laboratory frame, let particle 2 be stationary, and the laboratory frame energy of particle 1 be $E_{1\text{ lab}}$ then Eq. (1) gives

$$s = m_1^2 + m_2^2 + 2E_{1\text{ lab}}m_2 \quad (2)$$

In the center of mass frame, let $(E_{1\text{cm}}, \mathbf{p}_{1\text{cm}})$ and $(E_{2\text{cm}}, \mathbf{p}_{2\text{cm}})$ be the four momenta of the particles then $\mathbf{p}_{1\text{cm}} = -\mathbf{p}_{2\text{cm}}$, and Eq. (1) reduces to

$$s = (E_{1\text{cm}} + E_{2\text{cm}})^2 \quad (3)$$

In the conventional accelerators, a beam of particles is scattered from a fixed target; Eq. (2) shows that the center of mass energy \sqrt{s} increases roughly proportional to $\sqrt{E_{1\text{ lab}}}$. The beam colliders employ colliding beams of equal but opposite momenta, thus according to Eq. (3) higher values of s can be achieved in this case. The high energy region is determined by the mass scale of the particles of interest or the energy scale of the interaction. In mid 1950s the High Energy Physics Laboratory at Stanford utilized electron beam energy of 0.55 GeV to study the proton structure in the elastic scattering process

$$e^- + p \rightarrow e^- + p \quad (4)$$

These experiments showed that proton is not a point particle, but an extended structure. Compare the high energy region four decades later for the discovery of the sixth quark, top t . The top quark mass is a free parameter in the SM, and is believed to be ~ 200 times the mass of proton though the reason for this is not known. The $e^+ e^-$ accelerators at CERN and SLAC operate at $\sqrt{s} \sim 91$ GeV, but $M_t > 45$ GeV/ c^2

therefore the top quark cannot be observed in these accelerators. The top quark was finally discovered in 1994 [3] at the Fermilab Tevatron $p\bar{p}$ collider with $\sqrt{s} = 1800$ GeV = 1.8 TeV; the measured mass $M_t = 175 \pm 8$ GeV/ c^2 . The new $p\bar{p}$ collider LHC at CERN with $\sqrt{s} = 14$ TeV is expected to be operational within next few years.

3.1 The MIT-SLAC Experiment

The deep inelastic electron-proton scattering experiment has the same significance for the nucleons as the Geiger-Marsden-Rutherford α -particle scattering had for the atomic structure [15]. Inelastic scattering of electrons with liquid hydrogen and liquid deuterium targets was started in 1967 as MIT-SLAC collaborative project using electron beams with the highest energy of ~ 21 GeV in an underground two miles long accelerator. An idea of the tremendous amount of ingenuity, dedication and team-work required for building the machine and the high energy spectrometer can be had from the account given by Taylor [6]. For detailed theoretical treatment, we refer to a monograph exclusively on the deep inelastic scattering [17], and also [6]. Inelastic scattering is the process

$$e^- + p \rightarrow e^- + X \tag{5}$$

where X denotes one or more hadrons in the final state. This is an example of an inclusive reaction in which only the scattered electron is detected. For the collision process (5) one can define the following kinematic variables

$$q^2 = (p - p')^2 \tag{6}$$

$$\nu = \frac{p \cdot q}{M} \tag{7}$$

$$M_X^2 = (p + q)^2 \tag{8}$$

Here p and p' are the 4-momenta of the incoming and scattered electron, P and M are the 4-momentum and mass of the proton respectively, q , is the 4-momentum of the virtual photon, and M_X is the total mass of the hadron(s) X . In the laboratory

frame, neglecting the mass of the electron, we have

$$q^2 = -Q^2 = -4EE' \sin^2 \frac{\theta}{2} \quad (9)$$

$$\nu = E - E' \quad (10)$$

$$M_X^2 = M^2 - Q^2 + 2M\nu \quad (11)$$

where E , E' are the energies of the incident and scattered electron respectively and θ is the scattering angle. A dimensionless variable x is often used, defined by

$$x = \frac{Q^2}{2M\nu} \quad (12)$$

It can be shown that the differential cross section for the process (5) may be calculated using the Feynman diagram for this reaction to the lowest order electromagnetic electron-proton-coupling via the exchange of a virtual photon, and expressed in terms of the structure functions W_1 and W_2 as follows

$$\frac{d^2\sigma}{d\Omega dE'} = \sigma_M [W_2 + 2W_1 \tan^2 \frac{\theta}{2}] \quad (13)$$

Here σ_M is the Mott cross section

$$\sigma_M = \frac{\alpha^2 \cos^2 \theta/2}{4E^2 \sin^4 \theta/2} \quad (14)$$

Both W_1 and W_2 are functions of momentum transfer, Q^2 and energy loss, ν . In order to determine the structure functions, the differential cross section at several values of the angle θ for fixed ν and Q^2 has to be measured. The early experimental data showed two unexpected features: (1) the inelastic cross section was found to have weak dependence on the momentum transfer for large Q^2 , and (2) in the asymptotic region where both ν and Q^2 become very large $\rightarrow \infty$ keeping x to be finite, the structure functions showed the scaling behaviour

$$\nu W_2(Q^2, \nu) = F_2(x) \quad (15)$$

$$2MW_1(Q^2, \nu) = F_1(x) \quad (16)$$

In view of the existing contemporary interpretation of the elastic scattering data, both results appeared rather puzzling. The cross section for the process (4) was known to fall rapidly with the increasing momentum transfer as compared to that from a point charge. The electric and magnetic form factors in the cross section satisfied the dipole form for $Q^2 \leq 10 \text{ GeV}^2$.

$$G(Q)^2 = \left(1 + \frac{Q^2}{0.71 \text{ GeV}^2}\right)^{-2} \quad (17)$$

The accepted interpretation of these results was that the proton is not a point particle, but has a diffused extended structure with a size of ~ 0.8 Fermi. The deep (large Q^2) or continuum inelastic scattering experiments, on the other hand, seemed to indicate electron scattering from point particles. The question arose whether proton had internal structure with more elementary constituents. If yes, what are they? Though already quark model for hadron spectrum was there, it was thought more like a book keeping framework than a possible dynamical theory for strong interaction at that time. Bjorken's conjecture for scaling behavior using current algebra sum rules in 1967 prior to the MIT-SLAC data did not attract immediate attention. It has been pointed out [6] that Feynman's interpretation of the data in terms of the parton model in 1969 gave impetus to the model of the internal structure of the nucleons. For a critical evaluation of the parton model in the deep inelastic process, see [18]. Assuming partons to be point particles, and to be noninteracting with each other during virtual photon absorption one can calculate the cross section for the process (5). The variable x defined by Eq. (12) turns out to correspond to the ratio of the parton's momentum to the proton's momentum i.e. if N partons constitute a proton, then the momentum P_i of the i^{th} parton in the infinite momentum frame is given by $P_i = x_i P$, where x_i lies between 0 and 1. The infinite momentum frame is another way of looking at free partons. Let us assume that in the rest frame partons interact with each other changing their momenta during finite time intervals. As the momentum increases, the Lorentz transformation to the infinite momentum frame gives time dilation such that the changes occur so slow that the partons appear to be free. In this approximation scattering from a point charge e_i of a parton can be

calculated to give

$$W_2^i(Q^2, \nu) = e_i^2 \delta \left(\nu - \frac{Q^2}{2Mx_i} \right) \quad (18)$$

and the structure function

$$W_2(Q^2, \nu) = \sum_i \int_0^1 f_i(x_i) W_2^i dx_i \quad (19)$$

Here $f_i(x_i)$ is the probability of finding the i^{th} parton with the momentum fraction x_i . Substituting W_2^i from Eq. (18) and carrying out the integration in Eq. (19) finally we get

$$\nu W_2(Q^2, \nu) = \sum_i e_i^2 f_i(x) x \quad (20)$$

Comparing this equation with (15), we recognize that parton picture leads to Bjorken scaling. The calculation of scattering amplitude for scalar and spinor parton shows that while W_2 is unchanged, W_1 is zero for the former. In fact, for spin 1/2 partons

$$F_2(x) = xF_1(x) \quad (21)$$

and for spin zero partons

$$F_1(x) = 0 \quad (22)$$

in the Bjorken limit. Experiments show the behaviour expressed by Eq. (21), therefore, it can be concluded that partons are spin 1/2 particles. Are they quarks? This identification is not straightforward, however, a dynamical theory of quark-quark interaction with gluons as strong gauge fields, namely, the quantum chromodynamics was soon developed. The prediction of the logarithmic deviations from the Bjorken scaling confirmed in muon and neutrino scattering from nucleons gave confidence in the QCD. The theory was shown to be asymptotically free, which explained the assumption of free partons mentioned earlier.

3.2 The discovery of the weak gauge bosons

The discovery of the weak gauge bosons in the Super Proton Synchrotron $p\bar{p}$ collider at CERN is considered a great milestone in the quest for unified theory. The production

of W, Z with masses about 80 and 90 times the proton mass respectively was expected in the proton-antiproton collision at $\sqrt{s} = 540$ GeV achieved in the SPS collider. The idea of stochastic cooling pioneered by S. van der Meer, and sophisticated advanced electronics made it possible to accelerate and accumulate the $p\bar{p}$ beams to such a high energy range. In the SPS ring, 2.2 Km in diameter, the proton and antiproton beams accelerated to 26 GeV/c in the PS machine are injected in the opposite directions, and accelerated to high energy of 270 GeV. They are bunched for collisions to take place at well defined locations in the SPS ring. Antiprotons are created bombarding 26 GeV/c protons on Cu target in the PS. An accumulator ring in one day accumulates about 10^{11} antiprotons, which are accelerated to 26 GeV/c in the PS.

In the generation of intense antiproton beams the stochastic cooling has a key role. Random motion of particles in the beam is observed by pick-up sensors, and the signal is used in a kicker to push the particles towards a desired position [19]. Since the spread of the momenta of the particles is reduced in this process, it is referred to as beam cooling. The stochastic cooling is used in the antiproton storage ring, the Antiproton Accumulator of the SPS. The first project on $p\bar{p}$ collision was code-named UA1 (Underground Area), and was led by Carlo Rubbia, and the second experiment UA2 was led by Pierre Darriulat.

In the search for Ws, the reaction is

$$p + \bar{p} \rightarrow W^{\pm} + X \quad (23)$$

and from the decay mode

$$W^{\pm} \rightarrow e^{\pm} + \nu_e \quad (24)$$

detection of electrons and missing energy in the form of neutrinos provide hints for the Ws. Here X denotes other particles ‘the sum of the debris from the interactions of the other protons’ [19]. The process

$$Z \rightarrow e^{+} + e^{-} \quad \text{or} \quad \mu^{+} + \mu^{-} \quad (25)$$

is a factor of 10 less probable than (23), however, the leptonic decay modes are easier to detect.

In January, 1983 six possible W events by UA1 and four by UA2 were announced; observing high energy electrons in the detectors looking for them at relatively large angles to the beam direction. High energy particle tracks in opposite directions as a signature for Z neutral gauge boson were observed in both UA1 and UA2 detectors. The discovery was announced in June, 1983 based on 2 or 4 Z events [19]. Since then Fermi lab. in 1985, and the Stanford Linear Collider later detected the weak gauge boson events in large numbers.

3.3 Contrasting the two : alternatives

The first important difference in the two experiments is regarding the motivation. The MIT-SLAC experiment was planned to study the electro-production of resonances as a function of momentum transfer, and to probe the inelastic continuum in the high energy region. The unexpected results led to the discovery of the internal constituent model of the nucleons. On the other hand, in the SPS collider, the experiment was set to see the W and Z events almost with certainty. Equally important point distinguishing the two is the role of skepticism in analyzing the data. The first hint for the W events, few in number in millions of collisions, came in the beginning of January, 1983; and on 25 January, 1983 the discovery was announced in a Press Conference at CERN, more like a dramatic event. In contrast to this, the deep inelastic scattering experiments were carried out with thorough analysis. To quote from Kendall [6], “The collaboration was aware from the outset of the program that there were no accelerators in operation, or planned, that would be able to confirm the entire range of the results. The group carried out independent data analyses at MIT and at SLAC to minimize the chance of error. One consequence of the absence of comparable scattering facilities was that the collaboration was never pressed to conclude either data taking or analysis in competitive circumstances. It was possible throughout the program to take the time necessary to complete work thoroughly”.

Finally, the approach for theoretical interpretation is markedly different. The weak gauge bosons’ signatures were immediately identified confirming the SM. The results from the MIT-SLAC experiment led to intense debate comparing the parton model with other competing non-constituent models like the vector-dominance model and

Regge exchange mechanisms.

To conclude, more than the discoveries of tau-lepton in 1975 and b-quark ($b\bar{b}$ bound state) in 1977, it is the discovery of W and Z that gave big boost for building the accelerators at still higher energies. Most of the particle physicists believe that TeV energy range is absolutely essential for new physics. Such an approach seems unsatisfactory for at least two reasons: the maximum energy in the laboratory with best possible resources and funding is unlikely to reach 10^{15} GeV (the Grand Unification Scale), and secondly the indirect rare signatures in the TeV range will be extremely difficult to interpret, more so in view of many speculative models in between the SM and the GUT. Thus the need for alternative strategy is forced on us for down to earth practical reasons.

A logical approach in the best of the scientific traditions is to do precision experiments using the existing facilities. This program has already started [20], and deserves more attention and importance. It would be less expensive, and has a potential to probe new physics, if any. Exploring low energy physics afresh in the light of rich empirical data obtained in high energy experiments may also prove fruitful. For example, study of protonium ($p\bar{p}$ bound state) spectroscopy seems feasible in view of the recent remarkable success in creating anti-hydrogen ($\bar{p}e^+$ bound state) at CERN. Interesting results on the strong force may be expected from this. Low energy scattering for quark ionization such that scattered particle becomes fractionally charged seems another possible idea. Innovative ideas in this direction need to be encouraged.

In the present work, rethinking on the entire approach towards unification and ultimate reality is suggested: the principle of simplicity and parsimony guides us for searching the alternative. Would it not be the simplest idea if the space-time is the fundamental physical entity? Without postulating any new elementary constituents, the proposition that electron and neutrino are the elementary constituents of matter, is put forward to stimulate further investigations, and revision of the current focus on high energy physics.

4 Plan of the book

I have explained that this book is written with a radically new viewpoint on the foundational problems, however, technical rigour and scientific accuracy of the subject matter under discussion have been maintained. The reader with a background in field theory (both classical and quantum) should be able to appreciate the arguments presented. Quotations from the original writings are used to convey significant and unorthodox views of the writers, and sometimes just because I found them exceptionally lucid and effective. Exhaustive and complete review citing the work of all active researchers is not claimed, but the important contributions relevant for our arguments have been included. The Source Book by Magie and Whittaker's two volumes are referred to in the text by (M page number) and W (W vol page number) respectively due to frequent citations.

The organization of the text is such that one may classify it into four categories:

1. second Chapter reviews the Standard Model for unified strong, weak and electromagnetic forces with a critical commentary,
2. next three Chapters are devoted to the physical properties of the electron, neutrino and photon; their present understanding, outstanding problems and alternative ideas,
3. Chapters six to eight deal with the classical electrodynamics with emphasis on the foundational problems, attempts for the modifications, and field theory in the Weyl space, and
4. the last Chapter propounds a tentative model of the electron and outlines significance of three (2+1) dimensional field theories and knot theory for building an alternative model for the elementary particles and their interactions.

References

- [1] H. Poincare, The Foundations of Science (The Science Press,1946)

- [2] S. C. Tiwari, Phys. Essays 7, 22, 1994; in Proceedings Conference on Physical Interpretation of Relativity Theory(PIRT), British Society for the Philosophy of Science, London (September 1992 pp375-386)
- [3] Review of Particle Physics, Phys. Rev. D54 Part-I,1996
- [4] T. D. Lee, CERN Courier 27,7,1987
- [5] W. Crookes, Phil. Trans., Part-I,135,1879
- [6] R.E. Taylor, H.W. Kendall and J.I. Friedman, Rev. Mod. Phys.63,573-629,1991
- [7] P.A.M. Dirac,Directions in Physics (John Wiley 1978)
- [8] H.Woolf, ed. Some Strangeness in the Proportion (Addison-Wesley 1980)
- [9] S. C. Tiwari, in Global Conference on Mathematical Physics (Einstein Foundation International Nagpur,India 1987)
- [10] S.C. Tiwari, Phys. Essays 2,313,1989
- [11] G.P. Thomson, Phys. Today 20(5),55,1967
- [12] J.J. Thomson, Recollections and Reflections (Bell & Sons Ltd. London 1936)
- [13] F. Flam, Science 256,1518,1992
- [14] F. J. Dyson, Phys. Today, 23(9),23,1970
- [15] H. Geiger and E. Marsden, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) 82,495,1909; E. Rutherford, Phil. Mag. 21,669,1911
- [16] D. L. Anderson, The Discovery of the Electron (D. van Nostrand Co. Inc. 1964)
- [17] R.G. Roberts, The Structure of the Proton (C.U.P. 1990)
- [18] R.P. Feynman, Photon-Hadron Interactions (Reading, Mass, 1972)
- [19] S. van der Meer, C. Rubbia , Rev. Mod. Phys. 57.689-722.1985
- [20] P. Langacker, M.Luo, A.K. Mann, Rev. Mod. Phys. 64,87,1992