

1

Historical Introduction to the Elementary Particles

This chapter is a kind of ‘folk history’ of elementary particle physics. Its purpose is to provide a sense of how the various particles were first discovered, and how they fit into the overall scheme of things. Along the way some of the fundamental ideas that dominate elementary particle theory are explained. This material should be read quickly, as background to the rest of the book. (As history, the picture presented here is certainly misleading, for it sticks closely to the main track, ignoring the false starts and blind alleys that accompany the development of any science. That’s why I call it ‘folk’ history – it’s the way particle physicists like to remember the subject – a succession of brilliant insights and heroic triumphs unmarred by foolish mistakes, confusion, and frustration. It wasn’t really quite so easy.)

1.1

The Classical Era (1897–1932)

It is a little artificial to pinpoint such things, but I’d say that elementary particle physics was born in 1897, with J. J. Thomson’s discovery of the electron [1]. (It is fashionable to carry the story all the way back to Democritus and the Greek atomists, but apart from a few suggestive words their metaphysical speculations have nothing in common with modern science, and although they may be of modest antiquarian interest, their genuine relevance is negligible.) Thomson knew that *cathode rays* emitted by a hot filament could be deflected by a magnet. This suggested that they carried electric charge; in fact, the direction of the curvature required that the charge be negative. It seemed, therefore, that these were not rays at all, but rather streams of particles. By passing the beam through crossed electric and magnetic fields, and adjusting the field strength until the net deflection was zero, Thomson was able to determine the velocity of the particles (about a tenth the speed of light) as well as their charge-to-mass ratio (Problem 1.1). This ratio turned out to be enormously greater than for any known ion, indicating either that the charge was extremely large or the mass was very small. Indirect evidence pointed to the second conclusion. Thomson called the particles *corpuscles*. Back in 1891, George Johnstone Stoney had introduced the term ‘electron’ for the fundamental unit of charge; later, that name was taken over for the particles themselves.

Thomson correctly surmised that these electrons were essential constituents of atoms; however, since atoms as a whole are electrically neutral and very much heavier than electrons, there immediately arose the problem of how the compensating plus charge – and the bulk of the mass – is distributed within an atom. Thomson himself imagined that the electrons were suspended in a heavy, positively charged paste, like (as he put it) the plums in a pudding. But Thomson's model was decisively repudiated by Rutherford's famous scattering experiment, which showed that the positive charge, and most of the mass, was concentrated in a tiny core, or *nucleus*, at the center of the atom. Rutherford demonstrated this by firing a beam of α particles (ionized helium atoms) into a thin sheet of gold foil (Figure 1.1). Had the gold atoms consisted of rather diffuse spheres, as Thomson supposed, then all of the α particles should have been deflected a bit, but none would have been deflected much – any more than a bullet is deflected much when it passes, say, through a bag of sawdust. What in *fact* occurred was that *most* of the α particles passed through the gold completely undisturbed, but a few of them bounced off at wild angles. Rutherford's conclusion was that the α particles had




Fig. 1.1 Schematic diagram of the apparatus used in the Rutherford scattering experiment. Alpha particles scattered by the gold foil strike a fluorescent screen, giving off a flash of light, which is observed visually through a microscope.

encountered something very small, very hard, and very heavy. Evidently the positive charge, and virtually all of the mass, was concentrated at the center, occupying only a tiny fraction of the volume of the atom (the electrons are too light to play any role in the scattering; they are knocked right out of the way by the much heavier α particles).

The nucleus of the lightest atom (hydrogen) was given the name *proton* by Rutherford. In 1914 Niels Bohr proposed a model for hydrogen consisting of a single electron circling the proton, rather like a planet going around the sun, held in orbit by the mutual attraction of opposite charges. Using a primitive version of the quantum theory, Bohr was able to calculate the spectrum of hydrogen, and the agreement with experiment was nothing short of spectacular. It was natural then to suppose that the nuclei of heavier atoms were composed of two or more protons bound together, supporting a like number of orbiting electrons. Unfortunately, the next heavier atom (helium), although it does indeed carry two electrons, weighs *four* times as much as hydrogen, and lithium (three electrons) is *seven* times the weight of hydrogen, and so it goes. This dilemma was finally resolved in 1932 with Chadwick's discovery of the neutron – an electrically neutral twin to the proton. The helium nucleus, it turns out, contains two neutrons in addition to the two protons; lithium evidently includes four; and, in general, the heavier nuclei carry very roughly the same number of neutrons as protons. (The number of neutrons is in fact somewhat flexible – the same atom, chemically speaking, may come in several different *isotopes*, all with the same number of protons, but with varying numbers of neutrons.)

The discovery of the neutron put the final touch on what we might call the *classical period* in elementary particle physics. Never before (and I'm sorry to say never since) has physics offered so simple and satisfying an answer to the question, 'What is matter made of?' In 1932, it was all just protons, neutrons, and electrons. But already the seeds were planted for the three great ideas that were to dominate the *middle period* (1930–1960) in particle physics: Yukawa's meson, Dirac's positron, and Pauli's neutrino. Before we come to that, however, I must back up for a moment to introduce the photon.

1.2

The Photon (1900–1924)

In some respects, the photon is a very 'modern' particle, having more in common with the W and Z (which were not discovered until 1983) than with the classical trio. Moreover, it's hard to say exactly when or by whom the photon was really 'discovered', although the essential stages in the process are clear enough. The first contribution was made by Planck in 1900. Planck was attempting to explain the so-called *blackbody spectrum* for the electromagnetic radiation emitted by a hot object. Statistical mechanics, which had proved brilliantly successful in explaining other thermal processes, yielded nonsensical results when applied to electromagnetic fields. In particular, it led to the famous 'ultraviolet catastrophe', predicting that the total power radiated should be *infinite*. Planck found that he could escape the ultraviolet catastrophe – and fit the experimental curve – if he assumed

that electromagnetic radiation is *quantized*, coming in little ‘packages’ of energy

$$E = h\nu \tag{1.1}$$

where ν is the frequency of the radiation and h is a constant, which Planck adjusted to fit the data. The modern value of Planck’s constant is

$$h = 6.626 \times 10^{-27} \text{ erg s} \tag{1.2}$$

Planck did not profess to know *why* the radiation was quantized; he assumed that it was due to a peculiarity in the emission process: for some reason a hot surface only gives off light* in little squirts.

Einstein, in 1905, put forward a far more radical view. He argued that quantization was a feature of the electromagnetic field itself, having nothing to do with the emission mechanism. With this new twist, Einstein adapted Planck’s idea, and his formula, to explain the *photoelectric effect*: when electromagnetic radiation strikes a metal surface, electrons come popping out. Einstein suggested that an incoming light quantum hits an electron in the metal, giving up its energy ($h\nu$); the excited electron then breaks through the metal surface, losing in the process an energy w (the so-called *work function* of the material – an empirical constant that depends on the particular metal involved). The electron thus emerges with an energy

$$E \leq h\nu - w \tag{1.3}$$

(It may lose some energy before reaching the surface; that’s the reason for the inequality.) Einstein’s formula (Equation 1.3) is trivial to *derive*, but it carries an extraordinary implication: The maximum electron energy is *independent of the intensity of the light* and depends only on its *color* (frequency). To be sure, a more intense beam will knock out *more* electrons, but their *energies* will be the same.

Unlike Planck’s theory, Einstein’s met a hostile reception, and over the next 20 years he was to wage a lonely battle for the *light quantum* [2]. In saying that electromagnetic radiation is *by its nature* quantized, regardless of the emission mechanism, Einstein came dangerously close to resurrecting the discredited particle theory of light. Newton, of course, had introduced such a *corpuscular* model, but a major achievement of nineteenth-century physics was the decisive repudiation of Newton’s idea in favor of the rival wave theory. No one was prepared to see that accomplishment called into question, even when the experiments came down on Einstein’s side. In 1916 Millikan completed an exhaustive study of the photoelectric effect and was obliged to report that ‘Einstein’s photoelectric equation . . . appears in every case to predict exactly the observed results. . . . Yet the semicorpuscular theory by which Einstein arrived at his equation seems at present wholly untenable’ [3].

* In this book the word *light* stands for *electromagnetic radiation*, whether or not it happens to fall in the visible region.




Fig. 1.2 Compton scattering. A photon of wavelength λ scatters off a particle, initially at rest, of mass m . The scattered photon carries wavelength λ' given by Equation 1.4.

What finally settled the issue was an experiment conducted by A. H. Compton in 1923. Compton found that the light scattered from a particle at rest is shifted in wavelength, according to the equation

$$\lambda' = \lambda + \lambda_c(1 - \cos \theta) \quad (1.4)$$

where λ is the incident wavelength, λ' is the scattered wavelength, θ is the scattering angle, and

$$\lambda_c = h/mc \quad (1.5)$$

is the so-called *Compton wavelength* of the target particle (mass m). Now, this is *precisely* the formula you get (Problem 3.27) if you treat light as a particle of zero rest mass with energy given by Planck's equation, and apply the laws of conservation of (relativistic) energy and momentum – just as you would for an ordinary elastic collision (Figure 1.2). That clinched it; here was direct and incontrovertible experimental evidence that light behaves as a particle, on the subatomic scale. We call this particle the *photon* (a name suggested by the chemist Gilbert Lewis, in 1926); the symbol for a photon is γ (from *gamma ray*). How the particle nature of light on this level is to be reconciled with its well-established wave behavior on the macroscopic scale (exhibited in the phenomena of interference and diffraction) is a story I'll leave for books on quantum mechanics.

Although the photon initially *forced* itself on an unreceptive community of physicists, it eventually found a natural place in quantum field theory, and was to offer a whole new perspective on electromagnetic interactions. In classical electrodynamics, we attribute the electrical repulsion of two electrons, say, to the electric field surrounding them; each electron contributes to the field, and each one responds to the field. But in quantum field theory, the electric field is *quantized* (in the form of photons), and we may picture the interaction as consisting of a stream of photons passing back and forth between the two charges, each electron continually emitting photons and continually absorbing them. And the same goes for *any* noncontact

force: Where classically we interpret ‘action at a distance’ as ‘mediated’ by a *field*, we now say that it is mediated by an *exchange of particles* (the *quanta* of the field). In the case of electrodynamics, the mediator is the photon; for gravity, it is called the *graviton* (though a fully successful quantum theory of gravity has yet to be developed and it may well be centuries before anyone detects a graviton experimentally).

You will see later on how these ideas are implemented in practice, but for now I want to dispel one common misapprehension. When I say that every force is mediated by the exchange of particles, I am *not* speaking of a merely *kinematic* phenomenon. Two ice skaters throwing snowballs back and forth will of course move apart with the succession of recoils; they ‘repel one another by exchange of snowballs’, if you like. But that’s *not* what is involved here. For one thing, this mechanism would have a hard time accounting for an *attractive* force. You might think of the mediating particles, rather, as ‘messengers’, and the message can just as well be ‘come a little closer’ as ‘go away’.

I said earlier that in the ‘classical’ picture ordinary matter is made of atoms, in which electrons are held in orbit around a nucleus of protons and neutrons by the electrical attraction of opposite charges. We can now give this model a more sophisticated formulation by attributing the binding force to the exchange of photons between the electrons and the protons in the nucleus. However, for the purposes of atomic physics this is overkill, for in this context quantization of the electromagnetic field produces only minute effects (notably the Lamb shift and the anomalous magnetic moment of the electron). To excellent approximation we can pretend that the forces are given by Coulomb’s law (together with various magnetic dipole couplings). The point is that in a bound state enormous numbers of photons are continually streaming back and forth, so that the ‘lumpiness’ of the field is effectively smoothed out, and classical electrodynamics is a suitable approximation to the truth. But in most elementary particle processes, such as the photoelectric effect or Compton scattering, *individual* photons are involved, and quantization can no longer be ignored.

1.3

Mesons (1934–1947)

Now there is one conspicuous problem to which the ‘classical’ model does not address itself at all: what holds the *nucleus* together? After all, the positively charged protons should repel one another violently, packed together as they are in such close proximity. Evidently there must be some other force, more powerful than the force of electrical repulsion, that binds the protons (and neutrons) together; physicists of that less imaginative age called it, simply, the *strong force*. But if there exists such a potent force in nature, why don’t we notice it in everyday life? The *fact* is that virtually every force we experience directly, from the contraction of a muscle to the explosion of dynamite, is electromagnetic in origin; the only exception, outside a nuclear reactor or an atomic bomb, is gravity. The answer must be that, powerful though it is, the strong force is of very short *range*. (The range of a force is like the

arm's reach of a boxer – beyond that distance its influence falls off rapidly to zero. Gravitational and electromagnetic forces have *infinite* range, but the range of the strong force is about the size of the nucleus itself.)*

The first significant theory of the strong force was proposed by Yukawa in 1934 [4]. Yukawa assumed that the proton and neutron are attracted to one another by some sort of *field*, just as the electron is attracted to the nucleus by an electric field and the moon to the earth by a gravitational field. This field should properly be quantized, and Yukawa asked the question: what must be the properties of its *quantum* – the particle (analogous to the photon) whose exchange would account for the known features of the strong force? For example, the short range of the force indicated that the mediator would be rather heavy; Yukawa calculated that its mass should be nearly 300 times that of the electron, or about a sixth the mass of a proton (see Problem 1.2). Because it fell between the electron and the proton, Yukawa's particle came to be known as the *meson* (meaning 'middle-weight'). In the same spirit, the electron is called a *lepton* ('light-weight'), whereas the proton and neutron are *baryons* ('heavy-weight'). Now, Yukawa knew that no such particle had ever been observed in the laboratory, and he therefore assumed his theory was wrong. But at that time a number of systematic studies of cosmic rays were in progress, and by 1937 two separate groups (Anderson and Neddermeyer on the West Coast, and Street and Stevenson on the East) had identified particles matching Yukawa's description.† Indeed, the cosmic rays with which you are being bombarded every few seconds as you read this consist primarily of just such middle-weight particles.

For a while everything seemed to be in order. But as more detailed studies of the cosmic ray particles were undertaken, disturbing discrepancies began to appear. They had the wrong lifetime and they seemed to be significantly lighter than Yukawa had predicted; worse still, different mass measurements were not consistent with one another. In 1946 (after a period in which physicists were engaged in a less savory business) decisive experiments were carried out in Rome demonstrating that the cosmic ray particles interacted very weakly with atomic nuclei [5]. If this was really Yukawa's meson, the transmitter of the strong force, the interaction should have been dramatic. The puzzle was finally resolved in 1947, when Powell and his coworkers at Bristol [6] discovered that there are actually *two* middle-weight particles in cosmic rays, which they called π (or 'pion') and μ (or 'muon'). (Marshak reached the same conclusion simultaneously, on theoretical grounds [7].) The true Yukawa meson is the π ; it is produced copiously in the upper atmosphere, but ordinarily disintegrates long before reaching the ground (see Problem 3.4). Powell's group exposed their photographic emulsions on mountain tops (see Figure 1.3). One of the decay products is the lighter (and longer lived) μ , and it is primarily muons that one observes at sea level. In the search for Yukawa's meson, then, the muon was simply an impostor, having nothing whatever to do

* This is a bit of an oversimplification. Typically, the forces go like $e^{-(r/a)}/r^2$, where a is the 'range'. For Coulomb's law and Newton's law of universal gravitation, $a = \infty$; for the strong force a is about 10^{-13} cm (1 fm).

† Actually, it was Robert Oppenheimer who drew the connection between these cosmic ray particles and Yukawa's meson.




Fig. 1.3 One of Powell's earliest pictures showing the track of a pion in a photographic emulsion exposed to cosmic rays at high altitude. The pion (entering from the left) decays into a muon and a neutrino (the latter is electrically neutral, and leaves no

track). (Source: Powell, C. F., Fowler, P. H. and Perkins, D. H. (1959) *The Study of Elementary Particles by the Photographic Method* Pergamon, New York. First published in (1947) *Nature* **159**, 694.)

with the strong interactions. In fact, it behaves in every way like a heavier version of the electron and properly belongs in the *lepton* family (though some people to this day call it the 'mu-meson' by force of habit).

1.4 Antiparticles (1930–1956)

Nonrelativistic quantum mechanics was completed in the astonishingly brief period 1923–1926, but the relativistic version proved to be a much thornier problem.

The first major achievement was Dirac's discovery, in 1927, of the equation that bears his name. The Dirac equation was supposed to describe free electrons with energy given by the relativistic formula $E^2 - \mathbf{p}^2 c^2 = m^2 c^4$. But it had a very troubling feature: for every positive-energy solution ($E = +\sqrt{\mathbf{p}^2 c^2 + m^2 c^4}$) it admitted a corresponding solution with *negative* energy ($E = -\sqrt{\mathbf{p}^2 c^2 + m^2 c^4}$). This meant that, given the natural tendency of every system to evolve in the direction of lower energy, the electron should 'runaway' to increasingly negative states, radiating off an infinite amount of energy in the process. To rescue his equation, Dirac proposed a resolution that made up in brilliance for what it lacked in plausibility: he postulated that the negative-energy states are all filled by an infinite 'sea' of electrons. Because this sea is always there, and perfectly uniform, it exerts no net force on anything, and we are not normally aware of it. Dirac then invoked the Pauli exclusion principle (which says that no two electrons can occupy the same state), to 'explain' why the electrons we *do* observe are confined to the positive-energy states. But if this is true, then what happens when we impart to one of the electrons in the 'sea' an energy sufficient to knock it into a positive-energy state? The *absence* of the 'expected' electron in the sea would be interpreted as a net positive charge in that location, and the absence of its expected negative energy would be seen as a net positive energy. Thus a 'hole in the sea' would function as an ordinary particle with *positive* energy and *positive* charge. Dirac at first hoped that these holes might be *protons*, but it was soon apparent that they had to carry the same mass as the electron itself – 2000 times too light to be a proton. No such particle was known at the time, and Dirac's theory appeared to be in trouble. What may have seemed a fatal defect in 1930, however, turned into a spectacular triumph in late 1931, with Anderson's discovery of the *positron* (Figure 1.4), a positively charged twin for the electron, with precisely the attributes Dirac required [8].

Still, many physicists were uncomfortable with the notion that we are awash in an infinite sea of invisible electrons, and in the 1940s Stueckelberg and Feynman provided a much simpler and more compelling interpretation of the negative-energy states. In the Feynman–Stueckelberg formulation, the negative-energy solutions are re-expressed as *positive*-energy states of a *different particle* (the positron); the electron and positron appear on an equal footing, and there is no need for Dirac's 'electron sea' or for its mysterious 'holes'. We'll see in Chapter 7 how this – the modern interpretation – works. Meantime, it turned out that the dualism in Dirac's equation is a profound and universal feature of quantum field theory: for *every* kind of particle there must exist a corresponding *antiparticle*, with the same mass but opposite electric charge. The positron, then, is the *antielectron*. (Actually, it is in principle completely arbitrary which one you call the 'particle' and which the 'antiparticle' – I could just as well have said that the electron is the antipositron. But since there are a lot of electrons around, and not so many positrons, we tend to think of electrons as 'matter' and positrons as 'antimatter'). The (negatively charged) antiproton was first observed experimentally at the Berkeley Bevatron in 1955, and the (neutral) antineutron was discovered at the same facility the following year [9].




Fig. 1.4 The positron. In 1932, Anderson took this photograph of the track left in a cloud chamber by a cosmic ray particle. The chamber was placed in a magnetic field (pointing into the page), which caused the particle to travel in a curve. But was it a negative charge traveling downward or a positive charge traveling upward? In order to distinguish, Anderson had placed a lead plate across the center of the chamber (the thick horizontal line in the photograph). A

particle passing through the plate slows down, and subsequently moves in a tighter circle. By inspection of the curves, it is clear that this particle traveled upward, and hence must have been positively charged. From the curvature of the track and from its texture, Anderson was able to show that the mass of the particle was close to that of the electron. (Photo courtesy California Institute of Technology.)

The standard notation for antiparticles is an overbar. For example, p denotes the proton and \bar{p} the antiproton; n the neutron and \bar{n} the antineutron. However, in some cases it is customary simply to specify the charge. Thus most people write e^+ for the positron (not \bar{e}) and μ^+ for the antimuon (not $\bar{\mu}$).^{*} Some neutral particles are their *own* antiparticles. For example, the photon: $\bar{\gamma} \equiv \gamma$. In fact, you may have been wondering how the antineutron differs physically from the neutron, since both are uncharged. The answer is that neutrons carry other ‘quantum numbers’ besides charge (in particular, baryon number), which change sign for the antiparticle. Moreover, although its *net* charge is zero, the neutron *does* have a charge *structure* (positive at the center and near the surface, negative in between) and a magnetic dipole moment. These, too, have the opposite sign for \bar{n} .

There is a general principle in particle physics that goes under the name of *crossing symmetry*. Suppose that a reaction of the form

$$A + B \rightarrow C + D$$

is known to occur. Any of these particles can be ‘crossed’ over to the other side of the equation, provided it is turned into its antiparticle, and the resulting interaction

^{*} But you must not *mix* conventions: \bar{e}^+ is ambiguous, like a double negative – the reader doesn’t know if you mean the positron or the *antipositron*, (which is to say, the electron).

will also be allowed. For example,

$$A \rightarrow \bar{B} + C + D$$

$$A + \bar{C} \rightarrow \bar{B} + D$$

$$\bar{C} + \bar{D} \rightarrow \bar{A} + \bar{B}$$

In addition, the *reverse* reaction occurs: $C + D \rightarrow A + B$, but technically this derives from the principle of *detailed balance*, rather than from crossing symmetry. Indeed, as we shall see, the *calculations* involved in these various reactions are practically identical. We might almost regard them as different manifestations of the same fundamental process. However, there is one important *caveat* in all this: conservation of energy may veto a reaction that is otherwise permissible. For example, if A weighs less than the sum of B , C , and D , then the decay $A \rightarrow \bar{B} + C + D$ cannot occur; similarly, if A and C are light, whereas B and D are heavy, then the reaction $A + \bar{C} \rightarrow \bar{B} + D$ will not take place unless the initial kinetic energy exceeds a certain ‘threshold’ value. So perhaps I should say that the crossed (or reversed) reaction is *dynamically* permissible, but it may or may not be *kinematically* allowed. The power and beauty of crossing symmetry can scarcely be exaggerated. It tells us, for instance, that Compton scattering

$$\gamma + e^- \rightarrow \gamma + e^-$$

is ‘really’ the same process as pair annihilation

$$e^- + e^+ \rightarrow \gamma + \gamma$$

although in the laboratory they are completely different phenomena.

The union of special relativity and quantum mechanics, then, leads to a pleasing matter/antimatter symmetry. But this raises a disturbing question: how come *our* world is populated with protons, neutrons, and electrons, instead of antiprotons, antineutrons, and positrons? Matter and antimatter cannot coexist for long – if a particle meets its antiparticle, they annihilate. So maybe it’s just a historical accident that in our corner of the universe there happened to be more matter than antimatter, and pair annihilation has vacuumed up all but a leftover residue of matter. If this is so, then presumably there are other regions of space in which antimatter predominates. Unfortunately, the astronomical evidence is pretty compelling that all of the observable universe is made of ordinary matter. In Chapter 12 we will explore some contemporary ideas about the ‘matter–antimatter asymmetry’.

1.5 Neutrinos (1930–1962)

For the third strand in the story we return again to the year 1930 [10]. A problem had arisen in the study of nuclear beta decay. In beta decay, a radioactive nucleus A

is transformed into a slightly lighter nucleus B , with the emission of an electron:

$$A \rightarrow B + e^- \quad (1.6)$$

Conservation of charge requires that B carry one more unit of positive charge than A . (We now realize that the underlying process here is the conversion of a neutron, in A , into a proton, in B ; but remember that in 1930 the neutron had not yet been discovered.) Thus the ‘daughter’ nucleus (B) lies one position farther along on the periodic table. There are many examples of beta decay: potassium goes to calcium (${}_{19}^{40}\text{K} \rightarrow {}_{20}^{40}\text{Ca}$), copper goes to zinc (${}_{29}^{64}\text{Cu} \rightarrow {}_{30}^{64}\text{Zn}$), tritium goes to helium (${}_{1}^3\text{H} \rightarrow {}_{2}^3\text{He}$), and so on.*

Now, it is a characteristic of two-body decays ($A \rightarrow B + C$) that the outgoing energies are kinematically determined, in the center-of-mass frame. Specifically, if the ‘parent’ nucleus (A) is at rest, so that B and e come out back-to-back with equal and opposite momenta, then conservation of energy dictates that the electron energy is (Problem 3.19)

$$E = \left(\frac{m_A^2 - m_B^2 + m_e^2}{2m_A} \right) c^2 \quad (1.7)$$

The point to notice is that E is *fixed* once the three masses are specified. But when the experiments are done, it is found that the emitted electrons vary considerably in energy; Equation 1.7 only determines the *maximum* electron energy for a particular beta decay process (see Figure 1.5).

This was a most disturbing result. Niels Bohr (not for the first time) was ready to abandon the law of conservation of energy.† Fortunately, Pauli took a more sober view, suggesting that another particle was emitted along with the electron, a silent accomplice that carries off the ‘missing’ energy. It had to be electrically neutral, to conserve charge (and also, of course, to explain why it left no track); Pauli proposed to call it the *neutron*. The whole idea was greeted with some skepticism, and in 1932 Chadwick preempted the name. But in the following year Fermi presented a theory of beta decay that incorporated Pauli’s particle and proved so brilliantly successful that Pauli’s suggestion had to be taken seriously. From the fact that the observed electron energies range up to the value given in Equation 1.7 it follows that the new particle must be extremely light; Fermi called it the *neutrino* (‘little neutral one’). For reasons you’ll see in a moment, we now call it the *antineutrino*.

* The upper number is the *atomic weight* (the number of neutrons plus protons) and the lower number is the *atomic number* (the number of protons).

† It is interesting to note that Bohr was an outspoken critic of Einstein’s light quantum (prior to 1924), that he mercilessly denounced Schrödinger’s equation, discouraged Dirac’s work on the relativistic

electron theory (telling him, incorrectly, that Klein and Gordon had already succeeded), opposed Pauli’s introduction of the neutrino, ridiculed Yukawa’s theory of the meson, and disparaged Feynman’s approach to quantum electrodynamics. Great scientists do not always have good judgment – especially when it concerns other people’s work – but Bohr must hold the all-time record.




Fig. 1.5 The beta decay spectrum of tritium (${}^3_1\text{H} \rightarrow {}^3_2\text{He}$).
(Source: Lewis, G. M. (1970) *Neutrinos*, Wykeham, London, p. 30.)

In modern terminology, then, the fundamental beta decay process is



(neutron goes to proton plus electron plus antineutrino).

Now, you may have noticed something peculiar about Powell's picture of the disintegrating pion (Figure 1.3): the muon emerges at about 90° with respect to the original pion direction. (That's not the result of a *collision*, by the way; collisions with atoms in the emulsion account for the dither in the tracks, but they cannot produce an abrupt left turn.) What this kink indicates is that some *other* particle was produced in the decay of the pion, a particle that left no footprints in the emulsion, and hence must have been electrically neutral. It was natural (or at any rate *economical*) to suppose that this was again Pauli's neutrino:



A few months after their first paper, Powell's group published an even more striking picture, in which the subsequent decay of the muon is also visible (Figure 1.6). By then muon decays had been studied for many years, and it was well established that the charged secondary is an electron. From the figure there is clearly a neutral product as well, and you might guess that it is another neutrino. However, this time it is actually *two* neutrinos:






Fig. 1.6 Here, a pion decays into a muon (plus a neutrino); the muon subsequently decays into an electron (and two neutrinos). (Source: Powell, C. F., Fowler, P. H. and Perkins, D. H. (1959) *The Study of Elementary Particles by the Photographic Method* Pergamon, New York. First published in (1949) *Nature* **163**, 82.)

How do we know there are *two* of them? Same way as before: we repeat the experiment over and over, each time measuring the energy of the electron. If it always comes out the same, we know there are just two particles in the final state. But if it *varies*, then there must be (at least) three.* By 1949 it was clear that the

* Here, and in the original beta decay problem, conservation of angular momentum also requires a third outgoing particle, quite independently of energy conservation. But the spin assignments were not so clear in

the early days, and for most people energy conservation was the compelling argument. In the interest of simplicity, I will keep angular momentum out of the story until Chapter 4.

electron energy in muon decay is *not* fixed, and the emission of two neutrinos was the accepted explanation. (By contrast, the *muon* energy in *pion* decay is perfectly constant, within experimental uncertainties, confirming that this is a genuine two-body decay.)

By 1950, then, there was compelling *theoretical* evidence for the existence of neutrinos, but there was still no direct *experimental* verification. A skeptic might have argued that the neutrino was nothing but a bookkeeping device – a purely hypothetical particle whose only function was to rescue the conservation laws. It left no tracks, and it didn't decay; in fact, no one had ever seen a neutrino *do anything*. The reason for this is that neutrinos interact extraordinarily weakly with matter; a neutrino of moderate energy could easily penetrate a thousand light years(!) of lead.* To have a chance of detecting one you need an extremely intense source. The decisive experiments were conducted at the Savannah River nuclear reactor in South Carolina, in the mid-1950s. Here Cowan and Reines set up a large tank of water and watched for the 'inverse' beta decay reaction



At their detector the antineutrino flux was calculated to be 5×10^{13} particles per square centimeter per second, but even at this fantastic intensity they could only hope for two or three events every hour. On the other hand, they developed an ingenious method for identifying the outgoing positron. Their results provided unambiguous confirmation of the neutrino's existence [11].

As I mentioned earlier, the particle produced in ordinary beta decay is actually an antineutrino, not a neutrino. Of course, since they're electrically neutral, you might ask – and many people did – whether there is any *difference* between a neutrino and an antineutrino. The neutral pion, as we shall see, is its *own* antiparticle; so too is the photon. On the other hand, the antineutron is definitely *not* the same as a neutron. So we're left in a bit of a quandary: *is* the neutrino the same as the antineutrino, and if not, what property distinguishes them? In the late 1950s, Davis and Harmer put this question to an experimental test [12]. From the positive results of Cowan and Reines, we know that the crossed reaction



must also occur, and at about the same rate. Davis looked for the analogous reaction using *antineutrinos*:



* That's a comforting realization when you learn that hundreds of billions of neutrinos per second pass through every square inch of your body, night and day, coming from the sun (they hit you from below, at night, having passed right through the earth).

He found that this reaction does *not* occur, and concluded that the neutrino and antineutrino are distinct particles.*

Davis's result was not unexpected. In fact, back in 1953 Konopinski and Mahmoud [13] had introduced a beautifully simple rule for determining which reactions – such as Equation 1.12 – will work, and which – like Equation 1.13 – will not. In effect,[†] they assigned a *lepton number* $L = +1$ to the electron, the muon, and the neutrino, and $L = -1$ to the positron, the positive muon, and the antineutrino (all other particles are given a lepton number of zero). They then proposed the *law of conservation of lepton number* (analogous to the law of conservation of charge): in any physical process, the sum of the lepton numbers before must equal the sum of the lepton numbers after. Thus the Cowan–Reines reaction (1.11) is allowed ($L = -1$ before and after), but the Davis reaction (1.13) is forbidden (on the left $L = -1$, on the right $L = +1$). It was in anticipation of this rule that I called the beta decay particle (Equation 1.8) an *antineutrino*; likewise, the charged pion decays (Equation 1.9) should really be written

$$\begin{aligned}\pi^- &\rightarrow \mu^- + \bar{\nu} \\ \pi^+ &\rightarrow \mu^+ + \nu\end{aligned}\tag{1.14}$$

and the muon decays (Equation 1.10) are actually

$$\begin{aligned}\mu^- &\rightarrow e^- + \nu + \bar{\nu} \\ \mu^+ &\rightarrow e^+ + \nu + \bar{\nu}\end{aligned}\tag{1.15}$$

You might be wondering what *property* distinguishes the neutrino from the antineutrino. The cleanest answer is: *lepton number* – it's +1 for the neutrino and -1 for the antineutrino. These numbers are experimentally determinable, just as electric charge is, by watching how the particle in question interacts with others. (As we shall see, they also differ in their *helicity*: the neutrino is 'left-handed' whereas the antineutrino is 'right-handed'. But this is a technical matter best saved for later.)

There soon followed another curious twist to the neutrino story. Experimentally, the decay of a muon into an electron plus a *photon* is never observed:

$$\mu^- \not\rightarrow e^- + \gamma\tag{1.16}$$

and yet this process is consistent with conservation of charge and conservation of the lepton number. Now, a famous rule of thumb in particle physics (generally

* Actually, this conclusion is not as fireproof as it once seemed. It could be the spin state of the $\bar{\nu}$, rather than the fact that it is distinct from ν , that forbids reaction 1.13. Today, in fact, there are two viable models: *Dirac neutrinos*, which are distinct from their antiparticles, and *Majorana neutrinos*, for which ν and $\bar{\nu}$ are two states of the *same* particle. For most

of this book, I shall assume we are dealing with Dirac neutrinos, but we'll return to the question in Chapter 11.

[†] Konopinski and Mahmoud [13] did not use this terminology, and they got the muon assignments wrong. But never mind, the essential idea was there.

attributed to Richard Feynman) declares that whatever is not expressly *forbidden* is *mandatory*. The absence of $\mu \rightarrow e + \gamma$ suggests a law of conservation of ‘mu-ness’, but then how are we to explain the observed decays $\mu \rightarrow e + \nu + \bar{\nu}$? The answer occurred to a number of people in the late 1950s and early 1960s [14]: suppose there are two different *kinds* of neutrino – one associated with the electron (ν_e) and one with the muon (ν_μ). If we assign a *muon number* $L_\mu = +1$ to μ^- and ν_μ , and $L_\mu = -1$ to μ^+ and $\bar{\nu}_\mu$, and at the same time an *electron number* $L_e = +1$ to e^- and ν_e , and $L_e = -1$ to e^+ and $\bar{\nu}_e$, and refine the conservation of lepton number into two separate laws – conservation of electron number and conservation of muon number – we can then account for *all* allowed and forbidden processes. Neutron beta decay becomes

$$n \rightarrow p^+ + e^- + \bar{\nu}_e \quad (1.17)$$

the pion decays are

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^- &\rightarrow \mu^- + \bar{\nu}_\mu \\ \pi^+ &\rightarrow \mu^+ + \nu_\mu \end{aligned} \quad (1.18)$$

and the muon decays take the form

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^- &\rightarrow e^- + \bar{\nu}_e + \nu_\mu \\ \mu^+ &\rightarrow e^+ + \nu_e + \bar{\nu}_\mu \end{aligned} \quad (1.19)$$

I said earlier that when pion decay was first analyzed it was ‘natural’ and ‘economical’ to assume that the outgoing neutral particle was the same as in beta decay, and that’s quite true: it *was* natural and it *was* economical, but it was *wrong*.

The first experimental test of the two-neutrino hypothesis (and the separate conservation of electron and muon number) was conducted at Brookhaven in 1962 [15]. Using about 10^{14} antineutrinos from π^- decay, Lederman, Schwartz, Steinberger, and their collaborators identified 29 instances of the expected reaction

$$\bar{\nu}_\mu + p^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ + n \quad (1.20)$$

and no cases of the forbidden process

$$\bar{\nu}_\mu + p^+ \rightarrow e^+ + n \quad (1.21)$$

With only one kind of neutrino, the second reaction would be just as common as the first. (Incidentally, this experiment presented truly monumental shielding problems. Steel from a dismantled battleship was stacked up 44-feet thick, to make sure that nothing except neutrinos got through to the target.)

I mentioned earlier that neutrinos are extremely light – in fact, until fairly recently it was widely assumed (for no particularly good reason) that they are

Table 1.1 The lepton family, 1962–1976

	Lepton number	Electron number	Muon number
Leptons			
e^-	1	1	0
ν_e	1	1	0
μ^-	1	0	1
ν_μ	1	0	1
Antileptons			
e^+	-1	-1	0
$\bar{\nu}_e$	-1	-1	0
μ^+	-1	0	-1
$\bar{\nu}_\mu$	-1	0	-1

massless. This simplifies a lot of calculations, but we now know that it is not strictly true: neutrinos *have* mass, though we do not yet know what those masses are, except to reiterate that they are very small, even when compared to the electron's. What is more, over long distances neutrinos of one type can convert into neutrinos of another type (for example, electron neutrinos into muon neutrinos) – and back again, in a phenomenon known as *neutrino oscillation*. But this story belongs much later, and deserves a detailed treatment, so I'll save it for Chapter 11.

By 1962, then, the lepton family had grown to eight: the electron, the muon, their respective neutrinos, and the corresponding antiparticles (Table 1.1). The leptons are characterized by the fact that they do not participate in strong interactions. For the next 14 years things were pretty quiet, as far as the leptons go, so this is a good place to pause and catch up on the strongly interacting particles – the mesons and baryons, known collectively as the *hadrons*.

1.6

Strange Particles (1947–1960)

For a brief period in 1947, it was possible to believe that the major problems of elementary particle physics were solved. After a lengthy detour in pursuit of the muon, Yukawa's meson (the π) had finally been apprehended. Dirac's positron had been found, and Pauli's neutrino, although still at large (and, as we have seen, still capable of making mischief), was widely accepted. The role of the muon was something of a puzzle ('Who ordered *that*?' Rabi asked) – it seemed quite unnecessary in the overall scheme of things. On the whole, however, it looked in 1947 as though the job of elementary particle physics was essentially done.

But this comfortable state did not last long [16]. In December of that year, Rochester and Butler [17] published the cloud chamber photograph shown in Figure 1.8 Cosmic ray particles enter from the upper left and strike a lead plate,




Fig. 1.7 The first strange particle. Cosmic rays strike a lead plate, producing a K^0 , which subsequently decays into a pair of charged pions. (Photo courtesy of Prof. Rochester, G. D. (© 1947). *Nature*, **160**, 855. Copyright Macmillan Journals Limited.)

producing a neutral particle, whose presence is revealed when it decays into two charged secondaries, forming the upside-down ‘V’ in the lower right. Detailed analysis indicated that these charged particles are in fact a π^+ and a π^- . Here, then, was a new neutral particle with at least twice the mass of the pion; we call it the K^0 (‘kaon’):



In 1949 Brown and her collaborators published the photograph reproduced in Figure 1.8, showing the decay of a charged kaon:



(The K^0 was first known as the V^0 and later as the θ^0 ; the K^+ was originally called the τ^+ . Their identification as neutral and charged versions of the same basic particle was not completely settled until 1956 – but that’s another story, to which we shall return in Chapter 4.) The kaons behave in some respects like heavy pions, so the *meson* family was extended to include them. In due course, many more mesons were discovered – the η , the ϕ , the ω , the ρ ’s, and so on.

Meanwhile, in 1950 another neutral ‘V’ particle was found by Anderson’s group at Cal Tech. The photographs were similar to Rochester’s (Figure 1.7), but this time the products were a p^+ and a π^- . Evidently, this particle is substantially heavier




Fig. 1.8 K^+ , entering from above, decays at A: $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ + \pi^+ + \pi^-$. (The π^- subsequently causes a nuclear disintegration at B.) (Source: Powell, C. F. Fowler, P. H. and Perkins, D. H. (1959) *The Study of Elementary Particles by the Photographic Method*, Pergamon, New York. First published in *Nature*, **163**, 82 (1949).)

than the proton; we call it the Λ :

$$\Lambda \rightarrow p^+ + \pi^- \quad (1.24)$$

The lambda belongs with the proton and the neutron in the *baryon* family. To appreciate this, we must go back for a moment to 1938. The question had arisen, ‘Why is the proton stable?’ Why, for example, doesn’t it decay into a positron and a photon:

$$p^+ \rightarrow e^+ + \gamma \quad (1.25)$$

Needless to say, it would be unpleasant for us if this reaction were common (all atoms would disintegrate), and yet it does not violate any law known in 1938. (It does violate conservation of *lepton* number, but that law was not recognized, remember, until 1953.) Stückelberg [18] proposed to account for the stability of the proton by asserting a law of *conservation of baryon number*: assign to all baryons (which in 1938 meant the proton and the neutron) a ‘baryon number’ $A = +1$, and to the antibaryons (\bar{p} and \bar{n}) $A = -1$; then the total baryon number is conserved in any physical process. Thus, neutron beta decay ($n \rightarrow p^+ + e^- + \bar{\nu}_e$) is allowed ($A = 1$ before and after), and so too is the reaction in which the antiproton was first observed:



($A = 2$ on both sides). But the proton, as the lightest baryon, has nowhere to go; conservation of baryon number guarantees its absolute stability.* If we are to retain the conservation of baryon number in the light of reaction (1.24), the lambda must be assigned to the baryon family. Over the next few years, many more heavy baryons were discovered – the Σ ’s, the Ξ ’s, the Δ ’s, and so on. By the way, unlike leptons and baryons, there is *no* conservation of mesons. In pion decay ($\pi^- \rightarrow \mu^- + \bar{\nu}_\mu$) a meson disappears, and in lambda decay ($\Lambda \rightarrow p^+ + \pi^-$) a meson is created.

It is some measure of the surprise with which these new heavy baryons and mesons were greeted that they came to be known collectively as ‘strange’ particles. In 1952, the first of the modern particle accelerators (the Brookhaven Cosmotron) began operating, and soon it was possible to produce strange particles in the laboratory (before this the only source had been cosmic rays) . . . and with this the rate of proliferation increased. Willis Lamb began his Nobel Prize acceptance speech in 1955 with the following words [19]:

When the Nobel Prizes were first awarded in 1901, physicists knew something of just two objects which are now called “elementary particles”: the electron and the proton. A deluge of other “elementary” particles appeared after 1930; neutron, neutrino, μ meson (sic), π meson, heavier mesons, and various hyperons. I have heard it said that “the finder of a new elementary particle used to be rewarded by a Nobel Prize, but such a discovery now ought to be punished by a \$10,000 fine”.

Not only were the new particles unexpected; there is a more technical sense in which they seemed ‘strange’: they are *produced* copiously (on a time scale of about 10^{-23} seconds), but they *decay* relatively slowly (typically about 10^{-10} seconds). This suggested to Pais and others [20] that the mechanism involved in

* ‘Grand unified theories’ (GUTs) allow for a minute violation of baryon number conservation, and in these theories the proton is *not* absolutely stable (see Sections 2.6 and 12.2). As of 2007, no proton decay has been

observed, and its lifetime is known to exceed 10^{29} years—which is pretty stable, when you consider that the age of the universe is about 10^{10} years.

their production is entirely different from that which governs their disintegration. In modern language, the strange particles are *produced* by the *strong* force (the same one that holds the nucleus together), but they *decay* by the *weak* force (the one that accounts for beta decay and all other neutrino processes). The details of Pais's scheme required that the strange particles be produced in *pairs* (so-called *associated production*). The experimental evidence for this was far from clear at that time, but in 1953 Gell-Mann [21] and Nishijima [22] found a beautifully simple and, as it developed, stunningly successful way to implement and improve Pais's idea. They assigned to each particle a new property (Gell-Mann called it 'strangeness') that (like charge, lepton number, and baryon number) is conserved in any strong interaction, but (*unlike* those others) is *not* conserved in a weak interaction. In a pion–proton collision, for example, we might produce *two* strange particles:



Here, the K 's carry strangeness $S = +1$, the Σ 's and the Λ have $S = -1$, and the 'ordinary' particles – π , p , and n – have $S = 0$. But we never produce just *one* strange particle:



On the other hand, when these particles *decay*, strangeness is *not* conserved:



these are *weak* processes, which do not respect conservation of strangeness.

There is some arbitrariness in the assignment of strangeness numbers, obviously. We could just as well have given $S = +1$ to the Σ 's and the Λ , and $S = -1$ to K^+ and K^0 ; in fact, in retrospect it would have been a little nicer that way. (In exactly the same sense, Benjamin Franklin's original convention for plus and minus charge was perfectly arbitrary at the time, and unfortunate in retrospect, since it made the current-carrying particle – the electron – negative.) The significant point is that there exists a consistent assignment of strangeness numbers to all the hadrons (baryons and mesons) that accounts for the observed strong processes and 'explains' why the others do not occur. (The leptons and the


photon don't experience strong forces at all, so strangeness does not apply to them.)

The garden that seemed so tidy in 1947 had grown into a jungle by 1960, and hadron physics could only be described as chaos. The plethora of strongly interacting particles was divided into two great families – the baryons and the mesons – and the members of each family were distinguished by charge, strangeness, and mass; but beyond that there was no rhyme or reason to it all. This predicament reminded many physicists of the situation in chemistry a century earlier, in the days before the periodic table, when scores of elements had been identified, but there was no underlying order or system. In 1960, the elementary particles awaited their own 'periodic table'.

1.7

The Eightfold Way (1961–1964)


The Mendeleev of elementary particle physics was Murray Gell-Mann, who introduced the so-called *Eightfold Way* in 1961 [23]. (Essentially the same scheme was proposed independently by Ne'eman.) The Eightfold Way arranged the baryons and mesons into weird geometrical patterns, according to their charge and strangeness. The eight lightest baryons fit into a hexagonal array, with two particles at the center:*



This group is known as the *baryon octet*. Notice that particles of like charge lie along the downward-sloping *diagonal* lines: $Q = +1$ (in units of the proton charge) for the proton and the Σ^+ ; $Q = 0$ for the neutron, the Λ , the Σ^0 , and the Ξ^0 ; $Q = -1$ for the Σ^- and the Ξ^- . *Horizontal* lines associate particles of like *strangeness*: $S = 0$ for the proton and neutron, $S = -1$ for the middle line, and $S = -2$ for the two Ξ 's.


The eight lightest mesons fill a similar hexagonal pattern, forming the (*pseudo-scalar*) *meson octet*:

* The relative placement of the particles in the center is arbitrary, but in this book I shall always put the neutral member of the triplet (here the Σ^0) *above* the singlet (here the Λ).



Once again, diagonal lines determine charge and horizontal lines determine strangeness, but this time the top line has $S = 1$, the middle line $S = 0$, and the bottom line $S = -1$. (This discrepancy is again a historical accident; Gell-Mann could just as well have assigned $S = 1$ to the proton and neutron, $S = 0$ to the Σ 's and the Λ , and $S = -1$ to the Ξ 's. In 1953 he had no reason to prefer that choice, and it seemed most natural to give the familiar particles – proton, neutron, and pion – a strangeness of zero. After 1961, a new term – *hypercharge* – was introduced, which was equal to S for the mesons and to $S + 1$ for the baryons. But later developments revealed that strangeness was the better quantity after all, and the word 'hypercharge' has now been taken over for a quite different purpose.)

Hexagons were not the only figures allowed by the Eightfold Way; there was also, for example, a triangular array, incorporating 10 heavier baryons – the *baryon decuplet*.*



* In this book, for simplicity, I adhere to the old-fashioned notation in which the decuplet particles are designated Σ^* and Ξ^* ; modern usage drops the star and puts the mass in parentheses: $\Sigma(1385)$ and $\Xi(1530)$.

Now, as Gell-Mann was fitting these particles into the decuplet, an absolutely lovely thing happened. Nine of the particles were known experimentally, but at that time the tenth particle (the one at the very bottom, with a charge of -1 and strangeness -3) was missing; no particle with these properties had ever been detected in the laboratory [24]. Gell-Mann boldly predicted that such a particle would be found, and told the experimentalists exactly how to produce it. Moreover, he calculated its mass (as you can for yourself, in Problem 1.6) and its lifetime (Problem 1.8) – and sure enough, in 1964 the famous *omega-minus* particle was discovered [25], precisely as Gell-Mann had predicted (see Figure 1.9).*

Since the discovery of the omega-minus (Ω^-), no one has seriously doubted that the Eightfold Way is correct. Over the next 10 years, every new hadron found a place in one of the Eightfold Way *supermultiplets*. Some of these are shown in Figure 1.10†. In addition to the baryon octet, decuplet, and so on, there exist of course an *antibaryon* octet, decuplet, etc, with opposite charge and opposite strangeness. However, in the case of the mesons, the antiparticles lie in the *same supermultiplet* as the corresponding particles, in the diametrically opposite positions. Thus the antiparticle of the pi-plus is the pi-minus, the anti-*K*-minus is the *K*-plus, and so on (the pi-zero and the eta are their *own* antiparticles).

Classification is the first stage in the development of any science. The Eightfold Way did more than merely classify the hadrons, but its real importance lies in the organizational structure it provided. I think it's fair to say that the Eightfold Way initiated the modern era in particle physics.

1.8 The Quark Model (1964)

But the very success of the Eightfold Way begs the question: *why* do the hadrons fit into these bizarre patterns? The periodic table had to wait many years for quantum mechanics and the Pauli exclusion principle to provide its explanation. An understanding of the Eightfold Way, however, came already in 1964, when Gell-Mann and Zweig independently proposed that all hadrons are in fact composed of even more elementary constituents, which Gell-Mann called *quarks* [26]. The

* A similar thing happened in the case of the periodic table. There were three famous 'holes' (missing elements) on Mendeleev's chart, and he predicted that new elements would be discovered to fill in the gaps. Like Gell-Mann, he confidently described their properties, and within 20 years all three – gallium, scandium, and germanium – were found.

† To be sure, there were occasional false alarms – particles that did not seem to fit Gell-Mann's scheme – but they always turned out to be experimental errors. Elementary particles have a way of appearing and then *disappearing*. Of the 26 mesons listed on a standard table in 1963, 19 were later found to be spurious!





Fig. 1.9 The discovery of the Ω^- . The actual bubble chamber photograph is shown on the left; a line diagram of the relevant tracks is on the right. (Photo courtesy Brookhaven National Laboratory.)






Fig. 1.10 Some meson nonets, labeled in spectroscopic notation (see Chapter 5). There are now at least 15 established nonets (though in some cases not all members have been discovered). For the baryons there

are three complete octets (with spins 1/2, 3/2, and 5/2) and 10 others partly filled; there is only one complete decuplet, but 6 more are partly filled, and there are three known singlets.

quarks come in three types (or ‘flavors’), forming a triangular ‘Eightfold-Way’ pattern:



The u (for ‘up’) quark carries a charge of $\frac{2}{3}$ and a strangeness of zero; the d (‘down’) quark carries a charge of $-\frac{1}{3}$ and $S = 0$; the s (originally ‘sideways’, but now more commonly ‘strange’) quark carries a charge of $-\frac{1}{3}$ and $S = -1$. To each quark (q) there corresponds an *antiquark* (\bar{q}), with the opposite charge and strangeness:



And there are two *composition rules*:

1. Every baryon is composed of three quarks (and every antibaryon is composed of three antiquarks).
2. Every meson is composed of a quark and an antiquark.

With this, it is a matter of elementary arithmetic to construct the baryon decuplet and the meson octet. All we need to do is list the combinations of three quarks (or quark–antiquark pairs) and add up their charge and strangeness:

The baryon decuplet			
qqq	Q	S	Baryon
uuu	2	0	Δ^{++}
uud	1	0	Δ^+
udd	0	0	Δ^0
ddd	-1	0	Δ^-
uus	1	-1	Σ^{*+}
uds	0	-1	Σ^{*0}
dds	-1	-1	Σ^{*-}
uss	0	-2	Ξ^{*0}
dss	-1	-2	Ξ^{*-}
sss	-1	-3	Ω^-

Notice that there are 10 combinations of three quarks. Three u 's, for instance, at $Q = \frac{2}{3}$ each, yield a total charge of +2 and a strangeness of zero. This is the Δ^{++} particle. Continuing down the table, we find all the members of the decuplet ending with the Ω^- , which is evidently made of three s quarks.

A similar enumeration of the quark–antiquark combinations yields the meson table:

The meson nonet			
$q\bar{q}$	Q	S	Meson
$u\bar{u}$	0	0	π^0
$u\bar{d}$	1	0	π^+
$d\bar{u}$	-1	0	π^-
$d\bar{d}$	0	0	η
$u\bar{s}$	1	1	K^+
$d\bar{s}$	0	1	K^0
$s\bar{u}$	-1	-1	K^-
$s\bar{d}$	0	-1	\bar{K}^0
$s\bar{s}$	0	0	η'

But wait! There are *nine* combinations here, and only eight particles in the meson octet. The quark model requires that there be a third meson (in addition to the π^0 and the η) with $Q = 0$ and $S = 0$. As it turns out, just such a particle had already been found experimentally – the η' . In the Eightfold Way, the η' had been classified as a *singlet*, all by itself. According to the quark model, it properly belongs with the other eight mesons to form the *meson nonet*. (Actually, since $u\bar{u}$, $d\bar{d}$, and $s\bar{s}$ all have $Q = 0$ and $S = 0$, it is not possible to say, on the basis of anything we have done so far, which is the π^0 , which the η , and which the η' . But never mind, the point is that there are *three* mesons with $Q = S = 0$.) By the way, the *antimesons* automatically fall in the same supermultiplet as the mesons: $u\bar{d}$ is the antiparticle of $d\bar{u}$, and vice versa.

You may have noticed that I avoided talking about the baryon *octet* – and it is far from obvious how we are going to get *eight* baryons by putting together three quarks. In truth, the procedure is perfectly straightforward, but it does call for some facility in handling spins, and I would rather save the details for Chapter 5. For now, I'll just tantalize you with the mysterious observation that if you take the decuplet and knock off the three corners (where the quarks are identical – uuu , ddd , and sss) and double the center (where all three are different – uds), you obtain precisely the eight states in the baryon octet. So the same set of quarks can account for the octet; it's just that some combinations do not appear at all, and one appears twice.

Indeed, *all* the Eightfold Way supermultiplets emerge naturally in quark model. Of course, the same combination of quarks can go to make a number of different particles: the delta-plus and the proton are both composed of two u 's and a d ; the pi-plus and the rho-plus are both $u\bar{d}$, and so on. Just as the hydrogen atom (electron plus proton) has many different energy levels, a given collection of quarks can bind together in many different ways. But whereas the various energy levels in the electron/proton system are relatively close together (the spacings are typically several electron volts, in an atom whose rest energy is nearly 10^9 eV), so that we naturally think of them all as 'hydrogen', the energy spacings for different states of a bound quark system are very large, and we normally regard them as distinct particles. Thus we can, in principle, construct an infinite number of hadrons out of only three quarks. Notice, however, that *some* things are absolutely excluded in the quark model: for example, a baryon with $S = 1$ or $Q = -2$; no combination of the three quarks can produce these numbers (though they do occur for *antibaryons*). Nor can there be a *meson* with a charge of $+2$ (like the Δ^{++} baryon) or a strangeness of -3 (like the Ω^-). For a long time, there were major experimental searches for these so-called 'exotic' particles; their discovery would be devastating for the quark model, but none has ever been found (see Problem 1.11).

The quark model *does*, however, suffer from one profound embarrassment: in spite of the most diligent search, no one has ever seen an individual quark. Now, if a proton is really made out of three quarks, you'd think that if you hit one hard enough, the quarks ought to come popping out. Nor would they be hard to recognize, carrying as they do the unmistakable fingerprint of fractional charge – an ordinary Millikan oil drop experiment would clinch the identification. Moreover, at least one of the quarks should be absolutely stable; what could it decay




Fig. 1.11 (a) In Rutherford scattering, the number of particles deflected through large angles indicates that the atom has internal structure (a nucleus). (b) In deep inelastic scattering, the number of particles deflected through large angles indicates that the proton has internal structure (quarks). The dashed lines show what you would expect

if the positive charge were uniformly distributed over the volume of (a) the atom, (b) the proton. (Source: Halzen, F. and Martin, A. D. (1984) *Quarks and Leptons*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, p. 17. Copyright © John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Reprinted by permission.)

into, since there is no lighter particle with fractional charge? So quarks ought to be *easy* to produce, *easy* to identify, and *easy* to store, and yet, no one has ever found one.

The failure of experiments to produce isolated quarks occasioned widespread skepticism about the quark model in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Those who clung to the model tried to conceal their disappointment by introducing the notion of *quark confinement*: perhaps, for reasons not yet understood, quarks are *absolutely confined* within baryons and mesons, so that no matter how hard you try, you cannot get them out. Of course, this doesn't explain anything, it just gives a name to our frustration. But it does pose sharply a critical theoretical question that is still not completely answered: what is the *mechanism* responsible for quark confinement? [27]

Even if all quarks are stuck inside hadrons, this does not mean they are inaccessible to experimental study. One can explore the interior of a proton in much the same way as Rutherford probed the inside of an atom – by firing things into it. Such experiments were carried out in the late 1960s using high-energy electrons at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center (SLAC). They were repeated in the early 1970s using neutrino beams at CERN, and later still using protons. The results of these so-called 'deep inelastic scattering' experiments [28] were strikingly reminiscent of Rutherford's (Figure 1.11): *most* of the incident particles pass right through, whereas a small number bounce back sharply. This means that the charge of the proton is concentrated in small lumps, just as Rutherford's results indicated that the positive charge in an atom is concentrated at the nucleus [29]. However,

in the case of the proton the evidence suggests *three* lumps, instead of *one*. This is strong support for the quark model, obviously, but still not conclusive.

Finally, there was a theoretical objection to the quark model: it appears to violate the Pauli exclusion principle. In Pauli's original formulation, the exclusion principle states that no two electrons can occupy the same state. However, it was later realized that the same rule applies to all particles of half-integer spin (the proof of this is one of the most important achievements of quantum field theory). In particular, the exclusion principle should apply to quarks, which, as we shall see, must carry spin $\frac{1}{2}$. Now the Δ^{++} , for instance, is supposed to consist of three identical u quarks in the same state; it (and also the Δ^- and the Ω^-) appear to be inconsistent with the Pauli principle. In 1964, O. W. Greenberg proposed a way out of this dilemma [30]. He suggested that quarks not only come in three *flavors* (u , d , and s) but each of these also comes in three *colors* ('red', 'green', and 'blue', say). To make a baryon, we simply take one quark of each color; then the three u 's in Δ^{++} are no longer identical (one's red, one's green, and one's blue). Since the exclusion principle only applies to *identical* particles, the problem evaporates.

The color hypothesis sounds like sleight of hand, and many people initially considered it the last gasp of the quark model. As it turned out, the introduction of color was extraordinarily fruitful [31]. I need hardly say that the term 'color' here has absolutely no connection with the ordinary meaning of the word. Redness, blueness, and greenness are simply *labels* used to denote three new properties that, in addition to charge and strangeness, the quarks possess. A *red* quark carries one unit of redness, zero blueness, and zero greenness; its antiparticle carries *minus* one unit of redness, and so on. We could just as well call these quantities *X-ness*, *Y-ness*, and *Z-ness*, for instance. However, the color terminology has one especially nice feature: it suggests a delightfully simple characterization of the particular quark combinations that are found in nature.

All naturally occurring particles are colorless.

By 'colorless' I mean that *either* the total amount of each color is zero *or* all three colors are present in equal amounts. (The latter case mimics the optical fact that light beams of three primary colors combine to make white.) This clever rule 'explains' (if that's the word for it) why you can't make a particle out of *two* quarks, or *four* quarks, and for that matter why *individual* quarks do not occur in nature. The only colorless combinations you can make are $q\bar{q}$ (the mesons), qqq (the baryons), and $\bar{q}\bar{q}\bar{q}$ (the antibaryons).*

* Of course, you can package together *combinations* of these – the deuteron, for example, is a *six* quark state (three u 's and three d 's). In 2003, there was a flurry of excitement over the apparent observation of four-quark 'mesons' (actually, $qq\bar{q}\bar{q}$) and pentaquark 'baryons' ($qqqq\bar{q}$). The latter now appear to

have been statistical artifacts [32], but in at least one meson case (the so-called X(3872) discovered at KEK in Japan), the four-quark interpretation seems to be holding up, though it is still not clear whether it is best thought of as a $D\bar{D}^*$ 'molecule' or as a meson in its own right [33].

1.9

The November Revolution and Its Aftermath (1974–1983 and 1995)

The decade from 1964 to 1974 was a barren time for elementary particle physics. The quark model, which had seemed so promising at the beginning, was in an uncomfortable state of limbo by the end. It had some striking successes: it neatly explained the Eightfold Way, and correctly predicted the lumpy structure of the proton. But it had two conspicuous defects: the experimental absence of free quarks and inconsistency with the Pauli principle. Those who liked the model papered over these failures with what seemed at the time to be rather transparent rationalizations: the idea of quark confinement and the color hypothesis. But I think it is safe to say that by 1974 most elementary particle physicists felt queasy, at best, about the quark model. The lumps inside the proton were called *partons*, and it was unfashionable to identify them explicitly with quarks.

Curiously enough, what rescued the quark model was not the discovery of free quarks, or an explanation of quark confinement, or confirmation of the color hypothesis, but something entirely different and (almost) [34] completely unexpected: the discovery of the psi meson. The ψ was first observed at Brookhaven by a group under C. C. Ting, in the summer of 1974. But Ting wanted to check his results before announcing them publicly, and the discovery remained an astonishingly well-kept secret until the weekend of November 10–11, when the new particle was discovered independently by Burton Richter’s group at SLAC. The two teams then published simultaneously [35], Ting naming the particle J , and Richter calling it ψ . The J/ψ was an electrically neutral, extremely heavy meson – more than three times the weight of a proton (the original notion that mesons are ‘middle-weight’ and baryons ‘heavy-weight’ had long since gone by the boards). But what made this particle so unusual was its extraordinarily long lifetime, for the ψ lasted fully 10^{-20} seconds before disintegrating. Now, 10^{-20} seconds may not impress you as a particularly long time, but you must understand that the *typical* lifetimes for hadrons in this mass range are on the order of 10^{-23} seconds. So the ψ has a lifetime about a 1000 times longer than any comparable particle. It’s as though someone came upon an isolated village in Peru or the Caucasus where people live to be 70 000 years old. That wouldn’t just be some actuarial anomaly, it would be a sign of fundamentally new biology at work. And so it was with the ψ : its long lifetime, to those who understood, spoke of fundamentally new physics. For good reason, the events precipitated by the discovery of the ψ came to be known as the *November Revolution* [36].

In the months that followed, the true nature of the ψ meson was the subject of lively debate, but the explanation that won was provided by the quark model: the ψ is a bound state of a new (fourth) quark, the c (for *charm*) and its antiquark, $\psi = (c\bar{c})$. Actually, the idea of a fourth flavor, and even the whimsical name, had been introduced many years earlier by Bjorken and Glashow [37]. There was an




Fig. 1.13 The charmed baryon. The most probable interpretation of this event is $\nu_\mu + p \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ + \mu^- + \pi^+ + \pi^-$. The charmed baryon decays ($\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Lambda + \pi^+$) too soon to leave a track, but the subsequent decay of the Λ is clearly visible. (Photo courtesy of Samios, N. P. Brookhaven National Laboratory.)

carries no *net* charm, for if the c is assigned a charm of +1, then \bar{c} will have a charm of -1 ; the charm of the ψ is, if you will, ‘hidden’. To confirm the charm hypothesis, it was important to produce a particle with ‘naked’ (or ‘bare’) charm [39]. The first evidence for charmed baryons ($\Lambda_c^+ = udc$ and $\Sigma_c^{++} = uuc$) appeared already in 1975 (Figure 1.13) [40], followed later by $\Xi_c = usc$ and $\Omega_c = ssc$. (In 2002 there were hints of the first *doubly* charmed baryon at Fermilab.) The first charmed mesons ($D^0 = c\bar{u}$ and $D^+ = c\bar{d}$) were discovered in 1976 [41], followed by the charmed strange meson ($D_s^+ = c\bar{s}$) in 1977 [42]. With these discoveries, the interpretation of the ψ as $c\bar{c}$ was established beyond reasonable doubt. More important, the quark model itself was put back on its feet.

However, the story does not end there, for in 1975 a new *lepton* was discovered [43], spoiling Glashow’s symmetry. This new particle (the tau) has its own neutrino, so we are up to six leptons, and only four quarks. But don’t despair, because 2 years later a new heavy meson (the *upsilon*) was discovered [44], and quickly recognized as the carrier of a fifth quark, b (for *beauty*, or *bottom*, depending on your taste): $\Upsilon = b\bar{b}$. Immediately the search began for hadrons exhibiting ‘naked beauty’, or ‘bare bottom.’ (I’m sorry. *I* didn’t invent this terminology. In a way, its silliness is a reminder of how wary people were of taking the quark model seriously, in the early days.) The first bottom baryon, $\Lambda_b^0 = udb$, was observed in the 1980’s, and the second ($\Sigma_b^+ = uub$) in 2006; in 2007 the first baryon with a quark from all three generations was discovered ($\Xi_b^- = dsb$). The first bottom mesons ($\bar{B}^0 = b\bar{d}$ and $B^- = b\bar{u}$) were found in 1983 [45]. The B^0/\bar{B}^0 system has proven to be especially rich, and so-called ‘ B factories’ are now operating at SLAC (‘BaBar’) and KEK (‘Belle’). The *Particle Physics Booklet* also lists $B_s^0 = s\bar{b}$ and $B_c^+ = c\bar{b}$.

At this point, it didn’t take a genius to predict that a sixth quark (t , for *truth*, of course, or *top*) would soon be found, restoring Glashow’s symmetry with six quarks and six leptons. But the top quark turned out to be extraordinarily heavy and frustratingly elusive (at $174 \text{ GeV}/c^2$, it is over 40 times the weight of the bottom quark). Early searches for ‘toponium’ (a $t\bar{t}$ meson analogous to the ψ and Υ) were unsuccessful, both because the electron–positron colliders did not reach high enough energy and because, as we now realize, the top quark is simply too short-lived to form bound states – apparently there *are* no top baryons and mesons. The top quark’s existence was not definitively established until 1995, when the Tevatron finally accumulated enough data to sustain strong indications from the previous year [46]. (The basic reaction is $u + \bar{u}$ (or $d + \bar{d}$) $\rightarrow t + \bar{t}$; the top and anti-top immediately decay, and it is by analyzing the decay products that one is able to infer their fleeting appearance.) Until the LHC begins operation, Fermilab will be the only accelerator in the world capable of producing top quarks.

1.10 Intermediate Vector Bosons (1983)

In his original theory of beta decay (1933), Fermi treated the process as a contact interaction, occurring at a single point, and therefore requiring no mediating

particle. As it happens, the weak force (which is responsible for beta decay) is of extremely short range, so that Fermi's model was not far from the truth, and yields excellent approximate results at low energies. However, it was widely recognized that this approach was bound to fail at high energies and would eventually have to be supplanted with a theory in which the interaction is mediated by the exchange of some particle. The mediator came to be known by the prosaic name *intermediate vector boson*. The challenge for theorists was to predict the properties of the intermediate vector boson, and for experimentalists, to produce one in the laboratory. You may recall that Yukawa, faced with the analogous problem for the strong force, was able to estimate the mass of the pion in terms of the range of the force, which he took to be roughly the same as the size of a nucleus. But we have no corresponding way to measure the range of the weak force; there are no 'weak bound states' whose size would inform us – the weak force is simply too feeble to bind particles together. For many years, predictions of the intermediate vector boson mass were little more than educated guesses (the 'education' coming largely from the failure of experiments at progressively higher energies to detect the particle). By 1962, it was known that the mass had to be at least half the proton mass; 10 years later the experimental lower limit had grown to 2.5 proton masses.

But it was not until the emergence of the electroweak theory of Glashow, Weinberg, and Salam that a really firm prediction of the mass became possible. In this theory, there are in fact *three* intermediate vector bosons, two of them charged (W^\pm) and one neutral (Z). Their masses were calculated to be [47]

$$M_W = 82 \pm 2 \text{ GeV}/c^2, \quad M_Z = 92 \pm 2 \text{ GeV}/c^2 \quad (\text{predicted}) \quad (1.30)$$

In the late 1970s, CERN began construction of a proton–antiproton collider designed specifically to produce these extremely heavy particles (bear in mind that the mass of the proton is $0.94 \text{ GeV}/c^2$, so we're talking about something nearly 100 times as heavy). In January 1983, the discovery of the W was reported by Carlo Rubbia's group [48], and 5 months later the same team announced discovery of the Z [49]. Their measured masses are

$$M_W = 80.403 \pm 0.029 \text{ GeV}/c^2, \quad M_Z = 91.188 \pm 0.002 \text{ GeV}/c^2 \quad (\text{measured}) \quad (1.31)$$

These experiments represent an extraordinary technical triumph [50], and they were of fundamental importance in confirming a crucial aspect of the Standard Model, to which the physics community was by that time heavily committed (and for which a Nobel Prize had already been awarded). Unlike the strange particles or the ψ , however, (but like the top quark a decade later) the intermediate vector bosons were long awaited and universally expected, so the general reaction was a sigh of relief, not shock or surprise.

1.11

The Standard Model (1978–?)

In the current view, then, all matter is made out of three kinds of elementary particles: leptons, quarks, and mediators. There are six leptons, classified according to their charge (Q), electron number (L_e), muon number (L_μ), and tau number (L_τ). They fall naturally into three *generations*:

		Lepton classification				
		l	Q	L_e	L_μ	L_τ
First generation	{	e	-1	1	0	0
		ν_e	0	1	0	0
Second generation	{	μ	-1	0	1	0
		ν_μ	0	0	1	0
Third generation	{	τ	-1	0	0	1
		ν_τ	0	0	0	1

There are also six antileptons, with all the signs reversed. The positron, for example, carries a charge of +1 and an electron number -1. So there are really 12 leptons, all told.

Similarly, there are six ‘flavors’ of quarks, classified by charge, strangeness (S), charm (C), beauty (B), and truth (T). (For consistency, I suppose we should include ‘upness’, U , and ‘downness’, D , although these terms are seldom used. They are redundant, inasmuch as the only quark with $S = C = B = T = 0$ and $Q = \frac{2}{3}$, for instance, is the up quark, so it is not necessary to specify $U = 1$ and $D = 0$ as well.) The quarks, too, fall into three generations:

		Quark classification							
		q	Q	D	U	S	C	B	T
First generation	{	d	-1/3	-1	0	0	0	0	0
		u	2/3	0	1	0	0	0	0
Second generation	{	s	-1/3	0	0	-1	0	0	0
		c	2/3	0	0	0	1	0	0
Third generation	{	b	-1/3	0	0	0	0	-1	0
		t	2/3	0	0	0	0	0	1

Again, all signs would be reversed on the table of antiquarks. Meanwhile, each quark and antiquark comes in three colors, so there are 36 of them in all.

Finally, every interaction has its mediator – the photon for the electromagnetic force, two W ’s and a Z for the weak force, the graviton (presumably) for gravity . . . but what about the strong force? In Yukawa’s original theory the mediator of strong forces was the pion, but with the discovery of heavy mesons this simple picture could not stand; protons and neutrons could now exchange ρ ’s and η ’s and K ’s and ϕ ’s and all the rest of them. The quark model brought an even more radical revision: for if protons, neutrons, and mesons are complicated composite




Fig. 1.14 The three generations of quarks and leptons, in order of increasing mass.

structures, there is no reason to believe their interaction *should* be simple. To study the strong force at the fundamental level, one should look, rather, at the interaction between individual quarks. So the question becomes: what particle is exchanged between two quarks, in a strong process? This mediator is called the *gluon*, and in the Standard Model there are eight of them. As we shall see, the gluons themselves carry color, and therefore (like the quarks) should not exist as isolated particles. We can hope to detect gluons only within hadrons or in colorless combinations with other gluons (*glueballs*). Nevertheless, there is substantial indirect experimental evidence for the existence of gluons: the deep inelastic scattering experiments showed that roughly half the momentum of a proton is carried by electrically neutral constituents, presumably gluons; the *jet* structure characteristic of inelastic scattering at high energies can be explained in terms of the disintegration of quarks and gluons in flight [51] and glueballs may conceivably have been observed [52].

This is all adding up to an embarrassingly large number of supposedly ‘elementary’ particles: 12 leptons, 36 quarks, 12 mediators (I won’t count the graviton, since gravity is not included in the Standard Model). And, as we shall see later, the Glashow–Weinberg–Salam theory calls for at least one *Higgs* particle, so we have a minimum of 61 particles to contend with. Informed by our experience first with atoms and later with hadrons, many people have suggested that some, at least, of these 61 must be composites of more elementary subparticles (see Problem 1.18) [53]. Such speculations lie beyond the Standard Model and outside the scope of this book. Personally, I do not think the large number of ‘elementary’ particles in the Standard Model is by itself alarming, for they are tightly interrelated. The eight gluons, for example, are identical except for their colors, and the second and third generations mimic the first (Figure 1.14).

Still, it does seem odd that there should be *three* generations of quarks and leptons – after all, *ordinary* matter is made of up and down quarks (in the form of protons and neutrons) and electrons, all drawn from the first generation. Why are there two ‘extra’ generations; who needs ‘em? It’s a peculiar question, presuming a kind of purpose and efficiency on the part of the creator for which there is

little evidence ... but one can't help wondering. Actually, there is a surprising answer: as we shall see, the predominance of matter over antimatter admits a plausible accounting within the Standard Model, but only if there are (at least) three generations.

Of course, this begs the reverse question: why are there *only* three generations? Indeed, could there be more of them, which have not yet been discovered (presumably because they are too heavy to be made with existing machines)? As recently as 1988 [54], there were good reasons to anticipate a fourth generation, and perhaps even a fifth. But within a year that possibility was foreclosed by experiments at SLAC and CERN [55]. The Z^0 is (as Saddam would say) the 'mother of all particles', in the sense that it can decay (with a precisely calculable probability) into *any* quark/antiquark or lepton/antilepton pair ($e^- + e^+$, $u + \bar{u}$, $\nu_\mu + \bar{\nu}_\mu$, etc.), provided only that the particle's mass is less than half that of the Z^0 (else there wouldn't be enough energy to make the pair). So by measuring the lifetime of the Z^0 you can actually *count* the number of quarks and leptons with mass less than $45 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. The more there are, the shorter the lifetime of the Z^0 , just as the more fatal diseases we are susceptible to the shorter our average lifespan becomes. The experiments show that the lifetime of the Z^0 is exactly what you would expect on the basis of the established three generations. Of course, the quarks (and conceivably even the charged lepton) in a putative fourth generation might be too heavy to affect the Z^0 lifetime, but it is hardly to be imagined that the fourth neutrino would suddenly jump to over $45 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. At any rate, what the experiments do unequivocally show is that the number of *light* neutrinos is 2.99 ± 0.06 .

Although the Standard Model has survived unscathed for 30 years, it is certainly not the end of the story. There are many important issues that it simply does not address – it does not, for example, tell us how to calculate the quark and lepton masses.*

Quark and lepton masses (in MeV/c^2)

lepton	mass	quark	mass
ν_e	$<2 \times 10^{-6}$	u	2
ν_μ	<0.2	d	5
ν_τ	<18	s	100
e	0.511	c	1200
μ	106	b	4200
τ	1777	t	174 000

In the Standard Model, these are simply empirical numbers, taken from experiment, but a mature theory, presumably, would *explain* them, just as we can for the atoms on the periodic table.† As we shall see, the Standard Model also takes as empirical input three angles and a phase in the Kobayashi–Maskawa matrix, and analogous numbers for the leptons, and the Weinberg angle describing electroweak

* There is substantial uncertainty in the light quark masses; I have rounded them off for the sake of clarity.

† Note, however, that the quark/lepton mass formula is going to look very strange, since it has to cover a range of at least 11 powers of 10, from the electron neutrino to the top quark.

mixing, and . . . all told, there are over 20 arbitrary parameters in the Standard Model, and this is simply unacceptable in any ‘final’ theory [56].

On the experimental side, there remains much to be learned about neutrino oscillations (see Chapter 11), and CP violation (Chapter 12), but the most conspicuous missing link is the Higgs particle, which is necessary in the Standard Model to account for the masses of the W and Z (and perhaps all other particles as well). Like the top quark, the predicted mass of the Higgs has increased with time, as each new experiment failed to discover it. At this point, it is presumably beyond the range of any existing accelerator, and, since the cancellation of the SSC, the LHC is our best hope for finding this elusive particle.

Meanwhile, there are a number of theoretical speculations (supported as yet by no direct experimental evidence) that go beyond the Standard Model. There are the Grand Unified Theories (GUTs) that link the strong, electromagnetic, and weak interactions (Chapter 2); these are so widely accepted, at least in some form, as to be practically orthodox. Also very attractive to theorists is the idea of ‘supersymmetry’ (SUSY), which (among other things) would double the number of particles, associating with every fermion a boson, and vice versa. Thus the leptons would be joined by ‘sleptons’ (‘selectrons’, ‘sneutrinos’, etc.) and quarks by ‘squarks’; the mediators would acquire twins (the ‘photino’, ‘gluino’, ‘wino’, and ‘zino’). If subquarks or supersymmetric particles are discovered, this will be huge news, resetting the whole agenda for the next era in elementary particle physics. But except for several tantalizing false alarms [57], no evidence for either has yet appeared.

And then there is superstring theory, which since 1984 has captured the imagination of an entire generation of particle theorists. Superstrings promise not only to reconcile quantum mechanics and general relativity, and to eliminate the infinities that plague quantum field theory, but also to provide a unified ‘theory of everything’, from which all of elementary particle physics (including gravity) would emerge as an inescapable consequence. String theory has certainly enjoyed a brilliant and adventurous youth; it remains to be seen whether it can deliver on its extravagant ambition [58].

References

- 1 There are many good discussions of the history of elementary particle physics. My own favorite is the delightful little book by Yang, C. N. (1961) *Elementary Particles*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J. More recent accounts are (a) Trefil’s, J. S. (1980) *From Atoms to Quarks*, Scribners, New York; and (b) Close’s, F. E. (1983) *The Cosmic Onion*, Heinemann Educational Books, London. The early days are treated well in (c) Keller’s, A. (1983) *The Infancy of Atomic Physics*, Oxford University Press, Oxford; and (d) Weinberg’s, S. (1983) *Subatomic Particles*, Scientific American Library, New York. For a fascinating and masterful account, see (e) Pais, A. (1986) *Inward Bound*, Clarendon Press, Oxford. For a comprehensive bibliography see (f) Hovis, R. C. and Kragh, H. (1991) *American Journal of Physics*, 59, 779.
- 2 The story is beautifully told by Pais, A. in his biography of Einstein, (1982) *Subtle is the Lord*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.