ON THE VALUE OF FUNDAMENTAL CONSTANTS*

G. Parisi[†]

Department of Physics, Columbia University
New York, N. Y. 10027

NOTICE

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. Neither the United States nor the United States Atomic Energy Commission, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors, or their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights.

[†] On Leave of absence from INFN, Frascati, Italy.

* This research was supported by the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.

MASTER

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

See

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency Thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

DISCLAIMER

Portions of this document may be illegible in electronic image products. Images are produced from the best available original document.

ABSTRACT

We study how renormalized coupling constants depend on the cutoff in a renormalized quantum field theory. Assuming that the cutoff is connected with quantum gravity effects, relations are found between the fine structure constant α , the total cross section e^+e^- into hadrons, and the weak interaction angle θ_w .

It is an open problem whether the values of the fundamental constants of strong, electromagnetic, weak and gravitational interactions are free parameters or whether they satisfy some inner consistency condition. In recent times it has been suggested that the requirement of analyticity of first and second kind determines the strong interaction world.¹⁾

Unfortunately, the concept of only one admissible coupling constant is foreign to standard quantum field theory; it has been proven that in two-dimensional space-time a $\lambda\phi^4$ theory exists and satisfies all physical requirements for values of the coupling constant which are not too large.²⁾ Similar results should be valid for any super-renormalizable interaction.³⁾

However, if the interaction is only renormalizable, the situation is quite different. A cutoff must be introduced at an intermediate stage and finite results are obtained at any order in perturbation theory only if the bare coupling constant goes to infinity together with the cutoff.⁴⁾ This procedure has sometimes been criticized as being too artificial⁵⁾, since it would be much more natural to fix the coupling constant before doing the infinite cutoff limit. We argue that if finite results are obtained in this unconventional way, the renormalized coupling constant does not depend on the bare one and it is uniquely determined!

This can be simply understood in a theory with only one bare coupling constant G . Let g and Λ denote, respectively, the renormalized coupling constant and the cutoff. The following relation holds:

$$\Lambda \frac{\partial}{\partial \Lambda} \Big|_G g = -\beta(g) \quad (1)$$

where $\beta(g)$ is the Callan-Symanzik^{6,7)} function which can be computed in perturbation theory.

If the limit $\lim_{\Lambda \rightarrow \infty} g(G, \Lambda) \equiv g_{\infty}$ exists, then $\beta(g_{\infty})$ must be equal to zero⁸⁾; g_{∞} cannot be arbitrary since the function β is not identically equal to zero.

Two possibilities are present: (I). $g_{\infty} = 0$ or (II). $g_{\infty} \neq 0$. The first one is realized in a great majority of cases ($\beta(g) > 0, g \sim 0$), while the second one is typical of some non-abelian gauge theories.^{9,10)} (There are so-called asymptotically free theories.) In making this distinction we have assumed that the bare coupling constant is not too large in order to use perturbation theory as a reliable guide.

In the infinite cutoff limit only strong interactions survive; if other interactions are present in the Lagrangian, they disappear from the Green functions and the S-matrix. The actual existence of non-strong interactions suggests that the cutoff is finite, still being very large. In this case the renormalized coupling constant of a non-asymptotically free interaction is different from zero. For example, in pure quantum electrodynamics one finds:¹¹⁾

$$\alpha = \frac{3\pi}{2 \lg(\Lambda/m_e)} + O(\lg^{-2}(\Lambda/m_e)) \quad (2)$$

The dependence on the bare coupling constant appears only in the next order term; if $\lg(\Lambda/m_e)$ is a very large number, then the value of the non-strong coupling constant is approximately fixed and is independent of the value of the bare one.

We try to give a physical meaning to the cutoff assuming that quantum

gravity provides an automatic cutoff at distances of order 10^{-32} cm. ($10^{-5} g$).¹²⁾

The ratio of this distance to any strong or weak interaction scale is so small that a good approximation can be obtained without knowing in detail how the cutoff works.

As an application we discuss the following model: strong interactions are approximately symmetric under $SU(4) \times SU(4)$, the only leptons being the electron, the muon and their neutrinos. Electromagnetic and weak interactions are the same as in the Weinberg model¹³⁾, and the hadrons are coupled to the gauge fields following the Glashow-Ilioupoulos-Maiani prescription.¹⁴⁾ For simplicity, Higgs fields¹⁵⁾ are not introduced at this stage.

The hadrons have strong interactions; they must be described by an asymptotically free theory, and their Lagrangian is of the Yang-Mills type. The coupling constant is fixed by the condition $\beta(g) = 0$, but its actual value is uncomputable using standard field theory techniques.

Formulae similar to Eq. (2) can be found for the weak and electromagnetic charges:

$$\frac{g'^2}{4\pi} = \frac{3\pi}{2L} \left[\frac{3}{2} + \frac{23}{18} A \right]^{-1} + O(L^{-2}) \quad (3)$$

$$\frac{g^2}{4\pi} = \frac{3\pi}{2L} \left[A - \frac{9}{2} \right]^{-1} + O(L^{-2})$$

where

$$e = \frac{g g'}{g^2 + g'^2} ; \quad \text{tg } \theta_w = \frac{g'}{g} ; \quad L = l_g \Lambda / m_p \quad (4)$$

and,

$$A = \frac{9}{10} \frac{\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow \text{hadrons})}{\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-)} \Big|_{m^2 \ll s^2 < \Lambda^2}$$

In this model, we stress that the strong interaction world is asymptotic scale invariant, anomalous dimensions¹⁶⁾ are probably present, and A may assume a value quite different from its canonical one¹⁷⁾ which is 3 in the colored quark model.

Using as an input the actual value of α and choosing $\Lambda = 10^{18}$ GeV ($2L = 83$), we predict $\sin^2\theta_w \simeq .3$, $R \simeq 9$. Different results are obtained if the model for weak interactions is changed.

Summarizing, we suggest that at distances where quantum gravity becomes relevant, strong, electromagnetic and weak interactions are described by comparable coupling constants. Quantum fluctuations (vacuum polarization effects) screen the weak and electromagnetic charges and enhance the strong ones. This mechanism produces relations between the electromagnetic, weak and gravitational coupling constants. These relations become exact in the limit in which the gravitational coupling constant goes to zero. In the same limit the electromagnetic and weak interactions disappear. Assuming a particular model for the weak interactions,^{13,14)} we predict the value of the Weinberg angle and of the total cross section for the process of e^+e^- into hadrons. The results do not strongly conflict with the uncertain experimental situation.¹⁸⁻²²⁾

References

- 1). G. F. Chew, The Analytic S-Matrix, A Basis for Nuclear Democracy,
(W. A. Benjamin, New York, 1966).
- 2). J. Glimm, A. Jaffe, and T. Spencer, Physics of Quantum Fields Models,
Lecture Notes in Physics, Vol. 25 (Spring Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg,
New York, 1973).
- 3). J. Glimm and A. Jaffe, Fortschritte der Physics 21, 324 (1973).
- 4). F. J. Dyson, Phys. Rev. 75, 468, 1746 (1949).
- 5). P.A.M. Dirac, The Principles of Quantum Mechanics, (Claredon Press,
Oxford, 1958).
- 6). K. Symanzik, Comm. Math. Phys. 18, 22 (1970).
- 7). C. G. Callan, Phys. Rev. D2, 1541 (1970).
- 8). K. Wilson, Phys. Rev. D3, 1818 (1971).
- 9). K. Symanzik, Lettere Nuovo Cimento, 6, 420 (1973).
- 10). G. t'Hooft, discussion and remarks at the Marseille Conference (June 1972)
and CERN preprint #1666.
- 11). L. D. Landau and I. Pomeranchuk, Doklady Akad. Nauk. (U.S.S.R.) 95,
773 (1954).
- 12). C.J. Isham, A. Salam and J. Strathdee, Phys. Letters 35B, 585 (1971);
Phys. Rev. D3, 1805 (1971).
- 13). S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Letters 19, 1264 (1967).
- 14). S. L. Glashow, J. Iliopoulos, and L. Maiani, Phys. Rev. D2, 1285 (1970).

- 15). F. Englert and R. Brout, Phys. Rev. Letters 13, 321 (1964); P. W. Higgs, Phys. Rev. Letters 13, 508 (1964).
- 16). K. Wilson, Phys. Rev. 179, 1444 (1969).
- 17). N. Cabibbo, G. Parisi, and M. Testa, Lettere Nuovo Cimento, 4, 35 (1970).
- 18). CERN - Gargamelle Collaboration, Phys. Letters 46B, 121 (1973).
- 19). A. Benvenuti, et al., Phys. Rev. Letters 32, 800 (1974).
- 20). C. Bacci, et al., Phys. Rev. Letters 44B, 173 (1973).
- 21). F. Ceradini, et al., Phys. Letters, 47B, 80 (1973).
- 22). G. Tornopolsky, et al., Phys. Rev. Letters 32, 432 (1974).