MASTER

COO 264-597

EFI 71-72

DYNAMICS UNDERLYING DUALITY AND
GAUGE INVARIANCE IN THE DUAL RESONANCE MODEL

660 3000
Lay Nam Chang
Department of Physics
The University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., 19104
and
Freydoon Mansouri
The Enrico Fermi Institute
The University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60637

DECEMBER, 1971

Contract No. AT (11-1)-264

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.

COO 264-597

EFI 71-72

DYNAMICS UNDERLYING DUALITY AND
GAUGE INVARIANCE IN THE DUAL RESONANCE MODEL⁺

Lay Nam Chang
Department of Physics
The University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., 19104
and Freydoon Mansouri
The Enrico Fermi Institute
The University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60637
DECEMBER, 1971

ABSTRACT

Making use of the similarity between the factorized spectrum of the generalized beta-function and the spectrum of a vibrating string in Minkowski space, we construct a formalism within which we give a geometrical interpretation to the gauge symmetries inherent in the theory. The key point in the construction is the identification of the harmonic oscillator amplitude with the components of actual coordinates in space-time. It turns out that these coordinates must satisfy certain constraints arising from purely geometrical considerations, and these constraint equations are then shown to be the familiar gauge conditions on the underlying states. Analogies with more familiar gauge theories are pointed out.

⁺Supported in part by the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

Reg

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.

INTRODUCTION

The dynamical concept of duality¹ is most concretely realized within a pure resonance framework.² The resulting elastic scattering amplitude can be written as ratios of gamma functions and embodies duality in that it may be expressed either as a sum over s-channel resonances or over t-channel resonances. This particular realization of duality has been generalized to scattering amplitudes involving an arbitrary number of scalar external particles.³ When such an amplitude is factorized⁴ in a given channel, an extremely rich spectrum of resonances is revealed, which decay into scalar particles in a highly correlated (sequential) manner.

Straightforward factorization of the dual resonance model requires the introduction of many states not all of which can represent resonances. The states that do represent resonances⁵ are specified by their mass and spin and are supposed to carry⁶ timelike unitary irreducible representations of the Poincare' group. This means that they must have positive norms. Many of the states that arise from straightforward factorization of the Dual Resonance Model (DRM) have negative norms, however, so that they are unphysical in the sense described above.

A remarkable feature of the DRM is that it appears to have an intrinsic symmetry which allows for the freedom of imposing certain constraint equations on the factorizing states.⁷ This in turn raises the possibility that one might be able to partition these states into two equivalence classes, on one of which the Poincare' group action could be unitarily implemented. Since the result of such constraints is compatibility with

Poincare' invariance, one may inquire whether such constraint equations express the consistency conditions between Poincare' invariance and the dynamical realization of duality. The relevance of such an inquiry can be substantiated by recalling that in quantum electrodynamics the compatibility between Poincare' invariance and the coupling of photons to matter to yield long range interactions, a dynamical requirement, yield the gauge identities which eliminate the ghosts in the photon field.

In order to see whether such analogies provide a clue to the solution of the problems encountered in the DRM, one must have a formalism in which the realization of the conventional form of duality, the nature of the gauge symmetry involved, and the origin of the unphysical features of the model are clearly brought to the foreground. We report in this paper a possible framework which is internally consistent and within which such questions can be examined in detail.

Our considerations are based to a large extent on the observation that the dual resonance spectrum bears a striking resemblance to that of a vibrating string^{8,9,10} in 4-dimensional space-time. The amplitude of vibration is taken to be a Minkowski coordinate that expresses the internal degrees of freedom of the hadronic system. The equation of motion for this string is now reinterpreted as a geometric constraint in the Minkowski space. Such a space-time interpretation leads to a formalism which closely parallels that of the known gauge theories of physics. The subsidiary conditions are then seen to emerge from the geometrical invariances inherent in our considerations.

The theory which we develop along these lines also imposes severe restrictions on the possible forms of interaction. In particular, if one is to attach any significance to the gauge invariance implied by such

geometrical considerations, one must ensure that the gauge invariance is not disturbed in the presence of interactions. We shall show that the appearance of tachyon in the ground state is the result of preserving this gauge invariance in first order perturbation theory.

We are unable at present to offer a general solution to the possible forms of interaction compatible with our gauge invariance requirement. We suspect, however, that it is indeed possible to relax the unphysical mass-shell constraint. We shall come back to this and the problems related to spin in a later work. We only mention here in passing that our geometrical approach allows us to discuss these problems in a fairly direct way.

The plan of the paper is as follows: In Section I we discuss briefly those aspects of the DRM which provide the motivation for introducing the string variables. In Section II we construct an action from geometrical considerations and go on to deduce its basic consequences. In Section III we quantize our system and obtain a wave equation together with constraints imposed on its solution. The interaction is introduced in Section IV.

Section V is devoted to a summary of the results and conclusions.

I. THE STRING VARIABLES

It is well known by now that the factorization of the DRM can best be carried out^{9,10} in terms of the four dimensional annihilation and creation operators, $a^\mu(n)$ and $a^\mu(n)^\dagger$, satisfying the commutation relations

$$[a^\mu(n), a^\nu(m)] = -g^{\mu\nu} \delta_{mn} \quad (1.1)$$

Although the introduction of these operators is, strictly speaking, not necessary for factorization, their use definitely simplifies the description of the factorizing states.

The conventional dual amplitude¹¹ for the scattering of N scalar particles, may then be written in the form

$$B_N(p_1, \dots, p_N) = \langle 0 | \Gamma(p_{N-1}) \Delta^{(N-1, N-2)} \dots \Gamma(p_2) | 0 \rangle \quad (1.2)$$

where $\Gamma(p_r)$ is the vertex function for the particle r defined by

$$\Gamma(p) \equiv \exp \left[i p_r \cdot \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sqrt{\frac{2}{n}} a^\dagger(n) \right] \exp \left[i p_r \cdot \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sqrt{\frac{2}{n}} a(n) \right] \quad (1.3)$$

The states $|0\rangle$ and $|0\rangle_N$ are ground states which are annihilated by $a^\mu(n)$ for all n . The external momenta satisfy the mass-shell condition $p_r^2 = -1$ which fixes the intercept of the corresponding trajectory at $\alpha_0 = +1$. The propagation function $\Delta(i, j)$ is given by

$$\Delta = H^{-1} ; \quad \alpha_0 = +1 \quad (1.4)$$

where

$$H = P^2 + \alpha_0 + \sum_n n a^\dagger(n) \cdot a(n) \quad (I.5)$$

The operators $a^\mu(n)$ transform like 4-vectors under homogeneous Lorentz transformations. However, they do not carry a momentum label and at this stage serve only to label the degeneracy of the states at each pole that appears in B_N . The physical states of the system are generated by the operators $\Gamma(p_r)$ acting on proper eigenvectors of H , and these states carry momentum only through the momentum dependence of the vertex. We thus require, by momentum conservation, that

$$[P^\mu, \Gamma(p_r)] = p_r^\mu \Gamma(p_r) \quad (I.6)$$

A general solution of the eq. (I.6) is

$$\Gamma(p_r) = \exp[i p_r \cdot X] \quad (I.7)$$

with

$$[P^\mu, X^\nu] \sim -i g^{\mu\nu} \quad (I.8)$$

where $\sim$ means proportional to. We shall now recast the vertex (I.3) in a form compatible with (I.7) and (I.8). To do so we define the quantity $\tilde{Y}^\mu$ as

$$\tilde{Y}^\mu = X^\mu + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sqrt{\frac{2}{n}} [a^\mu(n) + a^{\mu\dagger}(n)] \quad (I.9a)$$

such that

$$[P^\mu, X^\nu] = \quad (I.9b)$$

The operator $\Gamma(p)$ in (I.3) may now be written as

$$\Gamma(p_r) \equiv : \exp[i p_r \cdot \tilde{Y}] : \quad (I.10)$$

where the dots indicate normal ordering of the operators involved.

By virtue of (I.9) it clearly satisfies the eq. (I.6). Moreover, since the poles of the DRM are controlled by the operator H which describes the spectrum of a vibrating string in 4-dimensional space-time, we may regard the quantity $\tilde{Y}^\mu$ as the end point of the vibrating amplitude, i.e.,

$$\tilde{Y}^\mu \equiv Y^\mu(\xi, \tau) \Big|_{\tau=\xi=0}$$

where

$$Y^\mu(\tau, \xi) \equiv X^\mu + 2P^\mu \tau + \sum \sqrt{\frac{2}{n}} [a^\mu(n) e^{-in(\tau-\xi)} + a^{\mu\dagger}(n) e^{in(\tau-\xi)}] \quad (I.11)$$

For fixed τ , the quantities $Y^\mu(\tau, \xi)$ describe the extension of the string in space-time, and as τ varies the points on the string sweep out a 2-dimensional surface in space-time, the equation of which is given by $Y^\mu(\tau, \xi)$. The exact nature of the surface naturally depends upon the boundary conditions, but the normal mode decomposition of the form given by (I.11) can always be carried out.

Observe that from the point of view of constructing scattering amplitudes one does not need the string variables $Y^\mu(\tau, \xi)$. However, as

we shall see, their introduction greatly facilitates the discussion of the possible symmetries of the Dual Resonance Model.

We can re-express the basic commutation relations (I.1) in terms of $Y^\mu(\tau, \xi)$. To this end we define

$$\beta^\mu(\tau, \xi) = \frac{\partial Y^\mu}{\partial \tau} \quad (I.12)$$

Then using (I.11), equation (I.1) becomes

$$[\beta^\mu(\tau, \xi), Y^\nu(\tau, \xi)] = -i g^{\mu\nu} \delta(\xi - \xi') \quad (I.13)$$

It is to be noted, however, that this commutator contains more information than that in (I.1), since it carries information about Poincare' transformations due to the presence of the operator P^μ in Y^μ and β^μ .

We finally note that the quantity $Y^\mu(\tau, \xi)$ as defined by (I.11) satisfies the wave equation

$$\left[\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \tau^2} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \xi^2} \right] Y^\mu(\tau, \xi) = 0 \quad (I.14)$$

With these preliminaries, we now turn to the formulation of the gauge symmetries inherent in DRM. It is well known that the canonical formalism offers the most convenient framework for the discussion of such symmetries. We shall therefore regard Y^μ as a dynamical variable and, in view of (I.13), β^μ as its canonical momentum, and go on to introduce an action which will generate the equations of this section.

II. CONSTRUCTION OF THE ACTION

The action that we want to construct must satisfy certain requirements. Firstly, it must of course be Poincare' invariant. This is to ensure that our dynamical equations generate states of definite mass and spin which have positive norms. [There is some question as to whether unstable resonances should be required to carry time-like irreducible representations of the Poincare' group. The resonances which we deal with here⁵ are regarded as stable so that the corresponding states must be so characterized.]

A second requirement on the action is that it be a function of the two internal variables we introduced in the previous section. We suppose that the composite nature of hadrons can be adequately described by such variables, so that the underlying Hilbert space of states realizes the algebra (I.13). In short, the action must be a function of the dynamical string variables of the last section, and the (τ, ξ) dependence of the action must come through the string variables $Y^\mu(\tau, \xi)$ and its derivatives. In addition, care must be taken to ensure that dependence on τ and ξ does not affect the definition of physical states. In this respect the procedure that we follow is analogous to that used by Dirac¹³ in his description of magnetic monopoles. The vector potential in the presence of monopoles loses its manifest isotropy, and its definition depends on a direction specified by the "Dirac strings." Such an anisotropy is, of course, spurious and consistency demands that transformations involving such variables not affect the physical states.

An analogous requirement must be imposed with respect to τ and ξ parameters, so that transformations on τ and ξ do not affect the physical states. This is the statement of gauge invariance in our formalism. The

easiest way to incorporate this is ^{to} require that the action be invariant under such transformations.

The action will be constructed from the geometrical quantities characterizing the surface, Σ , generated by Y^μ . Since the surface, Σ , is embedded in Minkowski space, the differential of length on the surface is given by

$$ds^2 = g_{ab} d\xi^a d\xi^b \quad ; \quad a, b = 0, 1 \quad (II.1)$$

where

$$g_{ab} = g_{\mu\nu} \frac{\partial Y^\mu}{\partial \xi^a} \frac{\partial Y^\nu}{\partial \xi^b} \quad (II.2)$$

$g_{\mu\nu}$ being the metric tensor in Minkowski space ($g_{00} = -g_{11} = -g_{22} = -g_{33} = 1$). The intrinsic geometry of a surface is completely determined¹⁴ by the metric tensor g_{ab} . The outer geometry, on the other hand, depends¹⁴ on the quantities

$$b_{ab}^\alpha = \left(\frac{\partial \hat{n}_\alpha^\mu}{\partial \xi^a} \right) \left(\frac{\partial Y^\mu}{\partial \xi^b} \right) g_{\mu\nu} \quad ; \quad \alpha = 1, 2 \quad (II.3)$$

where $\hat{n}_\alpha^\mu$, $\alpha = 1, 2$, are unit vectors normal to the surface

$$\hat{n}_\alpha \cdot \frac{\partial Y}{\partial \xi^a} = 0 \quad ; \quad \alpha = 1, 2 \quad ; \quad a = 0, 1 \quad (II.4)$$

The action that we wish to construct must be invariant under the coordinate transformations on the surface Σ . It must therefore be a scalar quantity constructed from the two fundamental forms defined above. If one further requires that the equation of motion for Y^μ be not higher than second order, one finds that the simplest action consistent with these requirements is

$$I = \int d\xi^2 \sqrt{-g} \equiv \int d\xi^2 \mathcal{L} \quad (II.5)$$

where

$$g = \det |g_{ab}| \quad (II.6)$$

The equations of motion are obtained by extremizing (II.5). Before doing this, we shall utilize the freedom of the choice of coordinates implied by the action integral to linearize the Lagrangian density. A very convenient choice of parameters are obtained by defining

$$du^\pm = \{f_1 \pm i f_2\} \{ \sqrt{g_{00}} d\xi^0 + (g_{00})^{-1/2} (g_{01} \pm i \sqrt{g}) d\xi^1 \} \quad (II.7)$$

Then the differential form (II.1) will take the form

$$ds^2 = (f_1^2 + f_2^2)^{-1} du^+ du^- \equiv g_{+-} du^+ du^- \quad (II.8)$$

The significance of the new parameters $u^\pm$ is that the lines of $u^\pm =$ constant form light paths on the surface Σ . In terms of these coordinates the metric tensor (II.2) takes a particularly simple form:

$$\begin{aligned} g_{ab} &= g_{\mu\nu} \frac{\partial Y^\mu}{\partial u^a} \frac{\partial Y^\nu}{\partial u^b} = g_{ba} \\ &= \sqrt{g} (\sigma^1)_{ab} \quad ; \quad a, b = +, - \end{aligned} \quad (II.9)$$

where σ^1 is the Pauli matrix

$$\sigma^1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (II.10)$$

The Lagrangian density now becomes

$$\mathcal{L} = g_{\mu\nu} \frac{\partial Y^\mu}{\partial u^+} \frac{\partial Y^\nu}{\partial u^-} \quad (II.11)$$

subject to the constraint equations

$$g_{\mu\nu} \frac{\partial Y^\mu}{\partial u^+} \frac{\partial Y^\nu}{\partial u^-} = g_{\mu\nu} \frac{\partial Y^\mu}{\partial u^-} \frac{\partial Y^\nu}{\partial u^+} = 0 \quad (II.12)$$

The Euler-Lagrange equations which follow from (II.11) are

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial u^+ \partial u^-} Y^\mu(u^+, u^-) = 0 \quad (II.13)$$

A general solution of this equation can be written as

$$Y^\mu(u^+, u^-) = Y_+^\mu(u^+) + Y_-^\mu(u^-) \quad (II.14)$$

where

$$Y_\pm^\mu = X^\mu + P^\mu u^\pm + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} [A_\pm^{\mu(n)} e^{-in u} + A_\pm^{\mu(n)\dagger} e^{in u}] \quad (II.14a)$$

The reality of the solution requires that

$$A_\pm^{\mu(n)\dagger} = A_\pm^{\mu(-n)}$$

The equations of motion and the constraint equations follow from the same action (II.5), so that they are (at least at the classical level) internally consistent.

It should perhaps be pointed out that the constraint equations came about when we made a specific choice of coordinates by utilizing the coordinate independence of the action. In the more suggestive language of gauge theories, this means that the gauge invariance of our formalism requires that we impose these gauge conditions when we make a specific choice of gauge.

For many purposes, in particular to make contact with the results of Section I, it is convenient to introduce a different set of coordinates related to $u^\pm$ by

$$u^\pm = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\tau \pm \xi) \quad (II.15)$$

Then the equations (II.11) - (II.13) will take the form

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial Y^\mu(\tau, \xi)}{\partial \tau} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial Y^\mu(\tau, \xi)}{\partial \xi} \right)^2 \quad (II.16)$$

$$\left[\frac{\partial Y^\mu}{\partial \tau} \pm \frac{\partial Y^\mu}{\partial \xi} \right]^2 = 0 \quad (II.17)$$

$$\left[\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \tau^2} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \xi^2} \right] Y^\mu(\tau, \xi) = 0 \quad (II.18)$$

The constraint equations (II.17) are equivalent to the set

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\partial Y^\mu}{\partial \tau} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{\partial Y^\mu}{\partial \xi} \right)^2 &= 0 \\ \frac{\partial Y^\mu}{\partial \tau} \frac{\partial Y^\mu}{\partial \xi} &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (II.19)$$

From the Lagrangian (II.11) we can obtain the Hamiltonian in the usual way:

$$\mathcal{H}(\xi) = \left(\frac{\partial Y^\mu}{\partial \tau} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{\partial Y^\mu}{\partial \xi} \right)^2 \quad (II.20)$$

Comparison with equation (II.19) shows that the Hamiltonian density is zero. This is not surprising since the Lagrangian density is homogeneous of first degree.

We wish to conclude this section by making a few comments on the role of the proper time in our formalism. We have emphasized throughout that as a result of gauge invariance, the choice of the two invariant parameters have no bearing on our conclusions. However, in special circumstances, such as in giving a physical interpretation, the choice of the parameter τ as proper time may turn out to be advantageous. In such cases we must require

$$g_{\mu\nu} \frac{\partial Y^\mu}{\partial \tau} \frac{\partial Y^\nu}{\partial \tau} = 1 \quad (\text{II.21})$$

Then to still satisfy our constraint equations (II.9) we must also set

$$\left(\frac{\partial Y^\mu}{\partial \xi} \right)^2 = -1 \quad (\text{II.22})$$

These relations are now regarded as special cases of the constraint equations (II.19). They can be satisfied by a suitable choice of the boundary conditions imposed on Y^μ . These boundary conditions are, however, not gauge invariant in the sense defined above.

III. QUANTIZATION

We now quantize our system by requiring that the dynamical variable $Y^\mu(\tau, \xi)$ and its canonically conjugate momentum $\Pi^\mu(\tau, \xi)$ satisfy the commutation relations

$$[\Pi^\mu(\tau, \xi), Y^\nu(\tau, \xi')] = -i g^{\mu\nu} \delta(\xi - \xi') \quad (\text{III.1})$$

Then the Hamiltonian and the constraint equations become operators acting on states.¹⁵ Because of the homogeneity conditions on the Lagrangian density (and consequently the vanishing of the Hamiltonian density) the determination of quantum expressions for the conjugate momentum and the Hamiltonian is a non-trivial task. We may ensure the correct expression for these by making use of the Lagrange multipliers in setting up the variational problem and requiring that the Heisenberg equations of motion be satisfied, i.e.,

$$i [Y^\mu(\tau, \xi), H] = \frac{\partial Y^\mu}{\partial \tau} \quad (\text{III.2})$$

The resulting action is

$$I = \int d\tau \int d\xi \frac{1}{2} \left[\left(\frac{\partial Y^\mu}{\partial \tau} \right)^2 - \left(\frac{\partial Y^\mu}{\partial \xi} \right)^2 + \frac{\partial Y^\mu}{\partial \tau} \frac{\partial Y_\mu}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial Y^\mu}{\partial \xi} \frac{\partial Y_\mu}{\partial \tau} \right] \quad (\text{III.3})$$

Then

$$\Pi^\mu(\tau, \xi) = \frac{\delta \mathcal{L}}{\delta \left(\frac{\partial Y^\mu}{\partial \tau} \right)} = \frac{\partial Y^\mu}{\partial \tau} + \frac{\partial Y^\mu}{\partial \xi} \quad (\text{III.4})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(\xi) &= \frac{\partial Y''}{\partial \tau} \frac{\delta \mathcal{L}}{\delta (\frac{\partial Y''}{\partial \tau})} - \mathcal{L} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\pi'' - \frac{\partial Y''}{\partial \xi} \right]^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial Y''}{\partial \xi} \right)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{III.5})$$

If we now choose to regard τ as the proper time we can write

$$\mathcal{H}(\xi) = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \left[\pi'' - \frac{\partial Y''}{\partial \xi} \right]^2 - 1 \right\} \quad (\text{III.6})$$

Then the Hamiltonian, H , is given by

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \int d\xi \mathcal{H}(\xi) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int d\xi \left\{ \left[\pi'' - \frac{\partial Y''}{\partial \xi} \right]^2 - 1 \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{III.7})$$

Since the classical Hamiltonian was zero¹⁵, the physical states must satisfy the constraint equation

$$H |\psi\rangle = 0 \quad (\text{III.8})$$

Written out in full, eq. (III.8) takes the form

$$\int d\xi \left[\left(\pi'' - \frac{\partial Y''}{\partial \xi} \right)^2 - 1 \right] |\psi\rangle = 0 \quad (\text{III.8a})$$

The integrand has a striking resemblance to the Klein-Gordon operator in the presence of minimal electromagnetic coupling, the self-coupling $\frac{\partial Y''}{\partial \xi}$ playing the role of the vector potential. In fact, one can stretch the analogy a bit further and try to linearize the quadratic operator in the integrand in the same manner that Dirac obtained his operator from the Klein-Gordon operator. One will then get the following wave equation¹⁶

(III.9)

Since we will take up the fermion problem in a subsequent paper, we defer the discussion of this equation to the latter work. We only mention here that it is possible to introduce space-time spinors consistent with our geometrical considerations without making use of the above equation.

The states (III.8) are subject to additional constraints.

The most general equation satisfied by $|\psi\rangle$ is, according to (II.11)

$$\left(\frac{\partial Y''}{\partial u^\pm} \right)^2 |\psi\rangle = 0 \quad (\text{III.10a})$$

or (III.5a)

$$\left[\frac{\partial Y''}{\partial \tau} \pm \frac{\partial Y''}{\partial \xi} \right]^2 |\psi\rangle \quad (\text{III.10b})$$

In these expressions symmetrization with respect to non-commuting operators is understood. It can be seen that for each τ , the states $|\psi\rangle$ must satisfy an infinite number of constraints since (III.10) is valid for each value of the parameter ξ . In fact, the wave equation (III.8) is also contained in (III.10)

The two sets of constraints in (III.10) correspond to the two linearly independent solutions $Y_\pm''$ given in (II.14a). In obtaining the conventional DRM the usual procedure is to eliminate one of the solutions by a suitable boundary condition, so that only one set of excitations remain. This need not be the case, however. One can, for example, impose periodic boundary conditions so that both solutions are retained. Then to obtain the conventional DRM, the interaction Hamiltonian must depend either on Y_+''

or $Y_{\pm}^{\mu}$ but not both. To allow for the latter possibility, we shall retain both sets of constraint equations with the understanding that one of them becomes trivially satisfied when one deals with the conventional DRM.

The classical equations of motion and the corresponding constraints were consistent because they were all obtained from the same action. We must now check that the quantum constraint equations (a) are compatible with each other, and (b) do not lead to any inconsistencies in the sense of being too stringent. To investigate these questions, it is convenient to define the Fourier coefficients

$$T_{\pm}^m = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} du^{\pm} \left(\frac{\partial Y^{\mu}}{\partial u^{\pm}} \right)^2 e^{i m u^{\pm}}; \quad m = \dots, \pm 1, \dots \quad (\text{III.11})$$

They satisfy the commutation relations

$$[T_{\pm}^m, T_{\pm}^n] = (m-n) T_{\pm}^{m+n} + \frac{1}{2} m(m-1)(m+1) \delta_{m+n,0} \quad (\text{III.12})$$

$$[T_{+}^m, T_{-}^n] = 0; \quad m, n = 0, \pm 1, \dots$$

It will be shown in the next section that in the conventional DRM where the physical states can be constructed in the manner described in Section I,

the required gauge operators can be constructed from the T^m 's.

IV. INTERACTIONS AND GAUGE INVARIANCE

In the developments of the previous sections we have worked in the Heisenberg picture. Since the results are true for all values of the parameter τ , they are true also for $\tau = 0$, at which value the Heisenberg and Interaction Pictures coincide. We shall now regard the τ -dependence of the state $|\psi\rangle$ to arise because of an interaction Hamiltonian, V . Then, the τ -development of the state is given by

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} |\psi\rangle = V |\psi\rangle \quad (\text{IV.1})$$

The time dependence of the Interaction Picture operators are determined by the unperturbed Hamiltonian:

$$i \frac{\partial V}{\partial \tau} = [V, H] \quad (\text{IV.2})$$

To discuss the restrictions that gauge invariance imposes on the possible form of interaction Hamiltonians, we consider the interaction Hamiltonian¹⁷

$$V_{-}(k) = : e^{i k \cdot Y_{-}(0)} : \quad (\text{IV.3})$$

which is the simplest potential consistent with momentum conservation.

It reproduces the conventional DRM in the tree approximation. Here the dots refer to normal ordering, and the interaction with the external field occurs at the point $\xi = 0$. Since $V_{-}(k)$ is defined at a specific point on the surface Σ , the manifest homogeneity of the Lagrangian is

destroyed, and the total action will no more remain invariant under all the transformations generated by $T_{\pm}^m$. We must therefore look for a reduced set of gauge operators formed from the $T_{\pm}^m$'s which leave the point $\xi = 0$ invariant. These are given by³

$$G_{\pm}^m = T_{\pm}^m - T_{\pm}^0 \quad (\text{IV.4})$$

The $G_{\pm}^m$'s satisfy the algebra

$$[G_{\pm}^m, G_{\pm}^n] = (m-n) G_{\pm}^{m+n} - m G_{\pm}^m - n G_{\pm}^n \quad (\text{IV.5})$$

In the absence of interaction we have

$$[G_{\pm}^m, H_{\pm}] = m G_{\pm}^m + m H_{\pm} \quad (\text{IV.6})$$

Therefore, the consistency of the formalism requires that when an interaction Hamiltonian is introduced, i.e., as $H_{\pm} \rightarrow H_{\pm} + V_{\pm}$, then (IV.6) must be replaced by

$$[G_{\pm}^m, H_{\pm} + V_{\pm}] = m G_{\pm}^m + m (H_{\pm} + V_{\pm}) \quad (\text{IV.7})$$

These are effectively the integrability conditions on our equations motion.

It is easy to verify that when the interaction is given by (IV.3),

the conditions (IV.7) hold only if the condition

$$k^2 = -1 \quad (\text{IV.8})$$

is satisfied. This is the price one has to pay to preserve gauge invariance.

Next let us consider the effect of the operators G^m on the physical state $|\psi\rangle$ obtained by the application of the operator (I.7) to the vacuum. Clearly if

$$G_{\pm}^m |\psi\rangle \stackrel{?}{=} 0 \quad ; \quad m = 0, \pm 1, \dots \quad (\text{IV.9})$$

then

$$[G_{\pm}^m, G_{\pm}^n] |\psi\rangle = 0, \text{ for all } |\psi\rangle$$

so that the quantization procedure does not lead to any additional constraints. One must check, however, whether the gauge conditions (IV.9) are too stringent. A similar situation arises in quantum electrodynamics in which the imposition of the classical Lorentz gauge requirement $\partial^\mu A_\mu = 0$ as an operator relation leads to inconsistencies and must be replaced by the condition

$$\delta^\mu A_\mu^{(+)} |\Phi\rangle = 0$$

Here $A_\mu^{(+)}$ is the positive frequency part of A_μ .

Since we know the explicit form of the state $|\psi\rangle$, it is easy to verify directly that equation (IV.9) holds only if $m > 0$. The correct quantum gauge conditions are therefore given by

$$G_{\pm}^m |\psi\rangle = 0, \quad m > 0 \quad (\text{IV.10})$$

so that

$$[G_{\pm}^m, G_{\pm}^n] |\Psi_r\rangle = 0 \quad ; \quad m, n > 0 \quad (\text{IV.11})$$

Since the mass-shell condition (IV.8) is the direct result of assuming the interaction Hamiltonian (IV.3), it may at first be thought that by a suitable modification of (IV.3) or a different choice of interaction Hamiltonian this condition could be relaxed completely. It appears, however, that this is highly unlikely to occur without a non-trivial modification of the vertex V . The best one can hope for by multiplicative modifications of the interaction Hamiltonian (IV.3) would be to obtain a more physical mass-shell condition. In this respect one must also bear in mind the possibility that renormalization effects from higher order diagrams may shift the external masses from the value -1.

V. CONCLUSION

In this work we have attempted to present a formalism within which the connection between the gauge symmetries of the conventional DRM and Poincaré invariance can be examined in detail. We have chosen to carry out our analysis in the canonical framework which is very convenient for the discussion of symmetries and gauge invariance. In the development of the formalism, we introduced "string-like" variables, reinterpreted them as points on a surface embedded in Minkowski space, and constructed an action which was invariant under the general coordinate transformations on the surface. It was from the invariance of action that we obtained a realization of gauge symmetries in terms of the string variables.

We have not offered a direct proof of the Poincaré invariance of the DRM, but we are optimistic that the concepts introduced in this paper will provide the means of understanding how Poincaré group is realized in the dual resonance model. The problem of dealing effectively with spin degrees of freedom is, of course, intimately related to this important question. Within our formalism there is no problem in introducing two component or four component objects which transform as spin 1/2 representations of the homogeneous Lorentz group. In fact two attractive possibilities immediately suggest themselves. One is to introduce spin by a suitable modification of the "tetrad" (or Vierbein) method as in the general theory of relativity. The idea here is to define spin degrees of freedom at each point on the surface, the spins at different points being correlated by the field Ψ . The other possibility is to build up the spin degrees of freedom by using the twistor formalism of Penrose¹⁸

appropriately modified for our surface. In the latter approach, the light-like coordinates $u^\pm$ are regarded as components of a spinor covariant under the group $SU(1,1) \otimes SU(1,1)$. We will discuss these in a subsequent paper.

Clearly, a lot more work needs to be done before the usefulness of our formalism can be justified.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Much of the content of the present paper was inspired by the works of Nambu. We would also like to thank him for many helpful conversations during the course of this work.

FOOTNOTES AND REFERENCES

1. R. Dolen, D. Horn and C. Schmid, Phys. Rev. 166, 1768 (1968). See also, R. Oehme, Nuc. Phys. B16, 161 (1970).
2. G. Veneziano, Nuovo Cimento 57A, 190 (1968).
3. For a review see Chan, H.M., CERN preprint TH-1057 (1969). References to the original papers can be found in this review.
4. S. Fubini and G. Veneziano, Nuovo Cimento 64A, 811 (1969). K. Bardakci and S. Mandelstam, Phys. Rev. 184, 1640 (1969).
5. These are resonances of zero width and therefore stable.
6. E. P. Wigner, Ann. Math. 40, 149 (1939).
7. M. A. Virasoro, Phys. Rev. D1, 2933 (1970).
8. Y. Nambu, Univ. of Chicago preprint EFI 70-70, unpublished, and Copenhagen Lectures (1971), unpublished.
9. Y. Nambu, Proceedings of the International Conference on Symmetries and Quark Models, Wayne U. 1969, Gordon and Breach, 1970, p. 269.
10. S. Fubini, D. Gordon and G. Veneziano, Phys. Lett. 29B, 679 (1969). L. Susskind, Phys. Rev. D1, 1182 (1969).
11. By conventional dual amplitude we mean one in which the states satisfy the subsidiary conditions found by Virasoro, Ref. 7.
12. An analogous situation exists in the study of chiral dynamics where phenomenological fields are very convenient for formulating the chiral constraint equations for the scattering amplitudes.

Footnotes and References (continued)

13. P. A. M. Dirac, Phys. Rev. 74, 817 (1948).
14. L. P. Eisenhart, Riemannian Geometry, Princeton U. Press, 1950.
15. P. A. M. Dirac, Canadian Journal of Mathematics 2, 147 (1950);
Lectures on Quantum Mechanics, Yeshiva University, New York 1964.
16. Equation (III.9) has been obtained independently by Y. Nambu. A
free wave equation of this type has been proposed by Ramond. See P.
Ramond, Phys. Rev. D3, 2415 (1971).
17. If the interaction Hamiltonian is taken to be $V(k) = V_+(k)V_-(k)$,
where $V_{\pm}(k) = : e^{ik \cdot Y_{\pm}(0)} :$, one obtains the Virasoro-Shapiro amplitude.
M. A. Virasoro, Phys. Rev. 177, 2309 (1969). J. Shapiro, Phys. Lett.
33B, 361 (1970). See also G. Domokos, S. Kovesi-Domokos, E. Schonberg,
Phys. Rev. D2, 1026 (1970).
18. R. Penrose, J. Math. Phys. 8, 345 (1967).