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Why should one want to look back 50 years?

- particle physics looked very much different then: no sign of anything like today’s Standard Model
- strong interactions ("nuclear force"): a hopeless case for quantum field theory (natural union of quantum theory and special relativity)
- within less than 15 years: quantum field theory arising like phoenix from the ashes common framework for electromagnetic, weak and strong interactions: Standard Model
- in moments of despair over lack of "New Physics": recall fascinating developments leading to Standard Model
Particle physics in the early sixties

already in those dark ages

4 fundamental forces in nature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gravitation</th>
<th>Strong nuclear force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electromagnetism</td>
<td>Weak nuclear force</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long range</th>
<th>Short range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Electromagnetism
Quantum Electrodynamics (QED)

- quantum corrections calculable
- precise predictions, but
- methodology (renormalization) not generally accepted

Dirac, Wigner, . . .: “. . . infinities are swept under the rug.”

Feynman (1961):
“I do not subscribe to the philosophy of renormalization.”
phenomenology of weak decays satisfactory, but
quantum corrections not calculable (nonrenormalizability)

end of sixties, beginning of seventies:
renormalizable gauge field theory of electroweak interactions
Glashow, Salam, Weinberg (Nobel Prize 1979)
’t Hooft, Veltman (Nobel Prize 1999)
hopeless case for quantum field theory

- degrees of freedom: nucleons, pions, \ldots (hadrons)?
- strength of interaction prohibits perturbative treatment

**Landau** : “It is well known that theoretical physics is at present almost helpless in dealing with the problem of strong interactions. We are driven to the conclusion that the Hamiltonian method for strong interactions is dead and must be buried, although of course with deserved honour.”
Goldberger: “My own feeling is that we have learned a great deal from field theory . . . that I am quite happy to discard it as an old, but rather friendly, mistress who I would be willing to recognize on the street if I should encounter her again.”

Alternative approaches

- Bootstrap (nuclear democracy) (Chew, . . . )
  politically correct, but not predictive
- Symmetries
  \( SU(3) \) classification of hadrons (Gell-Mann, Ne’eman )
  fictitious constituents: quarks (Gell-Mann, Zweig )
Symmetries explain classification of hadrons

but how does one calculate properties of hadrons?

French cuisine approach

Gell-Mann: We construct a mathematical theory of the strongly interacting particles, which may or may not have anything to do with reality, find suitable algebraic relations that hold in the model, postulate their validity, and then throw away the model. We may compare this process to a method sometimes employed in French cuisine: a piece of pheasant meat is cooked between two slices of veal, which are then discarded.”
Motivation

Scaling and asymptotic freedom

60s Scaling QCD

Scaling and asymptotic freedom

MIT-SLAC
(late sixties)

surprising result (Friedman, Kendall, Taylor Nobel Prize 1990)

- at high energies (and large momentum transfer): scaling

  nucleons seem to consist of non-interacting part(on)s

- obvious candidates for partons (Feynman): quarks

- seeming paradox

  quarks quasi-free at high energies
  yet permanently bound in hadrons
**Puzzle**: strength of interaction energy dependent?

In a collision of impact energy $E$, the effective charge is the charge contained in the sphere of radius $r = E$, which due to vacuum polarization is larger than the classical charge seen in a large sphere ($r = 1$).

**Vacuum polarization and charge screening** (charge renormalization).

**Well-known effect in QED**

**Charge screening**

Effective charge decreases with distance $\approx$ increases with energy

**QFT: $\beta$-function**

$$\beta(q_{\text{eff}}) \sim -r \frac{dq_{\text{eff}}(r)}{dr} > 0$$

Scaling requires negative $\beta$-function $\rightarrow$

“anti-screening” $\Leftrightarrow$ asymptotic freedom
majority view in early 1973 (Zee):
“...we conjecture that there are no asymptotically free quantum field theories in four dimensions.”

Coleman and Gross work on a general proof (“Price of asymptotic freedom”, July 1973)

Politzer and Wilczek, their graduate students, attempt to close a “loophole”: $\beta$-function for nonabelian gauge theories (Yang-Mills theories) was still unknown (except to ’t Hooft)
Earlier calculations of the $\beta$-function

Vanyashin, Terentyev (1965):
charge renormalization of charged vector bosons is negative
“absurd” result attributed to nonrenormalizability

Khriplovich (1969):
correct calculation of charge renormalization of Yang-Mills
theories, no connection made with asymptotic freedom

’t Hooft (1972):
complete calculation of $\beta$-function for Yang-Mills theories
Symanzik encourages publication (Veltman objects)
“I now regret not to have followed his sensible advice.” (1998)
majority view in early 1973 (Zee):
“...we conjecture that there are no asymptotically free quantum field theories in four dimensions.”

Coleman and Gross work on a general proof (“Price of asymptotic freedom”, July 1973)

Politzer and Wilczek, their graduate students, attempt to close a “loophole”: $\beta$-function for nonabelian gauge theories (Yang-Mills theories) was still unknown (except to 't Hooft)

April/May 1973 (Gross, Wilczek; Politzer Nobel Prize 2004)

Yang-Mills theories are asymptotically free!

reason: photons are electrically neutral

 gluons (quanta of strong interactions) carry “colour” charge
Motivation 60s Scaling QCD

Asymptotic freedom and the QCD vacuum

Nielsen: analogy with electrodynamics of continuous media  
vacuum of a relativistic QFT (Lorentz invariance)  
\[ \varepsilon \mu = 1 \]

QED: charge screening \( \rightarrow \) dielectric constant \( \varepsilon > 1 \)  
\( \rightarrow \) QED vacuum is a diamagnet (permeability \( \mu < 1 \))

QCD: colour charge screening of quarks (\( \varepsilon > 1 \)) is overcompensated by gluons (spin 1) acting as permanent colour dipoles (\( \mu > 1 \))  
\( \rightarrow \) QCD vacuum is a (colour) paramagnet for \( N_c = 3 \)  
\( N_F \) (number of quark types) \( < 11 \, N_c / 2 < 17 \)  
\( \rightarrow \) “anti-screening” (\( \varepsilon < 1 \))  
\( \rightarrow \) asymptotic freedom
Notwithstanding these open issues, a rather stable and well-defined world average value emerges from the compilation of current determinations of $\alpha_s$: $\alpha_s(M_Z^2) = 0.1184 \pm 0.0007$.

The results also provide a clear signature and proof of the energy dependence of $\alpha_s$, in full agreement with the QCD prediction of Asymptotic Freedom. This is demonstrated in Fig. 9.4, where results of $\alpha_s(Q^2)$ obtained at discrete energy scales $Q$, now also including those based just on NLO QCD, are summarized and plotted.

Figure 9.4: Summary of measurements of $\alpha_s$ as a function of the respective energy scale $Q$. The respective degree of QCD perturbation theory used in the extraction of $\alpha_s$ is indicated in brackets (NLO: next-to-leading order; NNLO: next-to-next-to-leading order; res. NNLO: NNLO matched with resummed next-to-leading logs; N3LO: next-to-NNLO).

energy dependence of strong force

Review of Particle Properties

compilation by Bethke
Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD)

Gross: “Like an atheist who has just received a message from a burning bush, I became an immediate true believer.”

However: ingredients of QCD already “known” in 1972

- quarks come in 3 colours (..., Bardeen, Fritzsch, Gell-Mann)
- 8 gluons (??)

Fritzsch, Gell-Mann: toy model with coloured quarks and singlet gluon (→ not asymptotically free)

Proc. ICHEP, Chicago 1972:
“Now the interesting question has been raised lately whether we should regard the gluons as well as the quarks as being non-singlets with respect to colour [5].”
Ref. [5]: J. Wess (private communication to B. Zumino)

$SU(3) \text{ group theory}$

$$\bar{3} \times 3 = 1 + 8$$

gluons can only be

$\text{singlet or octet}$

definitely settled by Fritzsch, Gell-Mann, Leutwyler (Oct. 1973): “Advantages of the colour octet gluon picture”

First (written) appearance of the name “QCD”? Fritzsch, Gell-Mann, Minkowski (1975): “A good name for this theory is quantum chromodynamics.”
Quantum Electrodynamics (QED)

for simplicity: only electrons and photons

\[ \mathcal{L}_{\text{QED}} = \bar{\psi} (i \slashed{D} - m) \psi - \frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} \]

Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD)

quarks (single flavour) and gluons

\[ \mathcal{L}_{\text{QCD}} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} \bar{q}_i (i \slashed{D} - m_q)_{ij} q_j - \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{8} G_{\mu\nu}^{\alpha} G^{\alpha,\mu\nu} \]

deceptively “simple”, much richer than QED

Thomas Mannel: The many facets of QCD