

forming us of some of their unpublished cross sections.

<sup>4</sup>L. Baggett, University of California Radiation Laboratory Report UCRL-8302 (unpublished). Also B. McCormick and L. Baggett, in 1958 Annual International Conference on High-Energy Physics at CERN, edited by B. Ferretti (CERN, Geneva, 1958).

<sup>5</sup>S. DeBenedetti (private communication).

<sup>6</sup>I. A. Pless, Phys. Rev. 104, 205 (1956).

<sup>7</sup>S. M. Korenchenko and V. G. Zinov, J. Exptl. Theoret. Phys. (U.S.S.R.) 33, 1307 (1957) [translation: Soviet Phys. JETP 6, 1006 (1958)].

<sup>8</sup>Walker, Hushfar, and Shephard, Phys. Rev. 104, 526 (1956).

<sup>9</sup>A. R. Erwin and J. Kopp, Phys. Rev. 109, 1364 (1958).

<sup>10</sup>Heinberg, McClelland, Turkot, Woodward, Wilson, and Zipoy, Phys. Rev. 110, 1211 (1958); J. I. Vette, Phys. Rev. 111, 622 (1958); F. P. Dixon and R. L. Walker, Phys. Rev. Lett. 1, 4 (1958); see also reports by R. R. Wilson and R. L. Walker at the 1958 Annual International Conference on High-Energy Physics at CERN, edited by B. Ferretti (CERN, Geneva, 1958); Sellen, Cocconi, and Hart, Phys. Rev. 110, 779 (1958).

<sup>11</sup>W. J. Willis, Ph. D. thesis, Yale University, 1958 (unpublished). Also Morris, Rahm, Rau, Thorndike, and Willis, Bull. Am. Phys. Soc. Ser. II, 3, 33 (1958).

<sup>12</sup>A. R. Erwin (private communication).

<sup>13</sup>S. J. Lindenbaum and R. M. Sternheimer, Phys. Rev. 109, 1723 (1958).

<sup>14</sup>The possibility of a  $d_{3/2}$  resonance to explain the peak in the photoproduction cross section was expressed in a quantitative way by R. F. Peierls, Phys. Rev. Lett. 1, 174 (1958).

### THEORY OF SPIN-ORBIT INTERACTION IN NUCLEAR FORCES\*

Suraj N. Gupta

Department of Physics,  
Wayne State University,  
Detroit, Michigan

(Received December 19, 1958)

It has repeatedly been pointed out in recent years<sup>1-4</sup> that a spin-orbit interaction between two nucleons is necessary to explain the observed scattering of nucleons. From a theoretical point of view the existence of a spin-orbit interaction is not at all surprising, because it has been shown by Breit<sup>5</sup> that in a relativistic treatment of the interaction of nucleons the spin-orbit interaction arises in a natural way. However, pion-theoretical calculations by Klein<sup>6</sup> and several other authors<sup>7</sup> show that the pion theory is unable to account for the large spin-orbit interaction, which is required to explain the experi-

mental results. It is, therefore, necessary to look for some other explanation of the spin-orbit interaction.

Recently we have predicted<sup>8,9</sup> the existence of a hitherto unobserved neutral scalar meson, the  $\rho^0$  meson, which is coupled strongly to the nucleons. Since the mass of the  $\rho^0$  meson is considerably larger than the pion mass, it leads to a force of very short range between the nucleons. The second-order nuclear potential due to the  $\rho^0$  meson is given by

$$V_2(\rho^0) = -\frac{g'^2}{4\pi r} e^{-\lambda' r} + \frac{g'^2}{4\pi r} \frac{1}{2\kappa^2} \frac{d}{dr} \left( \frac{e^{-\lambda' r}}{r} \right) \vec{L} \cdot \vec{S}, \quad (1)$$

where  $g'$  is the coupling constant for the interaction of  $\rho^0$  mesons and nucleons,  $\lambda'$  and  $\kappa$  are related to the  $\rho^0$ -meson mass  $\mu'$  and the nucleon mass  $M$  as  $\lambda' = \mu' c/\hbar$  and  $\kappa = Mc/\hbar$ , and we have used the Signell-Marshak definitions<sup>3</sup> of  $\vec{L}$  and  $\vec{S}$ . The coefficient of  $\vec{L} \cdot \vec{S}$  in (1) can be expressed as

$$V_{LS} = \frac{V_0}{x} \frac{d}{dx} \left( \frac{e^{-nx}}{x} \right), \quad (2)$$

with

$$V_0 = \frac{g'^2}{4\pi c\hbar} \frac{\lambda c\hbar}{2} \left( \frac{\lambda}{\kappa} \right)^2, \quad (3)$$

where  $\lambda$  is related to the pion mass  $\mu$  as  $\lambda = \mu c/\hbar$ , while  $x = \lambda r$  and  $n = \mu'/\mu$ .

According to our earlier ideas,<sup>8</sup> the  $\rho^0$ -meson mass should be somewhat larger than twice the pion mass, and the coupling constant for the interaction of  $\rho^0$  mesons and nucleons should have the same value as the coupling constant for pions and nucleons. Thus, we can take

$$n \approx 2, \quad g'^2/4\pi c\hbar \approx 14. \quad (4)$$

We also have

$$\lambda/\kappa = 1/6.7, \quad \lambda c\hbar = \mu c^2 = 139.4 \text{ Mev}, \quad (5)$$

where we have taken the pion mass as  $273m_e$ . Substituting the above values in (2) and (3), we find

$$V_{LS} = \frac{V_0}{x} \frac{d}{dx} \left( \frac{e^{-2x}}{x} \right), \quad (6)$$

with

$$V_0 = 21.7 \text{ Mev}. \quad (7)$$

It seems to us quite astonishing that not only (6) has exactly the same form as the latest phenomenological spin-orbit interaction of Signell, Zinn, and Marshak,<sup>4</sup> but our theoretical value of  $V_0$  is also remarkably close to the phenomeno-

logical value of  $V_0 = 21$  Mev.

It is tempting to conclude that the  $\rho^0$  meson provides a complete explanation of the spin-orbit interaction between two nucleons. The resulting interaction also seems to be in agreement with the requirements of the shell model of the heavier nuclei.<sup>10</sup> It must, however, be noted that some objections have also been raised<sup>11</sup> against isotopic-spin-independent spin-orbit interactions, and at the present stage of our knowledge we cannot settle the problem of spin-orbit interaction with complete certainty. It is also possible that the  $\rho^0$  meson is coupled less strongly to the nucleons than the pions, and that the spin-orbit interaction is partly due to the  $\rho^0$  meson and partly due to pions.

\*Supported in part by the National Science Foundation.

<sup>1</sup>K. M. Case and A. Pais, Phys. Rev. **80**, 203 (1950).

<sup>2</sup>J. L. Gammel and R. M. Thaler, Phys. Rev. **107**, 291, 1337 (1957).

<sup>3</sup>P. S. Signell and R. Marshak, Phys. Rev. **106**, 832 (1957); **109**, 1229 (1958).

<sup>4</sup>Signell, Zinn, and Marshak, Phys. Rev. Lett. **1**, 416 (1958).

<sup>5</sup>G. Breit, Phys. Rev. **51**, 248, 778 (1937); **53**, 153 (1938).

<sup>6</sup>A. Klein, Phys. Rev. **90**, 1101 (1953).

<sup>7</sup>For the latest work on this subject, see G. Breit, Phys. Rev. **111**, 652 (1958) and S. Otsuki, Progr. Theoret. Phys. (Japan) **20**, 171 (1958).

<sup>8</sup>S. N. Gupta, Phys. Rev. **111**, 1436 (1958).

<sup>9</sup>S. N. Gupta, Phys. Rev. **111**, 1698 (1958).

<sup>10</sup>J. P. Elliott and A. M. Lane, Phys. Rev. **96**, 1160 (1954).

<sup>11</sup>H. Feshbach, Phys. Rev. **107**, 1626 (1957); A. M. Sessler and H. M. Foley, Phys. Rev. **110**, 995 (1958).

#### V-A FOUR-FERMION INTERACTION AND THE INTERMEDIATE CHARGED VECTOR MESON\*

S. Oneda† and J. C. Pati

University of Maryland,  
College Park, Maryland

(Received December 22, 1958)

The universal V-A form of Fermi interaction seems to be compatible with the current experimental results.<sup>1,2</sup> In order to forbid many unwanted reactions, it has been speculated that the weak Fermi interactions are realized through the interaction of a charged current,  $J_\alpha$ , with itself by exchange of a heavy charged boson.<sup>1</sup> The simplest possibility is the introduction of a

charged vector meson  $B_\alpha$  (with mass  $m_B$ ) which is coupled to the  $J_\alpha$  with the coupling constant  $F$ :

$$F J_\alpha B_\alpha + \text{H.c.} \quad (1)$$

The  $J_\alpha$  may consist of the lepton currents,  $\bar{e}\gamma_\alpha \times (1 + \gamma_5)\nu$  and  $\bar{\mu}\gamma_\alpha (1 + \gamma_5)\omega$ , and of the strangeness conserving and nonconserving baryon currents. We deliberately denote the neutral counterpart of the muon as  $\omega$ . First of all, it may be remarked that the  $B_\alpha$ -meson must be heavier than the  $K$ -meson.<sup>3</sup> The case when the  $B_\alpha$ -meson is extremely heavy may not be realistic and there may be little point in introducing it. One interesting theoretical evidence against a  $B_\alpha$ -meson which is not unreasonably heavy has been pointed out. Namely, if we take the two-component theory of the neutrino ( $\nu \equiv \omega$ ) with lepton number conservation, the existence of the  $B_\alpha$  would cause the  $\mu \rightarrow e + \gamma$  transition.<sup>4</sup> It is, however, to be remembered that we could forbid this decay if we do not assume  $\nu \equiv \omega$ . For instance,<sup>5</sup> one may interchange the lepton number of  $\mu^+$  and  $\mu^-$  and at the same time change the neutrino accompanying  $\mu$  to an antineutrino<sup>6</sup> ( $\omega \equiv \nu^c$ ). This possibility can hardly be differentiated from the usual theory by presently feasible experiments. In view of this situation, it may be worthwhile to investigate further the possible existence of a  $B_\alpha$ -meson. In the following, unless mentioned, we neglect electromagnetic corrections. For the  $\pi \rightarrow \mu(e) + \nu$  and  $K \rightarrow \mu(e) + \nu$  decays nothing would be changed except for the replacement of the usual Fermi coupling constant  $G$  by  $\sqrt{2} F^2/m_B^2$ . For the  $K_{e3}$  and  $K_{\mu 3}$  decays, however, the effect may be observable by future experiments. For instance, the general form of the matrix element of the  $K_{e3}$  mode is given (neglecting the electron mass) by

$$M F^2 \bar{e}(k\gamma)(1 + \gamma_5)\nu(A - 2m_K E_\pi)^{-1} \phi_K(k) \phi_\pi(k-p), \quad (2)$$

where  $A = m_B^2 - m_K^2 - m_\pi^2$ .  $k_\alpha$  and  $k_\alpha - p_\alpha$  denote the energy-momentum four-vector of the  $K$ -meson and the pion, respectively. In principle, the effective coupling parameter  $M$  may depend on the total pion energy  $E_\pi$ . As  $M$  represents the contribution of baryon-antibaryon loops, this dependence is probably rather weak.<sup>7</sup> The denominator of (2) expresses the propagator of the  $B_\alpha$ -meson. If the mass of the  $B_\alpha$ -meson is not far removed from the  $K$ -meson mass, this denominator will behave as  $-2m_K E_\pi [A = 0 \text{ if } m_B = (m_K^2 + m_\pi^2)^{1/2}]$ . In this case the effect may be observ-