

Anomaly meltdown

C. Gajdzinski and R. F. Streater

Citation: *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **32**, 1981 (1991); doi: 10.1063/1.529218

View online: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.529218>

View Table of Contents: <http://scitation.aip.org/content/aip/journal/jmp/32/8?ver=pdfcov>

Published by the [AIP Publishing](#)



Now Available!

Maple 18
The Essential Tool for Mathematics and Modeling

State-of-the-art environment for algebraic computations in physics

- More than 500 enhancements throughout the entire Physics package in Maple 18
- Integration with the Maple library providing access to Maple's full mathematical power
- A full range of physics-related algebraic formulations performed in a natural way inside Maple
- World-leading tools for performing calculations in theoretical physics

[Read More](#)

ters, i.e., the anomaly has gone. They are: $U(t)$ given by the GNS construction from the invariant state; $V(n)$: restricted to Ω_0 is given by the operator (n positive)

$$\cdots \otimes I \otimes V \otimes \cdots \otimes V \otimes I \cdots$$

n times

The first V , given below, is at the position zero, and is unitarily equivalent to the representation of σ^1 on \mathbb{C}^4 . Thus $V(n)$ shifts the domain wall in Ω_0 n steps to the right.

Similarly one argues for n negative.

$U(t)$ restricted to Ω_0 is given by $\cdots \otimes U_t \otimes U_t \otimes U_t \cdots$ (simply by tensoring up U_t). V is given as a matrix

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and U_t is given by

$$U_t = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{2it} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{-2it} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

The construction of U_t involves the modular antiunitary in representation of $M_2(\mathbb{C})$ by the state ρ_β .³ $U_t = e^{iHt}$, where

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

H is defined by ρ_β as

$$H = \pi(\sigma^3) - \pi'(\sigma^3),$$

where $\pi(A)|\rho_\beta^{1/2}\rangle = |A\rho_\beta^{1/2}\rangle$, and $\pi'(A)|\rho_\beta^{1/2}\rangle = |\rho_\beta^{1/2}A^*\rangle = J\pi(A)J$, for A real, ($A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})$), where

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

In $\otimes_j \mathbb{C}^4$, Ω_0 is given from the GNS construction as $\otimes_{j=-\infty}^0 \Omega_1 \otimes_{j=1}^\infty \Omega_2$, where $\Omega_1 = (1/\alpha, 0, 0, 1/\beta)$, and $\Omega_2 = \sqrt{\Omega_1}$; $1/\alpha = (s_1)^{1/2}$, $1/\beta = (s_2)^{1/2}$. The parameters s_1 and s_2 come from

$$\rho_\beta = \begin{pmatrix} s_1 & 0 \\ 0 & s_2 \end{pmatrix};$$

s_1 and s_2 are positive and add up to 1. One sees, that $U(t)$ and $V(n)$ commute on Ω_0 , so by the properties of the GNS construction and the fact that the automorphisms commute, they commute.

As another example, consider a Boson field algebra \mathcal{A} at temperature $1/\beta$. To any canonical pair of coordinates p, q of the field, the group \mathbb{R}^2 acts on A by $(p, q) \rightarrow (p+x, q+y)$, ($x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2$). In the Fock representation this automorphism is spatial and is implemented by the Weyl operators of the mode in question: $W(x, y) = e^{i(pv - qx)}$. This provides a projective representation of \mathbb{R}^2 . But at non-

zero temperature, the same automorphism can be implemented by

$$W(x, y) = \pi_\beta(W(x, y)) \otimes J(\pi_\beta(W(x, y)))J^{-1}.$$

By the general KMS theory, the latter factor lies in $\pi_\beta(A)'$ and so does not interfere with the implementation, which is done by the first factor. The presence of J however, ensures that $J(\pi_\beta(W(x, y)))J^{-1}$ represents the Heisenberg commutation rules with a change of sign of i , and so the generators of $W(x, y)$ commute; if we regard canonical variables as generators of automorphisms, then they can be represented by classical (commuting) variables at $1/\beta > 0$. If, however, these variables are observable in their own right, we use π , not $\pi \otimes J\pi J^{-1}$ to represent them. Currents, typically, are defined only as generators of transformations, and so we have a mechanism for the cancellation of anomalies.

III. HENLE'S THEOREM

In 1970, J. Henle proved a theorem that can be applied directly to the example of Sec. II; it implies that in $\pi_\beta \circ \gamma$ there exists a true representation of the automorphism group of space-time.

Theorem (Henle²): Let \mathcal{A} be a W^* -algebra $\subseteq B(H)$, G be a locally compact group, H a separable Hilbert space. Moreover, let \mathcal{A} have a properly infinite commutant, and let $\tau: G \rightarrow \text{Aut } \mathcal{A}$ be a norm-continuous homomorphism of G into $\text{Aut } \mathcal{A}$, i.e., $\|(\tau_g - I)A\| \rightarrow 0$ as $g \rightarrow e_G$. Then there exists a strongly continuous representation of G , U_g , on H , implementing τ_g .

Since in the example of Sec. II, τ_t and $\sigma(n)$ are norm continuous, the existence of commuting $U(t)$, $V(n)$ is ensured. We have found just one choice.

The norm continuity of Henle's theorem is only rarely true in models. On the other hand, Henle does not assume (but proves) that τ_g is spatial. In our approach, as we are only interested in g such that τ_g is spatial, there is room to weaken the continuity assumption to a representation-dependent one. Thus we prove the following.

Modified Henle Theorem: Let \mathcal{A} be a W^* algebra with a properly infinite commutant, acting on a separable Hilbert space. Let G be a locally compact group of automorphisms of \mathcal{A} implemented by $U_g \in \text{Aut } H$. Suppose U_g is weakly measurable. Then there exist implementing operators U'_g without multiplier.

Proof: Let $K = L^2(G, H)$ and define for each $A \in \mathcal{A}$ the operators $\tau(A)$ on $L^2(G, H)$ by

$$(\tau(A))(\psi)(g) := \tau_g(A)\psi(g) = U_g A U_g^{-1} \psi(g)$$

(see M. Henle²). The right-hand side of the latter is measurable in g by assumption. The operator $\tau(A)$ is bounded:

$$\|\tau(A)\| = \text{esssup}_g \|\tau_g(A)\| = \|A\|.$$

The map $A \rightarrow \tau_g(A)$ is normal: If E_n is an increasing net of projections with upper bound E , then $\tau_g(E_n) = U_g E_n U_g^{-1}$ is an increasing net with upper bound $U_g E U_g^{-1} = (\tau(E))(g)$. Hence, the map $A \rightarrow \tau(A)$ is normal. It implies that $\tau(\mathcal{A})$ is a W^* -algebra. Then on $L^2(G, H)$ define

$$(V_g \psi)(h) := \psi(g^{-1}h),$$

a unitary continuous representation. The map τ is spatial: $\exists R: H \rightarrow L^2(G, H)$ such that $\tau(A) = RAR^{-1}$ for, as Henle notes, any isomorphism between W^* -algebras, both with infinite commutants, is spatial. Then $R^{-1}V_gR$ is a continuous true representation of G on H and implements τ_g , Q.E.D.

As the last example, consider a spin chain on \mathbb{Z} in a magnetic field h in the z direction, with an additional term in the Hamiltonian due to spin interaction of nearest neighbors:

$$H_J = -J \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sigma_i \cdot \sigma_{i+1}.$$

One can see that there is an anomaly at $\beta = \infty$ (same as if $J = 0$), but that it goes away at $0 < \beta < \infty$. The last point follows from Henle's theorem, since the automorphisms generated from $H = H_0 + H_J$ are strongly continuous⁴ ($H_0 = h \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sigma_i^{(3)}$), and commute with space translations. We now consider the representation at zero temperature. Clearly, H_0 and H_J commute and give spatial automorphisms in the representation (π, Ω, H_Ω) given by the state $\omega_\infty \circ \gamma$, where γ is the automorphism given in Sec. II. Let $U_0(t)$, $U_J(t)$ be the one-parameter groups implementing these automorphisms. It was shown in Ref. 1 that $U_0(t)V(n) = e^{inh}V(n)U_0(t)$.

Define $U(t) := U_0(t)U_J(t)$. This will have the anomaly with $V(n)$ provided $V(n)$ and $U_J(t)$ commute. The implementation of $-J \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sigma_i \cdot \sigma_{i+1}$ is by $H_J = 3J \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} P_{i,i+1}$, where $P_{i,i+1}$ is the projection of $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$ onto the singlet state $2^{-1/2}(\uparrow \otimes \downarrow - \downarrow \otimes \uparrow)$. We see that \mathcal{H}_J commutes with $V(n)$; to be precise $V(1)\mathcal{H}_J\Omega = \mathcal{H}_J V(1)\Omega$. So $V(n)\mathcal{H}_J\Psi = \mathcal{H}_J V(n)\Psi$, where $\Psi \in \mathcal{N} = \text{span}(A\Omega; A \in \text{local algebra})$. \mathcal{N} is dense in \mathcal{H}_Ω , invariant under $V(n)$ and \mathcal{H}_J . Moreover, each $\Psi \in \mathcal{N}$ is an analytic vector for \mathcal{H}_J , so \mathcal{H}_J generates a unique group of unitaries $U_J(t)$ that commutes with $V(n)$. But that means $U(t)V(n) = V(n)U(t)e^{inh}$.

IV. CONCLUSION

Suppose we have an algebra of fields \mathcal{F} on which acts a locally compact gauge group \mathcal{G} . The \mathcal{G} -invariant elements of \mathcal{F} comprise the observable algebra \mathcal{A} . Suppose G , a symmetry group, acts on \mathcal{A} , and each $g \in G$ is not spontaneously broken, so is spatial and given by U_g . Obviously G commutes with \mathcal{G} in its action on \mathcal{A} , as \mathcal{G} acts trivially. But even if each gauge transformation $\in \mathcal{G}$ is spatial, say $W(u)$, $u \in \mathcal{G}$, it is not always true that $W(u)$ commute with $U(g)$, $g \in G$. In particular, an anomaly arises if $W(u)$ does not commute with time evolution. But at positive temperature, we have shown that, by modifying U_g we can eliminate any multipliers of G . We interpret this as predicting that anomalies melt away if $T > 0$; we can regard $\mathcal{G} \times G$ as the group acting on \mathcal{A} , and so find a true representation. In particular, Galilean quantum mechanics becomes classical.

Thus, as mentioned in the abstract, the idea of Kuzmin, Rubakov, and Shaposhnikov that anomalies in baryon currents might have caused the baryon imbalance in the early hot universe needs reconsideration.⁵

The only way out of this meltdown is if the gauge group is spontaneously broken.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work supported in part by Center for Transport Theory and Mathematical Physics, Blacksburg, VA 24061.

¹R. F. Streater, Commun. Math. Phys. **132**, 201 (1990).

²M. Henle, Commun. Math. Phys. **19**, 273 (1970).

³W. Thirring, *Quantenmechanik Grosser Systeme* (Springer-Verlag, Wien, 1980).

⁴R. F. Streater, Commun. Math. Phys. **6**, 233 (1967).

⁵V. Kuzmin, V. Rubakov, and M. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. B **155**, 36 (1985).