Crystal -	Longitudinal elastic wave			Transverse elastic wave		
	Δ <b>λ</b> , Å	v, m/s (measured)(c		Δ <b>λ, Å</b>	v, m/ (measured)(	sec calculated)
NH <sub>4</sub> Cl + Co	0.228 ± 0.001	4650 ± 25	4430	0.117 ± 0.001	2380 ± 25	2110
NaCl	0.204 ± 0.002	4450 ± 50	4480			
KCl	0.169 ± 0.003	3820 ± 70	<b>383</b> 0			

- [1] E. Gross, Z. Physik 63, 685 (1932).
- [2] C. V. Raman and C. S. Venkateswaran, Nature 142, 250 (1938).
- [3] L. Sibaiya, Proc. Ind. Acad. Sci. <u>A8</u>, 393 (1938).
- [4] R. S. Krishnan, Symposium of Papers on the Vibration Spectra of Crystals. Reprinted from Proceedings of Indian Academy of Sci., 1947.
- [5] R. S. Krishnan and V. Chandrasekharan, Proc. Ind. Acad. Sci. 31A, 427 (1950).
- [6] V. Chandrasekharan, Proc. Ind. Acad. Sci. 32A, 379 (1950).
- [7] Benedek, Lastovka, Fritsch, and Greytak, J. Opt. Soc. Amer. 54, 1284 (1964).
- [8] H. B. Huntington, Solid State Physics 7, N. Y., 1958.
- 1) The authors are deeply grateful to the members of the Magnetic-spectroscopy Laboratory of the Kazan' State University, G. K. Chirkin and L. A. Shcherbakova, for growing the NH4Cl single crystals. The NaCl and KCl crystals were graciously supplied by B. A. Reznikov.

RELATIVISTIC GENERALIZATION OF SU(6) SYMMETRY AND PRODUCTION OF BARYON RESONANCES

V. A. Zakharov and A. B. Kaidalov Nuclear Physics Division, USSR Academy of Sciences Submitted 25 June 1965

1. Stodolsky and Sakurai advanced the hypothesis [1] that the principal role in isobar production reactions in meson-nucleon collisions

$$M_1 + B_1 \rightarrow B^* + M_2, \qquad B^* \rightarrow M_3 + B_2$$
 (1)

is played by vector-meson exchange, with the vertex VB\*B described, in analogy with the photon, by the magnetic-dipole transition <sup>[2]</sup>. The consequences of this model were checked most thoroughly in reactions (2) and (3) <sup>[3-11]</sup>:

$$K^{+} + p \rightarrow N^{*++} + K^{O}$$
 (2)

$$\pi^{+} + p \rightarrow N^{*++} + \pi^{0}$$
 (3)

In all cases, with the exception [7] of  $k_L = 1.1 - 1.27$  BeV/c in reaction (3), the observed angular distribution of the isobar decay products were in good agreement with the pre-

dictions of the Stodolsky-Sakurai model, whereas the dependence of the cross section on s and t contradicts (see [10]) the model of [1,12].

In the present note we consider the production of the isobar pertaining to the decuplet on the basis of  $\widetilde{U}(12)$  symmetry of strong interactions <sup>[13]</sup>. We show that in reaction (2) the predicted angular distribution coincides with that obtained in <sup>[1]</sup>. In reaction (3) the angular correlations have the same form, provided the principal role is played in the t-channel by exchange of states with T=1 and not 2. These deductions are not connected with assumption regarding the peripheral character of the interaction. The relativistic generalization of SU(6) symmetry, considered by Beg and Pais <sup>[14]</sup>, leads to the same results.

2. The baryon octet and decuplet enter into a single 364-plet, which is described by the symmetrical tensor  $\Psi_{ABC}(A, B, C = 1, ..., 12)$ , and the octet of pseudoscalar mesons belongs to the representation  $\{145\}M_B^A$ . All the processes  $(143) + (364) \rightarrow (143) + (364)$  are determined by the four amplitudes  $A_1 - A_4$ , with  $A_1$  making no contribution to (1):

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{A_{1}}(\mathbf{s,t})\bar{\mathbf{Y}}^{\mathrm{ABC}}\mathbf{Y}_{\mathrm{ABC}}\mathbf{M}_{\mathrm{1F}}^{\mathrm{D}}\mathbf{M}_{\mathrm{2D}}^{\mathrm{F}}, & \mathbf{A_{2}}(\mathbf{s,t})\bar{\mathbf{Y}}^{\mathrm{ABC'}}\mathbf{Y}_{\mathrm{ABC}}\mathbf{M}_{\mathrm{1C}}^{\mathrm{D}}\mathbf{M}_{\mathrm{2D}}^{\mathrm{C}}, \\ & \mathbf{A_{4}}(\mathbf{s,t})\bar{\mathbf{Y}}^{\mathrm{ABC'}}\mathbf{Y}_{\mathrm{ABC}}\mathbf{M}_{\mathrm{1B}}^{\mathrm{B}}\mathbf{M}_{\mathrm{2C}}^{\mathrm{C'}}, & \mathbf{A_{3}}(\mathbf{s,t})\bar{\mathbf{Y}}^{\mathrm{ABC'}}\mathbf{Y}_{\mathrm{ABC}}\mathbf{M}_{\mathrm{1D}}^{\mathrm{C}}\mathbf{M}_{\mathrm{2C}}^{\mathrm{D}}, \end{aligned}$$

Using the explicit form of the tensors  $\Psi_{ABC}$  and  $M_{B'}^{A}$  we can easily find that the following processes (4) are described by the amplitudes  $A_2$  and  $A_3$ , but not by  $A_4$ :

$$K^{+} + p \rightarrow N^{*++} + K^{O}, \qquad K^{-} + p \rightarrow N^{*+} + K^{-}$$
 $K^{+} + p \rightarrow N^{*+} + K^{+}, \qquad K^{-} + p \rightarrow N^{*O} + \bar{K}^{O}$ 
(4)

We confine ourselves here to reactions with two charged particles in the initial state.

There exists also a group of reactions (5), to which only the amplitude  $A_{\mu}$  makes a contribution:

$$\pi^{-} + p \rightarrow N^{*-} + \pi^{-}, \qquad K^{-} + p \rightarrow \Xi^{*0} + K^{0}$$

$$\pi^{-} + p \rightarrow Y_{1}^{*-} + K^{+}, \qquad K^{-} + p \rightarrow Y_{1}^{*-} + \pi^{+}$$

$$K^{-} + p \rightarrow \Xi^{*-} + K^{+}$$
(5)

Finally, the reactions (6) are determined by all the amplitudes  $A_2 - A_3$ :

$$\pi^{+} + p \rightarrow N^{*++} + \pi^{0} \qquad \pi^{+} + p \rightarrow Y^{*+} + K^{+} 
K^{-} + p \rightarrow Y^{*+}_{1} + \pi^{-} \qquad \pi^{-} + p \rightarrow N^{*+} + \pi^{-} 
\pi^{-} + p \rightarrow N^{*0} + \pi^{0} \qquad K^{-} + p \rightarrow Y^{*0}_{1} + \pi^{0} 
\pi^{+} + p \rightarrow N^{*+} + \pi^{+}$$
(6)

3. The matrix elements of reactions (4) are of the form

$$M = A(s,t) e_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \bar{u}_{\delta} k_{\beta}^{\perp} k_{\beta}^{2} p_{\gamma}^{\perp}$$
 (7)

where A is a linear combination of  $A_2$  and  $A_3$ , different for each different reaction. Here

 $\bar{u}_{\delta}$  is the wave function of a particle with spin 3/2 in the Rarita-Schwinger formalism;  $k_{\Omega}^{1}$ ,  $k_{\beta}^{2}$ , and  $p_{\Upsilon}^{1}$  are 4-momenta of  $M_{1}$ ,  $M_{2}$ , and  $B_{1}$ , respectively.

Squaring (7) and summing over the polarizations of the initial and final nucleons, we obtain in the isobar rest system

$$(1/2) |\mathbf{M}|^2 \sim |\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{st})|^2 (\epsilon_1 + \mathbf{m}) (\epsilon_2 + \mathbf{m}) |\mathbf{k}_1 \times \mathbf{k}_2|^2 |\mathbf{p}_2|^2 (1 + 3\cos^2\theta)$$
 (8)

where  $\epsilon_1$  and  $\epsilon_2$  are the energies of the initial and final nucleons, and  $\theta$  is the angle between the normal to the production plane and the direction of the momentum of the final nucleon.

We note that (7) leads to the Stodolsky-Sakurai distribution (8) without neglect of the recoil of the nucleon, in contrast with the results of [12].

The angular distribution in reactions (5), which can be due to vector-meson exchange, has the usual Adair form [16]

$$(1+3)[(k_1p_2)^2/(|k_1|^2|p_2|^2)]$$

The angular correlations in reactions (6) have in the general case when  $A_4 \sim A_2$ ,  $A_3$  a rather complicated form and coincide with (7) only for those values of s and t for which

$$A_4(st) \ll A_2(st), \quad A_3(st) \tag{9}$$

Expression (9) can be verified independently against the isotopic relations between the different cross sections. In the case of reaction (3), for example, (9) signifies that the principal role in the t-channel is played by exchange of states with T = 1 and not 2.

The fact that a 1 + 3  $\cos^2\theta$  distribution is observed in reaction (3) for an incident-meson momentum  $k_L^1 = 0.9$  [3] and 1.14 [4] BeV/c, and does not agree [7] with the experimental data in reaction (3) when  $k_L^1 \approx 1.2$  BeV/c is a confirmation of the  $\widetilde{U}(12)$  symmetry. Thus, the predictions of  $\widetilde{U}(12)$  with respect to the spin structure of the amplitudes of processes (1) agree with experiment.

4. At the same time, as shown in [17,18], the polarization of the  $\Xi$  hyperon produced in the reaction

$$K^{-} + p \rightarrow \Xi^{-} + K^{+} \tag{10}$$

is equal to zero in the  $\widetilde{U}(12)$ -symmetry approximation, thus contradicting the experimental data. We know of two possible explanations [17,20] of this fact within the framework of the relativistic generalizations of SU(6). First, (see [17]), the cross section of the reaction is small (of the order of 0.1 mb at  $k_L^1 = 1.95$  BeV/c) and it can be assumed that the symmetry is decisively broken. Such a value of the cross section corresponds to the assumption (9) that  $A_4$  is small compared with the remaining amplitudes, since only  $A_4$  contributes to (10). Second [20], the polarization of  $\Xi^-$  should not be equal to zero if the quantity  $\xi$  introduced by Beg and Pais [14] is complex. All the results obtained are valid for arbitrary  $\xi(st)$ .

The authors are grateful to I. Yu. Kobzarev and I. Ya. Pomeranchuk for discussions.

- [1] L. Stodolsky and J. J. Sakurai, Phys. Rev. Lett. 11, 90 (1963).
- [2] M. Gourdin and Ph. Salin, Nuovo Cimento 27, 193 (1963).

- [3] B. Kehoe, Phys. Rev. Lett. 11, 93 (1963).
- [4] Boldt, Dubos, Duong, Eberhard, George, Henri, Levy, Poyen, and Pripstein, Phys. Rev. 133B, 220 (1964).
- [5] Chadwik, Crennel, Davies, Derrick, Mulvey, Jones, Radojicic, Wilkinson, Bettini, Cresti, Limentani, Perrazo, and Santangelo, Phys. Lett. 6, 309 (1963).
- [6] Ferroluzzi, George, Goldschmidt-Clermon, Henri, Jongejans, Leith, Lynch, Muller, and Perreau, Nuovo Cimento 36, 1101 (1965).
- [7] G. W. Tautfest and R. B. Willmann, Bull. Amer. Phys. Soc. 10, 114 (1965).
- [8] Daudin, Jabiol, Kochowski, Lewin, Selleri, Mongelli, Romano, and Waloschek, Phys. Lett. 7, 125 (1963).
- [9] Saclay Orsay Bologne Bari Collaboration, Phys. Lett. 13, 341 (1964).
- [10] Abolins, Carmony, Duong N. Hoa, Lander, Rindfleisch, and Nguyen-huu Xuong, Phys. Rev. 136B, 195 (1964).
- [11] Aachen Berlin Birmingham Hamburg London (I. C.) Munich Collaboration, Nuovo Cimento 34, 495 (1964).
- [12] J. D. Jackson and H. Bilkuhn, Nuovo Cimento 33, 906 (1964).
- [13] Salam, Delbourgo, and Strathdee, Proc. Roy. Soc. A284, 146 (1965).
- [14] M. A. B. Beg and A. Pais, Phys. Rev. <u>137B</u>, 1514 (1965); Phys. Rev. Lett. <u>14</u>, 267, 577 (E) (1965).
- [15] W. Rarita and J. Schwinger, Phys. Rev. 60, 61 (1964).
- [16] R. K. Adair, Phys. Rev. 100, 1540 (1955).
- [17] Cornwell, Freund, and Mahanthappa, Phys. Rev. Lett. 14, 515 (1965).
- [18] Blankenbecler, Goldberger, Jonson, and Treiman, Phys. Rev. Lett. 14, 518 (1965).
- [19] Carmony, Pjerrou, Schlein, Slater, Stork, and Ticho, Phys. Rev. Lett. 12, 482 (1964).
- [20] Ngee Pong Chang and J. P. Sehpiz, Phys. Rev. Lett. 14, 617 (1965).

## ISOTOPIC STRUCTURE OF PARITY NONCONSERVING NUCLEAR FORCES

O. D. Dal'karov

Submitted 1 June 1965

Blin-Stoyle and Feshbach <sup>[1]</sup> calculated the asymmetry, relative to the plane of polarization of the incident radiation, of nucleon emission in the  $\gamma$  + d  $\rightarrow$  n + p reaction. This asymmetry is a result of the parity nonconserving weak interaction between nucleons, predicted by the V - A variant of the universal theory. The potential of the weak interaction in <sup>[1]</sup> corresponded to two-pion exchange <sup>[2]</sup>, and its isotopic structure constituted a superposition of an isoscalar and an irreducible isotensor of second rank. Actually, however, only the isoscalar part makes a contribution to the amplitude of the considered process.

In this paper we estimate the possible contribution made to the same effect by the static isovector part of weak internucleon interaction, corresponding to a potential in the