- [15] E. D. Shishin and V. V. Solov'ev, JETP 43, 268 (1962), Soviet Phys. JETP 16, 192 (1963).
- [16] A. Barbaro-Galtieri and R. Tripp, Phys. Rev. Lett. 14, 279 (1965).
- [17] R. A. Zdanis, L. Madansky, R. W. Kraemer, S. Hertzbach, and R. Strand, ibid. $\underline{14}$, 721 (1965).
- [18] D. M. Binnie et al., Phys. Lett. 18, 348 (1965).
 - 1) R. Boscovic Institute, Zagreb, Yugoslavia.
- The fraction of these decays due to virtual electromagnetic interaction was investigated in connection with the possible CP-noninvariance of strong interactions [2 7].

USE OF A POLARIZED PROTON TARGET TO DETERMINE ISOBAR PARITY

M. S. Dubovikov Moscow Physico-technical Institute Submitted 10 November 1965 ZhETF Pis'ma 3, No. 1, 8-11, 1 January 1966

To determine isobar parity by the method proposed here, there is no need to measure the polarization of the baryon produced as a result of the isobar decay. Our method may therefore prove to be most convenient in the case when this baryon is a nucleon.

The proposed method is based on the relations between the polarization effects in parity-conserving processes. For processes in which spin-1/2 particles participate, these relations are discussed in detail in the review [1]. In [2] is indicated a method of obtaining all the relations between the polarization effects in processes of the type $a + b \rightarrow c + d$, in which parity is conserved and particle spin is arbitrary.

Relations of this type have served as the basis for previously proposed methods for determining the parity of hyperons using a polarized proton target [1,3,4].

In [5] it is proposed to use a polarized target to determine the spin and parity of the isobar, but it is also necessary to measure the polarization of the baryon produced as a result of the isobar decay. However, as shown by Byers and Fenster [6], it is sufficient for this purpose to measure the polarization of the baryon with the target unpolarized.

Let us consider the process

$$\Pi_1 + p \to \Pi_2 + N^*, \tag{1}$$

where Π_1 and Π_2 are pseudoscalar mesons, p a proton, and N* an isobar with spin $j \geq 3/2$.

The polarization moments T_L^M of the isobar are expressed in terms of the polarization moments t_{ij}^m of the proton by means of the formula

$$\sum_{L_{9}M} \frac{2L+1}{2j+1} c_{\lambda^{1};LM}^{j\lambda} T_{L}^{M} = \frac{1}{F} \sum_{\ell,m,\mu,\mu,\mu'} f_{\lambda\mu}(\vartheta) f_{\lambda^{1},\mu^{1}}^{*}(\vartheta) \frac{2\ell+1}{2} c_{(1/2)\mu^{1};\ell m}^{(1/2)\mu} t_{\ell}^{m}, \qquad (2)$$

where

$$F = \sum_{\substack{\lambda, l, m, \\ \mu, \mu'}} f_{\lambda}(\vartheta) f_{\lambda}^{*}(\vartheta) \frac{2l+1}{2} C_{(1/2)\mu';lm}^{(1/2)\mu} t_{l}^{m},$$

$$(3)$$

 λ and μ are the helicities of the isobar and the proton, respectively, $f_{\lambda,\mu}(\vartheta)$ is the scattering helicity amplitude, which we define in a somewhat different fashion than in the known paper [7]:

$$\mathbf{f}_{\lambda\mu} = \langle \vartheta \varphi; \lambda | T | O \varphi \mu \rangle. \tag{4}$$

The quantities $| \vartheta \varphi; \lambda \rangle$ are also defined somewhat differently than in [7]

$$|\vartheta_{\Phi};\lambda\rangle = \hat{R}_{\Phi,\vartheta,O} 100;\lambda\rangle,$$
 (5)

where $\hat{R}_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}$ is the operator of rotation through the Eulerian angles α , β , γ ; $|00;\lambda\rangle$ is the state of N* and Π_2 when the momentum of N* is directed along the positive z axis and the helicity of N* is equal to λ .

It can be shown that, by virtue of the definition (4) and (5), $f_{\lambda\mu}$ does not depend on the angle φ . Using the definitions (4) and (5), and also the properties of the partial helicity amplitudes (given in [7] and resulting from parity conservation) and of the functions $d_{\lambda\mu}^{J}(\vartheta)$, we can easily show that in the c.m.s.

$$f_{\lambda,\mu}(\vartheta) = \frac{\eta_{N*} \eta_{\Pi_2}}{\eta_p \eta_{\Pi_1}} (-1)^{j-1/2+\lambda-\mu} f_{-\lambda,-\mu}(\vartheta), \tag{6}$$

It can be shown that relation (6) retains the same form in the laboratory frame, too. Replacing in (2) $f_{\lambda\mu}$ or $f_{\lambda'\mu'}^*$, in accordance with (6), we can obtain all the relations between the polarization effects of the process (1).

In particular, if the target is polarized at an angle $\pi/4$ to the incident meson beam and the isobar is scattered in a plane containing the incident beam and the target polarization vector $\vec{\xi}$, then the following relations hold:

$$\sum_{L} (2L + 1) C_{j-(M+M')/2;LM}^{j(M-M')/2} \text{ Im } T_{L}^{M}(\vartheta)
= \frac{\eta_{N*}}{\eta_{p}} (-1)^{j+(M-M')/2} \sum_{L'} (2L' + 1) C_{j-(M'+M)/2;L'M'}^{j(M'-M)/2} \text{ Im } \widetilde{T}_{L'}^{M'}(\vartheta),$$
(7)

where $T_L^M(\vartheta)$ ($\widetilde{T}_L^M(\vartheta)$) are the polarization moments of the isobar scattered through an angle ϑ relative to the incident beam in the direction of $\vec{\xi}_{\perp}$ ($-\vec{\xi}_{\perp}$), and $\vec{\xi}_{\perp}$ is the projection of the target polarization vector $\vec{\xi}$ on the plane perpendicular to the incident beam. The axes z and y, with respect to which T_L^M and \widetilde{T}_L^M are defined, are chosen to be in the directions of \vec{P}_{N*} and $[\vec{P}_{\Pi_1} \times \vec{P}_{N*}]$, respectively $(\vec{P}_{N*}$ and \vec{P}_{Π_1} are the momenta of N* and Π_1). Formula (7) constitutes in fact a set of $(j^2 - 1/2)$ independent equations (for different M and M'; of

course, there is no summation implied in (7) with respect to M and M'). M and M' should have different parities, $|M| + |M'| \le 2j$, and it can be assumed that M > 0 and M' > 0, so that $T_L^M = (-1)^M T_L^{M*}$.

If the target is not polarized, then the polarization moments contained in (7) are equal to zero.

The proposed method is suitable for the determination of the parity of the Ω hyperon. If the isobar spin is J = 3/2, (7) takes the form

Im
$$T_{\mathbf{2}}^{\mathbf{1}}(\vartheta) = -\frac{\eta_{N^{\mathbf{X}}}}{\eta_{\mathbf{p}}} \operatorname{Im} \widetilde{T}_{\mathbf{2}}^{\mathbf{2}}(\vartheta),$$

Im $T_{\mathbf{2}}^{\mathbf{2}}(\vartheta) = \frac{\eta_{N^{\mathbf{X}}}}{\eta_{\mathbf{p}}} \operatorname{Im} \widetilde{T}_{\mathbf{2}}^{\mathbf{1}}(\vartheta).$
(7)

The author is sincerely grateful to L. I. Lapidus and Yu. A. Simonov for useful discussions.

- [1] S. M. Bilen'kii, L. I. Lapidus, and R. M. Ryndin, UFN <u>84</u>, 243 (1964), Soviet Phys. Uspekhi 7, 721 (1965).
- [2] M. S. Dubovikov, YaF 3, No. 2, 1966, transl. in press.
- [3] G. Shapiro, Phys. Rev. <u>134B</u>, 1393 (1964).
- [4] S. M. Bilenky and R. M. Ryndin, Phys. Lett. 18, 346 (1964).
- [5] M. K. Gaillard, Nuovo Cimento 32, 1306 (1964).
- [6] N. Byers and S. Fenster, Phys. Rev. Lett. 11, 52 (1963).
- [7] M. Jacob and G. C. Wick, Ann. Phys. 7, 404 (1959).

STATES WITH POPULATION INVERSION IN A SELF-COMPRESSED DISCHARGE

S. G. Kulagin, V. M. Likhachev, E. V. Markuzon, M. S. Rabinovich, and V. M. Sutovskii P. N. Lebedev Physics Institute, USSR Academy of Sciences Submitted 11 November 1965
ZhETF Pis'ma 3, No. 1, 12-14, 1 January 1966

Stimulated emission is usually observed in gases at relatively low currents, when the electromagnetic forces exert no influence on the discharge development process. It is known, however, that in the case of cumulation of a strong-current pulsed discharge (pinch effect) the plasma is heated at an unusually fast rate, and magnetohydrodynamic instabilities develop. An unstable turbulent state is produced. The heating time is of the order of the time of ionic collisions at maximum pinch compression (without account of the collective processes). Estimates show that for singly-ionized atoms of argon this time amounts to