

The Miracle of the Higgs

Shivaji Sondhi¹

In the bulk of the commentary on the discovery of the Higgs particle at CERN and the recent award of the Nobel Prize to Peter Higgs and Francois Englert, one astonishing aspect has been largely overlooked. This discovery points to one of the most central aspects of postwar Physics – its unity across domains at distances (or energies) separated by vast gulfs which have allowed ideas to jump between very different physical problems. In the case of the Higgs particle, its discovery at an energy of one hundred billion electron volts in an incredibly complicated special purpose machine is, in a mathematical sense, a precise analog of a well understood phenomenon in ordinary metals at an energy of a thousandth of an electron volt – one hundred trillion times lower!

Indeed, this analogy is how the puzzle underlying the Higgs particle was first solved – by Phillip Anderson in 1963 – a full year before the papers by Higgs and Englert and Brout that were honored with the Nobel Prize. Anderson, now 89, is widely regarded as the greatest living condensed matter physicist – a maestro of the part of physics which tries to understand how the small set of subatomic forces and particles can still lead to the infinite variety of the matter we see around us. He has led an utterly spectacular career in science during which he picked up a Nobel Prize in 1977 for completely different work and could really have collected at least two more in condensed matter physics!

Back in 1963 Anderson had already played a key role in understanding the general phenomenon of “spontaneous symmetry breaking” in condensed matter physics over the previous decade in parallel with important developments in particle physics. An everyday example of this phenomenon is the formation of ice from water. While the molecules in water resemble the crowd in Times Square on a busy day with no clear preference for where they want to be, the molecules in ice are arranged in an array like an honor guard at attention. Their choice of particular positions breaks the symmetry embodied in a lack of positional preference.

More immediately Anderson had been one of the central players in elucidating the physics of superconductivity – the phenomenon in which metals permit electric

¹ Shivaji Sondhi is a Professor of Physics at Princeton University.

current to flow without loss when sufficiently cold. Superconductivity involves an unusual broken symmetry but with the complication of electromagnetic forces which act over large distances. In the context of superconductivity it was understood by Anderson that a “massless gauge field” (describing ordinary electromagnetic forces) could combine with a “massless Goldstone mode” (a signature of symmetry breaking) to yield purely massive excitations. Roughly, this reflects the dislike that superconductors exhibit for magnetic fields termed the Meissner effect, often dramatized by levitating magnets above pieces of superconductors.

At this point Anderson came across particle physicists trying to rescue an appealing potential description of short ranged forces among the zoo of particles being discovered in accelerators. This description, by means of “Yang-Mills gauge fields” had one key thing wrong – the gauge fields were massless and thus described long ranged forces. Anderson realized that by introducing a *second* wrong – a massless Goldstone boson due to symmetry breaking – he could make a right. Today, this magic trick is commonly referred to as the Anderson-Higgs mechanism, to credit Higgs with the subsequent realization that the mechanism implied a specific additional massive particle Anderson had overlooked. [That Higgs won out over his particle theory co-discoverers in the naming sweepstakes is proof of the inestimable advantage of a monosyllabic name, e.g. Marx.]

In any event, by staring into a piece of metal, Anderson had divined the solution to a puzzle about fundamental particles!

Now the energy involved in superconductivity is a thousandth of an electron volt while the energy of the Higgs particle is a hundred trillion times larger, or alternately the size of the Higgs particle is a hundred trillion times smaller than the size of the smallest superconducting unit, the so-called “Cooper pair” of electrons. Why is it that the same mathematics can be used to describe both?

The explanation for *this* astonishing fact is a central meta-idea in postwar physics, that of the effective field theory. Roughly it states that if you don't look too closely at the spatial details the mathematics simplifies greatly into a set of “field theories” which then provide a unifying mathematical framework for a vast range of phenomena. This meta-idea itself has a precise mathematical formulation known as

“universality under renormalization group flows” for which the late Kenneth Wilson received the Nobel in 1982.

Metals are made of electrons and nuclei but when we smooth over such details we end up with the field theory Anderson considered. In particle physics the details being smoothed over are unknown – perhaps described by string theory – and we end up with a close cousin of Anderson’s field theory. What Anderson called a mode, Higgs called a particle but both were describing a disturbance in an underlying medium, one known and the other unknown! [Yes, “fundamental” particles are not little indivisible bits of “stuff” in our modern understanding.]

The ubiquity of effective field theories in physics means that the Anderson-Higgs mechanism is by no means the only example of tight analogies between far separated phenomena in modern Physics. To take one recent example, the work of particle physicist Edward Witten on topological field theories in the 1980s, for which he won a Fields medal in mathematics, has turned out to be central to our understanding of the quantum Hall effect in semiconductor systems even though it was designed to do no such thing. Even the present author who is also a condensed matter physicist has had the (far more modest) pleasure of discovering in the same semiconductor systems “skyrmions” fifteen orders of magnitude larger than those considered by particle physicist Tony Skyrme as descriptions of protons and neutrons.

So all in all, the discovery of the Higgs particle is a triumph for this syncretic view built into modern physics. It turns out that space devoid of visible particles has something deeply in common with a superconducting metal. Furthermore it tells us that it was not always so – when the universe was younger and hotter, it resembled more a piece of superconductor heated to the point where the superconductivity vanishes and thus there was no Higgs particle to speak of.

This brings me to the recent Nobel Prize in Physics. I believe the Nobel Committee missed an opportunity in not including Anderson along with Higgs and Englert. It would have been a more accurate accounting of the credit on this particular discovery and an entirely deserved honor for a man whose contributions are truly legion. Above all, it would have paid tribute to the remarkable intellectual unity of modern physics.