In early January 1957 C. S. Wu announced that her experiment had shown that parity is not conserved in beta decay.



C.S. Wu (1912-1997)

Her famous paper was in preprint form at that time. It was officially published a month later.

The branching ratio of the two modes of decay of Fm^{233} , i.e., E.C./ α , was found to be about 8.5—which gives $\sim 89.5\%$ decay by electron capture and $\sim 10.5\%$ by alpha emission. It was not possible to measure the cross section for the Cf²⁵²($\alpha_3 3n$)Fm²⁵³ reaction because Fm²⁵³ could also be produced from other californium isotopes in the tareet.

A previous publication⁴ on a possible identification of the Fm^{243} gave the values of 6.85 ± 0.04 Mev for the alpha-particle energy, and a half-life >10 days.

It is a pleasure to thank the crew of the 60-inch cyclotron for their extremely careful and skillful operation of the machine during the bombardment. We wish to thank Professor Glenn T. Seaborg for his continued interest.

* On leave from the Israel Atomic Energy Commission, Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovoth, Israel.

¹Thompson, Ghiorso, Harvey, and Choppin, Phys. Rev. 93, 908 (1954).

² Harvey, Chetham-Strode, Ghiorso, Choppin, and Thompson, Phys. Rev. **104**, 1315 (1956).

³Thompson, Harvey, Choppin, and Seaborg, J. Am. Chem. Soc. **76**, 6229 (1954); Choppin, Harvey, and Thompson, J. Inorg. and Nuclear Chem. **2**, 66 (1956).

⁴ Friedman, Gindler, Barnes, Sjoblom, and Fields, Phys. Rev. 102, 585 (1956).

Experimental Test of Parity Conservation in Beta Decay*

C. S. WU, Columbia University, New York, New York

E. AMBLER, R. W. HAYWARD, D. D. HOPPES, AND R. P. HUDSON, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D. C. (Received January 15, 1957)

IN a recent paper¹ on the question of parity in weak interactions, Lee and Yang critically surveyed the experimental information concerning this question and reached the conclusion that there is no existing evidence either to support or to refute parity conservation in weak interactions. They proposed a number of experiments on beta decays and hyperon and meson decays which would provide the necessary evidence for parity conservation or nonconservation. In beta decay, one could measure the angular distribution of the electrons coming from beta decays of polarized nuclei. If an asymmetry in the distribution between θ and $180^{\circ} - \theta$ (where θ is the angle between the orientation of the parent nuclei and the momentum of the electrons) is observed, it provides unequivocal proof that parity is not conserved in beta decay. This asymmetry effect has been observed in the case of oriented Co60.

It has been known for some time that Co^{60} nuclei can be polarized by the Rose-Gorter method in cerium magnesium (cobalt) nitrate, and the degree of polarization detected by measuring the anisotropy of the succeeding gamma rays.² To apply this technique to the present problem, two major difficulties had to be over-

come. The beta-particle counter should be placed *inside* the demagnetization cryostat, and the radioactive nuclei must be located in a *thin surface* layer and polarized. The schematic diagram of the cryostat is shown in Fig. 1.

To detect beta particles, a thin anthracene crystal $\frac{3}{4}$ in. in diameter $\times \frac{1}{16}$ in. thick is located inside the vacuum chamber about 2 cm above the Co⁶⁰ source. The scintillations are transmitted through a glass window and a Lucite light pipe 4 feet long to a photomultiplier (6292) which is located at the top of the cryostat. The Lucite head is machined to a logarithmic spiral shape for maximum light collection. Under this condition, the Cs137 conversion line (624 kev) still retains a resolution of 17%. The stability of the beta counter was carefully checked for any magnetic or temperature effects and none were found. To measure the amount of polarization of Co60, two additional NaI gamma scintillation counters were installed, one in the equatorial plane and one near the polar position. The observed gamma-ray anisotropy was used as a measure of polarization, and, effectively, temperature. The bulk susceptibility was also monitored but this is of secondary significance due to surface heating effects, and the gamma-ray anisotropy alone provides a reliable measure of nuclear polarization. Specimens were made by taking good single crystals of cerium magnesium nitrate and growing on the upper surface only an additional crystalline layer containing Co60. One might point out here that since the allowed beta decay of Co60 involves a change of spin of



FIG. 1. Schematic drawing of the lower part of the cryostat.

In the meantime, news spread like wild fire in the world of physicists.

At the Annual meeting of the American **Physical Society on** February 2, at the new Yorker Hotel,

The largest hall normally at our disposal was occupied by so immense a crowd that some of its members did everything but hang from the chandeliers.

That 1957 excitement among physicists was exceeded only 40 years later in the high temperature superconductivity "Woodstock" meeting of 1997.

I Background

Experiments in physics were small in scale before WWI.

Typical example is Thomson's 1897 apparatus:



After WWII, nuclear physics became a very hot field of research. Larger and larger accelerators were built.





With these accelerators, and with cosmic ray experiments, many new kinds of "elementary particles", previously unknown, were discovered.



F

 $\pi^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ + ?$

The particle π had been predicted in 1935 by Yukawa. Discovery of π , and its daughter μ caused great excitement in 1947.

But then, in the next few years, several additional particles were discovered.

They were unexpected, so they were called strange particles.



$K^{+} \rightarrow \pi^{+} + \pi^{+} + \pi^{-}$

For the next 15 years, 1950-1965, fundamental physics was chiefly occupied with identifying these strange particles, and studying their properties:

- whether they are charged,
 ±, or neutral
- their masses
- how they decay
- whether they have "spin"

etc.

24						MASS
	ANTIBARYONS	BARYONS	LEPTONS	ANTILEPTONS	BOSONS	
		<u>н</u> н°	19	61		
	$(\overline{\Sigma}^{-})(\overline{\Sigma}^{\circ}), \overline{\Sigma}^{+}$	Σ^{-} Σ° Σ^{+}				
	Ā	<u>۸</u> °				
	<u>, </u>	<u>n</u> p			-	1000 MEV
					<u><u><u></u><u><u></u><u><u></u><u><u></u><u><u></u><u></u><u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u><u></u><u></u></u></u></u></u></u></u></u></u></u>	
					1	
					#- #° #+	
			μ ⁻	μ ⁺		IOO MEV
			<u>e</u>	<u>e</u> +	-	IMEV
			<u>×</u>	<u>v</u>	<u>×</u> _	O MEV
CHARGE	-1 0 +1	-1 0 +1	-1 0	0 +1	-1 0 +!	
SPIN	1/2	1/2	1/2	1/2	O AND I	
N	-1	1	0	0	0	
l	0	0	1	-1	0	

The *K* particle had first been called \mathcal{T} , to distinguish from θ particles:

 $\theta^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ + \pi^0$

 τ and θ were thought at first to be totally unrelated particles. But then other *K* particles were discovered, so there was great confusion:

 $K_{\pi^2} = \theta, \ K_{\pi^3} = \tau,$ $K_{\mu 2}, K_{\mu 3}, K_{e3}$ etc.

There was also great subtlety. E.g. Gell-**Mann theoretically** predicted there should be 2 kinds of K^0 .



$\mathbf{\Pi}$ $\mathbf{The} \ \theta - \tau \ \mathbf{Puzzle}$

Between 1954-1957, the hottest debate was the $\theta - \tau$ puzzle.

$\theta^{+} \rightarrow \pi^{+} + \pi^{0}$ $\tau^{+} \rightarrow \pi^{+} + \pi^{+} + \pi^{-}$

On the one hand, more and more precise experiments showed that θ^+ and τ^+ have the same masses,

and have very comparable longevity.

So they seem to be the same particle, with 2 different ways of decay: into 2π 's, or into 3π 's.
But on the other hand, each particle has a "parity", and there was a **FUNDAMENTAL LAW:**

Conservation of Parity

Which says in decays, parity cannot change.

 π^+, π^0, π^- all have parity of (-1). $\theta^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ + \pi^0$ has parity +1. $\tau^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ + \pi^+ + \pi^0$ has parity -1, (most likely).

Most likely, because some details about τ decay had to be examined to rule out "orbital" contribution to parity.

Dalitz Plot





At the International **Conference on High Energy physics, April 3-6,** 1956, at Rochester in New **York State**, (the most important conference in physics in the 1950's)

Dalitz's summarized the works of the previous two years, showing that the hundreds of *t* decays studied gave a uniform distribution in the Dalitz plot.

Hence no "orbital" parity.

Hence τ does have parity of (-1)!

Hence by parity conservation, θ and τ cannot be the same particle. Hence PUZZLE!

Explicitly and Implicitly:

Could Parity be not conserved?

Three reasons why people believed in parity conservation.

I. Parity Conservation means physical universe is right-left symmetrical.

This seems a priori indisputable. And it is also born out by Newton's equations, and Maxwell's equations.

II. Right-left symmetry has great intuitive and aesthetic appeal.

III. After the 1920-1930's, QM showed that parity is accurately conserved in atomic physics.

And indeed that conservation became a powerful tool used effectively in theoretical and experimental research:

first in atomic and molecular physics.

• then in nuclear decays.

• then in nuclear reactions.

In particular, in hundreds of beta decay experiments,

"selection and intensity rules" involving parity conservation were found to be in good agreement with experiments.

Thus:

It is inconceivable that parity can be not conserved!

"The situation physicists" found themselves in was like that of a man in a dark room groping for an exit. He knew there is a door somewhere. But in which direction?"

Ш Three Key Developments

1. Maybe for most forces, parity is conserved,

but for some forces, it is not.

This led to a detailed examination of parity conservation in weak forces, in particular, in beta decay.

2. All previous experiments in beta decay had nothing to do with parity conservation.

I.e. Parity conservation was, up to then, **UNTESTED** in beta decay.

3. We then suggested several experiments to test parity conservation in beta decay and in other weak interactions.

"The fact that parity" conservation in the weak interactions was believed for so long without experimental support was very startling.

But what was more startling was the prospect that a space time symmetry law which the physicists have learned so well may be violated.

This prospect did not appeal to us. Rather we were, so to speak, driven to it through frustration with the various other efforts at understanding the θ - τ puzzle that had been made."

The paper by Lee and Yang was submitted on June 22, 1956.

Abstract

The question of parity conservation in β -decays, and hyperon and meson decays is examined. Possible experiments are suggested that might test parity conservation in these interactions.

Reprinted from THE PHYSICAL REVIEW, Vol. 104, No. 1, 254-258, October 1, 1956 Printed in U. S. A.

Question of Parity Conservation in Weak Interactions*

T. D. LEE, Columbia University, New York, New York

AND.

C. N. YANG,[†] Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York (Received June 22, 1956)

The question of parity conservation in β decays and in hyperon and meson decays is examined. Possible experiments are suggested which might test parity conservation in these interactions.

R ECENT experimental data indicate closely identical masses¹ and lifetimes² of the $\theta^+(\equiv K_{\pi 2}^+)$ and the $\tau^+(\equiv K_{\pi 3}^+)$ mesons. On the other hand, analyses³ of the decay products of τ^+ strongly suggest on the grounds of angular momentum and parity conservation that the τ^+ and θ^+ are not the same particle. This poses a rather puzzling situation that has been extensively discussed.⁴

One way out of the difficulty is to assume that parity is not strictly conserved, so that θ^+ and τ^+ are two different decay modes of the same particle, which necessarily has a single mass value and a single lifetime. We wish to analyze this possibility in the present paper against the background of the existing experimental evidence of parity conservation. It will become clear that existing experiments do indicate parity conservation in strong and electromagnetic interactions to a high degree of accuracy, but that for the weak interactions (i.e., decay interactions for the mesons and hyperons, and various Fermi interactions) parity conservation is so far only an extrapolated hypothesis

PRESENT EXPERIMENTAL LIMIT ON PARITY NONCONSERVATION

If parity is not strictly conserved, all atomic and nuclear states become mixtures consisting mainly of the state they are usually assigned, together with small percentages of states possessing the opposite parity. The fractional weight of the latter will be called \mathfrak{F}^2 . It is a quantity that characterizes the degree of violation of parity conservation.

The existence of parity selection rules which work well in atomic and nuclear physics is a clear indication that the degree of mixing, \mathfrak{F}^2 , cannot be large. From such considerations one can impose the limit $\mathfrak{F}^2 \leq (r/\lambda)^2$, which for atomic spectroscopy is, in most cases, $\sim 10^{-6}$. In general a less accurate limit obtains for nuclear spectroscopy.

Parity nonconservation implies the existence of interactions which mix parities. The strength of such interactions compared to the usual interactions will in general be characterized by \mathfrak{F} , so that the mixing will be of the order \mathfrak{F}^2 . The presence of such interactions


General Disbelief

The formidable Pauli wrote:

"I do not believe that the Lord is a weak left-hander,

and I am ready to bet a very high sum that the experiment will give symmetric angular distribution of the electrons."



Wolftgang Pauli (1900-1958)

78

Feynman, a brilliant theoretical physicist, then 36 years old, made a bet that parity is conserved, at the overwhelming odds of 50 to 1.



Richard Feynman (1918-1988)

F. Bloch, who had won the Nobel Prize for NMR, the technology that led later to MRI, said he would eat his hat if parity is not conserved.



F. Bloch (1905-1983)

Lee and I felt we had pointed out an important fact:

the lack of experimental proof that parity is conserved in weak interactions.

But we did not believe that parity is indeed nonconserved in any interactions.

So after our paper was submitted in June 1956, we turned our main attention to another field of physics:

Statistical Mechanics.

V Wu's Experiment

In the meantime, most experimental physicists did not want to tackle the experiments we had suggested.

Because they felt the experiments we suggested were all difficult, and doing them would only confirm what everyone already knew was true,

i.e. parity is conserved.

So they were not worth doing.

But Wu had deeper strategic perception:

She also did not feel parity could be nonconserved. (She was a friend and admirer of the great **Pauli.**)

But she felt a fundamental law of nature must be tested experimentally.

"獨具慧眼"

She was a great β -decay physicist. She recruited four low temperature physicists from the Bureau of Standards to collaborate on one of the experiments we had suggested:

β-decay of polarized radioactive Co⁶⁰.

So for the next 5 months she shuttled between New York City and Washington D.C..

They had many difficulties, since β -decay and low temperature were two new technologies which had not yet been brought together in one experiment.

Many <u>tactical</u> problems had to be solved.

For example, the low temperature required them to make a big crystal to hold the Co⁶⁰ sample.

So they had to learn the technology of making big crystals.

After 3 weeks of frustrating struggle, Wu and her Columbia students finally succeeded in making a crystal of about 1cm size.

"Beautiful like a diamond."

"The day when I brought that crystal to Washington, I was the happiest and proudest person in the world."

The branching ratio of the two modes of decay of Fm^{233} , i.e., E.C./ α , was found to be about 8.5—which gives $\sim 89.5\%$ decay by electron capture and $\sim 10.5\%$ by alpha emission. It was not possible to measure the cross section for the Cf²⁵²($\alpha_3 3n$)Fm²⁵³ reaction because Fm²⁵³ could also be produced from other californium isotopes in the tareet.

A previous publication⁴ on a possible identification of the Fm^{243} gave the values of 6.85 ± 0.04 Mev for the alpha-particle energy, and a half-life >10 days.

It is a pleasure to thank the crew of the 60-inch cyclotron for their extremely careful and skillful operation of the machine during the bombardment. We wish to thank Professor Glenn T. Seaborg for his continued interest.

* On leave from the Israel Atomic Energy Commission, Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovoth, Israel.

¹Thompson, Ghiorso, Harvey, and Choppin, Phys. Rev. 93, 908 (1954).

² Harvey, Chetham-Strode, Ghiorso, Choppin, and Thompson, Phys. Rev. 104, 1315 (1956).

³Thompson, Harvey, Choppin, and Seaborg, J. Am. Chem. Soc. **76**, 6229 (1954); Choppin, Harvey, and Thompson, J. Inorg. and Nuclear Chem. **2**, 66 (1956).

⁴ Friedman, Gindler, Barnes, Sjoblom, and Fields, Phys. Rev. 102, 585 (1956).

Experimental Test of Parity Conservation in Beta Decay*

C. S. WU, Columbia University, New York, New York

E. AMBLER, R. W. HAYWARD, D. D. HOPPES, AND R. P. HUDSON, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D. C. (Received January 15, 1957)

IN a recent paper¹ on the question of parity in weak interactions, Lee and Yang critically surveyed the experimental information concerning this question and reached the conclusion that there is no existing evidence either to support or to refute parity conservation in weak interactions. They proposed a number of experiments on beta decays and hyperon and meson decays which would provide the necessary evidence for parity conservation or nonconservation. In beta decay, one could measure the angular distribution of the electrons coming from beta decays of polarized nuclei. If an asymmetry in the distribution between θ and $180^{\circ} - \theta$ (where θ is the angle between the orientation of the parent nuclei and the momentum of the electrons) is observed, it provides unequivocal proof that parity is not conserved in beta decay. This asymmetry effect has been observed in the case of oriented Co60.

It has been known for some time that Co^{60} nuclei can be polarized by the Rose-Gorter method in cerium magnesium (cobalt) nitrate, and the degree of polarization detected by measuring the anisotropy of the succeeding gamma rays.² To apply this technique to the present problem, two major difficulties had to be over-

come. The beta-particle counter should be placed *inside* the demagnetization cryostat, and the radioactive nuclei must be located in a *thin surface* layer and polarized. The schematic diagram of the cryostat is shown in Fig. 1.

To detect beta particles, a thin anthracene crystal $\frac{3}{4}$ in. in diameter $\times \frac{1}{16}$ in. thick is located inside the vacuum chamber about 2 cm above the Co⁶⁰ source. The scintillations are transmitted through a glass window and a Lucite light pipe 4 feet long to a photomultiplier (6292) which is located at the top of the cryostat. The Lucite head is machined to a logarithmic spiral shape for maximum light collection. Under this condition, the Cs137 conversion line (624 kev) still retains a resolution of 17%. The stability of the beta counter was carefully checked for any magnetic or temperature effects and none were found. To measure the amount of polarization of Co60, two additional NaI gamma scintillation counters were installed, one in the equatorial plane and one near the polar position. The observed gamma-ray anisotropy was used as a measure of polarization, and, effectively, temperature. The bulk susceptibility was also monitored but this is of secondary significance due to surface heating effects, and the gamma-ray anisotropy alone provides a reliable measure of nuclear polarization. Specimens were made by taking good single crystals of cerium magnesium nitrate and growing on the upper surface only an additional crystalline layer containing Co60. One might point out here that since the allowed beta decay of Co60 involves a change of spin of



FIG. 1. Schematic drawing of the lower part of the cryostat.



DOMESTIC SERV Check the class of service otherwise this message sent as a fullrate telep FULL RATE TELEGRAM DAY LETTER NIGHT LETTER	desired; \$ willbe	WIU	ESTERN INION ¹²⁰⁶ ¹⁰⁻⁵¹ . W. P. MARSHALL, PRESIDENT	INTERNATIONAL SERVICE Check the class of service desired; otherwise the message will be sent at the full rate FULL RATE LETTER TELEGRAM SHIP RADIOGRAM
NO. WDSCL. OF SVC.	PD. OR COLL.	CASH NO.	CHARGE TO THE ACCOUNT OF -	TIME FILED
NO. WDSCL. OF SVC.	PD. OK COLL.	CASH NO.		

Send the following message, subject to the terms on back hereof, which are hereby agreed to

Princeton, New Jersey, 5 January 1957

Dr. Robert Oppenheimer Club Comanche Christiansted St. Croix Virgin Islands

Wu's experiment yielding large asymmetry showing G equal to G prime STOP. Therefore neutrino is a two component wave function STOP. It is a pure screw. Greetings. Frank

Answe from JRO Walked through dow greetings

(A57c)



J.R. Oppenheimer (1904-1967)



f foot, filly require to in apply to all. The app old on Page 50, Column 2 a Page 26, Culture 1 in the new local from the local the

William A. Blakley

maining two years of the Daniel

Unwi

and was swot

Mr. Blakle

intervals were signer in the start of the McGreen equipment of the second start of the this a shopping dis in the more clock for the Hungarian Black-garbed intois of Rev Continued on Page 8, Column 4 Continued on Page 13, Column 3 Continued on Page 6 Column 4 Continued on Page 40

Mediterranean nomic strength, rather than the

108


Continued on Page 20, Column 5 Continued on Page 8, Column 1 Continued on Page 12, Column 3 Continued on Page 40, Column 5

109

d on Page 26, Colum-1 ; and the set Meridan's local data has held the

Basic Concept in Physics Is Reported Upset in Tests

Conservation of Parity Law in Nuclear Theory Challenged by Scientists at Columbia and Princeton Institute

By HAROLD M. SCHMECK Jr.

Experiments shattering a fun-is photographing the same set damental concept of nuclear of actions as reflected in a physics were reported yesterday mirror.

by Columbia University.

The concept, called the "prin-screened, a viewer would have ciple of conservation of parity,"

The text of Columbia report will be found on Page 24.

has been accepted for thirty years. It must now be discarded, according to the Columbia scientists.

The principle of parity states that two sets of phenomena, one of which is an exact mirror of the other, behave in an identical fashion except for the mirror image effect.

The principle might be explained this way:

Assume that one motion picture camera is photographing a given set of actions and that another camera simultaneously | Continued on Page 24, Column 3

If the two films are later no way, according to the principle of parity, of telling which of the two was the mirror image. The recently completed experiments indicate that there is a way of determining which of the two images is the mirror image.

In communicating with people in an intelligent civilization on another world, the Columbia report explained, it would be impossible, with the principle of parity in effect, to tell whether or not they and we meant the same thing by right-handed or left-handed. This could be true and still the basic physical laws in both worlds would behave ex-

The dam has cracked. **Physicists rushed to test** parity conservation in various weak interactions.

Over the next 5 years, hundreds of such experiments were performed,

Confirming the fact that indeed parity nonconservation is a general characteristic of all weak interactions.

VI Later Developments

Wu's experiment opened the door to many avenues of research in subsequent

years:

1. Elevating symmetry to a <u>central concept</u> in formulating fundamental theories. 2. Detailed understanding of "discrete symmetries":

P (Parity)
C (Charge conjugation)
T (Time reversal),

including CP nonconservation which won the 1980 Nobel Prize.

3. Understanding of the properties of the elusive particle: the neutrino, leading to 3 Nobel **Prizes:**

*"***2 neutrinos"**

Another neutrino

2002 Neutrino oscillation

But Wu never received the Nobel Prize which she richly deserved.

"This trio of Chinese physicists shows what China's future contribution to physics could be if that great country overcomes the period of revolutionary convulsions and

resumes its historic role as one of the leaders of civilization, as witnessed by the early European travelers, to their astonishment."