

effect the ratio but do effect the absolute value of the lifetime, may go undetected.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

The major contributions to the systematic error are small fluctuations in the timing system. An examination of these fluctuations during the data-taking periods enabled us to calculate the systematic error on each run and the correlations from one run to the next. We believe we understand these, and also the background subtraction, sufficiently well to calculate the mean lifetime of the positive kaon as 12.380 ± 0.016 nsec.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank Dr. P. I. P. Kalmus, Dr. A. Astbury, and Dr. H. J. Sherman for useful discussions and interest in this experiment. We are extremely grateful to the Birmingham University Group for allowing us to use their beam and Čerenkov counter. Thanks are due to Dr. C. Batty, A. Baker, and P. Jaggs for their contributions to the design of the experiment. We thank the Director and the staff of the Rutherford High Energy Laboratory for their invaluable support of the experiment.

PHYSICAL REVIEW D

VOLUME 3, NUMBER 1

1 JANUARY 1971

Upper Limit for Magnetic-Monopole Production by Neutrinos*

R. A. CARRIGAN, JR. AND F. A. NEZRICK

National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, Illinois 60510

(Received 11 June 1970)

Existing magnetic-monopole searches are reevaluated in terms of monopole production by cosmic-ray neutrinos. The upper limit for the cross section for monopole production inside the best ocean-bed sample is $\sigma_D \leq 1.0 \times 10^{-39} E_T^2$ cm², where E_T is the threshold energy to produce a pair of monopoles expressed in BeV. An even lower limit of $\sigma_C \leq 3.0 \times 10^{-45} E_T^2$ cm² is established if the monopoles are collected on the sample from surrounding ocean water.

I. INTRODUCTION

RECENTLY several speculations have been made concerning a magnetic basis of matter. Carrigan¹ suggested that massive quarks might consist of bound pairs of magnetic monopoles carrying electric charge. Schwinger² has proposed a model where quarks are replaced by dyons, particles which also carry both magnetic and electric charge. Dyons are quarklike in that a nucleon consists of three dyons, while a meson consists of two. Magnetic neutrality in normal particles is obtained by introducing two elementary magnetic charge magnitudes, one twice the size of the other. Similar proposals have also been considered by Nambu³ and by Han and Biedenharn⁴ in the framework of the three-triplet model. All of these theories contain the interesting possibility of a large time-reversal violation.⁵

The Schwinger dyon model is able to reproduce qualitatively some of the general features of the meson masses. The theory leads in a natural way to 0⁻ and 1⁻ multiplets, introduces hypercharge plausibly, and roughly predicts the magnitude of the *K*-meson electromagnetic mass splitting. However, there are difficulties

in detail with the signs of the mass splittings, the magnitude of the electric dipole moment of the neutron, and the smallness of the time-reversal violation that occurs in nature. Schwinger feels that these problems might be alleviated by introducing an exchange mechanism mediated by an intermediate magnetic boson. In turn, this boson could be coupled to the ordinary neutrino field and decay into a magnetic lepton and a neutrino.

Schwinger's suggestion, even aside from the question of dyons, raises an interesting point. No direct search has even been made for magnetic poles produced by neutrinos. Since weak processes and magnetic monopoles have the characteristic of symmetry violation in common, this is perhaps a natural process to investigate. A production mechanism analogous to intermediate vector boson production is illustrated in Fig. 1. The magnetic charges are given by the superscripts *S* and *N*. The incident neutrino produces a magnetic lepton *L* and a magnetic intermediate boson *S*. In turn, the boson decays to a magnetic lepton and a neutrino. An alternative production mechanism might take place by exchanging an *S* to produce a magnetic baryon at the lower vertex.

Extensive searches have been conducted for magnetic poles and evaluated in terms of strong and electromagnetic production. The most recent terrestrial search for naturally produced poles in ocean-bed ferromagnetic pavement gives a monopole cross-section limit of 2×10^{-34} cm² for pole masses of 1000 BeV produced in

* Work performed under the auspices of the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.

¹ R. A. Carrigan, Jr., *Nuovo Cimento* **38**, 638 (1965).

² J. Schwinger, *Science* **165**, 757 (1969).

³ Y. Nambu (private communication).

⁴ M. Y. Han and L. C. Biedenharn, *Phys. Rev. Letters* **24**, 118 (1970).

⁵ W. C. Carithers, R. Stefanski, and R. K. Adair [*Phys. Rev.* **149**, 1070 (1966)] have given a lucid example of the manner in which magnetic monopoles violate time-reversal invariance.

p -nucleon collisions.⁶ Alvarez *et al.*⁷ have recently conducted a search for magnetic monopoles on a lunar sample that sets a comparable strong-interaction limit at 1000 BeV and establishes an upper limit two orders of magnitude smaller at masses of 10 BeV.

These values set stringent bounds on the minimum mass of a pole produced by strong or electromagnetic interactions. It should be noted, however, that there are difficulties in establishing mass limits with any collection technique since the monopole collection and trapping process may be imperfectly understood. As an example, in the ocean-bed search mechanism the monopoles might be trapped on paramagnetic minerals in the ocean water and never arrive at the ocean bottom.

In view of Schwinger's suggestion we have re-evaluated the existing monopole search data to establish an upper limit for neutrino production of monopoles. The most sensitive of the terrestrial monopole searches^{6,8} use ferromagnetic collectors with long collection times such as deep ocean deposits of ferromanganese pavement. The monopoles are extracted from the sample with a powerful magnetic field and identified. In the case of neutrino production, the monopoles can appear in the sample by two processes: direct production in the sample or collection from the surroundings. In the direct-production case, the energy of one of the two monopoles from the pair must be low enough so that it does not escape the sample. The cross-section limit will be much higher because only the sample itself is available as a target. On the other hand, the estimate based on collection will be more susceptible to any uncertainties in the molecular binding properties of monopoles or details in the behavior of the sample surface.

II. DIRECT-PRODUCTION ESTIMATE

The muon neutrino flux at the surface of the earth has been evaluated by several groups.⁹ The spectrum of Osborne *et al.* can be approximated by an isotropic distribution of the form

$$dN/dE_\nu = a_\nu/E_\nu^3, \quad (1)$$

where $a_\nu = 0.05 \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ sec}^{-1} \text{ sr}^{-1} \text{ BeV}^{-1}$ to within 20% in the region 1.5–800 BeV and includes both muon neutrinos and antineutrinos. There are some disagreements between the groups and some uncertainty concerning the K/π ratio. A conservative value of a_ν at 1000 BeV which takes account of the differences can be taken as $a_\nu = 0.023$. For a flat sample of volume V , the number of monopoles produced by this flux in time T is

$$N_{\text{mono}} = 4\pi \frac{N_A \rho}{A} VT \int_{E_T}^{E_M} \sigma(E_\nu) \frac{dN}{dE_\nu} dE_\nu, \quad (2)$$

where N_A is Avogadro's number, ρ is the density of the


⁶ R. L. Fleischer *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **184**, 1393 (1969).

⁷ L. W. Alvarez *et al.*, Science **167**, 701 (1970).

⁸ H. H. Kolm, Sci. J. (London) **4**, 60 (1968).

⁹ J. L. Osborne, S. Said, and A. W. Wolfendale (unpublished);

FIG. 1. Intermediate-magnetic-boson mechanism for the production of magnetic lepton pairs.



material, $\sigma(E_\nu)$ is the monopole production cross section per nucleus as a function of energy, A is the effective mass number for the sample, E_T is the threshold energy, and E_M is the energy at which both monopoles escape the sample. (Note that half of the neutrino flux comes from below the horizon.) The cross section should be averaged over each nucleus, but for coherent production the higher- Z manganese will give the major contribution somewhat above threshold; therefore, the cross section is evaluated only per manganese nucleus.

In order to set a limit on the magnitude of the cross section, it is necessary to have some functional cross-section form. Ideally, a theoretical cross section such as the intermediate boson prediction of Wu *et al.*¹⁰ would be employed and the absence of poles used to establish a value for a coupling constant. This is not possible since there is no theoretical prediction for the neutrino-monopole cross section. Instead it has been assumed that the cross section is constant above a threshold energy. This is the assumption that has been used to evaluate the upper limit for strong interactions by Carithers *et al.*⁵ and by Goto *et al.*¹¹

A 95% confidence level on the upper limit is established¹² by letting $N_{\text{mono}} = \ln 20$. The direct-production cross section per manganese nucleus is then

$$\sigma_D \leq (A \ln 20) [2\pi N_A M T a_\nu (1/E_T^2 - 1/E_M^2)]^{-1}. \quad (3)$$

For convenience ρV has been replaced by M , the mass of the sample. The maximum energy E_M is established by the production mechanism. It is possible for one of the poles to carry off relatively little energy, since the monopoles are produced in pairs. In addition, since the poles will be extremely heavily ionizing, their range will be short. For instance, a Schwinger pole will lose at least 5000 BeV in moving through 1 cm of iron oxide. As a result, for reasonable threshold energies, E_M is much larger than E_T and can be neglected. For Fleischer *et al.*,⁶ $M = 7.7 \text{ kG}$ and $T = 16 \times 10^6 \text{ yr}$, so that $\sigma_D \leq 1.0 \times 10^{-39} E_T^2 \text{ cm}^2$, where E_T is in BeV.

Since the electron neutrino flux is an order of magnitude lower, the cross-section limit for electron neutrino production will be about an order of magnitude larger.

To get some feeling for the monopole mass implied by the monopole neutrino cross section, consider $\sigma_D = Z^2 \times 10^{-37} \text{ cm}^2$ and let $Z = 25$. This corresponds to an estimate for coherent production far away from

R. Cowsik, Y. Pal, and S. N. Tandon, Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. **63A**, 217 (1966).

¹⁰ A. C. T. Wu, C.-P. Yang, K. Fuchel, and S. Heller, Phys. Rev. Letters **12**, 57 (1964).

¹¹ E. Goto, H. H. Kolm, and K. W. Ford, Phys. Rev. **132**, 387 (1963).

¹² E. Amaldi *et al.*, CERN Report No. 63-15, 1963 (unpublished); Nuovo Cimento **28**, 773 (1963).

threshold for a conventional intermediate boson.¹³ This could very well be an underestimate since the fine-structure factor which appears in the cross section would probably be much larger for magnetic monopoles and the neutrino-magnetic boson coupling constant might be much larger. Then, $E_T \geq 260$ BeV. The free c.m. energy for coherent production off a manganese target at this threshold is 120 BeV. The pole mass corresponding to a 260-BeV threshold is $M = 60$ BeV.

III. COLLECTION ESTIMATE

A collection limit can be set using the same attack used for the evaluation of the direct-production limit. As a good approximation one can assume all of the poles are produced by neutrino interactions on oxygen in the ocean (thus neglecting the atmosphere and the poles coming up from the sea bed). These poles then drift down along the earth's field lines to the collector sample. From a simple argument it follows that

$$\sigma_C = \sigma_D (\rho_D L_D A_C / \rho_C L_C A_D), \quad (4)$$

where the subscripts D and C refer to the direct-production and collection processes, and ρ , L , and A refer to the density, thickness, and effective atomic number of the media. Effectively the relative cross-section ratio is the equivalent thickness of the ferromanganese target divided by the equivalent thickness of the ocean above the sample, so that $\sigma_C = 0.30 \times 10^{-5} \sigma_D$. Substituting in the direct-production cross section, one gets $\sigma_C \leq 3.0 \times 10^{-45} E_T^2 \text{ cm}^2$ (where E_T is in BeV). The threshold energy is found to be 4.7×10^4 BeV for a nominal production cross section of $Z^2 \times 10^{-37} \text{ cm}^2$. This corresponds to a c.m. energy of 1200 BeV. This is sufficient to produce poles with mass 600 BeV. Again the electron neutrino cross-section limit will be about a factor of 10 larger.

IV. CONCLUSION AND COMMENTS

The cross-section limits determined above for neutrino production of magnetic poles is $\sigma_C < 3.0 \times 10^{-45} E_T^2 \text{ cm}^2$ for the pole-collection interpretation of the data and $\sigma_D < 1.0 \times 10^{-39} E_T^2 \text{ cm}^2$ for the direct-production interpretation. The latter limit is more conservative, since it depends less on the pole-collection mechanism. The collection limit corresponds to quite high c.m. energies. If the intermediate magnetic boson has a cross section of the same order as a "normal" intermediate boson, then the monopole mass might be as high as several hundred BeV. On the other hand, the classical magnetic self-energy of a Schwinger lepton could be many hundred BeV, so that it is not difficult to conceive of magnetic leptons with masses greater than this limit. Thus it is not possible to say that Schwinger leptons have been ruled out by the present cross-section limits.

It is interesting to compare the direct neutrino flux received by the ocean-bed sample with the neutrino flux available in a bubble-chamber neutrino experiment at an accelerator. In a bubble chamber the two lepton poles would be slowed rapidly by ionization loss and then pulled toward the appropriate magnet pole along a field line. This should give rise to a very characteristic track along a field line with a possibly imperceptible kink at the production vertex. In the CERN propane bubble-chamber exposure,¹⁴ the total neutrino flux through the chamber was approximately 1.9×10^{11} neutrinos/cm², while the number of carbon nuclei was 1.7×10^{28} . The accelerator neutrino spectrum is only roughly similar to the cosmic-ray neutrino spectrum and, of course, has a definite upper bound. The integrated neutrino flux through the ocean-bottom sample above 1 BeV was of the order of 1.5×10^{14} neutrinos/cm². The mass of the sample of Fleischer *et al.* was 7.7 kg, so that the target contained 4.2×10^{25} manganese nuclei. Thus, if no monopole events are found in the CERN chamber film it will set a similar cross-section limit to the direct-production limit in the terrestrial sample for neutrino energies below about 10 GeV. The CERN neutrino bubble-chamber film has been reinvestigated to search for neutrino-induced monopole production. These results will be presented in a separate publication.

The recent macroscopic search conducted by Alvarez *et al.* on an 8.35-kg lunar sample using an electromotive-force technique gives an effective area-time factor about two orders of magnitude greater than the terrestrial sample of Fleischer *et al.* For poles produced by strong interactions, this essentially reduces the cross-section limit by the same factor. However, the situation is entirely different for neutrino production of poles. By far the dominant source of terrestrial neutrinos is the decay in the atmosphere of mesons that have been produced in strong interactions at the top of the atmosphere. This can occur because of the tenuous nature of the atmosphere. On the moon, mesons are produced by cosmic-ray interactions in the lunar surface, where the average meson interaction length is about 20 cm. In that distance a 1-BeV pion will have a probability of 0.4% of decaying, thus reducing the neutrino flux correspondingly. The actual situation is somewhat worse because the relevant momentum region of the neutrino spectrum which determines the cross-section limit is produced by higher-energy mesons. Consequently, the experiment of Fleischer *et al.* still sets the limit on neutrino production of poles. In fact, lunar and deep-ocean searches are somewhat complementary since one favors strong and electromagnetic interactions while the other includes the effects of weakly interacting particles.

It is interesting to consider less direct tests for a magnetic substructure in elementary particles. As an example, the very high magnetic fields predicted¹⁵ for

¹³ L. M. Lederman, in *High Energy Physics*, edited by E. H. S. Burhop (Academic, New York, 1967).

¹⁴ I. Budagov *et al.*, Phys. Letters **29B**, 524 (1969).

¹⁵ T. Gold, Nature **221**, 25 (1969); V. Canuto, H. Y. Chiu, C. Chinder, and H. J. Lee, *ibid.* **225**, 47 (1970).

pulsars (10^{12} – 10^{13} G) might be sufficient to directly overcome the pole-pole binding if the binding were small enough. In turn the interaction of the poles could result in γ -ray emission along the lines suggested by Ruderman and Zwanziger.¹⁶ At present, pulsar fields are estimated to be about five orders of magnitude smaller than the field required to overcome the binding of two Dirac poles at a separation of 1 F.

A second test might proceed along the following lines. If the K_L^0 and K_S^0 each consists of two dyons in different internal states, it might be possible to polarize the dyons in an external magnetic field and produce an effective-mass shift. This would be equivalent in some sense to the Zeeman effect in an atom. Note, however, that it does not presuppose the need for spin. The K_L^0 - K_S^0 interference phenomenon offers a sensitive tool similar to an interferometer for detecting a small change in the mass difference. Some years ago, prior to

the discovery of time-reversal violation, Good¹⁷ developed a decay distribution for a similar effect by considering neutral kaons with magnetic moments. A search for magnetic effects would consist of K_L^0 - K_S^0 mass-difference measurements in varying magnetic fields. The experiment would be complicated by the time delay for the alignment of the induced polarization axis. Present experiments¹⁸ show no indication of a mass difference that depends on the field in the regenerator region.

To usefully set bounds on the magnetic constituents, it would first be necessary to demonstrate theoretically that external polarization can occur in dyon models. The polarization energy of two point monopoles separated by 1 F in a field of several kilogauss is somewhat greater than the K_L^0 - K_S^0 mass difference. However, normal quantum-mechanical effects should appreciably diminish the splitting.

¹⁷ M. L. Good, Phys. Rev. **105**, 1120 (1957).

¹⁸ See summary in A. Barbaro-Galtieri *et al.*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **42**, 87 (1970).

¹⁶ M. A. Ruderman and D. Zwanziger, Phys. Rev. Letters **22**, 146 (1969).

Search for CP Violation in the Time Distribution of $K(\text{Neutral}) \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$

GERALD W. MEISNER,* W. ANTHONY MANN,† STANLEY S. HERTZBACH, RICHARD R. KOFLER,
AND S. STEVEN YAMAMOTO‡

University of Massachusetts,§ Amherst, Massachusetts 01002

AND

DAVID BERLEY AND S. PETER YAMIN||
*Brookhaven National Laboratory,** Upton, New York 11973*

AND

JULIA THOMPSON†† AND WILLIAM J. WILLIS
Yale University,‡‡ New Haven, Connecticut 06520

(Received 19 August 1970)

We have studied the time distribution of 50 unambiguous $K(\text{neutral}) \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$. Defining $x+iy = \text{amp}(K_S \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0) / \text{amp}(K_L \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0)$, we obtain $x = 2.75_{-0.60}^{+0.65}$, $y = 0.50_{-0.55}^{+0.70}$ by the maximum-likelihood technique; our results are roughly consistent with CP conservation. The kaons were produced by K^-p charge exchange at 400 MeV/c in the 30-in. BNL hydrogen bubble chamber.

INTRODUCTION

THE breakdown of CP conservation has been observed only in the existence of the 2π decay mode of K_L and in the charge asymmetry of leptonic decays

of K_L . CP conservation forbids the decay $K_S \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$ into final states with $I=1$ and 3; the decay is allowed if the isospin of the three pions in the final state is 0 or 2. However, the amplitude for the latter two states is reduced by approximately three orders of magnitude with respect to the amplitude for $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$ because of centrifugal-barrier factors and the nonleptonic $\Delta I = \frac{1}{2}$ selection rule.¹ We have looked for the CP -violating amplitude for $K_S \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$ by using the

* Present address: Physics Department, University of North Carolina, Greensboro, N. C. 27412.

† Present address: Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Ill. 60440.

‡ Present address: Physics Department, University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan.

§ Supported in part by AEC Contract No. AT(30-1)-3651.

|| Present address: Physics Department, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J. 08903.

** Work performed under the auspices of the Atomic Energy Commission.

†† Present address: Physics Department, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, N. Y. 11973.

‡‡ Supported in part by AEC Contract No. AT(30-1)-2726.

¹ For an estimate of the strength of these effects, see T. D. Lee and L. S. Wu, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Sci. **16**, 564 (1966).