At a time when certain pundits claim that all the important discoveries have already been made, it is worth emphasizing that the two main pillars of 20th-century physics, quantum mechanics and Einstein’s general theory of relativity, are mutually incompatible. General relativity fails to comply with the quantum rules that govern the behavior of elementary particles, while black holes are challenging the very foundations of quantum mechanics. Something big has to give.

Until recently, the best hope for a theory that would unite gravity with quantum mechanics and describe all physical phenomena was based on strings: one-dimensional objects whose modes of vibration represent the elementary particles. In 1995, however, strings were subsumed by M-theory. In the words of the guru of string theory, Edward Witten of the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, N.J., “M stands for magic, mystery or membrane, according to taste.” New evidence in favor of this theory is appearing daily, representing the most exciting development since strings first swept onto the scene.

M-theory, like string theory, relies crucially on the idea of supersymmetry. Physicists divide particles into two classes, according to their inherent angular momentum, or “spin.” Supersymmetry requires that for each known particle having integer spin—0, 1, 2 and so on, measured in quantum units—there is a particle with the same mass but half-integer spin (1/2, 3/2, 5/2 and so on), and vice versa. Unfortunately, no such superpartner has yet been found. The symmetry, if it exists at all, must be broken, so that the postulated particles do not have the same mass as known ones but instead are too heavy to be seen in current accelerators. Even so, theorists believe in supersymmetry because it provides a framework within which the weak, electromagnetic and strong forces may be united with the most elusive force of all: gravity.

Supersymmetry transforms the coordinates of space and time such that the laws of physics are the same for all observers. Einstein’s general theory of relativity derives from this condition, and so supersymmetry implies gravity. In fact, supersymmetry predicts “supergravity,” in which a particle with a spin of 2—the graviton—transmits gravitational interactions and has as a partner a gravitino, with a spin of 3/2.

Conventional gravity does not place any limits on the possible dimensions of spacetime: its equations can, in principle, be formulated in any dimension. Not so with supergravity, which places an upper limit of 11 on the dimensions of spacetime. The familiar universe, of course, has three dimensions of space: height, length and breadth; time is the fourth dimension of spacetime. But in the early 1920s Polish physicist Theodore Kaluza and Swedish physicist Oskar Klein suggested that spacetime may have a hidden fifth dimension. This extra dimension would not be
infinite, like the others; instead it would close in on itself, forming a circle. Around that circle could reside quantum waves, fitting neatly into a loop. Only integer numbers of waves could fit around the circle; each of these would correspond to a particle with a different energy. So the energies would be “quantized,” or discrete.

An observer living in the other four dimensions, however, would see a set of particles with discrete charges, rather than energies. The quantum, or unit, of charge would depend on the circle’s radius. In the real world as well, electrical charge is quantized, in units of \( e \), the charge on the electron. To get the right value for \( e \), the circle would have to be tiny, about \( 10^{-33} \) centimeter in radius.

The unseen dimension’s small size explains why humans, or even atoms, are unaware of it. Even so, it would yield electromagnetism. And gravity, already present in the four-dimensional world, would be united with that force.

In 1978 Eugene Cremmer, Bernard Julia and Joel Scherk of the École Normale Supérieure in Paris realized that supergravity not only permits up to seven extra dimensions but is most elegant when existing in a spacetime of 11 dimensions (10 of space and one of time).

In 1984, however, 11-dimensional supergravity was rudely knocked off its pedestal. An important feature of the real world is that nature distinguishes between right and left. Witten and others emphasized that such “handedness” cannot readily be derived by reducing spacetime from 11 dimensions down to four.

P-Branes
SUPERGRAVITY’S position was usurped by superstring theory in 10 dimensions. Five competing theories held sway, designated by their mathematical characteristics as the \( E_8 \times E_8 \) heterotic, the SO(32) heterotic, the SO(32) Type I, and the Type IIA and Type IIB strings. (The Type I is an “open” string consisting of just a segment; the others are “closed” strings that form loops.) The \( E_8 \times E_8 \) seemed—at least in principle—capable of explaining the elementary particles and forces, including their handedness. And strings seemed to provide a theory of gravity consistent with quantum effects. All these virtues enabled string theory to sweep physicists off their feet and supergravity into the doghouse.

After the initial euphoria over strings, however, doubts began to creep in. First, important questions—especially how to confront the theory with experiment—seemed incapable of being answered by traditional methods of calculation. Second, why were there five different string theories? If one is looking for a unique Theory of Everything, surely this is an embarrassment of riches. Third, if supersymmetry permits 11 dimensions, why do superstrings stop at 10? Finally, if we are going to conceive of pointlike particles as strings, why not as membranes or more generally as \( p \)-dimensional objects, inevitably dubbed \( p \)-branes?

Consequently, while most theorists were tucking into super-spaghetti, a small group was developing an appetite for super-ravioli. A particle, which has zero dimensions, sweeps out a one-dimensional trace, or “worldline,” as it evolves in spacetime [see top illustration on next page]. Similarly a string—having one dimension: length—sweeps out a two-dimensional “worldsheet,” and a membrane—having two dimensions: length and breadth—sweeps out a three-dimensional “worldvolume.” In general, a \( p \)-brane sweeps out a worldvolume of \( p + 1 \) dimensions.

As early as 1962, Paul A. M. Dirac...
had constructed an imaginative model based on a membrane. He postulated that the electron, instead of resembling a point, was in reality a minute bubble, a membrane closed in on itself. Its oscillations, Dirac suggested, might generate particles such as the muon, a heavier version of the electron. Although his attempt failed, the equations that he postulated for the membrane are essentially the ones we use today.

Supersymmetry severely restricts the possible dimensions of a p-brane. In the spacetime of 11 dimensions floats a membrane, which may take the form of a bubble or a two-dimensional sheet. Paul S. Howe of King’s College London, Takeo Inami of Kyoto University, Kellogg Stelle of Imperial College, London, and I were able to show that if one of the 11 dimensions is a circle, we can wrap the sheet around it once, pasting the edges together to form a tube. If the radius becomes sufficiently small, the rolled-up membrane ends up looking like a string in 10 dimensions; it yields precisely the Type IIA superstring.

Notwithstanding such results, the membrane enterprise was largely ignored by the string community. Fortunately, the situation was about to change because of progress in an apparently unrelated field.

In 1917 German mathematician Amalie Emmy Noether had shown that the mass, charge and other attributes of elementary particles are conserved because of symmetries of the laws of physics. For instance, conservation of electrical charge follows from a symmetry under a change of a particle’s wave function.

Sometimes, however, attributes may be maintained because of deformations in fields. Such conservation laws are called topological. Thus, it may happen that a knot in a set of field lines, called a soliton, cannot be smoothed out. As a result, the soliton is prevented from dissipating and behaves much like a particle. A classic example is a magnetic monopole, which has not been found in nature but shows up as twisted configurations in some field theories.

In the traditional view, then, particles such as electrons and quarks (which carry Noether charges) are seen as fundamental, whereas particles such as magnetic monopoles (which carry topological charge) are derivative. In 1977, however, Claus Montonen, now at the Helsinki Institute of Physics in Finland, and David I. Olive, now at the University of Wales at Swansea, made a bold conjecture. Might there exist an alternative formulation of physics in which the roles of Noether charges (like electrical charge) and topological charges (like magnetic charge) are reversed? In such a “dual” picture, the magnetic monopoles would be the elementary objects, whereas the familiar particles—quarks, electrons and so on—would arise as solitons.

More precisely, a fundamental particle with charge $e$ would be equivalent to a solitonic particle with charge $1/e$. Because its charge is a measure of how strongly a particle interacts, a monopole would interact weakly when the original particle interacts strongly (that is, when $e$ is large), and vice versa.

The conjecture, if true, would lead to a profound mathematical simplification. In the theory of quarks, for instance, physicists can make hardly any calculations when the quarks interact strongly. But any monopoles in the theory must then interact weakly. One could imagine doing calculations with a dual theory based on monopoles and automatically getting all the answers for quarks, because the dual theory would yield the same final results.

Unfortunately, the idea presented a chicken-and-egg problem. Once proved, the Montonen-Olive conjecture could leap beyond conventional calculational techniques, but it would need to be proved by some other method in the first place.

As it turns out, p-branes can also be viewed as solitons. In 1990 Andrew Strominger of the Institute for Theoretical Physics in Santa Barbara, Calif., found that a 10-dimensional string can yield a soliton that is a five-brane. Reviving a conjecture of mine, Strominger suggested that a strongly interacting string is the dual equivalent of weakly interacting five-branes.

There were two major impediments to this duality. First, the duality proposed by Montonen and Olive—between electricity and magnetism in four dimensions—was still unproved, so duality between strings and five-branes in 10 dimensions was even more tenuous. Second, there were issues about how to find the quantum properties of five-branes and
hence how to prove the new duality. The first of these impediments was removed, however, when Ashoke Sen of the Tata Institute of Fundamental Research in Bombay, India, established that supersymmetric theories would require the existence of certain solitons with both electrical and magnetic charges. These objects had been predicted by the Montonen-Olive conjecture. This seemingly inconspicuous result converted many skeptics and unleashed a flood of papers. In particular, it inspired Nathan Seiberg of Rutgers University and Edward Witten to look for duality in more realistic (though still supersymmetric) versions of quark theories. They provided a wealth of information on quantum fields, of a kind unthinkable just a few years before.

**Duality of Dualities**

In 1990 several theorists generalized the idea of Montonen-Olive duality to four-dimensional superstrings, in whose realm the idea becomes even more natural. This duality, which was then speculative, goes by the name S-duality.

In fact, string theorists had already become used to a totally different kind of duality called T-duality. T-duality relates two kinds of particles that arise when a string loops around a compact dimension. One kind (call them “vibrating” particles) is analogous to those predicted by Kaluza and Klein and comes from vibrations of the loop of string [see box on next page]. Such particles are more energetic if the circle is small. In addition, the string can wind many times around the circle, like a rubber band on a wrist; its energy becomes higher the more times it wraps around and the larger the circle is. Moreover, each energy level represents a new particle (call them “winding” particles).

T-duality states that the winding particles for a circle of radius \( R \) are the same as the vibrating particles for a circle of radius \( \frac{1}{R} \), and vice versa. To a physicist, the two sets of particles are indistinguishable: a fat, compact dimension may yield the same particles as a thin one.

This duality has a profound implication. For decades, physicists have been struggling to understand nature at the extremely small scales near the Planck length and that of dimension 2 is a sheet or bubble. Some branes have no spin (red), but Dirichlet-branes have spin of 1 (blue).

EXTRA DIMENSION curled into a tube offers insights into the fabric of spacetime.
drew together all the work on T-duality, S-duality and string-string duality under the umbrella of M-theory in 11 dimensions. In the following months, literally hundreds of papers appeared on the Internet confirming that whatever M-theory may be, it certainly involves membranes in an important way.

Even the E8 × E8 string, whose handedness was thought impossible to derive from 11 dimensions, acquired an origin in M-theory. Witten, along with Petr Horava of Princeton University, showed how to shrink the extra dimension of M-theory into a segment of a line. The resulting picture has two 10-dimensional universes (each at an end of the line) connected by a spacetime of 11 dimensions. Particles—and strings—exist only in the parallel universes at the ends, which can communicate with each other only via gravity. (One can speculate that all visible matter in our universe lies on one wall, whereas the “dark matter,” believed to account for the invisible mass in the universe, resides in a parallel universe on the other wall.)

This scenario may have important consequences for confronting M-theory with experiment. For example, physicists know that the intrinsic strengths of all the forces change with the energy of the relevant particles. In supersymmetric theories, one finds that the strengths of the strong, weak and electromagnetic forces all converge at an energy E of 10^{16} giga-electron-volts. Further, the interaction strengths almost equal—but not quite—the value of the dimensionless number GE^2, where G is Newton’s gravitational constant. This near miss, most likely not a coincidence, seems to call for an explanation; it has been a source of great frustration for physicists.

But in the bizarre spacetime envisioned by Horava and Witten, one can choose the size of the 11th dimension so that all four forces meet at this common scale. It is far less than the Planck energy of 10^{12} giga-electron-volts, at which gravity was formerly expected to become strong. (High
energy is connected to small distance via quantum mechanics. So Planck energy is simply Planck length expressed as energy.) Quantum-gravitational effects may thus be far closer in energy to everyday events than physicists previously believed, a result that would have all kinds of cosmological consequences. The Horava-Witten idea has prompted a variation on the Kaluza-Klein theme known as “brane-world,” in which our universe is a three-brane in a higher-dimensional universe. The strong, weak and electromagnetic forces are confined to the brane, but gravity lives in the bulk. The extra dimension may be as large as a millimeter.

In 1995 Joseph Polchinski of the Institute for Theoretical Physics realized that some p-branes resemble a surface discovered by 19th-century German mathematician Peter G. L. Dirichlet. On occasion these branes can be interpreted as black holes or, rather, black-branes—objects from which nothing, not even light, can escape. Open strings, for instance, may be regarded as closed strings, part of which are hidden behind the black-branes. Such breakthroughs have led to a new interpretation of black holes as intersecting black-branes wrapped around seven curled dimensions. As a result, there are strong hints that M-theory may even clear up the paradoxes of black holes raised by Stephen W. Hawking of the University of Cambridge.

In 1974 Hawking showed that black holes are not entirely black but may radiate energy. In that case, black holes must possess entropy, which measures the disorder by accounting for the number of quantum states available. Yet the microscopic origin of these states stayed a mystery. The technology of Dirichlet-branes has enabled Strominger and Cumrun Vafa of Harvard University to count the number of quantum states in black-branes. They find an entropy that agrees with the number of quantum states available. Yet the microscopic origin of these states stayed a mystery. The technology of Dirichlet-branes has enabled Strominger and Cumrun Vafa of Harvard University to count the number of quantum states in black-branes. They find an entropy that agrees with the number of quantum states available.
