



A Nucleon Observed: Of QCD, Higher Twist, and Hydrogen Hyperfine Splittings

K. Griffioen College of William & Mary

griff@physics.wm.edu

Nikhef Colloquium 4 September 2007



Inelastic Scattering





Lorentz invariants:

$$\begin{split} \nu &= p \cdot q/M = (E - E')_{\text{lab}} \\ Q^2 &= -q \cdot q = (4EE' \sin^2 \frac{\theta}{2})_{\text{lab}} \\ x &= -q \cdot q/2p \cdot q = (Q^2/2M\nu)_{\text{lab}} \\ y &= p \cdot q/p \cdot k = (\nu/E)_{\text{lab}} \\ W^2 &= (p + q)^2 = (M^2 + 2M\nu - Q^2)_{\text{lab}} \\ s &= (k + p)^2 = (2EM + M^2)_{\text{lab}} \end{split}$$



Unpolarized Cross Section:

$$rac{d^2\sigma}{dxdQ^2}=rac{8\pilpha^2 y}{Q^4}\left[rac{y}{2}F_1+rac{\xi}{2xy}F_2
ight]$$

Polarized Cross Section:

$$rac{d^2\Delta\sigma}{dxdQ^2} = rac{8\pilpha^2 y}{Q^4} [\coslpha\{(\xi+rac{y}{2})m{g_1}-rac{\gamma y}{2}m{g_2}\} - \sinlpha\cos\phi\{rac{y}{2}m{g_1}+m{g_2}\}]$$

$$\begin{split} &\alpha = \text{polar angle of target spin wrt the beam axis} \\ &\phi = \text{azimuthal spin angle wrt the scattering plane} \\ &\alpha = 0^\circ \text{ (longitudinal); } \alpha = 90^\circ, \phi = 0^\circ \text{ (transverse).} \\ &\gamma^2 = 4M^2x^2/Q^2 = Q^2/\nu^2 \\ &\xi = 1-y-\gamma y^2/4 \end{split}$$

Parton Model: $F_1(x, Q^2) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_i e_i^2 (q^{\uparrow}(x) + q^{\downarrow}(x) + \bar{q}^{\uparrow}(x) + \bar{q}^{\downarrow}(x))$ $F_2(x, Q^2) = 2x F_1(x, Q^2)$ $g_1(x, Q^2) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_i e_i^2 (q^{\uparrow}(x) - q^{\downarrow}(x) + \bar{q}^{\uparrow}(x) - \bar{q}^{\downarrow}(x))$ $g_2(x, Q^2) = 0$

4 September 2007

Nikhef



 $g_1(x,Q^2)$



- g₁ DIS measured for p, d and ³He
- CERN/HERA/SLAC
- (AAC: hepph0603213) NLO fits to extract quark and gluon distributions
- Notice the hole at high x and Q²<10 GeV²
- CLAS12 DIS coverage (red)
- CLAS 6 covers this triangle in the resonance region





NLO Fits



$$\frac{1}{2} = \frac{\Delta \Sigma}{2} + \Delta G + L_z$$

	$\Delta ar{q}$	Δg	$\Delta\Sigma$
Type 1	-0.05 ± 0.01	0.31 ± 0.32	0.27 ± 0.07
Type 2	-0.06 ± 0.02	0.47 ± 1.08	0.25 ± 0.10
AAC03	-0.06 ± 0.02	0.50 ± 1.27	0.21 ± 0.14







We've measured quite a lot about the proton in the last
 50 years since Hofstadter observed its charge distribution
 "Messen ist wissen" -- E. W. von Siemens

• The proton has proved to be quite complex

"Il y a science des choses simples, et art des choses compliquées." --Paul Valéry

• There's still a lot more work to be done

"Great art is never produced for its own sake. It is too difficult to be worth the effort" -- George Bernard Shaw





Our tendency is to go from inclusive to exclusive reactions

Our tendency is to go from low resolution (Q²) to high Σ of constituents resolved constituents

 $\left|f(x,Q^2)
ight|$ $\left|f(x,Q^2,p_{\perp})
ight|$

Our tendency is to go from holism to reductionism

Much of his talk is about going in the other direction:

$$\int f(x, Q^2, p_\perp) dp_\perp \to f(x, Q^2)$$

 $\int f(x, Q^2) dx \to f(Q^2)$
 $\int f(Q^2) dQ^2 \to \text{hyperfine splitting}$





Energy-Weighted Sum Rule

$$S(F) = \sum_{a} (E_a - E_0) |< a|F|0 > |^2 = <0|[F, [H, F]|0 >$$

GDH Sum Rule

$$\int_{k_{\pi}}^{\infty} \frac{dk}{k} \Delta \sigma^{\gamma N}(k) = \frac{2\pi^2 \alpha \kappa^2}{M^2}$$
$$\Delta \sigma^{\gamma N} = \sigma_{3/2}^{\gamma N} - \sigma_{1/2}^{\gamma N}$$

Sum over excited states is tied to properties of the ground state





Gottfried Sum Rule

0.235(26) at Q²=4 GeV²

$$\begin{split} \Phi_1^{p,n}(Q^2) &= \int_0^1 F_1^{p,n}(x,Q^2) dx \\ F_1(x) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_i e_i^2 q_i(x) \\ \Phi_1^p - \Phi_1^n &= \frac{1}{6} [u_v - d_v + 2\bar{u} - 2\bar{d}] \end{split}$$

Bjorken Sum Rule

$$0.176(7)$$
 at Q²=5 GeV²

 $\Gamma_{1}^{p,n}(Q^{2}) = \int_{0}^{1} g_{1}^{p,n}(x,Q^{2}) dx$ $g_{1}(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i} e_{i}^{2} \Delta q_{i}(x)$ $\Gamma_{1}^{p} - \Gamma_{1}^{n} = \frac{1}{6} [\Delta u_{v} - \Delta d_{v} + 2\Delta \bar{u} - 2\Delta \bar{d}]$ or $\Delta C_{NS}^{\bar{M}S} = 1 - \frac{\alpha_{S}}{\pi} - 3.583 \left(\frac{\alpha_{S}}{\pi}\right)^{2} - 20.215 \left(\frac{\alpha_{S}}{\pi}\right)^{3} + \dots$

Complicating Factor









 Long-standing program in Hall-B at JLab to measure longitudinal double spin asymmetries A_{II} on ¹⁵NH₃ and ¹⁵ND₃

- EG1: 0.05<Q²<3.5 GeV²
 data (2001); anal (2007)
- EG4: 0.01<Q²<1 GeV²
 data (2006); anal (2008)
- EG12: 0.5<Q²<7 GeV²
 data (2012?); anal (2014)

WILLIAM & MARY Spin Structure with CLAS









CEBAF Accelerator







- Electron beams up to 5.7 GeV with >80% longitudinal polarization
- Beam currents of 1-50 nA in Hall B



The College of — WILLIAM & MARY

Polarized Target





- Dynamic nuclear polarization of NH₃ and ND₃
- Polarizations of 70-80% for p and 20-30% for d
- Luminosity 10³⁵ cm⁻²s⁻¹





$$A_{\parallel} = rac{\sigma^{\downarrow\uparrow} - \sigma^{\uparrow\uparrow}}{\sigma^{\downarrow\uparrow} + \sigma^{\uparrow\uparrow}}$$

$$A_{\parallel} = D(A_1 + \eta A_2)$$

We can extract A_1 using a model for A_2 (small), or g_1 using a model for g_2 (small)

We can extract A_1 and A_2 from A_{\parallel} at multiple values of $\eta(E_{beam})$

$$A_{1} = \frac{\sigma_{1/2}^{T} - \sigma_{3/2}^{T}}{\sigma_{1/2}^{T} + \sigma_{3/2}^{T}}$$
$$= \frac{g_{1}(x, Q^{2}) - \gamma^{2}g_{2}(x, Q^{2})}{F_{1}(x, Q^{2})}$$

$$A_2 = \frac{2\sigma_{LT}}{\sigma_{1/2}^T + \sigma_{3/2}^T}$$

$$=\frac{\gamma[g_1(x,Q^2)+g_2(x,Q^2)]}{F_1(x,Q^2)}$$



Kinematics

EG12

EG1



EG4

- Overlapping colors correspond to different beam energies
- CLAS measures a large range in x at each fixed Q²
- Different E_{beam} for fixed (x,Q²) allows separation of A₁ & A₂



EG1 g_1^p (Q²<0.7)





- At low Q^2 the Δ resonance drives g_1 negative
- Extensive x-range at fixed Q² allows integration over x
- Red curve is the EG1 model used for radiative corrections







- At higher Q², g₁ becomes positive everywhere
- g_1/F_1 falls far below the DIS extrapolation at low Q^2
- Red curve is the EG1 model (dashed: DIS extrapolation)



PDFs and CLAS





- Error envelopes for PDFs from LSS05 global analysis (green)
- CLAS EG1 data significantly improve errors on Δu , Δd , Δx and ΔG (blue)
- CLAS EG12 (12 GeV upgrade) will especially improve ∆G (red)



EG1 Extraction of A₂





- Analysis is in progress to obtain both A₁ and A₂ from the EG1 data
- Intercept gives A₁
- Slope gives A₂
- A₂ is larger than EG1 model (MAID, AO) as is Hall C RSS experiment









A₁ Data from EG1







$$A_1(x,Q^2) = \frac{\sum e_i^2 \Delta q_i(x,Q^2)}{\sum e_i^2 q_i(x,Q^2)}$$

Simulated Data for EG12 Extracted from A_1^{p} , A_1^{d} and d/u





Duality





4 September 2007

Nikhef

5





$$\left[\frac{g_1(x,Q^2)}{F_1(x,Q^2)}\right]_{\exp} F_1(x,Q^2)_{\exp} = g_1(x,Q^2)_{\exp} = g_1(x,Q^2)_{LT} + h^{g_1}(x)/Q^2$$



The College of -

ILLIAM & MARY

 $1 < Q^2 < 5 ~{
m GeV}^2, \quad 2 < W < 3.5 ~{
m GeV}$ $\int_0^1 dx h^{g_1}(x) = rac{4}{9} M^2 (d_2 + f_2)$

•F₁ from NMC fit to F₂ and 1998 SLAC fit to R
•g₁ (leading twist) from NLO fit at high Q²
•h from fit to all data, especially CLAS in the pre-asymptotic region
•d₂: twist-3, f₂: twist-4



WILLIAM & MARY Bjorken Sum & Higher Twist

n-de

0.2

0.15

0.1

This work

CLAS EG1a HERMES E143

> Bernard et al

JLab Hall A/Hall B

LT

Ji et al



Burkert

-loffe

Soffer-Teryae (2004)

$$\Gamma_1^{(n)} = \int_0^1 x^n g_1(x, Q^2) dx = \frac{a_n}{2}, \quad n = 0, 2, 4, \dots,$$

$$\Gamma_2^{(n)} = \int_0^1 x^n g_2(x, Q^2) dx = \frac{1}{2} \frac{n}{n+1} (d_n - a_n), \quad n = 2, 4, \dots,$$

Bjorken Sum Rule:

$$\Gamma_{1}^{p-n} = \frac{g_{A}}{6} \left[1 - \frac{\alpha_{s}}{\pi} - 3.58 \left(\frac{\alpha_{s}}{\pi} \right)^{2} - 20.21 \left(\frac{\alpha_{s}}{\pi} \right)^{3} \right] + \frac{\mu_{4}^{p-n}}{Q^{2}} + \dots$$

$$\mu_{4}^{p-n} = \frac{M^{2}}{9} \left(a_{2}^{p-n} + 4d_{2}^{p-n} + 4f_{2}^{p-n} \right)$$

$$d_{2}^{p-n} = \int_{0}^{1} dx \ x^{2} \left(2g_{1}^{p-n} + 3g_{2}^{p-n} \right)$$

$$ig_{2}^{0.3} = \frac{EGIb, 3 \ par. \ fit}{1 \ Q^{2} \ min} = 0.6 \ Q^{2} \ min} = 0.8 \ Q^{2} \ min} = 1.0 \ Q^{2} \ min} = 0.8 \ Q^{2} \ min} = 1.0 \ Q^{2} \ min} = 0.6 \ Q^{2} \ min} = 0.8 \ Q^{2} \ min} = 1.0 \ Q^{2} \ min} = 0.6 \ Q^{2} \ min} = 0.6 \ Q^{2} \ min} = 0.6 \ Q^{2} \ min} = 0.8 \ Q^{2} \ min} = 1.0 \ Q^{2} \ min} = 0.6 \ Q^{2} \ min} = 0.8 \ Q^{2} \ min} = 1.0 \ min} \ M^{2} \ M^{2}$$







Brodsky, Lu, PRD51(95)3652

$$\int_{0}^{1} dx \left[g_{1}^{ep}(x,Q^{2}) - g_{1}^{en}(x,Q^{2}) \right] \equiv \frac{1}{3} \left| \frac{g_{A}}{g_{V}} \right| \left[1 - \frac{\alpha_{g_{1}}(Q)}{\pi} \right]$$
$$R(Q) \equiv 3 \sum_{f} Q_{f}^{2} \left[1 + \frac{\alpha_{R}(Q)}{\pi} \right]$$

 $\alpha_R(Q)$ in terms of $\alpha_{g_1}(Q)$.

$$\begin{split} \frac{\alpha_R(Q)}{\pi} &= \frac{\alpha_{g_1}(Q^{\star})}{\pi} + \frac{3}{4} C_F \left(\frac{\alpha_{g_1}(Q^{\star\star})}{\pi}\right)^2 \\ &+ \left[\frac{9}{16} C_F^2 + \left(\frac{11}{144} - \frac{1}{6}\zeta_3\right) \frac{d^{abc} d^{abc}}{C_F N} \frac{\left(\sum_f Q_f\right)^2}{\sum_f Q_f^2}\right] \left(\frac{\alpha_{g_1}(Q^{\star\star\star})}{\pi}\right)^3 \\ \ln(Q^{\star}/Q) &= -\frac{7}{4} + 2\zeta_3 + \left(-\frac{11}{96} - \frac{7}{3}\zeta_3 + 2\zeta_3^2 + \frac{\pi^2}{24}\right) \left(\frac{11}{3} C_A - \frac{2}{3}f\right) \frac{\alpha_{g_1}(Q)}{\pi}, \\ \ln(Q^{\star\star}/Q) &= -\frac{233}{216} + \frac{64}{9}\zeta_3 - \frac{20}{3}\zeta_5 + \left(-\frac{13}{54} + \frac{2}{9}\zeta_3\right) \frac{C_A}{C_F}. \end{split}$$





R





The College of — ______ WILLIAM & MARY











fit to $aQ^2 + bQ^4 + cQ^6 + dQ^8$

a fixed by GDH b compared to χPT











a = -0.97(11)b = 5.13(94)



a = -3.643(1) b = 20.180(8)

Amarian et al., PRL93(04)152301







Proton Feynman diagrams for the proton polarizability term in the hydrogen hyperfine splitting.

see Brodsky, Carlson, Hiller and Hwang, PRL94(05)022001,169902(E).

$$\begin{split} E_{\rm hfs}(e^-p) &= E_F^p(1 + \Delta_{\rm QED} + \Delta_R^p + \Delta_S + \Delta_{\rm hvp}^p + \Delta_{\mu\rm vp}^p + \Delta_{\rm weak}^p) = \\ 1.4204057517667(9) {\rm GHz} \end{split}$$

•
$$\Delta_{\text{QED}} = 1136.09(14) \text{ ppm } (\frac{\alpha}{2\pi} + ...)$$

•
$$\Delta_R^p = 5.86(15)$$
 ppm (recoil)

- $\Delta_{hvp}^{p} = 0.01$ ppm (hadronic vacuum polarization)
- $\Delta_{\mu vp}^{p} = 0.07$ ppm (muonic vacuum polarization)
- $\Delta_{\text{weak}}^p = 0.06 \text{ ppm}$ (weak interaction)
- $\Delta_S = -38.62(16)$ ppm (nucleon structure; deduced)
- Δ_S is the largest uncertainty in theoretical calculation

of $E_{\rm hfs}(e^-p)$

WILLIAM & MARY Hydrogen Hyperfine Splitting



 $E_{\rm HFS}(e^-p) = 1.4204057517667(9) \,{\rm GHz} = (1 + \Delta_{QED} + \Delta_R^p + \Delta_S) E_F^p$

$$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \text{Unperturbed} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} Triplet \end{array} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \Delta_{S} = \Delta_{Z} + \Delta_{\text{pol}} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \delta_{Z}^{\text{rad}} = \frac{\alpha}{3\pi} [2 \ln \frac{\Lambda^{2}}{m^{2}} - \frac{4111}{420}] \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \Delta_{E} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \Delta_{E} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \Delta_{E} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \Delta_{E} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \Delta_{Z} = -2\alpha m_{e} \langle r \rangle_{Z} (1 + \delta_{Z}^{\text{rad}}) \end{array} \\ \left\langle r \rangle_{Z} = -\frac{4}{\pi} \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{dQ}{Q^{2}} \left[G_{E}(Q^{2}) \frac{G_{M}(Q^{2})}{1 + \kappa} - 1 \right] \end{array} \end{array}$$

 $\Delta_{S} = -38.62(16) \text{ ppm } \Delta_{Z} = -41.0(5) \text{ ppm } \Delta_{\text{pol}} = 2.38(58) \text{ ppm}$ $\Delta_{\text{pol}} = \frac{\alpha m_{e}}{2\pi (1+\kappa)M} (\bar{\Delta_{1}} + \Delta_{2}) = (0.2264798 \text{ ppm}) (\Delta_{1} + \Delta_{2})$

$$\Delta_{1} = \frac{9}{4} \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{dQ^{2}}{Q^{2}} \left\{ F_{2}^{2}(Q^{2}) + \frac{8m_{p}^{2}}{Q^{2}} B_{1}(Q^{2}) \right\}$$
$$\Delta_{2} = -24m_{p}^{2} \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{dQ^{2}}{Q^{4}} B_{2}(Q^{2}).$$
$$\tau = \nu^{2}/Q^{2}$$

$$B_1 = \int_0^{x_{\rm th}} dx \,\beta(\tau) g_1(x,Q^2) \,,$$
$$B_2 = \int_0^{x_{\rm th}} dx \,\beta_2(\tau) g_2(x,Q^2) \,,$$

$$\beta(\tau) = \frac{4}{9} \left(-3\tau + 2\tau^2 + 2(2-\tau)\sqrt{\tau(\tau+1)} \right)$$

$$\beta_2(\tau) = 1 + 2\tau - 2\sqrt{\tau(\tau+1)},$$





Comparisons between $\Gamma_1 = \int g_1 dx$ and $B_1 = \int \beta_1 g_1 dx$ and between $\Gamma_2 = \int g_2 dx$ and $B_2 = \int \beta_2 g_2 dx$

PRL96,163001



Nucleon structure is the largest uncertainty in calculating HFS. Better g_1 , g_2 , G_M , G_E data at low Q^2 required to resolve discrepancy.

4 September 2007

The College of _____

WILLIAM & MARY







$$\begin{split} \Gamma_{1,2}^{(N)}(Q^2) &= \int_0^{x_{\rm th}} x^N g_{1,2}(x,Q^2) dx & \Gamma_{1,2}^{(N)} \sim (Q^2)^{N+1} \\ \Gamma_1^{(2)} &\to \gamma_0 Q^6 / (16\alpha m_p^2) & \gamma_0 (Q^2) = \frac{16\alpha m_p^2}{Q^6} \int_0^{x_{\rm th}} x^2 \left(g_1 - \frac{4m_p^2 x^2}{Q^2} g_2\right) dx \\ \Gamma_1^{(0)} &= -\kappa_p^2 Q^2 / (8m_p^2) + c_1 Q^4 + \dots \\ B_1 &= \Gamma_1^{(0)} - 10m_p^2 \Gamma_1^{(2)} / (9Q^2) + \dots \\ \Delta_1 [0,Q_1^2] &= \left\{ -\frac{3}{4} r_P^2 \kappa_p^2 + 18m_p^2 c_1 - \frac{5m_p^2}{4\alpha} \gamma_0 \right\} Q_1^2 \\ \Delta_2 [0,Q_1^2] &= 3m_p^2 Q_1^2 (\gamma_0 - \delta_{LT}) / 2\alpha & \delta_{LT}(Q^2) = \left(\frac{1}{2\pi^2}\right) \int_{\nu_0}^{\infty} \frac{K(\nu,Q^2)}{\nu} \frac{\sigma_{LT}(\nu,Q^2)}{Q\nu^2} d\nu \\ &= \frac{16\alpha M^2}{Q^6} \int_0^{x_0} x^2 [g_1(x,Q^2) + g_2(x,Q^2)] dx \end{split}$$







$$\Delta_2[0,Q_1^2] = 3m_p^2 Q_1^2(\gamma_0 - \delta_{LT})/2\alpha$$

$$\Delta_1[0,Q_1^2] = \left\{ -\frac{3}{4} r_P^2 \kappa_p^2 + 18 m_p^2 c_1 - \frac{5m_p^2}{4\alpha} \gamma_0 \right\} Q_1^2$$

term	$Q^2~({ m GeV^2})$	from	Kelly's F_2
Δ_1	[0, 0.05]	F_2 and g_1	0.45 ± 0.30
	[0.05, 20]	F_2	7.01 ± 0.22
		g_1	-1.10 ± 0.55
	$^{[20,\infty]}$	F_2	0.00
		g_1	0.12 ± 0.01
total Δ_1			6.48 ± 0.89
Δ_2	[0, 0.05]	g_2	-0.24 ± 0.24
	[0.05, 20]	g_2	-0.33 ± 0.33
	$^{[20,\infty]}$	g_2	0.00
total Δ_2			-0.57 ± 0.57
$\Delta_1 + \Delta_2$			5.91 ± 1.06
$\Delta_{ m pol}$			$1.34\pm0.24~\rm{ppm}$

 $\gamma_0 = -1.01 \times 10^{-4} \text{ fm}^4 \text{ (photons)}$ $r_P = 0.878(15) \text{ fm (Kelly)}$ $c_1 = 2.95 - 3.89 \text{ (fits/}\chi\text{PT)}$ $\delta_{LT} = 1.35 \times 10^{-4} \text{ fm}^4 \text{ (MAID)}$

$$g_2 = g_2^{WW} \rightarrow \Gamma_2^{(N)} = -N\Gamma_1^{(N)}/(N+1)$$

 $\Delta_2[0,0.05] =$ -0.40(05) [g₂^{WW}] -1.4 [MAID] -0.24 [EG1 Model]







Various estimates change Δ_{pol} up or down within the quoted errors. New data at low Q² are needed to improve this.

 $\Delta_1[0,0.05] = [-0.75r_P^2\kappa_p^2 + 18m_p^2b]0.05 = 0.32$

















The diversity of fits reflects an inaccurate knowledge of the form factors at low Q²





Zemach: $\Delta_Z = -2\alpha m_e \langle r \rangle_Z (1 + \delta_Z^{\text{rad}})$ $\langle r \rangle_Z = -\frac{4}{\pi} \int_0^\infty \frac{dQ}{Q^2} \left[G_E(Q^2) \frac{G_M(Q^2)}{1+\kappa} - 1 \right]$

Reference	r _z (fm)	Δ_{Z} (ppm)	$\Delta_{\rm S}$ - $\Delta_{\rm Z}$ - $\Delta_{\rm pol}$ (ppm)
Kelly	1.069(13)	-41.01	1.11
Sick	1.086(12)	-41.67	1.77
Friedrich	1.048	-40.20	0.30
Dipole	1.025	-39.32	-0.58

Quoted errors on S,Z and pol are 0.16, 0.49, and 0.24 ppm respectively. Quoted error on S-Z-pol is 0.57 ppm.

Largest uncertainty in hyperfine splitting comes from low Q² form factors!



EG4 Expectations







EG12 Expectations







Expected Γ_1^d for 50 days. CLAS12 data (Wmin=2 GeV)









CLAS, past, present and future, provides high-quality $A_{||}$ data over a large and continuous range in x and Q² that

- significantly improve global PDF fits to Δu , Δd , Δs and ΔG
- precisely determine higher twists
- rigorously probe duality over a wide Q² range
- quantitatively test χPT calculations at low Q^2
- accurately yield the polarizability correction to hydrogen hyperfine splittings





• Our patchwork understanding of the nucleon is not elegant and still incomplete

"If you are out to describe the truth, leave elegance to the tailor" -- A. Einstein

- After 50 years the nucleon still captures our interest
 - "La nature, pour nous hommes, et plus en profondeur qu'en surface." -
 - Paul Cézanne
- The nucleon, boring on the surface, has a rich internal life

"o sweet spontaneous earth how often has the naugty thumb of science prodded thy beauty thou answerest them only with spring" -- e e cummings