

NSF-ITP-96-60
hep-th/9607050

String Duality

A Colloquium

Joseph Polchinski

Institute for Theoretical Physics
University of California
Santa Barbara, CA 93106-4030
e-mail: joep@itp.ucsb.edu

Abstract

The strong coupling limit of a quantum system is in general quite complicated, but in some cases a great simplification occurs: the strongly coupled limit is equivalent to the weakly coupled limit of some other system. In string theory conjectures of this type go back several years, but only in the past year and a half has it been understood to be a general principle applying to all string theories. This has improved our understanding of string dynamics, including quantum gravity, in many new and sometimes surprising ways. I describe these developments and put them in the context of the search for the unified theory of particle physics and gravity.

1 Introduction

String duality is a recently discovered symmetry of string theory. String theory itself is over twenty-five years old, and has been under intensive development since 1984 as the leading candidate for a unified theory of particle physics and gravity. The reason that some of its symmetry has been overlooked until now is simple, and important: string duality is not manifest in the weak-coupling perturbation expansion by which the theory is usually studied, but it is a property of the exact theory. As a result, string duality gives information about the behavior of string theory at strong coupling. In a period of a little over a year, we have gone from near-complete ignorance of the behavior of strongly-coupled strings to a rather detailed understanding of the intricate dynamics which occurs, at least in vacua having enough supersymmetry, and the subject continues to develop at a rapid pace.

The central idea of string duality is that the strongly coupled limit of any string theory is equivalent to the weakly coupled limit of some other theory. All string theories are connected in this way, as well as something new and surprising: an eleven-dimensional theory known provisionally as ‘M-theory.’ Besides the ordinary vibrating strings which are the basic quanta of string theory, the multiplets of string duality include smooth classical objects (solitons), singular classical objects (black holes), and a new type of topological defect which is unique to string theory (D-branes). With the improved understanding of string dynamics it has become possible to address one of the long-standing problems of quantum gravity—to count the number of states of certain black holes in a controlled way, giving for the first time a statistical mechanical interpretation to the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy.

Beyond these specific results, string duality has greatly changed the way string theorists think about the fundamental principles of the theory. Many ideas which once seemed to be central are now seen as technicalities, while other ideas which were neglected are now central. In this Colloquium I would

like to try to explain these developments and to put them in the context of the search for the unified theory of particle physics and gravity.

2 String Theory: A Review

2.1 Strings as a Unified Theory

I will use units in which $\hbar = c = 1$. The gravitational coupling G_N is then a length-squared,

$$G_N = l_P^2 \tag{1}$$

where l_P is the Planck length, 1.6×10^{-33} cm. This is the natural length scale for the effects of quantum gravity to become important and so for the unification of gravity with the other interactions. It is far shorter than the length scales which can be probed directly; the corresponding energy scale is

$$M_P = l_P^{-1} = 1.2 \times 10^{19} \text{ GeV}, \tag{2}$$

far beyond the reach of accelerators. Thus, to construct a unified theory one must rely heavily on theoretical reasoning such as the internal consistency of the theory, and any experimental tests will be indirect.

Fortunately, consistency is a very restrictive guide. General relativity is a nonrenormalizable field theory, meaning that its quantum mechanical perturbation theory has uncontrollable divergences. To see the significance of this, let us recall the four-fermi theory of the weak interaction.¹ The weak interaction was originally described as an interaction of four fermionic fields at a spacetime point as depicted in figure 1a. The weak coupling constant G_F also has units of length-squared, or inverse energy-squared. In a process with a characteristic energy E the effective dimensionless coupling is then $G_F E^2$. It follows that at sufficiently high energy the coupling becomes arbitrarily

¹A review of weak interaction theory can be found in Commins and Bucksbaum (1983).




Figure 1: a) Leptonic weak interaction in four-fermi theory. b) The same interaction in Weinberg-Salam theory. At short distance the contact interaction is resolved into the exchange of a W boson.

strong, and this also implies divergences in the perturbation theory. A second order weak amplitude is dimensionally of the form

$$G_F^2 \int^\infty E' dE', \quad (3)$$

where E' is the energy of the virtual state in the second order process, and this diverges at large energy. In position space the divergence comes when the two weak interactions occur at the same spacetime point (high energy = short distance). The divergences become worse at each higher order of perturbation theory and so cannot be controlled even with renormalization.

The natural interpretation of such divergences is that the theory one is working with is only valid up to some energy scale, beyond which new physics appears. The new physics should have the effect of smearing out the interaction in spacetime and so soften the high energy behavior. One might imagine that this could be done in many ways, but in fact the combined constraints of Lorentz invariance and causality are very restrictive. This is because Lorentz invariance requires that if the interaction is spread out in




Figure 2: a) Exchange of a graviton between two elementary particles. b) The same interaction in string theory. The amplitude is given by the sum over histories, over all embeddings of the string world-sheet in spacetime. The world-sheet is smooth: there is no distinguished point at which the interaction occurs (the cross section on the intermediate line is only for illustration).

space it is also spread out in time. In fact, for the weak interaction there is only one known way to solve the short-distance problem. This is depicted in figure 1b, where the four-fermi interaction is resolved into the exchange of a vector boson. Moreover, this vector boson must be of a very specific kind, coming from a spontaneously broken gauge invariance. This is the only known solution, and in fact it is the one that nature chooses.²

For gravity the discussion is much the same. The gravitational interaction is depicted in figure 2a. As we have noted already, the gravitational

²It could also have been that the divergences are an artifact of perturbation theory but do not appear in the exact amplitudes. This is a logical possibility, a ‘nontrivial fixed point.’ Although conceivable, it seems unlikely, and it is not what happens in the case of the weak interaction.

coupling G_N has units of length-squared and so the dimensionless coupling is $G_N E^2$. This grows large at high energy and signifies a nonrenormalizable perturbation theory.³ Again the natural suspicion is that short-distance physics smears out the interaction, and again there is only one known way to do this, shown in figure 2b. It involves a bigger step than in the case of the weak interaction: it requires that at the Planck length the graviton and other particles turn out to be not points but one-dimensional objects, loops of ‘string.’⁴

It is certainly not obvious that this should be the right thing to do, but if one tries to make a consistent Lorentz-invariant quantum theory of one-dimensional objects, one finds that it is possible but that the theory is highly constrained. In particular, one of the states of the string is massless and has spin two. Consistency requires that such a particle be a graviton, that its long-wavelength interactions be described by general relativity, and indeed this is what is found from the sum-over-histories depicted in figure 2b (Yoneya, 1974; Scherk and Schwarz, 1974, 1975). In a sense string theory predicts gravity, in that every consistent string theory includes general relativity, even though the theory initially seems to be formulated in flat space. Further, calculation of the quantum corrections to amplitudes shows that they are finite.

It is also not obvious why *only* this idea should work. Many others have been tried without success. One natural question is, why one-dimensional objects and not two-dimensional or higher? For this at least there is a simple answer. Extended objects have an infinite number of internal degrees of freedom (the Fourier modes describing their shape). Spreading out point par-

³Note that the bad gravitational interaction of figure 2a is the same graph as the smeared-out weak interaction of figure 1b. However, its high energy behavior is worse because gravity couples to energy rather than charge.

⁴Reprints of early papers can be found in Schwarz (1985). Green, Schwarz, and Witten (1987) is a text with extensive references, including papers from the first period of string theory (roughly 1969-1974) when strings were studied as a possible theory of the strong interaction.

ticles into extended objects softens the spacetime divergences but introduces potential new divergences from the internal degrees of freedom. The latter grow worse as the dimension of the object increases, and the one-dimensional case is the only one for which both the spacetime and internal behavior is under control.

It could be that we suffer from a failure of imagination, and that there are other solutions. However, we see from the example of the weak interaction that if we can find even one solution to a short-distance problem we should take it very seriously and see where it leads. The result here is quite striking. Besides the graviton, other states of the string with different internal oscillators excited behave as gauge bosons (Neveu and Scherk, 1972), and yet others are fermions (Ramond, 1971). In fact, string theory automatically incorporates (and in some ways generalizes) three earlier ideas for explaining the patterns in the Standard Model, namely grand unification, supersymmetry (Gliozzi, Scherk and Olive, 1977), and Kaluza-Klein theory. Some of the simplest string theories, the Calabi-Yau models, closely resemble unified versions of the supersymmetric Standard Model.⁵

As a particle physicist I usually emphasize these particle physics motivations for string theory, but many of those educated in general relativity and in mathematics find string theory compelling for reasons that are not entirely the same. From Newton's gravity to Einstein's, from quantum mechanics to non-Abelian gauge theory, new physical theories have often required new mathematics, or least mathematics that had not previously been used in physics. If one searches for higher symmetries or other more mathematical structures that might be useful in physics, one finds many connections to string theory. One reason I emphasize this now is that in the recent work on string duality, all of these different points of view have had a role to play.

⁵Three key papers that established this were Green and Schwarz (1984), Gross, Harvey, Martinec and Rohm (1985), and Candelas, Horowitz, Strominger, and Witten (1985). Green, Schwarz and Witten (1987) gives extensive coverage to these developments.

It is worthwhile to note that these three kinds of motivation—solving the divergence problem, the connection with geometry, and explaining the broad patterns in the Standard Model, were also present in the weak interaction. Weinberg (1980) emphasized the divergence problem as I have done. Salam (1980) was more guided by the idea that non-Abelian gauge theory was a beautiful structure that should be incorporated in physics. Experiment gave no direct indication that the weak interaction was anything but the pointlike interaction of figure 1a, and no direct clue as to the new physics that smears it out, just as today it gives no direct indication of what lies beyond the Standard Model. But it did show certain broad patterns—universality and the $V - A$ structure, which were telltale signs of a gauge interaction. It appears that nature is kind to us, in providing many trails to a correct theory.

2.2 String Theory before Duality

The key question is, how do we go from explaining broad patterns to making precise predictions? To understand the situation, it is useful to look again to history, to the state of quantum field theory in the early '60's. At that time there was a good technical control of the weak-coupling perturbation theory, the Feynman graph expansion, but little else. Important dynamical ideas were missing, such as the Higgs mechanism, dynamical symmetry breaking, and confinement. These have largely to do with the fact that the vacuum, the ground state of quantum field theory, is generally a more interesting and less symmetric object than one might naively expect from the Hamiltonian. Without understanding these ideas one cannot make sense of the Standard Model: it would seem to predict fractionally charged particles and a long-ranged force coupled to isospin.

Beyond these dynamical ideas, it remained to discover the defining principle of the theory—that one should organize the physics not *graph by graph*

but rather *length scale by length scale* with the shortest distances first.⁶ This realization not only made it possible to define the theory beyond perturbation theory, but also provided a framework for understanding the dynamics, both analytically and numerically.

The situation is similar in string theory. There has been a good technical control of the perturbation theory, but little else, at least up until the recent developments. The need to understand the dynamics is even more acute than in the case of the Standard Model for two reasons. The first is that because the Planck energy is so large, there is no hope to explore a ‘partonic’ regime where the stringy behavior is directly visible—rather, we see only the extreme low energy limit of string theory, filtered through all the dynamics at intervening scales. The second reason has to do with one of the very attractive features of string theory, that it has no free dimensionless parameters at all. Instead it has, in perturbation theory, many degenerate ground states parameterized by the values of various scalar fields (moduli). The parameters of the Standard Model come ultimately from the values of these scalars, so it is necessary to understand the dynamics which selects one of the many ground states. String theory contains quantum field theory as its low energy limit, so all of the familiar dynamics of the latter is still present, but because string theory has many more degrees of freedom it is likely to have interesting new dynamics of its own.

Beyond this, the central defining principle of string theory is not known. We are trying to answer the question ‘What is string theory?’, just as Wilson and others addressed the question ‘What is field theory?’. The various properties that make string theory an attractive unifying idea also imply that the theory exists as something more than an asymptotic weak-coupling expansion. So there is good reason to expect that we will find a central principle as powerful as that in field theory, which will again enable us to better understand the dynamics.

⁶Wilson (1983) gives a fascinating account of this discovery.

With this background I can summarize what has been learned from string duality. We have learned a number of new dynamical ideas though certainly not yet all we need. We have not yet found the central principle but we have many new clues, some of which are surprising and have taken us in unexpected directions.

3 Some Ideas

String duality involves an interplay of many different ideas from quantum field theory and string theory. In this part I would like to explain some of the central principles.

3.1 Strong Coupling and Duality

Here are two ways to think about the meaning of the coupling constant g of a quantum field theory. The first is in terms of the weak-coupling perturbation expansion. The amplitude A for any process can be expanded

$$A = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n g^n, \tag{4}$$

where g is the amplitude for a single interaction to occur.⁷ The coefficient c_n is given by the sum over Feynman graphs with n interaction vertices.

Interpreted with sufficient care this is an asymptotic series, meaning that it gives an approximation of any desired accuracy by taking g to be sufficiently small. Thus it is also a good qualitative guide to the small- g physics. But for g of order 1 or larger it is of limited usefulness and can miss important aspects of the physics.

Another way to think about the meaning of g is in terms of the quantum fluctuation of the fields. For the purpose of this discussion it is useful to keep

⁷For simplicity this is written for the case that there is only one kind of interaction. Incidentally, it will frequently be the case that only even n , or only odd, contribute to a given amplitude.

explicit factors of $\hbar$; we will return to $\hbar = 1$ units after section 3.2. When g is small the fluctuations are small and their equations of motion can be approximated by linear equations—in other words, small g is approximately free field theory. For larger g the fluctuations of the fields, and the nonlinearities, become larger.⁸ In QCD, for example, the coupling is very strong at long distance, and correspondingly the color magnetic fields undergo large fluctuations in the vacuum—this is the source of confinement.

Weak/strong duality (in field theory or string theory) means that as the string coupling g becomes large, one can find new ‘dual’ fields whose fluctuations become *small*—they are characterized by a new coupling g' which is something like $1/g$. This is similar to a Fourier transform, where a function which becomes spread out in position space can become very narrow in momentum space. Here though, the Fourier transform is in a complicated nonlinear field space.

String theory includes gravity, and so one of the fields is the spacetime metric. One might therefore have expected strongly coupled string theory to have new and very exotic physics, including large fluctuations of the spacetime geometry and all other fields. This might correspond to some sort of confined phase of gravity. One of the surprises of string duality is that this is not so. As $g \rightarrow \infty$, $g' \rightarrow 0$ and so the metric of the dual theory behaves more and more classically.

It is quite likely that in nature the string coupling is close to 1 rather than to 0 or ∞ , so that string duality does not allow one to relate the theory directly to a weakly coupled theory in which one can calculate accurately. But

⁸A more detailed way to see the connection between the value of g and the size of the quantum fluctuations is in terms of the path integral, the sum over field histories weighted by $e^{iS/\hbar}$ with S the classical action. The fields can be rescaled in such a way that g appears in the action only as an overall factor g^{-2} , so g and $\hbar$ appear only in the combination $g^2\hbar$. It is then clear that small g and small $\hbar$ are equivalent with this scaling of the fields. To relate this to the familiar example of QED, one must note that the electric charges of individual quanta are related to the charge in the classical field action by $e = \hbar g$, so the familiar expansion parameter $\alpha = e^2/4\pi\hbar$ is indeed $g^2\hbar/4\pi$.

having an understanding of both limits, large and small coupling, constrains the kinds of qualitative physics that can occur at intermediate coupling. Even more important, duality gives a great deal of information about the exact theory and its symmetries, information that is not contained in the perturbation expansion, and so new clues to the answer to ‘What is string theory?’.

3.2 Electric/Magnetic Duality

Another perspective on the meaning of duality starts with Maxwell’s equations,

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla \cdot \mathbf{E} &= \rho & \nabla \times \mathbf{E} + \dot{\mathbf{B}} &= 0 \\ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} &= 0 & \nabla \times \mathbf{B} - \dot{\mathbf{E}} &= \mathbf{j}.\end{aligned}\tag{5}$$

The symmetry between $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ in these equations is striking. If one ignores the sources, or adds magnetic sources, the equations are invariant under $\mathbf{E} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}$, $\mathbf{B} \rightarrow -\mathbf{E}$.

This curious fact was made more interesting by Dirac’s study (1931) of the quantum mechanics of a charge moving in a magnetic monopole field. He found that the wavefunction could be consistently defined only if the electric charge e and magnetic charge q satisfy a quantization condition

$$eq = 2\pi\hbar n.\tag{6}$$

Note that if a monopole of some charge q exists, then all electric charges must be multiples of the unit $2\pi\hbar/q$. This would ‘explain’ why the magnitudes of the electron and proton charges should be *exactly* equal, a fact known to hold to one part in 10^{21} .

The subject took another step forward when ’t Hooft (1974) and Polyakov (1974) showed that in any grand unified theory, magnetic monopoles actually do exist. They are classical solutions, with a nonsingular core whose size is set by the scale of spontaneous symmetry breaking.

At weak coupling, the electrically and magnetically charged objects look very different. The electrically charged objects are weakly coupled and have pointlike interactions. The magnetically charged objects are strongly coupled—by the Dirac condition (6), the magnetic fine structure constant $\alpha_m = q^2/4\pi\hbar = n^2/4\alpha$ is roughly the reciprocal of the usual one—and as noted above they have cores of finite size.

Montonen and Olive (1977) were led by various evidence to conjecture that at strong coupling the situation would be reversed: the electrically charged objects would be strongly coupled and have nonsingular cores, while the magnetically charged objects would become weakly coupled and pointlike. The strongly coupled theory would be equivalent to weakly coupled theory in which the basic quanta carried magnetic rather than electric charges. In subsequent work this conjecture was refined (Witten and Olive, 1978; Osborn, 1979). It was argued to hold specifically in supersymmetric gauge theories, in particular $N = 4$ theories (N is the number of conserved supersymmetries). Relating this discussion to the previous section, the weakly coupled dual fields described there would be the fields corresponding to the magnetic quanta.⁹

These conjectures were greeted with wide skepticism because the evidence for them was rather circumstantial, while attempts to construct the dual fields directly in terms of the original ones did not succeed.¹⁰ This skepticism is now largely gone, not because the dual fields have been found (they have not), but because of a substantial strengthening of the circumstantial evidence. This evidence, based on supersymmetry, will be described in the next section.

⁹Returning to QCD, the strongly fluctuating color magnetic fields would be roughly dual to a state in which the color electric field goes rapidly to zero at long distance. This is indeed one way to understand confinement, though any sort of precise quantitative duality in QCD is unlikely.

¹⁰Dual fields can be constructed for some quantum field theories in two spacetime dimensions, the Ising model and the Sine-Gordon/Thirring models being the simplest examples.

The reader should notice that this whole section has been concerned with duality in field theory, not string theory. The extension to string theory will be discussed in section 3.5.

3.3 Supersymmetry

To test the duality conjectures we need to be able to say something about the physics of the strongly coupled theories. The methods available for this are very limited, but in supersymmetric theories it is possible.

Supersymmetry is of interest for a number of reasons. It is likely that it is associated with the breaking of the electroweak symmetry. If so, it should be discovered by the LHC if not before, and it is the one piece of new physics associated with string theory that might be accessible at accelerators. Beyond this, it is an appealing mathematical structure that extends general coordinate invariance and unifies fermions and bosons. Any consistent string theory must have supersymmetry, at least at the Planck scale. Finally, supersymmetric field theories, and string theories with unbroken supersymmetry below the Planck scale, have various nice properties that make them easier to study.

It is difficult to give an intuitive picture of supersymmetry. One way to think about it is that in addition to the usual spacetime dimensions, whose coordinates are real numbers x^μ (and so their multiplication commutes), there are additional ‘fermionic’ coordinates θ_α which anticommute, $\theta_\alpha\theta_\beta = -\theta_\beta\theta_\alpha$. These extra dimensions have no size; the anticommuting property means that they are essentially infinitesimal. One can make sensible field theories on this space. In fact, they can be thought of as quantum field theories on ordinary spacetime but with fields that have both fermionic and bosonic components, with a symmetry relating the masses and charges of the particles with different statistics.

To see why supersymmetry is valuable in studying strong coupling we need the algebra of the quantum mechanical generators of the symmetry.

For an ordinary internal symmetry, such as baryon number, the generator G commutes with the Hamiltonian H ,

$$[G, H] = 0. \quad (7)$$

This is the definition of a symmetry. For supersymmetry, with generator Q , there is an additional relation (see, for example, Haag, Lopuszansky, and Sohnius, 1975)

$$[Q, H] = 0 \quad \{Q, Q\} = H + G. \quad (8)$$

In the second, anticommutation, relation, both the Hamiltonian and various internal generators appear on the right-hand side. For clarity we have omitted the indices which would distinguish the various supersymmetry and internal symmetry generators and various associated constants, so this anticommutation relation is schematic.

The anticommutation relation has the Hamiltonian on the right-hand side, and as a result supersymmetry gives much more information about the dynamics than ordinary internal symmetries. To see one example of this (Witten and Olive, 1978), consider a one-particle state $|\psi\rangle$ which has the special property that is invariant under part of the supersymmetry algebra; in other words, $Q|\psi\rangle = 0$ for some of the Q 's. This is known as a *Bogomol'nyi-Prasad-Sommerfeld (BPS) state*. Take the expectation value of the anticommutator in eq. (8),

$$\langle\psi|\{Q, Q\}|\psi\rangle = \langle\psi|H|\psi\rangle + \langle\psi|G|\psi\rangle. \quad (9)$$

For those Q 's which annihilate $|\psi\rangle$, the left hand side is zero. The two terms on the right are just the mass of the particle and its G -charge. Thus, the mass of any BPS particle is determined entirely by its charge. This is a consequence of symmetry and does not depend on dynamics at all; in particular it remains true even if the coupling is large.

Further analysis puts strong constraints on the interactions and on the phase diagram. For example, any BPS state with zero charge has zero energy.

The anticommutation relations imply that no other state can have lower energy, so any such state will be the ground state. A typical supersymmetric theory has many such states, which are characterized by the expectation values of some scalar fields. All these states must be degenerate. This is similar to spontaneous symmetry breaking, but with spontaneous symmetry breaking the degenerate vacua all have the same physics while here they are physically inequivalent—they are not related to one another directly by any symmetry, rather the degeneracy follows indirectly from the BPS argument. The scalar fields which label these vacua, known as moduli, must be massless for the same reason that Goldstone bosons are massless.¹¹ The low energy physics, the phase structure, is determined by the physics of the moduli, which is strongly constrained by supersymmetry.

Applying these methods to test the $N = 4$ duality conjecture, one first finds that the BPS mass formula is duality symmetric.¹² That is, electrically charged BPS states at coupling g have the same masses as magnetically charged states at coupling $1/g$. Secondly, one can compare the degeneracies of BPS states with different charges and spins. The degeneracy of magnetic monopoles can be determined by semiclassical methods when g is small. In $N = 4$ theories there cannot be a phase transition as the coupling is varied and the supersymmetry algebra prevents the number of BPS states from changing, so this also determines the degeneracy at strong coupling. For $N = 4$ theories it is the same as that of the electrically charged states in the dual theory. As another test, the effective low energy physics of the moduli is duality invariant.

This evidence was widely regarded as unconvincing, an accidental consequence of supersymmetry, until Seiberg (1994) and others began to apply these methods systematically to determine the phase structures of theories

¹¹In realistic theories the degeneracy is removed and the moduli made massive by supersymmetry breaking.

¹²Recent reviews of this subject are Sen (1994) and Harvey (1996).

with less supersymmetry, $N = 1$ and $N = 2$. The arguments in these cases are more intricate, the physics is richer, and there are more consistency checks. Many more examples of duality were found (reviewed in Seiberg, 1995, and Intriligator and Seiberg, 1995), as well as convincing evidence for various associated phenomena such as composite gauge bosons.¹³ Duality in supersymmetric gauge theory is now well-established. It is important to note, though, that the dual fields still have not been constructed. It is believed that to make duality manifest one may need a new formulation of these quantum field theories, something more intrinsically quantum-mechanical than the path integral over classical histories. It is also suspected that an understanding of the dualities in field theory will ultimately come from string theory.

3.4 Higher Dimensions

We will need one more idea in order to fully understand string duality. This is that spacetime may have more than four dimensions. The three spatial dimensions we see are expanding, and once were highly curved. It is a logical possibility that there are other dimensions which did not expand but remain small and highly curved. Moreover, this is an attractive idea for a number of reasons.

A good model for physics in such a spacetime is a waveguide, a cavity which has some finite cross section in the x - y plane and is very long in the z dimension. Seen from far away, or with low resolution, this looks one-dimensional. An infinite number of different fields (functions of z and t) with different dispersion relations (masses) move along the waveguide. Seen up close, the three-dimensional structure is evident and one sees that there is only one field, the electromagnetic field, and that the different dispersion relations come from modes with different x , y dependence.

¹³In a few cases, like $N = 4$, the duality holds at all energies. In many others it holds only in the low energy theory.

Physics is much the same in a spacetime with three large spatial dimensions and additional ones which are small and compact. In nature, the additional dimensions would be quite small, close to the Planck scale, so we would have seen only the very lowest modes. One reason this is attractive is that it unifies gravitational and gauge interactions. Depending on whether its polarization is aligned along the long or compact directions, a higher-dimensional graviton can look like a graviton, photon, or scalar from the lower-dimensional point of view. This is the Kaluza-Klein mechanism. In addition, the Dirac equation on such a space typically gives rise to multiple copies of the same set of quantum numbers (that is, generations) in the lower-dimensional spectrum.

Consistent weakly-coupled string theories necessarily live in ten spacetime dimensions. The origin of this condition is difficult to explain in simple terms, but it can be understood in various ways. Calculation of quantum effects shows that they spoil essential symmetries unless the dimension is ten. Also, the properties of fermions depend in an essential way on the number of dimensions and ten is special here for a number of reasons related to supersymmetry. For example, ten is the highest dimension in which the number of states of a massless vector (eight: the spacetime dimension minus the timelike and longitudinal polarizations) can be equal to the number of states of a massless fermion—in higher dimensions the spinor representations are too large.

The field equations of ten-dimensional string theory are consistent with four-dimensional physics that looks very much like what we have. Some of the simplest solutions give rise to the same gauge groups and matter representations found in grand unification (Candelas, Horowitz, Strominger, and Witten, 1985). It is notable that the four-dimensional gauge couplings can be chiral, meaning that the right- and left-handed fermions have different gauge interactions. This was impossible for a number of previously considered unifying ideas including standard Kaluza-Klein theory (Witten, 1981).

For future reference it is useful to look at a simple example. This is a massless scalar field in five spacetime dimensions, with one dimension periodic with period $2\pi R$. Let x^μ with $\mu = 0, 1, 2, 3$ be the coordinates for the large dimensions, and x^4 be the periodic coordinate; the index M runs over all five values. The wave equation is

$$0 = \eta^{MN} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial X^M \partial X^N} \phi(x) = \left(\eta^{\mu\nu} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial X^\mu \partial X^\nu} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial^2 X^4} \right) \phi(x). \quad (10)$$

As in the waveguide, separate variables and expand the x^4 dependence in a complete set of modes,

$$\phi_n(x) = \phi_n(x^\mu) e^{inx^4/R}. \quad (11)$$

Then the n 'th mode satisfies

$$0 = \left(\eta^{\mu\nu} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial X^\mu \partial X^\nu} - \frac{n^2}{R^2} \right) \phi_n(x) \quad (12)$$

which is the Klein-Gordon equation for a scalar field of mass $M = n/R$. At low energies only the $n = 0$ mode is detectable, but at energies above $1/R$ one sees a characteristic infinite tower of states. For this simple geometry the states are spaced evenly in mass. More complicated compact spaces would of course give a more complicated spectrum, but the average density of states depends only on the number of additional dimensions. From another point of view, consider how the spectrum behaves as $R \rightarrow \infty$: the infinite tower comes down in mass and forms the continuum characteristic of a noncompact dimension.

3.5 String Duality

String theory includes gauge theory. Weak/strong duality in gauge theory is thus necessary if the same is to be true in string theory, but it is not sufficient. After the work of Seiberg, it was still possible that duality was a

property only of the low energy limit of string theory, not of the full massive spectrum.

There were a number of early duality conjectures in string theory. A partial list includes the self-duality of $N = 1$ heterotic string theories in four¹⁴ dimensions (Font, Ibanez, Lust, and Quevedo, 1990), self-duality of $N = 4$ heterotic strings in four dimensions (Font, Ibanez, Lust, and Quevedo, 1990; Sen, 1994), self-duality of the heterotic string in six dimensions (Duff, 1995), duality of certain string theories with theories of five-dimensional objects (five-branes) in ten dimensions (Duff, 1988; Strominger, 1990), and a relation—not specifically duality—of other string theories in ten dimensions to theories of membranes (two-branes) in eleven dimensions (Duff, Howe, Inami, and Stelle, 1987). These conjectures did not attract broad attention, due to their rather scattered nature and the limited evidence for any of them.

The subject took a major step forward with the papers of Hull and Townsend (1995), Townsend (1995), and Witten (1995a). These authors proposed a nearly complete set of duals for all known string theories with at least $N = 4$ supersymmetry. These new proposals elevated duality from a set of isolated conjectures to a general principle applying to any string theory in any dimension. The structure is quite rigid—for each string theory the spectrum and symmetries determine a unique candidate for its dual, and the entire pattern fits together in an intricate way as dimensions are compactified and decompactified. Some of the earlier conjectures, such as the $N = 4$ conjecture, were incorporated whole, while others were incorporated in a modified or limited form; we will return to the membrane idea in section 4.2.

These systematic conjectures made possible many new tests, and evidence for weak/strong duality in string theory accumulated rapidly. This led also to the discovery of various new dynamical ideas, some of which will be described in part 4. There is now an integrated picture of the strongly coupled

¹⁴Four is the number of large dimensions, meaning that six are compactified.




Figure 3: Space of string vacua. The cusps are limits in which a weakly coupled string description is possible (except for the M-theory limit).

dynamics, at least for string theories with enough supersymmetry, and the methods are being extended to theories with less supersymmetry.

Figure 3 is a schematic picture of the space of string vacua. The parameters are the string coupling and the sizes and shapes of the compact dimensions; in string theory these are not fixed but are determined by the expectation values of the moduli. Over most of the space, the string coupling g is of order 1. In various limits, there is an effective description in terms of one or another weakly coupled string theory. The different string theories are characterized by the number and kind of supersymmetries and by the world-sheet topologies allowed (oriented vs. unoriented and closed vs. open). In some limits new theories are encountered; the most interesting of these, M-theory, will be described in section 4.1.

Figure 3 is actually an oversimplification, in that the different limits are characterized not only by different string theories but by different topologies for the compact dimensions. It has been known for some time that even in weakly coupled string theory spacetime topology is not invariant (Aspinwall, Greene, and Morrison, 1993), and string duality has provided many more examples (Greene, Morrison, and Strominger, 1995). Also, a more accurate picture would have many pieces resembling figure 3, touching one another at points or along curves.

In field theory the duality multiplets included the elementary quanta plus smooth classical configurations (magnetic monopoles). The string duality multiplets include these (though the elementary quanta are now loops rather than points), plus singular classical configurations (black holes) and also a new type of object unique to string theory, the D-brane. D-branes are topological defects on which the ends of a string can be trapped, as shown in figure 4. They can be pointlike, one-dimensional, two-dimensional, and so on. These were discovered in the study of perturbative dualities of string theories, dualities that relate different weakly coupled theories (Dai, Leigh, and Polchinski, 1989; Polchinski, Chaudhuri, and Johnson, 1996). Their relevance to weak/strong duality was noticed more recently (Polchinski, 1995).

Let me illustrate one of the methods by which the strongly coupled limits are determined. In addition to the fundamental strings, various string theories have in their spectra one-dimensional objects which are either smooth solitons or D-branes. At weak coupling these are much heavier than the fundamental strings, but at strong coupling they are much lighter (again this is guaranteed by the BPS formula). In this limit it is natural to reinterpret the theory with the soliton or D-brane being the fundamental string. Which string theory one gets depends on the degrees of freedom of the object, which can be determined by a weak-coupling calculation. This has been applied to determine, or confirm, the strongly coupled limits of various string theories (Sen, 1995a; Harvey and Strominger, 1995; Dabholkar, 1995; Hull, 1995;




Figure 4: D-brane. Shown are two trapped strings and one not trapped.

Schwarz, 1995; Witten, 1996a; Polchinski and Witten, 1996).

4 Some Results

I have described the principal methods and general results of string duality. In this final part I would like to focus on some specific highlights, some of the discoveries that have most greatly changed our understanding.

4.1 M-Theory and the Eleventh Dimension

As described in section 3.4, weakly coupled string theory requires specifically ten dimensions. One of the striking consequences of string duality is the existence of an eleventh dimension, not visible in weakly coupled string

theory.

How does one discover a new dimension? The experimental signature was discussed in section 3.4, a tower of new states above the energy $1/R$. The theoretical signature is the same. A certain string theory, the IIA theory in ten dimensions, has zero-dimensional D-branes, D-particles. These are heavy, with a mass M_s/g at weak coupling (M_s is the string mass scale). For a pair of D-particles, the supersymmetric bound state problem can be solved and there is a single bound state with mass $2M_s/g$ (Witten, 1996a; Sen, 1995b). Similarly, n D-particles have a single bound state of mass nM_s/g . This bound state spectrum was actually inferred from lower-dimensional duality symmetries before the explicit construction of the bound states. At strong coupling all of these become light, and in the $g \rightarrow 0$ limit form a continuum. We have seen just such a spectrum before, in section 3.4. It is the signature of a new, eleventh, dimension with $R = g/M_s$ (Townsend, 1995, Witten, 1995a). This makes it clear why this dimension is invisible in string perturbation theory: the latter is an expansion in $g = RM_s$, so an expansion around the zero-radius limit.

Eleven dimensions is an interesting number. This is the maximum in which supersymmetry is possible—beyond eleven the massless multiplets would contain spins higher than two, something which seems to be impossible in a consistent theory. Eleven-dimensional supergravity is therefore the most symmetric theory based on supersymmetry (Cremmer, Julia, and Scherk, 1978), and was considered as a possible unifying idea before string theory. The principal problems were that it is nonrenormalizable and that it is not possible to obtain a chiral spectrum.

String theorists generally regarded eleven-dimensional supergravity as an irrelevant curiosity because of its difficulties and because strings seemed to live in ten, though some supergravity experts retained an interest in the theory because of its high degree of symmetry. Now it develops that strings have an eleven-dimensional limit whose low energy physics is determined by




Figure 5: a) Long IIA string in ten dimensions. At strong coupling a perpendicular direction, which is periodic, becomes visible. b) String in eleven dimensions. c) Wrapped membrane in eleven dimensions.

symmetry considerations to be eleven-dimensional supergravity and whose short distance physics is not understood. This has been given the provisional name ‘M-theory.’

4.2 Strings from Membranes

The following exercise gives an interesting insight into M-theory. Consider a long IIA string in ten dimensions, shown in figure 5a. Follow this state as the coupling is increased. We now know that a new orthogonal dimension will appear, but there are two possibilities for the form of the resulting state: in eleven dimensions it could look like a string as in figure 5b, or it could turn out to be a membrane wrapped around the eleventh dimension as shown in figure 5c. The answer can be determined in various ways—from the conserved

charges carried by the various objects, from the scaling of the string tension with coupling, from symmetry—and it is figure 5c, the wrapped membrane.¹⁵

This is a puzzle. It seems to say that string theory is really the quantum mechanics of membranes, but in section 2.1 we have said that theories of fundamental membranes do not seem to exist.

It is possible that the problems of quantizing membranes will be overcome and string theory will become membrane theory—this was one of the origins of the name M-theory.¹⁶ It is likely, though, that the resolution lies in a different direction, that strings and membranes will turn out to be composites of something else. This has long been suspected in the case of string theory. Some of the reasons for this are reviewed in Polchinski (1994). They include the general lack of success of string field theory and the fact that string perturbation theory diverges more rapidly than in field theory (Shenker, 1991). String duality seems to give further support for this. In figure 3, the *asymptotic* behaviors in various limits are generated by different string theories, but there is no sign that the string descriptions do more than this. Sums over string or membrane world-sheets are directly analogous to the Feynman graph expansion and so are intrinsically perturbative. As for duality in field theory, we need a more quantum-mechanical description, one in which $\hbar$ is not a free parameter (Witten, 1996c).

Incidentally, the membrane can also be oriented perpendicular to the eleventh dimension, so that in ten dimensions it still looks like a membrane. In string theory it appears as a D-brane. From the eleven-dimensional point of view one sees a symmetry in which a 90° rotation takes the eleventh dimension into one of the others. From the string theory point of view this is a nonperturbative symmetry, mixing radii and couplings and relating strings to D-branes.

¹⁵The supersymmetric membrane was found by Bergshoeff, Sezgin, and Townsend (1987). That a wrapped membrane had the same physics as a ten-dimensional IIA superstring was shown by Duff, Howe, Inami, and Stelle (1987).

¹⁶M-theory also has five-dimensional objects, five-branes.

4.3 Unification of Couplings

In this section I would like to explain how all this business of extra dimensions might enter into an important piece of physics, the unification of the couplings. Figure 6a shows the three gauge couplings and the dimensionless gravitational coupling $G_N E^2$ as a function of energy. The logarithmic running of the gauge couplings is familiar (Amaldi, de Boer, and Furstenau, 1991), as is the fact that they meet within experimental errors in the minimal supersymmetric model. It is also striking that the gravitational coupling nearly meets the other three, missing by a little over one order of magnitude out of fourteen.¹⁷ This is a near miss, less than ten percent in scale, but it is larger than the experimental error and so must be understood. There are many ways that the four couplings might turn out to unify. Additional particles at an intermediate scale would change the running of the gauge couplings and can cause them to meet at a higher energy. Enough extra states near the unification scale can have the same effect. Or, the three gauge couplings may actually unify at the lower energy and a grand unified field theory with a single gauge coupling describe the physics from there until the string scale.

All of these ideas modify the behavior of the gauge couplings. Since the gauge couplings already meet, it would seem more economical to find instead a mechanism to change the running of the gravitational coupling. But this seems impossible because the running of the gauge coupling is just dimensional, as E^2 ; gravity is still classical at these scales.

It is interesting to consider the effect of a new dimension below the unification scale. This changes the dimensional analysis. Both the gauge and gravitational couplings grow more rapidly as shown in figure 6b, but they do not meet any sooner.

In the $E_8 \times E_8$ heterotic string, the strong coupling limit leads to a new dimension which is slightly different from that considered before. Instead of

¹⁷The unification scale is about three orders of magnitude below the Planck scale, but accounting for 4π 's and other factors reduces this to a factor of 20 (Kaplunovsky, 1988).




Figure 6: a) Running of the three gauge couplings and the dimensionless gravitational coupling with energy. b) Effect of a fifth dimension below the unification scale. c) Effect of a fifth dimension of Horava-Witten type.

being periodic, a circle, it is a segment (Horava and Witten, 1996). The gauge fields and matter live at the endpoints only, while gravity propagates in the bulk. Suppose that a fifth dimension of this type exists below the unification scale. That is, spacetime is a narrow five-dimensional layer bounded by four-dimensional walls. Since the gauge fields and matter live in the walls, the evolution of the gauge couplings is the same as in four dimensions, but since gravity propagates in the full five dimensions the gravitational coupling behaves as in figure 6b. The result is shown in figure 6c: for a fifth dimension of appropriate size, the kink in the gravitational coupling makes it meet the others at the unification scale (Witten, 1996b).

This is no more predictive than the idea of a unified theory: it adds one new parameter, the size of the fifth dimension. Nevertheless it is an economical solution to the problem of the unification of all couplings, as likely to be true as any other. With only the data of the four couplings, there is not enough to distinguish among the possibilities. If supersymmetry is found and the masses of the superpartners measured with precision, many new renormalization group analyses become possible and it may be possible to determine the physics at the unification scale.

4.4 Gauge Invariance

Local symmetries—gauge invariance and coordinate invariance—are a key ingredient in physics, appearing in the strong, weak, electromagnetic, and gravitational interactions. Yet as has often been noted, these are not really symmetries in the usual sense. Rather, they are *redundancies*: different vector potentials or coordinate systems describe the same physical state. Why redundancy should be so important is puzzling, but it seems to be, and most attempts to unify are based on embedding the local symmetries at low energy into larger groups such as $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1) \rightarrow SU(5)$. In weakly coupled four dimensional theories, the size of the gauge group can only get larger at higher energies.

There have been various arguments made that at strong coupling the reverse could be true, but convincing examples have only come with the understanding of strongly coupled dynamics in supersymmetric gauge and string theories. There are now many examples of composite gauge fields in the low energy theory, gauge fields not among the original short-distance fields (Intriligator and Seiberg, 1995). The interpretation of gauge symmetry is reversed: gauge symmetry is ubiquitous not because it is present in the underlying ultraviolet theory, but because it is infrared stable. That is, it is one of the few kinds of interesting long-distance dynamics which is *natural*, which doesn't disappear when small changes are made in the short-distance parameters.

4.5 Black Holes

In the early 1970's it was found that classical black holes obey laws directly analogous to the laws of thermodynamics.¹⁸ This analogy was made sharper by Hawking's discovery (1975) that black holes radiate as black bodies at the corresponding temperature. Under this analogy, the entropy of a black hole (the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy) is the area of its horizon divided by $4l_P^2$.

It has long been a goal to find a statistical mechanical theory associated with this thermodynamics, and in particular to associate the entropy with the density of states of the black hole. Many arguments (too many to review here) have been put forward in this direction. While it may develop that some of the principles behind these are correct, until recently there was no example where the states of a black hole could be counted in a controlled way.

The idea is to count supersymmetric (BPS) black hole states. Such black holes always carry gauge charges and have the maximum allowed charge to mass ratio—they are extremal. As discussed in section 2.2, the number

¹⁸For a review, see for example Carter (1979).




Figure 7: Collection of weakly coupled D-particles with some attached strings, the weakly coupled limit of certain black holes.

of BPS states cannot change as we vary the string coupling constant. As the coupling is reduced and so the gravitational interaction weakened, certain black holes will at sufficiently weak coupling no longer look like black holes.¹⁹ Rather, they look like a collection of D-particles as depicted in figure 7; this has the same charge-to-mass ratio as the black hole. The D-particles are a weakly coupled quantum system whose spectrum is explicitly known from D-brane methods. The density of BPS states is just that given by the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy (Strominger and Vafa, 1996, and much subsequent work; for a review see Horowitz, 1996).

Closely associated with all this is the black hole information paradox. A black hole of given mass and charge can be formed in a very large number of ways. It will then evaporate, and the final state is black body radiation that does not depend on how the black hole formed. Thus, many initial states evolve to a single final state. This violates the usual laws of quantum mechanics.

¹⁹This depends on how the mass scales with the coupling. Other black holes continue to look like black holes no matter how weak the coupling becomes. The BPS strategy was applied to these by Larsen and Wilczek (1995), but here one does not have an explicit understanding of the space of states even at weak coupling.

There are various schools of thought here (reviewed in Page, 1993). The proposal of Hawking (1976) is that this is just the way things are: the laws of quantum mechanics need to be changed. There is also strong opposition to this view. The problem is not that theorists believe that the laws of quantum mechanics are in their final form—they may be, though most of us would like to see a less mysterious structure. Rather, it is that the specific modification required here, the replacement of wavefunctions with density matrices, seems ugly and very possibly inconsistent.

The principal alternative, that the initial state is encoded in subtle correlations in the Hawking radiation, sounds plausible but in fact is even more radical.²⁰ The problem is that Hawking radiation emerges from the region of the horizon, where the geometry is smooth and so ordinary low energy field theory should be valid. One can follow the Hawking radiation and see correlations develop between the fields inside and outside the black hole; the superposition principle then forbids the necessary correlations to exist strictly among the fields outside. To evade this requires that the locality principle in quantum field theory break down in some long-ranged but subtle way. There is a proposal for how this might occur in string theory (Susskind, 1993, 1995; Lowe, Polchinski, Susskind, Thorlacius, and Uglum, 1995), but it is controversial.

The recent progress in string duality suggests that black holes do obey the ordinary rules of quantum mechanics. The multiplets include black holes along with various nonsingular states, and in figure 7 we have continuously deformed a black hole into a system which obeys ordinary quantum mechanics, at least to high accuracy. This is certainly not decisive, however. The problem is that dynamical properties are not like the counting of BPS states;

²⁰The third major alternative is that the evaporation ends in a remnant, a Planck-mass object having an enormous number of internal states. This might be stable or might release its information over an exceedingly long time scale. My own interpretation of string duality is that it disfavors this idea, as near-extremal black holes have not been found to have the enormous number of states that it would require.

they are not invariant under changes in parameters. It could be that as the coupling constant is increased, a critical coupling is reached where the D-particles collapse into a black hole. At this coupling there could be a discontinuous change (or a smooth crossover) from ordinary quantum behavior to information loss. It is an open question whether D-branes will give insight into the dynamical behavior of black holes; there are hints that it may be so.

5 Conclusions

So when will string theory make sharp predictions? Probably not until the vacuum is understood, as we discussed in section 2.3. An important problem remains in our understanding of the vacuum, when we try to calculate the vacuum energy density, the cosmological constant. The vacuum is a complicated place, and there are many different contributions to the energy density—the zero point energies of the quantum fields, the potential energy of the Higgs field, the energy of the strongly fluctuating QCD fields. The total of the separate densities is at least 10^8 GeV^4 , and there is no reason known that they should cancel to any degree of accuracy. Yet the experimental bound on the cosmological constant is 55 orders of magnitude smaller than this (see Weinberg, 1989, for a review).

This is just as much problem in quantum field theory as in string theory but field theory can still make precise predictions because it is less ambitious. One can ignore gravity, or add a free parameter and adjust it to cancel the other contributions to the cosmological constant. In string theory, neither of these is possible.

Does string duality help here? Possibly. It is an interesting fact that in supersymmetric theories the energy density can cancel naturally. For example the zero point energies of bosons and their fermionic partners are equal and opposite. One can see this in the discussion of BPS states: a supersymmetric vacuum has zero energy (though the inclusion of supergravity makes things a

bit more subtle). In nature, though, supersymmetry must be spontaneously broken—there is no charged boson degenerate with the electron—and spontaneous breaking spoils the cancellation of the cosmological constant. We need some new phase of supersymmetric theories, in which the boson/fermion degeneracy is removed while the vacuum energy remains zero. Witten (1995b) has suggested how such a phase might appear in strongly coupled string theory.

From another point of view, the cosmological constant and black hole information problems both seem to require subtle nonlocalities in spacetime. For the information problem we have discussed this; for the cosmological constant, the point is that the low energy value of this constant must somehow feed back into the short-distance physics that determines it. For example, it was argued that spacetime wormholes could accomplish this (Coleman, 1988). This proposal was the subject of intense and skeptical scrutiny, but the subject ground to a halt because a nonperturbative formulation of quantum gravity was lacking. It may then be that it will return, possibly in some transmuted form, when we know what string theory is.

In closing, let me say that there is a sense among those working in string theory that we are dealing with a unique and remarkable structure, one which has many points of contact with the physics we know and with earlier attempts to unify it—quantum mechanics, gravity, gauge symmetry, chirality, grand unification, supersymmetry, and Kaluza-Klein theory. There is also a sense that we are discovering this structure, not inventing it.

The distinction is illustrated, for example, by the question of the nature of spacetime. There have been many previous attempts to modify spacetime in a way that would look the same at long distance but would solve the problems of quantum gravity. This approach has often been sterile—it is not a problem that seems to yield to direct effort. String theory, on the other hand, starts with a flat spacetime. One discovers first that the spacetime is dynamical, that the theory contains gravity. Later one finds, as mentioned

in section 3.5, that spacetime topology is not a physical invariant but can change in specific and controlled ways. There is still more to be learned. In perturbation theory it seems that the shortest sensible distance is the string length scale, the typical radius of zero point vibrations of the string (Gross and Mende, 1987; Amati, Ciafaloni, and Veneziano, 1989; reviewed in Witten, 1996c). This works out to be the Planck length divided by a power of the string coupling. There is evidence for a somewhat shorter scale in the exact theory (Shenker, 1995), and that D-branes may probe it (Bachas, 1995; Danielsson, Ferretti and Sundborg, 1995; Kabat and Pouliot, 1995). Moreover, there is a sense in which the spacetime coordinates for D-branes are elevated from numbers to matrices (Witten, 1996a); only at low energy the matrices are diagonal and an ordinary spacetime picture holds. It may turn that this is a curiosity, or it may signal a new uncertainty principle relating to a minimum distance. Exploring the connection between D-branes and black holes is a likely way to learn which. In effect, string theory is smarter than we are. It knows what spacetime is, and we don't, and we have to figure out how to ask it.

We are very fortunate that this remarkable structure exists and that it seems to be within our power to understand it.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Gary Horowitz, Clifford Johnson, and Andy Strominger for their suggestions on the manuscript. This work is supported by NSF grants PHY91-16964 and PHY94-07194.

References

- U. Amaldi, W. de Boer, and H. Furstenau, 1991, “Comparison of Grand Unified Theories with Electroweak and Strong Coupling Constants Measured at LEP,” Phys. Lett. **B260**, 447.
- D. Amati, M. Ciafaloni, and G. Veneziano, 1989, “Can Spacetime Be Probed Below the String Scale?” Phys. Lett. **B216**, 41.
- P. S. Aspinwall, B. R. Greene, and D. R. Morrison, 1993, “Multiple Mirror Manifolds and Topology Change in String Theory,” Phys. Lett. **B303**, 249, e-print hep-th/9301043.
- C. Bachas, 1996, “D-Brane Dynamics,” Phys. Lett. **B374**, 37, e-print hep-th/9511043.
- E. Bergshoeff, E. Sezgin, and P.K. Townsend, 1987, “Supermembranes and Eleven Dimensional Supergravity,” Phys. Lett. **B189**, 75.
- P. Candelas, G. Horowitz, A. Strominger, and E. Witten, 1985, “Vacuum Configurations for Superstrings,” Nucl. Phys. **B258**, 46.
- B. Carter, 1979, “The General Theory of the Mechanical, Electromagnetic, and Thermodynamic Properties of Black Holes,” in *General Relativity. An Einstein Centennial Survey*, ed. S. W. Hawking and W. Israel (Cambridge, Cambridge).
- S. Coleman, 1988, “Why There is Nothing Rather Than Something: A Theory of the Cosmological Constant,” Nucl. Phys. **B310**, 643.
- E. D. Commins and P. H. Bucksbaum, 1983, *Weak Interactions of Leptons and Quarks* (Cambridge, New York).
- E. Cremmer, B. Julia, and J. Scherk, 1978, “Supergravity Theory in Eleven Dimensions,” Phys. Lett. **76B**, 409.
- A. Dabholkar, 1995, “Ten-Dimensional Heterotic String as a Soliton,” Phys. Lett. **B357**, 307, e-print hep-th/9506160.
- J. Dai, R. G. Leigh, and J. Polchinski, 1989, “New Connections Between String Theories,” Mod. Phys. Lett. **A4**, 2073.
- U. H. Danielsson, G. Ferretti, and B. Sundborg, 1996, “D-Particle Dynamics

- and Bound States,” preprint USITP-96-03, e-print hep-th/9603081.
- P. A. M. Dirac, 1931, “Quantized Singularities in the Electromagnetic Field,” Proc. Roy. Soc. **A133**, 60.
- M. J. Duff, P.S. Howe, T. Inami, and K.S. Stelle, 1987, “Superstrings in $D = 10$ from Supermembranes in $D = 11$,” Phys. Lett. **191B**, 70.
- M. J. Duff, 1988, “Supermembranes: The First Fifteen Weeks,” Class. Quant. Grav. **5**, 189.
- M. J. Duff, 1995, “Strong/Weak Duality from the Dual String,” Nucl. Phys. **B442**, 47, e-print hep-th/9506057.
- A. Font, L. Ibanez, D. Lust, and F. Quevedo, 1990, “Strong-Weak Coupling Duality and Nonperturbative Effects in String Theory,” Phys. Lett. **B249**, 35.
- F. Gliozzi, J. Scherk, and D. Olive, 1977, “Supersymmetry, Supergravity Theories, and the Dual Spinor Model,” Nucl. Phys. **B122**, 253; reprinted in Schwarz, 1985, Vol. 1, 300.
- M. B. Green and J. H. Schwarz, 1984, “Anomaly Cancellations in Supersymmetric $D = 10$ Gauge Theory and Superstring Theory,” Phys. Lett. **136B**, 367; reprinted in Schwarz, 1985, Vol. 2, 1007.
- M. B. Green, J. H. Schwarz, and E. Witten, 1987, *Superstring Theory, Vols. 1 and 2* (Cambridge, Cambridge).
- B. R. Greene, D. R. Morrison, and A. Strominger, 1995, “Black Hole Condensation and the Unification of String Vacua,” Nucl. Phys. **B451**, 109, e-print hep-th/9504145 .
- D. J. Gross, J. A. Harvey, E. Martinec, and R. Rohm, 1985, “Heterotic String,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **54**, 502.
- R. Haag, J. T. Lopuszanski, and M. Sohnius, 1975, “All Possible Generators of Supersymmetries of the S Matrix,” Nucl. Phys. **B88**, 257.
- J. A. Harvey and A. Strominger, 1995, “The Heterotic String is a Soliton,” Nucl. Phys. **B449**, 535, (E) **B458**, 456, e-print hep-th/9504047.
- J. A. Harvey, 1996, “Magnetic Monopoles, Duality, and Supersymmetry,”

- Chicago preprint EFI-96-06, e-print hep-th/9603086.
- S. W. Hawking, 1975, “Particle Creation by Black Holes,” *Comm. Math. Phys.* **43**, 199.
- S. W. Hawking, 1976, “Breakdown of Predictability in Gravitational Collapse,” *Phys. Rev.* **D14**, 2460.
- P. Horava and E. Witten, 1996, “Heterotic and Type I String Dynamics from Eleven Dimensions,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B460**, 506, e-print hep-th/9510209.
- G. T. Horowitz, 1996, “The Origin of Black Hole Entropy in String Theory,” UCSB preprint UCSBTH-96-07, e-print gr-qc/9604051.
- C. M. Hull and P. K. Townsend, 1995, “Unity of Superstring Dualities,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B438**, 109, e-print hep-th/9410167.
- C. M. Hull, 1995, “String-String Duality in Ten-Dimensions,” *Phys. Lett.* **B357**, 545, e-print hep-th/9506194.
- K. Intriligator and N. Seiberg, 1995, “Lectures on Supersymmetric Gauge Theories and Electric - Magnetic Duality,” presented at TASI 95, Boulder, Colo., Trieste Summer School, Trieste, Italy, and Cargese Summer School, Cargese, France, Rutgers preprint RU-95-48, e-print hep-th/9509066.
- D. Kabat and P. Pouliot, “A Comment on Zero-Brane Quantum Mechanics,” Rutgers preprint RU-96-17, e-print hep-th/9603127.
- V. S. Kaplunovsky, 1988, “One Loop Effects in String Unification,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B307**, 145, (E) **B382**, 436 (1992), e-print hep-th/9205070.
- D. A. Lowe, J. Polchinski, L. Susskind, L. Thorlacius, and J. Uglum, 1995, “Black Hole Complementarity versus Locality,” *Phys. Rev.* **D52**, 6997, e-print hep-th/9506138.
- C. Montonen and D. Olive, 1977, “Magnetic Monopoles as Gauge Particles?” *Phys. Lett.* **72B**, 117.
- A. Neveu and J. Scherk, 1972, “Connection Between Yang-Mills Fields and Dual Models,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B36**, 155.
- H. Osborn, 1979, “Topological Charges for $N = 4$ Supersymmetric Gauge Theories and Monopoles of Spin 1,” *Phys. Lett.* **83B**, 321.

- D. N. Page, 1993, “Black Hole Information,” Canadian Gen. Rel. **1993**, 1, e-print hep-th/9305040.
- J. Polchinski, 1994, “What is String Theory?” Les Houches Summer School, Session 62: Fluctuating Geometries in Statistical Mechanics and Field Theory, 1994, e-print hep-th/9411028
- J. Polchinski, 1995, “Dirichlet-Branes and Ramond-Ramond Charges,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 4724, e-print hep-th/9510017.
- J. Polchinski and E. Witten, 1996, “Evidence for Heterotic - Type I String Duality,” Nucl. Phys. **B460**, 525, e-print hep-th/9510169.
- J. Polchinski, S. Chaudhuri, and C. V. Johnson, 1996, “Notes on D-Branes,” ITP preprint NSF-ITP-96-003, e-print hep-th/9602052.
- P. Ramond, 1971, “Dual Theory for Free Fermions,” Phys. Rev. **D3**, 2415; reprinted in Schwarz, 1985, Vol. 1, 53.
- A. Salam, 1980, “Grand Unification of Fundamental Forces,” Rev. Mod. Phys. **52**, 525.
- J. Scherk and J. H. Schwarz, 1974, “Dual Models for Non-Hadrons,” Nucl. Phys. **B81**, 118; reprinted in Schwarz, 1985, Vol. 1, 191.
- J. Scherk and J. H. Schwarz, 1975, “Dual Model Approach to a Renormalizable Theory of Gravitation,” Caltech preprint CALT-58-488; reprinted in Schwarz, 1985, Vol. 1, 218.
- J. H. Schwarz, 1985, *Superstrings. The First 15 Years of Superstring Theory, Vols. 1 and 2* (World Scientific, Singapore).
- J. H. Schwarz, 1995, “An $SL(2, Z)$ Multiplet of Type IIB Superstrings,” Phys. Lett. **B360**, 13, (E) **B364**, 252, e-print hep-th/9508143.
- N. Seiberg, 1994, “Exact Results on the Space of Vacua of Four-Dimensional SUSY Gauge Theories,” Phys. Rev. **D49**, 6857, e-print hep-th/9402044.
- N. Seiberg, 1995, “The Power of Duality: Exact Results in 4-D SUSY Field Theory,” Rutgers preprint RU-95-37, e-print hep-th/9506077.
- A. Sen, 1994, “Strong - Weak Coupling Duality in Four-Dimensional String Theory,” Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A9**, 3707, e-print hep-th/9402002.

- A. Sen, 1995a, “String String Duality Conjecture in Six-Dimensions and Charged Solitonic Strings,” Nucl. Phys. **B450**, 103, e-print hep-th/9504027.
- A. Sen, 1995b, “A Note on Marginally Stable Bound States in Type II String Theory,” Mehta preprint MRI-PHY-23-95, e-print hep-th/9510229.
- S. H. Shenker, 1991, “The Strength of Nonperturbative Effects in String Theory,” in *Random Surfaces and Quantum Gravity*, eds. O. Alvarez, E. Marinari, and P. Windey (Plenum, 1991).
- S. H. Shenker, 1995, “Another Length Scale in String Theory?” Rutgers preprint RU-95-53, e-print hep-th/9509132.
- A. Strominger, 1990, “Heterotic Solitons,” Nucl. Phys. **B343**, 167, (E) **B353**, 565.
- A. Strominger and C. Vafa, 1996, “Microscopic Origin of the Bekenstein-Hawking Entropy,” preprint HUTP-96-A002, e-print hep-th/9601029.
- L. Susskind, 1993, “String Theory and the Principles of Black Hole Complementarity,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 2367, e-print hep-th/9307168
- L. Susskind, 1995, “The World as a Hologram,” J. Math. Phys. **36**, 6377, e-print hep-th/9409089.
- P. K. Townsend, 1995, “The Eleven-Dimensional Supermembrane Revisited,” Phys. Lett. **B350**, 184, e-print hep-th/9501068.
- S. Weinberg, 1980, “Conceptual Foundations of the Unified Theory of Weak and Electromagnetic Interactions,” Rev. Mod. Phys. **52**, 515.
- S. Weinberg, 1989, “The Cosmological Constant Problem,” Rev. Mod. Phys. **61**, 1.
- K. Wilson, 1983, “The Renormalization Group and Critical Phenomena,” Rev. Mod. Phys. **55**, 515.
- E. Witten and D. Olive, 1978, “Supersymmetry Algebras that Include Topological Charges,” Phys. Lett. **78B**, 97.
- E. Witten, 1981, “Search for a Realistic Kaluza-Klein Theory,” Nucl. Phys. **B186**, 412.
- E. Witten, 1995a, “String Theory Dynamics in Various Dimensions,” Nucl.

- Phys. **B443**, 85, e-print hep-th/9503124.
- E. Witten, 1995b, “Strong Coupling and the Cosmological Constant,” Mod. Phys. Lett. **A10**, 2153, e-print hep-th/9506101.
- E. Witten, 1996a, “Bound States of Strings and p -Branes,” Nucl. Phys. **B460**, 335, e-print hep-th/9510135.
- E. Witten, 1996b, “Strong-Coupling Expansion of Calabi-Yau Compactification,” IAS preprint IASSNS-HEP-96-08, e-print hep-th/9602070.
- E. Witten, 1996c, “Reflections on the Fate of Spacetime,” Phys. Today **49**, 4, 5.