

Vacuum condensates and ‘ether-drift’ experiments

M. Consoli, A. Pagano and L. Pappalardo

Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Catania
and Dipartimento di Fisica dell’ Università
Via Santa Sofia 64, 95123 Catania, Italy

Abstract

The idea of a ‘condensed’ vacuum state is generally accepted in modern elementary particle physics. We argue that this should motivate a new generation of precise ‘ether-drift’ experiments with present-day technology.

1. The idea of a ‘condensed’ vacuum is generally accepted in modern elementary particle physics. Indeed, in many different contexts one introduces a set of elementary quanta whose perturbative ‘empty’ vacuum state $|o\rangle$ is not the physical ground of the interacting theory. In the physically relevant case of the Standard Model, the situation can be summarized saying [1] that ”What we experience as empty space is nothing but the configuration of the Higgs field that has the lowest possible energy. If we move from field jargon to particle jargon, this means that empty space is actually filled with Higgs particles. They have Bose condensed.”

In this case, where the condensing quanta are just neutral spinless particles (the ‘phions’ [2]), the translation from ‘field jargon to particle jargon’, amounts to establish a well defined functional relation (see ref.[2]) $n = n(\phi^2)$ between the average particle density n in the $\mathbf{k} = 0$ mode and the average value of the scalar field $\langle\Phi\rangle = \phi$. Thus, Bose condensation is just a consequence of the minimization condition of the effective potential $V_{\text{eff}}(\phi)$. This has absolute minima at some values $\phi = \pm v \neq 0$ for which $n(v^2) = \bar{n} \neq 0$ [2].

The symmetric phase, where $\langle\Phi\rangle = 0$ and $n = 0$, will eventually be re-established at a phase transition temperature $T = T_c$. This, in the Standard Model, is so high that one can safely approximate the ordinary vacuum as a zero-temperature system (for comparison think of ^4He at a temperature of 10^{-12} °K). This observation provides the argument to represent the vacuum as a quantum Bose liquid, i.e. a medium where bodies can flow without any apparent friction, as in superfluid ^4He , in agreement with the experimental results.

On the other hand, the condensed particle-physics vacuum, while certainly different from the ether of classical physics, is also different from the ‘empty’ space-time of Special Relativity which is assumed at the base of axiomatic quantum field theory. Therefore, following this line of thought, one may ask whether the macroscopic occupation of the same quantum state ($\mathbf{k} = 0$ in a given reference frame) can represent the operative construction of a ‘quantum ether’ whose existence might be detected through a precise ‘ether-drift’ experiment, of the type performed at the end of nineteenth century and in the first half of twentieth century. This question leads to the basic issue of a Lorentz-covariant description of the vacuum that will be addressed in the following section.

2. Although widely accepted, vacuum condensation is usually considered just a convenient way to rearrange the set of original degrees of freedom. In this perspective, all differences between the physical vacuum and empty space are believed to be reabsorbable into some basic parameters, such as the particle masses and few physical constants, while leaving for the rest an exact Lorentz-covariant theory.

On a more formal ground we observe, however, that the coexistence of *exact* Lorentz covariance and vacuum condensation in *effective* quantum field theories is not so trivial. In fact, as a consequence of the violations of locality at the energy scale fixed by the ultraviolet cutoff Λ [3], one may be faced with non-Lorentz-covariant *infrared* effects that depend on the vacuum structure.

This phenomenon can be understood in very simple terms starting from the observation that, in a cutoff theory, the elementary quanta are treated as ‘hard spheres’ of radius $a \sim 1/\Lambda$, as for the molecules of ordinary matter. For the same reason, however, the simple idea that deviations from Lorentz-covariance take only place at the cutoff scale is incorrect. In fact, it is true that in the perturbative empty vacuum state (with no condensed quanta) non-locality is restricted to very short wavelengths $2\pi/|\mathbf{k}| \leq a$. However, in a condensed vacuum, the hard spheres will ‘touch’ each other giving rise to the propagation of *long-wavelength* density fluctuations that, by definition, cannot be described in a Lorentz-covariant way.

To indicate this type of infrared-ultraviolet connection, originating from vacuum condensation in effective quantum field theories, Volovik [4] has introduced a very appropriate name: reentrant violations of special relativity in the low-energy corner. In the simplest case of spontaneous symmetry breaking in a $\lambda\Phi^4$ theory, where the condensing quanta are just neutral spinless particles, the ‘reentrant’ effects reduce to a small shell of three-momenta, say $|\mathbf{k}| < \delta$, where the energy spectrum deviates from a Lorentz-covariant form. Namely, by denoting M_H as the typical energy scale associated with the Lorentz-covariant part of the energy spectrum, one finds $\frac{\delta}{M_H} \rightarrow 0$ only when $\frac{M_H}{\Lambda} \rightarrow 0$.

The basic ingredient to detect such ‘reentrant’ effects in the broken phase consists in a purely quantum-field-theoretical result: the connected zero-four-momentum propagator $G^{-1}(k=0)$ is a two-valued function [5, 6]. In fact, besides the well known solution $G_a^{-1}(k=0) = M_H^2$, one also finds $G_b^{-1}(k=0) = 0$.

The b-type of solution corresponds to processes where absorbing (or emitting) a very small 3-momentum $\mathbf{k} \rightarrow 0$ does not cost a finite energy. This situation is well known in a condensed medium, where a small 3-momentum can be coherently distributed among a large number of elementary constituents, and corresponds to the hydrodynamical regime of density fluctuations whose wavelengths $2\pi/|\mathbf{k}|$ are *larger* than r_{mfp} , the mean free path for the elementary constituents.

This interpretation [7, 8] of the gap-less branch, which is very natural on the base of general arguments, is unavoidable in a superfluid medium. In fact, “Any quantum liquid consisting of particles with integral spin (such as the liquid isotope ^4He) must certainly have

a spectrum of this type...In a quantum Bose liquid, elementary excitations with small momenta \mathbf{k} (wavelengths large compared with distances between atoms) correspond to ordinary hydrodynamic sound waves, i.e. are phonons. This means that the energy of such quasi-particles is a linear function of their momentum” [9]. In this sense, a superfluid vacuum provides for $\mathbf{k} \rightarrow 0$ a universal picture. This result does not depend on the details of the short-distance interaction and even on the nature of the elementary constituents. For instance, the same coarse-grained description is found in superfluid fermionic vacua [10] that, as compared to the Higgs vacuum, bear the same relation of superfluid ^3He to superfluid ^4He .

Thus there are two possible types of excitations with the same quantum numbers but different energies when the 3-momentum $\mathbf{k} \rightarrow 0$: a single-particle massive one, with $E_a(\mathbf{k}) \rightarrow M_H$, and a collective gap-less one with $E_b(\mathbf{k}) \rightarrow 0$. ‘A priori’, they can both propagate (and interfere) in the broken-symmetry phase. Therefore, the situation is very similar to superfluid ^4He , where the observed energy spectrum is due to the peculiar transition from the ‘phonon branch’ to the ‘roton branch’ at a momentum scale $|\mathbf{k}_o|$ where

$$E_{\text{phonon}}(\mathbf{k}_o) \sim E_{\text{roton}}(\mathbf{k}_o) \quad (1)$$

The analog for the Higgs condensate amounts to an energy spectrum with the following limiting behaviours :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{i) } E(\mathbf{k}) &\rightarrow E_b(\mathbf{k}) = c_s |\mathbf{k}| && \text{for } \mathbf{k} \rightarrow 0 \\ \text{ii) } E(\mathbf{k}) &\rightarrow E_a(\mathbf{k}) = M_H + \frac{\mathbf{k}^2}{2M_H} && \text{for } |\mathbf{k}| \gtrsim \delta \end{aligned}$$

where the characteristic momentum scale $\delta \ll M_H$, at which $E_a(\delta) \sim E_b(\delta)$, marks the transition from collective to single-particle excitations. This occurs for

$$\delta \sim 1/r_{\text{mfp}} \quad (2)$$

where [11, 12]

$$r_{\text{mfp}} \sim \frac{1}{\bar{n}a^2} \quad (3)$$

is the phion mean free path, for a given value of the phion density $n = \bar{n}$ and a given value of the phion-phion scattering length a . In terms of the same quantities, one also finds [2]

$$M_H^2 \sim \bar{n}a \quad (4)$$

giving the trend of the dimensionless ratios ($\Lambda \sim 1/a$)

$$\frac{\delta}{M_H} \sim \frac{M_H}{\Lambda} \sim \sqrt{\bar{n}a^3} \rightarrow 0 \quad (5)$$

in the continuum limit where $a \rightarrow 0$ and the mass scale $\bar{n}a$ is held fixed.

By taking into account the above results, the physical decomposition of the scalar field in the broken phase can be conveniently expressed as (phys=‘physical’) [13]

$$\Phi_{\text{phys}}(x) = v_R + h(x) + H(x) \quad (6)$$

with

$$h(x) = \sum_{|\mathbf{k}| < \delta} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\mathcal{V}E_k}} \left[\tilde{h}_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x} - E_k t)} + (\tilde{h}_{\mathbf{k}})^\dagger e^{-i(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x} - E_k t)} \right] \quad (7)$$

and

$$H(x) = \sum_{|\mathbf{k}| > \delta} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\mathcal{V}E_k}} \left[\tilde{H}_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x} - E_k t)} + (\tilde{H}_{\mathbf{k}})^\dagger e^{-i(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x} - E_k t)} \right] \quad (8)$$

where \mathcal{V} is the quantization volume and $E_k = c_s |\mathbf{k}|$ for $|\mathbf{k}| < \delta$ while $E_k = \sqrt{\mathbf{k}^2 + M_H^2}$ for $|\mathbf{k}| > \delta$. Also, $c_s \delta \sim M_H$.

Eqs.(6)-(8) replace the more conventional relations

$$\Phi_{\text{phys}}(x) = v_R + H(x) \quad (9)$$

where

$$H(x) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\mathcal{V}E_k}} \left[\tilde{H}_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x} - E_k t)} + (\tilde{H}_{\mathbf{k}})^\dagger e^{-i(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x} - E_k t)} \right] \quad (10)$$

with $E_k = \sqrt{\mathbf{k}^2 + M_H^2}$. Eqs.(9) and (10) are reobtained in the limit $\frac{\delta}{M_H} \sim \frac{M_H}{\Lambda} \rightarrow 0$ where $h(x)$ disappears and the broken phase has only massive excitations thus recovering an exactly Lorentz-covariant theory.

3. Let us now return to the basic question posed at the end of Section 1. For finite values of Λ there are long-wavelength density fluctuations of the vacuum and Lorentz-covariance is not exact. Therefore, in the presence of such effects, can we try to detect the existence of the scalar condensate through a precise ‘ether-drift’ experiment ?

We first observe that a simple physical interpretation of the long-wavelength density fluctuation field

$$\varphi(x) \equiv \frac{h(x)}{v_R} \quad (11)$$

has been proposed in refs.[7, 8]. Introducing $G_F \equiv 1/v_R^2$ and choosing the momentum scale δ as

$$\delta = \sqrt{\frac{G_N M_H^2}{G_F}} \quad (12)$$

(G_N being the Newton constant) one obtains the identification

$$\varphi(x) = U_N(x) \quad (13)$$

$U_N(x)$ being the Newton potential. Indeed, with the choice in Eq.(12), to first order in φ and in the limits of slow motions, the equations of motion for φ reduce to the Poisson equation for the Newton potential U_N [7, 8] so that the deviations from Lorentz covariance are of gravitational strength. If, as in the Standard Model, G_F is taken to be the Fermi constant one then finds $\delta \sim 10^{-5}$ eV and $r_{\text{mfp}} \sim 1/\delta = \mathcal{O}(1)$ cm. As anticipated, the variation of $\varphi(x)$ takes place over distances that are larger than r_{mfp} and thus infinitely large on the elementary particle scale. Also, by introducing $M_{\text{Planck}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{G_N}}$, and using Eqs.(5) and (12), one finds $\Lambda = q_H M_{\text{Planck}}$ with $q_H = \sqrt{G_F M_H^2} = \mathcal{O}(1)$, or $a \sim 1/\Lambda \sim 10^{-33}$ cm.

At the same time, to first order, the observable effects of φ can be re-absorbed [8] into an effective metric structure

$$ds^2 = (1 + 2\varphi)dt^2 - (1 - 2\varphi)(dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2) \quad (14)$$

that agrees with the first approximation to the line element of General Relativity [14, 15]. In this perspective, the space-time curvature arises from a re-scaling of the space-time units and from a refractive index for light propagation

$$\mathcal{N}(\varphi) \sim 1 - 2\varphi \quad (15)$$

so that the speed of light in the condensate frame (in units of $c = 2.9979...10^{10}$ cm/sec) is

$$u \sim 1 + 2\varphi \quad (16)$$

Now, quite in general and within Special Relativity (see page 145 of ref.[16]), a value $\mathcal{N} \neq 1$ implies a non-zero drag coefficient k

$$k = 1 - \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}^2} \sim -4\varphi \quad (17)$$

so that, for an observer S' moving with respect to the condensate frame with velocity v , and to first-order, light would propagate at a velocity

$$u'(v) = u - kv \quad (18)$$

as for standard Galilei transformations with a reduced relative velocity kv .

4. This type of space-time picture leads naturally to the classical ‘ether-drift’ experiments performed by Michelson and Morley [17], Illingworth [18] and Miller [19] that have been recently re-analyzed by Cahill and Kitto [20]. Their conclusion is very simple and suggests the solution of the long-standing problem concerning the nature of the observed effects. Namely, provided in those old experiments one takes into account the refractive index $\mathcal{N}_{\text{medium}}$ of the dielectric medium used in the interferometer (air or helium), the observations become consistent [20] with the earth’s velocity $v_{\text{earth}} = 365 \pm 18$ km/sec extracted from a fit to the COBE data for the cosmic background radiation [21]. In fact, the fringe shifts are proportional to $\frac{v_{\text{earth}}^2}{c^2} (1 - \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_{\text{medium}}^2})$ rather than to $\frac{v_{\text{earth}}^2}{c^2}$ itself.

Cahill and Kitto used in their derivation a ‘Lorentzian’ approach. In this perspective, measuring devices are dynamically affected by their absolute motion in such a way that this motion becomes unobservable [22, 23]. However, if light propagates in a medium with $\mathcal{N}_{\text{medium}} \neq 1$, there is a small mismatch so that absolute motion may become observable. In the following we shall argue that this effect is not in contradiction with Special Relativity.

To this end, let us introduce an observer S' that moves in an infinite, isotropical and homogeneous medium that defines an observer S . Let us also consider two light beams, say 1 and 2, that are perpendicular in S where they propagate along the x and y axis with velocities $u_x(1) = u_y(2) = u = \frac{c}{\mathcal{N}_{\text{medium}}}$. Let us also assume that the velocity v of S' is along the x axis. In this case, to evaluate the velocities of 1 and 2 for S' , we can apply Lorentz transformations with the result

$$u'_x(1) = \frac{u - v}{1 - \frac{uv}{c^2}} \quad u'_y(1) = 0 \quad (19)$$

and

$$u'_x(2) = -v \quad u'_y(2) = u \sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}} \quad (20)$$

In this way, a Lorentz transformation is equivalent to a local anisotropy that becomes larger and larger by increasing the value of v .

Let us now define L'_A and L'_B to be the lengths of two optical paths, say A and B, as measured in the S' frame. For instance, they can represent the lengths of the arms of an interferometer which is at rest in the S' frame. In the first experimental set-up, the arm of length L'_A is taken along the direction of motion associated with the beam 1 while the arm of length L'_B lies along the direction of the beam 2. Notice that the two arms, in the S' frame, form an angle that differs from 90° by $\mathcal{O}(v/c)$ terms.

Therefore, using the above results, the time for the beam 1 to go forth and back along

L'_A is

$$T'_A = L'_A \left(\frac{1 - uv/c^2}{u - v} + \frac{1 + uv/c^2}{u + v} \right) \sim \frac{2L'_A}{u} \left(1 + k_{\text{medium}} \frac{v^2}{u^2} \right) \quad (21)$$

where

$$k_{\text{medium}} = 1 - \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_{\text{medium}}^2} \quad (22)$$

To evaluate the time T'_B , for the beam 2 to go forth and back along the arm of length L'_B , one has first to compute the modulus of its velocity in the S' frame

$$u' = \sqrt{(u'_x(2))^2 + ((u'_y(2))^2} = u \sqrt{1 + k_{\text{medium}} \frac{v^2}{u^2}} \quad (23)$$

and then use the relation $u'T'_B = 2L'_B$ thus obtaining

$$T'_B = \frac{2L'_B}{u'} \sim \frac{2L'_B}{u} \left(1 - k_{\text{medium}} \frac{v^2}{2u^2} \right) \quad (24)$$

In this way, the interference pattern, between the light beam coming out of the optical path A and that coming out of the optical path B, is determined by the delay time

$$\Delta T' = T'_A - T'_B \sim \frac{2L'_A}{u} \left(1 + k_{\text{medium}} \frac{v^2}{u^2} \right) - \frac{2L'_B}{u} \left(1 - k_{\text{medium}} \frac{v^2}{2u^2} \right) \quad (25)$$

On the other hand, if the beam 2 were to propagate along the optical path A and the beam 1 along B, one would obtain a different delay time, namely

$$(\Delta T')_{\text{rot}} = (T'_A - T'_B)_{\text{rot}} \sim \frac{2L'_A}{u} \left(1 - k_{\text{medium}} \frac{v^2}{2u^2} \right) - \frac{2L'_B}{u} \left(1 + k_{\text{medium}} \frac{v^2}{u^2} \right) \quad (26)$$

so that, by rotating the apparatus, there will be a fringe shift proportional to

$$(\Delta T') - (\Delta T')_{\text{rot}} \sim \frac{3(L'_A + L'_B)}{u} k_{\text{medium}} \frac{v^2}{u^2} \quad (27)$$

In this way S' will now be able to determine its ‘absolute’ velocity in complete agreement with Special Relativity. In fact, for S' Eq.(27) is the only way to detect the existence of the S observer through the value of a velocity v whose operative definition, otherwise, would be unclear (dealing with a uniform motion in an infinite, isotropical and homogeneous medium). On the other hand, if the numerical value $\mathcal{N}_{\text{medium}} \neq 1$ were unknown, S' would try to determine S through an effective, reduced velocity $v_{\text{obs}} \sim \sqrt{k_{\text{medium}}} v$ rather than through v itself.

Now, the following question naturally arises. What happens if we remove the medium everywhere except in a small region of space that includes the arms of the interferometer ?

Will the fringes shift upon rotation of the apparatus ? At first sight, the answer is positive. In fact, the occurrence of a fringe shift by rotating an apparatus at rest in the S' frame cannot depend on the presence of the medium in the outer regions of space. After some thought, however, the answer might become negative. Indeed, one may argue that the medium is now taken at rest in the S' frame so that the two light beams should propagate with the same velocity, regardless of their orientation.

The latter expectation is based on considering now the observer S' to be physically equivalent to the observer S introduced before (for which we assumed an exactly isotropical value $u = \frac{c}{N_{\text{medium}}}$ everywhere). However, this equivalence has no rigorous basis since, differently from S' , the observer S was taken at rest in an *infinite* medium.

Therefore, the occurrence (or not) of fringe shifts becomes a purely experimental issue [24]: a way to *test* local isotropy. In practice, for the earth's velocity, and to $\mathcal{O}(\frac{v_{\text{earth}}^2}{c^2})$, one can re-analyze [20] the experiments in terms of the effective parameter

$$\epsilon = \frac{v_{\text{earth}}^2}{u^2} k_{\text{medium}} \equiv \frac{v_{\text{obs}}^2}{c^2} \quad (28)$$

and use the relevant experimental values $\mathcal{N}_{\text{air}} \sim 1.00029$ or $\mathcal{N}_{\text{helium}} \sim 1.000036$.

For instance, for $v_{\text{earth}} = 365 \pm 18$ km/sec (and an in-air-operating optical system) one predicts $\epsilon \sim 10^{-9}$ or $v_{\text{obs}} \sim 9$ km/sec, precisely Miller's result.

The comparison with the experiment of Kennedy and Thorndike can also be done along similar lines by restricting their analysis to long-period observations where they found a non-zero value $v_{\text{obs}} = 15 \pm 4$ km/sec [25].

Notice that the same analysis might even be applied to the experiment by Jaseja *et al* [26] where one was measuring the shift $\Delta\nu$ in the maser frequency ν_c introduced by the rotation of the apparatus so that $\frac{\Delta\nu}{\nu_c} \sim \epsilon$. Indeed, the results were showing a well defined shift $\Delta\nu \sim 275$ kHz or roughly one part over 10^9 in the basic frequency $\nu_c \sim 3 \cdot 10^{14}$ Hz. However, this experimental effect, well consistent with Miller's results [27], was not taken seriously and considered to be spurious "...presumably due to magnetostriction in the Invar spacers due to the earth's magnetic field". To obtain a consistency check of this interpretation, the authors of ref.[26] were indeed planning to repeat their analysis by replacing the potentially problematic parts of their apparatus. However, this improved experiment was never performed [28].

5. We are now ready to return to the density fluctuations of the scalar condensate discussed in sect.3. To this end we observe that, according to Cahill and Kitto [20] (and according to our previous analysis) in the vacuum experiments of Joos [29] and of Brillet and

Hall [30] no effect could have been observed. In fact, in this case, $\mathcal{N}_{\text{vacuum}} = 1$ exactly so that $v_{\text{obs}} = 0$. However, even the very precise Brillet and Hall experiment might be considered as showing a non-zero result, although at a level of accuracy $\sim 10^{-15}$ (see their figure 3 and the associated figure caption). Thus one might speculate on the possible effect of the non-zero refractive index Eq.(15) for which, ‘in the vacuum’, there should be, nevertheless, corrections proportional to

$$\frac{v_{\text{earth}}^2}{c^2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}^2(\varphi)}\right) \quad (29)$$

Now, transforming to ordinary units, and for a centrally symmetric field, one has

$$\varphi(R) = -\frac{G_N M}{c^2 R} \quad (30)$$

Therefore, for an apparatus placed on the earth’s surface, one finds $\varphi(R) \sim -0.7 \cdot 10^{-9}$ (for $M = M_{\text{earth}}$ and $R = R_{\text{earth}}$) and

$$\frac{v_{\text{earth}}^2}{c^2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}^2(\varphi)}\right) \sim 4 \cdot 10^{-15} \quad (31)$$

for the same value $v_{\text{earth}} = 365 \pm 18$ km/sec extracted from the COBE data. This tiny effect, which is consistent with the results obtained by Brillet and Hall, might be detected in a more precise experiment, with present-day technology and level of accuracy $\sim 10^{-16}$.

Summarizing: according to current ideas, the vacuum is not ‘empty’. Thus, one should carefully check the compatibility between exact Lorentz covariance and vacuum condensation in effective quantum field theories. For the specific case of the scalar condensate, the non-locality associated with the presence of the ultraviolet cutoff will also show up at long wavelengths in the form of non-Lorentz-covariant density fluctuations associated with a scalar function $\varphi(x)$.

If, on the base of refs.[7, 8], these long-wavelength effects are naturally interpreted in terms of the Newton potential U_N (with the identification $\varphi = U_N$), one obtains the weak-field space-time curvature of General Relativity and a refractive index $\mathcal{N} \sim 1 - 2\varphi$. This value of $\mathcal{N}(\varphi)$ might be important to understand a very precise (vacuum) ‘ether-drift’ experiment with present-day technology and level of accuracy $\sim 10^{-16}$.

Acknowledgements

We thank D. Maccarrone and F. Selleri for useful discussions.

References

- [1] G. 't Hooft, *In search of the ultimate building blocks*, Cambridge University Press, 1997, pag. 70.
- [2] M. Consoli and P. M. Stevenson, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A15** (2000) 133.
- [3] H. Salehi and H. R. Sepangi, Phys. Lett. **A251** (1999) 95.
- [4] G. E. Volovik, JETP Lett. **73** (2001) 162.
- [5] M. Consoli, Phys. Lett. **B 512** (2001) 335.
- [6] M. Consoli, Phys. Rev. **D65** (2002) 105017.
- [7] M. Consoli, Phys. Lett. **B541** (2002) 307.
- [8] M. Consoli, *Approximate Lorentz invariance of the vacuum: a physical solution of the 'hierarchy problem' ?*, arXiv:hep-ph/0306070, submitted to Phys. Rev. **D**.
- [9] E. M. Lifshitz and L. P. Pitaevskii, *Statistical Physics*, Part 2. Pergamon Press Ltd 1980, pag.85.
- [10] G. E. Volovik, Phys. Rep. **351** (2001) 195.
- [11] E. M. Lifshitz and L. P. Pitaevskii, *Physical Kinetics*, Pergamon Press Ltd 1981, p. 11.
- [12] P. M. Stevenson, *Are there pressure waves in the vacuum?*, contribution to the Conference on 'Violations of CPT and Lorentz invariance', University of Indiana, August 2001. World Scientific, arXiv:hep-ph/0109204.
- [13] By 'physical' we mean that the normalization of the vacuum field v_R is such that the quadratic shape of $V_{\text{eff}}(\phi_R)$ at $\phi_R = v_R$ is precisely given by the physical Higgs mass M_H^2 .
- [14] N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. **15** (1940) 154.
- [15] S. Weinberg, *Gravitation and Cosmology*, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1972, pag. 181.
- [16] J. L. Synge, *Relativity: The Special Theory*, North-Holland, Amsterdam 1964.
- [17] A. A. Michelson and E. W. Morley, Phil. Mag. **24** (1887) 449.

- [18] K. K. Illingworth, Phys. Rev. **30** (1927) 692.
- [19] D. C. Miller, Rev. Mod. Phys. **5** (1933) 203.
- [20] R. T. Cahill and K. Kitto, arXiv:physics/0205070.
- [21] G. F. Smoot *et al*, ApJL. **371** (1991) 1.
- [22] J. S. Bell, ‘How to teach special relativity’, in *Speakable and unspeakable in quantum mechanics*, Cambridge University Press 1987, pages 67-81.
- [23] S. Liberati, S. Sonego and M. Visser, Ann. Phys. **298** (2002) 167.
- [24] In this sense, as already remarked by Synge (see page 161 of ref.[16]), it is hard to make definite predictions about ‘ether-drift’ experiments on the base only of Special Relativity.
- [25] R. J. Kennedy and E. M. Thorndike, Phys. Rev. **42** (1932) 400, see their value for V_α in page 416.
- [26] T. S. Jaseja, A. Javan, J. Murray and C. H. Townes, Phys. Rev. **133** (1964) A1221.
- [27] There is some model dependence due to the precise coefficient $\mathcal{O}(1)$ used to relate ϵ to the observable shift. For instance, using the relation $2\frac{\Delta\nu}{\nu_c} \sim \epsilon$ [26], the observable velocity would be increased to $v_{\text{obs}} \sim 12.8$ km/sec. This remark suggests that, may be, only a *part* of the shift was due to magnetostriction of the Invar spacers.
- [28] F. Selleri, *Lezioni di Relatività*, Ed. Progedit, Bari 2003, page 20.
- [29] G. Joos, Ann. d. Physik **5** (1930) 385.
- [30] A. Brillet and J. L. Hall, Phys. Rev. Lett. **42** (1979) 549.