

Dark Matter

FROM THE COSMOS TO THE LABORATORY

XXXV SLAC Summer Institute
July 30th - August 10, 2007
Stanford Linear Accelerator Center

A Brief History of Dark Matter



Joel Primack

University of California, Santa Cruz

A Brief History of Dark Matter

1930s – Discovery that cluster $\sigma_v \sim 1000$ km/s

1970s – Discovery of flat galaxy rotation curves

1980 – Most astronomers are convinced that dark matter exists around galaxies and clusters

1980–84 – short life of Hot Dark Matter theory

1984 – Cold Dark Matter theory proposed

1992 – COBE discovers CMB fluctuations as predicted by CDM; CHDM and LCDM are favored CDM variants

1998 – SN Ia and other evidence of Dark Energy

2000 – Λ CDM is the Standard Cosmological Model

2003 – WMAP and LSS data confirm Λ CDM predictions

~2010 – Discovery of dark matter particles??

Early History of Dark Matter

1922 – Kapteyn: “dark matter” in Milky Way disk¹

1933 – Zwicky: “dunkle (kalte) materie” in Coma cluster

1937 – Smith: “great mass of internebular material” in Virgo cluster

1937 – Holmberg: galaxy mass $5 \times 10^{11} M_{\text{sun}}$ from handful of pairs¹

1939 – Babcock observes rising rotation curve for M31¹

1940s – large cluster σ_v confirmed by many observers

1957 – van de Hulst: high HI rotation curve for M31

1959 – Kahn & Woltjer: MWy–M31 infall $\Rightarrow M_{\text{LocalGroup}} = 1.8 \times 10^{11} M_{\text{sun}}$

1970 – Rubin & Ford: M31 flat optical rotation curve

1973 – Ostriker & Peebles: halos stabilize galactic disks

1974 – Einasto, Kaasik, & Saar; Ostriker, Peebles, Yahil: summarize evidence that galaxy M/L increases with radius

1975, 78 – Roberts; Bosma: extended flat HI rotation curves

1979 – Faber & Gallagher: convincing evidence for dark matter²

1980 – Most astronomers are convinced that dark matter exists around galaxies and clusters

¹ Virginia Trimble, in D. Cline, ed., *Sources of Dark Matter in the Universe* (World Scientific, 1994).

² S. M. Faber and J. S. Gallagher 1979, *ARAA* 17, 135

1937 ApJ 86, 217

ON THE MASSES OF NEBULAE AND OF CLUSTERS OF NEBULAE

F. ZWICKY

The Coma cluster contains about one thousand nebulae. The average mass of one of these nebulae is therefore


$$\bar{M} > 9 \times 10^{43} \text{ gr} = 4.5 \times 10^{10} M_{\odot}. \quad (36)$$

Inasmuch as we have introduced at every step of our argument inequalities which tend to depress the final value of the mass \mathcal{M} , the foregoing value (36) should be considered as the lowest estimate for the average mass of nebulae in the Coma cluster. This result is somewhat unexpected, in view of the fact that the luminosity of an average nebula is equal to that of about 8.5×10^7 suns. According to (36), the conversion factor γ from luminosity to mass for nebulae in the Coma cluster would be of the order

$$\gamma = 500, \quad (37)$$

as compared with about $\gamma' = 3$ for the local Kapteyn stellar system.

This article also proposed measuring the masses of galaxies by gravitational lensing.



Fritz Zwicky

INTERGALACTIC MATTER AND THE GALAXY

F. D. KAHN* AND L. WOLTJER†

1959 ApJ 130, 705

Princeton University Observatory and the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, New Jersey

The fact that the motion is one of approach is significant. For if the Local Group is a physical unit, the Galaxy and M31 are not likely to have been formed very far from each other, certainly not at a much greater distance than their present separation. This indicates that they must have performed the larger part of at least one orbit around their center of gravity during a time of about 10^{10} years. Consequently, their orbital period must be less than 15 billion years. From this we obtain the total mass of the system as follows. According to Kepler's third law, we have

$$P^2 = \frac{4\pi^2}{GM^*} a^3 \leq 2 \times 10^{35} \text{ sec}^2, \quad (1)$$

where M^* represents the effective mass at the center of gravity. To obtain a minimum estimate for M^* , we assume that the system has no angular momentum. Then conservation of energy gives, for our Galaxy,

$$\frac{GM^*}{2a} = \frac{GM^*}{D} - E_k, \quad (2)$$

where D denotes the present distance of the Galaxy to the center of gravity (480 kpc) and E_k is its present kinetic energy per unit mass. From these equations we obtain

$$\underline{M^* \geq 1.8 \times 10^{12} m_\odot}, \quad (3)$$

which is six times larger than the reduced mass of M31 and the Galaxy.

The discrepancy seems to be well outside the observational errors.




See Rubin's "Reference Frame" in Dec 2006 *Physics Today* and her article, "A Brief History of Dark Matter," in *The dark universe: matter, energy and gravity*, Proc. STScl Symposium 2001, ed. Mario Livio.

1970 *ApJ* 159, 379

ROTATION OF THE ANDROMEDA NEBULA FROM A SPECTROSCOPIC SURVEY OF EMISSION REGIONS*

VERA C. RUBIN† AND W. KENT FORD, JR.†

Department of Terrestrial Magnetism, Carnegie Institution of Washington and Lowell Observatory, and Kitt Peak National Observatory‡



Triangles are HI data from Roberts & Whitehurst 1975

A NUMERICAL STUDY OF THE STABILITY OF FLATTENED GALAXIES: OR, CAN COLD GALAXIES SURVIVE?*



JERRY OSTRIKER

J. P. OSTRIKER


Princeton University Observatory

AND

P. J. E. PEEBLES

Joseph Henry Laboratories, Princeton University

Received 1973 May 29



JIM PEEBLES

ABSTRACT

To study the stability of flattened galaxies, we have followed the evolution of simulated galaxies containing 150 to 500 mass points. Models which begin with characteristics similar to the disk of our Galaxy (except for increased velocity dispersion and thickness to assure local stability) were found to be rapidly and grossly unstable to barlike modes. These modes cause an increase in random kinetic energy, with approximate stability being reached when the ratio of kinetic energy of rotation to total gravitational energy, designated t , is reduced to the value of 0.14 ± 0.02 . Parameter studies indicate that the result probably is not due to inadequacies of the numerical N -body simulation method. A survey of the literature shows that a critical value for limiting stability $t \simeq 0.14$ has been found by a variety of methods.

Models with added spherical (halo) component are more stable. It appears that halo-to-disk mass ratios of 1 to $2\frac{1}{2}$, and an initial value of $t \simeq 0.14 \pm 0.03$, are required for stability. If our Galaxy (and other spirals) do not have a substantial unobserved mass in a hot disk component, then apparently the halo (spherical) mass interior to the disk must be comparable to the disk mass. Thus normalized, the halo masses of our Galaxy and of other spiral galaxies exterior to the observed disks may be extremely large.

Nature 250, 309 - 310 (26 July 1974)

Dynamic evidence on massive coronas of galaxies

JAAN EINASTO, ANTS KAASIK & ENN SAAR

A LONGSTANDING unresolved problem in galactic astronomy is the mass discrepancy observed in clusters of galaxies. The virial mass of the cluster per galaxy and the mass–luminosity ratio are considerably larger than the corresponding quantities for individual galaxies. This discrepancy cannot be a result of expansion or be because of the recent origin of clusters: these ideas contradict our present knowledge of the physical evolution and ages of galaxies¹. Therefore it is necessary to adopt an alternative hypothesis: that the clusters of galaxies are stabilised by hidden matter.



JAAN EINASTO



ENN SAAR

Both papers: $\Omega_m \approx 0.2$

According to new estimates the total mass density of matter in galaxies is 20% of the critical cosmological density.

THE SIZE AND MASS OF GALAXIES, AND THE MASS OF THE UNIVERSE



JERRY OSTRIKER

J. P. OSTRIKER
Princeton University Observatory

P. J. E. PEEBLES
Joseph Henry Laboratories, Princeton University

AND

A. YAHIL
University Observatory; and Department of Physics, Tel-Aviv University
Received 1974 May 28; revised 1974 July 15



AMOS YAHIL

ABSTRACT 1974 ApJ 194, L1

Currently available observations strongly indicate that the mass of spiral galaxies increases almost linearly with radius to nearly 1 Mpc. This means that the total mass per giant spiral is of the order of $10^{12} M_{\odot}$, and that the ratio of this mass to the photographic light within the Holberg radius, f , is $\sim 200 (M/L)_{\odot}$. Using this value of f and the luminosity function of surveyed galaxies, we determine a local mean cosmological mass density $\approx 2 \times 10^{-30} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ corresponding to $\Omega \equiv \rho/\rho_{\text{crit}} \approx 0.2$. The uncertainty in this result is not less than a factor of 3.



THE ENORMOUS MASS OF THE ELLIPTICAL GALAXY M87: A MODEL FOR THE EXTENDED X-RAY SOURCE*

WILLIAM G. MATHEWS

Lick Observatory, Board of Studies in Astronomy and Astrophysics, University of California, Santa Cruz

Received 1977 March 28; accepted 1977 July 20

ABSTRACT

An analysis of the X-ray data from the Virgo cluster indicates that the mass of the giant elliptical galaxy M87 exceeds $10^{13} M_{\odot}$ and may be $\sim 10^{14} M_{\odot}$ or greater. This large mass is required in order to confine the extended thermal X-ray source to its observed projected size—provided the gas which radiates X-rays is essentially isothermal ($T = 3 \times 10^7$ K) and in hydrostatic equilibrium. Isothermality follows from the efficiency of heat conduction and the suggested origin of the gas. If these reasonable assumptions are correct, the bulk of the mass in M87 must be distributed in a low-density, low-luminosity component quite unlike the distribution of luminous matter. The mass of this component, which is uncertain by a factor of about 2, could account for the “missing mass” in the Virgo cluster.

1978 ApJ 219, 413

MASSES AND MASS-TO-LIGHT RATIOS OF GALAXIES¹



*S. M. Faber*²

Lick Observatory, Board of Studies in Astronomy and Astrophysics,
University of California, Santa Cruz, California 95064

J. S. Gallagher

Department of Astronomy, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801



After reviewing all the evidence, it is our opinion that the case for invisible mass in the Universe is very strong and getting stronger. Particularly encouraging is the fact that the mass-to-light ratio for binaries agrees so well with that for small groups. Furthermore, our detailed knowledge of the mass distribution of the Milky Way and Local Group is reassuringly consistent with the mean properties of galaxies and groups elsewhere. In sum, although such questions as observational errors and membership probabilities are not yet completely resolved, we think it likely that the discovery of invisible matter will endure as one of the major conclusions of modern astronomy.

1980 – Most astronomers are convinced that dark matter exists around galaxies and clusters – but is it Hot or Cold? It was known that BBN $\Rightarrow \Omega_b \approx 0.03$. Theorists usually assumed $\Omega_m = 1$, but observers typically found $\Omega_m \approx 0.2$.

The Hot–Warm–Cold DM terminology was first used by Dick Bond and me in our talks at the 1983 Moriond Conference.

1973 – Marx & Szalay, Cowsik & McClelland: $m_\nu < 100 h^2 \text{ eV}$

1980 – Zel'dovich group develops Hot Dark Matter theory¹

1983 – White, Frenk, Davis: 1st simulation rules out HDM

In ~1980, when purely baryonic adiabatic fluctuations were ruled out by the improving upper limits on CMB anisotropies, theorists led by Zel'dovich turned to what we now call the HDM scenario, with light neutrinos making up most of the dark matter. However, in this scheme the fluctuations on small scales are damped by relativistic motion (“free streaming”) of the neutrinos until $T < m_\nu$, which occurs when the mass entering the horizon is about $10^{15} M_{\text{sun}}$, the supercluster mass scale. Thus superclusters would form first, and galaxies later form by fragmentation. This predicted a galaxy distribution much more inhomogeneous than observed.

¹ E.g., Doroshkevich, Khlopov, Sunyaev, Szalay, & Zel'dovich 1981, NYASA 375, 32; Zel'dovich, Einasto, Shandarin 1982, Nature 300, 407; Bond & Szalay 1982, ApJ 274, 443.

Some steps toward understanding galaxies

Many people thought the early universe was complex (e.g. mixmaster universe [Misner](#), explosions [Ostriker](#), ...).

But [Zel'dovich](#) assumed that it is fundamentally simple, with just a scale-free spectrum of adiabatic fluctuations of

(a) **baryons**

and when that failed [$(\Delta T/T)_{\text{CMB}} < 10^{-4}$] and Moscow physicists thought they had discovered neutrino mass

(b) **hot dark matter**.

[Blumenthal](#) and I thought simplicity a good approach, but we tried other simple candidates for the dark matter, first

(c) **warm dark matter**, and then, with [Faber](#) and [Rees](#),

(d) **cold dark matter**, which moved sluggishly in the early universe.



Weakly Interacting Particles as Dark Matter

THE ASTROPHYSICAL JOURNAL, 180: 7-10, 1973 February 15
 © 1973. The American Astronomical Society. All rights reserved. Printed in U.S.A.

GRAVITY OF NEUTRINOS OF NONZERO MASS IN ASTROPHYSICS

R. COWSIK* AND J. MCCLELLAND
 Department of Physics, University of California, Berkeley
 Received 1972 July 24

ABSTRACT

If neutrinos have a rest mass of a few eV/c^2 , then they would dominate the gravitational dynamics of the large clusters of galaxies and of the Universe. A simple model to understand the virial mass discrepancy in the Coma cluster on this basis is outlined.

Subject headings: cosmology — galaxies, clusters of — neutrinos

The possibility of a finite rest mass for the neutrinos has fascinated astrophysicists (Kuchowicz 1969). A recent discussion of such a possibility has been in the context of the solar-neutrino experiments (Bahcall, Cabibbo, and Yahil 1972). Here we wish to point out some interesting consequences of the gravitational interactions of such neutrinos. These considerations become particularly relevant in the framework of big-bang cosmologies which we assume to be valid in our discussion here.

In the early phase of such a Universe when the temperature was ~ 1 MeV, several processes of neutrino production (Ruderman 1969) would have led to copious production of neutrinos and antineutrinos (Steigman 1972; Cowsik and McClelland 1972). Conditions of thermal equilibrium allow an easy estimate of their number densities (Landau and Lifshitz 1969):

$$n_{vi} = \frac{1}{\pi^2 \hbar^3} \int_0^\infty \frac{p^2 dp}{\exp [E/kT(z_{eq})] + 1} . \quad (1)$$

Here n_{vi} = number density of neutrinos of the i th kind (notice that in writing this expression we have assumed that both the helicity states are allowed for the neutrinos because of finite rest mass); $E = c(p^2 + m^2 c^2)^{1/2}$; k = Boltzmann's constant; $T(z_{eq}) = T_r(z_{eq}) = T_e(z_{eq}) = T_n(z_{eq}) \dots$ = the common temperature of radiation, neutrinos, electrons, etc., at the latest epoch characterized by redshift z_{eq} when they may be assumed to have been in thermal equilibrium; $kT(z_{eq}) \simeq 1$ MeV.

Since the masses of the neutrinos are expected to be small, $kT(z_{eq}) \gg m_{vi} c^2$, in the extreme-relativistic limit equation (1) reduces to

$$n_{vi}(z_{eq}) \simeq 0.183 [T(z_{eq})/hc]^3 . \quad (2)$$

As the Universe expands, only the neutrinos (in contrast to all other known particles) survive annihilation because of extremely low cross-sections (deGraff and Tolhock 1966), and their number density decreases with increasing volume of the Universe, simply as $\sim V(z_{eq})/V(z) = [(1+z)/(1+z_{eq})]^3$. Noting that $(1+z_{eq})/(1+z) = T_r(z_{eq})/T_r(z)$, the number density at the present epoch ($z = 0$) is given by

$$n_{vi}(0) = n_{vi}(z_{eq})/(1+z_{eq})^3 \simeq 0.183 [T_r(0)/hc]^3 \simeq 300 \text{ cm}^{-3} , \quad (3)$$

* On leave from the Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Bombay, India.

More than 30 years ago,
 beginnings of the idea of
 weakly interacting particles
 (neutrinos) as dark matter

Massive neutrinos are no
 longer a good candidate
 (hot dark matter)

However, the idea of
 weakly interacting massive
 particles as dark matter
 is now standard

Giant voids in the Universe

Ya. B. Zeldovich*, J. Einasto^{†‡} & S. F. Shandarin*

1982 Nature
300, 407

Neutrino dominated Universe

Perhaps the weakest point in the adiabatic scenario is its need for too large an amplitude of density perturbations at the decoupling era: $\delta\rho/\rho \approx 10^{-3}$ if $\Omega = 1$ and $\delta\rho/\rho \approx 10^{-1}$ if $\Omega = 0.02$ (ref. 40). As noted already by Silk²³, density fluctuations at the epoch of decoupling correspond to similar angular fluctuations of the temperature of the microwave background. $\delta T/T \sim 1/3\delta\rho/\rho$. On the other hand, observations give an upper limit of temperature fluctuations of the order 10^{-4} (refs 22, 23).

This controversy would be solved if the Universe were neutrino dominated with the neutrino mass $m \approx 10$ eV. Neutrino gas does not interact with radiation, thus perturbations in the neutrino gas could develop much earlier than in the baryon dominated Universe and could have the necessary amplitude. Baryon gas is bound to radiation and has smaller density fluctuations, after decoupling it simply flows to gravitational wells formed in the neutrino gas.

Thus in the neutrino dominated Universe one has low baryon density $\Omega_b \approx 0.01-0.1$ while the total density is close to the closure once $\Omega_t \approx \Omega_v \approx 1$.

The formation of the structure in a neutrino dominated Universe is, essentially, an adiabatic scenario⁴⁴⁻⁵¹. The initial ratio of baryons to neutrinos is the same everywhere (the entropy is constant), small-scale fluctuations are damped, the characteristic mass of objects to form first is $10^{12} M_\odot$ as in the conventional adiabatic scenario.



Zel'dovich



Shandarin

CLUSTERING IN A NEUTRINO-DOMINATED UNIVERSE

SIMON D. M. WHITE,^{1,2} CARLOS S. FRENK,¹ AND MARC DAVIS^{1,3}

University of California, Berkeley

Received 1983 June 17; accepted 1983 July 1

1983 ApJ 274, L1


ABSTRACT

We have simulated the nonlinear growth of structure in a universe dominated by massive neutrinos using initial conditions derived from detailed linear calculations of earlier evolution. Codes based on a direct N -body integrator and on a fast Fourier transform Poisson solver produce very similar results. The coherence length of the neutrino distribution at early times is directly related to the mass of the neutrino and thence to the present density of the universe. We find this length to be too large to be consistent with the observed clustering scale of galaxies if other cosmological parameters are to remain within their accepted ranges. The conventional neutrino-dominated picture appears to be ruled out.



Early History of Cold Dark Matter


- 1967 – Lynden–Bell: violent relaxation (also Shu 1978)
- 1976 – Binney, Rees & Ostriker, Silk: Cooling curves
- 1977 – White & Rees: galaxy formation in massive halos
- 1980 – Fall & Efstathiou: galactic disk formation in massive halos
- 1982 – Guth & Pi; Hawking; Starobinski: Cosmic Inflation $P(k) = k^1$
- 1982 – Pagels & Primack: lightest SUSY particle stable by R-parity: gravitino
- 1982 – Blumenthal, Pagels, & Primack; Bond, Szalay, & Turner: WDM
- 1982 – Peebles: CDM $P(k)$ – simplified treatment (no light neutrinos)
- 1983 – Goldberg: photino as SUSY CDM particle
- 1983 – Preskill, Wise, & Wilczek; Abbott & Sikivie; Dine & Fischler: Axion CDM
- 1983 – Blumenthal & Primack; Bond & Szalay: CDM $P(k)$
- 1984 – Blumenthal, Faber, Primack, & Rees: CDM cp. to CfA data
- 1984 – Peebles; Turner, Steigman, Krauss: effects of Λ
- 1984 – Ellis, Hagelin, Nanopoulos, Olive, & Srednicki: neutralino CDM
- 1985 – Davis, Efstathiou, Frenk, & White: 1st CDM, Λ CDM simulations



HDM



Observed Galaxy Distribution




CDM

White 1986

Core condensation in heavy halos: a two-stage theory for galaxy formation and clustering

S. D. M. White and M. J. Rees *Institute of Astronomy,
Madingley Road. Cambridge*

Summary. We suggest that most of the material in the Universe condensed at an early epoch into small 'dark' objects. Irrespective of their nature, these objects must subsequently have undergone hierarchical clustering, whose present scale we infer from the large-scale distribution of galaxies. As each stage of the hierarchy forms and collapses, relaxation effects wipe out its substructure, leading to a self-similar distribution of bound masses of the type discussed by Press & Schechter. The entire luminous content of galaxies, however, results from the cooling and fragmentation of residual gas within the transient potential wells provided by the dark matter. Every galaxy thus forms as a concentrated luminous core embedded in an extensive dark halo. The observed sizes of galaxies and their survival through later stages of the hierarchy seem inexplicable without invoking substantial dissipation; this dissipation allows the galaxies to become sufficiently concentrated to survive the disruption of their halos in groups and clusters of galaxies. We propose a specific model in which $\Omega \approx 0.2$, the dark matter makes up 80 per cent of the total mass, and half the residual gas has been converted into luminous galaxies by the present time. This model is consistent with the inferred proportions of dark matter, luminous matter and gas in rich clusters, with the observed luminosity density of the Universe and with the observed radii of galaxies; further, it predicts the characteristic luminosities of bright galaxies and can give a luminosity function of the observed shape.





1982 PRL 48, 224

Supersymmetry, Cosmology, and New Physics at Teraelectronvolt Energies

Heinz Pagels

The Rockefeller University, New York, New York 10021

and

Joel R. Primack

Physics Department, University of California, Santa Cruz, California 95064

(Received 17 August 1981)

If one assumes a spontaneously broken local supersymmetry, big-bang cosmology implies that the universe is filled with a gravitino ($g_{3/2}$) gas—possibly its dominant constituent. From the observational bound on the cosmological mass density it follows that $m_{g_{3/2}} \lesssim 1$ keV. Correspondingly, the supersymmetry breaking parameter F satisfies $\sqrt{F} \lesssim 2 \times 10^3$ TeV, requiring new supersymmetric physics in the teraelectronvolt energy region. An exact sum rule is derived and used to estimate the threshold and cross section for the production of the new states.

Galaxy formation by dissipationless particles heavier than neutrinos

1982 Nature 299, 37

George R. Blumenthal*, Heinz Pagels†
& Joel R. Primack‡

* Lick Observatory, Board of Studies in Astronomy and Astrophysics, ‡ Board of Studies in Physics, University of California, Santa Cruz, California 95064, USA

† The Rockefeller University, New York, New York 10021, USA



In a baryon dominated universe, there is no scale length corresponding to the masses of galaxies. If neutrinos with mass < 50 eV dominate the present mass density of the universe, then their Jeans mass $M_{J,\nu} \sim 10^{16} M_{\odot}$, which resembles super-cluster rather than galactic masses. Neutral particles that interact much more weakly than neutrinos would decouple much earlier, have a smaller number density today, and consequently could have a mass > 50 eV without exceeding the observational mass density limit. A candidate particle is the gravitino, the spin $3/2$ supersymmetric partner of the graviton, which has been shown¹ to have a mass ≤ 1 keV if stable². The Jeans mass for a 1-keV noninteracting particle is $\sim 10^{12} M_{\odot}$, about the mass of a typical spiral galaxy including the nonluminous halo. We suggest here that the gravitino dominated universe can produce galaxies by gravitational instability while avoiding several observational difficulties associated with the neutrino dominated universe.

1982 ApJ 263, L1

LARGE-SCALE BACKGROUND TEMPERATURE AND MASS FLUCTUATIONS
DUE TO SCALE-INVARIANT PRIMEVAL PERTURBATIONS



P. J. E. PEEBLES

Joseph Henry Laboratories, Physics Department, Princeton University

Received 1982 July 2; accepted 1982 August 13

ABSTRACT


The large-scale anisotropy of the microwave background and the large-scale fluctuations in the mass distribution are discussed under the assumptions that the universe is dominated by very massive, weakly interacting particles and that the primeval density fluctuations were adiabatic with the scale-invariant spectrum $P \propto$ wavenumber. This model yields a characteristic mass comparable to that of a large galaxy independent of the particle mass, m_x , if $m_x \gtrsim 1$ keV. The expected background temperature fluctuations are well below present observational limits.

REFERENCES

- Bahcall, N. A., and Soneira, R. M. 1982, preprint.
Blumenthal, G. R., Pagels, H., and Primack, J. R. 1982, *Nature*, in press.
Bond, J. R., Szalay, A. S., and Turner, M. S. 1982, *Phys. Rev. Letters*, **48**, 1636.
Boughn, S. P., Cheng, E. S., and Wilkinson, D. T. 1981, *Ap. J. (Letters)*, **243**, L113.
Davis, M., Lecar, M., Pryor, C., and Witten, E. 1981, *Ap. J.*, **250**, 423.
Davis, M., and Peebles, P. J. E. 1983, *Ap. J.*, submitted.
Doroshkevich, A. G., Khlopov, M. Yu., Sunyaev, R. A., Szalay, A. S., and Zel'dovich, Ya. B. 1981, in *Proceedings of the Tenth Texas Symposium, Ann. NY Acad. Sci.*, **375**, 32.
Fixsen, D. J. 1982, Ph.D. thesis, Princeton University.
Harrison, E. R. 1970, *Phys. Rev.*, **D1**, 2726.
Hauser, M. G., and Peebles, P. J. E. 1973, *Ap. J.*, **185**, 757.
Hawking, S. W. 1982, preprint.
Hogan, C. J. 1982, *Ap. J. (Letters)*, **256**, L33.
Lubin, P. M. 1982, paper presented at the 86th course of the International School of Physics, Varenna.
Melchiorri, F., Melchiorri, B. O., Ceccarelli, C., and Pietranera, L. 1981, *Ap. J. (Letters)*, **250**, L1.
Ostriker, J. P., and Cowie, L. L. 1981, *Ap. J. (Letters)*, **243**, L127.
Peebles, P. J. E. 1980, *The Large-Scale Structure of the Universe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press) (LSS).
———. 1981a, *Ap. J.*, **248**, 885.
———. 1981b, *Ap. J. (Letters)*, **243**, L119.
———. 1982a, *Ap. J.*, **258**, 415.
———. 1982b, *Ap. J.*, **259**, 442.
Peebles, P. J. E., and Groth, E. J. 1976, *Astr. Ap.*, **53**, 131.
Peebles, P. J. E., and Yu, J. T. 1970, *Ap. J.*, **162**, 815.
Press, W. H., and Vishniac, E. T. 1980, *Ap. J.*, **236**, 323.
Silk, J., and Wilson, M. L. 1981, *Ap. J. (Letters)*, **244**, L37.
Wasserman, L. 1981, *Ap. J.*, **248**, 1.
Zel'dovich, Ya. B. 1972, *M.N.R.A.S.*, **160**, 1P.

THE COLLISIONLESS DAMPING OF DENSITY FLUCTUATIONS IN AN EXPANDING UNIVERSE

1983 ApJ 274, 443



J. R. BOND AND A. S. SZALAY





ABSTRACT

The best candidate for the dark matter is a massive collisionless non-baryonic relic of the early universe. The most natural type of initial density fluctuations expected are of the adiabatic rather than of the isothermal type. We calculate the temporal evolution of the (initially adiabatic) fluctuation spectrum by numerical integration of the coupled Einstein-Boltzmann equations for scalar perturbations in the metric and in the density of photons, neutrinos, and collisionless relics. Our output linear perturbation spectrum, which is itself input to the nonlinear problem of large scale structure formation, is shown to be characterized by two scales: the damping mass and the horizon mass when the energy density in relativistic particles equals that in nonrelativistic ones, M_{Heq} . Collisionless relics which decouple when relativistic may be of two basic types if they are to dominate the mass of the universe: massive neutrinos of 10–100 eV, or massive gravitinos (or other weakly interacting particles) of mass about 1 keV. For massive neutrinos, both scales are of supercluster size; and the Zel'dovich pancake picture, in which a large scale is the first to collapse, is expected, regardless of initial spectrum. For massive gravitinos, the damping mass is of galactic scale. Depending upon the initial spectrum, one can get either hierarchical clustering from the damping scale upward or fragmentation of the large M_{Heq} scale. Collisionless relics which decouple when nonrelativistic have negligible damping masses; again, hierarchical clustering from very small scales or large scale fragmentation is possible in this adiabatic picture.

Early History of Cold Dark Matter

- 1967 – Lynden–Bell: violent relaxation (also Shu 1978)
- 1976 – Binney, Rees & Ostriker, Silk: Cooling curves
- 1977 – White & Rees: galaxy formation in massive halos
- 1980 – Fall & Efstathiou: galactic disk formation in massive halos
- 1982 – Guth & Pi; Hawking; Starobinski: Cosmic Inflation $P(k) = k^1$
- 1982 – Pagels & Primack: lightest SUSY particle stable by R-parity: gravitino
- 1982 – Blumenthal, Pagels, & Primack; Bond, Szalay, & Turner: WDM
- 1982 – Peebles: CDM $P(k)$ – simplified treatment (no light neutrinos)
- 1983 – Goldberg: photino as SUSY CDM particle
- 1983 – Preskill, Wise, & Wilczek; Abbott & Sikivie; Dine & Fischler: Axion CDM
- 1983 – Blumenthal & Primack; Bond & Szalay: CDM $P(k)$
- 1984 – Blumenthal, Faber, Primack, & Rees: CDM cp. to CfA data
- 1984 – Peebles; Turner, Steigman, Krauss: effects of Λ
- 1984 – Ellis, Hagelin, Nanopoulos, Olive, & Srednicki: neutralino CDM
- 1985 – Davis, Efstathiou, Frenk, & White: 1st CDM, Λ CDM simulations




White 1986

CDM Correctly Predicted the Masses of Galaxies


Rees & Ostriker 77, Silk 77, Binney 77, White & Rees 1978

CDM: Blumenthal, Faber, Primack, & Rees 1984




CDM Spherical Collapse Model

Primack & Blumenthal 1983
based on CDM, cooling
theory of Rees & Ostriker
1977, Silk 1977, Binney
1977 and baryonic
dissipation within dark
halos White & Rees 1978




The baryonic density vs. temperature as root-mean-square perturbations having total mass M become nonlinear and virialize. The numbers on the tick marks are the logarithm of M in units of M_{\odot} . This curve assumes $n = 1$, $\Omega = h = 1$ and a baryonic to total mass ratio of 0.07. The region where baryons can cool within a dynamical time lies below the cooling curves. Also shown are the positions of observed galaxies, groups and clusters of galaxies. The dashed line represents a possible evolutionary path for dissipating baryons.

CDM Structure Formation: Linear Theory



Matter fluctuations that enter the horizon during the radiation dominated era, with masses less than about $10^{15} M_{\odot}$, grow only $\propto \log a$, because they are not in the gravitationally dominant component. But matter fluctuations that enter the horizon in the matter-dominated era grow $\propto a$. This explains the characteristic shape of the CDM fluctuation spectrum, with $\delta(k) \propto k^{-n/2-2} \log k$

Primack & Blumenthal 1983



Blumenthal, Faber, Primack, & Rees 1984

Formation of galaxies and large-scale structure with cold dark matter

George R. Blumenthal* & S. M. Faber*


* Lick Observatory, Board of Studies in Astronomy and Astrophysics, University of California, Santa Cruz, California 95064, USA

Joel R. Primack^{†§} & Martin J. Rees^{‡§}

† Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305, USA

‡ Institute of Theoretical Physics, University of California, Santa Barbara, California 93106, USA

The dark matter that appears to be gravitationally dominant on all scales larger than galactic cores may consist of axions, stable photinos, or other collisionless particles whose velocity dispersion in the early Universe is so small that fluctuations of galactic size or larger are not damped by free streaming. An attractive feature of this cold dark matter hypothesis is its considerable predictive power: the post-recombination fluctuation spectrum is calculable, and it in turn governs the formation of galaxies and clusters. Good agreement with the data is obtained for a Zeldovich ($|\delta_k|^2 \propto k$) spectrum of primordial fluctuations.



Formation of galaxies and large-scale structure with cold dark matter

... We conclude that a straightforward interpretation of the evidence summarized above favours $\Omega \approx 0.2$ in the cold DM picture, but that $\Omega = 1$ is not implausible. ...

Conclusions

We have shown that a Universe with ~ 10 times as much cold dark matter as baryonic matter provides a remarkably good fit to the observed Universe. This model predicts roughly the observed mass range of galaxies, the dissipational nature of galaxy collapse, and the observed Faber-Jackson and Tully-Fisher relations. It also gives dissipationless galactic haloes and clusters. In addition, it may also provide natural explanations for galaxy-environment correlations and for the differences in angular momenta between ellipticals and spiral galaxies. Finally, the cold DM picture seems reasonably consistent with the observed large-scale clustering, including superclusters and voids. In short, it seems to be the best model available and merits close scrutiny and testing.



**Flatness of the Universe: Reconciling Theoretical Prejudices
with Observational Data**

1984 PRL 52, 2090

Michael S. Turner

*Theoretical Astrophysics, Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, Illinois 60510, and
The University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60637*

and

Gary Steigman

Bartol Research Foundation, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware 19716

and

Lawrence M. Krauss

Lyman Laboratory of Physics, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

(Received 2 March 1984)

Theoretical prejudices argue strongly for a flat Universe; however, observations do not support this view. We point out that this apparent conflict could be resolved if the mass density of the Universe today were dominated by (i) relativistic particles produced by the recent decay of a massive, relic particle species, or by (ii) a relic cosmological constant. Scenario (i) has several advantages in the context of galaxy formation, but must confront the problem of a young Universe.

1985 ApJ 292, 371



THE EVOLUTION OF LARGE-SCALE STRUCTURE IN A UNIVERSE DOMINATED BY COLD DARK MATTER

MARC DAVIS,^{1,2} GEORGE EFSTATHIOU,^{1,3} CARLOS S. FRENK,^{1,4} AND SIMON D. M. WHITE^{1,5}

Received 1984 August 20; accepted 1984 November 30

ABSTRACT

We present the results of numerical simulations of nonlinear gravitational clustering in universes dominated by weakly interacting, "cold" dark matter (e.g., axions or photinos). These studies employ a high resolution N -body code with periodic boundary conditions and 32,768 particles; they can accurately represent the theoretical initial conditions over a factor of 16 in length scale. We have followed the evolution of ensembles of models with $\Omega = 1$ and $\Omega < 1$ from the initial conditions predicted for a "constant curvature" primordial fluctuation spectrum. We also ran one model of a flat universe with a positive cosmological constant. Large filamentary structures, superclusters of clumps, and large low-density regions appear at certain times in all our simulations; however, we do not find large regions as extreme as the apparent void in Boötes. The evolution of the two-point correlation function, $\xi(r)$, is not self-similar; its effective power-law index becomes more negative with time. Models with $\Omega = 1$ are inconsistent with observation if galaxies are assumed to be unbiased tracers of the underlying mass distribution. The peculiar velocities of galaxies are predicted to be much too large. In addition, at times when the shape of $\xi(r)$ matches that observed, the amplitude of clustering is inferred to be too small for any acceptable value of the Hubble constant. Better agreement is obtained for $\Omega = 0.2$, but in both cases the rms relative peculiar velocity of particle pairs decreases markedly with pair separation, whereas the corresponding quantity for galaxies is observed to increase slowly. In all models the three-point correlation function ζ is found to fit the observed form, $\zeta \propto Q\xi^2$, but with Q depending weakly on scale. On small scales Q substantially exceeds its observed value. Consistent with this, the mass distribution of clusters is very broad, showing the presence of clumps with a very wide range in mass at any given time. The model with a positive cosmological constant closely resembles an open model with the same value of Ω . If galaxies are a random sampling of the mass distribution, none of our models is fully consistent with observation. An alternative hypothesis is that galaxies formed only at high peaks of the initial density field. The clustering properties of such "galaxies" are biased; they appear preferentially in high-density regions and so are more correlated than the overall mass distribution. Their two- and three-point correlation functions and their relative peculiar velocity distribution may be consistent with observation even in a universe with $\Omega = 1$. If this is an appropriate model for galaxy formation, it may be possible to reconcile a flat universe with most aspects of the observed galaxy distribution.



Some Later Highlights of CDM

- 1983 – Milgrom: modified Newtonian dynamics (MOND) as alternative to dark matter to explain flat galactic rotation curves
- 1986 – Blumenthal, Faber, Flores, & Primack: baryonic halo contraction
- 1986 – Large scale galaxy flows of ~ 600 km/s favor no bias
- 1989 – Holtzman: CMB and LSS predictions for 96 CDM variants
- 1992 – COBE: CMB fluctuations confirm CDM prediction $\Delta T/T \approx 10^{-5}$, favored variants are CHDM and Λ CDM
- 1996 – Seljak & Zaldarriaga: CMBfast code for $P(k)$, CMB fluctuations
- 1997 – Nararro, Frenk, & White: universal radial structure of DM halos
- 1997 – Hipparchos distance scale, SN Ia dark energy $\Rightarrow t_0 \approx 14$ Gyr
- 2001 – Bullock et al.: concentration–mass– z relation for DM halos; universal angular momentum structure of DM halos
- 2002 – Wechsler et al.: halo concentration from mass assembly history
- 2003 – WMAP and Large Scale Structure surveys confirm Λ CDM predictions with high precision

Whatever Happened to Hot Dark Matter?


Since 1984, the most successful structure formation scenarios have been those in which most of the matter is CDM. With the COBE CMB data in 1992, two CDM variants appeared to be viable: Λ CDM with $\Omega_m \approx 0.3$, and $\Omega_m = \text{Cold} + \text{Hot DM}$ with $\Omega_v \approx 0.2$ (Holtzman & Primack 1992, Wright et al. (COBE) 1992).

A potential problem with Λ CDM was that the correlation function of the dark matter was higher around 1 Mpc than the power-law $\xi_{gg}(r) = (r/r_0)^{-1.8}$ observed for galaxies, so “scale-dependent anti-biasing” was required (Klypin, Primack, & Holtzman 1996, Jenkins et al. 1998). A potential problem with CHDM was that, like all $\Omega_m = 1$ theories, it predicted rather late structure formation.

By 1998, the evidence of early galaxy and cluster formation and the increasing evidence that $\Omega_m \approx 0.3$ had doomed CHDM. But now we also know from neutrino oscillations that neutrinos have mass. The upper limit is $\Omega_v h^2 < 0.0076$ (95% CL), corresponding to $\Sigma m_\nu < 0.7$ eV (Spergel et al. 2003), with $\Sigma m_\nu < 1.8$ eV just from CMB (Spergel et al. 2007), and a stronger constraint $\Sigma m_\nu < 0.17$ eV including Ly α forest data (Seljak et al. 2006).


Λ CDM Scale-Dependent Anti-Biasing

The dark matter correlation function ξ_{mm} for Λ CDM is $3 \times \xi_{gg}$ at 1 Mpc. This disagreement between ξ_{mm} and ξ_{gg} was pointed out by [Klypin, Primack, & Holtzman 1996](#). When simulations could resolve galaxy halos, it turned out that the needed anti-biasing arises naturally. This occurs because of destruction of halos in dense regions caused by merging and tidal disruption.




[Colin et al. 1999](#)

Effect of Neutrino Mass on Predicted Power Spectrum $P(k)$



SDSS $P(k)$ Tegmark+05



$P(k)$ for LCDM with degenerate neutrino masses totaling 1.0 eV or less.

Masataka Fukugita, Massive Neutrinos in Cosmology
 Plenary talk given at NuFact05, Frascati, 21–26 June 2005, hep-ph/0511068

**ΛCDM
PREDICTS
EVOLUTION
IN ξ_{gg}**





FIG. 8.— Evolution of the two-point correlation function in the $80h^{-1}$ Mpc simulation. The solid line with error bars shows the clustering of filaments of the fixed number density $\bar{n} = 5.89 \times 10^{-3}h^3 \text{ Mpc}^{-3}$ at each epoch. The error-bars indicate the “jack-knife” one sigma errors and are larger than the Poisson error at all scales. The dot-dashed and dashed lines show the corresponding one- and two-halo term contributions. The long-dashed lines show the power-law fit to the correlation functions in the range of $r = [0.1 - 8h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}]$. Although the correlation functions can be well fit by the power law at $r \gtrsim 0.3h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$ in each epoch, at $z > 0$ the correlation function steepens significantly at smaller scales due to the one-halo term.


Kravtsov, Berlind, Wechsler, Klypin, Gottloeber, Allgood, & Primack 2004

Lick Survey
1M galaxies

North Galactic

CfA survey: Great Wall






The APM Galaxy Survey
Maddox et al


2dF Galaxy Redshift Survey

$\frac{1}{4}$ M galaxies 2003


1/4 of the horizon

CFA Survey
1983







Mapping the Galaxies Sloan Digital Sky Survey



Nearby Galaxies
to 2 billion light years



Luminous Red
Galaxies
to 6 billion light years




Quasars
to 28 billion
light years

GALAXIES MAPPED BY THE SLOAN SURVEY

Data Release 4:
565,715 Galaxies & 76,403
Quasars

GALAXIES MAPPED BY THE SLOAN SURVEY



Cosmic Horizon (The Big Bang)

Cosmic Background Radiation

Cosmic Dark Ages

Bright Galaxies Form

Big Galaxies Form


Earth Forms

Milky Way



Cosmic Spheres of Time

When we look out in space we look back in time...




Big Bang Data Agrees with Double Dark Theory!



1998 **BREAKTHROUGH OF THE YEAR** 2003




Latest Big Bang Data Strengthens the Agreement!



Double Dark theory


Distribution of Matter

Also Agrees with Double Dark Theory!




Max Tegmark

The Millennium Run




Springel et al. 2005

Particle number in cosmological N-body simulations vs. pub date



UNDERSTANDING GALAXY CORRELATIONS




Galaxy 2-point correlation function at the present epoch.

Springel et al. 2005

Galaxy clustering in SDSS at $z \sim 0$ is well reproduced by simulations

projected
2-point
correlation
function




$$n(>V_{\max, \text{acc}}) = n(>L)$$

Conroy,
Wechsler &
Kravtsov
2006, ApJ 647, 201

and at redshift $z \sim 1$ (DEEP2)!

projected
2-point
correlation
function




$$n(>V_{\text{max,acc}}) = n(>L)$$

Conroy,
Wechsler &
Kravtsov

projected separation

and at $z \sim 4-5$ (LBGs, Subaru)!!








stardust

stars

COSMIC
DENSITY
PYRAMID







Although the idea that the dark matter may be the lightest supersymmetric WIMP (Pagels & Primack 1982) remains popular with particle theorists, we still have no experimental evidence on what the dark matter is, and there may be problems with the standard Λ CDM **Double Dark** theory on small scales ...

Are we on the right track? Or should we take seriously Modified Newtonian Dynamics (MOND) or other alternatives to the Double Dark theory?

Evidence Against MOND from Galaxy Merger NGC 7252



J. E. Hibbard, Raja Guhathakurta, J. H. van Gorkom, & Francois Schweizer (1994)

A famous photograph by Schweizer (1982) left little doubt that the merger of two disk galaxies of comparable mass yields an elliptical galaxy. The photograph shows the two long tidal tails of NGC 7252, together with the galaxy's nearly relaxed core. Schweizer showed the brightness distribution of the core obeys the $R^{1/4}$ law that is characteristic of elliptical galaxies. Thus the nuclei of the two galaxies have already completely merged. Simulations show that the nuclei can only spiral together in the time available if they can effectively surrender their energy and angular momentum to dark halos. **If we banish the halos by modifying the law of gravity, the galactic nuclei take much longer to merge because the vacuum cannot relieve them of their energy and angular momentum.** James Binney (2004)

Bullet Cluster 1E 0657–558

WEAK-LENSING MASS RECONSTRUCTION OF THE INTERACTING CLUSTER 1E 0657–558:
DIRECT EVIDENCE FOR THE EXISTENCE OF DARK MATTER¹

DOUGLAS CLOWE²

Institut für Astrophysik und Extraterrestrische Forschung der Universität Bonn, Auf dem Hügel 71, 53121 Bonn, Germany; dclowe@as.arizona.edu

ANTHONY GONZALEZ

Department of Astronomy, University of Florida, 211 Bryant Space Science Center, Gainesville, FL 32611-2055

AND

MAXIM MARKEVITCH

Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, 60 Garden Street, Cambridge, MA 02138

Received 2003 October 28; accepted 2003 December 11



ABSTRACT

We present a weak-lensing mass reconstruction of the interacting cluster 1E 0657–558, in which we detect both the main cluster and a subcluster. The subcluster is identified as a smaller cluster that has just undergone initial infall and pass-through of the primary cluster and has been previously identified in both optical surveys and X-ray studies. The X-ray gas has been separated from the galaxies by ram pressure–stripping during the pass-through. The detected mass peak is located between the X-ray peak and galaxy concentration, although the position is consistent with the galaxy centroid within the errors of the mass reconstruction. We find that the mass peak for the main cluster is in good spatial agreement with the cluster galaxies and is offset from the X-ray halo at 3.4σ significance, and we determine that the mass-to-light ratios of the two components are consistent with those of relaxed clusters. The observed offsets of the lensing mass peaks from the peaks of the dominant visible mass component (the X-ray gas) directly demonstrate the presence, and dominance, of dark matter in this cluster. This proof of dark matter existence holds true even under the assumption of modified Newtonian dynamics (MOND); based on the observed gravitational shear–optical light ratios and the mass peak–X-ray gas offsets, the dark matter component in a MOND regime would have a total mass that is at least equal to the baryonic mass of the system.

More Evidence Against MOND

and also against Self-Interacting DM:
Markevich et al. 2004, ApJ, 606, 819

In a purely baryonic MOND universe the X-ray and galaxy centroids would still be separated as the galaxies are still collisionless particles in the interaction. However, because the X-ray halo is the dominant mass component of the visible baryons in the cluster, in the absence of a dark mass component the vast majority, $\sim 85 - 90\%$, of the mass of the subhump would be with the X-ray gas. Thus, any direct method to measure the mass of the system would detect a higher mass about the stripped X-ray halo than around the galaxies. This is not what is observed in this system.






FIG. 1.— Shown above in the top panel is a color image from the Magellan images of the merging cluster 1E0657–558, with the white bar indicating 200 kpc at the distance of the cluster. In the bottom panel is a 500 ks Chandra image of the cluster. Shown in green contours in both panels are the weak lensing κ reconstruction with the outer contour level at $\kappa = 0.16$ and increasing in steps of 0.07. The white contours show the errors on the positions of the κ peaks and correspond to 68.3%, 95.5%, and 99.7% confidence levels. The blue +s show the location of the centers used to measure the masses of the plasma clouds in Table 2. [Clowe et al. 2007](#)






FIG. 2.— X-ray surface brightness of 1E0657–56 observed with Chandra (left). Clearly visible are two X-ray peaks. The wedge-like structure on the right associated with the ‘bullet’ is bounded by a sharp contact discontinuity, which is interpreted as a cold front. The prominent bow shock in front demonstrates that the subcluster is moving to the right with high velocity. The panel on the right-hand side shows the X-ray surface brightness in one of our merger simulations, roughly drawn on the same scale and with similar dynamic range in the color table. [Springel & Farrar 2007](#)

The measured Mach number in the Bullet Cluster 1E0657-56 of about 3 implies a shock velocity of about **4700 km/s**. This is much higher than expected in Λ CDM ([Hayashi & White 2006](#)). Previous work assumed that this shock velocity is equal to the subcluster's velocity with respect to the parent cluster. But the two velocities can differ both because the upstream gas is gravitationally accelerated toward the shock front and also because the shock front is moving faster than the Bullet subcluster. The [Springel & Farrar](#) Λ CDM 1:10 mass ratio model with $V_{\text{bullet}} = 2600 \text{ km/s}$ nicely accounts for all of the available observations.

While claims have been made that MONDian models could possibly reproduce the bullet cluster, nothing that comes close to this quality of match for Λ CDM has been presented thus far.

Klypin & Prada
(arXiv:0706.3554)
show that SDSS
satellite galaxies
have velocities
that fall off with
distance from the
central galaxy just
as predicted by
standard Λ CDM
from 50 to 500
kpc. They show
that this
disagrees with the
MOND constant-
velocity prediction
at $\sim 10\sigma$.



WHAT IS THE DARK MATTER?

Lensing limits on MACHOs are getting stronger – skewness of high- z vs. low- z Type Ia SN disfavors $10^{-2} < M_{\text{MACHO}}/M_{\text{MACHO}} < 10^{-2}$ (Metcalf & Silk).

Prospects for DIRECT and INDIRECT detection of **WIMPs** and **AXIONS** are improving... But what kind of WIMP? SUSY LSP, NLSP \rightarrow LSP, KK, ...

WHAT IS THE DARK ENERGY??


We can use existing instruments to measure $w = P/\rho$ and see whether it changed in the past. But better telescopes (e.g. **LSST**, **SNAP**) will probably be required both on the ground and in space, according to the Dark Energy Task Force (Albrecht+). See NAS BEPAC report Sept 17, 07.

SUMMARY

- We now know the cosmic recipe. Most of the universe is invisible stuff called “nonbaryonic dark matter” (25%) and “dark energy” (70%). Everything that we can see makes up only about 1/2% of the cosmic density, and invisible atoms about 4%. The earth and its inhabitants are made of the rarest stuff of all: heavy elements (0.01%).
- The Λ CDM Cold Dark Matter **Double Dark** theory based on this appears to be able to account for all the **large scale** features of the observable universe, including the details of the heat radiation of the Big Bang and the large scale distribution of galaxies.
- Constantly improving data are repeatedly testing this theory. The main ingredients have been checked several different ways. There exist no convincing disagreements, as far as I can see. Possible problems on subgalactic scales may be due to the poorly understood physics of gas, stars, and massive black holes.
- **But we still don't know what the dark matter and dark energy are, nor really understand how galaxies form and evolve. There's lots more work for us to do, much of which will be discussed at this meeting.**

The Dark Matter Rap: Cosmological History for the MTV Generation by David Weinberg*

My name is Fritz Zwicky,
I can be kind of prickly,
This song had better start
by giving me priority.
Whatever anybody says,
I said in 1933.
Observe the Coma cluster,
the redshifts of the galaxies
imply some big velocities.
They're moving so fast,
there must be missing mass!
Dark matter.



Dark matter: Do we need it? What is it? Where is it? How much?
Do we need it? Do we need it? Do we need it? Do we need it?

* Written in 1992. <http://www.astronomy.ohio-state.edu/~dhw/Silliness/silliness.html>

For nearly forty years, the dark matter problem sits.
Nobody gets worried 'cause, "It's only crazy Fritz."
The next step's not 'til the early 1970s,
Ostriker and Peebles, dynamics of the galaxies,
cold disk instabilities.

They say: "If the mass, were sitting in the stars,
all those pretty spirals, ought to be bars!
Self-gravitating disks? Uh-uh, oh no.

What those spirals need is a massive halo.

And hey, look over here, check out these observations,
Vera Rubin's optical curves of rotation,
they can provide our needed confirmation:
Those curves aren't falling, they're FLAT!
Dark matter's where it's AT!





Dark matter: Do we need it? What is it? Where is it? How much?
What is it? What is it? What is it? What is it?

And so the call goes out for the dark matter candidates:
black holes, snowballs, gas clouds, low mass stars, or planets.
But we quickly hit a snag because galaxy formation
requires too much structure in the background radiation
if there's only baryons and adiabatic fluctuations.



The Russians have an answer: "We can solve the impasse.
Lyubimov has shown that the neutrino has mass."
Zel'dovich cries, "Pancakes! The dark matter's HOT."
Carlos Frenk, Simon White, Marc Davis say, "NOT!
Quasars are old, and the pancakes must be young.
Forming from the top down it can't be done."
So neutrinos hit the skids, and the picture's looking black.
But California laid-back, Blumenthal & Primack
say, "Don't have a heart attack.
There's lots of other particles. Just read the physics articles.
Take this pretty theory that's called supersymmetry.
What better for dark matter than the L-S-P?
The mass comes in at a \sim keV, and that's not hot, that's warm."
Jim Peebles says, "Warm? Don't be half-hearted.
Let's continue the trend that we have started.
I'll stake out a position that's bold:
dark matter's not hot, not warm, but COLD."
Well cold dark matter causes overnight sensations:
hand-waving calculations,
computer simulations,
detailed computations of the background fluctuations.
Results are good, and the prospects look bright.
Here's a theory that works! Well, maybe not quite.



Dark matter: Do we need it? What is it? Where is it? How much?
Where is it? How much? Where is it? How much?

We have another puzzle that goes back to Robert Dicke. Finding a solution has proven kind of tricky. The CMB's so smooth, it's as if there'd been a compact between parts of the universe that aren't in causal contact. Alan Guth says, "Inflation, will be our salvation, give smoothness of the universe a causal explanation, and even make the galaxies from quantum fluctuations! There is one prediction, from which it's hard to run. If inflation is correct, then Omega should be one." Observers say, "Stop, no, sorry, won't do. Look at these clusters, Omega's point 2." The theorists respond, "We have an explanation. The secret lies in biased galaxy formation. We're not short of critical mass density. Just some regions, are missing luminosity." Observers roll their eyes, and they start to get annoyed, But the theorists reply, "There's dark matter in the voids."




Dark matter: Do we need it? What is it? Where is it? How much?
Do we need it? Do we need it? Do we need it? Do we need it?

Along comes Moti Milgrom,
who's here to tell us all:
"This dark matter claptrap
has got you on the wrong track.
You're all too mired in conventionality,
wedded to your standard theory of gravity,
seduced by the elegance of General Relativity.
Just change your force law, that's the key.
Give me one free parameter, and I'll explain it all."
"Not so," claim Lake, and Spergel, et al.,
"On dwarf galaxies, your theory does fall."
The argument degenerates; it's soon a barroom brawl.



Dark matter: Do we need it? What is it? Where is it? How much?
What is it? What is it? What is it? What is it?

New observations hit the theory like an ice cold shower.
They show that cold dark matter has too little large scale power.
Says Peebles: "Cold dark matter? My feeblest innovation.
An overly aesthetic, theoretical abberation.
Our theories must have firmer empirical foundation.
Shed all this extra baggage, including the carry-ons.
Use particles we know, i.e., the baryons.
Others aren't convinced, and a few propose a mixture
of matter hot and cold, perhaps with strings or texture.
And nowadays some physicists are beginning to wonder
if it's time to resurrect Einstein's "greatest blunder."
Why seek exotic particles instead of just assume
that the dark matter's all around us -- it's what we call the vacuum?



Who's right? It's hard to know, 'til observation or experiment
gives overwhelming evidence that relieves our predicament.
The search is getting popular as many realize
that the detector of dark matter may well win the Nobel Prize.

So now you've heard my lecture, and it's time to end the session
with the standard closing line: Thank you, any questions?