

Why Sudarshan, Not Glauber, Should Have Won the 2005 Nobel Prize

Terry Bollinger

2023-05-14.10:33 EDT Sun

<https://youtu.be/II0LWR8gR5s&lc=Ugw3MXRq3YjfpPKj0TF4AaABAq>

A Comment on the [Parth G](#) YouTube post:

The 2005 Nobel Prize Controversy: The Indian-American Physicist Who Should Have Won It Instead
(Apr 25, 2023)

<https://youtu.be/II0LWR8gR5s>

Parth G, thank you for raising awareness of E. C. George Sudarshan's profound 1963 paper. Judging from your video and a reading of his nicely compact 1963 paper, what Sudarshan did was dare to postulate that any complete analysis of quantized light requires the inclusion of a strangely Maxwell-like semiclassical component. That makes his 1963 paper both scarily radical and exceptionally impactful on how history developed afterward.

To see the impact, consider what might have happened if Sudarshan had not been bold enough to propose such a radical-sounding inclusion of "obviously" obsolete pre-quantum mathematics. It's entirely possible that even by now, 60 years later, no one would have had the nerve to make such a retro-sounding recommendation. That in turn would have undermined, possibly to this day, the accurate mathematical modeling and prediction of a broad range of important and useful coherent optical phenomena.

Thus Sudarshan's 1963 act of intellectual daring makes his paper unique, exceptionally impactful, and singularly worthy of a Nobel Prize.

Both E. C. George Sudarshan and Roy Glauber sound like good people and great physicists. But it was unequivocally Sudarshan, not Glauber, who took that first scary step of saying the quantum models of that time had abandoned too much of the classical models that preceded them.

For that unique, impactful, and professionally risky act of intellectual courage, it was unequivocally Sudarshan, not Glauber, who should have received the Nobel Prize for physics theory that year.