

Predrag Cvitanović

GROUP THEORY



Birdtracks, Lie's, and
Exceptional Groups

Group Theory

Birdtracks, Lie's, and Exceptional Groups

Predrag Cvitanović

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS
PRINCETON AND OXFORD

Copyright © 2008 by Princeton University Press

Published by Princeton University Press
41 William Street, Princeton, New Jersey 08540

In the United Kingdom: Princeton University Press
6 Oxford Street, Woodstock, Oxfordshire OX20 1TW

All Rights Reserved

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Cvitanović, Predrag.

Group theory: Birdtracks, Lie's, and exceptional groups / Predrag Cvitanović.
p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN: 9780691118369 (alk. paper) 0691118361 (alk. paper) 1. Group theory. I. Title.

QA174.2 .C85 2008

512'.2--dc22

2008062101

British Library Cataloging-in-Publication Data is available

This book has been composed in L^AT_EX

The publisher would like to acknowledge the author of this volume for providing the camera-ready copy from which this book was printed.

Printed on acid-free paper. ∞

press.princeton.edu

Printed in the United States of America

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Group Theory



dedicated to the memory of
Boris Weisfeiler and William E. Caswell

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Tony Kennedy for coauthoring the work discussed in chapters on spinors, spinsters and negative dimensions; Henriette Elvang for coauthoring the chapter on representations of $U(n)$; David Pritchard for much help with the early versions of this manuscript; Roger Penrose for inventing birdtracks while I was struggling through grade school; Paul Lauwers for the birdtracks ‘rock around the clock’; Feza Gürsey and Pierre Ramond for the first lessons on exceptional groups; Susumu Okubo for inspiring correspondence; Bob Pearson for assorted birdtrack, Young tableaux and lattice calculations; Bernard Julia for many stimulating interactions; P. Howe and L. Brink for teaching me how to count (supergravity multiplets); W. Siegel for helpful criticisms; E. Cremmer for hospitality at École Normale Supérieure; M. Kontsevich for bringing to my attention the more recent work of Deligne, Cohen, and de Man; A. J. Macfarlane, H. Pfeiffer and an anonymous referee for critical reading of the manuscript; P. Cartier for wonderful history lessons; J. Landsberg for acknowledging my sufferings; R. Abdelatif, G. M. Cicuta, A. Duncan, B. Durhuus, R. Edgar, E. Eichten, P. G. O. Freund, S. Garoufalidis, T. Goldman, R. J. Gonsalves, M. Günaydin, H. Harari, I. Khavkine, N. MacKay, M. Marino, L. Michel, D. Miličević, R. L. Mkrtychyan, K. Oblivia, M. Peskin, C. Sachrajda, G. Seligman, P. Sikivie, A. Springer, A. Taylor, D. Thurston, G. Tiktopoulos, and B. W. Westbury for discussions and/or correspondence.

The appellation “birdtracks” is due to Bernice Durand, who entered my office, saw the blackboard and asked, puzzled: “What is this? Footprints left by birds scurrying along a sandy beach?”

I am grateful to Dorte Glass for typing most of the manuscript, to the Aksel Tovborg Jensens Legat, Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, for financial support which made the transformation from hand-drawn to drafted birdtracks possible, and, most of all, to the good Anders Johansen for drawing some 5,000 birdtracks — without him this book would still be but a collection of squiggles in my filing cabinet. Carol Monsrud and Cecile Gourgues helped with typing the early version of this manuscript.

The manuscript was written in stages, in Aspen, Chewton-Mendip, Princeton, Paris, Bures-sur-Yvette, Rome, Copenhagen, Frebberholm, Miramare, Røros, Juelsminde, Göteborg – Copenhagen train, Cathay Pacific (Hong Kong / Paris) and innumerable other airports and planes, Sjællands Odde, Göteborg, Miramare, Kurkela, Čijovo, assorted Starbucks, Virginia Highlands, and Kostrena. I am grateful to T. Dorrian-Smith, R. de la Torre, BDC, N.-R. Nilsson, U. Selmer, E. Høssøinen, A. Wad, families Cvitanović, and family Herlin for their kind hospitality along this

long road.

I would love to thank W. E. “Bill” Caswell for a perspicacious observation, and Boris Weisfeiler for delightful discussions at the Institute for Advanced Study, but it cannot be done. In 1985, while hiking in the Andes, Boris was kidnapped by the Chilean state security, then tortured and executed by Nazis at Colonia Dignidad, Chile. Bill boarded flight AA77 on September 11, 2001, and was flown into the Pentagon by a no-less-charming group of Islamic fanatics. This book is dedicated to Boris and Bill.

Contents

Acknowledgments	xi
Chapter 1. Introduction	1
Chapter 2. A preview	5
2.1 Basic concepts	5
2.2 First example: $SU(n)$	9
2.3 Second example: E_6 family	12
Chapter 3. Invariants and reducibility	14
3.1 Preliminaries	14
3.2 Defining space, tensors, reps	18
3.3 Invariants	19
3.4 Invariance groups	22
3.5 Projection operators	24
3.6 Spectral decomposition	25
Chapter 4. Diagrammatic notation	27
4.1 Birdtracks	27
4.2 Clebsch-Gordan coefficients	29
4.3 Zero- and one-dimensional subspaces	32
4.4 Infinitesimal transformations	32
4.5 Lie algebra	36
4.6 Other forms of Lie algebra commutators	38
4.7 Classification of Lie algebras by their primitive invariants	38
4.8 Irrelevancy of clebsches	39
4.9 A brief history of birdtracks	40
Chapter 5. Recouplings	43
5.1 Couplings and recouplings	43
5.2 Wigner $3n-j$ coefficients	46
5.3 Wigner-Eckart theorem	47
Chapter 6. Permutations	50
6.1 Symmetrization	50
6.2 Antisymmetrization	52
6.3 Levi-Civita tensor	54
6.4 Determinants	56
6.5 Characteristic equations	58

6.6	Fully (anti)symmetric tensors	58
6.7	Identically vanishing tensors	59
Chapter 7. Casimir operators		61
7.1	Casimirs and Lie algebra	62
7.2	Independent casimirs	63
7.3	Adjoint rep casimirs	65
7.4	Casimir operators	66
7.5	Dynkin indices	67
7.6	Quadratic, cubic casimirs	70
7.7	Quartic casimirs	71
7.8	Sundry relations between quartic casimirs	73
7.9	Dynkin labels	76
Chapter 8. Group integrals		78
8.1	Group integrals for arbitrary reps	79
8.2	Characters	81
8.3	Examples of group integrals	82
Chapter 9. Unitary groups		84
<i>P. Cvitanović, H. Elvang, and A. D. Kennedy</i>		
9.1	Two-index tensors	84
9.2	Three-index tensors	85
9.3	Young tableaux	86
9.4	Young projection operators	92
9.5	Reduction of tensor products	96
9.6	$U(n)$ recoupling relations	100
9.7	$U(n)$ $3n-j$ symbols	101
9.8	$SU(n)$ and the adjoint rep	105
9.9	An application of the negative dimensionality theorem	107
9.10	$SU(n)$ mixed two-index tensors	108
9.11	$SU(n)$ mixed defining \otimes adjoint tensors	109
9.12	$SU(n)$ two-index adjoint tensors	112
9.13	Casimirs for the fully symmetric reps of $SU(n)$	117
9.14	$SU(n)$, $U(n)$ equivalence in adjoint rep	118
9.15	Sources	119
Chapter 10. Orthogonal groups		121
10.1	Two-index tensors	122
10.2	Mixed adjoint \otimes defining rep tensors	123
10.3	Two-index adjoint tensors	124
10.4	Three-index tensors	128
10.5	Gravity tensors	130
10.6	$SO(n)$ Dynkin labels	133
Chapter 11. Spinors		135
<i>P. Cvitanović and A. D. Kennedy</i>		
11.1	Spinography	136
11.2	Fierzing around	139
11.3	Fierz coefficients	143

CONTENTS	ix
11.4 6- j coefficients	144
11.5 Exemplary evaluations, continued	146
11.6 Invariance of γ -matrices	147
11.7 Handedness	148
11.8 Kahane algorithm	149
Chapter 12. Symplectic groups	152
12.1 Two-index tensors	153
Chapter 13. Negative dimensions	155
<i>P. Cvitanović and A. D. Kennedy</i>	
13.1 $SU(n) = \overline{SU}(-n)$	156
13.2 $SO(n) = \overline{Sp}(-n)$	158
Chapter 14. Spinors' symplectic sisters	160
<i>P. Cvitanović and A. D. Kennedy</i>	
14.1 Spinsters	160
14.2 Racah coefficients	165
14.3 Heisenberg algebras	166
Chapter 15. $SU(n)$ family of invariance groups	168
15.1 Reps of $SU(2)$	168
15.2 $SU(3)$ as invariance group of a cubic invariant	170
15.3 Levi-Civita tensors and $SU(n)$	173
15.4 $SU(4)$ - $SO(6)$ isomorphism	174
Chapter 16. G_2 family of invariance groups	176
16.1 Jacobi relation	178
16.2 Alternativity and reduction of f -contractions	178
16.3 Primitivity implies alternativity	181
16.4 Casimirs for G_2	183
16.5 Hurwitz's theorem	184
Chapter 17. E_8 family of invariance groups	186
17.1 Two-index tensors	187
17.2 Decomposition of $\text{Sym}^3 A$	190
17.3 Diophantine conditions	192
17.4 Dynkin labels and Young tableaux for E_8	193
Chapter 18. E_6 family of invariance groups	196
18.1 Reduction of two-index tensors	196
18.2 Mixed two-index tensors	198
18.3 Diophantine conditions and the E_6 family	199
18.4 Three-index tensors	200
18.5 Defining \otimes adjoint tensors	202
18.6 Two-index adjoint tensors	205
18.7 Dynkin labels and Young tableaux for E_6	209
18.8 Casimirs for E_6	210
18.9 Subgroups of E_6	213
18.10 Springer relation	213


18.11	Springer's construction of E_6	214
Chapter 19. F_4 family of invariance groups		216
19.1	Two-index tensors	216
19.2	Defining \otimes adjoint tensors	219
19.3	Jordan algebra and $F_4(26)$	222
19.4	Dynkin labels and Young tableaux for F_4	223
Chapter 20. E_7 family and its negative-dimensional cousins		224
20.1	$SO(4)$ family	225
20.2	Defining \otimes adjoint tensors	227
20.3	Lie algebra identification	228
20.4	E_7 family	230
20.5	Dynkin labels and Young tableaux for E_7	233
Chapter 21. Exceptional magic		235
21.1	Magic Triangle	235
21.2	A brief history of exceptional magic	238
21.3	Extended supergravities and the Magic Triangle	241
Epilogue		242
Appendix A. Recursive decomposition		244
Appendix B. Properties of Young projections		246
<i>H. Elvang and P. Cvetanović</i>		
B.1	Uniqueness of Young projection operators	246
B.2	Orthogonality	247
B.3	Normalization and completeness	247
B.4	Dimension formula	248
Bibliography		251
Index		269

Chapter One

Introduction

This monograph offers a derivation of all classical and exceptional semisimple Lie algebras through a classification of “primitive invariants.” Using somewhat unconventional notation inspired by the Feynman diagrams of quantum field theory, the invariant tensors are represented by diagrams; severe limits on what simple groups could possibly exist are deduced by requiring that irreducible representations be of integer dimension. The method provides the full Killing-Cartan list of all possible simple Lie algebras, but fails to prove the existence of F_4 , E_6 , E_7 and E_8 .

One simple quantum field theory question started this project; what is the group-theoretic factor for the following Quantum Chromodynamics gluon self-energy diagram

(1.1)

I first computed the answer for $SU(n)$. There was a hard way of doing it, using Gell-Mann f_{ijk} and d_{ijk} coefficients. There was also an easy way, where one could doodle oneself to the answer in a few lines. This is the “birdtracks” method that will be developed here. It works nicely for $SO(n)$ and $Sp(n)$ as well. Out of curiosity, I wanted the answer for the remaining five exceptional groups. This engendered further thought, and that which I learned can be better understood as the answer to a different question. Suppose someone came into your office and asked, “On planet Z , mesons consist of quarks and antiquarks, but baryons contain three quarks in a symmetric color combination. What is the color group?” The answer is neither trivial nor without some beauty (planet Z quarks can come in 27 colors, and the color group can be E_6).

Once you know how to answer such group-theoretical questions, you can answer many others. This monograph tells you how. Like the brain, it is divided into two halves: the plodding half and the interesting half.

The plodding half describes how group-theoretic calculations are carried out for unitary, orthogonal, and symplectic groups (chapters 3–15). Except for the “negative dimensions” of chapter 13 and the “spinsters” of chapter 14, none of that is new, but the methods are helpful in carrying out daily chores, such as evaluating Quantum Chromodynamics group-theoretic weights, evaluating lattice gauge theory group integrals, computing $1/N$ corrections, evaluating spinor traces, evaluating casimirs, implementing evaluation algorithms on computers, and so on.

The interesting half, chapters 16–21, describes the “exceptional magic” (a new construction of exceptional Lie algebras), the “negative dimensions” (relations between bosonic and fermionic dimensions). Open problems, links to literature, software and other resources, and personal confessions are relegated to the epilogue,

monograph's Web page birdtracks.eu. The methods used are applicable to field-theoretic model building. Regardless of their potential applications, the results are sufficiently intriguing to justify this entire undertaking. In what follows we shall forget about quarks and quantum field theory, and offer instead a somewhat unorthodox introduction to the theory of Lie algebras. If the style is not Bourbaki [29], it is not so by accident.

There are two complementary approaches to group theory. In the *canonical* approach one chooses the basis, or the Clebsch-Gordan coefficients, as simply as possible. This is the method which Killing [189] and Cartan [43] used to obtain the complete classification of semisimple Lie algebras, and which has been brought to perfection by Coxeter [67] and Dynkin [105]. There exist many excellent reviews of applications of Dynkin diagram methods to physics, such as refs. [312, 126].

In the *tensorial* approach pursued here, the bases are arbitrary, and every statement is invariant under change of basis. Tensor calculus deals directly with the invariant blocks of the theory and gives the explicit forms of the invariants, Clebsch-Gordan series, evaluation algorithms for group-theoretic weights, *etc.*

The canonical approach is often impractical for computational purposes, as a choice of basis requires a specific coordinatization of the representation space. Usually, nothing that we want to compute depends on such a coordinatization; physical predictions are pure scalar numbers ("color singlets"), with all tensorial indices summed over. However, the canonical approach can be very useful in determining chains of subgroup embeddings. We refer the reader to refs. [312, 126] for such applications. Here we shall concentrate on tensorial methods, borrowing from Cartan and Dynkin only the nomenclature for identifying irreducible representations. Extensive listings of these are given by McKay and Patera [234] and Slansky [312].

To appreciate the sense in which canonical methods are impractical, let us consider using them to evaluate the group-theoretic factor associated with diagram (1.1) for the exceptional group E_8 . This would involve summations over 8 structure constants. The Cartan-Dynkin construction enables us to construct them explicitly; an E_8 structure constant has about $248^3/6$ elements, and the direct evaluation of the group-theoretic factor for diagram (1.1) is tedious even on a computer. An evaluation in terms of a canonical basis would be equally tedious for $SU(16)$; however, the tensorial approach illustrated by the example of section 2.2 yields the answer for all $SU(n)$ in a few steps.

Simplicity of such calculations is one motivation for formulating a tensorial approach to exceptional groups. The other is the desire to understand their geometrical significance. The Killing-Cartan classification is based on a mapping of Lie algebras onto a Diophantine problem on the Cartan root lattice. This yields an exhaustive classification of simple Lie algebras, but gives no insight into the associated geometries. In the 19th century, the geometries or the invariant theory were the central question, and Cartan, in his 1894 thesis, made an attempt to identify the primitive invariants. Most of the entries in his classification were the classical groups $SU(n)$, $SO(n)$, and $Sp(n)$. Of the five exceptional algebras, Cartan [44] identified G_2 as the group of octonion isomorphisms and noted already in his thesis that E_7 has a skew-symmetric quadratic and a symmetric quartic invariant. Dickson characterized E_6 as a 27-dimensional group with a cubic invariant. The fact that the orthogonal, uni-

tary and symplectic groups were invariance groups of real, complex, and quaternion norms suggested that the exceptional groups were associated with octonions, but it took more than 50 years to establish this connection. The remaining four exceptional Lie algebras emerged as rather complicated constructions from octonions and Jordan algebras, known as the *Freudenthal-Tits construction*. A mathematician's history of this subject is given in a delightful review by Freudenthal [130]. The problem has been taken up by physicists twice, first by Jordan, von Neumann, and Wigner [173], and then in the 1970s by Gürsey and collaborators [149, 151, 152]. Jordan *et al.*'s effort was a failed attempt at formulating a new quantum mechanics that would explain the neutron, discovered in 1932. However, it gave rise to the Jordan algebras, which became a mathematics field in itself. Gürsey *et al.* took up the subject again in the hope of formulating a quantum mechanics of quark confinement; however, the main applications so far have been in building models of grand unification.

Although beautiful, the Freudenthal-Tits construction is still not practical for the evaluation of group-theoretic weights. The reason is this: the construction involves $[3 \times 3]$ octonionic matrices with octonion coefficients, and the 248-dimensional defining space of E_8 is written as a direct sum of various subspaces. This is convenient for studying subgroup embeddings [291], but awkward for group-theoretical computations.

The inspiration for the primitive invariants construction came from the axiomatic approach of Springer [314, 315] and Brown [34]: one treats the defining representation as a single vector space, and characterizes the primitive invariants by algebraic identities. This approach solves the problem of formulating efficient tensorial algorithms for evaluating group-theoretic weights, and it yields some intuition about the geometrical significance of the exceptional Lie groups. Such intuition might be of use to quark-model builders. For example, because $SU(3)$ has a cubic invariant $\epsilon^{abc} q_a q_b q_c$, Quantum Chromodynamics, based on this color group, can accommodate 3-quark baryons. Are there any other groups that could accommodate 3-quark singlets? As we shall see, G_2 , F_4 , and E_6 are some of the groups whose defining representations possess such invariants.

Beyond its utility as a computational technique, the primitive invariants construction of exceptional groups yields several unexpected results. First, it generates in a somewhat magical fashion a triangular array of Lie algebras, depicted in figure 1.1. This is a classification of Lie algebras different from Cartan's classification; in this new classification, all exceptional Lie groups appear in the same series (the bottom line of figure 1.1). The second unexpected result is that many groups and group representations are mutually related by interchanges of symmetrizations and anti-symmetrizations and replacement of the dimension parameter n by $-n$. I call this phenomenon "negative dimensions."

For me, the greatest surprise of all is that in spite of all the magic and the strange diagrammatic notation, the resulting manuscript is in essence not very different from Wigner's [345] 1931 classic. Regardless of whether one is doing atomic, nuclear, or particle physics, all physical predictions ("spectroscopic levels") are expressed in terms of Wigner's $3n-j$ coefficients, which can be evaluated by means of recursive or combinatorial algorithms.

Parenthetically, this book is *not* a book about diagrammatic methods in group

							0	3	A_1
							0	2	
						0	1	8	A_2
						0	1	3	
					0	0	3	14	G_2
					0	1	3	7	
				0	0	2	9	28	D_4
				0	1	2	4	8	
		0	0	3	8	21	52		
		0	2	5	8	14	26		
		0	2	8	16	35	78		
		0	1	3	6	9	15	27	
	0	1	3	9	21	35	66	133	
	0	2	4	8	14	20	32	56	
3	8	14	28	52	78	133	248		
3	8	14	28	52	78	133	248		

Figure 1.1 The “Magic Triangle” for Lie algebras. The “Magic Square” is framed by the double line. For a discussion, consult chapter 21.

theory. If you master a traditional notation that covers all topics in this book in a uniform way, more elegantly than birdtracks, more power to you. I would love to learn it.

Chapter Two

A preview

The theory of Lie groups presented here had mutated greatly throughout its genesis. It arose from concrete calculations motivated by physical problems; but as it was written, the generalities were collected into introductory chapters, and the applications receded later and later into the text.

As a result, the first seven chapters are largely a compilation of definitions and general results that might appear unmotivated on first reading. The reader is advised to work through the examples, section 2.2 and section 2.3 in this chapter, jump to the topic of possible interest (such as the unitary groups, chapter 9, or the E_8 family, chapter 17), and birdtrack if able or backtrack when necessary.

The goal of these notes is to provide the reader with a set of basic group-theoretic tools. They are not particularly sophisticated, and they rest on a few simple ideas. The text is long, because various notational conventions, examples, special cases, and applications have been laid out in detail, but the basic concepts can be stated in a few lines. We shall briefly state them in this chapter, together with several illustrative examples. This preview presumes that the reader has considerable prior exposure to group theory; if a concept is unfamiliar, the reader is referred to the appropriate section for a detailed discussion.

2.1 BASIC CONCEPTS

A typical quantum theory is constructed from a few building blocks, which we shall refer to as the *defining space* V . They form the defining multiplet of the theory — for example, the “quark wave functions” q_a . The group-theoretical problem consists of determining the symmetry group, *i.e.*, the group of all linear transformations

$$q'_a = G_a^b q_b \quad a, b = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

which leaves invariant the predictions of the theory. The $[n \times n]$ matrices G form the *defining representation* (or “rep” for short) of the invariance group \mathcal{G} . The conjugate multiplet \bar{q} (“antiquarks”) transforms as

$$q'^a = G^a_b q^b.$$

Combinations of quarks and antiquarks transform as *tensors*, such as

$$\begin{aligned} p'_a q'_b r'^c &= G_{ab}^c{}_{,d}{}^{ef} p_f q_e r^d, \\ G_{ab}^c{}_{,d}{}^{ef} &= G_a^f G_b^e G_d^c \end{aligned}$$


(distinction between G_a^b and G^a_b as well as other notational details are explained in section 3.2). Tensor reps are plagued by a proliferation of indices. These indices

can either be replaced by a few collective indices:

$$\alpha = \left\{ \begin{matrix} c \\ ab \end{matrix} \right\}, \quad \beta = \left\{ \begin{matrix} ef \\ d \end{matrix} \right\},$$

$$q'_\alpha = G_\alpha{}^\beta q_\beta, \quad (2.1)$$

or represented diagrammatically:



(Diagrammatic notation is explained in section 4.1.) Collective indices are convenient for stating general theorems; diagrammatic notation speeds up explicit calculations.

A polynomial

$$H(\bar{q}, \bar{r}, \dots, s) = h_{ab\dots}{}^c q^a r^b \dots s_c$$

is an invariant if (and only if) for any transformation $G \in \mathcal{G}$ and for any set of vectors q, r, s, \dots (see section 3.4)

$$H(\overline{Gq}, \overline{Gr}, \dots, Gs) = H(\bar{q}, \bar{r}, \dots, s). \quad (2.2)$$

An invariance group is defined by its *primitive invariants*, i.e., by a list of the elementary “singlets” of the theory. For example, the orthogonal group $O(n)$ is defined as the group of all transformations that leaves the length of a vector invariant (see chapter 10). Another example is the color $SU(3)$ of QCD that leaves invariant the mesons ($q\bar{q}$) and the baryons (qqq) (see section 15.2). A complete list of primitive invariants *defines* the invariance group via the invariance conditions (2.2); only those transformations, which respect them, are allowed.

It is not necessary to list explicitly the components of primitive invariant tensors in order to define them. For example, the $O(n)$ group is defined by the requirement that it leaves invariant a symmetric and invertible tensor $g_{ab} = g_{ba}$, $\det(g) \neq 0$. Such definition is basis independent, while a component definition $g_{11} = 1, g_{12} = 0, g_{22} = 1, \dots$ relies on a specific basis choice. We shall define all simple Lie groups in this manner, specifying the primitive invariants only by their symmetry and by the basis-independent algebraic relations that they must satisfy.

These algebraic relations (which I shall call *primitiveness conditions*) are hard to describe without first giving some examples. In their essence they are statements of irreducibility; for example, if the primitive invariant tensors are δ_b^a , h_{abc} and h^{abc} , then $h_{abc}h^{cbe}$ must be proportional to δ_a^e , as otherwise the defining rep would be reducible. (Reducibility is discussed in section 3.5, section 3.6, and chapter 5.)

The objective of physicists’ group-theoretic calculations is a description of the spectroscopy of a given theory. This entails identifying the levels (irreducible multiplets), the degeneracy of a given level (dimension of the multiplet) and the level splittings (eigenvalues of various casimirs). The basic idea that enables us to carry this program through is extremely simple: a hermitian matrix can be diagonalized. This fact has many names: Schur’s lemma, Wigner-Eckart theorem, full reducibility of unitary reps, and so on (see section 3.5 and section 5.3). We exploit it by constructing invariant hermitian matrices M from the primitive invariant tensors. The