

How To Have a Transfer of Information From a Prior to a Present Universe, in Lieu of Information Theory

Andrew Beckwith

Chongqing University Department of Physics, Chongqing, PRC, 400044
abeckwith@uh.edu

ABSTRACT

What happens to the topological entanglement entropy of a system, when it is driven out of its ground state by increasing the temperature? This question is basic, especially if there is an increasing amount of temperature up to the interval of Planck time, in early universe cosmology. The author examines what is possible if a cyclic model is arranged via Penrose cyclic cosmology, which may enable entanglement entropy as a way to transfer essential information from a prior to the present universe. We reference Theorem 6.1.2 of the book by Ellis, Maartens, and MacCallum in order to argue that if there is a non zero initial scale factor, that there is a partial breakdown of the Fundamental Singularity theorem which is due to the Raychaudhuri equation. Afterwards, we review a construction of what could happen if we put in what Ellis, Maartens, and MacCallum call the measured effective cosmological constant and substitute $\Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda_{Effective}$ in the Friedman equation. I.e. there are two ways to look at the problem, i.e. after $\Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda_{Effective}$, set Λ_{vac} as equal to zero, and have the left over Λ as scaled to background cosmological temperature, as was postulated by Park (2002) or else have Λ_{vac} as proportional to $\Lambda_{vac} \sim 10^{38} GeV^2$ which then would imply using what we call a 5 dimensional contribution to Λ as proportional to $\Lambda \approx \Lambda_{5D} \sim -const/T^\beta$. We find that both these models do not work for generating an initial singularity. Λ removal as a non zero cosmological constant is most easily dealt with by a Bianchi I universe version of the generalized Friedman equation.

Keywords

Raychaudhuri equation; Fundamental Singularity theorem; Bianchi I universe; effective cosmological parameter.

Academic Discipline And Sub-Disciplines

Physics, mathematical physics; cosmology

SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION

Mathematical physics

TYPE (METHOD/APPROACH)

Mathematical physics applications

Council for Innovative Research

Peer Review Research Publishing System

Journal: Journal of Advances in Mathematics

Vol 3, No 1

editor@cirworld.com

www.cirworld.com, member.cirworld.com



1. Introduction

What happens to the topological entanglement entropy of a system, when it is driven out of its ground state by increasing the temperature? We ask this question because if the universe started as an initially cold universe, we have an initial cosmological "constant" which if it varies by temperature, could be initially set equal to zero, and which rises in value dramatically with increasing temperature. I.e. from a cold to a "hot" universe of up to $10^{19} \text{ GeV} \sim 10^{32} \text{ Kelvin}$. The dramatic increase in temperature from essentially zero to $10^{19} \text{ GeV} \sim 10^{32} \text{ Kelvin}$ would be in tandem with conditions in which Theorem 6.1.2 of Ellis, Maartens, and Mac Callum [1] would be when the initial conditions of the cosmos changed, no longer held. Note that we are assuming a temperature dependent cosmological 'constant' parameter, Λ , which we could write as given by Park, et. Al. [2]

$$\Lambda = \Lambda_{\text{start-value}} T^\beta \quad (1)$$

If Eq. (1) were about zero for an ultra low temperature, we would approach having Theorem 6.1.2 of Ellis, Maartens, and Mac Callum [1] with the cosmological parameter less than or equal to zero. This is different from having a very low, constant $\Lambda_{\text{start-value}}$ and β equal to zero, which would correspond to a uniform unchanging cosmological constant, never zero which would be with regards to the present era, very tiny and almost zero, although sufficient to initiate a deviation from Theorem 6.1.2. The present document is to determine what may contribute to a nonzero initial radius, i.e. not just an initial nonzero energy value, as Kauffman's paper would imply, and how different models of contributing vacuum energy, initially may affect divergence from the first singularity theorem. The choices of what can be used for an effective cosmological constant will affect if we have a four dimensional universe in terms of effective contributions to vacuum energy, or if we have a five dimensional universe. The second choice will probably necessitate a tie in with Kaluza Klein geometries, leaving open possible string theory cosmology. In order to be self contained, this paper will give partial re productions of Beckwith's [3] paper, but the 2nd half of this document will be completely different, ie. When considering an effective cosmological constant. With four different cases. The last case is unphysical, even if it has, via rescaling zero effective cosmological constant, due to an effective 'fluid mass' M_{eff}

2. Looking at the First Singularity theorem and how it could fail

Again, we restate at what is given by Ellis, Maartens, and MacCallum.[1] (2012) as to how to state the fundamental singularity theorem

Theorem 6.1.2 (Irrotational Geodesic singularities) *If $\Lambda \leq 0$, $\rho + 3p \geq 0$, and $\rho + p > 0$ in a fluid flow for which $\dot{u} = 0$, $\omega = 0$ and $H_0 > 0$ at some time s_0 , then a spacetime singularity, where either $\ell(\tau) \rightarrow 0$ or $\sigma \rightarrow \infty$, occurs at a finite proper time $\tau_0 \leq H_0$ before s_0 .*

As was brought up by Beckwith, [2](2013), if there is a non zero initial energy for the universe, a supposition which is counter to ADM theory as seen in Kolb and Turner [4], then the supposition by Kauffman [5] is supportable with evidence. I.e. then if there is a non zero initial energy, is this in any way counter to Theorem 6.1 above? We will review this question, keeping in mind that. $\ell(\tau) \rightarrow 0$ is in reference to a scale factor, as written by Ellis, Maartens, and MacCallum [1]. (2012), vanishing.

3. Looking at how to form $\ell(\tau) \neq 0$ for all scale factors.

What was done by Beckwith [2](2013) involved locking in the value of Planck's constant initially. Doing that locking in of an initial Planck's constant would be commensurate with some power of the mass within the Hubble parameter, namely M_0 ,

$$\hbar \propto \sqrt{M_0} \quad (2)$$

We would argue that a given amount of mass, M_0 would be fixed in by initial conditions, at the start of the universe and that if energy, is equal to mass ($E = M$) that in fact locking in a value of initial energy, according to the dimensional argument of $E \sim \hbar \cdot \omega$ that having a fixed initial energy of $E \sim \hbar \cdot \omega$, with Planck's constant fixed would be commensurate with, for very high frequencies, ω of having a non zero initial energy, thereby confirming in part Kauffmann(2012) , as discussed in Appendix A, for conditions for a non zero lower bound to the cosmological initial radius. If so then we always have $\ell(\tau) \neq 0$. We will then next examine the consequences of $\ell(\tau) \neq 0$. I.e. what if $\ell(\tau) = a(\tau)$ for a FLRW cosmology?

4. $\ell(\tau) \neq 0$ and what to look for in terms of the Raychaudhuri-Elders equation for

$\ell(\tau) = a(\tau)$ **at the start of cosmological expansion in FLRW cosmology**

We will start off with $\ell(\tau) = a(\tau) = a_{\text{initial}} e^{\tilde{H}\tau}$ with \tilde{H} an initial huge Hubble parameter



$$3\ddot{a} / a = -4\pi G \cdot (\rho + 3p) + \Lambda \Rightarrow \dot{a}^2 - 8\pi G \rho a^2 - \Lambda a^2 - const = 0 \tag{3}$$

Equation (2) above becomes, with $\ell(\tau) = a(\tau) = a_{initial} e^{\tilde{H}\tau}$ introduced will lead to

$$a_{initial}^2 = const / [\tilde{H}^2 - [8\pi G \rho + \Lambda]] \Rightarrow a_{initial} = \sqrt{const / [\tilde{H}^2 - [8\pi G \rho + \Lambda]]} \tag{4}$$

5. Analyzing Eq. (4) for different candidate values of Λ , with $\Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda_{Effective}$ for three cases.

The equation to look at if we have $\Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda_{Effective}$ put into Eq. (3) is to go to, instead to looking at

$$\Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda_{Effective} = \Lambda_{Vac} + \Lambda \tag{5}$$

Case 1, set $\Lambda_{Vac} = 0$, and $\Lambda = \Lambda_{start-value} T^\beta$ such that in the present era with T about 2.7 today

$$\Lambda_{Effective} = \Lambda_{Vac} + \Lambda \sim 10^{-83} GeV^2 (today) \tag{6}$$

This would change to , if the temperature T were about $10^{32} Kelvin \sim 10^{19} GeV$

$$\Lambda_{Effective} = \Lambda_{Vac} + \Lambda \sim 10^{38} GeV^2 (Plank era) \tag{7}$$

The upshot, is that if we have Case 1, we will not have a singularity if we use Theorem 6.1

Case 2, set $\Lambda_{Vac} = 0$, and such that $\Lambda = \Lambda_{start-value}$ in the present era with T about 2.7 today

The upshot, is that if we have Case 2, we will not have a singularity if we use Theorem 6.1

Unless $\Lambda = \Lambda_{start-value}$ is less than or equal to zero. In reality this does not happen, and we have

$$\Lambda_{Effective} = \Lambda_{Vac} + \Lambda \sim 10^{-83} GeV^2 (always) \tag{8}$$

Case 3, set $\Lambda_{Vac} \sim 10^{38} GeV^2$, and set $\Lambda \approx \Lambda_{5D} \sim -const / T^{|\beta|}$ for all eras. Such that

$$\Lambda_{Effective} = [\Lambda_{Vac} \sim 10^{38} GeV^2] + [\Lambda_{5D} \sim -const / T^{|\beta|}] \sim 10^{-83} GeV^2 (today) \tag{9}$$

$$\Lambda_{Effective} = [\Lambda_{Vac} \sim 10^{38} GeV^2] + [\Lambda_{5D} \sim -const / T^{|\beta|}] \sim 10^{38} GeV^2 (Planck- era) \tag{10}$$

The only way to have any fidelity as to this theorem 6.1 would be to eliminate the cosmological constant entirely. There is, one model where we can, in a sense “remove” a cosmological constant, as given by Ellis, Maartens, and MacCallum.[1] , and that is the Bianchi I universe model, as given on page 459 [1].

6. Bianchi I universe in the case of $\omega = p/\rho = -1 \Leftrightarrow \rho = const$

In this case, we have pressure as the negative quantity of density, and this will be enough to justify writing

$$3 \frac{\dot{\ell}^2}{\ell^2} = \frac{\Sigma^2}{\ell^6} + \frac{M}{\ell^{3\omega+3}} + \Lambda \Big|_{\omega=-1} = \frac{\Sigma^2}{\ell^6} + (M + \Lambda) \tag{11}$$

If $\ell(\tau) = \ell_{initial} e^{\tilde{H}\tau}$, we can re write Eq.(11) as, if the sheer term in fluid flow, namely Σ is a non zero constant term.(I.e. at the onset of inflation, this is dubious)

$$\ell^6 = \Sigma^2 / [3\tilde{H}^2 - [M + \Lambda]] \tag{12}$$

In this situation, we are speaking of a cosmological constant and we will collect $[M + \Lambda] \equiv M_{eff}$ such that

$$\ell^6 = \Sigma^2 / [3\tilde{H}^2 - M_{eff}] \tag{13}$$

If we speak of a fluid approximation, this will lead to for Planck times looking at $\ell \sim \ell_{initial}$ so we solve

$$\ell = \Sigma^{1/3} / [3\tilde{H}^2 - M_{eff}]^{1/6} \tag{14}$$



The above equation no longer has an effective cosmological constant, i.e. if matter is the same as energy, in early inflation, Eq. (14) is a requirement that we have, effectively, for a finite but very large \tilde{H}^2

$$\tilde{H}^2 \gg M_{eff}/3 \quad (15)$$

7. Use of Thermal history of Hubble parameter equation represented by Eq.(15)

Ellis, Maartens, and MacCallum. (2012) treatment of the thermal history will then be, if $100 < g_*(T) < 1000$

$$\tilde{H}^2 \approx (1.7)^2 g_*(T) \cdot \frac{T^4}{M_p^2} \quad (16)$$

Then we have for Eq. (15), if the value of Eq.(16) is very large due to Plank temperature values initially

$$(1.7)^2 g_*(T) \cdot \frac{T^4}{M_p^2} \gg M_{eff}/3 \quad (17)$$

This assumes that there is an effective mass which is equal to adding both the Mass and a cosmological constant together. In a fluid model of the early universe. This is of course highly unphysical. But it would lead to Eq. (14) having a non zero but almost infinitesimally small Eq. (14) value. The vanishing of a cosmological constant inside an effective (fluid) mass, as given above by $[M + \Lambda] \equiv M_{eff}$ means that if we treat Eq. (16) above as ALMOST infinite in value, that we ALMOST can satisfy Theorem 6.1 as written above. The fact that $100 < g_*(T) < 1000$ [6], i.e. we do not have infinite degrees of freedom, means that we get out of having Eq. (16) become infinite, but it comes very close.

8. Use of Thermal history of Hubble parameter equation represented by Eq.(3) and an effective cosmological parameter.

Case 1, if $\Lambda_{vac} = 0$. But the cosmological parameter has a temperature dependence. Is the following true when the temperatures get enormous?

$$(1.7)^2 g_*(T) \cdot \frac{T^4}{M_p^2} \gg 8\pi G \rho_{initial} + \Lambda_{start-value} T^\beta \quad (18)$$

Not necessarily,. It could break down.

Case 2, set $\Lambda_{vac} = 0$, and such that $\Lambda = \Lambda_{start-value}$ (cosmological constant). Then we have

$$(1.7)^2 g_*(T) \cdot \frac{T^4}{M_p^2} \gg 8\pi G \rho_{initial} + \Lambda_{start-value} \quad (19)$$

Yes, but we have problems because the cosmological parameter, while still very small is not zero or negative. So theorem 6.1.2 above will not hold. But it can come close if the initial value of the cosmological constant is almost zero.

Case 3, when we can no longer use $\Lambda_{vac} = 0$. Is the following true? When the Temperature is Planck temp?

$$(1.7)^2 g_*(T) \cdot \frac{T^4}{M_p^2} \gg \Lambda_{Effective} = [\Lambda_{vac} \sim 10^{38} GeV^2] + [\Lambda_{SD} \sim -const/T^{|\beta|}] \sim 10^{38} GeV^2 (Planck-era) \quad (20)$$

Almost certainly not true. Our section eight is far from optimal in terms of fidelity to Theorem 6.1.

We are close to Theorem 6.1.2 on our section seven. But this requires a demonstration of the constant value of the following term, in section 7, namely in the Bianchi universe model, that the sheer term in fluid flow, namely Σ is a non-zero constant term. (I.e. at the onset of inflation, this is dubious). If it, Σ , is not zero, then even close to Planck time, it is not likely we can make the assertion mentioned above. In Section 7.

9. Conclusion: Non singular solutions to cosmological evolution require new thinking. No initial singularity.

For section 7 above we have almost an initial singularity, if we replace a cosmological constant with $[M + \Lambda] \equiv M_{eff}$, And we also are assuming then, a thermal expression for the Hubble parameter given by Ellis, Maartens and Mac Callum [1] as a $(1.7)^2 g_*(T) \cdot \frac{T^4}{M_p^2}$ term which is almost infinite in initial value. Our conclusion is that we almost satisfy Theorem 6.1 if



we assume an initially almost perfect fluid model to get results near fidelity with the initial singularity theorem (Theorem 6.1). This is dubious in that it is unlikely that Σ , as a shear term is not zero, but constant over time, even initially. The situation when we look at effective cosmological “constants” is even worse. I.e. Case 1 to Case 3 in section eight nowhere come even close to what we would want for satisfying the initial singularity theorem (theorem 6.1). We as a result of these results will in future work examine applying Penrose’s CCC cosmology [7] to get about problems we run into due to the singularity theorem cosmology as represented by Theorem 6.1 above.

Appendix A: Indirect support for a massive graviton

We follow the recent work of Steven Kenneth Kauffmann [5], which sets an upper bound to concentrations of energy, in terms of how he formulated the following equation put in below as Eq. (A1). Eq. (A1) specifies an inter-relationship between an initial radius R for an expanding universe, and a “gravitationally based energy” expression we will call $T_G(r)$ which lead to a lower bound to the radius of the universe at the start of the Universe’s initial expansion, with manipulations. The term $T_G(r)$ is defined via Eq.(A2) afterwards. We start off with Kauffmann’s[5]

$$R \cdot \left(\frac{c^4}{G} \right) \geq \int_{|r'| \leq R} T_G(r+r'') d^3 r'' \quad (\text{A1})$$

Kauffmann calls $\left(\frac{c^4}{G} \right)$ a “Planck force” which is relevant due to the fact we will employ Eq. (A1) at the initial instant of the universe, in the Planckian regime of space-time. Also, we make full use of setting for small r , the following:

$$T_G(r+r'') \approx T_{G=0}(r) \cdot \text{const} \sim V(r) \sim m_{\text{Graviton}} \cdot n_{\text{Initial-entropy}} \cdot c^2 \quad (\text{A2})$$

I.e. what we are doing is to make the expression in the integrand proportional to information leaked by a past universe into our present universe, with Ng style quantum infinite statistics use of

$$n_{\text{Initial-entropy}} \sim S_{\text{Graviton-count-entropy}} \quad (\text{A3})$$

Then Eq. (A1) will lead to

$$\begin{aligned} R \cdot \left(\frac{c^4}{G} \right) &\geq \int_{|r'| \leq R} T_G(r+r'') d^3 r'' \approx \text{const} \cdot m_{\text{Graviton}} \cdot \left[n_{\text{Initial-entropy}} \sim S_{\text{Graviton-count-entropy}} \right] \\ \Rightarrow R \cdot \left(\frac{c^4}{G} \right) &\geq \text{const} \cdot m_{\text{Graviton}} \cdot \left[n_{\text{Initial-entropy}} \sim S_{\text{Graviton-count-entropy}} \right] \\ \Rightarrow R &\geq \left(\frac{c^4}{G} \right)^{-1} \cdot \left[\text{const} \cdot m_{\text{Graviton}} \cdot \left[n_{\text{Initial-entropy}} \sim S_{\text{Graviton-count-entropy}} \right] \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A4})$$

Here, $\left[n_{\text{Initial-entropy}} \sim S_{\text{Graviton-count-entropy}} \right] \sim 10^5$, $m_{\text{Graviton}} \sim 10^{-62}$ grams, and we set Planck length as:

$$\text{Planck length} = l_{\text{Planck}} = 1.616199 \times 10^{-35} \text{ meters}$$

where we set $l_{\text{Planck}} = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar G}{c^3}}$ with $R \sim l_{\text{Planck}} \cdot 10^\alpha$, and $\alpha > 0$. Typically $R \sim l_{\text{Planck}} \cdot 10^\alpha$ is about $10^3 \cdot l_{\text{Planck}}$ at the outset, when the universe is the most compact. The value of *const* is chosen based on common assumptions about contributions from all sources of early universe entropy, and will be more rigorously defined in a later paper.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to thank Chongqing university in its support of the Author’s investigation, in particular Dr. Fangyu Li who recognizes the research pertinence to early universe gravitational wave models. In addition, Dr. Christian Corda and Johnathan Dickau for illuminating criticism. In addition the author thanks his now deceased father for imbuing him with a love of cosmological models and truth. Also Dr. Xi Yang for her keeping Dr. Beckwith’s focus upon physics to obtain a PhD in the University of Houston, in 2001.



REFERENCES

- [1] G. Ellis, G. , R. Maartens, R. and MacCallum, M. A.; *Relativistic Cosmology* , Cambridge University press,2012, Cambridge, U.K.
- [2] Park, D., H. Kim, H., and Tamarayan, S., "Nonvanishing Cosmological Constant of Flat Universe in Brane world Scenarios," *Phys.Lett.* B535 (2002) pp. 5-10
- [3] Beckwith, A. "How Massive Gravitons (and Gravitinos) may Affect and Modify The Fundamental Singularity Theorem (Irrotational Geodesic Singularities from the Raychaudhuri Equation); April 2013, <http://vixra.org/abs/1304.0147>; accepted for distribution in the *Applied math Journal*, <http://www.scirp.org/journal/am>, Volume 4, Number 10C, October 2013 (Special Issue on *Advances in Mathematical Physics*)
- [4] Kolb,E., Turner,M., *The Early Universe*,Westview Press,Feb 21, 1994, Chicago, Illinois.
- [5] Kauffman, S. " A Self Gravitational Upper bound On Localized Energy Including that of Virtual Particles and Quantum Fields, which Yield a Passable Dark Energy Density Estimate", <http://arxiv.org/abs/1212.0426>
- [6]. Beckwith, A." How to use the cosmological Schwinger principle for energy flux, entropy, and "atoms of space–time" to create a thermodynamic space–time and multiverse", Dice 2010 conference *J. Phys.: Conf. Ser.* **306** 012064 doi:10.1088/1742-6596/306/1/012064 ; <http://iopscience.iop.org/1742-6596/306/1/012064/>
- [7] Penrose, R., *Cycles of Time*, The Bodley Head, 2010, London, UK



Author's biography

Dr. Beckwith Graduated from the U. of Houston in June 2002, PhD Physics; Since 2010 he has had a visiting scholar's position with Dr. Fangyu Li of Chongqing Physics, and is a frequent contributor to Rencontres De.Moriond, Rencontres Du Vietnam, and attended Erice Nuclear Physics, 2009, and Dice 2010, where he contributed to the conference proceedings. His specialties are condensed matter physics(instanton physics), Gravitational wavephysics, and early universe models. His sub specialties are non linear dynamics and mathematical physics,with a particular recent focus upon super gravity models and those models which may be an update as to MSSM models, and the hunt for Dr. Matter.