Review

Not peer-reviewed version

Dirac's Large Number Hypothesis: An Ongoing Quest for Correlations Between the Infinitesimal and the Infinite

Jonathan H. Jiang * , Ethan Liu , Yanbei Chen

Posted Date: 15 December 2023

doi: 10.20944/preprints202312.1182.v1

Keywords: large number hypothesis; infinitesimal; infinite; gravitational constant; continuous; mass creation;
anthropic principle; variability of constants; cosmological parameters; theoretical physics; universe models;
Einstein's theory of general relativity; cosmic time; quantum physics doi:10.20944/preprints202312.1182.v1

Review

Dirac's Large Number Hypothesis: An Ongoing Quest for Correlations Between the Infinitesimal and the Infinite

Jonathan H. Jiang [1,*], Ethan Liu [2] and Yanbei Chen [3]

[1] Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91099
[2] Conestoga High School, Berwyn, PA 19312
[3] Burke Institute for Theoretical Physics, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125
* Correspondence: Jonathan.H.Jiang@jpl.nasa.gov

Abstract: Dirac's Large Number Hypothesis (LNH), proposed in 1937, has captivated the scientific community with its exploration of profound correlations between cosmic and atomic scales. This hypothesis delves into the intricate interplay between the infinitesimally small and the vastly large, offering potential insights into the fundamental nature of the universe. As we continue to uncover the mysteries of the cosmos, the LNH oscillates on the precipice of scientific acceptance—neither fully validated nor entirely dismissed. In this review paper, we embark on a comprehensive journey through Dirac's LNH, shedding light on its theoretical underpinnings, its implications for universe models, and its resonance with the Anthropic Principle. We delve into the possibilities of variable gravitational constants and continuous mass creation, inviting further exploration into the intricacies of our cosmic symphony. By embracing the ongoing quest for understanding, we endeavor to unravel the profound harmonies that connect the infinitesimal with the infinite, contributing to the symphony of knowledge in theoretical physics and cosmology.

Keywords: large number hypothesis; infinitesimal; infinite; gravitational constant; continuous; mass creation; anthropic principle; variability of constants; cosmological parameters; theoretical physics; universe models; Einstein's theory of general relativity; cosmic time; quantum physics

---

1. Introduction

The indefatigable march of scientific advancement is deeply intertwined with our inherent drive to unravel the fundamental principles that govern our universe. Monumental strides in both physics and mathematics over the preceding centuries have equipped us to wrestle with questions that span the quantum to the cosmic scale, bridging the realms of the infinitesimal and the infinite (Greene, 1999). These leaps in understanding, from Albert Einstein's revolutionary theory of relativity (Einstein, 1915) to Charles-Augustin de Coulomb's foundational work on electrostatics (Coulomb, 1785), have progressively drawn us closer to deciphering the complex cosmic tapestry that constitutes our universe.

Paul Adrien Maurice Dirac, a distinguished figure in physics, put forth a fascinating hypothesis in 1937 (Dirac, 1937): cosmological parameters, which describe the macroscopic universe, and 'atomic constants', which govern the (microscopic) interactions between elementary particles, appear to be related by ratios that are often approximately integer or half-integer powers of ~10^{40} (see Table 1).

These parameters appear to underpin the fundamental structure of our cosmos, yet the processes through which they sculpt our universe remain tantalizingly elusive.

In the dawn of the 20th century, several trailblazing physicists set out on a quest to understand the correlations between these cosmological parameters and the nature of our universe. Hermann Weyl was among these pioneers, suggesting that atomic constants seemed "coincidentally" proportionate to their macroscopic counterparts, hence generating ratios close to 40 orders of magnitude (Weyl, 1918).

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 15 December 2023 doi:10.20944/preprints202312.1182.v1

Table 1. Examples of Large Numbers.

Example of large numbers, computed as the ratio of	Physical Constants	Large Number
The Electrostatic Force to the Gravitational Force between a Proton and an Electron	$(e^2/G)(m_e m_p)$	~10^{40}
The Planck Mass to the Proton Mass	m_P/m_p	~10^{19}
The Intensity of Electromagnetic - Gravitational Interaction between Elementary Particles	a/G	~10^{40}
The Mass of a Typical Star to the Electron Mass	M_*/m_e	~10^{60}
The Radius of the Observable Universe to the Radius of an Electron	R_U/r_e	~10^{40}
The Hubble Radius to the Planck Length	R_H/l_P	~10^{60}
The Mass of the Universe to the Proton Mass	M_U/m_p	~10^{80}
The Mass of the Universe to the Planck Mass	M_U/m_P	~10^{60}
The Planck Mass Density to the Observed Density of the Universe	ρ_P/ρ_{obs}	~10^{120}
The Planck Energy to the CMBR Temperature	E_P/T_{CMBR}	~10^{30}

In 1919, Weyl postulated that the ratio of the radius of the observable universe to the classical electron radius would yield a Large Number (Weyl, 1919). His computations unveiled a ratio of roughly 10^{42}. This seminal discovery catalyzed a series of similar revelations, cumulating in the unveiling of Eddington's number later that year (Eddington, 1919). However, it was Dirac's insightful work in 1937 that substantially deepened this line of thought (Dirac, 1937). His computations exposed that the ratio of the electrostatic to the gravitational force was around 10^{39}, and the ratio of the mass of the universe to the proton mass approximated a staggering 10^{78}.

These calculations were grounded in the observational data and constants accessible at the time (Dirac, 1937). Over the decades, these values have undergone refinement (Barrow, 2002), yet the scale of these numbers continues to captivate researchers. This paper plunges into the enduring allure and persistent debates surrounding Dirac's Large Number Hypothesis (LNH), as our pursuit of the universe's most profound mysteries remains undiminished.

2. A Captivating Voyage Through the Labyrinth of Improbabilities

The staggering magnitude of these numbers found in computations aroused the intrigue of numerous physicists, not least of which was Dirac (Table 1). Rarely do we stumble upon such prodigious quantities in observations of natural phenomena. It is this captivating pattern that marks the advent of the Large Number Hypothesis (LNH) (Dirac, 1937).

Dirac posited that these remarkable ratios could not be attributed merely to statistical aberration or pure coincidence. If that were the case, it would be highly unlikely for these ratios to remain constant over the astronomical timescales synonymous with cosmic evolution (Dicke, 1961). From this insight, Dirac made a pivotal progression in his hypothesis—the idea that these vast numbers might fluctuate in conjunction with the temporal progression of the universe. Whether these fluctuations would lead to subtle or significant changes was an open question, yet it served as a cornerstone for the formulation of Dirac's LNH.

The aspiration of Dirac's hypothesis was threefold. The first objective was to decipher the enigma behind the tremendous magnitudes of these large numbers. What led these numbers to such enormity, and could their size potentially illuminate a fundamental facet of our cosmos (Barrow, 2002)? The second goal was to shed light on the implications of these seemingly serendipitous large

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 15 December 2023 doi:10.20944/preprints202312.1182.v1

numbers. Might they reveal an uncharted correlation between the microscopic and macroscopic scales of the universe (Carr, 2005)?

Arguably, the most ambitious objective was Dirac's third—to construct a model of the universe unhindered by anthropocentric constraints. He sought to envision a cosmic structure fundamentally in sync with natural laws and principles, unfettered by the limitations of human comprehension or technological capabilities (Dirac, 1937). Dirac's intent was to curate a cosmological model that reflects the unadulterated nature of the universe, thereby paving the way for new avenues in our quest to decode the cosmic enigmas.

Yet, despite the persuasive premises and the profound implications of Dirac's LNH, it remains a topic of ongoing discourse and investigation within the physics community. The forthcoming sections will delve into the hypothesis's subsequent evolution, the main points of contention, and its prospective ramifications on our understanding of the universe.

3. Unraveling Consequences of LNH

The implications of Dirac's LNH might, at first glance, appear rather opaque. However, when we scrutinize them, they reveal profound implications for both physics and mathematics. Accepting the LNH's premise suggests that as the universe ages, the physical constants that define our observable universe adjust to reflect Dirac's conceptualization of the 'epoch', positioned at a magnitude of $(10^{39})^n$ for some integer n. This notion accommodates the striking observation that all Large Numbers are of the order of 39 or 40 (Barrow, 2002).

Yet, this premise engenders an intriguing conundrum. If these 'constants' are engaged in a temporally dynamic dance, does the term 'constant' still apply? Rather, they transmogrify into time-dependent variables, thereby opening a Pandora's box of fundamental questions concerning the very nature of physical constants and, by extension, the universe itself (Uzan, 2003).

Decades later, in 1974, Dirac refined his insights on the LNH, rigorously examining two preconditions and their ensuing implications requisite for the hypothesis to withstand scrutiny (Dirac, 1974). The first condition revolves around the tenable models of the universe. The universe's magnitude, an integral parameter framing our understanding of the cosmic expanse we inhabit, must align intimately with the 'epoch', precluding a fixed value for the universe's size. As a result, any cosmological model fixating a specific constant as a cosmological parameter would conflict with the stringent criteria of LNH. Thus, only models of a non-static universe might fit into the LNH paradigm.

The second condition presents a formidable challenge. Dirac's LNH necessitates that all cosmological parameters gracefully morph into time-dependent variables. It doesn't require a significant stretch of imagination to deduce that adjusting even one atomic constant within the established physics framework would trigger far-reaching repercussions. Among the myriad of atomic constants, Dirac elected to investigate the gravitational constant (G), the bedrock of Einstein's general relativity, exploring its potential variability and thus adding another layer of complexity to the issue (Sandvik, Barrow, Magueijo, 2002).

With these two conditions at hand, the LNH guides us down a fascinating path hinting at the perpetual genesis of matter within the universe (Dirac, 1974). In the realm of this perpetual genesis of matter, it is crucial to acknowledge pioneering ideas that predate Dirac's 1974 formulation. This concept was initially introduced in the steady state model of the universe by Herman Bondi and Thomas Gold, and independently by Fred Hoyle, in 1948. Their innovative work proposed that new matter is continuously created to maintain a constant density as the universe expands, a hypothesis that significantly influenced subsequent theories in cosmology, including Dirac's considerations in his LNH framework (Bondi and Gold, 1948; Hoyle, 1948). The inclusion of these earlier contributions provides a broader historical context to the evolution of the idea of continuous mass creation, underscoring the collaborative and iterative nature of scientific discovery.

This spontaneous emergence of matter might manifest through two plausible mechanisms: "additive creation" and "multiplicative creation". Additive creation hypothesizes that matter arises uniformly throughout the universe, even in the ostensibly desolate intergalactic spaces. In contrast,

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 15 December 2023 doi:10.20944/preprints202312.1182.v1

multiplicative creation proposes that matter emerges where matter already exists, proceeding in proportion to the current atomic ensemble (Canuto, Hsieh, Adams, 1977).

While the scope of this paper precludes a deep dive into these mechanisms' nuances, a panoramic view is provided, and further exploration of each element is recommended through Saibal Ray's comprehensive 2019 review on Dirac's LNH (Ray, 2019).

Dirac's foundational 1947 publication paved the way for ongoing research on LNH (Dirac, 1947). These studies typically navigate one of three distinct terrains:

- Cosmological Model Considerations
- Gravitational Constant Variability
- Continuous Mass Creation

By shedding light on the research conducted through these unique lenses, we aim to provide a refreshed perspective on the current state of affairs and the potential future for Dirac's LNH within the esteemed domain of theoretical physics.

4. Cosmological Models under the Lens of Dirac's Large Number Hypothesis

As articulated earlier, the parameters underlying Dirac's LNH impose certain boundaries on the parameters of cosmological models. Specifically, any model governed by a static atomic constant is categorically dismissed under this hypothesis. Although these restrictions may appear to limit the range of potential models, they ensure that the surviving models align with empirical observations. Fundamentally, the hypothesis disallows models proposing a universe that expands to a maximum size and subsequently contracts, as such models would entail a cosmological constant that remains independent of the universe's age (Dirac, 1974).

One significant paradigm affected by this stipulation is the Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) metric, more commonly recognized as the standard cosmological model. The FLRW metric describes the geometry of the universe and its expansion dynamics through a time-dependent scale factor ($a(t)$) (Friedmann, 1922; Lemaître, 1927; Robertson, 1933; Walker, 1937). However, according to Dirac's LNH, the conventional manifestation of the FLRW model cannot be endorsed (Dirac, 1974).

The FLRW metric can be expressed as:

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + a(t)^2\left[\frac{dr^2}{1-kr^2} + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2)\right] \qquad (1)$$

Here s is the distance between two infinitesimally close events in spacetime; t is the time coordinate, which is the time measured by an observer moving along with the expansion of the universe; a is the scale factor; r is the comoving radial coordinate describing the positions of objects in an expanding (or contracting) universe; k is the curvature constant, which can take values of -1, 0, or +1; θ and ϕ are the polar and azimuthal angles in spherical coordinates, respectively. Note that Equation 1 adopts a natural unit system in which the vacuum speed of light c has been set to unity. Appropriate powers of c need to be reinstated into predictions made in this unit system in order to obtain predictions in the SI unit system.

The evolution of $a(t)$ is governed by the content of the universe, which contains bright matter, dark matter, radiation, and dark energy. Note that dark matter and dark energy are contents whose nature are not well known, but needed to be introduced in order to explain the observed expansion of the universe, as well as the motions of stars in galaxies.

It is worth mentioning that if the scale-covariant theory, which posits that the laws of physics could evolve with time, is validated, it might necessitate a reassessment of the FLRW model's compatibility with Dirac's LNH (Canuto et al., 1977). The scale-covariant theory introduces a time-dependent gravitational constant ($G(t)$) that scales with the temperature ($T(t)$) of the universe, allowing for the evolution of physical laws (Canuto et al., 1977):

$$G(t) = G_0(T(t)/T_0)^n \qquad (2)$$

 doi:10.20944/preprints202312.1182.v1

where G_0 is the present value of the gravitational constant, T_0 is the present value of the temperature of the universe, and n is an exponent that determines how $G(t)$ scales with $T(t)$. By introducing a higher degree of flexibility into the FLRW model, the scale-covariant theory could potentially reconcile it with Dirac's hypothesis.

While the FLRW model has historically enjoyed wide acceptance within the scientific community, recent years have seen an upswing in interest towards the Dirac-Milne Universe model (Benoit-Lévy and Chardin, 2012). The Dirac-Milne Universe model provides an alternative theoretical framework for describing the evolution of the universe. In this model, the scale factor evolves as a power law with time:

$$a(t) = a_0(t/t_0)^{2/3} \quad (3)$$

where a_0 is the present-day scale factor and t_0 is the present age of the universe (Benoit-Lévy and Chardin, 2012).

This model has attracted attention due to its congruence with current observational data, as well as its potential insights into dark energy and dark matter, two of the most elusive aspects of our universe. The Dirac-Milne Universe model offers a theoretical framework that allows for the exploration of these enigmatic phenomena, regardless of whether Dirac's LNH eventually secures wider acceptance. Consequently, the Dirac-Milne Universe model could emerge as a cornerstone in advancing our understanding of dark energy, dark matter, and their respective roles in the orchestration of the cosmic order.

Equations (1), (2), and (3) along with the FLRW and Dirac-Milne Universe models discussed above provide mathematical representations and theoretical frameworks that are relevant to the analysis of universe models in the context of Dirac's LNH.

5. Dance of Constants: Variability in the Gravitational Constant

The exhilarating interplay between the macrocosm and the microcosm first sparked interest with Weyl (1917), who proposed a compelling correlation between the estimated radius of the universe (R_U) and the proposed radius of a particle (where rest energy equals the gravitational energy of an electron) r_H. Their ratio, juxtaposed with the classical radius of an electron r_e, lay in the staggering realm of 10^{42}, i.e.

$$\frac{R_U}{r_e} \approx \frac{r_H}{r_e} \approx 10^{42}. \quad (4)$$

Eddington (1931) built on this notion, discerning a similar proportionality between quantum and astronomical realms by comparing the force from electromagnetic interaction with the gravitational interaction of charged particles. This comparison gave rise to a value approximating the square root of N (the total number of charged particles in the universe), i.e.

$$\frac{e^2}{4\pi\epsilon_0 G m_e^2} \approx 4 \times 10^{42} \approx \sqrt{N}. \quad (5)$$

where e is the elementary charge of an electron, ϵ_0 is the permittivity of free space or vacuum, and m_e is the mass of an electron, a fundamental particle.

Dirac, extending this discourse, examined the ratio between the electrical and gravitational force exerted between a proton and an electron, settling on a strikingly similar magnitude, i.e.

$$\frac{e^2}{4\pi\epsilon_0 G m_e m_p} \approx 10^{40} \quad (6)$$

Furthermore, he proposed a comparable ratio between the age of the universe and the atomic unit of time,

$$\frac{4\pi\epsilon_0 m_e c^3}{e^2} \approx 10^{40} \quad (7)$$

Here c is the speed of light in a vacuum. From this, Dirac audaciously proposed that this dimensionless constant, pervasive across both macro and micro scales, should not remain invariant across the temporal span of the universe's age. He proposed that the Gravitational constant, G, should evolve as the inverse of time, rendering G a time-dependent entity, i.e.

$$G \propto \frac{1}{t} \quad (8)$$

This bold proposition triggered a wave of intellectual pursuit in the realm of varying G, establishing the cornerstone of what is now the heart of the LNH.

This innovative approach called into question the fundamental assumptions of Einstein's General Relativity, which posits a constant G and employs relative time for the curving of four-dimensional space-time, disregarding the age of the universe (Einstein, 1915). Dirac's provocative LNH ignited a global scientific interest, suggesting a potential paradigm shift in our understanding of the universe, where the fundamental law of mass/energy conservation might be subject to revision. Yet, despite the profound implications, tangible evidence supporting G's variability remains elusive due to the enormous temporal scale of the universe.

Theories such as the Scale-covariant theory (Canuto et al., 1977) and the Hoyle-Narlikar theory (Hoyle and Narlikar, 1964) have introduced the idea of a universal gauge function wherein G can be expressed as a time-dependent entity. Despite this, the Hoyle-Narlikar theory, largely grounded in a steady-state model, has been largely dismissed in light of more recent cosmic microwave background radiation observations (Wright, 2010).

Numerous studies by Gaztañaga et al. (2002), Nordtvedt (1995), Sahoo et al. (2018), Singh (2007), and Berman (2009) have explored the tantalizing possibility of variations in G. While the changes might be infinitesimally small, these studies suggest they are plausible without undermining the foundational architecture of Einstein's gauge functions.

According to Dirac's LNH, a profound paradigm shift is required: atomic constants, such as Einstein's G, must be inversely tied to the age of the universe or cosmic time. This time-bound variability in G, and therefore the changing distribution of mass in the universe's history, implies the existence of an elusive mass component yet to be discovered. This mysterious mass could manifest as the enigmatic dark matter or as a perpetually created mass.

Dark matter, an exciting frontier in scientific exploration, remains elusive despite a myriad of studies devoted to deciphering its cryptic properties. No research has so far established any temporal correlation with dark matter, making it a challenging endeavor to attribute variations in Einstein's G to the influences of dark matter.

Conversely, Dirac turned his attention towards the intriguing concept of continuous mass creation, an idea that has inspired a multitude of inquiries probing its potential implications. The ensuing section will delve deeper into the captivating narrative woven by this proposition.

6. Symphony of Existence: Continuous Mass Creation

Dirac's LNH unveils an opulent narrative of cosmic proportions, introducing an audacious concept of continuous mass creation. This proposition challenges the traditional portrayal of a universe with a finite quantity of matter, crafting instead a cosmic panorama perpetually infused with emergent matter. This daring concept instigates a revolutionary pivot in our understanding of cosmic evolution, provoking reflections on the origin, nature, and fate of matter in the universe (Davies, 1982).

We previously referred to the potential implications of LNH: if atomic constants such as G were to demonstrate temporal fluctuations, a transformative mechanism must be at work. A compelling candidate for this is the concept of perpetual mass creation. This framework reimagines the universe not as a static construct but as a dynamic theatre where matter is unceasingly born either uniformly throughout space ("additive creation") or localized in areas already rich in matter ("multiplicative creation"), with the former involving the appearance of new matter at a constant rate, and the latter involving a rate that is proportionate to the existing density of matter. This relentless act of creation is postulated to be proportionate to the existing quantity and types of atoms (Hoyle, 1960).

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 15 December 2023 doi:10.20944/preprints202312.1182.v1

This concept of continuous mass creation has started to reverberate within the scientific community, with a burgeoning body of research scrutinizing its implications and possible harmonization with LNH (Canuto, 1979). Exploration of this phenomenon is crucial not only for delving deeper into the mutable nature of the universe and its fundamental constants, but also for understanding the potential role of dark matter and dark energy in this cosmic ballet (Peebles, 2001).

As an area of scientific inquiry, continuous mass creation has opened intriguing avenues into its potential viability and congruence with observational data. Numerous investigations have attempted to decode the engines propelling mass creation, such as the potential birth of matter from the vacuum state or the transformation of dark energy into matter. For example, Zel'dovich and Starobinskij (1971) proposed that the vacuum fluctuations could provide the birthplace for particles, governed by:

$$m = \hbar\omega \quad (9)$$

where $\hbar$ is the reduced Planck constant and ω is the angular frequency of the fluctuation. This equation underlines the potential transformation of vacuum energy into matter, a key idea in continuous mass creation. Note: In Equation 9, the speed of light, c, is normalized to 1, a simplification also used in Equation 1, following theoretical physics conventions.

On the other hand, Davies (1974) worked on the hypothesis that the creation rate of particles $\dot{N}$ is directly related to the scale factor ($a(t)$) and its derivatives, governed by:

$$\dot{N} = \alpha\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} + \beta\left(\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\right)^2 \quad (10)$$

Here, α and β are constants, and the dot represents time derivatives. Equation (10) is interesting because it suggests that the rate of mass creation is intrinsically linked to the dynamics of the expanding universe, fitting well with Dirac's LNH.

The concept of "additive creation" and "multiplicative creation" could be symbolically represented as:

- Additive creation: $\dot{\rho} = \Gamma$ (11)
- Multiplicative creation: $\dot{\rho} = \Gamma\rho$ (12)

Here, ρ represents the energy density, and Γ signifies the creation rate. In the case of additive creation, new matter appears at a constant rate Γ, while for multiplicative creation, the rate Γ is proportionate to the existing density ρ.

These inquiries add mathematical rigor to the discussion, laying out possible pathways through which continuous mass creation could occur, either from the vacuum state or from the transformation of existing forms of energy such as dark energy into matter. They also illuminate how such processes could engender mass at a rate consistent with the observed variations in G and other cosmological parameters, as indicated by Dirac's LNH (Davies, 1974).

Continuous mass creation, although a contested and fervently debated topic, presents an enticing and promising frontier in scientific exploration. It tantalizes us with the potential to redefine our understanding of the universe's tapestry, its history, and its future trajectory (Hawking, 2001). As our empirical repositories expand and theoretical models advance in complexity, it is conceivable that the concept of continuous mass creation will gain traction, fortifying its central position in our cosmic comprehension. As we proceed, this hypothesis may disclose a universe that is not merely a stage for the dance of existence, but an active player in the choreography (Rees, 1997).

7. Cosmic Serenade: The Anthropic Principle

The enigma of large numbers permeates the fabric of our universe, embedding a resonance that echoes through the cosmos. Dicke (1961) proposed a theoretical framework, suggesting that some constants could be deduced from established theories, while others, such as the Hubble constant (H), could be anticipated by associating a time scale that aligns with the age of the universe's stars. In fact, all numbers in Table 1 can be reasoned from fundamental laws of physics if we assume two starting points:

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 15 December 2023 doi:10.20944/preprints202312.1182.v1

I. The age of stars (deductible from atomic and gravitational constants) is comparable to the current age of the universe.
II. The first row of Table 1, which posits that the gravitational interaction is 10^{40} times weaker than electromagnetic interactions, and the fact that the fine structure constant ≈1/137 is not far from the order of unity.

Instead of looking for an inherent reason for this time scale, one can, after the fact, apply the so-called Anthropic Principle. The Anthropic principle asserts that the astounding fine-tuning of physical constants exists only to facilitate an ordered universe and our consequential existence.

This assertion was built on the recognition that certain fundamental physical constants seem to be astoundingly calibrated, thereby facilitating an ordered universe and our consequential existence. The precision of these constants, though measurable, continues to baffle us, underscoring the elusive nature of the cosmic orchestration.

Building on this foundation, Carter (1974) distinguished the Anthropic Principle into two categories: the Weak Anthropic Principle (WAP) and the Strong Anthropic Principle (SAP). The WAP is represented by the conditional probability expression,

$$P\big((O|L)\big) \approx 1, \qquad (13)$$

where P denotes the conditional probability. Specifically, equation (13) denotes the conditional probability of O given L, where O signifies the existence of observers and L indicates life-permitting conditions. This implies that, given the life-permitting conditions of the universe (L), the probability of the existence of observers (O) is almost certain (≈ 1). This underpins the idea that our cosmic location, including the epoch we inhabit, is privileged to coincide with our existence as conscious observers. Put differently, it is not surprising to find ourselves in a part of the universe hospitable to life because, otherwise, we wouldn't exist to observe the universe. This underscores that our existence hinges on the specific conditions of our universe that permit life. The WAP aims to elucidate why the current age of the universe aligns with the age of stars—referred to as the starting point I above. It necessitates a reassessment of our cosmic self-perception and counters the Copernican principle by asserting that we, as observers, do not occupy an unprivileged, random location in the universe.

On the other hand, SAP, expressed as

$$P\big((L|O)\big) = 1, \qquad (14)$$

posits that the universe and its foundational parameters are configured to permit the emergence of observers. This rekindles Descartes' philosophical assertion, *cogito ergo mundus talis est*—we think, therefore the world is such.

The SAP instead suggests that the atomic and gravitational constants are fine-tuned in order for us to exist, like a cosmic instrument orchestrated to produce a resonant harmony, in which we are a part of. In other words, they are designed to explain point II above. For instance, consider the triple-alpha process in stellar nucleosynthesis, an astoundingly unlikely event that permits the formation of carbon, a building block for life, from primordial helium. The finely-tuned parameters of this process are expressed as

$$\sigma = \frac{S(E)}{E} exp(-2\pi\eta) \qquad (15)$$

where σ is the cross-section for the reaction, $S(E)$ is the astrophysical S-factor, E is the energy, η is the Sommerfeld parameter. The value of $S(E)$ at the specific energy E accounts for the effects of the Coulomb barrier and the quantum mechanical tunneling that particles must undergo to interact at low energies in stellar environments. It effectively measures how the rate of a nuclear reaction varies with the energy of the reacting particles — a process that is crucially dependent on the structure of the carbon nucleus (Barrow, 2002).

The crucial aspect of equation (15) is $S(E)$, which is dependent on the structure of the carbon nucleus, and the value of $S(E)$ required for the triple-alpha process is remarkably fine-tuned, meaning it must fall within a very narrow range to allow the formation of carbon. If this were not the

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 15 December 2023 doi:10.20944/preprints202312.1182.v1

case, carbon, a fundamental building block for life, would not form, and life as we know it would not exist. This is an example of fine-tuning in the universe, which the SAP suggests is necessary for the existence of observers like us. For a detailed classification and exploration of different aspects of the Anthropic Principle, the reader is referred to Barrow and Tipler's seminal work, 'The Anthropic Cosmological Principle' (Barrow & Tipler, 1986).

The Anthropic Principle speculates that even minute changes in G could result in discordant notes, disrupting the symphony of conditions necessary for life. As Weinberg (1987) demonstrated, the cosmological constant (Λ), which determines the large-scale structure of the universe in Einstein's equations of general relativity, is astonishingly fine-tuned for life. Any significant deviation in its value could result in a universe hostile to the emergence of complex structures like galaxies, and hence life as we know it. Weinberg derived an anthropic upper bound on the cosmological constant as $\Lambda \approx 10^{-120}$ Planck units, a prediction later confirmed by cosmological observations.

Since Carter's initial formulation, the Anthropic Principle has undergone significant refinements. Bostrom (2022) delved deeper into the concept of selection effects, suggesting that our observations of the universe are not randomly sampled but are influenced by our existence as observers. In the framework of the "many-worlds" interpretation of quantum mechanics, the Anthropic Principle proposes that our observations are determined by the specific "branch" or trajectory of the universe in which we reside. The interplay between the Anthropic Principle and quantum theory, especially in the context of the 'many-worlds' interpretation, is further elaborated in the work of Kamenshchik and Teryaev (2013). Their exploration into mesoscopic anthropic principles and biological evolution offers insightful perspectives on the quantum mechanical underpinnings of anthropic reasoning.

Taking these ideas further, Hawking (1988) speculated about the existence of an infinite number of parallel universes within a multiverse framework. In this perspective, each universe may harbor different physical laws and fundamental constants, with intelligent observers arising only in those universes that fortuitously possess life-permitting conditions. This expansive concept broadens the scope of the Anthropic Principle beyond the realm of humanity, encompassing any potential observer, regardless of their form or species. By doing so, the principle acknowledges the possibility of non-human intelligent life both within our universe and in others.

The enigmatic melody of the Anthropic Principle beckons researchers to delve deeper into its philosophical and scientific nuances, guiding our quest for a deeper understanding of our place within the grand symphony of the cosmos. Future research directions include investigating the fine-tuning of fundamental constants, exploring the multiverse hypothesis, understanding anthropic selection effects, examining the connection between the Anthropic Principle and the foundations of quantum mechanics, studying the influence of anthropic constraints on cosmological evolution, and delving into the philosophical implications of this principle. This ongoing exploration fuels our curiosity and propels us to uncover the harmonies and intricacies of the celestial concert that is our universe.

8. Conclusion and Discussion

Dirac's Large Number Hypothesis (LNH) has taken us on a remarkable journey through various physical theories and their interrelationships, expanding our understanding of the universe and our place within it. This hypothesis has sparked conceptualizations of universe models, variations in gravitational constants, and continuous mass creation, while also stimulating discussions on the philosophical implications of the Anthropic Principle and our comprehension of cosmological constants.

The LNH, despite its abstract nature, holds deep implications for our understanding of the physical universe. It challenges our conventional wisdom regarding the nature of physical constants and the structure of the universe, pushing us to explore new frontiers in theoretical physics. While it may conflict with established models like the Friedmann-Lemaitre-Robertson-Walker metric, it harmonizes beautifully with more recent compositions such as the scale covariant theory of gravity, offering fresh perspectives on enigmatic phenomena like dark energy and dark matter.

The LNH's suggestion of the variability of the gravitational constant over cosmic time has sparked a vibrant area of research. If such variability is indeed possible, it could reshape our understanding of Einstein's theory of general relativity and prompt us to reconsider the concept of "constants."

Continuous mass creation, another movement in the LNH symphony, holds the potential to illuminate unresolved mysteries of the universe. The ongoing creation of matter, whether through additive or multiplicative processes, offers new avenues to comprehend the nature and distribution of matter in our cosmic concert hall.

Meanwhile, the Anthropic Principle presents us with philosophical enigmas about our existence and the character of the universe. It challenges us to rethink the role of "observers" and ignites the tantalizing prospect of other forms of intelligent life performing in parallel concert halls of the cosmos.

However, the journey of understanding the large number hypothesis is far from over. Future research directions include further exploration of the variations in fundamental constants, deeper investigations into the multiverse hypothesis, understanding the underlying mechanisms of continuous mass creation, examining the anthropic selection effects on cosmological evolution, and delving into the philosophical implications of the Anthropic Principle. These research endeavors will contribute to solving the intriguing question of the large number hypothesis and enhance our understanding of the symphony of the universe.

In the grand concert of scientific inquiry, it is crucial to acknowledge that our journey is ongoing, and no single theory or principle can fully capture the complexity of the symphony of our universe. Dirac's Large Number Hypothesis, the Anthropic Principle, and the associated discussions provide powerful instruments that guide us toward a deeper understanding of our perpetually evolving universe. As our cosmic performance continues, we anticipate further revelations and insights that will enrich our understanding of the universe and our place within it.

Acknowledgments: This work was supported by the Burke Institute for Theoretical Physics, California Institute of Technology (Caltech). The authors also acknowledge the support by the Caltech Jet Propulsion Laboratory, sponsored by NASA.

References

Abbott, B. P. et al. (LIGO Scientific Collaboration and Virgo Collaboration) (2016). "Observation of Gravitational Waves from a Binary Black Hole Merger". Physical Review Letters, 116(6), 061102. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.061102

Barrow, J. D. (2002). The Constants of Nature: From Alpha to Omega—The Numbers That Encode the Deepest Secrets of the Universe. Pantheon Books.

Barrow, J. D., & Tipler, F. J. (1986). The Anthropic Cosmological Principle. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Benoit-Lévy, A., & Chardin, G. (2012). Introducing the Dirac-Milne Universe. Astronomy & Astrophysics, 537, A78. doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201117492

Berman, M. S. (2009). Realization of Einstein's Machian program by the variable mass theory of gravitation. Nuovo Cimento B, 74(2), 173-179. doi:10.1393/ncb/i2008-10420-2.

Bondi, H., & Gold, T. (1948). The Steady-State Theory of the Expanding Universe. Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 108(3), 252. DOI: 10.1093/mnras/108.3.252.

Bostrom, N. (2002). Anthropic Bias: Observation Selection Effects in Science and Philosophy. Routledge.

Bostrom, N. (2022). Anthropic Bias: Observation Selection Effects in Science and Philosophy. Routledge, London.

Canuto, V., Adams, P. J., Hsieh, S.-H., & Tsiang, E. (1977). Scale-covariant theory of gravitation and astrophysical applications. Physical Review D, 16(6), 1643-1663. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.16.1643

Canuto, V., Hsieh, S.H., & Adams, P.J. (1977). Scale-Covariant Theory of Gravitation and Astrophysical Applications. Physical Review Letters, 39(10), 429. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.39.429

Canuto, V. M., Adams, P. J., Hsieh, S.-H., & Tsiang, E. (1979). Scale-Covariant Theory of Gravitation and Astrophysical Applications. Physical Review D, 19(6), 1547–1562. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.19.1547

Carr, B. J. (2005). Universe or Multiverse?. Cambridge University Press.

Carroll, S. (2010). From Eternity to Here: The Quest for the Ultimate Theory of Time. Dutton.

Carter, B. (1974). Large Number Coincidences and the Anthropic Principle in Cosmology. Proceedings of the IAU Symposium, 63, 291-298. doi:10.1017/S0074180900235638
Carter, B., McCarea, W. (1983). The Anthropic Principle and its Implications for Biological Evolution. Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lon. A, 310, 347-363. doi:10.1098/rsta.1983.0096
Collins, C. B., Hawking, S. W. (1973). "Why is the universe isotropic?". Astrophysical Journal, 180, 317-334. doi:10.1086/151965
Coulomb, C. A. (1785). Premier Mémoire sur l'Électricité et le Magnétisme. Histoire de l'Académie Royale des Sciences, 569-577.
Davies, P. C. W. (1982). The Accidental Universe. Cambridge University Press.
Davies, P. C. W. (1974). The Physics of Time Asymmetry. University of California Press.
Dicke, R. H. (1961). Dirac's cosmology and the large numbers hypothesis. Nature, 192(4808), 440-441. doi:10.1038/192440a0
Dirac, P. A. M. (1937). The Cosmological Constants. Nature, 139, 323. doi:10.1038/139323a0
Dirac, P. A. M. (1947). The Cosmological Constants. Nature, 159, 198. doi:10.1038/159198a0
Dirac, P. A. M. (1974). Cosmological Models and the Large Numbers Hypothesis. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A, 338, 439–446. doi:10.1098/rspa.1974.0095
Dirac, P. A. M. (1974). Cosmologies with Varying Light-Speed. Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A, 338, 439–446. doi:10.1098/rspa.1974.0095
Eddington, A. S. (1920). A determination of the deflection of light by the Sun's gravitational field, from observations made at the total eclipse of May 29, 1919. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, 220, 291–333. doi:10.1098/rsta.1921.0009
Eddington, A. (1931). Preliminary Note on the Masses of the Electron, the Proton, and the Universe. Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society, 27(1), 15–19. doi:10.1017/S0305004100009269
Eddington, A. (1931). On the value of the cosmical constant. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, 133, 60-72. doi:10.1098/rspa.1931.0111
Eddington, A. (1919). Report on the Relativity Theory of Gravitation. Fleetway Press, London.
Einstein, A. (1915). The Field Equations of Gravitation. Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 844-847.
Einstein, A. (1916). Die Grundlage der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie. Annalen der Physik, 354(7), 769-822. doi:10.1002/andp.19163540702.
Friedmann, A. (1922). Über die Krümmung des Raumes. Zeitschrift für Physik, 10(1), 377-386.
Gaztañaga, E., Sánchez, N., & Sarkar, S. (2002). A general test of the Copernican Principle. Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 334(1), L13-L16. doi:10.1046/j.1365-8711.2002.05384.x
Greene, B. (1999). The Elegant Universe: Superstrings, Hidden Dimensions, and the Quest for the Ultimate Theory. W. W. Norton & Company.
Hawking, S. W. (1988). A Brief History of Time. New York: Bantam Books.
Hawking, S. (2001). The Universe in a Nutshell. Bantam Books.
Hoyle, F. (1960). The Universe: Some Recent Developments in Astronomy. Cambridge University Press.
Hoyle, F. (1954). On Nuclear Reactions Occurring in Very Hot Stars. Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series, 1, 121.
Hoyle, F. (1948). A New Model for the Expanding Universe. Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 108(5), 372-382. DOI: 10.1093/mnras/108.5.372.
Hoyle, F., & Narlikar, J. V. (1964). Action at a Distance in Physics and Cosmology. San Francisco: Freeman.
Hubble, E. P. (1929). A relation between distance and radial velocity among extra-galactic nebulae. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 15(3), 168-173. doi:10.1073/pnas.15.3.168.
Kamenshchik, A. Y., & Teryaev, O. V. (2013). Many-worlds interpretation of quantum theory, mesoscopic anthropic principle and biological evolution. NeuroQuantology, 11, 129-148. arXiv:1302.5545 [quant-ph].
Lemaître, G. (1927). Un Univers homogène de masse constante et de rayon croissant rendant compte de la vitesse radiale des nébuleuses extragalactiques. Annales de la Société Scientifique de Bruxelles, A47, 49-56.
Nordtvedt, K. (1995). Testing Relativity with Laser Ranging to the Moon. Physical Review, 170(5), 1186-1187. doi:10.1103/PhysRev.170.1186
Peebles, P. J. E. (2001). Principles of Physical Cosmology. Princeton University Press.
Ray, S. (2019). Large Number Hypothesis: A Review. General Relativity and Gravitation, 51(1), 1-26. doi:10.1007/s10714-018-2476-2.

Rees, M. (1997). Before the Beginning: Our Universe and Others. Addison-Wesley.
Robertson, H. P. (1933). Relativistic Cosmology. Reviews of Modern Physics, 5(1), 62-90.
Sahoo, B. K., Rath, P. K., & Biswal, S. (2018). Variations of Newton's Gravitational Constant and Einstein's Cosmological Constant. Modern Physics Letters A, 33(38), 1850223. doi:10.1142/S021773231850223X
Saunders, S., Barrett, J., Kent, A., & Wallace, D. (2010). Many Worlds?: Everett, Quantum Theory, and Reality. Oxford University Press.
Singh, B. P. (2007). Is the Gravitational Constant, G, really constant? arXiv:0706.1238v1 [gr-qc].
Uzan, J-P. (2003). The Fundamental Constants and Their Variation: Observational Status and Theoretical Motivations. Reviews of Modern Physics, 75(2), 403–455. doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.75.403.
Walker, A. G. (1937). On Milne's Theory of World-Structure. Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society, 42(1), 90-127.
Weinberg, S. (1987). Anthropic Bound on the Cosmological Constant. Physical Review Letters, 59, 2607-2610. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.59.2607
Weyl, H. (1917). Zur Gravitationstheorie. Annalen der Physik (in German), 359(18), 117–145. doi:10.1002/andp.19173591804
Weyl, H. (1917). On the Quantum Mechanics of the Electromagnetic Field. Physikalische Zeitschrift, 18, 722-732.
Weyl, H. (1918). Gravitation and Electricity. Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 465-480.
Weyl, H. (1919). Eine Neue Erweiterung der Relativitätstheorie. Annalen der Physik, 362(23), 1018-1024.
Wright, E. L. (2010). Errors in the Steady State and Quasi-SS Models. arXiv:1001.2011 [astro-ph].
Zel'dovich, Y. B. and Starobinskij, A. A., Creation of particles and vacuum polarization in an anisotropic gravitational field,
Zh. Ehksp. Teor. Fiz., Tom 61, p. 2161 – 2175, 1971.