

# A Look at the Abandoned Contributions to Cosmology of Dirac, Sciama and Dicke

Alexander Unzicker  
Pestalozzi-Gymnasium München, Germany

**e-mail:** alexander.unzicker et lrz.uni-muenchen.de

October 31, 2018

## Abstract

The separate contributions to cosmology of the above researchers are revisited and a cosmology encompassing their basic ideas is proposed. We study Dirac's article on the large number hypothesis (Proc.Roy.Soc. Lon. A 165, 199; 1938), Sciama's proposal of realizing Mach's principle (MNRAS 113, 34; 1953), and Robert Dicke's considerations on an 'electromagnetic' theory of gravitation with a variable speed of light (Rev.Mod.Phys. 129, 363; 1957). Dicke's tentative theory can be formulated in a way which is compatible with Sciama's hypothesis on the gravitational constant  $G$ . Additionally, such a cosmological model is shown to satisfy Dirac's *second* hypothesis on the total number of particles in the universe being proportional to the square of the epoch. In the same context, Dirac's *first* hypothesis on an epoch-dependent  $G$  -contrary to his prediction- does not produce a visible time dependence of  $G$  which indeed is not observed. While Dicke's proposal widely describes the classical tests of GR, the cosmological redshift arises from a shortening of measuring rods rather than an expansion of space. Since for the horizon  $R$  the temporal evolution  $\dot{R}(t) = c(t)$  is assumed, the flatness and horizon problems do not arise in the common form.

## 1 Introduction

Cosmology as a modern observational science started in the 1930s, when Hubble's observations set an end to the 'great debate' whether andromeda is a nebula inside the milky way or an independent galaxy. Shortly after, with the first mass and distance estimates of the whole universe, fundamental questions regarding the interrelation of properties of the universe with those of elementary particles were raised by Eddington and Dirac [1]. However, the main interest in Hubble's redshift-distance law was due to the fact that it paved the way for Friedmann-Lemaitre (FL) cosmology which naturally accompanied the spectacular success of general relativity developed just 15 years before. As if cosmology liked great debates, the discussion was then dominated by the rivalry between steady-state and big-bang models, which was decided in favor of the latter by the discovery of the cosmic microwave background (CMB). Notwithstanding such remarkable advance, there were reflective voices like Dirac's in 1968 [2]:

'One field of work in which there has been too much speculation is cosmology. There are very few hard facts to go on but theoretical workers have been busy constructing various models for the universe based on any assumptions that they fancy. These models are probably all wrong. It is usually assumed that the laws of nature have always been the same as they are now. There is no justification for this. The laws may be changing, and in particular, quantities which are considered to be constants of nature may be varying with cosmological time. Such variations would completely upset the model makers.'

Fortunately, cosmology in the meantime has many observational facts which allow to do much more quantitative science than in the 1930's and even the 1960's. Dirac's prediction on a change of the gravitational constant  $G$  he had expressed in a manner slightly too self-assured in his 1938 paper ('A new basis for cosmology' [3]) seems to be ruled out, GR has undergone an impressive series of confirmations, and FL-cosmology has won all battles so far. This success and the lack of alternatives however bears the danger of interpreting new data assuming a model we still should not forget to test. Though having won all battles, this was due to introducing considerable elasticity in the originally rigid theory by means of dark matter, dark energy, and further numbers we must call fitting parameters poorly understood so far. A review of the observational evidence for standard cosmology and its problems is given elsewhere [4].

The great debates and the enthusiasm about new data of the past decades brushed aside the interest in old unresolved problems and it is a somehow unfortunate development that Dirac's criticism has not been considered any more by theoreticians. Doubts on our usual assumptions of the time-independency of physical laws have been expressed by various researchers [5]:

The question if there is a unique absolute standard of time which globally is defined by the inner geometry of the universe, is a big unresolved problem of cosmology.<sup>1</sup>

In particular, the idea of time as an invisible river that runs without relation to the universe ('time is what happens when nothing else does') may be just wrong [6]. A redefinition of time by means of parameters which govern the evolution of the universe should have profound consequences, though observational evidence may be minute. Relating our local physical laws which base on apparently constant quantities to global properties of the universe is the greatest challenge of cosmology.

It should be clear that dealing with any alternative approach to cosmology requires much patience, and a reinterpretation of all new data we are flooded with cannot be done immediately. Contrarily, we shall prepare ourselves to stay for a little while in the period in which the unresolved problems first arose and some old seminal papers were trying to understand them. A closer look to their content is still fascinating: Dirac's large number hypothesis, which consists of two independent, struggling coincidences is one of the most mysterious, unexplained phenomena in cosmology. He considered them as 'fundamental though as yet unexplained truths', which remain valid, even though the Hubble "constant" varies with the age of the universe' [7]. No theoretical approach besides Jordan's [8] has taken them serious so far. Sciama's efforts to link the value of  $G$  to the mass distribution of the universe are accompanied by profound insights and for the first time realized Mach's principle concretely. Though Mach's ideas have always been as fascinating and convincing from a conceptual point of view, the missing quantitative formulation had remained an unsatisfying aspect. One of the most interesting proposals in this context, full of speculative ideas, has been given by Dicke [9], though this is much less known than the later developed scalar-tensor-theory. We shall first have a closer but compressed look at the mentioned papers, and then give a technical description of the proposal that makes use of the basic ideas expressed there. First consequences are discussed in section 4.

## 2 Review of the seminal papers

### 2.1 Dirac's Large Number Hypothesis

Strictly speaking, Dirac's article [3], relating three large dimensionless numbers occurring in physics, expresses three different coincidences we shall name Dirac 0, I, and II. Eddington had already noticed the number

$$\frac{F_e}{F_g} = \frac{e^2}{4\pi\epsilon_0 G m_p m_e} \approx 10^{39} \quad (1)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>Retranslated from the German edition.

and wondered how such a huge number could come out from any reasonable mathematical theory. Dirac then observed that the age of the universe is about the same multiple of the time light needs to pass the proton radius, or equivalently

$$\frac{R_u}{r_p} \approx 10^{40} := \epsilon, \quad (2)$$

thus escaping from the mathematical difficulty of producing  $\epsilon$  and postulating epoch-dependent forces. It was the first time somebody tried to relate properties of the atomic scale to those of the universe as a whole. Not enough here, he noted that the total number of baryons

$$\frac{M_u}{m_p} \approx N \approx 10^{78} \approx \epsilon^2. \quad (3)$$

As a consequence, for the gravitational constant, the relation

$$G \approx \frac{c^2 R_u}{M_u} \quad (4)$$

must hold, a coincidence that was previously noted by Eddington and much earlier (though lacking data, not in an explicit way) suggested by Ernst Mach, who insisted that the gravitational interaction must be related to the presence of all masses in the universe [10]. I shall call the coincidences (1+2) Dirac I and (2+3) Dirac II, while (4) should be named Dirac 0, to emphasize that Dirac's considerations go much further: (4) could be realized either with a different radius of elementary particles (not satisfying Dirac I) or with another number of baryons of different weight (and being in conflict with Dirac II).<sup>2</sup> It seems that Dirac himself was more convinced of hypothesis I than of II. According to [8], he abandoned the latter after various critiques, e.g. by [11]. Indeed, while Dirac I had a great influence on physics with a huge amount of experimental tests (see [12] for an overview of the  $\dot{G} \neq 0$  search) contesting the appreciation of the idea, Dirac II remained completely out of any theoretical approach so far. While Dirac I would be fairly compatible with standard FL cosmology, Dirac II is in explicit conflict with it. To be concrete, FL-cosmology assumes for the epoch  $\epsilon = 10^{25}$  (BBN, creation of light elements) a horizon containing  $10^{64}$  baryons, while in the epoch  $\epsilon = 10^{50}$  still  $10^{78}$  (or, considering the accelerated expansion, even less [13]) baryons should be seen. Dirac instead argued that 'Such a coincidence we may presume is due to some deep connection in nature between cosmology and atomic theory.' ([3], p. 201). Jordan [8] in 1959 commented on the second hypothesis:

'As far as I can see, I am the only one who was ready to take seriously Dirac's model of the universe which was immediately abandoned by its creator. I have to confess that I consider Dirac's thought as one of the greatest insights of our epoch, whose further investigation is one of the big tasks.'

According to the predominant opinion among cosmologists however  $N \sim \epsilon^2$  is just a coincidence invented by nature to fool today's physicists.

Dirac was aware that a cosmological theory of this type could require a change of time scales. In the sections 3 and 5 of his paper [3], he considered an idealized time  $t$  representing the epoch and an observable time ' $\tau$ ' which were quadratically related and considered<sup>3</sup> an evolution of the horizon  $R \sim t^{\frac{1}{3}}$ . Since time measurements necessarily involve frequencies of atomic transitions and therefore the speed of light, it is strange that he maintained the postulate  $c = 1$ . This omission led him to the inviting but somewhat premature claim that the gravitational constant  $G$  had to vary inversely with the epoch. The amount of

---

<sup>2</sup>We shall not go into detail regarding the question how Dirac II can be related to  $h \approx cm_p r_p$  and to the so-called Eddington-Weinberg number. The agreement of the Compton wavelength of the proton with its actual radius (determined by Rutherford) is however not trivial, as the comparison with the electron shows.

<sup>3</sup>See [7], eq. 16.4.6, for a comment on that.

experimental research done due to that prediction [12] illuminates the great influence of Dirac’s ideas on physicists. The (negative) outcome of the  $\dot{G} \neq 0$  search has prevented theorists from taking that deep principles too serious, without however challenging the prediction as such from a theoretical point of view.

## 2.2 Sciama’s implementation of Mach’s principle

Contrarily to Dirac, Sciama [14] focussed on the question how to realize Mach’ principle in a quantitative form, having noticed that in Newton’s theory the value of  $G$  is an arbitrary element (p. 39 below). From considerations we skip here he derived a dependence of the gravitational constant<sup>4</sup>

$$G = \frac{c^2}{\sum_i \frac{m_i}{r_i}}, \quad (5)$$

whereby the sum is taken over all particles and  $r_i$  denoting the distance to particle  $i$ . This is much more concrete and quantitative than Mach’s ideas or the speculations of Eddington and Dirac. It provides further a reasonable dependency on distance and alleviates the somewhat mysterious property that  $G$  should ‘feel’ the whole universe. Sciama commented the apparent constancy of  $G$ :

‘... then, local phenomena are strongly coupled to the universe as a whole, but owing to the small effect of local irregularities this coupling is practically constant over the distances and times available to observation. Because of this constancy, local phenomena appear to be isolated from the rest of the universe...’

Sciama further considered the gravitational potential (eq. 6 there)

$$\phi = -G \sum_i \frac{m_i}{r_i} = -c^2. \quad (6)$$

Despite the inspiring and insightful discussion in the following, astonishingly he did not consider a spatial variation of  $c$ , though it seems a reasonable consequence to relate  $c^2$  to the gravitational potential. As we shall see below, a variable speed of light in combination with (5) leads to a differential equation that satisfies Dirac’s second hypothesis.

## 2.3 Dicke’s ‘electromagnetic’ theory of gravitation

It was Robert Dicke [9]<sup>5</sup> who first thought of combining the dependence (5) with a variable speed of light, being apparently unaware of Sciama’s previous efforts. Though Dicke obviously left this path in favor of the much more prominent scalar-tensor-theories, we shall investigate this very different first approach here only. Dicke’s proposal belongs to the ‘conservative’ VSL theories that do not postulate exotic dependencies of  $c$  but widely agree with general relativity (GR) in the sense that  $\nabla c$  generates a curved space. While recent VSL theories had to suffer a couple of objections, at the moment I shall give no further justification for a VSL besides the fact that Einstein [15] and Dicke studied that case. Indeed, Dicke realized that the failure of Einstein’s 1911 attempts (see also [16]) were due to the neglect of varying length scales  $\lambda$  (Einstein considered varying time scales only)<sup>6</sup>, and noted that the classical tests could be described by

$$\frac{dc}{c} = \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} + \frac{df}{f}, \quad (7)$$

---

<sup>4</sup>eq. (1) and (5a) with a change of notation.

<sup>5</sup>Unfortunately, this paper was published with the misleading title ‘Gravitation without a principle of equivalence’ which tells very little about the inspiring content.

<sup>6</sup>It should be noted that though  $c$  being a scalar field here, this theory is not a ‘scalar’ theory *coupled to matter* to which Einstein later expressed general caveats; these reservations were however put into question by [17].

assuming further  $\frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} = \frac{df}{f}$ . Dicke started from Einstein's idea of light deflection caused by a lower  $c$  in the vicinity of masses [15]:

'... that the velocity of light in the gravitational field is a function of the place, we may easily infer, by means of Huyghens's principle, that light-rays propagated across a gravitational field undergo deflexion'.

Dicke introduced therefore a variable index of refraction ([9], eq. 5)

$$\epsilon = 1 + \frac{2GM}{rc^2}. \quad (8)$$

While the second term on the r.h.s. is related to the gravitational potential of the sun, Dicke was the first to raise the speculation on the first term having 'its origin in the remainder of the matter in the universe'. In Appendix A.1, the reader will find a brief description how Dicke's theory provides a formulation of spacetime geometry equivalent to GR and compatible with the classical tests.<sup>7</sup> In Appendix A.2, it will be repeated how Newton's law of gravitation arises from Sciama's hypothesis (5) and is embedded in Dicke's theory.

**The Cosmological redshift in Dicke's proposal** is a cornerstone that distinguishes drastically from standard cosmology. He described the idea as follows:

'The cosmological principle was taken to be a fundamental assumption of the theory. Namely, from any fixed position of a Newtonian frame the universe is assumed to be on the average uniform. This implies that matter is on the average fixed in position relative to the Newtonian coordinate frame, for motion would introduce a lack of uniformity as seen by an observer located where the matter would be moving. In like manner the scalar field variable  $\epsilon$  [polarizability of the vacuum] and matter density must be position independent.' ([9], p. 374 left).

Though not stated explicitly, the increase of the horizon  $R(t)$  must be governed by  $\dot{R}(t) = c(t)$ , since there is no other possibility for a horizon increase:

'Although all matter is at rest in this model there is a galactic red shift. With increasing  $\epsilon$  [and decreasing  $c$ ], the photon emitted in the past has more energy than its present counterpart. This might be thought to cause a "blue shift". However, a photon loses energy at twice the rate of loss characteristic of an atom, hence there is a net shift toward the red. The energy lost by a photon becomes converted to gravitational field energy.' ([9], p. 374 right).

The decrease in  $c$  is due to new masses dropping into the horizon. The corresponding decrease of length scales appears as a net expansion which becomes visible as cosmological redshift. Astonishingly, Dicke did not clearly follow that path and derived a total number of particles proportional to  $\epsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}$ , in contrast to Dirac II.<sup>8</sup> It seems that this was due to the quite arbitrary assumption in eq. (94) that led to the complicated form of (95) and which turns out to be in conflict with the differential equation that will be derived from (5). Contrarily, we shall see below that the density that arises from Sciama's assumption (and Dicke's 'rest' of the theory) matches indeed Dirac's second hypothesis on the number of particles.

<sup>7</sup>[18] reports a private communication that Dicke believed the perihelion of mercury to come out with a (wrong) factor, a problem which seems to be settled by the calculations of [19].

<sup>8</sup>There is a brief but quite insignificant correspondence on this topic [20]. To fix that difference, Dicke introduced another quantity  $\frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon_0}$  which later played an important role in the so-called Brans-Dicke theory.

### 3 Dirac-Sciama-Dicke (DSD) cosmology

#### 3.1 Units and Measurement

In the following, we assume an absolute, Euclidean space<sup>9</sup> and an absolute, undistorted time. The time  $t$  and the distances  $r$  expressed in this absolute units however are mathematical parameters not directly observable. All time and distance *measurements* instead are performed in relative, dynamical units defined by the actual frequencies  $f(t)$  and  $\lambda(t)$  of atomic or nuclear transitions. These perceived or relative quantities measured by means of  $f(t)$  and  $\lambda(t)$  shall be called  $t'$  and  $r'$ . The relative counterpart of any absolute quantity  $x$  will be denoted as  $x'$  in the following unless otherwise noted. In that absolute space, all matter is assumed to be at rest having a uniform density  $\rho$  (particles per absolute volume). In the next subsection we shall consider an evolution of the horizon  $R(t)$  (absolute distance) with the assumption<sup>10</sup>  $\dot{R}(t) = c(t)$  starting at  $R(t=0) = 0$  *everywhere* in Euclidean space. To obtain (arbitrarily chosen) time and length scales for the absolute units, we define  $\lambda_0 > 0 = \lambda(t_0 > 0)$  by the condition  $\frac{4}{3}\pi\rho\lambda_0^3 = 1$ . Equivalently, we may say the horizon  $R(t_0) = \lambda_0$  contains just one particle.  $\dot{R}(t_0) = c(t_0) =: c_0$  is then the speed of light at  $t = t_0$  in absolute units and we may define the frequency  $f(t_0) = f_0$  by the identity<sup>11</sup>  $\lambda_0 f_0 = c_0$ .

#### 3.2 Temporal evolution

Expressing Dicke's index of refraction in (eq. 8) as  $\epsilon = \frac{c+\delta c}{c}$  and taking into account the smallness of  $\delta c$ , with  $\delta c^2 = 2c\delta c$  we may write

$$\frac{c^2 + \delta c^2}{c^2} = 1 + \frac{GM}{rc^2}, \quad (9)$$

and after inserting Sciama's approximate formula (5),

$$1 + \frac{\delta c^2}{c^2} = 1 + \frac{\frac{M}{r}}{\sum_i \frac{m_i}{r_i}} \quad (10)$$

follows. While  $\delta$  indicates the difference of values far from and nearby the sun, the comparison of the l.h.s. and r.h.s in (10) with  $\frac{M}{r} = \delta \sum \frac{m_i}{r_i}$  leads to<sup>12</sup> a spatiotemporal dependency of the speed of light

$$c(\vec{r}, t)^2 = \frac{c_0^2}{\sum_i \frac{1}{|\vec{r}_i - \vec{r}|}}, \quad (11)$$

whereby the sum is taken over all particles  $i$  and  $|\vec{r}_i - \vec{r}|$  denoting the distance (time-dependent) to particle  $i$ , measured in absolute units. I shall abbreviate (11) as  $c_0^2/c^2 = \Sigma$  for simplicity<sup>13</sup>. The expansion rate  $c(t)$  depends therefore on the number of visible particles and will decrease while the horizon increases. Without loss of generality,  $r = 0$  is assumed, thus we also shall use the approximation

$$\Sigma \approx \int_0^R \frac{4\pi\rho r^2 dr}{r} = 2\pi\rho R^2. \quad (12)$$

<sup>9</sup>called 'Newtonian' by [9].

<sup>10</sup>The time derivative refers to the absolute time.

<sup>11</sup>To be precise,  $t_0$  coincides with  $\frac{1}{f(t_0)}$  only by a factor, since we did not introduce further assumptions on  $R(t)$  for the period  $0 < t < t_0$ . For the choice of units, this factor does not do any harm. Physically, the (only reasonable) definition of measurable time by atomic and nuclear transitions is not possible as long as the transition is not completed at  $t = t_0$ .

<sup>12</sup>After integration and cancelling of the arising logarithms.

<sup>13</sup>To be in precise agreement with section 3.1, the sum  $\Sigma$  should be replaced by  $\Sigma + 1$ , since one particle is visible at  $t_0$ . Since we shall consider only large values of  $\Sigma$  in the following, this will be omitted.

Keeping in mind that  $\dot{\rho} = 0$ , after inserting  $\dot{R}(t) = c(t)$ , (11) transforms to

$$\dot{R}(t)^2 = \frac{c_0^2}{2\pi\rho R(t)^2}, \quad (13)$$

which after taking the square root, reduces to the simple form

$$\frac{d}{dt}R(t)^2 = \text{const.} \quad (14)$$

with the solution<sup>14</sup>

$$R(t) \sim t^{\frac{1}{2}}; \quad c(t) \sim t^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (15)$$

In FL cosmology, the evolution  $R(t) \sim t^{\frac{1}{2}}$  holds for the early, radiation-dominated epoch of the universe, and is then followed by an expansion more or less linear in time,  $\frac{d}{dt}R(t) = \text{const.}$  In DSD cosmology instead, (15) is valid in any period.

### 3.3 Change of measuring rods

Since the locally observed speed of light  $c' = \lambda' f'$  is a constant<sup>15</sup>, the agreement with the classical tests of GR (see appendix A.1) requires  $\lambda \sim t^{-\frac{1}{4}}$  and  $f \sim t^{-\frac{1}{4}}$ , that means both wavelengths and frequencies of atomic transitions become smaller during the evolution of the universe. The intervals  $\tau$  we use to measure time change according to  $\tau \sim t^{\frac{3}{4}}$ , with the consequence that the relative, measured time  $t' = \frac{t}{\tau}$  shows a dependence  $t' \sim t^{\frac{3}{4}}$  (mind that constancy,  $\tau \sim t^0$  would lead to the usual  $t' \sim t^1$ ). The measuring value of the perceived epoch is  $t' = 10^{39}$  now<sup>16</sup>, therefore the ‘true’ epoch, in absolute units, must be  $t = 10^{52}$  at present.

**Cosmological redshift.** As Dicke ([9], p. 374) points out, in the context of a VSL light propagation the following properties hold:  $\nabla c$  with approximately  $\dot{c} = 0$  affects  $\lambda$ , while  $f$  remains unchanged. Vice versa, when  $\nabla c$  vanishes,  $\dot{c}$  will change  $f$  and leave  $\lambda$  constant. Therefore, assuming an isotropic DSD universe while analyzing the large-scale evolution, a propagating photon will change its frequency only, while  $\lambda$  is kept fixed.

Consider now a photon emitted at  $t_1$  with  $c(t_1) = \lambda(t_1)f(t_1)$ , in brief  $c_1 = \lambda_1 f_1$ . It is detected later at  $t_2$  when other photons (\*) of the same atomic transition obey  $\lambda_2^* f_2^* = c_2^*$  with

$$c_2^* = c_1 \left(\frac{t_2}{t_1}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}; \quad \lambda_2^* = \lambda_1 \left(\frac{t_2}{t_1}\right)^{-\frac{1}{4}}. \quad (16)$$

Since the arriving photon still has  $\lambda_2 = \lambda_1$  (and  $c_2 = c_2^*$ ), it will appear redshifted by the factor

$$(z + 1) := \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2^*} = \left(\frac{t_2}{t_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}}. \quad (17)$$

Its frequency decreased by  $\frac{f_2}{f_1} = (z + 1)^{-2}$  with respect to emission, but is lower only by  $\frac{f_2}{f_2^*} = (z + 1)^{-1}$  with respect to other photons (\*) generated at  $t_2$ .

<sup>14</sup>This describes approximately the evolution, since detailed assumptions for  $0 < t < t_0$  cannot be given.

<sup>15</sup> $c' = 299792458 \text{ m/s}$  is used for the SI definition.

<sup>16</sup>To avoid fractional exponents, we shall approximate  $10^{40}$  by  $10^{39}$ .

**Dimensionful units and change of further quantities.** The change of time and length scales has further consequences. E.g., all measurements of velocities and accelerations will be affected. This is already clear for those arising in atoms, otherwise the scale-defining decline of wavelengths and frequencies could not happen. Thinking in absolute units, the same particles, undergoing smaller accelerations, have an apparent *inertial mass* which accordingly increases. Developing further this principle of measurement with dynamical scales, almost all dimensionful physical units turn out to have a time evolution, thus we may imagine the dependency directly ‘attached’ to a unit like  $m$  or  $s$ . This eases to find the consistent trend but also elucidates why the change of physical quantities may be hidden at a first glance in conventional physics. A list of the respective change of physical quantities for the static case has already been given by [9], p. 366. A corresponding overview is given below in Table 1. All quantities at  $t_0$  are normalized to 1.

Quantity	Symbol	evolution $t^\gamma$	present epoch
abstract time	$t$	$t^1$	$10^{52}$
Horizon	$R$	$t^{\frac{1}{2}}$	$10^{26}$
Speed of light	$c$	$t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$	$10^{-26}$
wavelengths	$\lambda$	$t^{-\frac{1}{4}}$	$10^{-13}$
frequencies	$f$	$t^{-\frac{1}{4}}$	$10^{-13}$
actual time interval	$\tau$	$t^{\frac{1}{4}}$	$10^{13}$
velocities	$v$	$t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$	$10^{-26}$
accelerations	$a$	$t^{-\frac{3}{4}}$	$10^{-39}$
perceived Horizon $R'$	$\frac{R}{\lambda}$	$t^{\frac{3}{4}}$	$10^{39}$
perceived epoch $t'$	$\frac{t}{\tau}$	$t^{\frac{3}{4}}$	$10^{39}$
particles	$N$	$t^{\frac{3}{2}}$	$10^{78}$
density (particles)	$\rho'$	$t^{-\frac{3}{4}}$	$10^{-39}$
masses	$m$	$t^{\frac{3}{4}}$	$10^{39}$

Table 1.

**Dirac’s second hypothesis on the total number of particles.** Since we have assumed an Euclidean space with constant density  $\rho$  in which the horizon increases according to  $R(t) \sim t^{\frac{1}{2}}$  (eq. 15), for the total number of visible particles

$$N(t) = \frac{4}{3}\pi\rho R(t)^3 \sim t^{\frac{3}{2}} \quad (18)$$

holds. Taking into account that the perceived time shows the dependency  $t' \sim t^{\frac{3}{4}}$ , Dirac’s second hypothesis

$$N(t) \sim t'^2 \quad (19)$$

follows. Of course, the same result is obtained considering the shortening of length scales  $\lambda \sim t^{-\frac{1}{4}}$  causing the perceived horizon to be at the relative distance of  $R' = \frac{R}{\lambda} \sim t^{\frac{3}{4}}$ . Then for the number of particles

$$N = \frac{4}{3}\pi\rho'R'(t)^3 \sim \rho't'^{\frac{3}{2}} \sim \rho't'^3 \quad (20)$$

holds, which coincides with (18) because  $\rho' \sim t^{\frac{3}{4}} \sim t'^{-1}$ , an equivalent form of Dirac’s second observation.



### 3.4 Particle dynamics in DSD cosmology

While DSD cosmology predicts  $\frac{d}{dt}R^2 = const.$  for the evolution of the universe as a whole, it is not yet clear what general principle should govern the dynamics of individual particles. While the speed of light decreases with  $c^2 \sim t^{-1}$ , the inertial masses consequently show an evolution  $m \sim t^{\frac{3}{4}}$ , yielding  $E \sim t^{-\frac{1}{4}}$  for the individual energy  $mc^2$  of a particle. For the universe as a whole,  $M_u \sim t^{\frac{9}{4}} \sim t'^3$  holds, but  $E_u \sim t^{\frac{5}{4}} \sim t'^{\frac{5}{3}}$ . Hence, it is thus clear that energy conservation describes particle dynamics only in the limit  $t = const.$ , the snapshot of natural laws we observe indeed.

There are several conditions that must be obeyed however. Any velocity  $v$  a particle has acquired<sup>17</sup> must have the same relative decline than  $c \sim t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ . Otherwise, supraliminal velocities would soon arise. Correspondingly, any kinetic energy would show a decline  $E_k \sim t^{-\frac{1}{4}}$ , in agreement with the rest energy; thus the relativistic factor  $\gamma = (\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2})^{-1}$  would not be touched, resulting in an apparent validity of Newton's first law of inertia. It should be noted however that contrarily to rest masses, propagating photons, obeying  $\lambda = const.$ , evolve as  $E_{Photon} = \frac{hc}{\lambda} \sim t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ , since  $h$  is assumed to be a constant.

**The apparent constancy of  $c$  - a change without a change.** The distorted time arising in DSD cosmology manifests in some unexpected properties. According to (15),  $c(t) \sim t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  holds for absolute units. Translating this improvidently into relative units,  $c(t) \sim t'^{-\frac{2}{3}}$  still would describe an evolution. In reality, this only reflects the fact that  $c_0$  defined in section (3.1) has acquired a different value with respect to our actual measuring rods. It does *not* imply that there is any *visible* time dependence of  $c$  - the actual/local is defined by  $c = f\lambda$  and appears as a constant within the dynamic measuring rods. This kind of paradox is analogous to the differential geometry of manifolds, where a parallel transport of vectors can be defined. Though there are trajectories on which the direction of a vector is kept fixed - we may this associate to the constancy of a physical quantity -, there are closed paths that generate a change in direction.<sup>18</sup>

**The apparent constancy of the gravitational constant  $G$ .** There is strong observational evidence [12] against a temporal variation of  $G$ . In the DSD evolution developed above however, Dirac's postulate of a variation of  $G$  turns out to be premature. First we have to ask what observational evidence supports  $\dot{G} \approx 0$ . Exemplarily, we consider the absence of increasing radii in the Earth-moon and the Sun-Mars orbit (e.g., [21, 22]), since these are the most simple ones to discuss. In the DSD picture, frequencies and wavelengths of atomic transitions contract according to  $f \sim \lambda \sim t^{-\frac{1}{4}}$ . Hence, in the classical limit of orbiting electrons, Bohr's radius has to decline like  $r_b \sim \lambda \sim t^{-\frac{1}{4}}$  and the respective centripetal acceleration according to  $a_z \sim t^{-\frac{3}{4}}$ . On the other hand, the gravitational acceleration is proportional to  $\nabla c^2$ . Since all gradients are taken with respect to the dynamic units  $\lambda \sim t^{-\frac{1}{4}}$ , they appear bigger by the factor  $t^{\frac{3}{4}}$ , while  $c \sim t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ . Therefore, the gravitational acceleration (see appendix A.2)  $a_g \sim t^{-\frac{3}{4}}$  has precisely the dependence required for a decrease of the radius  $r \sim t^{-\frac{1}{4}}$  in a sun-planet orbit. This contraction synchronous with length scales results in an apparent absence of any change in distance; two-body systems, the 'planetary clocks', run slower and contract their orbits in the same manner as the atomic clocks do. This result is in agreement with Kepler's 2nd law, since the angular momentum  $\vec{l} = m\vec{v} \times \vec{r}$ , with  $m \sim t^{\frac{3}{4}}$ ,  $v \sim t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $r \sim t^{-\frac{1}{4}}$  should yield a time-invariant quantity even in absolute Euclidean units. From other considerations (see appendix A.1) there are good reasons to assume Planck's constant  $h$ , whose units correspond to  $\vec{l}$ , to be unchanged in time.

Contrarily to the speed of light, the factor  $\frac{F_e}{F_g}$  will yield different measuring values dependent on the epoch, and therefore the measuring value of  $G$ , too. The experimental bounds of absolute  $G$  determinations by far do not exclude such a possibility. The paradox of a changing  $G$  without a visible  $\dot{G}$  is a result of the assumption of an undistorted time, which cannot be upheld in DSD cosmology.

<sup>17</sup>The absolute space, observed by the CMB frame, uniquely determines  $v$ , though there is no conflict with SR.

<sup>18</sup>There is an example too instructive not to be mentioned. Start walking from the north pole on the zero meridian southwards while keeping a vector continuously southwards. Make a turn at the equator, follow it to longitude  $\alpha$ , and walk back to the north pole. The direction of the vector, though always kept southwards, has changed by  $\alpha$  !

## 4 Discussion

**Dirac's hypotheses and agreement with GR phenomenology.** As far as the classical tests are concerned, DSD cosmology does not predict any differences to GR. The formulation in terms of a varying speed of light is however unusual and has to gain yet repeated detailed descriptions and broad acceptance. DSD cosmology then is capable to explain the apparent  $\dot{G} \approx 0$ , preserving however the possibility to encompass Mach's principle. The most convincing property seems the agreement with Dirac's second hypothesis and the fact that the cosmological redshift is an intrinsic necessity of DSD cosmology. In general, there is a wide-ranging agreement with conventional cosmology due to the dynamics of physical units, whose relations to each other change so slowly that observational differences, if any, remain minute. This conjecture has still to be verified for the impact of DSD cosmology on electrodynamics, since nobody would expect  $c_{GR}$  to be different from  $c_{EM}$  (see [23] for a systematic review of the different meanings of  $c$ ). Though Dicke [9], p. 372 already proposed in an explicit way how to modify Maxwell's equations, we cannot go into details here.

Energy conservation is no longer a valuable condition for the evolution of the universe. Taking a general perspective, this is not heavily surprising, because energy is a concept introduced to describe the time-independency of physical laws. While this is true for the snapshot of the universe we are observing, the clumping of matter suggests that the universe is anything but stationary. Though the differential equation  $\frac{d}{dt}R^2 = const.$  seems to be a simple principle, but a general formulation, possibly by means of a Lagrangian, has still to be given.

**The flatness and horizon problem.** Flatness is closely related to the observation of the approximate coincidence (4). As it is evident from (5), the apparent  $G$  must have an according value in the same order of magnitude. It does not make sense at the moment to relate DSD predictions to the WMAP data which set tight bounds on flatness like  $\Omega = 1 \pm 0.02$ . Given that deviations from  $\Omega = 1$  at primordial times should cause huge deviations at present, approximate coincidence following from Sciamia's ansatz (5) is a step towards an explanation of 'flatness'.

In Friedman-Lemaitre cosmology, gravity acts as a contracting force which slows down the Hubble expansion. It is precisely that slowdown that causes new masses to drop into the horizon and raises the question how masses, without having causal contact, could show a highly uniform behavior like the CMB emission. Contrarily, in DSD cosmology, since all matter is initially at rest, masses attract due to gravitational interaction, but this does not affect the apparent redshift. Consequently, the problem of slowing down the 'expansion' does not even arise.

**Cosmic Microwave Background.** It is interesting to investigate the impact of the present proposal for the WMAP data of the cosmic microwave background. According to common cosmology, the CMB is a signal from the recombination period at  $z \approx 1100$ , commonly assumed to be 380000 years after the big bang. Assuming an nonuniform evolving time like in DSD cosmology,  $\frac{\lambda'}{\lambda} - 1 = z \approx 1100$  corresponds, since  $\lambda \sim t^{-\frac{1}{4}}$ , to an epoch of  $t = 3 \times 10^{42}$ , while at present  $t = 10^{53}$  holds. Measured in units of the 'local' time, that epoch corresponds to  $t' = 10^{31}$ , i.e. about one year. This is a dramatic difference and must carefully be compared to the observations. As far as the amplitude of CMB fluctuations is concerned, one expects much tinier fluctuations in DSD cosmology since there is much more time left for the fluctuations to evolve to galaxies. One should keep in mind that before the COBE data had analyzed, much greater fluctuations were expected, a riddle which was resolved in the following by postulating dark matter.

**Big Bang.** Though we were not able to discuss the details shortly after  $t = 0$ , some substantial differences to FL cosmology should be noted. The absolute scale  $\lambda_0$  was defined above by the condition of a single particle being contained in the horizon. If one assumes this particle to be a baryon, its rest energy corresponds to the zero energy  $E_0$  of a particle closed in a quantum well of the size of the horizon:

$E_0 = \frac{h}{t_0} = \frac{hc}{\lambda_0} \approx m_p$ . In this case, the evolutionary equation in absolute units writes as<sup>19</sup>  $\frac{d}{dt}R^2 = \frac{h}{m_p}$ . In general, a density equal to the density of nuclear matter seems to require much less extrapolation of physical laws than the densities that arise in FL cosmology shortly after the big bang.

## 5 Outlook

The present proposal based on the ideas of Dirac, Sciama and Dicke is a first sketchy framework for an alternative cosmology. Regarding the quantity of observations in agreement with a theoretical framework, the DSD proposal is unable to compete with standard FL cosmology with its currently accepted  $\Lambda$ CDM model. DSD cosmology may only gain importance if one is disposed to raise doubts to (1) the validity of the standard model with its considerable extrapolation of the laws of nature and an increasing number of free parameters (2) the suggestion of the standard model that Mach's principle and Dirac's enigmatic hypotheses being just numerical coincidences (3) the conviction of the constants of nature being fixed but arbitrary numbers; this last condition seems the most entrenched one and the idea that we are observers living inside a prison of dynamic measuring instruments, which in first approximation cause a blindness for the perception of change, is certainly unfamiliar.

**Acknowledgement.** The author thanks for various inspiring discussions with Karl Fabian.

## A Appendix

### A.1 VSL formulation of GR

It is well known that in a gravitational field clocks run slower and a shortening of measuring rods occurs with respect to clocks and rods outside the field. Defining  $c$  with respect to the latter scales, one can equivalently say that  $c$  is lowered<sup>20</sup> in the gravitational field (cfr. [24], p. 111). Based on that point of view, an equivalent description of GR by means of a VSL theory can be given. After the seminal idea by Dicke [9] this has been formulated by [19] and is also known as 'polarisable vacuum' (PV) representation of GR. The only necessary postulate is that since  $c = f\lambda$  and  $dc = fd\lambda + \lambda df$ , the relative change

$$\frac{dc}{c} = \frac{df}{f} + \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda}, \quad (21)$$

is equally<sup>21</sup> distributed to  $f$  and  $\lambda$ , that means  $\frac{df}{f} = \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda}$ . We shall denote the quantities outside the gravitational field as  $c, \lambda, f$  and the lower quantities in the field as  $c', \lambda', f'$ . Hence, in a gravitational field, clocks run slower by the relative amount

$$f' = \alpha^{-1}f; \quad \alpha := \left(1 + \frac{GM}{rc^2}\right) \quad (22)$$

and wavelengths  $\lambda$  shorten by the same factor  $\alpha$ :  $\lambda' = \alpha^{-1}\lambda$ , which is a well-known result of GR. According to (21),  $c' = \alpha^{-2}c$  has to be lowered by  $\alpha^2 \approx \left(1 + \frac{2GM}{rc^2}\right)$  in a weak-field approximation. While that idea has first been developed by [9], [19], sec. III, showed that all classical tests of GR can be described in this

---

<sup>19</sup>Given that  $m_p$  increased by a factor  $10^{40}$  in the meantime (see table 1), the perceived  $\frac{h}{m_b}$  accordingly decreased to the actual value  $5 \cdot 10^{-7} \frac{m^2}{s}$ .

<sup>20</sup>This is sometimes called 'non-proper' speed of light, see [16].

<sup>21</sup>In 1911, Einstein considered fixed  $\lambda$ 's only, thus  $\frac{dc}{c} = \frac{df}{f}$ , being in accordance with the 'Newtonian' value that failed to match the famous data of Eddington's eclipse observation in 1919.

manner, see also [25], sec. 3-5<sup>22</sup>. To give an example, we briefly describe the gravitational redshift of the sun [26].

One can imagine the process as follows: consider a photon travelling from the gravitational field of the sun to the earth (with approximately zero gravity). Starting at  $f', \lambda', c'$ , while travelling it keeps its (lowered) frequency  $f'$ . At earth, i.e. outside the gravitational field where  $c = \alpha^2 c'$  is higher by the double amount (21), the photon has to adjust its  $\lambda$ , and raise it with respect to the value  $\lambda'$  at departure. Since the adjustment  $\alpha^2$  to  $c$  overcompensates the originally lower  $\lambda' = \alpha^{-1} \lambda$ , we detect the photon as gravitationally redshifted with  $\alpha^2 \lambda' = \alpha \lambda$ .

**Change of measuring rods.** Time and length measurements naturally affect accelerations ( $a \sim \alpha^3$ ), and surprisingly, masses, too. Photon and rest masses,  $hf$  and  $mc^2$  have to behave in the same manner, and since  $f \sim \alpha^{-1}$ ,  $c^2 \sim \alpha^{-4}$ ,  $m \sim \alpha^3$  must hold. This is in agreement with Newton's second law according to which masses have to be proportional to inverse accelerations. An overview on the relative change of various quantities inside the gravitational field (cfr. [9], p. 366) is given in Table 2 below.  $\alpha$  denotes a factor of  $(1 + \frac{GM}{rc^2})$ :

Quantity	symbol	unit	rel. change
speed of light	$c$	$\frac{m}{s}$	$\alpha^{-2}$
Frequency	$f$	$\frac{1}{s}$	$\alpha^{-1}$
Time	$t$	$s$	$\alpha$
Length	$\lambda$	$m$	$\alpha^{-1}$
Velocity	$v$	$\frac{m}{s}$	$\alpha^{-2}$
Acceleration	$a$	$\frac{m}{s^2}$	$\alpha^{-3}$
Mass	$m$	$kg$	$\alpha^3$
Force	$F$	$N$	$\alpha^0$
Pot. energy	$E_p$	$Nm$	$\alpha^{-1}$
Ang. mom.	$l$	$\frac{kgm^2}{s}$	$\alpha^0$

Table 2: Relative change of quantities inside the gravitational field.

## A.2 Newton's law from a variable $c$ .

Once time and length measurement effects of GR are described by a spatial variation of  $c$ , all gravitational phenomena must be encompassed by the same framework. However,  $c \sim \alpha^{-2}$  requires (eqns. 8, 10)

$$\Delta(c^2) = 2c\Delta c = -\frac{4GM}{r}. \quad (23)$$

This requires a Newtonian gravitational potential of the form

$$\phi_{Newton} = \frac{1}{4}c^2, \quad (24)$$

which differs by a factor 4 from Sciamia's potential. Sciamia's proposal was however always considered as approximate by the author ([14], p. 38 below). Since (11)

$$c(\vec{r})^2 = \frac{c_0^2}{\sum_i \frac{1}{|\vec{r}_i - \vec{r}|}}, \quad (25)$$

---

<sup>22</sup>I do not uphold any longer the considerations in sec. 6.

for the acceleration of a test mass

$$\vec{a}(\vec{r}) = \frac{1}{4} \nabla c(\vec{r})^2 = -\frac{c_0^2}{4\Sigma^2} \sum_i \frac{\vec{r}_i - \vec{r}}{|\vec{r}_i - \vec{r}|^3} \quad (26)$$

holds. Assuming without loss of generality  $|\vec{r}| = r = 0$  and substituting  $c_0^2$ ,

$$-\frac{c^2}{4\Sigma} \sum_i \frac{\vec{e}_i}{r_i^2} \quad (27)$$

follows, yielding the inverse-square law. Thus  $c_0$  does not appear any more and the Newtonian force is perceived in the local, dynamic units. As one easily verifies, (27) does not depend on the units in which masses and distances are measured. Thus (25), while setting  $r = 0$ , may be rewritten in SI quantities (with an new reference  $c_*$ ):

$$c^2 = \frac{c_*^2}{\sum_i \frac{m_i}{r_i}}, \quad (28)$$

The ‘gravitational constant’ is then given by the quantity

$$G = \frac{c^2}{4 \sum_i \frac{m_i}{r_i}}, \quad (29)$$

in accordance with [14]. From (29) and the assumption of an homogeneous universe, elementary integration over a spherical volume yields  $\sum \frac{m_i}{r_i} \approx \frac{3m_u}{2r_u}$ , and therefore

$$m_u \approx \frac{c^2 r_u}{6G} \quad (30)$$

holds, which is in approximate agreement with the amount of baryonic matter.

## References

- [1] P. A. M. Dirac. *Nature*, 139:323, 1937.
- [2] P. A. M. Dirac. *Methods in Theoretical Physics*, page 128. Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- [3] P. A. M. Dirac. A new basis for cosmology. *Proc. Roy. Soc. London, A* 165:199–208, 1938.
- [4] A. Unzicker. Why do we Still Believe in Newton’s Law ? Facts, Myths and Methods in Gravitational Physics. *ArXiv: gr-qc/0702009*, February 2007.
- [5] J. Barrow. *The world within the world*. Oxford university Press, 1988.
- [6] J. Barbour. *The End of Time*. Oxford University Press, 2000.
- [7] S. Weinberg. *Gravitation and Cosmology*. Wiley, 1972.
- [8] P. Jordan. Zum gegenwärtigen Stand der Diracschen Hypothesen. *Zeitschrift für Physik*, 157:112–121, 1959.
- [9] R. H. Dicke. Gravitation without a principle of equivalence. *Review of modern Physics*, 129(3):363–376, 1957.
- [10] E. Mach. *Die Mechanik in ihrer Entwicklung - historisch-kritisch dargestellt*. 1897.

- [11] N. Fierz. *Helv. Phys. Acta*, 29:128, 1956.
- [12] J.-P. Uzan. The fundamental constants and their variation: observational and theoretical status, hep-ph/0205340. *Reviews of modern physics*, 75:403–455, 2003.
- [13] L. M. Krauss and R. J. Scherrer. The Return of a Static Universe and the End of Cosmology. *ArXiv: 0704.0221*, April 2007.
- [14] D. W. Sciama. On the origin of inertia. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 113:34–42, 1953.
- [15] A. Einstein. On the influence of gravitation on the propagation of light. *Annalen der Physik*, 35(German org: Über den Einfluss der Schwerkraft auf die Ausbreitung des Lichtes):35, 1911.
- [16] A. Ranada. The Pioneer anomaly as an effect of the dynamics of time. *arXiv*, gr-qc/0403013, 2004.
- [17] D. Giulini. What is (not) wrong with scalar gravity? *arXiv*, gr-qc/0611100, 2006.
- [18] H. Yilmaz. New Approach to General Relativity. *Physical Review*, 111:1417–1426, September 1958.
- [19] H. Puthoff. Polarizable-vacuum (PV) representation of general relativity. *Found.Phys.*, 32:927–943, arXiv: gr-qc/9909037, 2002.
- [20] R. H. Dicke. Dirac’s Cosmology and Mach’s Principle. *Nature*, 192:440–+, 1961.
- [21] J. G. Williams, S. G. Turyshev, and D. H. Boggs. Progress in lunar laser ranging tests of relativistic gravity. *arXiv*, gr-qc/0411113, 2004.
- [22] R. D. Reasenberg. Viking relativity experiment: Verification of signal retardation by solar gravity. *Astrophys. J. Lett.*, 234:L219–L221, 1979.
- [23] G. F. R. Ellis and J.-P. Uzan. ‘c’ is the speed of light, isn’t it ? *arXiv*, gr-qc/0305099, 2003.
- [24] C. Will. *Was Einstein Right ?* Basic Books, New York, 1986.
- [25] A. Unzicker. Mach’s principle and a variable speed of light. *arXiv*, gr-qc/0511038, 2005.
- [26] J. L. Snider. New measurement of the solar gravitational redshift. *Physical Review Letters*, 28:853–855, 1972.