

Open Universes, Inflation, and the Anthropic Principle*

Alexander Vilenkin[†]

Institute of Cosmology, Department of Physics and Astronomy,

Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts 02155, USA

(October 23, 2018)

Abstract

Models of open inflation with a variable density parameter Ω provide the most natural way to reconcile an open universe with inflation. The use of anthropic principle is essential to derive observational predictions of such models. I discuss how this principle can be used in a quantitative way to determine the most probable value of Ω . I also comment on recent work by Hawking and Turok on quantum creation of open universes from nothing.

I. INTRODUCTION.

Until recently, thinking about open universes was regarded as a waste of time because inflation predicted a flat universe. And thinking about the anthropic principle could get you into real trouble. The situation is now changing for open universes, as observations point to low values of the matter density. To meet this observational challenge, new models of inflation have been developed [1–4] in which the density parameter Ω can take a wide spectrum of values.

I think the bad reputation of the anthropic principle is also largely undeserved. If indeed we live in an open universe, then it is hard to explain the observed value of Ω without using the anthropic principle. The same applies to a universe with a nonzero cosmological constant. Here I am going to show how anthropic principle can be used in a quantitative way to determine the probability distribution for Ω . I will first give an overview of open inflation in Section II. Then, in Section III, I will introduce my favorite version of the anthropic principle, which I call the "principle of mediocrity". In Section IV this principle will be applied to open inflation to obtain the probability distribution for Ω . In Section V, I will argue that observers should not be surprised to find themselves living at an epoch when the curvature is about to dominate. Finally, in Section VI, I will comment on a somewhat related work by Hawking and Turok who discussed quantum creation of open universes from nothing.

*Talk given at the XIV-th Yamada Conference, Kyoto, April 1998.

[†]Electronic address: vilenkin@cosmos2.phy.tufts.edu

II. OPEN INFLATION.

A. One-field model.

The simplest model of open inflation [2,3] assumes a scalar field ϕ with a potential $V(\phi)$ of a rather special form. This potential is assumed to have a metastable false vacuum separated by a barrier from a flat slow roll region leading to the true vacuum. The first stage of inflation occurs when the field ϕ is stuck in the false vacuum. Occasionally ϕ tunnels through the barrier with the formation of a bubble. ϕ then slowly rolls towards the true minimum of the potential, resulting in a second stage of inflation inside the bubble.

The process of bubble nucleation is described [5] by a compact, $O(4)$ - invariant instanton which is a solution of Euclidean field equations. The nucleation probability is $\mathcal{P} \sim e^{-S_E}$, where S_E is the Euclidean action of the instanton. The evolution of a bubble after nucleation is obtained by analytically continuing the instanton to Lorentzian signature. It can be shown [5] that the bubble interior is isometric to an open Robertson-Walker universe. The homogeneity and isotropy of the bubble spacetime is ensured by the high symmetry of the instanton. Hence, in this case the horizon problem is solved not by a large amount of inflation but by the symmetry of the bubble nucleation process.

In the space between bubbles, the rate of expansion is very high, and bubble collisions are very rare. We can therefore think of the bubbles as isolated open universes. All of these universes have the same value of Ω which is determined by the number of e-foldings of slow-roll inflation, N . For observationally interesting values of Ω we need $N \approx 60$.

This simple model demonstrates that inflation can indeed be reconciled with a low-density universe, but it requires a substantial amount of fine-tuning. The potential $V(\phi)$ is required to have a sharp barrier next to a flat slow-roll region, which is a rather unnatural combination.

B. Two-field model.

A more natural model, introduced by Linde and Mezhlumian [4], has two fields, σ and ϕ , with σ doing the tunneling and ϕ the slow roll. The potential has the form

$$V(\sigma, \phi) = V_0(\sigma) + \frac{1}{2}g\sigma^2\phi^2, \quad (1)$$

where $V_0(\sigma)$ has a metastable false vacuum at $\sigma = 0$ and the true vacuum at $\sigma = \sigma_0$. When σ is in the false vacuum, the field ϕ is massless, while in the true vacuum it has a mass

$$m = g^{1/2}\sigma_0. \quad (2)$$

A massless scalar field in an inflating universe is subject to quantum fluctuations which can be pictured as a random walk along the ϕ -axis. After a while, all values of ϕ become equally probable.

In this model bubbles can nucleate at different values of ϕ . The nucleation probability is

$$\mathcal{P} \sim e^{-S_E(\phi)} \quad (3)$$

The number of e-foldings of the slow-roll inflation inside the bubbles is also ϕ -dependent,

$$N(\phi) \approx 2\pi G\phi^2. \quad (4)$$

Hence, one expects to have a distribution of bubbles with different values of Ω [4].

However, recent analysis by Garcia-Bellido, Garriga and Montes [6] has shown that this picture is oversimplified. The field ϕ is not homogeneous inside the bubbles. The reason is that the bubbles expand into the region of fluctuating field ϕ , and the fluctuations penetrate through the bubble wall. Mathematically, this is described by the so-called supercurvature modes. Let us denote by t_σ the time it takes the field σ to settle to its true minimum at σ_0 . (Here, t is the Robertson-Walker time inside a bubble). Then, on constant-time surfaces $t \sim t_\sigma$, ϕ has a gaussian distribution

$$\mathcal{P}(\phi) \propto \exp(-\phi^2/2 \langle \phi^2 \rangle) \quad (5)$$

with a dispersion [6]

$$\langle \phi^2 \rangle \sim m^{-2} R_0^{-4}. \quad (6)$$

Here, R_0 is the bubble radius at the time of nucleation. The distribution (5) is actually the same as that in Eq. (3), but their meanings are completely different. Eq. (3) gives the probability that a bubble nucleates with a given value of ϕ , while Eq. (5) gives the probability distribution for ϕ inside a single bubble.

Only regions where ϕ is greater than the Planck mass m_p are going to inflate, and the amount of inflation will differ from one region to another, according to Eq. (4). Hence, each bubble will contain an infinite number of regions with different values of Ω . Garcia-Bellido et. al. called this picture "quasiopen inflation".

The correlation length of ϕ inside the bubbles at $t \sim t_\sigma$ is $\xi \sim R_c/H_F^2 m^2 R_0^4$, where H_F is the expansion rate in the false vacuum and R_c is the curvature radius of the hypersurfaces $t \sim t_\sigma$. This correlation length sets the length scale of variation of Ω and must be much greater than the co-moving size of the presently observable universe (by a factor of at least 10^7 , in order that the microwave background anisotropies do not get unacceptably large). This can be enforced by a suitable choice of parameters in the potential (1).

Clearly, in this type of model, the value of Ω cannot be predicted with certainty. One can only try to determine the probability distribution for Ω .

III. PRINCIPLE OF MEDIOCRITY.

Each of the bubbles will be inhabited by an infinite number of civilizations which will generally measure different values of Ω . In some regions Ω will be too low for any galaxies to form. The probability for measuring such values of Ω should be set equal to zero, since there will be nobody there to observe them. When people talk about anthropic principle, they usually mean this anthropic constraint (see, e.g., [7]). However, I suggest that we use a much more quantitative version [8].

My suggestion is that the probability $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)d\Omega$ for Ω to be in the interval $d\Omega$ should be set proportional to the number of civilizations which will measure Ω in that interval. Assuming

that we are a typical civilization, we can expect to observe a value of Ω near the maximum of $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$. This version of the anthropic principle, which I called the principle of mediocrity [8], is an extension of the Copernican principle. The Copernican principle asserts that our position in space is not special, while the principle of mediocrity asserts that the values of the cosmological parameters we are going to measure are not special either.¹

A calculation of $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ based on the principle of mediocrity was discussed in Ref. [12]. At that time, the quasiopen nature of the Linde-Mezhlumian model (1) was not yet recognized. In the next two sections I shall report on the recent paper I wrote with Jaume Garriga and Takahiro Tanaka [13] where we extend the work of [12] in two important respects. First, we use the quasiopen picture (which actually makes the calculation much simpler) and second, we give a much more careful treatment of the astrophysical aspects of galaxy formation.

The principle of mediocrity has also been applied to other cosmological parameters, e.g., the cosmological constant [8,14–17] and the amplitude of density fluctuations [18].

IV. CALCULATION OF $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$.

A great simplification introduced by the quasi-open picture is that Ω takes all its possible values within each bubble. Since all bubbles are statistically equivalent, it is sufficient to calculate $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ for a single bubble.

The distribution $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ can be expressed as

$$\mathcal{P}(\Omega) \propto \mathcal{P}(\phi) e^{3N(\phi)} \nu(\Omega) \left| \frac{d\phi}{d\Omega} \right|. \quad (7)$$

Here, $\mathcal{P}(\phi)$ is the probability distribution for ϕ , Eq. (5), and the next factor accounts for the fact that regions starting out with different values of ϕ will inflate by a different amount; $e^{3N(\phi)}$ is the volume enhancement factor. The "anthropic factor" $\nu(\Omega)$ is proportional to the number of galaxies formed per unit volume. More precisely, it is the fraction of galactic-scale volumes which eventually collapse to form galaxies. (We assume that the number of civilizations is proportional to the number of galaxies). Finally, the last factor in (7) is the Jacobian transforming from ϕ to Ω via the relation [2]

$$H_*^2 e^{2N(\phi)} \approx \frac{T_*^2}{T_{eq} T_{CMB}} \cdot \frac{\Omega}{1 - \Omega}. \quad (8)$$

Here, H_* and T_* are the expansion rate and the temperature at the end of inflation, T_{eq} is the temperature at equal matter and radiation densities, and T_{CMB} is the temperature at the time when the value of Ω is specified.

The Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{P}(\phi)$ is peaked at $\phi = 0$, which corresponds to $\Omega = 0$, while the volume factor favors large values of ϕ and pushes Ω towards $\Omega = 1$. The effect of $\nu(\Omega)$

¹A very similar approach was used by Carter [9], Leslie [10] and Gott [11] to estimate the expected lifetime of our species. Gott also applied it to estimate the lifetimes of various political and economic structures, including the journal "Nature" where his article was published.

can be understood if we note that the growth of density fluctuations in an open universe terminates at a redshift $1+z \sim \Omega^{-1}$. If Ω is too low, galaxy formation is suppressed. Hence, $\nu(\Omega) \rightarrow 0$ as $\Omega \rightarrow 0$.

An interesting situation arises when $\mathcal{P}(\phi)$ dominates over the volume factor. In this case, the effect of the anthropic factor $\nu(\Omega)$ is to shift the peak of the distribution from $\Omega = 0$ to a non-zero value of Ω .

In order to calculate $\nu(\Omega)$, one needs to make some assumptions about the nature of cosmological density fluctuations. We shall assume Gaussian fluctuations characterized by a dispersion σ_{rec} on the co-moving galactic scale at the time of recombination. The choice of reference time here is unimportant, as long as it is much earlier than the time of curvature domination, so that one can reasonably assume that σ_{rec} is independent of Ω . For the galactic scale we choose the co-moving scale of 1 Mpc at present.

In an open universe with a density parameter Ω_{rec} at t_{rec} , the dispersion of density fluctuation in the asymptotic future, σ_∞ , is greater than σ_{rec} only by a finite factor,

$$\frac{\sigma_\infty}{\sigma_{rec}} = \frac{5}{2} \frac{\Omega_{rec}}{1 - \Omega_{rec}} = \frac{5}{2} \frac{T_{rec}}{T_{CMB}} \frac{\Omega}{1 - \Omega}, \quad (9)$$

where in the last step I have used the fact that

$$T(1 - \Omega)/\Omega = const \quad (10)$$

during the matter era. We can now use the Press-Schechter formalism to determine $\nu(\Omega)$. Galaxies will form in regions where the linearized density contrast δ exceeds the critical value $\delta_c \approx 1.7$. Hence, $\nu(\Omega)$ is given by the integral of the Gaussian distribution over $\delta > \delta_c$, that is, by the error function [19]

$$\nu(\Omega) = \text{erfc} \left(\frac{\delta_c}{\sqrt{2}\sigma_\infty} \right) = \text{erfc} \left(\kappa \frac{1 - \Omega}{\Omega} \right), \quad (11)$$

where

$$\kappa = \frac{2 T_{CMB}}{5 T_{rec}} \frac{\delta_c}{\sqrt{2}\sigma_{rec}}. \quad (12)$$

In principle, the value of σ_{rec} can be determined from the fundamental theory of density fluctuations. Until such theory is known, we can, in practice, adjust σ_{rec} to fit the CMB observations. Our ability to do so is, however, limited by the fact that the value of σ_{rec} inferred from observations depends on the Hubble "constant" H_0 and the density parameter Ω_0 in our part of the universe, which are not very well determined. With this uncertainty [13],

$$\kappa = 0.1 \pm 0.05. \quad (13)$$

Combining Eqs. (5) - (8) and (11), we can now write the final form of the probability distribution for Ω ,

$$\frac{d\mathcal{P}}{d \ln y} \propto y^{3(\mu - \frac{1}{2})} \text{erfc}(y). \quad (14)$$

Here,

$$y = \kappa \frac{1 - \Omega}{\Omega} \quad (15)$$

and

$$\mu = \frac{m_p^2}{24\pi \langle \phi^2 \rangle} \sim m_p^2 m^2 R_0^4. \quad (16)$$

Note that the variable y defined in (15) does not depend on the temperature T_{CMB} at which Ω is measured, because of Eq. (10).

For $y > 1$, the error function can be approximated as

$$\text{erfc}(y) \approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}y} e^{-y^2} \quad (17)$$

and the value of Ω at the peak of the distribution (14) can be expressed analytically,

$$\kappa \left(\frac{1 - \Omega}{\Omega} \right)_{peak} \approx \left(\frac{3}{2}\mu - \frac{5}{4} \right)^{1/2}. \quad (18)$$

The peak is rather broad, with a width

$$\Delta \left(\frac{1 - \Omega}{\Omega} \right) \sim 5. \quad (19)$$

Interesting values of Ω_{peak} , which are not too close to either 0 or 1, are obtained in models with $\mu \sim 1$ (which can be easily constructed). Further details of the calculations and the results can be found in Ref. [13].

The moral of this analysis is that, given a particle physics model, the probability distribution for Ω can be unambiguously calculated from first principles.

V. THE COSMIC AGE COINCIDENCE.

The usual objection against models with $\Omega < 1$ is that it is hard to explain why we happen to live at the epoch when the curvature is about to dominate. That is, why

$$t_0 \sim t_c, \quad (20)$$

where t_0 is the present time and t_c is the time of curvature domination. Observers at $t \ll t_c$ would find $\Omega \approx 1$, while observers at $t \gg t_c$ would find $\Omega \ll 1$. It appears that one needs to be lucky to live at a time when Ω differs substantially from both 0 and 1. Here I am going to argue that the coincidence (20) is not as surprising as it may first seem [13].

From the analysis in the preceding section, we can expect to have

$$t_c \sim t_G, \quad (21)$$

where t_G is the time of galaxy formation. Without the anthropic factor $\nu(\Omega)$, the probability distribution for Ω is peaked at $\Omega = 0$, which corresponds to $t_c \rightarrow 0$. The role of $\nu(\Omega)$ is to

push the peak to values of Ω such that the curvature domination occurs soon after galaxies are formed, so that $t_c \sim t_G$.

We now recall Dicke's observation [20] that the present time t_0 is likely to be comparable to the lifetime of a typical main sequence star, $t_0 \sim t_\star \sim 10^{10}$ yrs. Moreover, observationally the epoch of structure formation, when giant galaxies were assembled, is at $z_G \sim 1 - 3$, or $t_G \sim 10^9 - 10^{10}$ yrs. Since, $t_G \sim t_\star \sim t_0$, it follows from (21) that $t_c \sim t_0$.

The above argument is based on the coincidence

$$t_G \sim t_\star, \quad (22)$$

which cannot be explained in the framework of our model. The time of galaxy formation t_G depends on the amplitude of the cosmological density fluctuations, while the stellar lifetime t_\star is determined by the fundamental constants. In our model, the only variable is t_c , while t_G and t_\star remain fixed. It is conceivable that the coincidence (22) may find some kind of anthropic explanation in more general models where some other "constants" are allowed to vary.

VI. QUANTUM CREATION OF OPEN UNIVERSES.

Hawking and Turok (HT) have recently argued [21] that open universes can be spontaneously created from nothing and suggested an instanton to describe this process. The idea of using instantons to describe the creation of the universe is not new [22]. In the case of a homogeneous closed universe, the corresponding instanton is geometrically a four-dimensional sphere. In models with a metastable false vacuum, the same Coleman-de Luccia instanton [5] that is used to describe bubble nucleation can be interpreted as describing nucleation of a closed universe with a bubble [23]. Analytic continuation of this instanton gives a closed inflating universe with an expanding bubble, the interior of the bubble being isometric to an open Robertson-Walker space. In the course of the following evolution, an infinite number of bubbles will nucleate in addition to the initial one, and for all practical purposes it makes no difference whether the universe nucleates with a bubble or without. So this sort of quantum creation of open universes is not particularly interesting.

The new point of the HT paper is the claim that open universes can be created even in models with very simple potentials, like

$$V(\phi) = \frac{1}{2}m^2\phi^2, \quad (23)$$

which have no false vacua. Such models are known not to have regular instanton solutions, and indeed, the HT instanton is singular. Geometrically, it is like a sphere with a thorn, the tip of the thorn being the singularity where the curvature and the scalar field are infinite. HT point out, however, that the singularity is integrable and the instanton action is finite. Analytic continuation of this instanton gives a closed, singular spacetime (for a detailed discussion of its structure see, e.g., [24]). A part of this spacetime, is isometric to an open Robertson-Walker universe. The singularity has the form of an expanding singular bubble [25]. However, it never hits an observer in the Robertson-Walker part of the universe, and HT argue that the singularity is therefore not a problem [26].

HT instantons have a free parameter corresponding to the strength of the singularity. As this parameter is varied, the density parameter Ω of the open universe also changes, and HT use an anthropic approach² to find the most probable value of Ω .

I think there are serious problems with HT approach. We are interested in instantons because, being stationary points of the Euclidean action, they give a dominant contribution to the Euclidean path integral. In a singular instanton, the field equations are not satisfied at the singularity, and such an instanton is not, therefore, a stationary point of the action. All singular instantons should therefore be highly suspect, unless there is a good reason to believe that the singularity is spurious.

Moreover, for the same model (23) I have constructed an asymptotically-flat singular instanton [25]. Geometrically, it looks like a flat space with a thorn. The behavior of the fields near the singularity is identical to that in the HT instanton and the action is finite, so there is absolutely no reason to reject my instanton if HT instanton is legitimate. The analytic continuation of my instanton gives a flat space with a singular sphere which expands at a speed close to the speed of light. If this were indeed a legitimate instanton, then we would have to conclude that flat space is unstable with respect to nucleation of singular bubbles. The nucleation probability can be made very high by adjusting the strength of the singularity, and since this strength is a free parameter, the universe in this picture would have already been overrun by expanding singular bubbles. Since this is in a glaring contradiction with observations, we have to conclude that HT instanton, as it stands, cannot be used to describe the creation of open universes.

An interesting recent development is the paper by Garriga [27] where he shows that an instanton of HT type can be obtained as a 4-d reduction of a non-singular 5-d Kaluza-Klein instanton. He also found non-singular 5-d analogue of my asymptotically flat instanton. The strength of the singularity of the 4-d instantons obtained by reduction is no longer arbitrary; it is fixed by the fundamental constants of the theory. As a result, both HT-type and asymptotically flat instantons have no free parameters. Garriga found that, for a sufficiently large radius of the compactified dimension, the probability of flat space decay is negligibly small. It appears that in this case there are no objections against using Garriga's instanton to describe the creation of open universes. However, as noted by Garriga himself, since his instanton has no free parameters, the value of Ω in the resulting universe is fixed. Anthropic considerations discussed in Sections III-V do not apply to this model, and certain amount of fine-tuning is required to obtain a non-trivial value of Ω at the present time. It would be interesting if models of this type could be constructed that would allow for a continuous range of Ω .

²The version of the anthropic principle employed by HT is different from the principle of mediocrity I am using here. They take the anthropic factor $\nu(\Omega)$ to be proportional to the spatial density rather than to the number of observers who measure the corresponding value of Ω . I find this choice rather arbitrary, and therefore hard to justify.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the organizers of this meeting for their warm hospitality. It was a pleasure to be back to Kyoto, particularly on this happy occasion of celebrating Humitaka Sato's birthday and his accomplishments.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. R. Gott, *Nature* **295**, 304 (1982).
- [2] M. Bucher, A. S. Goldhaber and N. Turok, *Phys. Rev.* **D52**, 3314 (1995).
- [3] K. Yamamoto, M. Sasaki and T. Tanaka, *Ap. J.* **455**, 412 (1995).
- [4] A. D. Linde and A. Mezhlumian, *Phys. Rev.* **D52**, 5538 (1995).
- [5] S. Coleman and F. De Luccia, *Phys. Rev.* **D21**, 3305 (1980).
- [6] J. Garcia-Bellido, J. Garriga and X. Montes, hep-ph/9711214.
- [7] S. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **59**, 2607 (1987).
- [8] A. Vilenkin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 846 (1995).
- [9] B. Carter, unpublished.
- [10] J. Leslie, *Mind* **101.403**, 521 (1992).
- [11] J. R. Gott, *Nature* **363**, 315 (1993).
- [12] A. Vilenkin and S. Winitzki, *Phys. Rev.* **D55**, 548 (1997).
- [13] J. Garriga, T. Tanaka and A. Vilenkin, astro-ph/9803268.
- [14] G. Efstathiou, *M.N.R.A.S.* **274**, L73 (1995).
- [15] A. Vilenkin, in *Cosmological Constant and the Evolution of the Universe*, ed. By K. Sato *et. al.*, Universal Academy Press, Tokyo, 1996 (gr-qc/9512031).
- [16] S. Weinberg, in *Critical Dialogues in Cosmology*, ed. By N. Turok, World Scientific, Singapore, 1997.
- [17] H. Martel, P. R. Shapiro and S. Weinberg, *Ap. J.* **492**, 29 (1998).
- [18] M. Tegmark and M. J. Rees, *Ap. J.* **499**, 526 (1998).
- [19] W. H. Press and P. Schechter, *Ap. J.* **187**, 425 (1974).
- [20] R. H. Dicke, *Nature* **192**, 440 (1962).
- [21] S. W. Hawking and N. G. Turok, hep-th/9802030.
- [22] A. Vilenkin, *Phys. Lett.* **117B**, 25 (1982).
- [23] R. Bousso and A. D. Linde, gr-qc/9803068.
- [24] W. Unruh, gr-qc/9803050.
- [25] A. Vilenkin, hep-th/9803084.
- [26] N. G. Turok and S. W. Hawking, hep-th/9803156.
- [27] J. Garriga, hep-th/9804106.