SomeCommentsontheUniversalConstants.

J.Dunning-Davies, DepartmentofPhysics, UniversityofHull, EnglandHU67RX. J.Dunning-Davies@hull.ac.uk

Abstract.

Recentreferences to the commonly accepted expression for the entry of a black hole to questions concerning the constancy of some of the so-called 'uni versal constants of nature' are questioned, as is the validity of the saidentropy expression.

Introduction.

The notion that some of the commonly accepted 'universal constants 'ar enotin fact constant has been around for quite a long time, certainly ext ending back to the work of such as Dirac [1] and Milne [2]. In more recent times, a varying speed of lighthas been advocated [3] and has been seen to explain some of the problems facing cosmology, eliminating the need for inflationary theories. However, t articles linking possible constraints on the variation of these consta nts with the accepted theory of black holes are certainly open to question [4,5].

EntropyandUniversalConstants.

According to Planck [6], 'The entropy of a physical system in a definite state depends solely on the probability of this state'. Based upon the statist ical independence of independent events and the additivity of entropies of separa te systems, this dependence is found to be logarithmic. Any constants i ntheargumentof thelogarithmappearas additive constants, and Boltzmann deliberately lefta nadditive constant in the entropy undetermined, as is done in all of classical thermodynamics. The only universal constant to appear is that in the constant factorofproportionality. Boltzmann worked in moles, Planck in molecules, and so it was Planck w ho determinedBoltzmann'sconstant, kandthisistheonly'universal'constanttoappear creep into entropy naturally in the expression for entropy. Other universal constants expressions through the introduction of equations of state into the basic r elation. A classic example of this is provided by black body radiation, where Planck'sconstant and the speed of light invacuo appear in the Stefan-Boltzmann constant.

Heisenberg remarked [7] some years ago that, in order to introduce a mass, a fundamental length must be found for only then can a minimum mass be def inedby itsComptonwavelength.Oncethisisaccomplished,thechargemay beintroducedvia the 'classical' radius of the electron, e^2/mc^2 . This introduction of a finite radius goes beyond quantum theory though since Planck's constant, \hbar , does not appear. The constant \hbar is seen to separate the classical theory of heat from t hequantumtheoryof black body radiation and the constant, *c*, separates Newtonian from relativistic mechanics but the constant e has no such role. Hence, the electric charge or, $e^2/\hbar c$, must await explanation. equivalently, the size of the fine structure constant,

Conventional wisdom decrees that the entropy of a black hole is proport ional to the area of its event horizon [8,9] and, for an uncharged, non-rotating black hole, the widely accepted expression is

$$S_{bh} = \frac{4\pi kG}{\hbar c}M^2,$$

where k is Boltzmann's constant, G the universal constant of gravitation, \hbar Planck's constant, c the speed of light and M the mass of the black hole. It might be noted that this expression for the entropy of an uncharged, non-rotating black hole, t he so-called Bekenstein-Hawking expression, shares a common feature with the ent ropy of black body radiation; it does not contain an arbitrary constant. In the case of black body radiation, this is vitally important since, if this were not so, the entropy would not the entropy with the ent to zero with temperature. However, from the equation above, it is clearly seen from

the derivative that the temperature is inversely proportional to the mass of the black holeand, as a result, the entropy will tend to infinity as the tem peraturetendstozero, - in clear violation of Nernst's heat theorem! Again, it might be noted that, if the above entropy is parameterised in terms of the temperature, ad ecreaseinthespeedof ature. This is light would result in a decrease in the entropy at constant temper contrarytowhatisclaimed[4]ifitistreatedasafuncti onofmass.Theproblemhere isthattheaboveblackholeentropyexpressionisnotatrulyfundam entalexpression for the entropy, certainly not in the sense that that for the entrop y of black body radiation is when expressed in terms of the internal energy and vol ume, since the equation of state introduces the Stefan-Boltzmann constant. Incidenta lly, it might be noted also that, as mentioned some years ago [10], if true, the above e ntropy expression for a black hole does not permit the use of several wellknown thermodynamic expressions. More importantly, the result has been show n[11]tolead toviolationoftheSecondLawofThermodynamics.Hence,itsvalidit ymustbeopen toquestion!

Ashasbeenpointed outpreviously [11], with the undoubted benefit of hind sight, itmightbefeltthatPlanckcouldhavefocussedbeneficiallyon findingafundamental relation for entropy which contained, in addition to *k*,oneotherfundamentalconstant - ħ. Boltzmann's 'lottery', as Lorentz [12] liked to call it, alwa vs contained such a constant, although he paid no attention to its physical significance. T oBoltzmannit was simply a mathematical trick enabling him to count discrete entities and, in any case, at the end of his calculation it was always allowed to tendtozerotherebytaking the continuum limit. Planck, however, was allowed no such luxury buth adtogr apple with its physical meaning. He introduced two constants, k and \hbar . The first distinguished the macroscopic from the microscopic; the second, the cla ssicaltheory ofheatfromquantumtheory. The constant cappearedonlyintheclassicalculation of the number of Planck oscillators in a finite frequency interval . These constants, togetherwiththeuniversalconstantofgravitation G, could be used to construct units of mass, length, time, and temperature and Planck [13] speculated that they would 'retain their significance for all times and all cultures, inc luding extraterrestrial and nonhumanones.' Incidentally, Planck went on to comment that 'these natural units would retain their natural significance as long as the laws of gravitation and the propagation of light in vacuum and the two laws of thermodynamics ret ain their validity'. Hence, Planck seemed to feel that questioning universalit y and the fundamental constants tantamount to questioning the two most important law s of thermodynamics!

Conclusion.

The whole question of the constancy of the so-called 'universal constants of nature'hasbeenaroundforalongtime,asindicatedbytheearly referencescitedhere. However, work is still ongoing in this area. As far as the univers al constant of gravitationisconcerned, for example, measurements have been being madeofitsince Cavendish's attempt, based on a suggestion by Michell, in 1798 [14]. When a llthe measurements made over the intervening years are considered, the value of this universal constant of gravitation would seem to be increasing with t imeveryslowly. However, the more recent, more accurate experiments seem to indic ate that it is. in fact, constantintime, although there are suggestions that its val uevarieswithposition

over the earth's surface. Again, as mentioned in the introduction, it has been suggested that the speed of light is not a constant but varies as the square root of the background temperature. If true, this would revolution is emuch scient is, as yet really only a theoretical suggestion. This whole a real so by iously one that requires a lot more investigation but the constancy, or otherwise, of the normally accepted constant so finature remains an open question.

References.

[1]Dirac, P.A.M., Nature **139**(1937)323

[2]Milne,E.A., *Relativity,GravitationandWorldStructure* (ClarendonPress,Oxford,1935)

[3]Thornhill,K.,SpeculationsSci.Technol. 8(1985)263

[4]Davies, P.C.W.etal, Nature **418**(2002)602.

[5]Carlip,S.&Vaidya,S.,Nature **421**(2003)498.

[6]Planck,M., *TheTheoryofHeatRadiation* , (Dover,NewYork,1991)

[7]Heisenberg,W.,Ann.derPhys. 5(1938)20

[8]Bekenstein, J., Lett. Nuovo Cimento 4(1972)737

[9]Hawking,S.,Phys.Rev.D **13**(1976)191

[10]Dunning-Davies,J.,J.Phys.A **16**(1983)3377 Phys.Lett. **97A**(1983)327

[11]Lavenda,B.H., *StatisticalPhysics:AProbabilisticApproach* and references cited there. (Wiley,NewYork,1991)

[12]Lorentz,H.A., *LecturesonTheoreticalPhysics* ,volII, (Macmillan,London,1927)

[13]Planck, M., Ann. der Phys. **4**(1901)553

[14]Cavendish,H.,Phil.Trans.Roy.Soc. **88**(1798)469