



HAL
open science

Extraction of the Planck Length From Cosmological redshift Without Knowledge of G or h

Espen Gaarder Haug

► **To cite this version:**

Espen Gaarder Haug. Extraction of the Planck Length From Cosmological redshift Without Knowledge of G or h . 2021. hal-03307143

HAL Id: hal-03307143

<https://hal.science/hal-03307143>

Preprint submitted on 29 Jul 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Extraction of the Planck Length From Cosmological redshift Without Knowledge of G or \hbar

Espen Gaarder Haug
Norwegian University of Life Sciences, Norway
e-mail espenhaug@mac.com

June 26, 2021

Abstract

We demonstrate how one can extract the Planck length from cosmological redshift without any knowledge of Newton's gravitational constant G or the Planck constant h . This result strongly points in the direction that there is a direct link between the cosmic scale and the Planck scale. We will shortly discuss also why this outcome will likely bring us closer to a unified quantum gravity theory closely linked to quantum cosmology. We have good reasons to think our findings are significant and should be of great interest for anyone trying to unify gravity and cosmology with the Planck scale.

Keywords: Cosmological redshift, Planck length, Planck scale, quantum gravity, quantum cosmology, gravitational redshift, Compton wavelength.

1 Introduction

Max Planck [1, 2] in 1899 and 1906 introduced the Planck units. He assumed there were three important universal constants, Newton's gravitational constant G , the speed of light c and the Planck constant, and he used dimensional analysis in relation to this and found a unique length; $l_p = \sqrt{\frac{G\hbar}{c^3}}$, time $t_p = \sqrt{\frac{G\hbar}{c^5}}$, a mass $m_p = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar c}{G}}$ and a temperature $T_p = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar c^5}{Gk_B^2}}$. However, Max Planck did not say much about what they could represent, except that they likely were some important natural units.

Einstein [3] already in 1916 in one of the same papers he discussed general relativity theory suggested that the next step in understanding gravity theory likely was to develop a quantum gravity theory. Eddington [4] in 1918 was likely the first to suggest that gravity theory ultimately had to be linked to the Planck length. However, this was far from easily accepted. For example: Bridgman [5] in 1931 ridiculed that the Planck units would play an important role in physics as he looked at them more like mathematical artifacts coming out of the dimensional analysis. Today most researchers [6–10], and particularly those researchers working with quantum gravity theory assume the Planck length is the minimum length and that it will play an important role in a quantum gravity theory that could unify gravity with quantum mechanics. Also, in superstring theory, the Planck length normally plays an important role. However, there are still physicists that held a view more similar to that of Bridgman, that the Planck units basically are mathematical artifacts coming out of the dimensional analysis, see for example [11]. The critics' points are that if the Planck scale never can be detected, not even consequences of it indirectly, why not simply abandon the concept that they play an important role. It is very similar to the ether. If one cannot come up with any experiment to show the ether exists, why not simply abandon it as Einstein did in 1905. However, recently Haug has shown that the Planck length can be extracted from a Newton force spring [12] as well as from many other gravity phenomena [13] without any knowledge of the Newton gravitational constant G or the Planck constant h , in other words, a more direct approach. We will claim this result is an indirect detection of the Planck scale. Here we go one step further and even show that the Planck length can be extracted from cosmological redshift observations without any knowledge of G or h . If this result is possible, as we will demonstrate, this outcome supports a series of more theoretical papers that have claimed there likely is a link between the Planck scale and gravity and even the cosmological scale.

A series of researchers have mentioned a possible link between the cosmological scale and the Planck scale [14, 15]. Seshavatharam and Lakshminarayana [16] has suggested that it is likely needed to implement the Planck scale in the entire cosmic evolution as an important step in quantum cosmology. Calmet suggests [17] in an interesting paper

“Finally, using hand waving arguments, we show that a minimal length might be related to the cosmological constant which, if this scenario is realized, is time-dependent.”

Here we will demonstrate that we can extract the Planck length directly from the cosmological redshift and use the Planck length and the speed of light as the only two constants to correctly predict a series of gravity phenomena cosmological parameters such as the Hubble constant. This result does not give any more precise predictions, but it gives in our view a deeper insight as it strongly supports the link between the macroscopic and even the cosmological scale and the Planck scale.

2 The Compton wavelength

The Compton wavelength will play a central role in how we get to the Planck length also from cosmology, so we will have to spend some time on how it can be extracted from any mass, even the critical mass of the universe without any knowledge of G and \hbar . The Compton [18] wavelength was introduced in 1923 by Arthur Compton. The Compton wavelength of any rest-mass if we already know the mass in terms of kg can be calculated by the following well-known formula

$$\lambda = \frac{h}{mc} \quad (1)$$

This calculation involves the Planck constant, and we need to know the mass in terms of the kg. However, it is important to note that we also can solve the above equation with respect to m . This solution gives

$$m = \frac{h}{\lambda} \frac{1}{c} = \frac{\hbar}{\lambda} \frac{1}{c} \quad (2)$$

Any mass in terms of a kilogram can be expressed from the Planck constant, the speed of light, and Compton wavelength of the mass. We will soon get back to how all masses have an indirect measurable Compton wavelength.

One can also find the Compton wavelength directly from Compton scattering. Here we shoot photons at an electron. We measure the photon's wavelength before and after it hits the electron and the incoming and outgoing photon angle. Based on these three measurements, the Compton wavelength of the electron is given by

$$\lambda_e = \frac{\lambda_{\gamma,2} - \lambda_{\gamma,1}}{1 - \cos \theta} \quad (3)$$

where θ is the angle between the incoming and outgoing beam, and $\lambda_{\gamma,1}$ and $\lambda_{\gamma,2}$ are the wavelength of the incoming and outgoing photon. So, we can in this way measure the Compton wavelength of the electron without any knowledge of the Planck constant, and also without knowledge of G .

Next, we want to find the Compton wavelength of a proton. We here utilize the cyclotron frequency ratio of a proton and electron to equal the Compton wavelength ratio. This because the cyclotron frequency is given by

$$\omega = \frac{qB}{m} \quad (4)$$

where q is the charge, and since electrons and protons have the same charge their cyclotron frequency ratio must be equal to

$$\frac{\omega_e}{\omega_P} = \frac{\frac{qB}{m_e}}{\frac{qB}{m_P}} = \frac{m_P}{m_e} = \frac{\lambda_e}{\lambda_P} \approx 1836.15 \quad (5)$$

This result is more than just theory. Cyclotron experiments are one of the methods to find the proton-electron mass ratio. See for example [19]. So the proton Compton wavelength is simply the electron Compton wavelength divided by 1836.15. There has been a growing interest in the proton Compton wavelength recently. For example, Trinhammer and Bohr [20] has shown a likely relationship between the Compton wavelength of the proton and the proton radius. Some will perhaps question how a composite particle like the proton can have a Compton wavelength. Is it not only elementary particles like an electron that can have it? Personally, we think that only elementary particles have a physical Compton wavelength. However, since any composite mass ultimately consists of elementary particles, we can aggregate the Compton wavelengths of these elementary particles to get the Compton wavelength of the composite mass. We must have

$$\begin{aligned} m &= m_1 + m_2 + m_3 + \dots + m_n \\ \frac{\hbar}{m} &= \frac{\hbar}{m_1 + m_2 + m_3 + \dots + m_n} \\ \frac{\hbar}{mc} &= \frac{\hbar}{(m_1 + m_2 + m_3 + \dots + m_n)c} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Next, if we replace the masses on the right side with the formula 2, and we get

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\hbar}{mc} &= \frac{\hbar}{\left(\frac{\hbar}{\lambda_1 c} + \frac{\hbar}{\lambda_2 c} + \frac{\hbar}{\lambda_3 c} + \dots + \frac{\hbar}{\lambda_n c}\right)c} \\ \lambda &= \frac{1}{\frac{1}{\lambda_1} + \frac{1}{\lambda_2} + \frac{1}{\lambda_3} + \dots + \frac{1}{\lambda_n}}\end{aligned}\quad (7)$$

This result means that if we are only interested in the mass's kg size and describe the mass this way, the only variable that distinguishes the different masses is the Compton wavelength. And again, even if the mass does not have a single physical Compton wavelength, it consists of many elementary particles. To find the Compton wavelength of the Earth or the Sun, we “simply” need to count the number of protons in them. The Compton wavelength of a large mass, for example, the Earth, is simply the Compton wavelength of the proton divided by the number of protons in the Earth. Well, we should also count the number of electrons, but as a good approximation, we can ignore them as they only make up $\frac{1}{1836.15}$ of the mass, or we could also easily include these. Still, how do we count the number of protons in for a large mass like Earth? A direct count of the number of protons in the Earth is in principle naturally possible but practically impossible. We could take the mass of the earth in kg and divide it by the proton mass in kg. However, to know the kg mass of the Earth, we would need to know the gravity constant. We aim to be independent of the gravitational constant and the Planck constant, so we want to avoid this method. We can count the number of protons (atoms) in a small mass where we know the type of substance of which it consists. In recent times one has developed accurate methods to count the number of atoms in a silicon sphere [21–23], this was one of the competing methods to become the new kilogram standard, that one kilogram should be defined as an “exact” number of atoms. Also, other methods exist to count the number of atoms in macroscopic masses. See for example [24, 25]. Again, when we know the number of atoms (protons) in the mass, we know its Compton wavelength, as it is simply to take the Compton wavelength of a single proton that we described how to find above and divide it by the number of protons in the mass. When we know the Compton wavelength of a small (but macroscopic size) mass, we can easily find the Compton wavelength, for example, of the Earth. This because the relative Compton wavelength in two masses is equal to, for example, the ratio of the gravitational acceleration fields multiplied by the ratio of the square of the radius of the objects, we must have

$$\frac{g_1 r_1^2}{g_2 r_2^2} = \frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1} \quad (8)$$

the gravitational acceleration field of an object can be predicted by $g = \frac{GM}{R^2}$, so then, we need to know the gravitational constant, but that is not the case if we want to measure the gravitational acceleration field. The gravitational acceleration field of the earth can easily be found by simply dropping a ball from a high H and measure the time it took to fall to the ground. This task is particularly simple today, where one even can buy balls with a built-in stopwatch precisely for this purpose (a so called g-ball). One can after these measurements back out the gravitational acceleration field of the Earth by the following well-known formula

$$g = \frac{2H}{T^2} \quad (9)$$

where H is the ball drop height and T is the time it took for the ball to fall the height H . So, one will easily find that the gravitational acceleration field of the earth is approximately 9.8 m/s^2 . For the small object where we have counted the atoms, we also need to know g , which we can measure with a Cavendish apparatus. For example, we can use silicon spheres to count the numbers of atoms as the large balls in the apparatus. Next, we need to measure the oscillation time and the angle θ when the arm in the apparatus is deflected. We also need to know the distance between the two small balls in the apparatus L , and from this calculation, we can estimate the gravitational acceleration field from the silicon sphere by plugging these measured values into the following formula

$$g \approx \frac{2\pi^2 L\theta}{T^2} \quad (10)$$

It is important to note here that no gravitational constant is needed, nor the Planck constant. A common misunderstanding is that the Cavendish apparatus was designed to measure Newton’s gravitational constant G , which was not the case. It was Jon Mitchell [26] that in 1783/84 designed what today is known as a Cavendish apparatus (torsion balance), but he died before able to use it. Cavendish [27] in 1798, with full credit to Mitchell, used it to measure the density of the Earth. Mitchell nor Cavendish never mention or used a gravitational constant. The main idea behind the Cavendish apparatus is that it is sensitive enough to measure the gravitational effect from a mass that is so small that we can control from what it is made. Because one can make sure that the gravitational object in the apparatus, the large balls are made of a known uniform substance, such as lead, gold, or iron, Cavendish used lead. That a Cavendish apparatus, in addition, can be used to find G is true. However, the so-called Newton gravitational constant was actually never in the original Newton formula,

which stated in word by Newton [28] in Principia as simply $F = \frac{Mm}{r^2}$. However, Newton used a very different mass definition than today. The gravitational constant was first introduced in 1873 by Cornuand, and Baille [29]. It was introduced largely because the kilogram definition of mass had become the standard, at least in big parts of Europe. Cornu and Baille used the notation f for the gravity constant. Today's notation G was first introduced in 1894 by Boys [30]. Naturally, if one uses f or G for the gravitational constant or as Einstein k is just cosmetic, the important point here is that the gravity constant did not play an important role in the Cavendish apparatus, not even in the original Newton gravity force formula. This fact is part of the reason why we can measure the gravitational acceleration field in a Cavendish apparatus with no prior knowledge of G .

3 Planck length from Cosmological redshift

The cosmological redshift is given by (see for example [31])

$$z_H = \frac{\lambda_{obs} - \lambda_{emit}}{\lambda_{emit}} = \frac{dH_0}{c} \quad (11)$$

where H_0 is the Hubble constant, and d is the distance to the object we are studying. The critical mass of the universe that we get from the Freidmann [32] equation is given by $M_c = \frac{c^3}{2GH_0}$, see for example [33, 34]. Next, we solve the critical mass equation with respect to H_0 , this gives

$$H_0 = \frac{c^3}{2GM_c} \quad (12)$$

and next we are replacing H_0 with this in the cosmological redshift equation 11 and we get

$$\begin{aligned} z_H &\approx \frac{d \frac{c^3}{2GM_c}}{c} \\ z_H &\approx \frac{1}{\frac{2GM_c}{c^2 d}} \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Please pay attention to the fact that this looks very much like one divided by standard gravitational redshift $z = \frac{GM}{c^2 r}$, except it is multiplied by 2, and that d act as a r . We can measure the gravitational redshift of the Earth by, for example, sending a laser beam from a tower and measure the wavelength at r_2 and r_1 ($r_1 \gg r_2$), a similar experiment was done already in 1959 by Pound and Rebka [35]. The predicted gravitational redshift in such an experiment is given by

$$z = \frac{\lambda_{obs} - \lambda_{emit}}{\lambda_{emit}} = \frac{\sqrt{1 - \frac{2GM}{c^2 r_1}}}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{2GM}{c^2 r_2}}} - 1 \approx \frac{1 - \frac{GM}{c^2 r_1}}{1 - \frac{GM}{c^2 r_2}} - 1 \approx \frac{GM}{c^2 r_1} - \frac{GM}{c^2 r_2} \quad (14)$$

Next, we multiply the cosmological redshift with the gravitational redshift we can measure from a laser beam (and predict) on Earth. This calculation gives

$$\begin{aligned} z z_H &= \left(\frac{GM}{c^2 r_1} - \frac{GM}{c^2 r_2} \right) \frac{1}{\frac{2GM_c}{c^2 d}} \\ z z_H &= \left(\frac{M}{r_1} - \frac{M}{r_2} \right) \frac{1}{\frac{2M_c}{d}} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Next, we take advantage of that the Mass of the Earth in kg can be expressed as $M = \frac{\hbar}{\lambda_E} \frac{1}{c}$ and that the mass of the critical universe can also be expressed as $M = \frac{\hbar}{\lambda_c} \frac{1}{c}$, and input these into the equation above, and we end up with

$$\begin{aligned} z z_H &= \left(\frac{\frac{\hbar}{\lambda_E} \frac{1}{c}}{r_1} - \frac{\frac{\hbar}{\lambda_E} \frac{1}{c}}{r_2} \right) \frac{1}{\frac{2 \frac{\hbar}{\lambda_c} \frac{1}{c}}{d}} \\ z z_H &= \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_E r_1} - \frac{1}{\lambda_E r_2} \right) \frac{1}{\frac{2 \frac{1}{\lambda_c}}{d}} \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

If we now solve this with respect to the Compton wavelength of the critical mass of the universe, we get

$$\bar{\lambda}_c = \frac{2 \lambda_E r_1 r_2 z z_H}{d(r_1 - r_2)} \quad (17)$$

We do not need to know G to find the Compton wavelength of the mass of the critical universe as G cancels out. We need to know the observed cosmological redshift, the distance to the object from which we measure the cosmological redshift, and the two radiuses from which we measure the gravitational redshift on earth and the Compton wavelength of the Earth.

The Planck length formula $l_p = \sqrt{\frac{G\hbar}{c^3}}$ can be solved with respect to G this gives

$$G = \frac{l_p^2 c^3}{\hbar} \quad (18)$$

One could, in other words, claim the gravitational constant is a composite constant that consists of even more fundamental constants as suggested by [36, 37]. However, this would be of little use if the Planck length always is dependent on G , as it just would lead to a circular problem, which is the view in standard physics, at least until recently. However, as we [12, 13] already have demonstrated and demonstrate in a different way here, the Planck length can be measured independent of any knowledge of G . This composite form of G also contains the Planck constant. But almost any gravity phenomena that can both be predicted and observed contains GM and never GMm (real two body problems contain $\mu = GM_1 + GM_2$), that is, the small m in the Newton gravity force formula cancel out in calculations when dealing with predictable observable phenomena, something we will look closer at in the last section before the conclusion in this paper. Let us input the composite form of G in the cosmological redshift formula and also replace the critical mass with $M_c = \frac{\hbar}{\lambda_c} \frac{1}{c}$, this gives

$$\begin{aligned} z_H &\approx \frac{1}{\frac{2GM_c}{c^2 d}} \\ z_H &\approx \frac{1}{\frac{2l_p^2 c^3}{\hbar} \frac{\hbar}{\lambda_c} \frac{1}{c}} \\ z_H &\approx \frac{d\bar{\lambda}_c}{2l_p^2} \\ l_p^2 &\approx \frac{d\bar{\lambda}_c}{2z_H} \\ l_p &\approx \sqrt{\frac{d\bar{\lambda}_c}{2z_H}} \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Alternatively, we can use the following relation

$$l_p = \sqrt{\frac{c\bar{\lambda}_c}{2H_0}} \quad (20)$$

We also notice that we must have

$$H_0 = \frac{\bar{\lambda}_c}{2t_p l_p} \quad (21)$$

Further, the Hubble time (time since the Big Bang) is given by

$$T_H = \frac{2l_p}{\lambda_c} t_p \approx 13.7 \text{ billion years} \quad (22)$$

and the Hubble radius is given by

$$r_H = \frac{2l_p^2}{\lambda_c} \approx 13.7 \text{ billion years} \times c \approx 1.32 \times 10^{26} \text{ m} \quad (23)$$

That is the Hubble constant, the Hubble time and the Hubble length can all be expressed as a function of the reduced Compton wavelength of the critical universe and the Planck time and the Planck length. It is worth noting that we [38] have recently also shown how one can find the Planck time independent of G , and \hbar from a Huygens [39] pendulum clock, and also with a Newton force spring [12].

4 Numerical example

First, we find the Compton wavelength of the electron by using Compton scattering and inputting our findings in formulas 3. It is about 2.43×10^{-12} m. Next, we measure the cyclotron frequency of a proton and electron and take the ratio of these. It is about 1836.15. We now divide the Compton wavelength of the electron by this number and get a Compton wavelength of the proton equal to approximately 1.32×10^{-15} m. Next, we make a silicon crystal sphere, and due to the uniformness of the sphere and the crystal structure, we can

count the numbers of atoms in the sphere. We need to count the number of atoms in a very small part of this sphere and know the volume of that area, and next measure the radius of the sphere accurately, and we know the number of protons in the whole sphere. Assume it is 3×10^{26} protons in this silicon sphere that is the size we can easily hold it in our hand (approximately half a kg, but we do not need to know anything about how many kg is in this mass, but just as a reference point as many researchers are used to think in kg. Its Compton wavelength is therefore the Compton wavelength of a single proton divided by this number, this gives $\lambda_{\text{silicon sphere}} = \frac{\lambda_P}{N} = \frac{1.32 \times 10^{-15}}{3 \times 10^{26}} \approx 4.4 \times 10^{-42}$ m.

We next make two of these silicon spheres. Next, we use a Cavendish apparatus to measure the gravitational acceleration from these balls on even smaller balls. Assume the smaller balls in the Cavendish apparatus are 5 cm distance from the large ball. We measure a gravitational acceleration of 1.34×10^{-08} m/s², we are measuring the oscillation time and the angle θ in the apparatus and inputting this in formula 10. And again, this formula does not require any knowledge of G or \hbar and, therefore, no knowledge of G or \hbar . Next, we measure the gravitational acceleration field on the surface of the earth, for example, by simply dropping a ball from height H and measure how long it took for it to fall to the ground T . Then we get g from $g = \frac{2H}{T^2}$, which is approximately 9.81 m/s². The radius of the earth is approximately 6371000 meter. We now can find the Compton wavelength of the Earth. It is given by

$$\lambda_E = \frac{g_1 r_1^2}{g_E r_E^2} \lambda_1 = \frac{1.34 \times 10^{-08} \times 0.05^2}{9.81 \times 6371000^2} \times 4.4 \times 10^{-42} \approx 3.7 \times 10^{-67} \text{ m} \quad (24)$$

Next, we measure the gravitational redshift from a laser beam sent down an 800-meter tower¹ and get $z = 8.76 \times 10^{-14}$. Next, we measure the cosmological redshift of an object at a distance of 10 Gpc (3.08×10^{23} m). This value will be approximately $z_H \approx 0.00233$. To find the Compton wavelength of the critical mass of the cosmos, we now use formula 17 and get

$$\bar{\lambda}_c = \frac{2\bar{\lambda}_E r_1 r_2 z z_H}{d} = \frac{2 \frac{3.7 \times 10^{-67}}{2\pi} \times 6371800 \times 6371000 \times 8.76 \times 10^{-14} \times 0.00233}{3.08 \times 10^{23} (6371800 - 6371000)} \approx 3.96 \times 10^{-96} \text{ m}$$

We now have all the input to plug into formula 19, and we get

$$l_p \approx \sqrt{\frac{d\bar{\lambda}_c}{2z_H}} \approx \sqrt{\frac{3.08 \times 10^{23} \times 3.96 \times 10^{-96}}{2 \times 0.00233}} \approx 1.617 \times 10^{-35} \text{ m}$$

which is very close to the CODATA (2019) value of the Planck length 1.616255×10^{-35} m. Naturally, one can discuss how accurately one can measure the cosmological redshift, especially for large distances. There is considerable uncertainty in such measurements, as also reflected in the considerable differences in recent estimates of the Hubble constant [40–45]. So, our point is not that this is easily done in practice or improves our precision in Planck length estimates, but this method is fully possible. All the different elements in the method described above have been done, so we have just put it all together. This result strongly supports the idea that the Planck length is linked to gravity and cosmology. Hence, a quantum gravity theory linked to the Planck scale is also a quantum cosmology, and we think great progress has been made in recent years.

5 Discussion

We have earlier demonstrated that we can extract the Planck length as well as the Planck-time (as it simply is the Planck length divided by c) from a series of gravity phenomena without knowledge of the gravitational constant using a Cavendish apparatus [46], a Newton force spring [12] a Huygens [39] clock. We have also shown how the Planck length can be extracted from cosmological redshift without knowing the gravitational constant and the Planck constant in strong contrast to the view that one needs to know the Planck constant and the gravity constant in addition to the speed of light and that one can find the Planck units from these using dimensional analysis. An important question is if this has any important implications? We think so. Table 1 shows a series of observable gravitational phenomena. All of the observable gravitational and cosmological phenomena in the table contain GM and none of them GMm . In our view, G is a composite constant of the form $G = \frac{l_p^2 c^3}{\hbar}$ and when multiplied by the kg definition of mass, the Planck constant cancels out, that is, in all the formulas below, we have

$$GM = \frac{l_p^2 c^3}{\hbar} \frac{\hbar}{\lambda} \frac{1}{c} = c^2 \frac{l_p^2}{\lambda} \quad (25)$$

In our view, the Planck constant embedded in G is needed to get the Planck constant out of the kg mass definition. We likely have an incomplete mass definition when defined as kg that is fixed with G . One needs

¹For example from the tower in Dubai.

to get \hbar out, and the Planck length is because gravity phenomena are linked to the Planck scale, a view we recently have discussed in more detail [47, 48]. G contains the Planck length, not at all by assumption but from calibration to gravity phenomena. In the table, all the formulas in the most-right column give the same output units and the same output predictions as the traditional way to write the gravity formulas using G and M . As we can see from the table, we only need two constants, l_p and c , in addition to variables to predict any of these gravity phenomena. In comparison, the standard view is that we need knowledge of G , c , and \hbar . However, this can lead to a long discussion. The main purpose of this paper was to show that we can extract the Planck length from cosmological redshift with no knowledge of G or \hbar . This outcome should hopefully give rise to curiosity why this can be the case.

	Standard:	Deeper level:
Mass	M (kg)	$M = \frac{\hbar}{\lambda_M} \frac{1}{c}$ (kg)
Gravitational constant	G	$G, \left(G = \frac{l_p^2 c^3}{\hbar} \right)$
Non observable (contains GMm)		
Gravity force	$F = G \frac{Mm}{R^2}$ ($\text{kg} \cdot \text{m} \cdot \text{s}^{-2}$)	$F = \frac{l_p^2 c^3}{\hbar} \frac{Mm}{R^2}$ ($\text{kg} \cdot \text{m} \cdot \text{s}^{-2}$)
Observable predictions, identical for the two methods: (contains only GM)		
Gravity acceleration	$g = \frac{GM}{R^2}$	$g = \frac{c^2}{R^2} \frac{l_p^2}{\lambda_M}$
Orbital velocity	$v_o = \sqrt{\frac{GM}{R}}$	$v_o = cl_p \sqrt{\frac{1}{R\lambda_M}}$
Orbital time	$T = \frac{2\pi R}{\sqrt{\frac{GM}{R}}}$	$T = \frac{2\pi \sqrt{\lambda R^3}}{cl_p}$
Velocity ball Newton cradle	$v_{out} = \sqrt{2 \frac{GM}{R^2} H}$	$v_{out} = \frac{cl_p}{R} \sqrt{\frac{H}{\lambda}}$
Periodicity Pendulum (clock)	$T = 2\pi \sqrt{\frac{L}{g}} = 2\pi R \sqrt{\frac{L}{GM}}$	$T = \frac{2\pi R}{cl_p} \sqrt{L\lambda}$
Frequency Newton spring	$f = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sqrt{\frac{k}{m}} = \frac{1}{2\pi R} \sqrt{\frac{GM}{x}}$	$f = \frac{cl_p}{2\pi R} \sqrt{\frac{1}{\lambda x}}$
Observable predictions (from GR): (contains only GM)		
Gravitational redshift	$z = \frac{\sqrt{1 - \frac{2GM}{R_1 c^2}}}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{2GM}{R_2 c^2}}} - 1$	$z = \frac{\sqrt{1 - \frac{2l_p^2}{R_1 \lambda_M}}}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{2l_p^2}{R_2 \lambda_M}}} - 1$
Time dilation	$T_R = T_f \sqrt{1 - \sqrt{\frac{2GM}{R}} / c^2}$	$T_R = T_f \sqrt{1 - \frac{2l_p^2}{R\lambda_M}}$
Gravitational deflection (GR)	$\delta = \frac{4GM}{c^2 R}$	$\delta = \frac{4}{R} \frac{l_p^2}{\lambda_M}$
Advance of perihelion	$\sigma = \frac{6\pi GM}{a(1-e^2)c^2}$	$\sigma = \frac{6\pi}{a(1-e^2)} \frac{l_p^2}{\lambda_M}$
Micro lensing	$\theta = \sqrt{\frac{4GM}{c^2} \frac{d_s - d_L}{d_s d_L}}$	$\theta = 2l_p \sqrt{\frac{1}{\lambda_M} \frac{d_s - d_L}{d_s d_L}}$
Indirectly/“hypothetical“ observable predictions: (contains only GM)		
Escape velocity	$v_e = \sqrt{\frac{2GM}{R}}$	$v_e = cl_p \sqrt{\frac{2}{R\lambda_M}}$
Schwarzschild radius	$r_s = \frac{2GM}{c^2}$	$r_s = 2 \frac{l_p^2}{\lambda_M}$
Gravitational parameter	$\mu = GM$	$\mu = c^2 \frac{l_p^2}{\lambda_M}$
Two body problem	$\mu = G(M_1 + M_2)$	$\mu = c^2 \frac{l_p^2}{\lambda_1} + c^2 \frac{l_p^2}{\lambda_2}$
Cosmology: (contains only GM)		
Cosmological redshift	$z_H \approx \frac{dH_0}{c} = \frac{1}{\frac{2GM_c}{c^2 d}}$	$z_H \approx \frac{d\bar{\lambda}_c}{2l_p^2}$
Hubble constant	$H_0 = \frac{c^3}{2GM_c}$	$H_0 = \frac{\bar{\lambda}_c c}{2l_p^2} = \frac{\bar{\lambda}_c}{2t_p l_p}$
Hubble radius	$R_H = \frac{c}{H_0} = \frac{2GM_c}{c^2}$	$R_H = \frac{2l_p^2}{\lambda_c} = \frac{2ct_p l_p}{\lambda_c}$
Quantum analysis:		
Constants needed	$G, \hbar,$ and c or $l_p, \hbar,$ and c	l_p and c , for some phenomena only l_p
Variable needed	one for mass size	one for mass size

Table 1: The table shows that all observable gravity phenomena are linked to the Planck length and the speed of gravity, which is equal to the speed of light. For all observable gravity phenomena, we have GM and not GMm . This means that the embedded Planck constant cancels out, and all observable gravity phenomena are linked to the Planck length and the speed of gravity, that again are identical to the speed of light. When this is understood, one can as we have demonstrated extract the Planck length directly from gravity phenomena, such as cosmological redshift.

There is likely no need for G in physics [47, 48] as we can replace G , \hbar and c with simply l_p and c , still it is interesting to note that G can also be found from the Hubble constant and the critical mass of the universe. It is given by

$$G = \frac{c^3}{H_0 2M_c} = \frac{l_p^2 c^3}{\hbar} \quad (26)$$

where M_c is the critical mass of the universe. It is worth nothing that in recent modified gravity theory [49] that do not ignore relativistic mass, as is done in standard theory the critical mass is twice of this and one in that theory have $G = \frac{c^3}{H_0 M_h} = \frac{l_p^2 c^3}{\hbar}$ (where M_h is the critical mass given by this new model), that is the 2 disappear. Be aware that we can find both H_0 and M_c (or M_h) without any knowledge of G , as the critical mass is also given by $M_c = \frac{\hbar}{2l_p^2 H_0}$. The reason we can find G from the Hubble constant and the critical mass is that the Hubble constant embedded contains the Planck length. It is the Planck length and the speed of light (gravity) [13, 50] that is important for observable gravity phenomena, not G . This naturally means one must be able to find l_p independent on G as clearly demonstrated is possible also in this paper.

6 Conclusion

We have shown how one can extract the Planck length from the cosmological redshift. Our findings strongly strengthen that there is a relation between the Planck scale and cosmology and could be important information for the development of full quantum cosmology. Our findings, in our view, also support the idea that most if not all gravity phenomena are an indirect detection of the Planck scale.

Competing interest and conflict of interest statement

- Competing interests: no competing interest and no conflict of interest.
- Funding: no funding has been received for this study.
- Authors contributions: the research and paper have been done by Espen Gaarder Haug.

Data Availability Statement

Data Availability Statement

No data has been used for this paper, except the CODATA 2019 Planck length number that is publicly available at

<https://physics.nist.gov/cgi-bin/cuu/Value?plkl>

References

- [1] M. Planck. *Natuerliche Masseinheiten*. Der Königlich Preussischen Akademie Der Wissenschaften, 1899.
- [2] M. Planck. *Vorlesungen über die Theorie der Wärmestrahlung*. Leipzig: J.A. Barth, p. 163, see also the English translation “The Theory of Radiation” (1959) Dover, 1906.
- [3] A. Einstein. Näherungsweise integration der feldgleichungen der gravitation. *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften Berlin*, 1916.
- [4] A. S. Eddington. *Report On The Relativity Theory Of Gravitation*. The Physical Society Of London, Fleetway Press, London, 1918.
- [5] P. W. Bridgman. *Dimensional Analysis*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1931.
- [6] T. Padmanabhan. Planck length as the lower bound to all physical length scales. *General Relativity and Gravitation*, 17, 1985. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00760244>.
- [7] S. Hossenfelder. Can we measure structures to a precision better than the Planck length? *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 29, 2012. URL <https://doi.org/10.1088/0264-9381/29/11/115011>.
- [8] S. Hossenfelder. Minimal length scale scenarios for quantum gravity. *Living Reviews in Relativity*, 16, 2013. URL <https://doi.org/10.12942/lrr-2013-2>.
- [9] G. M. Obermair. Primordial Planck mass black holes (PPMBHS) as candidates for dark matter? *Journal of Physics, Conference Series*, 442, 2013. URL <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/442/1/012066>.
- [10] V. Faraoni. Three new roads to the Planck scale. *American Journal of Physics*, 85, 2017. URL <https://aapt.scitacion.org/doi/pdf/10.1119/1.4994804>.

- [11] A. Unzicker. *The Mathematical Reality: Why Space and Time Are an Illusion*. Independently published, 2020.
- [12] E. G. Haug. Finding the Planck length multiplied by the speed of light without any knowledge of g , c , or h , using a newton force spring. *Journal Physics Communication*, 4:075001, 2020. URL <https://doi.org/10.1088/2399-6528/ab9dd7>.
- [13] E. G. Haug. Demonstration that Newtonian gravity moves at the speed of light and not instantaneously (infinite speed) as thought! *Journal of Physics Communication.*, 5(2):1, 2021. URL <https://doi.org/10.1088/2399-6528/abe4c8>.
- [14] C. Sivaram. The Planck length as a cosmological constraint. *Astrophysics and Space Science*, 127:133, 1986. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00637768>.
- [15] M. Khodadi, K. Nozari, and F. Hajkarim. On the viability of Planck scale cosmology with quartessence. *The European Physical Journal C*, 78:716, 2018. URL <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-018-6191-4>.
- [16] U. V. S. Seshavatharam and S. Lakshminarayana. A first step in evolving quantum cosmology. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1251:012045, 2019. URL <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1251/1/012045>.
- [17] X. Calmet. Planck length and cosmology. *Journal of Modern Physics A*, 22:2027, 2007. URL <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0217732307025261>.
- [18] A. H. Compton. A quantum theory of the scattering of x-rays by light elements. *Physical Review*, 21(5):483, 1923. URL <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.21.483>.
- [19] G. Gräff, H. Kalinowsky, and J. Traut. A direct determination of the proton electron mass ratio. *Zeitschrift für Physik A Atoms and Nuclei*, 297(1), 1980. URL <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF01414243>.
- [20] O. L. Trinhammer and H. G. Bohr. On proton charge radius definition. *EPL*, 128:21001, 2019. URL <https://doi.org/10.1209/0295-5075/128/21001>.
- [21] P. Becker and H. Bettin. The avogadro constant: determining the number of atoms in a single-crystal ^{28}Si sphere. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A*, 369:3925, 2011. URL <https://doi:10.1098/rsta.2011.0222>.
- [22] P. Becker. The new kilogram definition based on counting the atoms in a ^{28}Si crystal. *Contemporary Physics*, 53:461, 2012. URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/00107514.2012.746054>.
- [23] et. al. Bartl, G. A new ^{28}Si single crystal: Counting the atoms for the new kilogram definition. *Metrologica*, 54:693, 2017. URL <https://doi.org/10.1088/1681-7575/aa7820>.
- [24] O. Wang, Z. W. and. Toikkanen, F. Yin, Z.Y. Li, B. M Quinn, and R. E. Palmer. Counting the atoms in supported, monolayer-protected gold clusters. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 132:2854, 2010. URL <https://pubs.acs.org/doi/pdf/10.1021/ja909598g>.
- [25] E. Massam and G. Mana. Counting atoms. *Nature Physics*, 12:522, 2016. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/nphys3754>.
- [26] J. Michell. On the means of discovering the distance, magnitude &c.of the fixed stars, in consequence of the diminution of the velocity of their light, in case such a diminution should be found to take place in any of them, and such other data should be procured from observations. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*, 74, 1784.
- [27] H. Cavendish. Experiments to determine the density of the earth. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, (part II)*, 88, 1798.
- [28] I Newton. *Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica*. London, 1686.
- [29] A. Cornu and J. B. Baille. Détermination nouvelle de la constante de l'attraction et de la densité moyenne de la terre. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 76, 1873.
- [30] C. V. Boys. On the Newtonian constant of gravitation. *Nature*, 5, 1894. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/050330a0>.
- [31] M. P. Hobson, G. Efstathiou, and A. N. Lasenby. *General Relativity, An Introduction for Physicists*. Cambridge, 2014.

- [32] A. Friedmann. Über die krümmung des raumes. *Zeitschrift für Physik*, 10:377, 1922. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01332580>.
- [33] S. Weinberg. *Gravitation and Cosmology*. Wiley, New York, 1972.
- [34] M. Guifry. *Modern General Relativity*. Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- [35] R. V. Pound and G. A. Rebka Jr. Gravitational red-shift in nuclear resonance. *Physical Review Letters*, 3(9):439–441, 1959. URL <https://journals.aps.org/prl/pdf/10.1103/PhysRevLett.3.439>.
- [36] E. G. Haug. The gravitational constant and the Planck units. A simplification of the quantum realm. *Physics Essays*, 29(4):558, 2016. URL <https://doi.org/10.4006/0836-1398-29.4.558>.
- [37] E. G. Haug. Planck quantization of newton and Einstein gravitation. *International Journal of Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 6(2), 2016.
- [38] E. G. Haug. Using a grandfather pendulum clock to measure the world's shortest time interval, the Planck time (with zero knowledge of G). *Journal of Applied Mathematics and Physics*, 9:1076, 2021.
- [39] C. Huygens. *Horologium oscillatorium sive de motu pendularium*. 1673.
- [40] C. L. Bennett and et al. Nine-year Wilkinson microwave anisotropy probe(WMAP) observations: Final maps and results. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 208:20, 2012. URL <https://doi.org/10.1088/0067-0049/208/2/20>.
- [41] A. G. Riess and et al. Milky way cepheid standards for measuring cosmic distances and application to Gaia DR2: Implications for the constant. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 861:126, 2018. URL <https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aac82e>.
- [42] W. L. Freedman and et al. The Carnegie-Chicago Hubble program. viii. an independent determination of the Hubble constant based on the tip of the red giant branch. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 882:24, 2019. URL <https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ab2f73>.
- [43] A. Dominguez and et al. A new measurement of the Hubble constant and matter content of the universe using extragalactic background light γ -ray attenuation. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 885:137, 2019. URL <https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ab4a0e>.
- [44] K.; et al. Hotokezaka. A Hubble constant measurement from superluminal motion of the jet in gw170817. *Nature Astronomy*, 3:940, 2019. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41550-019-0820-1>.
- [45] S. Mukherjee and et al. First measurement of the Hubble parameter from bright binary black hole gw190521. *arXiv:2009.14199*, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.14199>.
- [46] E. G. Haug. Can the Planck length be found independent of big G ? *Applied Physics Research*, 9(6):58, 2017. URL <https://doi.org/10.5539/apr.v9n6p58>.
- [47] E. G. Haug. Collision space-time: Unified quantum gravity. *Physics Essays*, 33(1):46, 2020. URL <https://doi.org/10.4006/0836-1398-33.1.46>.
- [48] E. G. Haug. *Quantum Gravity Hidden In Newton Gravity And How To Unify It With Quantum Mechanics*. in the book: *The Origin of Gravity from the First Principles*, NOVA Publishing, New York, 1921.
- [49] E. G. Haug. A new full relativistic escape velocity and a new Hubble related equation for the universe. *Hal archives*, 2021. URL <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-03240114>.
- [50] E. G. Haug. Extraction of the speed of gravity (light) from gravity observations only. *International Journal of Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 9(2), 2019. URL <https://doi.org/10.4236/ijaa.2019.92008>.