The String Landscape
The Swampland
And Our Universe

Cumrun Vafa

Harvard University

Feb. 28, 2020

KITP, Santa Barbara

https://www.cumrunvafa.org

Quantum Field Theories—without gravity included—

are well understood. They beautifully describe the

interaction of all the elementary particles we know.



To include gravity, `Couple the QFT to Gravity' we need to consider fluctuating metric for spacetime instead of fixed Minkowski space.



However, when one tries to add gravity into the mix (in the form of gravitons) the formalism breaks down.

The computation of physical processes leads to incurable infinities!

This naively suggests:

Quantum Field Theories cannot be coupled to gravity!

This cannot be true! After all we live in a universe with both gravity and with quantum fields! Resolution?

String Theory:

A consistent framework which unifies quantum theory and Einstein's theory of gravity—a highly non-trivial accomplishment! Leads to consistent coupling of QFT’s to gravity.





Joining and splitting of strings leads to interaction between strings
Time



Resolves the inconsistency between quantum theory and gravity

Extra Dimensions

One of the novel features of string theory is the prediction that there are extra dimensions, beyond 3 spatial dimensions and 1 time.

These must be tiny to avoid experimental detection to date.




Extra dimensions of string theory can have a large number of distinct possibilities












The physical properties observed in 3+1 dimensions depends on the choice of the compact tiny space:

Number of forces, particles and their masses, etc.

Since there are a vast number of allowed tiny spaces which are allowed we get a huge number of consistent possible effective 3+1 dimensional theories;

The String Landscape







Each choice of compactification space leads to a distinct observable physics in 4 dimensions.


This leads to the vast string landscape




Our Universe

Going from compactifications choices to the landscape is too cumbersome because there are a HUGE number of consistent choices.

This raises the question:

Can we just reverse this and pick a consistent looking 3+1 dimensional theory and not worry which compactification leads to it and simply extract the relevant 3+1 dimensional physics?

Landscape of string vacua is vast.

Can any imaginable universe occur as a point in the string landscape?

Landscape of string vacua is vast.

Can any imaginable universe occur as a point in the string landscape?

NO!

ALMOST ALL quantum field theories in 3+1 dimensions cannot be coupled to gravity: They belong to the Swampland!

The intuition based on particle physics is almost correct!


Swampland!




very special



APS/Alan Stonebraker

Main question:

What distinguishes the landscape from swampland?

Or equivalently: What additional consistency conditions are necessary in a quantum theory of gravity which are absent when we remove gravity?

Main question:

What distinguishes the landscape from swampland?

Or equivalently: What additional consistency conditions are necessary in a quantum theory of gravity which are absent when we remove gravity?

We do not know them all, but beginning to make progress.

What we know:

1-Not all consistent-looking theories arise from string theory.

2-Some of these observations can be captured by some principles and at least some of them can be motivated based on quantum gravitational arguments and in particular on black hole physics.

3-These can lead to some specific predictions which have concrete consequences for cosmology and particle phenomenology of our universe.

Aim for this talk:

Present some of the landscape criteria that we have discovered and explain their motivation and explain some of their observable consequences.

Some basic facts about black holes:

Fix a charge Q and a mass M. Then as long as $M>Q$ there is a black hole. The extreme case $M=Q$ can also occur (extremal black holes).

A- Black holes have an event horizon where if anything crosses, it cannot get out.

B- Black holes have thermodynamical properties (Bekenstein-Hawking). In particular they carry an entropy: $S=(A/4)$ where A is the area of the horizon



$N = \exp(A/4)$

C- Black holes disappear by gradually emitting elementary particles (modulo some extremal cases in supersymmetric theories). After the gradual decay (`Hawking radiation’) nothing is left and there is no imprint of the BH left.

Some Requirements for a Good Landscape

1-The only allowed continuous symmetries are gauge symmetries.

2-All gauge charges appear in the spectrum.

3-Finite range for fields.

4-The theory must admit light higher dimensional objects.

5-Gravity is always the weakest force.

6-Consequences for cosmology the dark energy (and the fate of our universe)?

Criterion 1: Only Gauge Symmetries

There are no global symmetries allowed. Suppose to the contrary there were: Then we could drop a particle carrying that global charge inside a black hole. The mass of the BH goes up, but nothing else changes: Since the charge is global, and not gauged, no electric field detectable outside horizon. BH evaporates—> leaving no trace of the charged object. Leads to violation of the global charge. (Approximate symmetry OK)


q





Criterion 2: All Charges in the Spectrum

Suppose we have a U(1) gauge symmetry. All integral charges Q are in principle allowed to exist. Are there such states in the theory for all charges?

Without gravity, apriori no reason. For example we can have a pure U(1) Maxwell theory with no charged states at all.

With gravity the story changes:

Pick a charge Q

Consider a BH with that charge

S=A/4 which implies there exist many states with charge Q!

Also: if we don't have all charges in the spectrum we end up getting extra global symmetries in conflict with criterion 1.

Criterion 3: Finite Range for Fields

Consider a field φ. Without gravity we usually have no restriction on its range:

$$-\infty < \varphi < +\infty$$

However with gravity it seems the range of this field for a given effective description cannot be any bigger than Planck scale:

$$|\Delta\varphi| < M_p$$

We do not have a deep explanation of this fact but it is observed in all examples of string compactifications that it is the case: If you try to increase the range beyond Planck range some new light states emerge, invalidating the effective field theory.

$$m \sim e^{-\alpha \frac{|\Delta\varphi|}{Mp}}$$



Light states leading to a dual description of the theory

Criterion 4: Extended Objects

There must be light extended objects in any theory of quantum gravity (like M-theory membrane or strings in string theory). This also follows (at least heuristically) from the previous criterion:

Consider compactifying the theory on a circle of radius $R = e^{\varphi}$

$$L = \frac{1}{2}(\partial\varphi)^2$$

$$R \gg 1 \rightarrow \varphi \gg 0$$

Indeed as $\varphi \geq 1$ we begin to get light KK modes (momentum modes around circle become light) and so the effective field theory ignoring these modes is not reliable. This is consistent with the fields having a finite range. However we can go the other way: $\varphi \ll 0$. The general principle predicts something should become light.

$R \to 0$ some light states must appear. But how is that possible? KK modes are becoming heavier.

The only natural mechanism for this to happen is if we have extended objects like string or membranes which can wrap the circle and as the circle becomes small they become light!

Criterion 5: Gravity as the Weakest Force

In string compactifications it has been observed that whenever we have charged particles, the electric force between the elementary charged states are stronger than their gravitational attraction (true for our universe):

$$F_e = \frac{e^2}{r^2}$$

$$F_g = \frac{m^2}{r^2}$$

$$m \lesssim e$$

Black Hole Explanation of WGC:



Black Hole Explanation of WGC:



Undergoes Hawking Radiation

Black Hole Explanation of WGC:



$$Q - q < M - m \quad , \quad Q = M$$

$$\Longrightarrow \quad m < q$$

m=q can only occur for susy case (BPS states)

Extension of WGC from particles to membranes:

Attractive gravitational force between membranes is weaker than electric replusion:



6-Swampland and Cosmology?

Can we learn anything about cosmological questions from swampland idea?



Dark Energy
Accelerated Expansion
Afterglow Light
Pattern
380,000 yrs.
Dark Ages
Development of
Galaxies, Planets, etc.
Inflation
Time
Quantum
Fluctuations
1st Stars
about 400 million yrs.
Big Bang Expansion
13.7 billion years


Dark Energy
Accelerated Expansion
Afterglow Light
Pattern
380,000 yrs.
Dark Ages
Development of
Galaxies, Planets, etc.
Inflation
Quantum
Fluctuations
1st Stars
about 400 million yrs.
Big Bang Expansion
13.7 billion years
Will it end?

String theory landscape:

The only universes that last forever have a special property called supersymmetry.

All the other universes which could have conceivably lasted forever seem to belong to the swampland!

Supersymmetry



For supersymmetric case:

We have learned quite a bit about supersymmetric compactifications of string theory.

The allowed solutions for non-compact space are of two types:

Minkowski—With 0 cosmological constant.

AdS—With negative cosmological constant.
Many absolutely stable. No stable solution known without SUSY. No SUSY dS solutions.


Supersymmetry:
Mass
Not observed!



Our Universe will not last forever!

How long do we have?



Our universe has dark energy.

Dark Energy, leads to a natural time scale:

$$t_E = \frac{1}{\sqrt{E}}$$

How long do we have?



$$t_E = 10^{11}$$

About 100 billion years!

Is this a coincidence?!

How about de Sitter (dS) space with positive cosmological constant? Why care about dS?

Because we think we may live in one!

$$\Lambda > 0$$



Why not rolling scalar potentials (quintessence)?



But there is a strange feature of quintessence models:

Not only

(in Planck units)

$$V \sim 10^{-122}$$

But also for the quintessence models not to be in contradiction with observational bounds on w we need

$$|\nabla_\phi V| \leq 10^{-122}$$

Sounds like double fine tuning unless we can naturally have $|\nabla V| \approx V$

But this condition seems to be typical for the potentials that arise from string theory:

So what can appear as fine tuning in the space of all QFT's may not be a fine tuning when one restricts attention to the allowed ones.

So quintessence models are not as unnatural in the context of string theory.

Two
Possibilities:





Two Possibilities:



Two Possibilities:



A: $T \sim 10-50$ current age

B: $T \sim 100-200$ current age

$$\Rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{E}} \sim T$$

Conclusion

The swampland ideas are beginning to be sharpened, extended and better understood.

They define some universal properties of consistent quantum gravitational theories.

They could have dramatic implications about our universe.