International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)
ISSN: 2319-7064
Impact Factor 2025: 7.089

A Near-Balance Interpretation of Cosmology and the Role of Photon Energy in Gravitational Structure

Russell C. Crawford

Email: *rccrawford[at]swbell.net*

Abstract: ***This study examines the interpretation of a near-zero energy universe within a structured cosmological framework grounded in general relativity. The purpose is to assess whether a near-balanced global energy condition can be consistently interpreted alongside locally nonzero energy regions. The method relies on theoretical analysis of the stress-energy tensor, photon propagation, and gravitational redshift as observational tools. The results show that photon energy provides a consistent link between measurable energy content and spacetime curvature, and that high-energy photon observations can define an effective mass scale using $E = mc^2$. The findings support the view that a near-balanced energy interpretation is physically consistent and compatible with known principles, while clarifying the distinction between global interpretation and local measurement.***

Keywords: cosmology, zero-energy universe, gravitational redshift, photon energy, general relativity, energy-mass equivalence, cosmological energy balance, stress-energy tensor, gravitational curvature

1. Introduction

A central unresolved problem in modern physics is the lack of a complete and consistent account for the origin of the universe, including the emergence of energy, matter, gravitation, and the laws that govern their interaction. While existing frameworks provide highly successful descriptions of many observed phenomena, they do not yet offer fully grounded explanation of initial conditions or of the origin of the governing structure itself.

Existing cosmological models successfully describe observed evolution but do not constitute complete theory of origin, leaving the emergence of energy, matter, gravitation, and physical law unexplained.

This limitation has important consequences for scientific reasoning and education, as it can reinforce a restricted framework in which foundational questions of origin are not directly addressed. In doing so, it risks conflating descriptive adequacy with explanatory completeness, thereby limiting a rigorous account of physical theory.

From an observational and theoretical standpoint, the possibility that the universe is globally balanced has been explored by several prominent physicists. Early work by Tryon [8] proposed that the universe could arise as quantum fluctuation with net zero energy, while subsequent developments by Vilenkin [9] and Guth [6] examined related mechanisms within inflationary cosmology. These approaches, while differing in formulation, share the feature that positive energy may be offset by gravitational effects, leading to a globally balanced configuration.

Related qualitative arguments appear in Hawking [7], who noted that in spatially uniform universe the negative energy associated with gravitation can offset the positive energy of matter, yielding total energy consistent with zero. Although such interpretations remain model-dependent, they are motivated in part by the observed large-scale uniformity and near-critical density of the universe [4], suggesting that balance may reflect an underlying physical condition rather than coincidental feature of late-time evolution.

If the present universe is consistent with near-balanced state, it is reasonable to consider whether a balanced configuration may also characterize the earliest physically meaningful state. This work explores that possibility within structured and explicitly defined framework. Rather than proposing replacement for established theories, the aim is to examine whether a balanced initial condition can be formulated in way that is logically consistent, physically interpretable, and compatible with known constraints.

Interpretive Framework

In this work, we do not attempt to demonstrate that the universe possesses exactly zero total energy as an observationally established fact. Rather, we adopt the more limited and defensible position that the universe is consistent with a near-zero energy condition when considered at sufficiently large scales, as suggested in various theoretical treatments. This interpretation is used here as a working assumption to explore its logical and physical implications. At the same time, it is evident that localized regions of the universe, when considered in isolation, exhibit nonzero energy content. The framework developed in this paper is therefore intended to reconcile this apparent tension between global balance and local imbalance.

Within this interpretive context, we proceed to examine the consequences of near-balance conditions for the emergence of structure, observability, and cosmological consistency.

Because globally defined total energy in cosmology is not uniquely specified in general relativity and depends on the choice of spacetime description, the near-balance condition is treated here as an interpretive large-scale statement rather than directly observable invariant [12].

Paper ID: SR26330082908 DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.21275/SR26330082908

Scope and Contribution
The contribution of this work is not to resolve the origin of the universe in complete theoretical sense, but to clarify the implications of a near-balanced energy interpretation within physically grounded framework. In particular, the analysis establishes consistent relation between global balance and local nonzero energy regions, and demonstrates how photon-based observables provide an operational link between energy content, spacetime curvature, and measurable physical scales.

This work therefore provides physically grounded interpretive framework that connects global energy considerations, local measurable structure, and photon-based observations within single consistent description.

The central research question addressed in this work is: Can a near-balanced global energy condition be consistently interpreted within general relativity while remaining compatible with locally measurable nonzero energy and photon-based observational evidence?

1.1. Novelty and Contribution Beyond Prior Work

While the concept of a zero-energy universe has been explored in prior theoretical work—most notably by Tryon [8], who proposed the universe as a quantum vacuum fluctuation with net zero energy, and by Vilenkin [9] and Guth [6], who examined zero-energy conditions within inflationary cosmology—the present work provides distinct contributions that extend beyond these earlier models.

Comparison with Prior Zero-Energy Models:
Tryon's original proposal focused on the quantum mechanical possibility of spontaneous universe creation from nothing, treating the universe as a large-scale fluctuation with zero net energy. Vilenkin and Guth developed this idea further within the context of inflationary cosmology, showing how quantum tunneling from a false vacuum state could lead to universe creation with globally balanced energy. These models primarily addressed the *mechanism* of universe creation and the *initial conditions* compatible with zero total energy.

Distinct Contributions of This Work:

The present framework differs in three key respects:
1) **Observational Grounding Through Photon Energy:** Rather than focusing solely on initial conditions or creation mechanisms, this work establishes an explicit operational link between photon-based observables (particularly high-energy photon detections and gravitational redshift) and the near-balance interpretation. By connecting measurable photon energy scales to effective mass scales via $E = mc^2$, the framework provides a concrete observational anchor that bridges abstract global energy considerations with locally measurable phenomena.
2) **Reconciliation of Global and Local Energy Descriptions:** While prior models emphasized global energy balance, they did not systematically address the apparent tension between global near-zero energy and the clearly nonzero local energy content observed in structured regions. This work explicitly treats the coexistence of global near-balance and local nonzero energy as a consistency condition rather than a contradiction, clarifying how both perspectives can be maintained within general relativity without conflict.
3) **Methodological Clarity and Interpretive Framework:** The present analysis provides a structured methodological framework (detailed in Section 2) that distinguishes between global interpretation and local measurement, and clarifies the role of photon-based observables to connect energy content to spacetime curvature. This interpretive clarity extends beyond the creation-mechanism focus of earlier work.

2. Practical Implications

This framework has potential implications for future theoretical and observational work:
- **Observational Strategy:** By emphasizing photon energy as a bridge between local measurements and global structure, the framework suggests that high-energy photon observations (e.g., from gamma-ray astronomy and cosmic ray detections) can provide empirical constraints on cosmological energy balance interpretations.
- **Theoretical Development:** The explicit treatment of the global-local energy relationship provides a foundation for future work exploring how near-balance conditions might influence structure formation, dark energy interpretations, or quantum cosmology models.
- **Educational and Conceptual Clarity:** By distinguishing clearly between global interpretive statements and local measurable quantities, the framework helps clarify common conceptual confusions about energy conservation in general relativity and the meaning of "zero-energy universe" claims.

In summary, while building on the foundational insights of Tryon, Vilenkin, and Guth, this work provides new observational grounding, explicit reconciliation of global and local energy descriptions, and methodological clarity that extend the zero-energy universe concept toward a more operationally defined and observationally connected framework.

3. Global Near-Balance and Local Nonzero Structure

Methodological Framework
The analysis in this section follows a structured approach:
1) **Assumptions:** The universe is treated as appearing consistent with a near-balanced energy condition at sufficiently large scales, interpreted as an effective large-scale statement rather than a directly measurable global invariant. Locally, regions exhibit nonzero energy content as required for observable structure.
2) **Theoretical Relations:** The coexistence of global near-balance and local nonzero energy is examined through the framework of general relativity, treating this as a consistency condition rather than a contradiction.
3) **Observational Linkage:** Photon-based observables (particularly gravitational redshift and high-energy photon detections) provide the operational connection between local energy measurements and spacetime curvature.

4) **Interpretation:** The near-balance condition is understood as a large-scale interpretive statement compatible with locally measurable nonzero energy, with photon energy scales selected based on the highest directly observed astrophysical photon energies (multi-TeV to PeV range) [1], [2], [13], [14], providing empirically grounded reference points.

Global Interpretation

Within the framework adopted in this work, the universe is treated as appearing consistent with near-balanced energy condition at sufficiently large scales. This statement is not intended as a directly measurable global invariant, but as an effective interpretation motivated by theoretical considerations and large-scale observational uniformity. Because globally defined total energy in general relativity is not straightforwardly measurable, the near-balance condition is understood here as large-scale interpretive statement rather than directly testable quantity.

Local Nonzero Energy

In contrast to this global interpretation, localized regions of the universe clearly exhibit nonzero energy content. Matter distributions, radiation fields, and gravitational structures all reflect measurable departures from exact balance. These local nonzero energy densities are not in contradiction with global near-balance interpretation, but are instead necessary for the existence of observable structure.

Consistency Between Global and Local Descriptions

The coexistence of global near-balance and local nonzero energy can be understood as consistency condition rather than contradiction. A perfectly balanced configuration would lack observable structure, while physically realized systems necessarily exhibit gradients and asymmetries. The presence of local non-equilibrium regions is therefore not a violation of global balance, but requirement for physical processes, measurement, and the emergence of structure.

Observational Consequences

All observational access to the universe occurs through such non-equilibrium regions. In practice, measurements are mediated by propagating fields, particularly photons, whose energies and trajectories encode information about the underlying spacetime geometry. This establishes a direct connection between local energy content, observable structure, and the global interpretive framework.

Transition to Photon-Based Description

These considerations motivate the use of photon-based observables as a central element of the analysis. Since photons both contribute to the energy content of spacetime and provide the primary means of observational access, they form natural bridge between local physical measurements and the broader gravitational structure of the universe.

4. Photon Energy, Curvature, and Observational Access to Gravity

Introduction

In general relativity, gravity is described not as conventional force but as the curvature of spacetime generated by energy and momentum. This relation is expressed by the Einstein field equations,

$$G_{\mu\nu} = \frac{8\pi G}{c^4} T_{\mu\nu}$$

where $G_{\mu\nu}$ describes spacetime curvature and $T_{\mu\nu}$ represents the local stress-energy content. All physically realizable forms of energy contribute to $T_{\mu\nu}$, including radiation. Thus, photons, although massless, are not outside the gravitational framework: their energy and momentum participate directly in the local content that determines curvature.

General relativity provides the established framework for describing the relation between energy and spacetime curvature [3], [10].

Local Photon Energy

For an observer with four-velocity u^μ, the locally measured energy of photon with four-momentum p^μ is

$$E = -p_\mu u^\mu$$

This expression shows that photon energy is operationally defined through observation and is therefore inseparable from the spacetime setting in which the measurement occurs. In this sense, photon energy is not an abstract quantity detached from gravity, but part of the local physical description to which gravitation responds.

Photon Energy and Curvature

The relation between photon energy and gravity is therefore not a one-to-one matching condition between an individual photon and particular gravitational strength. Rather, it is a consistency relation arising from their common dependence on local energy momentum content. Radiation contributes to the stress-energy tensor, and the resulting curvature governs photon propagation. High radiation-energy regimes are therefore naturally associated with stronger curvature, not because a single photon directly determines gravity, but because both belong to the same dynamical structure.

Observational Link via Redshift

The clearest operational connection between photon behavior and gravity is gravitational redshift. In a static spacetime, the ratio of observed to emitted photon frequency is given by

$$\frac{\nu_{\text{obs}}}{\nu_{\text{emit}}} = \sqrt{\frac{g_{tt}(\text{obs})}{g_{tt}(\text{emit})}}$$

This relation shows directly that the measured photon frequency depends on spacetime geometry. Redshift therefore provides observational probes such as the link between local photon-energy measurements and gravitational structure.

Interpretive Perspective

Within the framework adopted here, these relations motivate an interpretation in which photon energy and curvature are mutually constrained parts of a single physical system. Photon energy contributes to spacetime geometry through $T_{\mu\nu}$, while photon propagation reveals the effects of curvature through measurable frequency shifts and trajectory changes. This dual role makes photon-based observables, especially redshift, central to any attempt to connect local energy distributions with broader gravitational behavior.

Paper ID: SR26330082908 DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.21275/SR26330082908

Energy-Mass Equivalence and Observational Scale

The relation between energy and mass is given by

$$E = mc^2$$

This equivalence allows any physically realized energy scale to be expressed in terms of an associated mass scale.

In the context of this work, observed high-energy photons provide natural reference point. Photons with energies in the multi-TeV to PeV range have been detected in astrophysical observations [1], [2], [13], [14], representing some of the highest directly measured energy scales.

This interpretation is consistent with standard relativistic treatments, in which energy and mass are related through invariant equivalence, even when no rest mass is present.

It is important to emphasize that this correspondence does not imply that photons directly generate rest mass or that these values represent fundamental particle masses. Rather, the relation provides consistent mapping between observed energy scales and equivalent mass scales, allowing abstract energy considerations to be grounded in measurable quantities.

For example, a photon with energy on the order of 1 PeV corresponds to an effective mass scale of approximately 10^{-21} kg, illustrating how high-energy observational data can be directly related to mass-equivalent quantities.

This mapping is introduced not to define fundamental particle masses but to establish an observationally grounded reference scale linking measurable high-energy phenomena to mass-equivalent quantities within the framework of relativity.

Numerical Example

To provide a concrete illustration, consider a photon with energy on the order of 1 PeV consistent with the highest-energy photons currently observed [2]. Using the relation $E = mc^2$, this corresponds to an effective mass scale

$$m = \frac{E}{c^2}$$

Taking $E \sim 10^{15}$ eV $\sim 1.6 \times 10^{-4}$ J, one obtains

$$m \approx \frac{1.6 \times 10^{-4}}{(3 \times 10^8)^2} \approx 1.8 \times 10^{-21} \text{ kg}$$

This value does not represent a particle rest mass, but rather an effective mass scale associated with the observed photon energy. It provides physically realized reference point linking high-energy observations to mass-equivalent quantities within the framework of relativity.

This establishes a physically realized reference scale that connects observed high-energy phenomena to mass-equivalent quantities, providing a concrete link between abstract energy considerations and measurable physical regimes.

5. Conclusion

This study presents a consistent interpretation of a near-balanced energy universe within the framework of general relativity. It shows that global near-balance can coexist with locally measurable nonzero energy and that photon-based observables provide a practical link between energy content and spacetime curvature. The use of high-energy photon observations allows the definition of an effective mass scale through E = mc², connecting measurable phenomena to theoretical structure. These results support a physically consistent interpretation without requiring exact global energy cancellation. Future work should extend this framework toward quantitative predictions and explore its implications for observational cosmology.

6. Limitations and Scope

The framework presented here is not intended as an empirically complete model of cosmological origin, nor does it introduce new dynamical mechanisms beyond established theory. Instead, it provides structured interpretation that connects existing principles of general relativity with observationally accessible quantities. The results should therefore be understood as clarifying consistency and interpretation, rather than as direct proposal of testable new physics. Further work would be required to extend this framework toward detailed empirical predictions.

Although no new dynamical mechanism is introduced, the framework clarifies how existing physical principles can be consistently interpreted across global and local scales.

References

[1] A. U. Abeysekara et al., “Measurement of the Crab Nebula at the highest energies with HAWC,” *The Astrophysical Journal*, vol. 881, no. 2, p. 134, 2019.
[2] Z. Cao et al., “Ultrahigh-energy photons up to 1.4 petaelectronvolts from 12 γ-ray Galactic sources,” *Nature*, vol. 594, pp. 33–36, 2021.
[3] S. M. Carroll, *Spacetime and Geometry: An Introduction to General Relativity*. Addison-Wesley, 2004.
[4] Planck Collaboration, “Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters,” *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, vol. 641, A6, 2020.
[5] A. Einstein, “Does the inertia of a body depend upon its energy content?” *Annalen der Physik*, vol. 18, pp. 639–641, 1905.
[6] A. H. Guth, “Inflationary universe: A possible solution to the horizon and flatness problems,” *Physical Review D*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 347–356, 1981.
[7] S. W. Hawking, *A Brief History of Time: From the Big Bang to Black Holes*. Bantam Books, 1988.
[8] E. P. Tryon, “Is the universe a vacuum fluctuation?” *Nature*, vol. 246, pp. 396–397, 1973.
[9] A. Vilenkin, “Creation of universes from nothing,” *Physics Letters B*, vol. 117, no. 1–2, pp. 25–28, 1982.
[10] R. M. Wald, *General Relativity*. University of Chicago Press, 1984.
[11] S. Weinberg, *Gravitation and Cosmology*. Wiley, 1972.
[12] S. Weinberg, *Cosmology*. Oxford University Press, 2008.
[13] F. Aharonian et al. (H.E.S.S. Collaboration), “Observations of the Crab nebula with HESS,”

Astronomy & Astrophysics, vol. 457, pp. 899–915, 2006.

[14] LHAASO Collaboration, “Ultrahigh-energy photons up to 1.4 petaelectronvolts from 12 γ-ray Galactic sources,” *Nature*, vol. 594, pp. 33–36, 2021.

[15] E. V. Linder, “Exploring the expansion history of the universe,” *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 90, no. 9, 091301, 2003.

[16] E. Di Valentino et al., “In the realm of the Hubble tension—a review of solutions,” *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, vol. 38, no. 15, 153001, 2021.

[17] E. Di Valentino et al., “Cosmology intertwined: A review of the particle physics, astrophysics, and cosmology associated with the cosmological tensions and anomalies,” *Astroparticle Physics*, vol. 131, 102604, 2021.