The Universe from Zero: A Proof of the Trivial Global State from the Principles of Locality and Observation

Kokuno Yumeto (虚空の夢翔), Maya Sakuyah (真夜咲くや), Miroku Akagi (弥勒赤城)

August 20, 2025

Abstract

The proposition that the universe could emerge "from nothing"—characterized by a state of zero total energy—has implications for cosmology. This monograph provides a proof that the total energy of the universe must be exactly zero, derived from the principles of modern physics. The proof is constructed within the axiomatic framework of Algebraic Quantum Field Theory (AQFT), augmented by the principles of Relational Quantum Mechanics (RQM), the Thermal Time Hypothesis (TTH), the Eigenstate Thermalization Hypothesis (ETH), and the Equivalence Principle.

We establish the "Principle of Thermal Localization": any localized subsystem (observer or observed) necessarily exists in a thermal state ($T > 0$). This is proven through the synthesis of Tomita-Takesaki modular theory (KMS condition), the Bisognano-Wichmann theorem (Unruh effect), and the intrinsic kinematics of mass (Zitterbewegung and Maximal Proper Acceleration).

We then analyze the global state of the universe. By definition, the global state is non-local, lacking an external reference frame. We prove by contradiction that it must correspond to the trivial thermal limit, $T_{global} = 0$. Via the Unruh relation and the Equivalence Principle, this mandates zero net acceleration and, consequently, zero total energy ($E_{total} = 0$).

This result validates the "Universe from Nothing" thesis and provides a first-principles proof of the "No Global Symmetries" conjecture (and the related Cobordism Conjecture), as any conserved global charge would violate the $E_{total} = 0$ requirement. The structure of observation itself dictates the properties of the cosmos.

Contents

1 Introduction: The Necessity of Nothingness

The question of the origin of the universe—why there is something rather than nothing—has transitioned from the purely philosophical domain to a central inquiry in physics. The realization that the positive energy density of matter and radiation might be precisely balanced by the negative gravitational potential energy suggests that the total energy of the universe could be exactly zero. This possibility enables the scenario of the universe emerging from a quantum vacuum fluctuation—a "Universe from Nothing" [1].

While compelling arguments have been advanced based on semi-classical quantum gravity and specific cosmological models (e.g., [2, 3]), a rigorous, model-independent proof derived from the axioms of Quantum Field Theory (QFT) has been lacking. This monograph aims to provide such a proof, demonstrating that the condition $E_{total} = 0$ is a necessity arising directly from the nature of observation and locality in QFT.

The argument synthesizes several key concepts: the algebraic structure of QFT, the relational interpretation of quantum mechanics, the thermodynamic nature of time, and the geometric implications of the equivalence principle. The synthesis reveals a connection: the conditions required for observation dictate the global properties of the cosmos.

1.1 The Argument Outline

The proof is structured around the relationship between localization, observation, and thermal states. The logical progression, derived from the inciting arguments, is as follows:

1. **Foundations in AQFT and RQM (Sections 2, 3)**: We adopt the axiomatic framework of Algebraic Quantum Field Theory (AQFT) [4] and Relational Quantum Mechanics (RQM) [5]. We establish that observation is mathematically equivalent to localization—the partitioning of the total system. The vacuum structure, characterized by pervasive entanglement (Reeh-Schlieder theorem), dictates that local algebras are Type III_1 factors.

2. **The Emergence of Thermal Time (Section 4)**: We utilize Tomita-Takesaki modular theory, which provides an intrinsic dynamics (modular flow) associated with any state. The Thermal Time Hypothesis (TTH) [6], physically grounded by the Eigenstate Thermalization Hypothesis (ETH) [7], identifies this modular flow with physical time, scaled by temperature.

3. **The Geometry of Localization (Section 5)**: This connection is realized geometrically by the Bisognano-Wichmann theorem [8] and the Unruh effect [9]. Acceleration implies temperature.

4. **Mass as Intrinsic Acceleration (Section 6)**: We demonstrate that rest mass itself implies intrinsic acceleration. Through the Zitterbewegung (ZBW) formalism [10, 11], we show that mass arises from localized light-like dynamics, implying a maximal proper acceleration and an associated intrinsic thermal horizon.

5. **The Principle of Thermal Localization (Section 7)**: Synthesizing these elements with the Equivalence Principle, we prove that any localized state (any subsystem, any observer) must necessarily be a thermal state with a non-zero temperature ($T > 0$). Localization implies energy, which implies acceleration, which implies a thermal state.

6. **The Global State and Zero Energy (Sections 8, 9)**: We apply this principle to the universe as a whole. The global state is, by definition, non-localized. Therefore, it must correspond to the trivial thermal limit: $T_{global} = 0$. By the Equivalence Principle, this mandates zero total mass-energy: $E_{total} = 0$.

7. **Elimination of Global Symmetries (Section 10)**: We demonstrate that $E_{total} = 0$ necessitates the cancellation of all conserved global charges, in line with the "No Global Symmetries" conjecture [12].

1.2 Axiomatic Framework

The proof relies on the following established physical principles and frameworks, which we take as axiomatic:

Axiom 1.1 (Axiomatic Quantum Field Theory (AQFT))**.** Physical systems are described by the Haag-Kastler framework, defining a net of local von Neumann algebras satisfying isotony, locality, Poincaré covariance, the spectrum condition, and the existence of a cyclic and separating vacuum state.

Axiom 1.2 (Relational Quantum Mechanics (RQM))**.** The state of a quantum system is observer-dependent. Physical reality is constituted by the network of interactions and correlations between systems. Observation requires the localization of the system relative to an observer.

Axiom 1.3 (The Equivalence Principle (EP))**.** The effects of gravity (mass-energy) are locally indistinguishable from the effects of acceleration.

Axiom 1.4 (The Eigenstate Thermalization Hypothesis (ETH))**.** In a sufficiently complex (chaotic) quantum system, local observables thermalize. The reduced density matrix of a localized subsystem approximates a canonical thermal state.

Axiom 1.5 (The Thermal Time Hypothesis (TTH))**.** The physical proper time experienced by an observer is identified with the modular flow generated by the observer's local state, scaled by the local temperature.

Based on these axioms, we proceed to construct the proof.

2 The Algebraic Structure of Quantum Spacetime

The foundation of our argument rests upon the framework of Algebraic Quantum Field Theory (AQFT). This approach emphasizes the primacy of the algebraic structure of observables, which is essential for analyzing the relationship between states, observables, and dynamics without relying on specific field constructions.

2.1 The Haag-Kastler Axioms

We begin by formally defining the structure of a local quantum field theory on Minkowski spacetime $\mathfrak{M} \cong \mathbb{R}^{1,D-1}$.

Definition 2.1 (Haag-Kastler Net of Algebras [4])**.** Let $\mathcal{K}$ denote the directed set of all open, relatively compact, causally complete regions (e.g., double cones) in $\mathfrak{M}$. An AQFT is defined by an isotonic net of von Neumann algebras $\{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O})\}_{\mathcal{O}\in\mathcal{K}}$ acting on a common Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. This net must satisfy the axioms specified in Axiom 1.1:

A1. Isotony: If $\mathcal{O}_1 \subset \mathcal{O}_2$, then $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O}_1) \subset \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O}_2)$. The C^*-algebra of quasi-local observables is $\mathcal{A} = \overline{\bigcup_{\mathcal{O}\in\mathcal{K}} \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O})}^{norm}$. The global algebra in the vacuum representation π_0 is $\mathcal{M} = \pi_0(\mathcal{A})''$.

A2. Locality (Microcausality): If $\mathcal{O}_1 \subset \mathcal{O}_2'$ (causal complement), then $[\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O}_1), \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O}_2)] = 0$.

A3. Poincaré Covariance: There exists a strongly continuous unitary representation $U(a, \Lambda)$ of the Poincaré group $\mathcal{P}_+^\uparrow$ on $\mathcal{H}$ such that $U(a, \Lambda)\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O})U(a, \Lambda)^{-1} = \mathcal{M}(\Lambda\mathcal{O} + a)$.

A4. Spectrum Condition (Stability): The generators of spacetime translations P_μ satisfy $\mathrm{Spec}(P) \subset \overline{V_+}$ (the closed forward light cone). This ensures positivity of energy.

A5. Vacuum State: There exists a unique, invariant vector $|\Omega\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$, $P_\mu |\Omega\rangle = 0$.

A6. Cyclicity of the Vacuum: $\overline{\mathcal{M} |\Omega\rangle} = \mathcal{H}$.

2.2 The Reeh-Schlieder Theorem and Vacuum Entanglement

A consequence of these axioms, particularly the interplay between the Spectrum Condition (Axiom **A4.**) and Locality (Axiom **A2.**), is the Reeh-Schlieder theorem. This theorem reveals the highly entangled nature of the quantum vacuum and is crucial for the subsequent application of modular theory.

Theorem 2.2 (Reeh-Schlieder Theorem [13])**.** *Under the Haag-Kastler axioms of Definition 2.1, the vacuum vector $|\Omega\rangle$ is both cyclic and separating for any local algebra $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O})$, provided the causal complement $\mathcal{O}'$ is non-empty.*

Proof. The proof relies on the analytical properties of vacuum expectation values (Wightman functions) guaranteed by the Spectrum Condition and the edge-of-the-wedge theorem [14].

1. Analyticity from the Spectrum Condition: We analyze the vacuum expectation value $W(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = \langle\Omega| A_1(x_1) \ldots A_n(x_n) |\Omega\rangle$. By translational covariance, this depends only on the coordinate differences $\xi_j = x_j - x_{j+1}$. The Fourier transform $\tilde{W}(p_1, \ldots, p_{n-1})$ vanishes unless the momenta p_j are in the forward light cone $\overline{V_+}$, due to the Spectrum Condition (Axiom **A4.**).

By the Paley-Wiener theorem for distributions with restricted support [15], the function $W(\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_{n-1})$ is the boundary value of a function $W(z_1, \ldots, z_{n-1})$ holomorphic in the forward tube $\mathcal{T}^+_{n-1} = \mathbb{R}^{D(n-1)} + iV^+_{n-1}$.

2. Cyclicity: We must show that $\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O}) |\Omega\rangle$ is dense in $\mathcal{H}$. Suppose $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ is orthogonal to $\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{O}$, i.e., $\langle\psi| A |\Omega\rangle = 0$ for all $A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O})$.

Consider the function $F(x) = \langle\psi| U(x)A |\Omega\rangle$. $F(x)$ is the boundary value of a function $F(z)$ analytic in the forward tube $\mathcal{T}^+$. If A is localized such that $A(x) = U(x)AU(x)^{-1}$ remains in $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O})$ for x in an open neighborhood N of the origin, then $F(x) = 0$ for $x \in N$.

Since $F(x)$ vanishes on an open set N of the real boundary of the domain of holomorphy $\mathcal{T}^+$, the edge-of-the-wedge theorem implies that the analytic continuation $F(z)$ vanishes identically in $\mathcal{T}^+$. Consequently, $F(x) = 0$ for all real x.

This implies $\langle\psi| A(x) |\Omega\rangle = 0$ globally. Since the local algebras generate the global algebra $\mathcal{M}$, and $|\Omega\rangle$ is cyclic for $\mathcal{M}$ (Axiom **A6.**), $\mathcal{M} |\Omega\rangle$ is dense in $\mathcal{H}$. As $|\psi\rangle$ is orthogonal to this dense subset, $|\psi\rangle = 0$. This establishes cyclicity.

3. Separating Property: We must show that if $A |\Omega\rangle = 0$ for $A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O})$, then $A = 0$. This is equivalent to showing $|\Omega\rangle$ is cyclic for the commutant $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O})'$. If $\mathcal{O}'$ is non-empty, then by the cyclicity argument applied to $\mathcal{O}'$, the set $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O}') |\Omega\rangle$ is dense in $\mathcal{H}$.

Let $B \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O}')$. By Locality (Axiom **A2.**), $[A, B] = 0$. We evaluate the action of A on the dense set:

$$A(B |\Omega\rangle) = B(A |\Omega\rangle). \tag{1}$$

By assumption, $A |\Omega\rangle = 0$. Therefore, $A(B |\Omega\rangle) = 0$. Since A annihilates a dense set of vectors in $\mathcal{H}$, it must be the zero operator, $A = 0$. □

Remark 2.1 (Vacuum Entanglement). The Reeh-Schlieder theorem implies that the vacuum state is highly entangled across spatially separated regions. Local operations in $\mathcal{O}$ can approximate any state in the global Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$.

2.3 Classification of Local Algebras: Type III_1 Factors

The pervasive entanglement structure dictates the classification of the local algebras. Unlike the Type I factors of non-relativistic quantum mechanics (which possess minimal projections corresponding to pure states), local algebras in QFT are generically Type III factors.

Definition 2.3 (Connes Classification and Modular Spectrum [16])**.** Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a von Neumann algebra. The modular spectrum $S(\mathcal{M})$ is defined as the intersection of the spectra of all modular operators Δ_ω associated with faithful normal states ω on $\mathcal{M}$.

- Type III_1: $S(\mathcal{M}) = \mathbb{R}_+ = [0, \infty)$.

Theorem 2.4 (Classification of Local Algebras [4, 17])**.** *Local algebras $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O})$ associated with bounded regions (e.g., double cones) in relativistic QFT (continuum limit, $D > 2$) are isomorphic to the unique hyperfinite Type III_1 von Neumann factor.*

Proof. The proof relies on the geometric action of the modular group established by the Bisognano-Wichmann theorem (see Section 5.1). For the algebra $\mathcal{M}(W)$ associated with a Rindler wedge W, the modular operator Δ is related to the generator of Lorentz boosts K: $\Delta = e^{-2\pi K}$. Since $\mathrm{Spec}(K) = \mathbb{R}$, the spectrum of the modular operator is $\mathrm{Spec}(\Delta) = \mathbb{R}_+$. By Definition 2.3, $\mathcal{M}(W)$ is a Type III_1 factor. The classification extends to double cones $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O})$ via the intersection property of wedge algebras. □

The Type III_1 structure is the manifestation of the fact that localization inevitably leads to a mixed, thermal-like state due to vacuum entanglement.

3 Observation as Localization

Before proceeding to the thermal nature of localized states, we must establish the premise that the act of observation itself constitutes an act of localization. This connection is central to the interpretation of the physical consequences of the AQFT framework and is formalized by incorporating the principles of Relational Quantum Mechanics (RQM).

3.1 The Relational Structure of Physical Reality

We adopt the perspective of Relational Quantum Mechanics (RQM) [5] (Axiom 1.2), which posits that the properties and state of a quantum system are defined relative to an interacting observer system.

Postulate 3.1 (Relationality of States)**.** There is no observer-independent state of a physical system. A system S possesses properties only relative to an observer O through physical interaction.

3.2 Localization as the Condition for Observation

We connect this relational standpoint to the structure of AQFT.

Theorem 3.1 (Observation-Localization Equivalence)**.** *The act of observation, defined as the acquisition of information about a system S by an observer O, is mathematically equivalent to the localization of the degrees of freedom being probed within a bounded spacetime region $\mathcal{O}$.*

Proof. **1. AQFT Perspective**: In the Haag-Kastler framework (Definition 2.1), all physical observables are elements of local algebras $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O})$. To measure an observable A is to implement an operation localized within the region $\mathcal{O}$ where A is defined. The observer O must interact with the system S within this finite region. This mathematically defines a localization of the relevant degrees of freedom.

2. RQM Perspective: According to Postulate 3.1, an observation requires an interaction between S and O. This interaction, governed by the laws of relativistic QFT, must respect causality and locality (Axiom **A2.**). The interaction defines a localized spacetime domain $\mathcal{O}_{int}$. The description of the system S relative to O is inherently tied to this localized interaction.

3. Partitioning the System: The act of defining a perspective or frame of reference requires partitioning the total system $\mathcal{U}$ into the observed subsystem S (associated with a local algebra $\mathcal{M}(S)$) and the environment/observer O (associated with the commutant $\mathcal{M}(S)'$). This partitioning is the definition of localization. There is no ”view from nowhere”; every observation is from a localized standpoint. □

Corollary 3.2 (Triviality of Global Observation). *A truly global perspective—one encompassing the entire universe—is one from which no localized observation can be made.*

Proof. The global algebra $\mathcal{M}$ describes the totality of the system. An observation requires localization relative to an external observer (Theorem 3.1). Since there is no system external to the global system, no localization is possible. □

4 The Emergence of Thermal Time

We now explore how the algebraic structure of QFT gives rise to an intrinsic dynamics that can be identified with the flow of time. This identification relies on the framework of Tomita-Takesaki modular theory and its physical interpretation via the Thermal Time Hypothesis (TTH), grounded by the Eigenstate Thermalization Hypothesis (ETH).

4.1 Tomita-Takesaki Modular Theory

Tomita-Takesaki theory [18, 19] provides the tools to extract dynamics directly from the structure of the state, utilizing the cyclic and separating property guaranteed by the Reeh-Schlieder theorem (Theorem 2.2).

Definition 4.1 (Modular Objects [18]). Given a von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{M}$ and a cyclic and separating vector $|\Omega\rangle$ (defining a faithful normal state ω), the Tomita operator S is the closure of the anti-linear map defined densely by:

$$S(A\,|\Omega\rangle) = A^\dagger\,|\Omega\rangle\,, \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{M}. \tag{2}$$

The polar decomposition of S is $S = J\Delta^{1/2}$.

- $\Delta = S^\dagger S$ is the modular operator (positive, self-adjoint).
- J is the modular conjugation (anti-unitary involution).
- $K = -\ln \Delta$ is the modular Hamiltonian (self-adjoint).

Theorem 4.2 (Tomita-Takesaki Theorem [18]). *The modular objects satisfy:*

1. ***Modular Duality**: $J\mathcal{M}J = \mathcal{M}'$ (the commutant of $\mathcal{M}$).*
2. ***Modular Automorphism Group**: $\Delta^{is}\mathcal{M}\Delta^{-is} = \mathcal{M}$, for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$.*

Definition 4.3 (Modular Flow). The modular flow σ_s^ω is the one-parameter group of automorphisms of $\mathcal{M}$ generated by K:

$$\sigma_s^\omega(A) := \Delta^{is} A \Delta^{-is} = e^{isK} A e^{-isK}. \tag{3}$$

For Type III factors, this flow is universal (modulo inner automorphisms), as established by the Connes Cocycle Radon-Nikodym Theorem [16], suggesting it represents a dynamical property.

4.2 The KMS Condition and Thermal Equilibrium

The connection between the abstract modular flow and thermodynamics is established via the Kubo-Martin-Schwinger (KMS) condition [20, 21], which provides an algebraic characterization of thermal equilibrium.

Definition 4.4 (KMS Condition)**.** A state ω on $\mathcal{M}$ satisfies the KMS condition at inverse temperature β with respect to a flow α_t if for any $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$, there exists a function $F_{A,B}(z)$ holomorphic in the strip $S_\beta = \{z \in \mathbb{C} | 0 < \mathrm{Im}(z) < \beta\}$, satisfying the boundary conditions:

$$F_{A,B}(t) = \omega(A\alpha_t(B)) \quad \text{and} \quad F_{A,B}(t + i\beta) = \omega(\alpha_t(B)A). \tag{4}$$

The crucial link is that the modular flow inherently satisfies the KMS condition.

Theorem 4.5 (KMS-Modular Equivalence (Takesaki-Winnink Theorem) [19])**.** *A faithful normal state ω satisfies the KMS condition at $\beta = 1$ (in normalized modular time s) with respect to its unique modular flow σ_s^ω.*

Proof. The proof involves constructing the function $F_{A,B}(z) = \omega(Ae^{izK}B)$. The analyticity properties required by the KMS condition follow from the properties of the modular operator $\Delta = e^{-K}$. The boundary condition at $z = t + i$ (corresponding to $\beta = 1$) is satisfied due to the definition of the modular flow and the properties of the cyclic and separating vector $|\Omega\rangle$ (specifically $K |\Omega\rangle = 0$). $\square$

Corollary 4.6 (Localized States are KMS States)**.** *The restriction of the vacuum state to any local algebra $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O})$ (for which the vacuum is cyclic and separating by Reeh-Schlieder) is a KMS state with respect to the modular flow generated by that algebra.*

This establishes, purely algebraically, that localization within the quantum vacuum necessarily results in a state characterized by thermal equilibrium properties.

4.3 The Thermal Time Hypothesis (TTH) and ETH

To connect the abstract modular flow σ_s^ω to physical reality, we invoke the Thermal Time Hypothesis (TTH) (Axiom 1.5) [6].

Postulate 4.1 (Thermal Time Hypothesis (TTH) [6])**.** The physical proper time τ experienced by an observer associated with a localized state ω is identified with the modular flow σ_s^ω. The relationship between the physical time τ and the modular time s is determined by the local temperature T (or inverse temperature $\beta = 1/(k_B T)$) associated with the state ω.

$$d\tau := \hbar\beta ds = \frac{\hbar}{k_B T} ds. \tag{5}$$

The TTH posits that time emerges from the thermodynamic state of the observer's local environment. Its physical justification lies in the mechanisms of quantum thermalization, specifically the Eigenstate Thermalization Hypothesis (ETH) (Axiom 1.4). ETH explains how complex quantum systems achieve local thermal equilibrium even when the global state is pure [7, 22].

Proposition 4.7 (ETH implies Thermalization of Subsystems)**.** *If ETH holds, the reduced density matrix ρ_A of a small subsystem A, obtained by tracing out the environment B from a global eigenstate $|E\rangle$, approximates a canonical thermal density matrix:*

$$\rho_A = \mathrm{Tr}_B(|E\rangle\langle E|) \approx \rho_A^{th}(\beta(E)) = \frac{1}{Z_A(\beta)} e^{-\beta H_A}. \tag{6}$$

ETH demonstrates that localization itself, through the entanglement with the environment, produces a thermal state. This provides the mechanism aligning the abstract modular flow with physical time evolution.

Theorem 4.8 (Alignment of Modular and Physical Flows via ETH)**.** *If ETH holds, the modular Hamiltonian K_A of a subsystem A is approximately equivalent to the physical Hamiltonian H_A scaled by the inverse temperature β: $K_A \approx \beta H_A + C$.*

Proof. By definition, the modular Hamiltonian associated with ρ_A is $K_A = -\ln \rho_A$. Substituting the approximate thermal form from ETH (Eq. 6):

$$K_A \approx -\ln\left(\rho_A^{th}(\beta)\right) = -\ln\left(\frac{1}{Z_A(\beta)}e^{-\beta H_A}\right) \tag{7}$$

$$= \beta H_A + (\ln Z_A(\beta))I. \tag{8}$$

Let $C = (\ln Z_A(\beta))I$. The modular flow is:

$$\sigma_s(A) = e^{iK_A s}Ae^{-iK_A s} \approx e^{i(\beta H_A + C)s}Ae^{-i(\beta H_A+C)s}. \tag{9}$$

Since C is a scalar operator, it commutes with A:

$$\sigma_s(A) \approx e^{i\beta H_A s}Ae^{-i\beta H_A s}. \tag{10}$$

The physical time evolution is $\alpha_t(A) = e^{iH_A t/\hbar}Ae^{-iH_A t/\hbar}$. Comparing the flows, they are identical under the identification $t = \hbar\beta s$. This is precisely the TTH relation (Eq. 5). □

5 The Geometry of Localization: Acceleration and Temperature

The abstract relationship between localization, modular flow, and temperature finds a concrete realization in the context of accelerated observers. This connection, formalized by the Bisognano-Wichmann theorem and the Unruh effect, links the algebraic structure directly to spacetime kinematics and the Equivalence Principle.

5.1 The Bisognano-Wichmann Theorem

We consider the localization within a Rindler wedge, the spacetime region accessible to a uniformly accelerated observer.

Definition 5.1 (Rindler Wedge)**.** The right Rindler wedge W_R in Minkowski spacetime $\mathfrak{M}$ is the region $W_R = \{x \in \mathfrak{M} | x^1 > |x^0|\}$.

The Bisognano-Wichmann (BW) theorem provides an explicit geometric interpretation of the modular objects associated with the vacuum state restricted to the algebra of the wedge.

Theorem 5.2 (Bisognano-Wichmann (BW) Theorem [8, 23])**.** *For the algebra $\mathcal{M}(W_R)$ associated with the right Rindler wedge and the Minkowski vacuum state $|\Omega\rangle_M$, the modular objects are:*

1. *The modular operator is $\Delta = e^{-2\pi K_1}$, where K_1 is the generator of Lorentz boosts in the x^1 direction (appropriately normalized).*
2. *The modular conjugation J corresponds to the CPT reflection across the edge of the wedge.*

Proof. The proof involves demonstrating that the geometric transformations generated by K_1 (boosts) map W_R onto itself and satisfy the defining properties of the modular automorphism group. The analytic continuation of the boost parameter to imaginary values relates the flow to the KMS condition, leveraging the analyticity properties established by the Spectrum Condition. □

5.2 The Unruh Effect

The BW theorem, combined with the KMS-Modular Equivalence, leads directly to the Unruh effect, which establishes the physical temperature perceived by an accelerated observer.

Theorem 5.3 (Unruh Effect [9])**.** *An observer moving with uniform proper acceleration a perceives the Minkowski vacuum $|\Omega\rangle_M$ as a thermal bath (KMS state) at the Unruh temperature T_U:*

$$T_U = \frac{\hbar a}{2\pi k_B c}. \tag{11}$$

Proof. We utilize the results of the BW theorem and the KMS-Modular Equivalence. **1. Modular Hamiltonian**: From Theorem 5.2, the modular Hamiltonian for the vacuum state and the wedge algebra is $K_{mod} = 2\pi K_1$. **2. KMS Condition**: By Theorem 4.5, the vacuum state ω_M satisfies the KMS condition at $\beta_{mod} = 1$ with respect to the modular flow generated by K_{mod}. **3. Physical Hamiltonian**: An observer with constant proper acceleration a follows an orbit of the boost transformation. The physical Hamiltonian H_R generating evolution with respect to the observer's proper time τ is related to the boost generator K_1 by the acceleration a:

$$H_R = \left(\frac{\hbar a}{c}\right) K_1. \tag{12}$$

4. Relating Hamiltonians: We express the modular Hamiltonian in terms of the physical Hamiltonian:

$$K_{mod} = 2\pi K_1 = \left(\frac{2\pi c}{\hbar a}\right) H_R. \tag{13}$$

5. Scaling of KMS States: If a state is KMS at β_1 w.r.t. H_1, it is KMS at $\beta_2 = \lambda\beta_1$ w.r.t. $H_2 = H_1/\lambda$. Applying this with $\lambda = (2\pi c/\hbar a)$: The state ω_M is KMS with respect to H_R at the rescaled inverse temperature β_U:

$$\beta_U = \beta_{mod} \cdot \left(\frac{2\pi c}{\hbar a}\right) = \frac{2\pi c}{\hbar a}. \tag{14}$$

6. Unruh Temperature: The corresponding temperature is $T_U = 1/(k_B\beta_U) = \hbar a/(2\pi k_B c)$. □

The Unruh effect establishes that acceleration, a kinematic property resulting from localization relative to an inertial frame, necessarily induces a thermal state.

6 The Kinematics of Mass and Intrinsic Thermal States

We now demonstrate that the connection between localization, acceleration, and temperature is inherent to the existence of mass itself. The concept of rest mass implies an intrinsic acceleration and, consequently, an intrinsic thermal state. This is realized kinematically through Zitterbewegung (ZBW).

6.1 Zitterbewegung (ZBW) Formalism

The Zitterbewegung phenomenon [10] reveals that the instantaneous motion of a relativistic fermion is light-like. The observed rest mass emerges from the localization and time-averaging of this intrinsic light-like dynamic. This formalism is developed using Spacetime Algebra (STA) [11, 24].

Definition 6.1 (Dirac Hamiltonian)**.** The Hamiltonian for a relativistic fermion of mass m is $H_D = c\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{p} + \beta mc^2$.

Proposition 6.2 (Instantaneous Light-Like Velocity)**.** *The velocity operator derived from the Dirac Hamiltonian has eigenvalues* $\pm c$*.*

Proof. In the Heisenberg picture, the velocity operator is $\hat{\mathbf{v}}(t) = \frac{d\hat{\mathbf{x}}}{dt} = \frac{i}{\hbar}[H_D, \hat{\mathbf{x}}]$. Evaluating the commutator:

$$[H_D, x^k] = [c\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{p}, x^k] = -i\hbar c\alpha^k. \tag{15}$$

Thus, $\hat{v}^k(t) = c\alpha^k$. Since $(\alpha^k)^2 = I$, the eigenvalues are $\pm c$. □

Proposition 6.3 (Zitterbewegung Oscillation)**.** *The velocity operator undergoes rapid oscillation (ZBW) with a characteristic frequency* ω_{ZBW}*.*

Proof. The time evolution of the velocity operator is:

$$\frac{d\boldsymbol{\alpha}}{dt} = \frac{i}{\hbar}[H_D, \boldsymbol{\alpha}] = \frac{2i}{\hbar}(c\mathbf{p} - H_D\boldsymbol{\alpha}). \tag{16}$$

The solution for a free particle involves an oscillatory term $e^{-2iH_Dt/\hbar}$. In the rest frame ($\mathbf{p} = 0, H_D = mc^2$), the angular frequency is:

$$\omega_{ZBW} = \frac{2mc^2}{\hbar}. \tag{17}$$

□

6.2 Maximal Proper Acceleration (MPA) and Intrinsic Temperature

The ZBW represents an intrinsic circulatory motion localized within a scale defined by the Compton wavelength. We analyze the acceleration required to maintain this localization.

Definition 6.4 (Zitterbewegung Radius)**.** The spatial localization scale of the ZBW is the Zitterbewegung radius R_{ZBW}:

$$R_{ZBW} = \frac{c}{\omega_{ZBW}} = \frac{\hbar}{2mc} = \frac{1}{2}\lambda_C. \tag{18}$$

We derive the concept of Maximal Proper Acceleration (MPA) [25] directly from the ZBW kinematics.

Theorem 6.5 (Derivation of A_{max} (Mass-Acceleration Equivalence))**.** *The Maximal Proper Acceleration* A_{max} *is realized by the centripetal acceleration required to localize the light-like dynamics at the Zitterbewegung scale* R_{ZBW}*.*

$$A_{max} = \frac{2mc^3}{\hbar}. \tag{19}$$

Proof. We model the dynamics by a centripetal acceleration $a = v^2/R$. We impose the kinematic constraints derived from the ZBW formalism: $v = c$ (Proposition 6.2) and $R = R_{ZBW}$ (Definition 6.4).

$$A_{max} := \frac{c^2}{R_{ZBW}} = \frac{c^2}{\hbar/(2mc)} = \frac{2mc^3}{\hbar}. \tag{20}$$

□

This theorem establishes a equivalence: the existence of rest mass m implies an intrinsic acceleration scale A_{max}.

Theorem 6.6 (Intrinsic Temperature of Mass)**.** *The configuration defined by the intrinsic acceleration A_{max} corresponds to a local thermal state characterized by the temperature T_{max}, realized via the Unruh effect.*

$$k_B T_{max} = \frac{mc^2}{\pi}. \tag{21}$$

Proof. We apply the Unruh effect formula (Theorem 5.3) to the intrinsic acceleration A_{max}:

$$T_{max} = T_U(A_{max}) = \frac{\hbar A_{max}}{2\pi k_B c}. \tag{22}$$

Substituting the expression for A_{max} (Eq. 19):

$$T_{max} = \frac{\hbar}{2\pi k_B c}\left(\frac{2mc^3}{\hbar}\right) = \frac{mc^2}{\pi k_B}. \tag{23}$$

□

The ZBW formalism demonstrates that massive particles are inherently dynamic systems characterized by intrinsic acceleration and an associated thermal horizon. This provides a concrete, kinematic realization of the connection between mass, localization, and temperature.

7 The Principle of Thermal Localization

We now synthesize the results of the preceding sections—the algebraic structure of QFT, the nature of thermal time, the geometry of acceleration, and the kinematics of mass—to establish a universal principle: localization necessarily implies a thermal state.

7.1 The Synthesis of Principles

The argument relies on the conjunction of the established axioms and theorems.

Theorem 7.1 (The Universal Thermal Nature of Localized States)**.** *Any localized state (subsystem) within the universe, characterized by non-zero energy-momentum, is necessarily perceived as a thermal state with a non-zero temperature ($T > 0$) from the perspective of an observer localized within or interacting with that state.*

Proof. We present the proof through the convergence of complementary chains of reasoning.

Chain 1: Algebraic Structure and Entanglement (AQFT, ETH, TTH)

1. **Observation is Localization**: The act of observation requires the localization of the system relative to an observer (Theorem 3.1).

2. **Localization implies Entanglement**: By the Reeh-Schlieder theorem (Theorem 2.2), a localized subsystem $\mathcal{O}$ is necessarily entangled with its environment $\mathcal{O}'$.

3. **Algebraic Thermalization (KMS Condition)**: The restriction of the global state to the local algebra $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O})$ (a Type III_1 factor) satisfies the KMS condition with respect to the modular flow (Theorem 4.5). This is the algebraic definition of a thermal state.

4. **Physical Thermalization (ETH/TTH)**: The Eigenstate Thermalization Hypothesis (Axiom 1.4) provides the physical mechanism, ensuring the reduced density matrix $\rho_{\mathcal{O}}$ is locally thermal (Proposition 4.7). The Thermal Time Hypothesis (Axiom 1.5) identifies the physical time flow with the modular flow, scaled by the temperature T associated with this KMS state (Theorem 4.8).

Chain 2: Kinematics and the Equivalence Principle (EP, Unruh, ZBW)

1. **Localization implies Energy**: Any non-trivial localized state possesses non-zero local energy-momentum ($E_{\mathcal{O}} > 0$) relative to the vacuum (Spectrum Condition, Axiom **A4.**).
2. **Energy implies Acceleration (Equivalence Principle)**: By the Equivalence Principle (Axiom 1.3), the presence of energy-momentum is locally indistinguishable from acceleration ($a > 0$).
3. **Mass implies Acceleration (ZBW)**: Furthermore, as demonstrated in Section 6 (Theorem 6.5), the existence of mass m intrinsically implies an acceleration A_{max} associated with the Zitterbewegung dynamics.
4. **Acceleration implies Temperature (Unruh Effect)**: By the Unruh effect (Theorem 5.3), any accelerated frame perceives a thermal bath at $T_U \propto a$. Since $a > 0$, the temperature is strictly positive, $T_U > 0$.

Conclusion: The convergence of these arguments establishes that the physical act of localization (and thus observation) is intrinsically and universally linked to the emergence of thermal properties. To be a localized observer or observable is to exist in a state that is, from that localized perspective, fundamentally thermal, $T > 0$. □

7.2 Symmetry of Observation

The relationship between the observer and the observed is symmetric, consistent with RQM (Axiom 1.2).

Theorem 7.2 (Symmetry of Thermal Observation)**.** *If observer A perceives system B as a thermal state, then system B perceives observer A as a thermal state.*

Proof. This follows from the structure of Tomita-Takesaki theory. The localization defines a partitioning into the algebra $\mathcal{M}_A$ and its commutant $\mathcal{M}'_A$ (which contains $\mathcal{M}_B$). The modular conjugation J implements the duality $J\mathcal{M}_A J = \mathcal{M}'_A$ (Theorem 4.2). The action of J swaps the roles of the system and the environment. If the state restricted to $\mathcal{M}_A$ is KMS (thermal), the state restricted to $\mathcal{M}'_A$ is also KMS with respect to the conjugate modular flow. □

8 The Global State and the Trivial Thermal Limit

Having established the Principle of Thermal Localization—that any localized subsystem is necessarily thermal—we now apply this principle to the universe considered as a whole system.

8.1 The Non-Locality of the Global State

We define the global state as the state encompassing all degrees of freedom in the universe.

Definition 8.1 (Global State)**.** The Global State $|\Psi_{Global}\rangle$ is the state associated with the global algebra $\mathcal{M}$ of the entire universe $\mathcal{U}$. It represents the totality of all correlated systems.

Lemma 8.2 (Non-Locality of the Global State)**.** *The Global State is inherently non-local.*

Proof. By definition, the universe $\mathcal{U}$ is not a subsystem of any larger system. It has no external environment and thus lacks the relational context required for localization. Localization requires partitioning the system relative to an external observer (Theorem 3.1). Since no such external observer exists for the global state, it cannot be localized. □

8.2 The Athermal Nature of the Totality

We now derive the necessary thermal properties of the global state by extremizing the Principle of Thermal Localization.

Theorem 8.3 (The Athermal Global State Theorem)**.** *The global state of the universe must correspond to the trivial thermal limit, characterized by zero temperature ($T_{global} = 0$).*

Proof. We present the argument by contradiction.

1. Premise (Proven): Any localized state is necessarily a thermal state with $T > 0$. (Theorem 7.1).

2. Hypothesis (to be falsified): Assume the global state of the universe is a thermal state with $T_{global} > 0$.

3. Contradiction: If $T_{global} > 0$, then by the Premise (Theorem 7.1), the global state must be a localized state. This implies the "global state" would have to be a subsystem of a larger system, localized relative to an external observer. This directly contradicts the definition of the global state as the totality (Definition 8.1 and Lemma 8.2).

4. Conclusion (Q.E.D.): The only self-consistent thermal state for the non-localized universe as a whole is the trivial state, $T_{global} = 0$. □

Remark 8.1*.* This result aligns with the intuition that temperature is a measure of correlation between a system and its environment (as formalized by the modular flow). The universe, having no environment, cannot have a temperature.

9 The Necessity of Zero Total Energy

The established fact that the global state must have zero temperature has immediate and physical consequences when interpreted through the lens of the Equivalence Principle and the Unruh effect.

9.1 Derivation of Zero Energy

We derive the central thesis of the "Universe from Nothing" proposal directly from the Athermal Global State Theorem.

Theorem 9.1 (Zero Total Energy Theorem)**.** *The total energy-momentum of the universe must be exactly zero ($E_{total} = 0$).*

Proof. We utilize the chain of equivalences established between temperature, acceleration, and energy.

1. Zero Global Temperature: The global state has $T_{global} = 0$ (Theorem 8.3).

2. Zero Net Acceleration: We apply the Unruh relation (Theorem 5.3), $T = \hbar a/(2\pi k_B c)$. This relation arises because temperature characterizes the modular flow, which corresponds to the physical time flow generated by the local Hamiltonian (boost generator in an accelerated frame). The condition $T_{global} = 0$ implies that the net acceleration associated with the global spacetime manifold is zero, $a_{net} = 0$. The universe as a whole must be in an inertial state.

3. Zero Net Gravitational Mass: We invoke the Equivalence Principle (Axiom 1.3). Zero net acceleration is locally indistinguishable from zero net gravitational field. Therefore, the total effective gravitational mass of the universe must be zero, $M_{total} = 0$.

4. Zero Total Energy: By mass-energy equivalence, the total energy content of the universe is $E_{total} = M_{total}c^2 = 0$. □

9.2 Interpretation and Cosmological Context

The Zero Total Energy Theorem provides a foundation for the ”Universe from Nothing” thesis. It demonstrates that the cancellation between positive energy components (matter, radiation) and negative gravitational potential energy is a necessary consequence of the structure of QFT and the nature of observation.

9.2.1 Defining Energy in General Relativity

It is crucial to clarify the meaning of ”total energy” in General Relativity (GR). While energy definition in GR is subtle, the argument presented here relies on the local equivalence between energy and acceleration (via the EP) and the global implications derived from the thermal nature of the quantum state.

If we assume the universe is spatially closed (compact without boundary), the definition of total energy is unambiguous. In the Hamiltonian formulation of GR (ADM formalism), the total Hamiltonian constraint $\mathcal{H}$ must vanish on physical states. For a closed universe, the boundary terms that typically define energy vanish identically, implying the total energy is zero [26]. Our derivation provides an independent, QFT-based proof of this condition, derived from the properties of the global quantum state.

10 The Elimination of Global Symmetries

The Zero Total Energy Theorem provides a powerful constraint not only on the energy content of the universe but also on the allowed symmetries of the physical laws. It leads directly to the ”No Global Symmetries” principle, a central conjecture in quantum gravity [12].

10.1 Global Symmetries and Conserved Charges

A global symmetry implies, via Noether’s theorem, the existence of a conserved current J^μ and a corresponding conserved charge Q.

10.2 Proof of the No Global Symmetries Conjecture

We demonstrate that the existence of any non-zero conserved global charge is incompatible with the Zero Total Energy Theorem.

Theorem 10.1 (No Global Symmetries Theorem)**.** *The theory of the universe cannot possess any exact global symmetries.*

Proof. We proceed by contradiction.

1. Assumption: Assume there exists an exact continuous global symmetry group G.

2. Consequence of Symmetry: By Noether’s theorem, this symmetry implies the existence of a conserved global charge Q.

3. Charge Contribution to Energy: If the universe possessed a non-zero net conserved global charge ($Q \neq 0$), this charge distribution would necessarily contribute to the universe’s total stress-energy tensor $T_{\mu\nu}$. A non-zero net charge implies a non-zero total energy, $E_{total} \neq 0$.

4. Contradiction: This contradicts the Zero Total Energy Theorem (Theorem 9.1), which proved that $E_{total} = 0$ is a necessary condition for a consistent global state derived from the principles of locality and observation.

5. Conclusion: The initial assumption must be false. No exact continuous global symmetries can exist. □

Remark 10.1. This implies that all apparent global symmetries in low-energy physics (like baryon number) must be either gauged (local) or accidental (approximate and broken at high energies).

10.3 Connection to the Cobordism Conjecture

The absence of global symmetries is intimately related to the Cobordism Conjecture in quantum gravity [27].

Conjecture 10.2 (Cobordism Conjecture)**.** The cobordism group of the gravitational theory is trivial: $\Omega^{QG} = 0$.

This conjecture posits that all consistent theories of quantum gravity can transition to the ”nothing” state. A conserved charge would represent a topological obstruction preventing this transition. The proof presented in Theorem 10.1 provides the underlying physical justification: The universe must be structured such that its global state is equivalent to ”nothing” ($E_{total} = 0, T = 0$) because any other state would imply it is a localized subsystem rather than the totality.

11 Conclusion: The Mathematical Inevitability of the Trivial State

This monograph has presented a proof demonstrating that the universe must possess zero total energy. This proof is derived from the principles governing observation, locality, and the nature of time within Quantum Field Theory and General Relativity.

The synthesis of AQFT, RQM, TTH, ETH, and the Equivalence Principle leads inexorably to the Principle of Thermal Localization: any localized observation defines a thermal state ($T > 0$). By applying this principle to the totality of the universe—the global state—we conclude that it must be non-local and therefore characterized by zero temperature ($T_{global} = 0$), which mandates zero total energy ($E_{total} = 0$).

This result provides a robust theoretical foundation for the ”Universe from Nothing” thesis and simultaneously proves the ”No Global Symmetries” conjecture. The arguments presented herein establish that the emergence of ”something” (a complex, locally non-trivial universe) is mathematically consistent only if the global structure is equivalent to ”nothing” (a trivial, zero-energy state). This equivalence is a necessary consequence of the structure of a self-consistent physical reality capable of observation.

References

[1] Lawrence M. Krauss. *A Universe from Nothing: Why There Is Something Rather Than Nothing*. Free Press, 2012.

[2] Alexander Vilenkin. "Creation of Universes from Nothing". In: *Phys. Lett. B* 117 (1982), pp. 25–28.

[3] J. B. Hartle and S. W. Hawking. "Wave function of the Universe". In: *Phys. Rev. D* 28 (1983), pp. 2960–2975.

[4] Rudolf Haag. *Local Quantum Physics: Fields, Particles, Algebras*. Springer-Verlag, 1996.

[5] Carlo Rovelli. "Relational Quantum Mechanics". In: *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* 35.8 (1996), pp. 1637–1678. eprint: `quant-ph/9609002`.

[6] A. Connes and C. Rovelli. "Von Neumann algebra automorphisms and time-thermodynamics relation in general covariant quantum theories". In: *Class. Quant. Grav.* 11 (1994), p. 2899. eprint: `gr-qc/9406019`.

[7] Mark Srednicki. "Chaos and quantum thermalization". In: *Phys. Rev. E* 50 (1994), p. 888. eprint: `cond-mat/9403051`.

[8] Joseph J. Bisognano and Eyvind H. Wichmann. "On the duality condition for a Hermitian scalar field". In: *J. Math. Phys.* 16 (1975), p. 985.

[9] W. G. Unruh. "Notes on black-hole evaporation". In: *Phys. Rev. D* 14 (1976), p. 870.

[10] E. Schrödinger. "Über die kräftefreie Bewegung in der relativistischen Quantenmechanik". In: *Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad. Wiss. Phys.-Math. Kl.* 24 (1930), pp. 418–428.

[11] David Hestenes. "The Zitterbewegung interpretation of quantum mechanics". In: *Found. Phys.* 20 (1990), pp. 1213–1232.

[12] Tom Banks and Nathan Seiberg. "Holographic Space-time and the Hypothesis of No Global Symmetries". In: *Phys. Rev. D* 83 (2011), p. 084019. eprint: `1011.5120`.

[13] H. Reeh and S. Schlieder. "Bemerkungen zur Unitäräquivalenz von Lorentzinvarianten Feldern". In: *Il Nuovo Cimento* 22.5 (1961), pp. 1051–1068.

[14] R. F. Streater and A. S. Wightman. *PCT, Spin and Statistics, and All That*. Benjamin, 1964.

[15] R. E. A. C. Paley and N. Wiener. "Fourier Transforms in the Complex Domain". In: (1934).

[16] Alain Connes. "Une classification des facteurs de type III". In: *Annales scientifiques de l'École Normale Supérieure*. 4th ser. 6.2 (1973), pp. 133–252.

[17] Klaus Fredenhagen. "On the modular structure of local algebras of observables". In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 97 (1985), pp. 79–89.

[18] Masamichi Takesaki. *Theory of Operator Algebras I*. Springer-Verlag, 2003.

[19] Masamichi Takesaki. *Theory of Operator Algebras II*. Springer-Verlag, 2003.

[20] R. Kubo. "Statistical-Mechanical Theory of Irreversible Processes. I." In: *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* 12 (1957), p. 570.

[21] P. C. Martin and J. Schwinger. "Theory of Many-Particle Systems. I". In: *Phys. Rev.* 115 (1959), p. 1342.

[22] J. M. Deutsch. "Quantum statistical mechanics in a closed system". In: *Phys. Rev. A* 43 (1991), p. 2046.

[23] Joseph J. Bisognano and Eyvind H. Wichmann. "On the Duality Condition for Quantum Fields". In: *J. Math. Phys.* 17 (1976), p. 303.

[24] David Hestenes. *New Foundations for Classical Mechanics*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003.

[25] E. R. Caianiello. “Is there a maximal acceleration?” In: *Lettere al Nuovo Cimento* 32.3 (1981), pp. 65–70.

[26] Robert M. Wald. *General Relativity*. University of Chicago Press, 1984.

[27] Jacob McNamara and Cumrun Vafa. “The Cobordism Conjecture and Quantum Gravity”. In: *arXiv preprint* (2020). eprint: 1909.10355.