

# Thermodynamics vs Teleodynamics: A Cosmological Divide?

Oem Trivedi<sup>1\*</sup> and Venkat Venkatasubramanian<sup>2†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN, 37235, USA and*

<sup>2</sup>*Complex Resilient Intelligent Systems Laboratory, Department of Chemical Engineering, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027, U.S.A.*

(Dated: December 5, 2025)

We show that stationary black holes and the evolving universe belong to fundamentally different thermodynamic regimes: black holes obey ordinary Bekenstein–Hawking thermodynamics, whereas cosmology necessarily follows memory-bearing teleodynamics. We show that teleodynamics is not valid for black holes, but is unavoidable in an expanding cosmology. This provides a dynamical, semi-classical realization of the thermodynamic split conjecture and identifies memory accumulation as the natural source of deviations from the area law in cosmology. Our results suggest that quantum gravity should not seek to extrapolate black hole thermodynamics to the universe, but instead must incorporate horizon memory as a fundamental microscopic ingredient and consider cosmological constructions consistent with that.

In a recent work, we showed that the teleodynamic extension of statistical mechanics introduced in [1] can naturally incorporate all the features of modern cosmology. Cosmic Teleodynamics can provide a completely new form of cosmology that explains dark energy, dark matter, and the cosmic tensions by positing a memory-bearing universe. This theory generically emerges when one considers cosmology in terms of teleodynamics [2–5], introducing game-theoretic concepts of agents to cosmological entities such as galaxies, thereby giving us a memory-bearing regime whose correct coarse-grained description has sharp departures from simple thermodynamic descriptions that have been employed for cosmology so far, by taking the liberty of employing Bekenstein–Hawking [6–8] formalism to the cosmological horizon. This raises a deeper question: are teleodynamics and thermodynamics valid in different regimes? We answer this question in this letter and show that the answer is affirmative.

The teleodynamic microscopic ensemble is defined by assigning to each configuration  $x$  an energy functional  $E(x)$  and a bias functional  $\Phi(x)$ , with microscopic weight [1]

$$p(x) = \frac{1}{Z(\beta, \alpha)} \exp[-\beta E(x) - \alpha \Phi(x)] \quad (1)$$

where  $\beta$  is the usual inverse temperature parameter,  $\alpha$  controls the strength of teleodynamic bias and  $Z(\beta, \alpha)$  is the generalized partition function [3, 4]

$$Z(\beta, \alpha) = \sum_x \exp[-\beta E(x) - \alpha \Phi(x)] \quad (2)$$

For histories  $\Gamma = \{x(t), p(t)\}$ , the maximum-caliber ensemble takes the form [1]

$$P[\Gamma] \propto \exp[-\beta A[\Gamma] - \alpha K[\Gamma]] \quad (3)$$

where  $A[\Gamma]$  is the standard action and  $K[\Gamma]$  is a bias functional encoding memory and environmental dependence, and for collisionless tracers of mass  $m$  in an expanding universe with scale factor  $a(t)$  and Newtonian potential  $\Psi(x, t)$ , one may take

$$A[\Gamma] = \int dt \left[ \frac{p^2(t)}{2a^2(t)m} + m \Psi(x(t), t) \right] \quad (4)$$

and

$$K[\Gamma] = \int \Phi(x(t), p(t); f(t, x, p), E(t, x)) dt \quad (5)$$

with  $f(t, x, p)$  being the phase-space distribution and  $E(t, x)$  coarse environmental fields.

Ordinary thermodynamics is recovered in a limit here, whenever the teleodynamic bias is effectively constant over the relevant sector. If  $\Phi(x) = \Phi_0$  for all microstates  $x$  contributing to a given macroscopic configuration, then Eq. (1) becomes

$$p(x) \propto e^{-\beta E(x) - \alpha \Phi_0} = e^{-\alpha \Phi_0} e^{-\beta E(x)} \quad (6)$$

and the constant factor  $e^{-\alpha \Phi_0}$  cancels in the normalized ensemble, giving us

$$p(x) = \frac{e^{-\beta E(x)}}{\sum_{x'} e^{-\beta E(x')}} \quad (7)$$

Similarly, if  $K[\Gamma] = T_{\text{obs}} \Phi_0$  is constant along the histories of interest, then we see that Eq. (3) reduces to

$$P[\Gamma] \propto e^{-\alpha T_{\text{obs}} \Phi_0} e^{-\beta A[\Gamma]} \quad (8)$$

and the path ensemble is again purely thermodynamic after normalization.

So, what would be the regimes where the teleodynamic bias ends up being effectively constant? Stationary black hole spacetimes provide precisely such a regime. Let  $(\mathcal{M}, g_{\mu\nu})$  be a stationary black hole with a time-like Killing vector  $\xi^\mu$  outside the horizon, where the existence

\* oem.trivedi@vanderbilt.edu

† venkat@columbia.edu

of  $\xi^\mu$  implies a conserved Hamiltonian  $H_K$  and a canonical ensemble

$$Z_{\text{BH}}(\beta) = \text{Tr } e^{-\beta H_K} \quad (9)$$

with microstate weights  $p_i \propto e^{-\beta E_i}$ . Here, the teleodynamic bias is a function of conserved charges only, for instance

$$\Phi_i = \Phi(E_i, J_i, Q_i) = \Phi(M, J, Q) \equiv \Phi_0 \quad (10)$$

for microstates that share the same macroscopic mass  $M$ , angular momentum  $J$ , and charge  $Q$ , Eq. (1) reduces to Eq. (7). At the level of histories, orbits of  $\xi^\mu$  and their perturbations admit no secular memory accumulation so that the integrand of Eq. (5) is effectively constant and  $K[\Gamma]$  contributes only a normalization. In this stationary Killing horizon regime, teleodynamics reduces to ordinary thermodynamics, and so we see that the Bekenstein–Hawking entropy and its string-theoretic microstate derivations [9–12] are recovered unchanged.

Let us make this discussion more explicit, and consider that  $\xi^\mu$  is a timelike Killing vector generating stationarity outside the horizon, so that  $\mathcal{L}_\xi g_{\mu\nu} = 0$ . Along an orbit of  $\xi^\mu$ , a phase space point  $(x^\mu(\tau), p_\mu(\tau))$  evolves according to

$$\frac{dx^\mu}{d\tau} = \xi^\mu(x(\tau)), \quad \frac{dp_\mu}{d\tau} = \mathcal{F}_\mu(x(\tau), p(\tau)) \quad (11)$$

where  $\tau$  is a parameter adapted to the Killing flow and  $\mathcal{F}_\mu$  encodes the usual Hamiltonian evolution, and so here in the stationary black hole regime, the relevant coarse-grained fields  $f$  and  $E$  entering the bias functional satisfy

$$\mathcal{L}_\xi f = 0, \quad \mathcal{L}_\xi E = 0 \quad (12)$$

That is, they are invariant under the Killing flow. Note that the bias density  $\Phi(x, p; f, E)$  is constructed from  $f$ ,  $E$ , and local geometric invariants, so Killing invariance implies

$$\mathcal{L}_\xi \Phi = \xi^\mu \nabla_\mu \Phi = 0 \quad (13)$$

This, in turn, ends up giving us

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} \Phi(x(\tau), p(\tau); f, E) = \xi^\mu \nabla_\mu \Phi = 0 \quad (14)$$

Therefore, along any orbit of  $\xi^\mu$  one has

$$\Phi(x(\tau), p(\tau); f, E) = \Phi_0 \quad (15)$$

This is a constant that depends only on the conserved macroscopic charges of the black hole, not on the microscopic details of its trajectory. The bias functional is then given as

$$K[\Gamma] = \int_{\tau_i}^{\tau_f} d\tau \Phi(x(\tau), p(\tau); f, E) = \Phi_0 (\tau_f - \tau_i) \quad (16)$$

For an observation time  $T_{\text{obs}} = \tau_f - \tau_i$ , this gives us the following

$$K[\Gamma] = \Phi_0 T_{\text{obs}} \quad (17)$$

which is independent of the detailed history  $\Gamma$  as long as one remains in the stationary sector. The teleodynamic weight for histories then becomes

$$P[\Gamma] \propto \exp[-\beta A[\Gamma] - \alpha \Phi_0 T_{\text{obs}}] = e^{-\alpha \Phi_0 T_{\text{obs}}} e^{-\beta A[\Gamma]} \quad (18)$$

so that all histories in the stationary sector acquire the same multiplicative factor  $e^{-\alpha \Phi_0 T_{\text{obs}}}$ . After normalization, this factor will cancel out, and the normalized path probability reduces to

$$P[\Gamma] = \frac{e^{-\beta A[\Gamma]}}{\int \mathcal{D}\Gamma' e^{-\beta A[\Gamma']}} \quad (19)$$

which is exactly the standard thermodynamic path ensemble. We can also reach the same conclusion at the level of the partition function, where the teleodynamic partition function factorizes as

$$Z(\beta, \alpha) = \sum_{\Gamma} \exp[-\beta A[\Gamma] - \alpha K[\Gamma]] = e^{-\alpha \Phi_0 T_{\text{obs}}} \sum_{\Gamma} e^{-\beta A[\Gamma]} = e^{-\alpha \Phi_0 T_{\text{obs}}} Z_{\text{BH}}(\beta) \quad (20)$$

where  $Z_{\text{BH}}(\beta)$  is the usual black hole partition function, and the free energy and entropy also follow as

$$F(\beta, \alpha) = -\frac{1}{\beta} \ln Z(\beta, \alpha) = -\frac{1}{\beta} \ln Z_{\text{BH}}(\beta) + \frac{\alpha \Phi_0 T_{\text{obs}}}{\beta}, \quad (21)$$

$$S(\beta, \alpha) = \left(1 - \beta \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta}\right) \ln Z(\beta, \alpha) = \left(1 - \beta \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta}\right) \ln Z_{\text{BH}}(\beta) \quad (22)$$

since the additive term  $\alpha \Phi_0 T_{\text{obs}}$  is independent of  $\beta$ . Thus, what we see is that the macroscopic entropy and all related thermodynamic quantities coincide with those obtained from  $Z_{\text{BH}}(\beta)$  alone. In particular, the Bekenstein–Hawking entropy and its string-theoretic microstate derivations are unchanged by the teleodynamic factor in the stationary Killing-horizon regime, confirming that teleodynamics reduces to ordinary thermodynamics in this limit.

Cosmology, by contrast, is intrinsically time-dependent and non-equilibrium, as for a spatially flat FLRW universe with scale factor  $a(t)$  and Hubble rate  $H(t) = \dot{a}/a$ , there is no global timelike Killing vector and the large-scale matter distribution develops a nontrivial cosmic web of filaments, walls, and voids. In this setting, the teleodynamic bias must be decomposed as

$$\Phi(t, x) = \bar{\Phi}(t) + \varphi(t, x) \quad (23)$$

with  $\bar{\Phi}(t)$  the spatial average and  $\varphi(t, x)$  the fluctuation. As established in [1], the homogeneous part gives rise to an effective teleodynamic energy density

$$\rho_{\text{TD}}(t) = \alpha \bar{\Phi}(t) \quad (24)$$

leading to a modified Friedmann equation

$$3M_P^2 H^2(t) = \rho(t) + \rho_{\text{TD}}(t) \quad (25)$$

where  $\rho(t)$  denotes the usual matter and radiation energy density. The associated pressure  $p_{\text{TD}}(t)$  is obtained from the time dependence of  $\bar{\Phi}(t)$  and produces an effective equation of state  $w_{\text{TD}}(t) = p_{\text{TD}}(t)/\rho_{\text{TD}}(t)$  that can mimic a cosmological constant-like, quintessence-like, or phantom-like behavior depending on the evolution of  $\bar{\Phi}(t)$ .

The inhomogeneous part  $\varphi(t, x)$  modifies the Boltzmann and Poisson equations. The teleodynamic Boltzmann equation for the distribution function  $f(t, x, p)$  in comoving coordinates reads [1]

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} + \frac{p}{a^2 m} \cdot \nabla_x f - (\nabla_x \Psi + \alpha \nabla_x \Phi) \cdot \nabla_p f - H p \cdot \nabla_p f = 0 \quad (26)$$

with  $\Psi(t, x)$  the Newtonian potential, and the teleodynamic term introduces an additional drift  $-\alpha \nabla_x \Phi$ , corresponding to an effective potential

$$\Psi_{\text{eff}}(t, x) = \Psi(t, x) + \alpha \varphi(t, x) \quad (27)$$

since  $\bar{\Phi}(t)$  does not contribute to spatial gradients, and the Poisson equation becomes

$$\nabla^2 \Psi_{\text{eff}}(t, x) = 4\pi G a^2(t) [\bar{\rho}(t) \delta(t, x) + \rho_{\text{TD}}(t, x)] \quad (28)$$

with

$$\nabla^2 \Psi(t, x) = 4\pi G a^2(t) \bar{\rho}(t) \delta(t, x) \quad (29)$$

and

$$\rho_{\text{TD}}(t, x) = \frac{\alpha}{4\pi G a^2(t)} \nabla^2 \varphi(t, x) \quad (30)$$

In Fourier space, one can posit a teleodynamic response kernel  $K(k, a)$  such that

$$\varphi_k(a) = K(k, a) \delta_k(a) \quad (31)$$

which gives us the emergent clustering density

$$\rho_{\text{TD}}(k, a) = \Delta\mu(k, a) \bar{\rho}(a) \delta_k(a) \quad (32)$$

with

$$\Delta\mu(k, a) = \frac{\alpha K(k, a)}{4\pi G a^2} \quad (33)$$

The linear growth equation for the density contrast then takes the form

$$\ddot{\delta}_k + 2H\dot{\delta}_k - 4\pi G \bar{\rho} [1 + \Delta\mu(k, a)] \delta_k = 0 \quad (34)$$

Equations (25) and (34) express the central teleodynamic fact that the same functional  $\Phi(t, x)$ , through its homogeneous and inhomogeneous parts, drives both an effective dark energy sector and a scale-dependent modification of clustering. In a universe with evolving large-scale structure, correlators and tidal fields,  $\bar{\Phi}(t)$  and  $\varphi(t, x)$  cannot be treated as constants. The teleodynamic corrections are therefore unavoidable, in sharp contrast to the stationary black hole case, where  $\Phi$  may consistently be taken as constant over the relevant ensemble.

Horizon thermodynamics can make this distinction even more transparent. For that, consider the apparent horizon of radius  $r_H(t) = H^{-1}(t)$  in a spatially flat FLRW universe. Following [1], we model the horizon as composed of  $N(H)$  coarse-grained cells of correlation length  $\ell_\chi$ , so that

$$N(H) = \frac{A}{\ell_\chi^2} = \frac{4\pi}{\ell_\chi^2 H^2} \quad (35)$$

where  $A = 4\pi r_H^2 = 4\pi H^{-2}$  is the horizon area and if each cell carries an entropy  $s_{\text{cell}}$ , the geometric teleodynamic entropy is

$$S_{\text{geom}}(H) = N(H) s_{\text{cell}} = \frac{4\pi s_{\text{cell}}}{\ell_\chi^2} \frac{1}{H^2} \equiv \frac{C_{\text{TD}}}{H^2} \quad (36)$$

with

$$C_{\text{TD}} = \frac{4\pi s_{\text{cell}}}{\ell_\chi^2} \quad (37)$$

In a non-equilibrium teleodynamic setting there is in addition a history-dependent entropy production term, so that the total teleodynamic horizon entropy is

$$S_{\text{TD}}(t) = \frac{C_{\text{TD}}(t)}{H^2(t)} + \int^t \sigma_{\text{TD}}(t') dt' \quad (38)$$

where  $\sigma_{\text{TD}}(t) \geq 0$  is the entropy production rate associated with teleodynamic memory and fluxes. The Misner–Sharp energy inside the Hubble sphere is

$$E_H(t) = \rho_{\text{eff}}(t) V_H(t), \quad (39)$$

with  $V_H(t) = \frac{4\pi}{3} r_H^3 = \frac{4\pi}{3} H^{-3}$  and  $\rho_{\text{eff}}(t) = 3M_P^2 H^2(t)$  and this gives

$$E_H(t) = \frac{4\pi}{3} H^{-3}(t) (3M_P^2 H^2(t)) = 4\pi M_P^2 \frac{1}{H(t)}, \quad (40)$$

and hence

$$\frac{dE_H}{dH} = -\frac{4\pi M_P^2}{H^2} \quad (41)$$

Differentiating Eq. (38) with respect to time yields

$$\dot{S}_{\text{TD}} = -\frac{2C_{\text{TD}}\dot{H}}{H^3} + \frac{\dot{C}_{\text{TD}}}{H^2} + \sigma_{\text{TD}}(t) \quad (42)$$

The teleodynamic temperature is defined as

$$T_{\text{TD}}^{-1} = \frac{\partial S_{\text{TD}}}{\partial E_H} = \frac{dS_{\text{TD}}/dH}{dE_H/dH} \quad (43)$$

For slowly varying  $C_{\text{TD}}$  and neglecting the explicit  $H$  dependence of the integral term in Eq. (38), one finds

$$\frac{dS_{\text{TD}}}{dH} \simeq -\frac{2C_{\text{TD}}}{H^3} \quad (44)$$

and combining this with Equation (41) gives

$$\frac{\partial S_{\text{TD}}}{\partial E_H} \simeq \frac{C_{\text{TD}}}{2\pi M_P^2} \frac{1}{H} \quad (45)$$

This gives us

$$T_{\text{TD}}(H) \simeq \frac{2\pi M_P^2}{C_{\text{TD}}} H \quad (46)$$

For the special calibration  $C_{\text{TD}} = 8\pi^2 M_P^2$  Eq. (46) reduces to  $T_{\text{TD}} = H/(2\pi)$ , reproducing the Gibbons–Hawking temperature.

To obtain the dynamical content, we impose a Clausius-type relation on the apparent horizon,

$$\dot{Q} = T_{\text{TD}} \dot{S}_{\text{TD}} \quad (47)$$

with a flux

$$\dot{Q} = -\frac{4\pi}{H^2}(\rho_{\text{eff}} + p_{\text{eff}}), \quad (48)$$

where  $\rho_{\text{eff}}$  and  $p_{\text{eff}}$  include both conventional and teleodynamic contributions, and then, substituting Eqs. (46) and (42) into Eq. (47) and using Eq. (48), one finds

$$-\frac{4\pi}{H^2}(\rho_{\text{eff}} + p_{\text{eff}}) = \frac{2\pi M_P^2}{C_{\text{TD}}} H \left( -\frac{2C_{\text{TD}}\dot{H}}{H^3} + \frac{\dot{C}_{\text{TD}}}{H^2} + \sigma_{\text{TD}} \right) \quad (49)$$

This simplifies to

$$-(\rho_{\text{eff}} + p_{\text{eff}}) = M_P^2 \left( -2\dot{H} + H \frac{\dot{C}_{\text{TD}}}{C_{\text{TD}}} + H^3 \frac{\sigma_{\text{TD}}}{C_{\text{TD}}} \right) \quad (50)$$

This can equivalently be

$$\dot{H} = -\frac{\rho_{\text{eff}} + p_{\text{eff}}}{2M_P^2} + \frac{H}{2} \frac{\dot{C}_{\text{TD}}}{C_{\text{TD}}} + \frac{H^3}{2C_{\text{TD}}} \sigma_{\text{TD}} \quad (51)$$

Equation (51) is the teleodynamic Raychaudhuri equation. In the stationary black hole limit, one expects no net entropy production and a fixed microstate density per correlation area, so that

$$\dot{C}_{\text{TD}} = 0, \quad \sigma_{\text{TD}} = 0 \quad (52)$$

and Eq. (51) reduces to

$$\dot{H} = -\frac{\rho_{\text{eff}} + p_{\text{eff}}}{2M_P^2} \quad (53)$$

This is the usual GR identity that underlies the thermodynamic derivations of Einstein’s equations. With the calibration  $C_{\text{TD}} = 8\pi^2 M_P^2$ , the familiar Gibbons–Hawking entropy and temperature are recovered [13–18]. Stationary black hole thermodynamics, therefore, appears as the equilibrium, constant  $C_{\text{TD}}$ , zero  $\sigma_{\text{TD}}$  limit of teleodynamic horizon thermodynamics.

Cosmology generically lies away from this equilibrium limit as the Hubble rate evolves, correlation lengths, and cell entropies change as large-scale structure forms, and teleodynamic memory accumulates. In this regime,  $\dot{C}_{\text{TD}}$  and  $\sigma_{\text{TD}}$  cannot both vanish without eliminating the very physics responsible for dark energy, clustering modifications, and horizon memory. The teleodynamic corrections in Eq. (51) are thus not optional deformations, but necessary consequences of the non-equilibrium, history-dependent character of the universe.

The combination of Eqs. (25), (34), and (51) establishes a sharp distinction, which is that black holes live in the equilibrium teleodynamic regime where the bias functional is constant and Bekenstein–Hawking thermodynamics is valid, while cosmology inhabits a non-equilibrium regime where the correct coarse-grained theory is teleodynamic. Deviations of cosmological horizon entropy from the black hole area law are then naturally interpreted as teleodynamic memory corrections governed by  $C_{\text{TD}}(t)$  and  $\sigma_{\text{TD}}(t)$ , rather than as ad hoc power-law deformations such as Tsallis or Barrow entropies [19, 20]. If future observations detect departures from Gibbons–Hawking scaling that track the growth of large-scale structure and horizon memory, the simplest explanation will not be a static modification of the area law, but the fact that the universe obeys teleodynamics while black holes obey thermodynamics.

From a quantum gravity perspective, the distinction between black hole thermodynamics and cosmological teleodynamics carries structural significance, as Black hole thermodynamics arises in settings where a Killing horizon provides a stationary environment, allowing a microcanonical sector with well-defined charges  $(M, J, Q)$  and a fixed surface gravity  $\kappa$ . In such a regime, the teleodynamic bias functional reduces to a constant, as shown by  $\mathcal{L}_\xi \Phi = 0$ , so that  $K[\Gamma] = \Phi_0 T_{\text{obs}}$  contributes only a normalization to the path ensemble. This collapse of teleodynamics into ordinary thermodynamics yields the Bekenstein–Hawking law  $S_{\text{BH}} = A/4G$  and also underlies the success of string-theoretic microstate counting, the quantum entropy function, and related constructions. These frameworks succeed precisely because the microscopic Hilbert space organizes into nearly time-independent sectors whose degeneracies are protected by supersymmetry, modular invariance, and conserved charges [21–23]. In this sense, the thermodynamic split conjecture reflects a QG-relevant structural divide - that stationary horizons admit a temperature  $T = \kappa/2\pi$  fixed by Killing symmetry - while cosmological

horizons lack the stationary environment required for such a microstate interpretation.

Cosmology, on the other hand, is inherently non-stationary and memory-bearing in our framework. This semi-classical teleodynamic memory is the simplest possible source of deviations from the standard thermodynamic area law. The horizon entropy  $S_{\text{hor}}(t) \propto H^{-2}(t)$  already evolves because  $\dot{H} \neq 0$ , but the full teleodynamic entropy includes additional non-equilibrium contributions,  $S_{\text{TD}}(t) = C_{\text{TD}}(t)/H^2(t) + \int^t dt' \sigma_{\text{TD}}(t')$ , which any stationary microstate counting cannot reproduce. If the universe exhibits non-vanishing entropy production  $\sigma_{\text{TD}} > 0$  or a time-varying microstate density  $C_{\text{TD}}(t)$  driven by large-scale structure and horizon memory, then any attempt to impose a black hole-like quantum gravity formula  $S = A/4G$  on cosmology misses the fundamental dominant physics. The quantum gravity implication here is clear: instead of extending black hole thermodynamics to cosmology, a successful quantum theory of cosmological horizons must incorporate memory, coarse-graining, and non-equilibrium structure at a fundamental level. The teleodynamic framework shows that the smallest, most “classical” departure from ordinary thermodynamics already generates new cosmological horizon laws. Thus, if one is to consider the notions of both cosmic teleodynamics and thermodynamic split conjecture together, then quantum gravity should seek not to impose black hole formulas on cosmology, but rather to explain how non-equilibrium memory and teleodynamic bias emerge from microscopic gravitational degrees of freedom in an expanding universe.

Also, it should be noted that the “microstate counting”

that appears in the teleodynamic derivation of cosmological horizon entropy (38) is fundamentally different from the quantum microstate counting underlying black hole entropy in string theory [24–30]. Note that teleodynamics counts coarse-grained, time dependent correlation cells  $N_{\text{TD}}(t) = A_{\text{hor}}(t)/\ell_{\chi}^2(t)$  on a dynamical FLRW horizon and incorporates non-equilibrium memory production through  $S_{\text{TD}}(t) = N_{\text{TD}}(t)s_{\text{cell}}(t) + \int^t \sigma_{\text{TD}}(t')dt'$ , whereas string theory counts genuine quantum states in a stationary Hilbert-space sector labeled by fixed charges  $(M, J, Q)$  and protected by supersymmetry, modular invariance, and the presence of a timelike Killing vector. Because the universe possesses no such stationary structure—its  $H(t)$  evolves, its correlation lengths grow, and  $\sigma_{\text{TD}}(t) > 0$  reflects genuine gravitational memory. This also highlights that any future quantum gravity microstate construction capable of describing cosmology cannot reproduce the Bekenstein–Hawking formula as its semiclassical limit. Instead, it must reduce to the teleodynamic entropy. In this sense, the correct quantum gravity “microstates of the universe” would have to encode non-equilibrium horizon memory rather than stationary black hole degeneracy. This points to a profound shift in how quantum gravity should approach cosmological horizons and provides a deep, far-reaching interpretation of the thermodynamic split conjecture as well [31, 32].

*Acknowledgments:* The work of OT is supported in part by the Vanderbilt Discovery Doctoral Fellowship. The authors thank Robert Scherrer, Abraham Loeb, Sunny Vagnozzi, and Sergey Odintsov for their very helpful comments on Cosmological Teleodynamics. VV thanks Julia Velkovska and her colleagues in the Department of Physics and Astronomy at Vanderbilt University for their kind invitation to present the 2025 Wendell G. Holladay Lecture, which resulted in this paper.

- 
- [1] O. Trivedi and V. Venkatsubramanian, Game Theory in Cosmology, (2025), arXiv:2511.20739 [astro-ph.CO].
  - [2] V. Venkatsubramanian, *How Much Inequality Is Fair?: Mathematical Principles of a Moral, Optimal, and Stable Capitalist Society* (Columbia University Press, 2017).
  - [3] V. Venkatasubramanian, A. Sivaram, N. Sanjeevrajan, and A. Sankar, Arbitrage equilibria in active matter systems, *Computers & Chemical Engineering* **192**, 108861 (2025).
  - [4] V. Venkatasubramanian, N. Sanjeevrajan, M. Khandekar, A. Sivaram, and C. Szczepanski, Jaynes machine: The universal microstructure in deep neural networks, *Computers & Chemical Engineering* **192**, 108908 (2025).
  - [5] V. Venkatasubramanian, J. Shi, L. Goldman, E. A. Sankar, and A. Sivaram, Arbitrage equilibrium in scale- and venue-mediated socioeconomic segregation: A behavioral microeconomics framework, *Social Science Research* **132**, 103250 (2025).
  - [6] S. W. Hawking, Black holes in general relativity, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **25**, 152 (1972).
  - [7] J. D. Bekenstein, Black holes and entropy, *Physical Review D* **7**, 2333 (1973).
  - [8] J. D. Bekenstein, Generalized second law of thermodynamics in black-hole physics, *Physical Review D* **9**, 3292 (1974).
  - [9] A. Strominger and C. Vafa, Microscopic origin of the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy, *Phys. Lett. B* **379**, 99 (1996), arXiv:hep-th/9601029.
  - [10] T. Nishioka, S. Ryu, and T. Takayanagi, Holographic Entanglement Entropy: An Overview, *J. Phys. A* **42**, 504008 (2009), arXiv:0905.0932 [hep-th].
  - [11] A. Strominger, Black hole entropy from near horizon microstates, *JHEP* **02**, 009, arXiv:hep-th/9712251.
  - [12] I. Bena and N. P. Warner, Bubbling supertubes and foaming black holes, *Phys. Rev. D* **74**, 066001 (2006), arXiv:hep-th/0505166.
  - [13] G. W. Gibbons and S. W. Hawking, Cosmological Event Horizons, Thermodynamics, and Particle Creation, *Phys.*

- Rev. D **15**, 2738 (1977).
- [14] G. W. Gibbons and S. W. Hawking, Action Integrals and Partition Functions in Quantum Gravity, *Phys. Rev. D* **15**, 2752 (1977).
  - [15] G. W. Gibbons, S. W. Hawking, and M. J. Perry, Path Integrals and the Indefiniteness of the Gravitational Action, *Nucl. Phys. B* **138**, 141 (1978).
  - [16] S. W. Hawking and G. T. Horowitz, The Gravitational Hamiltonian, action, entropy and surface terms, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **13**, 1487 (1996), arXiv:gr-qc/9501014.
  - [17] S. A. Hayward, Unified first law of black hole dynamics and relativistic thermodynamics, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **15**, 3147 (1998), arXiv:gr-qc/9710089.
  - [18] S. A. Hayward, R. Di Criscienzo, L. Vanzo, M. Nadalini, and S. Zerbini, Local Hawking temperature for dynamical black holes, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **26**, 062001 (2009), arXiv:0806.0014 [gr-qc].
  - [19] C. Tsallis and L. J. L. Cirto, Black hole thermodynamical entropy, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **73**, 2487 (2013), arXiv:1202.2154 [cond-mat.stat-mech].
  - [20] J. D. Barrow, The Area of a Rough Black Hole, *Phys. Lett. B* **808**, 135643 (2020), arXiv:2004.09444 [gr-qc].
  - [21] S. Carlip, Black hole entropy from conformal field theory in any dimension, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 2828 (1999), arXiv:hep-th/9812013.
  - [22] S. De Haro, J. van Dongen, M. Visser, and J. Butterfield, Conceptual analysis of black hole entropy in string theory, *Stud. Hist. Phil. Sci. B* **69**, 82 (2020), arXiv:1904.03232 [physics.hist-ph].
  - [23] R. Emparan and G. T. Horowitz, Microstates of a Neutral Black Hole in M Theory, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 141601 (2006), arXiv:hep-th/0607023.
  - [24] D. R. Mayerson and M. Shigemori, Counting D1-D5-P microstates in supergravity, *SciPost Phys.* **10**, 018 (2021), arXiv:2010.04172 [hep-th].
  - [25] A. Sen, NonBPS states and Branes in string theory, in *Advanced School on Supersymmetry in the Theories of Fields, Strings and Branes* (1999) pp. 187–234, arXiv:hep-th/9904207.
  - [26] A. Sen, Logarithmic Corrections to N=2 Black Hole Entropy: An Infrared Window into the Microstates, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **44**, 1207 (2012), arXiv:1108.3842 [hep-th].
  - [27] S. Banerjee, R. K. Gupta, and A. Sen, Logarithmic Corrections to Extremal Black Hole Entropy from Quantum Entropy Function, *JHEP* **03**, 147, arXiv:1005.3044 [hep-th].
  - [28] S. Banerjee, R. K. Gupta, I. Mandal, and A. Sen, Logarithmic Corrections to N=4 and N=8 Black Hole Entropy: A One Loop Test of Quantum Gravity, *JHEP* **11**, 143, arXiv:1106.0080 [hep-th].
  - [29] A. Sen, Logarithmic Corrections to Rotating Extremal Black Hole Entropy in Four and Five Dimensions, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **44**, 1947 (2012), arXiv:1109.3706 [hep-th].
  - [30] A. Dabholkar, J. Gomes, and S. Murthy, Nonperturbative black hole entropy and Kloosterman sums, *JHEP* **03**, 074, arXiv:1404.0033 [hep-th].
  - [31] O. Trivedi, Thermodynamic Split Conjecture and an Observational Test for Cosmological Entropy, (2025), arXiv:2509.13689 [hep-th].
  - [32] O. Trivedi, Cosmological Implications of Thermodynamic Split Conjecture, (2025), arXiv:2510.10441 [gr-qc].