Victoria
UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON
Te Whare Wānanga o te Ūpoko o te Ika a Māui

School of Mathematical and Computing Sciences
Te Kura Pangarau, Rorohiko

Small, dark, and heavy... but is it a black hole ?

Matt Visser

Veli Losinj, Croatia

August 2008





BLACK HOLES IN GENERAL RELATIVITY AND STRING THEORY

24th – 30th August, 2008
Veli Lošinj, Croatia



ACADEMIA SCIENTIARUM ET ARTIUM CROATICA
MDCCCLXI

UNIVERSITAS STUDIORUM ZAGRABIENSIS
MDCLXIX

nzz

UNIADRION
Virtual University of the Adriatic-Ionian Basin

ministryofscienceeducationandsports

Scuola Internazionale Superiore di Studi Avanzati
ma per seguir virtute e conoscenza

UNIVERSITAS DEGLI STUDI DI TRIESTE
www.units.it
Università degli Studi di Trieste
www.units.it Tel. +39-040.558.7111 Piazzale Europa, 1 I-34127 Trieste, ITALIA - P.I. 00211830328

fit
Fondazione Internazionale Trieste
per il Progresso e la Libertà delle Scienze

INFN Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare

Abstract:

Astronomers have certainly seen things that are small, dark, and heavy...

But are these small, dark, heavy objects really black holes in the sense of general relativity **?**

(The consensus opinion is simply "yes", and there is very little "wriggle room".)

In this talk I'll discuss one of the alternatives...

Do alternatives "exist"?

Quark stars, Q-balls, boson-stars?

Gravastars: Mazur-Mottola variants.

Gravastars: Laughlin-et-al variants.

Fuzz-balls: Mathur-et-al variant.

Fuzz-balls: Amati variant.

Vachaspati & Krauss... Hajicek...

Boulware... Marek Abramowicz...

Our proposal:

Fate of gravitational collapse in semiclassical gravity.

Carlos Barcelo, Stefano Liberati,
Sebastiano Sonego, Matt Visser.

e-Print: arXiv:0712.1130 [gr-qc]
Physical Review D77 (2008) 044032

Uncollapsed state:

Star before collapse:

$$G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi \left(T^{c}_{\mu\nu} + \langle C | \widehat{T}_{\mu\nu} | C \rangle \right) \ ,$$

Vacuum polarization effect negligible in an ordinary uncollapsed star...

(This, after all, is why we can get away with just solving the classical Einstein equations most of the time...)

Does this remain true during collapse?

Issues:

Fulling--Sweeny--Wald (no-singularity) theorem:

CMP 63 (1978) 257-264.

Loosely: “Everything in curved-spacetime QFT
is hunky-dory at the event horizon,
and all the way down to either the
singularity or Cauchy horizon...”

Based on showing that the Hadamard form
of the QFT two-point function is not affected
by the presence of an event horizon...

(So for a Hadamard quantum state, everything is fine...)

Issues:

Unfortunately, Fulling--Sweeny--Wald also "begs the question"...

FSW shows that *if* an event horizon forms, then the QFT is well behaved there...

This is *not* the same as showing that an event horizon will naturally form in semiclassical collapse...

Finite <=/=> "small"...

Compact horizonless objects, and/or naked singularities, are also compatible with the FSW theorem.

Our proposal:

Related to questions of the (quantum) vacuum...

*** Boulware vacuum? (singular at any Killing horizon)

Renormalized stress-energy diverges at 2m/r ~ **1**

*** Unruh vacuum? (designed to be well behaved at any future Killing horizon)

Renormalized stress energy finite at future horizon.

Sometimes apparent horizons
(or better yet,
dynamical horizons,
trapping horizons)
are better candidates for
characterizing the black hole.

Spherical symmetry with Schwarzschild coordinates:

$$2m(r,t) / r = \mathbf{1}$$

Collapse picture:

Standard collapse picture:

(Modes “bounce” off the centre...)

(**1+1**) dimensions to keep calculation tractable...



Collapse picture:

Our preferred "symmetric" version...

Modes propagate straight through the centre...

Affine null coordinates:

$$U = p(u)$$



$$U = p(u)$$

Choose modes:

near $\mathscr{I}^-$

$$\varphi_\Omega(r,t) \approx \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{3/2}(2\Omega)^{1/2}\,|r|}\,\mathrm{e}^{-i\Omega U}\ ,$$

near $\mathscr{I}^+$

$$\varphi_\Omega(r,t) \approx \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{3/2}(2\Omega)^{1/2}\,r}\,\mathrm{e}^{-i\Omega p(u)}\ .$$

$$U = p(u)$$

but we could also write: $\quad$ near $\mathscr{I}^+$

$$\psi_\omega(r,t) \approx \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{3/2}(2\omega)^{1/2}\,r}\,\mathrm{e}^{-i\omega u}\ ,$$

this lets you define:

$$\omega(u,\Omega) = \dot{p}(u)\ \Omega,$$

adiabatic condition:

$$|\dot{\omega}(u,\Omega)|/\omega^2 \ll 1$$

Collapse picture:

“Modes” are excited if adiabatic condition fails.

This occurs at:

$$\Omega_0(u) \sim |\ddot{p}(u)|/\dot{p}(u)^2 \ .$$

One can then think of $\Omega_0(u)$ as a frequency marking, at each instant of retarded time u, the separation between the modes that have been excited ($\Omega \ll \Omega_0$) and those that are still unexcited ($\Omega \gg \Omega_0$).

Collapse estimate:

Naively, you can think of an infinite "reservoir" of Boulware-like modes above:

$$\Omega_0(u) \sim |\ddot{p}(u)|/\dot{p}(u)^2 \ .$$

Contributing to the RSET:

$$\langle 0_B | \widehat{T}_{\hat{\mu}\hat{\nu}}(r) | 0_B \rangle_{\text{ren}} \propto -\frac{1}{M^2} \, \frac{1}{1-2M/r} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} ,$$

This is, however, far too naive a picture, instead, let us calculate...

Collapse calculation:

Victoria University of Wellington
Te Whare Wānanga o te Ūpoko o te Ika a Māui

Metric and coordinates:

$$g = -C(U,W)\,\mathrm{d}U\,\mathrm{d}W \ .$$ (scri-, scri-)

$$g = -\bar{C}(u,W)\,\mathrm{d}u\,\mathrm{d}W \ .$$ (scri+, scri-)

$$C(U,W) = \bar{C}(u,W)/\dot{p}(u) \ ,$$

$$\partial_U = \dot{p}^{-1}\,\partial_u \ .$$

Collapse calculation:



(u,W) coordinates best near here...

(U,W) coordinates best near here...

Collapse calculation:

RSET:

$$T_{UU} \propto C^{1/2}\, \partial_U^2\, C^{-1/2} \,,$$

$$T_{WW} \propto C^{1/2}\, \partial_W^2\, C^{-1/2} \,,$$

$$T_{UW} \propto R \,.$$

Quantum state "initially Boulware-like".

Specific coefficients not particularly important...

T_{WW} and T_{UW} are automatically OK.

T_{UU} needs a calculation...

Collapse calculation:

Victoria
UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON
Te Whare Wānanga o te Ūpoko o te Ika a Māui

Key point:

$$C^{1/2}\,\partial_U^2\,C^{-1/2} = \frac{1}{\dot{p}^2}\left[\bar{C}^{1/2}\,\partial_u^2\,\bar{C}^{-1/2} - \dot{p}^{1/2}\,\partial_u^2\,\dot{p}^{-1/2}\right].$$

"static" contribution

"dynamic" contribution

Boulware-like...

excited modes...

(static spacetime outside collapsing star)

[can arrange cancellations...]

Collapse calculation:

The key point here is that we have two terms, one $(\bar{C}^{1/2}\,\partial_u^2\,\bar{C}^{-1/2})$ arising purely from the static spacetime outside the collapsing star, and the other $(\dot{p}^{1/2}\,\partial_u^2\,\dot{p}^{-1/2})$ arising purely from the dynamics of the collapse. If, and only if, the horizon is assumed to form at finite time will the leading contributions of these two terms cancel against each other — this is the standard scenario.

Collapse calculation:

Victoria University of Wellington
Te Whare Wānanga o te Ūpoko o te Ika a Māui

Indeed the first term is exactly what one would compute from using standard Boulware vacuum for a static star. As the surface of the star recedes, more and more of the static spacetime is "uncovered", and one begins to see regions of the spacetime where the Boulware contribution to the RSET is more and more negative, in fact diverging as the surface of the star crosses the horizon.

Painleve--Gullstrand:

$$g = -c^2(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}t^2 + [\,\mathrm{d}x - v(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}t\,]^2 \;.$$

Technical computation:

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{tt} &= U_t^2\, T_{UU} + 2\, U_t\, W_t\, T_{UW} + W_t^2\, T_{WW} \\
&= (c+v)^2\, U_x^2\, T_{UU} - 2\,(c^2 - v^2)\, U_x\, W_x\, T_{UW} + (c-v)^2\, W_x^2\, T_{WW} \\
&= \dot{p}^2\, T_{UU} - 2\,\dot{p}\, T_{UW} + T_{WW} \;;
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{tx} &= U_t\, U_x\, T_{UU} + (U_t\, W_x + U_x\, W_t)\; T_{UW} + W_t\; W_x\; T_{WW} \\
&= -(c+v)\, U_x^2\, T_{UU} - 2\, v\, U_x\, W_x\, T_{UW} + (c-v)\, W_x^2\, T_{WW} \\
&= -\frac{\dot{p}^2}{c+v}\, T_{UU} + \frac{2\,\dot{p}\, v}{c^2 - v^2}\, T_{UW} + \frac{1}{c-v}\, T_{WW} \;;
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{xx} &= U_x^2\, T_{UU} + 2\, U_x\, W_x\, T_{UW} + W_x^2\, T_{WW} \\
&= \frac{\dot{p}^2}{(c+v)^2}\, T_{UU} - 2\, \frac{\dot{p}}{c^2 - v^2}\, T_{UW} + \frac{1}{(c-v)^2}\, T_{WW} \;.
\end{aligned}$$

Collapse calculation:

Calculation assuming normal horizon formation

$$v(x) \approx -1 + \kappa\, x + \kappa_2\, x^2 + \cdots$$

Static contribution:

$$\bar{C}^{1/2}\, \partial_u^2\, \bar{C}^{-1/2} = \frac{\kappa^2}{4} + \mathcal{O}(x^2).$$

Collapse: $p(u) \approx U_{\mathrm{H}} - A_1\, \mathrm{e}^{-\kappa u}$ Note!

$$p(u) = U_{\mathrm{H}} - A_1\, \mathrm{e}^{-\kappa u} + \frac{A_2}{2}\, \mathrm{e}^{-2\kappa u} + \frac{A_3}{3!}\, \mathrm{e}^{-3\kappa u} + \cdots$$

$$p(u) = U_{\mathrm{H}} - F(\mathrm{e}^{-\kappa u})$$

Dynamic contribution:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\dot{p}^{1/2}\,\partial_u^2\,\dot{p}^{-1/2} &= -\frac{1}{2}\frac{\dddot{p}}{\dot{p}} + \frac{3}{4}\left(\frac{\ddot{p}}{\dot{p}}\right)^2 \\
&= \frac{\kappa^2}{4} + \left[-\frac{1}{2}\frac{F'''}{F'} + \frac{3}{4}\left(\frac{F''}{F'}\right)^2\right]\kappa^2\,\mathrm{e}^{-2\kappa u} \\
&= \frac{\kappa^2}{4} + \left[-\frac{1}{2}\frac{A_3}{A_1} + \frac{3}{4}\left(\frac{A_2}{A_1}\right)^2\right]\kappa^2\,\mathrm{e}^{-2\kappa u} \\
&\qquad + \mathcal{O}\left(\mathrm{e}^{-3\kappa u}\right) \; .
\end{aligned}
$$

small**?**

Note: Leading term cancels against static contribution...

Dynamic contribution:

Calculation assuming asymptotic horizon formation

$$r(t) = 2M + B\mathrm{e}^{-\kappa_{\mathrm{D}} t}$$ (PG coordinates)

$$p(u) = U_{\mathrm{H}} - A_1 \mathrm{e}^{-\kappa_{\mathrm{eff}} u}$$

$$\kappa_{\mathrm{eff}} = \frac{\kappa\ \kappa_{\mathrm{D}}}{\kappa + \kappa_{\mathrm{D}}} \qquad \kappa_{\mathrm{eff}} < \kappa.$$

(Still get Hawking-like radiation...; no true horizon...)

Dynamic contribution:

Now only have partial cancellation outside the star:

$$\mathrm{RSET}(x \approx 0) \approx \frac{1}{\kappa^2 x^2}\left(\kappa_{\mathrm{eff}}^2 - \kappa^2\right)$$
$$= -\frac{\kappa\,(2\,\kappa_{\mathrm{D}} + \kappa)}{(\kappa_{\mathrm{D}} + \kappa)^2\; x^2}\,,$$

Does not violate FSW (finite <=/=> small)

RSET can become large (albeit finite in compliance with FSW) as one approaches 2m/r ~ **1**

Collapse calculation:

- In the standard collapse scenario the regularity of the RSET at horizon formation is due to a subtle cancelation between the dynamical and the static contributions.

- Contributions that can be neglected at late times can indeed be very large at the onset of horizon formation. The actual value of these contributions depends on the rapidity with which the configuration approaches its trapping horizon.

QUASI-BLACK HOLE SCENARIO

In the standard collapse you can argue that the RSET at horizon-crossing felt by infalling matter is negligible if you have:

1) a Hadamard state (which we have by assertion --- FSW)
2) matter is basically free falling
3) the equivalence principle holds

The first point tells you that the quantum vacuum has the same UV form as in Minkowski spacetime, the second point tells you that matter is approximately in a local inertial frame, the third point tells you that the local RSET the matter then "feels" must be approximately the value it has in Minkowski spacetime, i.e. approximately zero (after renormalization).

Collapse scenario:

Our result is saying exactly that large deviations from this standard conclusion can arise if matter is not freely falling, but actually accelerated (as it must be to sustain itself against the gravitational attraction).

So we are explicitly violating point 2
(while we explicitly keep 1 and implicitly keep 3).

If the surface of the star deviates significantly from free-fall, then a large stress-energy builds up, which can force it further away from free-fall --- either stopping or exponentially delaying the collapse.

Precisely predicting what happens in a specific collapse scenario relies on messy model-dependent physics...

Collapse scenario:

Many people are now
(for numerous independent reasons)
arguing against the standard
Carter-Penrose diagram
for the formation and evaporation
of a semi-classical BH....

Information "problem" ?

don't ask,
don't tell



"Standard" Carter-Penrose diagram for an evaporating black hole...

Collapse scenario:

Apart from the nut-jobs
(which we shall quietly discount),
there are hints from string-inspired models,
from attempts at unitarity preservation
(in our asymptotic region...),
from one-loop curved-space QFT,
from analogue spacetimes,
all hinting at a more subtle history
for collapse and evolution...

Information “problem” ?

Victoria
UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON
Te Whare Wānanga
o te Ūpoko o te Ika a Māui

Planckian curvature



Ashtekar-Bojowald version of the Carter-Penrose diagram for an evaporating black hole...

Information "problem" ?



Hayward version of the Carter-Penrose diagram for an evaporating black hole...

Information "problem" ?



Apparent horizons
without an
event horizon

Bergmann-Roman



Collapse scenario:

Specific predictions are frustratingly model-dependent,
but there is some “wriggle room” for interesting new physics...

Collapse scenario:



It's the ergosurface, dummy...

Once you add rotation,
the ergosurface is probably
more important than the
"would be horizon".

Cardoso, Pani , Cadoni, Cavliaga:

arXiv:0709.0532; 0808.1615

Ergoregion instabilities...

Conclusion:

A black hole for (almost) all practical purposes?

But some deep issues of principle remain...

"It is important to keep an open mind; just not so open that your brains fall out"

--- Albert Einstein

In my more cynical moments...

Victoria
UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON
Te Whare Wānanga
o te Ūpoko o te Ika a Māui