

REGULAR BLACK HOLES AND TOPOLOGY CHANGE

Arvind Borde*

Institute of Cosmology, Department of Physics and Astronomy
Tufts University, Medford, MA 02155

and

Department of Mathematics, Southampton College
Long Island University, Southampton, NY 11968

Abstract

The conditions are clarified under which regular (i.e., singularity-free) black holes can exist. It is shown that in a large class of spacetimes that satisfy the weak energy condition the existence of a regular black hole requires topology change.

PACS numbers: 02.40.-k, 04.20.Cv, 04.20.Dw, 04.70.Bw

* *Electronic mail:* borde@cosmos2.phy.tufts.edu

Mars *et al.* [1] have recently produced a “Schwarzschild black hole” that obeys the weak energy condition [2], but is nevertheless free of singularities. In this letter I clarify how the singularity-avoidance occurs, not only in their model, but in general. My main result is that singularities can be avoided in a large class of black holes only through topology change. In proving this result I will use methods and terminology from the “global techniques” area of general relativity. Since these may be unfamiliar to many physicists, I will give some informal definitions as they seem necessary. Precise definitions may be found in the book by Hawking and Ellis [3].

Regular black holes are not new. In 1968, Bardeen [4] produced a famous model, conventionally interpreted as a counterexample to the possibility that the existence of singularities may be proved in black hole spacetimes without assuming either a global Cauchy hypersurface [5] or the strong energy condition [6]. (See, for example, ref. [3], page 265.) This model is a regular black hole obeying the weak energy condition, and it was influential in shaping the direction of subsequent research on the existence or avoidance of singularities. The paper in which it was originally presented [4] is not readily available, but a discussion of the model, and the role that it has played, has since appeared in a more accessible place [7]. In brief, the model uses the Reissner-Nordström spacetime as inspiration. The metric expressed in standard spherical coordinates (t, r, θ, ϕ) is

$$ds^2 = -f(r) dt^2 + \frac{1}{f(r)} dr^2 + r^2 d\theta^2 + r^2 \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2,$$

where Bardeen replaced the usual Reissner-Nordström function

$$f(r) = 1 - \frac{2m}{r} + \frac{e^2}{r^2}$$

by

$$f(r) = 1 - \frac{2mr^2}{(r^2 + e^2)^{3/2}}.$$

When $e^2 < (16/27)m^2$ in Bardeen’s model, there is an event horizon. The new spacetime also obeys the weak energy condition (assuming Einstein’s field equation), yet it contains no physical singularities. A similar example (i.e., possessing an event horizon and obeying the weak energy condition, yet non-singular) has also been constructed by modifying the Reissner-Nordström metric in a region near $r = 0$ and leaving it untouched outside [7, 8].

The recently proposed regular black hole [1] has a global structure identical to these previously-discussed Reissner-Nordström-based black holes. The metric here is

$$ds^2 = -e^{4\beta}\chi du^2 + 2e^{2\beta}dudr + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2)$$

where

$$\chi = 1 - \frac{2M(r)}{r},$$

$$M(r) = \begin{cases} m, & r \geq 2m \\ \frac{r^3}{8m^2} \left(10 - \frac{15r}{2m} + \frac{3r^2}{2m^2} \right), & r \leq 2m \end{cases},$$

and β is obtained from

$$\beta'(r) = \begin{cases} 0, & r \geq 2m \\ \frac{5r}{2m} \left(1 - \frac{r}{2m} \right)^2, & r \leq 2m \end{cases}.$$

This metric coincides with the Schwarzschild metric for $r \geq 2m$. There is still an event horizon at $r = 2m$ and trapped surfaces just inside.

Yet another class of spacetimes with similar properties has been discussed by Frolov *et al.* [9, 10]. In these spacetimes, part of the region inside $r = 2m$ in a Schwarzschild black hole is joined through a thin boundary layer to de Sitter spacetime, allowing in some cases singularity-avoidance to occur. (See Barrabès and Frolov [11] and additional references cited therein.)

All these black hole spacetimes have very similar global properties. I will therefore refer to them as “Bardeen black holes.”

How do Bardeen black holes avoid singularities? Consider fig. 1. It represents part of the maximally extended spacetime of a Bardeen black hole (compare it with, for example, fig. 3 of Mars *et al.* [1]). The shaded region there represents part of the interior of the black hole. (Signals from that region cannot escape to future null infinity, i^+ .) There are trapped surfaces, \mathcal{T} , in this region. The escape from a singularity inside the black hole occurs because in this crucial region where trapped surfaces exist it is possible for light rays to “wrap around the universe;” i.e., although both the “ingoing” and “outgoing” systems of future-directed null geodesics from \mathcal{T} are converging, the two sets converge to focii at different $r = 0$ points (antipodally located with respect to each other). The trapped surface \mathcal{T} and its future light cone $E^+(\mathcal{T})$ both lie in the future Cauchy development of the surface \mathcal{S}_2 , and a singularity is avoided *purely because* \mathcal{S}_2 is




Figure 1: *The global structure of a portion of a Bardeen black hole.*

A point in the interior of the spacetime represents a 2-sphere. The boundaries of the diagram are drawn according to these conventions: solid lines and hollow circles represent regions at infinity, dashed lines represent the origins ($r = 0$) of the coordinate systems. (The two $r = 0$ lines shown above are the origins of two different coordinate patches.) If one imagines a series of horizontal lines across the diagram, representing spacelike hypersurfaces, the topology of these surfaces will switch from $S^2 \times R$ in the asymptotically flat part of the spacetime to S^3 in the region between the $r = 0$ lines. For instance, the surface \mathcal{S}_1 has topology $S^2 \times R$ while \mathcal{S}_2 has the topology of a 3-sphere. The shaded region lies inside the black hole, and contains trapped surfaces, \mathcal{T} . One such trapped surface is represented above by a solid dot. The dotted lines emanating from it represent the two systems of future-directed null rays from \mathcal{T} : the “ingoing” and the “outgoing.” Each system reaches a focal point at $r = 0$. This light cone has the topology of a 3-sphere.

compact. (The compactness of \mathcal{S}_2 is, in essence, what allows this spacetime to escape the clutches of Penrose’s singularity theorem of 1965 [12]; this point is explained in detail elsewhere [7].)

In other words, spacelike slices [13] in a Bardeen black hole evolve – as Bardeen himself noted in the case of his original model – from a region in which they are noncompact (e.g., \mathcal{S}_1 in fig.1), into a region where they are compact

(e.g., \mathcal{S}_2): i.e., the Universe changes its topology from “open” to “closed.” Such a topology-change statement must, in general, be approached with caution. de Sitter spacetime, for example, contains both open and closed spacelike slices, but can hardly be considered to change topology. There, however, the non-compact slices are just poorly (or, in the case of inflationary models, deliberately) chosen ones in that globally hyperbolic spacetime. Through every point of that spacetime there passes a compact global Cauchy hypersurface. In a Bardeen black hole, that is not the case. There are regions of spacetime through points of which no slice is compact, and other regions through points of which every slice is compact.

Is such topology change necessary for the existence of regular black holes that obey the weak energy condition? The following theorem shows that it is:

Theorem: *Suppose that there is a spacetime \mathcal{M} that*

- A. contains an eventually future-trapped surface \mathcal{T} ,*
- B. obeys the null convergence condition (i.e., the Ricci tensor, R_{ab} , obeys $R_{ab}N^aN^b \geq 0$ for all null vectors N^a),*
- C. is null-geodesically complete to the future, and*
- D. is future causally simple, with $E^+(X) \neq \emptyset, \forall X \subset \mathcal{M}$.*

Then there is a compact slice to the causal future of \mathcal{T} .

Assumption A may be expected to hold in the interior of a typical black hole. I am introducing here the notion of an *eventually trapped surface* as an extension of the usual notion of a trapped surface. A future-trapped surface is one in which the future-directed null geodesics that emanate orthogonally from the surface all have negative divergence at the surface. In an eventually future-trapped surface, the divergence is only required to become negative somewhere to the future of the surface along each geodesic. This weakening of the notion of a trapped surface is intended to cover situations where a black hole might be growing due to infalling matter. Inside the black hole one may expect there to be closed spacelike 2-surfaces that are eventually future trapped. Otherwise, there would be congruences of geodesics with non-negative divergence throughout – and it is hard to see how these could avoid escaping to infinity. It is possible to contrive situations where geodesics inside a black hole have positive divergence, and escape to infinity, but to a “different infinity” than the one with respect to which the black hole is defined. This happens, for example, in the $e^2 = m^2$ case of a Reissner-Nordström black hole [14]. Such behavior does not, however,

appear to be generic, and in all reasonable cases trapped surfaces do occur inside black holes.

Assumption B follows from the weak energy condition and a field equation such as Einstein's. It may be replaced by a suitable "averaged condition" in situations where there are small violations of the pointwise weak energy condition [15–19]. Some form of convergence condition is crucial here. Without it, singularities can be avoided with no topology change [20, 21].

Assumption C is a weak regularity condition – it will hold in any regular spacetime.

Assumption D may require some explanation: Let $I^+(p)$ be the future of a point p and $E^+(p)$ its future light cone. It may be shown that $E^+(p) \subset \dot{I}^+(p)$. In general, however, $E^+(p) \neq \dot{I}^+(p)$; i.e., the future light cone of p is a subset of the boundary of the future of p , but is not necessarily the full boundary of this future. A situation where this occurs has been illustrated elsewhere [7, 22, 23]. Spacetimes in which $E^+(p) = \dot{I}^+(p)$ for all points p are called *future causally simple*. All the spacetimes in the Bardeen black hole category discussed here are causally simple, as are the standard Schwarzschild and Reissner-Nordström black holes and the exterior ($r \geq 0$) Kerr black hole. Some form of causality assumption is necessary for the topology-change argument of this paper to go through. If no such assumption is made, there are scenarios possible, based on the Gödel solution, that neither possess singularities nor change topology [24–26].

The theorem, as stated, does not directly make a statement about topology change. A black hole spacetime, however, usually contains a region at infinity and may therefore be expected to "start" with a noncompact slice \mathcal{S} , with the black hole, and, hence, at least one eventually future-trapped surface to the future of it. The theorem shows, under very general conditions, that if the black hole is to be regular, the spacetime must develop a compact slice to the future of \mathcal{S} : i.e., the topology must change from open to closed. It follows, of course, that such a spacetime cannot be globally hyperbolic. There is no violation here of known results that forbid topology change [27–32]. Most of these make some form of compactness assumption, ranging from causal compactness [32] to more stringent ones [27–31]. These assumptions do not hold in scenarios that change an open Universe to a closed one.

Proof: The convergence, θ , of the null geodesic generators of $E^+(\mathcal{T})$ becomes negative, by definition, somewhere to the future of \mathcal{T} along each generator. The

quantity θ obeys [3]

$$\dot{\theta} \leq -\frac{1}{2}\theta^2 - R_{ab}N^aN^b \leq -\frac{1}{2}\theta^2,$$

where assumption B has been used in the last step. It follows from this and from assumption C that θ must diverge to $-\infty$ at some point along each generator. This means that each generator must leave $E^+(\mathcal{T})$ within a finite affine parameter distance [3]. Thus $E^+(\mathcal{T})$ is compact. But, assumption D says that $E^+(\mathcal{T}) = \dot{I}^+(\mathcal{T})$. Since $\dot{I}^+(\mathcal{T})$ is the full boundary of the future of \mathcal{T} , it has no edge. This is the advertised compact slice. \square

Acknowledgements

I thank Tom Roman for bringing Ref. [1] to my attention, and him, Rosanne DiStefano and Alex Vilenkin for discussions. I also thank both the Institute of Cosmology at Tufts University and the High Energy Theory Group at Brookhaven National Laboratory for their warm hospitality over the period when this work was done, and the Faculty Research Awards Committee of Southampton College for providing partial financial support.

References

1. M. Mars, M.M. Martín-Prats and J.M.M. Senovilla, *Class. Quant. Grav.*, **13**, L51 (1996).
2. The weak energy condition requires that the energy density of matter be non-negative, when measured by any observer.
3. S.W. Hawking and G.F.R. Ellis, *The large scale structure of spacetime*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England (1973).
4. J. Bardeen, presented at GR5, Tiflis, U.S.S.R., and published in the conference proceedings in the U.S.S.R. (1968).
5. A Cauchy hypersurface, \mathcal{S} , is a hypersurface from which the behavior of at least a portion of the entire spacetime can be predicted. This portion of the spacetime is called the Cauchy development of \mathcal{S} . If the Cauchy development is, in fact, the full spacetime, \mathcal{S} is called a global Cauchy hypersurface.
6. The strong energy condition requires that certain combinations of the components of the stress-energy tensor of matter be non-negative. The

condition holds in most spacetimes of interest, but is violated, for example, in inflating spacetimes.

7. A. Borde, *Phys. Rev. D.*, **50**, 3392 (1994).
8. A. Borde, *Singularities in Classical Spacetimes*, Ph.D. dissertation, SUNY at Stony Brook (1982).
9. V.P. Frolov, M.A. Markov and V.F. Mukhanov, *Phys. Lett. B*, **216**, 272 (1989).
10. V.P. Frolov, M.A. Markov and V.F. Mukhanov, *Phys. Rev. D*, **41**, 383 (1990).
11. C. Barrabès and V.P. Frolov, *Phys. Rev. D* **53**, 3215 (1996).
12. R. Penrose, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **14**, 57 (1965).
13. A *slice* is an edgeless hypersurface such that no two points on it can be connected by a timelike curve.
14. I am grateful to Tom Roman for pointing this out.
15. F.J. Tipler, *J. Diff. Eq.*, **30**, 165 (1978).
16. F.J. Tipler, *Phys. Rev. D*, **17**, 2521 (1978).
17. G. Galloway, *Manuscripta Math.*, **35**, 209 (1981).
18. T. Roman, *Phys. Rev. D*, **33**, 3526 (1986); *Phys. Rev. D*, **37**, 546 (1988).
19. A. Borde, *Cl. and Quant. Gravity* **4**, 343 (1987).
20. T. Roman and P.G. Bergmann, *Phys. Rev. D*, **28**, 1265 (1983).
21. D. Garfinkle, unpublished
22. A. Borde and A. Vilenkin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **72**, 3305 (1994).
23. A. Borde and A. Vilenkin, in *Relativistic Astrophysics: The Proceedings of the Eighth Yukawa Symposium*, edited by M. Sasaki, Universal Academy Press, Japan (1995).
24. My attention was drawn to this aspect of Gödel's solution in 1982 by Roger Penrose.
25. A. Borde, Syracuse University report (1987); Example V in *T_EX by Example*, Academic Press, Cambridge, MA, USA (1992).
26. R.P.A.C. Newman, *Gen. Rel. and Grav.*, **21**, 981 (1989).
27. R.P. Geroch, *J. of Math. Phys.*, **8**, 782 (1967).
28. R.P. Geroch, *Singularities in the spacetime of General Relativity*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Princeton University (1968).
29. F.J. Tipler, *Causality Violations in General Relativity*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Univ. of Maryland (1976).

- 30. F.J. Tipler, *Ann. of Physics (NY)*, **108**, 1 (1977).
- 31. F.J. Tipler, *Phys. Lett.*, **165B**, 67 (1985).
- 32. A. Borde, preprint (1996).