Quantum mechanics, common sense and the black hole information paradox

UlfH.Danielsson and Marcelo Schier¹ Theory Division, CERN, CH-1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland.

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to analyse, in the light of inform ation theory and with the arsenal of (elementary) quantum mechanics (EPR correlations, copying machines, teleportation, mixing produced in sub-systems owing to a trace operation, etc.) the scenarios available on the market to resolve the so-called black-hole inform ation paradox. We shall conclude that the only plausible ones are those where either the unitary evolution of quantum mechanics is given up, in which inform ation leaks continuously in the course of black-hole evaporation through non-local processes, or those in which the world is polluted by an in nite number of meta-stable remnants.

¹Supported by a John Stewart Bell Fellow ship

CERN-TH.6889/93 M ay 1993

1 Introduction

In this paper we will discuss the black-hole inform ation paradox, rst discovered by Hawking [1]. As discussed by him, when a pure state has collapsed to form a black hole, it will later evolve into a mixed one as the outcom e of the complete evaporation of the black hole. In the wake of this observation, a erce controversy emerged in the literature. 't Hooft [2] proposed, as a way out of the paradox, that som e unknown mechanism could provide the needed correlation between incom ing and outgoing radiation to save the unitary evolution of quantum states. Nevertheless, as became increasingly clear during the past year or so, a resolution of the paradox will need a much better understanding of the interplay between gravity and quantum mechanics than is currently at hand. In this context, a lot has been learnt from studies of two-dimensional black holes initiated by Callan et al. in [3]. It might even be that the inform ation paradox is our best clue to the elusive quantum gravity theory. It is therefore of extrem e in portance to have a thorough understanding of this paradox, as free of model-dependent technicalities as possible.

W ith the arsenary of elem entary quantum mechanics and some inform ation theory we will illustrate the paradox. Our simple analysis will shed some light on the very nature of the paradox and de ne the properties that any solution must possess. In particular, we will consider the point of view that a black hole is a \quantum object", somehow implying that our usual intuition of what is wrong and right in physics is not applicable. This typically suggests that EPR -like correlations are important and that this would circum vene the standard arguments leading to the paradox. We will nd that no such easy way out is possible.

W e will begin by analysing the problem using elementary quantum mechanics. Then, in section 3, we will use information theory to derive some simple results concerning the way in which information may be stored in black holes.

In section 4 we w ill arrive at a standard set of possibilities, how ever w ith a much better understanding of why none of these can be conservative in the sense of not involving fundam entally new phenom ena.

2 Quantum Copy Rights

In this section we will consider limitations on the possible resolutions of the information paradox due to quantum mechanics. It is important to see why certain obvious suggestions do not work.

We will consider a situation where the information is \copied" before the in-falling matter crosses the horizon. In this way it is made available to the Hawking radiation. In fact, for an outside observer, the in-falling matter will not be seen to cross the horizon until very late. For an etemal black hole it would never be seen to cross. Hence one m ight think that all information is conveniently stored and accessible. Still, the act of making a copy is necessary if the original is assumed to continue through the horizon and into the black hole. This, in turn, is based on our expectation, due to the equivalence principle, that the horizon does not have any exceptional local properties capable of completely re ecting all information. If this had been the case we would have had a very simple resolution of the paradox at hand.

In general, both the original and the copy m ay experience a unitary transform ation through som e scattering m atrices. The process is schem atically

Since the nalstate is a direct product between the internal black-hole state j_B i and the outside state j_0 i, there are no correlations between the inside and the outside. Hence, if we ignore the inside, i.e. take the trace, no m ixing will result on the outside. There would then be no loss of information. Is this a possible scenario? Unfortunately (1) is forbidden. One cannot copy quantum states in this way [4]. The proof goes as follows. Let us assume the state to be copied to be a spin 1/2 particle with states j#i and j"i. For sim plicity we will ignore the state of the copying machine itself. This can be taken into account, [4], with no change in the conclusions. The copying process must be described by som e unitary operator U. Let us assume that the copying process works for states that are purely up or down. By linearity we then have

$$U [(aj#i+bj"i]= aj#ij#i+bj"ij"i:$$
 (2)

However, the desired state

$$(aj#i+bj"i)(aj#i+bj"i) = a^2j#ij#i+b^2j"ij"i+ab(j#ij"i+j"ij#i) (3)$$

cannot result for general a and b, since U produces no states j #ij "i or j "ij #i. W e conclude that even if one can construct a U which works for a given state, the sam e U will not work for all states. In a sense, U is too good at making copies! The correlations are always perfect in the up/down basis. Hence taking the trace over one subsystem produces a maximal mixing in the other subsystem and hence a loss of information. In fact, in this case all information is stored in the correlations.

Now, can this perfect correlation be exploited? If we, given the outside state, always know the inside through these perfect correlations, clearly there can not be any loss of inform ation. It would be silly to take the trace over the inside, since it is identical to the outside, and interpret this as true entropy. The situation recalls of the EPR-phenom enon. Is this the way to solve the paradox? Again the suggestion does not work. The reason is that the correlation cannot be perfect for all states in all bases. This is clearly needed if we are allowed to make any measurement that we want. C onsideronce more our example:

$$U(aj\#i+bj"i) = aj\#ij\#i+bj"ij"i:$$
(4)

Use

$$j#i = \frac{1}{\frac{p}{2}}(j! i j i) ; j"i = \frac{1}{\frac{p}{2}}(j! i + j i)$$
 (5)

to get

aj#ij#i+ bj"ij"i

$$= \frac{a+b}{2}(j! \; ij! \; i+j \; ij \; i) + \frac{a-b}{2}(j! \; ij \; i+j \; ij! \; i): \quad (6)$$

It is only when (a = b) a = b that the (anti-) correlation is perfect. In the EPR case this means that it is only for singlet states that the anti-correlation is perfect in all bases. Hence, since the correlation is not perfect in general, we are forced to take the trace. At any rate, for a given unknown state, an EPR - related state cannot be obtained through a unitary copying process that works for a general state.

For completeness we should note one loophole in the above argument. This is the case of black-hole hair as discussed in [5]. A coording to these ideas there are an in nite number of conserved quantities in the world whoose conservation protects unitarity. For this to be the case, everything needs to be conserved, which amounts to say that the world is an integrable system. This means that there are superselection rules that forbid superpositions. C om pare the superselection rule for electric charge. In the presence of these superselection rules the above argument will not hold. On the other hand, one faces the di cult problem of reconstructing quantum mechanics as we know it, starting with this barren universe.

It seems, therefore, that we have to cope with the fact that inform ation does cross the horizon and is at least tem porarily hidden from the outside observer. The questions then are: if, when and how is the inform ation restored? In the next section we will consider the possibility that the inform ation is stored not locally, in the black hole, but rather in its correlations with the environm ent.

3 How to Store Information

A s is well known, there is a fundam ental objection from QFT to the idea that the inform ation is stored in a black-hole remnant. Low -m assobjects with a huge number of internal states would su er from enormous production rates completely inconsistent with observations. This argument is not qualitatively changed if we take into account that the remnants may slow by evaporate and disappear. Since very little energy is available and a lot of information must be transmitted, the needed time is very long and the remnant e ectively stable as far as the argument is concerned [6].

There have been attempts to construct remnants that would not have this defect [7]. However, these attempts seem to run into inevitable problems [8]. We will not consider this further.

In an interesting paper [9], it has been suggested that the inform ation need not be stored locally in the remnant, which implies the above problem, but rather in its correlations with the outside world. This would then, it seems, point at a conservative resolution of the paradox. It is important to note that the correlations we have in m ind are correlations between the em itted radiation and the black hole, not correlations between radiation em itted at di erent times. The reason that the latter is not so relevant is that until the late-time radiation is em itted, the inform ation still has to reside som ewhere. This must be inside the black hole. This is because, as we proved in the previous section, given some reasonable assumptions, there will always be inform ation crossing the horizon that is impossible for the Hawking radiation to copy. As we will see, and comment on later on, the correlations can be restored to the Hawking radiation (e.g. between radiation em itted at dierent times) only through non-local processes.

Below, we will analyse the situation using information theory. We will consider two coupled systems 1 and 2 with basis $j_1 i_1$, n = 1; ...; N_1 , and $j_1 i_2$, m = 1; ...; N_2 , where N_2 N_1 . We will assume that the initial state of the combined system is pure, i.e. that

$$j = \sum_{\substack{n \neq m = 1 \\ n \neq m = 1}}^{N_{X} N_{2}} A_{nm} j_{1} j_{m} j_{2} :$$
 (7)

The corresponding pure density matrix is

$$= \int_{n,m,k,l}^{N_{\chi},N_{2}} A_{nm} j_{1} j_{1} j_{1} j_{1} j_{21} h_{pj} h_{qj} A_{pq} : \qquad (8)$$

From this one may construct reduced, in generalmixed, density matrices for the individual subsystems 1 and 2. For 1 we obtain

$$_{1} = \int_{j\pi p}^{N_{X}N_{2}} A_{nj}A_{pj}jni_{11}hpj$$
(9)

and for 2 we get

$${}_{2} = \int_{jm \ pq}^{N_{X}N_{2}} A_{jm} A_{jq} jm i_{22} hqj:$$
(10)

Information will be de ned as follows [10]

$$I = I_{max} + Tr \log$$
 (11)

where S = Tr log and $I_{m ax} = S_{m ax}$. The entropy, S, is to be thought of as a lack of inform ation. Note that S = 0) I = $I_{m ax}$ and S = $S_{m ax}$) I = 0. If the number of states is N, we have $S_{m ax} = N \frac{1}{N} \log \frac{1}{N} = \log N$, where $= \frac{1}{N}$ for all states. So,

$$I = \log N + Tr \log :$$
 (12)

W ith two subsystems we have

$$I_1 = \log N_1 + Tr_1 \log_1;$$

$$I_{2} = \log N_{2} + Tr_{2} \log_{2};$$

$$I_{tot} = \log N_{1}N_{2} + Tr_{1} \log ;$$
(13)

and

$$I_{tot} = I_1 + I_2 + I_{12};$$
(14)

which de nes I_{12} , the information content of the correlations.

W ith a pure total state the total information is maximized (i.e. the entropy is zero)

$$I_{tot} = \log N_1 + \log N_2 :$$
 (15)

W hat then can be said about the inform ation content of the separate system s 1 and 2? C learly $I_{1,m ax} = \log N_1$ and $I_{2,m ax} = \log N_2$, but what else can we know? Below we will prove that

$$I_{2,m in} = \log N_2 \quad \log N_1:$$
 (16)

The result (16) is very reasonable. A little tracing in a small subsystem cannot produce a lot of entropy, or loss of information, in the rest of the system.

Let us now pretend that system 2 is the outside world, containing the Hawking radiation, and that system 1 is the interior of the black hole. If we nd that there is very little information in 2, i.e. $I_2 = 0$, we must conclude that $N_1 = N_2$. That is, the number of internal states must be very large. It might, how ever, still be the case that the information is not stored in system 1 but in the correlations, i.e. $I_1 = 0$ and $I_{12} \in 0$. The important point is that if the information is to be stored in the correlations between the subsystem s, each of the subsystem s must still have the capacity to store (half of) the information. This must be the case even if the capacity is not used!

Let us now be more precise and relate the above reasoning to a more realistic model of a black hole. When the black hole is formed, we assume that the total system is in a pure state. There is inform ation stored in the outside world, the black hole itself, and necessarily also in correlations. The latter is a consequence of the non-existence of perfect copying machines, as we saw in the previous section. A sthe black hole begins to evaporate, entropy will be produced in the outside world subsystem. Our objective is to estimate a lower limit on this entropy if we ignore back reaction or any other transfer of inform ation to the Hawking radiation. The total entropy carried by the radiation per unit time during the evaporation is then

$$S_{-} = \sum_{j}^{X} \frac{d!}{2} S_{j}(!); \qquad (17)$$

where d! = 2 is the number of phase cells per unit time that emanate from the black hole and S_j is the entropy in a given eld mode of the j-th species [11]

$$S_{j}(!) = [n_{j} \ln n_{j} (1 n_{j}) \ln (1 n_{j})]:$$
 (18)

Here and in what follows, the lower and upper signs apply for ferm ions and bosons, respectively. On the other hand, the mean num ber of quanta em itted in a given mode by the back hole is [1]:

$$n = \frac{1}{e^x - 1}; \tag{19}$$

with $x = h! = T_{bh}$ and is the black hole absorptivity.

The calculation of the entropy ux in eq. (17) by m eans of the above equations has to be carried out num erically, because the black-hole absorption coe cient cannot be cast in a closed form. Here, we borrow Page's [12,13] result where he calculated S-num erically for a m ixture of three species of neutrinos and antineutrinos, photons and gravitons

$$S = 1.619 \frac{E}{T_{bh}}$$
: (20)

Integrating this equation, we obtain the amount of m ixing in the radiation produced along the black-hole history. Together with eqs. (13 and 16) we can write the relations

$$\ln N_1 > S_{rad \, iation} = 1.619 S_{bh}$$
: (21)

So, the presence of entropy in the outside world puts a lower lim it on the num ber of necessary states of the black hole. Note that this really is a lower lim it: there is also entropy initially, before the evaporation has begun, which is due to the always present correlations between what went in and what stayed behind. This may generally be of the same order.

These relations teach us two things. First, if the inform ation has not been returned through H awking radiation as the black hole approaches the P lanck m ass, then the rem nant has to have an enorm ous number of internal states to save unitarity. The inform ation m ight be stored in correlations, as in [9], but this does not solve the rem nant problem . Secondly, if we decide to follow the rules of quantum m echanics, we have to seriously interpret $e^{S_{bh}}$ as the number of black-hole quantum states. The black hole m ust m ake full use of its quantum states in order for the inform ation that it subtracted from the environ ent to be m om entarily stored either in these states them selves or in correlations. Furtherm ore, we have learned from the previous discussion the inform ation in question cannot wait until the last m om ents of evaporation to be restored. A ccordingly, it has to leak steadily in the course of black-hole evaporation.

A popular point of view is that back reaction could transfer the information from the in-falling matter forming the black hole to the Hawking radiation. As we have seen, there are two sources of entropy for the outside world. One is the matter that form ed the black hole, the other one is the Hawking radiation, or rather the negative energy part that falls into the black-hole. The idea of back reaction suggests that the Hawking pair production is in uenced, in such a way that the two potential sources of entropy conspire so that at the end no entropy is produced. As we have seen in the previous section, such a process can never be perfect, if, as is commonly assumed, it is possible to travel into a black hole without losing one's m em ory. In this connection, it has recently been shown that stimulated em ission (bosons) and the exclusion principle (ferm ions) are two such mechanisms, providing an imperfect correlation between incoming and outgoing radiations, which allows a partial transfer of the inform ation content of the form er to the latter [14]. Hence, the only remaining possibility is non-local information transfer.

4 Three Possibilities

In view of the previous discussion, we see only three possible solutions to the paradox.

I.G ive up unitary quantum mechanics.

II. Find a way to get along with the rem nants. No such possibility seems to exist at the moment [8].

III. The information is restored as the black hole evaporates. This requires non-local e ects.

W e will discuss the third possibility in a little more detail. The nonlocality which is needed is not just the standard non-locality of quantum mechanics. This would have been in the spirit of correlations, and we have just shown that this is not enough. Instead, one needs a rue inform ation ow from behind the (apparent) horizon.

It is amusing to compare this situation with the idea of Bennet et al [15] on teleportation. There a state is destroyed at one point in space time only to reappear at another. Two kinds of inform ation transfer are needed: one nonlocal EPR -like piece and one classical piece, which must respect the causal structure of space-time. More precisely, the sender and the receiver are each equipped with the members of EPR pairs. The sender brings its EPR particles together with the state to be teleportated. He then makes some measurements on the combined system. The results are then sent to the receiver who, with this know ledge, may reconstruct the teleportated state. This is also the case here. In fact, the parallel is rather complete. The EPR pairs are the pair-produced Hawking radiation, with one particle escaping and the other one venturing into the black hole. The problem is that the second part of the inform ation transfer, which is crucial as we have seen, is troubled by the horizon. Now, the relevant horizon is an apparent horizon, which means that escape is possible but has to be delayed until very late. At this later stage the storage capacity of the black hole has necessarily decreased, unless we contem plate alternative II. Therefore the inform ation must either be destroyed, alternative I, or transferred from the interior and the correlations to the exterior, alternative III.

In the latter case, the question is how? If we trust the correspondence principle, no spectacular quantum gravity e ects could occur in the outgoing radiation when the black hole is large with respect to Planckian scales. So it seems that the black-hole must make use of nonlocal e ects through its quantum states for transferring the information in question.

It has been recently suggested [16, 17], based on information theoretic prem isses, that the black-hole event horizon is quantized in units of Planck length squared and, furtherm ore, similarly to what happens in atom ic physics, the leakage of information is made possible by transitions among various quantum black-hole states (black hole-spectroscopy) [17]. Let us analyse, from the information theoretic point of view, whether this mechanism could account for the information ow needed to solve the paradox. That is to say, whether the entropy associated with the di erent transitions from a given state to the ground state (total evaporation) is comparable with the information the black hole has subtracted from the environment. In order to estimate this, let us assume that the black hole is in an eigenstate of event horizon area A;xi, where x stands for the set of quantum num bers accounting for the corresponding degeneracy $e^{\frac{A}{4}}$ for a given A. Now, the transition probability from level $\frac{1}{4}$; xi to $\frac{1}{4}^{0}$; x⁰i, for any x and x⁰, must be proportional to the ratio between the degeneracy of the levels in question. A coordingly, the probability of transition of going from level A to A⁰ cannot strongly depend on whether the transition occurs directly or if it proceeds through interm ediate states. The reason is that in order to estim ate the transition probability from the initial to the nal state in the case of cascading, we have to multiply all the intermediate transition probabilities, assuming that these are statistically independent. A fter multiplying all these probabilities and cancelling out the interm ediate degeneracies, we end up with the ratio between the degeneracies of the naland initial states, exactly as if the transition had occurred in one step. Thus, in order to obtain an estimation of the inform ation that could be transferred to the environm ent by m eans of the black-hole spectral lines, should they exist, we assume that all transitions are equally probable. A ssum e now that the black hole is in its n-th excited state. Then, the decay to the ground state through k interm ediate states can occur in $\frac{n!}{k!(n-k)!}$ di erent ways. Sum m ing over k gives the num ber of possible di erent transitions N $_{\text{transitions}} = 2^n$. Thus the corresponding information capacity is approxim ately

$$I_{transitions}$$
 n ln 2 / S_{bh} (22)

Therefore, the mechanism proposed in [17] could be behind the resolution of the paradox, because enough inform ation could be encoded in the transitions

to the ground state. Nevertheless, if the Hawking radiation were exactly them al, then this mechanism would be irrelevant because it lacks the vehicle necessary to transm it the inform ation to a distant observer. How ever, it has recently been shown, based on inform ation theoretic prem isses [18], that the fact that the black hole absorptivity is not unity could render this radiation the interm ediary between the black hole and a distant observer. This is so because the radiation is not exactly them al, i.e. not com pletely random, and there is enough them odynam ical room in the radiation to transfer all this inform ation.

For an observer far away from the black hole, the situation would be quite acceptable. The black hole appears as a quantum object emitting Hawking radiation whose spectral lines can be used to reconstruct all the information. The black hole is in some sense not very dierent from an atom. But, contrary to the case of an atom, we can move in closer and investigate the macroscopic black hole and its horizon in greater detail. Then we will observe e ects that we will experience as non-local, transmitting information from the interior across the apparent horizon. It is important to note, and this is precisely what we have proven quite generally in the previous section, that this occurs throughout the history of the evaporating black hole. Even when it is macroscopic. There is no way, unless we consider alternative II above, to delay this to the later stages of the evaporation.

The key question is: Can such processes be harm less without causing new paradoxes? In this context we must exam ine also in a more quantitative way how restrictive the presence of an apparent horizon is. Even if, as we have argued, complete rejection of information at the macroscopic apparent horizon is in possible, it is conceivable that it could take place at the event horizon, which m ight be as sm all as the P lanck scale and, therefore, sensitive to quantum gravity e ects. The key question is whether this is too late, in the sense that the remaining energy would be compatible with the information content. It is commonly accepted that this is really too late. This is also the reason why we have been forced to consider non-locale ects. However, a m ore quantitative analysis would clearly be needed to rule out this possibility, which otherwise would make these e ects unnecessary, or at least present only close to the event horizon and the singularity. In fact, through redshifting, Planck scale physics near the event horizon will be magnied trem endously in the eyes of an observer at in nity. W hile the time to fall into the blackhole is very short for the freely falling black-hole explorer, it would take of the order of the whole evaporation time according for an observer at in nity. A Planck time before the event horizon might be well in advance of the complete evaporation, while the black hole is still macroscopic as viewed from the outside. A similar suggestion has been made in [19] in the context of two-dimensional dilaton gravity.

5 Summary

O ur discussion points out that if we do not allow for non-unitarity, we must either learn to live with an in nite number of metastable or stable black-hole rem nants, or there must exist non-local information transfer, which is at work throughout the evaporation, even when the black hole is macroscopic. O ur conclusion is that quantum correlations are insu cient to solve either of these problems. In the rst case, we have shown that the information storage in correlations does not allow us to decrease the number of needed black-hole states. In the second case, it is well known that EPR correlations do not allow for the kind of information transfer that is needed. If we say that a black hole is like an atom with information encoded in its spectral lines, we still need to confront the issue of locality.

N ote A dded

A fler com pletion of this work we received a paper [20], where the information paradox is discussed.

A cknow ledgm ents:

M S. is partially supported by W orld Laboratory. M S. is particulary indebted to Jacob Bekenstein, M aurizio G asperini and D on Page for enlightening conversations.

R eferences

[1] S.Hawking, Phys. Rev. D 14 (1976) 2460.

- [2] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. B 335 (1990) 138.
- [3] C G .Callan, S B .G iddings, JA .Harvey, A .Strom inger, Phys. Rev. D 45 (1992) R 1005.
- [4] W.K.Wootters and W.H.Zurek, Nature 299 (1982) 802.
- [5] S.Colem an, J. Preskill and F.W ilczek, Nucl. Phys. B378 (1991) 175.
 J. Ellis, N.E. M avrom atos and D.V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B267 (1991) 465.
- [6] J. Preskill, \D o B lack H oles D estroy Inform ation?", Proceedings of the International Symposium on B lack H oles, M em branes, W orm holes and Superstrings, Texas, January 1992.
- [7] T.Banks, A.Dabholkar, M.R.Douglas and M.O'Loughlin, Phys. Rev. D 45 (1992) 3607.
- [8] S.B. Giddings, \Constraints on Black Hole Rem nants", Santa Barbara preprint UCSBTH-9308, hepth/9304027.
- [9] F.W ilczek, \Quantum Purity at a Small Price: Easing a Black Hole Paradox", IASSNS-HEP-93/12, hepth/9302096.
- [10] W.H.Zurek \information transfer in Quantum Measurements: Irreversibility and Amplication" in Quantum Optics, Experimental Gravitation and Measurement Theory, Eds: P.Meystre and M.O.Scully, (Plenum Press, New York, 1983)
- [11] L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshitz, Statistical Physics (Addison-W esley, Reading, Mass., 1970).
- [12] D.N.Page, Phys. Rev. D13 (1976) 198.
- [13] D.N.Page, Phys. Rev. D14 (1976), 3260.
- [14] M. Schi er, \Is it possible to recover inform ation from the black hole radiation?", preprint CERN-TH 6811/93, February 1993 hep-th/9303011.
- [15] C H . Bennett, G . Brassard, C . C repeau, R . Jozsa, A . Peres and W K . W ootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70 (1993) 1895.

- [16] V.F.Mukhanov, JETP Lett. 44 (1986) 63.
- [17] J.G. Bellido \Quantum Black Holes" Stanford University preprint SU IT P-93-4, IEM -FT-68/93, hep-th/9302127.
- [18] J.D.Bekenstein, H ow fast does inform ation leak out from black hole?" Santa Barbara preprint UCSB-TH 93-02, January 1993 .
- [19] K. Schoutens, H. Verlinde, E. Verlinde, \Quantum Black-Hole Evaporation", Princeton preprint PUPT-1395, IASSNS-HEP-93/25, hepth/9304128