

GRAVITATIONAL COLLAPSES TO BODIES OF A FINITE VOLUME

TIZIANA MARSICO AND ANGELO LOINGER

ABSTRACT. We prove with an *exact* relativistic computation that the spherically symmetric gravitational collapses with a time-dependent pressure end in bodies with a small, but *finite* volume. Against a diffuse, wrong conviction.

Summary. – **1.** The recent discovery of the bright quasar HE 0450-2958; *et cetera*. – **2.** Relativistic significance of a time-dependent hydrodynamical pressure. – **3.** Comments about papers by McVittie, May and White, Chandrasekhar. – **4.** *Exact* computation of a gravitational collapse with a time-dependent pressure. – **4bis.** A remark on the polytropic equations of state. – **5.** External forms of solution and the problem of continuity adjustments between internal and external solutions. – **6.** Origin of a double error by Chandrasekhar and followers. – Appendix: The singular *loci* as defective points of any continuum theory; *et cetera*.

1. – The fictitiousness of the notion of black hole (BH) has been demonstrated with many arguments [1]. However, the majority of the astrophysicists are still convinced of the real existence of the BH's, in particular of the supermassive BH's: thus, "A quasar is thought to be powered by the infall of matter onto a massive black hole at the centre of a massive galaxy" [2]. (See also [2bis]). In reality, *all* the claimed observational discoveries of BH's show only the existence of very large, or enormous, masses concentrated in relatively small volumes (see, e.g., [3]). The discovery of the bright quasar HE 0450-2958 (some 5 billion light-years away), which does *not* reside in the centre of a massive host galaxy, has generated some interpretative difficulty. According to an explanation of the authors of the paper quoted in [2], "the black hole of HE 0450-2958 lies in a galaxy with not only a stellar content much lower than average, but also with a dark halo ...".

In the present paper we give a *new* argument against the physical reality of the BH's: we show that a sufficiently realistic computation of the relativistic gravitational collapse of a massive (or supermassive) object yields as a final product a body with a small, but *finite* volume. We infer, in particular, that the quasar phenomenon is a consequence of a permanent inward mass flow of a galactic origin, which accumulates onto a supermassive body restricted within a *finite*, small volume.

An important by-product of our computation is the following: our internal solution confirms a general fact (see [4] and references therein), which contradicts a widespread, naive opinion: the accelerated motions of the matter

To be published on *Spacetime & Substance*.

particles of our collapsing body do *not* generate gravitational waves (GW's); these particles describe geodesic lines. [5].

A last remark, which concerns the concept of gravitational potential energy in general relativity (GR): this concept is extraneous to the spirit of GR, for the simple reason that it cannot be formulated in a tensorial manner. Here a (partial) analogy with Poynting theorem of Maxwell electrodynamics is enlightening: the energy of a closed system of charged particles that are in motion under the action of their e.m. fields is composed of two parts: the total kinetic energy of the charges plus the energy of the global e.m. field; the consideration of the instantaneous Coulombian interactions between the particles destroys the *manifest* Lorentzian covariance. Nevertheless, the Newtonian concept of gravitational potential energy is practically useful – and theoretically sensible – in several astrophysical instances: e.g., if we assume, with a good approximation, that the potential energy of any spherical mass M of radius R is GM^2/R (where G is the gravitational constant), we have an energy of 10^{60} erg when $M = 10^8$ solar masses and $R = 3.8 \times 10^4$ solar radii, with an average density of 2.57×10^{-6} g/cm³; the same potential energy is obtained for $M = 10^6$ solar masses and $R = 3.8$ solar radii, with a density of 2.57×10^4 g/cm³ (see further [6]).

2. – With standard notations, the (pre-relativistic) Euler equation of perfect fluids and the continuity equation are, as it is well known [$\mu = \mu(\mathbf{r}, t)$, $p = p(\mathbf{r}, t)$]:

$$(1) \quad \mu \frac{d\mathbf{v}}{dt} = \mu \mathbf{F} - \text{grad } p \quad ; \quad (\mu = f(p), \text{equation of state}) \quad ,$$

$$(2) \quad \frac{d\mu}{dt} + \text{div}(\mu \mathbf{v}) = 0 \quad ;$$

a mere time dependence of pressure, $p = p(t)$, is here of a scarce interest. On the contrary, in the theory of relativity such time dependence can have important physical consequences – as we shall see in the sequel. For the time being, we limit ourselves to remember that in special relativity (SR) we have the following Eulerian equations ($j = 0, 1, 2, 3$); u^j is the four-velocity:

$$(3) \quad \left(\mu + \frac{p}{c^2} \right) c \frac{du^j}{ds} = \mu F^j + \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_j} - \frac{1}{c} \frac{dp}{ds} u^j \quad ; \quad [\mu = \varphi(p)] \quad ;$$

eqs.(3) follow from $\partial T^{jk}/\partial x^k = \mu F^j$, with

$$(3') \quad c^2 T^{jk} = \left(\mu + \frac{p}{c^2} \right) u^j u^k - p \eta^{jk} \quad ,$$

where η^{jk} is the customary Minkowskian metrical tensor.

3. – An interesting essay on the gravitational collapses of massive celestial bodies of a spherical shape has been written by McVittie in 1964 [6]. Subsequent authors have strangely ignored his results. It is here sufficient to cite a paper by May and White (1966) [7] and a review article by Chandrasekhar

(1972) [8], because their erroneous conclusion that any relativistic gravitational collapse of a spherical body ends always in a BH has become a *caput doctrinae sacrae* for the astrophysical community.

In a previous paper [1] we have proved that an appropriate treatment of relativistic gravitational collapses with *zero* pressure yields finally *a point mass, not a BH*. By revisiting and completing a result by McVittie [6], we shall show that relativistic gravitational collapses of spherical bodies with pressure and density which are *functions of the time alone* end in objects of a **finite** volume. It is evident that a computation with pressure and density which are functions of time *and* of radial co-ordinate would strengthen this result. It contradicts the statement of Chandrasekhar [8] that in GR the allowance for pressure does not prevent the matter from collapsing to a BH. We shall see in sect.6 the reason of this Chandrasekhar's error, which is really a double error.

4. – We adopt notations (with some inessential modification), units of measure (CGS-system), and internal reference frame as in [6]. The problem: to study a relativistic gravitational collapse with spherical symmetry under the assumption that matter density and pressure are *only* time-dependent.

In a Gaussian-normal (or synchronous) and co-moving reference system, we can write, assuming – for simplicity's sake only – that the constant spatial curvature κ is equal to *zero* (FRW metric with $\kappa = 0$):

$$(4) \quad ds^2 = c^2 dt^2 - S^2(\tau) [dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega^2] \quad ,$$

$$(5) \quad d\Omega^2 := d\vartheta^2 + \sin^2 \vartheta d\varphi^2 \quad ,$$

where: $\tau := t/T$, and T is a fixed time interval, whose physical meaning will be clear presently; the function $S(\tau)$ will be determined as a solution of Einstein field equations. We assume that at the initial instant ($t = 0$) of the collapse $S(0) \equiv S_0 = 1$.

The celestial material is a perfect fluid of density $\varrho(\tau)$ and pressure $p(\tau)$. The only components of mass tensor T_{jk} , ($j, k = 0, 1, 2, 3$), which are different from zero, are the following:

$$(6) \quad T^{00} = \varrho(\tau) \quad , \quad S^2(\tau) T^{11} = S^2(\tau) r^2 T^{22} = S^2(\tau) r^2 \sin^2 \vartheta T^{33} = p(\tau) \quad .$$

Let us denote with a subscript a derivative with respect to τ . The Einstein equations give:

$$(7) \quad 8\pi G \varrho T^2 = 3 \frac{S_\tau^2}{S^2} \quad ,$$

$$(8) \quad 8\pi G \frac{p}{c^2} T^2 = -2 \frac{S_{\tau\tau}}{S} - \frac{S_\tau^2}{S^2} \quad ;$$

the four equations {covariant divergence of mass tensor equal to zero} yield only:

$$(9) \quad \frac{d}{d\tau}(\varrho S^2) + \frac{p}{c^2} \frac{dS^2}{d\tau} = 0 \quad .$$

It follows from eq.(4) that the volume of our spherical body is equal to $(4/3) \pi [S(\tau) r_b]^3$, where r_b is the radial co-ordinate of the boundary; since this volume is contracting, the derivative $S_\tau(\tau)$ is negative. Accordingly, from eq.(7) we obtain

$$(10) \quad (S_\tau)_0 = - \left(\frac{8}{3} \pi G \varrho_0 \right)^{1/2} T \quad ,$$

if $\varrho_0 := \varrho(0)$. Let us assume with McVittie the following *equation of state*:

$$(11) \quad \frac{p}{c^2} = \varepsilon_0 \varrho_0 \left(\frac{\varrho}{\varrho_0} \right)^{3/2} \quad ,$$

where: $\varepsilon_0 := p_0/(c^2 \varrho_0)$; $p_0 := p(0)$.

Then, the solution of eqs.(7) and (8) can be written as follows (see [9]):

$$(12) \quad \varrho = \varrho_0 \left[(1 + \varepsilon_0) S^{3/2} - \varepsilon_0 \right]^{-2} \quad ,$$

$$(13) \quad \tau = \frac{1 + \varepsilon_0}{(6 \pi G \varrho_0)^{1/2} T} \left(1 - S^{3/2} + \frac{3}{2} \frac{\varepsilon_0}{1 + \varepsilon_0} \ln S \right) \quad ;$$

the functions $S(\tau)$ and $\varrho(\tau)$ are thus determined.

At time $t = T$, i.e. when $\tau = 1$, we have that $\varrho(1) := \varrho_{fin}$ and $p(1) := p_{fin}$ become infinite, and

$$(14) \quad S(1) := S_{fin} = \varepsilon_0^{2/3} (1 + \varepsilon_0)^{-2/3} \quad ;$$

consequently, at the final stage of the collapse *our body has a **finite** volume equal to $(4/3) \pi (S_{fin} r_b)^3$* .

By substituting S_{fin} of eq.(14) into eq.(13), we obtain the duration T of the collapse:

$$(15) \quad T = \frac{2}{3} \left(1 + \varepsilon_0 \ln \frac{\varepsilon_0}{1 + \varepsilon_0} \right) \left(\frac{8}{3} \pi G \varrho_0 \right)^{-1/2} \quad .$$

By differentiating eq.(13):

$$(16) \quad S_\tau^2 = \frac{4}{9} \left(1 + \varepsilon_0 \ln \frac{\varepsilon_0}{1 + \varepsilon_0} \right)^2 S^2 \left[(1 + \varepsilon_0) S^{3/2} - \varepsilon_0 \right]^{-2} \quad ;$$

from which: $(S_\tau)_{fin} = -\infty$.

For a *zero*-pressure collapse, $\varepsilon_0 = 0$, and eqs.(14) and (15) give:

$$(14') \quad [S_{fin}]_{p=0} = 0 \quad ,$$

$$(15') \quad [T]_{p=0} = \frac{2}{3}(8\pi G \varrho_0)^{-1/2} \quad ,$$

i.e. a **zero** final volume and a duration of collapse *greater* than T .

From a conceptual standpoint, we could stop here: the above (internal) solution is completely exhaustive: if $p = p(t) \neq 0$ at the end of the collapse the body has a *finite* volume.

However, it has become customary, in the investigations of gravitational collapses, to study also the *external* solution of the problem, i.e. the gravitational potential g_{jk} *outside* of the collapsing object. But here McVittie's approach met with an unexpected difficulty: the *continuity adjustment* of the two solutions (internal and external) at the boundary of the material sphere succeeded only for the *zero*-pressure collapses. In the more interesting case of a *non-zero* pressure $p = p(t)$ it failed. Our author wrote [6]: "It may, of course, be true that other forms of external solution exist [... that] might insure the continuity at the boundary [in all the considered instances]. If such form exists, I am not aware that they have been discovered."

4bis. – Equation (11) is the equation of state of a given polytropic model of the celestial material. For our problem it is, of course, a little schematic model. However, polytropic equations are not infrequently adopted also for material densities above those of nuclear matter, owing to the uncertainties concerning the real equation of state in such cases.

We think that our final result – i.e., the collapse to a *finite* volume – is qualitatively independent of the precise structure of the equation of state.

5. – A physically interesting and *general form* of external solution has been given by Eddington at p.94 of his treatise [10]:

$$(17) \quad ds^2 = \left[1 - \frac{2m}{f(r)}\right] c^2 dt^2 - \left[1 - \frac{2m}{f(r)}\right]^{-1} [df(r)]^2 - [f(r)]^2 d\Omega \quad ;$$

here: $m \equiv GM/c^2$; M is the mass of the spherical distribution of matter; $f(r)$ is *any* regular function of the radial co-ordinate r .

Strictly speaking, eq.(17) was derived by Eddington under the assumption that the gravitational field is generated by a point mass at rest. But it is obvious that, with *suitable* choices for $f(r)$, it holds also for the outside of *any* spherical distribution at rest – or even in any spherosymmetrical motion, by virtue of a well-known Birkhoff's theorem.

Examples. – For a material point: if $f(r) \equiv r$, we have the form of solution by Hilbert, Droste, Weyl, the so-called *standard* form (improperly denominated "by Schwarzschild"); for $f(r) \equiv [r^3 + (2m)^3]^{1/3}$, we have the **original** Schwarzschild form [11]; for $f(r) \equiv r + 2m$, we have a form which was first investigated by M. Brillouin; *etc. etc.* For a sphere of an incompressible fluid Schwarzschild [12] found an internal and an external solution; the latter can be formally obtained from (17) by putting $f(r) \equiv [r^3 + \delta^3]^{1/3}$, where the constant $\delta \neq 2m$ is given by his formula (33). *N.B.*: the constant δ – denoted with ϱ by Schwarzschild – is different from $2m$ as a consequence of

the fact that, in perfect analogy with Newton theory, He prescribed continuity conditions on the boundary of the sphere *both* for g_{jk} and for $\partial g_{jk}/\partial x^\alpha$, ($\alpha = 1, 2, 3$). –

Owing to the “flexibility” of eq.(17), it is *certain* that there exist functions $f(r)$ which are apt to describe correctly the outside of any collapsing spherical body for which eq.(4) is valid. However, eq.(17) is not written in a Gaussian-normal and co-moving frame as eq.(4) is. Therefore, to verify the existence (or non-existence) of continuity conditions on the periphery of the sphere we should transform eq.(4) into the generic Eddington’s reference system, or *vice-versa* eq.(17) into a Gaussian-normal form. To our aims, we can avoid this tedious procedure, the following trivial argument being sufficient to rule out the possibility of a collapse to a BH. Indeed, the values $S(\tau')$, $S(\tau'')$, ... of function $S(\tau)$ at different times t', t'' ... of the Gaussian frame of eq.(4) have corresponding values, say $f(r[b'])$, $f(r[b''])$, ... – where $r[b']$, $r[b'']$, ... are radial co-ordinates of the spherical boundary b – in the reference system of eq.(17). In particular, S_{fin} has a corresponding value $f(r[b_{fin}])$ in Eddington’s frame. Now, any function $f(r)$ in eq.(17), which does *not* originate an event horizon, excludes *ipso facto* the fictive notion of BH.

Even if in the present problem GR did not allow a continuity adjustment, the above reasoning would remain adequate to our purpose: to demonstrate the unreality of the BH’s.

6. – We can see now the origin of the double error by Chandrasekhar [8], i.e. of his assertion that a non-zero pressure does not hinder the spherical body from collapsing into a BH.

First of all, we observe that the original form of solution given by Schwarzschild [11] for a point mass (and which can be formally obtained by putting $f(r) \equiv [r^3 + (2m)^3]^{1/3}$ in eq.(17)) is everywhere regular, with the only exception of the origin $r = 0$: there is here no room for the fantastic notion of BH. However, in the relativistic literature has prevailed the HDW-standard form of solution, for which $f(r) \equiv r$. The Schwarzschildian form is diffeomorphic to standard form *only if this form is considered for $r > 2m$* . This is *no* physical restriction – and only for $r > 2m$ one can call (with admissible impropriety) “by Schwarzschild” the standard form. Obviously, the condition $r > 2m$ is sufficient to exclude the BH, whose fictitiousness can be proved in several ways. The simplest one is as follows: the existence of the BH’s would demand that, in the internal region of the singular surface $r = 2m$, the radial co-ordinate r (which was chosen so that the area of the surface $r = \text{const}$ be $4\pi(\text{const}^2)$) became a time co-ordinate; and *vice-versa*: a mathematical and physical absurdity, as it was stressed by Nathan Rosen. We remember finally that *no* physical result depends on the choice of the function $f(r)$ – provided that, of course, we exclude the fictive singularities.

Chandrasekhar was a convinced believer in the real existence of the BH’s (first error), and this conviction had a momentous consequence for the problem of a collapsing sphere, since he wrote: “There is no alternative to the matter collapsing to infinite density at a singularity once a point of no return [an event horizon, the surface $r = 2m$ of the standard form of the

external solution] is passed". In this way, the final result of the collapse would be the same as in a zero-pressure case (second error). The two errors have a unique origin: the belief that the standard form has a mathematical and physical meaning *even for* $r \leq 2m$. It seems that Chandrasekhar and the great majority of the astrophysicists have not read, in particular, the fundamental memoirs by Schwarzschild ([11], [12]) and Eddington's treatise [10]. (A tentative psychological explanation: perhaps Chandrasekhar and followers have been misled by an improper interpretation of the usual version of Birkhoff's theorem, i.e. by the assertion that the time-independent *standard* form is valid outside of *any* spherical distribution of matter. But they have forgotten that for the Fathers of Relativity this form holds – and for good reasons – *only for* $r > 2m$ [13].

In conclusion: according to Chandrasekhar and followers, the final result of all spherical gravitational collapses is always a BH, both for $p = 0$ and for $p \neq 0$. On the contrary, we have demonstrated (see [1] and previous sect.4) that when $p = 0$ the final stage of collapse is simply a *material point*, not a BH; and when $p = p(t) \neq 0$ is a body of a small, but *finite* volume (see sect.4).

APPENDIX

With regard to the last term at the right side of eqs.(3), Einstein emphasized that it is absent in pre-relativistic hydrodynamics [14]. However, its contribution to gravitational collapses, although small, is *not* negligible, as we have seen.

It seems a little queer that Chandrasekhar and followers have preferred to direct their attention on the various kinds of singularities of Einsteinian fields [15] rather than try to solve precise problems on the gravitational collapses, as McVittie did.

On the other hand, it is obvious that accurate results proving that GR does not represent an overturning of Newton theory, but a refinement and a completion of it, do not impress the public opinion and the politicians, who decide the financing of scientific researches. On the contrary, the belief in fictive notions (as the BH's) and in physically unreal entities (as the GW's) favours fanciful divagations that stir up popular curiosity and *épatent les bourgeois*.

Immediately after the turning of tide, we shall assist at amusing theatrical recriminations.

*Wenn man für's Künftige was erbaut,
Schief wird's von vielen angeschaut.*

J.W. von Goethe

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Loinger and T. Marsico, *arXiv:physics/0512237 v1* (December 24th, 2005)– in course of publication on *Spacetime & Substance*; and references therein; see also C. Frønsdal, *arXiv: gr-qc/0508048 v1* (August 11th, 2005).
- [2] P. Magain *et al.*, *Nature*, **437** (2005) 381.
- [2bis] S.L. Shapiro, *arXiv: astro-ph/0310070 v1* (October 20th, 2003).
- [3] A. Loinger and T. Marsico, *Spacetime & Substance*, **4** (2003) 80. Also in *arXiv:astro-ph/0305036 v1* (March 9th, 2003).
- [4] A. Loinger, *arXiv:physics/0606019 v1* (June 2nd, 2006); in course of publication in *Spacetime & Substance*.
- [5] Geodesic lines are also described, in particular, by the two components of the famous system PSR1913+16 and of system J0737-3039AB. Consequently, the observed energy losses cannot be attributed to emission of GW's, but to the action of non-gravitational forces; see A. Loinger, *arXiv:physics/0502089 v1* (February 16th, 2005), also in *Spacetime & Substance*, **6** (2005) 28.
- [6] G.C. Mc Vittie, *Astrophys. J.*, **140** (1964) 401. (See further: Idem, *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré*, VI (1967) 1.)
- [7] M.M. May and R.H. White, *Phys. Rev.*, **141** (1966) 1232.
- [8] S. Chandrasekhar, *The Observatory*, **92** (1972) 160 – and references therein.
- [9] G.C. Mc Vittie, *General Relativity and Cosmology*, 2nd edition (University of Illinois Press, Urbane, Ill.) 1965, App.B (viii-a).
- [10] A. S. Eddington, *The Mathematical Theory of Relativity*, Second Edition (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge) 1960.
- [11] K. Schwarzschild, *Berl. Ber.*, (1916) 189; an English translation in *arXiv:physics/9905030* (May 12th, 1999) and in *Gen. Rel. Grav.*, **35** (2003) 951.
- [12] K. Schwarzschild, *Berl. Ber.*, (1916) 424; an English translation in *arXiv:physics/9912033* (December 16th, 1999).
- [13] Strictly speaking, the customary version of Birkhoff's theorem that considers only the standard form ($f(r) = r$ in eq.(17)) – see, e.g., L. Landau et E. Lifchitz, *Théorie du Champ* (Éditions Mir, Moscou) 1966, p.362 – implies continuity adjustments at the boundaries of spherical distributions of matter *only* for the metrical tensor, *not* for its derivatives. However, Birkhoff's theorem is obviously valid for any choice of $f(r)$; accordingly, with suitable functions $f(r)$ continuity adjustments may exist also for the above derivatives.
- [14] A. Einstein, *The Meaning of Relativity*, (Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.) 1955, p.54.
- [15] The singular geometrical *loci* are defective points of general relativity – more generally, of any continuum theory, as Einstein always emphasized; see, e.g., in [14]: the footnote at p.124, and at p.164: "... it is my opinion that the singularities must be excluded. It does not seem reasonable to me to introduce into a continuum theory points (or lines etc.) for which the field equations do not hold."

LICEO CLASSICO "G. BERCHET", VIA DELLA COMMENDA, 26 - 20122 MILANO (ITALY)

DIPARTIMENTO DI FISICA, UNIVERSITÀ DI MILANO, VIA CELORIA, 16 - 20133 MILANO (ITALY)

E-mail address: `martiz64@libero.it`

E-mail address: `angelo.loinger@mi.infn.it`