Title: AMATH 875/PHYS 786 - Fall 2015 - Lecture 18

Date: Nov 09, 2015 01:30 PM

URL: http://pirsa.org/15110002

Abstract: <p>Course Description coming soon.</p>

File Edit View Insert Actions Tools Help

GR for Cosmology, Achim Kempf, Fall 2015, Lecture 18

Note Title

Horizons & Singularities

Local causal structure

The metric, g, not only defines the "shape" of a pseudo-Riemannian manifold, it also defines what is causal and what is acausal: (by defining what is space-, null- or time-like)

Preparation: • Consider an arbitrary point $p \in M$ and an arbitrary "convex normal neighborhood" of p, i.e., a set $U \subset M$

1 / 20

File Edit View Insert Actions Tools Help

Preparation: • Consider an arbitrary point $p \in M$ and an arbitrary "convex normal neighborhood" of p, i.e., a set $U \subset M$ with $p \in U$ for which holds:

$q, r \in U \Rightarrow$ there exist a unique geodesic connecting q and r.

• **Lemma:** There always exists such a neighborhood.

□ Now consider in U:



past light cone is determined by the metric.

some arbitrary coordinate system in which the hyperplanes $t = $ const. are space-like.

2 / 20

File Edit View Insert Actions Tools Help

Now consider in $\mathcal{U}$:



past light cone is determined by the metric.

some arbitrary coordinate system in which the hyperplanes $t=$ const. are space-like.

Definition: In order for the laws of matter fields ψ to be called "locally causal" (and therefore reasonable), their equations of motion must allow one to calculate $\psi(p)$ from only the values $\psi(q)$ and finite order derivatives $\psi(q), \ldots$ for all $q \in \mathcal{F}$.

Remark:
For massless fields of spin >1, there is no natural linear equation of motion with such well-defined causality.
Note: Gravitons are spin $s=2$ but their dynamics is ultimately nonlinear.
(See Wald p. 375)

2 / 20

File Edit View Insert Actions Tools Help

- **Remark:** In Newton's theory these data don't suffice, because there: $c = \infty$

- **Equivalently:** The laws of matter fields are locally causal if signals can be sent between events $q, p \in \mathcal{U}$ only iff there is a curve $\gamma \subset \mathcal{U}$ with $\gamma(t_1) = q$, $\gamma(t_2) = p$ whose tangents are non-space-like:

$$g(\dot\gamma(t), \dot\gamma(t)) \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } t \in [t_a, t_b]$$

Question: Assume that on a differentiable manifold M only a causal structure is given. To what extent fixes this g?

3 / 20

File Edit View Insert Actions Tools Help

- **Equivalently:** The laws of matter fields are locally causal if signals can be sent between events $q, p \in \mathcal{U}$ only iff there is a curve $\gamma \subset \mathcal{U}$ with $\gamma(t_1) = q$, $\gamma(t_2) = p$ whose tangents are non-space-like:

$$g(\dot\gamma(t), \dot\gamma(t)) \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } t \in [t_a, t_b]$$

Question: Assume that on a differentiable manifold $\mathcal{M}$ only a causal structure is given. To what extent fixes this g?

Answer: Nearly completely!

3 / 20

File Edit View Insert Actions Tools Help

Consider for the essay

Theorem:

Assume that on a differentiable manifold M we don't know the metric, i.e., we can't evaluate

$$g(\xi,\eta)$$

but assume that for all $p \in M$ and all $\xi \in T_p(M)$ we know for each ξ whether it is space-, light- or time-like, i.e. assume we know: $\in \{-1, 0, 1\}$

$$\text{sign}(g(\xi,\xi)) \text{ for all } p \in M,\ \xi \in T_p(M)$$

Then, this information already determines the metric tensor up to conformal transformations

4 / 20

File Edit View Insert Actions Tools Help

but assume that for all $p \in M$ and all $\xi \in T_p(M)$

we know for each ξ whether it is space-, light- or time-like, i.e.

assume we know: $\in \{-1, 0, 1\}$

$$\text{sign}(g(\xi,\xi)) \text{ for all } p \in M, \xi \in T_p(M)$$

Then, this information already determines the metric tensor up to conformal transformations,

i.e., we obtain:

unspecified scalar function: "conformal factor"

$$c(x)\, g_{\mu\nu}(x)$$

metric in canonical frame — also called "holonomic frame"

Remark:

Conformal transformations affect only the

4 / 20

Remark:

Conformal transformations affect only the length of vectors but leave their mutual "angles" invariant:

$$\cos(\sphericalangle(\xi,\eta)) = \frac{g(\xi,\eta)}{\sqrt{g(\xi,\xi)\,g(\eta,\eta)}} \qquad \left(\frac{c}{\sqrt{c}\sqrt{c}}\right)$$

Proof: $\square$ Consider a timelike ξ and a spacelike η.

Are there linear combinations

$$\xi + \lambda\eta$$

that are light-like? If yes, we can assume

File Edit View Insert Actions Tools Help

Proof: □ Consider a timelike ξ and a spacelike η.

Are there linear combinations

$$\xi + \lambda \eta$$

that are light-like? If yes, we can assume that we know these λ from knowing the causal structure!

□ Need to solve this quadratic equation in λ:

$$f(\lambda) = g(\xi + \lambda\eta, \xi + \lambda\eta) = 0 \qquad (*)$$

i.e.: $g^{\mu\nu}(\xi_\mu + \lambda\eta_\mu)(\xi_\nu + \lambda\eta_\nu) = 0$

5 / 20

File Edit View Insert Actions Tools Help

$$f(\lambda) = g(\xi + \lambda\eta, \xi + \lambda\eta) = 0 \qquad (*)$$

i.e.: $g^{\mu\nu}(\xi_\mu + \lambda\eta_\mu)(\xi_\nu + \lambda\eta_\nu) = 0$

- Eq. $(*)$ has two roots λ_1, λ_2. Are they real?

Yes, because:

ξ timelike $\Rightarrow$ $f(0) < 0$

η spacelike $\Rightarrow$ $f(\lambda) > 0$ for large enough λ

$\Rightarrow$ $f(\lambda) = 0$ has one real root

$\Rightarrow$ Both roots, λ_1, λ_2 of $f(\lambda) = 0$ are real.

- Since by assumption we can identify all null vectors we can assume λ_1, λ_2 known.

6 / 20

File Edit View Insert Actions Tools Help

Lemma:

$$\frac{g(\xi,\xi)}{g(\eta,\eta)} = \lambda_1 \lambda_2$$

Thus, the ratio $\frac{g(\xi,\xi)}{g(\eta,\eta)}$ can be assumed known for all timelike ξ and all spacelike η.

Proof: From $g(\xi+\lambda_{1,2}\eta, \xi+\lambda_{1,2}\eta)=0$

we have: $g(\xi,\xi) + 2\lambda_1 g(\xi,\eta) + \lambda_1^2 g(\eta,\eta) = 0$

and: $g(\xi,\xi) + 2\lambda_2 g(\xi,\eta) + \lambda_2^2 g(\eta,\eta) = 0$

7 / 20

File Edit View Insert Actions Tools Help

$$\frac{g(\xi,\xi)}{g(\eta,\eta)} = \lambda_1 \lambda_2$$

Thus, the ratio $\frac{g(\xi,\xi)}{g(\eta,\eta)}$ can be assumed known for all timelike ξ and all spacelike η.

Proof: From $g(\xi+\lambda_{1,2}\eta, \xi+\lambda_{1,2}\eta)=0$

we have: $g(\xi,\xi) + 2\lambda_1 g(\xi,\eta) + \lambda_1^2 g(\eta,\eta) = 0$

and: $g(\xi,\xi) + 2\lambda_2 g(\xi,\eta) + \lambda_2^2 g(\eta,\eta) = 0$

Eliminate $g(\xi,\eta)$ $\Rightarrow$ $\frac{g(\xi,\xi)}{g(\eta,\eta)} = \lambda_1 \lambda_2$ ✓

7 / 20

File Edit View Insert Actions Tools Help

Corollary:

Also the ratios $\frac{g(\xi,\xi)}{g(\xi',\xi')}$ for ξ, ξ' both timelike

(or both spacelike) can be assumed known:

$$\frac{g(\xi,\xi)}{g(\eta,\eta)} = \lambda_1\lambda_2 \; ; \; \frac{g(\xi',\xi')}{g(\eta,\eta)} = \lambda_1'\lambda_2' \Rightarrow \frac{g(\xi',\xi')}{g(\xi,\xi)} = \frac{\lambda_1'\lambda_2'}{\lambda_1\lambda_2}$$

Corollary:

Consider arbitrary non-null vectors α, β.

Then

$$g(\alpha,\beta) = -\frac{1}{2}\left[g(\alpha,\alpha) + g(\beta,\beta) - g(\alpha+\beta,\alpha+\beta)\right]$$

and thus: By lemma, all these ratios can be assumed kno...

8 / 20

File Edit View Insert Actions Tools Help

(or both spacelike) can be assumed known:

$$\frac{g(\xi,\xi)}{g(\eta,\eta)} = \lambda_1\lambda_2 \; ; \; \frac{g(\xi',\xi')}{g(\eta,\eta)} = \lambda_1'\lambda_2' \Rightarrow \frac{g(\xi',\xi')}{g(\xi,\xi)} = \frac{\lambda_1'\lambda_2'}{\lambda_1\lambda_2}$$

Corollary:

Consider arbitrary non-null vectors α, β.

Then

$$g(\alpha,\beta) = -\frac{1}{2}\left[g(\alpha,\alpha) + g(\beta,\beta) - g(\alpha+\beta,\alpha+\beta)\right]$$

and thus: By lemma, all these ratios can be assumed known

We can consider $g(\xi,\xi)$ to be a fixed, unknown scalar function.

$$\frac{g(\alpha,\beta)}{g(\xi,\xi)} = -\frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{g(\alpha,\alpha)}{g(\xi,\xi)} + \frac{g(\beta,\beta)}{g(\xi,\xi)} - \frac{g(\alpha+\beta,\alpha+\beta)}{g(\xi,\xi)}\right]$$

8 / 20

File Edit View Insert Actions Tools Help

Therefore, if it is known which vectors are timelike, spacelike or null, then it is possible to calculate

$$g(\alpha,\beta) \text{ at all } p\in M \text{ for all } \alpha,\beta\in T_p(M)$$

up to a scalar prefactor. $\Rightarrow$ Proof of Theorem complete.

Interpretation:

The causal structure alone already determines:

- the "angles" between vectors precisely
- the "lengths" of vectors up to a positive scalar function.

An application to QFT: arxiv: 1510.02725 w. prev. students of this course!

9 / 20

File Edit View Insert Actions Tools Help

Implications: Spacetimes $(\mathcal{M}, g)$ and $(\mathcal{M}, \tilde{g})$ for which

$$\tilde{g} = \phi\, g$$

(if $\phi = 0$ then g not invertible)
(if $\phi < 0$ then change signature)

some positive scalar function

possess the same causal structure.

$\Rightarrow$ Spacetimes fall into "conformal equivalence classes" within which the local causal structure is invariant.

$\rightsquigarrow$ This is very useful to help intuition:

Choose a conformally equivalent spacetime, for which space and time are conformally so much squeezed that infinities turn into a finite distance

File Edit View Insert Actions Tools Help

$$g = \varphi g$$

(if $\varphi < 0$ then change signature)

some positive scalar function

possess the same causal structure.

⇒ Spacetimes fall into "conformal equivalence classes" within which the local causal structure is invariant.

⇝ This is very useful to help intuition:

Choose a conformally equivalent spacetime, for which space and time are conformally so much squeezed that infinities turn into a finite distance, all while 45° remain 45° degrees b/c conformality.

10 / 20

Application: Penrose diagrams

Example: Consider Minkowski space, (M, g) in spherical coordinates:

$$g = -dx^0 \otimes dx^0 + dx^1 \otimes dx^1 + dx^2 \otimes dx^2 + dx^3 \otimes dx^3$$
$$= -dt \otimes dt + dr \otimes dr + r^2 \left(d\theta \otimes d\theta + \sin^2\theta \, d\phi \otimes d\phi \right)$$
with $-\infty < t < \infty$, $0 \leq r < \infty$, $0 \leq \phi < 2\pi$, $0 \leq \theta < \pi$

Now consider the spacetime $(\bar{M}, \bar{g})$ given by:
$$\bar{g} = d\bar{t} \otimes d\bar{t} + d\bar{r} \otimes d\bar{r} + \sin^2(\bar{r}^2) \left(d\theta \otimes d\theta + \sin^2\theta \, d\phi \otimes d\phi \right)$$
with $\overbrace{-\pi < \bar{t} + \bar{r} < \pi, \; -\pi < \bar{t} - \bar{r} < \pi}^{\text{finite!}}, \; \bar{r} \geq 0, \; 0 \leq \phi < 2\pi, \; 0 \leq \theta < \pi$

The spacetimes $(M, g), (\bar{M}, \bar{g})$ are related by a diffeomorphism $\bar{M} \to M$:

File Edit View Insert Actions Tools Help

Example: Consider Minkowski space, $(\mathcal{M}, g)$ in spherical coordinates:

$$g = -dx^0 \otimes dx^0 + dx^1 \otimes dx^1 + dx^2 \otimes dx^2 + dx^3 \otimes dx^3$$
$$= -dt \otimes dt + dr \otimes dr + r^2 (d\theta \otimes d\theta + \sin^2\theta \, d\phi \otimes d\phi)$$

with $-\infty < t < \infty$, $0 \le r < \infty$, $0 \le \phi < 2\pi$, $0 \le \theta < \pi$

Now consider the spacetime $(\bar{\mathcal{M}}, \bar{g})$ given by:

$$\bar{g} = d\bar{t} \otimes d\bar{t} + d\bar{r} \otimes d\bar{r} + \sin^2(\bar{r}^2)(d\theta \otimes d\theta + \sin^2\theta \, d\phi \otimes d\phi)$$

with $\underbrace{-\pi < \bar{t} + \bar{r} < \pi, -\pi < \bar{t} - \bar{r} < \pi}_{\text{finite!}}, \bar{r} \geq 0, 0 \le \phi < 2\pi, 0 \le \theta < \pi$

The spacetimes $(\mathcal{M}, g), (\bar{\mathcal{M}}, \bar{g})$ are related by a diffeomorphism $\bar{\mathcal{M}} \to \mathcal{M}$:

$$t := \frac{1}{2} \tan\left(\frac{1}{2}(\bar{t} + \bar{r})\right) + \frac{1}{2} \tan\left(\frac{1}{2}(\bar{t} - \bar{r})\right)$$
$$r := \frac{1}{2} \tan\left(\frac{1}{2}(\bar{t} + \bar{r})\right) - \frac{1}{2} \tan\left(\frac{1}{2}(\bar{t} - \bar{r})\right)$$

11 / 20

File Edit View Insert Actions Tools Help

$$g_{\mu\nu} = \varphi\, \bar{g}_{\mu\nu} \quad \text{with} \quad \varphi = \frac{1}{4}\sec\left(\tfrac{1}{2}(t+r)\right)\sec\left(\tfrac{1}{2}(t-r)\right)$$

Thus, (M, g) and $(\bar{M}, \bar{g})$ have the same causal structure, although $-\pi < \bar{t} + \bar{r} < \pi$ and $-\pi < \bar{t} - \bar{r} < \pi$ and $\bar{r} > 0$.

$\rightsquigarrow$ Use this to study the causal structure using $(\bar{M}, \bar{g})$ which is of finite size:

Legend:

- Continuous (green) lines: Infinities
- Dotted (green) line: Radius = 0
- Singularities (later): double line.



12 / 20

Examples:

A.) geodesic, massive observers, sitting at r_i.

B) same but then uniformly accelerating.

C) light ray



Definition:

An observer's Event horizon (if any) is the boundary of the past of this observer's future causal infinity.



I.e., the event horizon is the boundary

of the set of those events that can possibly

File Edit View Insert Actions Tools Help

A) geodesic, massive observers, sitting at r_i.

B) same but then uniformly accelerating.

C) light ray



Definition:

An observer's Event horizon (if any) is the boundary of the past of this observer's future causal infinity.



I.e., the event horizon is the boundary of the set of those events that can possibly ever influence the observer, i.e., it's the boundary of the set of events the observer can ever learn about.

13 / 20

F.L. cosmologies: (e.g. with $K=0$)

One can again find a conformally equivalent metric and coordinates of finite range, leaving all light rays at 45°.
For the transformation, see e.g. Hawking & Ellis, Ch. 5.3. Result:

A) geodesic, massive observer

B) same but then uniformly accelerating

C) light rays



Notice: Singularity at $t=0$ assumed. (Some FL spacetimes are without, e.g. de Sitter: $a(t)= {}^{Ht}$)

File Edit View Insert Actions Tools Help

One can again find a conformally equivalent metric and coordinates of finite range, leaving all light rays at 45°.

For the transformation, see e.g. Hawking & Ellis, Ch. 5.3. Result:

A.) geodesic, massive observer

B) same but then uniformly accelerating

C) light rays



Notice: Singularity at $t=0$ assumed. (Some FL spacetimes are without, e.g. de Sitter: $a(t)=e^{Ht}$)

At finite t, an observer can see only a finite distance.

Def: This distance is called the observer's "Particle Horizon" at time t.

14 / 20

File Edit View Insert Actions Tools Help

Particle horizon:

How far away, d_p, is the particle horizon at time t?



Recall:

r is the comoving radius, i.e., galaxies sit at fixed (r,θ,ϕ) at all time. Recall that by definition, $a(t_{today})=1$, i.e., comov. distance = proper distance today.

$$g = -dt\otimes dt + a^2(t)\, dr\otimes dr + r^2\left(d\theta\otimes d\theta + \sin^2\theta\, d\phi\otimes d\phi\right)$$

Consider a light ray $\gamma(\lambda) = (\underbrace{\gamma^0(\lambda)}_{t(\lambda)}, \underbrace{\gamma^1(\lambda)}_{r(\lambda)}, \underbrace{0}_{\theta(\lambda)}, \underbrace{0}_{\phi(\lambda)})$, i.e., emitted radially.

Its tangent is null $g_{\mu\nu}\dfrac{\partial\gamma^\mu}{\partial\lambda}\dfrac{\partial\gamma^\nu}{\partial\lambda}=0$, i.e.:

$$\left(\frac{\partial\gamma^0(\lambda)}{\partial\lambda}\right)^2 - a^2(t)\left(\frac{\partial\gamma^1(\lambda)}{\partial\lambda}\right)^2 = 0$$

Note: $\gamma^0(\lambda)=t(\lambda)$

(Note: this speed is not $=1=c$ because r is the comov

15 / 20

File Edit View Insert Actions Tools Help

Recall:

r is the comoving radius, i.e., galaxies sit at fixed (r, θ, ϕ) at all time. Recall that by definition, $a(t_{today}) = 1$, i.e., comov. distance = proper distance today.

$$g = -dt \otimes dt + a^2(t)\, dr \otimes dr + r^2 (d\theta \otimes d\theta + \sin^2\theta\, d\phi \otimes d\phi)$$



$\mathscr{I}^-$ "Scri minus" $(t = 0)$

Consider a light ray $\gamma(\alpha) = (\gamma^0(\alpha), \gamma^1(\alpha), 0, 0)$, i.e., emitted radially.

$$\gamma^0(\alpha) = t(\alpha), \quad \gamma^1(\alpha) = r(\alpha), \quad 0 = \theta(\alpha), \quad 0 = \phi(\alpha)$$

Its tangent is null $g_{\mu\nu} \frac{\partial \gamma^\mu}{\partial \alpha} \frac{\partial \gamma^\nu}{\partial \alpha} = 0$, i.e.:

$$\left(\frac{\partial \gamma^0(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha}\right)^2 - a^2(t) \left(\frac{\partial \gamma^1(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha}\right)^2 = 0$$

Note: $\gamma^0(\alpha) = t(\alpha)$

Thus: $\frac{dt}{d\alpha} = \pm a(t) \frac{dr}{d\alpha}$ i.e. $\frac{dr}{dt} = \pm \frac{1}{a(t)}$

Note: this speed is not $= 1 = c$ because r is the comoving distance. At late times, $a(t) \gg 1$, i.e., $\frac{dr}{dt}$ small, i.e., light crosses comoving distances slowly, - because the same comoving distance becomes larger and larger.

Thus: $d = \int^t \frac{1}{\ldots} dt'$

$$\left(\frac{\partial x^0(\lambda)}{\partial\lambda}\right) - a^2(t)\left(\frac{\partial x^1(\lambda)}{\partial\lambda}\right) = 0$$

Note: $x^0(\lambda) = t(\lambda)$

Thus: $\frac{dt}{d\lambda} = \pm a(t)\frac{dr}{d\lambda}$ i.e. $\frac{dr}{dt} = \pm\frac{1}{a(t)}$

(Note: this speed is not $=1=c$ because r is the comoving distance. At late times, $a(t) \gg 1$, i.e., $\frac{dr}{dt}$ small, i.e., light crosses comoving distances slowly, because the same comoving distance becomes larger and larger.)

Thus: $d_p = \int_{t=0}^{t} \frac{1}{a(t')}\,dt'$ (It's the comoving distance travelled, and with $a(\text{today}) = 1$, it's also the current proper distance to what's the furthest we can see.)

For example for us today: $d_p \approx 4\cdot 10^{10}$ light years. (Say since CMB emission)

Recall event horizon:

An observer's event horizon is the boundary of the past of this observer's future infinity.

$\Rightarrow$ If we have a cosmological event horizon, it is the particle horizon

File Edit View Insert Actions Tools Help

Thus: $d_p = \int_{t=0}^{t} \frac{1}{a(t')} dt'$ (It's the comoving distance travelled, and with $a(\text{today}) = 1$, it's also the current proper distance to what's the furthest we can see.)

For example for us today: $d_p \approx 4 \cdot 10^{10}$ light years. (Say since CMB emission)

Recall event horizon:

An observer's event horizon is the boundary of the past of this observer's future infinity.

⇒ If we have a cosmological event horizon, it is the particle horizon that we will have at future infinity.

Do we have a cosmological event horizon?

16 / 20

File Edit View Insert Actions Tools Help

Thus: $d_p = \int_{t=0}^{t} \frac{1}{a(t')} dt'$ (It's the comoving distance travelled, and with a(today) = 1, it's also the current proper distance to what's the furthest we can see.)

For example for us today: $d_p \approx 4 \cdot 10^{10}$ light years. (Say since CMB emission)

Recall event horizon:

An observer's event horizon is the boundary of the past of this observer's future infinity.

$\Rightarrow$ If we have a cosmological event horizon, it is the particle horizon that we will have at future infinity.

Do we have a cosmological event horizon?

16 / 20

For example for us today: $d_p \approx 4\cdot 10^{10}$ light years. (Say since CMB emission)

Recall event horizon:

An observer's event horizon is the boundary of the past of this observer's future infinity.

$\Rightarrow$ If we have a cosmological event horizon, it is the particle horizon that we will have at future infinity.

Do we have a cosmological event horizon?

I.e., does $d_p^\infty = \int_{t_0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{a(t)} dt$ converge to a finite comoving distance?

File Edit View Insert Actions Tools Help

Do we have a cosmological event horizon?

I.e., does $d_p^{\infty} = \int_{t_0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{a(t)} dt$ converge to a finite comoving distance?

Recall: $a(t) \sim t^{\frac{2}{3(1+w)}}$

Notice: convergence iff $r < -1$

$$\Rightarrow \quad d_p^{\infty} = \int_0^{\infty} \frac{1}{a(t)} dt \sim \int_0^{\infty} \underbrace{t^{\frac{-2}{3(1+w)}}}_{t^r} dt$$

$\Rightarrow$ $\exists$ Event horizon iff $w < -\frac{1}{3}$, i.e., if "inflation", i.e., iff $\ddot{a} > 0$!



17 / 20

$\Rightarrow$ $\exists$ Event horizon iff $w < -\frac{1}{3}$, i.e., if "inflation", i.e., iff $\ddot{a} > 0$!





Inflation
& event horizon

No inflation
no event horizon

Black holes:

File Edit View Insert Actions Tools Help

Black holes:

The metric of an eternal, nonrotating, uncharged classical black hole was first found by Schwarzschild in Dec. 1915. It can be written as:

$$ds^2 = \left(1-\frac{r_s}{r}\right)dt^2 - \left(1-\frac{r_s}{r}\right)^{-1}dr^2 - r^2\left(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta \, d\varphi^2\right)$$

where $r_s = 2GM$ is the Schwartzschild radius.

Notice: At $r = r_s$ only this representation becomes singular. E.g. Kruskal coordinates show that g is regular there.

$\rightsquigarrow$ $r = r_s$ is merely the event horizon (which is light-like!)

Only $r=0$ is a singularity (it is spacelike).

18 / 20

Example: Collapsing star, forming black hole (non-rotating)

The (light like) event horizon (of all observers who travel to i^+, i.e., who do not fall into the black hole and who do not end up on $\mathscr{I}^+$, i.e., who do not speed away at the speed of light)



For the transformation, see, e.g., the text by Susskind and Lindsay.

File Edit View Insert Actions Tools Help

And if the black hole eventually radiates away:



20 / 20