RELATÓRIO DE PESQUISA

AGAIN ON THE MASS AND ENERGY
IN GENERAL RELATIVITY

Yuri Bozhkov

and

Waldyr A. Rodrigues Jr.

Abril RP 18/95

INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA
ESTATÍSTICA E CIÊNCIA DA COMPUTAÇÃO

UNICAMP

UNIVERSIDADE ESTADUAL DE CAMPINAS

ABSTRACT - We consider the Denisov-Solov'ov example which shows that the inertial mass is not well defined in General Relativity. It is shown that the mathematical reason why this is true is a wrong application of the Stokes theor discuss the role of the order of asymptotically flatness in the definition of the mass. In conclusion some comments on the conservation laws in General Relativity are presented.

IMECC - UNICAMP
Universidade Estadual de Campinas
CP 6065
13081-970 Campinas SP
Brasil

Abril - 1995

Again On The Mass And Energy In General Relativity

Yuri Bozhkov[1,2] and Waldyr A. Rodrigues, Jr.[1]

[1] *Instituto de Matemática, Estatística e Ciência de Computação IMECC - UNICAMP, CP 6065, Campinas, SP, Brasil*

[2] *Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Trieste, Piazzale Europa 1, 34127 Trieste, Italy*

E-mail: walrod@ime.unicamp.br or 47596::WALROD
bozhkov@uts340.univ.trieste.it

April 17, 1995

Abstract

We consider the Denisov-Solov'ov example which shows that the inertial mass is not well defined in General Relativity. It is shown that the mathematical reason why this is true is a wrong application of the Stokes theor discuss the role of the order of asymptotically flatness in the definition of the mass. In conclusion some comments on the conservation laws in General Relativity are presented.

PACS numbers:
04.20.Cv, 04.20.Me, 02.40.Vh

Key words:
inertial mass, energy, conservation laws, Stokes theorem

to appear in General Relativity and Gravitation 1995

In any physical theory the notions of *mass* and *energy* play an important role. The related conservation laws are the corner stones of the theory. There is a huge number of literature where authors describe

The *equivalence principle* states that the gravitational mass and the inertial mass are equal. It is a fundamental law in physics. Logun that the gravitational mass is well defined in GRT. However they point out that in GRT there is no satisfactory definition of the inertial mass exposition is close to [5,4].

Let $T^{\mu\nu}$ be the energy-momentum tensor and $G^{\mu\nu}$ - the Einstein tensor. The Einstein equations read

$$G^{\mu\nu} = T^{\mu\nu}. \qquad (1)$$

Then fix a basis ϵ_ν of 1-form fields and let $J^\mu = T^{\mu\nu}\epsilon_\nu$ and $G^\mu = G^{\mu\nu}\epsilon_\nu$ be respectively the energ and Einstein equations (1) imply

$$D * J^\mu = d * J^\mu + \omega^\mu_\nu \wedge *J^\nu = 0, \qquad (2)$$

where (ω^μ_ν) is the matrix of the connection 1-forms of the Levi-Civita connection D and $*$ is the Hodge-star operator.

Now one looks for a "1-form" τ^μ such that

$$d * \tau^\mu = \omega^\mu_\nu \wedge *J^\nu. \qquad (3)$$

From equations (2) and (3) we have the following conservation laws:

$$d * (J^\mu + \tau^\mu) = 0. \qquad (4)$$

From (4) one concludes that there is an exact 3-form $-d * S^\mu$ such that

$$* J^\mu + *\tau^\mu = -d * S^\mu. \qquad (5)$$

See [5]. The latter conclusion is not true for arbitrary 4-manifold since its third de Rham cohomology group could not be zero. In particular, this invalidates Thirring-Wallner's proof [5] that for a closed universe (with topology $\mathbb{R} \times S^3$) the total energy must be zero, since $H^3(S^3) = \mathbb{R}$ is non-trivial. However, we agree with eq.(5) if we are in $\mathbb{R}^4$ where every closed differential form is actually exact.

Further one integrates eq. (5) over a "certain finite three-dimensional volume", say a ball B, and then by the Stokes theorem

$$\int_B (*J^\mu + *\tau^\mu) = -\int_{\partial B} *S^\mu. \tag{6}$$

If we express $*S^\mu$ in eq.(6) in the terms of a metric g_{ij}, the (inertial) mass is given by

$$m_i = \lim_{R\to\infty} \int_{\partial B} *S^0 \doteq -\frac{1}{16\pi} \lim_{R\to\infty} \int_{\partial B} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\beta}[g_{11}g_{22}g_{33}g^{\alpha\beta}]d\sigma_\alpha, \tag{7}$$

where $\partial B = S^2(R)$ is a 2-sphere of radius R, $(-1)n_\alpha$ - its outward unit normal and $d\sigma_\alpha = -R^2 n_\alpha dA$. If the metric g_{ij} is asymptotically flat (see below), then eq.(7) is equivalent to

$$m_i = -\frac{1}{16\pi} \lim_{R\to\infty} \int_{S^2(R)} \sum_{\mu,\nu=1}^{3} \left(\frac{\partial g_{\mu\nu}}{\partial x^\mu} - \frac{\partial g_{\mu\mu}}{\partial x^\nu}\right) d\sigma_\nu. \tag{8}$$

Logunov et al. claim that the inertial mass defined above depends on the spatial co-ordinates and therefore has no physical meaning. Indeed, Denisov and Solov'ov [6] (see also [4]) have found an explicit

$$ds^2 = \left(1 - \frac{2m}{r}\right) dt^2 - \left(1 - \frac{2m}{r}\right)^{-1} dr^2 - r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin\theta^2 d\varphi^2). \tag{9}$$

Then introduce Cartesian co-ordinates x^μ_C. The Schwarzschild metric becomes

$$ds^2 = g_{00}dt^2 + g_{\alpha\beta}dx^\alpha_C dx^\beta_C, \tag{10}$$

where

$$g_{00} = \frac{\left(1 - \frac{2m}{4r}\right)^2}{\left(1 + \frac{2m}{4r}\right)^2}, \qquad g_{\alpha\beta} = -\delta_{\alpha\beta}\left(1 + \frac{2m}{4r}\right)^4. \tag{11}$$

Now make another change of the spatial co-ordinates

$$x^\mu_C = x^\mu_N(1 + f(r_N)). \tag{12}$$

where $r_N = ((x^1_N)^2 + (x^2_N)^2 + (x^3_N)^2)^{1/2}$. f is an appropriate function such that f and f' have good behavi infinity and the Jacobian is positive. In fact

$$f(y) = a^2\left(\frac{8m}{y}\right)^{1/2}(1 - \exp[-y]). \tag{13}$$

where a is a non-zero constant. Clearly

$$f(y) \geq 0, \qquad \lim_{y\to\infty} f(y) = 0, \qquad \lim_{y\to\infty} yf'(y) = 0$$

and the Jacobian is greater than 1. After this change the metric has the form

$$g_{00} = \left(1 - \frac{2m}{4r_N(1+f)}\right)^2 \left(1 + \frac{2m}{4r_N(1+f)}\right)^{-2} \tag{14}$$

$$g_{\alpha\beta} = -\left(1 - \frac{2m}{4r_N(1+f)}\right)^4 [\delta_{\alpha\beta}(1+f)^2 + x^N_\alpha x^N_\beta[(f')^2 + \frac{2}{r_N}f'(1+f)]] \tag{15}$$

and the inertial mass m'_i in the new spatial co-ordinates x^μ_N is

$$m'_i = m(1 + a^4).$$

Therefore the inertial mass changes and depends on the spatial co-ordinates even in the case of the well known Schwarzschild metric. Of course, like the velocity dependence of mass in SRT.

We have checked the above calculations and confirm their correctness. Here we would like to point out the mathematical reason why they are right, what seems to be not clear even to the authors that proposed this example. First let observe that the definition of τ^μ and $d*S^\mu$, $\mu = 0,1,2,3$, as it can be seen from (3) and (5), depends upon a ch basis $\{e_\nu, \nu = 0,1,2,3\}$ of 1-form fields. Hence it follows that τ^μ and $d*S^\mu$, $\mu = 0,1,2,3$, are not tensors. Above one applies the Stokes (Ostrogradskii-Gauss-Green) theorem to each one of the objects $d*S^\mu$, $\mu = 0,1,2,3$, in order to express $d*S^\mu$ as $\int_{\partial B} *S^\mu$. But the Stokes theorem concerns differential forms, which are anti-symmetric tensors. Therefore it can not be applied to non-tensorial quantities like $d*S^\mu$, $\mu = 0,1$. In particular to $d*S^0$.

The situation can be also viewed in local co-ordinates. Indeed, one has a decomposition of the energy-momentum tensor into two non-covariant quantities

$$T^{\mu\nu} = \partial_\sigma h^{\mu\nu\sigma} + t^{\mu\nu},$$

where $t^{\mu\nu}$ is the so-called energy-momentum pseudo-tensor of the gravitational field [1,4]. In our case the corresponding symmetric "object" $t^{\mu\nu}$ is called Landau-Lifshitz pseudo-tensor. In fact, there are many energy-momentum pseudo-tens [1] or [4]), which we shall not introduce here. Then the inertial mass

$$m_i = \lim_{R\to\infty} \int_{\partial B} h^{00\alpha} d\sigma_\alpha,$$

what is obtained by the Stokes theorem (as in eq.(6) and eq.(7)). Actually, (7) is a consequence of the last formula. It is again clear that $\tau^0 = t^{0\nu} e_\nu$ and $d*S^0$, where

$$S_0 = \frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2(-g)} g_{0\tau}[g(g^{\nu\tau}g^{\rho\beta} - g^{\rho\tau}g^{\nu\beta}]_{,\beta} e_\nu \wedge e_\rho$$

(see [5]), do not transform as tensors. Compare this with a paragraph in the Misner-Thorne-Wheeler's book [1], where they make right comments on page 465, noting that all objects like τ^μ are co-ordinate dependent. Namely: "All the quantities $H^{\mu\alpha\nu\beta}$, $T^{\mu\nu}_{eff}$ and $t^{\mu\nu}$ depend for their definition and existence on the choice of co-ordinates: they have no existence independent Correspondingly, the equations (20.14) and (20.19) involving $T^{\mu\nu}_{eff}$ and $t^{\mu\nu}$ have no geometric, co-ordinate-free significan "covariant tensor equations"."([1], p. 465). However, the next comments are wrong, because they claim that the integral given by our eq co-ordinate independent. The Denisov-Solov'ov-Logunov-Mestvirishvili example shows the opposite.

Another purpose of the present paper is to discuss how the definition of the mass notion is intimately related with the concept of asymptotically flat metric. It actually states two things: 1) existence of special co-ordinates and 2) the behaviour of the metric at infinity is of the form

$$g = \delta + O(r^{-k}). \tag{16}$$

In the earlier paper [7] by Schoen-Yau $k = 2$, while in the next one [8] $k = 1$, a weaker condition. Note that Schoen and Yau consider metrics on three-dimensional manifolds. Therefore in (16) by g we mean the spatial part $g_{\alpha\beta}$ of a Lorentzian metric, which in the considered example is negative-definite. The latter resulted in the minus sign in the definition of m_i.

In all papers on the positive mass conjecture (e.g. [7,8]), the mass is defined for asymptotically flat metrics and then it is shown that it is non-negative if the scalar curvature is non-negative. However, Bando et al. [9] emphasize that it is not absolutely certain that the mass (=inertial mass, our note) is not independent of the co-ordinates. They prove a sufficient condition for existence of asymptotically flat co-ordinates. They also mention a p of the example above this is not true. And we would say, it should be independent only of the asymptotically flat co-ordinates, in which it is considered example $k = 1/2$ (see (14) and (15)) and therefore they are not the asymptotically flat co-ordinates used by Schoen and Yau, since they need co-ordinates in which metric has $k = 1$. Hence we are **not** saying that Schoen-Yau result is not true. Simply, what they call mass is not good for physics since it depends on the spati be overcome also by the looking global definition of asymptotically flatness [2,11]. Indeed, the problem 2, p. 295 in [2] reduces th satisfy (16) with $k = 1$. Then the definition of (inertial) mass, p. 293, is the same as that given by the integral (8), up to t counter example [12] to the generalized positive action conjecture provides a good metric with negative mass. We think that this is quite

Before concluding this short note, we would like to comment briefly the conservation laws in General Relativity (GR). In his paper [13] Dalton arrives at the right conclusion that in GR we can have only conservation in *infinitesimal* regions of the spacetime and that this conservation is expressed by the vanis covariant derivative of the energy-momentum tensor. What surprises is that, according [13], there is not a real problem in GR due to the lack of integral conservation laws for energy-momentum and angular momentum in this theory. This point has been emphasized by Vargas and Torr [14] they use vector-valued differential forms and correctly obtain the result that local conservation of the vector-valued differential forms $\Pi = \Pi^\mu \epsilon_\mu$ is represented by the vanishing of the exterior covariant derivative of the form Π^μ, i.e., $D\Pi^\mu = d\Pi^\mu + \omega^\mu_\nu \wedge \Pi^\nu = 0$. Another analysis of the possibility for genuine conservation laws in a general field theory where gravitation

(and possible other fields) are geometrized has been proposed by Benn [15]. However, using the words of Ferraris and Francaviglia [16], the problems of conserved quantities are "problems still to be satisfactorily solved in General Relativity" [16]. In such attempts one must always keep in mind that global conservation laws for energy, momentum and angular momentum depend on the existence of appropriate Killing vector fields in the spacetime manifold. Such vector fields in general do not exist in an arbitrary Lorentzian (or Riemann-Cartan) manifold.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the referees for theirs suggestions and comments. Yu. Bozhkov would also like to thank FAPESP, São Paulo, Brasil, for the fellowship at State University of Campinas and the Commission of EC, "Difussion Reaction Equations", grant No. ERBCHRXCT930409, for the partial financial support. W. A. Rodrigues is grateful to CNPq, Brasil, for the partial financial support.

References

[1] Misner,C.W., K.S.Thorne, J.A.Wheeler (1973) *Gravitation*, (Freeman), San Francisco

[2] Wald,R. (1984) *General relativity* (University of Chicago Press), Chicago

[3] Sachs,R.K., H.Wu (1977) *General relativity for Mathematicians* (Springer), New York

[4] Logunov,A., M.Mestvirishvili (1989) *The Relativistic Theory of Gravitation* (Mir Publishers), Moskow

[5] Thirring,W., R.Wallner (1978) *Brazilian J. Phys*, **8**, 686

[6] Denisov,V.I., V.O.Solov'ov (1983) *Theor. Math. Phys.*, **56**, 832

[7] Schoen,R., S.-T.Yau (1979) *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **65**, 45

[8] Schoen,R., S.-T.Yau (1979) *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **79**, 231

[9] Bando,S., A.Kasue, H.Nakajima (1989) *Invent. Math.*, **97**, 313

[10] Bartnik,R. (1986) *Comm. Pure App. Math.*, **XXXIX**, 661

[11] Ashtekar,A. (1978) *Asymptotical structure of the gravitational field at spatial infinity*, p.37 in: *General Relativity and Gravitation. Vol.2*. Ed. A. Held (Plenum Press), New York

[12] LeBrun,C. (1988) *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **118**, 591

[13] Dalton,K. (1989) *Gen. Relat. Grav.*, **21**, 533

[14] Vargas,J.G., D.G.Torr (1991) *Gen. Relat. Grav.*, **23**, 713

[15] Benn,I.M. (1982) *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré*, **XXXVII A**, 67

[16] Ferraris, M., M.Francaviglia (1992) *Class. Quant. Grav.*, **9**, S79

RELATÓRIOS DE PESQUISA — 1995

01/95 Modelo de Regressão Weibull Dependente para Testes Acelerados em Riscos Competitivos - *Silvia Emiko Shimakura* and *Cecilia Yuko Wada*.

02/95 Semilinear Elliptic Equations with Exponential Nonlinearities - *João Marcos Bezerra do Ó*.

03/95 Some inequalities for immersed surfaces - *Valery Marenich* and *Irwen Valle Guadalupe*.

04/95 Geometria e Topologia de Fluxos de Anosov em 3-variedades - *Sérgio R. Fenley*.

05/95 Tangent Cones at Infinity Under Quadratic Sectional Curvature Decay - *G. Pacelli Bessa* and *Valery Marenich*.

05/95 Tangent Cones at Infinity Under Quadratic Sectional Curvature Decay - *G. Pacelli Bessa* and *Valery Marenich*.

06/95 The Holonomy in Open Manifolds of Nonnegative Curvature - *Valery Marenich*.

07/95 The Log Gamma Model and the Choice of a Parametric Lifetime Model - *Dione Maria Valença* and *Jonathan Biele*.

08/95 Shock Indicator for Adaptive Schemes for Conservation Laws - *Cristina Cunha* and *Sônia M. Gomes*.

09/95 Singularities of Reversible Vector Fields - *Marco Antonio Teixeira*.

10/95 On the Homology of Manifolds — *Ricardo N. Cruz*.

11/95 Submersions of Open Manifolds of Nonnegative Curvature — *Valery Marenich*.

12/95 Topological Gap-Phenomenon — *Valery Marenich*.

13/95 Cohomogeneity one Manifolds and Hypersurfaces of Revolution — *Antonio Carlos Asperti*, *Francesco Mercuri* and *Maria Helena Noronha*.

14/95 Low Codimensional Submanifolds of Euclidean Space with Nonnegative Isotropic Curvature - *Francesco Mercuri* and *Maria Helena Noronha*.

15/95 Creation of Particles in the Early Friedmann Universe — *A. A. Grib*.

16/95 EPR Paradox, Bell's Inequalities and Telepathic Communication — *A. A. Grib*.

17/95 O Grupo das Rotações com Dez Parâmetros — *G.C. Ducati*, *E. Capelas de Oliveira* and *G. Arcidiacono*.