

ANTI-DE SITTER QUOTIENTS:
WHEN ARE THEY BLACK HOLES?

Stefan Åminneborg¹

*Norra Reals Gymnasium
S-113 55 Stockholm, Sweden*

Ingemar Bengtsson²

*Stockholm University, AlbaNova
Fysikum
S-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden*

Abstract

We point out that the BTZ black holes, and their relatives, can be defined in a cleaner way than they originally were. The covering space can be taken to be anti-de Sitter space, period, while \mathcal{F} splits up into components due to Misner singularities. Our definition permits us to choose between two conflicting claims concerning BTZ black holes in $3 + 1$ dimensions.

¹Email address: stefan.aminneborg@utbildning.stockholm.se

²Email address: ingemar@physto.se. Supported by VR.

1. Introduction

Because of the special properties of the conformal boundary of anti-de Sitter space, it is possible to form black hole spacetimes by taking the quotient of anti-de Sitter space with some discrete isometry groups. This was first realized in the context of 2+1 dimensional gravity, and a black hole family with properties analogous to those of the Kerr family was found [1, 2]. The construction was later generalized to more involved topologies [3, 4, 5], to higher dimensions [6, 7, 8], and to the Kaluza-Klein case [9]. We call all black holes of this kind “BTZ black holes”. They have attracted a considerable amount of attention; apparently the original paper has been referred to in more than 1200 publications. We will be concerned with two conflicting claims concerning 3+1 dimensional BTZ black holes: Figueroa-O’Farrill et al. [9] argue that a certain class of spacetimes contain black holes, while Holst and Peldán argue that they do not [10]. Clearly either one of these claims is wrong, or—the 1200 publications notwithstanding—the BTZ black holes have not been properly defined. We will argue that the second alternative holds, and will sharpen the definition to ensure that only one of the two claims survive.

The appropriate definition of a black hole is as a region of spacetime which cannot be seen from far away; technically from its conformal boundary \mathcal{F} . True, there may be situations where this definition fails, but for the simple spacetimes considered here we trust it completely. In section 2 of this paper we discuss the conformal boundary of anti-de Sitter space, and stress the fact that this boundary is singular at past and future infinity [11, 12]. Then we define the BTZ black holes. We choose their covering spaces to be anti-de Sitter space, with nothing removed. Whether they are black holes or not is decided by our treatment of their boundaries. In section 3 we discuss the original BTZ-Kerr black holes; according to our definition they are—when they spin—examples of singularity free and causally complete spacetimes, with all closed trapped surfaces and chronology violations confined to a black hole. (This is not quite in line with how BTZ black holes are usually described; in this sense we say something slightly new here.) In section 4 we show how the present viewpoint makes it easy to choose between the two conflicting claims mentioned above. Section 5 gives a brief summary of our argument.

One more thing: the “topological” black holes [6] acquire much of their interest as members of a one parameter family of asymptotically anti-de Sitter

black holes [7]. The “toroidal” black hole to be discussed below also belongs to a one parameter family of spacetimes, viz. the Ehlers-Kundt B1 metrics [13] (or “bubbles of nothing” [14]), but these spacetimes do not describe black holes except in one exceptional case. Both families of spacetimes can be obtained (locally) through analytic continuation from the Schwarzschild-anti-de Sitter spacetimes. Actually there is a third way to perform the analytic continuation, so that the toroidal black hole does appear as a member of a one parameter family of black holes. This will be described in a separate publication [15].

2. BTZ black holes defined

For us, anti-de Sitter space (or adS) is a simply connected spacetime with constant non-zero curvature. It is the covering space of the quadric surface

$$X^2 + Y^2 + Z^2 - U^2 - V^2 = -1 \quad (1)$$

in a flat space with the metric

$$ds^2 = dX^2 + dY^2 + dZ^2 - dU^2 - dV^2 . \quad (2)$$

If the dimension differs from 3+1, adjust the number of “spacelike” coordinates. To understand the intrinsic geometry of this quadric, introduce an intrinsic time coordinate t through

$$U = T \cos t \quad V = T \sin t , \quad -\infty < t < \infty , \quad T \geq 1 \quad (3)$$

At constant t we then have one sheet of a spacelike hyperboloid embedded in a Minkowski space. It is well known that the intrinsic geometry of such a surface has constant negative curvature. We choose the Poincaré model to describe this space, that is to say hyperbolic space is represented as the interior of the unit ball, and its geodesics are arcs of circles meeting the boundary at right angles.

In 3+1 dimensions the intrinsic metric is

$$ds^2 = - \left(\frac{1 + \rho^2}{1 - \rho^2} \right)^2 dt^2 + \frac{4}{(1 - \rho^2)^2} \left(d\rho^2 + \rho^2 (d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2) \right) , \quad (4)$$

where

$$0 \leq \rho < 1, \quad 0 < \theta < \pi, \quad 0 \leq \phi < 2\pi. \quad (5)$$

The 2+1 dimensional version is obtained by setting $Z = 0 \Leftrightarrow \theta = \pi/2$; this is an infinite salami whose slices are Poincaré disks.

As we have learned from Penrose, we can attach a timelike conformal boundary to anti-de Sitter space. We do this by a conformal rescaling of the metric; we will actually work with

$$d\hat{s}^2 = -dt^2 + \frac{4}{(1 + \rho^2)^2} \left(d\rho^2 + \rho^2 \frac{4r^2}{(1 + r^2)^2} (dr^2 + r^2 d\phi^2) \right). \quad (6)$$

The conformal boundary is called scri, is denoted by a script \mathcal{F} , and is attached to the spacetime equipped with the unphysical metric at $\rho = 1$. Conformally the boundary is an Einstein universe, with dimension one less than we started out with, and with topology equal to a sphere cross the real line.

In eq. (6) we somewhat incidentally introduced stereographic coordinates on the 2-sphere ($0 \leq r \leq \infty$). We use them to visualize \mathcal{F} . The picture of 2+1 dimensional anti-de Sitter space itself is an infinite solid cylinder, with a definite choice of conformal structure. The picture of the 2+1 dimensional boundary of a 3+1 dimensional anti-de Sitter space consists of two identical copies of this very cylinder, with their 1+1 dimensional boundaries identified, and with the same choice of conformal structure (so light propagates in the same way in the two pictures). This is depicted, with some additional detail, in fig. 3 below. Two disks at constant time serve to represent a sphere; recall that a sphere can be represented by two disks, each of which is conformal to a hyperbolic plane. Such pictures are useful because they can to a large extent replace analytic calculations, once one has learned to recognize light cones, Killing vector flows, and the like. This information can be found by browsing the literature [4, 6, 10, 16].

The Einstein universe is non-compact, so anti-de Sitter space is not yet conformally compactified; spacelike and null geodesics end at \mathcal{F} , but where do the timelike geodesics go? In Minkowski space this question has a clear answer, but anti-de Sitter space is different. To see what the problem is let us introduce a time coordinate whose range is bounded from below, through

$$t = \ln \tau , \quad 0 < \tau < \infty . \quad (7)$$

We would like to attach a regular point i^- at $\tau = 0$, smoothly connected to \mathcal{F} . If we also introduce a conformal factor $\Omega(\tau)$ in front of the metric (6), and restrict it to \mathcal{F} , it becomes

$$d\hat{s}_{|\rho=1}^2 = \Omega^2(\tau) \left(-\frac{d\tau^2}{\tau^2} + d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2 \right) = -d\tau^2 + \tau^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2) , \quad (8)$$

where we used $\Omega = \tau$ in the second step. But this metric has a curvature singularity at $\tau = 0$, and so does the corresponding spacetime metric. The attempt to attach a point at $\tau = 0$ has therefore failed.

It is instructive to look at the problem in the 2+1 dimensional case [11]. In this case our manipulations have turned \mathcal{F} into a flat Lorentzian cylinder, with metric

$$d\hat{s}_{|\rho=1}^2 = -d\tau^2 + \tau^2 d\phi^2 , \quad 0 \leq \phi < 2\pi . \quad (9)$$

The covering space is a quadrant in a flat Minkowski space, but we cannot unroll the cylinder without destroying the topology. Hence there is of necessity a Misner singularity at the origin. Considered as a two dimensional spacetime \mathcal{F} does not admit a maximal analytic extension to a complete Hausdorff manifold [17, 18].

Was this conclusion an artefact of the particular way in which we tried to do the conformal compactification? As far as we know this point has not received much attention in the literature, but H. Friedrich has kindly sketched an argument for us, which shows that it is in fact impossible to add regular points at i^- and i^+ in a smooth manner in the anti-de Sitter case. The argument employs congruences of timelike conformal geodesics [19]; the idea is that their preferred parameters must go through an infinite number of poles, so that timelike geodesics in anti-de Sitter space are infinitely long also in a conformal sense [20, 12]. This is related to the fact that if we insist on using coordinates for which the metric is manifestly conformally flat, we will need an infinite number of patches to cover a timelike geodesic. The argument fails in 1+1 dimensions because the conformal geodesics are not defined there.




Figure 1: A 1+1 dimensional Einstein universe (left), unrolled to a strip (middle), and its conformal diagram including the singular points at past and future infinity (right).

A proper Penrose diagram of \mathcal{F} , or equivalently of the Einstein universe, can now be drawn. The precise form of its timelike boundaries varies depending on the choice of a conformal factor; our choice differs a little from the standard picture [21, 22]. The key unnegotiable points are that a light ray must be able to wind an infinite number of times around it, and that the diagram ends with singular points both to the future and to the past.

Finally we can state a definition of a BTZ black hole spacetime. We begin with three requirements that we think the conformal boundary has to meet, in order for a d -dimensional spacetime to qualify as asymptotically anti-de Sitter:

1. \mathcal{F} has topology $\mathbf{R} \times \Sigma$, where Σ is a compact $(d - 2)$ -manifold.
2. \mathcal{F} is locally conformal to the Einstein universe.
3. \mathcal{F} does not admit a conformal compactification at past and future temporal infinity.

There are some further technical requirements, for which we refer to Ashtekar and Magnon [23]. Anti-de Sitter space itself admits such a \mathcal{F} , and moreover in this case Σ is a sphere. We keep things more general because we will be forced to later on. Our definition of a BTZ black hole spacetime then becomes:

Definition: A BTZ black hole is a spacetime of the form adS/Γ , where Γ

is a discrete subgroup of the anti-de Sitter group, such that its conformal boundary \mathcal{F} contains a component with the above three properties, and such that there is a black hole (in the ordinary sense) with respect to that component.

Note carefully that we do not assume that the conformal boundary of the quotient is the quotient of the conformal boundary of anti-de Sitter space. Indeed the isometries we use to take the quotient will have fixed points on the latter, and this will dictate precisely how the former splits up into several components.

In the original paper it was argued that a slightly different definition is to be preferred; the covering space was taken to be an open set of anti-de Sitter space chosen in such a way that no closed timelike curves appear when the quotient is taken [2]. But we argue in section 3 that this approach weakens the analogy to the Kerr black hole, and in section 4 that it has led to confusion.

3. The (2+1) Kerr family

In the 2+1 dimensional case the definition of a BTZ black hole can be made even cleaner. Assumptions 1-3 above can be replaced by:

1'. \mathcal{F} contains a component conformal to the anti-de Sitter \mathcal{F} .

In this paper we will quotient with isometry groups Γ obtained by exponentiating a single Killing vector field ξ . Here an appropriate choice is [2]

$$\xi = r_+ J_{XU} + r_- J_{YV} \equiv r_+(X\partial_U + U\partial_X) + r_-(Y\partial_V + V\partial_Y), \quad (10)$$

where r_+ and r_- are parameters related to mass and spin; we assume that $r_+ > r_-$. Inside anti-de Sitter space itself this Killing vector field will have fixed points if and only if $r_- = 0$, which is the spinless case. In the spinning case there are no fixed points, and the quotient space adS/Γ is everywhere well behaved as a manifold.

The expression (10) is not valid on \mathcal{F} , but can be reexpressed in terms of the intrinsic coordinates used in eq. (4). We introduce the light cone




Figure 2: The flow of ξ on a piece of the conformal boundary, and fundamental regions for four components of the conformal boundary of the quotient space. We show the spinless case; the spinning case is depicted elsewhere [16].

coordinates

$$u = t - \phi \quad v = t + \phi . \quad (11)$$

On \mathcal{F} we obtain

$$\xi_{|\rho=1} = -(r_+ + r_-) \sin u \partial_u - (r_+ - r_-) \sin v \partial_v . \quad (12)$$

As explained elsewhere [16], it is then easy to see what the flow lines look like, and it is also easy to see what happens when identifications are made along them in order to produce the conformal boundary of the BTZ-Kerr black hole. Comparing to the Penrose diagram of \mathcal{F} it is immediately clear that the identifications, when applied to one of the diamonds where ξ is spacelike, will produce a conformal copy of the anti-de Sitter \mathcal{F} , complete with Misner singularities at the ends. Each diamond gives rise to separate component of \mathcal{F} . In this sense the BTZ-Kerr spacetime is asymptotically anti-de Sitter, and a black hole spacetime according to our definition.

The Misner singularities on \mathcal{F} deserve some further comments though. The discrete group generated by e^ξ does act properly discontinuously on a

region larger than the diamond shaped one that we have chosen as our covering space, say on two neighbouring diamonds, one where ξ is spacelike and one where it is timelike (including their null boundary). Is it then reasonable to limit ourselves to one diamond only? We claim it is. First of all it is impossible to define a covering space leading to a geodesically complete quotient manifold. Secondly, when we add a neighbouring diamond to the one we started out from we are in the situation of Buridan's ass; we get no help to choose which one of two possible diamonds we should add. Including both would lead to a mildly non-Hausdorff geodesically incomplete manifold [18]. Thirdly, and in our opinion decisively, we did aim to get a conformal copy of the anti-de Sitter boundary as our \mathcal{F} , and this is precisely what we do obtain when we limit ourselves to one diamond where the flow of ξ is spacelike. Observe also that there is very little arbitrariness involved, since our definition requires \mathcal{F} to end with a singularity to the future. For quotient black holes such a singularity can arise only because the isometries have fixed points on \mathcal{F} .

We turn to the physical spacetime. It is what it is, and it is not reasonable to restrict its covering space by hand. This means that there will be closed timelike curves in the interior of the black hole, coming from the regions where the flow of ξ is timelike. But then it is precisely because of this feature that the BTZ-Kerr black hole is a very good analogy to the 3+1 dimensional Kerr black hole—this also has closed timelike curves in its interior, as well as alternating asymptotic regions with and without them. Moreover the Kerr black hole just barely fails to be geodesically complete: causal geodesics are affected by the singularity only when confined to the equator [24, 25]. This was stressed by Newman, who gave a discussion of geodesically complete black hole spacetimes [26]. The Schwarzschild solution works in a different way, and so does the spinless BTZ black hole. In this case one may contemplate restricting the covering space in order to avoid Misner singularities; the decision affects only the interior of the black hole and need not concern us here.

Bañados et al. [2] defined their spacetimes in a different way. They suggested that the covering space be restricted to the open set in anti-de Sitter space where the flow of ξ is spacelike. This evidently leads to an incomplete quotient space. They drew Penrose diagrams for both cases, but ended up advocating that the incomplete version is preferred. The causal structure of the BTZ-Kerr black hole in their version is closely analogous to

that of the Reissner-Nordström black hole; it has a timelike singularity (or “edge”) surrounded by outer and inner horizons, and is free of closed timelike curves. Now it might be argued that the behaviour inside the inner (or even outer) horizon is irrelevant, because this part of the solution will be changed by generic perturbations. This may be so, but any instability is likely to occur already at the inner horizon so we do not feel that this is an excuse for introducing a singularity by hand somewhere else.

4. Black holes and time machines in (3+1) dimensions

In 3+1 dimensions Holst and Peldán classified all possible spacetimes that arise by performing identifications using one-parameter subgroups of $SO(3, 2)$ [10]. A black hole is obtained when the subgroup is generated by the Killing vector

$$\xi = J_{ZU} . \tag{13}$$

To see this, begin by considering the flow of ξ on \mathcal{F} , as sketched in fig. 3. The flow is spacelike in the region surrounding the pair of light cones in the cylinders depicted in fig. 3. There are two circles of fixed points at $t = \pm\pi/2$. When the identifications are carried through the circles of fixed points become Misner singularities in the quotient space, and in accordance with our philosophy we regard the region outside the light cones as the covering space for a component of the quotient \mathcal{F} . This component is indeed singular (in the Misner sense) at future and past infinity; and there will be regions of spacetime that cannot be seen from it. Hence we do have a BTZ black hole [6, 10].

Holst and Peldán classified all spacetimes of the form adS/Γ , where the discrete group Γ is generated by a single element of the isometry group. One of the cases they called type Id. The generator of Γ is then obtained by exponentiating the Killing vector field

$$\tilde{\xi} = J_{ZU} + aJ_{XY} , \quad a \neq 0 . \tag{14}$$

When $a = 0$ the type is Ib. They argued that, in 3+1 dimensions, type Ib is the only one leading to a black hole. This was disputed by Figueroa-O’Farrill et al. [9], who argued that all spacetimes of type Id contain black holes. The




Figure 3: The two solid cylinders represent the conformal boundary of 3+1 dimensional adS. The region where J_{ZU} is spacelike surrounds the two light cones, and the flow of J_{ZU} defines the spacelike surfaces shown; they are punctured spheres, and turn into tori when the identification is carried through. The three balls represent three equal t -slices through anti-de Sitter space itself. They are bounded by spheres, appearing as constant t -surfaces at infinity. We remind the reader that the two descriptions go together because two disks can be made to represent a sphere. In the Poincaré balls we see how the event horizon is born as a circle at $t = 0$, and then becomes a torus—that is, once the identifications have been carried through.




Figure 4: The mistake in Holst and Peldán: A spacelike curve may fail to be achronal.

confusion arises because of ambiguities in the choice of covering space. Holst and Peldán followed Bañados et al. [2] in choosing their covering space to be the open subset of anti-de Sitter space where ξ is spacelike. With the coordinates and conformal factor that we use on \mathcal{F} , we find

$$\|\tilde{\xi}\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 = \frac{1}{(1+r^2)^2} \left(4r^2(\cos^2 t + a^2) - (1-r^2)^2 \sin^2 t \right). \quad (15)$$

With increasing a the region where $\tilde{\xi}$ is spacelike grows. As soon as $a \neq 0$ it is bounded by a timelike surface, and—crucially—it becomes connected. Hence the flow is spacelike in an open region including the boundaries of the two solid cylinders in Fig. 3 for all times t , all points in the anti-de Sitter interior can be seen from it, and there is no black hole.

Figuroa-O’Farrill et al. [9] correctly note a problem with this. Inside the light cones in Fig. 3 a flow line of $\tilde{\xi}$ is a helix; hence different points on it can be connected with timelike curves. Technically $\tilde{\xi}$ is spacelike but not achronal, and when identifications are made along it closed timelike curves (CTCs) will arise. See Fig. 4. Hence the motivation for the restricted covering space chosen by Holst and Peldán has disappeared.

According to us the covering space of the physical spacetime should not be restricted in any way, and the covering space of \mathcal{F} is restricted only if the isometries have fixed points there. For spacetimes of type Id there are no fixed points to limit the future of \mathcal{F} , and therefore these spacetimes are not black holes. But they are rather striking counterexamples to at least some versions of the chronology protection conjecture [27]. The Poincaré ball at $t = 0$ is transformed into itself by $\tilde{\xi}$, hence no CTC can pass it after taking the quotient. Moreover the data imposed on \mathcal{F} , to the future of this

spatial slice, seem quite reasonable. Nevertheless CTCs are created by the time evolution.

Figuroa-O’Farrill et al. draw a very different conclusion. They restrict the covering space even further, to the region where J_{ZU} is spacelike—also when $a \neq 0$. The resulting quotient space is free of CTCs, and it is a black hole spacetime. From our point of view this restriction by hand is inadmissible because the resulting \mathcal{F} admits a regular completion at future infinity. To support our view, let us consider an experimentalist (in anti-de Sitter space) who plans to build a time machine, and applies for support from the Anti-de Sitter Research Council. Suppose that the evaluation report states the scheme to be impossible, because any part of spacetime containing CTCs will be declared void by decree of the Establishment. The experimentalist will rightly object to this report. Clearly she would object to the suggestion by Figuroa-O’Farrill et al. on the same grounds—even if their attitude is softened to the extent that only regions from where the Research Council can see the CTCs is taken away. It would be a different matter if the Council were able to present detailed arguments to show that the time machine cannot be created because of, say, generic small perturbations or quantum mechanical effects. Perhaps it should give additional funding to someone trying to work such an argument out?

Thus the conclusion, but not the argument, of Holst and Peldán still stands.

5. Summary

The aim of this paper was to give an unambiguous definition of “BTZ black holes”. We believe we have succeeded in this. First we define a spacetime as the quotient of anti-de Sitter space (in any dimension) with a discrete isometry group. No restrictions on the covering space are needed. We treat \mathcal{F} somewhat differently; if Misner singularities are present there, we allow the quotient to split up into components. A “physical” component is the quotient of a region where the flow of the Killing vector is spacelike, and it must end with a Misner singularity to the future (and past). We argue that this is a sensible procedure, in particular it is the only way in which to ensure that the 2+1 BTZ black hole has a component of its conformal boundary which is conformally equivalent to the anti-de Sitter \mathcal{F} .

Once this definition has been agreed on, it is seen that all the anti-de Sitter quotient black holes proposed in the literature do deserve their name—with the exception of the case under discussion, Holst’s and Peldán’s type Id, which is seen not to be a black hole at all. On the contrary it is an interesting example of a spacetime containing both closed timelike curves and an achronal spacelike hypersurface.

Acknowledgements

We thank Johan Brännlund for drawing our attention to the work of Figueroa-O’Farrill et al., and Helmut Friedrich and Paul Tod for some help with infinity. We also thank Sören Holst and Peter Peldán for comments on the manuscript—and for authorizing phrases like that in the caption of Fig. 4.

References

- [1] M. Bañados, C. Teitelboim, and J. Zanelli, *The black hole in three-dimensional space-time*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69** (1992) 1849.
- [2] M. Bañados, M. Henneaux, C. Teitelboim, and J. Zanelli, *Geometry of the (2+1) black hole*, Phys. Rev. **D48** (1993) 1506.
- [3] S. Åminneborg, I. Bengtsson, D. Brill, S. Holst, and P. Peldán, *Black holes and wormholes in 2+1 dimensions*, Class. Quant. Grav. **15** (1998) 627.
- [4] D. Brill, *2+1 dimensional black holes with momentum and angular momentum*, Annalen Phys. **9** (2000) 217.
- [5] F. Bonsante, K. Krasnov, and J.-M. Schlenker, *Multi black holes and earthquakes on Riemann surfaces with boundaries*, arXiv: math/0610429.
- [6] S. Åminneborg, I. Bengtsson, S. Holst, and P. Peldán, *Making anti-de Sitter black holes*, Class. Quant. Grav. **13** (1996) 2707.

- [7] D. R. Brill, J. Louko, and P. Peldán, *Thermodynamics of (3+1)-dimensional black holes with toroidal or higher genus horizons*, Phys. Rev. **D56** (1997) 3600.
- [8] C. Cadeau and E. Woolgar, *New five dimensional black holes classified by horizon geometry, and a Bianchi VI braneworld*, Class. Quant. Grav. **18** (2001) 527.
- [9] J. Figueroa-O’Farrill, O. Madden, S. F. Ross, and J. Simon, *Quotients of $AdS_{p+1} \times S^q$: causally well-behaved spaces and black holes*, Phys. Rev. **D69** (2004) 124026.
- [10] S. Holst and P. Peldán, *Black holes and causal structure in anti-de Sitter isometric spacetimes*, Class. Quant. Grav. **14** (1997) 3433.
- [11] V. Di Carlo, *Conformal compactification and anti-de Sitter space*, Master’s Thesis, Stockholm 2007. Available at <http://www.kof.physto.se>.
- [12] P. Tod and C. Lübbe, *An extension theorem for conformal gauge singularities*, arXiv:0710.5552.
- [13] J. Ehlers and W. Kundt, *Exact solutions of the gravitational field equations*, in L. Witten (ed.): Gravitation: An Introduction to Current Research, Wiley, New York 1962.
- [14] O. Aharony, M. Fabinger, G. T. Horowitz, and E. Silverstein, *Clean time-dependent string backgrounds from bubble baths*, JHEP **0207** (2002) 007.
- [15] J. E. Åman, S. Åminneborg, I. Bengtsson, and N. Pidokrajt, *Anti-de Sitter quotients, bubbles of nothing, and black holes*, Gen. Rel. Grav. **40** (2008), to appear.
- [16] S. Åminneborg, I. Bengtsson, and S. Holst, *A spinning anti-de Sitter wormhole*, Class. Quant. Grav. **16** (1999) 363.
- [17] C. W. Misner, *Taub-NUT space as a counterexample to almost anything*, in J. Ehlers (ed.): Relativity Theory and Astrophysics 1: Relativity and Cosmology, Providence, RI, American Mathematical Society 1967.

- [18] S. W. Hawking and G. F. R. Ellis: *The Large Scale Structure of Space-Time*, Cambridge U.P., 1973.
- [19] H. Friedrich and B. G. Schmidt, *Conformal geodesics in general relativity*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. **A414** (1987) 171.
- [20] H. Friedrich, *Einstein equations and conformal structure: Existence of Anti-de-Sitter-type space-times*, J. Geom. Phys. **17** (1995) 125.
- [21] F. J. Tipler, *Penrose diagrams for the Einstein, Eddington-Lemaître, Eddington-Lemaître-Bondi, and Anti-de Sitter universes*, J. Math. Phys. **27** (1986) 559.
- [22] A. García-Parrado and J. M. M. Senovilla, *Causal structures and causal boundaries*, Class. Quant. Grav. **22** (2005) R1.
- [23] A. Ashtekar and A. Magnon, *Asymptotically anti-de Sitter space-times*, Class. Quant. Grav. **1** (1984) L39.
- [24] R. H. Boyer and R. W. Lindquist, *Maximal analytic extension of the Kerr metric*, J. Math. Phys. **8** (1967) 265.
- [25] B. Carter, *Global structure of the Kerr family of gravitational fields*, Phys. Rev. **174** (1968) 1559.
- [26] R. P. A. C. Newman, *Black holes without singularities*, Gen. Rel. Grav. **21** (1989) 981.
- [27] S. W. Hawking, *Chronology protection conjecture*, Phys. Rev. **D46** (1992) 603.