

K-CAUSAL MAPS AND CAUSAL CONDITIONS ON C^0 -LORENTZIAN MANIFOLDS

SUJATHA JANARDHAN*

Department of Mathematics, St.Francis De Sales' College, Nagpur-440 006 , India.

AND

R.V.SARAYKAR†

Department of Mathematics, Nagpur University Campus, Nagpur-440 033, India.

Abstract

Using K-Causal relation introduced by Sorkin and Woolgar ¹, we generalize results of Garcia-Parrado and Senovilla ⁷ on causal maps. We also introduce new concepts like K-future sets, K-reflecting and K-future distinguishing space-times, and prove some of their properties. This approach is simpler and more general as compared to traditional causal approach ^{2,3} and it has been used by Penrose et.al ⁴ in giving a new proof of positivity of mass theorem.

Key Words: K-causality, Causal maps, Causality conditions, C^0 -Lorentzian manifolds.

*e-mail address: sujata_jana@yahoo.com

†e-mail address: r_saraykar@rediffmail.com and sarayaka_ngp@sancharnet.in

1 Introduction

In 1996, Sorkin and Woolgar ¹ introduced a new causal relation K^+ which is a generalization of usual causal relations I^+ and J^+ (cf Penrose ² and Hawking and Ellis ³). Theory of Causal structures developed by Penrose and Hawking played an important role in establishing singularity theorems in general relativity and quite exhaustive work has been done in this area since 1964. Books by Hawking and Ellis ³, Wald ⁵, Joshi ⁶ and Beem, Ehrlich and Easley ⁷ are a proof of it. The Causal relation K^+ introduced in ¹ is order-theoretic in nature and no smoothness assumption is needed to develop the ideas in General Relativity. In Sorkin and Woolgar ¹, the results are proved for C^0 -Lorentzian manifolds and the framework developed is of wider applicability as compared to previous work and also conceptually simple. The authors have made use of Vietoris topology to establish some basic results. An important result proved is the compactness of the space of all K -causal curves in a globally hyperbolic space-time. More recently A. Garcia-Parrado and J.M.M. Senovilla ^{8,9} introduced the concept of causal mappings and proved a series of results in Causal structure theory of space-times in General Relativity. These mappings are more general than conformal mappings and the authors have also discussed a good number of examples to illustrate their ideas.

In this paper, we combine the concept of K -causality with causal mappings and prove a series of results which are generalizations of results of Garcia-Parrado and Senovilla. In fact, our aim is to recast ‘global causal analysis’ along order-theoretic and general-topological lines, following the definitions and basic results of Sorkin and Woolgar ¹ and following other works by Hawking and Sachs ¹⁰, Beem ¹¹, Geroch ¹², Joshi ⁶ and Diekmann ¹³.

Thus in section 2, after recalling basic definitions from Sorkin and Woolgar ¹, we define K -causal maps and derive their properties while working with K -causal space-times.

In section 3, we define K -future sets and other causality conditions with respect to K^+ , and prove some properties of these sets. We note that if $p \prec q$, there need not exist a future directed K -causal curve from p to q even if q is in the interior of $K^+(p)$. Noldus ^{14,15,16} rectifies this situation by introducing the notion of path-metric K -causal spaces. In this section, we prove that if a path-metric K -causal space is K -distinguishing, then every linearly ordered curve is a K -causal curve. We also prove that in such a space if $p \neq q$, then $K^+(p) \neq K^+(q)$. We also discuss briefly the algebraic structure of the set of all K -causal maps on a C^0 -Lorentzian manifold.

In section 4, we make some concluding remarks and indicate further work in this direction.

2 K -Causal Mappings

We first recall basic definitions and some results from Sorkin and Woolgar ¹ that will be used in this paper.

Definition : Let V be a C^0 -Lorentzian manifold with metric g_{ab} , and let u^a be any vector field defining its time orientation. A timelike or lightlike vector v^a is *future-pointing* if $g_{ab}v^a u^b < 0$ and *past-pointing* if $g_{ab}v^a u^b > 0$. Now let $I = [0, 1] \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. A *future-timelike path* in V is a piecewise C^1 continuous function $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ whose tangent vector $\gamma^a(t) = (d\gamma(t)/dt)^a$ is future-pointing timelike whenever it is defined. A *past-timelike path* is defined dually. The image of a future- or past-timelike path is a *timelike curve*. Let O be an open subset of V . If there is a future-timelike curve in O from p to q , we

write $q \in I^+(p, O)$, and we call $I^+(p, O)$, the *chronological future* of p relative to O . Past-timelike paths and curves are defined analogously.

Definition : K^+ is the smallest relation containing I^+ that is transitive and topologically closed. If p is in $K^+(q)$ then $q \prec p$.

Definition : An open set O is *K-causal* iff the relation \prec induces a reflexive partial ordering on O .

Definition : A subset of V is *K-convex* iff it contains along with p and q any $r \in V$ for which $p \prec r \prec q$.

Definition : A *K-causal curve* Γ from p to q is the image of a C^0 map $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow V$ with $p = \gamma(0), q = \gamma(1)$ and such that for each $t \in (0, 1)$ and each open set $O \ni \gamma(t)$ there is a positive number ϵ such that

$$\begin{aligned} t' \in (t, t + \epsilon) &\Rightarrow \gamma(t) \prec_O \gamma(t') \\ t' \in (t - \epsilon, t) &\Rightarrow \gamma(t') \prec_O \gamma(t). \end{aligned}$$

The following theorems are proved in Sorokin and Woolgar ¹:

Theorem : If V is K-causal then every element of V possesses arbitrarily small K-convex open neighbourhoods.

Theorem : A subset Γ of a K-causal manifold is a K-causal curve iff it is compact, connected and linearly ordered by $\prec = K^+$.

Theorem : In a K-causal manifold, let the causal curve Γ be the Vietoris limit of a sequence of causal curves Γ_n with initial endpoints p_n and final endpoints q_n . Then p_n converge to the initial endpoint of Γ and q_n to its final endpoint.

With this background we now define a K-causal map. We work with K^+ throughout. Analogous definitions and results for K^- can be derived similarly.

We first define an order preserving map with respect to K^+ :

Definition 1: Let V and W be C^0 Lorentzian Manifolds. A mapping $f : V \rightarrow W$ is said to be *order preserving with respect to K^+* or simply *order preserving* if whenever $p, q \in V$ with $q \in K^+(p)$, we have $f(q) \in K^+(f(p))$.

Definition 2: Let V and W be C^0 Lorentzian Manifolds. A homeomorphism $f : V \rightarrow W$ is said to be *K-causal* if f is order preserving.

We can immediately prove the following proposition:

Proposition 1: A homeomorphism $f : V \rightarrow W$ is order preserving iff $f(K^+(x)) \subseteq K^+(f(x)), \forall x \in V$.

Proof : Let $f : V \rightarrow W$ be an order preserving homeomorphism and let $x \in V$. Let $y \in f(K^+(x))$. Then $y = f(p), p \in K^+(x)$ which implies $x \prec p$. Then $f(x) \prec f(p)$ as f is order preserving. i.e., $f(x) \prec y$. Therefore $y \in K^+(f(x))$.

Hence $f(K^+(x)) \subseteq K^+(f(x)), \forall x \in V$.

Conversely let $f : V \rightarrow W$ be a homeomorphism such that

$$f(K^+(x)) \subseteq K^+(f(x)), x \in V.$$

If $p \prec q$ then $q \in K^+(p) \implies f(q) \in f(K^+(p))$. By hypothesis, this gives $f(q) \in K^+(f(p))$. Hence $f(p) \prec f(q)$.

Thus if f is a K-causal map then $f(K^+(x)) \subseteq K^+(f(x)), \forall x \in V$.

We now define, for $S \subseteq V, K^+(S)$ as $K^+(S) = \bigcap \{R \supseteq I^+(S) / R \text{ is closed and}$

transitive}.Then we have,

Proposition 2: If $f : V \rightarrow W$ is an order preserving homeomorphism then $f(K^+(S)) \subseteq K^+(f(S)), S \subseteq V$.

Proof : Let $f : V \rightarrow W$ be an order preserving homeomorphism and $S \subseteq V$. By definition, $I^+(S) = \bigcup_{x \in S} I^+(x)$ and $K^+(S) = \bigcap \{R \supseteq I^+(S) / R \text{ is closed and transitive}\}$. Let $y \in f(K^+(S))$. Then there exists x in S such that $y \in f(K^+(x))$. This gives, by proposition 1, $y \in K^+(f(x))$. i.e., $y \in K^+(f(S))$. Hence $f(K^+(S)) \subseteq K^+(f(S))$.

We can also prove the following which is similar to proposition 1.

Proposition 3: If $f : V \rightarrow W$ be a homeomorphism, then f^{-1} is order preserving iff $K^+(f(x)) \subseteq f(K^+(x)), x \in V$.

Proof : Let $f : V \rightarrow W$ be a homeomorphism and $x \in V$. let $y \in K^+(f(x))$. Then $f(x) \prec y$ which implies $x \prec f^{-1}(y)$ as f^{-1} is order preserving. Hence $f^{-1}(y) \in K^+(x)$. i.e., $y \in f(K^+(x))$. Hence $K^+(f(x)) \subseteq f(K^+(x))$.

Conversely, let $K^+(f(x)) \subseteq f(K^+(x)), x \in V$. Let $p \prec q$ where $p, q \in W$. Then there exists $p', q' \in V$ such that $f(p') = p$ and $f(q') = q$. Now $p \prec q \rightarrow q' \in K^+(p')$. i.e., $f(q') \in K^+(f(p'))$. i.e., $f(q') \in f(K^+(p'))$ which implies $q' \in K^+(p')$. Therefore $p' \prec q'$ i.e., $f^{-1}(p) \prec f^{-1}(q)$. Hence f^{-1} is order preserving.

Analogue of proposition 2 is the following.

Proposition 4: If $f : V \rightarrow W$ be a homeomorphism, and f^{-1} is order preserving then $K^+(f(S)) \subseteq f(K^+(S)), S \subseteq V$.

Proof : Let f^{-1} be an order preserving homeomorphism and $S \subseteq V$. Let $y \in K^+(f(S))$. Therefore there exists $x \in S$ such that $y \in K^+(f(x))$. Then $y \in f(K^+(x))$ by proposition:3. Hence $K^+(f(S)) \subseteq f(K^+(S))$.

Combining propositions 1 and 3, we now have the following theorem.

Theorem 5: If $f : V \rightarrow W$ is K-causal and f^{-1} is order preserving then $f(K^+(x)) = K^+(f(x)), \forall x \in V$.

In this case, $f^{-1} : W \rightarrow V$ is also a K-causal map.

Also, a K-causal mapping takes K-causal curves to K-causal curves. This is given by the following theorem.

Theorem 6: Let $f : V \rightarrow W$ be a K-causal mapping. Then f maps every K-causal curve in V to a K-causal curve in W .

Proof : Let $f : V \rightarrow W$ be a K-causal map. Therefore f is an order preserving homeomorphism. Let Γ be a K-causal curve in V . Then Γ is connected, compact and linearly ordered [1]. Since f is continuous, it maps a connected set to a connected set and a compact set to a compact set. Since f is order preserving and Γ is linearly ordered, $f(\Gamma)$ is a K-causal curve in W .

Definition 3: Let V and W be two C^0 -Lorentzian manifolds. Then W is said to be *K-causally related* to V if there exists a K-causal mapping f from V to W . i.e., $V \prec_f W$.

The following proposition follows easily from this definition.

Proposition 7: If $V \prec_f W$ and $W \prec_g U$ then $V \prec_{g \circ f} U$.

Proof : Let $V \prec_f W$ and $W \prec_g U$. Then $f(K^+(x)) \subseteq K^+(f(x)), x \in V$ and $g(K^+(y)) \subseteq K^+(g(y)), y \in W$. Now, $(g \circ f)(K^+(x)) = g(f(K^+(x))) \subseteq g(K^+(f(x))) \subseteq$

$K^+(g(f(x))) \subseteq K^+((g \circ f)(x))$, $x \in V$. Hence $(g \circ f) : V \rightarrow U$ is a homeomorphism such that $(g \circ f)(K^+(x)) \subseteq K^+((g \circ f)(x))$, for $x \in V$ which implies $(g \circ f)$ is K-causal. Thus by proposition 1, U is K-causally related to V .

We also have the following result.

Proposition 8: Let $f : V \rightarrow W$ be K-causal and f^{-1} be order preserving. Then V is K-causal iff W is K-causal.

Proof : Let $f : V \rightarrow W$ be a K-causal map and V be K-causal. Let $p \prec q$ and $q \prec p$, $p, q \in W$. Then there exist $x, y \in V$ such that $f(x) = p$ and $f(y) = q$. Therefore $f(x) \prec f(y)$ and $f(y) \prec f(x)$ which gives $x \prec y$ and $y \prec x$ as f^{-1} is order preserving. Therefore $x = y$ since V is K-causal. Hence $f(x) = f(y)$. i.e., $p = q$. Thus W is K-causal. Converse is similar.

Thus K-causal structure is preserved by a K-causal mapping if we assume that inverse of a K-causal mapping is order preserving. This is similar to isocausal relation in Beem, Ehlich and Easley ⁷. In addition we have the following proposition.

Proposition 9: Let f be a K-causal map from V to W . Then for every future directed K-causal curve Γ in V , any two points $x, y \in f(\Gamma)$ satisfy $x \prec y$ or $y \prec x$.

Proof : Let f be a K-causal map from V to W . Let Γ be a future directed K-causal curve in V . Let $p, q \in \Gamma$ such that $p \prec q$. Since f is K-causal, $f(K^+(p)) \subseteq K^+(f(p))$. Now $p \prec q \Rightarrow q \in K^+(p)$. i.e., $f(q) \in f(K^+(p))$. i.e., $f(q) \in K^+(f(p))$. Hence $f(p) \prec f(q)$.

We recall the definition of a K-convex set. Then we have the following.

Theorem 10: If $f : V \rightarrow W$ is a K-causal map and $C \subseteq V$ is K-convex then $f(C)$ is a K-convex subset of W .

Proof : Let $f : V \rightarrow W$ be K-causal and C be a K-convex subset of V . Let $p', q' \in f(C)$ and $r' \in W$ such that $p' \prec r' \prec q'$. Since f^{-1} is order preserving we get $f^{-1}(p') \prec f^{-1}(r') \prec f^{-1}(q')$ where $f^{-1}(p'), f^{-1}(q') \in C$ and $f^{-1}(r') \in V$. Since C is K-convex, $f^{-1}(r') \in C$. i.e., $r' \in f(C)$. Hence $f(C)$ is a K-convex subset of W .

In the next section we define more concepts with respect to K-causality analogous to causal structure theory and prove their properties.

3 Other causality conditions

We begin with defining K-future sets. We first define

Definition 4: *K-causal future* of $x \in V$ is defined as $K(x) = \{p / \text{there exists a future directed K-causal curve from } x \text{ to } p\}$.

Remark: If $p \in K(x)$, then by definition there exists a future directed K-causal curve from x to p , hence $p \in K^+(x)$. However, if $p \in K^+(x)$ there need not exist a future directed K-causal curve from x to p as remarked in Sorokin and Woolgar ¹.

Definition 5: *K-causal future* of $S \subseteq V$ is defined as $K(S) = \{p / \text{there exists a future directed K-causal curve from } x \text{ to } p, x \in S\}$.

Definition 6: A subset F of V is called a *K-future set* if $F = K(S)$ for some $S \subseteq V$.

We have the following theorem for K-future sets:

Theorem 11: If F is a K-future set in V then $F = K(F)$.

Proof : Let F be a K -future set in V . Let $p \in K(F)$. Then there exists a future directed K -causal curve from x to $p, x \in F$. Therefore, there exists a future directed K -causal curve from q to $x, q \in S$. Hence, there exists a future directed K -causal curve from q to $p, q \in S$. Hence $p \in F$. Therefore $K(F) \subseteq F$.

Conversely, let $x \in F$. Then there exists a future directed K -causal curve Γ from y to $x, y \in S$. Since Γ is connected, there exists $z \in \Gamma$ such that $y \prec z \prec x$. i.e., there exists a future directed K -causal curve from y to $z, y \in S$. i.e., $z \in F$. Then there exists a future directed K -causal curve from z to $x, z \in F$. Therefore $x \in K(F)$. Hence $F \subseteq K(F)$. Thus $F=K(F)$.

We also have the following:

Theorem 12: If $S \subseteq V$ is compact then $K(S)$ is closed.

Proof : Let $S \subseteq V$ be compact. Let $q \in \overline{K(S)}$. Then there exists a sequence q_n in $K(S)$ such that q_n converges to q . Hence there exists a sequence p_n and a future directed K -causal curve Γ_n from p_n to q_n . Then p_n has a subsequence p_{n_k} converging to $p \in S$ since S is compact, which implies there exists a sequence Γ_{n_k} of future directed K -causal curves from p_{n_k} to q_{n_k} where p_{n_k} converges to p and q_{n_k} converges to q .

We know from [1] that Vietoris limit of a sequence of K -causal curves is again a K -causal curve. Hence if Γ is the Vietoris limit of Γ_{n_k} then p and q are respectively the initial and final end points of Γ . Therefore Γ is a future directed K -causal curve from p to q . i.e., $q \in K(S)$. Hence $\overline{K(S)} \subseteq K(S)$. Thus $K(S)$ is closed.

We now prove that if f is a K -causal map and f^{-1} is order preserving then f takes future sets to future sets.

Theorem 13: If $f : V \rightarrow W$ is a K -Causal map and f^{-1} is order preserving then f maps every future set in V to a future set in W .

Proof : Let $f : V \rightarrow W$ be a K -causal map and F be a future set in V . Then $F=K(S)$ for some $S \subseteq V$. Therefore $f(F) = f(K(S))$.

Let $y \in f(K(S))$. Then there exists $x \in K(S)$ such that $y = f(x)$. Hence there exists a future directed K -causal curve Γ from p to x where $p \in S$.

Then $f(\Gamma)$ is a future directed K -causal curve from $f(p)$ to $y, f(p) \in f(S)$. i.e., $y \in K(f(S))$. Thus $f(K(S)) \subseteq K(f(S))$.

If $y \in K(f(S))$, then there exists a future directed K -causal curve from q to y where $q \in f(S)$. For $q \in f(S)$, there exists $p \in S$ such that $q = f(p)$.

Since f^{-1} is order preserving and also a K -causal map, $f^{-1}(\Gamma)$ is a future directed K -causal curve from p to $f^{-1}(y)$ where $p \in S$. Therefore, $f^{-1}(y) \in K(S)$. i.e., $y \in f(K(S))$. Hence $K(f(S)) \subseteq f(K(S))$. Thus $f(K(S)) = K(f(S))$. i.e., $f(F)$ is a future set.

Analogous to usual causal structure, we now define the concepts of K -future distinguishing and K -reflecting space-times.

Definition 7: A C^0 -Lorentzian manifold V is said to be K -future (past) distinguishing at p , if for every K -convex neighbourhood of p there exists a K -convex neighbourhood, which no future (past) directed K -causal curve from p intersects more than once. V is said to be K -future (past) distinguishing if it is K -future (past) distinguishing at every point p in V .

Definition 8: A C^0 -Lorentzian manifold V is said to be K -distinguishing if it is both K -future and K -past distinguishing.

Definition 9: A C^0 -Lorentzian manifold V is said to be K -reflecting if for all p and q

in V , $K^+(p) \supseteq K^+(q)$ iff $K^-(p) \subseteq K^-(q)$.

Remark: In general, K-distinguishing need not imply distinguishing and K-reflecting need not imply reflecting. For example, $K^+(p) \supseteq K^+(q)$ iff $K^-(p) \subseteq K^-(q)$ need not imply that $I^+(p) \supseteq I^+(q)$ iff $I^-(p) \subseteq I^-(q)$. (See example 7, p.17 in [16]).

Theorem 14: Let V and W be K-causal and let W be K-causally related to V . If W is K-future distinguishing then V is also so.

Proof : Let W be K-future distinguishing. W is K-causally related to V . If V is not K-future distinguishing then there exists a point p in V and a K-convex neighbourhood V_p of p such that every K-convex neighbourhood U_p , $p \in U_p \subseteq V_p$ would intersect at least one K-causal curve Γ from p more than once.

Hence, by theorems 6 and 11, every K-convex subset $f(U_p)$ would intersect the K-causal curve $f(\Gamma)$ from $f(p)$ more than once implying that W is not K-future distinguishing. This contradiction shows that, V is K-future distinguishing.

As with many properties discussed above, we show that property of K-reflecting is also preserved by a K-causal map, if f^{-1} is order preserving.

Theorem 15: Let $f : V \rightarrow W$ be K-Causal and f^{-1} be order preserving. Then V is K-reflecting iff W is K-reflecting.

Proof : Let $f : V \rightarrow W$ be K-causal, f^{-1} be order preserving and V be K-reflecting. Let $K^+(p) \subseteq K^+(q)$, $p, q \in W$. Then there exists $x, y \in V$ such that $f(x) = p$ and $f(y) = q$. Therefore $K^+(f(x)) \subseteq K^+(f(y))$ which implies $f(K^+(x)) \subseteq f(K^+(y))$ by theorem 5. Since f is a homeomorphism this gives $K^+(x) \subseteq K^+(y)$. Therefore $K^-(y) \subseteq K^-(x)$ as V is K-reflecting. Then $f(K^-(y)) \subseteq f(K^-(x))$. Thus, $K^-(f(y)) \subseteq K^-(f(x))$. i.e., $K^-(q) \subseteq K^-(p)$, $p, q \in W$. It can be proved similarly that $K^-(q) \subseteq K^-(p) \Rightarrow K^+(p) \subseteq K^+(q)$, $p, q \in W$ Hence W is K-reflecting. Converse is similar.

Then we have similar results for globally hyperbolic space-times.

Theorem 16: Let V be a K-causal open set. Let $f : V \rightarrow W$ be a K-causal map and f^{-1} be order preserving. Then V is globally hyperbolic iff W is globally hyperbolic.

Proof : Let V be globally hyperbolic and $f : V \rightarrow W$ be K-causal. Since V is a K-causal open set by proposition:8, W is also so. Let $p, q \in W$. Then there exists x and y in V such that $f(x) = p$ and $f(y) = q$.

Consider $K^+(p) \cap K^-(q) = K^+(f(x)) \cap K^-(f(y)) = f(K^+(x)) \cap f(K^-(y)) = f(K^+(x) \cap K^-(y))$ which implies $K^+(p) \cap K^-(q)$ is compact as $K^+(x) \cap K^-(y)$ is compact and f is a homeomorphism. Hence W is globally hyperbolic.

Remark: In [1] the following lemma has been proved: If $\Gamma = \text{image}(\gamma)$ is a causal curve, then for every neighborhood $O \supseteq \Gamma$ and every pair $t_i < t_f \in [0, 1]$, we have $\gamma(t_i) \prec_O \gamma(t_f)$.

Notice that the converse of this lemma is in general false: $p \prec q$ need not imply the existence of a causal curve from p to q , even for q in the interior of $K^+(p)$. Notice also that, in the absence of K-causality, this lemma does not in general endow Γ with a linear order, because the asymmetry axiom can fail for \prec restricted to Γ even if we replace \prec by the intersection of the \prec_O for all $O \supseteq \Gamma$.

In [18], Noldus has introduced the concept of path metric K-causal Lorentz space. He defined it as follows: V is a path metric K-causal Lorentz space iff for any $p \prec q$, there exists a distance-realizing future directed K-causal curve from p to q .

All the results proved above are valid for path-metric K-causal spaces. In addition, we

have the following theorems which are not true in the general K-causal setting, but hold true for path metric K-causal spaces:

Theorem 17: Let V be a path metric Lorentz space with respect to K^+ relation. Let V be K-distinguishing. Then every curve γ of finite length, satisfying $p \prec q$ or $q \prec p$, for all $p, q \in \gamma$ is a K-causal curve.

Proof : Let $p \in \gamma$ and N_p be a neighbourhood of p . Since V is K-distinguishing, there exists another neighbourhood $U_p \subseteq N_p$ of p such that all K-causal curves starting at p meet U_p in a connected set. Let $z \in \gamma \cap U_p$. Hence, $z \prec p$ or $p \prec z$.

If $p \prec z$ then there exists a K-causal segment λ from p to z such that $\lambda \cap U_p$ is connected which gives $\lambda \subseteq U_p$ as U_p is open. i.e., λ is a future directed K-causal segment contained in N_p . If $z \prec p$, then by similar argument, there exists a past directed K-causal segment contained in N_p . Since z is arbitrary, there exist such segments for every $z \in \gamma \cap U_p \subseteq N_p$ which implies γ is K-causal near by p . Since $\gamma \subseteq \bigcup_{p \in \gamma} \gamma \cap U_p$, the result follows.

Theorem 18: Let V be a path metric Lorentz space with respect to K^+ relation. If V is K-causal and K-future distinguishing then for every $p \neq q$, $K^+(p) \neq K^+(q)$.

Proof : Let V be K-causal and K-future distinguishing. Let $p, q \in V$ such that $p \neq q$ and $K^+(p) = K^+(q)$.

Consider the disjoint K-convex neighbourhoods P and Q in V such that $p \in P$, $q \in Q$. Choose $x \in K^+(p) \cap P$. Then $x \in K^+(q)$. i.e., $q \prec x$.

Let y in Q be such that $q \prec y \prec x$. Then y is not in P and $y \in K^+(q)$ which implies $y \in K^+(p)$. i.e., $p \prec y$.

Thus there exists a K-causal segment from p to x through y , y not in P which intersects P in a disconnected set. This shows that V is not K-future distinguishing at p , contradicting the hypothesis. Hence, $K^+(p) \neq K^+(q)$ whenever $p \neq q$.

We now define K-acausal sets.

Definition 10: In a path-metric Lorentzian space V , a subset S of V is said to be *K-acausal* if there are no points p, q in V such that $p \prec q$, $p \neq q$.

We have the following result for these sets.

Theorem 19: If V is a path-metric Lorentzian space, $f : V \rightarrow W$ is a K-causal map and $S \subseteq W$ is K-acausal then $f^{-1}(S)$ is K-acausal.

Proof : Let $f : V \rightarrow W$ be a K-causal map and $S \subseteq W$ be K-acausal. If $f^{-1}(S)$ is not K-acausal, then there are points p, q in $f^{-1}(S)$ such that $p \prec q$, $p \neq q$. Hence, there are points $f(p), f(q)$ in S such that $f(p) \prec f(q)$, $f(p) \neq f(q)$. This implies S is not K-acausal which is a contradiction. Hence, $f^{-1}(S)$ is K-acausal.

Remark : If S is K-acausal then $S \cap K(S) = S$

Finally we discuss briefly the algebraic structure of the set of all K-causal maps from V to V . We define the following.

Definition 12: If V is a C^0 - Lorentzian manifold then $Hom(V)$ is defined as the group consisting of all homeomorphisms acting on V .

Definition 13: If V is a C^0 - Lorentzian manifold then $K(V)$ is defined as the set of all K-causal maps from V to V .

Then we have the following result which is more or less obvious.

Theorem 20: The set of all K-causal maps from V to V is a submonoid of $\text{Hom}(V)$.

Proof: Let $K(V)$ be the set of all K-causal maps from V to V . Let $f_1, f_2, f_3 \in K(V)$. Then by proposition:7, $f_1 \circ f_2 \in K(V)$, $f_1 \circ (f_2 \circ f_3) = (f_1 \circ f_2) \circ f_3$ and identity homeomorphism exists. Hence $K(V)$ is a submonoid of $\text{Hom}(V)$.

4 Concluding remarks:

1. The causal relation defined in Garcia-Parrado and Senovilla ⁷ on flat Minkowski space-time (see p.631 of Garcia-Parrado and Senovilla ⁷) is a K-causal map, since for Minkowski space-time, J^+ coincides with K^+ .

In fact,if V is a causally simple C^2 -Lorentzian manifold(space-time), then a causal relation from V to V will be a K-causal map (see lemma 25 in Sorkin and Woolgar ¹).

2. In a strongly causal space-time, Alexandrov topology coincides with the manifold topology.Since K-causal space-time is strongly causal,for a K-causal space-time also,Alexandrov topology will coincide with the manifold topology.

3. Martin and Panangaden ^{17,18,19} have defined a bicontinuous poset (X, \leq) as ‘globally hyperbolic’, if the intervals $[a,b]$ are compact in the interval topology.Similar definition has been given,using causal intervals in the theory of convex cones in Causal symmetric spaces (cf Martin and Panangaden ¹⁹).In Martin and Panangaden ¹⁸ (see theorem 4.1),it is proved that in a globally hyperbolic poset, its partial order \leq is a closed subset of $X \times X$.

In a K-causal space-time, since the relation we have studied in this paper is a closed partial order,and global hyperbolicity is defined in terms of this relation,it is natural to ask whether the results in Martin and Panangaden ^{17,18,19} can be proved for K-causal space-time.Work is in progress in this direction.

4. As we have noted there is no direct relationship between *K-future distinguishing* and *future distinguishing*,between *K-reflecting* and *reflecting*,etc., we would like to investigate whether in a path-metric K-causal space, these conditions are related, in the sense that K-reflecting implies reflecting etc.

5 References

1. R.D. Sorkin and Woolgar, *Class.Quantum Grav.* **3** (1996), 1971-1993.
2. R.Penrose, *Techniques of Differential Topology in Relativity*, (AMS Colloquium Publications, 1972).
3. S.W. Hawking and G.F.R Ellis, *The Large Scale Structure of Space-time*, (Cambridge Univ Press, 1973).

4. R.Penrose, R.D.Sorkin and E.Woolgar, *gr-qc/9301015*.
5. R.Wald , *General Relativity*, (Univ of Chicago Press, 1984).
6. P.S. Joshi, *Global Aspects in Gravitation and Cosmology*, (Oxford Science Publications, 1993).
7. J.K. Beem, P.E. Ehrlich and K.L. Easley, *Global Lorentzian Geometry*, (Monographs textbooks. Pure Appl Mathematics, Dekker Inc., New York 1996).
8. A.Garcia-Parrado and J.M. Senovilla, *Class.Quantum Grav.* **20** (2003), 625-664.
9. A.Garcia Parrado and J.M. Senovila, *gr-qc/0308091*.
10. S.W Hawking and R.K. Sachs, *Commun.MathPhys.* **35** (1974),287-296.
11. J.K. Beem, *General Relativity and Gravitation*, **8** (1977), No.4, 245-257.
12. R.Geroch, *J Math Phys*, **11** (1970), 437-449.
13. J.Dieckmann, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **20** (1988), No.9, 59-867.
14. J.Noldus, *gr-qc/0308074*.
15. J.Noldus, *gr-qc/0308075*.
16. J.Noldus, *gr-qc/0402049*.
17. K Martin and P.Panangaden, *gr-qc/0407093*
18. K Martin and P.Panangaden, *gr-qc/0407094*
19. J.Hilgert and G.Olafsson, *Causal symmetric spaces, Geometry and Harmonic Analysis*, (Academic Press, New York 1997).