

CLASSICAL SCALAR FIELDS AND VIOLATIONS OF THE SECOND LAW

L.H. Ford* and Thomas A. Roman†

Institute of Cosmology
Department of Physics and Astronomy
Tufts University
Medford, Massachusetts 02155

Abstract

It has been recently shown that classical non-minimally coupled scalar fields can violate all of the standard energy conditions in general relativity. Violations of the null and averaged null energy conditions obtainable with such fields have been suggested as possible exotic matter candidates required for the maintenance of traversable wormholes. In this paper, we demonstrate that if such fields exist, they could be used to produce large negative energy fluxes and macroscopic violations of the generalized second law of thermodynamics. This would appear to present a serious problem, as such fields are widely used in many areas of modern theoretical physics.

*email: ford@cosmos2.phy.tufts.edu

†Permanent address: Department of Physics and Earth Sciences,
Central Connecticut State University, New Britain, CT 06050
email: roman@ccsu.edu

1 Introduction

The weak energy condition (WEC) states that [1]: $T_{\mu\nu}U^\mu U^\nu \geq 0$, for all timelike vectors, where $T_{\mu\nu}$ is the stress-energy tensor of matter, and U^μ is an arbitrary timelike vector. By continuity, the condition holds for all null vectors as well. Physically the WEC implies that the energy density seen by all observers is non-negative. All experimentally observed forms of classical matter satisfy this condition. However, quantum matter fields can violate this and all the other standard energy conditions of general relativity [2]. In at least some circumstances, quantum field theory imposes certain restrictions on the degree of energy condition breakdown, in the form of what have come to be known as “quantum inequalities”. These typically restrict the magnitude and duration of negative energy densities and fluxes, and seem to limit the production of gross macroscopic effects. The quantum inequalities put severe restrictions on the realizability of, e. g., traversable wormholes and warp drives [3, 4, 5, 6, 7].

It was previously thought that *all* physically reasonable forms of *classical* matter obey the WEC. Of course, this depends to some extent on what one thinks of as “physically reasonable”. It has been pointed out by Flanagan and Wald [8], Fakir [9], and in more detail by Barcelo and Visser [10, 11, 12], that classical non-minimally coupled scalar fields can violate all of the standard energy conditions, both pointwise and averaged. These include violations of the WEC and the averaged null energy condition (ANEC), $\int T_{\mu\nu}K^\mu K^\nu d\lambda \geq 0$, where the integral is taken over null geodesics with tangent vector K^μ and affine parameter λ . (It should be noted that the classical minimally coupled scalar field obeys these conditions.) These features have enabled Barcelo and Visser to construct macroscopic wormhole solutions in which non-minimally coupled scalar fields serve as the “exotic matter” source required for wormhole maintenance. Because such fields are classical, they are not subject to the quantum inequality restrictions on the magnitude and duration of negative energy.

This situation is rather unsettling, since the door is then opened for all sorts of bizarre effects. One of the most disturbing of these is a potential violation of the second law of thermodynamics by creating fluxes of negative energy. For example, one might shine such a flux at a hot object and decrease its entropy. If the radiation field has zero entropy, then the second law will be violated. In the case of negative energy fluxes produced by quantum fields, the quantum inequalities appear to prevent such large scale breakdowns of the second law [13, 14]. Indeed in some cases, such as the Hawking evaporation of black holes, negative energy is required for the consistency of the unification of the laws of black hole physics and the laws of thermodynamics. The generalized second law states that the sum of the entropy of a black hole and that of any surrounding matter can never decrease, so

$$\Delta S_{total} = \Delta S + \Delta S_{matter} \geq 0 \tag{1}$$

where here S is taken to be the entropy of the black hole, which is proportional to the area of its event horizon. In the Hawking evaporation process, although the area and thus the entropy of the black hole decrease, this is more than compensated for by the entropy of the emitted thermal Hawking radiation.

In this paper we demonstrate that large, transient negative energy fluxes can be produced quite easily with classical massless non-minimally coupled scalar fields, even in flat spacetime. Such fluxes appear to have magnitudes large enough to violate the second law for arbitrary lengths of time. However, due to possible uncertainties of how such fields might interact with ordinary matter, one could conceivably argue that perhaps the second law might still hold. To circumvent the latter possibility, we examine a classical non-minimally coupled scalar field on a Schwarzschild black hole background. We show that a negative energy flux injected into the hole can be made to last long enough to violate the generalized second law.

We use the MTW metric signature and sign conventions, and work in units where $\hbar = c = 1$.

2 Negative Energy Fluxes

The Einstein equations for a generically coupled massless scalar field can be obtained by varying the Einstein–Hilbert action:

$$\mathcal{S} = \frac{1}{2} \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \kappa R + \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left(-\frac{1}{2} g^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \phi \partial_\nu \phi - V(\phi) - \frac{1}{2} \xi R \phi^2 \right), \quad (2)$$

where we take $\kappa = 1/(8\pi G)$, and G is Newton’s gravitational constant. The resulting stress-energy tensor, $T_{\mu\nu}$, for the scalar field has the form [8]

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\mu\nu} = & \nabla_\mu \phi \nabla_\nu \phi - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} (\nabla \phi)^2 - g_{\mu\nu} V(\phi) \\ & + \xi \left[G_{\mu\nu} \phi^2 - 2 \nabla_\mu (\phi \nabla_\nu \phi) + 2 g_{\mu\nu} \nabla^\lambda (\phi \nabla_\lambda \phi) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $G_{\mu\nu}$ is the Einstein tensor, and $V(\phi)$ is the scalar potential. If all the dependence on $G_{\mu\nu}$ is grouped on the left hand side of Einstein equations then we can rewrite them, following Barcelo and Visser [12], by using an effective energy-momentum tensor given by

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{eff}} = & \frac{\kappa}{\kappa - \xi \phi^2} \left[\nabla_\mu \phi \nabla_\nu \phi - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} (\nabla \phi)^2 - g_{\mu\nu} V(\phi) \right. \\ & \left. - 2 \xi \left[\nabla_\mu (\phi \nabla_\nu \phi) - g_{\mu\nu} \nabla^\lambda (\phi \nabla_\lambda \phi) \right] \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

This is the expression used by Barcelo and Visser for their analysis of energy condition violations. The Einstein equations now read $\kappa G_{\mu\nu} = T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{eff}}$. Thus a constraint on this effective stress-energy tensor is translated directly into a constraint on the spacetime curvature.

2.1 Fluxes in Flat Spacetime

In the remainder of this paper we will set $V(\phi) = 0$. Let us first demonstrate that the effective stress-tensor, Eq. (4), leads to potential problems with the second law even

in flat spacetime. We choose the simple case of waves travelling only in the positive x -direction, where

$$\phi = \phi(t - x). \quad (5)$$

In this case, the energy density T^{tt} , and the flux $T^{tx} = F_x$, are equal, and so the energy density will also be negative when the flux is negative. (To distinguish the case of a positive flux in the minus x -direction from a “true” negative energy flux, we count the flux as negative only when the energy density is simultaneously negative.)

Note: We make the restriction that $\kappa - \xi\phi^2 > 0$; otherwise the effective stress tensor can become singular. Flanagan [15] has pointed out that the resulting sign change which arises in going through this singularity in $T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{eff}}$ may imply that the initial value problem is ill-defined in this case. The wormhole solutions of Barcelo and Visser have this feature, which imply either super-Planckian values for ϕ or extremely large values of the coupling parameter ξ . However, we will show that even with the restriction that $\kappa - \xi\phi^2 > 0$ one can achieve violations of the second law. We will also assume here that

$$\kappa \gg \xi\phi^2. \quad (6)$$

From now on we will drop the “eff” superscript on the stress tensor components.

With the above choices, the energy flux in flat spacetime reduces to

$$F_x = T^{tx} = -T_{tx} = [(1 - 2\xi)(\phi')^2 - 2\xi\phi\phi''] = (\phi')^2 - \xi(\phi^2)'', \quad (7)$$

where we have used the fact that if ϕ has the form of Eq. (5),

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \phi &= -\partial_x \phi = \phi' \\ \partial_x \partial_t \phi &= -\phi'' \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Let t_0 be a point at which ϕ' has a nonzero extremum, so that $\phi'(t_0) = 0$, but $\phi \neq 0$ and $\phi'' \neq 0$. Then, we can make $F_x < 0$ in a neighborhood of t_0 for the following cases: 1) if $\xi > 0$ and $\phi > 0$, then $F_x < 0$ if $\phi'' > 0$; 2) if $\xi > 0$ and $\phi < 0$, then $F_x < 0$ if $\phi'' < 0$; and 3) if $\xi < 0$, then $F_x < 0$ when ϕ and ϕ'' have opposite signs.

As an example, choose $\xi > 0$ and

$$\phi(t - x) = A \sin \omega(t - x) + b, \quad (9)$$

where $\omega = k = k_x > 0$, and we assume that $A > 0$, $b > 0$. Require that

$$\frac{1}{8\pi\xi} \gg (A + b)^2, \quad (10)$$

which will satisfy our condition Eq. (6), where we have set $G = 1$. The instantaneous flux, when $\cos \omega(t - x) = 0$ and $\sin \omega(t - x) = -1$, is

$$F_x = -2\xi A^2 \omega^2 \left(\frac{b}{A} - 1 \right). \quad (11)$$

Let $A^2 = \alpha/\xi$, with $\alpha \ll 1$ and $b/A - 1 \sim O(1)$, which will satisfy Eq. (10). Then

$$F_x \approx -2\alpha\omega^2 = -\alpha \frac{8\pi^2}{T^2}, \quad (12)$$

where $T = 2\pi/\omega$ is the period of oscillation. This expression is in Planck units. We can convert to conventional units by recalling that the Planck unit of flux is

$$F_p = \frac{m_p}{l_p^2 t_p} \approx 1.6 \times 10^{104} \frac{\text{g}}{\text{cm}^2 \text{s}}, \quad (13)$$

where $m_p \approx 2.2 \times 10^{-5} \text{g}$, $l_p \approx 1.6 \times 10^{-33} \text{cm}$, and $t_p \approx 5.4 \times 10^{-44} \text{s}$ are the Planck mass, Planck length and Planck time, respectively. Then Eq. (12) becomes

$$F_x \approx -8\pi^2 \alpha F_p \frac{t_p^2}{T^2} \approx -3.7 \times 10^{19} \frac{\text{g}}{\text{cm}^2 \text{s}} \alpha \left(\frac{1\text{s}}{T}\right)^2. \quad (14)$$

If, for example, we set $T = 1\text{s}$, $b = 2A$ and $\alpha = 0.01$, we have a negative energy flux of magnitude

$$|F_x| \approx 3.7 \times 10^{17} \frac{\text{g}}{\text{cm}^2 \text{s}}, \quad (15)$$

which has a duration of the order of a few tenths of a second. By ordinary standards, this is an enormous amount of negative energy, which has the potential to cause dramatic effects.

Note that Eq. (7) shows that the flux can be expressed as a positive quantity plus a total derivative. This means that if ϕ and its first derivative vanish in both the past and the future, then the time integrated flux is positive. As the above example illustrates, however, the transient flux can be negative for an arbitrarily long time.

In order to argue that this flux can be used to achieve a violation of the second law, we need to specify how the scalar field interacts with ordinary matter. It might be argued that if this interaction is sufficiently weak, then second law violations might be avoided. Without a detailed model of a system to detect the negative flux, this question may be hard to answer definitively. Our purpose here was to demonstrate that one can already achieve negative energy fluxes of large magnitude, which have the *possibility* of violating the second law, even in flat spacetime. In the next section we turn our attention to a relatively unambiguous energy flux detector - a black hole.

2.2 Fluxes in Curved Spacetime

In this section, we will consider the absorption of a classical scalar negative energy flux by a black hole, a situation which can lead to violations of the generalized second law of thermodynamics.

In Schwarzschild spacetime, from Eq. (4), a flux in the radial direction is given by

$$T^{tr} = -T_{tr} = -\frac{\kappa}{\kappa - \xi\phi^2} \left[(1 - 2\xi)\phi_{,t}\phi_{,r} - 2\xi \left(\phi\phi_{,tr} - \frac{C_{,r}}{2C} \phi\phi_{,t} \right) \right], \quad (16)$$

where $C = 1 - 2M/r$, and $C_{,r} = 2M/r^2$, and we have once again set $V(\phi) = 0$. If we redefine the radial coordinate in the standard way, using $r^* = \int C^{-1} dr$, we can express the righthand side as

$$T_{tr} = \frac{\kappa C^{-1}}{\kappa - \xi \phi^2} \left[(1 - 2\xi) \phi_{,t} \phi_{,r^*} - 2\xi \left(\phi \phi_{,tr^*} - \frac{1}{2} C_{,r} \phi \phi_{,t} \right) \right], \quad (17)$$

Let

$$\phi = \phi(t + r^*), \quad (18)$$

representing spherically symmetric, radially ingoing waves, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{,t} &= \phi_{,r^*} = \phi' \\ \phi_{,tr^*} &= \phi'' \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Therefore we have

$$T_t^r = \frac{\kappa}{\kappa - \xi \phi^2} \left[(1 - 2\xi) (\phi')^2 - 2\xi \phi \phi'' + \xi C_{,r} \phi \phi' \right]. \quad (20)$$

In flat spacetime, $C = 1$, and our expression reduces to

$$T_t^r = \frac{\kappa}{\kappa - \xi \phi^2} \left[(1 - 2\xi) (\phi')^2 - 2\xi \phi \phi'' \right] = \left[\kappa \ln \left(\frac{\kappa - \xi \phi^2}{\kappa} \right) \right]'' + \text{a positive quantity}, \quad (21)$$

provided that $\kappa - \xi \phi^2 > 0$. When $\kappa \gg \xi \phi^2$, this result reduces to Eq. (7). Note that in the flat spacetime case of Sec. 2.1 we used “outgoing” waves, that is, waves travelling in the *positive* x -direction, so that we had $\phi = \phi(t - x)$. In this section we deal with ingoing waves (in the minus r^* -direction) imploding onto the horizon.

The mass change of the black hole due to the absorption of the flux can be calculated from

$$E = \int T_{\mu\nu} \beta^\mu d\Sigma^\nu, \quad (22)$$

where β^μ is the timelike Killing vector and $d\Sigma^\nu$ is the area element of the three-dimensional hypersurface defined by the black hole’s horizon. Here we are assuming that the fractional change in the black hole’s mass, M , is small over the time scale M , the light travel time across the hole. Therefore the metric is approximately Schwarzschild and hence has a timelike Killing vector. By energy conservation, the time rate of change of the mass is given by [16]

$$M' = \frac{dM}{dt} = F = \int T_t^r r^2 d\Omega. \quad (23)$$

On the horizon, this becomes

$$M' = 16\pi M^2 (T_t^r)_{r=2M}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= 16\pi M^2 \left\{ \frac{\kappa}{(\kappa - \xi\phi^2)} \left[(1 - 2\xi)(\phi')^2 - 2\xi\phi\phi'' + \frac{\xi}{2M}\phi\phi' \right] \right\}_{r=2M} \\
&= 16\pi M^2 \kappa \left\{ \left[\ln \left(\frac{\kappa - \xi\phi^2}{\kappa} \right) \right]'' - \frac{1}{4M} \left[\ln \left(\frac{\kappa - \xi\phi^2}{\kappa} \right) \right]' \right\} \\
&+ \text{ a positive quantity ,} \tag{24}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that, on the horizon, $C_{,r} = 1/(2M)$. As an example, if we initially assume that $\xi > 0$ and $\phi > 0$, then when $\phi' = 0$ and $\phi'' > 0$, we have $M' < 0$, and thus $A_H' < 0$, where A_H is the area of the horizon.

Strictly speaking, $r^* \rightarrow -\infty$ at $r = 2M$. However, we can get around this problem by taking the effective boundary of the hole to be at $r = 2M + \epsilon$. That is, we draw a surface very close to the horizon, at a finite value of r^* , and assume that any waves that pass through this surface also go into the black hole.

As is the case for the flat spacetime flux, M' can be written as the sum of a total derivative and a positive quantity. Thus if ϕ and its first derivative vanish in both the past and the future, the net change in M is positive. We will argue below that this still allows the possibility of macroscopic violations of the second law over long periods of time.

2.3 Entropy and the Second Law

It has been shown by a number of authors [17, 18, 19] that in the presence of a classical field on the horizon, the entropy of a black hole is not simply $S = A_H/4$, but is modified by the presence of additional terms. Visser [18] has referred to these and similar objects as “dirty” black holes. For a free classical massless non-minimally coupled scalar field, the Lagrangian density is given by (see, for example, Eq. (2.1) of Ref. [8])

$$L = \frac{1}{2}(-g^{\mu\nu} \nabla_\mu \phi \nabla_\nu \phi - \xi R \phi^2). \tag{25}$$

In the case where the Lagrangian is an arbitrary function of the scalar Ricci curvature R , Visser has shown that the entropy of the black hole is given by (see Eq. (59) of Ref. [18])

$$S = \frac{A_H}{4} + 4\pi \int_H \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial R} \sqrt{2g} d^2x, \tag{26}$$

where \mathcal{L} is the (Euclidean) Lagrangian density for the scalar field, and where we have set $\hbar = k = \text{Boltzmann's constant} = 1$. The integration runs over a spacelike cross section of the horizon H .

In our case, $\partial \mathcal{L} / \partial R = -(1/2)\xi \phi^2$. If we again assume that $\phi = \phi(t + r^*)$, and so has no angular dependence, then

$$\int_H \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial R} \sqrt{2g} d^2x = -\frac{1}{2} \xi \phi^2 A_H. \tag{27}$$

The resulting expression for the black hole's entropy is then simply

$$S = \frac{A_H}{4} \left(1 - \frac{\xi}{\kappa} \phi^2 \right). \quad (28)$$

One can interpret Eq. (28) as

$$S = \frac{A_H}{4 G_{eff}}, \quad (29)$$

where

$$G_{eff} = \left(1 - \frac{\xi}{\kappa} \phi^2 \right)^{-1}. \quad (30)$$

The scalar field effectively modifies the local value of Newton's constant. When $\xi = 0$, the case of minimal coupling, our expression reduces to the usual Bekenstein-Hawking entropy. If $\xi > 0$, the contribution due to the second term is always negative. This term only contributes to the black hole's entropy when $\phi \neq 0$ on the horizon. Here we are discussing the effect of the presence of the scalar field on the entropy of the black hole. Since the radiation field itself is classical and all moving in one direction, i. e., the radial direction, then its entropy, S_{matter} , is zero.

Initially we assume that $\phi = 0$ on the horizon, so the initial entropy of the black hole is $S_0 = A_H/4$. We then shine in a classical scalar field flux from infinity onto the horizon. During the time that $\phi \neq 0$ on H , we get a contribution to the black hole entropy from the second term in Eq. (28). One might guess that any entropy decrease due to the shrinkage of the horizon area might be cancelled by the contribution due to the presence of the scalar field. As we shall see, this is not quite what happens. In order to count as a violation of the generalized second law, any decrease in entropy should be sustainable for a least a time of a order M , in order to make a measurement of the horizon area. At a later time, the entropy might increase again due to oscillations in the sign of the flux, but we would still have achieved a measurable violation of the second law.

Let us rewrite Eq. (28), using $\kappa = 1/(8\pi)$ and $A_H = 16\pi M^2$, as

$$S = 4\pi M^2 (1 - 8\pi\xi \phi^2), \quad (31)$$

and differentiate with respect to time to get

$$S' = 8\pi M M' (1 - 8\pi\xi \phi^2) - 64\pi^2 M^2 \xi \phi \phi'. \quad (32)$$

The rate of change in S divided by its initial value is

$$\frac{S'}{S_0} = \frac{2M'}{M} (1 - 8\pi\xi \phi^2) - 16\pi \xi \phi \phi'. \quad (33)$$

Using Eq. (24), we can express this as

$$\frac{S'}{S_0} = 32\pi M [(1 - 2\xi) (\phi')^2 - 2\xi \phi \phi'']. \quad (34)$$

Two interesting things have occurred in this calculation. First, the $\phi\phi'$ term in S' (that due to the ϕ -dependence of S) was cancelled by the $\phi\phi'$ term in M' (which is the curved space correction to T_t^r). Second, the potentially troublesome term $(\kappa - \xi\phi^2)$ in the denominator of M' cancelled out, so in fact for the purposes of this calculation we did not need to assume, as was done earlier, that $\kappa > \xi\phi^2$.

Equation (34) can be written as

$$\frac{S'}{S_0} = 32\pi M [(\phi')^2 - \xi(\phi^2)'']. \quad (35)$$

Suppose that $\phi(t + r^*)$ is a sum of sine and cosine waves. Then if we average over a complete cycle, assuming the change in M to be small, the contribution of the second term will vanish and we obtain

$$\Delta(\ln S) = 32\pi M \int (\phi')^2 dt, \quad (36)$$

which is non-negative. Therefore, the second law holds when averaged over a complete cycle, but this cycle could be made very long. As discussed previously, if during a part of this cycle we can create a decrease in entropy which lasts long enough to be measurable, then we have violated the second law.

For example, at some time t_0 , let $\phi'(t_0) = \phi'''(t_0) = 0$, $\phi(t_0) > 0$, and $\phi''(t_0) = X > 0$, where we also assume $\xi > 0$. Then in a neighborhood of t_0

$$\begin{aligned} \phi &\approx \phi(t_0) + \frac{1}{2}X(t-t_0)^2 + Z\frac{(t-t_0)^4}{4!} + \dots \\ \phi' &\approx X(t-t_0) + Z\frac{(t-t_0)^3}{3!} + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Substituting into Eq. (34), we obtain

$$\frac{S'}{S_0} \approx 32\pi M \{-2\xi X\phi(t_0) + [X^2(1-3\xi) - Z\xi\phi(t_0)](t-t_0)^2 + O(t-t_0)^3\}. \quad (38)$$

If we keep ϕ large but X small, then S'/S_0 can remain negative for a long time.

3 An Ingoing Wave Profile on the Horizon

In this section, we construct a specific waveform for ϕ on the horizon which results in a violation of the generalized second law. First let us consider the general problem of wave propagation in a black hole spacetime. In general

$$\phi = \phi(t, r^*, \theta, \Phi) = \frac{f(t, r^*)}{r} Y_{lm}, \quad (39)$$

where the Y_{lm} are the usual spherical harmonics. For a monochromatic incident wave, f has incident, reflected, and transmitted parts:

$$\begin{aligned} f &\sim f_I(v) + f_R(u), \quad \text{as } r^* \rightarrow +\infty \\ &\sim f_T(v), \quad \text{as } r^* \rightarrow -\infty, \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

where $v = t + r^*$ and $u = t - r^*$. Let $R_{\omega l}$, and $T_{\omega l}$ be the reflection and transmission coefficients, respectively. Then we can have

$$\begin{aligned} f_I &\sim e^{-i\omega v}, \quad \text{as } r^* \rightarrow +\infty \\ f_R &\sim R_{\omega l} e^{-i\omega u}, \quad \text{as } r^* \rightarrow +\infty \\ f_T &\sim T_{\omega l} e^{-i\omega v}, \quad \text{as } r^* \rightarrow -\infty. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Assume that $T_{\omega l} \neq 0$, and let

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{f}_I &= \frac{f_I}{T_{\omega l}} \sim \frac{1}{T_{\omega l}} e^{-i\omega v}, \quad \text{as } r^* \rightarrow +\infty \\ \hat{f}_R &= \frac{f_R}{T_{\omega l}} \sim \frac{R_{\omega l}}{T_{\omega l}} e^{-i\omega u}, \quad \text{as } r^* \rightarrow +\infty \\ \hat{f}_T &= \frac{f_T}{T_{\omega l}} \sim e^{-i\omega v}, \quad \text{as } r^* \rightarrow -\infty. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

The key point here is that we can choose whatever form we want for a transmitted wavepacket on the horizon, Fourier transform it, and then write down the Fourier integral for the incident packet that will produce the transmitted form. Let $f_T(v)$ be replaced by $g_T(v)$, an ingoing wavepacket on the horizon (i. e., as $r^* \rightarrow -\infty$) and write

$$g_T(v) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G(\omega) e^{-i\omega v} d\omega. \quad (43)$$

Then the incident wavepacket that will produce this transmitted piece is

$$g_I(v) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{G(\omega)}{T_{\omega l}} e^{-i\omega v} d\omega, \quad (44)$$

and the associated reflected piece is

$$g_R(u) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{G(\omega)}{T_{\omega l}} R_{\omega l} e^{-i\omega u} d\omega. \quad (45)$$

Here we assume that only $l = 0$ modes are excited. Because $T_{\omega l} \rightarrow 0$ as $\omega \rightarrow 0$, we do need to restrict g_T so that $G(\omega)$ also vanishes as $\omega \rightarrow 0$ sufficiently rapidly to guarantee convergence of these integrals. Otherwise, g_T is an arbitrary wavepacket.

We will take g_T to be a sum of two sinusoidal functions, as this form is an example which produces a negative energy flux down the hole. Choose the ingoing modes to be $l = 0$ only and let

$$\begin{aligned} g_T &= A_1 \cos \omega_1 v + A_0 \cos \omega_0 v \\ &= \frac{A_1}{2} (e^{i\omega_1 v} + e^{-i\omega_1 v}) + \frac{A_0}{2} (e^{i\omega_0 v} + e^{-i\omega_0 v}). \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

The transmission coefficient for an $e^{-i\omega v}$ wave is given by [20]

$$T_{\omega_0} = -4iM\omega, \quad (47)$$

when $\omega \ll M^{-1}$. Thus the form of the incident wave is

$$\begin{aligned} g_I &= \frac{A_1}{2} \left(\frac{e^{i\omega_1 v}}{4iM\omega_1} + \frac{e^{-i\omega_1 v}}{(-4iM\omega_1)} \right) + \frac{A_0}{2} \left(\frac{e^{i\omega_0 v}}{4iM\omega_0} + \frac{e^{-i\omega_0 v}}{(-4iM\omega_0)} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{4M} \left(\frac{A_1}{\omega_1} \sin \omega_1 v + \frac{A_0}{\omega_0} \sin \omega_0 v \right). \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

We can choose $1/M \gg \omega_1 \geq \omega_0$, to get a form for g_T that is approximately a constant + a sinusoidal part with a frequency much less than $1/M$. Note that we need both of the frequencies, ω_0 and ω_1 , to be nonzero so that the transmission coefficients for both components be nonzero. For this reason, the choice, Eq. (9), used in flat spacetime is not appropriate here.

The choice of A_0 and A_1 is now restricted by the requirement that $\kappa - \xi \phi^2 > 0$. An upper bound on the value of ϕ everywhere outside of the horizon can be obtained by considering the value which the incident wave would have on the horizon if there were no potential barrier. This is due to the fact that without the potential barrier, ϕ would increase monotonically with decreasing r . The effect of the potential barrier is to reduce the actual value of ϕ on the horizon. Thus

$$|\phi| < \frac{|g_I|}{2M} Y_{00} = \frac{|g_I|}{4\sqrt{\pi}M}, \quad (49)$$

and $\kappa - \xi \phi^2 > 0$ will be satisfied everywhere if

$$|g_I| < M \sqrt{\frac{2}{\xi}}. \quad (50)$$

For $\xi > 0$, we will take $A_0 > A_1$ and $\omega_1 \gg \omega_0$, so that

$$g_I \approx \frac{A_0}{4M\omega_0} \sin \omega_0 v \leq \frac{A_0}{4M\omega_0}. \quad (51)$$

This gives the condition

$$A_0 < \frac{8\pi M^2}{T_0} \sqrt{\frac{2}{\xi}}, \quad (52)$$

where $T_0 = 2\pi/\omega_0$. Now let $T_1 = 2\pi/\omega_1$. We want $T_0 \geq T_1 \gg M$. The former condition may not be essential, but it does help us obtain the negative energy we want. The latter condition will insure that any violations of the second law last for a time long compared to M . This allows the changes in the Schwarzschild geometry to be quasistatic.




Figure 1: A plot of S'/S_0 versus $v = t + r^*$, in units of $M = 1$, for the coupling parameter $\xi = 1/6$, i. e., conformal coupling.

3.1 Some Numerical Results

Here we present some numerical examples of generalized second law violations. We consider situations of both $\xi > 0$ and $\xi < 0$, and also specifically examine the case of conformal coupling, $\xi = 1/6$.

3.1.1 $\xi > 0$

Let us first take $\xi = 1/6$, which corresponds to the case of conformal coupling. We work in units where $M = 1$, and take $T_0 = 100$, $T_1 = 10$, $A_1 = A_0/2$, and $A_0 = 0.78$. The value of A_0 is chosen to be about 0.9 times the upper bound given by Eq. (52). Our numerical result for the above values is shown in Fig. 1. This corresponds to a fractional decrease in S of the order of a few percent over a time of a few M , which would certainly appear to be a macroscopic violation of the second law. It should be emphasized that any fractional decrease in S will count as a violation of the second law in the present context. We are free to make our initial black hole as massive as we like and hence to have any initial entropy. Thus even extremely small values of S'/S_0 can correspond to macroscopic decreases in entropy.

In Fig. 2 is shown a graph of S'/S_0 versus v with the same choices for T_0 , T_1 , and A_1 as before, but with $0 < \xi \leq 1$. Again, the value of A_0 is chosen to be about 0.9 times the upper bound given by Eq. (52). We see that the decrease in S persists down to small ξ , grows as ξ increases, and persists for (an advanced) time v of order $1/\omega_1$.




Figure 2: A plot of S'/S_0 versus $v = t + r^*$, in units of $M = 1$, for positive ξ in the range $1 \geq \xi > 0$.




Figure 3: A plot of $S'/(S_0 A_1^2)$ versus $v = t + r^*$, in units of $M = 1$, for the coupling parameter $\xi = -1/6$. Note that the vertical axis scales as A_1^{-2} , and thus the violation can be made as large as we like by increasing the wave amplitude A_1 .

3.1.2 $\xi < 0$

If $\xi < 0$, then $\kappa - \xi\phi^2 > 0$, so there is no restriction on the magnitude of ξ or on the amplitude of ϕ , as the effective stress-tensor is nonsingular for all values of ξ and ϕ . As a result, here any decrease in S can be made arbitrarily large (for any fixed ξ) by scaling the amplitude of the wave.

First take $\xi = -1/6$, and set $A_0 = 0$ and $T_1 = 10$, in units of $M = 1$. The result is plotted in Fig. 3. The vertical axis scales as A_1^{-2} . So, again over a time v of a few M , we get a decrease in S that can be of arbitrary magnitude.

Next use the same values for A_0 and T_1 , but let $0 \geq \xi \geq -1$. The graph of $S'/(S_0 A_1^2)$ versus v is plotted in Fig. 4. We see again that the decrease in S persists down to small $|\xi|$, grows as $|\xi|$ increases, and persists for (an advanced) time v of order $1/\omega_1$.

4 Conclusions

There is an issue which we have not yet addressed in this paper, the existence of various “conformal frames” for scalar field theories. The form of the action of Eq. (2) is often called the “Jordan frame”. It is possible to perform a conformal metric transformation which converts the action into a form in which the $\xi R\phi^2$ term is no longer present. (See the excellent review article by Faraoni, Gunzig, and Nardone [21] for details.) This form of the theory is called the “Einstein frame”. The use




Figure 4: A plot of $S'/(S_0 A_1^2)$ versus $v = t + r^*$, in units of $M = 1$, for negative ξ in the range $0 \geq \xi \geq -1$. Note that the vertical axis scales as A_1^{-2} , and thus the violation can be made as large as we like by increasing the wave amplitude A_1 .

of the word frame to describe these forms of the action is perhaps misleading; the transformation between the two is *not* a coordinate transformation, but rather a field redefinition which mixes the scalar and gravitational fields.

The question which now arises is whether the Jordan frame and the Einstein frame are physically equivalent to one another. This issue has been widely debated in the literature and is reviewed in Ref. [21]. We can summarize the problem in the context of the present paper as follows: If the action alone determines a physical theory, it should not matter which variables we use in writing it. Then both Eq. (2) and its Einstein frame variant should lead to the same observable predictions. On the other hand, we have argued in this paper that the Jordan frame formulation can lead to macroscopic violations of the second law. In the Einstein frame, the classical energy conditions are satisfied, so it is hard to see how any violations of the second law are possible.

This apparent paradox can be resolved if one adopts the viewpoint that actions such as Eq. (2) are only a piece of the full theory. In this viewpoint, the full action would also include pieces describing test particles which couple only to the gravitational field, as well as possibly other fields which couple to ϕ and can act as “field meters” for the scalar field. In this case, both ϕ and the spacetime geometry each have an independent physical reality. This viewpoint seems to be implicit in any discussion of black hole thermodynamics, where it is assumed that the spacetime geometry of the black hole is an observable quantity.

If one adopts this view, then the Jordan frame and the Einstein frame refer to physically distinct theories. The problems with the second law arise only in the Jordan frame theories.

We have demonstrated that classical massless non-minimally coupled scalar fields can be used to produce disturbingly large negative energy fluxes, even in flat spacetime. These fluxes appear to have magnitudes sufficient to produce gross violations of the second law of thermodynamics. However, whether such violations occur could depend on the details of how these fields interact with ordinary matter. To circumvent this loophole, we examined these negative energy fluxes in the presence of a relatively unambiguous energy detector, a Schwarzschild black hole. We found that, by shining a negative energy flux composed of classical massless non-minimally coupled scalar fields down the horizon, it is possible to temporarily violate the generalized second law of thermodynamics, by decreasing the entropy of the black hole with no compensating increase in entropy. This can be done for essentially any positive or negative value of the coupling parameter, including the case of conformal coupling ($\xi = 1/6$), and without the necessity of trans-Planckian values for the scalar field.

Recall that the discussion in this paper has concentrated on free scalar fields, for which $V(\phi) = 0$. Self-coupling with $V(\phi) > 0$ will certainly make it easier to satisfy the WEC, as may be seen from Eq. (4). However, given that we have found that one can in principle violate the second law even with very small magnitude scalar fields, it is hard to see how self-coupling can always avoid the problem. Any reasonable form of $V(\phi)$ would presumably have the property that $V(\phi) \rightarrow 0$ as $\phi \rightarrow 0$, and

hence have no effect in the limit of weak fields.

It is true that the negative energy fluxes and consequent violations of the second law are temporary in the sense that the time-integrated flux or entropy change is always positive. However, unlike the situation in quantum theory, there are no constraints here analogous to the quantum inequalities. It is possible for observable decreases in entropy to be sustained over macroscopically long time intervals.

This result is unsettling and may indicate that such fields cannot exist in nature. On the other hand, these fields appear in many areas of modern theoretical physics, such as string theory and inflationary cosmology (for a good summary, see the last section of Ref. [12], and Refs. [21, 22]). Classical massless minimally coupled scalar fields do not exhibit these problems, so perhaps only these fields can exist. However, when one quantizes such a theory, a non-minimal coupling term can emerge, e. g., in the form of quantum corrections, as discussed in Ref. [21]. It might also be argued that the second law of thermodynamics has never been directly tested in a gravitational context, in the form of the generalized second law, and perhaps could fail in certain circumstances. We consider this possibility to be unlikely, given the compelling and beautiful connection between black holes and thermodynamics forged by Hawking's discovery of the black hole evaporation process. Violation of the generalized second law would put this framework in jeopardy.

If such classical scalar fields can exist, that raises the question of why only certain classical fields are capable of producing large energy condition violations. For example, it is often thought that the conformally coupled scalar field is “physically reasonable” because it faithfully mimics certain aspects of the electromagnetic field. But why then does the classical electromagnetic field obey the WEC, while the conformally coupled scalar field does not?

It is usually easier to get negative energy in the context of quantum rather than classical fields. Moreover, in the regime of quantum fields, there seem to be some rather strong restrictions imposed on the magnitude and extent of negative energy densities and fluxes, in the form of the quantum inequalities. It would therefore seem a bit paradoxical if classical fields in nature could exhibit large negative energy densities. If this is really the case, perhaps Einstein was right when he suggested that “I have had second thoughts. Maybe God is malicious after all” [23].

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Paul Anderson, Carlos Barcelo, Éanna Flanagan, Jaume Garriga, and Alex Vilenkin for useful comments, and Matt Visser for useful discussions and suggestions on the presentation. TAR would like to thank the members of the Tufts Institute of Cosmology for their hospitality while this work was being done. This research was supported by NSF Grant No. Phy-9800965 (to LHF) and by NSF Grant No. Phy-9988464 (to TAR).

References

- [1] S.W. Hawking and G.F.R. Ellis, *The Large Scale Structure of Spacetime* (Cambridge University Press, London, 1973), p. 88-96.
- [2] H. Epstein, V. Glaser, and A. Jaffe, *Nuovo Cim.* **36**, 1016 (1965).
- [3] M. Morris and K. Thorne, *Am. J. Phys.* **56**, 395 (1988).
- [4] M. Morris, K. Thorne, and U. Yurtsever, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **61**, 1446 (1988).
- [5] M. Alcubierre, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **11**, L73 (1994).
- [6] L.H. Ford and T.A. Roman, *Phys. Rev. D* **53**, 5496 (1996), gr-qc/9510071.
- [7] M.J. Pfenning and L.H. Ford, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **14**, 1743 (1997), gr-qc/9702026.
- [8] É.É. Flanagan and R.M. Wald, *Phys. Rev. D* **54**, 6233 (1996).
- [9] R. Fakir, *General relativistic cosmology with no beginning of time*, gr-qc/9810054.
- [10] C. Barcelo and M. Visser, *Phys. Lett.* **B466**, 127 (1999); gr-qc/9908029.
- [11] C. Barcelo and M. Visser, *Energy Conditions and Their Cosmological Implications*, gr-qc/0001099.
- [12] C. Barcelo and M. Visser, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **17** 3843 (2000); gr-qc/0003025.
- [13] L.H. Ford, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **364**, 227 (1978).
- [14] L.H. Ford, *Phys. Rev. D* **43**, 3972 (1991).
- [15] É.É. Flanagan, talk given at the “KipFest” meeting, Cal Tech, June 2000.
- [16] L.H. Ford and T.A. Roman, *Phys. Rev. D* **46**, 1328 (1992).
- [17] V. Iyer and R.M. Wald, *Phys. Rev. D* **50**, 846 (1994); *Phys. Rev. D* **52**, 4430 (1995).
- [18] M. Visser, *Phys. Rev. D* **48**, 5697 (1993).
- [19] M. Visser, *Phys. Rev. D* **48**, 583 (1993).
- [20] See Eq.(134) of M.J. Pfenning and L.H. Ford, *Phys. Rev. D* **57**, 3489 (1998), gr-qc/9710055, which is based on the work of B.P. Jensen, J.G. McLaughlin, and A.C. Ottewill, *Phys. Rev. D* **45**, 3002 (1992).
- [21] V. Faraoni, E. Gunzig, and P. Nardone, *Conformal transformations in classical gravitational field theories and cosmology*, gr-qc/9811047.

- [22] V. Faraoni, *A crucial ingredient of inflation*, hep-th/0009053.
- [23] A. Einstein, related by V. Bargmann, in “Some Strangeness in the Proportion: A Centennial Symposium to Celebrate the Achievements of Albert Einstein”, ed. by Harry Woolf, (Addison-Wesley, Reading, Massachusetts, 1980) p. 480.