Incompleteness Theorems for Observables in General Relativity

Aristotelis Panagiotopoulos

Kurt Gödel Research Center
University of Vienna

Research supported by DMS-2154258

This is joint work with

Marios Christodoulou (IQOQI)

George Sparling (UPitt)

Table of Contents

Lorentzian metrics: abstractly

Lorentzian metrics: abstractly

Let M be smooth 4-dimensional manifold. A **Lorentzian metric** on M is

"a symmetric and $(1,3)$-signature **section** g of the bundle $(TM \otimes TM)^* \to M$"

Lorentzian metrics: abstractly

Let M be smooth 4-dimensional manifold. A **Lorentzian metric** on M is

"a symmetric and $(1,3)$-signature **section** g of the bundle $(TM \otimes TM)^* \to M$"

$$\boxed{g(\vec{V},\vec{W})_p := \text{ the "inner product" of } \vec{V},\vec{W} \text{ at } p \in M}$$



Lorentzian metrics: abstractly

Let M be smooth 4-dimensional manifold. A **Lorentzian metric** on M is

"a symmetric and $(1,3)$-signature **section** g of the bundle $(TM \otimes TM)^* \to M$"

$$g(\vec{V}, \vec{W})_p := \text{ the "inner product" of } \vec{V}, \vec{W} \text{ at } p \in M$$



Lorentzian metrics: abstractly

Let M be smooth 4-dimensional manifold. A **Lorentzian metric** on M is

"a symmetric and $(1,3)$-signature **section** g of the bundle $(TM \otimes TM)^* \to M$"

$$g(\vec{V}, \vec{W})_p := \text{ the "inner product" of } \vec{V}, \vec{W} \text{ at } p \in M$$



Lorentzian metrics: abstractly

Let M be smooth 4-dimensional manifold. A **Lorentzian metric** on M is

"a symmetric and $(1,3)$-signature **section** g of the bundle $(TM \otimes TM)^* \to M$"

$$\boxed{g(\vec{V},\vec{W})_p := \text{ the "inner product" of } \vec{V},\vec{W} \text{ at } p \in M}$$



R. Penrose, "The Road to Reality"

Lorentzian metrics: concretely

A **Lorentzian metric** on $\mathbb{R}^4$ is given by a smooth map $g_{\mu\nu} \colon \mathbb{R}^4 \to \mathbb{R}^{4\times 4}$

$$(x^0, x^1, x^2, x^3) \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} g_{00} & g_{01} & g_{02} & g_{03} \\ g_{10} & g_{11} & g_{12} & g_{13} \\ g_{20} & g_{21} & g_{22} & g_{23} \\ g_{30} & g_{31} & g_{32} & g_{33} \end{bmatrix}$$

with $g_{\mu\nu}$ being a symmetric, $(-,+,+,+)$-signature matrix. We have

$$g = g_{\mu\nu}\, dx^\mu dx^\nu$$

Lorentzian metrics: concretely

A **Lorentzian metric** on $\mathbb{R}^4$ is given by a smooth map $g_{\mu\nu} \colon \mathbb{R}^4 \to \mathbb{R}^{4\times 4}$

$$(x^0, x^1, x^2, x^3) \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} g_{00} & g_{01} & g_{02} & g_{03} \\ g_{10} & g_{11} & g_{12} & g_{13} \\ g_{20} & g_{21} & g_{22} & g_{23} \\ g_{30} & g_{31} & g_{32} & g_{33} \end{bmatrix}$$

with $g_{\mu\nu}$ being a symmetric, $(-,+,+,+)$-signature matrix. We have

$$g = g_{\mu\nu}\, dx^\mu dx^\nu$$

Example

If $\quad \eta_{\mu\nu} := \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad$ then $\quad \eta = -dt^2 + dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2$

Einstein field equations

By a **spacetime** we mean a Lorentzian metric $g_{\mu\nu} : \mathbb{R}^4 \to \mathbb{R}^{4\times 4}$, satisfying:

$$\boxed{R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} R \; = \; \frac{8\pi G}{c^4} T_{\mu\nu}}$$

for some "physically relevant" **Stress-Energy tensor** $T_{\mu\nu}$.

$$g_{\mu\nu} \rightsquigarrow R^{\rho}_{\mu\sigma\nu} \rightsquigarrow R_{\mu\nu} \rightsquigarrow R$$

Compare to Poisson's equation for Newton's law of gravity:

$$\boxed{\nabla^2 \varphi = 4\pi G \rho}$$

Example

$$g_{\mu\nu} := 1/(2\omega^2)\left[-(dt + e^x dy)^2 + dx^2 + 1/2e^{2x}dy^2 + dz^2\right]$$

$$T_{\mu\nu} = \text{"rotating dust"} + \text{"negative cosmological constant"}$$



Figure. *Nḿeti, Madarász, Andréka, Andai* (after Hawking, Ellis)

Example

$$g_{\mu\nu} := 1/(2\omega^2)\big[-(dt + e^x dy)^2 + dx^2 + 1/2 e^{2x} dy^2 + dz^2\big]$$

$$T_{\mu\nu} = \text{“rotating dust”} + \text{“negative cosmological constant”}$$



Figure. *Nḿe* … king, Ellis)

“*Is the universe rotating yet*?” K. Gödel

Table of Contents

Question. Do $g_{\mu\nu}$ and $\widetilde{g}_{\rho\sigma}$ represent different "geometries"?

$$g_{\mu\nu} := \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\widetilde{g}_{\rho\sigma} := \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -\cos(x_1) & 0 & 0 \\ -\cos(x_1) & 1-\cos^2(x_1) & 2x_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 2x_2 & 4x_2^2+1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$$

Question. Do $g_{\mu\nu}$ and $\widetilde{g}_{\rho\sigma}$ represent different "geometries"?

$$g_{\mu\nu} : = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\widetilde{g}_{\rho\sigma} : = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -\cos(x_1) & 0 & 0 \\ -\cos(x_1) & 1-\cos^2(x_1) & 2x_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 2x_2 & 4x_2^2+1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$$

We say that $g_{\mu\nu}$ and $\widetilde{g}_{\rho\sigma}$ are **diffeomorphic** and write $g_{\mu\nu} \simeq_{\text{diff}} \widetilde{g}_{\rho\sigma}$ if there exists are smooth change of coordinates $x_\eta = x_\eta(\widetilde{x}^\xi)$ so that

$$\widetilde{g}_{\rho\sigma}(\widetilde{x}^\xi) = \frac{\partial x^\mu}{\partial \widetilde{x}^\rho} \frac{\partial x^\nu}{\partial \widetilde{x}^\sigma} g_{\mu\nu}(x^\eta) \quad \text{for all} \quad \widetilde{x}^\xi.$$

Same geometry, different coordinate system...

$$\begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \simeq_{\text{diff}} \quad \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -\cos(\widetilde{x}_1) & 0 & 0 \\ -\cos(\widetilde{x}_1) & 1-\cos^2(\widetilde{x}_1) & 2\widetilde{x}_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 2\widetilde{x}_2 & 4\widetilde{x}_2^2+1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$$

Same geometry, different coordinate system...

$$\begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \simeq_{\text{diff}} \quad \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -\cos(\widetilde{x}_1) & 0 & 0 \\ -\cos(\widetilde{x}_1) & 1-\cos^2(\widetilde{x}_1) & 2\widetilde{x}_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 2\widetilde{x}_2 & 4\widetilde{x}_2^2+1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$$

Consider the change of coordinates $x_\eta = x_\eta(\widetilde{x}^\xi)$ given by:

$$\begin{aligned} x_0 &= \widetilde{x}_0 + \sin(\widetilde{x}_1) \\ x_1 &= \widetilde{x}_1 + \widetilde{x}_2^2 \\ x_2 &= \widetilde{x}_2 - \widetilde{x}_3 \\ x_3 &= \widetilde{x}_3 \end{aligned}$$

Same geometry, different coordinate system...

$$\begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \simeq_{\text{diff}} \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -\cos(\widetilde{x}_1) & 0 & 0 \\ -\cos(\widetilde{x}_1) & 1-\cos^2(\widetilde{x}_1) & 2\widetilde{x}_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 2\widetilde{x}_2 & 4\widetilde{x}_2^2+1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$$

Consider the change of coordinates $x_\eta = x_\eta(\widetilde{x}^\xi)$ given by:

$$\begin{aligned} x_0 &= \widetilde{x}_0 + \sin(\widetilde{x}_1) \\ x_1 &= \widetilde{x}_1 + \widetilde{x}_2^2 \\ x_2 &= \widetilde{x}_2 - \widetilde{x}_3 \\ x_3 &= \widetilde{x}_3 \end{aligned} \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \begin{aligned} dx_0 &= d\widetilde{x}_0 + \cos(\widetilde{x}_1) d\widetilde{x}_1 \\ dx_1 &= d\widetilde{x}_1 + 2\widetilde{x}_2 d\widetilde{x}_2 \\ dx_2 &= d\widetilde{x}_2 - d\widetilde{x}_3 \\ dx_3 &= d\widetilde{x}_3 \end{aligned}$$

$$\rightsquigarrow \quad \begin{aligned} (dx_0)^2 &= (d\widetilde{x}_0)^2 + 2\cos(\widetilde{x}_1) d\widetilde{x}_0 d\widetilde{x}_1 + \cos^2(\widetilde{x}_1)(d\widetilde{x}_1)^2 \\ (dx_1)^2 &= (d\widetilde{x}_1)^2 + 4\widetilde{x}_2 d\widetilde{x}_1 d\widetilde{x}_2 + 4\widetilde{x}_2^2 (d\widetilde{x}_2)^2 \\ (dx_2)^2 &= (d\widetilde{x}_2)^2 - 2d\widetilde{x}_2 d\widetilde{x}_3 + (d\widetilde{x}_3)^2 \\ (dx_3)^2 &= (d\widetilde{x}_3)^2 \end{aligned}$$

Same geometry, different coordinate system...

$$\begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \simeq_{\text{diff}} \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -\cos(\widetilde{x}_1) & 0 & 0 \\ -\cos(\widetilde{x}_1) & 1-\cos^2(\widetilde{x}_1) & 2\widetilde{x}_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 2\widetilde{x}_2 & 4\widetilde{x}_2^2+1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$$

Consider the change of coordinates $x_\eta = x_\eta(\widetilde{x}^\xi)$ given by:

$$\begin{aligned} x_0 &= \widetilde{x}_0 + \sin(\widetilde{x}_1) \\ x_1 &= \widetilde{x}_1 + \widetilde{x}_2^2 \\ x_2 &= \widetilde{x}_2 - \widetilde{x}_3 \\ x_3 &= \widetilde{x}_3 \end{aligned} \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \begin{aligned} dx_0 &= d\widetilde{x}_0 + \cos(\widetilde{x}_1)d\widetilde{x}_1 \\ dx_1 &= d\widetilde{x}_1 + 2\widetilde{x}_2 d\widetilde{x}_2 \\ dx_2 &= d\widetilde{x}_2 - d\widetilde{x}_3 \\ dx_3 &= d\widetilde{x}_3 \end{aligned}$$

$$\rightsquigarrow \quad \begin{aligned} (dx_0)^2 &= (d\widetilde{x}_0)^2 + 2\cos(\widetilde{x}_1)d\widetilde{x}_0 d\widetilde{x}_1 + \cos^2(\widetilde{x}_1)(d\widetilde{x}_1)^2 \\ (dx_1)^2 &= (d\widetilde{x}_1)^2 + 4\widetilde{x}_2 d\widetilde{x}_1 d\widetilde{x}_2 + 4\widetilde{x}_2^2(d\widetilde{x}_2)^2 \\ (dx_2)^2 &= (d\widetilde{x}_2)^2 - 2d\widetilde{x}_2 d\widetilde{x}_3 + (d\widetilde{x}_3)^2 \\ (dx_3)^2 &= (d\widetilde{x}_3)^2 \end{aligned}$$

Plug to $\boxed{ds^2 = -(dx_0)^2 + (dx_1)^2 + (dx_2)^2 + (dx_3)^2}$

Observables

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a collection of spacetimes and consider the relation $\simeq_{\text{diff}}$ on $\mathcal{S}$:



Observables

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a collection of spacetimes and consider the relation $\simeq_{\mathrm{diff}}$ on $\mathcal{S}$:



An **observable** is any map $f \colon \mathcal{S} \to R$ that is diffeomorphism invariant:

for all $g_{\mu\nu}, \widetilde{g}_{\rho\sigma} \in \mathcal{S}$ we have $g_{\mu\nu} \simeq_{\mathrm{diff}} \widetilde{g}_{\rho\sigma} \implies f(g_{\mu\nu}) = f(\widetilde{g}_{\rho\sigma})$

Observables

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a collection of spacetimes and consider the relation $\simeq_{\text{diff}}$ on $\mathcal{S}$:



An **observable** is any map $f\colon \mathcal{S} \to R$ that is diffeomorphism invariant:

for all $g_{\mu\nu}, \widetilde{g}_{\rho\sigma} \in \mathcal{S}$ we have $g_{\mu\nu} \simeq_{\text{diff}} \widetilde{g}_{\rho\sigma} \implies f(g_{\mu\nu}) = f(\widetilde{g}_{\rho\sigma})$

Usually $R = \mathbb{R}$. For us, R can be any **Polish space**, such as $R = \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$.

Observables

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a collection of spacetimes and consider the relation $\simeq_{\text{diff}}$ on $\mathcal{S}$:



An **observable** is any map $f\colon \mathcal{S} \to R$ that is diffeomorphism invariant:

for all $g_{\mu\nu}, \widetilde{g}_{\rho\sigma} \in \mathcal{S}$ we have $g_{\mu\nu} \simeq_{\text{diff}} \widetilde{g}_{\rho\sigma} \implies f(g_{\mu\nu}) = f(\widetilde{g}_{\rho\sigma})$

Usually $R = \mathbb{R}$. For us, R can be any **Polish space**, such as $R = \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$.

Canonical Quantization Process

Step 1: Find a **complete** set of observables for $\mathcal{S}$.

Step 2: Promote them to an **algebra of operators** on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$.

The problem of observables

"*We define observables as functions (or functionals) of field variables that are invariant with respect to coordinate transformations*."

(1958) P.G. Bergmann, and A.I. Janis

"*A program aiming at the identification and systematic exploitation of the observables has been under way for many years, but its execution is* **hampered by profound technical difficulties, which have not yet been overcome completely**."

(1965) P.G. Bergmann,

The problem of observables

"*We define observables as functions (or functionals) of field variables that are invariant with respect to coordinate transformations*."

(1958) P.G. Bergmann, and A.I. Janis

"*A program aiming at the identification and systematic exploitation of the observables has been under way for many years, but its execution is* **hampered by profound technical difficulties, which have not yet been overcome completely**."

(1965) P.G. Bergmann,

"*...presently we can give a formal characterization of observables in general relativity, but we are actually* **not able to explicitly construct many examples** *of quantities that satisfy it*."

(2001) L. Smolin

The problem of observables

"*We define observables as functions (or functionals) of field variables that are invariant with respect to coordinate transformations*."

(1958) P.G. Bergmann, and A.I. Janis

"*A program aiming at the identification and systematic exploitation of the observables has been under way for many years, but its execution is* **hampered by profound technical difficulties, which have not yet been overcome completely**."

(1965) P.G. Bergmann,

"*...presently we can give a formal characterization of observables in general relativity, but we are actually* **not able to explicitly construct many examples** *of quantities that satisfy it*."

(2001) L. Smolin

"*Observables for full general relativity (without special asymptotic symmetries or matter content)* **almost certainly do not exist**."

(2015) B. Dittrich, P. A. Höhn, T.A. Koslowski, and M.I. Nelson,

Examples of Observables

- **Komar mass** for static spacetimes

$$g_{\mu\nu} \mapsto \int_M (2T_{\mu\nu} - T g_{\mu\nu}) u^\mu \xi^\nu \, dM$$

It is a complete observable for all Schwarzschild solutions



- **ADM Observables** for asymptotically flat spacetimes

- **Coordinate-like Observables** for spacetimes filled with "generic dust"

Incompleteness of Observables

Theorem (P., Sparling, Christodoulou)

Complete observables are **not** *"analytically definable"*

...in the same way that $\sqrt[3]{2}$ **cannot** constructed by "straightedge–and–compass"

Incompleteness of Observables

Theorem (P., Sparling, Christodoulou)

Assume that $\mathcal{S} \supseteq \mathcal{S}_\emptyset$ contains the collection of all **vacuum solutions** $\mathcal{S}_\emptyset$*. Then there is no observable $f\colon \mathcal{S} \to R$ that is both* **Borel** *and* **complete**.

Incompleteness of Observables

Theorem (P., Sparling, Christodoulou)

Assume that $\mathcal{S} \supseteq \mathcal{S}_\emptyset$ contains the collection of all **vacuum solutions** *$\mathcal{S}_\emptyset$. Then there is no observable $f : \mathcal{S} \to R$ that is both* **Borel** *and* **complete**.

- A **vacuum solution** is any spacetime $g_{\mu\nu}$ which satisfies:

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} R = 0$$

Incompleteness of Observables

Theorem (P., Sparling, Christodoulou)

Assume that $\mathcal{S} \supseteq \mathcal{S}_\emptyset$ contains the collection of all **vacuum solutions** *$\mathcal{S}_\emptyset$. Then there is no observable $f \colon \mathcal{S} \to R$ that is both* **Borel** *and* **complete**.

- A **vacuum solution** is any spacetime $g_{\mu\nu}$ which satisfies:

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} R = 0$$

- $f \colon \mathcal{S} \to R$ is **complete** if $g_{\mu\nu} \simeq_{\text{diff}} \widetilde{g}_{\rho\sigma} \iff f(g_{\mu\nu}) = f(\widetilde{g}_{\rho\sigma})$.

Incompleteness of Observables

Theorem (P., Sparling, Christodoulou)

Assume that $\mathcal{S} \supseteq \mathcal{S}_\emptyset$ contains the collection of all **vacuum solutions** *$\mathcal{S}_\emptyset$. Then there is no observable $f\colon \mathcal{S} \to R$ that is both* **Borel** *and* **complete**.

- A **vacuum solution** is any spacetime $g_{\mu\nu}$ which satisfies:

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} R = 0$$

- $f\colon \mathcal{S} \to R$ is **complete** if $g_{\mu\nu} \simeq_{\mathrm{diff}} \widetilde{g}_{\rho\sigma} \iff f(g_{\mu\nu}) = f(\widetilde{g}_{\rho\sigma})$.

- $f\colon \mathcal{S} \to R$ is **Borel** if it is Borel as a map from $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathrm{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^{4\times 4})$ endowed with the C^∞-compact-open topology to the Polish space R.

Incompleteness of Observables

Theorem (P., Sparling, Christodoulou)

Assume that $\mathcal{S} \supseteq \mathcal{S}_\emptyset$ contains the collection of all **vacuum solutions** $\mathcal{S}_\emptyset$*. Then there is no observable $f\colon \mathcal{S} \to R$ that is both* **Borel** *and* **complete***.*

- A **vacuum solution** is any spacetime $g_{\mu\nu}$ which satisfies:

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} R = 0$$

- $f\colon \mathcal{S} \to R$ is **complete** if $g_{\mu\nu} \simeq_{\text{diff}} \widetilde{g}_{\rho\sigma} \iff f(g_{\mu\nu}) = f(\widetilde{g}_{\rho\sigma})$.

- $f\colon \mathcal{S} \to R$ is **Borel** if it is Borel as a map from $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathrm{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^{4\times 4})$ endowed with the C^∞-compact-open topology to the Polish space R.

Theorem (P., Sparling, Christodoulou)

"ZF+DC+no **complete** *observables for $\mathcal{S} \supseteq \mathcal{S}_\emptyset$ exist" is consistent.*

Table of Contents

Consider the equivalence relation $\simeq_{\mathbb{Z}}$ on the space $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ where

$$\alpha \simeq_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta \iff \exists k \in \mathbb{Z} \;\; \forall n \in \mathbb{Z} \;\; \alpha(n+k) = \beta(n)$$

i.e., the **orbit equivalence relation** of the *Bernoulli shift* $\mathbb{Z} \curvearrowright \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$.

Consider the equivalence relation $\simeq_{\mathbb{Z}}$ on the space $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ where

$$\alpha \simeq_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta \iff \exists k \in \mathbb{Z} \ \forall n \in \mathbb{Z} \ \alpha(n+k) = \beta(n)$$

i.e., the **orbit equivalence relation** of the *Bernoulli shift* $\mathbb{Z} \curvearrowright \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$.

Theorem (Folkore)

There is **no** **Borel** *map* $f\colon \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \to R$*, taking values in Polish* R*, with*

$$\alpha \simeq_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta \iff f(\alpha) = f(\beta), \qquad \text{for all} \qquad \alpha, \beta \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$$

Consider the equivalence relation $\simeq_{\mathbb{Z}}$ on the space $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ where

$$\alpha \simeq_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta \iff \exists k \in \mathbb{Z} \ \forall n \in \mathbb{Z} \ \ \alpha(n+k) = \beta(n)$$

i.e., the **orbit equivalence relation** of the *Bernoulli shift* $\mathbb{Z} \curvearrowright \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$.

Theorem (Folkore)

There is **no Borel** *map* $f\colon \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \to R$*, taking values in Polish* R*, with*

$$\alpha \simeq_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta \iff f(\alpha) = f(\beta), \qquad \textit{for all} \qquad \alpha, \beta \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$$

Proof Sketch.

• Notice that $\mathbb{Z} \curvearrowright \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ has a dense orbit. This implies the "0–1 law": if $B \subseteq \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is $\mathbb{Z}$–invariant and Borel, then one of B, B^c is comeager.

Consider the equivalence relation $\simeq_{\mathbb{Z}}$ on the space $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ where

$$\alpha \simeq_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta \iff \exists k \in \mathbb{Z} \ \forall n \in \mathbb{Z} \ \ \alpha(n+k) = \beta(n)$$

i.e., the **orbit equivalence relation** of the *Bernoulli shift* $\mathbb{Z} \curvearrowright \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$.

Theorem (Folkore)

There is **no Borel** *map* $f\colon \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \to R$*, taking values in Polish* R*, with*

$$\alpha \simeq_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta \iff f(\alpha) = f(\beta), \quad \textit{for all} \quad \alpha, \beta \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$$

Proof Sketch.

- Notice that $\mathbb{Z} \curvearrowright \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ has a dense orbit. This implies the "0–1 law": if $B \subseteq \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is $\mathbb{Z}$–invariant and Borel, then one of B, B^c is comeager.
- Assume f exists. Find comeager $C \subseteq \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ so that $f(C) = \{x\}$



Consider the equivalence relation $\simeq_{\mathbb{Z}}$ on the space $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ where

$$\alpha \simeq_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta \iff \exists k \in \mathbb{Z}\ \forall n \in \mathbb{Z}\ \ \alpha(n+k) = \beta(n)$$

i.e., the **orbit equivalence relation** of the *Bernoulli shift* $\mathbb{Z} \curvearrowright \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$.

Theorem (Folkore)

There is **no Borel** *map* $f\colon \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \to R$*, taking values in Polish* R*, with*

$$\alpha \simeq_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta \iff f(\alpha) = f(\beta), \quad \textit{for all} \quad \alpha, \beta \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$$

Proof Sketch.

- Notice that $\mathbb{Z} \curvearrowright \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ has a dense orbit. This implies the "0–1 law": if $B \subseteq \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is $\mathbb{Z}$-invariant and Borel, then one of B, B^c is comeager.
- Assume f exists and get comeager $C \subseteq \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ so that $f(C) = \{x\}$



Consider the equivalence relation $\simeq_{\mathbb{Z}}$ on the space $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ where

$$\alpha \simeq_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta \iff \exists k \in \mathbb{Z} \ \forall n \in \mathbb{Z} \ \ \alpha(n+k) = \beta(n)$$

i.e., the **orbit equivalence relation** of the *Bernoulli shift* $\mathbb{Z} \curvearrowright \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$.

Theorem (Folkore)

There is **no** **Borel** *map* $f\colon \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \to R$, *taking values in Polish* R, *with*

$$\alpha \simeq_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta \iff f(\alpha) = f(\beta), \qquad \textit{for all} \qquad \alpha, \beta \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$$

Proof Sketch.

- Notice that $\mathbb{Z} \curvearrowright \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ has a dense orbit. This implies the "0–1 law": if $B \subseteq \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is $\mathbb{Z}$-invariant and Borel, then one of B, B^c is comeager.
- Assume f exists and get comeager $C \subseteq \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ so that $f(C) = \{x\}$



Consider the equivalence relation $\simeq_{\mathbb{Z}}$ on the space $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ where

$$\alpha \simeq_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta \iff \exists k \in \mathbb{Z} \ \forall n \in \mathbb{Z} \ \ \alpha(n+k) = \beta(n)$$

i.e., the **orbit equivalence relation** of the *Bernoulli shift* $\mathbb{Z} \curvearrowright \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$.

Theorem (Folkore)

There is **no Borel** *map* $f\colon \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \to R$*, taking values in Polish* R*, with*

$$\alpha \simeq_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta \iff f(\alpha) = f(\beta), \qquad \textit{for all} \qquad \alpha, \beta \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$$

Proof Sketch.

- Notice that $\mathbb{Z} \curvearrowright \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ has a dense orbit. This implies the "0–1 law": if $B \subseteq \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is $\mathbb{Z}$-invariant and Borel, then one of B, B^c is comeager.
- Assume f exists and get comeager $C \subseteq \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ so that $f(C) = \{x\}$



Consider the equivalence relation $\simeq_{\mathbb{Z}}$ on the space $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ where

$$\alpha \simeq_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta \iff \exists k \in \mathbb{Z} \ \forall n \in \mathbb{Z} \ \alpha(n+k) = \beta(n)$$

i.e., the **orbit equivalence relation** of the *Bernoulli shift* $\mathbb{Z} \curvearrowright \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$.

Theorem (Folkore)

There is **no Borel** *map* $f\colon \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \to R$*, taking values in Polish* R*, with*

$$\alpha \simeq_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta \iff f(\alpha) = f(\beta), \quad \text{for all} \quad \alpha, \beta \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$$

Proof Sketch.

- Notice that $\mathbb{Z} \curvearrowright \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ has a dense orbit. This implies the "0–1 law": if $B \subseteq \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is $\mathbb{Z}$-invariant and Borel, then one of B, B^c is comeager.
- Assume f exists and get comeager $C \subseteq \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ so that $f(C) = \{x\}$



Consider the equivalence relation $\simeq_{\mathbb{Z}}$ on the space $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ where

$$\alpha \simeq_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta \iff \exists k \in \mathbb{Z} \ \forall n \in \mathbb{Z} \ \alpha(n+k) = \beta(n)$$

i.e., the **orbit equivalence relation** of the *Bernoulli shift* $\mathbb{Z} \curvearrowright \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$.

Theorem (Folkore)

There is **no Borel** *map* $f \colon \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \to R$*, taking values in Polish* R*, with*

$$\alpha \simeq_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta \iff f(\alpha) = f(\beta), \quad \textit{for all} \quad \alpha, \beta \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$$

Proof Sketch.

- Notice that $\mathbb{Z} \curvearrowright \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ has a dense orbit. This implies the "0–1 law": if $B \subseteq \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is $\mathbb{Z}$-invariant and Borel, then one of B, B^c is comeager.
- Assume f exists and get comeager $C \subseteq \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ so that $f(C) = \{x\}$



- Since $\mathbb{Z}$ is countable, there exist $\alpha \not\simeq_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta$ in C. But $f(\alpha) = x = f(\beta)$

General Strategy

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a collection of spacetimes.

In order to prove that:

"there is no observable $f\colon \mathcal{S} \to R$ that is both **Borel** & **complete**"

it suffices to prove that:

there exists a **Borel reduction** from $(\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}, \simeq_{\mathbb{Z}})$ to $(\mathcal{S}, \simeq_{\mathrm{diff}})$,
i.e., a Borel map $r\colon \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \to \mathcal{S}$ with $\alpha \simeq_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta \iff r(\alpha) \simeq_{\mathrm{diff}} r(\beta)$

General Strategy

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a collection of spacetimes.

In order to prove that:

"there is no observable $f\colon \mathcal{S} \to R$ that is both **Borel** & **complete**"

it suffices to prove that:

there exists a **Borel reduction** from $(\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}, \simeq_{\mathbb{Z}})$ to $(\mathcal{S}, \simeq_{\mathrm{diff}})$,
i.e., a Borel map $r\colon \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \to \mathcal{S}$ with $\alpha \simeq_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta \iff r(\alpha) \simeq_{\mathrm{diff}} r(\beta)$

Definition

$\mathcal{S}$ is **rich** if there exists a Borel reduction from $(\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}, \simeq_{\mathbb{Z}})$ to $(\mathcal{S}, \simeq_{\mathrm{diff}})$

Examples of Rich Families: part I

Theorem (Christodoulou, Sparling, P.)

For every $n \geq 2$, the family of all spacetimes on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is rich.

Examples of Rich Families: part I

Theorem (Christodoulou, Sparling, P.)

For every $n \geq 2$, the family of all spacetimes on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is rich.

Proof Idea.
Use the Cosmological Friedmann–Lemaître–Robertson–Walker metrics:

$$g_{\mu\nu} := -dt^2 + W(t)(dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2)$$

Examples of Rich Families: part I

Theorem (Christodoulou, Sparling, P.)

For every $n \geq 2$, the family of all spacetimes on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is rich.

Proof Idea.

Use the Cosmological Friedmann–Lemaître–Robertson–Walker metrics:

$$g_{\mu\nu} := -dt^2 + W(t)(dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2)$$



Source: Wikipedia



Source: Samuel Velasco/Quanta Magazine

Examples of Rich Families: part II

Theorem (Christodoulou, Sparling, P.)

The family $\mathcal{S}_{\emptyset}$ of all **vacuum solutions** *on $\mathbb{R}^4$ is rich.*

"*The problem already lies in the local degrees of freedom of the background theory in 4D.*"

Examples of Rich Families: part II

Theorem (Christodoulou, Sparling, P.)

The family $\mathcal{S}_\emptyset$ of all **vacuum solutions** *on $\mathbb{R}^4$ is rich.*

"*The problem already lies in the local degrees of freedom of the background theory in 4D.*"

Remark. There is a unique vacuum solution on $\mathbb{R}^3$!

Proof: Plane Waves

Consider the variables u, v, x, y.

$$g^H_{\mu\nu}: \qquad (u, v, x, y) \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} H(u,x,y) & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Is a **vacuum solution** whenever $H_{xx} + H_{yy} = 0$.



Penrose: "*A Remarkable Property of Plane Waves in General Relativity*"

The reduction

For every $\alpha \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ we define a "smooth version" $w^\alpha \colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ of α:





This defines a map $r \colon \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \to \mathcal{S}_\emptyset$ which maps α to

$$r(\alpha) := g^\alpha_{\mu\nu} \quad \text{given by} \quad (u,v,x,y) \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} w^\alpha(u)xy & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

The reduction

For every $\alpha \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ we define a "smooth version" $w^\alpha\colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ of α:





This defines a map $r\colon \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \to \mathcal{S}_\emptyset$ which maps α to

$$r(\alpha) := g^\alpha_{\mu\nu} \quad \text{given by} \quad (u,v,x,y) \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} w^\alpha(u)xy & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

- Showing that $\alpha E_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta \;\; \Rightarrow \;\; r(\alpha) \simeq_{\text{diff}} r(\beta)$ is easy.

The reduction

For every $\alpha \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ we define a "smooth version" $w^\alpha \colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ of α:





This defines a map $r \colon \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \to \mathcal{S}_\emptyset$ which maps α to

$$r(\alpha) := g^\alpha_{\mu\nu} \quad \text{given by} \quad (u,v,x,y) \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} w^\alpha(u)xy & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

- Showing that $\alpha E_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta \;\Rightarrow\; r(\alpha) \simeq_{\mathrm{diff}} r(\beta)$ is easy.
- Showing that $\alpha E_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta \;\Leftarrow\; r(\alpha) \simeq_{\mathrm{diff}} r(\beta)$ is **hard**.

The difficult direction

Assume that:

$$g := \big(\tilde{w}(\tilde{u})\tilde{x}\tilde{y}\big)d\tilde{u}^2 + 2d\tilde{u}d\tilde{v} + d\tilde{x}^2 + d\tilde{y}^2$$
$$\tilde{g} := \big(w(u)xy\big)du^2 + 2dudv + dx^2 + dy^2$$

are diffeomorphic under the smooth change of coordinates φ specified by

$$\tilde{u} = \tilde{u}(u, v, x, y)$$
$$\tilde{v} = \tilde{v}(u, v, x, y)$$
$$\tilde{x} = \tilde{x}(u, v, x, y)$$
$$\tilde{y} = \tilde{y}(u, v, x, y)$$

Goal:

To show that $w(u)$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$-shift of $\tilde{w}(\tilde{u})$.

The difficult direction

Assume that:

$$g := \big(\tilde{w}(\tilde{u})\tilde{x}\tilde{y}\big)d\tilde{u}^2 + 2d\tilde{u}d\tilde{v} + d\tilde{x}^2 + d\tilde{y}^2$$
$$\tilde{g} := \big(w(u)xy\big)du^2 + 2dudv + dx^2 + dy^2$$

are diffeomorphic under the smooth change of coordinates φ specified by

$$\tilde{u} = \tilde{u}(u, v, x, y)$$
$$\tilde{v} = \tilde{v}(u, v, x, y)$$
$$\tilde{x} = \tilde{x}(u, v, x, y)$$
$$\tilde{y} = \tilde{y}(u, v, x, y)$$

Goal:

To show that $w(u)$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$-shift of $\tilde{w}(\tilde{u})$.

Naive approach: use the definition $\boxed{g_{\mu\nu} = \frac{\partial \tilde{x}^\rho}{\partial x^\mu}\frac{\partial \tilde{x}^\sigma}{\partial x^\nu}\tilde{g}_{\rho\sigma}}$

Dead end

The relation $\boxed{g_{\mu\nu} = \frac{\partial \tilde{x}^\rho}{\partial x^\mu} \frac{\partial \tilde{x}^\sigma}{\partial x^\nu} \tilde{g}_{\rho\sigma}}$ gives the following equations:

$$
\begin{aligned}
H(u,x,y) &= \tilde{H}(\tilde{u},\tilde{x},\tilde{y})\tilde{u}_u + 2\tilde{u}_u\tilde{v}_u + \tilde{x}_u^2 + \tilde{y}_u^2 \\
0 &= \tilde{H}(\tilde{u},\tilde{x},\tilde{y})\tilde{u}_v + 2\tilde{u}_v\tilde{v}_v + \tilde{x}_v^2 + \tilde{y}_v^2 \\
1 &= \tilde{H}(\tilde{u},\tilde{x},\tilde{y})\tilde{u}_x + 2\tilde{u}_x\tilde{v}_x + \tilde{x}_x^2 + \tilde{y}_x^2 \\
1 &= \tilde{H}(\tilde{u},\tilde{x},\tilde{y})\tilde{u}_y + 2\tilde{u}_y\tilde{v}_y + \tilde{x}_y^2 + \tilde{y}_y^2 \\
1 &= 2\tilde{H}(\tilde{u},\tilde{x},\tilde{y})\tilde{u}_u\tilde{u}_v + 2(\tilde{u}_u\tilde{v}_v + \tilde{u}_v\tilde{v}_u) + 2\tilde{x}_u\tilde{x}_v + 2\tilde{y}_u\tilde{y}_v \\
0 &= 2\tilde{H}(\tilde{u},\tilde{x},\tilde{y})\tilde{u}_x\tilde{u}_y + 2(\tilde{u}_x\tilde{v}_y + \tilde{u}_y\tilde{v}_x) + 2\tilde{x}_x\tilde{x}_y + 2\tilde{y}_x\tilde{y}_y \\
0 &= 2\tilde{H}(\tilde{u},\tilde{x},\tilde{y})\tilde{u}_u\tilde{u}_x + 2(\tilde{u}_u\tilde{v}_x + \tilde{u}_x\tilde{v}_u) + 2\tilde{x}_u\tilde{x}_x + 2\tilde{y}_u\tilde{y}_x \\
0 &= 2\tilde{H}(\tilde{u},\tilde{x},\tilde{y})\tilde{u}_u\tilde{u}_y + 2(\tilde{u}_u\tilde{v}_y + \tilde{u}_y\tilde{v}_u) + 2\tilde{x}_u\tilde{x}_y + 2\tilde{y}_u\tilde{y}_y \\
0 &= 2\tilde{H}(\tilde{u},\tilde{x},\tilde{y})\tilde{u}_v\tilde{u}_x + 2(\tilde{u}_v\tilde{v}_x + \tilde{u}_x\tilde{v}_v) + 2\tilde{x}_v\tilde{x}_x + 2\tilde{y}_v\tilde{y}_x \\
0 &= 2\tilde{H}(\tilde{u},\tilde{x},\tilde{y})\tilde{u}_v\tilde{u}_y + 2(\tilde{u}_v\tilde{v}_y + \tilde{u}_y\tilde{v}_v) + 2\tilde{x}_v\tilde{x}_y + 2\tilde{y}_v\tilde{y}_y
\end{aligned}
$$

Good Luck!

Instead: analyze the Killing vector fields!

By analyzing the Lie algebra of Killing fields: every diffeo φ between

$$g = \tilde{H}(\tilde{u}, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) d\tilde{u}^2 + 2 d\tilde{u} d\tilde{v} + d\tilde{x}^2 + d\tilde{y}^2$$

$$\tilde{g} = H(u, x, y) du^2 + 2 du dv + dx^2 + dy^2$$

has to be of the following form, for some a, b, c and $f(x), g(u), h(u)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{u} &= (u + a)/c \\
\tilde{x} &= x \cos(b) + y \sin(b) + g(u) \\
\tilde{y} &= -x \sin(b) + y \cos(b) + h(u) \\
\tilde{v} &= c[v - x\big(\cos(b) g'(u) - \sin(b) h'(u)\big) \\
&\quad -y\big(\sin(b) g'(u) - \cos(b) h'(u)\big) - f(u)]
\end{aligned}$$

Jordan, Ehlers, Kundt (based on work of Robinson)

Table of Contents

Canonical Quantization

Step 1: Find **complete** set of observables.

$(\mathcal{S}, \simeq_{\text{diff}})$ 

Step 2: promote them to an **algebra of operators** on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$.

Canonical Quantization

~~Step 1: Find **complete** set of observables.~~

Cannot be done in a constructive fashion if $\mathcal{S} \supseteq \{\text{vacuum solutions}\}$



Step 2: promote them to an **algebra of operators** on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$.

Canonical Quantization

~~Step 1: Find **complete** set of observables.~~

Cannot be done in a constructive fashion if $\mathcal{S} \supseteq \{\text{vacuum solutions}\}$



Step 2: promote them to an **algebra of operators** on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$.

Equivariant forms of Quantization



G–**observables** where G has **nice representation theoretic properties**.

The Borel reduction hierarchy



A **classification problem** (X, E) is an equivalence relation E on Polish X

$(X, E) \leqslant (\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{E})$ iff (X, E) **Borel reduces** to (Y, F)
iff there exists Borel $r \colon X \to Y$ so that $xEx' \iff r(x)Fr(x')$

Program. Place $(\mathcal{S}, \simeq_{\text{diff}})$ in the **Borel reduction hierarchy**



Program. Place $(\mathcal{S}, \simeq_{\mathrm{diff}})$ in the **Borel reduction hierarchy**



Thαnk you!