The Weak Gravity Conjecture

and the Axionic Black Hole Paradox

Arthur Hebecker & Pablo Soler (Heidelberg)

<u>Outline</u>

- Motivation
- Axionic Black Holes
- Deriving a Weak Gravity Conjecture from the need to avoid exotic remnants
- What, if Weak Gravity is violated only in the effective theory?

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Motivation

The Weak Gravity Conjecture,

Arkani-Hamed/Motl/Nikolis/Vafa '06

$$m < gM_P$$
 or $\Lambda < gM_P$,

has recently been revisited by many authors:

Cheung/Remmen; de la Fuente/Saraswat/Sundrum ...'14 Rudelius; Ibanez/Montero/Uranga/Valenzuela; Brown/Cottrell/Shiu/Soler; Bachlechner/Long/McAllister; AH/Mangat/Rompineve/Witkowski; Junghans; Heidenreich/Reece/Rudelius; Kooner/Parameswaran/Zavala; Harlow; AH/Rompineve/Westphal; ...'15 Conlon/Krippendorf; Ooguri/Vafa; Freivogel/Kleban; Banks; Danielsson/Dibitetto;'16 Motivation (continued)

• An important new motivation is the axionic case,

 $g\equiv 1/f$,

relevant for natural inflation.

- Also, the domain wall case, is relevant for monodromy models.
- However, the basic origin of a possible Weak Gravity Theorem remains obscure.

see however Cottrell/Shiu/Soler '16

• Progress towards establishing such a theorem is important, even if (at first) only in 'exotic' cases.

Weak Gravity Conjecture for 2-forms

• We will study the dual side of the 'natural inflation case':

$$\int \frac{1}{f^2} |dB_2|^2 + \int_{\text{string}} B_2 \quad \text{for} \quad f \ll M_P.$$

Formally extending the WGC to this case implies
(a) Electric: Light strings with tension σ < f M_P

or

- (b) Magnetic: A cutoff $\Lambda < \sqrt{f M_P}$.
- The 'derivations' of both bounds are problematic since we would need 'extremal black strings' or 'black-hole instantons'.

Let us instead consider

Axionic Black Holes

Bowick/Giddings/Harvey/Horowitz/Strominger '88

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

 In the simplest case, these are just Schwarzschild BHs with a non-zero 'B₂-Wilson-line':

$$\bigcup_{S^2} \mathcal{B}_{S^2} = b$$

 Since the BH effectively induces a non-zero 2-cycle of space-time, such a non-zero (b) can be added at no cost to a standard BH solution. Axionic Black Holes (continued)

• The non-zero 'Wilson-line' *b* can in principle be measured by strings 'lassoing' the BH.

Illustration from recent paper by Dvali/Gußmann:



• There is some controversy concerning the observability of this effect, but we believe this does not affect our parameter ranges.

Preskill/Krauss '90; Coleman/Preskill/Wilczek '92

Axionic Black Hole evaporation – explosive

- Now let the BH Hawking-radiate, as usual.
- *R* goes down, *T* goes up, nothing unusual happens before they reach

 $R_c \equiv 1/\sqrt{\sigma}$ and $T_c \equiv \sqrt{\sigma}$

or, alternatively,

$$R_c \equiv 1/\Lambda$$
 and $T_c \equiv \Lambda$.

 Let us assume that, at this moment, the BHs life ends on a short time scale ~ R_c (e.g. due to a KK or string tower-of-states).

Axionic Black Hole evaporation – explosive (continued)

• With the BH gone, the non-zero B_2 integral **must** be supported by field-strength (flux) of $H_3 = dB_2$



• Using $b = \oint B_2 = \int H_3$, we can estimate the energy of the resulting field configuration as

$$E \sim \frac{1}{f^2} \int |H_3|^2 \sim \frac{b^2}{f^2 R_c^3} \sim \frac{1}{f^2 R_c^3}.$$

Axionic Black Hole evaporation – explosive (continued)

 The necessary condition E < M(R_c) ~ R_cM_P² then immediately gives

$$\frac{1}{f^2 R_c^3} < R_c M_P^2 \qquad \text{and hence} \qquad \frac{1}{R_c^4} < f^2 M_P^2 \,.$$

• Recalling that $R_c = 1/\sqrt{\sigma}$, we now have

$$\sigma < f M_P$$
 or $\Lambda^2 < f M_P$,

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

i.e. precisely what is expected from the WGC.

Axionic Black Hole evaporation – slow

• Next, let us assume that nothing dramatic happens when the BH reaches

$$R_c \equiv 1/\sqrt{\sigma}$$
 and $T_c \equiv \sqrt{\sigma}$.

• However, unavoidably, virtual strings will start lassoing the BH and hence the variable

$$b(r) \equiv \int_{S^2(r)} B_2(r,\theta,\varphi)$$

will start experiencing an effective force at $r \sim R_c$.

• b(r) will develop a non-trival profile in r, and $H_3 = dB_2$ will have time to spread until the BH is gone.

Axionic Black Hole evaporation – slow (continued)

• Crucially, the resulting *H*₃ can be much more dilute than in the 'explosive' case:



Axionic Black Hole evaporation – slow (continued)

• The evaporation time from critical radius to 'zero' is

$$t_{ev}\sim rac{M_c^3}{M_P^4}\sim R_c^3 M_P^2\sim rac{M_P^2}{\sigma^{3/2}}\,.$$

- Then H_3 can maximally spread to a radius $\sim t_{ev}$.
- Demanding that the corresponding energy satisfies $E < M(R_c)$, we now find

$$\sigma \sim \Lambda^2 \lesssim f^{2/5} \cdot M_P^{8/5}$$
.

- This is much weaker than the naive WGC bound $\sigma < f \cdot M_P$.
- We expect a more careful analysis to give a bound in between our 'explosive' and 'slow' limits.

What if the WGC is violated only in the effective theory?

 As is well-known, with appropriate instanton choice, an axion with large f_{eff} can in principle follow from two small-f axions.

Kim/Nilles/Peloso '04 (Berg/Pajer/Sjors '09; Ben-Dayan/Pedro/Westphal '14)

 The possibly simplest way to achive such an effective small coupling is via Kaloper-Sorbo gauging, as in 'winding inflation'

AH/Mangat/Rompineve/Witkowski '14

$$|F_0|^2 \rightarrow |F_0 + \varphi_1 + N\varphi_2|^2$$



э

• This can of course be done more generally, trying to evade e.g. the WGC for 1-forms in the effective theory. What if the WGC is violated only in the effective theory? (continued)

• We start with two 2-forms, $H_i = dB_i$, with

$$\mathcal{L} \sim rac{1}{f^2}(|H_1|^2 + |H_2|^2) + rac{1}{g^2}|dA + B_1 + NB_2|^2.$$

- A single 2-form with $\sim (NB_1 B_2)$ with $f_{eff} \sim f/N \ll 1$ will survive at low energies.
- It couples to a composite effective instanton, built from particles (monopoles) and the two fundamental instantons:



What if the WGC is violated only in the effective theory? (continued)

- We see that 'morally' *F* = *dA* is identified with *B*, such that particles carry axionic charge.
- The axionic BH can now end by emitting some of those particles (ending on 'fractional' instantons)



- However, this does not provide us with a free lunch: We generically need O(N) of those, with N = f/f_{eff}.
- For $f = O(M_P)$, we recover the WGC-scale Λ no gain...

Two comments:

Quantum vs. classical

- Our 'axionic charge' b is actually a a periodic quantum mechanical variable (like a Wilson-line in a compactification to d = 1).
- We checked that our classical treatment is justified since the time scales involved are below the 'quantum-spread-time'.

Scalar perspective

- It is interesting to understand what the dual (scalar-field) picture for $b = \int_{S^2} B_2$ is.
- One needs to think about superimposing ∂φ-fluxes on the dual 1-cycle (in our case the radial direction).
- It turns out that b is the phase of this superposition (just like the familiar θ-angle).

Summary/Conclusions

- Barring various simplifying assumptions (which may or may not be innocent) we gave a new argument for a WGC-like-bound for 2-forms.
- Violation leads either to very exotic remnants, or to rather serious dynamical problems (stronger than the stable-BH or BH-monopoles issue?).
- Clearly, a much more careful analysis of the final moments of an axionic BH is desired.
- Most importantly, generalizations of the underlying idea to other dimensions/p-forms are needed.

(<u>An idea</u>: We need to make sure that topology change through shriking cycles is dynamically consistent.)