The Black Hole Information Paradox: Origins, Battles, and Where We Stand Now

Agamjot Singh Babra

Student at Spring Dale Senior School, Amritsar, Punjab
Email: *agamjot.11642[at]springdaleeducation.com*

Abstract: ***The black hole information paradox arises from the apparent conflict between Hawking radiation and the unitary evolution required by quantum mechanics. This review traces the development of the problem from Bekenstein's black hole entropy and Hawking's radiation calculation through black hole complementarity, the firewall paradox, holography, the Page curve, the island formula, and fuzzball models. Particular attention is given to a 2025 proposal by Christoph Adami arguing that stimulated emission provides an information-carrying channel that was absent from Hawking's original treatment. The review compares the strengths and limitations of these approaches and finds that modern theoretical developments strongly favor information preservation, while the complete microscopic description of information recovery during black hole evaporation remains unresolved.***

Keywords: Black Hole Information Paradox, Hawking Radiation, Quantum Information, Unitarity, Black Hole Thermodynamics

1. Introduction: Why Black Holes are different

The reason the black hole problem has attracted such sustained attention is that black holes lie at the intersection of general relativity and quantum mechanics, and the two theories seem to disagree about what happens there. General relativity, Einstein's 1915 theory of gravity, says that if enough mass is packed into a small enough region, space itself curves so severely that nothing can escape. Not just matter: light itself gets trapped. The boundary of the trapped region is called the event horizon, and the point at which all matter gets crushed is the singularity. That is a black hole. Einstein himself found the idea disturbing and spent years trying to argue black holes could not actually form. Modern theory and observation do not support that conclusion. We now have horizon-scale images consistent with black hole predictions [17]. Quantum mechanics, on the other hand, is the framework that governs everything at microscopic scales: atoms, particles, radiation. And it has one rule that it treats as absolutely non-negotiable: information cannot be destroyed. If you burn a book, the information in it is not gone: it is scrambled into the thermal motion of smoke particles and photons, but in principle, if you could track every particle, you could reconstruct the book. This property is called unitarity, and every prediction quantum mechanics has ever made depends on it being true. The information paradox is what you get when these two theories are applied to the same object at the same time. To understand how the paradox actually works, you need to understand three things in sequence: what black holes are, what Hawking radiation is, and why it causes a problem. That is what this paper does and then it goes further to look at what physicists have done about it, and where the field stands right now. This narrative review is based primarily on landmark theoretical publications and selected recent literature.

1.1 A Brief History of the Idea

The concept of a gravitational trap for light goes back much further than Einstein. In 1783, the English clergyman and natural philosopher John Michell sent a letter to the Royal Society arguing that a sufficiently massive and compact star would have an escape velocity greater than the speed of light. The French mathematician Pierre-Simon de Laplace independently arrived at the same idea a few years later. Neither of them had any way to know whether such objects existed, and the idea was quietly shelved when the wave theory of light took over and people stopped thinking of light as a stream of particles that gravity could grab. The idea was resurrected properly only in 1917, when Karl Schwarzschild solved Einstein's recently formulated field equations and found an exact mathematical solution describing a spherically symmetric mass. That solution contained a critical radius (now called the Schwarzschild radius) at which the geometry of space became singular. This was the event horizon, derived from pure mathematics with no observations to guide it. Einstein disliked the result intensely. He published a paper in 1939 arguing that such objects could never actually form. Later theoretical work did not support that conclusion. The modern understanding of black holes as the endpoint of stellar collapse came from J. Robert Oppenheimer and his student Hartland Snyder in 1939 [15], and was then developed extensively by Roger Penrose, John Wheeler, and others in the 1960s and 70s. Wheeler coined the term black hole in 1967; earlier descriptions used the term completely collapsed gravitational object. By the early 1970s, black holes were understood reasonably well in classical terms. Then quantum mechanics entered the picture and everything got complicated.

2. Hawking Radiation and the Birth of the Problem

2.1 What Hawking Actually Calculated

In the autumn of 1973, Stephen Hawking visited Moscow and met with two Soviet physicists, Yakov Zeldovich and Alexander Starobinsky. They argued that rotating black holes should emit particles through a quantum process called superradiance: essentially, quantum vacuum fluctuations amplified by the black hole's rotation. Hawking found their mathematics unconvincing and decided to do his own calculation. What he found when he did shocked him. Not just rotating black holes (all black holes, even perfectly static non-rotating ones) should radiate. “I found, to my surprise and annoyance,” he later wrote in A Brief History of Time, “that even non-rotating black holes should apparently create and emit particles at a steady rate.” [1,4] The mechanism is rooted in the quantum vacuum. In quantum field theory, empty space is never truly empty: it seethes with what are called virtual particle-antiparticle pairs, which pop into existence and annihilate each other almost instantly. This happens everywhere, all the time. Near the event horizon of a black hole, something unusual happens to these pairs. If a pair forms just at the horizon, the partner with negative energy can fall inward and exist as a real particle inside the black hole, while the positive-energy partner escapes to infinity as real radiation. The black hole loses mass by absorbing negative energy, and an outside observer sees a steady trickle of particles emerging from near the horizon. The temperature of this radiation (the Hawking temperature) is given by:

$$T_{BH} = \hbar c^3 / (8\pi G M k_B) \quad [4]$$

where T_{BH} is the Hawking temperature, ħ is the reduced Planck constant, c is the speed of light, G is Newton's gravitational constant, M is the black hole mass, and k_B is the Boltzmann constant. The formula says something immediately striking: the more massive the black hole, the colder it is. A stellar-mass black hole emits at roughly 60 nanokelvin, far colder than the cosmic microwave background radiation filling all of space. It would absorb far more radiation than it emits, and its evaporation time would be unimaginably long. Only very small, primordial black holes (if they exist) would be hot enough to evaporate on any timescale we could hope to observe. The evaporation timescale goes as:

$$t \propto M^3 \quad [4]$$

where t is the evaporation timescale and M is the black hole mass, meaning the timescale grows extremely rapidly with mass.

2.2 The Bekenstein Connection: Entropy and the Area of the Horizon

Before Hawking’s radiation result, a Princeton graduate student named Jacob Bekenstein had made an observation that Hawking himself initially dismissed as a misappropriation of his work. In 1971, Hawking had proved a result about black holes: the area of the event horizon can never decrease. It can stay the same or grow when matter falls in or when two black holes merge, but it never shrinks. This is known as the area theorem. Bekenstein noticed that this sounded uncomfortably like the second law of thermodynamics, which says entropy (a measure of disorder) can never decrease either. He proposed that the entropy of a black hole is proportional to the area of its event horizon [7,8]. This was controversial. Hawking was annoyed by the suggestion, partly because entropy implies temperature, and temperature implies radiation, and black holes, by definition, were not supposed to radiate anything. After Hawking's calculation confirmed that black holes do radiate [4], he was forced to admit Bekenstein had been essentially right. The Bekenstein-Hawking entropy formula is:

$$S_{BH} = k_B c^3 A / (4G\hbar) \quad [7]$$

where S_{BH} is the black hole entropy, k_B is the Boltzmann constant, c is the speed of light, A is the event-horizon area, G is Newton's gravitational constant, and ħ is the reduced Planck constant. There is something deeply strange about this formula that deserves emphasis. For every other physical system in nature (a box of gas, a star, a planet), entropy scales with volume. If you double the size of a gas container, you roughly double its entropy. For a black hole, entropy scales with area. This means that all the information describing what is inside a black hole can, in principle, be encoded on its two-dimensional surface. This is not just a curiosity: it became the foundation of the holographic principle, one of the most important ideas in theoretical physics of the past thirty years.

2.3 The Information Paradox

Here is the problem. Quantum mechanics requires that the evolution of any physical system is unitary: any process can, in principle, be run backwards. If you know the final state of a system with complete precision, you can reconstruct its initial state. Information is never created or destroyed; it is just rearranged. Hawking radiation is thermal radiation: it is indistinguishable from the heat given off by a warm object. A lump of coal at some temperature emits radiation, and from that radiation you can extract information about the coal: its temperature, its composition. Thermal radiation does carry information in ordinary circumstances. But Hawking’s calculation showed that his radiation was purely thermal, in a stricter sense: it contained no information about what had fallen into the black hole. If you throw a book in, and then a hydrogen atom, and then a person, the radiation that comes out looks identical in all three cases: a featureless thermal glow determined only by the black hole’s mass, charge, and spin. All of the complexity, the information, the quantum state, is gone. When the black hole finally evaporates completely, the entire quantum state of whatever fell in has been converted to a random thermal state. In the language of quantum mechanics, a pure state has evolved into a mixed state. This is explicitly forbidden by quantum theory. Hawking acknowledged this directly in a 1976 paper called “Breakdown of Predictability in Gravitational Collapse”, and concluded that black hole physics requires modifying the laws of quantum mechanics. That conclusion set off a war that would last nearly thirty years [5].

3. The Black Hole War

3.1 What Was Actually at Stake

In the early 1980s, Hawking presented these results at a conference in San Francisco. Leonard Susskind was in the audience. So was Gerard t’Hooft. Both were deeply troubled by what Hawking was claiming. As Susskind later recounted in The Black Hole War, “t’Hooft and I are quantum physicists who felt certain that the laws of Quantum Mechanics could not be violated without destroying the foundations of physics.” [2] The stakes were not abstract. If

Paper ID: SR26821110153 DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.21275/SR26821110153

Hawking was right (if information could genuinely be destroyed in a black hole), then the entire logical structure of quantum mechanics was contingent on black holes not existing, or being irrelevant. Every calculation in quantum chemistry, nuclear physics, particle physics: all of it rested on unitarity being a genuine law of nature, not just a useful approximation. Hawking was saying it was not a genuine law. Susskind and t'Hooft were not willing to accept this. But they also could not find a clear error in Hawking's calculation. For years, neither side could prove the other wrong.

3.2 Black Hole Complementarity

The first serious proposal for how information might escape came from Susskind, t'Hooft, and colleagues in the early 1990s, under the name black hole complementarity [16]. The key observation was about perspective. Consider two observers: Alice falls into the black hole, and Bob watches from outside. From Bob's perspective, Alice never quite reaches the horizon: he watches her slow down, redshift, fade, and appear to freeze just outside. The information she carries, from Bob's point of view, gets encoded in tiny fluctuations of the Hawking radiation emitted from the horizon region. From Alice's perspective, she passes through the horizon without noticing anything unusual: the equivalence principle (the cornerstone of general relativity) says that free-fall should feel like floating in empty space. Complementarity says both descriptions are valid, but they are not simultaneously accessible to any single observer. Bob sees information encoded on the horizon; Alice sees information falling smoothly through. No experiment can combine both perspectives. There is no contradiction, just complementarity, in the same way that a quantum particle can be both a wave and a particle without contradiction, as long as you do not try to measure both properties at once. This was elegant. It was widely accepted through the 1990s and 2000s. It also left a crucial question unanswered: how exactly does information get encoded in Hawking radiation? The mechanism was unclear.

3.3 Hawking Revises His Position

In 2004 at a conference in Dublin, Hawking publicly changed his mind. He announced that he had been wrong about information loss, that information is preserved, and he paid off a longstanding bet with John Preskill by handing over a baseball encyclopedia, as a repository of information that could be retrieved freely. The concession was awkward. As Hawking's 2015 arXiv paper acknowledged, information may be preserved through horizon degrees of freedom, although a complete recovery mechanism was not established [6]. His proposed mechanism (that information is stored in "supertranslations" of the horizon, soft imprints left by infalling particles on the quantum state of the horizon) was suggestive but not mathematically complete. The consensus was that Hawking had conceded the war without fully explaining how information gets out.

4. Proposed Resolutions

4.1 The Firewall: When Complementarity Broke Down

For about two decades after complementarity was proposed, things were relatively quiet. Then, in 2012, four physicists (Ahmed Almheiri, Donald Marolf, Joseph Polchinski, and James Sully, whose initials gave the paper the nickname "AMPS") published a paper that challenged complementarity from within [10]. Their argument used a property of quantum entanglement called monogamy: a quantum system cannot be maximally entangled with two independent systems simultaneously. According to the standard picture, each outgoing Hawking photon is entangled with its partner that fell through the horizon. Fine. But for information to eventually escape, each late Hawking photon must also be entangled with the earlier Hawking radiation already emitted, because that is how unitary evolution works, threading correlations through the entire emission history. One photon cannot be maximally entangled with two different things at once. Something has to break. AMPS proposed that the entanglement between the outgoing photon and its infalling partner gets cut, releasing a burst of energy at the horizon that incinerates anything crossing it. A "wall of fire." Any observer falling into a black hole would not experience a smooth, empty horizon: they would hit a firewall and be destroyed. This put physicists in an impossible position. The AMPS analysis showed that the following three assumptions cannot all remain valid [10]: Einstein's equivalence principle (no firewall means free-fall should be smooth), unitarity (information is preserved), or the standard quantum field theory description of entanglement. All three had mountains of experimental support. The firewall paradox did not offer a resolution: it sharpened the crisis.

4.2 The Holographic Principle and AdS/CFT

A completely different approach came from the holographic principle. The insight from Bekenstein's entropy formula (that information about a black hole's interior is encoded on its surface) was extended by Susskind and t'Hooft into a much more general claim: all the information describing any region of space can be encoded on the boundary of that region, at a density of roughly one bit per Planck area. In 1997, Juan Maldacena made this concrete through the AdS/CFT correspondence [13]. The AdS/CFT correspondence (Anti-de Sitter/Conformal Field Theory) posits that a full theory of gravity in a negatively curved spacetime (AdS) is exactly equivalent to a quantum field theory without gravity living on the boundary of that spacetime. Black hole evaporation in the interior is dual to a perfectly ordinary, unitary quantum mechanical process on the boundary. In this framework, information cannot be lost: the boundary theory is manifestly unitary, and the two descriptions are equivalent. AdS/CFT is powerful evidence that information is preserved. But it does not explain how: it shows the answer must exist, not what the mechanism is. And it applies strictly only in Anti-de Sitter spacetime, which is not the spacetime we actually live in.

4.3 The Page Curve and the Island Formula

In 1993, before the firewall debate and before AdS/CFT, Don Page made a simple but important point [9]. If black hole evaporation is unitary, then the entropy of the radiation emitted should behave in a specific, predictable way over time. Initially, as radiation is emitted, its entropy grows: the radiation is entangled with the black hole interior, which is hidden. But after the "Page time" (roughly when the black hole has emitted half its total energy), the entropy should begin to decrease as correlations between different bits of radiation start to carry information. By the time the black hole has fully evaporated, the entropy of the radiation returns to zero: a pure state. For decades, nobody could derive the Page curve from any actual quantum gravity calculation. Then, in 2019, Geoffrey Penington (Stanford) and Ahmed Almheiri with collaborators independently showed that a specific extension of the holographic approach, known as the island formula, reproduces the Page curve [11,12]. The island formula modifies the entropy calculation by including contributions from specific regions inside the black hole (the "islands") that become entangled with the radiation at late times. Once these island contributions are included, the entropy does exactly what Page predicted: it rises, peaks, and falls. This was regarded as a breakthrough. These calculations demonstrated a deep connection between entanglement entropy and spacetime geometry [11,12]. But the calculation is semi-classical: it approximates rather than derives from a fully quantum theory of gravity, and its microscopic mechanism is still debated.

4.4 Fuzzballs: No Horizon, No Problem

A separate resolution comes from string theory. Samir Mathur of Ohio State University, in work presented at CERN and extensively published on arXiv, has argued in the fuzzball program that black holes as described by general relativity [14] (smooth empty space inside a horizon) simply do not exist in nature. In string theory, the enormous number of microstates counted by the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy corresponds to fuzzballs: horizonless objects made of strings and branes filling the region where we would classically say the black hole interior is. If fuzzballs are right, then infalling matter does not fall through a horizon at all. It interacts directly with the complex fuzzball structure, and its information is imprinted on the object and eventually re-emitted in a perfectly unitary process. There is no singularity, no event horizon, no paradox. The fuzzball proposal has the significant advantage of providing explicit microstates that actually account for the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy, something no other proposal does as concretely. The challenge is showing that fuzzball geometries reproduce the smooth, empty-seeming spacetime of a black hole interior that classical general relativity predicts, particularly for large black holes where the equivalence principle says the horizon should be completely unremarkable.

5. Adami's 2025 Proposed Resolution

5.1 The Missing Piece

A recent proposal comes from a February 2025 paper by Christoph Adami of Michigan State University, submitted to arXiv as paper 2502.05642 and written as an invited chapter for a collected volume on the black hole information paradox [3]. Adami's argument is different in character from everything that came before it. He is not proposing a new theory of quantum gravity. He is not invoking the holographic principle or string theory. He argues that Hawking's original calculation omitted stimulated emission and that restoring this contribution resolves the information-transmission aspect of the paradox [3]. The missing piece is stimulated emission. This is not an exotic idea. It was described by Einstein in 1917 [20], in the same paper that introduced the A and B coefficients of atomic radiation. Einstein showed that any process of spontaneous emission from a quantum system (a hot atom releasing a photon, for instance) must be accompanied by a corresponding process of stimulated emission: when an incoming quantum arrives, it stimulates the system to emit an additional quantum with the same quantum numbers. Lasers work on exactly this principle. The detailed balance condition (the requirement that a system in equilibrium emits and absorbs at the same rate) demands both processes simultaneously. Spontaneous emission without stimulated emission is thermodynamically inconsistent. This is textbook quantum optics. Adami traces Hawking's oversight to a specific step in the derivation. When following radiation modes backwards in time from future infinity to past infinity, Hawking set to zero the amplitudes for positive-frequency incoming modes at past infinity, on the grounds that Schwarzschild black holes cannot superradiate classically. Adami argues that this step prevented Hawking's treatment from including stimulated emission [3]. The result was a calculation that included only spontaneous Hawking radiation (purely thermal, carrying no information) and left out the stimulated component entirely. Bekenstein himself had partially identified this problem. In a paper with student Amnon Meisel, Bekenstein showed that spontaneous radiation without stimulated emission is inconsistent with detailed balance [19], and derived what the probability distribution of stimulated radiation should be using Einstein's A and B coefficient formalism. But the full implications for information preservation were not followed through at the time.

5.2 What Stimulated Emission Does

When stimulated emission is properly included, an incoming quantum state (a particle carrying information that has fallen into the black hole) stimulates the creation of a particle-antiparticle pair at the horizon with quantum numbers aligned with the incoming state. Adami describes this as an approximate quantum-cloning process [3]: the information of the infalling particle is approximately duplicated in the outgoing stimulated radiation. The approximate nature of the cloning is important. The quantum no-cloning theorem says that a quantum state cannot be perfectly copied. But it says nothing about approximate copies. And as the physicist Mandel showed, approximate cloning accompanied by spontaneous emission (which is exactly what happens here) is not forbidden by the no-cloning theorem.

5.3 The Holevo Capacity Result

The core technical result of Adami's paper [3] is the calculation of the Holevo capacity of black holes as an information channel. In quantum information theory, the Holevo capacity χ of a channel is the maximum rate at which classical information can be transmitted through it. If $\chi > 0$, information can be retrieved with arbitrary accuracy. If $\chi = 0$, information is lost. Using rigorous quantum information theory and curved-space quantum field theory, Adami calculates χ for both early-time modes (particles sent in at the moment of black hole formation) and late-time modes (particles sent into an already-formed black hole), including the correct treatment of stimulated emission. The result:

$$\chi > 0 \qquad [3]$$

for all parameter values, for all black hole masses, at all times during evaporation. Adami interprets this result as showing that classical information is recoverable from radiation outside the horizon [3]. The information is not in the Hawking (spontaneous) radiation: that part is indeed thermal. It is in the stimulated radiation accompanying it, which retains an imprint of the information that crossed the horizon [3]. Adami also shows that including stimulated emission restores CPT invariance: the symmetry of physics under simultaneous reversal of charge, parity, and time. Classical black holes violate CPT. Hawking radiation alone does not restore it. But Hawking radiation plus stimulated emission does.

5.4 What This Does and Does Not Solve

Adami is careful to note what his result does and does not claim to resolve. The stimulated emission result solves what might be called the information transmission paradox: the question of whether information that falls into a black hole can be recovered from the radiation outside. It shows that the answer is yes, and gives the explicit channel capacity. It does not, by itself, prove that the complete evaporation of a black hole starting from a pure state returns to a pure state: the question addressed by the Page curve and the island formula. That is a separate question about the global unitarity of the evaporation process, and Adami acknowledges it remains open. The two lines of work address complementary aspects of the same problem.

6. Putting It Together: The State of the Field in 2025

6.1 The Evidence Converges

It is worth stepping back and looking at what all these different approaches have in common. They provide converging evidence in the same general direction. Black hole complementarity established that the laws of quantum mechanics are not violated from any single observer's perspective. AdS/CFT showed that black hole evaporation is equivalent to a unitary process in a dual description. The Page curve calculation via the island formula showed that the entropy of radiation follows the unitary prediction, rising and then falling. Adami's analysis finds a positive classical information-channel capacity, supporting the possibility of continuous information recovery [3]. The firewall paradox, whatever its resolution, demonstrated that the smooth-horizon assumption and unitarity cannot both be exactly right: a conclusion consistent with information escaping. None of these proofs is complete. AdS/CFT is exact but operates in the wrong spacetime. The island formula is semi-classical. Adami's result solves classical information transmission but does not close the question of global unitarity. But the convergence is striking, and much of the current discussion focuses on the harder question of exactly how information may be preserved and recovered.

Proposal	What it claims	Strength	Limitation
Black Hole Complementarity	No single observer sees a contradiction	Resolved apparent paradox	Does not specify mechanism
AdS/CFT (Maldacena 1997)	BH evaporation is dual to unitary QFT	Strong theoretical foundation	Restricted to AdS spacetime
Page Curve / Island Formula (2019)	Entropy follows unitary prediction	Reproduces Page curve	Semi-classical; mechanism unclear
Fuzzball Proposal (Mathur)	No horizon; horizonless string objects	Provides explicit microstates	Hard to recover classical GR limit
Stimulated Emission (Adami 2025)	Hawking missed stimulated emission; $\chi > 0$	Rigorous QIT calculation	Addresses classical info, not full unitarity

6.2 What About Observation?

This is a fair question to raise. All of the above is theoretical. Can any of it be tested? The honest answer is: not directly, at least not yet. Hawking radiation from any astrophysically realistic black hole is so cold (nanokelvin for stellar-mass black holes, even colder for heavier ones) that no detector remotely conceivable with present technology could observe it. The cosmic microwave background radiation filling all of space is about 2.7 Kelvin. Stellar black holes are billions of times colder than that. Astrophysically, they are invisible in radiation terms. There are two indirect paths. The first is through analogue gravity experiments: laboratory systems in which a flowing fluid or ultracold gas creates an acoustic analogue of an event horizon. Jeff Steinhauer at the Technion reported thermal Hawking radiation in an analogue black hole in 2019 [18], providing the first laboratory-scale confirmation that the physics of the horizon vacuum is real. These experiments cannot directly test information preservation, but they validate the vacuum physics that underlies Hawking's calculation. The second path is through primordial black holes. If very small black holes (ones with masses around 1010 kg) formed in the early universe, they would by now be completing their evaporation, emitting a burst of high-energy gamma rays that might be detectable. NASA's Fermi Gamma-ray Space Telescope has been searching for such bursts. So far, no confirmed primordial black hole evaporation has been observed, which itself sets useful limits on the early universe. The Event Horizon Telescope's 2019 image of M87* [17] (a black hole 6.5 billion times the mass of the Sun in the galaxy Messier 87) provided horizon-scale observations consistent with the predicted structure of a black hole. The 2022 image of Sagittarius A*, the black hole at the centre of our own galaxy, gave us a second direct reference point. Neither observation bears on the information paradox directly, but both confirm the basic physics against which all theoretical claims must be checked.

7. A Note on Why This Problem Matters

It might be fair to ask at this point why a question about black holes (objects that exist nowhere near Earth, that are observationally inaccessible in the relevant ways, and that most people will never need to think about) deserves this much attention. The answer is that the information paradox is not really about black holes. It is about whether general relativity and quantum mechanics can be made consistent with each other. These are the two most precisely tested theories in the history of physics. General relativity has been confirmed to extraordinary precision in everything from the orbit of Mercury to the detection of gravitational waves by LIGO. Quantum mechanics underlies every semiconductor, every laser, every MRI machine, and the GPS system. Both work, in their respective domains, with stunning accuracy. But they are mutually inconsistent at a fundamental level. General relativity treats spacetime as smooth and continuous. Quantum mechanics says everything is discrete and probabilistic at small enough scales. When you apply both simultaneously (as you must near a black hole singularity, or at the moment of the Big Bang), the equations break down and give nonsense. The information paradox is one clean, sharp expression of this incompatibility. Understanding its resolution would amount to understanding how the two theories fit together, which is the central unsolved problem in theoretical physics. The central question is therefore not only whether information is preserved, but by what microscopic mechanism it is encoded and recovered. The answer to that mechanism question would tell us something genuinely fundamental about the nature of spacetime, quantum entanglement, and the structure of physical reality.

8. Conclusion

Black holes started as a mathematical curiosity in Einstein's equations, something theorists worried about but observers shrugged at. Hawking's 1974 calculation changed that. It connected black holes to thermodynamics, to quantum mechanics, and eventually to information theory in ways nobody had anticipated. The paradox that Hawking's calculation created (the apparent destruction of information) turned out to be one of the most productive puzzles in the history of physics. It forced the development of the holographic principle. It led to AdS/CFT, which reshaped mathematical physics. It produced the firewall debate, the island formula, and a sustained confrontation with the deepest assumptions of both major theories in physics. And, if Adami's 2025 result is correct, it turns out to have been caused (at least in significant part) by Hawking overlooking stimulated emission: one of the oldest established principles in quantum optics, known since Einstein's 1917 paper on the A and B coefficients. Taken together, developments in holography, Page-curve calculations, island methods, and quantum-information approaches provide substantial theoretical support for information preservation in black hole physics. Adami's stimulated-emission analysis adds an interesting recent mechanism by which information associated with infalling states may remain accessible in outgoing radiation. However, this proposal does not by itself establish the global purity of the complete evaporation process. The central challenge therefore shifts from whether information can be preserved to obtaining a complete microscopic account of how information is encoded and recovered. Resolving this question remains important for understanding the relationship between quantum mechanics, gravity, and spacetime.

References

[1] Hawking SW. A Brief History of Time: From the Big Bang to Black Holes. New York: Bantam Books; 1988.
[2] Susskind L. The Black Hole War: My Battle with Stephen Hawking to Make the World Safe for Quantum Mechanics. New York: Little, Brown and Company; 2008.
[3] Adami C. Paradox no more: how stimulated emission of radiation preserves information absorbed by black holes. arXiv [Preprint]. 2025. arXiv:2502.05642. Available from: https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.05642
[4] Hawking SW. Particle creation by black holes. Commun Math Phys. 1975;43:199-220. doi:10.1007/BF02345020.
[5] Hawking SW. Breakdown of predictability in gravitational collapse. Phys Rev D. 1976;14:2460-2473. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.14.2460.
[6] Hawking SW, Perry MJ, Strominger A. Soft hair on black holes. Phys Rev Lett. 2016;116:231301. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.231301.
[7] Bekenstein JD. Black holes and entropy. Phys Rev D. 1973;7:2333-2346. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.7.2333.
[8] Bekenstein JD. Generalized second law of thermodynamics in black-hole physics. Phys Rev D. 1974;9:3292-3300. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.9.3292.
[9] Page DN. Information in black hole radiation. Phys Rev Lett. 1993;71:3743-3746. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.71.3743.
[10] Almheiri A, Marolf D, Polchinski J, Sully J. Black holes: complementarity or firewalls? J High Energy Phys. 2013;2013(2):62. doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2013)062.
[11] Penington G. Entanglement wedge reconstruction and the information paradox. J High Energy Phys. 2020;2020(9):2. doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2020)002.
[12] Almheiri A, Mahajan R, Maldacena J, Zhao Y. The Page curve of Hawking radiation from semiclassical geometry. J High Energy Phys. 2020;2020(3):149. doi:10.1007/JHEP03(2020)149.
[13] Maldacena JM. The large-N limit of superconformal field theories and supergravity. Int J Theor Phys. 1999;38:1113-1133. doi:10.1023/A:1026654312961.
[14] Mathur SD. The information paradox: a pedagogical introduction. Class Quantum Grav. 2009;26:224001. doi:10.1088/0264-9381/26/22/224001.

[15] Oppenheimer JR, Snyder H. On continued gravitational contraction. Phys Rev. 1939;56:455-459. doi:10.1103/PhysRev.56.455.
[16] Susskind L, Thorlacius L, Uglum J. The stretched horizon and black hole complementarity. Phys Rev D. 1993;48:3743-3761. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.48.3743.
[17] Event Horizon Telescope Collaboration. First M87 Event Horizon Telescope results. I. The shadow of the supermassive black hole. Astrophys J Lett. 2019;875:L1. doi:10.3847/2041-8213/ab0ec7.
[18] Steinhauer J. Observation of thermal Hawking radiation and its temperature in an analogue black hole. Nature. 2019;569:688-691. doi:10.1038/s41586-019-1241-0.
[19] Bekenstein JD, Meisels A. Einstein A and B coefficients for a black hole. Phys Rev D. 1977;15:2775-2781. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.15.2775.
[20] Einstein A. Zur Quantentheorie der Strahlung. Phys Z. 1917;18:121-128.