

# Homotopy symmetry in the multiply connected twin paradox of special relativity

Boudewijn F. Roukema<sup>1</sup> and Stanislaw Bajtlik<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Toruń Centre for Astronomy, Nicolaus Copernicus University, ul. Gagarina 11, 87-100 Toruń, Poland

<sup>2</sup> Nicolaus Copernicus Astronomical Center, ul. Bartycka 18, 00-716 Warsaw, Poland

Le 19 août 2021

## ABSTRACT

In a multiply connected space, the two twins of the special relativity twin paradox move with constant relative speed and meet a second time without acceleration. The twins' situations appear to be symmetrical despite the need for one to be younger due to time dilation. Here, the suggestion that the apparent symmetry is broken by homotopy classes of the twins' worldlines is reexamined using space-time diagrams. It is found that each twin finds her own spatial path to have zero winding index and that of the other twin to have unity winding index, i.e. the twins' worldlines' relative homotopy classes are symmetrical. Although the twins' apparent symmetry is in fact broken by the need for the non-favoured twin to non-simultaneously identify spatial domain boundaries, the non-favoured twin *cannot* detect her disfavoured state if she only measures the homotopy classes of the two twins' projected worldlines, contrary to what was previously suggested. We also note that for the non-favoured twin, the fundamental domain can be chosen by identifying time boundaries (with a spatial offset) instead of space boundaries (with a temporal offset).

**Key words:** Reference systems – Time – Cosmology: theory

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Since the confirmation by Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) observations of the cosmic microwave background that the large scale ( $r > 10h^{-1}$  Gpc in comoving units) auto-correlation function of temperature fluctuations is close to zero [fig. 16, Spergel et al. 2003 (orthogonally projected spatial scale); fig. 1 of Roukema et al. 2008 (non-projected spatial scale)] and difficult to reconcile with a standard cosmic concordance model (Sect. 7 of Spergel et al. 2003; though see also Efstathiou 2004) there has recently been considerable observational interest in understanding multiply connected models of the Universe. The Poincaré dodecahedral space (PDS) has been proposed as a better model of the 3-manifold of comoving space rather than an “infinite” flat space (e.g. Luminet et al. 2003; Roukema et al. 2004; Aurich et al. 2005a,b; Gundermann 2005; Roukema et al. 2008; though see also Niarchou & Jaffe 2007). Curvature estimates are consistent with the model: analysis of the 3-year WMAP data (Spergel et al. 2007) results in best estimates of the total density parameter  $\Omega_{\text{tot}} = 1.010_{-0.009}^{+0.016}$  (when combined with HST key project on  $H_0$  data) and  $\Omega_{\text{tot}} = 1.015_{-0.016}^{+0.020}$  (when combined with Supernova Legacy Survey data), or together with the third, fourth and fifth acoustic peaks, as estimated from their observations near the South Galactic Pole using the Arcminute Cosmology

Bolometer Array Receiver (ACBAR),  $\Omega_{\text{tot}} = 1.03_{-0.06}^{+0.04}$  is obtained (Reichardt et al. 2008), consistently with that expected from the PDS analyses, which require positive curvature in this range of  $\Omega_{\text{tot}}$  values.

It has also recently become noticed that global topology in a universe containing density perturbations can, in principle, have at least some effect on the metric, even though the effect is expected to be small. At the present epoch, in the case of a  $\mathbb{T}^3$  model of fundamental lengths which are slightly unequal by a small fraction  $\delta$ , a new term appears in the acceleration equation, causing the scale factor to accelerate or decelerate in the directions of the three fundamental lengths in a way that tends to equalise them (Roukema et al. 2007).

In this context, the properties and implications of the twin paradox of special relativity in a multiply connected space need to be correctly understood. It has already been shown (Brans & Stewart 1973; Peters 1983, 1986; Low 1990; Uzan et al. 2002; Barrow & Levin 2001) that resolving the twin paradox of special relativity in a multiply-connected “Minkowski” space-time implies new understanding of the paradox relative to the case in simply connected Minkowski space.

Moreover, it is known that, at least in the case of a static space with zero Levi-Civita connection, multiple connectedness implies a favoured space-time splitting. This should correspond to the comoving reference frame (Uzan et al. 2002;

Barrow & Levin 2001). This could be of considerable importance to the standard cosmological model, since it would provide a novel physical (geometrical) motivation for the existence of a favoured space-time foliation, i.e. the comoving coordinate system.

The difference between the twin paradox of special relativity in a multiply connected space relative to that in a simply connected space is that in a multiply connected space, the two twins can move with constant relative speed and meet each other a second time, *without requiring any acceleration*. The paradox is the apparent symmetry of the twins' situations despite the time dilation effect expected due to their non-zero relative speed. It is difficult to understand how one twin can be younger than the other — why should moving to the left or to the right be somehow favoured? Does the time dilation fail to occur?

As shown by several authors (Peters 1983; Low 1990; Uzan et al. 2002; Barrow & Levin 2001), the apparent symmetry is violated by the fact that (at least) one twin must identify the faces of the fundamental domain of the spatial 3-manifold *non-simultaneously*, and has problems in clock synchronisation.

Uzan et al. (2002) suggested that the apparent symmetry is also violated by an asymmetry between the homotopy classes of the worldlines of the two twins.

Here, we reexamine this suggestion.

The multiply connected space version of the twins paradox is briefly reviewed in Sect. 2.1, the question of clarifying the asymmetry is described in Sect. 2.2, and a multiply connected space-time, with a standard Minkowski covering space-time, and the corresponding space-time diagrams, are introduced in Sect. 2.3. In Sect. 2.4, the worldlines of the two twins, projections from space-time to space, homotopy classes and winding numbers are expressed algebraically.

In Sect. 3, the resulting projections of the twins' paths from space-time to space are given and their homotopy classes inferred. We also calculate whether or not the generator of the multiply connected space and the Lorentz transformation commute with one another, in Sect. 3.4.

Discussion suggesting why this result differs from that of Uzan et al. (2002) is presented in Sect. 4, including a brief description in Sect. 4.2 of how the non-favoured twin can choose a time-limited instead of a space-limited fundamental domain of space-time. Conclusions are summarised in Sect. 5. A thought experiment to develop physical intuition of the non-favoured twin's understanding of the spatial homotopy classes is given in Appendix A.

For a short, concise review of the terminology, geometry and relativistic context of cosmic topology (multiply connected universes in the context of modern, physical cosmology), see Roukema (2000) (slightly outdated, but sufficient for beginners). There are several in-depth review papers available (Lachièze-Rey & Luminet 1995; Luminet 1998; Starkman 1998; Luminet & Roukema 1999) and workshop proceedings are in Starkman (1998) and the following articles, and Blançœil & Roukema (2000). Comparisons and classifications of different *observational* strategies, have also been made (Uzan et al. 1999; Luminet & Roukema 1999; Roukema 2002; Rebouças & Gomero 2004).

We set the conversion factor between space and time units to unity throughout:  $c_{\text{space-time}} = 1$ .

## 2 METHOD: SPACE-TIME DIAGRAMS AND WORLDLINES

The first articles presenting the special relativity twins paradox in a multiply connected space were apparently Brans & Stewart (1973) and Peters (1983). There are several more recent articles, including e.g. Uzan et al. (2002) and Barrow & Levin (2001).

### 2.1 The twins paradox in multiply connected space

Consider the following description.

In a one-dimensional, multiply connected, locally Lorentz invariant space, one twin moves to the left and one to the right in rockets moving at constant relative speed to one another. The two twins meet twice, at two distinct space-time events. At the earlier space-time event, the two twins are of equal ages. At the later space-time event, each twin considers the other to be younger due to Lorentz time dilation.

However, this later space-time event is a single space-time event — each twin has undergone physical aging processes. If necessary, each twin could carry an atomic clock in order to more precisely measure proper time than with biological clocks. So there can only be one ordinal relation between the two twins' ages at the second space-time event: either the leftward moving twin is younger, or the rightward moving twin is younger, or the two twins are of equal age.<sup>1</sup> Which is correct?

There is no acceleration (change in velocity) by either twin, so the usual explanation of the paradox (in simply connected space) is invalid.

However, in this case, the situation is, or at least seems to be, perfectly symmetrical. It would be absurd for either “leftwards” or “rightwards” movement to yield a younger age.

On the other hand, time dilation implies that the “other” twin must “age more slowly”. The twins physically meet up (for an instant) at the second space-time event, which is a single location in space-time, so the “first” twin objectively measures that the “other” twin is younger, so the two twins cannot be equally aged at the second space-time event. But then which twin is “the first” and which is “the other”?

This question illustrates the apparent symmetry of the situation and the apparent implication that “time dilation fails”.

Alternatively, if the situation is *not* symmetrical and time dilation occurs as is expected, then what breaks the apparent symmetry? Why should leftwards movement be favoured relative to rightward movement, or vice-versa?

Which is correct: is the situation symmetrical with a failure of time dilation, or is the situation asymmetrical with time dilation taking place?

<sup>1</sup> No quantum mechanical effects are considered in this paper.

## 2.2 Where is the asymmetry?

In Peters (1983), Peters (1986), Uzan et al. (2002) and Barrow & Levin (2001) it was shown that the apparent symmetry in the question as stated above is not mathematically (physically) possible. There is a hidden implicit assumption related to the usual intuitive error common to beginners in special relativity: the assumption of absolute simultaneity.

The necessary asymmetry can be described in different ways. One way of explaining the asymmetry is as follows.

One twin is able to consistently synchronise her clocks by sending photons in opposite directions to each make a loop around the Universe and observing their simultaneous arrival time, and the other twin measures a delay between receiving the two photons (or coded signal streams) and is forced to conclude that something is asymmetrical about the nature of her “inertial” reference frame (Barrow & Levin 2001).

Carrying out this test requires a metrical measurement, that of proper time intervals.

Here, in order to examine Uzan et al. (2002)’s suggestion that there is a homotopy asymmetry, i.e. an asymmetry of topology rather than an asymmetry depending on the metric, it is easier to first explain the asymmetry of the apparently symmetrical paradox in a more geometric way, similar to the presentation in Peters (1983), but with some additional figures.

## 2.3 Multiply connected space-time diagrams

Figure 1 shows a standard Minkowski space — as covering space — for simplicity with only one spatial dimension, for two twins moving with constant velocity relative to one another, hereafter, the “leftmoving” and “rightmoving” twins respectively. Specifically, we set the rightmoving twin moving at a velocity  $\beta$ , in units of the space-time conversion constant  $c \equiv 1$ , towards the right. As a covering space, this space is a standard locally and globally Lorentz invariant space-time  $M$ .

We choose a generator  $g$  which favours, arbitrarily, but without loss of generality, the leftmoving twin. This generator,  $g$ , a translation of constant length  $L$  with


$$g((x, t)) = (x + L, t), \quad \forall (x, t), \quad (1)$$

generates the quotient, multiply connected space,  $M/\Gamma$ , where  $\Gamma$  is the group generated by  $g$ , i.e.  $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}$ .

This arbitrary choice reveals where an implicit assumption was made in the presentation of the paradox above: a generator matching space-time events in a way that preserves time unchanged in one reference frame, or in other words, a generator which “is simultaneous” in one reference frame, is not simultaneous in other frames. Hence, symmetry is not possible.

The generator  $g$  identifies points (in three-dimensional space, these would be faces of the fundamental domain rather than points) in a spatial section at any given time  $t$ :  $A_1 = A_2$  and  $B_1 = B_2 = B_3$ .

The rightmoving twin has  $x'$  and  $t'$  axes different from those of her leftmoving twin, in order to preserve Lorentz invariance. She disagrees with the leftmoving twin about simultaneity of events, finding, e.g. that space-time event  $A_2$  occurs before space-time event  $A_1$ , space-time event  $B_2$



**Figure 1.** Minkowski covering space space-time for a twin (hereafter, the “leftmoving twin”) with worldline  $t$  and coordinate system  $(x, t)$ , made multiply connected in each spatial section at constant time  $t$  via the generator (translation)  $g$ . A twin moving to the right at constant relative velocity  $\beta$  (hereafter, the “rightmoving twin”) has worldline  $t'$  and simultaneity axis  $x'$  where  $t' \equiv 0$ , defining her coordinate system  $(x', t')$ . Space-time points  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  are identical space-time events under the generator  $g$ , i.e. the single event may in general be called  $A$ . Similarly, space-time points  $B_1$ ,  $B_2$  and  $B_3$  are a single space-time event  $B$ . Space-time events  $C$  and  $D$  are distinct from each other and from  $A$  and  $B$ ;  $C$  and  $D$  occur at the same spatial location for the rightmoving twin. The worldlines of the leftmoving and rightmoving twins are  $p$  and  $q$  respectively.

occurs before space-time event  $B_1$ , etc. This is shown in Fig. 2, where  $\gamma \equiv (1 - \beta^2)^{-1/2}$  is the Doppler boost.

So far, this is identical to the situation in simply connected Minkowski space-time, until we realise that both twins must agree that  $A_1 = A_2$  and that  $B_1 = B_2 = B_3$ .

While both twins agree that  $A_1 = A_2$ , they *disagree* as to whether or not these are simultaneous events. Using the terminology of Barrow & Levin (2001), the leftmoving twin is able to synchronise clocks, while the rightmoving twin is *unable to synchronise clocks*.


Writing the Lorentz transformation from  $(x, t)$  to  $(x', t')$  as a matrix,

$$\mathcal{L} = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma & -\beta\gamma \\ -\beta\gamma & \gamma \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2)$$


the generator  $g$ , initially expressed in the first twin’s coordinates in Eq. (1), can be rewritten using the second twin’s coordinates as

$$g((x', t')) = (x' + \gamma L, t' - \beta\gamma L). \quad (3)$$


An intuitive, geometric way of describing this is that according to the rightmoving twin, *after cutting the covering space, non-simultaneous points are pasted together*.



**Figure 2.** Identical space-time to Figure 1, but shown in the rest frame of the rightmoving twin. The identities due to the generator  $g$  remain correct:  $A_1 = A_2$  and  $B_1 = B_2 = B_3$ , even though they are non-simultaneous;  $g$  could be described as a non-simultaneous generator in the rightmoving twin’s reference frame. The worldline  $p$  of the leftmoving twin is mapped by the generator to a physically equivalent copy,  $p_g$ , running from  $A_2$  to  $B_2$ . Figure 4 helps show this is possible by using our three-dimensional intuition.



**Figure 3.** A space-time region, with constant space and time boundaries according to the leftmoving twin’s view of space-time, shown in Figure 1, embedded in 3-D Euclidean space and projected onto the page, or informally, “rectangle  $A_1A_2B_2B_1$  rolled up into a cylinder and stuck together to make it multiply connected”. The leftmoving twin’s worldline  $p$  is shown.



**Figure 4.** A space-time region with constant space and time boundaries according to the rightmoving twin’s view of space-time, shown in Figure 2, embedded in 3-D Euclidean space and projected onto the page, or informally, “rectangle  $A_1CDB_2$  rolled up and stuck together to make it multiply connected”. The spatial boundaries of this region,  $A_1B_2$  and  $CD$ , are offset by a time interval  $A_2C = \beta\gamma L$  before being matched: the result is not a cylinder. Note that in space-time, there are two geodesics joining space-time events  $A_1$  and  $C$ : one at constant spatial position (appearing vertical here), and one at constant time (appearing nearly horizontal, but sloped at a moderate angle in this projection), and similarly for  $B_2$  and  $D$ . However, only one of these two geodesics — the vertical (timelike) one — can be a worldline of a physical (non-tachyonic) particle, so there is no causality violation. A similar diagram to this one has earlier been published in Figure 5b in Wucknitz (2004). The rightmoving twin’s worldline  $q$  from  $A_1$  to  $B_2$  is shown.

Figure 3 shows the cylinder “cut and pasted together” out of a space-time region with constant space and time boundaries according to the leftmoving twin. Note that a trapezium in Fig. 1, e.g.  $A_1A_2B_3B_2$  would serve just as well as the rectangle  $A_1A_2B_2B_1$  for this “rolling up” process. As long as there are boundaries of constant time  $t$ , the result of identifying the other two sides of the trapezium is a cylinder.

This trapezium,  $A_1A_2B_3B_2$ , is particularly interesting when we shift to the reference frame of the rightmoving twin in Fig. 2, since the boundaries  $A_1B_2$  and  $A_2B_3$  now become spatial boundaries:

$$\begin{aligned} t'(A_1) &= t'(B_2) \\ t'(A_2) &= t'(B_3). \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Cutting and pasting from the rightmoving twin’s point of view must still identify identical space-time events to one another: either identifying  $A_1B_1$  to  $A_2B_2$ , or  $A_1B_2$  to  $A_2B_3$ ,

will correctly apply the isometry to the covering space and “paste” together our spatially finite interval in order to obtain a manifold without any boundaries. (The time domain extends infinitely from this rectangle in both the negative and positive directions.)

So, one option for embedding this identification in 3-D Euclidean space and projecting it onto the page would be to use the same trapezium.

This corresponds to the rightmoving twin’s intuition of identifying “two spatial points” to one another while trying to ignore the nature of space-time as a two-dimensional continuum: the set of points along the line segment  $A_1B_2$  constitute a single “spatial point”  $x' = 0$ , while the set of points along the line segment  $A_2B_3$  constitute a single “spatial point”  $x' = \gamma L$ , a “spatial point” is really a worldline — it is not just a single point, it’s a curve in space-time.

However, rather than identifying the “spatial borders” of  $A_1A_2B_3B_2$  to one another, it is helpful to follow the rightmoving twin’s naive intuition even further.

Let us try to cut out and then paste together the space-time region with both constant space boundaries and constant time boundaries, i.e. the region  $A_1CDB_2$ .

The result is shown in Fig. 4 (cf. fig. 5b in Wucknitz 2004).

This clearly shows the non-simultaneity of the cutting/pasting process for the rightmoving twin. The rectangle in  $(x', t')$  space-time has to be given a time mismatch when it’s pasted together.

This visually illustrates the error in the twins paradox in a multiply connected space (as described in Sect. 2.1): *the implicit assumption of absolute simultaneity*. If we implicitly assume absolute simultaneity, then we implicitly assume that there is no inconsistency in supposing that both twins can identify spatial boundaries without any time offsets. However, Lorentz invariance is inconsistent with absolute simultaneity; hence, the asymmetry: at most one twin can simultaneously identify spatial boundaries. Of course, neither the leftmoving twin nor the rightmoving twin are necessarily favoured. A complete, precise statement of the problem needs to arbitrarily favour one twin over the other: either the leftmoving or the rightmoving twin may be chosen, but one of them must be chosen to be favoured in order for the space-time to be self-consistent.

This also illustrates the potential interest for cosmology: several authors note the existence of a favoured inertial reference frame implied by the multiple-connectedness of a (static) space-time whose covering space-time is Minkowski and that this could provide a physical motivation for the comoving coordinate system (Uzan et al. 2002; Barrow & Levin 2001).

## 2.4 Worldlines, projections, homotopy classes and winding numbers

Is the apparent (erroneous) symmetry of the two twins’ situations broken by asymmetry between the homotopy classes of the two twins’ projected worldlines (“spatial paths”) in some way? In Uzan et al. (2002) it was suggested that the twin who simultaneously identifies spatial boundaries (in this paper, the leftmoving twin) has a spatial path of zero winding index, while the rightmoving twin has a spatial path of non-zero winding index.

### 2.4.1 Worldlines

We consider the worldlines of the two twins between the two space-time events A and B, using Figs 1 and 2 and Eqs (1), (2) and (3). A superscript “L” or “R” is used to denote which reference frame is being used for expression in a particular coordinate system.

The leftmoving twin’s worldline,  $p = \overline{A_1B_1}$ , can be written in her own reference frame as

$$p^L = \left\{ (0, \tau) : 0 \leq \tau \leq \frac{L}{\beta} \right\}, \quad (5)$$

using her proper time  $\tau$  (see Fig. 1).

A copy of the leftmoving twin’s worldline as mapped by  $g$  can be written, using Eq. (1), as

$$\begin{aligned} p_g^L &\equiv \{g((x, t)) : (x, t) \in p\} \\ &= \left\{ (L, \tau) : 0 \leq \tau \leq \frac{L}{\beta} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

We can write this in the rightmoving twin’s frame using Eq. (2):

$$p_g^R = \left\{ \gamma(L - \beta\tau, -\beta L + \tau) : 0 \leq \tau \leq \frac{L}{\beta} \right\}. \quad (7)$$

The rightmoving twin’s worldline,  $q = \overline{A_1B_2}$ , can be written in her own reference frame as

$$q^R = \left\{ (0, \tau') : 0 \leq \tau' \leq \frac{L}{\beta\gamma} \right\} \quad (8)$$

using her own proper time  $\tau'$  (see Fig. 2), or equivalently in the leftmoving twin’s frame, using  $\mathcal{L}^{-1}$  and Eq. (2), as

$$q^L = \left\{ (\beta\gamma\tau', \gamma\tau') : 0 \leq \tau' \leq \frac{L}{\beta\gamma} \right\}. \quad (9)$$

### 2.4.2 Projections from space-time to space

Uzan et al. (2002) state that “the asymmetry between [the two twins’] spacetime trajectories lies in a topological invariant of their spatial geodesics, namely the homotopy class”.

In order to consider spatial geodesics in the two twins’ reference frames, we need to project from space-time to space in each of their reference frames.

Let us write these projections  $\phi$  and  $\phi'$  algebraically in the leftmoving and rightmoving twins’ frames in the most obvious way:

$$\phi((x, t)) = x \quad (10)$$

and

$$\phi'((x', t')) = x'. \quad (11)$$

Using Eqs (1) and (3), the generator  $g$  can then be rewritten in *projected* form as

$$g_\phi(x) = x + L, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (12)$$

and

$$g_{\phi'}(x') = x' + \gamma L, \quad \forall x' \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (13)$$

in the two twins’ frames respectively.

The two spaces which space-time is projected to are clearly both equivalent to  $\mathbb{R}/\Gamma \equiv S^1$ , where the group  $\Gamma$  is defined by the generator  $g_\phi$  or  $g_{\phi'}$  for the leftmoving or

rightmoving twin respectively. The length (circumference) of  $S^1$  is  $L$  or  $\gamma L$  respectively.

It is important to note here that *in the absence of metric information, the two twins do not know anything more than this about the nature of their respective spaces, and they do not know how their spaces relate to spatial sections, i.e. subspaces of the covering space  $M$ .*

In fact, metric information gives an important difference between these two (in this paper, one-dimensional) spaces: the rightmoving twin's constant time hypersurface has a time mismatch after "going around" the universe once. However, here the question is to examine the *topological* nature of the twins' spatial paths in the *absence* of metric information. The space-time point of view which the rightmoving twin would have, if she had metric information available (e.g. by sending out photons and measuring proper time intervals), is irrelevant.

### 2.4.3 Homotopy classes and winding numbers

Similarly to Uzan et al. (2002), we write that two loops in  $\mathbb{R}/\Gamma$  at  $A$  are homotopic to one another,

$$p_1 \sim p_2 \quad (14)$$

"if they can be *continuously* deformed into one another, i.e. that there exists a continuous map"  $F : [0, 1) \times [0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}/\Gamma$  satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \tau \in [0, 1) \quad , \quad F(\tau, 0) = p_1(\tau), F(\tau, 1) = p_2(\tau) \\ \forall s \in [0, 1) \quad , \quad F(0, s) = F(1, s) = A. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

As in Uzan et al. (2002), we will assume that no proof is needed that  $S^1 \not\sim \{0\}$ , and we define the winding number as the "the number of times a loop rolls around" the circle  $S^1$ . Since the aim is to see if the leftmoving and rightmoving twins' points of view can be distinguished in order to determine who is favoured, we need indices on the winding number to indicate whether it refers to the worldline of the leftmoving or rightmoving twin, and from whose point of view.


Again, we use the superscript "L" or "R" to denote which reference frame is being used. A twin's point of view of her own winding number is denoted by an empty subscript, and the subscript "other" is used for a twin's point of view of the other twin's winding number. That is, the leftmoving twin measures her own winding number  $N^L$  and the other twin's winding number  $N_{\text{other}}^L$ , and the rightmoving twin measures her own winding number  $N^R$  and the other twin's winding number  $N_{\text{other}}^R$ .

In each case, the winding number is positive in the direction of motion of the "other" twin.

## 3 RESULTS

### 3.1 The leftmoving twin

Figure 5 shows that  $p \equiv \overline{A_1 B_1}$  projects to a point, and  $q \equiv \overline{A_1 B_2}$  projects to a closed loop. As stated in Uzan et al. (2002), the former path has a zero winding index, while the second has a unity winding index: from the point of view of the leftmoving twin, there is a difference in the two twins'



**Figure 5.** Space-time as viewed by the leftmoving twin, as in Figure 3, including the worldlines  $p$  and  $q$  of the leftmoving and rightmoving twins respectively, corresponding to  $\overline{A_1 B_1}$  and  $\overline{A_1 B_2}$  in the covering space-time as shown in Figure 1, and showing their projections from space-time into space under the projection  $\phi$  given in Eq. (10). Arrows indicate increasing proper time along each worldline. The worldlines are given algebraically in Sect. 2.4.1.

winding numbers. However, we haven't yet checked if the winding numbers are relative or absolute.

We evaluate the winding numbers as follows. Using the two twins' worldlines from the leftmoving twin's point of view, Eqs (5) and (9), and projecting them with Eq. (10), we have

$$\phi(p) = \phi(p^L) = \{0\} \quad (16)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(q) = \phi(q^L) &= \left\{ \beta\gamma\tau' : 0 \leq \tau' \leq \frac{L}{\beta\gamma} \right\} \\ &= \{ \lambda : 0 \leq \lambda \leq L \}. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Since  $g_\phi(0) = L$  from Eq. (12), clearly

$$\phi(p) \sim \{0\} \quad (18)$$

and


$$\phi(q) \sim S^1 \quad (19)$$

in the sense of Eq. (14), so that the winding index of the leftmoving twin is zero, i.e.

$$N^L = 0 \quad (20)$$

and that of the rightmoving twin is unity,

$$N_{\text{other}}^L = 1. \quad (21)$$



**Figure 6.** Space-time as viewed by the rightmoving twin, as in Figure 4, including the worldlines  $q, p_g$  of the leftmoving and rightmoving twins respectively. These correspond to  $\overline{A_1B_2}$  and  $\overline{A_2B_2}$  in the covering space-time as shown in Fig. 2. Also shown are their projections from space-time into space under the projection  $\phi'$  given in Eq. (11). Arrows indicate increasing proper time along each worldline. The worldlines are given algebraically in Sect. 2.4.1.

### 3.2 The rightmoving twin

Figure 6 shows that  $q \equiv \overline{A_1B_2}$  projects to a point, and  $p_g \equiv \overline{A_2B_2}$  projects to a closed loop. The former path has a zero winding index, while the latter has a unity winding index: from the point of view of the rightmoving twin, there is a difference in the two twins' winding numbers. However, if each twin each assume that she is stationary and that the other is moving away, as we have assumed throughout, then they also disagree regarding the winding numbers: neither simultaneity nor winding number is absolute.

We evaluate this algebraically as follows. Using the two twins' worldlines from the rightmoving twin's point of view, Eqs (7) and (8) and projecting them with Eq. (11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi'(p_g) = \phi'(p_g^R) &= \left\{ \gamma(L - \beta\tau) : 0 \leq \tau \leq \frac{L}{\beta} \right\} \\ &= [\gamma L, 0] \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

and

$$\phi'(q) = \phi'(q^R) = \{0\}. \quad (23)$$

Eq. (23) shows that in this case, the rightmoving twin has winding index zero:

$$N^R = 0. \quad (24)$$

Since  $g'_\phi(0) = \gamma L$  from Eq. (13), Eq. (22) clearly gives

$$\phi'(p_g) \sim S^1. \quad (25)$$

Using the sign convention which we use globally here for the  $x$  or  $x'$  coordinates, the winding index of the leftmoving twin in this case would be  $-1$ . More usefully, using the winding number convention described in Sect. 2.4.3, i.e. the winding number is positive in the direction of motion of the “other” twin, this becomes

$$N_{\text{other}}^R = +1. \quad (26)$$

### 3.3 Summary: both twins

In summary, from Eqs. (20), (21), (24) and (26), we have

$$\begin{aligned} N^L = 0 & \quad N_{\text{other}}^L = 1 \\ N^R = 0 & \quad N_{\text{other}}^R = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Clearly, the homotopy classes of the twins' worldlines do not reveal the asymmetry of the system: each twin considers herself to have winding index  $N = 0$  and the other twin to have  $N_{\text{other}} = 1$ .

### 3.4 Commutativity of the generator $g$ and the Lorentz transformation $\mathcal{L}$

Uzan et al. (2002) also suggested in their eqs (6)–(8) that the generator  $g$  does not commute with the Lorentz transformation. Here we calculate this explicitly.

Equation (2) gives

$$g \circ \mathcal{L}((x, t)) = g \circ (\gamma x - \beta\gamma t, -\beta\gamma x + \gamma t). \quad (28)$$

Applying the generator in the appropriate reference frame, Eq. (3), gives

$$\begin{aligned} g \circ \mathcal{L}((x, t)) &= [(\gamma x - \beta\gamma t) + \gamma L, (-\beta\gamma x + \gamma t) - \beta\gamma L] \\ &= \gamma[x - \beta t + L, t - \beta(x + L)]. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Equation (1) gives

$$\mathcal{L} \circ g((x, t)) = \mathcal{L} \circ (x + L, t). \quad (30)$$


The Lorentz transformation, Eq. (2), gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} \circ (x + L, t) &= [\gamma(x + L) - \beta\gamma t, -\beta\gamma(x + L) + \gamma t] \\ &= \gamma[x - \beta t + L, t - \beta(x + L)] \\ &= g \circ \mathcal{L}((x, t)), \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where the last equality uses Eq. (29). These last two equations give

$$\mathcal{L} \circ g((x, t)) = g \circ \mathcal{L}((x, t)). \quad (32)$$

This result is in contrast to Uzan et al. (2002)'s suggestion that  $g \circ \mathcal{L} \neq \mathcal{L} \circ g$ . It is not obvious why our results differ. Here, we consider  $g \in \Gamma$  to be a holonomy transformation on



**Figure 7.** As for Figure 5, but showing that the two worldlines together form a single closed loop in space-time. Neither worldline constitutes a closed curve alone, prior to projection.

the covering Minkowski space  $M$ , independently of any particular coordinate representation. As in Uzan et al. (2002), we consider  $\mathcal{L}$  to be a transformation “from one frame of space-time coordinates to another system”.


#### 4 DISCUSSION

The results summarised in Sect. 3.3 differ from the conclusion in Uzan et al. (2002), where it was pointed out that since winding indices are topological invariants, “neither change of coordinates or reference frame (which ought to be continuous) can change [the winding indices] values”, i.e. the rightmoving twin and the leftmoving twin should agree that the leftmoving twin has a zero winding index and the rightmoving twin a unity winding index.

This argument does not take into account the nature of the projection from space-time to space. The argument is correct in that the topologically invariant nature of winding indices is valid in *space-time*, but is not necessarily valid in the worldlines *after projection from space-time to space*. The projection from an  $n$ -dimensional manifold to an  $(n-1)$ -dimensional manifold does not (in general) conserve all topological properties of subspaces: while a continuous projection conserves continuity, it does not conserve non-continuity.

For example, consider a discontinuous path  $p_1 = \{(x, f(x)) \mid \forall x \in [0, L)\}$  in the leftmoving twin’s reference frame, where  $f(x)$  is a step function, i.e. a function discontinuous for some values  $x \in [0, L)$ . This projects under  $\phi$  to a continuous, closed loop. Similarly in higher dimensions: consider  $S^1 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ , which can be continuously deformed into something resembling a mess of string with the two ends tied together and not touching itself anywhere. Project this from Euclidean 3-space into the Euclidean 2-plane. The projection will (in general) be a graph with many nodes, not  $S^1$ .

In fact, the worldlines (e.g. those labelled 1, 2, 3, 4 in fig. 2 in Uzan et al. 2002) are all open curves in space-time, i.e. each of them is in the same homotopy class as a single point. Figures 5 and 6 show that these open curves only become either a loop or a point after projection. The pro-



**Figure 8.** Identical space-time to Figure 2, again in the reference frame of the rightmoving twin, showing part of a hypersurface at constant time for the rightmoving twin as thick horizontal line segments. Space-time events  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are identical to one another (the generator  $g$  identifying equal space-time events is illustrated); space-time events  $E_1$ ,  $E_2$  and  $E_3$  are identical to one another.  $A$  is a single space-time event,  $C$  is a single space-time event, and  $E$  is a single space-time event. The fundamental domain (FD) can be written as a space-limited region with unconstrained time (shaded with a backslash “\”) and a time offset when matching boundaries. It can also be written as a *time*-limited region with unconstrained space (shaded with a forward slash “/”) and a space offset when matching boundaries. Within this FD, consider an observer at rest in this frame, capable of making metric measurements, located at space-time event  $A$  and shown in the covering space at  $A_1$ . For this observer, the events  $C$  and  $E$  happen “over there and simultaneously to  $A$ ”. The observer will arrive at those spatially distant events without any motion, simply by waiting. See Fig. 9 for a cylindrical representation of the time-limited FD.

jection can convert a discontinuity into a continuity (or a continuum of points into a single point).

In space-time, it is the union of the two twins’ worldlines (two different paths in space-time from space-time event  $A$  to space-time event  $B$ ) which forms a closed curve, not either worldline alone. This is shown in Fig. 7.

This is why a “change of coordinates or reference frame” using a continuous function *can* change the winding index values of two worldlines, if those two worldlines are projections from  $(n+1)$ -space-time to  $n$ -space, considered in two different reference frames.


Nevertheless, with the use of metrical information and space-time rather than just space, it is interesting to note some different possibilities of what “space” could correspond to if thought of as a subspace of the covering space-time  $M$ .

##### 4.1 The nature of spatial sections differs for the two twins

Let us now use our knowledge of metrical information for considering the nature of “space”, i.e. spacelike sections of space-time, for the two twins.

A spacelike section of space-time at constant time for the leftmoving twin connects with itself and is clearly  $S^1$ .





**Figure 9.** A time-limited choice of the fundamental domain according to the rightmoving twin’s view of space-time, embedded in 3-D Euclidean space and projected onto the page. See Fig. 8 and Sect. 4.2.  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are a single space-time location;  $E_1$  and  $E_2$  are a single space-time location. Time boundaries are identified to one another with a spatial offset. Some of the multiple topological images of the worldlines of the leftmoving and rightmoving twins are labelled as previously, i.e.  $p_g$  and  $q$  respectively, as well as  $p_{g \circ g} \equiv g(p_g)$ . The positive spatial and time directions are shown as  $x'$  and  $t'$  respectively.

In contrast, a spacelike section of space-time at constant time for the rightmoving twin does not connect with itself: there is a time offset of  $\beta\gamma L$  after one loop. For a spacelike section to connect with itself, it would need to be at non-constant time. This is not a problem for topological measurements in the absence of metrical information: the rightmoving observer who sends out slow moving probes equipped with neither clocks nor rods and having speeds which cannot be precisely calibrated will assume that space is  $S^1$ .

In the covering space, this could be most simply interpreted as replacing Eq. (11) by a projection from  $M$  to a subspace  $S^1 \subset M$  defined:

$$\phi'_{\text{sub}}((x', t')) = (x', -\beta x') \quad (33)$$

in the rightmoving twin’s reference frame, or equivalently,

$$\phi'_{\text{sub}}((x, t)) = (x - \beta t, 0) \quad (34)$$

in the leftmoving twin’s reference frame. In other words, the subspace  $S^1$  of  $M$  correspond to the rightmoving twin’s interpretation of space from topological measurements alone would most easily be modelled as a spatial hypersurface of constant time for the leftmoving twin.

#### 4.2 The fundamental domain may be “periodic” in time instead of space

While the rightmoving (non-favoured) twin making only topological measurements does not *know* that her “space”  $S^1$  consists of a set of space-time points at differing times  $t'$ , the nature of what would be her constant time hypersurface, if she were able to determine it, reveals an interesting property of a multiply connected space-time for a non-favoured observer: *the fundamental domain can be chosen by matching time boundaries instead of space boundaries.* Figures 8 and 9 illustrate this situation.

The fundamental domain of this space-time can either be described as the region

$$D_{x'} \equiv [0, \gamma L) \times \mathbb{R}, \quad (35)$$

expressed as the direct product of a spatial interval as the first parameter and a time interval as the second, or as

$$D_{t'} \equiv \mathbb{R} \times [0, \beta\gamma L), \quad (36)$$

again with space first and time second.

The former,  $D_{x'}$ , is the “obvious” fundamental domain, satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \bigcup \{g^i(D_{x'}), \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}\} &= M \\ g^i(D_{x'}) \cap g^j(D_{x'}) &= \emptyset, \forall i \neq j, i, j \in \mathbb{Z} \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

where the generator  $g$  is easiest to use if expressed in the rightmoving twin’s reference frame, i.e. as in Eq. (3), and  $g^2 = g \circ g$ ,  $g^{-1} \circ g = g \circ g^{-1} = I$ , etc.

The latter,  $D_{t'}$ , is the more surprising fundamental domain, satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \bigcup \{g^i(D_{t'}), \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}\} &= M \\ g^i(D_{t'}) \cap g^j(D_{t'}) &= \emptyset, \forall i \neq j, i, j \in \mathbb{Z}, \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

again where  $g$  is best expressed using Eq. (3).

What is surprising is that a verbal description of  $D_{t'}$  could be “time is periodic for the non-favoured twin”. However, this description omits important information; a more complete description would be “time is periodic, but with a spatial offset, for the non-favoured twin”.

In other words, the ability to choose a time-limited fundamental domain does *not* mean that events periodically repeat themselves from the rightmoving twin’s point of view, since the generator of the periodicity does *not* yield an offset by a vector  $(0, \beta\gamma L)$ . What it yields is a space-time offset by (an integer multiple of) the vector  $(\gamma L, -\beta\gamma L)$ .

We could also say that for a non-favoured twin, the space-time periodicity is “diagonal” to the space-time axes, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \forall a \neq 0, b \neq 0, a, b \in \mathbb{R}, (x', t') \in M, \\ g((x', t')) \neq (x' + a, t'), g((x', t')) \neq (x', t' + b). \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

## 5 CONCLUSIONS

Finding an asymmetry in the twin paradox of special relativity in a multiply connected space is less obvious than in a simply connected space, since neither twin accelerates. It was already known that the asymmetry required is the fact that (at least) one twin must identify space-time events non-simultaneously and has problems in clock synchronisation.

Here, space-time diagrams and the corresponding algebra have been presented in order to examine whether or not the homotopy classes of the twins’ worldlines provide another asymmetry. They show that homotopy classes (numbers of windings) do *not* show which of the two twins of the twin paradox has a preferred status, contrary to what was previously suggested: each twin finds her own spatial path to have zero winding index and that of the other twin to have unity winding index (in the direction of travel of the other twin).

Although the twins’ apparent symmetry is broken by the need for the non-favoured twin to non-simultaneously identify spatial domain boundaries, and by the non-favoured twin’s problems in clock synchronisation (provided that she

has precise clocks), the non-favoured twin *cannot* detect her disfavoured state by measuring the topological properties of the two twins' worldlines in the absence of precise metric measurements with clocks or rods.

On the other hand, a non-favoured twin capable of making precise metric measurements will notice many surprising properties of space-time. For example, a non-favoured twin could define the fundamental domain of space-time to be  $\mathbb{R} \times [0, \beta\gamma L)$  where the first dimension is space and the second is time. In words, time would be "periodic with period  $\beta\gamma L$  and a spatial offset when matching time boundaries" as an alternative explanation to having space be "periodic with period  $\gamma L$  and a time offset when matching space boundaries".

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Agnieszka Szaniewska for a careful reading and useful comments on this paper. St.B. acknowledges support from Polish Ministry of Science Grant No NN203 394234.

## REFERENCES

- Aurich R., Lustig S., Steiner F., 2005a, CQG, 22, 3443, [arXiv:astro-ph/0504656]
- Aurich R., Lustig S., Steiner F., 2005b, CQG, 22, 2061, [arXiv:astro-ph/0412569]
- Barrow J. D., Levin J., 2001, Phys. Rev. A, 63, 044104, [arXiv:gr-qc/0101014]
- Blançœil V., Roukema B. F., eds, 2000, "Cosmological Topology in Paris 1998" Paris: Blançœil & Roukema, [arXiv:astro-ph/0010170]
- Brans C. H., Stewart D. R., 1973, Phys. Rev. D, 8, 1662
- Efstathiou G., 2004, MNRAS, 348, 885, [arXiv:astro-ph/0310207]
- Gundermann J., 2005, arXiv preprints, [arXiv:astro-ph/0503014]
- Lachièze-Rey M., Luminet J., 1995, Phys. Rep., 254, 135, [arXiv:gr-qc/9605010]
- Low R. J., 1990, European Journal of Physics, 11, 25
- Luminet J., Roukema B. F., 1999, in NATO ASIC Proc. 541: Theoretical and Observational Cosmology Topology of the Universe: Theory and Observation. p. 117, [arXiv:astro-ph/9901364]
- Luminet J., Weeks J. R., Riazuelo A., Lehoucq R., Uzan J., 2003, Nature, 425, 593, [arXiv:astro-ph/0310253]
- Luminet J.-P., 1998, Acta Cosmologica, XXIV-1, 105, [arXiv:gr-qc/9804006]
- Niarchou A., Jaffe A., 2007, Physical Review Letters, 99, 081302, [arXiv:astro-ph/0702436]
- Peters P. C., 1983, Am. J. Phys., 51, 791
- Peters P. C., 1986, Am. J. Phys., 54, 334
- Rebouças M. J., Gomero G. I., 2004, Braz. J. Phys., 34, 1358, [arXiv:astro-ph/0402324]
- Reichardt C. L., Ade P. A. R., Bock J. J., Bond J. R., Brevik J. A., Contaldi C. R., Daub M. D., Dempsey J. T., Goldstein J. H., et al. 2008, ArXiv e-prints, 801, [arXiv:0801.1491]
- Roukema B. F., 2000, Bull. Astr. Soc. India, 28, 483, [arXiv:astro-ph/0010185]
- Roukema B. F., 2002, in Marcel Grossmann IX Conference on General Relativity, eds V.G. Gurzadyan, R.T. Jantzen and R. Ruffini, World Scientific, Singapore Observational Approaches to the Topology of the Universe. p. p. 1937, [arXiv:astro-ph/0010189]
- Roukema B. F., Bajtlik S., Biesiada M., Szaniewska A., Jurkiewicz H., 2007, A&A, 463, 861, [arXiv:astro-ph/0602159]
- Roukema B. F., Buliński Z., Szaniewska A., Gaudin N. E., 2008, A&A, 486, 55, [arXiv:0801.0006]
- Roukema B. F., Lew B., Cechowska M., Marecki A., Bajtlik S., 2004, A&A, 423, 821, [arXiv:astro-ph/0402608]
- Spergel D. N., Bean R., Doré O., Nolta M. R., Bennett C. L., Hinshaw G., Jarosik N., Komatsu E., Page L., Peiris H. V., Verde L., Barnes C., Halpern M., Hill R. S., Kogut A., et al. 2007, ApJSupp, 170, 377, [arXiv:astro-ph/0603449]
- Spergel D. N., Verde L., Peiris H. V., Komatsu E., Nolta M. R., Bennett C. L., Halpern M., Hinshaw G., Jarosik N., Kogut A., Limon M., Meyer S. S., Page L., Tucker G. S., Weiland J. L., Wollack E., Wright E. L., 2003, ApJSupp, 148, 175, [arXiv:astro-ph/0302209]
- Starkman G. D., 1998, CQG, 15, 2529
- Uzan J.-P., Lehoucq R., Luminet J.-P., 1999, in Proc. of the XIX<sup>th</sup> Texas meeting, Paris 14–18 December 1998, Eds. E. Aubourg, T. Montmerle, J. Paul and P. Peter, article n° 04/25 New Developments in the Search for the Topology of the Universe, [arXiv:gr-qc/0005128]
- Uzan J.-P., Luminet J.-P., Lehoucq R., Peter P., 2002, Eur. J. Phys., 23, 277, [arXiv:physics/0006039v1]
- Wucknitz O., 2004, submitted to Found. Phys., [arXiv:gr-qc/0403111]

## APPENDIX A: THOUGHT EXPERIMENT: STRETCHABLE CORD BETWEEN THE TWINS

Since we are interested in topology, suppose that neither twin has *precise* measuring rods or clocks, though both twins may have *very approximate* methods of measuring metric properties. Neither twin is aware that when she completes a loop of the Universe, she may detect a time offset. However, both twins have read history books and are aware of claims that "space is multiply connected", so they attempt to verify this experimentally.

We can imagine that at event A, the two twins instantaneously create a highly stretchable physical link between them, such as a light-weight string or cord of negligible mass and extremely high strength against breaking. As they move apart, the cord stretches, preserving the topological properties of space connectedness, while ignoring time.

We could alternatively imagine that one of the twins leaves behind a "trail" of some sort, e.g. like the vapour trail of an aircraft visible by human eye from the ground. However, in this case, we have to be careful to avoid thinking of the particles in the vapour trail as being at rest in any particular frame, since otherwise we favour one of the two twins arbitrarily.

Now consider the state of the cord "at" event B, when the two twins meet up again and join the two ends of the cord together. B is a single space-time event. Even though the two twins disagree about space-time coordinates of the

event, they agree that it is a single event and agree that they have physically joined the two ends of the cord. Clearly the cord now forms a closed loop, of winding index one.

Note that the word “at” is, in fact, misleading, for two reasons.

Firstly, it is misleading because event B is just one space-time point among a whole set of space-time points where the particles constituting the cord are located, but “the state of the cord” is only of interest at this point of the discussion in the local neighbourhood of event B. It is difficult to avoid intuitively thinking of “the state of the cord”, i.e. of the state of a spatially extended object “at” the *time* of the event B, which is wrong, because it assumes simultaneity. A better way of thinking of the cord is presented below.

Secondly, it is misleading because the word “at” suggests a mono-valued time coordinate for a single event. The reality is that just as in a multiply connected space, a single (physical) spatial point exists at many spatial points in the covering space, the situation is similar in a multiply connected space-time: a twin (observer) finds that a single space-time event exists at many (in general) non-simultaneous space-time points in the covering space-time. One twin happens to be favoured and finds that the multiple space-time copies of a single event are simultaneous, but the other twin, moving with a different velocity, has a generator which is “diagonal” to her space-time axes.

Figs 1 and 2 can help to understand the space-time nature of the cord and to avoid the implicit assumption of simultaneity.

From the leftmoving twin’s point of view, in Fig. 1, the cord can always be considered as a simultaneous object, i.e. a series of successive “snapshots” of the cord consist of horizontal line segments joining  $\overline{A_1B_1}$  and  $\overline{A_1B_2}$ , starting at A and sliding up to a final state of  $\overline{B_1B_2}$  which for the leftmoving twin, is the state of the cord “at” the time of space-time event B.

The rightmoving twin’s point of view is similar, except that as can be seen in Fig. 2, “simultaneous” snapshots of the cord, i.e. horizontal line segments joining  $\overline{A_1B_1}$  and  $\overline{A_1B_2}$ , starting at A and sliding upwards, have a problem when the right-hand end of the cord arrives at B<sub>2</sub>. At this point, the left-hand end of the cord has not yet arrived at B<sub>1</sub> — according to the rightmoving twin’s notion of simultaneity.

However, B<sub>1</sub> and B<sub>2</sub> are a single physical space-time event: the space-time event of joining the two ends of the cord together occurs *non-simultaneously* according to the rightmoving twin.

This is intuitively difficult to imagine. One way that the rightmoving twin could think about this could be that “as” the cord slides up from event A, it tilts in some way so that when/where the two ends of the cord are joined at B, the cord can be imagined as stretched along the line segment  $\overline{B_1B_2}$  — along a series of space-time events which are non-simultaneous. This requires the use of some arbitrary affine parameter to define “as” for the rightmoving twin, i.e. a parameter that is something like time but is not physical time. Of course, the simplest option for this parameter is the leftmoving twin’s time coordinate, but this does not make it any easier for the rightmoving twin to develop her intuition about it.

If we consider the cord to be “stretched” rather than

“unrolled”, so that the parts of the cord closest to each twin are (nearly) stationary with respect to that twin, and if the cord is created containing a mix of isotopes of radioactive elements in initially known proportions, then at event B, the proper times at the two ends of the cord will be measurable by measuring the isotopic mixes.

In this case, both twins will agree that not only the rightmoving twin has aged less, but also that the end of the cord “held” by the rightmoving twin is younger than the end of the cord “held” by the leftmoving twin. So although the joined-up cord forms a single closed loop, its non-simultaneous nature is revealed by the discordant ages (isotope mixes) of the two ends that are joined up at B.

This is dependent on the thought experimental setup requiring the cord to be locally (nearly) at rest with respect to each twin, i.e. the cord is “stretched”. With a different experimental setup for the behaviour of the cord, the aging of the cord occurs differently, and can be calculated by studying the worldlines of the particles composing the cord.

Now that we have some way of seeing either twin’s way of thinking of this closed loop from B<sub>1</sub> to B<sub>2</sub>, whose path through space (projection of worldline to a spacelike hypersurface) does this loop represent? Each twin considers herself to be stationary, and the other twin to be moving “rightwards” or “leftwards”, respectively. So each twin considers her own path through space to be a single point — a path of zero winding index — and that of the other twin to be a closed loop — a path of winding index unity represented by the cord. Each twin considers the *other* twin to have pulled and/or stretched the cord so that eventually the two ends could be joined, not herself.

This is just an intuitive way of thinking of the projections described above: an observer in a spatially multiply connected, locally Lorentz space-time, who is unable to make high-precision spatial and temporal measurements but can measure topological properties of space is unable to use the homotopy class of her spatial path (projected worldline) to detect the fact that she is either a favoured or a non-favoured observer.

Of course, if we understand the full nature of this space-time, then we can note that the nature of “the cord” for at least one of the twins is a cross-section through space-time at non-constant time, as noted above. This is necessary in order for event B to be a single event in space-time. It can also help to remember a key idea in resolving the “pole in the barn paradox” of simply connected Minkowski space: neither a pole nor the door-to-door path of a barn is a one-dimensional object — both are *two-dimensional space-time objects*. The “length” of any such object depends on the choice of the reference frame, or in other words, the choice of spacelike cross-section.

Yet another useful way of thinking of a pole is as a “worldplane” — a collection of worldlines. Our ordinary intuition of a pole as a one-dimensional object is due to our implicit assumption of absolute simultaneity. We can think of the cord stretched between the two twins and joined up at event B to be the entire filled-in area of the triangle A<sub>1</sub>B<sub>1</sub>B<sub>2</sub> in Figs 1 and 2 — a two-dimensional space-time object. Depending on various possible thought experimental setups for creating/producing/stretching the cord, various sets of worldlines for the particles composing the cord are possible, but in each case would fill in this triangle.