Homotopy symmetry in the multiply connected twin paradox of special relativity

Boudewijn F. Roukema¹ and Stanislaw Bajtlik²

¹ Toruń Centre for Astronomy, N. Copernicus University, ul. Gagarina 11, PL-87-100 Toruń, Poland

² Copernicus Astronomy Centre, ul. Bartycka 18, PL-00-716 Warsaw, Poland

Le 2 décembre 2024

ABSTRACT

Context. The twin paradox of special relativity is resolved differently in a multiply connected space than in a simply connected space. In 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 implied by their relative speed. This apparent symmetry is violated by the fact that (at least) one twin must identify space-time events non-simultaneously (her space-time must have a "non-simultaneous" generator), and has problems in clock synchronisation.

Aims. Here, the suggestion that the apparent symmetry is also broken by homotopy classes of the twins' worldlines is reexamined.

Methods. Space-time diagrams are presented as an aid to understanding the twin paradox in multiply connected space, consistently with previous work, and to examine the suggested asymmetry.

Results. (i) 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. (ii) However, an asymmetrical property of the global space-time, unrelated to the twins' worldlines' homotopy classes, is also found, generalising from Peters' (1983) earlier results: For a non-favoured twin (a twin who identifies spatial fundamental domain boundaries non-simultaneously), there exist pairs of distinct events which are *both* spacelike and timelike separated in the covering space-time.

Conclusions. 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, the non-favoured twin *cannot* detect her disfavoured state by measuring the homotopy class of the two twins' projected worldlines: homotopy classes (numbers of windings) do *not* distinguish the two twins of the twin paradox, contrary to what was previously suggested.

Key words. cosmology: theory – cosmological parameters

1. Introduction

It has already been shown (Peters 1983, 1986; 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 is the case discussed in this paper. Uzan et al. (2002) and Barrow & Levin (2001) note that this should correspond to the comoving reference frame. 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.

Further theoretical interest in multiply connected space includes the small (but at present observationally negligible) component to dark energy density, of an estimated magnitude at the present epoch of $\Omega_{\text{topology}} \sim 10^{-9}\delta$, which could be induced as a residual effect of ordinary gravity in a multiply connected space if the lengths of the fundamental domain are slightly unequal, by a small fraction δ (shown for a \mathbb{T}^3 model in Roukema et al. 2006).

There is also observational interest in understanding multiple connectedness. In particular, recent analyses of the cosmic microwave background observations by the WMAP satellite suggest that the temperature fluctuation map is better modelled by a multiply-connected model of the Universe, for a Poincaré dodecahedral space (PDS) as the 3-manifold of comoving space, rather than by an "infinite" flat space (e.g. Luminet et al. 2003; Roukema et al. 2004; Aurich et al. 2005a, 2005b; Gundermann 2005). Spergel et al. (2006)'s analysis of the 3-year WMAP data results in best estimates of the total density parameter $\Omega_{\rm tot} = 1.010^{+0.016}_{-0.009}$ (when combined with HST key project on H_0 data) and $\Omega_{\rm tot} = 1.015^{+0.020}_{-0.016}$ (when combined with Supernova Legacy Survey data), consistently with that expected by the PDS analyses, which require positive curvature in this range of $\Omega_{\rm tot}$ values.

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 Peters (1983), Uzan et al. (2002) and 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.

Here, what seems to be an absolute asymmetry between the homotopy classes of the worldlines of the two twins of the twin paradox, as suggested by Uzan et al. (2002), is reexamined.

In Sect. 2, space-time diagrams are used to develop intuition of a multiply connected space-time with a standard Minkowski covering space-time.

In Sect. 3, the projections of the twins' paths into a spacelike section and their homotopy classes are presented. Discussions are presented in Sect. 4 and conclusions in Sect. 5.

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). For in-depth review papers see, e.g. Lachièze-Rey & Luminet (1995); Luminet (1998); Starkman (1998); Luminet & Roukema (1999); workshop proceedings are in Starkman (1998) and following articles, and Blanlœil & Roukema (2000). For comparison and classification of different *observational* strategies, see e.g. Uzan et al. (1999); Luminet & Roukema (1999); Roukema (2002); Rebouças & Gomero (2004).

2. Space-time diagrams

Peters (1983), Uzan et al. (2002) and Barrow & Levin (2001) present the special relativity twins paradox in a multiply connected space.

2.1. The paradox

The paradoxical nature of the situation can be restated in words as follows.

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 spacetime 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.¹ 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 spacetime event. But then which twin is "the first" and which is "the other"?

This question suggests that the situation is symmetrical and 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 by favoured relative to rightward movement, or vice-versa?

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

2.2. Where is the asymmetry?

Peters (1983, 1986), Uzan et al. (2002) and Barrow & Levin (2001) show 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.

¹ No quantum mechanical effects are considered in this paper.

Barrow & Levin (2001) point out that 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.

This is one way of explaining the asymmetry.

Here, in order to examine Uzan et al. (2002)'s suggestion about homotopy asymmetry, it is easier to first explain the asymmetry of the apparently symmetrical paradox in a more geometric way, similar to the way Peters (1983) presented it, but with some additional figures.



Fig. 1. Minkowski covering space space-time for a twin (hereafer, 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 β (hereafter, the "rightmoving twin") has worldline t' and simultaneity axis x' where $t' \equiv 0$, defining her coordinate system (x', t'). Spacetime 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 spacetime 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.

2.3. Multiply connected space-time diagrams

Fig. 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. As a covering space, this 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

$$g((x,t)) = (x+L,t),$$
 (1)

for every (x, t), generates the quotient, multiply connected space, M/Γ , where Γ 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.



Fig. 2. Identical space-time to Fig. 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. Fig. 4 helps show this is possible by using our three-dimensional intuition.

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 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 A₂ occurs before space-time event A₁, space-time event B₂ occurs before space-time event B₁, etc. This is shown in Fig. 2.

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 $B_1 = B_2 = B_3$.



Fig. 3. A space-time region, with constant space and time boundaries according to the leftmoving twin's view of space-time, shown in Fig. 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".

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*.

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

$$g((x',t')) = \left(x' + \gamma L, t - \beta \gamma \frac{L}{c}\right), \qquad (2)$$

where β is the rightmoving twin's velocity in units of the space-time conversion constant c and $\gamma \equiv (1 - \beta^2)^{-1/2}$ is the Doppler boost.

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.

Fig. 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



Fig. 4. A space-time region with constant space and time boundaries according to the rightmoving twin's view of spacetime, shown in Fig. 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, $\overline{A_1B_2}$ and \overline{CD} , are offset by a time interval A_2C 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 fig. 5b of Wucknitz (2004).

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:

$$t'(A_1) = t'(B_2)$$

 $t'(A_2) = t'(B_3).$ (3)

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 can be trivially extended.)

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" $x' = \gamma L$, where $\gamma \equiv (1-\beta)^{-1/2}$ is the usual Doppler boost. In space-time thinking, 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 naïve intuition even further.

Let us try to cut out and then paste together the spacetime 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, 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 statement of the paradox 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 why Uzan et al. (2002) and Barrow & Levin (2001) 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.

2.4. Homotopy classes

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? Uzan et al. (2002) suggest 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.

Here, the worldlines of the two twins between the two space-time events A and B, i.e. $\overline{A_1B_1}$ and $\overline{A_1B_2}$ in the covering space-time, are considered from the points of view of the two twins, i.e. $\overline{A_1B_1}$ and $\overline{A_1B_2}$ in Fig 1 and $\overline{A_2B_2}$ (equivalent to $\overline{A_1B_1}$ through the generator g) and $\overline{A_1B_2}$ in Fig. 2, respectively for the leftmoving and rightmoving twin in each case.

Again, a single domain of the space-time, with constant spatial boundaries for that observer, will be shown for each observer, as in Figs 3 and 4, but with the addition of the two worldlines and their projections into spacelike hypersurfaces.

The spacelike hypersurface onto which the worldlines will be projected for the leftmoving twin is a constant time hypersurface, as in Uzan et al. (2002).

However, for the rightmoving twin, the choice of which spacelike hypersurface should be used for the projection is ambiguous, and is presented in more detail below in Sect. 3.2.



Fig. 5. Space-time as viewed by the leftmoving twin, as in Fig. 3, with the addition of worldlines of the two twins from Fig. 1, $\overline{A_1B_1}$ (leftmoving twin) and $\overline{A_1B_2}$ (rightmoving twin) in the covering space-time, and their projections from space-time into "space", i.e. a hypersurface at constant time for the leftmoving twin. Arrows indicate increasing proper time along each worldline.

3. Results

Roukema & Bajtlik: Homotopy symmetry in twin paradox

3.1. The leftmoving twin

 $\mathbf{6}$

Fig. 5 shows that $\overline{A_1B_1}$ projects to a point, and $\overline{A_1B_2}$ projects to a closed loop. As stated by 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 clear asymmetry, and she (the leftmoving twin) is "favoured", in the sense of having a zero winding index.

3.2. The rightmoving twin

However, the point of view of the rightmoving twin needs to be examined as well.

The first question is to what spacelike hypersurface the projection should be made.



Fig. 6. Identical space-time to Fig. 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 (the generator g identifying equal space-time events is illustrated); space-time events E_1 and E_2 are identical. A is a single space-time event, C is a single space-time event, and E is a single space-time event.

3.2.1. The nature of constant time hypersurfaces differs for the two twins

This hypersurface could be the hypersurface at constant time, but the latter fails to connect to itself — in space-



Fig. 7. Space-time as viewed by the rightmoving twin, as in Fig. 4, with the addition of worldlines of the two twins from Fig. 2, $\overline{A_1B_2}$ (rightmoving twin) and $\overline{A_2B_2}$ (leftmoving twin), and their projections from space-time into a spacelike hypersurface, which is at constant time for the leftmoving twin. See Sect. 3.2 for discussion of which spacelike hypersurface could or should be used. Arrows indicate increasing proper time along each worldline.

time — after making one "loop" of length γL , due to the $\beta \gamma \frac{L}{c}$ time offset (Eq. 2): see Fig. 6.

Another way of describing this is that if we are interested in the concept of hypersurfaces of constant time for the rightmoving twin, then the fundamental domain of the (multiply connected) space-time can either be described as $[0, \gamma L) \times \mathbb{R}$ — which is the "obvious" fundamental domain — or as $\mathbb{R} \times [0, \beta \gamma \frac{L}{c})$, where in each case, the space dimension is first and the time dimension second.

Note that this 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 $(0, \beta \gamma \frac{L}{c})$. What it yields is a space-time offset by (an integer multiple of) the vector $(-\gamma L, \beta \gamma \frac{L}{c})$. In other words, the space-time periodicity could be described as "diagonal" to the space-time axes.

A paradoxical aspect of Fig. 6, given normal relativistic intuition, is that it shows that for the rightmoving twin, there exist certain pairs of distinct events in the covering space-time for which the two members of the pair may be considered either as located in the same spatial position but separated in time, or as simultaneous and separated in space, depending on which multiple images of the events in space-time are chosen for the comparison (cf section III Peters 1983).

Another way of describing this is that a pair of events can be *both* spacelike and timelike separated in the covering space-time. This is due to the existence of multiple images in the covering space-time, and hence multiple separation vectors between a single pair of physical events.

If a particular choice of fundamental domain is made, with each event occurring exactly once, then only one geodesic between the pair of events exists entirely inside of the fundamental domain, and the ambiguity is removed. For example, for events A and C in $[0, \gamma L) \times \mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{R} \times [0, \beta \gamma \frac{L}{c})$, the separation vector is timelike or spacelike respectively and there is no ambiguity. However, this is an arbitrary choice.

Although this property has partially been explored earlier by Peters (1983), it is useful to summarise it more generally as follows:

For a non-favoured twin (a twin who identifies spatial fundamental domain boundaries non-simultaneously), there exist pairs of distinct events which are both spacelike and timelike separated in the covering space-time.

Let us return to the need to find a hypersurface on to which the rightmoving twin's worldline can be projected. If the rightmoving twin makes precise space-time measurements, using precise clocks and rods, then she will notice that her constant time hypersurfaces "wrap around" the whole of "space" many times, or, in fact, infinitely many times if the local model is extended globally (static space with an infinite time axis). This extends the discussion of the "pole in the Universe paradox", a variant on the "pole in the barn paradox" (section V, Peters 1983). However, this type of hypersurface can only be known to the twin if she has precise metric measuring instruments, and would not help her with topological measurements.

3.2.2. Projection to a "cross-sectional" hypersurface

If the twin is only interested in measuring *topological* properties of "space", e.g. if she lacks precise clocks for attempting clock synchronisation and lacks precise metre sticks for measuring distances, but can measure "spatial" topological properties, then the relevant spacelike hypersurface onto which the worldlines can be projected should be one which is a spacelike "cross-section" X of the spacetime $X \times \mathbb{R} = M/\Gamma$, for an infinite time domain, i.e. in the case illustrated in this discussion, $X = T^1 \equiv S^1$.

One obvious choice of such a cross-section is the hypersurface of constant time t for the leftmoving twin, even

though the rightmoving twin, lacking precise measuring tools, may not be fully aware of the nature of this surface.

Fig. 7 shows that when the rightmoving twin projects into a spacelike hypersurface topologically equivalent to X, the same spatial cross-section as in the leftmoving twin's point of view, the situation is symmetrical to that of the leftmoving twin. In this projection, the rightmoving twin's (projected) path has a winding index of zero, while the leftmoving twin has a winding index of one (or minus one, if we include a sense of direction, but hereafter we will ignore this).



Fig. 8. As for Fig. 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.

To summarise: the projections of the worldlines of *ei*ther twin onto a cross-sectional, spacelike hypersurface implies that the twin finds herself to be following a path of winding index zero and considers the other twin to be following a path of non-zero winding index. In other words, the homotopy class of a twin's worldline projected into space does *not* enable that twin to decide whether or not she is a favoured twin.

4. Discussion

This result differs from Uzan et al. (2002)'s conclusion, who 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.

However, this argument forgets 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) preserve topological properties of subspaces. For example, consider $\mathbb{S}^1 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ (e.g. imagine a mess of string with the two ends tied but which does not touch itself anywhere), projected from Euclidean 3-space into the Euclidean 2plane. The projection will (in general) be a complicate graph with many nodes, not \mathbb{S}^1 .

In fact, the worldlines (e.g. those labelled 1, 2, 3, 4 in fig. 2 of Uzan et al. 2002) are all open curves in space-time. Figs 5 and 7 show that these open curves only become either a loop or a point after projection.

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 (see Fig. 8), not either worldline alone.

Since the question of interest is how to break the (apparent) symmetry in the multiply connected twin paradox, a thought experiment using more physical intuition can help to understand why the winding indices of the twins' worldlines are insufficient for the purpose.

4.1. 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 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, 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, because it 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 B₂. At this point, the left-hand end of the cord has not yet arrived at B₁ — according to the righmoving twin's notion of simultaneity.

However, B_1 and B_2 are a single physical space-time event: the cord is joined to itself *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 with some initial, known mix of isotopes of radioactive elements, then at event B, the proper times at the two ends of the cord will be measurable by measuring the remaining isotopal 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 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_1 to B_2 , 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 spacetime. It can also to 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 *twodimensional 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 $A_1B_1B_2$ 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.

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 spacetime events non-simultaneously and has problems in clock synchronisation.

Here, space-time diagrams have been presented as an aid to understanding whether or not the homotopy classes of the twins' worldlines provide another asymmetry. They show that homotopy classes (numbers of windings) do *not* distinguish the two twins of the twin paradox, 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.

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 nonfavoured 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. Generalising from Peters (1983)'s discussion, we note the property that there exist pairs of distinct space-time events, for a non-favoured twin, which are *both* spacelike and timelike separated in the covering space-time, i.e. the generator of her manifold relative to her covering space-time is *diagonal* with respect to her space-time axes.

Acknowledgments

SB acknowledges support from KBN Grant 1P03D 012 26.

References

- Aurich, R., Lustig, S., & Steiner, F. 2005a, Classical and Quantum Gravity, 22, 3443, arXiv:astro-ph/0504656
- Aurich, R., Lustig, S., & Steiner, F. 2005b, Classical and Quantum Gravity, 22, 2061, arXiv:astro-ph/0412569
- Barrow, J. D., & Levin, J. 2001, Phys. Rev. A, 63, 044104, arXiv:gr-qc/0101014
- Blanlœil, V., & Roukema, B. F., eds. 2000, "Cosmological Topology in Paris 1998" (Paris: Blanlœil & Roukema), arXiv:astro-ph/0010170
- Gundermann, J. 2005, e-print, arXiv:astro-ph/0503014

- Lachièze-Rey, M., & Luminet, J. 1995, Phys. Rep., 254, 135,, arXiv:gr-qc/9605010
- Luminet, J., & Roukema, B. F. 1999, in NATO ASIC Proc. 541: Theoretical and Observational Cosmology, 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:grqc/9804006
- Peters, P. C. 1983, American Journal of Physics, 51, 791
- Peters, P. C. 1986, American Journal of Physics, 54, 334
- Rebouças, M. J., & Gomero, G. I. 2004, Braz. J. Phys., 34, 1358, arXiv:astro-ph/0402324
- Roukema, B. F. 2000, Bulletin of the Astronomical Society of 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, p. 1937, arXiv:astro-ph/0010189
- Roukema, B. F., Bajtlik, S., Biesiada, M., Szaniewska, A., & Jurkiewicz, H. 2006, A&A, submitted, arXiv:astroph/0602159
- Roukema, B. F., Lew, B., Cechowska, M., Marecki, A., & Bajtlik, S. 2004, A&A, 423, arXiv:astro-ph/0402608
- Spergel, D. N. et al. 2006, submitted, arXiv:astro-ph/0603449
- Starkman, G. D. 1998, Classical and Quantum Gravity, 15, 2529
- Uzan, J.-P., Lehoucq, R., & Luminet, J.-P. 1999, in "Proc. of the XIXth Texas meeting, Paris 14–18 December 1998, Eds.
 E. Aubourg, T. Montmerle, J. Paul and P. Peter, article n° 04/25", arXiv:gr-qc/0005128
- Uzan, J.-P., Luminet, J.-P., Lehoucq, R., & Peter, P. 2002, Eur. J. Phys., 23, arXiv:physics/0006039
- Wucknitz, O. 2004, submitted to Foundations of Physics, arXiv:gr-qc/0403111