

The topological undecidabilities hidden in the Principle of Equivalence of Classical General Relativity

Gavriel Segre*

(Dated: 1-3-2004)

Abstract

We show that the work required to move a unit magnetic charge around a loop c_1 in the presence of the magnetic field due to a unit electric current along a loop c_2 on a generic curved space-time cannot be decided through the Principle of Equivalence owing to its topological indetermination and to Markov's theorem

arXiv:gr-qc/0402121v2 1 Mar 2004

*URL: <http://www.gavrielsegre.com>; Electronic address: info@gavrielsegre.com

I. NOTATION

$\vec{x} \cdot \vec{y}$	scalar product of \vec{x} and \vec{y}
$\vec{x} \wedge \vec{y}$	wedge product of \vec{x} and \vec{y}
∂_a^η	Levi-Civita (trivial) covariant derivative of Minkowski spacetime
∇_a^g	Levi-Civita covariant derivative on the space-time (X, g_{ab})
$d\mu_g$	natural measure of (X, g_{ab})
$\Omega^n(X)$	space of the n-forms on X
$\omega_1 \wedge \omega_2$	exterior product among the forms ω_1 and ω_2
$d\omega$	exterior derivative of the form ω
*	Hodge duality operator
st_{REF}	reference space-time
∂X	boundary of X
$X_{1p.c}$	one point compactification of X
$\pi_n(X)$	n^{th} homotopy group of X
$H^2(X, \mathbb{R})$	n^{th} group of De-Rham cohomology of X
$D(S)$	domain of dependence of S
\sim_T	homeomorphism equivalence relation among topological spaces
\sim_I	isotopy equivalence relation among knots and links
$LN_{Gauss}(c_1, c_2)$	Gauss' linking number of c_1 and c_2
$\Omega_2(\vec{y})$	solid angle under which c_1 appears from $\vec{y} \in c_2$
$M - LN(L_1, L_2)$	M-linking number among L_1 and L_2
$CS(X, G)$	Chern-Simons quantum field theory on X with gauge group G
$W(n, L)$	Wilson loop of the link L of n^{th} order

II. THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPLE OF EQUIVALENCE IN CLASSICAL GENERAL RELATIVITY

While Quantum Gravity is an open field with many concurring theories (Super-Gravity [1], [2] , Loop Quantum Gravity [3], Simplicial Quantum Gravity [4], Connes' Quantum Gravity [5] being the most reknown ones to which one should add, for democracy, also some less popular proposal such as the one by David Ritz Finkelstein [6] or that by Eduard Prugovecki [7]) Classical General Relativity is usually considered as a completely established theory about which nothing new can be said.

It is common opinion (and it was also my opinion times ago [8]), in particular, that the subtilities lying behind the axiomatization of the Principle of Equivalence may be simply avoided getting rid of it through an axiomatization based on the assumption of the Hilbert-Einstein's action as to the space-time's metric augmented with suitable constraints on the energy-momentum tensor of matter fields. (cfr. e.g. [9]).

That this is not the case, anyway, is easily understood as soon as one observes that Classical General Relativity doesn't simply consists in a **geometrical theory of Gravitation**, but expresses, precisely through the Principle of Equivalence, a constraint about how all the **non-gravitational laws of Physics** has to be modified on passing from a flat spacetime to a curved one.

With this regard the Principle of Equivalence is usually [10] stated as the prescription of the following:

DEFINITION II.1

ANSATZ FROM COMMA TO SEMI-COLON

*If $F(M^{abc\dots}, \partial_a^\eta M^{abc\dots}, \dots) = 0$ ¹ is a **non-gravitational physical law** on the Minkowski space-time $(\mathbb{R}^4, \eta_{ab})$ then $F(M^{abc\dots}, \nabla_a^g M^{abc\dots}, \dots) = 0$ is the corresponding **non-gravitational physical law** on a curved spacetime (M, g_{ab})*

where ∂_a^η is the (trivial) **Levi Civita covariant derivative** on the Minkowski spacetime while ∇_a^g is the **Levi Civita covariant derivative** on (M, g_{ab}) .

¹ I adopt here Penrose's abstract index convention [11]

The name of definitionII.1 has been chosen (by Misner, Thorne and Wheeler) because, in the old-fashioned coordinates' formulation, the involved ansatz may be expressed as the following graphical rule:

$$, \mapsto ; \tag{2.1}$$

So the Principle of Equivalence is a prescription that may be decomposed in two passages:

1. it fixes a **reference space-time** $st_{REF} := (\mathbb{R}^4, \eta_{ab})$
2. it expresses how any **non-gravitational physical law** has to be generalized from st_{REF} to an arbitrary space-time $st \neq st_{REF}$

But here comes the rub:

as I will show there are topologically non trivial flat space-times, i.e. space-times of the form (X, η_{ab}) , where X is a topologically nontrivial differentiable 4-manifold, on which **topological effects** ² appear in suitable **non-gravitational physical laws** while they don't appear on the topologically-trivial **reference space-time** st_{REF} .

Since these topological effects appear also on any non-flat space-time of the form (X, g_{ab}) and, more generally, on any space-time of the form (Y, g_{ab}) such that Y is homeomorphic to X ($X \sim_T Y$), it follows that the role of **reference space-time** in the application of the Principle of Equivalence to (Y, g_{ab}) is played not by $(\mathbb{R}^4, \eta_{ab})$ but by (X, η_{ab}) .

But here comes the second rub:

in 1958 A.A. Markov proved that the problem of classifying the equivalence classes of homeomorphic 4-manifolds is undecidable (cfr. the 7th chapter "Decision Problems" of [12]), the proof consisting in:

- the observation that any finitely-presented group can be realized as the 1th homotopy group of a 4-manifold

² A first attempt to identify this kind of topological effects was performed in [8] taking into account the possibility of non-equivariant momentum maps for the action of the isometries'-group on the reduced phase-space of a free-falling observer; unfortunately (for me) I didn't succeed in finding an example owing both to the fact that such non-equivariance may appear only if the Lie algebra of the isometries'group is not semi-simple, and to the Theorem of Equivariance for Cotangent Lifts that can be bypassed only at the prize of inglobating modular-terms in the symplectic form of the (reduced) phase-space; an other kind of topologically nontrivial flat space-time on which topologic effect could appear are space-times of the form (X, η_{ab}) with $H^2(M, \mathbb{R}) \neq 0$ so that the 2-form F, though closed, is not exact and may consequentially be integrated only locally giving rise to a non-trivial bundle situation on which holonomies, e.g. as Hannay' angles, could appear

- the unsolvability of the isomorphism problem stated by the Adyan-Rabin's Theorem

As a consequence the problem of selecting the correct **reference space-time** to adopt in the Principle of Equivalence is undecidable too.

That Markov's theorem could have some consequence as to gravitational issues was, first, shown by Robert Geroch and James B. Hartle [13] but in a quantistic context where a particular strategy to compute the euclidean quantum gravity path-integrals was shown to be undecidable.

Curiously Robert Geroch is also the father of the following possible way [11] of bypassing Markov's Theorem

Theorem II.1

GEROCH'S THEOREM:

HP:

(M, g_{ab}) is a **globally-hyperbolic** space-time

TH:

$$\exists \Sigma \text{ differentiable 3-manifold} : M \sim_T \mathbb{R} \times \Sigma \quad (2.2)$$

(where I remember that (M, g_{ab}) is said to be **globally hyperbolic** if it admits a **Cauchy surface** S, i.e. a surface S whose **domain of dependence** D(S) is equal to M) that combined with the following:

Conjecture II.1

PENROSE'S STRONG COSMIC CENSORSHIP CONJECTURE

$$(M, g_{ab}) \text{ physically possible} \Rightarrow (M, g_{ab}) \text{ globally - hyperbolic} \quad (2.3)$$

exorcizes Markov's Theorem allowing to pass from the undecidable problem of deciding \sim_T for differentiable 4-manifold to the problem of deciding \sim_T for differentiable 3-manifold about which no Undecidability Theorem nowadays exists.

The mathematical status of the conjectureII.1 is, anyway, dubious in the following sense:

1. if it is considered as a **conjecture** than it should be proved as a theorem in which globally-hyperbolicity is deduced from some precise formalization of the "physicality"-constraint for (M, g_{ab})
2. if it is considered as an **axiom** then one has to strongly state that one is leaving away Classical General Relativity for a more restrictive theory.

Many relativists, enthusiast of the beauty of the Arnowitt-Deser-Misner's formalism for geometrodynamics, would, at this point, assert that the "physicality" hypothesis under which try to deduce global-hyperbolicity is that the Cauchy-problem for an action of the form:

$$S(\Phi, g_{ab}) = S_{E.H.}(g_{ab}) + S_{matter}(\Phi) \tag{2.4}$$

(where obviously $S_{E.H.}(g_{ab}) := \frac{1}{16\pi G} \int_M d\mu_g R(g)$ is the Einstein-Hilbert action) has to be well-posed.

But, though being a sufficient condition for that, global-hyperbolicity is not necessary [14].

III. TOPOLOGICAL EFFECTS IN ELECTROMAGNETISM ON TOPOLOGICALLY NON TRIVIAL FLAT SPACE-TIMES

The Maxwell's equations on the Minkowski space-time $(\mathbb{R}^4, \eta_{ab} := \eta_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu \otimes dx^\nu)$ (with $\eta_{\mu\nu} = \text{diag}(-1, 1, 1, 1)$) [15]:

$$dF = 0 \tag{3.1}$$

$$d^\dagger F = J \tag{3.2}$$

(where $d^\dagger := *d*$ is the adjoint exterior derivative operator on the space $\Omega^2(\mathbb{R}^4)$ of the 2-forms, $* : \Omega^2(\mathbb{R}^4) \mapsto \Omega^2(\mathbb{R}^4)$ being the Hodge operator) for the electromagnetic-field 2-form:

$$F := F_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu \tag{3.3}$$

$$F_{\mu\nu} := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -E_1 & -E_2 & -E_3 \\ E_1 & 0 & B_3 & -B_2 \\ E_2 & -B_3 & 0 & B_1 \\ E_3 & B_2 & -B_1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.4}$$

in presence of the current one-form:

$$J := \eta_{\mu\nu} j^\nu dx^\mu \tag{3.5}$$

$$j^\nu := \begin{pmatrix} \rho \\ \dot{j}_1 \\ \dot{j}_2 \\ \dot{j}_3 \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.6}$$

imply that the work required to move a unit magnetic charge around a loop c_1 in the presence of the magnetic field due to a unit electric current along a loop c_2 (and viceversa) is given by **Gauss' linking number** among c_1 and c_2 : (cfr. the sections 417-421 of the 3th chapter "Magnetic solenoids and cells" of [16] and the section 16.5 "The Gauss Invariant

of Two Curves” of [17]³):

$$LN_{Gauss}(c_1, c_2) := \frac{1}{4\pi} \oint_{c_1} dx^a \oint_{c_2} dy^b \epsilon_{abc} \frac{(x-y)^c}{|x-y|^3} \quad (3.7)$$

measuring how many times c_1 winds around c_2 (and viceversa).

Reporting Kleinert’s proof for completeness, the above statement may be proved through the following steps:

1. first of all one proves that the Gauss linking number counts how many times c_1 intersects the surface S such that $c_2 = \partial S$:

Lemma III.1

$$LN_{Gauss}(c_1, c_2) = \oint_{c_2} dy^a \delta_a(\vec{y}; S) \quad (3.8)$$

where:

$$\delta_a(\vec{y}; S) := \int_S d\hat{S} \delta^3(\vec{y} - \vec{x}) \quad (3.9)$$

PROOF:

$$\begin{aligned} \oint_{c_1} \oint_{c_2} d\vec{x} \cdot \frac{\vec{y} \wedge (\vec{x} - \vec{y})}{|\vec{x} - \vec{y}|^3} &= \oint_{c_1} d\vec{x} \cdot \left(\vec{\nabla} \wedge \oint_{c_2} \frac{d\vec{y}}{|\vec{x} - \vec{y}|} \right) \\ &= \int_S d\hat{S} \cdot \left[\vec{\nabla} \wedge \left(\vec{\nabla} \wedge \oint_{c_2} \frac{d\vec{y}}{|\vec{x} - \vec{y}|} \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

where $\vec{\nabla} := \vec{\nabla}_x$. Using the identity:

$$\vec{\nabla} \wedge (\vec{\nabla} \wedge \vec{v}) = \vec{\nabla}(\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{v}) - \vec{\nabla}^2 \vec{v} \quad (3.11)$$

the eq.3.10 may be expressed as the sum of two addenda, the first of which vanishes:

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{\nabla} \cdot \oint_{c_2} \frac{d\vec{y}}{|\vec{x} - \vec{y}|} &= - \oint_{c_2} \frac{d\vec{y} \cdot (\vec{x} - \vec{y})}{|\vec{x} - \vec{y}|^3} = \\ &= - \int_{S_2} d\hat{S}_2 \cdot (\vec{\nabla}_y \wedge \vec{\nabla}_y) \frac{1}{|\vec{x} - \vec{y}|} = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

³ following the not too clear deduction of [18] the 10th chapter ”Knot theory and physical states of quantum gravity” of [3] claims that the Gauss linking number would be also the magnetic flux induced on a solenoid with the shape of c_2 by a thin solenoid with the shape of c_1

while the second may be transformed adopting the Poisson equation:

$$\vec{\nabla}^2 \frac{1}{|\vec{x} - \vec{y}|} = -4\pi\delta^{(3)}(\vec{x} - \vec{y}) \quad (3.13)$$

to obtain that:

$$L_{Gauss}(c_1, c_2) = \int_S d\hat{S} \cdot \oint_{c_2} d\vec{y} \delta^{(3)}(\vec{x} - \vec{y}) = \oint_{c_2} dy^a \delta_a(\vec{y}; S) \quad (3.14)$$

■

2. one expresses the lemma III.1 in terms of the solid angle $\Omega_2(\vec{y})$ ($\Omega_1(\vec{x})$) under which the loop c_1 (c_2) appears as seen from a point $\vec{y} \in c_2$ ($\vec{y} \in c_1$):

DEFINITION III.1

SOLID ANGLE UNDER WHICH c_1 APPEARS FROM $\vec{y} \in c_2$:

$$\Omega_2(\vec{y}) = \vec{\nabla}_y \cdot \int_S d\hat{S} \frac{1}{|\vec{x} - \vec{y}|} \quad (3.15)$$

obtaining the following:

Lemma III.2

$$L_{Gauss}(c_1, c_2) = -\frac{1}{4\pi} \oint_{c_2} d\Omega_2(\vec{y}) = -\frac{1}{4\pi} \oint_{c_1} d\Omega_1(\vec{x}) \quad (3.16)$$

PROOF:

Since:

$$\vec{\nabla}_y \Omega_2(\vec{y}) = \vec{\nabla}_y (\vec{\nabla}_y \cdot \int_S d\hat{S} \frac{1}{|\vec{x} - \vec{y}|}) \quad (3.17)$$

and using eq.3.11, the first addendum gives the required result:

$$\vec{\nabla}_{y\alpha} \Omega_2(\vec{y}) = -4\pi\delta_\alpha(\vec{y}; S) \quad (3.18)$$

while the second term is:

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{\nabla}_y \wedge (\vec{\nabla}_y \wedge \int_S d\hat{S} \frac{1}{|\vec{x} - \vec{y}|}) &= \vec{\nabla}_y \wedge (\int_S d\hat{S} \wedge \vec{\nabla}_y \frac{1}{|\vec{x} - \vec{y}|}) = \\ &= \vec{\nabla}_y \wedge (\int_{c_1} d\vec{x} \frac{1}{|\vec{x} - \vec{y}|}) = \\ &= \int_{c_1} d\vec{x} \wedge \vec{\nabla}_y \frac{1}{|\vec{x} - \vec{y}|} = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

■

3. one observes that:

$$B_a = \partial_a \Omega \tag{3.20}$$

to obtain that:

$$L_{Gauss}(c_1, c_2) = - \oint_{c_1} dx_a B_a \tag{3.21}$$

Remark III.1

THE GEOMETRICAL CONSTRUCTION OF THE SOLID ANGLE:

Its important for later developments to clarify the meaning of the definition III.1 by the explicit geometric construction of $\Omega_2(\vec{y})$

1. one considers the sphere $S[\vec{y}, 1]$ with center \vec{y} and unit radius.
2. one consider the portion induced on $S[\vec{y}, 1]$ by making the radius-vector to turn around c_1

Denoted by $WORK(c_1, c_2)$ the work required to move a unit magnetic charge around a loop c_1 in the presence of the magnetic field due to a unit electric current along a loop c_2 , we have obtained, following step by step the proof by Hagen Kleinert, the following:

Theorem III.1

THEOREM ON THE PHYSICAL MEANING OF GAUSS LINKING NUMBER ON THE MINKOWSKY SPACE-TIME

HP:

$$st = (\mathbb{R}^4, \eta_{ab} := \eta_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu \otimes dx^\nu)$$

c_1, c_2 loops in the space-like surface $\{x^\mu \in \mathbb{R}^4 : x^0 = 0\}$ of st

TH:

$$WORK(c_1, c_2) = L_{Gauss}(c_1, c_2)$$

Let us now alter topologically \mathbb{R}^4 by a suitable cutting of a part $P_{\text{throw away}}$ of its

$$X := \mathbb{R}^4 - P_{\text{throw away}} \tag{3.22}$$

in a way such that:

$$\pi_1(X) \neq 0 \tag{3.23}$$

For example we could choose $P_{\text{throw away}} := \{x^\mu \in \mathbb{R}^4 : (x^1)^2 + (x^2)^2 < 1\}$.

One can still repeat all the passages of the proof of the theorem III.1 and everything would seem to remain ok.

But let us try to repeat the construction of the remark III.1: turning around c_1 the radius-vector, at a certain point, meets the cutted $P_{\text{throw away}}$. Since according to how many times it turns around it in closing its trajectory one obtains different values, it follows that $\Omega_2(\vec{y})$ is no more uniquely defined.

Let us observe that, in such a situation, the physically observable quantity $WORK(c_1, c_2)$ is again given by the linking number among the two loops but the topological alteration of the ambient space changes such a quantity, posing constraints on the ways one loop can be deformed smoothly in order of winding around the other.

Leaving aside these heuristic considerations, let us formalize the situation introducing the necessary notions of Knot Theory (following the 1th chapter "Knots and polynomial invariants" of [19]).

Given a 3-differentiable-manifold M :

DEFINITION III.2

K IS AN M-KNOT:

$$\exists f : S^1 \mapsto M \text{ smooth embedding} : K = f(S^1) \tag{3.24}$$

DEFINITION III.3

L IS AN M-LINK OF n COMPONENTS:

$$\exists f : \cup_{dis\ i=1}^n S^1 \mapsto M \text{ smooth embedding} : K = f(\cup_{dis\ i=1}^n S^1) \tag{3.25}$$

where \cup_{dis} denotes the **disjoint union**:

$$S_1 \cup_{dis} S_2 := (S_1 \cup S_2) - (S_1 \cap S_2) \quad (3.26)$$

Given two knots K_1 and K_2 :

DEFINITION III.4

K_1 IS ISOTOPIC TO K_2 ($K_1 \sim_I K_2$)

$$\exists h_t : M \mapsto M, t \in [0, 1] \text{ family of homeomorphisms} : h_0 = Id_M \text{ and } h_1(K_1) = K_2 \quad (3.27)$$

Similarly, given two links L_1 and L_2 :

DEFINITION III.5

L_1 IS ISOTOPIC TO L_2 ($L_1 \sim_I L_2$)

$$\exists h_t : M \mapsto M, t \in [0, 1] \text{ family of homeomorphisms} : h_0 = Id_M \text{ and } h_1(L_1) = L_2 \quad (3.28)$$

Let us now introduce the following basic:

DEFINITION III.6

M-LINKING NUMBER OF L_1 AND L_2 :

$$M - LN(L_1, L_2) := \text{card}(F \cap L_2 \cap M), L_1 = \partial F \quad (3.29)$$

What is essential to us is the dependence of the definition III.6 from M.

One has that:

Theorem III.2

M-LINKING NUMBER VERSUS GAUSS' LINKING NUMBER:

$$\mathbb{R}^3 - LN(L_1, L_2) = LN_{Gauss}(L_1, L_2) \quad \forall L_1, L_2 \quad (3.30)$$

but considering a non-trivial M the linking-number changes.

In fact, in the case of our topologically non-trivial flat space-time (X, η_{ab}) one has that:

$$WORK(c_1, c_2) = (X \cap \{x^\mu \in \mathbb{R}^4 : x^0 = 0\}) - LN(c_1, c_2) \neq \mathbb{R}^3 - LN(L_1, L_2) \quad (3.31)$$

Let us observe that the fact that in the minkwoskian case $X = \mathbb{R}^4, M = \mathbb{R}^3$, $WORK(c_1, c_2)$ may be computed by the formal equation (cfr. [20] or the section 13.5 "Chern-Simons theory and knots" of [21])

$$\mathbb{R}^3 - LN[L_1, L_2] = -\frac{ki}{\pi} \log(\langle W(1, L_1)W(1, L_2) \rangle) \text{ w.r.t. } CS(\mathbb{R}_{1p.c}^4, U(1)) \quad (3.32)$$

(where $CS(\mathbb{R}_{1p.c}^4, U(1))$ is a Chern-Simons quantum field theory on the one-point compactification of \mathbb{R}^4 with gauge group $U(1)$, $W(n, L) := \exp(in \oint_L A)$ being Wilson loops) is useless as to the computation of $M - LN(L_1, L_2)$ in the topologically non-trivial flat space-time (X, η_{ab}) where $-\frac{ki}{\pi} \log(\langle W(1, L_1)W(1, L_2) \rangle) \text{ w.r.t. } CS(X_{1p.c}, U(1))$ has no reason to be again proportional to $(X - \{x^\mu \in \mathbb{R}^4 : x^0 = 0\}) - LN(L_1, L_2)$.

IV. THE TOPOLOGICAL INDETERMINATION OF THE REFERENCE-SPACE-TIME

Let us now consider two loops c_1 and c_2 lying on a space-like 3-submanifold M of an arbitrary curved spacetime (Y, g_{ab}) and suppose that we want to infer the value $WORK(c_1, c_2)$ applying the Principle of Equivalence.

Such a principle tells us that such a quantity may be expressed as:

$$WORK(c_1, c_2) = N - LINK(c_1, c_2) \quad (4.1)$$

where N is a 3-differentiable submanifold of Y to be deduced by the form that the expression $WORK(c_1, c_2)$ assumes on a reference flat space-time $st_{REF} = (Z, \eta_{ab})$ such that $Z \sim_T Y$ applying the ansatzII.1.

But, by Markov's Theorem, we cannot decide which is the 4-differentiable-manifold $Z \sim_T Y$ and hence the reference flat space-time $st_{REF} = (Z, \eta_{ab})$ to be adopted and, consequentially, we cannot decide which N has to be adopted in eq.4.1.

-
- [1] J. Polchinski. *String Theory, Vol 1. An introduction to the bosonic string*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998.
- [2] J. Polchinski. *String Theory, Vol 2. Superstring Theory and beyond*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998.
- [3] R. Gambini J. Pullin. *Loops, knots, gauge theories and quantum gravity*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.
- [4] J. Ambjørn M. Carfora A. Marzuoli. *The Geometry of Dynamical Triangulations*. Springer, Berlin, 1997.
- [5] A. Connes. *Noncommutative Geometry*. Academic Press, San Diego, 1994.
- [6] D.R. Finkelstein. *Quantum Relativity*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997.
- [7] E. Prugovečki. *Quantum Geometry. A Framework for Quantum General Relativity*. Kluwer Academic Publisher, Dordrecht, 1992.
- [8] G. Segre. Einstein's lifts and topology: topological investigations on the principle of equivalence. *gr-qc/0207114*, 2002.
- [9] S.W. Hawking G.F.R. Ellis. *The large scale structure of space-time*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1973.
- [10] C.W. Misner K.S. Thorne J.A. Wheeler. *Gravitation*. W.H. Freeman and company, New York, 1973.
- [11] R.M. Wald. *General Relativity*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1984.
- [12] D.J. Collins H. Zieschang. Combinatorial Group Theory and Fundamental Groups. In D.J. Collins R.I. Grigorchuk P.F. Kurchanov H. Zieschang, editor, *Combinatorial Group Theory and Applications to Geometry*, pages 3–166. Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1998.
- [13] R. Geroch J.B. Hartle. Computability and Physical Theories. *available at Toffoli's Quantum Computation Library <http://pks.bu.edu/qcl>*, 1986.
- [14] R. Geroch. Partial differential equations of physics. In G.S. Hall J.R. Pulham, editor, *General Relativity*, pages 19–60. Scottish University Summer School in Physics and Institute of Physics Publishing, Edinburgh and London, 1995.
- [15] M. Nakahara. *Geometry, Topology and Physics*. Institute of Physics Publishing, Bristol, 1995.
- [16] J.C. Maxwell. *A Treatise on Electricity and Magnetism*, volume 2. Dover Publication Inc.,

- New York, 1954.
- [17] H. Kleinert. *Path Integrals in Quantum Mechanics, Statistics and Polymer Physics*. World Scientific, Singapore, 1995.
 - [18] S. Majid. Fourier transforms on \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G} and knot invariants. *J. Math. Phys.*, 31(4):924–927, April 1990.
 - [19] T. Ohtsuki. *Quantum Invariants. A Study of Knots, 3-Manifolds and Their Sets*. World Scientific, Singapore, 2002.
 - [20] E. Witten. Quantum Field Theory and the Jones polynomial. In C.N. Yang M.L. Ge, editor, *Braid Group, Knot Theory and Statistical Mechanics, II*, pages 361–451. World Scientific, Singapore, 1994.
 - [21] J.C. Nash. *Differential Topology and Quantum Field Theory*. Academic Press, 1991.