

An imaginary one-dimensional world* (advancing into chaos) and its preserved 'past'

Original chaos during IO's registration of *instant 1* & *2*

↑ 'Active time' during IO's registration of *instant 2* (corresponding to a hypothetical process in a propagating 3-space reality, involving *gravitation*, that perhaps can be described by Reg Cahill's [Process Physics](#) – its “disappearing connections” just disappearing from sight into the ‘past’).

Every ray below this line belongs to a hypothetical 'active past' of standing waves representing the history of the universe up to this moment.

Possible ray (one aspect of an 'offer wave' or state vector) which may be established (in the 'active past') as a result of a future *transaction* (according to John G. Cramer's [Transactional Interpretation](#) of QM) when the temporal world is at W2b.

Repeatedly reflected rays of light (black lines) inside the enduring objects A and B (marked by parallel blue lines)

Reflection through
a distant molecule

Ray of light, (a hypothetical standing wave) created through a [transaction](#) between an emitter at W1 and an absorber (R), which as a result has sent an 'offer wave' to a vast future region, including possible occasions of the enduring objects A and B, who will be in position for a transaction when the temporal world is at W2b.

'Active time' during IO's registration of *instant 1*

Original chaos during IO's registration of *instant 1*

W_1, W_2, W_{2b} = The World during registration of *instant 1, 2, and 2b* by an *imaginary observer*.

x, x; o, o: Occasions close to these lines may have been regarded as contemporary by observers close to the enduring objects A and B, because light signals from these occasions would have met at a point (p_2), which – through measurements of the earlier point, p_1 , – is judged to be situated at equal distances from these occasions.

IO = Imaginary observer

This is how an *imaginary observer* (IO) of an extremely simplified world might explain the twin paradox:

Through changed directions of reproductory processes of matter (reflected light or energy) – immediately registered by IO, who is regarded as not moving – a ray of light of the ‘moving’ enduring object B, having been reflected back and forth a single period, has propagated a longer route, noted by IO, than the ray of a corresponding event of the enduring object A, which is not moving. But for the same reason, the ticking of a watch at B is adapted to this process just enough to show the same amount of time for it as a watch measuring the corresponding process at A. Everything is changed accordingly, so the natural laws are not (perceived as) changed. But between W1 and W2 there are fewer reflections noted at B than what is noted at A, which observers, who have followed A and B, may interpret, when they meet, as a proof that time has been ‘slower’ for B than for A. For the photons, who have followed C, the path without reflections would correspond to no time at all. Thus the longest way may seem to be the shortest, but actually every way, from one moment to another, has the same distance.

Bo Herlin http://home.swipnet.se/bo_herlin/time.html

* With no room for »Michelson and Morley« (length contraction is not considered here).