

UNITED WISDOM

Bergson and Measurable Time

World and Consciousness

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W-12-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Bergson and Measurable Time

Epigraph

> *I merely count simultaneities, which is very different.*

Henri Bergson, Time and Free Will, II, p.108, F. L. Pogson's English translation, 1913 exemplar. A complete clause from the clock-observation sentence. The distinction concerns counting and philosophical duration within Bergson's argument; it does not cancel a specified physical measurement procedure.

What this article is about

Clocks answer how much time has passed, but equal minutes do not make two events equal in content. A much larger conclusion can follow too easily: measurable time is artificial and the only reality is inward. Bergson offers more demanding reading. His distinction between duration and numerical representation develops an argument containing strong claims about consciousness and motion. This article examines Chapter II of Time and Free Will through melody, pendulum, and the representation of movement. James's perception description and Einstein's definition of simultaneity stand alongside it without losing their differences. For UW, the value lies in asking which question measurement answers, what remains outside it, and when a useful number becomes an inappropriate assessment. The application concerns choosing a description carefully, rather than abandoning clocks, proving free will, or prescribing how life must be experienced.

I. What it means to measure

Imagine someone translating a letter during an allocated half-hour and recording the beginning and end. They know the interval, but must still establish whether the text is ready, its meaning preserved, and its request understandable. These questions have separate criteria. Taking twice as long changes the recorded cost without establishing quality or explaining delay. A term may have needed clarification, or external circumstances may have intervened. Measurement matters as specified evidence. Using it to answer another question requires an additional transition that should be named and checked.

Ordinary language often assigns that extra work to measurement silently. Study hours become understanding of a subject; numbers of meetings become relationship quality; length of reflection becomes seriousness of decision. A connection may be useful within a particular task, but the number alone does not establish it. What happened, how content was assessed, and whether conditions are comparable must be known. Here these are questions about our

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

descriptions, rather than confirmed general laws. An interval record's accuracy and the appropriateness of a conclusion drawn from it are separate checks, even when both matter.

Philosophical criticism begins by identifying measurement's subject. Are we comparing intervals, counting events, allocating available time, or judging experience? A number gains meaning through a specified question. Without one, impressive data can remain useless for a decision. This calls for clearer quantitative description rather than its rejection. Coordinating two people's availability cannot be replaced by impressions of their past week. Understanding a letter's difficulty cannot be replaced by a clock reading. A method's usefulness depends on the work it is expected to do.

Bergson matters through his insistence on the transition from experienced succession to a represented series. A contemporary reader need not agree in advance with every premise or assessment of that transition. The author's question can first be reconstructed and the selected example examined; a personal application can then be separated from the philosophical conclusion. This resists two hasty responses: dismissing measurement criticism as meaningless or turning it into a universal exposure of science. A substantive discussion needs an argument, an identified comparison, and a boundary beyond which the passage no longer supplies an answer.

II. Number presupposes distinction

In Chapter II, pp.99–106, Bergson contrasts succession represented as a line or chain with succession experienced through interpenetrating states. Numerical representation concerns distinguishable elements set alongside one another. This belongs to his philosophical duration argument, rather than a current brain study. The authorized translation is F. L. Pogson's actual 1913 exemplar. Neither the French original nor the entire treatise is examined here. Its title does not authorize a proof of free will from one selected passage about time.

Consider two comments on a translation. Counting them as two items helps avoid overlooking either. The first may change how the second is understood: clarifying the salutation can alter the tone of the concluding request. The item count survives while their relationship becomes important. Counting and understanding structure address different questions. This illustration does not confirm Bergson's metaphysics. It shows why a list sometimes needs its connections examined. Counting elements is useful; deriving completed understanding from their quantity requires a further criterion that remains to be established.

Not every distinction between parts is a distortion. Discussing an error requires isolating a phrase. Agreeing on work order requires separate actions. Returning to the whole can then show what the correction changed. Distinguishing and connecting can serve one task if their functions are clear. The practical question is what is lost when only one is used. Separate

items may be needed to start; checking their relationships may be needed to justify completion. This is an editorial inquiry, rather than a work protocol endorsed by Bergson.

Criticism of representation can therefore prompt examination of our own shortcuts. What content does a reported number assume? Which unchecked parts remain within an impression of the whole? Both forms have costs. A list can conceal relationships; an overall impression can conceal a missing condition. The reader can choose a description for the task and revise it when information changes. Within Path, this preserves an activity and its meaning without requiring every event to be described exclusively through quality, or every inner change to become a collection of units supposedly explaining its structure in advance.

III. Why the melody example matters

Bergson turns to melody on pp.100–104. His argument connects notes so that changing one affects the experienced whole. This is a philosophical interpenetration example, not an experiment establishing hearing's mechanism. James's Chapter XV, pp.605–610, also addresses connected succession with a different purpose. Comparison opens a question about experiencing parts in relation. It neither identifies the approaches as one doctrine nor establishes a universal perceptual duration for music, conversation, and thought.

The example itself should not be romanticized. A listener may be unable to name a melody's structure. A musician may distinguish technical parts while still perceiving a whole. Difficulty describing does not establish absent structure, and analysis does not establish that experience is exhausted by a list. Experience, subsequent account, and task-specific analysis can be distinguished. In an imagined musical discussion, someone describes an impression, another points to a passage, and both listen again. No step must become a final judgment on someone else's experience. Each adds specified information and permits clarification.

Transferring this to a life choice needs caution. A connected melody does not entail a harmonious life or a hidden meaning in every disrupted plan. That would be a new analogy needing its own grounds; it is not made here. A smaller question remains: can one changed circumstance alter the interpretation of others? Clarifying a letter's addressee may change an appropriate tone. That is checked against the letter and situation. It neither justifies every event nor promises inner harmony, and requires nobody to find coherence where they currently see rupture or uncertainty.

The image remains useful without a large promise. Equal element counts permit different relationships. An imagined letter can retain every phrase yet change meaning through rearrangement or clarification. Comparing its length alone is insufficient. Assessment needs an identified subject: message accuracy, appropriate address, or a comprehensible request. Minutes and a strong feeling of completion settle none of these independently. Bergson's

image highlights a limit of quantity-based description. A particular change's appropriateness is checked in its own field, without receiving evidence from the philosophical comparison itself.

IV. The pendulum and a strong consciousness claim

On pp.104–110, Bergson examines counting pendulum oscillations and coincidences with an observer's states, distinguishing juxtaposed symbols from experienced succession. He then makes a stronger claim: without conscious connection, his account leaves an isolated position, while duration belongs to the inner process. This retains its status as his philosophical position. It is not adopted as an established fact that removing a person stops physical processes. The argument can be studied without presenting its metaphysical commitments as a modern experimental result or a reader's obligatory belief.

A practical illustration is smaller. While translating, someone checks a clock and notices that the allocated interval has ended. They may simultaneously report that the task remains unclear. Both statements make sense: one concerns time spent and the other concerns work status. Unclarity does not falsify the clock, and an accurate reading does not complete understanding. They can stop, request clarification, or allocate another interval if available. Quantity supports a decision about costs; the letter's content identifies missing information. Neither check should substitute for the other.

Someone demonstrating depth by refusing to look at a clock adds a norm the example does not require. An ending time may be necessary for shared work. Another person awaits the material, must finish, or cannot extend the meeting. Discussing duration must preserve those conditions. Qualitative content does not cancel the cost of another person's waiting. A deadline does not confirm understood meaning either. Conflict needs clear information: what is ready, what is unknown, and which agreement is possible. Philosophical vocabulary cannot conduct that conversation instead of its participants.

The pendulum also cautions against oversized conclusions. Distinguishing experience from representation does not make every quantitative procedure mistaken. Criticizing a particular measurement requires identifying its subject, rule, and point of failure. A criticism concerning another subject should be labelled accordingly. Work hours do not exhaust a translation's description; that does not refute recording them. This limit allows a substantive philosophical critique without abandoning measurability generally, while retaining the question of whether Bergson's own stronger conclusion convinces the reader.

V. Movement and its trace

In Chapter II's selected continuation, pp.111–125, Bergson distinguishes movement from the spatial representation of what was traversed, discussing Zeno and division of motion. This is philosophical criticism of representation. The article reproduces no mathematical proof and concludes nothing against velocity descriptions or modern analysis. Such conclusions need other sources and independent examination. Bergson's position remains contextualized. The question retained is whether a series of positions supplies a complete account of a process, rather than a ready-made negative verdict on physics.

In an original example, a finished translation differs from the process producing it. The document contains final sentences without displaying every question, clarification, or correction. Version history adds information while still not reproducing the participant's whole experience. Distinguishing outcome from process helps discuss work without making the outcome less real. A finished letter may be appropriate regardless of how easily it was written. A difficult process guarantees no good result. Each assessment requires its own conditions rather than a single scale combining difficulty, length, and time.

Returning to an event's record happens from a current situation. Some relations are clearer, and information may have arrived later. A sequence of entries may prevent knowledge unavailable then from being attributed to an earlier participant. This is neither a universal memory theory nor diagnostic advice. It is a principle for discussing the illustration honestly: distinguish earlier information from current explanation. If a clarification changed a phrase's meaning, name that clarification. Retrospective clarity then need not become an accusation that everything was obvious beforehand and someone simply refused to act correctly.

Both descriptions have practical uses. An outcome serves an addressee needing to understand the letter. Process information may inform the next task: what should be clarified earlier, how much time is available, and who must confirm a disputed term. Examining the whole process is unnecessary when only the finished message matters. The task and inquiry's cost guide the choice. Returning to every step should not become a compulsory condition of depth. Bergson's distinction alerts us to substitution; contemporary work with a letter remains a separate application, usable where it answers the person's question.

VI. A physical definition remains a definition

In §1 of Einstein's 1905 paper, local clocks A and B do not yet supply common time without a synchronization rule. Section 2 compares relatively moving systems and simultaneity. This is a physical construction with explicit conditions, not a claim about inner quality. Comparison with Bergson asks what has been defined and which question remains outside it. Bergson's later relativity debate is not covered. An 1889 work in a 1913 English exemplar does not establish the contents of a 1922 dispute.

A strong philosophical criticism may say the procedure leaves true duration outside it. That does not yet show the procedure failing at its physical function. Two levels can be retained: a specified measurement's adequacy and a philosophical claim to exhaustive description of time. They can be discussed separately. Someone may judge measurement incomplete for experience without accepting that consciousness creates external succession. Clocks can be useful while experienced content remains a question. This is a limited comparison, rather than a proposal to reconcile every assertion through one contemporary vocabulary.

Observer particularly needs caution. In clock coordination it concerns a role within physical description; in philosophical discussion it may concern conscious connection of states. A shared word does not identify the roles. Mood, attention, and belief cannot be transferred into an explanation of relative simultaneity. Nor can a physical definition prove absent inner experience. Such a transition needs separate grounds; none is made here. Sources clarify a boundary instead of creating the impression that science has confirmed a desired philosophy.

Within Path, a useful question remains. If an assessment differs from a record, identify the disagreement. Was time spent different? Did the task's content change? Was completion undefined? Does someone understand the outcome's value differently? Only then can a check be selected. A mismatch need not mean personal error or profound crisis. Clarifying a deadline, phrase, or addressee's expectation may suffice. Proportionate inquiry preserves the limit of quantity without making every encounter with a schedule, report, or external requirement demand a special inner transformation.

VII. Quality supplies no universal assessment

Content assessment also needs a question and limits. A letter can feel complete while a condition is missing; an accurate message can be prepared without special clarity. Qualitative description has no automatic superiority over another check. It communicates how someone understands the process, what matters to them, and where difficulty remains. Readiness requires further task-appropriate information. A subjective account need not be the sole judge to deserve attention. Its role is lost when it must simultaneously confirm meaning, outcome, and the causes of everything that occurred.

Between people, an imposed scale is especially unhelpful. One assesses accuracy, another tone, and a third the agreed deadline. All criteria can matter. Conflict requires identifying the priority and available change in that situation. Requiring an answer by a specified time does not make someone superficial. Pointing to a meaning error instead of acknowledging hours spent does not establish indifference. Process and outcome accounts allow different interests to be discussed, retaining another person's right to name their criterion and decline an imposed assessment.

There is a material side. A participant may understand the task without having conditions to complete it. Work, travel, or necessary assistance restrict the interval. Fullness of experience does not automatically add hours. Distinguishing quality and quantity cannot replace changed conditions. A next step may need an agreement, resource, or withdrawal from an unmanageable promise; it may be unavailable now. The limit can be named without a judgment of weak intention. A philosophy of duration should not demand a hidden inner resource supposedly compensating for every external shortage.

Qualitative and quantitative descriptions can support a decision without a common score. A number indicates cost and availability; an account describes content and an open question. The task's criterion relates them to action. Suppose an addressee needs a precise term while little time remains. Confirmation, an interim answer, or acknowledgment of impossibility may be possible. Choice depends on conditions and agreement. It is not derived from a melody image or guaranteed correct by recording. The distinction's practical value is a precise question that can actually be discussed and examined.

VIII. Reading criticism without losing its subject

Reading Bergson substantively benefits from separating example, argument, and conclusion's strength. Melody concerns relationships in experience. The pendulum examines counting and symbolic representation. Motion extends the critique to a process's depiction. The next question is whether those grounds support the stronger philosophical assertions. A reader can accept some distinctions and leave a conclusion open. That is not evasion when what is accepted, treated as a position, and unproved in the passage is stated clearly. Agreement with an interesting example need not mean accepting an entire metaphysics.

James adds a boundary: connectedness of the perceived present is not Bergson's duration in its full philosophical role. Einstein adds a specified definition not intended to answer every experiential question. No unified theory assigns each author a convenient component here. Subjects and transitions are progressively clarified. This may suffice for reflection. Philosophical reading need not settle a question forever to improve language and make a previously obvious-looking conclusion from a number or an impression less hasty.

Returning to the imagined letter, someone can decide what needs checking now. Time spent is known; a disputed phrase's meaning is not. More minute-counting will not close that question. Alternatively, content is agreed but no working interval is available. Further clarity will not secure completion. The distinction leads to different actions and allows no immediate solution. It is a contemporary UW application. Sources help formulate limits; the available step is decided within the situation. Neither rejecting measurement nor declaring an inner account final truth is required to use the distinction.

Bergson's criticism remains demanding when it avoids becoming a slogan. It asks which subject a convenient representation has replaced and whether that replacement suits the task. Sometimes it does: a deadline or cost comparison is needed. Sometimes content remains an important open question. Naming both cases neither turns life into a table nor requires unconditional trust in impressions. It preserves precise description, considered choice, and acknowledgment of limits. Their place in a life remains the person's decision, rather than a number on a clock or the authority of a philosophical quotation.

What this means in practice

Choose a situation where a number is used for assessment: work time, meeting duration, or a step count. State what you want to learn. If it is settled, no further inquiry is needed. This is an original UW proposal, neither a method with established efficacy nor Bergson's practical recommendation.

Name the measured subject and its definition. Then identify the conclusion drawn: cost, understanding, quality, or availability. A content conclusion needs a separate criterion and available evidence. Do not replace it with a demand for vivid experience. Missing information can leave the conclusion open without a general accusation of wasted time.

Consider your qualitative account separately. What does it report about process, and what does it assume about outcome or another person's intention? Clarify meaning and the agreed criterion with a participant if needed. They may offer another question or decline further discussion. Your sense of completion alone does not confirm mutual understanding.

Choose an available step only if needed: clarify a condition, check an outcome, agree a deadline, or acknowledge an absent resource. A correct attitude to duration cannot be promised to remove external constraints. Once the original question is answered, stop. The practice distinguishes subjects of description without requiring continuous assessment of every life interval.

Key quotation

> *We have not defined a common “time” for A and B*

Albert Einstein, On the Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies, §1, W. Perrett and G. B. Jeffery translation, 1923. A complete clause from a sentence continuing with the required light-signal coordination rule. It concerns a common time not yet defined within the procedure, rather than absent time or physical reality.

Connections between traditions

Texts and locators	Comparison	Boundary
Bergson, II, pp.100–106, melody; James, XV, pp.605–610, succession	Connected parts invite questions about an isolated element's limits.	Bergson's philosophical duration differs from James's perception description.
Bergson, II, pp.104–110, pendulum; Einstein, §1, clocks A/B	Identify measurement's subject and procedure before assessment.	A metaphysical consciousness argument is not a physical synchronization rule.
Bergson, II, pp.111–125, motion/representation; Einstein, §2, measured rod	Representation and a defined measurement operation follow their questions.	Philosophical criticism does not establish physical error; calculations are not reproduced here.
Bergson, II, pp.100–104, interpenetration; James, XV, pp.609–610, perceived duration's parts	Distinguishing parts can be compared with considering their relationships.	No common neural mechanism or ontology is asserted.
Bergson, II, pp.104–110, counting; James, XV, p.611, symbolically conceived intervals	An interval's magnitude does not exhaust an activity's content.	Translation is an original UW illustration with no established work-quality effect.
Bergson, II, pp.115–121, mechanical representation; Einstein, Introduction and §§1–2	Clarify explanatory scope before a strong conclusion about time.	The 1889 work and its 1913 translation exemplar do not establish the 1922 debate's content.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Primary sources

1. Henri Bergson, Time and Free Will, authorized F. L. Pogson English translation; George Allen & Company / Macmillan, 1913 exemplar. Selected contiguous Chapter II passage, pp.99–125: melody, pendulum, duration, and motion. Strong consciousness claims retain philosophical status; the whole treatise and later relativity debate are outside this article.

2. Albert Einstein, On the Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies, 1905; W. Perrett and G. B. Jeffery, The Principle of Relativity, Methuen, 1923; John Walker electronic edition. Introduction and §§1–2, pp.1–5: synchronization and reference systems. The physical definition does not describe inner duration.

3. William James, The Principles of Psychology, XV, original English, 1890; Christopher D. Green transcription, York University. Pages 605–610 and opening p.611: perceived succession and symbolically conceived intervals. No current universal perception mechanism is established.

Tags

Bergson, duration, measurable time, time, numerical representation, quality, quantity, melody, pendulum, motion, spatial representation, succession, interpenetration, consciousness, philosophical argument, Einstein, synchronization, simultaneity, reference system, William James, perception, Path, task criterion, process, outcome, time costs, available conditions, comparison limits

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a co-author of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.