

Real History's Clock Keeps Only Relative Time

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

18 May 2011

“A Timely Suggestion”

Academician V.I. Vernadsky had already made the point, implicitly: the role in history of simple clock-time, were properly regarded as very much a limited one. Take as an example of this, what has been, in effect, my own role as a forecaster.

This means, at first hand, that I am living and acting according to three different kinds of relative time. These are:

1. (Pfui!) Clock time.
2. Biological time.
3. Historical time.

My economic forecasting has been made in “historical time.”

To this we might add, wisely, scientific time, which belongs within both historical time, and scientific-progress time.

For a competent system of historical accounting, each and all of what I have just listed as varying qualities of the notion of lapsed time, or foreseeing of sundry qualities of time to come, should be correlated with respect to the subdividing standards of actually forecast, and “had actually happened.” “Capisce?”

Such were to be the basis for a significant improvement in the way we think politically.

Take, for example, the significance of using the notion of “seismic time,” or, also, “political expressions of physical-economic time.” Additions such as those bring us closer to the notion of a subsuming notion of “galactic time,” which has come onto our own choice of agenda now. Indeed, we have adopted,

in fact, a general notion of the term “galactical time,” as subsuming all categories of experience within our Solar System.

Overall, I would venture to suggest, that Albert Einstein, were he alive presently, would concur. Fortunately, by now, we should have had time to rid ourselves of captivity to the archaic follies embedded in the notions of “space and time.”

That much said here, up to this point in the writing of this report, all of such timely thoughts must be regarded as being superseded by a still higher, more than natural “clock,” by the notion of “human life time.” For, certainly, as Vernadsky had already indicated, the Noösphere supersedes the Biosphere in rank of authority; not only does it embody a higher order of creativity (anti-entropy) on Vernadsky’s scale, than that Biosphere which is superior to the Lithosphere; it reveals a relatively supreme principle of the universe.

This is, indeed, the relativity of a rather large family. That is, also, certainly a truthful picture of the situation we are in; but it falls short of the crucial point to be made and emphasized here. This is not merely a kind of map of the state of affairs in which we actually exist; it is a map for the accounting of our responsibilities to respond to the realities of our existing in such as that universe at relatively close hand.

That latter is my crucial point here.

It is the matter of how we should think of ourselves, if we wish to be really effective in making our judgments.

What This All Means—for You

The remaining question to be addressed, after the foregoing point is considered, is the matter assembled under the title: “What should this mean for you?” How do you, consequently, locate the reality of that identity which must define your reaction to such a conception? What must be your proper point of view of both the world and your self?

Are you still locating your own sense of personal identity as “little you” looking out, as from below, a conception which is your captivity; or, are you viewing yourself as looking from a vantage-point of a responsibility which you must accept as being on top of the location I have just described here up to this point?

I think that a goodly number among you, might be beginning, at the least, to understand my point.