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**Editorial (‘TIME’)**

Why TIME? Continuing our foundational series (*Foundations I, II, III, …*) and examination of basic existential behaviors and their intersectionality with questions about human ecology and “ecopsychology,” the present issue focuses on various conceptualizations of time, time passing, and intervals, again, from transdisciplinary perspectives. By way of introduction, in his foundational work on ‘time,’ *About Time: Inventing the Fourth Dimension*, William Friedman (1990) made an observation that could be applied to most over-generalized concepts (e.g., ‘self,’ ‘nature,’ ‘consciousness’):

> Much of the history of the philosophy of time is a series of attempts to find time’s essence, whether in nature or in consciousness. Among those conceptions tying time to the physical world, time has been defined as motions, as the succession of events, and as an absolute, universal framework period. Mentalist definitions refer to the perception of succession and simultaneity or the succession of ideas in consciousness. In the midst of all this diversity is a common tendency to treat time as a single thing. Psychologists too seem inclined to seek a single entity, as they write of “the concept,” “the notion,” or “the sense,” of time. Perhaps the fact that we have a single word for time has seduced us into searching for its essence (1990: 5).

The “seduction” of slipping into ‘essential thinking’ might be due, in part, to our, mostly, taken-for-granted attitudes about time, in Friedman’s words: *“Usually … time remains in the background. It seems to surround us like space and is just as likely to be unnoticed. With little attention we move about in space without bumping into things, and so we seldom bump into time.”* (1990: 1)

The present volume showcases assumed and critically examined ideas of time from the perspectives of philosophy and neuroscience, environmental literature, education, and horticultural art. With these foundations in place further conversations might ensue about enshrining and thus privileging ‘time’ as an absolutism (an *empty signifier*), one’s cherished memories (e.g., nostalgia—see *Conesa, 2021, IJE Vol 2*), preferred developmental periods and epochs (as a ‘golden age’), “the future” (utopias and dystopias), or ambiguously defined and overgeneralized temporal reservoirs of epistemologically “superior” knowledge (as in ‘ancestral wisdom’). It is perhaps due to recurring human hubris that, in a decontextualized and conspiratorial manner, some people cherry pick or distort ‘facts from the past’ with the intention of upending factual history¹ -- are so bold as to believe that the ‘future is theirs to shape.’ To the extent that ‘time’ is a resultant of complex multi-systems transformations (the physical world and organisms—see Gruber, Block, and Montemayo in this issue), with most variables unknown or ever controlled, ‘creation’ is subordinate to its peculiarities—objective and subjective notions of ‘time.’

---

Two legacy papers, one from Bill Duvall the other from Michael J. Cohen, state ‘time’ implicitly and explicitly. Duvall’s (1980) is a time capsule and necessary reintroduction of deep ecological ideas carefully expressed long before the many reiterations of ‘deep ecology’ took hold:

There are several other phrases that some writers are using for the perspective I am describing in this paper. Some call it “eco-philosophy” or “foundational ecology” or the “new natural philosophy.” I use “deep ecology” as the shortest label. Although I am convinced that deep ecology is radically different from the perspective of the dominant social paradigm, I do not use the phrase “radical ecology” or “revolutionary ecology” because I think those labels have such a burden of emotive associations that many people would not hear what is being said about deep ecology because of their projection of other meanings of “revolution” onto the perspective of deep ecology.

I contend that both streams of environmentalism are reactions to the successes and excesses of the implementation of the dominant social paradigm. (1980: 1)

On that note, it is the editor’s contention that fewer ‘ecopsychology’ writers are invested in or write from Devall’s perspective of “intellectual archeology.”

Cohen’s work is, in essence, a reiteration and summary of his nature (natureness) pedagogy. His heartfelt attempt at classifying multiple and complex eigenwelt << >> umwelten relational aspects (his “senses” and “essences”), from a phenomenological perspective, entices one to delve and inquire into the ecosemiotics of time. Dr. Cohen was gracious enough—an aspect of his generous nature—to meet with us, in person.

We are always thankful and indebted to all the reviewers who provided invaluable feedback and to those who continue supporting our efforts.
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George Conesa, Editor-in-Chief, Ozette, WA, September 2023
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