# The Tangibility of Time

**Daniel L. Butler, M.S.Ed (Ph.D, in progress)**
Associate Professor
Dept. Coordinator of Interdisciplinary Studies, NYIT
United States of America

**Abstract**

*In this article, I explore the first installment of a closer examination of time and how understanding time can influence how we live. Examining time as a self-conscious opportunity to adjust one's future for the better is the premise of this article.*

Part One

The Tangibility of Time

*"Nobody sees a flower really;*
*It is so small. We haven't time, and to see*
*takes time…"*

*-Georgia Okeeffe*

Igrew up in Queens, New York City where there was never enough time to do much of anything as a young adult. In fact, some say that living in NYC is equivalent to living "the fast life" as in to equate life with speed. Others have said, "If you can make it in New York, you can make it anywhere". It can be assumed that the fortunate survival of individuals in a fast paced environment contends survival anywhere in the world. Essentially, human beings in urban areas and in major cities live life so fast that seldom do they ever have time to explore the idea of the essentiality of time in their lives. The essentiality I speak of applies to both the countryman and the city man and is coming to the knowing and acceptance that everything in essentiality will either happen or conclude. In her article, *Essentiality Conferred*, Sveinsdo´ttir (2008) maintains that essentiality is conferred by our use of concepts—not by how we have used them, but how we are committed to using them (pg. 138). I submit that how individuals commit to using time makes the experience the tangible manifestation of time. Sveinsdo´ttir (2008) adds, "essentiality is conferred by ideal versions of us concept users, when they are maximally knowledgeable and attentive to how we are committed to using concepts" (pg. 138) strengthening the idea that if human beings were able to perceive time as something attainable, then human beings would maximize their time to regard his or her present conscious awareness as a linear manifestation of onward adjustability.

Religion, philosophy and science have all been concerned with time (Leisman, 2006). In her book, *Big Ideas:* Time, Hoffman (2010) asks, does it exist? What is it made of? Can we know it in itself? Or see it as only through a glass darkly? (pg.64). I attempt to answer these questions and define time philosophically as a framework for humans to live better lives and experience better outcomes.

The notion that once you lose today, you can never get it back, always struck a chord with me. I believe there is a fundamental process by which time organically operates allowing you to have your day back, or in simple terms—the chance to redo and vindicate your mistakes. For an individual's vantage point the concept of time can be generated from the very moment one open's his or her eyes or as far back as when one is conceived. Nevertheless, until one is able to conceive an event as an experience then time has not truly been activated.

Ever heard the saying, "only time will tell"? Essentially, one is saying: let's see how this experience, over time, turns out—let's wait for *time's* outcome? The mere fact that time is equated to the outcome supports the notion that humans do associate time with experience and vice versa. Time is therefore a singular opportunity for one to regard his or her present conscious-awareness as a linear and fully clothed manifestation of onward adjustability.

The idea of onward adjustability puts forth the idea that one is in control of every forward moving behavior, choice, decision—all the ideas that we connote to productivity. Does a child conceive time the same way an adult does at this juncture? No. For a child, time moves slow and there is no real grasp of time, nor the restraints of limited time to accomplish said goals. Children experience little experiences and don't really pay them much mind—unless the more sever experiences that have detrimental effects on them. For the adult, there is never enough time to accomplish many tasks. This is why in a fast paced environment there is little room to rethink outcomes. Since there is very little time to make the necessary adjustments regarding simple decision processes more and more mistakes are commonly made. These mistakes are commonly the ripple effect that often leads to uninvited and displeasing outcomes—even catastrophes.

The conundrum of time is this four part series. This concept of time—a rather life changing one-- makes it very easy to change potential negative outcomes into positive ones. Leisman (2012) defined time as "the dimension along which events are ordered from the past through the present into the future, and the measure of durations of events and the intervals between them" (pg. 341). It is then safe to suggest that time which we would normally think and know of as *future*, isn't a future time at all but rather a certainty of experiences that will occur one way or another, good or bad. If you strip your physical nature from the confinements of time and vice versa, you are left with only the inevitabilities of life, not what we consider as a time frame of *future*. *Future* has no certainties. Experiences do. Cranton (2006) describes it this way:

> Our habitual expectations—what we expect to happen based on what has happened in the past—are the product of experiences, and it is those expectations that are called into question (pg. 8)

*Future* is therefore questionably undefined. However, I'm suggesting that if we consider onward adjustability as a conscious time effort, then one can and will indeed define their future. *Future* in this way is like being on a ship with a sail but without a compass—there is no set point of direction, no certainties, no measure of a time (i.e. having a set time of when to *arrive*) as a restriction and no criteria for arriving at any given outcome. On the relevance of the past, present and future, Forstl (2013) summarizes it this way:

> The past—but not the future—is a part of our presence and both are real and relevant. Past and presence offer the basis of different options for future developments as we experience them. But if it was true, would it imply that our experience and reality had to expand constantly with time? (pg. 95)

We can hope to arrive at the desired place, or outcome, and even take the necessary measures to get there, but it is our experiences that steer the ship. That's the creation of one's future in their time. Time, from this point of view, which doesn't restrict one's life to perform, is the perfect juncture in which potential catastrophes can be significantly altered or even prevented. This joining of time and outcome is called experiences. I'm asserting that given the right tools one can make the kind of experiences that only reflect controlled and well thought decisions, rather than on cause & effect—impulsive ones restricted by man-made timelines.

One has to imagine that there is vast amount of time space allotted yet ahead. Globally, we are taught that one or more of the following lie ahead: days, months ahead, years etc. However, none of that regimented time is promised or guaranteed. Therefore, time is not promised, nor do authentic outcomes guarantee success. Looking too far ahead keeps individuals in a complacent state of mind, preventing them from unlocking their potential and immediate practical successes. More focus should be placed on the *now experience* as a future projectile for change and transformational eventualities, not the *regimented time* ahead that doesn't exist and in most cases, is not guaranteed.

Hoffman (2010) says we perceive time mentally, and are shaped by it biologically. To absorb time in its voluptuousness, it is suggested that one simply put into perspective everything within their reach through use of: sight, sound, smell, taste & touch.

The stillness of a stationary object; the movement of ongoing traffic; the sound of the television; the silence of an empty room; the brightness of the light and even the darkness of the sky; the taste of a well-cooked Amberjack fish or even the dry thirst of a parched tongue. Each, in its own existence, contributes to the progressive survival and *life* challenging human experiences of its interrelation concomitants—you, the subject of the happening moment we label time.

Each, in its own existence exemplifies the physical manifestation of a desired outcome, hence the physical manifestation of a past time. Leismen (2012) sees time as evidently measurable stating that even if it weren't, what happens within its units is critical and vital to measuring the attributes of life itself (pg. 342). The wonder of time and its proportionate stake in the human life precipitates its fundamental processes—that in the regiments of *time*, catastrophes, or undesired outcomes, will imminently to follow. This is why we must eliminate the regiment of it. We must take away its tangibility and by fully understanding its intangibility freeing humans as a routine based species.

Time is the absolute value of intangibility. You can't physically grab hold of time nor safe keep it in some storage cabinet that you can always come back to whenever you need some. It's constantly unmoving, yet moving. It's constantly *flying*, as we say, yet it *stands still*. It's unimaginable to the imagination. It can't be boxed in considering, even in a physical box, its asomatous permanence prevails and reckons with that which it comes in contact with. It only exists through the carrying on and existence of human life. Without life, time doesn't incarnate. Time takes on its form and dresses in majestic garments when it comes into contact with our lives—through experiences and outcomes.

Generally, scientists attribute physical characteristics to time by the interrelations of one tangible object to another. Noffal (2011) simplify it by submitting that humans accelerate, much like mass, when subjected to a force (pg. 199). Our lives are subjected by time regimented forces on a daily basis: schedules, plans, deadlines, routines, lateness, due dates and so forth. Hoffman (2010) asserts that this problem started when new industries made human activity more advanced and therefore personal time less available. In a nutshell, *time* is the contrast-variable of objectivity movement to the action, speed or motion of another organism.

Simply, time can be defined as or measured by the calculation of approximate movement or motion of a thing in contrast to the motion of something entirely different. Biological time, whether it is bacterium, a plant or human, is represented by a temporally defined activity (Ridderbos, 2002). Therefore, if time always existed, it is safe to assume that two or more organisms have always contrasted in movement, creating a tangible manifestation of time. A single organism in isolation and remoteness isn't confined by or limited to the lengthiness or shortness of time. The organism simply exists. In complete solitude, the organism is not defined by the length of "time" it spends alone, nor is it dwelling in what we systematically try to define as "time". It isn't conformed to the boundaries we tend to bind it by or the limitless extents we attempt to freely give. In his observation of Newton's Law, Leismen (2012) views time as part of the fundamental structure of the universe—a dimension of independent of events, in which events occur sequentially (pg. 342)

Our minds are operating in a boxed contrast with everything around us, limiting our own interpretations of time. This limitation leaves me where I sit today—in a position to attempt to define it, understand how it operates and perhaps to redefine it in a way that helps individuals alter their decisions.

In summation, freeing one of the boundaries of synthetic time (i.e. man-made deadlines, time frames, and routines) in turn increases ones potential for increasing desired outcomes. In reality, being conscious of the unknown outcomes gives us the opportunities to create our own future outcomes and not the outcomes restriction grants us. To be successful, we must all participate as individuals moving in contrast to one another, both creating positive outcomes. The various attempts to define time, or to at least manifest its tangibility, are man's attempt to once again limit time from its enormity. The mere fact that we can't touch time makes it tangible. The existence of its non-existence gives us a chance to change our lives, and change the time we have to do so into whatever we want it to be. Time, according to Ribberdos (2002), is what happens when things change. When we change our lives we touch time.

**References**

Burgess, D. J. (2013). Evolution: Reconstructing essentiality. Nature Reviews. Genetics, 14(7), 442.

Cranton, P. (2006). *Understanding and promoting transformative learning* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Forstl, H. (2013). Parts of the Brain Represent Parts of the time. Evolution of Time: Studies of Time in Science, Anthropology, Theology (1).

Hoffman, E. (2010). Big Ideas : Time. London, GB: Profile Books.

Khamoui, A. V., Brown, L. E., Nguyen, D., Uribe, B. P., Coburn, J. W.,

Noffal, G. J., & Tran, T. (2011).Relationship Between Force-Time and Velocity-Time Characteristics of Dynamic and Isometric muscle Actions. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research, 25*(1), 198-204.

Leisman, G. (2012). Time. *Functional Neurology, Rehabilitation, and Ergonomics*,*2*(4), 341-342.

Ridderbos, K. (Ed.). (2002). Darwin College Lectures : Time. Cambridge, GB: Cambridge University Press.

Sveinsdóttir, Á. (2008). Essentiality conferred. Philosophical Studies, 140(1), 135-148.