



# Theorizing Social Acceleration. Criticisms for Today's Society

*Teorizando la aceleración social.  
Crítica para la sociedad de hoy*

FELIPE TORRES (P. Universidad Católica de Chile).<sup>1,2</sup>

Artículo recibido: 5 de noviembre de 2025  
Solicitud de revisión: 23 de enero de 2026  
Artículo aceptado: 24 de febrero de 2026

Torres, Felipe (2026). Theorizing Social Acceleration. Criticisms for Today's Society. *Recerca. Revista de Pensament i Anàlisi*, 31(1), pp. 1-19. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6035/recerca.9262>

## Abstract

This paper seeks to expose the background, approaches, and central criticisms of the social acceleration thesis. It is proposed that the fundamental aspects of this theorization on social time correspond to a model of special interest for the contemporary world given its capacity to articulate theory and empirical studies. It is postulated that this articulation represents an axis of special interest for current critical theory.

**Key Words:** social acceleration, critical theory, social theory, theorizing, Frankfurt School.

## Resumen

Este artículo busca exponer los antecedentes, planteamientos y críticas centrales de la tesis de la aceleración social. Se propone que los aspectos fundamentales de esta teorización sobre el tiempo social corresponden a un modelo de especial interés para el mundo contemporáneo dada su capacidad de articular teoría y empiria. Se postula que esta articulación representa un eje de especial interés para la teoría crítica actual.

**Palabras clave:** aceleración social, teoría crítica, teoría social, teorización, Escuela de Frankfurt.

<sup>1</sup> [ftorren@uc.cl](mailto:ftorren@uc.cl)

<sup>2</sup> Funding Grant. FONDECYT Iniciación, ANID. Project number: 11240326.

## INTRODUCTION

This is not so much a paper about practices under a regime of social acceleration, but rather about how the theory of social acceleration is itself a critical practice. Following the pathos opened by the early authors of this tradition, the paper will go beyond its historical framework (the first half of the 20th century) and geographical location (Western Europe, particularly Germany) to address what, under certain criteria that I intend to specify throughout the paper, constitutes the critical theory of acceleration. Often, one of the best ways to situate theoretical practice is to clarify the lines that contribute to delineating it, as well as to identify its scope. Following this, the paper will present an analysis of the theory of social acceleration, both in terms of its strengths and some of its limitations. This theory will be presented as a highly original proposal within the current tradition of social and critical theory, which, of course, does not come without weaknesses and shortcomings. To do this, I proceed in three steps: 1) I begin by briefly reconstructing the main concepts that comprise it and that come from different traditions of thought (mainly philosophy, history, and sociology); 2) secondly, I analyze and evaluate its impact and reception both in discussions in Europe and, especially, Latin America where it has been received with great attention; and 3) in the final section, I present some of the criticisms that the acceleration approach has also received, emphasizing both the limitations and possibilities of such criticisms from a comparative perspective. Finally, I conclude by discussing the potential of the acceleration perspective for social criticism in the 21st century.

### 1. THEORY, CRITICISM, AND THEIR PREVAILING CONTEXT

Theory and criticism have undergone significant changes in recent times. Regarding theory, it has been argued that what characterizes the explanation of general trends today is more an ongoing way to theorize than a conclusive theory. In this sense, rather than providing a totalizing/totalized explanation of reality, what is needed today is to *theorize* as a process about the general aspects of society (Abbott, 2016; Carleheden, 2019). This observation is not without meaning in a context of high fragmentation and plurality in contemporary knowledge, rendering a *comprehensive* explanation more difficult, especially when it is coupled with the

pretension of privileged observation and, to a large extent, excessively generalizing certain phenomena. Thus, theoretical production today is marked by a work that focuses mainly on specific aspects of social reality in order to advance more general proposals about social life. In addition, the transitive factor also deserves to be highlighted: *theorizing* in action also means placing oneself on a continuum to which new information and data can constantly be added, so that it can hardly ever be considered complete, as might be the case with a theory in the strict sense (Swedberg, 2012), with closure and exhaustiveness' appeals. Yet this procedure is not without risks. Probably one of the most important ones is the resignation to one of the traditional tasks of theory, namely, identifying what is common in diversity. All in all, it is still possible to defend that there are several commons within diversity, and the contemporary theory is requested to address them separately to see their richness and complexities, instead of subsuming—and thereby almost nullify them—into one general theory of the social. With regard to criticism, it is possible to establish more or less the same precautions: accepting the lack of a common general framework for diagnosing and evaluating all social processes and recognizing the recurring lack of an empirical basis for the formulation of proposals and, therefore, the preponderance (even arrogance) of a view that pays little attention to the differences between societies and within them. Taking this into account, the first thing I would like to highlight is that the thesis of acceleration fits within the definition of a theorization about today's society rather than the closure of a general theory—usually considered as the *strict* sense of theory. I defend that acceleration theory does not comply the requisites of a general theory—does not even look for it—because its purpose is not to cover all aspects of social reality as system theory or the theory of communicative action. Its call is different. It seeks to name a set of time—sometimes also space—related to social affairs such as the speed of production and consumption, the steady technological changes, the cultural process in motion (fashion, trends), the rapid communication and transportations mean, among others, that in aggregation compose a regime of acceleration (Torres, 2022).

However, it is also possible to develop a broad-based theory without falling into the trap of a *general theory of society* or an *ontology of the social*, while also avoiding long-range scrutiny under the siege of specific data. Later on, I will show that there are various justified criticisms of the theory of acceleration, but one of its advantages undoubtedly lies in

the fact that it can effectively cover several of the levels outlined above: it can be considered a theorization of contemporary temporal life, it seeks to be empirically grounded, and, from there on, aims to account for the contingent structures that underlie the temporality of today's societies—without any closure. Overall, as we can easily recognize, it is no small feat.

## 2. THEORIZING ACCELERATION. BACKGROUND ON CRITICALLY THEORIZING ABOUT TIME

Critical theory has been concerned with time since its foundation. Although not systematically and often without directly mentioning the term, the fact is that, since the analyses of the first generation of the Frankfurt School, the question of change in the social structures and the forces that historically govern social life has been steady. This is the case in *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (1998) and the analysis of the change brought about by the Enlightenment's promise of a *rational* society, which later led to new forms of state repression and cultural domination. Time is also present in Herbert Marcuse's *Reason and Revolution* (2024 [1941]) as a historical and conceptual reconstruction of the *truth* influenced by Hegelian emancipatory projects in political milieus, with special attention to what the future might hold or what might be expected from the progression of reason. Yet critical theses on time have been developed mainly outside the Frankfurt School tradition. Most of the direct critical theses on temporality have focused on phenomena of space-time compression (Harvey, 1990; Warf, 2008), the constitution of time and the *other* (Fabian, 1983), as well as the colonization cases through the imposition of uses of time (Bourdieu, 1963; Nanni, 2012; Conrad, 2016). Each of these approaches highlights how time is used as a tool for symbolic distinction under labels such as *advanced vs. primitive* societies (Fabian) or for domination, when it comes to allowing or prohibiting the celebration of rites and the imposition of calendars on cultures tied to colonial regimes (Nanni, Conrad).

We can thus see that critiques of time, and the thesis of acceleration more particularly, do not respond to theorizations coming out strictly from the Frankfurt School. Several of the time critical scholars have no direct connection to the Institut für Sozialforschung (IfS). To put it clearly then, the theory of acceleration has not been developed strictly within the framework of what is commonly defined as the Frankfurt School (Jay,

1988; Jeffries, 2016). Hartmut Rosa, surely one of its leading exponents, has an ambiguous relationship with the Frankfurt tradition. At times he has emphasized his belonging to the cannon, while at others he has been less enthusiastic (Schiermer & Rosa, 2017; Torres & Rosa 2021). The next question goes: is acceleration theory a critical theory of the Frankfurt School? Here, it is necessary to ponder what might mean to inherit a theoretical spirit and how it can transcend the institutional boundaries of its origin. Therefore, beyond direct affiliation with one school or another, we must evaluate whether the theory follows the critical path developed within the IfS umbrella. In the critical stance that the authors of the IfS would surely support, we can observe that acceleration theory emphasizes two key aspects of the critic: on one hand, the diagnosis of the era's major trends (*Zeitdiagnose*), and, on the other hand, the alienating and pathological potentials of such trends. Without attempting to identify all the criteria that would allow us to define a theory as 'critical' in the Frankfurt School fashion, it seems to me that the two parameters mentioned before are transversally present in the work of emblematic authors of this tradition, such as Theodor W. Adorno, Herbert Marcuse, Friedrich Pollock, Max Horkheimer, Karl Korsch, or Walter Benjamin. Yet these criteria are also present in the work of authors out of the Frankfurt School orbit, while at the same time those works would not be questioned in terms of their critical potential only because their authors do not belong to the Frankfurt tradition, such as Franz Fanon, Angela Davis or Nancy Fraser, to name a few.

My claim here is that acceleration theory is a critical theory, but, above all, it is a theorization about society. It means that is a social theory that combines a theory of society along with a social ontology in Mikael Carleheden's sense (2024). A theory of society implies an exhaustive identification and description of the most relevant aspects of the social formations. Here we can count foundational theoretical coinages such as *rationalization*, *functional differentiation* or *industrialization*. A social ontology in turn supposes a normative ponder of those social formations. Canonical terms in this regard are *alienation*, *colonization*, *misrecognition*, and lately *extractivism*. Those pathologies arise after an evaluation of affirmative dimensions of society that are chained or challenged by them: *emancipation*, *equality*, *recognition*, *good life*. In our case, acceleration is both an identification and a description of the most fundamental features of time in western societies—in the sense of a theory of society—, as well as a normative

evaluation of its consequences—in a social ontology fashion. What it attempts to scrutinize first, and foremost, are the temporal conditions that transversally mark the so-called modern societies. The structuring lines of social life are those that present themselves to the observer after a process that brings together various theoretical and empirical sources. It requires all kinds of distinctions and selections, linking empirical and theoretical evidence with the author's reflections. Thus, we can see that changes in the productive and emotional lives of individuals influence the formation of their identities, or the well-documented work on the impact of new technologies on the development of transport and telecommunications (Birth, 2012). Such contributions shape some of the main theses on acceleration found in the *Social Acceleration* book (Rosa, 2013), but also in other works, such as *Empires of Speed* (Hassan, 2008) and *Speed and Politics* (Glezos, 2012). Having said that, critical practice potential is still there when acceleration theorizing unveils the environmental and human costs of steady, speeding up the limits of the possible. The theory of acceleration as a critical practice relies on the identification of concrete levels in which alienation occurs in technological societies of late capitalism. Both levels, the diagnosis and the critic, are consequences of the different currents with what acceleration theorists have built up their theorizations.

I move on now to outline some of the key background disciplines of the acceleration theory. Such an account will evidence a plural basis for the diagnosis and critic, as well as it will shed some light on the limits of such theorization, that I will expose in the third section.

### 3. PHILOSOPHICAL, HISTORICAL, AND SOCIOLOGICAL BACKGROUNDS

I will briefly divide the background of the acceleration thesis into three levels, the most notorious and prominent ones: philosophical, historical, and sociological.

Firstly, among the philosophical background, we can include Hans Blumenberg (2007) and Hermann Lübbe's (1992) works on the time structures of modern times. Rather than detailing the proposals of both authors, which are dense and at times hard to follow for a non-specialized reader—making it impossible to reduce them to two or three paragraphs in this paper—, I am interested in highlighting two aspects that represent a

direct influence on the theory of acceleration. The first one is Blumenberg's distinction between world time and lifetime, and the second one is Lubbe's thesis on presentism. The first distinction seeks to explain the conditions for a permanent search to maximize life options, in tune with economic growth demands. World perspectives are thus significantly broadening in the scientific and technical modern world, fostering a significant opening of possibilities about how the world should and/or can be. However, the time of life is always insufficient for the materialization of all possibilities, for which increasing speed seems to be the plausible solution. Blumenberg detects that temporality is altered in this split, turning acceleration into an equivalent of Christian salvation, but this time secularized: we can only make justice to the world if we increase the speed to consummate the opportunities that might be found in a rationalized world, whether explicitly or yet to be discovered (Blumenberg, 2007). In short, acceleration would be a response of the times to the growing consciousness of alternative worlds and the pressing need to consummate them. On the other hand, the notion of contraction of the present (*Gegenwartsschrumpfung*) in Lübbe (1992) refers to the inability to imagine history beyond the urgent. Carving in the wake of Blumenberg's thesis, Lübbe suggests that the emergence of alternatives opened by modern science and technology promote the urgency of their own developments, affecting the political dimension, which is subordinated and subsumed to other times. In this context, there is no horizon of expectation that can transcend the tyranny of the present, preventing politics and economy from focusing on directing the destiny of society, turning instead to the resolution of immediate issues in the best cases, and succumbing to irrelevance in the worst.

In second place, considering the historical background, I must mention Koselleck and his thesis on the temporalization of history (Koselleck, 2000). Koselleck's proposal pursues to explain the growing awareness of a history without a fixed or extemporaneous telos. Waves of secularization, together with scientific and political revolutions, alter timeless narratives about the direction of history, knowledge, and social organization, respectively, placing meanings, knowledge, and norms in time. In other words, there are no timeless meanings, universal laws, or natural norms that must be followed without consideration of the era in which they emerged. In this way, both the atrocities/calamities, as well as the betterments in different spheres (medicine, nutrition, connectivity), can also be overcome or

achieved, respectively, based on the defined social pace. Accelerating in this case is another way of seeking the fulfillment of the maximum possible ideals in different fields such as science or justice. This speeding up condition allows the emergence of a historical awareness of the temporal limits of each process, but at the same time, the very possibility of overcoming them over time (Torres, 2024).

Finally, among the sociological record, it is necessary to place authors such as Karl Marx, followed by David Harvey and Anthony Giddens with their thesis of space-time compression. From Marx what is rescued is the idea of a disarticulation of time in terms of its value to produce goods, thus the modes of production of the modern era reduce the time that must be invested in the generation of goods, establishing a new parameter for the valuation of labor power. Time appears as a variable that shows the power with which capital can generate and consume resources, making it possible to measure the sale of labor power in terms of the time invested in the production process, rewarding those who reduce the amount of time invested (Marx, 1975. Book One, Chapter 18: "Wages for Time"; Book Two, Chapter 7: "Turnover Time and Number" and Chapter 14: "Circulation Time"). This leads to a reduction in free time and leisure for the bourgeoisie and an increase in working time, as well as a reduction in *free* time for the workers. This reduced use of time creates urgency and becomes key to the process of increasing speed, both in terms of productivity and life. More contemporary acceleration authors such as Robert Hassan, Hartmut Rosa, and Simon Glezos' emphasize the reduction of leisure time, with varying relevance, but always in an unavoidable way. Therefore, the influence of capital and technology appears with full force. At this point, it is possible to point a link with Marcuse's critique of technology and homogenization, especially in *One Dimensional Man* (2013 [1964]), where the homogenizing capacity of technology and consumption are ideologies of standardization at stake. I can thus state further that the thesis of space-time compression (Harvey, 1990; Giddens, 1990) points to the narrowing of the world through connectivity driven by expansionist and colonizing projects, while creating the conditions for an increasingly homogeneous global village. What is useful about the sociological analysis to acceleration is to highlight the centrality of modern capacity to reach remote regions of the world in a matter of seconds when it comes to communications and in much less time than in previous eras when it comes to transportation. The ability to circulate information, goods, and people not only makes spatial barriers

porous, but also alters the temporal experience of speed. This point is key to the thesis of acceleration, as it describes the situation of compression in the world while establishing its material foundations. Both technology and its growing value in social production, as well as new markets for capital flows, represent material pillars of the acceleratory dynamic.

As it is possible to realize at this point, except for sociological influence, acceleration theory does not have a strong foundation within the critical theory developed again by the Frankfurt School. However, the complexity and richness of its background, as well as the importance and originality of highlighting the temporal orders of societies as a source of explanation and criticism, are in themselves central elements for the critical theory of today's societies.

#### 4. EMPIRICAL CONNECTION. APPLICATIONS TO CASE STUDIES

Thus, it could be said that acceleration theory proposes a more concrete version of theory and criticism. Or at least one that is highly visible to researchers and the general audience. It deals with phenomena that occur at a direct level of observation, but which can nevertheless be treated with greater abstraction. From individual experience due to time constraints to developments in communications, transportation, electricity (i.e., affecting sleep hours), and measurements of rates of change and innovations, as well as examples of broader social processes such as the spread of the COVID-19 virus, they all account as conditions for the rapid, in some cases frenetic, spread of phenomena on a planetary scale. Acceleration, therefore, does not respond to a social ontology that seeks to capture invariant aspects of life in society in the style of phenomenology, or to a type of emerging configuration of society in the manner of a general theory of interaction. Instead, it is anchored in the observation of contingent aspects that nevertheless mark various dimensions of society transversally and structurally. The phenomenon of acceleration, therefore, is not a reality that is based on theory alone but rather builds its assumptions on current evidence from large groups of the population, as well as broad social and material processes. This is how comparative international evidence shows how time pressure is perceived in different contexts. For example, in the United States Southerton and Tomlinson (2005) showed various sources of time pressure that lead different groups studied to feel them-

selves “harried” by time due to daily activities. In Germany, the consequences of changing working hours have also been studied (Garhammer, 1995), with impacts on perceptions of personal time and leisure. In Chile, there are studies that evidence time pressure in different segments of the population, including work, age groups, and gender (Carrasco et al., 2005; Barriga & Sato, 2021) as well as the impact of temporal deficits in household for stress levels (Casanova-Brito, 2025), manifesting all concrete instances in which segments of the population are hurried by time. The critical practice of an acceleration theory serves to frame those social dilemmas by pointing out the temporal constraints of contemporary societies. The practice of theorizing on acceleration implies nurturing the analysis with empirical data to expand them in a broader perspective and then to offer integrated positions for those very social problems, not from above, but from the same perspective of the case studied. The theory of practice has been widely discussed in social sciences (Bourdieu, 1990; Turner, 1994), pointing out the relevance of theory as a practice not substantially differentiated from any other practices with their own objects. In this regard the difference between a craftsman, a priest or a scientist does not rely on the fact that they *do* something, but rather in what they do, with what kind of resources, and to which extent.

The critic is also based on everyday practices where the theorists are not decoupled from the object that they construct—*explanations, diagnoses*—and try to unchain—marginated groups, alienated conditions. The practice of critic and theory is today seen as two sides of the same coin: the production of knowledge and its liberating force (Boltanski, 2015, Celikates, 2021). In this regard, the acceleration thesis has the potential and advantage to be understood by the people who directly experience it and by the theorists that are living in and naming it. In my view, this condition sets the critical theory practice of the acceleration theory at least two-fold: on one hand, it is fully tied to the experienced phenomena described, and, on the other, its fate is to exist only if it achieves to be steadily informed and updated by social research.

The above-mentioned studies highlight various aspects of the speedup phenomenon for different social groups, making clear that the approach is neither superficial nor secondary but rather responds to the demand to turn visible the explanation of acceleration in the most diverse spheres. And crucially, as a process. It means that the theory should be prepared to deal with a dynamic object, doing justice to its changing nature. Then, it

offers both an evidence-based justification as well as a demonstration of its potential for application in various social domains in changing conditions.

## 5. CRITICISMS

Like any approach to society that seeks to capture cross-cutting phenomena, whether in theory or applied studies, the theory of acceleration does not come without limitations. Because of space limitations, I will focus on two of the most recurrent and, in my view, best-argued problematic points of the proposal. I am referring, on a descriptive level, to the claim of universality of the acceleration phenomenon; and, on a normative level, to its tendency to consider above all the alienating consequences of acceleration. The first point is an epistemological challenge; the second one is a political clarification.

In relation to its claimed universality, this would not be so much of a problem if the thesis of acceleration were a proposal for advanced capitalist societies. The problem arises when its application is extended to “modernity” (Rosa, 2005; 2011; 2013). We know that not only the concept of modernity is subject to debate in sociology (to name just two of the most recent examples, see Araujo, 2021 and Bhambra, 2023), but its epochal quality is also challenged from a historical point of view (Osborne, 1992). In other words, the problem is not to distinguish between acceleration and modernity—sometimes also capitalism—and the latter with a group of adjectives that describe it, including *individualization*, *differentiation*, *rationalization*, and *instrumentalization*. All of these, as we are all aware of, are unevenly distributed not only between different regions of the globe—if we take modernity as an era—, but also within capitalist societies themselves—if we consider modernity as an eminently *Western* condition. Beyond an explanation of modernity itself which would take us on a long conceptual and political journey, acceleration is often conceived as a fundamental force in contemporary societies without regard for necessary differences by group (age, gender), location (urban, rural), and strata (class, occupations). To its critics, acceleration presents itself as a universally flat condition, present without nuances in different regions and social classes worldwide.

On the other hand, a second criticism points out that it is somewhat reductionist to place excessive emphasis on the alienating characteristics of acceleration. Without denying the importance and reality of the perverse effects of frenetic life, recent literature has highlighted the critical potential of accelerating both sociopolitical processes and operational demands (Vostal, 2021; Torres & Gros, 2022). From a comparative point of view, there are, for example, at least two levels where, on one hand, there is a culturalist critique of acceleration that emphasizes the lack of time and the alienating life linked to the (im)possibility of consumption. On the other hand, in Latin America, for example, acceleration is criticized in expansionist (imperialist) and extractivist terms, while at the same time there is a perceived need to accelerate political processes for social justice. Thus, the former would be fundamentally an acceleration prototypical of the Global North, from a culturalist critique of it, while the latter is a situation characteristic of the ambiguities of the Global South, where a materialist critique of capitalist expansion and extraction coexists with a political critique for social justice—rights, recognition—in an accelerationist fashion. Additionally, in Latin America, work on acceleration has also been critically received in various academic spheres (Álvarez-Cienfuegos, 2016; Cristiano, 2020, 2021; Montero & Torres, 2020; Gros, 2022; Torres & Gros, 2022; Torres, 2023), where the aforementioned criticisms of the supposed universality of the phenomenon are outlined in one way or another, as well as the cultural or material conditions that would be found at its origin.

Rather than seeking an answer to these criticisms, I am interested in getting this far with the layout of such problems. It seems to me that both objections point to serious weaknesses in the theorization of acceleration. However, the value of this theorization does not lie in its infallibility, but in its ability to open new understandings of the time of the society, materialized in research programs and critical reflections that consider the potential of this theory, as well as its necessary adaptations, adjustments, limits, and errors even.

## 6. FINAL REMARKS

At this point, we can summarize the paper claims by identifying two major conclusions.

First, the practice of theorizing upon acceleration is an approach that strongly relies on empirical research. This means that it should steadily be updated with research findings that can show the different shapes that acceleration adopts—or ceases to have. It also implies that evidence might contest the acceleration thesis itself and to ponder or deny its presence and impact across diverse society domains. Communication and transport might stabilize or slow its pace due to technological thresholds or economic-political decisions (protectionism), the life rhythm can come to a standstill due to health system conditions, or the speed of living might feel stuck because of unemployment rising rates. In any case, the inherent dynamic character of the social must be mirrored in the theoretical insights offered by acceleration theorists.

Secondly, the critical potential of the acceleration theorizing exceeds the limits of any theoretical current. There is no dependence from only one perspective. In this sense, beyond any theoretical approach, the influence of any author, no matter how strong s/he is, cannot be considered solely. As I have shown, the critical dimensions of the acceleration theory have been outlined before by scholars critically addressing the bond between time and society. The processual character of the theory and its object, as pointed above, stress the fact that the critical practice of the theory must be adapted to the evidence collected from different sources and contexts. This means that the acceleration itself can be normatively evaluated differently depending on its historical conditions. If in the early days of the so-called *modernity* acceleration played an emancipatory role thanks to the pursuit of ideals that promoted the mobilization of political forces reflected in the Haitian, US, and French revolutions, as well as in the Latin American independence movements, to name a few; in the current phase, acceleration is characterized by a society movement without progress, where the social rhythm oscillates between constant “dynamic stabilization” (Rosa, 2013) of the various social spheres. There is a search for relative synchronization between the scientific, political, economic, legal, religious, and artistic fields and frantic paralysis, that is, the logic of capital-

ist appropriation, accumulation, and expansion in which the new is barely the reproduction of the old (the exploitation and domination of humanity and nature) by other means (innovations or adaptations). The critical dimension of acceleration becomes apparent, where the thesis of effective change is put under strain by that of a *novel* maintenance of the status quo. Social energy is then worn into a movement without transformation.

In this regard, it is easily recognizable that social criticism in the contemporary world has strong empirical roots. There is a correlation of the widespread disaffection with theoretical policies and limited empirical basis. In other words, if there is one thing to study in the future, it is the extent to which excessively *theoretical* criticism, at times essayistic, has contributed to the lack of concrete political courses of action, on one hand, and to the discrediting and even confinement of such criticism of general trends to the corridors of universities and academic meetings, on the other. Fortunately, this has undoubtedly been changing within different levels in several contexts in recent times (it can also be seen in research centers in Latin America, Europe, and the United States), with a greater commitment by theorists to the everyday world, as well as to their research in the public sphere. We can therefore expect more theorizing, as well as a better connection with local and international appeals—without any excessive optimism.

Critical thinking has borne fruit in the past. It has been a powerful force in identifying social problems and ultimately helping to mobilize collective forces. Today, however, it is not enough—it probably never was—to simply read and compare legitimately the concept of “cultural industry” in Marcuse and Horkheimer, or the notion of “dialectic” in Adorno and Benjamin, if this is not accompanied by a firm sight at today’s society and its situated changing reality from one place to another. From funding constraints to trendy temporary topics, academic research is prone to be recursive and hermetic. This path should be nuanced by research findings that allow to reconnect theory with practice. Theorizing about acceleration seems to be a fine example of such a procedure.

## BIBLIOGRAFÍA

- Abbott, Andrew (2016). The future of the social sciences: Between empiricism and normativity. *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales*, 71(3), 575-596. <https://shs.cairn.info/journal-Annales-2016-3-page575?lang=es>
- Adorno, Theodor, and Horkheimer, Max (1998). *Dialéctica de la Ilustración. Fragmentos filosóficos*. Madrid: Trotta. Trans. Juan José Sánchez.
- Álvarez-Cienfuegos, Juan (2016). La aceleración del tiempo como alienación. La propuesta de Hartmut Rosa desde la teoría crítica. *Acta Sociológica*, 69, 111-124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actso.2016.02.005>
- Araujo, Kathya (2021). Social theory anew: From contesting modernity to revisiting our conceptual toolbox — the case of individualization. *Current Sociology*, 69(3), 415-432. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392120931148>
- Barriga, Francisca, and Sato, Andrés (2021). *El tiempo es oro: Pobreza de tiempo y desigualdad: La reproducción del capital desde una mirada feminista*. Technical Report, Fundación SOL. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.19688.14081>
- Bhambra, Gurinder (2023 [2007]). *Rethinking Modernity: Postcolonialism and the Sociological Imagination*. Cham: Palgrave. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-21537-7>
- Birth, Kevin (2012). *Objects of Time. How Things Shape Temporality*. Palgrave.
- Blumenberg, Hans (2007). *Tiempo de la vida y tiempo del mundo*. Valencia: Pre-Textos. Trans. Manuel Canet.
- Boltanski, Luc (2015). *De la crítica: Compendio de sociología de la emancipación*. Ediciones Akal. Trans. Tomás Fernández Aúz y Beatriz Eguibar.

- Bourdieu, Pierre (1963). The Attitude of the Algerian Peasant Towards Time. *Mediterranean Countryman*, 6, 55-72.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1990). *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford University Press.
- Carleheden, Mikael (2019). How to Theorize? On the Changing Role and Meaning of Theory in the Social Sciences. In Nagatsu, Michiru, and Ruzzene, Attilia (Eds.). *Contemporary Philosophy and Social Science: An Interdisciplinary Dialogue* (311-331). London: Bloomsbury Academic. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781474248785.CH-010>
- Carleheden, Mikael (2024). Unchain the Beast! Pluralizing the Method of Theorizing. In Anicker, Fabian, and Armbruster, André (Eds.). *Die Praxis soziologischer Theoriebildung. Neue Soziologische Theorie*. Springer VS, Wiesbaden.
- Carrasco, Cristina; Aguirre, Rosario, and García-Sainz, Cristina (2005). *El tiempo, los tiempos, una vara de la desigualdad*. Santiago: CEPAL.
- Casanova-Brito, M. (2025). Temporal Deficit Ratio of Households: A Historical Perspective on Studying Absolute Time Poverty in Underdeveloped and Developing Countries. *Social Indicators Research*, 176(2), 851-861. Doi: 10.1007/s11205-024-03486-6
- Celikates, Robin (2021). Beyond needs: Recognition, Conflict, and the Limits of Institutionalization. In Ikäheimo, Heikki; Lepold, Kristina, and Stahl, Titus (Eds). *Recognition and Ambivalence* (257-291). Columbia University Press.
- Conrad, Sebastian (2016). *What is Global History?* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Cristiano, Javier (2020). Para una precisión sociológica del concepto de aceleración social. *Estudios Sociológicos*, 38, 829-848. <https://doi.org/10.24201/es.2020v38n114.1811>

- Cristiano, Javier (2021). Bosquejo para una historia estructural de la aceleración capitalista. *Revista Mexicana de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales*, 66(241), 89-108. <https://doi.org/10.22201/fcpys.2448492xe.2020.241.70747>
- Fabian, Johannes (1983). *Time and the Other. How Anthropology Makes its Object*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Garhammer, Manfred (1995). Changes in Working Hours in Germany: The Resulting Impact on Everyday Life. *Time & Society*, 4(2), 167-203. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0961463X95004002002>
- Giddens, Anthony (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Glezos, Simon (2012). *The Politics of Speed. Capitalism, the State and War in an Accelerating World*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203804728>
- Gros, Alexis (2022). Las formas de vida y su aceleración: Un diálogo entre las perspectivas de Rahel Jaeggi y Hartmut Rosa. *Castalia*, 37(1), 93-114.
- Harvey, David (1990). *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Hassan, Robert (2008). *Empires of Speed: Time and the Acceleration of Politics and Society*. Leiden: Brill.
- Jay, Martin (1988). *La Imaginación Dialéctica*. Madrid: Taurus.
- Jeffries, Stuart (2016). *Grand Hotel Abyss: The Lives of the Frankfurt School*. London: Verso.
- Koselleck, Reinhart (2000). *Zeitschichten*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Lübbe, Hermann (1992). Gegenwartsschrumpfung. In Kray, Ralph Pfeiffer, Karl Ludwig, and Studer, Thomas (Eds.). *Autorität*. VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften (pp. 78-91). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-322-83900-8\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-322-83900-8_5)
- Marcuse, Herbert (2013 [1964]). *One Dimensional Man. Studies on the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*. London: Routledge.

- Marcuse, Herbert (2024 [1941]). *Reason and Revolution*. London: Routledge.
- Marx, Karl (1975). *El Capital. Tomos 1-3*. México: Siglo XXI. Trans. Pedro Scaron.
- Montero, Darío, and Torres, Felipe (2020). Acceleration, Alienation, and Resonance. Reconstructing Hartmut Rosa's Theory of Modernity. *Pléyade*, 25, 155-181. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0719-36962020000100155>
- Nanni, Giordano (2012). *The Colonisation of Time: Ritual, Routine and Resistance in the British Empire*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Osborne, Peter (1992). Modernity is a Qualitative, Not a Chronological, Category. *New Left Review*, 192(1), 65-84.
- Rosa, Hartmut (2005). *Beschleunigung. Die Veränderung der Zeitstrukturen in der Moderne*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Rosa, Hartmut (2011). Aceleración social: consecuencias éticas y políticas de una sociedad de alta velocidad desincronizada. *Persona y Sociedad*, 25(1), 9-49. <https://doi.org/10.53689/pys.v25i1.204>
- Rosa, Hartmut (2013). *Social Acceleration. A New Theory of Modernity*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Schiermer, Bjørn, and Rosa, Hartmut (2017). Acceleration and Resonance: An Interview with Hartmut Rosa. *Acta Sociológica*, 47(4), 374-82.
- Southerton, Dale, and Tomlinson, Mark (2005). 'Pressed for Time' — the Differential Impacts of a 'Time Squeeze.' *The Sociological Review*, 53(2), 215-239. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2005.00511.x>
- Swedberg, Richard (2012). Theorizing in Sociology and Social Science: Turning to the Context of Discovery. *Theory and Society*, 41, 1-40.
- Torres, Felipe (2022). *Temporal Regimes: Materiality, Politics, Technology*. London: Routledge.

- Torres, Felipe (2023). Teorizando la aceleración social. Crítica para la sociedad actual. *Revista de Sociología*, 38(1), 84-95. <https://doi.org/10.5354/0719-529X.2023.71234>
- Torres, Felipe (2024). Historical Time and Acceleration. A Constitutive Bond. *International Journal for History, Culture and Modernity*, 12(1), 27-48. <https://doi.org/10.1163/22130624-20230012>
- Torres, Felipe, and Gros, Alexis (2022). Slowing Down Society? Theoretical Reflections on Social Deceleration in Pandemic Times (and Beyond). *KronoScope*, 22(1), 3-29. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15685241-20221505>
- Torres, Felipe, and Rosa, Hartmut (2021) Acceleration Theory, Temporal Regimes, and Politics Today an Interview with Hartmut Rosa. *Res Publica: Revista de Historia de las Ideas Políticas*, 24(3), 519-523.
- Turner, Stephen (1994). *The Social Theory of Practices. Tradition, Tacit Knowledge and Presuppositions*. London: Polity.
- Vostal, Filip (2021). Social Acceleration: Five 'Deflationary' Comments. *Res Publica: Revista de Historia de las Ideas Políticas*, 24(3), 446-453. <https://dx.doi.org/10.5209/rpub.79243>
- Warf, Barney (2008). *Time-Space Compression: Historical Geographies*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203938058>