

# 1 TIME IN SUSPENSE: TEMPORAL REGIMES IN ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

## 2 Summary

3 Artificial intelligence allows us to analyze time from two complementary perspectives:  
4 one technical and the other social. From the first perspective, time is a formal structure  
5 indispensable for the functioning of systems. Algorithms need to represent sequences,  
6 intervals, duration, change, and causality in order to plan, classify, predict, or decide.  
7 Time thus appears as a calculable variable translated into mathematical models. In the  
8 second conception, time is a form of organization of collective life. It encompasses  
9 work rhythms, institutional timelines, shared memories, expectations, and future  
10 projects. From this perspective, artificial intelligence not only uses pre-existing  
11 temporalities but also modifies them by accelerating processes, reducing waiting times,  
12 and reorganizing everyday decisions. The comparison reveals key differences. For  
13 algorithmic logic, the past is a training dataset; for social logic, it is also memory and  
14 history. The computational present tends to be compressed through real-time decisions,  
15 while the social present requires deliberation, interpretation, and negotiation. The future,  
16 for artificial intelligence, is an estimable probability; for society, it is also openness and  
17 the possibility of change. Both perspectives agree that time shapes decisions. However,  
18 when high-speed technical temporality takes precedence over human and institutional  
19 timeframes, tensions arise between efficiency, justice, and autonomy. The central issue  
20 is not only what artificial intelligence can do, but what forms of time it produces and  
21 governs.

22 **Keywords:** artificial intelligence, social time, temporality, automation, prediction.

## 23 Introduction

24 The expansion of artificial intelligence systems introduces specific ways of organizing  
25 social time. It is no longer merely a technical innovation, but a reconfiguration of  
26 rhythms, expectations, sequences, and decision-making horizons comparable to the  
27 introduction of the first machines at the dawn of capitalism. The central question is to  
28 determine what temporalities it produces, accelerates, suspends, or redistributes in  
29 different institutional and everyday spheres.

30 As a preliminary hypothesis, one might think that artificial intelligence consolidates a  
31 temporal regime oriented by anticipation, continuous processing, and a reduction in the

32 intervals between data, calculation, and action. This regime does not eliminate other  
33 temporalities; on the contrary, it coexists with bureaucratic, biographical, political, and  
34 organizational timeframes, generating conflicts, frictions, and asymmetries.

35 Artificial intelligence radically alters decision-making times by transferring processes  
36 that traditionally required contextual interpretation and moral reasoning to automated  
37 systems that operate with a speed and scale unattainable for human institutions.  
38 Decisions are made in real time by algorithms that process big data instantaneously,  
39 displacing reflective deliberation and human discretion with automatic resolutions.  
40 "Predictive models are the tools we will increasingly depend on to run our institutions,  
41 deploy our resources, and manage our lives (O'Neil, 2018, pág. 343). "

#### 42 **Subhuman acceleration and the fading of the interval**

43 Social acceleration, as described by Hartmut Rosa (2013; 2016), finds in artificial  
44 intelligence not only a technical culmination but also an ontological mutation. While  
45 mechanical modernity accelerated the transfer of matter and the communication of  
46 signs, AI operates on the micro-time scale (Pani, 2001). This temporality can be  
47 considered subhuman, since operations are measured in nanoseconds, generating an  
48 insurmountable gap with the phenomenology of human perception.

49  
50 The concept of interval, fundamental to democratic deliberation and reflective  
51 judgment, is being suppressed. In action theory, the interval is the space where the  
52 subject processes the stimulus, evaluating and contrasting arguments, (Susen, 2018)and  
53 requires time to formulate a response. AI, by implementing real-time computing  
54 processes, collapses this space (Stiegler, 2018). The consequence is systemic  
55 asynchrony; society's technical infrastructure operates at a speed that inhibits critical  
56 thinking during execution. It is not simply a matter of speed, but of a reproductive  
57 instantaneity that alienates the subject from their own capacity to inhabit the time of  
58 decision-making.

59 In this new technological context, activities related to massive data processing, logistics,  
60 surveillance, citizen profiling, and content generation and distribution are accelerating  
61 dramatically. This dynamic creates an economy of speed and just-in-time delivery  
62 (Virilio, 2012). In contrast, the capacities for human scrutiny, understanding, and  
63 auditing are slowed or marginalized. The pace of AI development outpaces the adaptive

64 capacity of regulatory institutions and citizens themselves, limiting the time and space  
65 to challenge decisions or participate thoughtfully in the public sphere, thus fostering  
66 political passivity and problem fatigue (O'Neil, 2018).

### 67 **The construction of social time and its temporal regimes**

68 The problem of time and its interpretations permeates the social sciences and  
69 philosophy and has gained renewed relevance in times of acceleration (De Angelis,  
70 2025; Ramos Torre, 2005). However, this discussion will focus on two  
71 conceptualizations: social time and the constitution of the temporal regime. The  
72 methodological approach will be as follows: each conceptualization will be detailed,  
73 compared with the temporal forms of artificial intelligence (Coeckelbergh, 2021), and  
74 finally, a corresponding critique will be offered.

75 The first approach will be that of Javier Cristiano, (2020; 2021; 2018) who proposes an  
76 operational clarification by dividing the conceptualization of time into two broad logical  
77 levels: the basic components or characterizations of the idea of time in general, and the  
78 various analytical operations that specifically define what social time is. Within the  
79 basic components of time, Cristiano establishes that the general idea of time, regardless  
80 of its application, is characterized by eight fundamental elements:

- 81 1. It is a dimension of every phenomenon or event, since there are no realities  
82 exempt from temporality.
- 83 2. It is a central aspect of making sense of things in the world; understanding the  
84 environment requires ordering it temporally.
- 85 3. It is a relational phenomenon, which means that the act of temporalizing is  
86 equivalent to establishing relationships (for example, to capture the change or  
87 identity of things).
- 88 4. It always presupposes the existence of a process, of phenomena of mutation or  
89 movement.
- 90 5. It requires duration, since perceiving the change in a process makes the  
91 existence of a reference point that remains still or stable indispensable.
- 92 6. It simultaneously involves novelty and repetition, combining movement  
93 understood as constant creation and movement understood as a natural rhythm  
94 or cycle.

- 95 7. It necessarily encompasses the distinctions of past, present, and future.
- 96 8. It requires a parameter of observation, recognizing that time has an external and
- 97 quantifiable dimension (objective time or *Chronos* ), and an internal experiential
- 98 and qualitative dimension (subjective time or *Kairos* ).
- 99 Each proposed component is contrasted with the apparent behavior of artificial
- 100 intelligence.

101 **Table 1: Social time component and AI behavior**

Basic Component of Time	Apparent behavior of AI with respect to temporality
1. Dimension of every phenomenon (There are no realities exempt from temporality)	The subsumption of life to machine time: AI imposes a new, hyper-accelerated temporal dimension on human phenomena. In real-time decision-making systems (finance, autonomous vehicles, healthcare), AI operates in fractions of a millisecond.
2. Putting things into perspective (Understanding the environment requires ordering it temporally)	The imposition of an opaque algorithmic meaning (Black Boxes): To make sense of the world, AI orders sequences of data at speeds incomprehensible to humans.
3. Relational phenomenon (Temporalizing is equivalent to establishing relationships to capture change/identity)	The temporal perpetuation of inequality (historical biases): AI establishes temporal relationships by linking past data with present identities. However, when trained on biased historical databases, AI reifies and automates prejudices.
4. Process (Mutation or movement phenomena)	The extraction and expropriation of historical effort: The AI process is divided into training (expensive) and inference or testing (cheap and fast).
5. Duration (Need for a stable reference point to perceive change)	The setting of parameters and the inability to cope with true uncertainty: In order to function, models assume stabilities based on the duration of past patterns.
6. Novelty and Repetition (Combination of constant creation and cycle)	De-futurization and colonization of novelty: AI operates by predicting the future based on the repetition of the past. From a critical perspective, this functions as a technique of de-futurization.
7. Past, present and future (Forced distinctions of temporality)	Consuming the future in the present: AI accelerates time by extracting answers and dragging them from the future into the present.

8. Observation parameter (External Chronos vs. Internal Kairos)	The tyranny of automated <i>Chronos</i> over ethical <i>Kairos</i> : While humans experience time internally and deliberate ethically (Kairos), AI imposes a purely external, quantitative, and ruthless measurement parameter (Chronos).
---	--

102 Original work based on Cristiano (2018; 2020)

103 From a critical perspective, the vital need for time in all AI activity subjects human  
104 temporality to a regime of virtual instantaneity where technological speed dominates  
105 over social rhythms. The constitution of meaning (even in the Weberian formulation)  
106 sacrifices transparency and explainability. The machine imposes its own meaning on  
107 vital decisions in a black box environment that marginalizes the subject from  
108 understanding their own reality. Regarding the need for a point of reference, as Elena  
109 Esposito warns (2011) about quantified finance, blindly trusting that future risk will  
110 behave as it has in the past is a systemic error. AI and complex models assume a stable  
111 world (continuous risk), failing catastrophically in the face of radical ruptures or  
112 extreme events, producing systemic fragility. With regard to the need for creation and  
113 generation of novelties inherent in human endeavor (innovation as the engine of  
114 capitalist competition), AI, insofar as it (due to its own internal organization) seeks to  
115 reduce the future to a few calculable probabilistic sequences, needs to eliminate true  
116 novelty or surprise. The future loses its creative openness and becomes trapped within  
117 the limits of what the algorithm can calculate, stifling the imagination of alternatives.  
118 Instead of enabling social change, AI relates to the past in a deterministic way,  
119 reproducing and justifying systemic discrimination in the present under a false guise of  
120 objective neutrality. The training phase is an extractive process: algorithms assimilate  
121 hundreds or thousands of human lifetimes of cognitive effort and millennia of human  
122 history only to privatize them. The AI movement is the capitalization of the collective  
123 intellect of the past to automate and dominate the present.

124 Hyper-anticipation (highly evident in the use of predictive models in finance) means  
125 that future possibilities are being exhausted and consumed by present decisions. Society  
126 is trapped by the consequences of automated predictions, facing a future already  
127 mortgaged or determined by machines. With regard to the parameters of observation in  
128 real-time scenarios, traditional methods of ethical oversight, such as human review or  
129 prolonged deliberation, become impractical or impossible due to the immediacy. As

130 argued above, the speed of AI negates the time needed for human moral judgment,  
131 subjecting life to machine efficiency.

132 Artificial time in AI is not merely a computational tool, but a powerful device of  
133 control. By processing centuries of history in weeks and making decisions in  
134 milliseconds without human oversight, AI expropriates past human experience to  
135 govern the future. In this regime, individuals risk becoming mere objects of algorithmic  
136 prediction: their futures are colonized and their discriminatory pasts are automated,  
137 imposing a technological speed that overwhelms and nullifies our capacity for ethical  
138 deliberation and social transformation.

139 Furthermore, based on the previous notion, Cristiano classifies the ways in which  
140 sociology socializes time, identifying five distinct operations that configure social time:

141 1. Time conditioned by social variables: It conceives of time as a variable  
142 dependent on other social factors, seeing it as a tool forged by human needs and  
143 the social construction of reality.

144 2. Socio-institutional expression of time: It focuses on how society physically  
145 embodies time through institutions, norms, calendars, and guidelines that govern  
146 collective interaction.

147 3. Attention to the temporal dimension of social phenomena: This is the approach  
148 that analyzes the inherent temporality of key sociological processes that are not  
149 time in themselves, such as social action, human interaction or the value circuit  
150 in the economy.

151 4. The change of society as a whole: It considers social time as the analysis of  
152 historical movement and the global transformations of society itself and its  
153 stages.

154 5. Sociological processing of the two dimensions of time: It is the theoretical effort  
155 that seeks to reconcile and theorize the dual nature of time, articulating the  
156 differences between its internal subjective experience and its objective  
157 institutional structure.

158 Once again, an analytical scheme is proposed to assume the relationship of artificial  
159 intelligence in an environment that is outside its logic, time.

160 **Table 2. Social time in relation to the temporality of AI**

Operation Social Time	AI Behavior
-----------------------	-------------

Time conditioned by social variables (Time as a variable dependent on human needs / social construction)	Speed forged by accumulation and efficiency: Algorithmic acceleration does not respond to a neutral social need, but rather to the "systematic contraction of the valorization cycle" inherent in capitalism. In sectors like high-frequency finance, the need to generate profits dictates an operational speed measured in milliseconds.
Socio-institutional expression of time (How society embodies time in institutions and norms).	The institutionalization of the autonomous black box: AI has become the new temporary infrastructure that governs collective interaction in critical institutions (hospitals, financial markets, smart cities, transit).
3. Temporal dimension of social phenomena (Temporality of key processes such as action and the economic circuit)	The commodification and performativity of the future: In the economy's value circuit, time itself becomes a tradable commodity. Through predictive instruments and financial derivatives, algorithmic actions do not passively describe the world, but rather performatively construct it.
4. The change of society as a whole (Historical movement and global transformations).	De-futurization and the end of natural history: AI is pushing humanity out of natural time toward an "accelerated future created by machines." Historically, AI assimilates centuries of knowledge in weeks.
5. Sociological processing of the two dimensions of time (Reconciling internal subjective experience and objective structure).	The expropriation of moral <i>Kairos</i> versus technical hyper- <i>Chronos</i> : AI promises to expand the subjective human experience (the <i>Kairos</i> ), symbolically providing 100 years of experience for every year we live through cognitive prostheses.

161 Original work based on Cristiano (2018; 2020; 2021)

162 Prioritizing the speed and efficiency of artificial intelligence subordinates and sacrifices  
163 fundamental social factors such as equity, transparency, and justice, codifying historical  
164 inequalities at high speed. Considering AI as a new, temporary institutional framework  
165 imposes opaque regimes where decisions occur instantaneously, rendering ethical  
166 oversight or human review impractical or impossible. Social norms are delegated to  
167 automated systems that are not clearly accountable to society. Furthermore, this  
168 automated social action exhausts and consumes the future in the present; actors cease to  
169 react to material reality and begin to react, in a recursive loop, to the automated  
170 expectations of other algorithms. The absence of internal critical mechanisms in AI and  
171 the non-hierarchical accumulation of information operate as a technique of de-

172 futurization: by forcing society to operate based on probabilistic models trained on the  
173 past, the capacity to create genuinely new alternatives is stifled. When the truly  
174 unpredictable occurs (systemic shocks), the model collapses, revealing the fragility of a  
175 society that entrusted its evolution to the machine. The objective structure of AI time  
176 (the Chronos of milliseconds) advances at a pace incompatible with human deliberation.  
177 Life-or-death decisions are calculated in purely mathematical time, eliminating the  
178 possibility for the individual to experience the time necessary for ethical judgment and  
179 moral reasoning.

180 Within the framework of social time operations, AI reveals its nature as a socio-  
181 temporal power device. It is not limited to measuring time or predicting data; it  
182 restructures human institutions by operating at speeds that marginalize human  
183 intervention and ethical responsibility. By commodifying the future to resolve present  
184 uncertainty and accelerating decision-making cycles through market pressures, Artificial  
185 Intelligence transforms social time into an extractive and opaque resource, closing off  
186 society's creative possibilities and subordinating lived experience to the relentless logic  
187 of computing.

188 Under these conditions, prediction becomes the dominant temporal form, transforming  
189 analysis into a real-time cycle that constantly iterates between past data, present  
190 updates, and future projections to anticipate human propensities. It is no longer just  
191 about producing goods, but about operating in an economy of prediction and induction  
192 that seeks to anticipate demand and shape behavior. This predictive logic imposes a new  
193 regime of algorithmic anticipation in which value no longer resides in the present, but in  
194 the ability to calculate future behavior and optimize individuals.

195 The concept of defuturization refers to the process by which prediction, calculation, and  
196 risk management techniques attempt to control the future, reducing its inherent  
197 openness to a few calculable sequences of events. For the future to truly exist, it must  
198 remain open, unpredictable, and contain multiple possible courses of action. However,  
199 disciplines such as econometrics and structured finance assume they can derive the  
200 unpredictability of the future from past data and patterns. In doing so, they simplify the  
201 complexity of tomorrow in order to make seemingly safe decisions today. By using  
202 these predictive techniques, society and markets consume the future in the present.

203 Current decisions are made that drastically limit the freedom and space of possibilities  
204 for tomorrow. This generates a kind of colonization of the future, where profits are  
205 extracted in the present at the cost of mortgaging and exhausting the alternatives that  
206 society will have available later.

207 The biggest problem with this process is that the future resists being controlled or de-  
208 futurized. Attempts in the present to strengthen predictability about tomorrow end up  
209 producing the exact opposite effect, making the real future far more surprising and  
210 turbulent. The false sense of security provided by predictive models leads actors to take  
211 more risks, which generates systemic and uncontrollable macro-risks that the models  
212 themselves are unable to foresee.

213 When the real future finally arrives and diverges from the precise projections calculated  
214 by the models, collapse ensues. The result is profound paralysis and a loss of human  
215 agency. Operators and society discover they have exhausted their options and face a  
216 futurelessness. Trapped within the limitations imposed by their own past predictions,  
217 they lose their capacity to decide, to act, and to be productively surprised by new  
218 possibilities. In short, this phenomenon describes the drama of a society that, in its  
219 obsessive quest to secure and anticipate what is to come, ends up stifling novelty and  
220 locking itself into a prefabricated future that no longer belongs to it.

221 This system profoundly impacts the subjective experience of work and daily life. On a  
222 daily level, life is mediated and constantly monitored by automated devices. The  
223 subject's identity ceases to be a holistic construct and becomes an anticipatory and  
224 speculative self, forced to constantly modulate itself in a fluid environment to adapt to  
225 the predictions of algorithms. In the workplace, time is fragmented and made  
226 precarious. Tasks, even cognitive ones that previously required complex judgment, are  
227 delegated to the machine, which desubjectifies the worker and empties entire  
228 professions of meaning. Furthermore, the illusion of automated intelligence is sustained  
229 by invisible and precarious labor (human micro-labor in the shadows) that feeds the  
230 digital infrastructure.

231 Ultimately, all of this generates serious tensions between automation and democratic  
232 deliberation, fostering the emergence of an algorithmocracy or algorithmic government.  
233 The main tension lies in the fact that automation circumvents the rational Habermasian

234 public sphere, replacing democratic consensus with opaque technological black boxes.  
235 This produces the following conflicts:

236 1. Opacity and displacement of responsibility: When AI makes decisions with social  
237 impact (for example, in the allocation of social welfare or criminal justice), it is almost  
238 impossible to determine who is responsible, leaving citizens without clear ways to  
239 question and repair damages.

240 2. Technical authority as symbolic violence: A false appearance of mathematical  
241 objectivity is imposed, naturalizing historically biased decisions. This symbolic  
242 violence undermines the capacity for citizen resistance, as discriminatory results are  
243 presented as incontrovertible technical facts .

244 3. Manipulation and fragmentation: The deliberative public sphere is replaced by  
245 information bubbles where automated tactics (micro-segmentation, deepfakes, bots)  
246 manipulate emotions, exacerbating polarization to the detriment of rational debate.

247 Furthermore, the concept of temporal regimes was proposed by Felipe Torres (2022;  
248 2018) as a way to understand how societies live, organize, and experience time. Instead  
249 of viewing time as a single line or as a collection of isolated moments, Torres proposes  
250 an analytical lens that integrates different ways of experiencing time: from daily  
251 routines to historical transformations, including our ideas of the future. With this  
252 perspective, he seeks to overcome reductionist views and unite trends that previously  
253 seemed opposed, such as standardization and temporal diversity.

254 While authors like Gurvitch (1964) presented these dimensions as separate, Torres  
255 suggests that they can coexist within the same logic. In other words, temporal regimes  
256 help us see how the ways in which we remember the past, act in the present, and project  
257 the future are intertwined, while simultaneously revealing power relations, material  
258 structures, and social contradictions.

259 According to Torres, a temporal regime is a complex, organized, and multifaceted  
260 structure that shapes how time is experienced in a society. It functions as a unifying core  
261 that allows for the blending and stabilization of different temporal layers: the past, the  
262 present, and the future. This gives rise to dominant configurations, such as a more linear  
263 or cyclical perception of time, or an emphasis on speed or pause.

264 The relevance of this notion lies in its ability to encompass contradictions: a temporal  
265 regime can include both continuities and changes, uniformities and diversities, norms  
266 and everyday practices. The word "regime" suggests the idea of repetitive and stable  
267 patterns, but it also opens the door to the simultaneous existence of multiple patterns,  
268 even those in tension with one another. Thus, these regimes are not abstract ideas: they  
269 become visible in concrete social practices, in how we work, rest, study, or think about  
270 our lives. Torres identifies three fundamental aspects that intertwine in every temporal  
271 regime: iterability, articulability, and governmentality.

272 1. Iterability: This refers to how certain elements of the past are repeated and kept alive  
273 in the present. Traditions, for example, are a way of iterating values, norms, and  
274 customs. Although no regime can avoid repetition, each manages it in different ways.

275 2. Articulability: This refers to the capacity to connect and make visible different ways  
276 of organizing time. For example, in the same society, linear logics (progress,  
277 chronology) and circular logics (natural rhythms, rituals) can coexist, as well as tensions  
278 between duration and rupture. This dimension allows us to consider the mixing and  
279 overlapping of temporalities.

280 3. Governmentality: This refers to how time is used as a tool of power. For example,  
281 when access to the future is limited (due to lack of opportunities, inequality, or  
282 violence), people may feel trapped in a hopeless present. Thus, the ways in which we  
283 organize time also influence how we govern individual and collective life.

284 This approach finds its etymological root in the Latin *regere* (to govern, to direct),  
285 which reinforces the idea that temporal regimes not only describe time, but order it,  
286 shape it and channel it, as would be done with a political body or even a medical  
287 treatment.

288 The concept of temporal regimes helps resolve a common tension in time studies: on the  
289 one hand, there are theories that insist we live in an era marked by instability (such as  
290 the acceleration or compression of spacetime), and on the other, there are studies that  
291 highlight the diversity and fragmentation of temporal experiences. Far from seeing these  
292 two positions as irreconcilable, Torres proposes understanding them as two sides of the  
293 same coin. The same core values of global capitalism simultaneously drive the search  
294 for a universal temporality (to make production more efficient, for example) and respect  
295 for cultural differences (as a form of political legitimation). Thus, we can see how a

296 globalized and technological time coexists with profoundly different local experiences,  
 297 marked by gender, class, age, or culture. Although her focus is on Western societies,  
 298 Torres recognizes the value of looking at other geographical contexts to broaden or  
 299 challenge these conclusions.

300 Felipe Torres emphasizes that time regimes are deeply connected to politics and  
 301 technology. Political decisions (even when disguised as neutral) are at the heart of how  
 302 time is regulated: from working hours to school calendars and life cycles.

303 The following is a critical evaluation of the behavior of Artificial Intelligence (AI)  
 304 structured from the three fundamental aspects of the temporal regime proposed by  
 305 Torres: iterability, articulability and governmentality.

306 **Table 3: Evaluation of the temporal regime of Artificial Intelligence**

Aspect	Behavior in Artificial Intelligence
1. Iterability (Repetition of the past in the present)	The extraction and perpetuation of the past. The core of modern machine learning is based on massive iterability. During its training phase, AI digests colossal amounts of historical data, assimilating decades or centuries of information to apply it in the present. AI tools iterate the intellectual output of countless years of human experience almost instantaneously.
2. Articulability (Connection of different temporal logics)	The hybridization of machine, cyclical, and linear time: AI demonstrates an immense capacity to articulate multiple temporalities. At the algorithmic level, architectures such as Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs) connect the past and present by feeding the output of one instant back into the input of the next, capturing temporal dependencies in sequences. At the predictive level, hybrid AI models articulate linear logics (long-term trends) with circular logics (components of seasonality or natural cycles) to predict the future.
3. Governmentality (Time as a tool of power and control of the future)	The algorithmic governance of opportunities and life: In the context of AI, the speed of time is used directly as a tool of power. In sectors like finance (high-frequency trading), reducing latency to microseconds translates into a brutal competitive advantage, allowing those who control the technology to capitalize on opportunities and monopolize the future before others can react.

307 Original work based on Torres(2022; 2018)

308 While iteration grants AI an unprecedented body of experiential knowledge, it comes at  
309 a serious ethical cost. By iterating over the past, AI risks repeating and perpetuating  
310 historical inequalities. If training data contains biases, the algorithm iterates these  
311 discriminatory values in the present, reproducing unjust outcomes in critical sectors  
312 such as healthcare or criminal justice. Technological iteration is not neutral; it can be a  
313 mechanism for reproducing past injustices.

314 AI articulates a profound tension between biological and technological time. By  
315 injecting artificial time into subjects, the linear, biological scale of human life is  
316 superimposed on the hyper-accelerated scale of machines, allowing humans to  
317 symbolically accumulate 100 years of experience for every year they live. However, this  
318 articulation also generates conflicts when the machine's speed (milliseconds) becomes  
319 incompatible with the time required for human ethical deliberation, creating "black box"  
320 systems where speed sacrifices transparency.

321 AI exerts governance by limiting or granting people's access to the future through  
322 automated, real-time decisions. Because these systems operate without direct human  
323 oversight, they assume the power to dictate individuals' futures in fractions of a second.  
324 For example, in autonomous vehicles, an algorithm governs life-or-death decisions  
325 about whom to protect in the event of an accident. In medicine or finance, a biased  
326 algorithm can deny appropriate treatment to a minority or block legitimate transactions  
327 by labeling them as fraud, trapping people in a present devoid of opportunities and  
328 causing immediate hardship. AI organizes time at speeds unattainable for humans,  
329 governing collective life according to efficiency criteria that often sacrifice justice and  
330 fairness.

331 Through Torres's lens, Artificial Intelligence is not merely a computational tool, but a  
332 device of temporal power. Its capacity to iterate the past on massive scales allows it to  
333 predict a kind of future that risks automating discrimination. Its ability to articulate  
334 cyclical and linear rhythms creates augmented humans, but subjects it to an  
335 incomprehensible speed. Finally, its governmentality manifests itself in how it uses real-  
336 time (millisecond) processing to exclude humans from critical decision-making,  
337 dictating who has access to resources, opportunities, or even survival itself.

338 Regarding technology, its influence is twofold. On the one hand, there are time  
339 technologies, such as clocks and calendars, which allow us to measure and organize  
340 time (Johnston, 2022). On the other hand, there are technologies about time (such as  
341 instant communication and the internet) that, while not directly measuring time,  
342 completely transform our experience of time. The rationalization of time, accelerated by  
343 technological development, is a clear example of how technology modifies daily life.  
344 This dual temporal insertion is key to avoiding getting lost in technocentric  
345 perspectives.

346 Torres identifies several regimes that have had a profound impact on how we think and  
347 organize our time. Among them are: progress: a linear idea of time that assumes that  
348 everything moves towards something better; utopia: a projection of the future as  
349 something ideal, desired, that has not yet arrived, acceleration: an experience of time as  
350 increasingly faster, more intense.

351 These three elements form what Torres calls a regime of futurization, where the future  
352 becomes the driving force of history. Thus, the promises of a better world (utopia), the  
353 path to reach it (progress), and the urgency to achieve it as soon as possible  
354 (acceleration) are intertwined in a single imaginary. This relationship is not only  
355 conceptual but profoundly political: it structures our expectations, decisions, and ways  
356 of imagining change.

## 357 **References**

358 Coeckelbergh, M. (2021). Time machines: Artificial intelligence, process, and narrative.  
359 *Philosophy & Technology*, 34,, 1623–1628 [https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-021-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-021-00479-y)  
360 00479-y.

361 Cristiano, J. (2018). Tiempo-regla, tiempo-recurso y tiempo-sentido: aspectos de la  
362 estructuración del tiempo social.. *Athenea Digital - 18(3)*,  
363 <https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/athenea.2134>.

364 Cristiano, J. (2020). ¿Qué tiempo? ¿Qué sociedad? La idea de tiempo social.  
365 *Diferencia(s). Revista de teoría social contemporánea*, N. 11, 33-44  
366 [https://www.revista.diferencias.com.ar/index.php/diferencias/article/view/216/13](https://www.revista.diferencias.com.ar/index.php/diferencias/article/view/216/137)  
367 7.

368 Cristiano, J. (2021). Bosquejo para una historia estructural de la aceleración capitalista.  
369 *Revista Mexicana de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales I Universidad Nacional*

- 370 *Autónoma de México Nueva Época, Año LXV, núm. 241, 89-108* doi:  
371 <http://dx.doi.org/10.22201/fcpys.2448492xe.2020.241.70747>.
- 372 De Angelis, C. (2025). Para una sociología crítica del tiempo. En S. M. A. L. Alonso, *La*  
373 *Argentina y el centenario del Instituto de Investigación Social: Variaciones*  
374 *sobre la historia, la actualidad y sobre la historia, la actualidad y el porvenir de*  
375 *la Teoría Crítica* (págs. 459-478). Buenos Aires: Clacso [https://biblioteca-](https://biblioteca-repositorio.clacso.edu.ar/bitstream/CLACSO/272994/1/La-Argentina-centenario.pdf)  
376 [repositorio.clacso.edu.ar/bitstream/CLACSO/272994/1/La-Argentina-](https://biblioteca-repositorio.clacso.edu.ar/bitstream/CLACSO/272994/1/La-Argentina-centenario.pdf)  
377 [centenario.pdf](https://biblioteca-repositorio.clacso.edu.ar/bitstream/CLACSO/272994/1/La-Argentina-centenario.pdf).
- 378 Esposito, E. (2011). *The Future of Futures. The Time of Money in Financing and*  
379 *Society*. Cheshire: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- 380 Gurvitch, G. (1964). *The Spectrum of Social Time*. New York: Dordrecht: D. Reidel  
381 Publishing Co.
- 382 Johnston, S. A. (2022). *The Clocks Are Telling Lies. Science, Society, and the*  
383 *Construction of Time*. Montreal: McGill- Queen's University Press .
- 384 O'Neil, C. (2018). *Armas de destrucción matemática: Cómo el big data aumenta la*  
385 *desigualdad y amenaza la democracia*. Madrid: Capitán Swing.
- 386 Pani, A. K. (2001). Temporal representation and reasoning in artificial intelligence: A  
387 review. *Mathematical and Computer Modelling*, 34(1-2), 55-80  
388 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0895-7177\(01\)00049-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0895-7177(01)00049-8).
- 389 Ramos Torre, R. (2005). Discursos sociales del tiempo. En G. Valencia García, *Tiempo y*  
390 *espacio: miradas múltiples* (págs. 525-544). México: CEIICH-UNAM / Plaza y  
391 Valdéz [https://www.ucm.es/data/cont/docs/183-2013-05-10-](https://www.ucm.es/data/cont/docs/183-2013-05-10-Ram%C3%B3n%20Ramos%20Torre.pdf)  
392 [Ram%C3%B3n%20Ramos%20Torre.pdf](https://www.ucm.es/data/cont/docs/183-2013-05-10-Ram%C3%B3n%20Ramos%20Torre.pdf).
- 393 Rosa, H. (2013). *Social acceleration: a new theory of modernity*. New York: Columbia  
394 University Press.
- 395 Rosa, H. (2016). *Alienación y aceleración. Hacia una teoría crítica de la temporalidad*  
396 *en la modernidad tardía*. Buenos Aires: Katz.
- 397 Stiegler, B. (2018). *For a neganthropology of automatic society*. . Cambridge, UK:  
398 Polity Press. .
- 399 Susen, S. (2018). Jürgen Habermas: Between Democratic Deliberation and Deliberative  
400 Democracy. En R. & Wodak, *The Routledge Handbook of Language and*  
401 *Politics* (págs. 43-66). Abingdon: Routledge  
402 <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/18941/>.
- 403 Torres, F. (2018). Tiempo Histórico. Una promesa de aceleración. *Isegoría Revista de*  
404 *Filosofía Moral y Política N.º 59, julio-diciembre, 553-571*  
405 <https://doi.org/10.3989/isegoria.2018.059.10>.

- 406 Torres, F. (2022). *Temporal Regimes. Materiality, Politics, Technology*. New York:  
407 Routledge .
- 408 Virilio, P. (2012). *The Great Accelerator*. Cambridge: Polity.
- 409

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR