Chapter 3

Cultural Rhythmics Inside Academic Temporalities

Gonzalo Iparraguirre

Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to explore how temporalities produced by academia defines the way we learn and interpret social life, politics, and development. Academia imposes these temporalities by teaching and managing intrinsic temporal notions of social dynamics, as the notion of past, history, present, future, pace, rhythm, acceleration, planning, expectation, synchronization, deadlines, schedules, among others. A general hypothesis that guide this work is that the acceleration of academia and the notion of time it reproduces, configures, and impact in the design of development agendas all over the world.

To achieve this aim, in the first place, it is introduced why it is possible to understand daily life among social rhythms using a method called *cultural rhythmics*. In the second place, it is explained why temporalities incorporated inside academia defines certain rhythmics that allows to comprehend and diagnose potential interventions, with a particular example about the rhythmic of "urgency." The third part introduces the theoretical frame to research development as temporality, as a result of time representations that take account of the past, present, and future of a social process, analyzed through cultural rhythmics. Finally, the design of agendas in academia is explored, following a preliminary idea about how it is possible to create academic and political policies considering their rhythmics.

The Rhythmics of Social Life

In the first place, I will introduce why it is possible to understand daily life among social rhythms and the method I use to analyze social dynamics. Within the last 10 years, I worked in the construction of an ethnographic methodology for studying temporality, spatiality and rhythms of life in different cultural contexts, which called "cultural rhythmics" (Iparraguirre, 2011, 2016). It is rooted

in the interpretative sociocultural anthropology tradition, with ethnography as methodological base (Appadurai, 2015; Bourdieu, 2007; Ingold, 2010; Latour, 2007; Lévi-Strauss, 1979, 1993; Wright, 2008) in dialogue with the backgrounds of anthropology of time (Abram & Weszkalnys, 2011; Carbonell, 2004; Fabian, 2002; Gell, 1992; Hodges, 2008; Munn, 1992).

This method is part of a set of theoretical and methodological tools that defines and sets in motion a precise mode for researching and interpreting social phenomena, whose philosophical and scientific backgrounds can be found in Boas (2010), Mauss (1979), Bachelard (2011), Durand (2004), Evans-Pritchard (1977), and Lévi-Strauss (1993). Lefebvre's *Rhythmanalysis* (2004) demonstrates a strong "mode of analysis of everyday life," to put it in his words, that runs in the same direction and constitutes a complementary method to the one presented here. More recent publications follow Lefebvre's direction such as Goodman (2010), Blue (2017), and Alhadeff-Jones (2017).

At a conceptual level, *cultural rhythmic* defines the set of life rhythms that enables us to characterize and interpret constitutive practices of the social dynamics of a group of people in its everydayness. As method, *cultural rhythmics* constitute a tool for the understanding of the connection between life rhythms and processes of social dynamics, discerning notions of time, called temporalities, and notions of space, that is spatialities. As well as a rhythm of life can characterize a person's way of living, the set of social rhythms can characterize it at the group's level, both *symbolically* and *materially*. This conceptual complement of rhythms and rhythmics enables us to address the articulation between imaginaries, discourses, and practices by studying the *collective* rhythm of the studied group; that is, the cultural rhythmics their members reveal in their practices, and, therefore, able to be grasped in the participant observation.[1]

This method systematizes the set of everyday rhythms of life and aims to connect the "presence of the past" in the imaginaries (like history, family, identity, life trajectory, and tradition), with the "presence of the future" (like planning, projects of life, dreams, hopes, wishes, utopias, and anticipation). So the composition of the present imaginaries of development in decision-making groups can be understood as simultaneity of past and future representations. This methodology is composed of two simultaneous processes of ethnographic research: (1) the analysis of practices of development (which gives access to the presence of the past) and (2) the analysis of modes of agenda planning (giving access to the presence of the future) in each of the study social groups. The first one proposes to interpret how different rhythmics of development allow characterizing of their temporalities (focusing the past in terms of experience, memory, tradition, and habits). In the second one, the study of imaginaries about the future

---

[1]In the conceptual context of this book, rhythmics can be associated to "timescapes" (Adam, 1998) in the sense that "time" implicate rhythms and "scapes" defines the background or space where "times" or "rhythms" are traced, lived, performed, and imagined.

allows comprehension of how the decision-making process works (focusing the future in terms of vision, anticipation, foresight, forecast, and prospective) (Iparraguirre, 2019).

According to the scheme proposed for the interpretation of the various rhythms which are tuned in to the anthropological observation of social life, it is possible to group them under three operational categories: (1) rhythmics of the social organization; (2) rhythmics of administration; (3) rhythmics of the worldview (Table 1). These groupings are neither watertight compartments of an abstraction, nor arbitrary cuts of a reality from which it is intended to discern a symbolic-material totality. Instead, they systematize life rhythms in three dimensions of the social dynamics in order to conceptually place them and make them operational as method of social research. This classification is not fixed and its denominations may be permeable to variations, which are, in their turn, likely to be fused.

The first group, rhythmics of the social organization, comprises daily and seasonal life rhythms, as well as communicative rhythms. Those certainly include every organization of a cultural nature; however, I am not using the term "cultural" in order not to create a confusion with the cultural rhythmics that give the name to the method. I insist that *cultural rhythmics* set up a methodology that requires to differentiate notions of time (temporalities) and notions of space (spatialities) within each systematization of rhythms. I must add that biorhythms (Golombek, Bussi, & Agostino, 2014) are intertwined in the shaping of rhythmics by generating the physiological dynamics that sets the homeostasis of every human body. In his work *Time, the familiar stranger*, Julius T. Fraser (1987) sketches out a close correlation among biorhythms, social cycles, and various temporalities, which although not specifically treated, it opens up a broad field of study to explore. For example, when mentioning that "Time reckoning by bird migration is an ancient custom. It was still very much alive in the Europe of the 1930s […] but began to disappear as industrial and commercial rhythms took over the task of timekeeping" (p. 123); or when explaining that "social cycles are rhythmic schedules, cyclic variations in the amplitude or nature of one or another of the variables, such as work, of the social present" (p. 190).

Daily life rhythms, at the temporality level, are constituted from the organization of the daily activities, and work and tasks schedules, and they define the attitudes towards becoming; at the spatiality level, daily rhythms are expressed in the uses of intimate or immediate spheres of life, either home, school, work, or at the local scale of individual or group movements. Edward Hall has extensively referred to these notions of space in his studies on proxemics, where he distinguishes "types of spaces" based on the analysis of various distance modalities (intimate, personal, social, public) (Hall, 1999).

Seasonal life rhythms, at the temporality level, are constituted from the apprehension of celestial phenomena (sunrises and sunsets, moon phases, solstices, and equinoxes) and the interaction with their manifestations (tides, seasons, and annual sun path), as well as from the calendar organization present in "time counting" instruments, such as calendars, world time zones, historical, and/or

Table 1.   Composition of Social Dynamics as Cultural Rhythmics.

| Rhythms of Life | Cultural Rhythmics | | |
	Temporality	Spatiality	Social Dynamics
Daily rhythms	Daily and hourly organization, schedule of actions and tasks Projective/futural attitude	Uses of intimate, local, immediate spheres of life	Social organization
Seasonal rhythms	Calendars Seasonal schedules Cumulative chronology Natural cycles	Seasonal use of territory, movements, rotations Reading natural-cultural landscape Topologies	
Communicative rhythms	Narrative rhythms, linear and non-linear narratives Art, music Virtual and Internet rhythms Globalized rhythms Academic rhythms	Private and social places Symbolic, virtual spheres Communicative cultural fields and capitals	
Economic rhythms	Production and work rhythms Rhythms of local and global markets Rhythms of consumption	Spheres of production, sustenance, work Virtual spheres of financial production	Sustenance
Political rhythms	Rhythms of bureaucracy, mediation of representatives, relations of power The "right now," urgency Rhythms in decision making	Spheres of management, Public/private spheres, open, no "owners" Decision-making environments	
Ritual rhythms	Rhythms of religious practices, beliefs, worshipping Rhythms of celebrations, disruptions, catastrophes Philosophy of life, vision of the world	Spheres of reflection and worship Oneiric places Sacred places	Worldview

geological chronologies. At the spatiality level, these rhythms are apprehended in the seasonal use of territories, people's moves for work or holidays, strategic moves (as in goat grazing). An example of seasonal cultural rhythmic are the calendar rhythmics (days, weeks, months, and years), the academic calendar and the tourism dynamics that divides leisure from work rhythms. I remark that they should not be confused with the seasonal natural rhythmics, such as the rhythmics of the lunar cycle (the set of rhythms generated by moon phases).

Communicative life rhythms are revealed, at the temporality level, in the narrative rhythms of speech and of various literary genres, in the linearity or nonlinearity of the discursive content, in the rhythms of artistic expressions, in the rhythms of nonverbal communication, in the rhythms of virtual life (length of digital processes), in globalized rhythms (TV, radio, Internet, and phone), and of course in all the academic rhythms already mentioned (studying, researching, writing, publishing, traveling, etc.). At the spatiality level, these rhythms are found either in the use of private as well as of social places, in the representation of symbolic and virtual spheres (Canevacci, 2013; García Canclini, 2008). Examples of communicative cultural rhythmics are the virtual rhythmics of online life (Internet), the gestural rhythmics of sign language, the performative rhythmics (in dance, music, theater, painting, and others) and all the academic activities that reproduce the educative field.

The second group, rhythmics of administration, gathers the economic and political rhythms. The term "administration" is used to unify the economic-political binomial into a further degree of systematization, which entails the criterion of management of life through the economic and political practices. Economic life rhythms operate at the temporality level in the rhythms of production and work, the rhythms of the tangible local market and the intangible global market, rhythms of consumption, rhythms of the banking and financial systems; at the spatiality level, these rhythms are sustained in the notions of space implied in the transformation of raw material into product (production of goods and social relations of production), and in the representation of "production environments" (agricultural soil, mining mountain, and fishing water). Examples of economic cultural rhythmics are the production, financial, tax, and salary rhythmics. Even though these can be considered as everyday rhythmics, they may respond either to daily or seasonal practices, by which they are differentiated from both groups of rhythms.

Then, political life rhythms, at the temporality level, are those rhythms of the representation of facts and people on behalf of institutions, rhythms of mediation, bureaucracy, governance, the rhythm in decision making (the "right now" and "the urgent"), agenda design and planning. The notions of space involved are built in spheres of management (public and private), in state administration with no private "owners," in decision-making environments (places with symbolic capitals of power, such as government "houses," Universities, and International organizations buildings). Examples of political rhythmics are rhythmics of government, management, of international organizations and lobbies, rhythmics of clientelism, electoral rhythmics, among others. Academic rhythmics are also political when they impact in governmental decision making.

Finally, the rhythmics of the worldview comprise the ritual life rhythms. At the temporality level, we can differentiate the rhythms of religious practices (rhythms when praying, attending services, marrying, and meditating), rhythms of celebrations, dances, and every disruptive event of the stable social order, rhythms denoting philosophies of life or visions of the world. The notions of space involved in ritual rhythms are present around spheres of reflection and worship, places considered sacred (temples and churches). Examples of cultural rhythmics of the worldview are all those ritual rhythmics, religious in a broad sense, that in varied ways re-unite the actor with the social group he identifies with (rhythmics of meditation, contemplation, and daydreaming).

This rhythmical schematization of the social dynamics does not necessarily imply a "search" in the fieldwork for all the rhythms mentioned for explaining the dynamics of the studied group. It operates as a "catalogue" of "behaviors" likely to be found or deserving attention. Certainly, there are others not mentioned here that may generate another setting of rhythms, thus, creating permutations, overlaps, broadenings or resignifications of rhythms and rhythmics, respectively.

Academic Rhythmics

In the second place, I will explain why temporalities produced inside academia affects the way we interpret social dynamics. Academic temporalities manifest the rhythmics of scientific production embedded in the metrics of academic behavior: how many papers, how many congresses, how many students, how many teaching hours, how many credits, how many travels, and so on. *How many*, in rhythmics terms, is translated as *how fast* can we express our capacity to produce science, models, methods, policies or whatever.

Let's see a specific example of cultural rhythmic inside academic temporality: the imaginary of "urgency." In academic life, "urgency" can be connected to notions such us "time pressure," "working time," or "time compression"[2] that push every single activity toward deadlines and to fulfill schedules; it allows to exemplify a cultural rhythmic inside academic temporalities. Everything around us, inside a polychronic world (Hall, 1999) and in accelerated way of life, tell us that we are urged to live in an urgent world. The emergent captivates us and ephemerally ceases to be new when another urgency replaces the previous one, and, thus, spasmodically, we move ourselves toward another one. Why do we live in urgency? What is pushing us to live urgently? What is, in short, an urgent rhythm of life?

---

[2]I emphasize that in my writings, rhythm-rhythmical concepts are substitutes of time-temporal concepts because it is common, in time studies literature, to naturalize any use of the concept time to the hegemonic temporality, that is: lost time, temporal, times, time spans, time logics, and similar.

Today, an overlapping of local and global rhythms constitutes the urgent way of living, a cultural rhythmic we identify here as "urgency." Our culture moves to the rhythm of the urgent. There exists an imaginary of urgency that structures physically and daily into the rhythms of the urgent. An activity is yet unfinished while the following one has already started; the overlapping of possible actions stimulates the acceleration of each of them, thus, becoming urgent to finish with all of them in order to start with the new ones, which are already appearing above a horizon of imminent future.

As a net of symbolic components, urgency is built around categories such as speed, rush, acceleration, immediacy, stress, anxiety, deadlines, among other similar ones. Acceleration of everyday activities sets up a permanent state of urgency, an imaginary of immediacy as – using a medical metaphor – if we lived in intensive care. Precisely, the model of living set up by the imaginaries of hospital, health and biopolitics – as Foucault would argue, confronts us to our sense of death, thus, of life. Under this scheme, nothing is more urgent than discarding illness as soon as possible through multiple checkups and medical consultations. The value of being alive is measured according to the health control, with millimetric accuracy and amid a deep anxiety for securing an immediate biological control.

As set of life rhythms, urgency reveals itself in daily rhythms, as well as in the political and economic rhythms. As temporality, routine tasks become saturated with scheduling conflicts, unfinished activities and a constant concept of work that fails to distinguish when it is possible to stop working and rest. As spatiality, places we live in at home, work, and the public spaces, either material or virtual, fill with micro-spaces that flatten spatial diversity to a plane, to the straight line, and to distances that must be given "as soon as possible" and without "delays" or discontinuities.

Modernization – approaching the most recent modernity, today entails being "up-to-date" by getting the *latest* model available of anything (being cars, seeds, fertilizers, touristic attractions, or smartphones). In the rhythmic record, to have access and getting "the latest" is to approach the immediacy of becoming that assimilates a status of the *closest real*, legitimated in its economic correlate, its exchange value and its socio-cultural capital. Before and now, far and close, old and new; images reflecting the linear and mechanistic temporality that conceives production and social practices over a straight line of natural numbers, or on a mass production conveyor belt, or on the rails of a track, or on the furrows made on the ground by agricultural machinery. The "modern" modes of imagining technology are symbolic and technical expressions of how the notion of development *is* a precise temporality that sets an inexorable life rhythm *to the beat* of a socially shared urgency.

The imaginary of "urgency" is nowadays at the core of economic models of development impelling societies to live to produce and consume to put up with the accelerated rhythm of life. Thus, analyzing the paradigm of global capitalist development as temporality allows to comprehend the symbolic components behind this imaginary and their practical manifestations (such us agricultural intensification, fast-food production, tourism, virtual commerce, global political

agendas, ecological devastation, overpopulated territories, and, in this precisely case, the accelerated academia that joint us in this book).

Development as Temporality

Deploying the conceptualization of development as temporality requires two complementary analytic instances. First, to initially introduce the historical construction of the concept of "development" and to analyze it from the symbolic perspective of the study of imaginaries (Durand, 2004; Ricoeur, 2012; Wright, 2008); then, to explain afterwards the reach of the concept of *temporality*, its distinction from the concept of *time* and the conception of development *as* temporality (Iparraguirre, 2017).

Development as a concept is a rationalization of the apprehension of time that implies the three tensions of every temporality: origin (past), becoming (present), and destiny (future) of a process. If, as an exercise, we consider the biological development of any living creature, the interpretation of the concept is always diachronic as current development is understood in comparison to a previous stage (how it developed) or to a future stage (how it will develop). Although the term is not directly used, there are multiple allusions to "the process of development" in daily life, as it often happens in family contexts: – *"look how big your kid is!"* or *"how fast you grew up!"* or *"the town took off; it developed."* In other contexts – economics, politics or media – its use has often a negative connotation: "*underdeveloped or developing countries"* (those unable to balance their past with their present), or a positive one when mentioning: *"overdeveloped sectors"* (when their present is ahead of their future expected in later stages). Whatever expression is used, the semantic structure of the various definitions of "development" entails the three tensions of every temporality that, for broadening its meaning, I here associate with *origin*, *becoming,* and *destiny*; in Western societies, this temporality has precise ontological characteristics: linear, projective, cumulative.

As stated in a previous work (Iparraguirre, 2016), temporality is all human interpretation of becoming that sustains us in life; a becoming that has been assigned with multiple variations of what was historically called "time." In precise terms, time is defined as *phenomenon of becoming in itself*, and temporality, as *human apprehension of becoming*. Then I suggested that the concept of temporality:

> is referred to a cultural construction, thus derived from a subject's experience, hence not an *a priori* intuition. Time, then as phenomenon, is intrinsic to every human being; on the other hand, temporality, besides being intrinsic to every human being, acquires instead a cultural character since it depends on an experience in context, thus constituting an interpretation […] Notions of time, as conceptualizations on the *time phenomenon* placed in a socio-historical context, are temporalities. The distinction is useful for not to reduce the phenomenon (time) to only one interpretation (temporality). (Iparraguirre, 2016, p. 617)

The indistinguishable usage of time and temporality in everyday language, either in political, scientific, pedagogical, or media discourses, contributes to naturalize a same meaning for both concepts, therefore, naturalizing the hegemonic temporality as the *only* possible way of thinking the phenomenon of time. The hegemonic temporality, understood as the conceptualization of western linear time in various processes of officialization, is detected in the analysis of the imaginaries when considering the existence of *other temporalities* responding to other logics and attitudes facing becoming, and not conceived as unique and univocal. Global hour reckoning, calendars, and any other standardization of production are examples of the hegemonic temporality imposed by the western to the rest of the world.

Likewise, *development*, as a central concept of the hegemonic capitalistic temporality – and for academia too, is naturalized as a unique notion of the sense of life – individual and collective, when it is stated, for instance, among other similar expressions: "there is no progress without development." Interpreting development as temporality implies a notion that cannot be univocal, has a historical construction crossed by processes of officialization, and that by becoming hegemonic it imposes onto other notions, replacing, syncretizing, or removing them. The various notions of development are circumscribed to both the uses (daily practices) and the representations of the processes (temporality) and locations (spatiality) where the mentioned development occurs, is done and undone, is produced, managed, and consumed. In Claude Lévi-Strauss's words: "A society is always a spatial–temporal given, and therefore subject to the impact of other societies and of earlier states of its own development" (cited in Mauss, 1979, p. 20).

The philosophical and scientific problematization of "development" withdraws in another horizon of problematics: that of the *cultural discontinuities* that goes back to the "discovery" of the New World with the sixteenth century European colonialism (Lévi-Strauss, 1979, pp. 294–303). As explained by the author, a *unitary vision of development* of mankind emerges from the context of that process, conceived as progression, regression or a combination of both. Lévi-Strauss highlights that those societies which today we call "underdeveloped" are not such through their own doing, and one would be wrong to conceive of them as exterior to western development (hegemonic) or indifferent to it. In truth, they are the very societies whose direct or indirect destruction between the sixteenth and the nineteenth centuries have made possible the *development of the Western world* (Lévi-Strauss, 1979, pp. 296–297).

Considering the interpretation of development as temporality, the difference stated by Lévi-Strauss between *cumulative history*, associated with "progressive cultures," and *stationary history*, associated with "inert cultures," can be found in our context in the stigmatizations attributed to "market sectors" or groups of producers, which are not strictly functional to the serialized accumulation of capitalism. In fact, we can resignify those definitions to circumscribe at least two notions of development: the *cumulative development* associated to the hegemonic temporality of the western capitalist mode of production and living, and the *stationary development* associated to native temporalities with a different attitude toward becoming,

lying far from the canon of accumulation and progress. Caution is required in this sense when "types" of development are remarked, as the author points out:

> At every occasion we are inclined to call a culture inert or stationary, we must therefore ask ourselves if that apparent immobility does not stem from our ignorance of its true interests, and if, with its own criteria – which are different from our own – that culture is not a victim of the same illusion with respect to us. (Lévi-Strauss, 1979, p. 320)

Both notions of development, both temporalities, are neither diametrically polarized, nor impossible to find together in a same socio-territorial process; on the contrary, what we observe is a *coexistence* of modes of production, living, developing; in short, coexisting in the same territory. We are then able to visualize at the regional level what Lévi-Strauss clarified more than 50 years ago at the world level – what today we call global:

> No world civilization [aka globalization] can exist because civilization implies the coexistence of cultures offering among themselves the maximum of diversity and even consists in this very coexistence. […] all cultural progress depends on a coalition of cultures. (Lévi-Strauss, 1979, p. 336).

To sum up, development is a constellation of imaginaries rather than a specific practice; it is an interpretation of becoming and matter, and specifically, on *how* "things" unfold in the becoming. Development, as well as progress, is an imaginary of the becoming. We see a blooming plant and say: "it is developing, it evolved" – or when comparing groups of similar plants or animals, it is usually said: "here we can clearly see how this species developed", although obviating in this reasoning that the term "evolution" is a component of the imaginary "development," which then implies an *evolutionist* interpretation of biological change, as if there were no others (Lévi-Strauss, 1993).

The productivistic temporality imposed by an academic field formatted by capitalism, reproduces through its agents (professors, researchers, students, and employees) a way of life and an agenda of priorities and actions that transform the academy in a cog of the global market of services and products. As Vostal remind us in the Introduction chapter of this book: "Capitalism is a fundamental part of academia, academia is a fundamental part of capitalism."

Design of Academic-political Agendas

Finally, I want to explore the design of the future, if it is possible to create academic and political policies considering their rhythmics following this question: Is academy prepared to face the challenge of thinking about the presence of the future? Will academics insist at looking only to the past to solve our becoming troubles?

During the last 4 years, I've been working in a governmental position as Secretary of Development, so I've been able to confirm that the design, planning, and analysis of the social dynamics that make up specific public policies, have a deficit in naturalizing assumptions about core categories of daily life, such us nature, time, space, production, economy, education, and culture. To design policy can be interpret as rhythmics configuration because regulating social life is a practice to anticipate future shapes, through the organization of temporalities, spatialities, rhythms of life, modes of communication, and education. Planning social policies, such as urbanization, industries, finances, energy, or academic contents among others, face us to balance the imaginaries that coexist between the presence of the past and the presence of the future.

Cultural rhythmics method proposes that every cultural process could be interpreted as a triad of *imaginaries, discourses*, and *practices*. It considers development as a composition of the three elements, thus, able to be treated as an imaginary that acquires various discursive forms and could be practiced in multiple ways. Likewise, the method does not conceive these elements separately, as development is not only an imaginary, it is not produced just at the discursive level and it is not reduced to a concrete action. In fact, it is not feasible to practice development, but to execute specific practices that promote or materialize it (to produce food, to commercialize, to pay taxes, to planning agendas, to govern, to produce academic contents, among others). Applying this type of study to the construction of academic agendas requires us to know precisely what academic implications are, how they were historically built, and in what way they are intertwined in the rhythms of life of the societies involved.

Ethnography done over 10 years in Argentina, from a double role as an academic and as a public official, made explicit that "development," based on the recurrence of the components "progress" and "evolution," constitutes a triad of cultural imagination that provides symbolic material to reproduce linear temporality. In its symbolic and discursive dimension, development is the matrix imaginary of the hegemonic temporality as it brings together the set of symbolic representations that sustains the linear-cumulative temporality inherent in the currently hegemonic global economic-political-academic system.

However, is there only one rhythmic of development? Does "progress" of a society define the rhythm of its development? Results of the above mentioned anthropological research enable us to argue that "development," in its practical-symbolical dimension, can be characterized as a set of cultural rhythmics that are rooted in local-cultural characteristics. This means that it is not restricted only to a set of life rhythms (economic, political, communicational, ritual, or others) because it is simultaneously, a set of imaginaries, which are in turn materialized through definite practices, many of them learned from academic trajectory (the knowledge of farming, of food production, of tool making, of public policy planning, of social administration, among others).

Therefore, these practices can be, or not be considered, as contributors to development, depending on the diverse values and senses the groups have; that is, the imaginaries they share on development. By considering the concept of

"development" as historically and territorially built, thus, implying a specific temporality and spatiality, it is unavoidable to see it as one possible notion among many. Hence, its social and local sense will depend precisely on these two configurations of every social imaginary: the symbolic components and its empirical correlate structured by territorial conditions. A clear example is the role that academia plays when designing policies in Latin American indebted and impoverished countries, as the case of Argentina, in contrast with lender and financial countries that promotes a "global and equal development" through their academic agents.

A final example outside academia can shed light to emphasize how temporalities shapes our social organization, from our houses to complete urbanizations. The rhythmic of urgency becomes overwhelmingly tangible in cities like Dubai,[3] where the superposition of future states around the world can be condense into a single city and under the same consumption concept: here you can experience the future of the whole world simultaneously. An Arab culture with a presence of the past crystallized for millennia went on to *decentralize* from its own tradition and turn to cultural forms of an extreme capitalism where everything can be sold because the value comes from the *urgent* exchange of cultures–tourists–business–flights. Fishing, oil, and species (historical heritage) were relegated to the attraction of a combination of elements and symbols (religion, mathematics, architecture, highways, hotels, cars, buildings, airplanes, and fashion) that incessantly produce the feeling of being living only at the edge of the future. Dubai exemplifies today, in an extreme way, that *cultural decentering* manifests itself in the production of value through the consumption of what is to come.

The rhythmical analysis of socio-territorial dynamics, as it happens with academic dynamics, enables us to give an account of the various ways of living that can be practiced in a same territory. That is, without restricting to the analysis of the imaginaries that reproduce crystallized and naturalized notions (i.e. the urgent as inexorable way of living, or the polarity between work and life as a natural process). The dynamics of a society, its ideological, cultural, political, economic, and ritual organization, is produced and reproduced in its everydayness; social life is being in becoming. The movement of materials and social actors that sustains social dynamics can be fully understood by articulating its small movements, the minimum processes of daily life, with the major movements, the maximum processes that define transitions or consolidations (historical epochs such as the current Anthropocene, political trends, social movements, scientific paradigms, academic schools, educational systems, among others).

For all that has been said, it is proposed that academic temporalities, like urgency, can be diagnosed and analyzed for potential interventions inside and beyond academia (i.e. the design of academic-political agendas), if those minimum processes of the daily academic becoming (rhythms of teaching, of learning, of scheduling, of writing, of

---

[3]On my way to Prague to the 4th Accelerated Academy Conference in 2018, I visited Dubai because of the combination of the flights.

researching, and of publishing) are put in resonance with the major ones that enable to identify the rhythmics of a culture (the temporal and spatial dynamics that sustains social organization, administration, and worldviews).

References

Abram, S., & Weszkalnys, G. (2011). Introduction: Anthropologies of planning – Temporality, imagination and ethnography. *Journal of Global and HIstorical Anthropology*, *61*, 3–18.

Adam, B. (1998). *Timescapes of modernity. The environment and invisible hazards*. London: Routledge.

Alhadeff-Jones, M. (2017). *Time and the rhythms of emancipatory education*. London: Routledge.

Appadurai, A. (2015). *El futuro como hecho cultural. Ensayos sobre la condición global*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Bachelard, G. (2011 [1957]). *Poética del espacio*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Blue, S. (2017). Institutional rhythms: Combining practice theory and rhythmanalysis to conceptualise processes of institutionalisation. *Time & Society*, *28*(3), 922–950.

Boas, F. (2010 [1927]). *Primitive art*. Toronto: Courier Dover Publications.

Bourdieu, P. (2007). *El sentido práctico*. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI.

Canevacci, M. (2013). *Sincrétika. Exploracoes etnográficas sobre artes contemporáneas*. Sao Paulo: Studio Nobel.

Carbonell, E. (2004). *Debates acerca de la antropología del tiempo*. Barcelona: Publicacions de la Universitat de Barcelona.

Durand, G. (2004). *Las estructuras antropológicas del imaginario*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Evans-Pritchard, E. (1977 [1939]). *Los Nuer*. Barcelona: Anagrama.

Fabian, J. (2002). *Time and the other: How anthropology makes its object*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Fraser, J. T. (1987). *Time, the familiar stranger*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.

García Canclini, N. (2008). *La globalización imaginada*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.

Gell, A. (1992). *The anthropology of time: Cultural constructions of temporal maps and images*. Oxford: Berg.

Golombek, D., Bussi, L., & Agostino, P. (2014). Minutes, days and years: Molecular inter-actions among different scales of biological timing. *Philosophical Transactions of The Royal Society. Series B: Biological Sciences*, *369*, 20120465.

Goodman, S. (2010). *Sonic warfare: Sound, affect and the ecology of fear*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Hall, E. (1999). *La dimensión oculta*. Barcelona: Siglo XXI Editores.

Hodges, M. (2008). Reconsidering time's arrow: Bergson, Deleuze and the anthropology of time. *Anthropological Theory*, *8*(4), 399–429.

Ingold, T. (2010). The textility of making. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, *34*, 91–201.

Iparraguirre, G. (2011). *Antropología del tiempo. El caso mocoví*. Buenos Aires: Sociedad Argentina de Antropología.

Iparraguirre, G. (2016). Time, temporality and cultural rhythmics: An anthropological case study. *Time and Society*, *25*(3), 613–633.

Iparraguirre, G. (2017). *Imaginarios del desarrollo. Gestión política y científica de la cultura*. Buenos Aires: Biblos.

Iparraguirre, G. (2019). Anticipation as presence of the future. In R. Poli (Ed.), *Handbook of anticipation. Theoretical and applied aspects of the use of future in decision making* (pp. 407–424). Cham: Springer.

Latour, B. (2007). *Nunca fuimos modernos. Ensayo de antropología simétrica*. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI Editores.

Lefebvre, H. (2004). *Rhythmanalysis: Space, time and everyday life*. London: Continuum.

Lévi-Strauss, C. (1979). *Antropología estructural: mito, sociedad, humanidades*. México: Siglo XXI Editores.

Lévi-Strauss, C. (1993). *El pensamiento salvaje*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Mauss, M. (1979). *Sociología y Antropología*. Madrid: Tecnos.

Munn, N. (1992). The cultural anthropology of time: A critical essay. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *21*, 93–123.

Ricoeur, P. (2012). *Ideología y utopía*. Barcelona: Gedisa.

Wright, P. (2008). *Ser-en-el-sueño. Crónicas de historia y vida toba*. Buenos Aires: Biblos.