

1-10-2024

Earth Art in the Great Acceleration: Times/Counter-Times, Monuments/Counter-Monuments

Gary Shapiro
University of Richmond, gshapiro@richmond.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.richmond.edu/philosophy-faculty-publications>



Part of the [Continental Philosophy Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Shapiro, Gary, "Earth Art in the Great Acceleration: Times/Counter-Times, Monuments-Counter-Monuments," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 38 (1): 47-61 (2024).

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Philosophy at UR Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Philosophy Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of UR Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact scholarshiprepository@richmond.edu.

**Earth Art in the Great Acceleration:
Times/Counter-Times, Monuments/Counter-Monuments**

Gary Shapiro

Since the 1960s Western American deserts have become sites of iconic earthworks such as Robert Smithson's *Spiral Jetty* (Great Salt Lake), Walter de Maria's *Lightning Field* (New Mexico), James Turrell's *Roden Crater* (Arizona), and Michael Heizer's *City* (Nevada). Most of these works are difficult to access, available only to limited groups who secure expensive reservations through relevant foundations. These site-specific works are known mostly through photography and in reports from intrepid, wealthy, or lucky visitors. In some cases – notoriously at the *Lightning Field* – visitors must agree not to take or distribute their own photographs, ensuring DIA Foundation's control of the site's imagery and public meaning. Travelers' reports tend to be affective, confessional, and highly personal; this is not surprising, given the structural analogy between a multi-stage transcontinental journey to a secluded artwork and a religious pilgrimage to a sacred site.¹ They could be considered alongside other memoirs of self-exploration by desert isolation. Although frequently eloquent, such reports cannot substitute for critical responses to these works that could examine their places in the artworld, their geographical and historical topography, and their sense as planetary markers at a crucial point in the human orientation to the Earth – and also as candidates to be American equivalents of Delphi, inspiring prophecies in immersive atmospheres.

¹ For an example of such memoirs see Felicity Colman "Affective entropy: Art as differential form," *Angelaki* 11:1, 169-178. For a pilgrimage narrative, see Erin Hogan, *Spiral Jetty* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009).

Earth art since the last ice age. I'll try to contextualize these works within a more inclusive time span, noting just a few predecessors (I'm necessarily painting with a broad brush).² At least since the cessation of the last ice age (about 12,000 BCE), human communities have engaged in large scale constructive markings on the land that involve changing ways of thinking with the Earth. Certain archaic works like Stonehenge were oriented astronomically to perceived movements of the sun, moon, and stars. We imagine that they demonstrated the knowledge and power of a priestly elite who designed them and commanded the labor necessary to build them (evidence of agricultural surplus and political organization). Often they marked what was taken to be the *axis mundi*, the Earth's center. The specific meaning of others, like the Peruvian Nazca lines, remains elusive, but they were surely intended to display and enact a certain culture's relation to its environment. In other words, they enacted and expressed its sense of Earth's meaning. Those works of land art – like later parks, gardens, and monuments - implicitly assumed that the natural environment was relatively unchanging, its resources would be continuously available, and that human activity was on the whole productive, cultivating, and civilizing. They took for granted a steady-state ecology, whose only variations were those of the seasons and daily weather. Unusual spikes of hot or cold temperatures or even rarer multi-continent consequences of volcanic explosions (like that of 1883) were seen as one-off idiosyncratic events, rather than signs of a trend. Only after 1950 or so did these assumptions begin to waver, as earlier confidence was shaken by awareness of environmental chemical pollution (cf. Rachel Carson, *Silent Spring*), effects of nuclear testing, and danger of nuclear war. Since then, of course, humans have discovered that they live in the Anthropocene, a new geological era of their own making. Climate change and pandemics are recognized now as not

² For an excellent comprehensive history, see Elizabeth Barlow Rogers, *Landscape Design: A Cultural and Architectural History* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 2001).

mere unintended consequences of civilization but as something more like a critical or terminal disease. In the millennia before such apprehensions arose – still ignored or denied in too many quarters – various civilizations continued to express their sense of the Earth in distinctive forms of art (here I find it useful to think of parks, gardens, and large scale monumental works as forms of Earth Art). Enclosed Persian gardens, emphasizing water features and lush plantings were paradises (the Hebrew word *pardes* derives from a Persian term for park or garden); as adapted by Islamic cultures they offered foretastes of the next life awaiting the righteous. There is some echo of the *axis mundi* aspiration in great classic French gardens like Versailles, whose geometrical style and indefinitely receding horizons say something about the power of the Sun King or the wealthy and privileged nobility. They were made possible by a centralized mercantile economy. Approximately contemporary [British picturesque gardens](#) were typically understood by landed nobility and their designers as individual expressions and retreats; contrasts with the centralized [French style](#) were often explicit (although the “liberty” of wealthy British landowners was secured by a non-democratic state’s growing colonial empire, as were contemporary French gardens). Nature was idealized by hiding the frame (*parergon*) that visibly enclosed earlier gardens; borrowed scenery contributed to producing a sense of infinite horizons, often modeled on landscape paintings (e.g. Claude Lorraine). In hiding the garden’s physical frame, the designers also obscured its political and economic genealogy; lands that had once been commons were now enclosed and much of the former population had little choice but to become part of a more urban work force in an industrial, commercial society.

As cities grew, landscape architects undertook to produce urban versions of the picturesque for densely settled populations. In the US Frederick Law Olmsted brought the outside into the inside in iconic works like New York’s [Central Park](#), promising city dwellers an

escape from alienating experiences in crowded streets, allowing them to enjoy varied strolls on serpentine paths in natural settings, encountering fellow citizens in a more humane fashion, encouraging a social atmosphere of acceptance, recognition, and shared pleasure for otherwise harried urbanites, providing an alternative to the problem of "other minds" (his words) that they otherwise encountered on crowded streets with their competitive rush. Olmsted and Calvert Vaux's Central Park design is topologically and diagrammatically inventive. Smithson remarked on its "dialectical materialism," relating the inside and the outside, accommodating the park to the busy city around it, deploying semi-concealed carriage paths (now also roads for automotive traffic). Christo and Jeanne-Claude's 2005 work [The Gates](#) was a brilliant later adaptation and renewal of the diagram/atmosphere double.³ A few decades after Olmsted, [Roberto Burle Marx](#) followed a related but distinct path in Brazil's burgeoning urban centers (especially Rio de Janeiro). Rather than building on the British picturesque like Olmsted, Burle Marx creatively fused modern design with lush plantings of tropical vegetation while adapting design principles from early 20th century modernism. While such projects offered temporary respites from urban congestion, they were possible only because of the political and economic concentration of the cities themselves. These two landscape architects left testimonies of their struggles with corrupt political bosses or juntas. Their interventions on the surface of a rapidly industrializing Earth are perhaps the zenith of a political aesthetic blissfully ignorant of all that we associate with the Anthropocene.

Relation and rupture: atmospheres and diagrams. Looking back at traditional Earth Art from the perspective of the more recent desert works, several aspects of relation and rupture

³ Cf. Gary Shapiro, "The Pragmatic Picturesque: The Philosophy of Central Park," in Dan O'Brien ed., *Gardening: Cultivating Wisdom* (New York: Blackwell, 2010).

become discernible. All are large-scale markings of the Earth, aiming to endure, and to be seen. So far they have a monumental character. Structurally, both the earlier works and more recent desert forms can be understood as diagrammatic arrangements (*dispositifs*) directing movement and attention, framing and displaying the surrounding atmosphere. I speak of diagrams here not simply as outlines or blueprints but as arrangements involving affordances for movement, viewing (and the use of other senses), following suggestions from Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze. Both traditional gardens, such as the British picturesque, and an innovative construction like the *Spiral Jetty* are atmospheric theaters, a point made explicitly by their designers. I understand atmosphere to involve the look and feel (including sound, smell, air pressure) of the surroundings as well as the sky's vault or dome. Atmosphere varies seasonally, by time of day, and in relation to changing meteorological conditions. Atmosphere involves such felt qualities as mood, *Stimmung*, milieu, ambience, pervasive aura, sense, or quality. Some call that dimension of "atmosphere" subjective, but let's reject this tired objective/subjective template. To put things in a different vocabulary, while the diagram requires a structural analysis, atmosphere is a phenomenological category. Earth Art involves atmosphere's twofold being, both mood as a subtle, fragile, pervasive quality, and as the actual air we breathe, feel, see, smell, and (sometimes) hear. Affective atmosphere is closely and intricately bound to physical, chemical, and meteorological atmosphere. Public places encourage affective contagion among groups; this potential is intensified when the places are creatively designed.

While a work's expanse on the ground is defined by its physical footprint, its atmospheric reach is in principle unlimited, a fact that's especially obvious in desert constructions. Earth Art of all eras embodies cultural norms and aspirations (cf. the earlier discussion of British and French gardens) typically involving ideological, religious, or political forces. Consciously or not,

all are products of specific economic and political forces and available forms of energy. All implicitly pose or suggest an answer to the question “what is the sense of the Earth?”

This last question indicates how we might begin to think the ruptures separating the desert works from their predecessors. Traditional works embody *answers*, with gardens typically embodying culturally various versions of what Stendhal and Nietzsche called the “promise of happiness.” Yet works like Smithson’s and Heizer’s seem to stress *questions*. While later explorers puzzled at first over the sense of Egyptian or Mayan monuments, they were confident (as we are) that they *did* express some meaning. It’s as if the post-60s earthworks artists realized (as some did explicitly) that the anthropocentric narratives supporting earlier works are no longer tenable, that humans are no longer masters of their environment, that the Earth’s flux renders its (and our) future vastly more indeterminate than previously imagined. Geological and ecological naïveté is no longer possible. The relatively difficult access to these desert works, their disconnection from general cultural practices (other than their problematic relation to the artworld), and their openness to the “real space” of its big sky intensify the question they pose (see below on Robert Morris’s discussion of “real space”). If the end of the last ice age sparked a series of massive, meaningful inscriptions of the Earth, the desert works do not mark an achieved sense but function as experiments and interrogatives. They signal that the Holocene honeymoon time was temporary, a rather illusive harmony of humans and the Earth; it’s no longer our condition but “a shining artifact of the past” (Leonard Cohen).

The traditional discipline of art history may not be fully adequate to understanding the desert works. Art history, let’s recall, is an offshoot of world-history, and still struggles to shake off its Hegelian roots, especially those binding it to Hegel’s concept of world, which is not only anthropocentric but privileges “worlds” centered in the state and marginalizes other forms of

inhabiting the Earth.⁴ The world, whether in Hegel or in Heidegger, is understood in terms of a very specific human temporality. Even when Heidegger analyzes the *Kunstwerk* as a *Riss* (rift) disclosing the strife of *Erde* and *Welt*, his concept of earth seems to implicitly assume the state of relative climatic constancy that obtained following the last ice age. The hope of traditional monument builders to mark the Earth for an unlimited posterity has been subject to critique at least since the European romantics (Cf. Shelley “Ozymandias” and Volney’s *The Ruins of Empires*).⁵ Yet the recognition of eventual decay, neglect, or deliberate destruction was still limited to the worldly perspective, with the Earth intervening only through sporadic, singular events, such as volcanic eruptions. In the counter-monuments discussed here, the world meets the Earth, not in Heidegger’s sense of productive tension – which might well describe traditional Earthworks - but as collision, confrontation, and interrogation. The desert or wasteland, actual or metaphorical, has typically been seen as a challenge to the world as an assured place of human dwelling. From Nietzsche’s warning that “*die Wüste wächst*,” through Eliot’s *The Wasteland*, and Heidegger’s glosses on Nietzsche, it’s become a modern (post-modern?) commonplace that the world is generally threatened by a desertification of human making that throws the assumption of meaningful human dwelling (Heideggerian *Wohnung*) into question.⁶

When recent and contemporary Earth Art is situated within the context sketched above, it becomes possible to see both significant continuities and differences between older and newer forms. All Earth Art has ethical and political implications in so far as it indicates and opens up ideal spaces of desire, pleasure, wonder, or learning. Step by step, Earth Art followed in the

⁴ I develop this contrast of earth and world in *Nietzsche’s Earth: Great Events, Great Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016),

⁵ For a comprehensive recent statement, see Paul B. Preciado “When Statues Fall,” *Artforum* December 2020.

⁶ For a provocative statement and rich references, see Aidan Tynan, *The Desert in Modern literature and Philosophy: Wasteland Aesthetics* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2020).

wake of the scientific revolutions (Copernican, Darwinian, Einsteinian) that challenged various forms of anthropocentrism. Now that we're caught up in a largely human-caused cascade of environmental catastrophe, the desert works find inspiration in Earth System Science – if not for new promises of happiness then for a renewed sense of wonder and understanding.

Time out of joint: an archaeology of the future? Recently, certain thinkers have formulated or mapped the specific ways in which Anthropocene time is “out of joint.” In *The Great Acceleration: An Environmental History of the Anthropocene since 1945*, J.R. McNeill and Peter Engelke argue that the testing and use of nuclear weapons with enduring global effects is a good marker of the new geological era. Since then energy use, greenhouse gas emissions, production of nuclear weapons and power plants, and rapid population growth, have led to measurably extreme ecological damages, including climate change and pollution of air and sea. The Southwestern deserts are now inevitably identified with the first and subsequent nuclear weapons tests, eventual concerns about fallout, and the new international order of mutually assured destruction that held sway explicitly during the Cold War and still holds, even as more public attention is devoted to climate change, regional conflicts, and massive population movements associated with both. The consequences of heightened fossil fuel extraction undermine earlier settled conceptions (or fantasies) of virgin landscape.

What then is involved in art's turn to the desert in the Anthropocene? Desert aesthetics, so travelers, critics, and geographers testify, involves a distinctive alteration of sensory experience. Space expands there, while time slows down. While one continuum seems to asymptotically approach infinite extension, the other invites us to linger in a surprisingly dense duration. So the desert is traditionally a retreat for contemplation and meditation, a place free from both hurried, syncopated cities and agricultural life's scheduled routines. Even an ascetic

retreat requires minimal resources, and these are notoriously in short supply in wastelands. The desert functions proleptically as the specter of an entropic, devastated future, as lands become increasingly deforested, arid, and too hot for general habitation. Don De Lillo's 2010 novel *Point Omega* narrates a retreat to the American desert by an aging intellectual who contemplates the entropic process of human extinction, accompanied by a young filmmaker who aspires to make a documentary recording the guru's late reflections on cosmic and human order, including his experience as an interdisciplinary advisor to US Iraq War planners. The conversation of elder and younger could be read alongside Heidegger's *Conversation on a Country Path*, each discussion developing a geographically distinctive version of *Gelassenheit*. That conversation, reported by the filmmaker, is framed so as to emphasize the central story's decelerated desert temporality. Yet given the senior professor's involvement in 21st century war planning, the great acceleration involving oil wars, energy waste, and the desertification of conflict are ineluctable aspects of the scene. Two time frames and two deserts intersect here: a theater of war and an empty space of solitude. The novel is framed by opening and closing scenes in an urban museum, describing a man who returns, day after day to watch a radically slowed frame by frame soundless projection of Hitchcock's *Psycho*, an experience analogous to slowed desert time, yet turning on a violent event. *Point Omega* suggests that the desert is a good site for thinking about space and time, as are the post-1960s works of land art.

The desert milieu encourages temporal deceleration under a big sky and distant horizons, to focusing on the present as such, to perceptual attention to small variations in light, shadow, sound, and atmosphere. Even those accessing the Earth Works through visual media or travelers' reports may virtually approach such contemplative experiences. Some critics are right to remind us that the desert was never a blank canvas for art. Indigenous peoples preceded European

settlers, before being driven out or confined to reservations. A recent writer points out that the *Lightning Field* with its regular rectangular grid of 400 poles (one mile by one kilometer) replicates the structure of Western land division following the genocide of indigenous groups, expropriation of their land, and conquest from Mexico (there is a structural analogy here with the enclosure of the commons that enabled many classic British gardens).⁷

Counter-Monuments as “ruins in reverse.” The desert earthworks are monuments, or better *counter-monuments*, marking the intersection and interplay of world, earth, and the planet. What are monuments? Let’s first consider them as *worldly* structures. In art-historical (or art-world) terms, monuments can be distinguished by their scale relative to the human body. As Robert Morris suggests, there is a continuum of three dimensional works ranging from smaller ornamental ones to monuments exceeding the scale of the human body. Sculpture occupies the midsection of this continuum.⁸ We typically think of monuments as belonging to a world, that is a meaningful human context with a history. Many traditional monuments are erected in public space, recalling important events or figures in communal history. As such they are subject to dispute and controversy, because the world’s sense and history are in principle subject to re-examination and revision.⁹ Given their scale, the desert earthworks are monuments, yet they are atypically sited in areas difficult for the average person to access. Moreover, in several cases

⁷ Sean J Patrick Carney [“The Lightning Field: How Walter De Maria’s Land Art Lodestar Communes with Cormac McCarthy, Herman Melville, and Web3”](#)

⁸ Robert Morris, “Aligned with Nazca,” in *Continuous Project Altered Daily* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1993), 143-173.

⁹ [Elsewhere](#) I’ve discussed such controversies in cases like Richmond’s Confederate statues, arguing that their defense was based on a confusion between monuments that encourage their audiences to remember major events of communal importance, and memorials that ask us not to forget that which should not fall into oblivion, typically the dead, whether as individuals or groups.

access is available only to a few select viewers at a time who must apply and pay for the experience. On the other hand, these monuments are well-established in the art-world, their designers are celebrated as innovative artists, with their images well-distributed in print and online. Art historians have demonstrated how these works emerged from the 1960s Minimalist movement and its theorists.

I call the desert earthworks *counter-monuments*, because they have different relations to time and temporality than do such works as the Washington Monument or the now deposed Richmond Confederate “monuments.” Smithson, whose later work and writing relied on the idea of entropy (which he sometimes associated with Freud’s “death principle”) spoke of “monuments rising into ruin,” rather than being erected for the ages. They were “ruins in reverse.” Since traditional monuments struggle to withstand entropy (whether natural or human) these works accept their destined erosion or transformation. They are not reminders or testimonies of past glory, nor are they celebrations of a distinctive event to which they owe their erection, but evocations of a future perfect temporality: *they are what they will have been*.

Smithson claimed that a “trans-historical consciousness has emerged” in the art of the 1960s (*Collected Writings* [CW]1996, 63). Writing in 1966 about a range of Minimalist constructions, Smithson said: “Instead of causing us to remember the past like the old monuments, the new monuments seem to cause us to forget the future...They are not built for the ages, but against the ages...Rather than saying ‘What time is it?’ we should say ‘Where is the time?’” (CW 11).

In this perspective we can see the counter-monuments as questions, not affirmations. Even the *Jetty’s* spiral form suggests a question mark. On site Smithson’s work opens up an

enormous space of water, sky, and earth; the elements frame the work as it offers a perspective on them. Walking its 1500 feet both centripetally and centrifugally is an adventure in spatial reorientation. Changing conditions – water level, seasons, color of surrounding algae – undermine any expectations of eternal art. The *Jetty*'s form suggests the shape of a collapsed ziggurat (or Tower of Babel), evoking ideas of inevitable ruin and entropy. Ecological entropy is apparent now, as the Great Salt Lake rapidly dries and shrinks, potentially releasing toxic chemicals into a large surrounding area. While Michael Heizer's recently completed *City* is not as obviously vulnerable as the *Jetty*, it achieves monumental scale while negating its title's implications, for this uninhabited city highly restricts visitors, being accessible on terms appropriate to a fragile archaeological site. What might such a "city" look like to some future or alien archaeologist? Again Smithson's 1966 essay is suggestive. He cites Malevich's affirmation that art is turning away from likeness or idealistic images, leaving "nothing but a desert." The desert then is uncharted, shifting space (smooth or nomadic in Deleuzian terms). In what can be read as a proleptic statement about Heizer's *City* (completed and unveiled in 2022), he continues: "But for many of today's artists this 'desert' is a 'City of the Future' made of null structures and surfaces. This City performs no natural function, it simply exists between mind and matter, detached from both, representing neither" (CW 14).

The *Lightning Field* poses the constant question whether it will or will not display a spectacular light show, an infrequent event even during the brief local electrical storm season. Those familiar with the site advise visitors that whether or not lightning strikes, they should use their 24 hours to experience the place's isolation, tramping the large area, immersing themselves in the spatial expanse and atmosphere. Nevertheless, the *Lightning Field*'s name and reputation guarantee that the visit will also be a time of waiting for a startling display. Thus two temporal

modes are at play here, *Gelassenheit* of slow exploration and the tension of expecting a remarkable evanescent event.

Along with the desert earthworks' challenge to traditional temporality, they alter the conventional space of everyday urban scale and its continuation in visual art, replacing it with what Robert Morris calls "real space." In his important (but underappreciated essay) "Aligned With Nazca" (1979) Morris offers an on-the-ground reading of the [Peruvian desert markings](#), rather than the usual aerial overview. Refusing an invitation to survey the lines from an aircraft, he analyzes the experience at ground level, as receding lines open up asymptotically to an apparently unlimited horizon. Morris contrasts this immersive "real space" with Western art's limitation to flat surfaces and to objects implicitly limited by enclosure in or projection on such surfaces (the white cube of gallery or museum, framed works of landscape architecture). This desert-inspired renewal of an archaic, expansive spatial aesthetics contrasts with Lessing's classic dichotomy of arts of space and time in his *Laocoön*, which implicitly identifies visual arts in terms of their flatness, flat enclosures, or limited objecthood (Lessing's tradition arguably extends to Clement Greenberg's criticism and Michael Fried's now canonical 1965 critique of Minimalism "Art and Objecthood"). Nietzsche, who never saw a geographical desert, was nevertheless fascinated by the imagination of a ground-level view of such expanses, as evidenced both in written evocations of desert aesthetics, and in his response to landscapes (actual or painted, as in Claude Lorraine) that suggest infinite recession. Such "real space" also contrasts with attempts by landscape architects to open up congenial spaces within the newly dense urban environments of the Americas, whether borrowing their vocabulary from the British picturesque (Olmsted) or European modernism (Burlie Marx).

For over forty years the artist James Turrell has been constructing a complex observatory of the heavens at Roden Crater in northeast Arizona. No telescopes or optical devices are employed, only strategic placement of tunnels, domes, and openings. It is a theater of the sky, an architecture designed to transform the viewer's orientation. Gazing through the carefully designed oculi, viewers experience what Turrell calls "celestial vaulting," the sense of being drawn into the further reaches of the heavens, as if you were on the verge of falling upward. Like Morris and some other Minimalists, Turrell learned much from Merleau-Ponty's *Phenomenology of Perception*. Following Husserl's paradoxical "the Earth does not move," Roden Crater throws viewers into an unaccustomed relation to the cosmos. The vaulting experience recalls the exclamation of Nietzsche's Zarathustra: "Into your height I cast myself – that is my depth!" ("Before Sunrise"). The heavens, in both scenarios, are an "abyss of light," where viewers find their usual sense of the vertical dimension reversed. Rather than the possible apprehension that the ground might give way, that one might fall into a groundless space, an *Abgrund*, one feels drawn upwards without limit. Viewers are released (or torn from) their usual spatio-temporal orientation. In a variation of Morris's reading of the Nazca lines, embodied subjects become open to "real space," freed from the limits of walls and objects, although in vertical rather than horizontal dimensions.

Another aspect of Morris's response to the Nazca lines: in collaborating with and manifesting "real space" the lines avoid the process of centering that seem – if one may say so – central to Western art. Smithson went far in the theory and practice of de-centering with his art of site and non-site and his complication of a circular structure by an indeterminacy of centrifugal and centripetal movement. If we attempt to imagine a desert aesthetic – alternatively an archaic or post-modern anti-*Laocoon* - it is a geoaesthetic in which space flows or bleeds into

time, nomadic movement precludes stable positioning or dwelling, while fluidity and relative disorganization are rich in possibilities.

The desert earthworks are points where three distinct temporalities intersect, marking their relations and ruptures, and inviting us to rethink our orientation in time. They juxtapose the shorter time frame of the human globe (world, culture, history, civilization), Earth's longer one (geological epochs through the Anthropocene), and the longest planetary (cosmic) time-frame.¹⁰ Set against the accelerating state of the world, Earth Art offers alternative experiences of time. As I've suggested, Heizer's *City* wavers between aspiring to changeless monumentality and ironizing such aspirations. Smithson's *Spiral Jetty* exhibits entropy and ruin, in a context revealing similar tendencies in the industrial civilization that continues to exploit the US West. Although Smithson did not know the term "Anthropocene" his descriptions of urban sprawl, slurbs, decaying industrial sites (as in the mock-travelogue "Tour of the Monuments of Passaic New Jersey") and strip-mining devastation, taken together with his keen geological passion, show that he understood how humans were behaving entropically, contributing to an emerging geological stratum, and repeatedly discovering that their attempts at master the Earth had unanticipated consequences or blowback. Smithson's turning away from anthropocentrism, and the *hybris* of mid-20th century industrial civilization could also be condensed into a new scientific word as he adopted Levi-Strauss's sly suggestion that anthropology be renamed entropology. de Maria's *Lightning Field* sets up a doubled time fractured by slow exposure to a vast space while waiting for its electrifying punctuations. Turrell's *Roden Crater* and Nancy Holt's *Sun Tunnels* reorient viewers to cosmic time, resituating their planetary perception.

¹⁰ Two valuable recent attempts to rethink these multiple temporalities: Dipesh Chakrabarty, *The Climate of History in a Planetary Age* (Chicago, 2021); Thomas Nail, *Theory of the Earth* (Stanford, 2021).