Affective entropy: art as differential form

Felicity Colman

Through direct observation, rather than explanation, many of these artists have developed ways to treat the theory of sets, vectoral geometry, topology, and crystal structure... [they] face the possibility of other dimensions, with a new kind of sight.

Robert Smithson, ‘Entropy and the New Monuments’ 1966

As I faintly smell the sulphur in the air, hear the crunch of my boots upon the salt crystals that have grown upon this art form, and taste the saltiest water ever, actualities are overtaken by the ‘limitless scale of one’s mind’, just as Robert Smithson described. As I traverse the territory of the infamous Spiral Jetty, the gyrations of this Utah time machine shift gear and offer a smorgasbord of sensations. Intensive magnitude. Morpho-sorcery. Alchemical differentiation. This affective place of my choosing turns me into a larval subject of Smithson’s system. This world sings its salt hymn in my ears: a slight wind off the snow covered mountain ranges that encircle the spiral coming across the solid lake, rustling the parched low level scrub, invisibly moving over the basalt rocks that cluster at Rozel Point. Today, the end of winter, it is a deathly silent space, haunted by the incessant affect of the multiple temporal positions that cohabit within this world’s stark geological formations. To arrive at the end point of the jetty, finally, is to realise that one has to indeed, begin at the ‘indeterminate’ yet singular middle to access the complex place of the reality one is immersed in, where the spinning categories of map and material – all possible configurations of east, south, west, north, mud, salt, crystals, rocks, water, as the infamous chant goes – admit uncertainty, ambiguity, chaos - just as the crystal lattice of
the steady growth of the salt maintains a coherent site. One enters Smithson’s virtual underground movie house, generative of an endless thought of ‘jeopardy’ – ‘a spiral lightening bolt’. Does the experience of this walk reveal the aesthetic art form to be a chiasmatic synthesis of the fourth dimension – ‘laughter’ as Smithson once described it (after Buckminster Fuller) another name for – ‘entropic verbalization’? Or is this empirically formed cogito of mine merely another empty reminiscence? Here I will argue that Smithson’s spiral is indeed an affective prompt for a moving image of the thought of demented time (Deleuze); a deranged time (Smithson), a Peircean graph of duration that in charting aesthetic movement, becomes a study in the texture of forces.

Art is diaphora. The specific sense of perception of the affective energy of an artwork becomes an aesthetic determinant of movement, and this essay will address the dimensions engendered through the invocation of the temporal modality of entropy. Built in the Great Salt Lake in Utah in 1970, submerged for over thirty years, the Spiral Jetty rematerialized in the early 2000s as the lake’s levels dropped, due to an extensive drought begun in the 1990s in the American mid west. The jetty’s form remains the largely the same, but its 2005 surface has been altered through the crystallographic growth of salt over its basalt rock base. The jetty is encircled by an infinite number of spiral forms - the sheltering arm of Rozel Point within the Great Salt Lake, the Rocky mountains, the multiple spiralling freeway entrances and exits of the new highway from Salt Lake City. This is the place where the Mormon’s keep their soul register, a salt-safe – where the bass guitarist, Killer Kane from the New York Dolls worked. To get to this end point, one has to traverse the beauty of middle America, a landscape that share some key topological forms with southern Arabia. On the journey to the Jetty are markers of this country’s culture – military test sites, rocket vapour trails, abandoned gas stations, the home of a ‘Miss Utah’, the historical marker of America’s transcontinental railway that Smithson loved – the Golden Spike, absolutely no signs of indigenous Americans, (this region’s Uta Indians were massacred when the Mormons came to town, the rest live up the road on the Uintah and Ouray reservation in Northeastern Utah). The Great Salt Desert and Lake is an already invented site - a lake sometimes referred to as ‘America’s Dead Sea’. My vernacular experiences on the journey to this place invoke the inevitable allegories, at once anachronistic and relevant - precise eidetic moments, and as yet unnameable others tumble past. I view this world through my camera lens, listen to the C&W music on the local radio. The digital documentation later reveals to others things I have not seen, reminding me that I am merely a ‘partial observer’. I have become the site of the jetty, I belong to it, to the landscape, to the art work, to the magazine reproductions, to all that I have ever read and written about this art work – as Deleuze and Guattari note of force, it ‘is not what acts but, as Leibniz and Nietzsche knew, what perceives and experiences’. Even when this force skews out of its learned scale, perceptual movements bring the elements together, forcing a singularity, or focus – the being created when the system of thought overcomes consciousness of Being. Deleuze and Guattari suggest we look to the microscopic for awareness of the affective passage of consciousness. I look to the salt crunch: incessant movement, entropic implosion and crystal dimensions of the segmentary. Atop Rozel Hill I
think about Nancy Holt [fig 1]. This place exerts an affective entropy upon my bounded knowledge, the empirical reality of it knowable as an affective modality, but the physics of this aesthetic form stubbornly remain a dynamically qualitative, canonised art form. Yet I know that this art work, however many times reproduced, is firmly oriented toward the subject of its experience - of the weekend trail bike riders and dog walkers that come for a look, of the art curators and collectors from around the globe that come in expensive SUVs – the qualities are not all anthropomorphic - there are the jack rabbits in the low scrub nearby, the plane that circles eerily around the site, the salt crystals gleefully sucking up to the firm basalt base. The jetty in the salt lake remains a thermodynamic witness to each and all of those temporal modalities, holding me, the rabbits, and the salt crystals in its power, and its thalassic utility for crystals cracks my subjective aesthetic.

Art is inherently phenomenologically determined, yet its critical forms are governed by a concentration of force, a factor present in all art forms, across time. Dependent upon the political and cultural society one inhabits, what we often call aesthetic sensibility is given through that culture’s noetic art forms, producing the modality of a specific cultural intensity (or coercive idea), and sense of historicity of a given place and time. ‘The energy of art imposes itself upon men [sic’], the poet Guillaume Apollinaire wryly observed in 1913, ‘and becomes for them the plastic standard of the period.’ This aesthetic, cultural energy is affective information – transformative of the collective interests of a community, and even within the spectrum of possible social-political situations, able to produce the most divergent forms - coordinated by the temporal and spatial constraints of a particular place-system and its constructed ethics. Coextensively, the energy of those (art) forms can affectively radiate across time, and across primordial knowledge, imposing, as Apollinaire noted, an historical model – an aesthetic sensibility that functions by its self-regulating (aesthetic and ethical) standards. This is a system of knowledge that is subject to the operations of the market, and it is impossible to conceive of a practice, or work, that could exceed the reaches of the vampiric topography of this continuous marketplace. Everywhere, collections of affective energies have been chosen, dictating the sensible intensities binding the game, and the vectors of its pathways of meaning. However, certain forces can intervene in established cultural circuits of meaning, and acting as archaeological future finds, insert rhizomatic deviations within the historically figured paths of cultural systems of political and formal organization. Such insertions (prefigured, aleatory, innate) not only highlight the models whose values they invert, but question, doubt, and even interrogate historicized modalities of the aesthetic sensibilities of given eras and their objects. Art forms are energy movements of a particular aesthetic regime, generative of forces of sensible disturbance – expansion, distortion, reduction, and perhaps dissolution. The movement of an aesthetic is realised through an antimonic exposure of its system – its plastic standard – and becomes expressive of the encrusted modes of temporal existence.

It is history that turns forms into styles (Smithson’s pop-structuralism; Deleuze’s post-structuralism), but each of those forms may contain an affective force able to manifest its energy in both future and
past interactions. These concerns were also those of Deleuze and Guattari who, working on a philosophy that celebrated affective encounters and critically examined systems of control that regulate existential and inventive life, discussed the question of what qualifies as art and how it functions in terms of the creation of affective compounds in their last collaborative book, *What is Philosophy?* (1991). Considering how materials unrelated to the content of art forms can be continuously expressive of ‘blocs of sensation’, Deleuze and Guattari describe the rendering of the forces of the perception of the world, as the flesh of being (living and non human) that simultaneously produces and accesses a priori affects in the world. The affection by art forms (here they are inclusive of painting, sculpture, literature, music, the cinema, photography, architecture, and configurations found and made in the natural world) comes through a ‘transformation’, a ‘becoming’ of a nonhuman nature, where the ‘[f]lesh is only the developer which disappears in what develops: the compound of sensation’. They note that ‘many works that claim to be art do not stand up for an instant’, but the non human world of insects, birds, and shells contain ‘forces’ that we might recognize as artistic. However, even this question of considered opinion is something that artists take on with amusement – providing a basis for art as a banal aesthetic energy with which one might choose to interact. It is to these singular events and practices that continue to provide affective thought (inspiration, impetus for future work) - enabling mutations in time -wherein art reconfigures energy-matter.

Smithson was interested in conveying the physical experience of time as an irruption of forms that work to dispel known situations. In an interview in 1971 discussing the work and possible film of the work *Broken Circle - Spiral Hill* (still accessible in Sonsbeek, Holland), Smithson commented:

> Unlike Buckminster Fuller, I’m interested in collaborating with entropy. Some day I would like to compile all the different entropies. All the classifications would lose their grids. Levi-Strauss had a good insight; he suggested we change the study of anthropology into ‘entropology’. It would be a study that devotes itself to the process of disintegration in highly developed structures. After all, wreckage is often more interesting than structure. At least, not as depressing as Dymaxion domes. Utopian saviours we can do without.

Paradigmatic of the 1960s eschatological aesthetic, in both Smithson (whose works encompass the period 1957-1972) and Deleuze (and later with Guattari – both also working through the 1960s), the thermodynamic becomes model that provides the means with which to articulate the habits and mannerisms of this aesthetic. For Smithson, the model becomes a modality; a way of marking the infinite divisions of the crystallographic operations of time, which he sees manifested in contemporary art forms as a mannerist entropy that rejects the pursuit of any sublime aesthetic. For Deleuze, the thermodynamic model is one that is precisely allegorical of the perpetuation of habitual systems of affective pedagogy (such as some of the forms of art that Smithson’s writings describe), a metaphysical repetition of the already configured modal relations of the world – a model that does not allow for the inexhaustibility of difference. While Smithson’s use of entropy as a temporal modality would appear to
be antithetical to Deleuze’s critical rejection of what the latter sees as a flawed concept, the correlations and the creative differences to be had from these two approaches to the idea is nevertheless telling in terms of the differences of utility of terms between a philosophic or an artistic traffic with a scientific discussion. Smithson’s interest in entropic situations comes from his suspicion of the ways in which the concept of ‘time’ is used as a ‘mental structure’ for describing history.\(^{13}\) Adoptive of a Warholesque understanding of the apprehension of a singular art form (even a readymade) only through its series, Smithson’s often variable statements nevertheless make clear his position that any temporally constructed form cannot be regarded as a singular abstract entity within different sequential movements. Just as the notion of time itself is bound by its own narrative construction, individual works are made through their paradigmatic series. For Deleuze, entropy is typical of paradoxical thinking, bound to a ‘trancendental physical illusion’.\(^{14}\) Here, I am less interested to define whether the artistic or the philosophic field’s terminology is the “correct” one; rather, each interface with the term entropy performs an intermediation of the affective conditions of time, and its narration. Entropy affords an experimental conceptualisation of an intense scenario of energy movement, and as such, is a lens by which we might adjust the conception of aesthetics and the physics of affect. Through their respective use of Bergson’s conception of creative evolution there are curious overlaps in the thinking and writing of this term: Smithson’s spiral offers a practical coda to Deleuze’s egg.\(^{15}\)

A neologism invented in 1865 by the German physicist Rudolf Clausius for describing the contemporaneous scientific concept of energy movement, specifically the Second law of Thermodynamics, *entropy* has multiple meanings through its short scientific paradigms, and cultural contexts, where the concept generally refers to the inevitable dissolution of the universe.\(^{16}\) Today, entropy is discussed through a variety of systems - mathematical, creative, economic, information, geo and bio morphological, eco, and social. Contextually it is possible to broadly unite these various uses of the concept of entropy geometrically, by noting that the term often denotes energy functions within a specific locality. This spatial application has been crossed with psychological systems of thought, including information management and communication theories; however this is a conception of the term that neither Deleuze and Guattari, nor Smithson employ.

Smithson primarily described entropy as a syndrome where energy dispersal occurs, replacing the idea of time as a unidirectional process of decay, with the idea of time as a syntactical measurement - of the movement of an affective transformation of material organization. Intrigued by different forms of kinetic affectivity as it forms itself through material situations created and sustained through the passage of time, Smithson at first claimed to recognise in his vernacular life what he will describe as entropic situations. He finds the ruins of the 19th century industry in his hometown of Passaic to be not another Roman forum, but a place where durational change is creative of different comprehensive forms, not unlike the unfinished narrative woven in William Carlos Williams’ lifelong poem on the
region of New Jersey, Paterson. Just as those crusty beards of salted time that will later grow on the Spiral Jetty can only ever be experienced relational to the reality that produced them, in time, Smithson’s art is engaged with the dissolution of ‘original “functions”’ in the pursuit of forms that dialectically engage with the ‘limits’ and scales of those go-socially configured ‘confines’ of the Earth. In many of his pronouncements on the future and past ‘obliteration’ of ‘the problem of the human figure’ and ‘history’, Smithson notes: ‘Time is deranged’. Smithson would appear to employ a Nietzschean logic through such comments on the anthropocentric situation, one of an inevitable dissolution of humanity, however his address to the subject is not limited to a conception of humanity, or a ‘people’, rather he focuses on life in terms of a geomorphology, wherein all molecular structures co-exist. For Smithson, the function of art is to merely offer an apperception of the shifts in this morphology.

Like Deleuze’s use of the crystal as a device for articulating the movement of time in the cinema, Smithson’s use of the crystal is as a ‘manneristic’ structure that is a device for registration of the movement of time at certain entropic conditions such as the ‘readymade’ in art. Taking his cue from Bergson’s essay on ‘Laughter’ and Lewis Carroll’s ‘highly ordered non-sense’, Smithson, in a 1966 review of contemporary art forms and exhibitions in New York, titled ‘Entropy and the New Monuments’, reads each form as a degree of crystal-math, a ‘solid-state hilarity’. While the economic conditions for making art are always influential of collectable morphologies, Smithson’s critical review of artists that aspire to make ‘the impossibility of the real’ through the readymade, only accessible through the ‘order and disorder of the fourth dimension […] set between laughter and crystal-structure, as a device for unlimited speculation’, seeks to account for temporal extensiveness through the variations of intensities of humour. As he relates, these art forms’ ‘curious condition’ is generative of a ‘reduction of time’, one that cannot be emploted into a narrative history of events, only into a history of ‘a more visible math that is unconcerned with size or shape in any metrical sense’. Using a ‘ha-ha’ crystal concept, Smithson partially describes how the entropic factor is a device to access the fourth (non-sensical) dimension: ‘A fit of silliness becomes a rhomboid, a high-pitched discharge of mirth becomes prismatic, a happy outburst becomes a cube’. There is much of this type of humorous posturing in Smithson’s film of the Spiral Jetty.

Deleuze’s reference to entropy is as a systemic component for measuring, managing, and judging affective orders of the sensible (thought, forms), and like Smithson, Deleuze utilises the affective intensity of the humorous, of irony, to critique through calculus, the effect of sense. Working on Nietzsche in 1962, Deleuze views the scientific discussion of ‘matter, weight and heat of being’ as part of the nihilism of modern thought, a denial of difference that is part of ‘the more general enterprise of denying life, depreciating existence and promising it a death…. Where the universe sinks into the undifferentiated’. The reduction and denial of differences, according to Deleuze, is the result of a science that ‘understands phenomena in terms of reactive forces’ homogenizing time and meaning.
through abstraction and tautological disparities, thus maintaining a system of “good sense” which actively categorises, divides and distributes temporally produced meanings and things.  

By 1968, thermodynamics is a notion of which Deleuze is particularly dismissive as yet another transcendental folly of nineteenth century construction. The newly invented formulas of the nineteenth century (including those by Carnot and Curie) for discussing the processes of the distribution of energies acquire what Deleuze calls a “prescient” sensibility - that is, a universalist “good sense” that “essentially distributes or repartitions”. Influenced by Ludwig Boltzmann and Léon Selme’s recognition of the illusory nature of entropy, and consolidating his previous work on Nietzsche, Deleuze dismissed entropy as a part of the “naturalised” world of the ‘middle classes’. Deleuze rejects these ideas of the ‘recognition’ of divisions of energy into intensive and extensive spatial distribution as a scientific-philosophical grasping of difference a synthetic description of reality, and names this discourse: “thermodynamic”. In his critique of philosophy’s “strange alliance” with 19th century’s scientific principles concerning the distribution of energy forms, thermodynamics is catalytic for Deleuze’s formation of his conception of difference as an habitual belief system.

Deleuze’s notion of the ‘asymmetrical synthesis of the sensible’, the title of his final chapter in *Difference and Repetition*, states his thesis on a philosophy of energy mobilisation, through individuated realisation. Deleuze calls it ‘indi-drama-differentiation’, offering a way of thinking through creativity, not in the terms of the Platonic model of re/presentation, but via the relational movements of ‘intensive quantities and differentials’, unmeasurable, but actualised through dramatisation. Deleuze notes, this ‘aesthetic of intensities’, is comprised of ‘asymmetrical elements’ that direct, through durationally distinctive points, the dialectical realisation of ideas, connections, and the constitution of an Idea, an individuation that is in process, an expressive becoming.

Smithson’s perception of the affective movement of temporal duration comes to form through dialogue with art historians, science fiction stories, and cybernetic theories circulating in the 1960s. Deleuze sees in thermodynamics a denial of a true movement, through the denial of difference, and an *adiaphoria* principle that seeks ‘an equalization of quantities’. Conversely, Smithson’s dialectical experimentation with the idea of entropy transversally affecting movement lends itself to a conception of art that, like Deleuze and Guattari’s final position in *What is Philosophy?*, is concerned with charting the relationships between the materials of art and their production of affective meanings within time, over duration. Deleuze and Guattari insisted on a triad of points of conceptual and sensory investigation – art, science, philosophy – for comprehending the energy-chaos of the world. They named the protagonists of each of these arenas - conceptual personae (such as Maxwell’s Demon), aesthetic figures (the great art-monuments such as the ‘Rembrandt-universe or Debussy-universe’), and the philosophers (the creators of events). In doing so, this provides an arrangement for their way of thinking through the chaos of the world, currently made into systems. For Smithson, similarly interested in systems, the dissolution of all boundaries was the only way he could see through the perception of change, not the question that philosophy wants to ask, but the question that art attempts to
form. The question of what constitutes art is a question of utility and a fictive contextuality of order that Smithson joked around with, from commenting how the B grade film *The Planet of the Vampires* was a ‘movie about entropy’, to an artist’s statement comprising of a list of 12 items including a definition of entropy as ‘militant laziness’.  

In pursuit of a particularly sensorial temporal philosophy, Smithson’s work utilised a dialogic of temporality that incorporated the creation of sites through the perception of modalities of entropy, duration, allegory, heterotopia, and iconography. Discussing the situation of the spiral jetty in April 1970, just before it was built, Smithson commented on his choice of the site in the Great Salt Lake:

> I am interested in great masses of materials that are threatened by physical forces. The winds on that lake are of hurricane force, and the water there is twice as heavy. The lake itself is interesting because it always changes its shape. Your mental processes are always being pushed out of shape too, so no matter how precise you get or how strict you are, there is always a shift or breakdown . . .

Smithson’s display of the conditions of the production of the jetty and comprehension of his entropic/evolutionary form are described in terms of a deliberately mannered heliopoetics - an apprehension of the temporal flux of consciousness of the unlimited possibilities for speculation. This liaison between the perception of a place and the limits of the temporal modalities that determines a given situation emphasises the awareness of physical conditions for creative ventures. As he famously wrote,

> The sound of the helicopter motor became a primal groan echoing into tenuous aerial views. Was I but a shadow in a plastic bubble hovering in a place outside mind and body? *Et in Utah ego.* I was slipping out of myself again, dissolving into a unicellular beginning, trying to locate the nucleus at the end of the spiral. All that blood stirring makes one aware of protoplasmic solutions, the essential matter between the formed and the unformed, masses of cells consisting largely of water, proteins, lipoids, carbohydrates, and inorganic salts. Each drop that splashed onto the Spiral Jetty coagulated into a crystal. Undulating waters spread millions upon millions of crystals over the basalt.

Although Deleuze never directly referred to Smithson in his work, he is aware of Smithson’s generation of filmmakers, and discusses what he terms ‘the American experimental school’ in his first book on cinema. Smithson’s articulation of the affective system created by the threefold jetty (film-essay-site) is evocative of the form Deleuze visualised in this cinema of the 1960s evolution in perception, a break from a liquid state (in comparison with French cinema’s ‘aquatic lyricism’) to a ‘gaseous state, defined by the free movement of each molecule’. With this free movement –and Deleuze gives the example of the deprivation of the camera of any centre - came the possibility of ‘attaining a pure perception, as it is in things or in matter, to the point which molecular interactions
extend'. In the *Spiral Jetty*, the centre Smithson provides is Pascalian, seeking to break the obvious dialectic of the construction of a rhizomatic site of disorder. Smithson looks to the singular to access the points of change, of ‘associative becoming’. This saline centre, *et in Utah ego*, becomes both the *sited* and the *non-sited* time of the *Spiral Jetty* film/site, and the viewer/walker is cued to the recognition of certain specific points of accumulated time by which they might recognize their own points of orientation. In other words, at determined aggregated temporal points, conceptual bearing is enabled, but then the viewer conceives that the film/site of a work is slipping into the documentation of events (as in Smithson’s nonsite’s heterotopic affects). The *effect* of time, as St Augustine described, produces the *affect* – the energy of a specific temporal form. Rather than think of the death of the Smithonian self, that ‘I’ in Utah as a singular entity, the entropic condition invoked directs any contemplation of this art object towards its as-yet unknowable affective outcomes for experience.

Like Smithson, Deleuze was interested in the physicality of a change (however slight) in the understanding of the conditions of situations and systems of forms, and particularly obsessed with the notion of the ‘formation of an image defined by molecular parameters’. Smithson pursued an amorphous aesthetics. He searched for these at those junctures of ‘molecular interaction’ that Deleuze referred to in terms of a drug community, but which Smithson found with and without drugs - the ‘molecular intervals, the holes in sounds, in forms, and even in water’ in the *Spiral Jetty*.

Like Smithson, Deleuze and Guattari observed that the ‘relationship with the material [of art] must therefore be assessed within the limits of duration, *whatever this may be*. Smithson uses entropy in terms of its invented etymological sense of energy idea to discuss this paradoxical perceptual movement of change, where entropic temporality articulates (for him) the contradictions of the metamorphosis (expansion and contraction) of things (events, ideas, information) as described and experienced. As an information-energy notion produced in the 1960s climate of political-social change, entropy is a conceptual trope for the perception of temporal modalities in art forms. In Smithson, and in Deleuze and Guattari’s usage, entropy becomes a term that describes teleological histories (Art History for Smithson, Royal Science for Deleuze and Guattari), drawn through the formal stabilization of the physical organization of differences, to their commonly accepted material point of nondifferentiation. The metaphorical association of entropy with such nullification of form / meaning is rejected by both. Individually Smithson and Deleuze and Guattari’s utilization of the term entropy is, respectively, a way to chart the thinking of a sensible regime -- of what Rancière termed the ‘aesthetic regime’ of the sensible aesthetic.

Smithson’s pursuit of the movement of the temporal with which to chart ‘Reality’ sees him construct, and most importantly, enact, his own curved monuments to duration, productive of the ‘demented time’ that Deleuze noted of that ‘Northern philosopher’, Hamlet. Realisation of the curves, points, and systems of the temporal performs a dissipation of the existing orders of energy forms. Rather than suppose a disparity between (art) forms through a comparative recognition of their
affective energies, the non-sense engendered by virtual systems like humour denies an orientation of the conception of an ordered, or disordered (sense/self) event. Instead, entropy in Smithson’s conception – a device for unlimited speculation - and the ‘asymmetrical synthesis of the sensible’, in Deleuze’s terms, enables a calculus for a dynamic life, one continually created and reformulated through variable affective terms. A ha-ha affect causes movement to occur, as a folding of and between bodily states, resulting in a resonance within bodies’ specific planes of consistency or composition. As Deleuze and Guattari discussed, an affective resonance in art is one that acts as an uncoding (of bodies), fixed (in its locality), yet mobile (with its energy), opposed to any form of habitual organization, yet engendering possession of the mindful and needy flesh. For Smithson, who lived art, perceptual recognition is self-affective, an expression of an entropic passionate movement, a wholly lived gesture that must be broken apart to be thought.
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