WOOD looks at how the law intersects with nature. The legal framework is a machine of truth-making. The law is always up for debate, and yet its frame of reference seems increasingly blind-sighted, limited to outdated jurisprudential methods or over-simplified definitions of "who" and "what" fall under its authority. What voices are allowed to speak? What languages count as language? Is nature the limit of the law? How do we account for global climate crimes? The far-reaching scope of environmental catastrophe certainly puts a whole series of actions, normally seen as "collateral damage" into a new light. What about the rights of nature? How to account for the destruction of environments? Who takes responsibility and for what? These incidents not only damage local lives but have a domino-effect of repercussions well beyond their site of perpetration – making it as much a geo-political issue as it is a question of temporality. Can the law incorporate such complexity?

Foundational considerations are laid out by **Razmig Keucheyan** in his essay *How to Politicize Nature? Environmental Racism and its Consequences*, a clear historical outline, accompanied by case studies, of the origins of "green environmentalism" and the problematic concept of "Nature" it embraces. In fact, it may be that much environmental catastrophe and climate injustice, when seen from an intersectional perspective that analyzes dynamics of race, class, and unequal geographic distribution, is a consequence of green thinking. The "environment" must be problematized in order to re-structure the legal and political frameworks that guarantee a right to "nature" to some while divesting "nature" from others. As an invention of 19th century Romanticism, nature-as-wilderness becomes connected to narratives of the nation-state. This has engendered systematic violence, characterized by unjust legislation and rampant market forces that turn entire neighborhoods, lands, and territories into dumping grounds for the waste of the geopolitically privileged. A further engagement with this process is presented in **Forensic Architecture**'s essay *A Tribe Against The State*, taking the Naqab Desert in Palestine as a complex site where the State of Israel, since its inception, has strategically geo-engineered the desert in order to divest indigenous Bedouin populations of their claim to settlement. Here, climate change is mobilized as a colonial weapon – the "desert" frontier has been altered through forestation projects, waterways have been re-routed, infrastructure constructed, and surveys taken after the fact, erasing undocumented colonial violence. The desert has never been a place hospitable to life, and thus, the State argues for its mandate to "protect" and "intervene" in the land, to erase and redraw its history along lines of race and exclusion. The essay follows the case of the Al-Turi family in the village of Al-'Araqib, examining the historical documents that have been activated for and against the tribe in various legal proceedings against the State of Israel. Important here are the different ways in which visual "evidence," particularly photographic aerial shots of the land, can be read and misread. A Truth Commission was set up by local activist organizations to show how Bedouin residents can use kites mounted with cameras so as to document their territories, taking the production of visual testimony into their own hands for the future. That local populations rise up against the state, using "evidence" in innovative ways, is the focus of **Paolo Tavares and Ursula Biemann**'s document *The Forest Court*. Here, excerpts of court proceeding transcripts from the case of the Kichawa Indigenous People of Sarayaku v. Ecuador at the Inter-American Court of Human Rights in Costa Rica in 2011 are presented and commented upon. These documents reveal how

indigenous communities were able to translate their cosmologies into legal application. It calls to account for the destruction of the forest by corporate interests in Ecuador, a process of wholesale environmental catastrophe initiated by the state and private interests in the mid-90s. This is not only to be understood as a "humanitarian" crime against indigenous populations, a continuation of the colonial project, but also as an act of ecocide against the "living forest" and its extra-human agents. Nature is posited in this seminal case as a "subject" that has rights and has experienced unspeakable violence. How can the law incorporate the multiplicity of agents and the complex re-distribution of responsibility and consequence such indigenous cosmologies propose? This is certainly not an easy question to answer – it requires revisiting the deeper philosophical "roots" of the law, an inquiry taken up by **Bronwyn Lay** in her essay *Ecological Haunting: The Legal Standing of Dead Trees*. Trees appear again and again as a common legal metaphor within the Western imaginary – they represent the sovereign, a single, strong body rising up from the ground, rooted, branching out with its power. With this in mind, forests become a site suspended between law and non-law. They are to be ravaged, used as a resource; yet they are to be protected, for they must exist as a romantic space of national identity (such as the famous Cedars of Lebanon). How can the life and death of forests – its trees, the land, soil, and sky – help us think through the aporias of the juridical? Our laws are neither universal nor "natural", they are founded upon the Roman tradition. This is a law based on the centrality of *anthropos*, and in particular that violent form-of-life that occupies the humanistic traditions of the West and its insistence that "justice" is to be found in the Word. The challenge in conceiving the "rights of nature" would be to go beyond the legal epistemology of the logocentric, anthropocentric tradition and instead articulate a "law" of the in-between, a framework of responsibility and consequence that moves between multiple worlds. Perhaps this requires re-animating wisdoms – such as that of the indigenous – that may have been eclipsed, but have never been truly lost. **Zoe S. Todd and Erica Violet Lee** meet for a conversation on the relationship between wisdom, testimony, and practice in their piece *Our Home in the World: Care, Reciprocity, and Indigenous Climate Activism*. Both reflect on their shared and divergent experiences as thinkers and activists in Canada, addressing the nodes of resistance that emerge out of a long tradition of indigenous philosophy that the moderns have never recognized as such. Much of the current, normative discourse around climate change proposes "new" ways of looking, thinking, and doing in the world, and yet, what is often touted as new is in fact very, very old. Indigenous philosophies have already and always been working through and building up an ethics of reciprocation, obligation, and duty between the environment, humans, and their "more-than-human" kin – that is, all those beings beyond-the-human that co-inhabit the web of life. Significantly, a discursive turn towards the "indigenous" is currently underway, in which practical cosmologies that have never been written down but have always been practiced are appropriated into Western cosmopolitical "theory." Todd and Lee reflect on the problematics of such epistemic colonization, making a claim for the agency of sensuous life-worlds that refuse ontological fetishization and work passionately to develop daily practices of co-inhabitation. If the law is to be re-conceptualized to allow for a space within which extra-human forces and beings are able to participate, then the first task at hand is working towards the construction of a habitat-in-common.

Ashkan Sepahvand