

“Law understands the environment is something separate from itself. But in fact, it is not”: a conversation with legal scholars Usha Natarajan and Julia Dehm on international law’s inadequacy in face of the climate crisis

In the fourth and last episode of the first season of the Carbon Critique podcast series, we have two guests. Usha Natarajan is Edward W. Said Fellow at Columbia University and International Schulich Visiting Scholar at Dalhousie University. She employs postcolonial and Third World Approaches to International Law (TWAIL) in her interdisciplinary research to offer a holistic comprehension of the correlation among development, environment, migration, and conflict. Our second guest is Professor Julia Dehm. She is a Senior Lecturer at the La Trobe Law School. Through her scholarly work, she tackles pressing matters concerning environmental law in climate change on both international and domestic spheres, as well as issues surrounding natural resource management, human rights, economic disparities, and social justice.

We talked to them about the new book that they have edited for Cambridge University Press, “[Locating Nature: Making and Unmaking International Law](#).” This edited collection questions how international lawyers have understood the environment, and how they have attempted to govern it. The book argues that re-examining international law assumptions about the natural world is an urgent and necessary step for addressing crucial environmental challenges such as climate change, mass extinction, deforestation, desertification, and pollution. In this interview, we talk about the process of writing the book, the current understanding of nature and the environment in international law, exercise of anthropocentric power and modes of governing nature, marketizing carbon reduction and environmental protection, and the complex relation of human rights and the ecological crises.

Cecília Oliveira

Welcome to a one more Carbon Critique. Thank you so much, Julia and Usha for being with us today. I think my first question to you is how did the book project start? And how did this idea of locating nature become the central motivation of a book on international law?

Usha Natarajan

Okay, so perhaps I'll get started, if that's alright with you. So basically, what we were frustrated by a number of things. Firstly, that environmental law wasn't working, not just that it wasn't making things better. But in some sense, it was actually making things worse, because since the 1990s, many of the problems environmental laws tried to tackle have actually gotten significantly worse, since international environmental law came about. So international lawyers in the specialization of environmental law and not engaging well with environmental problems, what about other international lawyers. Well, they

tend to basically relegated to the specialization and say, well, even we cannot engage with this because it's too specialized, or we don't want to engage with this because it's boring. We prefer to do other things, we have other priorities. And, you know, we were frustrated with both those things, because they work together to mean that these problems are systemically reproduced through international laws and international institutions. And one of the things that both Julia and I have focused on throughout our career is the exclusion and the marginalization of most people in the world, most of the legal traditions in the world from international law, without which we can't actually find solutions to environmental problems, because this exploitation of people and the planet go hand in hand. So these were the three different frustrations that provoked this project. And we conceptualized it as locating nature in international law because we felt that by trying to understand how international law understands the environment, that's a good starting point, an entry point to raise these critiques and then address them.

Julia Dehm

I was delighted to meet Usha while I was doing my PhD and it was such a breath of fresh air, because a lot of my work had been looking at how international environmental law structures were reproducing some of the same harms that were causing the environmental problems in the first place, the forms of global inequality, and the forms of vulnerable precariat precarity and differential marginalization and unequal power relations. And so I just... hearing about this project, and I was delighted to either come on board, provided a way of really talking about environment as a problem not for the sub discipline of environment law, but as a problem for international law as a whole. And to say, what are those backwards legal structures of international law that are driving environmental harm in the first place. So rather than just focusing on, you know, this sub discipline of environmental law that's trying to prevent the damage, let's talk about all the structures of international law that are authorizing the exploitation of the natural world, whether that says, you know, huge concepts such as sovereignty, and property and the way we structure the economy, and all those things that this needs to be interrogated. And that's, I think, so key to what she was saying that, in order to address the exploitation of the environment and the natural world, and to remake human-nature relations in a different way, we need to really get all international lawyers on board this project, because it's all parts of international law, that are implicated in driving this destruction.

Cecília Oliveira

Oh, thank you so much. And, well, I need to ask this because we have met before in the US in the conference, I think many years ago, while we were still PhD students, and it's very nice to see how you and Usha are developing your work. So is the first time that you work together like crafting a critical book of international law. And what was the biggest challenge of organizing this book that is addressing pressing environmental challenges, as you mentioned in the book?

Usha Natarajan

The biggest challenge when we started was that even critical international lawyers weren't interested in this project. So I being from the Third World Approaches to International Law, which is basically a post-colonial school within international law, spent a lot of time with critical international scholars, leftist, people working on critical race theory, people working on Marxism, and people working on all different aspects of legal critique. And they were either intimidated or bored by the question of the environment.

And so when we started, there weren't too many of us. And it was the challenge was to bring together at least an initial small group, there were no readings to fall back on. And we had to bring in experts from other fields from science and technology studies from schools of divinity, from Comparative Literature, from all different fields, of course, environmental history to try and start this conversation. And then I think, it just ballooned, because more and more people just couldn't ignore this issue anymore. Different critical scholars decided, well, we have to figure out how we can enter this conversation, even if we are uncomfortable, even if we are intimidated, even if we don't know where to start. Let's just try. And so you know, we did it together. And you know, the numbers are growing, and even more people joining us, every, every conference that we go to, every time present this, you know, people just join and say, well, we've been doing this as well. And we thought we were alone. And so it just goes like that.

Julia Dehm

And just like some of the practical challenges, too, which is like the challenges of academic life. You know, during the course of this project, I've moved from Australia to the US. And then back to Australia, again, I went on mat leave. Usha also, you know, shifted between different jobs. And there were periods of precarious employment, the global pandemic, and so there are just various loads of challenges that led to successive delays in getting the book out. So took quite a long time to come to fruition. But I think in a way, what was productive about that is that the audience for the book was also growing as that time went on, and so I think it came out at a time when there was an audience that was really looking for this type of analysis and ready to ready to take this up and engage with it in their own thinking.

Cecília Oliveira

No, super congratulations that so we are here to talk about the book. Now. I will pass to Bernardo that comes also, with some questions to you.

Bernardo Jurema

Yeah, thank you, Cecilia. And Thank you Julia and Usha, and it was definitely worth the wait for the book. We really enjoyed it. So the first part of the book focuses on the on the question: where is the environment? In the introduction of the book, you formulate the goal to, quote, "deconstruct and denaturalize assumptions about the relationship between nature and the environment," unquote. What are the current understandings of nature and the environment in international law?

Usha Natarajan

What we started with the where is the environment question because it's interesting that the concept exists at all that that law is able to objectify the source of all existence, that were able to conceptualize and name this thing from which everything comes including, amongst other things law, what that ensures about the hubris of the modern Western lawyer that happened. And so we start with looking at how that came about, you know, in the 1960s, and 1970s, in Western countries, and then in international law, and what kind of move that makes in a very modern move, a move that International has been making for centuries, and then makes with the environment. And it's a massive leap, because when you create environment is the object of law, that means everything is the object of law. And so, we start with that question, because it then sets up all the problems that stem from that fundamental move, and that move is actually, not just in law, it's in many of the social sciences. So it then sets up

some of the problems with Western knowledge production and epistemology in general. And in terms of your question about how does law understand the environment, then, law understands the environment is something separate from itself. But in fact, it is not. That's the fundamental problem where we're grappling with in this book, because if there is, in western law, there's always separation between the subject of law and the objective for the lawmaker, and what the law applies to. And because that's inaccurate, scientifically, ethically, philosophically, this creates a lot of problems. And then as we go through the book and look at different legal concepts like sovereignty, territory, jurisdiction, and things like that, we can see how each of those makes this move in different ways and what the problems are, and whether we can repair that in some way.

Julia Dehm

Just to jump in too, like, even though the concept of the environment, which then becomes an object of governance for international law, is really recent, you know, like Usha said, dating to the 50s or so. International law has been engaging with the natural world for a much longer period of time. And I think Ileana Porras' chapter beautifully talks about how, in the history of international law, when there's engagement with the natural world, the natural world is seen simply as a resource, or potentially like a river as something to be in as a mode of transport or something that will facilitate human movements. But the natural world then appears as an inert thing that's open to and that where human exploitation is seen as both inevitable and desirable. And so I think it's that sort of longer history to have how law is engaged with the natural world, as well as this objective governance of the environment. That was sort of try to grapple with.

Cecília Oliveira

Moving a bit to what we see in the second movement of your book "Towards New Thinking". Your chapter, Julia, "Reconfiguring Environmental Governance in the Green Economy" poses right from the beginning the question: how international law governs the environment in the 21st century. You invite the reader to reflect on the exercise of anthropocentric power, and you bring these two modalities, the ethics of domination versus ethics of stewardship. So I would like to know these modes of governing nature, when you are bringing that to us. Could you tell us more about what you mean by complementarity of anthropocentric power and its relation to international law, what you were trying to provoke a little bit here, when you bring that to the core of your chapter?

Julia Dehm

Sure, let's try to push past the binary thinking that we often use, or we sort of can't oppose or see domination of nature, as opposed to stewardship. And I think that's traditionally how we've thought about these sort of categories. And then I think it's quite common in environmental discourse, to say we need to stop, move away from this paradigm of exploitation, domination and extraction of the natural world to one of stewardship. And whilst I'm not opposed to that, I want to complicate that sort of assumed binary that underpins that by saying in contemporary modes of environmental governance, I think these two dynamics are becoming much more complicated. So we're seeing how extractive companies really involved in projects that create conservation things to you know, green their image to promote their reputation. And most specifically, I'd say the offset relation that sort of puts these things in an economic relation where damage somewhere else in one place can be supposedly offset by conservation or the capacity of nature to repair somewhere else. And so I say like, in contemporary

modes of environmental governance, we really look at need to examine how these two things have become really entangled with one another. But then I say, just disentangling them isn't enough, because then we're still left with these two modalities of environmental governance, that if we look at them really critically, we see that they do share some underlying assumptions. And both of them it is this idea of anthropocentric power over nature. In one, it's seen as the power to exploit, and to dominate. And other it's the power to guide, to direct, a more benevolent power, certainly, but it still assumes human mastery to some extent, and both of them assume to some extent that nature is a resource that's subject to human exploitation or human management in different ways. And I think we need to look at that both these histories of environmental exploitation has obviously had devastating effects for communities around the world. But the history of environmental conservation is also completely linked up with colonial histories. And it's led to exclusions of local communities from their lands as well. And so I suggest in the conclusion, that we need to think about ways of relating to the natural world that go past both these modalities as well as to contest the ways in which they are increasingly becoming co implicated with one another in contemporary environmental governance.

Usha Natarajan

I would just add quickly that the beautiful thing about what Julia's chapter does is by looking at stewardship as domination, by looking at them together, she shows that similar to what we were talking about before with the concept of the environment itself, that by seeing ourselves as stewards of nature, much as that's seen as laudable, and it's at the source of a lot of environmental law, we essentially are neglecting that, really, it's the other way around, that it's nature that stewards, human life and all life. And so, you know, again, you know, I feel that chapter ties in beautifully at the start of the book with these themes, because it does show the inextricability of the notion of stewardship and the notion of domination.

Cecília Oliveira

Yes, thank you. One of the things that, for example, Bernardo and I were discussing after reading the chapter is this, how she shows also this connection of extractivism and the stewardship of being integral of the same way sometimes, and this kind of study of the rationality of stewardship also being the same mode sometimes of domination. Do you think that that also illuminates a bit how we see today, "green extractivism", as has been now connected with economic activities that tries to green a little bit, this kind of exploitation.

Julia Dehm

I think we're seeing a number of different trends at the moment, clearly this green extractivism, you know, the extraction of the resources that are going to be necessary to power the green economy, lithium for batteries, other rare minerals for turbines, solar panels, etc, alongside in a more geographically remote extractive frontiers, deep sea, outer space mining, we're seeing, you know, green grabbing, the appropriation of land for environmental purposes, whether that's biofuels or conservation or carbon credits, the increasing take, you know, linkages between conservation and you know, capitalist accumulation, you know, some people are calling this accumulation by repair. So I think we're seeing all these different things in contemporary dynamics. And so one of the things I suggest in the chapter is that we need to -- that while we often talk about a transition from one mode to another, that kind of what we're seeing at the moment is a much more complex intensification of both these

dynamics as well as the scrambling of them. So while we previously had under like, sort of extractivism their appropriation or nature for environmental, I mean for economic ends, we see now the protection of the environment for economic ends, and at the same time, we see the exploitation of the environment. And then we're seeing forms of exploitation for environmental ends and things, so there's just a really complex sort of scrambling of these different modalities, I think that's going on. And so I think that helps us diagnose the present that we're in, and to really pay attention to the way in which, you know, we are seeing these new forms of so-called green extractivism and green grabbing, as well, that we need to contest the false solutions, even as we keep in mind what it is that we want to be the vision of a more ecologically just world that we want to be working towards.

Bernardo Jurema

So Usha, in your chapter, "Who Do We Think We Are? Human Rights in a Time of Ecological Change," you reflect on the connections of international human rights law in the environment, based on two fundamental questions: Who do we think we are? And where do we think we are? These problematizations on what humans think of themselves and nonhuman realms creates the tension of your critique of how human rights sometimes can "asseverate" inequalities, or a specific Western standards towards nature? Could you tell us how these questions helped you to reflect on the complex relation of human rights and the ecological crisis?

Usha Natarajan

Thank you. So this part of the book contains each chapter deals with a different concept of international law and my chapters about human rights. So that's the context in which I'm writing the chapter. So we have the wonderful chapter, Julia mentioned by Ileana Porrás on, on development, on comments on economic development, and another chapter on sovereignty from two legal geographers, Tyler McCreary and Vanessa Lamb and another chapter on jurisdiction and other on labor and other territory and so on. So I urge you to look at all these chapters, because what we're saying is that the way international law participates and perpetuates environmental destruction is because that is built into each of these concepts. And that's why it's very hard to create treaties that work against these concepts, because because the discipline itself is very much wedded to extractivism, and exploitation of people, exploitation of the planet. So in that context, I enter into the concept of human rights, which is something that has actually always troubled me even before I was working on environmental issues, I always had my doubts about human rights -- how helpful it really was, as someone who's worked in the United Nations before, as an academic, I've kind of seen these principles in action. And I wondered, you know, are these really doing what we think they're going to do? These ideas, these different rights, and then in the context of the environment, the obvious thing that strikes one is that this is a very clear separation of people from planet through this concept. So that's why I thought, Well, who do we think we are, that we think that the air we breathe, or all the food that creates our body, the water that keeps us alive... Everything that's gone into creating a person that everything that's in me right now, that, you know, how do I consider myself separate from the world that keeps me alive? And how do I consider myself separate from all the people that give me meaning and thoughts? And how do we separate ourselves from each other and from the world we live in? And human rights is a very powerful way for doing that. And so that was the way I, you know, and entered the chapter. And then, of course, that quickly, you know, makes you realize that, well, it's that separation is very useful for liberalism and capitalism and those ways of thinking about life, because they do need an autonomous state and

autonomous people in autonomous states for law to regulate them, in certain ways, through contracts through property and so on. So the "where do we think we are" question is related to the first question you asked about what is this environment? You know, and it is only by separating ourselves that we can we can say that I can see this thing and govern it, you know, that there is something there that I can govern that I'm not part of, you know, I can cast my mind around. So those were just my two initial questions, just as a way of entering the problem, and then through answering them, I realized that, while the questions themselves actually separate us and the environment, so by the time I get to the end of the chapter, of course, they say, well, the only reason I asked these questions is because I myself am part of this problem. And so then I look at, you know, non western philosophies, including my own being someone from India from, you know, parents and grandparents raised in Hindu and Buddhist philosophies. Well, actually, we don't think of the world in this way. And can I use that to sort of bring myself out of everything I've learned in school, everything I've learned in law school in Australia, can I sort of reeducate myself to ask different questions. So I think in the future, I'd write the chapter differently, but it was just my journey of sort of learning about this.

Cecília Oliveira

And talking a little bit more like of this relationship with non-western, although like we are part of this kind of Western educated elite, because we are able still to publish our papers, go to conference. And this is a privilege if we compare like in the, what is called Global South, many of the scholars that their voices don't reach here. And then we are dealing with international law -- law that it's sometimes as you write in this chapter, how privilege is the expertise of a lawyer, but I think Bernardo put a very good question when we were discussing what the lecturer bring that, Bernardo, about power and epistemology of law.

Bernardo Jurema

Yeah, Usha, in your chapter, you will show that human rights law also exercises specific knowledge politics. In one of the examples that you use is how oil companies use sustainable narratives to justify their internal, their policies and standards over the environment. So how are the strategies to research International Law today, that can embrace an epistemic struggle against the founding idea of international law, which is based on a colonized notion of nature and on social, political, and racial hierarchies?

Usha Natarajan

So both Julia and I are part of this movement called Third World Approaches to International Law -- TWAIL. And TWAIL scholars are essentially so that, you know, as you just said, international law comes from corporate entrance into the, into into the non-European world. And it's a discipline created to enable extracting the labor and resources of the non-European world. And it's from that that we have the discipline we have today. And one of the things that TWAIL tries to do is to say, well, it is possible for international law to move towards being an actually international discipline, it's not just possible, but that it's necessary that it does so because we have these problems that are indeed global, and require global solutions. And then to say, Well, the way to do that, the way to bring in non western epistemologies and the way to allow us to tackle the role -- the very elusive role of corporate actors in international law is to have more international lawyers from the south. People whose everyday lives are affected by the acts of these corporations, who currently can't because of all the elite training and

privileges that Cecilia was talking about, but that are indeed, at the receiving end of all these things, and in fact, have an intimate knowledge of the way international laws and institutions impact the world. And then if they participate in lawmaking, then the whole subject/object dichotomy of human rights law and international law in general changes because the nature of the subject, the lawmaker, is different. You know, and so that's, that's how you bring in new epistemologies. Because the risk otherwise is just this methodological whiteness, where any knowledge from the south is then reinterpreted by white scholars, and then given back to us as though it's news, but rather to allow people to speak in their own languages through their own articulations without having to call it the rights of nature, but to call it what it actually is in their in their own legal tradition, and bring that to international law. That allows us to then escape some of these sort of really reductive holes, that legal holes that we just stuck in and just continually reproduce. So I mean, I think that Praxis of these kinds of findings is, you know, quite personal, like, Who do you bring into these books? Who writes the chapters? What languages do we publish in? Is the book affordable? Who's gonna know what we say in there? What's the point of all of this? You know, and who are our students? Who do we hire? How do we change the discipline? So you know, it is definitely tied to all those questions. It's not -- neither Julia nor I entered this discipline thinking of it as a purely theoretical or academic endeavor. We came into it as practitioners and we definitely see our role in it very much as we want to do. We want to make practical change.

Julia Dehm

Just to jump in too, like, I think this scope for really broadening our imaginary of international norm pluralizing this to recognize that there are multiple international laws, and that's one of the things I really love about Irene Watson's chapter that concludes the book. She's an indigenous jurist from Australia. And she talks about how on the continent of so-called Australia, there's a history of 1000s of years of international law between different indigenous nations and the way they interact with one another. And this is not something we ever talk about, we talk about international law. But there's whole traditions of international law, that are completely different to this western model of international law, that's now a posited itself as the only international law. And that's, you know, got a particular idea of who its subjects and objects and what the sources of law are. But there are other traditions of international law and I think Irene Watson's chapter is such a beautiful way to end the book, because she reminds us of that, and also of, you know, the real importance of acknowledging other laws that continue to exist in the world, despite the violence of genocide and settler colonialism. That indigenous, you know, communities are still, you know, maintaining this law and caring for -- caring for their laws and for country.

Cecília Oliveira

Thank you so much, Julia, because this brings us then, also to the end of the interview, and that you just mention the last chapter. But I would like effect to not end with a period. But end with, like, new perspective and avenues. And then my question to both of you is, what is your next step? What do you expect with the book, but also, in your research in this huge seara? What is your wish or interest, what comes next?

Julia Dehm

Personally, I'm working on two different projects at the moment. So one called "Accounting for Carbon" is trying to look at the international climate regime or at various domestic and transactional

manifestations, to look at the different ways in which we practice the measurement and monitoring how we construct our targets, the inventories, what we count how we count it, and the way we conceptualize risks, how that opens up and for closes different forms of accountability, and thus, also different obligations and what obligations are owed to whom. But I also want to start another project, looking more broadly at the history of international law and natural resource governance, because I think that's sort of the prehistory of environmental law in a way and the engagement that we often don't have, when thinking about environmental law as this narrow, disciplinary, field or sub-field. But I think asking questions about international law, and how it's been engaged in natural resource management, governance opens up, you know, questions to look at trade law, or investment law, and all that, how will the other regimes of law, national security, etc, implicated in the way in which humans have engaged with the natural world. So there are two different directions that I'm working on. But I think there's also a lot to be said about, you know, where we go forward with locating nature as a collective, as a collective project. And I could see, in a different strands coming out of the three different sections of the book. I think there's a lot more work to be done to sort of develop that first section of the book, sort of mapping contemporary forms of environmental governance and the history of environmental governance. I think there's a lot more work to be done under the second section of the book, which was looking at how key concepts of international law are themselves structured by particular ideas of the environment. So as Usha said, in the book, so far, we've got wonderful chapters looking at sovereignty, territory, economy, human rights, labor, landscape, and more. But there's a lot of other concepts that we could develop -- property, in particular really stands out as a key gap, investment, the migrant, the refugee, all these different legal categories, I think, really call for much more unpacking. And then I think there's also another strand of scholarship that could pick up on the third part of the book, which is about reimaginings. And how enduring from different epistemological traditions, we can bring resources for thinking about international law, international laws or more differently and remaking the discipline in particular ways. And there we have wonderful chapters, you know, drawing on literature, drawing on ideas of the commons, drawing on ideas of rights of nature, drawing on indigenous mythology, drawing on indigenous jurisprudence. But again, like the world is full of various epistemological traditions, and there's a lot more work to be done thinking about, you know, how we can learn from all these other non-western modes of thought and modes of being in the world to reconceptualize international law.

Cecília Oliveira

Oh, thank you so much for the summary. So it's really like, just a part one, we're really expecting for the part two, three, and so on. Sounds really as a wonderful project. Usha, with you now.

Usha Natarajan

No, I just completely agree with everything Julia said. So we want to address the continuation of the project precisely in these three prongs. One of the wonderful chapters that's very complimentary to Julia's chapter, actually, in the first part is by H el ene Mayrand. And she talks about the role of liberalism and capitalism in international law and in international environmental law. And one of the things we want to develop in future, because this is some of the feedback we've gotten through, you know, book launches and panel conversations and so on, is to look at what the left has to offer to this question. I personally have been very skeptical in the past in terms of what, you know, Marxist traditions and socialist traditions have to offer on the environmental question, because I feel like, in the past, at least,

it's been fairly useless. But in more recent years, there's been, you know, eco-Marxist contributions and so on that, you know, I think that that's something we could investigate more and participate and, you know, bring some of those voices into the next steps to see you know, what developments have been happening there. And I think that could be really productive. For the second part, I totally agree with Julia. We need to deal with more concepts, property, migration, and asylum definitely would be priorities for me as well. And yeah, for the third part, you know, I love the contributions we have, I think, in the future, we need to bring in more contributions from the global South. We have, of course, that already, but I think that there's so much more that could be said, and I think that one of the things that I've learned through this process, because it's, you know, very much in the early stages of the project is that we need to be quite careful in terms of how we do the project, who, what voices we bring in, and you know, where we publish, and how people can access it and all of that, and I hope we'll be more attentive to that, you know, and learn from, you know, maybe some of the accessibility issues this time. We don't have an open access text, for instance, it's quite expensive. So, you know, maybe we can address some of those things next time as well.

Cecília Oliveira

And how do you guys keep the connection with all the authors in the group, how you like, keep the chain together and expand them for the future?

Usha Natarajan

Well, it's quite difficult because while I'm in the Global South, the only reason I have any connection with these groups is because of the TWAIL network. That's why we have Third World Approaches to International Law, because a lot of us are in places that are quite isolated, don't have necessarily access to journals, or institutions, and we just help each other. Help each other with funding, with conference invitations, with... we just keep an eye on each other. And remember, people who need more help, try and keep the network going and keep building it. And I mean, that goes beyond this project. Of course, it's for all participation from the south and international law. And, and, you know, that's why we have these networks, I wouldn't have been able to do this without Julia because she has infrastructure, institutions, just experience that I just don't have and you know, vice versa. That was that's what every author in the book, we all just, you know, bring to it what we can and try and keep it going it is. I mean, you need strategies and tactics because academia tries to make it so you can't do this. So you can't bring authors from Africa, Latin America and Asia and all over the world together you -- it's hard, but it's possible now.

Cecília Oliveira

I really hope that your your words echoes through Spotify, or all the SoundCloud and with this episode. And thank you so much for your contribution, congratulations for your strength, your attitudes towards these themes and to be brave to embrace all these topics and challenges. It's a pleasure for us, count on us to embrace this network and also do things in the future together. I really hope with this episode that people can understand more of the book because as you beautifully showed the summary. There are so many interesting chapters and the burning questions that this book "Locating Natures" brings that I'm sure you are going to hear feedbacks and follow-ups after this conversation being in the internet also online. Thank you so much.

Julia Dehm

Well, thank you so much for having us on your wonderful podcast. It's been such a delight and pleasure.

Usha Natarajan

Yeah, that's it for me too, just thank you. Thanks for the opportunity. And it was lovely hearing your questions and just meeting you.

Bernardo Jurema

Thank you both Julia and Usha. I loved not just the book, but I loved learning in this interview, that also the story behind the book is just as interesting and important as the book itself. So yeah, thank you so much. Really appreciate it.

Cecília Oliveira

And that's it for today's episode of Carbon Critique. Follow us on Twitter at @democracyRIFS. Carbon Critique is produced by the Ecolpol Research Group: Cecília Oliveira, Alexandra Tost, Bernardo Jurema, Niklas Scheffer, and Pablo Nuñez. Anja Krieger is the consultant who has provided technical assistance. The music is by Mateus Alves. If you liked our podcast episode, leave us a comment or a review. If you want to know more about our project and what we do, you can find a link to [our web page](#) in the show notes.