Introduction

Alexandra Coțofană

On January 14, 2021, the authors of this edited volume met over Zoom for a four-hour discussion. We had disseminated a reading list some months prior to the meeting and had received first drafts from thirteen authors for ten chapters in the weeks prior to the event. We had to work with an eighteen-hour time difference between our easternmost and our westernmost authors—some of them had just woken up for our Zoom meeting, while for others, it was already bedtime. The aim of the meeting was, as we, the editors, had envisioned it, to offer the authors food for thought, to allow them to present their chapters and listen to their peers' presentations, in order to assemble a cohesive manuscript from their revised, final submissions.

Equipped with enthusiasm and a foolproof plan, we welcomed everyone to the Zoom conversation that day. All the authors introduced themselves, and we proceeded with the presentations of our individual chapters. Halfway through the meeting, one author halfheartedly admitted to struggling with the concept of the edited volume, that of sentient landscapes capable of xenophobia. Later, three coauthors presenting one of the chapters focused their presentations on the various ways in which both the concept of sentience and that of xenophobia seemed to not fully fit their ethnographic experience. A long conversation followed on how other chapters could potentially inform and dialogue with the data from our skeptics' chapters. Perhaps naively, we, the editors of the manuscript, had not expected that any of our authors would feel conflicted about the core concept of the manuscript.

Months later, several drafts needed a third set of revisions, which were meant to create a more productive dialogue between the book's core concept and the authors' data. In our subsequent editorial conversations, after receiving the final versions of our authors' chapters, we noticed that some of this tension was still present in the narratives of our colleagues.

And so we tried to understand why. Why have our colleagues submitted substantial work to an edited volume focused on the notion of sentient landscapes capable of xenophobia while at the same time revealing apprehension toward the concept? This introduction is dedicated to our authors and is an attempt to untangle the ontologies of our disciplines, past and present.[1] Our goal is twofold, as our above question is itself twofold. On the one hand, the introduction will tease out the threads that make the concept of sentient landscapes capable of xenophobia a possible model to our authors.[2] On the other hand, the introduction will seek out the logics present in our disciplines that would make a scholar apprehensive toward fully embracing the term.

We chose to keep the name of the book centered around the concept of sentient landscapes capable of xenophobia not because it offers clear answers or, as we have seen, consensus, but because we believe the title's tensions and the uneasiness these create can be used productively. On the topic of the choices we make in naming a book, Anna Tsing made a fundamental point in her introduction to *The Feral Atlas* (2021). People in social sciences and the humanities use words poetically, as guidance, as a way to "simultaneously open up and drill down into meanings rather than cordoning them off as fixed and decided." To complicate things even further, the scholar is not a locus of objectivity. We come from different disciplines, each with our own disciplinary limits regarding what we can accept as real and what we cannot. We are all also actors and, equally, products of our unique upbringing, our experiences, our embodied interactions with the big concepts (nation, religion, gender, etc.). This, we believe, is a strength of the volume.

To better understand why the concept of sentient landscapes capable of xenophobia might create discomfort among moderns, the Latourian concept of hybridity comes in handy. The outofplaceness of sentient landscapes capable of xenophobia is in part due to the fact that the term does not fit with how we imagine modernity. Modernities, in whatever shape they may take, are all defined by the passage of time, in which we imagine a point of rupture, a break from an archaic past, producing an acceleration. In other words, hybridity produces a crisis: as scholars, we have heard of sentient landscapes, but they have always been associated with a romanticized image of indigeneity—just like the colonized, Indigenous people, sentient landscape could do no harm. To have to imagine, then, a sentient landscape capable of xenophobia, one which shares the ugly sentiments of moderns, means imagining a hybrid that is hard to grasp.

Before we move on, the Latourian hybridity of a sentient landscape capable of xenophobia needs some adjusting to fit our concept and context better. In most scholarship, the sentience is revealed only to the Indig-

enous tribes, as both humans and nonhumans share martyrdom at the hands of colonial actors. Scholarship has banalized the term of indigeneity to the point where it almost fully overlaps with a good spirit (Coletta and Raftopoulos 2016: xvii). We suspect this is in part due to the guilt stemming from the colonial history of anthropology. This metanoia results in anthropologists' needing to talk about the discipline's history as the handmaiden to European empires and to recognize the suffering this has produced for the colonized. While all these are historically accurate narratives, it is unhealthy for scholarship to romanticize a concept as big as indigeneity, and it also does not fit well with a moment in our disciplines when we are rethinking binaries. The Indigenous are not lesser beings with a more modest palette of emotions and wants—to suggest this would be to deny them coevalness (Fabian 1983). Thus, to be Indigenous or to be a sentient landscape does not mean to always be good. We must extend the argument to recognize the fullness and complexity of all sentient beings.

Furthermore, our own ontologies do not allow us to imagine the reality of sentient landscapes capable of xenophobia, and these ontologies have been long in the making. To be sure, the relationship between humans and nature has long been governed by the understanding of a Christian God. This understanding allows a constitution of moderns that enables us to imagine as much distance as possible between nature and society, a process started during the Reformation of the sixteenth century (Latour 1993: 34). Furthermore, the biblical moment of creation has imagined a violent separation between humans and everything else, a mode of thinking based on an apartheid between humans and nonhumans (Descola 2005). We are, as a result, incapable of seeing our human and nonhuman others as being able to cope with the same range of emotions as our own.

Theories and concepts are cultural objects just like any other cultural object—this means they change through time, through space, through the interdisciplinary translations they undergo (Guillaume 2015). How moldable they are reveals their plasticity, how transferable they are between disciplines and vocabularies reveals their elasticity, and what they can merge with reveals their hybridity. This volume should be read as a series of physics experiments on the concept of sentient landscapes capable of xenophobia, a first attempt at testing the plasticity, elasticity, and hybridity of the idea. We hope to witness an interesting diachronic curve for the concept, in the short, middle, or long term. At the same time, we acknowledge that we have very little control over how the term will be initially received, how it might be used, rejected, or reclaimed.

The title of the book is the result of the intellectual wandering of the editors. The authors generously responded to the general prompt, not always endorsing the analytical framework but instead engaging with

diverse arguments and forms of evidence to experiment with the limits of the concept. In our January meeting and in their writing, the authors' diverse lenses revealed productive tensions that we hope will fuel future engagement with the term. Taken together, the chapters of the book endeavor to lay a few bricks toward the foundation of a more complex, and thus a more honoring, understanding of sentient landscape.

How, might one ask, can a narrative of xenophobia be respectful? In the book, we use the term xenophobia (from *xénos*, meaning "stranger, foreigner," and *phóbos*, meaning "fear") in its original meaning,[3] freeing it from today's very specific understanding of someone who has power and uses it to further disempower ethnoreligious others. The power dynamics between self and other differ greatly from one chapter to another, and this variety is intentional. The central question of the volume is how can we think with sentient landscapes without just romanticizing them as pure, kind, Gaia-like? Furthermore, how are the ways of thinking of sentient landscapes capable of xenophobia intertwined with human ontologies? We try to answer this question by lessening the human-nature divide.

If we are going to engage seriously with the concept of sentient landscapes, then we must accept that with their agency comes a full range of emotions. As the literature tells us, sentient landscapes see, smell, judge, and protect. This edited volume adds to that range of emotions by revealing ontologies in which sentient landscapes also fear, hate, dislike, and punish. Going even further, sentient landscapes capable of xenophobia should be treated as uneven—they do not behave the same everywhere, even when one important factor (fascist human ontologies) is present alongside several landscapes.

At this point, we must address a rather important question, one which we, together with some of our authors, have had to think about when explaining to peers, students, friends, and family what this book is about. How does one talk to a skeptic about sentient landscapes capable of xenophobia? The arguments are rather simple. First, no matter at what scale they gaze at a landscape (be it microbial, regional, or planetary), scholars and nonscholars alike can agree that landscape is imbued with life. Next, we must clarify what we mean by sentience. Tim Ingold understands sentience as "the inner essence, or soul, that holds the attributes of sentience, volition, memory and speech. Any being that possesses these attributes is a person, irrespective of the intrinsically unstable form in which it appears" (2000: 92). An experienced scholar, Ingold suspected that the skeptics would shriek that they have never seen the landscape speak. To this point, Ingold warns that we see sentience from a Western, Christian point of view. The fact that we have the ability to act on speech does not mean we have to do it. Or as Ingold puts it: "I may or may not choose to speak,

or I may decide to say one thing rather than another, but as a being with intentions and purposes—that is, as a person—I am not the same as my speech" (2000: 102).

Communities that understand their survival is directly connected to the health of the landscape can choose to act on that instinct. Some scholars would argue that a partnership with the sentient landscape has ensured the success and longevity of great civilizations. For example, the Maya civilization flourished for millennia in a geographically diverse and climatically volatile region because of a fundamental belief in the vital essence of all sentient beings, including stones and streams, existing in dynamic cycles of interdependence (Coe and Houston 2015). It could be argued that communities that live closest to an environment and have a long-term practice of interacting with it will have its best interest in mind, and that we should learn from their wisdom.

We beg to differ, using a Hobbesian argument and statistical evidence. As human nature is corruptible, it happens more often than not that humans act against the health of the landscape. When hurt, misused and exploited, landscape reacts—rivers swell and destroy everything around them, boulders hurtle down in landslides onto communities, and post-deforestation landscape turns to desert. To some extent, even global warming could be understood through this logic: global warming just happens at a different pace than some of the other reactions of landscape, and we are yet to fully experience a violent moment of decompression, as we would understand it in our human time.

We will take this a step further and ask: Is landscape always good? Victimized? Just reactive? It could not possibly be that simple—but equally, the answers as to why it feels other things could be manifold. As any living sentient being would, landscape learns to adapt, but it also learns behaviors from other species. Just as humans have observed the landscape and learned from it virtues like patience, resilience, and nurturance, landscape could have observed predatory beasts (humans included) and learned how to hate, how to hurt. We could be confronted with a case of xenophobic cohabitations or symbiosis. We can understand the symbiosis of human-nature xenophobia as resembling how human capitalist extractivism cohabits and encourages species that decimate (rats, fungi, cockroaches). Is xenophobia then a product of colonial globalization that has been spread like a pest, has adapted, and can no longer be contained? Changing no longer just ecologies but the ontologies of ecologies?

There are certainly traceable cotemporalities between the colonial spread of European pests and diseases and European xenophobia. Have colonial humans, by reproducing the same ways of treating the environment back home, changed the way that colonized landscape understands

itself and others? Has colonized landscape internalized the racism brought upon itself? Another option, borrowing the set of relationships described by Eduardo Viveiros de Castro and Peter Skafish in *Cannibal Metaphysics* (2014), could be that humans with their xenophobia are to the landscape what ticks with their Lyme disease are to humans. Or maybe landscape was the first teacher of xenophobia, making humans the student. We cannot be certain. The only certain thing is our lives are too short and we are too distracted by the monotone of whatever human culture we live within to ever be able to truly understand the logics of landscape. What we are learning to know—and this is a good thing—is that we do not know that much. And the more we look at what we know, the more we seem to understand how little it actually is, and how much of our time as a species we spend looking at ourselves.

Sketching a Conceptual Framework for Sentient Landscapes Capable of Xenophobia

The remainder of this introduction will follow sentience (when and where does it happen?), it will follow xenophobia (where and when does it happen, and which landscapes are stirred by it?), and it will follow landscape (what have people been trying or achieving when using certain narratives to talk about the environment?).

First, we cannot think of the agency of landscape without acknowledging the agency of humans. Human imaginaries about the landscape affect policies, which in turn change landscape itself. For example, in countries that take pride in their mountains, national parks will be created in an attempt to protect the forests, while the less compelling lowlands will be ignored, exploited, and not replenished, which in turn makes the mountains into the nation's favorite son. Yet this alone does not decide xenophobia—as with humans, both the privileged and the neglected could start harboring feelings of hatred towards a perceived other.

What ecologies do xenophobic landscapes and xenophobic people form together? Nonideal ones, as the nation rarely ends up carrying to term a landscape-protection project successfully; in the absence of an easy-to-blame, ethnoreligious other, the fragile eco-fantasy of a perfect nation-nature symbiosis crumbles. We see this more and more as conversations revolve around the Anthropocene, a term popularized in 2000 by Paul Crutzen, an atmospheric chemist, as a way to think about the planet's geological history and the effects that the Industrial Revolution has had. The term has since been adopted in discourse across social sciences and the humanities, art and activism, climate change scholarship and related

fields, mainly as a starting point for a (legitimate) discursive self-flogging of our species. In these narratives, the modern human is seen as the root cause of dismal planetary changes, and the discussion then often extends to invasive species, toxic chemicals, and pathogens, whose behaviors and modes of existence mirror the same sort of colonial, totalizing, obliterating forms of greed towards fellow species.

It might then not be surprising that we are investigating and commenting on the xenophobia of landscapes at a time when the scholarly community has been focusing across the board on the detrimental consequences of human greed and the capitalist ethos. Despite holding on to our differences, we are following the connections between our fieldsites, and we have all, as authors present in the volume, harbored questions that we hoped the concept of "xenophobic landscapes" might answer. As the concept of the Anthropocene makes its way into the mainstream of scholarly debate, its meanings become schismatic, reproducing previously instituted imperial categories of class, race, and hegemony (Gilroy 2018).

The (Good) Sentient, the (Bad) Landscape, and the (Ugly) Xenophobic

A most useful theorization of sentient landscapes comes from Tim Ingold, who draws attention to the fact that landscape is not a stable object of knowledge, as "people's knowledge of the environment undergoes continuous formation in the very course of their moving about in it" (2000: 230). For Ingold, it is vital that people receive sensory education in order to be able to come to terms with the sentience of landscape. This education includes stories that explain the interconnectedness and reactions of sentient beings to each other. This interconnectedness, in turn, is what Ingold calls sentient ecology (2000: 10). To be part of a sentient ecology, one must live in it for a long time and have a commitment to the relationships that this interdependent ecology needs.

Donald Crosby coins the term *fellow thous* to refer to the other beings inhabiting this planet who are, in some ontologies, capable of conscious awareness: "I show that these creatures, and especially those capable of conscious awareness and feeling, are richly deserving of our moral recognition, respect, and responsibility" (Crosby 2013: x). While Crosby's intentions seem good, the problem is that this way of thinking remains anthropocentric—it is because other beings are like us, in that they are capable of conscious awareness (a superior, human capacity) that they deserve respect. What then happens to the entities that do not possess this capacity? Further, are those inferior entities not vitally intertwined with

the thous? Can the thous be respected separately, while the non-thous are disrespected? Or is the balance of nature only formed of those deemed deserving—us and the thous? Furthermore, what do we do when the rights of thous come into conflict?

One theme that we see explored in current literature on sentient landscapes is that of scholars and their informants acknowledging the landscape's sentience and agency, and describing the landscape as kind, Gaia-like, and as siding with the marginalized and the colonized. The binary of modern/nonmodern has also superimposed a reality in which the modern is up to no good, driven by neoliberal, capitalist greed, while the ancestor imbued in the mountain or river is inherently good. This purifying, simplifying logic cannot be healthy to scholarship.

In some parts of the world, ontologies of sentience have been lost due to colonialism, and the concept of a sentient landscape was not the only one to be lost. The Amazonian Wari' used to consider the heart as the locus of knowledge, but after Protestant missionaries introduced them to their God and taught them mathematics in school, the Wari' started thinking of the brain as the site of knowledge (although the brain did not hold a place in their knowledge cosmology before) and started needing a numerological vocabulary to negotiate with white people. So they started using Wari' words as numbers: for example, the word for one is "alone" (Vilaça 2019). Christianity has also reinvented the relationship of the Wari' to their sentient others—before the colonial encounter the Wari' saw themselves and other animals as *wari'* (same, person) or *karawa* (prey). Christianity gave them a new cosmology in which no animal is off limits as prey because the Christian God made them all for humans to eat. This also normalized antisocial behavior (which, as refusal of socializing around food, used to be attributed to the fact that the person had turned jaguar, for example). In other places, the beliefs of locals had to be taken seriously by the scientific community and the elites out of a lack of alternatives. The Mount Paektu/Changbai stratovolcano, for instance, had not been within the reach of the elites, geographically and topographically, so the scientific expeditions to the mountain had to rely on a combination of rationalistic science and local beliefs in the mountain's sentience as data (Rogaski 2018).

Some of the current academic focus on sentience has followed the development of legal personhood around the world. Environmental personhood is the practice of granting parts of nature the status of legal person. Right now this means that they can be represented in a court of law and that their rights can be protected (Gordon 2017), but eventually the status might also be used in prosecuting landscape for crimes or for violating the rights of other sentient beings—how will a lawyer defend the intentionality of the land? Some authors have already started to reflect on this:

"Because the country is sentient, the ground, for Belyuen Aborigines, is always potentially liable to act for its own reasons" (Povinelli 1993: 150).

In March of 2017 the Whanganui River in New Zealand was granted the same legal rights as humans, after the Whanganui tribe's 140-year-long legal battle on behalf of their ancestor and living kin, the river. Days later the Yamuna and Ganges rivers in India were also legally recognized as living and legal entities (Chandran 2017). In Australia, the Belyuen Aboriginal community had tried to make the government understand that Old Man Rock listens, smells the sweat of the Aboriginals, and intentionally acts and reacts, as part of legal negotiations for granting the mountain legal personhood (Povinelli 1995). The Aboriginals and the Australian state think differently, not only in their ontologies regarding the mountains, but in how land should be used and in considering the economic value of acting one way or another—yet the balance of power between these groups is unequal at best.

Scholars have been discussing this phenomenon in the context of heterological societies, meaning cultures that extend membership to nonhuman others or *héteros* (Kwek and Seyfert 2018i). The questions that stem from this type of ontology have to rely on the framework of the material turn: How do nonhumans shape social life? How can we approach these nonhumans in their own terms? How can we understand these materialities and their agency?

Posthumanism and the focus on animals and nonhumans were earlier analytical steps toward answering these questions (Haraway 2003; Wolfe 2003). Yet all terms in the debate reveal Western, Cartesian ways of thinking, which separate humans from others. (See Latour's term "nature-culture," whereas Butler's "array of materialities" [1993: 97] and Ingold's idea of plurality in flux [2012] do not seem to agree on the conceptual framework.) Furthermore, we seem to disregard the very fact that we are made up of and in symbiosis with many types of nonhumans.

Outside of looking at environmental personhood, scholars fall under a few other categories in terms of how they construe sentience. It can be a country that is sentient, alive, and sensuous to those who can recognize it and know it (Biddle 2007: 12–13), a nod back to Ingold; or in the lens of new animism, sentience is simply personhood (Harvey 2005). For some authors, like Sylvie Poirier, the issue becomes something extremely important to communicate to the academic community: "When it is said that some rocks at Kutal are the ears of the ancestors that dwell there, this should be understood in a literal sense and not as a metaphor" (2005: 153).

Of all the accounts we encountered in the literature, two are ontologically closest to our volume. The first comes from the Yup'ik Eskimos, for whom the sentient cosmos (*ella* for the Yup'ik Eskimos), which perceives

and engages, is understood as a large eye that can both hear and see. For their safety, people who were too loud (like mourners) or who had a specific scent (like menstruating women) had restrictions around their movement to make them pass unnoticed to the invisible eye (Fienup-Riordan 1994: 248). The other is from the Mapuche, for whom it is essential to be connected with ancestral land. The Mapuche believe that those who cannot trace their geographical ancestry have unpredictable, potentially dangerous behaviors (Di Giminiani 2018).

Some other authors have had engagements with the landscape in their fieldwork, and while there is a discussion about sentient landscapes in their work, it is unclear where they stand on the issue. Gaston Gordillo (2018) completes an analysis of terrain as an affective geography, inspired by Baruch Spinoza's term affective geometry, a term that analyzes the many ways in which bodies affect other bodies and are affected by them. These range from negative ways that could diminish the body's ability to act, to those that might positively expand the body's powers for action. The question guiding his work probes the ways in which bodies in motion affect and are affected by the terrain. The terms he uses—"bodies in motion" and "terrain"—manage to be more appropriate than the classic human/nonhuman binary. Still, the issue here remains the fact that Gordillo thinks of movement in human time and decides that terrain is not a body in motion, when in fact, as we well know, landscape also moves, constantly, it is just imperceptible to those of us perceiving in human time.

Gordillo's research maps US military interventions in the Korengal mountains and their valleys between 2005 and 2010 and uses the term "vectors of militarization" to refer to his main data source: a genre of film that normalized the presence and heroism of US troops in Iraq and Afghanistan while banalizing as terrorists the locals who were fighting back (2018: 54). For Gordillo, terrain is a process that includes not only land but also bodies of water, the atmosphere, and something that should also be conceptualized as political technology (laws, mapmaking, policing deployed for control of the terrain's volumetric physicality), since the dynamism of terrain can disrupt these technologies. Even though Gordillo cites Latour (2004) on the capacity of terrain to affect human action in either positive or negative ways as proof of the agency of matter, he goes on to say:

> But the very idea of terrain being an "actor" that has "agency" risks reifying and obscuring the multiple actions, pressure points, and affectations at play in these violent encounters. First, the capacity of steep rock formations to affect and slow down the march of Americans resulted not from their agency but from what Spinoza would call their power, that is, their capacity to affect other bodies. This is power that can be measured through its effects

(Viljanen 2014). But at the same time, the exhaustion felt by the soldiers was caused not only by the effect of those rocks on their exertion but also by these men's own efforts to move up carrying heavy loads. Likewise, it was the agency of the insurgency that turned the mountains into a weaponized field of action. (2018: 55)

Similarly, the title of Nicolas Peterson's work (2011) inquires: "Is the Aboriginal Landscape Sentient." The title localizes sentience as if it can be geographical—to draw a parallel, it would be the same as asking, Are Indigenous people alive? The problem here remains that there is a tendency to think it is the people who imbue the landscape with sentience, in the same way you would a stage puppet, which lies limp and lifeless once its human leaves. Last but not least, some engagements with the sentient landscape end up focusing completely on the human agent, making sentience a quality that humans can bestow on the land, instead of a feature intrinsic to the landscape itself. Take for example Simon Schama's reflection on his fieldwork: "Landscape is the work of the mind. Its scenery is built up as much from strata of memory as from layers of rock" (1995: 6–7).

The last thematic category that came out of our literature survey contains the work of scholars who try to understand where the problem lies by arguing that we do not grasp sentience to its full extent. Using their fieldwork data as a reference point, these scholars try to explain what exactly in the ontologies of the West might be lacking and thus preventing us from grasping the full meaning of a sentient landscape.

Take for example Julie Cruikshank's work (2006) in Athapaskan and Tlingit oral traditions from Yukon and Alaska, where glaciers can feel smells and listen, and where they punish the unjust and make moral judgements. One reason why this ontology may not have translated well to English-speaking settlers is the fact that, unlike some native languages that are rich in verbs and describe landscape through its actions, English does not have verb forms that differentiate between animate and inanimate subjects (Thornton 1995). That being said, this ontology has morphed through time: the sentience of landscape was not foreign to Europeans before the Industrial Revolution, yet their entire ontology ever since has been built on rejecting that possibility (Povinelli 1993: 12).

Following the Industrial Revolution and colonial encounters, shamanic ontologies have usually been dismissed as inferior by Western science, even though, for example, Amerindian shamanism has an understanding of syphilis and microbes in general that is close to modern-day biology (Giraldo Herrera 2018). Furthermore, shamans understood geological formations as having souls or spirits (Descola 1996). Even though we recognize that anthropology has gone through a process of self-reflection in the last few decades, trying to find some sense of cognitive justice and recog-

nize the legitimacy of non-Western ontologies, we must also acknowledge that the binary of Western/non-Western still exists and is employed as if the world were as simple as literally non-white and white. At fault for the difficulty in grasping the ontological meaning of sentient landscapes could be the very anthropologists who create problems by trying to translate local vocabularies into Western terms. In any form of translation, a complete overlap can never happen; there are always shades of otherness that, despite their importance in the original context, can get lost through the work of academic translation.

As Giraldo Herrera puts it, translation is epistemic violence—and so is most research found in archives and museums, as forms of extractivist, colonial violence that split the world into modern and nonmodern, north and south, individual works of Western contemporary artists versus works exhibited as pertaining to an anonymous collective of nonmodern others (Marhöfer 2015). Anthropologists, historians, and their ken, have played important roles in the making and legitimation of these binaries and discourses. Not only is there violence in these discourses, as one of the binary terms always governs the other (Derrida 1990), but they also hinder our ability to imagine the multiple ontologies we inhabit. To speak of the nonhuman or other-than-human can further legitimate the zoning and segmentation of these ways of thinking.

The established procedures of knowledge production have a tendency to highlight human activity and make humans the reference point for everything (Marhöfer 2015). We may have been unable to escape this issue throughout the volume as the only language our ethnographers spoke was that of other humans, so their interlocutors were exclusively human. Not being able to talk to the landscape means we cannot assume things of its modes of thinking. Yet for so long we have been assuming it to be mother-like: generous, victimized, wanting to live in harmony—so perhaps one important move in unthinking colonial mindsets would be to also allow ourselves to imagine the opposite.

Even so, there is hope to recuperate colonial terminology and to use it to decolonize thought. Animism is an example of how this can be done: once a term used to talk about nonmodern ontologies, with the direct implication that they are epistemologically less than their Western counterparts, animism has been recuperated through the work of Descola (2013), Viveiros de Castro (2012), and Stengers (2010) as an academic tool that could help unthink and rethink Western beliefs.

In surveying the literature, we found a question posed by Ruth Rogaski (2018: 717) to be vitally productive for the purpose of the volume: "Do we need to know a mountain's nationality or can our knowledge about mountains transcend the political?" The question is an excellent starting

point for investigating the links between the sentient landscapes capable of xenophobia and the sacralization of the nation. As the closest to the sky, mountain peaks have been the easiest to imagine as sacred. Additionally, there is an underlying assumption that uninhabited geographies are somehow pure and authentic and inspire a certain form of psychogeography. In fact, these landscapes remain uninhabited by way of government projects (the establishment of national parks or protected areas), or they are desolate, empty of infrastructure, and left wild with weeds, in a way that does not please the econationalist gaze.

From the sixteenth century on, mountains gained a sacred place in Europe in both religious and nonreligious fields (Mathieu 2006). We can notice that many of the Alpine peaks have names of saints (St. Moritz, St. Gallen, etc.) and so do valleys and passes (St. Bernhard, San Marco). Many of these had popular names for the longest time in history and were only given these Christian names as part of a rather nonreligious combination of topographical measurements and mountain tourism (Schorta 1988). Furthermore, the seventeenth century saw a boom in the creation of new pilgrimage places for Catholics, many of them overlapping with the topography of mountains. This happened less in Protestant countries, where God's omnipresence is central to the cosmology. In Southern Germany and Austria, the Santi Monti—artificially created mountains—have a whole pilgrimage devoted to them. All these pilgrimage sites were attempts of Europeans to recreate in Europe the mountain of Golgotha, thus topographically mimicking Jerusalem (Mathieu 2006).

Similarly, the root of far-right ecological thinking can be traced back to Romanticism, in the form of worries surrounding the shortage of wood and the risks surrounding the forests (Radkau 2014). This was coupled with a rejection of cold, uninvolved universalism in the favor of local uniqueness and diversity. With time, the nation and nature become a poetic, symbiotic ethnospace (Smith 2009). The discourses of protecting the environment and protecting the nation have a few elements in common—one is notably that both need to be protected against invasive species in the forms of plants, animals, or ethnoreligious others (Olwig 2003; Forchtner 2019). While these found an important place in fascist and National Socialist narratives of the mid-twentieth century, they have equally become an essential part of political imaginaries gathered under today's Nouvelle Droite or "new right," an ideology that supports nature as a partner of humans but also advocates for cultural and racial purity rather than mixing (de Benoist and Champetier 1999).

Perhaps most famously, the Nazis were very protective of the environment. In 1934, the Nazis mandated Dauerwald as the official silviculture doctrine of the German Reich through the law of 13 December 1934 Con-

cerning the Protection of the Racial Purity of Forest Plants, whose aim was to "cast out the unwanted foreigners and bastards that have as little right to be in the German forest as they have to be in the German Volk" (Bruggemeier 2005: 44). Bruggemeier claims the policy was as the forest herself: green on the surface, and brown underneath (2005: 44), although he later oscillates between whether it was their intentions or their outcomes that were brown, meaning he is unclear on how much of the initial policy was racially motivated and how much of it had just the environment in mind.

Dauerwald is a form of *naturgemäße Waldwirtschaft*, or "natural forest management," a close-to-nature form of forestry that also produced many laws that were environmentally sound and progressive. The Dauerwald doctrine allowed for discourse that likened the German forest to the German volk—it was an easy tool to compare individual trees/individual Germans and the forest/nation. The Dauerwald had to only contain *bodenständige* (native) trees, which had always been rooted in German soil—and this was equally true of the volk. Ironically, the forest was seen as national even though its species were not, because the eighteenth-century German forests were planted with Norway pine and Scots pine. But they were planting monocultures, which had the same downfall as all monocultures, so scientific forestry fell out of fashion in Germany by the 1850s. Coniferous forests were held as particularly pure in German ideology, while broadleaf trees were considered "the stepchildren of forestry." However, the very idea of a national forest is rather artificial and noncongruent with the realities of the land: as landscape itself is not national, species will vary.

It can help us grasp the concept of sentient landscapes capable of xenophobia to recognize that German foresters in the 1930s famously spoke and wrote of the forest as an organism. Furthermore, one official is quoted saying, "Ask the trees, they will teach you how to become National Socialists!" (Modersohn 1939). The idea of a superior race was also maintained through parallels with a xenophobic sentient forest: "The balance among the components of the forest is maintained through the consumption of those who are superfluous, and that the survivors are those who are stronger and healthier, so that both the struggle and its victims serve the community. Thus, the forest teaches us the foundational laws of a völkisch and racially aware state such as the National Socialist one. And that is no coincidence" (Guenther 1936).

Tacitus's text *Germania* was a great influence on Protestant German scholars, who used it to create a lasting link between the noble savages of the past and the forest that could provide a legitimate source for the German national identity. This was not solely a political move—literary men like philosopher Johann Gottfried Herder used this connection to an

idealized past as a tool against the globalizing effects of the French Enlightenment (Wilson 2012). In the late 1800s and early 1900s, the German forest became an important topic for works in botany, forestry, geography, history, literature, law, and politics, where the connection between the historical barbaric nation and its forests was praised in unison. The Germans were not alone in semiotically investing in the nature-nation connection: the British were deeply invested in connecting pastoral landscapes to the image of the nation, the Swedes were also praising the forest as a source of the nation, and French reforestation helped develop a sylvan nationalist discourse.

Chapter Summaries

We structured the book following concepts that matter in the ontological making of xenophobic landscapes: territory, nation, hostility, resources, who gets to speak with authority on who counts as Indigenous, and who counts as other. For example, the nation has resources and the know-how to protect nature, whereas the poor or marginalized lack both and are thus seen as dangerous to the landscape. In this sense, the nation is often discursively exempt from having negatively affected the landscape. In many of the chapters in this volume, geographical spaces have been the object of an ideological recovery in the service of right-wing ideologies.

One overarching theme that comes out of the narratives explored in the volume investigates who counts as other. In the first two sections of the book, the human populations inhabiting the sentient landscape see the land as coterminous with themselves, and they place human ethnoreligious others outside those boundaries. In this sense, the particular ontology of sentient landscapes explored in current literature (as kind, Gaia-like, siding with the marginalized and the colonized) does not match the findings of our authors. Such investigations illuminate ontologies in which the landscape is seen as more human than other groups perceived as less than human, whether historical or contemporary. The arguments against these less-than-human others go through the whole spectrum of disenfranchised others, including the Jew as both a contemporary colonial military other as well as a historically undesirable other in twentieth-century fascism (Coțofană's chapter), Japanese historical minorities in ethnoreligious nationalist Japan (Malitz's chapter), and competing Chilean discourses of human-landscape allegiances (Krizmanics's chapter).

The first part, "Reinventing the State," is made up of four chapters, each analyzing, with distinct ethnographic data and a distinctive lens, the tools and strategies that states concoct to imagine and narrate close

bonds between a sentient landscape capable of xenophobia and their own political agendas. The book embarks on these conceptual and ethnographic explorations with the work of Scott Burnett. Burnett's study investigates the narratives and politics of South Africa's apartheid era. Here, he explores through anthems and poetry imaginaries of the connections between white South Africans and a sentient landscape. In Burnett's analysis, the sentient landscapes capable of xenophobia are revealed as both something to be feared and as a tool for a continued governing of the land. Next, Phillipe Blouin's work explores tensions between the settler institutions of Montreal and the Kanien'kehá:ka (Mohawk) Indigenous community. The Canadian settler population is appropriating logics of a partnership between the sentient land and humans to fit its ultranationalist, anti-immigration agenda. In the course of this ontological remolding, the sentient landscape itself becomes xenophobic, while the actual Indigenous people are imagined as part of the landscape. This attempt to self-indigenize is meant to legitimate the French settler's belonging to the land and give them the authority to speak against new waves of migration and refugees.

Coțofană's chapter traces the steady theme of sentient landscapes capable of xenophobia in Romania's long twentieth century, despite the many changes in political regimes and ideology. Her work looks at literary magazines and books assigned to primary school pupils, as well as at the discourse of Romanian politicians, journalists, and poets, to reveal how the concept of a xenophobic sentient landscape has come to the support of the Romanian people against both real colonizing political others (such as the Ottoman or Austro-Hungarian Empires) and imagined colonizing ethnoreligious others (such as the Jew in the early and mid-twentieth century). In the next chapter, Callum Pearce discusses his fieldwork in the Ladakh region of Himalayan India, focusing on tensions between Buddhists and Muslims that come accompanied by stories of how the sentient landscape attacks the Muslims, as they are not of that place.

The next part, called "Famous Fascisms," brings together ethnographic data from Nazi Germany, post-Franco Spain, Japan, and Chile. First, Hikmet Kuran's chapter sketches the historical context that we need to understand the connections between nation and the environment in Nazi Germany. Kuran's chapter alludes to the ways sentient landscapes capable of xenophobia become a trusted partner for the writing of Nazi history. In Arvid van Dam's chapter, we encounter a Spain like we have never seen before: eroded desert landscape and solitude inspire a cinematographic imaginary that includes hostile environments and the mirrored actions of the landscape's human counterparts. The section continues with the work of David Malitz on sentient landscapes capable of xenophobia in Japan.

Japan has at least four historical minorities, who differ from mainstream Japanese culture and have different legal status. These minorities are set against the concept of *shinkoku*, a term referring to the Japanese sentient landscape, imbued with deities, which throughout history has been reframed as connected to Japanese superiority, imperialism, and, later, to ultranationalism.

Last but not least, the ethnography of Georg T. A. Krizmanics illuminates ontologies of sentient landscapes capable of xenophobia in Chile. Settlers initially spoke of the relationship of the Indigenous Mapuche people with the sentient landscape, yet in the eyes of the Mapuche, the settlers, especially the Germans, had their own history of a bond with the sentient landscape, specifically the forest. Both forms had a rejection of foreigners at their core.

The last part, called "The Skeptics," concludes the book with two chapters that question the applicability of the concept. This section is vital as it opens new avenues for thinking with our concept. Sarah Czerny and her colleagues use their ethnographic fieldwork in Gorski Kotar, Croatia, to test the limits of the concept of sentient landscapes capable of xenophobia. Their work is extremely important as they are wary of European countries' xenophobic political history of associating the nation and nature. Susanna Trnka's work on Czech cities tests further directions in which the concept of sentient landscapes can be extended and applied, questioning whether the sentience of the built environment can exhibit xenophobia. Lastly, Hikmet Kuran delivers the concluding statements of the book.

Alexandra Coțofană holds a doctorate in anthropology from Indiana University Bloomington, with a doctoral minor in religious studies. Her research explores intersections of politics, modernities, and ontologies of governing. Alexandra's scholarly interests focus on political ecologies, the ontological turn, the study of political elites, and ways of governing, as well as on the occult as a tool for governing and discursive techniques employed in populist imaginaries to form racial, gender, and political Others. She is currently teaching and conducting research at Zayed University in Abu Dhabi as assistant professor of social sciences.

Notes

1. Ontology is the way we understand reality, the body of knowledge we have about being.
2. The word landscape comes from the Dutch word for flood fields, *landschap*, referring to the Dutch floodplains (Forchtner 2020), a topic of much artistic and literary interest during Romanticism.
3. We understand xenophobia as explained by Gregory Papanikos in his 2020 paper "Philoxenia and Xenophobia in Ancient Greece." Papanikos explains the complexities of the concept in ancient Greece—it was not used to mean solely fear or pure hatred but a complex set of emotions, rooted in the historical and political context in which the term emerged. The way our contemporaries use xenophobia today seems to carry the meaning of xenelasia (expulsion of foreigners). See https://www.atiner.gr/gtp/Papanikos(2020)-Philoxenia.pdf.

References

Biddle, Jennifer. 2007. *Breasts, Bodies, Canvas: Central Desert Art as Experience.* Sydney: UNSW Press.

Bruggemeier Franz-Josef. 2005. "Eternal Volk." In *How Green Were the Nazis? Nature, Environment, and Nation in the Third Reich,* ed. Franz-Josef Bruggemeier and Mark Cioc, 43–72. Athens: Ohio University Press.

Butler, Judith. 1993. *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex*. New York: Routledge.

Chandran, Rina. 2017. "India's Sacred Ganges and Yamuna Rivers Granted Same Legal Rights as Humans." *Reuters*, 21 March. Retrieved from www.reuters.com/article/us-india-water- lawmaking- idUSKBN16S109.

Coe, Michael D., and Stephan Houston. 2015. *The Maya*, 9th edn. London: Thames & Hudson.

Coletta, Michela, and Malayna Raftopoulos. 2016. *Provincialising Nature.* London: University of London Press.

Crosby, Donald A. 2013. *The Thou of Nature: Religious Naturalism and Reverence for Sentient Life.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Cruikshank, Julie. 2006. *Do Glaciers Listen? Local Knowledge, Colonial Encounters, and Social Imagination*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

de Benoist, Alain, and Charles Champetier. 1999. "The French New Right in the year 2000." In *Alphalink*. Retrieved from http://home.alphalink.com.au/-radnat/debenoist/alain9.html.

Derrida, Jacques. 1990. *Positions*. London: The Athlone Press.

Descola, Phillipe. 1996. "Constructing natures: Symbolic ecology and social practice." In *Nature and society: Anthropological perspectives,* ed. Philippe Descola and Gisli Palsson, 82–101. London: Routledge.

———. 2005. *Par delà nature et culture*. Paris: Gallimard.

———. 2013. *The Ecology of Others*. Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press.

Di Giminiani, Piergiorgio. 2018. *Sentient Lands: Indigeneity, Property, and Political Imagination in Neoliberal Chile*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Fabian, Johannes. 1983. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Fienup-Riordan, Ann. 1994. *Boundaries and Passages: Rule and Ritual in Yup'ik Eskimo Oral Tradition*. Norman, OK.: University of Oklahoma Press.

Forchtner, Bernhard. 2019: "Nation, Nature, Purity: Extreme-right Biodiversity, Cultural Imaginaries of the Extreme Right." *Special Issue of Patterns of Prejudice* 53(3): 285–301.

———. 2020. *The Far Right and the Environment: Politics, Discourse and Communication*. London: Routledge.

Gilroy, Paul. 2018. "'Where Every Breeze Speaks of Courage and Liberty': Offshore Humanism and Marine Xenology, or, Racism and the Problem of Critique at Sea Level." *Antipode* 50: 3–22.

Giraldo Herrera, César E. 2018. *Microbes and Other Shamanic Beings*. London: Palgrave.

Gordillo, Gaston. 2018. "Terrain as Insurgent Weapon: An Affective Geometry of Warfare in the Mountains of Afghanistan." *Political Geography* 64: 53–62.

Gordon, Gwendolyn J. 2017. "Environmental Personhood." *Columbia Journal of Environmental Law* 43(1): 50–88.

Guenther, Konrad. 1936. "Preface." *In So lebt die Waldgemeinschaft: Eine Bildreihe in 3 Heften. 1. Heft: Biologische Gemeinschaftskunde*, ed. Hugo Keller, v–vi. Leipzig: Ernst Wunderlich.

Guillaume, Astrid. 2015. "The Intertheoricity: Plasticity, Elasticity and Hybridity of Theories." *HSS* IV(1): 13–29.

Haraway, Donna J. 2003. *The Companion Species Manifesto: Dogs, People, and Significant Otherness*. Chicago: Prickly Paradigm.

Harvey, Graham. 2005. *Animism: Respecting the Living World*. London: Hurst.

Ingold, Tim. 2000. *The Perception of the Environment: Essays on Livelihood, Dwelling and Skill.* London: Routledge.

———. 2012. "Toward an Ecology of Materials." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 41: 427- 442.

Kwek, Dorothy H. B, and Robert Seyfert. 2018. "Affect Matters: Strolling through Heterological Ecologies." *Public Culture* 30(1): 35–59.

Latour, Bruno. 1993. *We Have Never Been Modern*. Translated by Catherine Porter. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

———. 2004. *Politics of Nature: How to Bring the Sciences into Democracy*. Translated by Catherine Porter. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Marhöfer, Elke. 2015. "Ecologies of Practices and Thinking." PhD dissertation. Gothernburg, Sweden: Valand Academy, University of Gothenburg.

Mathieu, Jon. 2006. "The Sacralization of Mountains in Europe during the Modern Age." *Mountain Research and Development* 26(4): 343–49.

Modersohn, A. W. 1939. "Weltanschauung und beruflicher Einsatz." *Deutsche Forst-Zeitung* 8(15): 602–3.

Olwig, Kenneth. 2003. "Natives and Aliens in the National Landscape." *Landscape Research* 28(1): 61–74.

Peterson, Nicolas. 2011. "Is the Aboriginal Landscape Sentient? Animism, the New Animism and the Warlpiri." *Oceania* 81(2): 167–79.

Poirier, Sylvie. 2005. *A World of Relationships: Itineraries, Dreams and Events in the Australian Western Desert*. Toronto: Toronto University Press.

Povinelli, Elizabeth A. 1993. *Labor's Lot. The Power, History, and Culture of Aboriginal Action.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

———. 1995. "Do Rocks Listen? The Cultural Politics of Apprehending Australian Aboriginal Labor." *American Anthropologist New Series* 97(3): 505–18.

Radkau, Joachim. 2014. *The Age of Ecology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Rogaski, Ruth. 2018. "Knowing A Sentient Mountain. Space, Science, and the Sacred in Ascents of Mount Paektu/Changbai." *Modern Asian Studies* 52(2): 716–52.

Sampson, Fiona. 2018. "The Wilderness in Us." *Eurozine*, 28 February. Retrieved from https://www.eurozine.com/the-wilderness-in-us/.

Schama, Simon. 1995. *Landscape and Memory.* London: HarperCollins.

Schorta, Andrea. 1988. *Wie der Berg zu seinem Namen kam.* Chur, Switzerland: Terra Grischuna.

Smith, Anthony D. 2009. *Ethno-Symbolism and Nationalism*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Stengers, Isabelle. 2010. "Including Nonhumans into Political Theory: Opening the Pandora Box?" In *Political Matter: Technoscience, Democracy, and Public Life*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Thornton, Thomas. 1995. "Tlingit and Euro-American Toponymies in Glacier Bay." In *Proceedings of the Third Glacier Bay Science Symposium*, 1993, ed. Daniel R. Engstrom, 294–301. Anchorage: National Park Service.

Tsing, Anna L., Jennifer Deger, Alder Saxena Keleman, and Feifei Zhou. 2020. *The Feral Atlas*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Vilaça, Aparecida. 2019. "Inventing Nature: Christianity and Science in Indigenous Amazonia." *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 9(1): 44–57.

Viljanen, Valtteri. 2014. *Spinoza's geometry of power.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Viveiros de Castro, Eduardo. 2012. *Cosmologies: Perspectivism in Amazonia and Elsewhere*. Manchester: HAU Network of Ethnographic Theory.

Viveiros de Castro, Eduardo, and Peter Skafish. 2014. *Cannibal Metaphysics.* Minneapolis, MN: Univocal.

Wilson, Jeffrey K. 2012. *The German Forest: Nature, Identity, and the Contestation of a National Symbol*, 1871–1914. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Wolfe, Cary. 2003. *Animal Rites: American Culture, the Discourse of Species, and Posthumanist Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.