In 2008, photographer Jim Harrison, whose portraits of Harvard community members have appeared in this magazine for decades, turned his eye to a new subject: the plants at the University’s Arnold Arboretum, where he began capturing the dramatic seasonal changes of a world-class collection of trees and shrubs. Photographers know that, when shooting outdoors, the “golden hours” just after sunrise and just before sunset provide dramatic light. For Harrison, that meant rising on some summer days at 4 a.m. to record the fuschia glow of first light, or venturing out into frigid winter dawns the day after a blizzard to record a landscape shrouded in shades of white. Some plants present specific challenges, such as the kerchief-like white bracts of Davidia involucrata, the dove tree, gently backlit by the sun in the image opposite.

This summer, an exhibition of 31 prints from his project will open at the Arboretum’s Hunnewell Visitor Center. In Continuations: Seasons at the Arboretum (July 28 through the first week of October), Harrison’s fascination with the architecture of plants—the way they branch or form their flowers—is a thematic undercurrent. Another is decay: the bloom gone by, or the fallen leaf.

These five photographs from the exhibit illustrate those themes; they also show off some of the finest plant specimens growing on the Arboretum’s 281-acre grounds. At far left is Acer griseum, the paperbark maple, its cinnamon limbs...
over the country have relied on immigration attorneys like Torrey to prepare Padilla advisals for their clients—often in hasty circumstances, without enough time to conduct a proper analysis. To provide the advisals this past semester, his students partnered with students in the Criminal Justice Institute (HLS’s clinic for students training to become public defenders; see “Criminal Injustice,” September-October 2017, page 44).

To draw up a Padilla adversial, students must engage with both the criminal and the immigration systems to combine information about a client’s immigration status with data about the particular crime at issue, and determine whether that crime meets federal grounds for deportation. Most convictions occur at the state level, and there are thousands of state statutes, many with no precedent for triggering deportation, so students must conduct a “categorical analysis” to determine whether a particular state criminal statute matches the generic, federal definition for a given crime, regardless of the particular circumstances of the defendant’s crime. A state statute that defines burglary as “entry” into a home with intent to commit a crime, for example, would be too broad to meet the federal definition: “an unlawful or unprivileged entry.” “You have different sovereigns, the federal and state governments—two bodies of law with different protections and procedures attached to them,” Torrey explains. “It can be very difficult to figure out when a state-level conviction would trigger something in the federal civil process.”

The most fraught part of this process, though, is making a judgment about U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) deportation priorities: how likely the agency is to target the client for deportation. The students’ main frustration involves the difficulty of communicating the relative risk of deportation to a terrified client. The Trump administration “is trying to stretch every removal ground,” third-year student Paulina Arnold points out: revised priorities for deportations target not just immigrants convicted of crimes, but also those who have been charged with crimes, or have committed acts that could be charged as crimes. That raises the stakes for advisals, and makes it even harder to communicate deportation risks. A few years ago, she says, she would have been comfortable telling a client that deportation was unlikely. “Now, if there’s any possible chance [the client] could fit under any removal ground, you want to flag it.”

Eleven more images from the exhibition appear online at harvardmag.com/harrison-trees-18. —JONATHAN SHAW