

## **Building bridges in the post-Trump era: can conservation scientists help recover bipartisan support for U.S. environmental protection?**

David J. Kurz<sup>1</sup>, Arthur D. Middleton<sup>1</sup>, Melissa S. Chapman<sup>1</sup>, Kyle S. Van Houtan<sup>2,3</sup>, Christine E. Wilkinson<sup>1</sup>, Lauren Withey<sup>1</sup>, and Justin S. Brashares<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Environmental Science, Policy, and Management, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

<sup>2</sup>Monterey Bay Aquarium, 886 Cannery Row, Monterey, CA 93940, USA

<sup>3</sup>Nicholas School of the Environment, Duke University, P.O. Box 90328, Durham, NC 27708, USA

### **Abstract**

Nearly three-fourths of U.S. citizens support strong action for environmental protection, yet the U.S. Congress has passed little in the way of momentous environmental legislation since 1980. This dearth of new bipartisan environmental policy has coincided with increasing political polarization, which has risen to historic levels in the United States. Though broadly supported by the U.S. public, environmental protection has wavered as the Trump administration has left the Paris Climate Agreement, lifted oil and gas regulations, gutted century-old migratory bird protections, and deprioritized endangered species conservation. This discordance between U.S. public opinion and policy action—in the midst of multiple environmental emergencies—leads us to ask: How did environmental conservation become so polarized, and how can the U.S. environmental movement recover broad bipartisan support? As conservation scientists in academia, we believe our community has contributed to the partisan breakdown over the environment; we also believe that scientists have a critical role to play in bridging this divide. In this essay, we consider how “the environment” has become a political wedge issue in the United States and the role of academic conservation scientists in this historical arc. We conclude by identifying opportunities for conservation scientists in academia to: (a) better respond to public needs and values; and (b) build support for bipartisan conservation policies through greater proximity with local communities, re-structured university tenure policies, and updated approaches to training 21st century environmental science students.

## I. Introduction

The United States is currently at one of its most politically polarized moments in history (Pew 2017), a phenomenon that has attracted significant scholarly and journalistic attention (e.g., Drutman 2016, Thurber and Yoshinaka 2016, Corothers and O'Donahue 2019). Strikingly, a majority of self-identified Republicans (66%) and Democrats (58%) now think the other party's policies are "bad or dangerous" (YouGov 2019). This polarization has recently manifested itself in the hyper-partisan impeachment of President Trump, the protracted wars over Supreme Court Justice nominations, and the bitter divide between the Democrat-controlled House of Representatives and Republican-controlled Senate. As political psychologist Lilliana Mason (2018) notes: *"In this political environment, a candidate who picks up the banner of 'us versus them' and 'winning versus losing' is almost guaranteed to tap into a current of resentment and anger across racial, religious, and cultural lines, which have recently divided neatly by party."* Many feel that these currents of resentment—expressed in partisan ways—have spilled into traditionally bipartisan policy areas, such as infrastructure and immigration reform, and led to stagnation in political momentum on widely shared policy goals (Rice 2018).

Environmental management and conservation have not been spared from the stagnating and undermining effects of U.S. political polarization (Turner & Isenberg 2019). With only a few exceptions, there has been limited landmark legislation on U.S. environmental policy since 1980. For example, despite numerous calls by state and local leaders as well as voters and activists for updates to the Endangered Species Act and the passage of federal climate legislation, neither measure has garnered sufficient political support in Congress for passage into law. In the United States, costs of this inaction come in the form of wildlife population declines (e.g., an estimated 29% net loss of birds in North America since 1970, Rosenberg et al., 2019), reduced land and water protections for wildlife conservation (e.g., opening of nine million acres of sage grouse habitat for drilling and mining, U.S. Department of the Interior, 2019), and an accelerating climate crisis that is likely contributing to increased economic costs of natural disasters in some U.S. communities (Estrada et al., 2015, Hsiang et al., 2017). These costs are borne by all but fall disproportionately on some communities, particularly the economically poor and politically disenfranchised.

As conservation scientists, we invest significant time into understanding and quantifying relationships between human society and the environment, and making recommendations for improved management of natural habitats. In fact, the research output of the conservation

community has increased dramatically in recent decades: for example, from 1993 to 2012, the number of journals publishing 'wildlife conservation' articles skyrocketed by more than 400% (Cronin et al., 2014), and the number of papers published by several major conservation journals has more than doubled (Griffiths & Dos Santos 2012). However, this research is not always communicated robustly or effectively to stakeholders (Coyle 2005, Moser 2016). For example, land owners, land managers, farmers, and ranchers, particularly in U.S. rural areas, often have livelihoods deeply tied to natural spaces and processes, yet their perspectives and the challenges they face are often overlooked by much of academic conservation science (Bonnie et al., 2020). In addition to the need for improved communication of science to the public (Dahlstrom, 2014), there is a more fundamental need for conservation researchers to prioritize the questions we ask based on the expressed needs of public stakeholders (Roux et al., 2006). With some notable exceptions, we believe the academic-public disconnect is both cause and effect of insufficient understanding—and goodwill—between conservation scientists and diverse groups of stakeholders. We suggest that our science community has contributed to this alienation, primarily by choosing questions and modes of communication that reflect a pursuit of impact factor over meaningful impact. This is not a new observation; our conservation community has struggled since its inception with the often conflicting benchmarks of academic achievement (e.g., peer-reviewed publications) vs. measurable conservation outcomes (e.g., tangible conservation actions) (Arlettaz et al., 2010). However, our goal of conserving resilient and diverse ecosystems is overwhelmingly shared by the U.S. public; this common aim offers great potential for building new bridges and sustained engagement with stakeholders. Therefore, we ask: how did conservation, or 'the environment' broadly, become a politically divisive and partisan issue, and how can we move from this moment towards meaningful consensus?

---

“With some notable exceptions, we believe the academic-public disconnect is both cause and effect of insufficient understanding—and goodwill—between conservation scientists and diverse groups of stakeholders.”

---

## II. How did we get here?

In the second half of the 19th century, in the wake of George Marsh's *Man and Nature* in 1864, conservation awareness in the United States burgeoned into a major social and political force. New state and federal parks and reserves were established<sup>a</sup>, culminating in the inauguration of the U.S. Forest Service in 1905 and the National Park Service in 1916. This political momentum produced some of the first federal laws to protect wildlife—e.g., The Lacey Act of 1900 and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918—and to fund wildlife and habitat conservation, such as the Pittman-Robertson Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act of 1937. In 1962, biologist Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* became an instant best-seller, warning of the health and ecological costs of the increasingly widespread use of pesticides (Griswold, 2012). Shortly thereafter, Congress passed the Clean Air Act (1963) and Water Quality Act (1965). Several years later, in 1969, the impacts of industry on vital natural resources grew even greater in the public eye after Cleveland's Cuyahoga River caught fire—not for the first time—the image of the river in flames plastered across *Time* and *National Geographic* that year (Boissoneault, 2019). Watching powerful, for-profit corporate actors harm individuals and communities from Cleveland to Santa Barbara renewed public recognition of environmental protection as a populist cause, similar to widespread support for the creation of national parks early in the 20th century. This swell of grassroots support inspired the inaugural Earth Day in 1970, the creation of the Environmental Protection Agency by Republican President Richard Nixon that same year, and a wave of federal environmental legislation through the 1970s. The U.S. environmental movement had well and truly swept the country.

a. The establishment of U.S. parks was not without controversy, leading to disenfranchisement and conflict with Native American communities, among others (Merchant, 2002).

While new environmental laws passed in the 1960s and 1970s were rightly hailed as major victories for conservation, they also came with economic costs for some businesses and rural landowners (e.g., Brown & Shogren, 1998). For example, for many rural farmers, ranchers, and landowners in the Western US, the Endangered Species Act of 1973 became a mechanism for exclusion from decision-making on their own lands, and the most salient symbol of federal government overreach. Enforcement of top-down federal environmental laws – while successful in helping species, lands, and waterways recover – also contributed to the increasing alienation of rural communities from the mainstream U.S. environmental movement, dominated by scientists, activists, and politicians in urban areas. This alienation, as well as the economic stress of the 1970s, helped stoke a base of rural support for the growing conservative movement (Turner & Isenberg, 2019). In addition to its agenda built on faith and family values, belief in the free market, distrust of scientific elites, and anti-federalism, this new brand of conservatism would now reverse course on many issues of environmental protection (Turner & Isenberg, 2019). In a few years, the party of Teddy Roosevelt, champion of U.S. National Parks, became the bastion of opposition to environmental protection in the United States and ushered in an era of environmental partisanship (Turner & Isenberg, 2019). As Turner & Isenberg (2019) have commented: *“The conservative abdication of environmental concern stands out as one of the most profound turnabouts in modern American political history, critical to our understanding of the GOP’s modern success.”*

The rising influence of corporations, PACs, and lobbyists in the U.S. political system from 1990 - 2010 further underpinned the disaffection of the Republican Party with many environmental issues (Ard et al., 2017). Corporate influence on political leaders throughout the country has promoted a powerful anti-federalist ethic of limited government regulation of industry, and individuals, as the path to a strong U.S. economy and a return to American ideals of liberty. Moreover, in many ways the political gridlock on environmental issues has become more about cultural values than about science. For example, for many rural voters in the United States—whose livelihoods and way of life are closely tied to working lands—protection of farmlands is a more important environmental issue than climate change, whereas the reverse is true for urban and suburban voters (Bonnie et al. 2020). Different contexts and socio-political narratives across the rural-urban divide, intensifying since the “Republican Reversal” four decades ago, have driven the transformation of U.S. environmental policy into a “wedge” issue, alienating conservative communities closest to wild places from liberal communities fighting to protect

those same lands and waters. In the process, we have too often lost a shared sense of partnership in caring for our landscapes, and for one another.

### **III. Soul-searching within the conservation science community in academia**

Following the last several decades of increasing political partisanship and limited federal action on environmental protection, now is an important moment for conservation scientists in academia to soul search about our role in U.S. public and policy spheres. We believe we are not blameless in the polarization of environmental policy - our community has had a role in fanning partisan flames and allowing the concept of “environmentalism” to become synonymous with out-of-touch urban elites and narrow-minded scientists. In prioritizing international venues for information-sharing over conversations with local stakeholders, and by targeting federal funding opportunities before local needs, we have helped create an association between environmental conservation and heavy-handed federal overreach in the minds of many stakeholders in the United States. In our efforts to help protect species, habitats, and processes, we have too often forgotten the perspectives of rural communities, fueling the sentiment that neither environmental scientists nor laws passed in Washington, D.C. reflect the interests, values, and realities of those who live within and around the most biodiverse, environmentally intact regions of the United States.

So we ask ourselves and our academic colleagues: Are we, conservation scientists in academia, truly among US environmental leaders? If so, how can we be more effective allies to other environmental leaders and to diverse groups of stakeholders? How can we more fully consider people, and our collective cultural, spiritual, and economic connections to natural landscapes? How can we consider rural communities and livelihoods not as inherent threats to biodiversity, but as valued co-participants and collaborators in shared goals? If we indeed aspire to these roles, what are the implications for how we move forward as a community?

---

Are we, conservation scientists in academia, truly among US environmental leaders? If so, how can we be more effective allies to other environmental leaders and to diverse groups of stakeholders? How can we more fully consider people, and our collective cultural, spiritual, and economic connections to natural landscapes?

---

As conservation scientists who have each spent numerous years in academia, we believe that as a community we must continue challenging ourselves to grow in these areas of service to the U.S. public. We want to be better partners to the same stakeholders whom we hope will be good partners to us. We therefore suggest some opportunities that we see for ourselves and our conservation science community in academia to grow in our engagement with the U.S. public, and thereby work towards a bigger, more diverse “environmental tent” in the United States. We hope these suggestions will serve as just one starting point for a robust conversation among our colleagues, rural communities, politicians, and others, as academia-community partnerships lie at the core of universities, the public square, the role of science and scientists in society, and the political future of the environment.

#### **IV. Pathways for the academic conservation science community to engage with the U.S. public**

##### *Prioritizing proximity in engagement with the public on conservation*

Holistic outreach—truly connecting the academy with the public—requires radical creativity and intentionality throughout the research process. This reorientation begins with proximity (Fig. 1). Face to face engagement allows an irreplaceable cultural cache to be built between researchers and stakeholders, and helps researchers develop a more intimate knowledge of the socio-cultural realities of a study context or constituency (Roux et al., 2006). For example, rural communities often bear disproportionate burdens on the front lines of environmental issues,

such as climate change-related natural disasters, predator reintroduction, water pollution, and disease introduction. Rural communities are also important stewards of U.S. landscapes, and 97% of U.S. land is found in rural areas (US Census Bureau, 2016). Therefore, professors, extension specialists, postdocs, and graduate students working on conservation in rural areas all have a responsibility to listen to and engage with rural stakeholders in accessible ways on environmental issues that are important to them. What climate change-related issues cause ranchers and farmers to lose sleep? What social, environmental, and economic futures do hunters and fishers envision, and how can we help them take steps toward those futures? What information or environmental strategies are most important to rural, religious communities? Whether through participatory mapping, a task force, or simply spending time with local U.S. communities, integrating these types of questions more fully into research design and practice results in deeper academic-public partnerships and more impactful conservation solutions.

In addition to conceiving and designing research in tune with societal needs, proximity also entails leadership in communicating our research to the public (Lubchenco, 1998). Specifically, we challenge ourselves and others in academia to communicate our science in ways that are not only “accessible”, but culturally-embedded. Successful long-term conservation is, in large part, a question of socio-culturally contextualized ethics (Van Houtan, 2006). In order to inspire sacrifice and allegiance to conservation issues, scientific arguments should be expressed within communally accepted ethical frameworks and existing social traditions (Van Houtan, 2006, Nisbet & Mooney, 2007). Indeed, a recent report on rural conservation attitudes in the United States found that rural voters often have sophisticated environmental views, but disagree with some environmental policies due to other values, such as a strong sense of place and low trust of the federal government (Bonnie et al., 2020). We believe this communication cannot be limited to extension specialists and science journalists—important as those roles are—as public communication is part and parcel of being an academic. What could this outreach look like? A few ideas, some of which we have implemented ourselves, include workshops, public lectures and town halls, novel conferences, accessible op-eds in newspapers, podcasts, museum exhibits, collaboration with religious groups, participation on boards with diverse stakeholder representation, and art shows. For example, one of us (ADM) communicated research on ungulate movements in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem through not only peer-reviewed reports (e.g., Middleton et al., 2020) and national op-eds (e.g., Middleton, 2018) but also through an innovative 2500 sq ft traveling museum exhibit at the Buffalo Bill Center of the West. The exhibit included interactive maps of ungulate migrations, photo and video media



showcasing the drama of long-distance wildlife migrations, and original paintings of Wyoming wildlife. As a result, thousands of people—including ranchers, hunters, farmers, hikers, and other members of the public who directly and indirectly interact with migratory ungulates—were able to engage directly with important conservation research in accessible, inspiring ways. This effort has helped lead to new federal and state initiatives to protect ungulate migration corridors in western states. These kinds of initiatives, while significant commitments of time and resources, are necessary to build the trust and cultural legitimacy that must undergird broad conservation policy support.

---

“Achieving this type of holistic outreach—truly connecting the academy with the public—requires radical creativity and intentionality throughout the research process. This reorientation begins with proximity.”

---




Figure 1. While the literature calls for more progress in all areas of the “knowledge-action boundary” (Cook et al., 2013), the conservation science community within academia has made significant strides in translating and communicating our research to the public (large solid gray arrow). However, we have often relied heavily on outside institutions, such as conservation NGOs and resource management agencies, to robustly incorporate needs of local communities into our work (dotted gray arrows). We call for a more integrated connection between local communities and academia, in which conservation scientists in academia directly respond to stakeholder needs (large purple arrow), and prioritize proximity with the public, the value of service in tenure decisions, and student training for the 21st century (purple text).

### *Valuing service in tenure decisions*

Another major step forward toward an academy in service of the public would be a re-orientation of the incentive structures and norms of academia to more fully include and value public engagement (Alperin et al., 2019). For the academic conservation science community to be fully committed to creative forms of public engagement, this service value must be grounded in tangible structures and incentives, including greater weight in tenure review. For example, participation at a rural stakeholder meeting ought to carry similar weight as a presentation at an academic conference. In the same way, an influential op-ed in a small newspaper read by community partners should be valued comparably to a short comment published in an academic journal. Of course, tenure standards vary widely across institutions, so institutions will likely need to take a variety of approaches to update their policies. Some universities may need to start encouraging public outreach and engagement in their tenure policies for the first time, whereas others may need to weigh public outreach and engagement more heavily (Doberneck,

2016). As shown by powerful calls for diversity recently within academic science, e.g. #BlackinSTEM and #BlackintheIvory, as well as more attention in the literature (e.g., Smith-Doerr et al., 2017), awareness is rapidly growing that science is more creative and innovative when diverse voices are at the table. By widely re-emphasizing the centrality of “service” in the “Teaching-Research-Service” paradigm, we may be able to further the mission of the academy and find touchpoints to build broader coalitions for bipartisan conservation policy. These points of connection become exponentially more elusive without institutional mechanisms to mark public outreach as a tangible, highly valued, and indispensable part of the academic endeavor.

#### *Training the next generation of conservation leaders*

Another key pathway to build support for conservation policy among modern stakeholders is providing more robust, relevant training for environmental science students entering a 21<sup>st</sup> century world dominated by messaging, social media, branding, and digital experience. The environmental science field is growing quickly, with jobs in the field expected to grow 8% between 2018 – 2028 (US Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2019). And yet, environmental science students are often unprepared for the types of modern communication they need to be effective. For example, one study found that communication was valued in scientific academic training, but communication tasks in undergraduate majors addressed a very narrow range of contexts (Stevens et al., 2019). Within undergraduate and graduate degree programs, we can better integrate training on messaging to help students practice more clear, accessible framing of conservation research and applications. For example, last year the Trump administration proposed expanded logging access in Alaska’s Tongass National Forest (Eilperin & Dawsey, 2019). A student hoping to help sustainably manage the Tongass needs to understand not only the political, social, economic, and environmental dimensions of logging in Alaska, but also how to communicate meaningfully with local and national audiences in a world rife with prominent ideologies and narratives that powerfully shape public discourse. In the modern United States, framing an issue often carries as much—or more—weight as understanding the issue itself.

## **V. Conclusion**

As conservation scientists in academia, we have a powerful opportunity to build bridges between the public and the existing environmental movement in the United States. Most U.S. voters want stronger environmental protections; they just need to be included in contexts and solutions built on trust and shared values. Conservation scientists in academia have a key role to play in finding this common ground: by seeing ourselves as integral to society, and seeking proximity with community stakeholders, we can do more relevant, collaborative, and impactful work. By increasing proximity with the public, re-structuring tenure standards, and renewing training approaches, we can help increase public support for science-based and socially-informed conservation solutions on wilderness preservation, recreation, animal migrations, economic development, emissions regulations, and other salient challenges.

Our current political moment is an urgent reminder that we need to be able to listen and engage with one another to solve conservation problems. As conservation scientists in academia, we have tremendous potential to set the tone and lay the groundwork for a more inclusive U.S. environmental movement that recovers the broad bipartisan support of the 1960s and 1970s. By learning from our constituents and seeking their good in our work, we can be an academy that more fully serves people and the environment.

## **Acknowledgements**

Thank you to Claire Kremen and the Brashares Lab for comments and support that helped develop the manuscript ideas. DJK and CEW were supported by National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowships. DJK also received support from a Harvey Fellowship from the Mustard Seed Foundation. MSC received support from a Data Sciences for the 21st Century (DS421) program.

## References

Alperin, J. P., Nieves, C. M., Schimanski, L. A., Fischman, G. E., Niles, M. T., & McKiernan, E. C. (2019). Meta-Research. How significant are the public dimensions of faculty work in review, promotion and tenure documents? *eLife*, *8*, e42254. doi: 10.7554/eLife.42254

Ard, K., Garcia, N., & Kelly, P. (2017). Another avenue of action: an examination of climate change countermovement industries' use of PAC donations and their relationship to Congressional voting over time. *Environmental Politics*, *26*, 1107-1131.

Arlettaz, R., Schaub, M., Fournier, J., Reichlin, T. S., Sierro, A., Watson, J. E. M., & Braunisch, V. (2010). From publications to public actions: when conservation biologists bridge the gap between research and implementation. *BioScience*, *60*, 835-842.

Boissoneault, L. (2019, June 19). The Cuyahoga River caught fire at least a dozen times, but no one cared until 1969. *Smithsonian Magazine*.

<https://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/cuyahoga-river-caught-fire-least-dozen-times-no-one-cared-until-1969-180972444/>

Bonnie, R., Diamond, E. P., & Rowe, E. (2020). *Understanding rural attitudes toward the environment and conservation in America*. Nicholas Institute for Environmental Policy Solutions. <https://nicholasinstitute.duke.edu/sites/default/files/publications/understanding-rural-attitudes-toward-environment-conservation-america.pdf>

Brown, G.M., & Shogren, J.F. (1998). Economics of the Endangered Species Act. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *12*(3), 3-20.

Brownell, S. E., Price, J. V., & Steinman, L. (2013). Science communication to the general public: why we need to teach undergraduate and graduate students this skill as part of their formal scientific training. *Journal of Undergraduate Neuroscience Education*, *12*, E6-E10. PMID: 24319399

Cook, C. N., Mascia, M. B., Schwartz, M. W., Possingham, H. P., and Fuller, R. A. (2013). Achieving conservation science that bridges the knowledge - action boundary. *Conservation Biology*, 27, 669-678.

Coyle, K. (2005). *Environmental literacy in America: what ten years of NEETF/Roper research and related studies say about environmental literacy in the U.S.* The National Environmental Education & Training Foundation. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED522820.pdf>

Cronin, D. T., Owens, J. R., Choi, H., Hromada, S., Malhotra, R., Roser, F., & Bergl, R. A. (2014). Where has all our research gone? A 20-year assessment of the peer-reviewed wildlife conservation literature. *International Journal of Comparative Psychology*, 27, 101-116.

Dahlstrom, M. F. (2014). Using narratives and storytelling to communicate science with nonexpert audiences. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA*, 111, 13614-13620.

Doberneck, D. M. (2016). Are we there yet?: Outreach and engagement in the consortium for institutional cooperation promotion and tenure policies. *Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship*, 9, 8-18.

Drutman, L. (2016, March 24). American politics has reached peak polarization. *Vox*. <https://www.vox.com/polyarchy/2016/3/24/11298808/american-politics-peak-polarization>

Eilperin, J., & Dawsey, J. (2019, August 27). Trump pushes to allow new logging in Alaska's Tongass National Forest. [https://www.washingtonpost.com/climate-environment/trump-pushes-to-allow-new-logging-in-alaskas-tongass-national-forest/2019/08/27/b4ca78d6-c832-11e9-be05-f76ac4ec618c\\_story.html](https://www.washingtonpost.com/climate-environment/trump-pushes-to-allow-new-logging-in-alaskas-tongass-national-forest/2019/08/27/b4ca78d6-c832-11e9-be05-f76ac4ec618c_story.html)

Frankovic, K. (2019, May 28). America's political parties remain polarized. *YouGov*. <https://today.yougov.com/topics/politics/articles-reports/2019/05/28/americas-political-parties-remain-polarized>

Griffiths, R. A., & Dos Santos, M. (2012). Trends in conservation biology: progress or procrastination in a new millenium? *Biological Conservation*, 153, 153-158.

Griswold, E. (2012, September 21). How 'Silent Spring' ignited the environmental movement. *The New York Times Magazine*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/23/magazine/how-silent-spring-ignited-the-environmental-movement.html>

Hsiang, S., Kopp, R., Jina, A., Rising, J., Delgado, M., Mohan, S., ... Houser, T. (2017). *Science*, 356, 1362-1369. doi: 10.1126/science.aal4369

Lubchenco, J. (1998). Entering the century of the environment: a new social contract for science. *Science*, 279, 491-497. doi: 10.1126/science.279.5350.491

Merchant, C. (2002). *The Columbia guide to American environmental history*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Middleton, A. (2018, February 23). Protecting America's last great animal migrations. *The New York Times*.

<https://www.nytimes.com/2018/02/23/opinion/protecting-americas-animal-migrations.html>

Middleton, A.M., Sawyer, H., Merkle, J.A., Kauffman, M.J., Cole, E.K., Dewey, S.R., ... White, P.J. (2020). Conserving transboundary wildlife migrations: recent insights from the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, 18, 83-91. Doi: 10.1002/fee.2145

Moser, S. C. (2016). Reflections on climate change communication research and practice in the second decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century: what more is there to say? *WIREs Climate Change*, 7, 345-369. doi: 10.1002/wcc.403

Pew Research Center. 2017. *Political Polarization, 1994-2017*. Retrieved from <https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/interactives/political-polarization-1994-2017/>

Rice, S. E. (2018, January 25). We have met the enemy, and he is us. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/01/25/opinion/national-security-polarization.html>

Rosenberg, K. V., Dokter, A. M., Blancher, P. J., Sauer, J. R., Smith, A. C., Smith, P. A., ... Marra, P. P. (2019). Decline of the North American avifauna. *Science*, 366, 120-124. doi: 10.1126/science.aaw1313

Smith-Doerr, L., Alegria, S., and Sacco, T. (2017). How diversity matters in the US science and engineering workforce: a critical review considering integration in teams, fields, and organizational contexts. *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society*, 3, 139-153. doi: 10.17351/ests2017.142

Thurber, J., & Yoshinaka, A. (Eds.). 2015. *American Gridlock: The Sources, Character, and Impact of Political Polarization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9781316287002

Turner, J.M., and Isenberg, A.C. 2018. *The republican reversal: conservatives and the environment from Nixon to Trump*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

US Bureau of Labor Statistics 2019: <https://www.bls.gov/ooh/life-physical-and-social-science/environmental-scientists-and-specialists.htm>

U.S. Department of the Interior. (2020, February 19). *BLM's sage grouse plans put Western communities first* [Press release]. <https://www.blm.gov/press-release/BLM-sage-grouse-plans-put-Western-communities-first>

U.S. Department of State. (2019, November 4). *On the U.S. withdrawal from the Paris Agreement* [Press release]. <https://www.state.gov/on-the-u-s-withdrawal-from-the-paris-agreement/>

Van Houtan, K. S. (2006). Conservation as virtue: a scientific and social process for conservation ethics. *Conservation Biology*, 20, 1367-1372. doi: 10.1111/j.1523-1739.2006.00447.x