

Perspectives of Earth and Space Scientists



PERSPECTIVE

10.1029/2024CN000237

Key Points:

- Human beings are changing Earth's systems from local to global scales in ways that are not well understood, quantified, or modeled
- There is dire need to prioritize the Earth sciences and engineering to advance environmental policy for a more sustainable future

Correspondence to:



























D. D. Richter,
drichter@duke.edu

Citation:

Richter, D. D., Billings, S. A., Brantley, S. L., Gaillardet, J., Markewitz, D., Schlesinger, W. H., et al. (2024). Earth sciences are the model sciences of the Anthropocene. *Perspectives of Earth and Space Scientists*, 5, e2024CN000237. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2024CN000237>

Received 25 JAN 2024
 Accepted 31 JUL 2024

Earth Sciences Are the Model Sciences of the Anthropocene

Daniel D. Richter¹ , Sharon A. Billings² , Susan L. Brantley³ , Jerome Gaillardet⁴ , Daniel Markewitz⁵ , William H. Schlesinger⁶ , Ronald Amundson⁷ , Gail M. Ashley⁸ , Allan R. Bacon⁹ , Roger C. Bales¹⁰ , Dan Binkley¹¹, Zachary Brecheisen¹² , Julio Calvo-Alvarado¹³ , Nicolas Cassar¹ , Chelsea Clifford¹⁴, Louis A. Derry¹⁵ , Matt Edgeworth¹⁶ , Martha-Cary Eppes¹⁷ , Ying Fan⁸ , Terry A. Ferguson¹⁸, Marie-Anne de Graaff¹⁹, Jo Handelsman²⁰, Alfred E. Hartemink²⁰ , Kirsten Hofmockel²¹, Richard J. Huggett²² , Esteban G. Jobbagy²³, Hyun Seok Kim²⁴, Jagdish Krishnaswamy²⁵ , Praveen Kumar²⁶ , Susan Lozier²⁷, Louis Lu¹, William H. McDowell²⁸ , John R. McNeill²⁹, Neung-Hwan Oh²⁴ , Katherine O'Neill³⁰, Mary E. Prendergast³¹ , Curtis J. Richardson¹, Justin B. Richardson³², Paul A. Schroeder⁵, Kate Scow³³, Christina Siebe³⁴ , Aaron Thompson⁵ , Timothy White³, Cathy L. Whitlock³⁵, and Marilyn Wolf³⁶

¹Duke University, Durham, NC, USA, ²University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS, USA, ³The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, USA, ⁴Institut de physique du globe de Paris, Paris, France, ⁵University of Georgia, Athens, GA, USA, ⁶Cary Institute of Ecosystem Studies, Millbrook, NY, USA, ⁷University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA, ⁸Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ, USA, ⁹University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, USA, ¹⁰University of California, Merced, CA, USA, ¹¹Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, AZ, USA, ¹²Purdue University, Lafayette, IN, USA, ¹³Instituto Tecnológico de Costa Rica, Cartago, Costa Rica, ¹⁴Iowa State University, Ames, IA, USA, ¹⁵Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA, ¹⁶University of Leicester, Leicester, UK, ¹⁷University of North Carolina, Charlotte, NC, USA, ¹⁸Wofford College, Spartanburg, SC, USA, ¹⁹Boise State University, Boise, ID, USA, ²⁰University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI, USA, ²¹Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA, USA, ²²University of Manchester, Manchester, UK, ²³Universidad Nacional de San Luis & CONICET, San Luis, Argentina, ²⁴Seoul National University, Seoul, South Korea, ²⁵Indian Institute for Human Settlements, Bengaluru, India, ²⁶University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, IL, USA, ²⁷Georgia Institutes of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA, ²⁸University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH, USA, ²⁹Georgetown University, Washington, DC, USA, ³⁰Roanoke College, Salem, VA, USA, ³¹Rice University, Houston, TX, USA, ³²University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA, USA, ³³University of California, Davis, CA, USA, ³⁴Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico City, Mexico, ³⁵Montana State University, Bozeman, MT, USA, ³⁶University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NB, USA

Abstract After 4.5 billion years as an evolving and dynamic planet, the Earth continues to evolve but with human-altered dynamics. Earth scientists have special opportunities and responsibilities to accelerate our understanding of Earth's changes that are transforming our most remarkable home.

Since 2000 when atmospheric chemist Paul Crutzen and ecologist Eugene Stoermer proclaimed that we live in the Anthropocene (Crutzen, 2002; Crutzen & Stoermer, 2000), a burgeoning Anthropocene literature has erupted across the fields of anthropology (Mathews, 2020), archeology (Edgeworth et al., 2015), biology (Kidwell, 2015), ecology (McDowell et al., 2019; Wilson, 2016), engineering (Allenby et al., 2009), environmental humanities (Castree, 2014), finance (Shrivastava et al., 2019), fine arts (May & Price, 2024), geography (Cook et al., 2015), history (Chakrabarty, 2009), literature (Menely & Taylor, 2017), philosophy (Raffinsoe, 2016), science studies (Latour, 2017), soil science (Richter, 2020), and stratigraphy (Waters et al., 2016). Reaction to the Anthropocene extends to newspaper editorial cartoons (Figure 1). By Anthropocene, we refer not to the currently contested mid-20th century Anthropocene Epoch but to all the many time-transgressive interactions of human beings with Earth's systems.

Notably absent are comprehensive assessments for how the Earth sciences (*all geo- and eco-system sciences, and related social sciences and fields of engineering*, hereafter “Earth sciences”) can best address the many open scientific questions about our planet's changing and interconnected systems. These questions encompass our climate, atmosphere, hydrosphere, pedosphere, lithosphere, biosphere, cryosphere, magnetosphere, and technosphere, indeed all of Earth's “tangled banks,” Darwin's (1859) still stunning metaphor for life on Earth, whether on land and its freshwaters, at sea, or in the air.

Here, we open this much-needed assessment of the Earth sciences by asserting that to understand these gathering changes requires a new integration of our scientific and engineering disciplines, *and* the prioritization of these

© 2024 The Author(s). Perspectives of Earth and Space Scientists published by Wiley Periodicals LLC on behalf of American Geophysical Union. This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.



Figure 1. “Are We There Yet?...” Reactions to the Anthropocene have even reached newspaper editorial cartoons (reproduced with permission, © David Pope/*The Canberra Times*).

fields within universities, colleges, and research institutes, funding agencies, scholarly journals, and pre-University (K-12) education. To keep pace with our planet's changing dynamics that are so intimately joined by human forcings (Figure 1) and so deeply geological (Figure 2), we seek broad international support for an upscaling of the Earth sciences, which we argue, is critically important to a more sustainable future for all.

The Earth sciences have shaped human history, thinking, and behavior as much as any of the sciences (Wooten, 2015). Stephen Jay Gould (1987), for example, ranked deep geological time to be one of science's most important contributions to human development. The promotion of the Earth sciences to what historians of science call the model sciences (Cayley, 2009) will benefit the future well being of the planet and the societies we are a part of, draw much needed attention from oncoming students and scholars across academia, and present major interdisciplinary opportunities because the Earth sciences are rooted in physics, chemistry, biology, and even the social sciences and humanities (White et al., 2017). To support this realignment of the sciences, major reforms will be required in the science education of teachers and professors from K-12 to graduate school.

To those skeptical about the need to prioritize the Earth sciences, consider that the Earth sciences have the temporal and spatial scope needed to understand how human beings have been interacting with Earth's systems for millennia (Barnosky et al., 2004; Edgeworth et al., 2015; Hochella et al., 2019; Ruddiman, 2017; Schlesinger & Bernhardt, 2020; Wolfe & Broughton, 2020). Consider also that all we know *quantitatively* about our planet comes from observations, analyses, and modeling by Earth scientists who are taking full advantage of ongoing technological revolutions in advanced computer-assisted instrumentation, environmental analyses and sensors, drone and satellite observatories, artificial intelligence, and digitalization (Brantley et al., 2019; Reichstein et al., 2019), advances claimed by some to be making the 21st century unique in the history of science and technology (OECD, 2020). Consider lastly that interactions of human health with our Earth's diverse environments are increasingly identifiable with geo-spatial and geo-temporal analyses (Mielke et al., 2019).

This is no time to be complacent about the current state of the sciences. The 25-year-old argument from policy advocates that “climate science is settled” (Cushman, 1998) belies the ancient wisdom that “the sun is daily new and old” and the reality that our planet evolves in response to dynamic, high-order interactions that are difficult to predict. Transitioning energy systems for example, from fossil-carbon to wind, solar, biomass, geothermal, and nuclear will significantly affect Earth's many systems in ways that are not well understood from local to global scales. *There will always be important Earth science to do* and we promote our science and engineering crafts to ensure that future environmental policy and governance are based on the best that science and engineering can offer.



Figure 2. The February 2023 Kahramanmaraş earthquake affecting Turkey and Syria reminds us that our 8-billion person world is highly vulnerable to Earth disasters such as earthquakes, volcanic explosions, tsunamis, epidemics, floods, landslides, and windstorms (reproduced with permission from Getty Photos).

Most pertinent are the perspectives of veteran IPCC climate-scientists Tim Palmer and Bjorn Stevens (2019), who argue that climate-modeling science has reached global-scale limits. Palmer and Stevens contend that it will be next-generation climate modeling, observations, and analyses that will address how and why regional climate changes are altering the functioning of regional and local ecosystems. Their perspective underscores that Earth scientists prioritize for example, the dependencies of local and regional ecosystems and their coupled socio-economic systems on:

- Water supplies including storage, quality, and recharge of surface and groundwaters, that are subject to weather and climates but also to land-uses, vegetation, soils, and geology (Duncombe, 2022; Fan et al., 2013; Grafton et al., 2023; Porporato & Yin, 2022; Taylor et al., 2013);
- Sustainability and restoration of managed landscapes and soils that today produce food and fiber for more than 8 billion people. Many of these agro-ecosystems are managed at an intensity and geographic scale never before attempted, and risk long-lasting degradation of landscape biogeochemistry, food security, physical structures, and biodiversity (Gaffney et al., 2019; Richardson et al., 2022; Sachs et al., 2010; Thomas et al., 2023; Udvardi et al., 2021);
- Sea-level changes that vary widely along continental margins and render some coastal communities far more vulnerable than others (Frederikse et al., 2020; Hamlington et al., 2020);
- Responses of marine ecosystems and fisheries to climate forcings that will require adaptive climate-informed management (Heenan et al., 2015);
- Externalities from mineral exploration and mining on land and at sea that need scientific and engineering improvements given accelerating demands on Earth's critical minerals such as Li, Ni, Co, Cu, P, and the lanthanides (Jung & Choi, 2021; Labay et al., 2017; Schlesinger et al., 2021; Sharpley et al., 2018);
- Reducing the staggering human and financial costs of earthquakes, volcanic explosions, tsunamis, epidemics, floods, landslides, and windstorms and improving disaster prediction and warning systems (e.g., Costa et al., 2020; Wald, 2023);
- Accelerating research on the potential regional consequences of solar geoengineering, to date understudied (Irvine et al., 2010), and broadening the field of geoengineering to include all pro-active engineering of Earth's systems whether to improve the efficiency of nutrient and water cycling in crop fields or forests (Chen & Liao, 2017), or to advance carbon-cycle science and innovative carbon usage and capture technologies (Dziejarski et al., 2023).

As scientists and supporting scholars, we thus propose an ambitious international program of Earth sciences, engineering, and education. This new effort must be led by national academies of science and engineering, and national science foundations and their equivalents in many nations and make multi-decadal and multi-billion dollar commitments to international networks of research observatories that focus on the highest priority questions about our evolving planet across local, regional, and global scales.

What can individual Earth scientists and like-minded research administrators do to promote such an emboldened research and education program? We can learn much from the histories of the 1957–1958 International Geophysical Year (Sullivan, 1961), the 1964–1974 International Biological Program (Coleman, 2010), the 1987–2015 International Geosphere-Biosphere Program (Daniel, 1990), the ongoing Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (Agrawala, 1998) and the UN Decade of Ecological Restoration (Fischer et al., 2021), and the new International Decade of Sciences for Sustainable Development. We can continue to train highly talented Earth scientists from many nations, seek major financial support for new science organizations such as the Earth Observatory of Singapore, and participate in regional Earth science assessments, for example, of the Amazon (Albert et al., 2023). We can also collaborate with colleagues across the arts and humanities to circulate our ongoing findings and create new venues for our sciences.

Among the co-authors of this paper, one proposed the concept of Earth's critical zone in an oral presentation at an annual geological society meeting (Ashley, 1998), and over the following decade other coauthors wrote critical-zone white papers and scientific manuscripts, staged discussions with research funders, and built what are today the international research and education programs based at critical zone observatories on six continents (Arènes et al., 2018; Banwart et al., 2013; Brantley et al., 2007; Grant & Dietrich, 2017; Latour & Weibel, 2019; National Research Council, 2001; Schroeder, 2018). Not only has this program brought together geophysicists, geochemists, geomorphologists, pedologists, hydrologists, ecosystem ecologists, physical geographers, social scientists, and even humanities scholars, thousands of students have been educated in an integrative approach to place- and network-based Earth science from “treetops to bedrock” or from “rocks to the sky” (Gaillardet et al., 2018; Lee et al., 2023).

We must thus organize ourselves across the full breadth and scale of the Earth sciences to marshal unprecedented support for research and education to accelerate our understanding of Earth's changes that are transforming our most remarkable home.

The stakes are high. Let the new work begin!

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest relevant to this study.

Data Availability Statement

No pre-existing or original data, software, or code were used or created in the writing of this manuscript.

Acknowledgments

The essay was inspired by the late Professors Steve Banwart, Peter Haff, Bruno Latour, Will Steffen, and Diana Wall. The paper benefited from comments by two anonymous reviewers and Editor Tissa Illangasekare.

References

- Agrawala, S. (1998). Context and early origins of the intergovernmental panel on climate change. *Climatic Change*, 39(4), 605–620. <https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1005315532386>
- Albert, J. S., Carnaval, A. C., Flantua, S. G. A., Lohmann, L. G., Ribas, C. C., Riff, D., et al. (2023). Human impacts outpace natural processes in the Amazon. *Science*, 379(6630), eabo5003. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abo5003>
- Allenby, B., Murphy, C. F., Allen, D., & Davidson, C. (2009). Sustainable engineering education in the United States. *Sustainability Science*, 4(1), 7–15. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-009-0065-5>
- Arènes, A., Latour, B., & Gaillardet, J. (2018). Giving depth to the surface: An exercise in the Gaia-graphy of critical zones. *The Anthropocene Review*, 5(2), 120–135. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053019618782257>
- Ashley, G. M. (1998). *Where are we headed? “Soft” rock research into the new millennium*. Geological Society of America Abstracts #50167.
- Banwart, S. A., Chorover, J., Gaillardet, J., Sparks, D., White, T., Anderson, S., et al. (2013). *Sustaining Earth's critical zone basic science and interdisciplinary solutions for global challenges*. University of Sheffield.
- Barnosky, A. D., Koch, P. L., Feranec, R. S., Wing, S. L., & Shabel, A. B. (2004). Assessing the causes of late Pleistocene extinctions on the continents. *Science*, 306(5693), 70–75. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1101476>
- Brantley, S. L., Goldhaber, M. B., & Ragnarsdottir, K. V. (2007). Crossing disciplines and scales to understand the critical zone. *Elements*, 3(5), 307–314. <https://doi.org/10.2113/gselements.3.5.307>
- Brantley, S. L., Wen, T., Agarwal, D. A., Catalano, J. G., Schroeder, P. A., Lehnert, K., et al. (2019). The future low-temperature geochemical data-scape as envisioned by the U.S. geochemical community. *Computers & Geosciences*, 157, 104933. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cageo.2021.104933>

- Castree, N. (2014). The Anthropocene and the environmental humanities: Extending the conversation. *Environmental Humanities*, 5(1), 233–260. <https://doi.org/10.1215/22011919-3615496>
- Cayley, D. (Ed.). (2009). *Interview with S. Schaffer. Ideas on the nature of science*. Goose Lane.
- Chakrabarty, D. (2009). The climate of history: Four theses. *Critical Inquiry*, 35(2), 197–222. <https://doi.org/10.1086/596640>
- Chen, L., & Liao, H. (2017). Engineering crop nutrient efficiency for sustainable agriculture. *Journal of Integrative Plant Biology*, 59(10), 710–735. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jipb.12559>
- Coleman, D. C. (2010). *Big ecology: The emergence of ecosystem science*. Univ of California Press.
- Cook, B. R., Richards, L. A., & Rutherford, I. (2015). Geographies of the Anthropocene. *Geographical Research*, 53(3), 231–243. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-5871.12127>
- Costa, F., Shea, T., & Ubide, T. (2020). Diffusion chronometry and the timescales of magmatic processes. *Nature Reviews Earth & Environment*, 1(4), 201–214. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-020-0038-x>
- Crutzen, P. (2002). The geology of mankind: The Anthropocene. *Nature*, 415(6867), 23. <https://doi.org/10.1038/415023a>
- Crutzen, P., & Stoermer, E. F. (2000). Have we entered the “Anthropocene”. *International Geosphere-Biosphere Program Newsletter*, 41, 17–18.
- Cushman, J. H. (1998). Industrial group plans to battle climate treaty.
- Daniel, R. R. (1990). The international geosphere–biosphere programme—A study of global change. *Current Science*, 59, 134–138.
- Darwin, C. (1859). *On the origin of species*. John Murray.
- Duncombe, J. (2022). Not your childhood water cycle. *Eos*, 103. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2022EO220499>
- Dziejarski, B., Krzyżyńska, R., & Andersson, K. (2023). Current status of carbon capture, utilization, and storage technologies in the global economy: A survey of technical assessment. *Fuel*, 342, 127776. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2023.127776>
- Edgeworth, M., Richter, D. D., Waters, C., Haff, P., Neal, C., & Price, S. J. (2015). Diachronous beginnings of the Anthropocene: The lower bounding surface of anthropogenic deposits. *The Anthropocene Review*, 2(1), 33–58. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053019614565394>
- Fan, Y., Li, H., & Miguez-Macho, G. (2013). Global patterns of groundwater table depth. *Science*, 339(6122), 940–943. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1229881>
- Fischer, J., Riechers, M., Loos, J., Martin-Lopez, B., & Temperton, V. M. (2021). Making the UN decade on ecosystem restoration a social-ecological endeavour. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 36(1), 20–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2020.08.018>
- Frederikse, T., Landerer, F., Caron, L., Adhikari, S., Parkes, D., Humphrey, V. W., et al. (2020). The causes of sea-level rise since 1900. *Nature*, 584(7821), 393–397. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2591-3>
- Gaffney, J., Bing, J., Byrne, P. F., Cassman, K. G., Ciampitti, I., Delmer, D., et al. (2019). Science-based intensive agriculture: Sustainability, food security, and the role of technology. *Global Food Security*, 23, 236–244. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2019.08.003>
- Gaillardet, J., Braud, I., Hankard, F., Anquetin, S., Bour, O., Dorfliger, N., et al. (2018). OZCAR: The French network of critical zone observatories. *Vadose Zone Journal*, 17, 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.2136/vzj2018.04.0067>
- Gould, S. J. (1987). *Time's arrow, time's cycle*. Harvard University Press.
- Grafton, R. Q., Krishnaswamy, J., & Revi, A. (2023). *The water cycle and the economy*. Technical Report. Global Commission on the Economics of Water.
- Grant, G. E., & Dietrich, W. A. (2017). The Frontier beneath our feet. *Water Resources Research*, 53(4), 2605–2609. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017wr020835>
- Hamlington, B. D., Gardner, A. S., Ivins, E., Lenaerts, J. T., Reager, J. T., Trossman, D. S., et al. (2020). Understanding of contemporary regional sea-level change and the implications for the future. *Reviews of Geophysics*, 58(3), e2019RG000672. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019rg000672>
- Heenan, A., Pomeroy, R., Bell, J., Munday, P. L., Cheung, W., Logan, C., et al. (2015). A climate-informed, ecosystem approach to fisheries management. *Marine Policy*, 57, 182–192. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2015.03.018>
- Hochella, M. F., Mogk, D. W., Ranville, J., Allen, I. C., Luther, G. W., Marr, L. C., et al. (2019). Natural, incidental, and engineered nanomaterials and their impacts on the Earth system. *Science*, 363(6434), eaau8299. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aau8299>
- Irvine, P. J., Ridgwell, A., & Lunt, D. J. (2010). Assessing the regional disparities in geoengineering impacts. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 37(18), L18702. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2010gl044447>
- Jung, D., & Choi, Y. (2021). Systematic review of machine learning applications in mining: Exploration, exploitation, and reclamation. *Minerals*, 11(2), 148. <https://doi.org/10.3390/min11020148>
- Kidwell, S. M. (2015). Biology in the Anthropocene: Challenges and insights from young fossil records. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(16), 4922–4929. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1403660112>
- Labay, K., Burger, M. H., Bellora, J. D., Schultz, K. J., DeYoung, J. H., Seal, et al. (2017). Global distribution of selected mines, deposits, and districts of critical minerals. *US Geological Survey Data Release*. <https://doi.org/10.5066/F7GH9GQR>
- Latour, B. (2017). Anthropology at the time of the Anthropocene: A personal view of what is to be studied. In M. Brightman & J. Lewis (Eds.), *The anthropology of sustainability: Beyond development and progress* (pp. 35–49). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Latour, B. & Weibel, P. (Eds.). (2019). *Critical zones*. MIT Press.
- Lee, R. M., Shoshitaishvili, B., Wood, R. L., Bekker, J., & Abbott, B. W. (2023). The meanings of the critical zone. *Anthropocene*, 42, 100377. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ancene.2023.100377>
- Mathews, A. S. (2020). Anthropology and the Anthropocene: Criticisms, experiments, and collaborations. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 49(1), 67–82. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-anthro-102218-011317>
- May, J., & Price, M. N. (2024). *Second nature*. Rizzoli/Electa.
- McDowell, W. H., McDowell, W. G., Potter, J. D., & Ramírez, A. (2019). Nutrient export and elemental stoichiometry in an urban tropical river. *Ecological Applications*, 29(2), e01839. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eap.1839>
- Menely, T., & Taylor, J. O. (2017). *Anthropocene reading: Literary history in geologic times*. Penn State University Press.
- Mielke, H. W., Gonzales, C. R., Powell, E. T., Laidlaw, M. A., Berry, K. J., Mielke Jr, P. W., & Egendorf, S. P. (2019). The concurrent decline of soil lead and children’s blood lead in New Orleans. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(44), 22058–22064. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1906092116>
- National Research Council (NRC). (2001). *Basic research opportunities in Earth science*. National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/13236>
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2020). *The digitalization of science, technology and innovation: Key developments and policies*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/b9e4a2c0-en>
- Palmer, T., & Stevens, B. (2019). The scientific challenge of understanding and estimating climate change. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(49), 24390–24395. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1906691116>
- Porporato, A., & Yin, J. (2022). *Ecohydrology: Dynamics of life and water in the critical zone*. Cambridge University Press.
- Raffinsoe, S. (2016). *Philosophy of the Anthropocene: The human turn*. Palgrave Macmillan.

- Reichstein, M., Camps-Valls, G., Stevens, B., Jung, M., Denzler, J., Carvalhais, N., & Prabhath, F. (2019). Deep learning and process understanding for data-driven Earth system science. *Nature*, *566*(7743), 195–204. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-0912-1>
- Richardson, C. J., Flanagan, N. E., Wang, H., & Ho, M. (2022). Annual carbon sequestration and loss rates under altered hydrology and fire regimes in southeastern USA pocosin peatlands. *Global Change Biology*, *28*(21), 6370–6384. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.16366>
- Richter, D. D. (2020). Game changer in soil science. The Anthropocene in soil science and pedology. *Journal of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science*, *183*(1), 5–11. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jpln.201900320>
- Ruddiman, W. (2017). Geographic evidence of the early anthropogenic hypothesis. *Anthropocene*, *20*, 4–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ancene.2017.11.003>
- Sachs, J., Remans, R., Smukler, S., Winowiecki, L., Anelman, S. J., Cassman, K. G., et al. (2010). Monitoring the world's agriculture. *Nature*, *466*(7306), 558–560. <https://doi.org/10.1038/466558a>
- Schlesinger, W. H., & Bernhardt, E. S. (2020). *Biogeochemistry: An analysis of global change*. Elsevier.
- Schlesinger, W. H., Klein, E. M., Wang, Z., & Vengosh, A. (2021). Global biogeochemical cycle of lithium. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, *35*(8), e2021GB006999. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021GB006999>
- Schroeder, P. A. (2018). *Clays in the critical zone*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sharpley, A., Jarvie, H., Flaten, D., & Kleinman, P. (2018). Celebrating the 350th anniversary of phosphorus discovery: A conundrum of deficiency and excess. *Journal of Environmental Quality*, *47*(4), 774–777. <https://doi.org/10.2134/jeq2018.05.0170>
- Shrivastava, P., Zsolnai, L., Wasieleski, D., Stafford-Smith, M., Walker, T., Weber, O., et al. (2019). Finance and management for the Anthropocene. *Organization & Environment*, *32*(1), 26–40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086026619831451>
- Sullivan, W. (1961). *Assault on the unknown: The international geophysical year*. McGraw-Hill.
- Taylor, R. G., Scanlon, B., Döll, P., Rodell, M., Van Beek, R., Wada, Y., et al. (2013). Ground water and climate change. *Nature Climate*, *3*(4), 322–329. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate1744>
- Thomas, C. J., Shriver, R. K., Nippgen, F., Hepler, M., & Ross, M. R. (2023). Mines to forests? Analyzing long-term recovery trends for surface coal mines in Central Appalachia. *Restoration Ecology*, *31*(5), e13827. <https://doi.org/10.1111/rec.13827>
- Udvardi, M., Below, F. E., Castellano, M. J., Eagle, A. J., Giller, K. E., Ladha, J. K., et al. (2021). A research road map for responsible use of agricultural nitrogen. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*, *5*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2021.660155>
- Wald, D. J. (2023). Alerting the globe of consequential earthquakes. *Perspectives of Earth and Space Scientists*, *4*(1), e2022CN000200. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2022cn000200>
- Waters, C. N., Zalasiewicz, J., Summerhayes, C., Barnosky, A. D., Poirier, C., Gałuszka, A., et al. (2016). The Anthropocene is functionally and stratigraphically distinct from the Holocene. *Science*, *351*(6269), aad2622. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aad2622>
- White, T., Wymore, A., Dere, A., Hoffman, A., Washburne, J., & Conklin, M. (2017). Integrated interdisciplinary science of the critical zone as a foundational curriculum for addressing issues of environmental sustainability. *Journal of Geoscience Education*, *65*(2), 136–145. <https://doi.org/10.5408/16-171.1>
- Wilson, E. O. (2016). *Half-earth*. Liveright Publishing Corporation.
- Wolfe, A. L., & Broughton, J. M. (2020). A foraging theory perspective on the associational critique of North American Pleistocene overkill. *Journal of Archaeological Science*, *119*, 105162. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2020.105162>
- Wootton, D. (2015). *The invention of science*. Harper Perennial.