Environmental Reviews
Dossiers environnement

The effects of modern war and military activities on biodiversity and the environment

Journal:	*Environmental Reviews*
Manuscript ID	er-2015-0039.R1
Manuscript Type:	Review
Date Submitted by the Author:	06-Sep-2015
Complete List of Authors:	Lawrence, Michael; Carleton University, Biology Stemberger, Holly; Carleton University, Biology Zolderdo, Aaron; Carleton University, Biology Struthers, Daniel; Carleton University, Biology Cooke, Steven; Carleton University, Biology
Keyword:	war, biodiversity, ecosystem structure, conservation biology, military activities

The effects of modern war and military activities on biodiversity and the environment

In Prep for Environmental Reviews

Michael J. Lawrence[1,*], Holly L.J. Stemberger[2], Aaron J. Zolderdo[1], Daniel P. Struthers[1] and Steven J. Cooke[1]

[1]Fish Ecology and Conservation Physiology Laboratory, Department of Biology and Institute of Environmental Science, Carleton University, Ottawa, ON, Canada K1S 5B6

[2] Department of Biology, Carleton University, Ottawa, ON, Canada K1S 5B6

*Address for correspondence:
Fish Ecology and Conservation Physiology Laboratory, Carleton University, 1125 Colonel By Dr., Ottawa, ON, Canada, K1S 5B6.

Email address: m_lawrence27@live.ca (Michael Lawrence)

Running Title: War and the environment

Keywords: war, biodiversity, ecosystem structure, conflict, military activities, environment, conservation biology

Summary

War is an ever-present force that has the potential to alter the biosphere. Here we review the potential consequences of modern war and military activities on ecosystem structure and function. We focus on the effects of direct conflict, nuclear weapons, military training and military produced contaminants. Overall, the aforementioned activities were found to have overwhelmingly negative effects on ecosystem structure and function. Dramatic habitat alteration, environmental pollution and disturbance contributed to population declines and biodiversity losses arising from both acute and chronic effects in both terrestrial and aquatic systems. In some instances, even in the face of massive alterations to ecosystem structure, recovery was possible. Interestingly, military activity was beneficial under specific conditions such as when an exclusion zone was generated that generally resulted in population increases and/or population recovery; an observation noted in both terrestrial and aquatic systems. Additionally, military technological advances (e.g. GPS technology, drone technology, biotelemetry) have provided conservation scientists with novel tools for research. Because of the challenges associated with conducting research in areas with military activities (e.g. restricted access, hazardous conditions), information pertaining to military impacts on the environment are relatively scarce and are often studied years after military activities have ceased and with no knowledge of baseline conditions. Additional research would help to elucidate the environmental consequences (positive and negative) and thus reveal opportunities for mitigating negative effects while informing the development of optimal strategies for rehabilitation and recovery.

Introduction

Conflict has been an ever-present aspect of human civilization. Indeed, the manifestation of conflict in direct combat and military engagements has continuously plagued the world throughout the 20th century leading to more than 100 million human deaths across a number of major and minor wars (Westing 1980; Penderson 2002; Leitenberg 2006; Sarkees et al. 2003). Beyond war's rather obvious negative impacts on human populations (Penderson 2002; Machlis and Hanson 2008), human warfare has also been documented as having a significant influence on the biosphere across a range of ecological scales (Dudley et al. 2002; Machlis and Hanson 2008). The degree to which warfare can exert an impact upon an ecosystem and its constituent populations rests entirely on the nature of the disturbance, the sensitivity of the biological system (including resilience) and the timescale of the impacts (Westing 1971; Demarais et al. 1999; Dudley et al. 2002; Warren and Buttner 2006; Warren et al. 2007). Consequently, human conflict has the potential to impart a wide range of impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem structure and function. Interestingly, although one might presume that all conflict is overwhelmingly "negative" in an ecological context, in reality the consequences of warfare generate a continuum of outcomes ranging from highly positive to highly detrimental.

While a large body of knowledge of the consequences of war on the ecological dynamics of a variety of biological systems is known, a comprehensive assessment of these impacts has yet to be conducted. Current reviews on the subject often frame ecological changes in the greater context of socio-economic factors and human interactions which are often restricted to terrestrial mammalian megafauna (e.g., Dudley et al. 2002; Machlis and Hanson 2008). Thus, the purpose of this review will be to address the specific impacts of modern warfare (i.e. turn of the 20th century) on ecosystem structure (especially biodiversity and the status of populations and communities) and ecosystem function in a variety of systems (e.g. aquatic, terrestrial). For the sake of simplicity, our analysis will be restricted to the following impacts of military activities: direct armed conflict (between two or more factions), nuclear warfare, military training, and military produced chemical and metals contamination. For the entirety of this review, the term warfare will encompass the preparation (e.g. training, material development and testing), mobilization, conflict and related activities of nations/factions involved in a military operation against one another. This review will also limit its scope to include assessments of the impacts of military activities on ecosystem structure and function during the "preparations for war", "violent conflict" and "post-war activities" phases as outlined in Machlis and Hanson (2008). As such, any activity that directly relates to preparation and/or is a product of war, outside of civilian operations, will be considered an aspect of warfare. Our assessment will encompass a continuum-based approach whereby both the negative and positive impacts of the above factors are highlighted appropriately.

Active Armed Conflict

Armed conflict is the act of war generated by two or more governmental, non-governmental groups or international states that generally involves a combination of active military actions, including aerial assaults, naval craft operations, or ground forces (ICRC 2008; Machlis and Hanson 2008; Pearson 2012). Often, natural ecosystems are termed "terrain" in military battlespace terminology (O'May et al. 2005; Visone 2005; Hieb et al. 2007), taking on an anthropogenic rather than an eco-centric view of natural landscapes during periods of armed conflict. As a result, ecosystem health and integrity are often neglected causalities of warfare with little responsibility from involved factions in contributing to conservation efforts (Gangwar 2003; Clark and Jorgenson 2012). The consequences of active armed conflict range across a spectrum of ecological scales and lead to unexpected and complex outcomes - either beneficial, negative, or a combination of these two. This component of the paper highlights a number of types of active warfare engagement forms including airborne, naval, and ground warfare activities, which have demonstrable impacts on ecosystem structure and function.

Aerial Assault:

Aircraft (both rotary and fixed-wing) are commonly used in military operations that can produce bursts of noise (e.g. sonic booms, jet afterburners, rotary pulses, etc). The auditory system is more sensitive in many animals compared to that of humans (Manci et al. 1988; Larkin et al. 1996) and thus aerial activities possess a significant source of noise pollution that is of global concern for the wellbeing of wildlife (Dunnet 1977; Dufour 1980; Gladwin et al. 1988). The production of noise from military aircraft has variable impacts on wildlife, which encompass primary, secondary, and tertiary effects (Janssen 1980; reviewed in Manci et al. 1988). These effects can occur over an acute or chronic timescale representing both sub-lethal and lethal impacts that have the potential to cause permanent damage; a factor that is influenced by acoustic duration, intensity and the biology of the specific species. Primary effects can include eardrum rupture, shifts in hearing abilities (either temporary or permanent), and/or auditory signal masking (e.g. unable to identify noises from prey, predators, or mates). Secondary effects are related to physiological impacts (Manci et al. 1988), which can lead to impediments in reproduction, foraging behaviour, and natural habitat use of wildlife residing in areas where aircraft noise is prevalent (Francis 2011). Tertiary impacts consist of a combination of primary and secondary effects that can lead to population declines, species extinction and habitat degradation (Klein 1973; Bender 1977; Manci et al. 1988).

Ecosystem structure has been affected by means beyond noise pollution from military aircraft. For example, during WWII, aircraft acted as a vector for the transportation of exotics whereby weeds and cultivated species were brought to oceanic island ecosystems by way of aircraft landing strips used for refueling and staging stations during operations in the Pacific theatre (Stoddart 1968). Prior to the war, these isolated islands were home to a number of sensitive and endemic species that had naturally dispersed to their current positions. However, in the aftermath of aerial warfare events, large numbers of invasive species had become established on these small islands which altered the evolutionary pathways of native species causing competitive exclusion, predation, and extinction of endemic species (Mooney and Cleland 2001). Aerial warfare also has had a great influence on altering population dynamics directly. Air-to-ground assaults are known to cause elevations in wildlife mortality (Zahler and Graham 2001; Gangwar 2003) and destroy natural habitat (Levy et al. 1997) both of which may contribute to a localized population decline. Conventional aerial assault weapons are generally categorized into 4 groups which include: high explosive fragmentation, incendiary weapons, enhanced blast munitions, and defoliants; all of which have potential to destroy wildlife and natural habitat in different ways and with varying degrees of severity (reviewed in Majeed 2004). These impacts have been illustrated in a number of species including Asian elephants (*Elephas maximus*;

Chadwick 1992; Dudley et al. 2002) and snow leopards (*Panthera uncia*; Zahler and Graham 2001) where aerial combat maneuvers were observed to decimate entire forest ecosystems leaving behind stumps and craters, alongside contaminated and destabilized soils (Levy et al. 1997).

Naval Operations:

Naval conflict between foreign nations has a diverse range of effects on the marine environment. Like aircraft, ships have been implicated in introducing foreign species to otherwise un-colonisable regions under normal circumstances. This has been achieved through the dumping of ballast waters (Apte et al. 2000) and the introduction of naval structures/materials into the region (Tavares and De Melo 2004). As an example of the latter, the brown tree snake (*Boiga irregularis*) was introduced into Guam in 1949 just after WWII, most likely as a stowaway on boats salvaging materials from a port in New Guinea (Rodda and Savidge 2007). This species has subsequently invaded all terrestrial ecosystems in Guam leading to the extirpation of many bird and lizard species, as well as a number of other native invertebrates thus having a measurable effect on the local biodiversity (Rodda and Savidge 2007).

Naval blasts and sonar operations, during active periods of warfare, have the potential to interfere with the daily lives of many aquatic species. The acoustic frequency used by dolphins and whales coincides with that used by naval sonar devices which can cause ear hemorrhaging and beach stranding (Science Wire 2001; NRDC 2003). In addition to this, conventional naval ordinance (e.g. depth charges, torpedoes) create substantial underwater blasts which can inflict overpressure and fragmentation injury to invertebrates, fish, reptiles, birds, and marine mammals in proximity of the blast radius (Gaspin 1975; Westing 1980; Ketten 1995; Reviewed in Keevin and Hempen 1997; see Nuclear Warfare for more info on blast injury).

While there are a number of negative impacts associated with naval operations, marine environments have profited from this activity in a number of ways. Fish populations greatly benefited from the activities occurring in the North Atlantic during WWII whereby sensitive and overexploited populations were given time to recover from anthropogenic disturbances and fisheries exploitation (Beare et al. 2010) as fishing fleets were drastically reduced in size resulting from their participation in naval operations including mine sweeping and shipping supplies (Gulland 1968; Engelhard 2008). If not called to assist in military services, then fishing vessels were often harboured and, therefore, excluded from fishing activity due to threats at sea from naval/aerial strikes and subsurface mining (Beare et al. 2010). During this period of war, large areas in the Atlantic Ocean functioned as Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) for several years which allowed commercial fish populations to proliferate with a reduction in fishing effort (Beare et al. 2010). During this time, it was observed that the reduction in fishing mortality altered the age-structure dynamics of gadoid fisheries resulting in a larger proportion of mature/larger fish which allowed populations to proliferate to a greater extent (Beare et al. 2010). Additionally, opportunistic species (e.g. oceanic whitetip sharks, *Carcharhinus longimanus*) have been reported as benefitting from naval ship wrecks as they provided a rich food source during periods of warfare representing an acute “ecological bonanza”(Bass et al. 1973).

Indirectly, the occurrence of naval warfare allowed fisheries and other untargeted species to rebound and proliferate which may not have otherwise occurred in its absence.

Naval conflicts, particularly during WWII, have also led to the creation of heterogeneous habitats that would not exist otherwise. During World War II, there was a global expansion with ocean-going vessels that navigated the coastal and pelagic waters of the Atlantic and South-Pacific oceans to engage hostile countries. Although this led to devastating consequences for human life, the resulting ship wrecks created a large number of artificial reefs where aquatic life could colonize, utilize, and flourish (Hynes et al. 2004). While there are concerns regarding long term contamination with sunken naval craft (Westing 1980; Martore et al. 1998; Ampleman et al. 2004; Barrett 2011; Monfils 2005; see Military Contamination), these vessels have proven to be a source of new habitat for aquatic life in areas of the ocean that were largely void of structure for animals to colonize (Hynes et al. 2004).

Terrestrial Conflict:

Ground warfare often takes place in sensitive and remote locations around the globe. Indeed, a large number of biological hotspots have set the stage for major ground conflict events (Kim 1997; Hart et al. 1997; Hanson et al. 2009). Furthermore, modern ground warfare has often altered natural landscapes and impacted wildlife in a number of different ways. Often, soldiers were positioned for on-ground battle within critical habitats of endemic and endangered species (Shambaugh et al. 2001; Zahler and Graham 2001; Hanson et al. 2009; Lindsell 2011) representing a potential threat to these organisms. As one might expect, armed conflict found within terrestrial ecosystems often facilitates poaching by military forces (Shambaugh et al. 2001; Draulans and Krunkelsven 2002; Dudley et al. 2002) and can promote further destruction of the landscape and wildlife populations by displaced refugees of war (Shambaugh et al. 2001; McNeely 2003; Dudley et al. 2002; Dubey and Shreni 2008). In contrast, there are reports of large adaptable predators, including Bengal tigers (*Panthera tigris tigris*) and grey wolves (*Canis lupus*) becoming habituated to gunfire noise on the battlefields of WWII; they were often sighted foraging on causalities in the aftermath of battles (Orians and Pfeiffer 1970; Westing 1980; McNeely 2003) which may acutely benefit the species as in the case of marine predators illustrated above.

The weapons employed by militaries probably pose the greatest hazard by terrestrial conflicts to ecosystem structure. The numerous explosive techniques and tools at the disposal of army forces during ground warfare have left a legacy on landscapes across the globe by leaving large craters, shrapnel, and contamination, thus devastating many ecosystems across the biosphere (Westing 1980; Hupy 2008; Certini et al. 2013). Landmines applied during active ground warfare have left a lasting legacy on the environment and still remain a major threat to biodiversity, even decades after being deployed (Westing 1985; Roberts and Williams 1995; Reviewed in Berhe 2007). However, landmines may help ecosystems recuperate after heavy impact from armed conflict by creating “no-mans-land” in an analogous manner to a game reserve or park as seen in the case of the cranes in the demilitarized zone of the Korean Peninsula (Box 1; Higuchi et al. 1996; Kim 1997; Dudley et al. 2002). Landmines do not differentiate between soldiers and wildlife (especially large mammals) and therefore, many organisms have been damaged or killed directly from landmine explosions (Shambaugh et al. 2001; Zahler and

Graham 2001; Westing 1996; Berhe 2007). Indeed, land mines have been responsible for pushing at risk species closer to extinction (e.g. elephants in Africa, leopards in Afghanistan; Troll 2000) and deteriorating ecosystem integrity by destroying vegetation and degrading soil structure (Miller 1972; Berhe 2007).

Artillery fire also poses a risk to the environment. During WWI and II, artillery weapons were positioned behind soldiers and were fired towards the opposing factions with the capability of firing hundreds of shells per hour (Hupy 2008). Troops often found shelter or fought battles in forested areas resulting in heavy artillery fire on these regions, devastating the local ecosystem and associated biodiversity (Hupy 2008). Decades after WWII, craters in Verdun, France produced by heavy artillery fire still remain void of vegetative growth; deep craters extending to the water table cause hydric conditions, making them unsuitable for colonization by terrestrial plant species (Hupy 2006). Thus, shelling can result in chronic legacy impacts in addition to acute influences (e.g. instant mortality).

Terrestrial conflicts have been known to target military and civilian infrastructure to stifle opposing factions. Ground forces, in the past, have used explosives to destroy hydropower dams (Sweetman 1982; Gleick 1993; Clodfelter 2006) and dikes (Lacoste 1973) as a means to impede the mobility of countering factions (Francis 2011). The abrupt removal of long established dams can cause a number of ecological consequences such as siltation, mortality of fish and wildlife populations situated above and below the dam (e.g. abrasion, suffocation, habitat loss), and produce lasting physical, chemical, and biological legacies (Bednarek 2001; Stanley and Doyle 2003).

Nuclear Warfare

The development and use of nuclear warheads, in both times of peace and conflict, has undoubtedly left a significant scar on the earth's surface. As of the late 1990s, more than 2000 nuclear weapons tests have been conducted around the world (Yang et al. 2003). The detonation of a nuclear warhead represents a significant threat to local biodiversity as, unlike conventional ordinance, the energy released is partitioned into three distinct categories including thermal (35 %), kinetic (50 %) and radioactive (15 %) energies (Glasstone 1964; Brode 1968; Nishiwaki 1995; Eisenbud and Gesell 1997). Here we will review the documented and potential effects of each of these detonation impacts on ecosystem structure and function.

Thermal Impacts:

Thermal emissions from nuclear blasts can have a number of impacts on local ecosystems. The immense release of thermal energy at the detonation's epicentre results in temperatures far in excess of 3000°C (Brode 1968; Pinaev and Shcherbakov 1996). As such, thermal emissions pose a lethal force to any life in the vicinity of the epicentre resulting from incineration (Glasstone 1964; Lifton 1967) as seen in the bombings of Japan (Summary Report 1951; Silberner 1981; Ruhm et al. 2006; Ochiai 2014). Beyond the epicentre, an outward thermal wave (100-1000°C) moves radially (a distance dependent on the bomb strength) (Brode 1968) and is a serious risk to most life over its expansion. Here, local vegetation is burnt and defoliated, often perishing through the extreme heat (Palumbo 1962; Shields and Wells 1962; Shields et al. 1963; Craft 1964) representing severe reductions in plant species richness and abundances (Shields and Wells 1962; Shields et al. 1963; Palumbo 1962), not unlike an intense forest fire (Noble and Slatyer 1980; Rowell and Moore 2000; Grace and Keeley 2006). The spatial extent to which vegetation burning occurs is highly dependent on the status (e.g. moisture content) and composition of the vegetative assemblages present in the blast area (Chandler et al. 1963; Craft 1964; Small and Bush 1985). Some have speculated that thermal emissions may indirectly impact adjacent forests/vegetative regions, through the generation and spread of wildfires (Chandler et al. 1963; Craft 1964) that may extend the immediate population/diversity reduction outside of the blast area for both plants (Noble and Slatyer 1980; Rowell and Moore 2000; Grace and Keeley 2006) and animals (Singer et al. 1989; Kaufman et al. 1990; Moreira and Russo 2007; Lindenmayer et al. 2008). In contrast to plant life, there is comparatively little research on the effects of thermal impacts from nuclear blasts on animals, humans notwithstanding. Thermal wave exposure has been reported to cause severe whole body burns on unprotected skin in humans (Kajitani and Hatano 1953; Oughterson et al. 1951; Oughterson and Warren 1956; Nishiwaki 1995). In the bombings of Japan, fatal burns and mild non-lethal burns were observed within 1.2-2.5 km and 3-4 km from the epicentre, respectively, (Oughterson et al. 1951; Oughterson and Warren 1956; Glasstone 1964; Nishiwaki 1995) with the former resulting in a large proportion of the total deaths (~30%) during this event (Oughterson and Warren 1956; Glasstone 1964; Nishiwaki 1995). Additionally, thermal radiation, along with high intensity visible radiation, can also result in severe retinal burning in humans (Oyama and Sasaki 1946; Rose et al. 1956; Glasstone 1964). There is no reason to assume that similar consequences would not be observed among terrestrial wildlife, especially mammals.

Experimental tests of simulated and/or actual nuclear weapons produced thermal energy exposure in rats (Alpen and Sheline 1954), dogs (Brooks et al. 1952; Richmond et al. 1959a), rabbits (Byrnes et al. 1955; DuPont Guerry III et al. 1956; Ham et al. 1957) and swine (Baxter et al. 1953; McDonnel et al. 1961; Hinshaw 1968) have generated analogous effects as seen in humans suggesting that wild mammals may have a similar burn response during a nuclear detonation. Severe burns were also reported in teleost fish that were in close proximity to the detonation of the warhead in Bikini Atoll (Donaldson et al. 1997). Not surprisingly, in simulated experiments, severe burns increased the rates of mammalian mortality, resulting from general physiological disturbances and secondary infection occurring 0-2 weeks "post-blast" (Brooks et al. 1952; Alpen and Sheline 1954; McDonnel et al. 1961). This effect was also amplified under a combined thermal and radiation exposure resulting in a severely immunocompromised, physiologically disturbed individual (Brooks et al. 1952; Baxter et al. 1953; Alpen and Sheline 1954; Valeriote and Baker 1964; Ledney et al. 1992) similar to what is believed to occur in humans (Nishiwaki et al. 2000). Scaling these effects up, it would be highly likely that thermal emission exposure would result in a large die-off event in the local animal life thereby reducing local populations and, potentially, reducing local species richness over an acute time frame (0-2 weeks). It should be noted that the intensity of the burns is likely to be a product of the distance from the epicentre as the thermal wave will gradually reduce in magnitude (Brooks et al. 1952; McDonnel et al. 1961; Glasstone 1964), a factor that must be acknowledged when predicting the expected impacts on animal populations. However, this effect would not be equal for all creatures as rats on Bikini Atoll were able to avoid both thermal and kinetic emissions from warhead testing even in close proximity to the blast as a product of their subterranean existence

(Donaldson et al. 1997). As such, we would expect that species occupying "sheltered" habitats may not experience a large die-off as described earlier.

Blast Effects:

As mentioned earlier, in a nuclear warhead detonation, blast energy accounts for approximately 50% of the total emitted energy that moves away from the epicentre in a radial pattern (Randall 1961; Glasstone 1962; Eisenbud and Gesell 1997; Glasstone 1964). The large amount of kinetic energy emanating from the blast (1-3500+ kPa) is especially damaging to plants whereby the blast force is capable of denuding foliage as well as damaging branch structure and uprooting vegetation from the soil (Shields and Wells 1962; Shields et al. 1963; Palumbo 1962; Beatley 1966; Glasstone and Dolan 1977; Hunter 1991) effectively destroying a large proportion of the surrounding plant life and primary production.

Animals caught within the blast wave can be impacted in a number of ways. Terrestrial species are likely to experience damage resulting from overpressure injury. Using blast pressures similar to what has been reported during nuclear explosions, rats experienced severe lung damage as well as large degrees of hemorrhaging in various regions of the body (Jaffin et al. 1987). Similar effects have been noted in a number of other vertebrate species (Richmond et al. 1959a; 1959b; Goldizen et al. 1961; Richmond and White 1962; Candole 1967; Jaffin et al. 1987; Mayorga 1997) with the extent of physiological damage dependent upon the mass of the animal (larger animals are less susceptible to injury; Richmond and White 1962; Jaffin et al. 1987) as well as the magnitude and duration of the over-pressure exposure (Candole

1967). Unsurprisingly, mortality in these trials was elevated (Richmond et al. 1959a; 1959b; Richmond and White 1962; Jaffin et al. 1987) which, under an actual nuclear detonation, would be expected to increase mortality rates in exposed populations. Further exacerbating these effects would be the large amount of debris and shrapnel carried through the air by the blast causing injury and death to animals in the surrounding area (Candole 1967; Mayorga 1997). This effect has been directly observed during a nuclear detonation on both humans (Shaeffer 1957; Liebow 1983; Kishi 2000) and other mammalian species (McDonnel et al. 1961; Goldizen et al. 1961; Masco 2004).

Aquatic organisms are particularly sensitive to the effects of a blast. While direct evidence is rather limited in the literature, nuclear denotations in proximity to aquatic environments have been shown to result in large fish population die offs (Kirkwood 1970; Kirkwood and Fuller 1972; Merritt 1970; Merritt 1973; Planes et al. 2005) demonstrating similar impacts to conventional ordinance explosion on fish mortality on a much larger scale (Govoni et al. 2008; Popper and Hastings 2009). This is primarily a result of the anatomical design of teleost fish having a gas filled swim bladder that is easily ruptured upon exposure to large pressure differentials (Simenstad 1974; Yelverton et al. 1975; Baxter et al. 1982; Planes et al. 2005; Popper and Hastings 2009). Marine mammals, given the presence of large gas filled lungs, would also be expected to suffer high rates of mortality under a nuclear blast resulting from severe lung damage in a manner similar to that of fish swim bladders (Baxter et al. 1982; Goertner 1982). Marine mammals in proximity to a warhead detonation experienced severe lung damage and elevated mortality (Kirkwood and Fuller 1972; Rausch 1973). This effect also extended to diving birds (Kirwood and Fuller 1972; Rausch 1973). Interestingly, invertebrates are not seemingly affected by pressure waves in aquatic systems (Isakason 1974; Baxter et al. 1982) and are unlikely to be impacted, in this manner, under a nuclear blast. However, not all invertebrates are equal, in respect to kinetic energy disturbances, in that warhead detonation over coral reefs lead to widespread coral death presumably through mechanical disruption from the blast (Richards et al. 2008). While most of the coral community appears able to recover, highly turbid conditions generated during blasts have led to the extinction of calm water specialist coral species on some reefs (Richards et al. 2008).

Both thermal and kinetic impacts of a nuclear detonation occur over an acute timeframe and would likely result in a great reduction in the abundances and diversity of local flora and fauna. However, over a more chronic duration, these impacts are likely to be minimal as populations and diversity could recover through dispersal to the area as well as contributions from surviving organisms. Indeed, this has been observed in a number of plant (Palumbo 1962; Shields and Wells 1962; Shields et al. 1963; Beatley 1966; Fosberg 1985; Hunter 1991; 1992) and animal (Pinca et al. 2005; Planes et al. 2005; Richards et al. 2008; Houk and Musburger 2013; Jorgensen and Hayward 1965; O'Farrell 1984; Hunter 1992; Wills 2001; Kolesnikova et al. 2005) communities from a diversity of testing site environments. In some instances, the exclusion of human activity from test sites has been quite beneficial to the recovery and prosperity of organisms found in these areas as in the case of the atolls of the Marshall Islands (see Box 2; Davis 2007; Richards et al. 2008; Houk and Musburger 2013).

Radiation Impacts:

Nuclear weapons emit a portion of their energy as ionizing, radioactive emissions either as electromagnetic radiation (e.g. gamma & X rays) or through radionuclides of various elements (Aakrog 1988; Robison and Noshkin 1999; Whicker and Pinder 2002) which are accumulated primarily through direct exposure or through consumption of producers, respectively (Donaldson et al. 1997; Entry and Watrud 1998; Whicker and Pinder 2002). However, the effects of radioactivity on life are variable. Over an acute timescale, provided sufficient activity (< 2 Gy), radiation exposure in humans can result in the development of radiation poisoning that can manifest itself as (depending on the dose) hemorrhaging, blood cell and tissue destruction, and mortality in doses in excess of 6 Gy (Prosser et al. 1947; Ohkita 1975; Guskova et al. 2001; Mettler 2001) thus accounting for the elevated mortality rate in the bombings of Japan (Ohkita 1975). Similar effects have been observed to occur in terrestrial mammals in both laboratory experiments (Eldred and Throwbridge 1954; Brown et al. 1961; Zallinger and Tempel 1998) and bomb exposed animals (Tullis et al. 1955; McDonnel et al. 1961; Zallinger and Tempel 1998) resulting in considerable mortality. As previously mentioned, radiation and thermal energy exposure can work synergistically to induce higher mortality rates (Brooks et al. 1952; Baxter et al. 1953; Alpen and Sheline 1954; Valeriote and Baker 1964; Ledney et al. 1992). In plants, acute radiation exposure results in tissue degradation and death under sufficiently high radioactivity levels (Sparrow and Woodwell 1962; Shields et al. 1963; Rhoads and Platt 1971; Rhoads et al. 1972). However, the extent of tissue damage in plants varies with development state (Sparrow and Woodwell 1962; Shields et al. 1963; Rhoads and Platt 1971; Rhoads and Ragsdale 1971). Together, these effects could represent a substantial source of mortality following a weapon detonation on ecosystems on an acute time scale.

Radioactive exposure may also lend itself to more chronic impacts on animal populations. In humans exposed to nuclear weapon emissions, there has been an observed elevation in the rates (Bizzozero et al. 1966; Wanebo et al. 1968; Prentice et al. 1982; Darby et al. 1988) and risk level (Pierce and Preston 2000) of developing a chronic disease such as neoplasia. Assuming this effect occurred in a similar manner as in humans (Mole 1958), it would be expected to significantly reduce life expectancies and survival in wild animals. Chronic radiation effects may also result in the development of chromosomal and/or genetic aberrations (Hatch et al. 1968; Bickham et al. 1988; Lamb et al. 1991; Sugg et al. 1995) in addition to altered genetic structure of populations (Theodorakis and Shugart 1997; Theodorakis and Shugart 1998; Theodorakis et al. 1998) in wild animals under radiation exposure from weapons test and development sites. While extremely limited data exist, reduced reproductive capacities in wild animals have been noted at detonation sites (Medica et al. 1973; Turner et al. 1971; Turner 1975; Turner and Meica 1977) consistent with the expected effects of radiation's impacts on the reproductive system (Reviewed in Real et al. 2004). However, this effect seems to be variable as a few species at weapons test sites seem to have no genetic or macroscopic level impacts (Hatch et al. 1970; Campbell et al. 1975; Theodorakis et al. 2001) with the sensitivity of reproductive systems to radiation being non-ubiquitous among species (Barnthouse 1995; Mudie et al. 2007). It is believed that in some cases the "null" effect of radiation may be the product of immigration of non-affected individuals into the irradiated area (Theodorakis et al. 2001). The overall effect of these long term impacts are relatively uncertain and could have variable consequences on a given population depending on the strength and type of the effect. However, it should be noted that because of the high degree of hazard (i.e. radiation) and security precautions associated with nuclear weapons/production sites, many of these areas are devoid of human activity and thus serve as important refuge sites for a variety of plant and animal species. Indeed, these areas have been demonstrated in having quite diverse and thriving ecosystems that are often in a better ecological state when compared to similar areas where routine human activity is present (see Box 2; Gray and Rickard 1989; Whicker et al. 2004; Davis 2007; Richards et al. 2008; Houk and Musburger 2013). Thus, sites devoted to nuclear arms production and testing can still be considered a positive feature in maintaining biodiversity despite the potential for chronic health impacts in resident organisms.

Military Infrastructure and Bases

Military Bases:

The impacts of war on ecosystems are not limited to armed conflict events, but can be connected to, and influenced by, the development and operational use of military training bases. A military training base is a general designation applied to military facilities that house military equipment and personnel, and facilitate training exercises and tactical operations (Kazmarek et al. 2005; Zentelis and Lindenmayer, 2014). Military training bases can range from small outpost sites to large military "cities" (Brady 1992). The variation in size and operational use of military training bases leads to a broad spectrum of anthropogenic impacts, both in type and severity, on the local ecosystem (Owens 1990; Rideout and Walsh 1990; Goldsmith 2010). These impacts can be broken down into two broad categories: (*1*) the development of military training bases, which includes the establishment and construction of the facility and site and (*2*) operations of the military training base, which include the functional operation of the infrastructure itself and the corresponding military activities designated for the specific site. In this section, we will focus our discussion on the effects of development and operations of military training bases (including air, naval, and terrestrial) on ecosystem structure and function.

Environmental Impacts of Military Base Development:

The environmental impacts associated with the construction of infrastructure projects are site specific (Augenbroe and Pearce 1998; Tang et al. 2005; Gontier 2007; Mortberg et al. 2007). For example, the development of naval ports and shipyards are more likely to have a greater contamination risk of adjacent water bodies than the development of a terrestrial airstrip which can be situated miles from water sources and surrounded by a natural vegetation buffer zone (Tull 2006; Mortberg et al. 2007). Even the construction of similar base infrastructure, situated in different locales, are subject to different environmental impacts based on the landscape and ecosystem they are built within and thus impacts are highly site specific (Kazmarek et al. 2005; Gontier 2007; Mortberg et al. 2007). Although construction projects are associated with site-specific environmental impacts, the focus of this section is not to dissect these site-specific characteristics, but to address some overarching impacts on ecosystems that are germane to most military base development projects.

There are several generic impacts associated with the construction of most complex infrastructure projects. Some of these impacts include habitat degradation, soil erosion, and chemical contamination (Westing 1980; Tang et al. 2005; Xun et al. 2013). Initial site development requires the clearing of vegetation and trees, followed by intensive soil excavation and compaction. This process alters the natural landscape by the removal of existing vegetation and the prevention of future vegetation growth (Kopel et al. 2015). The removal of vegetation coupled with soil excavation increases the potential for soil erosion, and reduces water infiltration rates, altering the landscape ecology by changing soil structure and chemistry, and increasing water runoff rates (Tang et al. 2005). Chemical contamination of local water sources can also occur from increased water runoff carrying sediments and chemicals associated with waste dumping (e.g. hazardous building materials, paints, solvents, etc.), and accidental chemical spills (e.g. fuel and oil) during the development stage (Brady 1992; Kazmarek et al. 2005; Villoria Saez et al. 2014; Kopel et al. 2015). These pollutants can alter community structure within the vicinity of the infrastructure (Meyer-Reil and Koster 2000; Beasley and Kneale 2002; Edwards 2002; Osuji and Nwoye 2007).

However, the establishment of military training bases can also have beneficial impacts on biodiversity at the local, regional, and global scale. For effective combat training in real-world scenarios, military training bases need to be large and encompass a wide variety of environments and climates (Stephenson et al. 1996; Doxford and Judd 2002; Smith et al. 2002). Depending on the specific nature and use of military training areas, public and commercial access are usually restricted due to safety and security issues. This creates great tracts of land largely devoid of human contact and commercial development, preserving these wilderness areas which have been lost to human development elsewhere (Rideout and Walsh 1990; Doxford and Judd 2002; Zentelis and Lindenmayer 2014). Military training areas have been increasingly recognized as areas of high biodiversity, and in particular, for harbouring endangered and at-risk species (Box 3). It has been estimated that in the United States alone, over 200 federally listed endangered species inhabit military training areas; which is more endangered species per area within military installations compared to other federally managed lands in the United States (Doxford and Judd 2002; Pekins 2006; Zentelis and Lindenmayer 2014). Aside from these training lands supporting IUCN red-listed species, they also support highly diverse landscapes. The U.S. Army holds two of their largest European training bases in Bavaria, Grafenwohr and Hohenfels, which are situated on 22,855 and 16,175 ha of land, comprising 0.34 and 0.24% of the land area in Bavaria, respectively (Warren et al. 2007). Despite the relatively small size of these training areas and their exposure to intensive military training exercises, they contain approximately 27% of the total plant species richness found in Bavaria (Schonfelder et al. 1990). Similarly, the military training areas in the Netherlands comprise approximately 1% of the total available land area, but have been reported to support approximately 53% of all vascular plant species, and 61% of all bird species found within this nation (Gazenbeek 2005; Warren et al. 2007). It is also important to recognize the significance of military training areas to provide key habitat for wide-ranging megafauna species such as bears, ungulates, coyotes and wolves that require large tracts of land for foraging and hunting (Gese et al. 1989; Stephenson et al. 1996; Telesco and Van Manen 2006). Globally, military training areas have been estimated to encompass approximately 6% of the Earth's surface spanning a multitude of environments and ecosystems. This extended global coverage makes military training lands important areas for biodiversity conservation and preservation (Zentelis and Lindenmayer 2014), notwithstanding the fact that the type of activities that occur on these sites could rapidly alter biodiversity. Recognizing the importance of military facilities in conserving biodiversity, the USA has begun rehabilitating former training sites to serve as nature preserves (Coates 2013; Havlick 2014). As of 2014, 15 of these areas have been developed in an effort to promote and conserve the biodiversity of these regions (Havlick 2014). In this way, military facilities are of great benefit to sustaining and conserving biodiversity.

Operations of a Military Training Base:

The environmental impacts associated with the upkeep of military infrastructure and equipment has been a growing concern. Many military bases have been targeted for environmental assessment and site remediation (Kazmarek et al. 2005; Goldsmith 2010). Military infrastructure and equipment is subject to rigorous use, often under extreme conditions, creating the need for constant maintenance and upkeep. This maintenance leads to the generation of large quantities of hazardous wastes including heavy metals, solvents, corrosives, paints, fuel, and oils (Brady 1992; Kazmarek et al. 2005). When these hazardous wastes are improperly stored/disposed of, it can cause serious water contamination and habitat degradation issues, which can directly affect biodiversity (Edwards 2002; Osuji and Nwoye 2007). There have even been documented reports of military sites that dump hazardous wastes into open holding ponds, evaporation ponds, mines, and wells (Brady 1992; see Military Contamination for more detail). The Otis Air Base in the United States has received significant attention over the past few decades due to the extensive contamination of groundwater caused from fuel spills and aircraft maintenance (Kazmarek et al. 2005; Goldsmith 2010). Similarly, the Norton Air Force Base in the US is under scrutiny for its poor approach of storing hazardous wastes in above and below ground storage drums, which have begun to leak, causing environmental contamination issues (Brady 1992). However, poor environmental planning at military bases appears to be a common theme. The US Environmental Protection Agency has listed over 53 military bases on the National Priorities List of sites that pose direct hazards to human health and the environment (Brady 1992; Kazmarek et al. 2005; Goldsmith 2010). Unfortunately, the majority of literature on the environmental impacts associated with the upkeep of military infrastructure and equipment is focused mainly on the USA with, comparatively, little known about such issues in other jurisdictions.

Training Activities:

Live-fire training has similar impacts on the environment as those discussed in the active armed conflict section, with respect to local landscape alteration and vegetation destruction, chemical and heavy metal contamination, and the incidental killing or maiming of wildlife. However, there are also differences in environmental impacts of live-fire training that occur in training facilities as opposed to actual armed conflict events (Owens 1990; Goldsmith 2010). Training facilities are faced with the challenge of repeated use of live-fire training shooting ranges, which leads to consistent site-specific degradation and contamination. The most common and extensive life-fire training occurs on small arms ranges (Goldsmith 2010), which are associated with extensive heavy metal contamination, with lead being the most notable contaminant (Cao et al. 2003a; 2003b; Goldsmith 2010). The weathering and oxidation of lead bullets leads to the contamination of soils, groundwater and surface water sources. It has been noted that high lead concentration in soils can reduce vegetation growth and species richness (Cao et al. 2003a; 2003b; Hardison et al. 2004; Goldsmith 2010).

Other forms of live-fire training involve the use of advanced high-power weaponry including, but not limited to, artillery and mortars, multiple-launch rocket systems, hand grenades, and anti-tank weapons (Rideout and Walsh 1990; Doxford and Judd 2002; Pekins

2006). These high-powered weapons require special training areas to safely contain the blast radius and noise from civilian areas. This type of weapon training can create significant habitat damage by cratering the terrain and altering the species composition within the area. Specifically, these highly disturbed landscapes can suffer from degraded soil structure and quality, and are reduced to disturbance-tolerant flora and fauna species (Fehmi et al. 2001; Smith et al. 2002; Pekins 2006; Warren et al. 2007). Chemical contamination is also prevalent in these training areas in the form of heavy metals, radiation (see Nuclear Warfare), and unused propellants, all of which can directly impact community composition (Doxford and Judd 2002; Edwards 2002; Garten et al. 2003). However, for most of these high-powered weapons, ‘dummy’ rounds (rounds containing less explosives and/or propellants) have been developed to lessen the environmental impacts (Doxford and Judd 2002; Goldsmith 2010).

Armoured vehicles are considered all tracked and wheeled military vehicles used for combat and transport (Johnson 1982) and are essential in most conflict situations due to their long range firing capacity, protective armour, and all terrain maneuverability (Doxford and Judd 2002). These vehicles are generally outfitted with heavy armour and weaponry, making them extremely heavy, with some vehicles weighing upwards of 60 metric tons. Due to the heavy weight of these vehicles, terrain compaction is a significant issue which can have detrimental impacts on the soil and vegetation communities (Lathrop 1983; Foster et al. 2006; Dickson et al. 2008). Armoured manoeuvre training is seen as being particularly damaging and persistent (Doxford and Judd 2002), especially in fragile environments such as the Mojave Desert (Johnson 1982). The conditions for when armoured manoeuvre training occurs can also influence the severity of the impact on the landscape; operations during wet spring conditions can cause enlarged track ruts and higher rates of vegetation removal (Johnson 1983; Watts 1998; Dickson et al. 2008). In frequently used landscapes, tracked vehicles have been noted to reduce total plant and woody vegetation cover, and increase soil erosion rates (Johnson 1982; Wilson 1988). Armoured manoeuvre training can also lead to changes in soil structure and chemistry with frequently used sites having lower carbon to nitrogen ratios, as well as reduced soil carbon content (Garten et al. 2003). Certain training exercises in wooded areas can be particularly degrading on vegetation communities, as tracked vehicles can often be used as bulldozers to clear paths and sight lines (Rideout and Walsh 1990). Armoured vehicle operations have also been linked to incidentally hitting and killing wildlife during training exercises (Zakrajsek and Bissonette 2005; Telesco and Van Manen 2006).

Aside from terrestrial armoured vehicle training, military training areas are intensively used for fighter jet and helicopter training exercises (Black et al. 1984; Harrington and Veitch 1991; Conomy et al. 1998). The largest environmental impact associated with aviation exercises is hitting and killing birds during flight manoeuvres (Richardson and West 2000; Civil Aviation Authority 2001; Zakrajsek and Bissonette 2005). Bird-aircraft collisions are particularly serious as they can often cause a loss of human life and damage/destruction to aircraft. From 1985-1998, the United States Air Force (USAF) recorded an average of 2,700 aviation related bird strikes each year, accumulating in excess of 35,000 bird-aircraft collisions over the 13 year period; an average cost of $35 million US dollars annually in aircraft repair and replacement to the USAF (Zakrajsek and Bissonette 2005). The most vulnerable bird species to aircraft collisions noted by the USAF included raptors, waterfowl, and passerines (Lovell and Dolbeer 1999; Zakrajsek and Bissonette 2005). For all bird-aircraft collisions, it has been estimated that roughly 69% take place below 305 m of altitude, which makes birds especially vulnerable to low flight training exercises (Lovell and Dolbeer 1999; Civil Aviation Authority 2001; Zakrajsek and Bissonette 2005; Dukiya and Gahlot 2013). Due to the high risk of bird-aircraft collisions, special measures have been taken at airstrips to reduce bird strike hazards. These precautionary measures include reducing attractive installations near airfields (e.g. landfills or new water environments), altering flight training routes, and using falconry to deter birds from the airfield vicinity (Cleary and Dolbeer 1999; Lovell and Dolbeer 1999; Civil Aviation Authority 2001).

Naval military training exercises can have negative impacts on marine life. Unlike the issues associated with over-pressure injuries from explosive detonations and live-fire operations (see Nuclear Warfare, and Active Armed Conflict sections for further explanation), the main impacts of naval training exercises are caused from the generation of excessive noise pollution (Dolman et al. 2009). Noise pollution can be generated from a variety of sources including, but not limited to, mechanical and propeller noise, gun discharges, explosives detonations, and the use of sonar technologies (Parsons et al. 2000; Scott 2007; Dolman et al. 2009). The latter source has received a lot of research attention and has been noted to negatively impact large marine mammals in various ways (reviewed in Parsons et al. 2008). Active sonar systems range from low-frequency levels, 1 Hz – 1 kHz, to mid-frequency levels, 1 – 10 kHz (Dolman et al. 2009). When operational, both low- and mid-frequency systems emit high-intensity sound into the ocean and listen for echoes that provide a sonic image of the ocean environment (Dolman et al. 2009). This type of imaging technology is highly useful for military operations but it can impact the behaviour and survival of large marine mammals (Balcomb and Claridge 2001; Madsen 2005). Marine mammals rely on echolocation for most biological aspects of their lives, and the use of sonar technologies has been linked to disrupting their signaling abilities. This can interfere with foraging, reproduction, communication, and their predator detection abilities (Rendell and Gordon 1999; Miller et al. 2000; Dolman et al. 2009). The use of sonar technology has also been linked to mass stranding mortality events in cetacean species, most notably in beaked whales (reviewed in Parsons et al. 2008) however, the causal mechanism of mortality from sonar is still unknown (Dolman et al. 2009).

Dry troop training refers to dismounted infantry exercises and is widely practiced by militaries around the world. This type of training can have a wide range of environmental impacts determined by the size of the infantry and the nature of the exercise itself (Fehmi et al. 2001; Garten et al. 2003). Dismounted infantry can cause vegetation destruction, alter soil structuring, and increase soil erosion from repetitive use of designated training areas (Whitecotton et al. 2000; Warren et al. 2007). Realistic training requires infantry to dig defensive positions for combat, and tent ditches for sleep and rest, further increasing soil erosion rates (Trumbull et al. 1994; Fehmi et al. 2001). Dismounted infantry exercises can also negatively affect wildlife distribution in active training areas where infantry presence can act to deter large mammal species including black bears (*Ursus americanus*), mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*), and coyotes (*Canis latrans*) (Stephenson et al. 1996; Telesco and Van Manen 2006). Although wildlife avoidance of such activities reduces likelihood of direct mortality, the disturbance and displacement can have sublethal consequences.

Military Contamination

Military conflict is associated with the testing, production, transportation, and deployment of weapons. At each of these stages, there exists the potential for environmental contamination (Dudley et al 2002; Machlis and Hanson 2008). In a warfare context, chemicals can be manufactured for use in weapons to cause direct human mortality and/or to alter landscapes to gain strategic tactical advantages that can expose the surrounding ecosystems to potentially toxic compounds (Stellman et al. 2003; Ganesan et al. 2010; Westing 2013a). Military activities also have the potential to indirectly contaminate the environment through various by-products and spills associated with warfare as in the case of fuels and compounds used in maintaining vehicle operation (Dudley et al 2002; Brady 1992; Machlis and Hanson 2008). Chemicals (in the broader sense), such as hydrocarbons and metals, can have immediate destructive and toxic effects that may also persist for long periods of time in soil, water, and the tissues of animals, all posing legacy issues. This section will aim to review how military actions contribute to harmful chemical contamination at the different stages of warfare and their subsequent effect on ecosystems with a particular focus on wildlife.

Pre-War Contamination:

Military chemical production and testing facilities require massive attention due to hazardous waste accidents, spills, and dumping as the production of chemicals can be highly volatile. These chemicals are required for the day-to-day operation of the military, as well as in weapons development. In the United States, military training facilities and bases are responsible for localized contamination from the dumping of chemicals directly into the environment causing regional waterbodies, including drinking water sources, in the area to become toxic (Brady 1992;

Miller et al. 1998). Contaminated reservoirs on US army bases have caused the deaths of thousands of waterfowl from drinking water on site (Lanier-Graham 1993). Similar pollution conditions are present in Russia where dioxin pesticides have been disposed of improperly resulting in soil and water contamination, thereby affecting the surrounding vegetation negatively (Sidel 2000). Additionally, weapons testing, such as those done in Puerto Rico, Bikini Atoll, and the United States, can result in significant soil, groundwater, and marine contamination of chemicals and metals which may include mercury, iron, and plutonium. This could have deleterious consequences to local vegetation and marine organisms in these regions resulting in food chain disturbances (Donaldson 1997; Ortiz-Roque and Lopez-Rivera 2004; Porter 2005; Machlis and Hanson 2008). All of these pre-war activities can lead to soil, water, and vegetation contamination and have negative impacts on the wildlife that interacts with these contaminated areas.

Active Combat Contamination:

Chemical warfare agents (CWAs) are weapons employed by the military to cause direct human mortality (Ganesan et al. 2010). Many of the products developed as chemical warfare agents have highly toxic and damaging properties intended for human targets, but may have negative impacts on other species as well. These chemicals can fall under five main categories of weapon effects: blistering agents that cause burning and blistering, nerve agents that target neuron impulses, choking agents that affect the respiratory tract, blood agents that interrupt oxygen absorption, and riot agents that cause immediate, short-term incapacitation (Ganesan et al 2010). Most chemical agents that can harm humans are toxic to other vertebrates and can injure or kill some aquatic organisms at high concentrations. Often, these chemicals persist in plant tissue resulting in developmental issues and can be potentially toxic to herbivores upon consumption (Coppock 2009; Ganesan et al. 2010). Bullets and related debris (e.g. shell casings) are often composed of materials that can be harmful to the ecosystem they are fired in. Lead, one of the more commonly used metals in bullets and casings, has toxic properties that are highly detrimental to a number of organ systems in vertebrates including the nervous system (Burger and Gochfeld 2000; Papanikolaou et al. 2005). Leftover shells or fragments after combat can result in accidental ingestion by many bird species who consume small particles inadvertently, or as grit to aid in their digestion (Fisher et al. 2006). Depleted uranium shells/casings are also used by some factions and can cause localized soil and sediment contamination (Haavisto et al. 2001; Papastefanou 2002; Briner 2010). Uranium toxicity is of concern to exposed terrestrial and freshwater plants, freshwater invertebrates and vertebrates, and mammals (Sheppard et al. 2005). In mammals, uranium toxicity can be highly detrimental to development, brain chemistry, behaviour and kidney function (Briner 2010).

Not all chemical warfare agents used are directly targeted at humans. Herbicides have also been used, during combat operations, to alter landscapes and reduce foliage to enhance visibility (Westing 1980; Stellman et al. 2003). Agent Orange, used during the Vietnam War (1961-1971), was one of several types of dioxin-based herbicides sprayed by United States forces to destroy crops and obstructing vegetation (Orians and Pfeiffer 1970; Westing 1980; Westing 1984; Stellman et al. 2003). During this war, the landscapes in Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos were exposed to over 77 million litres of herbicides covering some 2600 million hectares of land (Nguyen 2009). Over the past three to four decades, various studies have attempted to evaluate environmental damage caused by these events and to assess their long term effects. In doing so, it was apparent that the defoliation of the landscape resulted in immediate tree and shrub mortality in addition to the local extirpation of many large mammals such as ungulates, carnivores and elephants (Westing 1980; Oriands and Pfeiffer 1970; Westing 1985).

The application of large quantities of concentrated herbicides can alter the local community structure as well. In Vietnam, forested and mangrove dominated habitats have become scrubby grasslands, greatly changing the community assemblages (Dinh 1984; Westing 1989; Nguyen 2009). Surveys comparing un-impacted habitat with that inflicted with herbicide found notably less species diversity (Westing 1989). However, one of the major limiting factors in assessing and quantifying ecosystem changes is the lack of data in the region's baseline ecological conditions (e.g. before war). In attempting to evaluate how biodiversity was affected, researchers have made broad assumptions based off of limited observations and local indigenous knowledge. Orians and Pfeiffer (1970) used these methods and suggested that regions of Vietnam experienced a decline in bird species richness post conflict, specifically in those consuming insects and fruit.

An additional long term problem associated with herbicide exposure is bioaccumulation and the persistence of these chemicals in the environment. After the Vietnam War, high concentrations of dioxins were found in the ovaries and livers of turtles (Schecter et al. 1989). This effect was also demonstrated in tissues isolated from local pigs and chickens, likely resulting from a combination of residual Agent Orange and other herbicidal exposure over the past few decades (Schecter et al. 2006). More recently, the dioxin contamination still present in the soils near the Bien Hoa Airbase (a "hotspot") was discovered to fall within a high risk category in terms of Canadian Environmental Quality Guidelines (Mai et al. 2007). The probable effect level was 46x higher than the standard value for soil, even 30 years after the initial chemical deployment illustrating a capacity of these chemicals to have chronic impacts on the ecosystem.

Military activity is a highly mobile system occurring at multiple spatial scales (e.g. nationally and internationally) that requires vast fuel and hydrocarbon resources that may increase the possibility of oil and gas contamination. The Gulf War oil spill of 1991 resulted in over 10 million m^3 of oil and heavy metals intentionally dumped into the ocean (Box 4; Westing 2003) resulting in elevated bird mortalities and damage to important avian, mammalian and reptilian migratory feeding habitats (Evans et al. 1993; Westing 2013b). Studies on benthic invertebrates such as snails and clams immediately after the spill were found to have significantly higher levels of Zn, Cu, and Ni in their tissues (Bu-Olayan and Subrahmanyam 1997). A decade after the spill, studies on the tissues of crabs showed high levels of Zn and Cu, along with detectable levels of other heavy metals, demonstrating the persistence of these compounds in the ecosystem (Al-Mohanna and Subrahmanyam 2001).

Post-War Environmental Impacts Associated with Disposal:

The long term effects of chemicals results from both their potential persistence and the poor disposal programs of nations with stockpiled weapons. After WWII, CWAs such as mustard gases, and arsenic poisons were packaged in barrels and directly disposed of in the ocean (Chepesiuk 1997; Smith 2011); a common practice across the globe at the time. Disposal of these vessels in the ocean runs the risk of the metal-based containers corroding and leaching the chemical contents of the vessel into the ocean; an effect which could lead to a localized exposure to the chemical as well as more widespread impacts via trophic movements (Long 2009). Sanderson et. al. (2010) modelled propagation of chemical warfare agents in the Baltic Sea through the food chain in cod (*Gadus morhua*), herring (*Clupea harengus*), and sprat (*Sprattus sprattus*). Adamsite, a component found in chemical weapons, was found to be consistently present in the tissues of Atlantic cod demonstrating bioamplification and accumulation of these substances in higher trophic levels. However, that study did not take into account the number of buried munitions and containers on the seafloor that could reintroduce high levels of chemicals to the surrounding area as the containers holding them degrade and corrode. Regardless, this represents a pathway by which contaminants may be spread throughout the various components of the ecosystem. Similarly, wreckages from naval ships pose certain risks for the marine ecosystem in which they are found. Oil contamination in the Atlantic Ocean due to World War II shipwrecks alone is estimated at over 15 million tonnes (Monfils 2005). Much of the oil still resides within these wrecks and will pose future problems as the vessels begin to degrade (Westing 1980; Monfils 2005). In much the same manner, during the conflict in Kosovo, shelling of civilian infrastructure, namely manufacturing plants, resulted in a significant but unintentional emission of industrial contaminants into the environment (Haavisto et al. 1999). Attention and care needs to be present during all stages of warfare, as contamination events are common throughout training and active war with their effects persisting well after the conflict has been resolved. Stringent policies are recognized as necessary to hold militaries accountable for cleanup before training facilities can be returned to the public. Indeed, many

Western nations have adopted policies that require strict environmental management and concern on home soil (Durrant 2007; Ramos et al. 2007). However, it should be noted that during war outside of their respective countries, these policies are not necessarily followed.

The Up-Shot: Technology

One undeniable benefit that environmental and conservation science has reaped from military research and development is the ability to utilize and refine resulting technological advances. Military research and development teams share a common interest with ecological and environmental researchers in needing to collect meaningful information more efficiently. An exhaustive list of military developments used in everyday applications would include everything from computing systems and the internet to nylon material that makes field equipment durable and light-weight (Alic et al. 1992). However, there are a few notable technologies that have been crucial to shaping modern ecological research. Satellites emerged over the course of the Cold-War tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union (Alic et al. 1992; Slotten 2002) and were followed closely by the creation of Global Positioning Systems (GPS) which allows for high precision and accurate navigation (Parkinson 1996). Today, satellite imagery has paved the way for the development of GIS spatial analyses, the backbone of evaluating large scale spatial patterns and trends (Goodchild 2000). GIS permits investigators to relate spatially organized data to other variables such as weather, animal abundance, or natural resource quantities. Remote sensing technologies have military roots as well, and involve either passive or active gathering of energy to help locate and identify objects (Turner et al. 2003). Electromagnetic energy, detected by satellites, is commonly used to accomplish tasks such as assessing wildlife spatial distribution and calculating species diversity (Turner et al. 2003). Similarly, RADAR technology actively uses radio-waves to locate objects and obstructions with system advances being developed between the British and American forces during the 1940s (Science News Letter 1945). Currently, RADAR is one of the best methods for monitoring migratory bird species (Gauthreaux and Belsier 2003). Remote Operated Vehicles (ROVs) including aerial drones, marine vehicles, and terrestrial vehicles were originally developed by military organizations for training operations, bomb recovery, and hostile terrain observations (Springer 2013). Now, aerial ROVs are used in conservation to film and survey overhead parks, to monitor wildlife and to look for illegal activity such as poaching and unauthorized logging (Sutherland et al. 2013; Schiffman 2014). Marine ROVs have been employed to monitor marine life as well as being used as a potential tool in gaining valuable insight into the system in question (Cohen 1995; Jones 2009; Moura et al. 2013; Van Dover et al. 2014). Integration of autonomous technology has huge advantages in ecological studies that are often limited by man-power and overwhelmed by spatial scales; ROVs can efficiently extend work periods and area covered without human intervention. Lastly, advances in telemetry technology by the military have greatly improved conservation research through the miniaturization of tag components (e.g. batteries, transmitters, etc.) for use in a wide number of biotelemetry projects which are useful in animal tracking and monitoring (Cooke 2008; Benson 2010). Not only has this greatly improved the performance, operation and capabilities of many of these devices (Cooke 2008) but it has permitted them to be deployed on a greater number of species/weight classes as the mass of the tag has often been a limiting factor in determining the lower size limit of their use (Olival and Higuchi 2006; Bridge et al. 2011; Cooke et al. 2013).

Research Gaps

War is a perilous activity that makes for a poor research environment. Conflict zones, restricted access military bases and warfare-induced hazardous material zones are often out of reach of researchers attempting to assess war's impact on ecological functioning resulting in a significant knowledge gap for current and post-conflict field sites. Additionally, because of the stochastic nature of war (e.g. unknown when/where conflict and battles will occur), the battlefield sites may not have pre-conflict information available thereby complicating before-after impact analysis. To the extent possible, conducting research of military activities in a before-after-control-impact framework would help to elucidate the environmental consequences and thus reveal opportunities for mitigating negative effects while informing the development of optimal strategies for rehabilitation and recovery. There also exists an apparent taxonomic bias in the literature presented here whereby mammals, fish, and plants are often the studied components of the impacted system presumably as a result of some perceived importance and/or ease of access. Given that war is unlikely to be eliminated from society, the literature should further expand to include other taxonomic representations and/or focus on species that are vital to ecological functioning (e.g. keystone species, ecosystem engineers, etc.) in warfare impact assessment. This could allow for the potential to expand our knowledge base significantly while providing a potentially more streamlined approach that may be able to infer how overall ecosystem functioning may be impaired/impacted under "conflict stress". It may be of relevance and use to develop a mesocosm model system whereby the various impacts of warfare could be modelled in a controlled environment to aid in developing an impact model at the whole ecosystem level under a variety of climatic and environmental scenarios.

Conclusions

Given the information presented here, it is quite evident that warfare's impacts on ecosystem functioning are indeed overwhelmingly deleterious. The impacts of conflict, nuclear weapons, training operations and chemical contaminations all contribute to both reductions in the populations of local flora and fauna as well as reducing species diversity in the affected ecosystems. Impacts were demonstrated in a number of environments with a diversity of taxonomic groups represented with war resulting in both acute and chronic impacts on the ecosystem. A general overview of the impacts induced by the various aspects of war can be found in Fig.1. In some instances, warfare is a positive force in ecosystem functioning whereby unintentional human exclusion provides refugia for a variety of species and, in some cases, provides suitable habitat for endangered/threatened species. Some of these beneficial impacts are illustrated in the Boxes 1-4. Additionally, research into developing military technology has benefitted ecosystem functioning, indirectly, through providing a wide diversity of technological tools and devices that are employed by many researchers involved with conservation and ecological sciences. However, because of the inherent dangers of warfare and its seemingly stochastic nature, research and assessments of military activities' impacts on the environment are difficult to conduct and as such, the literature is limited in its scope. Moreover, new technologies and militarily-unique substances continue to be developed and deployed such that the threats are dynamic. With humanity continually engaging in war, the biosphere is likely to continue to suffer. As such, this area of research should be continually pursued to attempt to better understand war's impact on ecosystem structure and assist with developing potential mitigation strategies to minimize negative consequences and implementing effective rehabilitation and restoration approaches.

There seems to be little evidence that military strategists consider environmental consequences of military activities when planning or executing military actions related to conflict. We submit that there is much scope for proactive efforts to consider the environment and biodiversity in formulating military plans. Yet, we also recognize that at the end of the day, battlefield supremacy and achieving military objectives will likely continue to trump any and all concerns related to the environment during active conflict (Westing 1986). The situation is somewhat different for training facilities or other military installations during the preparatory and readiness phases, at least in developed countries, where there is legal obligation to address environmental concerns (e.g., contamination, endangered species; see Durant 2007). Unfortunately, most warfare occurs in developing countries that tend to have unstable governance structures where there is limited capacity for developing environmental policy or addressing environmental issues that arise following conflict (Westing 1986). The policy implications of warfare are beyond the scope of this article, but nonetheless, we wish to emphasize greater need for global consideration of the environmental consequences of warfare with efforts to develop policy instruments and agreements that consider the environment (sensu Gasser 1995; Mrema et al. 2009) in that same way that attempts are made to consider aspects of human welfare (e.g., war crimes tribunals, Geneva convention; see Drumbl 1998). The findings of the synthesis presented here are clear – the consequences of modern warfare are overwhelmingly negative for the environment and biodiversity. Indeed, although not quantified, it is not unreasonable to think that modern warfare is one of the major forces associated with environmental issues and biodiversity declines in some regions.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Jacqueline Chapman and Vivian Nguyen for their insight into military environmental policies and procedures that helped shape this paper. SJ Cooke is supported by NSERC and the Canada Research Chairs program. We thank Sofia M.R. Jain-Schlaepfer, James Monaghan, Tanya Prystay, Arthur H. Westing and an anonymous reviewer for kindly commenting on drafts of this manuscript.

Contributions

All authors contributed equally to the design, research, writing and editing of this work.

References

Aarkrog, A. 1988. The radiological impact of the Chernobyl debris compared with that from nuclear weapons fallout. J. Environ. Radioactiv. **6**:151-162.

Alic, J.A., Branscomb, L.M., Brooks, H., Carter, A.B., and Epstein, G.L. 1992. Beyond spinoff: military and commercial technologies in a changing world. Harvard Business Press, Waterdown, M.A., USA.

Al-Mohanna, S.Y., and Subrahmanyam, M.N.V. 2001. Flux of heavy metal accumulation in various organs of the intertidal marine blue crab, *Portunus pelagicus* (L.) from the Kuwait coast after the Gulf War. Environ. Int. **27**(4):321-326.

Alpen, E.L., and Sheline, G.E. 1954. The combined effects of thermal burns and whole body X-irradiation ion survival time and mortality. Ann. Surg. **140**(1):113-118.

Ampleman, G., Baucher, D., Thiboutot, S., Hawari, J., and Monteil-Rivera, F. 2004. Evaluation of underwater contamination by explosives and metals at Point Amour Labrador and in the Halifax Harbour area. Available from Defence Research and Development Canada, Valcartier, Q.C., CA. No. DRDC-V-TR-2004-125

Apte, S., Holland, B.S., Godwin, L.S., and Gardner, J.P. 2000. Jumping ship: a stepping stone event mediating transfer of a non-indigenous species via a potentially unsuitable environment. Biol. Invasions **2**:75-79.

Augenbroe, G.L.M., and Pearce, A.R. 1998. Sustainable construction in the USA; a perspective to the year 2010. Available from the Sustainable Development and the Future of Construction. Vol. report 225.

Balcomb, K.C., and Claridge, D.E. 2001. A mass stranding of cetaceans caused by naval sonar in the Bahamas. Bahamas J. Sci. **8**:1–12.

Barnthouse, L.W. 1995. Effects of ionizing radiation on terrestrial plants and animals: a workshop report. Available from Oak Ridge National Lab, T.N., USA. ORNL/TM-13141

Barrett, M.J. 2011. Potentially polluting shipwrecks. Doctoral dissertation, School of the Environment, Duke University, Durham, N.C., USA.

Bass, A.J., D'Aubrey, J.D., and Kistnasamy, N. 1973. Sharks of the east coast of southern Africa. The genus *Carcharhinus* (*Carcharhinidae*). Available from Invest. Rep. Oceanogr. Res. Inst., Durban, SA. pp.1-168.

Baxter, H., Drummond, J.A., Stephens-Newsham, L.G., and Randall, R.G. 1953. Reduction of mortality in swine from combined total body radiation and thermal burns by streptomycin. Ann. Surg. **137**(4):450-455.

Baxter, L., Hays, E.E., Hampson, G.R., and Backus, R.H. 1982. Mortality of fish subjected to explosive shock as applied to oil well severance on Georges Bank. Available from the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, M.A., USA. Technical Report WHOI-82-54

Beare, D., Hölker, F., Engelhard, G.H., McKenzie, E., and Reid, D.G. 2010. An unintended experiment in fisheries science: a marine area protected by war results in Mexican waves in fish numbers-at-age. Naturwissenschaften **97**:797-808.

Beasley, G., and Kneale, P. 2002. Reviewing the impacts of metals and PAHs on macroinvertebrates in urban watercourses. Prog. Phys. Geogr. **26**(2):236-270.

Beatley, J.C. 1966. Winter annual vegetation following a nuclear detonation in the Northern Mojave Desert (Nevada Test Site). Radiat. Bot. **6**:69-82.

Bednarek, A.T. 2001. Undamming rivers: a review of the ecological impacts of dam removal. Environ. Manage. **27**:803-814.

Bender, A. 1977. Noise impact on wildlife: an environmental impact assessment. *In* Proceedings of the 9th Conference of Space Simulation, NASA (P-2000,7), Los Angeles, C.A., USA, 26-28 April 1977. pp. 155-165.

Benson, E. 2010. Wired wilderness: technologies of tracking and the making of modern wildlife. John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, M.D., USA.

Berhe, A.A. 2007. The contribution of landmines to land degradation. Land Degrad. Dev. **18**:1-15.

Bickham, J.W., Hanks, B.G., Smolen, M.J., Lamb, T., and Gibbons, J.W. 1988. Flow cytometric analysis of the effects of low-level radiation exposure on natural populations of slider turtles (*Pseudemys scripta*). Arch. Environ. Contam. Toxicol. **17**(6):837-841.

Bizzozero Jr, O.J., Johnson, K.G., Ciocco, C., Hoshino, T., Itoga, T., Toyoda, S., and Kawasaki, S. 1966. Radiation-related leukemia in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, 1946–1964: distribution, incidence and appearance time. New Engl. J. Med. **274**(20):1095-1101.

Black, B.B., Collopy, M.W., Percival, H.F., Tiller, A.A., and Bohall, P.G. 1984. Effects of low level military training flights on wading bird colonies in Florida. Available from the Florida Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, University of Florida, Gainesville, F.L., USA. Technical Report No. 7.

Brady, M.T. 1992. Environmental review of military base closures: implications for affected governments. Duke Environ. Policy Forum **2**(1):1-15.

Bridge, E.S., Thorup, K., Bowlin, M.S., Chilson, P.B., Diehl, R.H., Fléron, R.W., Hartl, P., Kelly, J.F., Robinson, D., and Wikelski, M. 2011. Technology on the move: recent and forthcoming innovations for tracking migratory birds. BioScience **61**(9):689-698.

Briner, W. 2010. The toxicity of depleted uranium. Int. J. Environ. Res. Publ. Health **7**(1):303-313.

Brode, H.L. 1968. Review of nuclear weapons effects. Annu. Rev. Nucl. Sci. **18**(1):153-202.

Brooks, J.W., Evans, E.I., Ham, W.T., and Reid, J.D. 1952. The influence of external body radiation on mortality from thermal burns. Ann. Surg. **136**:533-545.

Brown, D.G., Thomas, R.E., Jones, L.P., Cross, F.H., and Sasmore, D.P. 1961. Lethal dose studies with cattle exposed to whole-body Co-60 gamma radiation. Radiat. Res. **15**(5):675-683.

Bu-Olayan, A.H., and Subrahmanyam, M.N.V. 1997. Accumulation of copper, nickel, lead and zinc by snail, *Lunella coronatus* and pearl oyster, *Pinctada radiata* from the Kuwait coast before and after the gulf war oil spill. Sci. Total Environ. **197**(1):161-165.

Burger, J., and Gochfeld, M. 2000. Effects of lead on birds (*Laridae*): a review of laboratory and field studies. J. Toxicol. Environ. Health B **3**(2):59-78.

Byrnes, V.A., Brwon, D., Rose H.W., and Cibis, P.A. 1955. Chorio-retinal burns produced by atomic flashes. A.M.A. Arch. Ophthal. **53**(3):351-364.

Campbell, C.A., Valentine, J.W., and Ayala, F.J. 1975. High genetic variability in a population of *Tridacna maxima* from the Great Barrier Reef. Mar. Biol. **33**(4): 341-345.

Candole, C.A. 1967. Blast injury. Canad. Med. Ass. J. **96**:207-214.

Cao, X., Ma, L.Q., Chen, M., Hardison Jr, D.W., and Harris, W.G. 2003a. Weathering of lead bullets and their environmental effects at outdoor shooting ranges. J. Environ. Qual. Q**32**(2):526-534.

Cao, X., Ma, L.Q., Chen, M., Hardison Jr, D.W., and Harris, W.Q. 2003b. Lead transformation and distribution in the soils of shooting ranges in Florida, USA. Sci Total Environ. **307**(1-3):179-189.

Certini, G., Scalenghe, R., Woods, W.I. 2013. The impact of warfare on the soil environment. Earth Sci. Rev. **127**:1-15.

Chadwick, D. 1992. The fate of the elephant. Available from the Sierra Club, Washington, D.C., USA.

Chandler, C.C., Storey, T.G., and Tangren, C.D. 1963. Prediction of forest fire spread following a nuclear explosion. Available from U.S. Forest Service Pacific Southwest Forest and Range Experiment Station, Albany, C.A., USA. Research Paper PSW-5.

Chepesuik, R. 1997. A Sea of Trouble? B. Atom. Sci. **53**(5):40-44.

Civil Aviation Authority. 2001. Large flocking birds: an international conflict between conservation and air safety [Online]. Available from http://www.caa.co.uk/docs/224/srg_dps_flockingbirds.pdf [Accessed April 15 2015].

Clark, B., and Jorgenson, A.K. 2012. The treadmill of destruction and the environmental impacts of Militaries. Sociol. Compass **6**:557-569.

Cleary, E.C., and Dolbeer, R.A. 1999. Wildlife hazard management at airports. Available from the Federal Aviation Administration, Office of Airport Safety and Standards, Washington D.C., USA.

Clodfelter, M. 2006. The limits of air power: the American bombing of North Vietnam. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, N.E., USA.

Coates, P. 2013. From hazard to habitat (or hazardous habitat): the lively and lethal afterlife of Rocky Flats, Colorado. Prog. Phys. Geogr. **XX**(X):1–15.

Cohen, A.S. 1995. Paleoecological approaches to the conservation biology of benthos in ancient lakes: a case study from Lake Tanganyika. J. N. Am. Benthol. Soc. **14**(4):654-668.

Conomy, J.T., Collazo, J.A., Dubovsky, J.A., and Fleming, W.J. 1998. Dabbling duck behavior and aircraft activity in coastal North Carolina. J. Wildlife Manage. **62**(3):1127-1134.

Cooke, S.J. 2008. Biotelemetry and biologging in endangered species research and animal conservation: relevance to regional, national, and IUCN Red List threat assessments. Endanger. Species Res. 4:165-185.

Cooke, S.J., Midwood, J.D., Thiem, J.D., Klimley, P., Lucas, M.C., Thorstad, E.B., Eiler, J., Holbrook, C., and Ebner, B.C. 2013. Tracking animals in freshwater with electronic tags: past, present and future. Anim. Biotelem. **1**(5):1-19.

Coppock, R.W. 2009. Threats to wildlife by chemical warfare agents. *In* Handbook of Toxicology of Chemical Warfare Agents. *Edited by* R.C. Gupta. Academic Press, Waltham, M.E., USA. pp. 747-751.

Craft, T.F. 1964. Effects of nuclear explosions on watersheds. J. Am. Water Works Assoc. **56**(7):846-852.

Darby, S.C., Kendall, G.M., Fell, T.P., O'Hagan, J.A., Muirhead, C.R., Ennis, J.R., Ball, A.M., Dennis, J.A., and Doll, R. 1988. A summary of mortality and incidence of cancer in men from the United Kingdom who participated in the United Kingdom's atmospheric nuclear weapon tests and experimental programmes. Brit. Med. J. **296**(6618):332-338.

Davis, J.S. 2007. Scales of Eden: conservation and pristine devastation on Bikini Atoll. Enivron. Plan. D **25**(2):213-235.

Demarais, S., Tazik, D. J., Guertin, P. J., and Jorgensen, E. E. 1999. Disturbance associated with military exercises. *In* Ecosystems of Disturbed Ground. *Edited by* L.R. Walker. Elsevier Science B.V., Amsterdam, NL. pp. 385-396.

Dickson, T.L., Wilsey, B.J., Busby, R.R., and Gebhart, D.L. 2008. Grassland plant composition alters vehicular disturbance effects in Kansas, USA. Environ. Manage. **41**:676-684.

Dinh, H. 1984. Long-term changes in dense inland forest following herbicidal attack. *In* Herbicides in war: the long term ecological and human consequences. *Edited by* A.H. Westing. Taylor & Francis, London, UK. pp. 31-32.

Dolman, S.J., Weir, C.R., and Jasny, M. 2009. Comparative review of marine mammal guidance implemented during naval exercises. Mar. Pollut. Bull. **58**:465-477.

Donaldson, L.R., Seymour, A.H., and Nevissi, A.E. 1997. University of Washington's radioecological studies in the Marshall Islands, 1946-1977. Health Phys. **73**(1):214-222.

Downing N., and Roberts C. 1993. Has the Gulf War affected coral reefs of the Northwestern Gulf? Mar. Pollut. Bull. **27**:149-156.

Doxford, D., and Judd, A. 2002. Army training: the environmental gains resulting from the adoption of alternatives to traditional training methods. J. Environ. Plann. Man. **45**(2):245-265.

Draulans, D., Van Krunkelsven, E. 2002. The impact of wars on the Democratic Republic of Congo. Oryx **36**:35–40.

Drumbl, M.A. 1998. Waging war against the world: the need to move from war crimes to environmental crimes. Fordham Int'l L. J. **22**:122-153.

Dubey, A., and Shreni, P.D. 2008. War and environment: an overview. J. Environ. Res. Dev. **4**:968-976.

Dudley, J.P., Ginsberg, J.R., Plumptre, A.J., Hart, J.A., and Campos, L.C. 2002. Effects of war and civil strife on wildlife and habitats. Cons. Biol. **16**(2): 319-329.

Dufour, P.A. 1980. Effects of noise on wildlife and other animals: review of research since 1971. Available from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. EPA 550/9-80-100:1-97.

Dukiya, J.J., and Gahlot, V. 2013. An evaluation of the effect of bird strikes on flight safety operations at international airports. Int. J. Traffic Transport Eng. **3**(1):16-33.

Dunnet, G.M. 1977. Observations on the effects of low-flying aircraft at seabird colonies on the coast of Aberdeenshire, Scotland. Biol. Conserv. **12**:55-63.

DuPont Guerry III, W.T., Ham, W.T., Wiesinger, H., Schmidt, F.H., Williams, R.C., Ruffin, R.S., and Shaffer, M.C. 1956. Experimental production of flash burns in the rabbit retina. T. Am. Opthalmol. Soc. **54**:259-273.

Durant, R.F. 2007. The greening of the US military: environmental policy, national security, and organizational change. *Edited by* B.A. Radin. Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C., USA.

Edwards, C.A. 2002. Assessing the effects of environmental pollutants on soil organisms, communities, processes and ecosystems. Euro. J. Soil Biol. **38**(3-4):225-231.

Eisenbud, M., and Gesell, T.F. 1997. Nuclear weapons. *In* Environmental Radioactivity from Natural, Industrial & Military Sources. Academic Press, San Diego, C.A., USA, pp. 271-314.

Eldred, E., and Trowbridge, W.V. 1954. Radiation Sickness in the monkey 1. Radiology **62**(1):65-73.

Engelhard, G.H. 2008. One hundred and twenty years of change in fishing power of English North Sea trawlers. *In* Advances in fisheries science 50 years on from Beverton and Holt. *Edited by* A. Payne, J. Cotter and T. Potter. Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, UK. pp.1-15.

Entry, J.A., and Watrud, L.S. 1998. Potential remediation of ^{137}Cs and ^{90}Sr contaminated soil by accumulation in alamo switchgrass. Water Air Soil Poll. **104**(3-4):39-352.

Evans, M.I., Symens, P., and Pilcher, C.W.T. 1993. Short-term damage to coastal bird populations in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait following the 1991 Gulf War marine pollution. Mar. Pollut. Bull. **27**:157–161.

Fehmi, J.S., Farmer, T., and Zimmerman, A. 2001. Impacts of military vehicle training activities on vegetation: bibliography with abstracts. Available from the US Army Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, MI, USA. pp 1-50.

Fisher, I.J., Pain, D.J., and Thomas, V.G. 2006. A review of lead poisoning from ammunition sources in terrestrial birds. Biol. Conserv. **131**:421-432.

Fosberg, F.R. 1985. Vegetation of Bikini Atoll. Atoll Res. Bull. **315**:1-28.

Foster, J.R., Ayers, P.D., Lombardi-Przbylowicz, A.M., and Simmons, K. 2006. Initial effects of light armored vehicle use on grassland vegetation at Fort Lewis, Washington. J. Environ. Manage. **81**(4):315-322.

Francis, R.A. 2011. The impacts of modern warfare on freshwater ecosystems. Environ. Manage. **48**:985-999.

Ganesan, K., Raza, S.K., and Vijayaraghavan, R. 2010. Chemical warfare agents. J Pharm Bioallied Sci. **2**(3):166-178.

Gangwar, A. 2003. Impact of war and landmines on environment. *In* Forum Proceedings: Landmines-Challenges to Humanity and Environment. Srinigar, IN, 20 April 2003.

Garten, C.T., Ashwood, T.L., and Dale, V.H. 2003. Effect of military training on indicators of soil quality at Fort Benning, Georgia. Ecol. Indic. **3**:171-179.

Gaspin, J.B. 1975. Experimental investigations of the effects of underwater explosions on swimbladder fish. I. 1973 Chesapeake Bay tests. Available from the Naval Surface Weapons Center, White Oak Lab, Silver Spring, M.D., USA. No. NSWC/WOL/TR-75-58.

Gasser, H.P. 1995. For better protection of the natural environment in armed conflict: a proposal for action. Am. J. Int’l L. **1995:** 637-644.

Gauthreaux, S.A. Jr., and Belsier, C.G. 2003. Radar ornithology and biological conservation. The Auk **120**(2):266-277.

Gazenbeek, A. 2005. LIFE, Natura 2000 and the military. Available from the European Commission, Environment Directorate General, Brussels, BE.

Gese, E.M., Rongstad, O.J., and Mytton, W.R. 1989. Changes in coyote movements due to military activity. J. Wildlife Manage. **53**(2):334-339.

Gladwin, D.N., Asherin, D.A., and Manci, K.M. 1988. Effects of aircraft noise and sonic booms on fish and wildlife: results of a survey of U.S. fish and wildlife service endangered species and ecological services field offices, refuges, hatcheries, and research centers. Available from the US Departments of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Services. NERC-88/30

Glasstone, G. 1962. The effects of nuclear weapons (Revised Edn.). U.S. Department of Defense and Energy, Washington D.C., USA.

Glasstone, G., and Dolan, P.J. 1977. The effects of nuclear weapons (3rd Edn.). U.S. Department of Defence and Energy, Washington D.C., USA.

Glasstone, S. 1964. The effects of nuclear weapons. Available from the US Department of Defense, Washington D.C., USA. OTSI identification 972902.

Gleick, P.H. 1993. Water and conflict: fresh water resources and international security. Int. Secur. **18**:79–112.

Goertner, J.F. 1982. Prediction of underwater explosion safe ranges for sea mammals. Available from the Naval Surface Weapons Center, Silver Spring, M.D., USA, Report No. NSWC/TR-82-188.

Goldizen, V.C., Richmond, D.R., Chiffelle, T.L., Bowen, I.G., and White, C.S. 1961. Missile studies with a biological target. Available from the Office of Technical Services, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C., USA. USAEC Civil Effects Test Group Report WT-1470.

Goldsmith, G.S. 2010. Environmental impacts and military range use: an investigation and summary of what we have learned after 12 years at Massachusetts Military Reservation (MMR) and implications for the continued use of military ranges in the United States. Available from the Army Environmental Policy Institute. pp 1-36.

Gontier, M. 2007. Scale issues in the assessment of ecological impacts using a GIS-based habitat model - A case study for the Stockholm region. Environ. Impact Assess. Rev. **27**:440-459.

Goodchild, M.F. 2000. The current status of GIS and spatial analysis. J. Geogr. Syst. **2**:5-10.

Govoni J.J., West, M.A., Settle, L.R., Lynch, R.T., and Greene, M.D. 2008. Effects of underwater explosions on larval fish: implications for a coastal engineering project. J. Coast. Res. **24**(2B):228-233.

Grace, J.B., and Keeley, J.E. 2006. A structural equation model analysis of postfire plant diversity in California shrublands. Ecol. Appl. **16**(2):503-514.

Gray, R.H., and Rickard, W.H. 1989. The protected area of Hanford as a refugium for native plants and animals. Environ. Conserv. **16**(03):251-260.

Gulland, J.A. 1968. Recent changes in the North Sea plaice fishery. J. Cons. Int. Explor. Mer. **31**:305-322.

Guskova, A.K., Baranov, A.E., and Gusev, I.A. 2001. Acute radiation sickness: underlying principles and assessments. *In* Medical Management of Radiation Accidents (2nd Edn.). *Edited by* I. Gusev, A.K. Guskova and F.A. Mettler. CRC Press, Boca Raton, F.L., USA. pp 33-52.

Haavisto, P. et al. 1999. The Kosovo conflict: consequences for the environment & human settlements. Available from UN Environment Programme, Nairobi, KE.

Haavisto, P. et al. 2001. Depleted Uranium in Kosovo: Post-conflict Environmental Assessment. Available from UN Environment Programme, Nairobi, KE.

Ham, W.T., Wiesinger, H., Guerry, D., Schmidt, F.H., Williams, R.C., Ruffin, R.S., and Shaffer, M.C. 1957. Experimental production of flash burns in the rabbit retina. Am. J. Opthalmol. **43**(5):711-718.

Hanson, T., Brooks, T.M., Da Fonseca, G.A., Hoffmann, M., Lamoreux, J.F., Machlis, G., and Pilgrim, J.D. 2009. Warfare in biodiversity hotspots. Conserv. Biol. **23**:578-587.

Hardison Jr, D.W., Ma, L.Q., Luongo, T., and Harris, W.G. 2004. Lead contamination in shooting range soils from abrasion of lead bullets and subsequent weathering. Sci. Total Environ. **328**(1-3):175-183.

Harrington, F.H., and Veitch, A.M. 1991. Short-term impacts of low-level jet fighter training on caribou in Labrador. Arctic **44**(4):318-327.

Hart, T., Hart, J., Fimbel, C., Fimbel, R., Laurance, W.F., Oren, C., Struhsaker, T.T., Rosenbaum, H.C., Walsh, P.D., Razafindrakoto, Y., Vely, M., and DeSalle, P. 1997. Conservation and civil strife: two perspectives from Central Africa Conservation and civil strife. Conserv. Biol. **11**:308-314.

Hatch, F.T., Mazarimas, J.A., Greenway, G.G., Koranda, J.J., and Moore, J.L. 1968. Studies on liver DNA in tritiated kangaroo rats living at Sedan Crater. Available from California University, Lawrence Radiation Lab, Livermore, C.A., USA. Technical Report No. UCRL-50481.

Hatch, T., Mazrimas, J.A., Koranda, J.J., and Martin, J.R. 1970. Ecology and radiation exposure of kangaroo rats living in a tritiated environment. Radiat. Res. **44**(1):97-107.

Havlick, D.G. 2014. Opportunistic conservation at former military sites in the United States. Prog. Phys. Geogr. **38**(3): 71-285.

Hieb, M.R., Mackay, S., Powers, M.W., Yu, H., Kleiner, M., and Pullen, J.M. 2007. Geospatial challenges in a net centric environment: actionable information technology, design, and implementation. *In* Defense and Security Symposium (657816), International Society for Optics and Photonics. pp. 1-12.

Higuchi, H., Ozaki, K., Fujita, G., Minton, J., Ueta, M., Soma, M., and Mita, N. 1996. Satellite tracking of white-naped crane migration and the importance of the Korean demilitarized zone. Conserv. Biol. **10**:806-812.

Hinshaw, J.R. 1968. Early changes in the depth of burns. Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci. **150**(3):548-553.

Houk, P., and Musburger, C. 2013. Trophic interactions and ecological stability across coral reefs in the Marshal Islands. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. **488**:23-34.

Hunter, R. 1991. *Bromus* invasions on the Nevada Test Site: present status of *B. rubens* and *B. tectorum* with notes on their relationship to disturbance and altitude. Great Basin Nat. **51**(2):176-182.

Hunter, R.B. 1992. Status of flora and fauna on the Nevada test site, 1988. Available from the United States Department of Energy Nevada Field Office, N.V., USA. Report No. DOE/NV/10630-29.

Hupy, J.P. 2006. The long-term effects of explosive munitions on the WWI battlefield surface of Verdun, France. Scot. Geogr. Mag. **122**:167-184.

Hupy, J.P. 2008. The environmental footprint of war. Environ. Hist. 405-421.

Hynes, M.V., Peter, J.E., and Rushworth, D. 2004. Artificial Reefs: A disposal option for Navy and MARAD Ships. Available from the Rand National Defense Research Institute, Santa Monica, C.A., USA. No. Rand/DB-391-Navy

ICRC. 2008. How is the term “armed conflict” defined in international humanitarian law? Available from the International Committee of the Red Cross. Opinion paper. pp.1-5.

Isakason, J.S. 1974. Biological effects of underground nuclear testing on marine organisms. II. Observed effects of Amchitka Island, Alaska, tests on marine fauna. *In* Proceedings of the First Conference on the Environmental Effects of Explosives and Explosions (Technical Report 73-223). Naval Ordinance Laboratory, White Oak, M.D., USA. pp. 86-97.

Jaffin, J.H., McKinney, L., Kinney, R.C., Cunningham, J.A., Mortiz, D.M., Kraimer, J.M., Graeber, G.M., Moe, J.B., Salander, J.M., and Harmon, J.W. 1987. A laboratory model for studying blast overpressure injury. J. Trauma **27**(4):349-356.

Janssen, R. 1980. Future scientific activities in effects of noise on animals. *In* Proceedings of the Third International Congress on Noise as a Public Health Problem, American Speech-Language-Hearing Association Rockville, M.D., USA, 1980. *Edited by* J.V. Tobias, G. Jansen, and W.D. Ward. pp.632-637.

Johnson, F.L. 1982. Effects of tank training activities on botanical features at Fort Hood, Texas. Southwest. Nat. **27**(3):309–314.

Jones, D.O. 2009. Using existing industrial remotely operated vehicles for deep-sea science. Zool. Scr. **38**(s1):41-47.

Jorgensen, C.D., and Hayward, C.L. 1965. Mammals of the Nevada test site. Brigham Young Univ. Sci. Bull. **6**(3):1-81.

Kajitani, N., and Hatano, S. 1953. A-bomb disaster investigation report (Hiroshima) first and second investigations. *In* Research on the Effects of the Atomic Bomb, Part 1. *Edited by* the Japan Science Council. pp. 522-601.

Kaufman, D.W., Finck, E.J., and Kaufman, G.A. 1990. Small mammals and grassland fires. *In* Fire in North American Tallgrass Prairies. *Edited by* S.L. Collins and L.L. Wallace. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, Oklahoma, USA, pp. 46-80.

Kazmarek, S.E.A., Gray, P., and Booher, A. 2005. Environmental issues at military installations: what they are and how they're handled. Available from the Environmental Advisory. pp 1-9.

Ketten, D.R. 1995. Estimates of blast injury and acoustic trauma zones for marine mammals from underwater explosions. *In* Sensory Systems of Aquatic Mammals. *Edited by* R.A. Kastelein, J.A. Thomas and P.E. Nachtigall. De Spil Publishers, Woerden, NE. pp 391-407.

Keevin, T.M., and Hempen, G.L. 1997. The environmental effects of underwater explosions with methods to mitigate impacts. Available from the US. Department of the Army Corps of Engineers St. Louis, MO, USA

Kim, K.C. 1997. Preserving biodiversity in Korea's demilitarized zone. Science **278**:242-243.

Kirkwood, J. B. 1970. Bioenvironmental safety studies, Amchitka Island, Alaska. Milrow D+2 Months Report. Amchitka Bioenvironmental Program. Available from the Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus Laboratories, Columbus, O.H., USA. Report No. BHI-171-126.

Kirkwood, J.B., and Fuller, R.G. 1972. Amchitka Bioenvironmental Program: Bioenvironmental Safety Studies, Amchitka Island, Alaska: Cannikin D+2 Months Report. Available from the Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus Laboratories, Columbus, O.H., USA. Report No. BMI-171-147,

Kishi, H. 2000. Effects of the "special bomb": recollections of a neurosurgeon in Hiroshima, August 8-15, 1945. Neurosurgery **47**(2):441-446.

Klein, D.R. 1973. The reaction of some northern mammals to aircraft disturbance. *In* 11th International Congress of Game Biology, Stockholm, SE, 3-7 September 1973. pp. 377-383.

Kolesnikova, A.A., Taskaeva, A.A., Krivolutskii, and Taskaev, A.I. 2005. Condition of the soil fauna near the epicentre of an underground nuclear explosion in the Northern Urals. Russ. J. Ecol. **36**(3):150-157.

Kopel, D., Malkinson, D., and Wittenberg, L. 2015. Characterization of vegetation community dynamics in areas affected by construction waste along the urban fringe. Urban Ecosys. **18**:133-150.

Lacoste, Y.1973. An illustration of geographical warfare: bombing the dikes on the Red River, North Vietnam. Antipode **5**:1–13.

Lamb, T., Bickham, J.W., Gibbons, J.W., Smolen, M.J., and McDowell, S. 1991. Genetic damage in a population of slider turtles (*Trachemys scripta*) inhabiting a radioactive reservoir. Arch. Environ. Contam. Toxicol. **20**(1):138-142.

Lanier-Graham, S. 1993. The ecology of war: environmental impacts of weaponry and warfare. Walker and Company, New York, N.Y., USA.

Larkin, R.P., Pater, L.L., and Tazik, D.J. 1996. Effects of military noise on wildlife. A literature review. Available from the Construction Engineering Research Lab (Army), Champaign, I.L., USA. No. USACERL-TR-96/21

Lathrop, E.W. 1983. Recovery of perennial vegetation in military maneuver areas. *In* Environmental Efects of Off-Road Vehicles: Impacts and Management in Arid Regions. *Edited by* R.H. Webband and H.G. Wilshire. Springer, NL. pp 265-277.

Ledney, G.D., Elliot, T.B., and Moore, M.M. 1992. Modulation of mortality by tissue trauma and sepsis in mice after radiation injury. *In* The Biological Basis of Radiation Protection Practice. *Edited by* K.L. Mossan and W.A. Mills. Williams and Wilkens, Baltimore, MD, USA, pp. 202-217.

Leitenberg, M. 2006. Deaths in Wars and Conflicts in the 20th Century. 3rd ed. Available from the Cornell University Peace Studies Program, Ithaca, N.Y., USA. ISSN 1075-4857

Levy, B.S., Lee, C., and Shahi, B.S. 1997. The environmental consequences of war. *In* War and Public Health. *Edited by* B.S. Levy and V.W. Sidel. Oxford University Press New York, N.Y., USA. pp. 51-62.

Liebow, A.A. 1983. Encounter with disaster: a medical diary of Hiroshima, 1945. Yale J. Biol. Med. **56**:23-38.

Lifton, R.J. 1967. Death in life: survivors of Hiroshima. Random House, New York, NY, USA.

Lindenmayer, D.B., Wood, J.T., Cunningham, R.B., MacGregor, C., Crane, M., Michael, D., Montague-Drake, R., Brown, D., Muntz, R., and Gill, A.M. 2008. Testing hypotheses associated with bird response to wildfire. Ecol. Appl. **18**(8):1967-1983.

Lindsell, J. A., Klop, E., and Siaka, A. M. 2011. The impact of civil war on forest wildlife in West Africa: mammals in Gola Forest, Sierra Leone. Oryx **45**(01):69-77.

Long, T. P. 2009. A global prospective on underwater munitions. Mar. Technol. Soc. J. **43**(4): 5-10.

Lovell, C.D., and Dolbeer, R.A. 1999. Validation of the United States air force bird avoidance model. Wildlife Soc. Bull. **27**(1):167-171.

Machlis, G.E., and Hanson, T. 2008. Warfare ecology. BioScience **58**:729–736.

Madsen, P.T. 2005. Marine mammals and noise: problems with root mean square sound pressure levels. J. Acoust, Soc. Am. **117**: 3952–3957.

Mai, T.A., Doan, T.V., Tarradellas, J., de Alecastra, L.F., and Gradnjean, D. 2007. Dioxin contamination in soils of Southern Vietnam. Chemosphere **67**:1802-1807.

Majeed, A. 2004. The impact of militarism on the environment: an overview of direct and indirect effects. Available from the Physicians for Global Survival, Ottawa, O.N., CA. ISBN 0-9735916-0-9

Manci, K.M., Gladwin, D.N., Villella, R., and Cavendish, M.G. 1988. Effects of aircraft noise and sonic booms on domestic animals and wildlife: a literature synthesis. Available from National Ecology Research Center, Fort Collins, C.O., USA. No. NERC 88/29

Martore, R.M., Mathews, T.D., and Bell, M. 1998. Levels of PCBs and heavy metals in biota found on ex-military ships used as artificial reefs. Available from the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources Charleston, S.C., USA.

Masco, J. 2004. Mutant ecologies: radioactive life in post-cold war New Mexico. Cult. Anthropol. **19**(4):517-550.

Mayorga, M.A. 1997. The pathology of primary blast overpressure injury. Toxicology **121**: 17-28.

McDonnel, G.M., Crosby, W.H., Tessmer, C.F., Moncrief,W.H., Baker, H.J., Goldstein, J.D., Woodward, K., Shively, J.N., Daniell, H.W., Horava, A., and Claypool, H.A. 1961. Effects of nuclear detonations on a large biological specimen (swine). Available from the Defense Atomic Support Agency, Sandia Base, Albuquerque, N.M., USA. Operation Plumbbob, Project 4.1 Report WT-1428

McNeely, J.A. 2003. Conserving forest biodiversity in times of violent conflict. Oryx **37**:142-152.

Medica, P. A., Turner, F.B., and Smith, D.D. 1973. Effects of radiation on a fenced population of horned lizards (*Phrynosoma platyrhinos*) in southern Nevada. J. Hepetol. **7**:79-85.

Merritt, M. 1970. Physical and biological effects: Milrow Event. Available from the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, National Technical Information Service, U.S. Dep. Of Commerce, Springfield, V.A., USA. Report No. NVO-79.

Merritt, M. 1973. Physical and biological effects: Cannikin. Available from the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, National Technical Information Service, U.S. Dep. of Commerce, Springfield, V.A., USA. Report No. NVO-123

Mettler, F.A. 2001. Direct effects of radiation on specific tissues. *In* Medical Management of Radiation Accidents (2nd Edn.). *Edited by* I. Gusev, A.K. Guskova and F.A. Mettler. CRC Press, Boca Raton, F.L., USA. pp 69-132.

Meyer-Reil, L., and Köster, M. 2000. Eutrophication of marine water: effects on benthic microbial communities. Mar. Pollut. Bull. **41**(1-6):255-263.

Miller, J.W. 1972. Forest fighting on the Eastern Front in World War II. Geogr. Rev. 186-202.

Miller, P.J.O., Biassoni, N., Samuels, A., and Tyack, P.L. 2000. Whale songs lengthen in response to sonar. Nature **405**(6789):903-903.

Miller, T.A., Yaghoobian, A., Stuckert, B.J., Goudey, J.S., and McAndless, J.M. 1998. The use of mapping techniques in an ecological risk assessment of sites contaminated with chemical warfare agents. J. Hazard. Mater. **61**:31-36.

Mole, R.H. 1958. The development of leukaemia in irradiated animals. Brit Med. Bull. **14(**2):174-177.

Monfils, R. 2005. The global risk of marine pollution from WWII shipwrecks: examples from the seven seas. *In* International Oil Spill Conference, Miami Beach, FL, USA, 15-19 May 2005. pp. 1049-1054.

Mooney, H.A., and Cleland, E.E. 2001. The evolutionary impact of invasive species. Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. **98**:5446-5451.

Moreira, F., and Russo, D. 2007. Modelling the impact of agricultural abandonment and wildfires on vertebrate diversity in Mediterranean Europe. Landscape Ecol. **22**:1461-1476.

Mortberg, U.M., Balfors, B., and Knol, W.C. 2007. Landscape ecological assessment: a tool for integrating biodiversity issues in strategic environmental assessment and planning. J. Environ. Manage. **82**(4):457-470.

Moura, R.L., Secchin, N.A., Amado-Filho, G.M., Francini-Filho, R.B., Freitas, M.O., Minte-Vera, C.V.Teixeira, J.B., Thompson, F.L., Dutr, G.F., Sumida, P.Y.G., Guth, A.Z., Lopes, R.M., and Bastos, A.C. 2013. Spatial patterns of benthic megahabitats and conservation planning in the Abrolhos Bank. Cont. Shelf Res. **70**:109-117.

Mrema, E., Bruch, C.E., and Diamond, J. 2009. Protecting the environment during armed conflict: an inventory and analysis of international law. UNEP/Earthprint.

Mudie, N.Y., Gusev, B. I., Pivina, L.M., Schoemaker, M.J., Rijinkova, O.N., Apsalikov, K.N., and Swerdlow, A. J. 2007. Sex ratio in the offspring of parents with chronic radiation exposure from nuclear testing in Kazakhstan. Radiat. Res. **168(**5):600-607.

Nguyen, T.T. 2009. Vietnam and the environment: problems and solutions. Int. J. Environ. Stud. **66**(1):1-8.

Nishiwaki, Y. 1995. Fifty years after Hiroshima and Nagasaki (Invited Lecture). *In* Proceedings Radiation Protection in Neighbouring Countries in Central Europe, Portoroz, SI, 4-8 Sept 1995. *Edited by* D. Glavic-Cindro. Portoroz, SI. pp. 17-26.

Nishiwaki, Y., Kawai, H., Shono, N., Fujita, S., Matsuoka, H., Fujiwara, S., and Hosoda, T. 2000. Uncertainties under emergency conditions in Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945 and Bikini Accident in 1954. *In* 10th International Congress of The International Radiation Protection Association. Hiroshima, JP, May 14-18 2000. pp 1-10

Noble, I.R., and Slatyer, R.O. 1980. The use of vital attributes to predict successional changes in plants communities subject to recurrent disturbances. Vegetatio **4**(3):5-21.

NRDC. 2003. Navy Sonar System Threatens Whales [online]. Available from http://www.nrdc.org/wildlife/marine [Accessed 15 April 2015].

O'Farrell, T.P. 1984. Populations of small mammals inhabiting sites 22 to 32 years after nuclear events. *In* Joint international Meeting of the Australian and the American Society of Mammalogists, Sydney, AU, 9-13 July 1984. Report No. CONF-840770-1

Ochiai, E. 2014. Hiroshima to Fukushima biohazards of radiation. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, DE.

Ohkita, T. 1975. A. Acute Effects. J. Radiat. Res. **16**(Suppl 1):49-66.

Olival, K. J., and Higuchi, H. 2006. Monitoring the long-distance movement of wildlife in Asia using satellite telemetry. *In* Conservation Biology in Asia. *Edited by* J. McNeely, T. McCarthy, A. Smith, L. Whittaker and E. Wikramnayake. Society for Conservation Biology Asia Section and Resources Himalaya Foundation, Kathmandu, NP. pp 319-339.

O'May, J.F., Hansen, C.E., Heilman, E.G., Kaste, R.C., and Neiderer, A.M. 2005. Battlespace terrain ownership: a new situation awareness tool. Available from the Army Research Lab Aberdeen Proving Ground, M.D., USA.

Orians, G.H., and Pfeiffer, E.W. 1970. Ecological effects of the war in Vietnam. Science **168**:544-554.

Ortiz-Roque, C., and Lopez-Riviera, Y. 2004. Mercury contamination in reproductive age women in a Caribbean island: Vieques. J. Epidemiol. Commun. Health **58**: 756-757.

Osuji, L.C., and Nwoye, I. 2007. An appraisal of the impact of petroleum hydrocarbons on soil fertility: the Owaza experience. Afr. J. Agricult. Res. **2**(7):318-324.

Oughterson, A.W., and Warren, S. 1956. Medical effects of the atomic bomb in Japan (Vol 8). McGraw-Hill, New York, NY, USA.

Oughterson, A.W., LeRoy, G.V., Liebow, A.A., Hammond, E.C., Barnett, H.L., Rosenbaum, J.D., and Schneider, B.A. 1951. Statistical analysis of the medical effects of the atomic bombs. Available from the Report of the Joint Commission for the Investigation of the Effects of the Atomic Bomb in Japan, Army Institute of Pathology. Report No. TID-5252

Owens, S. 1990. Defense and the environment: the impacts of military live firing in national parks. Cambridge J. Econ. **14**:497-505.

Oyama, A., and Sasaki, T. 1946. A case of burn of the cornea and retina by atomic bomb. Ganka Rinsho Iho **40**:177.

Palumbo, R.F. 1962. Recovery of the land plants at Eniwetok Atoll following a nuclear detonation. Radiat. Bot. **1**:182-189.

Papanikolaou, N.C., Hatzidaki, E.G., Belivanis, S., Tzanakakis, G.N., and Tsatsakis, A.M. 2005. Lead toxicity update. A brief review. Med. Sci. Monit. **11**(10):RA329-RA336.

Papastefanou, C. 2002. Depleted uranium in military conflicts and the impact on the environment. Health phys. **83**(2):280-282.

Parkinson, B.W. 1996. Progress in astronautics and aeronautics: global positioning system: theory and applications, volume 2. AIAA, Reston, V.A., USA.

Parsons, E.C.M., Birks, I., Evans, P.G.H., Gordon, J.G., Shrimpton, J.H., and Pooley, S. 2000. The possible impacts of military activity on cetaceans in West Scotland. Eur. Res. Cetaceans **14**: 185-190.

Parsons, E.C.M., Dolman, S.J., Wright, A.J, Rose, N.A., and Burns, W.C.G. 2008. Navy Sonar and cetaceans: just how much does the gun need to smoke before we act? Mar. Pollut. Bull. **56**:1248-1257.

Pearson, C. 2012. Researching militarized landscapes: a literature review on war and the militarization of the environment. Landscape Res. **37**:115-133.

Pekins, C.E. 2006. Armored military training and endangered species restrictions at Fort Hood, Texas. Fed. Facil. Environ. J. **17**(1):37-50.

Pendersen, D. 2002. Political violence, ethnic conflict, and contemporary wars: broad implications for health and social well-being. Soc. Sci. Med. **55**:175-190.

Pierce, D.A., and Preston, D.L. 2000. Radiation-related cancer risks at low doses among atomic bomb survivors. Radiat. Res. **154**(2):178-186.

Pinaev, V.S., and Shcherbakov, V.A. 1996. Fires caused by nuclear explosions and their consequences. Combust. Explo. Shock+. **32**(5):572-576.

Pinca, S., Beger, M., Jacobson, D., and Keju, T. 2005. The state of coral reef ecosystems of the Marshall Islands. *In* The State of Coral Reef Ecosystems of the United States and Pacific Freely Associated States. *Edited by* J. Waddell. NOAA Technical Memorandum NOS NCCOS 11, Silver Spring, M.D., USA. pp. 373–386.

Planes, S., Galzin, R., Bablet, J.P., and Sale, P.F. 2005. Stability of coral reef fish assemblages impacted by nuclear tests. Ecology **86**(10):2578-2585.

Popper, A.N., and Hastings, M.C. 2009. The effects of human-generated sound on fish. Integ. Zool. **4**(1):43-52.

Porter W. 2005. Movement of toxic materials through the Vieques marine ecosystem: The effects of naval bombardment on a Puerto Rican coral reef. *In* Paper presented at Ecological Society of America Annual Meeting, Montreal, Q.C., CA, 7-12 August 2005.

Prentice, R.L., Kato, H., Yoshimoto, K., and Mason, M. 1982. Radiation exposure and thyroid cancer incidence among Hiroshima and Nagasaki residents. Natl. Cancer I. Monogr. **62**:207-212.

Prosser, C.L., Painter, E.E., Lisco, H., Brues, A.M., Jacobson, L.O., and Swift, M.N. 1947. The clinical sequence of physiological effects of ionizing radiation in animals 1. Radiology **49**(3):299-313.

Ramos, T.B., Alves, I., Subtil, R., and de Melo, J.J. 2007. Environmental performance policy indicators for the public sector: The case of the defence sector. J. Environ. Manage. **82**(4):410-432.

Randall, P.A., 1961. Damage to conventional and special types of residences exposed to nuclear effects. Available from the US Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., USA. Report WT-1194.

Rausch, R.L. 1973. Post mortem findings in some marine mammals and birds following the Cannikin test on Amchitka Island. Available from U.S. AEC, Nevada Operations Office, Las Vegas, N.V., USA. Report No. HVO-130.

Real, A., Sundell-Bergman, S., Knowles, J.F., Woodhead, D.S., and Zinger, I. 2004. Effects of ionising radiation exposure on plants, fish and mammals: relevant data for environmental radiation protection. J. Radiol. Prot. **24**(4A):A123-A137.

Rendell, L.E., and Gordon, J.C.D. 1999. Vocal response of long-finned pilot whales (*Globicephala melas*) to military sonar in the Ligurian Sea. Mar. Mammal Sci. **15**:198–204.

Rhoads, W.A., and Platt, R.B. 1971. Beta radiation damage to vegetation from close-in fallout from two nuclear detonations. BioScience **21**(15):1121-1125.

Rhoads, W.A., and Ragsdale, H.L. 1971. *Artemisia* shrub size and radiation damage to *Artemisiu* from local fallout from Project Schooner. *In* Pro. Nat. Symp. Radioecology, 3rd. *Edited by* D.J. Nelson. National Technical Information Service, U.S. Department of Commerce, Springfield, V.A., USA, pp. 953-960.

Rhoads, W.A., Asher D. K., and Ragsdale, H.L. 1972. Ecological and environmental effects from local fallout from schooner. 2. The beta and gamma radiation effects from close in fallout. Available from the US Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., USA. Technical Report No. PNE--529.

Richards, Z.T., Beger, M., Pinca, S., and Wallace, C.C. 2008. Bikini Atoll coral biodiversity resilience five decades after nuclear testing. Mar. Pollut. Bull. **56**:503-515.

Richardson, J.W., and West, T. 2000. Serious birdstrike accidents to military aircraft: updated list and summary. IBSC Proc. **25**(1):67-97.

Richmond, D.R., and White C.S. 1962. A tentative estimation of mans tolerance to overpressures from air blast. Available from the Defense Atomic Support Agency, Department of Defense, Washington, D.C., USA. Technical Progress Report No. DASA 1335.

Richmond, D.R., Taboreili, Bowen, I.G., Chiffelle, T.L., Hirsch, F.G., Longwell, B.B., Riley, J.G., White, C.S., Sherping, F., Goldizen, V.C., Ward, J.D., Wetherbe, M.B., Clare, V.R., Kuhn, M.L., and Sanchez, R.T. 1959a. Blast biology a study of the primary and tertiary effects of blast in open underground protective shelters. Available from the Office of Technical Services, Department of Commerce, Washington D.C. USAEC Civil Effects Test Group Report WT-1467.

Richmond, D.R., Wetherbe, M.B., Taborelli, R.V., Sanchez,R.T., Sherping, F., Goldizen, V.C., and White, C.S. 1959b. Shock tube studies of the effects of sharp-rising, long-duration overpressures on biological systems. Available from the Office of Technical Services, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C., USA. USAEC Technical Report TID-6056.

Rideout, G. and Walsh, B.W. 1990. War games and multiple use: is it mission impossible to train combat troops and manage natural resources on the same forested acres? Am. Forests **96**:11-21.

Roberts S., and Williams J. 1995. After the guns fall silent: the enduring legacy of landmines. Available from the Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation, Washington, D.C., USA.

Robison, W.L., and Noshkin, V.E. 1999. Radionuclide characterization and associated dose from long-lived radionuclides in close-in fallout delivered to the marine environment at Bikini and Enewetak Atolls. Sci. Tot. Environ. **237**:311-327.

Rodda, G.H., and Savidge, J.A. 2007. Biology and impacts of Pacific Island invasive species. *Boiga irregularis*, the brown tree snake (Reptilia: *Colubridae*). Pac. Sci. **61**:307-324.

Rose, H.W., Brown, D.V.L., Byrnes, V.A., Cibis, P.A. 1956. Human chorioretinal burns from atomic fireballs. Arch. Ophth. **55**:205-210.

Rowell A., and Moore, P.F. 2000. Global review of forest fires. Available from Forests for Life Programme Unit, WWF International.

Ruhm, W., Walsh, L., and Nekolla, E.A. 2006. The cohort of the atomic bomb survivors-major basis of radiation safety regulations. *In* CAS - CERN Accelerator School and KVI: Specialised CAS Course on Small Accelerators. CERN, Geneva, CH. pp. 319-329.

Sanderson, H., Fauser, P., Thomsen, M., Vanninen, P., Soderstrom, M., Savin, Y., Khalikov, I., Hirvonen, A., Niiranen, S., Missiaen, T., Gress, A., Borodin, P., Medvedeva, N., Polyak, Y., Paka, V., Zhurbas, V., and Feller P. 2010. Environmental hazards of sea-dumped chemical weapons. Environ. Sci. and Technol. **44**(12):4389-4394.

Sarkees, M.R., Wayman, F.W., and Singer, J.D. 2003. Inter-state, intra-state, and extra-state wars: a comprehensive look at their distribution over time, 1816–1997. Int. Stud. Q. **47**(1):49-70.

Schecter, A., Birnbaum, L., Ryan, J.J., and Constable, J.D. 2006. Dioxins: an overview. Environ. Res. **101**(3):419-428.

Schecter, A., Kooke, R., Serne, P., Olie, K., Huy, D.Q., Hue, N., and Constable, J. 1989. Chlorinated Dioxin and dibenzofuran levels in food samples collected between 1985-87 in the north and south of Vietnam. Chemosphere. **18**:627-634.

Schiffman, R. 2014. Drones flying high as new tool for field biologists. Science **344**(6183):459-459.

Schonfelder, P., Bresinsky, A., Garnweidner, E., Krach, E., Linhard, H., Mergenthaler, O., Nezadal, W., and Wirth, V. 1990. Verbreitungatlas der Farn- und Blutenpflanzen Bayerns. Eugen Ulmer, Stuttgart, DE.

Science News Letter. 1945. Magnetron tube. Sci. News **48**(26):403.

Science Wire. 2001. How Does Sonar Work? [Online]. Available from http://www.exploratorium.edu/theworld/sonar/sonar.html [Accessed 16 April 2015].

Scott, K.N. 2007. Sound and cetaceans: a regional response to regulating acoustic marine pollution. J. Int. Wildlife Law. Policy. **10**:175-199.

Shaeffer, J.R. 1957. Radiation injuries, with notes on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Am. J. Surg. **93**(4):641-643.

Shambaugh, J., Oglethorpe, J., and Ham, R. 2001. The trampled grass: mitigating the impacts of armed conflict on the environment. Available from the Biodiversity Support Program, Washington, DC, USA. Report No. 333.72096 S528.

Sheppard, S.C., Sheppard, M.I., Gallerand, M., and Sanipelli, B. 2005. Deviation of ecotoxicity thresholds for uranium. J. Environ. Radioact. **79**(1):55-83.

Shields, L.M., and Wells, P.V. 1962. Effects of nuclear testing on desert vegetation. Science **135**(3497):38-40.

Shields, L.M., Wells, P.V., and Rickard, W.H. 1963. Vegetational recovery on atomic target areas in Nevada. Ecology **44**(4):697-705.

Sidel, V.W. 2000. The impact of military preparedness on health and the environment. *In* The Environmental Consequences of War: Legal, Economic, and Scientific Perspectives. *Edited by* J.E., Austin, and C.E., Bruch. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK. pp. 426-443.

Silberner, J. 1981. Hiroshima & Nagasaki: thirty six years later, the struggle continues. Sci. News **120**(18):284-285,287.

Simenstad, C.A. 1974. Biological effects of underground nuclear testing on marine organisms. I. Review of documented shock effects, discussion of mechanisms of damage, and predictions of Amchitka test effects. *In* Proceedings of the First Conference on the Environmental Effects of Explosives and Explosions (Technical Report 73-223). Naval Ordinance Laboratory, White Oak, M.D., USA. pp. 86-97.

Singer, F.J., Schreier, W., Oppenhiem, J., and Garton. E.O. 1989. Drought, fires and large mammals. BioScience **39**(10):716-722.

Slotten, H.R. 2002. Satellite communications, globalization, and the Cold War. Technol. Cult. **43**(2):315-350.

Small, R.D., and Bush, B.W. 1985. Smoke production from multiple nuclear explosions in nonurban areas. Science **229**(4712):465-469.

Smith, M.A., Turner, M.G., and Rusch, D.H. 2002. Lupine and the karner blue butterfly at Fort McCoy Wisconsin, USA. Environ. Manage. **29**(1):102-115.

Smith, S. L. 2011. Toxic legacy: mustard gas in the sea around us. J. law Med. Ethics **39**(1):34-40.

Sparrow, A.H., and Woodwell, G.M. 1962. Prediction of the sensitivity of plants to chronic gamma irradiation. Radiat. Bot. **2**(1):9-26.

Springer, P.J. 2013. Military robots and drones: a reference handbook. ABC-CLIO, Santa Barbara, CA, USA.

Stanley, E.H., and Doyle, M.W. 2003. Trading off: the ecological effects of dam removal. Front. Ecol. Enviro. **1**:15-22.

Stein, B.A., Scott, C., and Benton, N. 2008. Federal lands and endangered species: the role of military and other federal lands in sustain biodiversity. BioScience **58**(4):339-347.

Stellman, J.M., Stellman, S.D., Christian, R., Weber, T., and Tomasallo, C. 2003. The extent and patterns of usage of Agent Orange and other herbicides in Vietnam. Nature **422**:681-687.

Stephenson, T.R., Vaughan, M.R., and Anderson, D.E. 1996. Mule deer movement in response to military activity in southeast Colorado. J. Wildlife Manage. **60**(4):777-787.

Stoddart, D.R. 1968. Catastrophic human interference with coral atoll ecosystems. Geography **53**(1):25-40.

Sugg, D.W., Chesser, R.K., Brooks, J.A., and Grasman, B.T. 1995. The association of DNA damage to concentrations of mercury and radiocesium in largemouth bass. Environ. Toxicol. Chem. **14**(4):661-668.

Summary Report of Research in the Effects of the Atomic Bomb. 1951. *Edited by* the Japan Science Council. Japan Society for the Promotion of Science.

Sutherland, W.J., Bardsley, S., Clout, M., Depledge, M.H., Dicks, L.V., Fellman, L., Fleishman, E., Gibbons, D.W., Keim, B., Lickorish, F., Margersion, C., Monk, K.A., Norris, K., Peck, L.S., Prior, S.V., Scharlemann, J.P.W., Spalding, M.D., and Watkinson, A.R. 2013. A horizon scan of global conservation issues for 2013. Trends Ecol. Evol. **28**(1):16-22.

Sweetman, J. 1982. Operation chastise: the dams raid: epic or myth. Jane's Publishing Company, London, UK.

Tang, Z., Engel, B.A., Pijanowski, B.C., and Lim, K.J. 2005. Forecasting land use change and its environmental impact at a watershed scale. J. Environ. Manage. **76**:35-45.

Tavares, M., and De Melo, G.A.S. 2004. Discovery of the first known benthic invasive species in the southern ocean: The north Atlantic spider crab *Hyas araneus* found in the Antarctic Peninsula. Antarct. Sci. **16**:129-131.

Telesco, D.J., and Van Manen, F.T. 2006. Do black bears respond to military weapons training? J. Wildlife Manage. **70**(1):222-230.

Theodorakis, C.W., and Shugart, L.R. 1997. Genetic ecotoxicology II: population genetic structure in mosquito fish exposed in situ to radionuclides. Ecotoxicology **6**:335-354.

Theodorakis, C.W., and Shugart, L.R. 1998. Genetic ecotoxicology III: the relationship between DNA strand breaks and genotype in mosquito fish exposed to radiation. Ecotoxicology **7**(4):227-235.

Theodorakis, C.W., Bickham, J.W., Elbl, T., Shugart, L.R., and Chesser, R. K. 1998. Genetics of radionuclide-contaminated mosquitofish populations and homology between *Gambusia affinis* and *G. holbrooki*. Environ. Toxicol. Chem. **17(**10):1992-1998.

Theodorakis, C.W., Bickham, J.W., Lamb, T., Medica, P.A., and Lyne, T.B. 2001. Integration of genotoxicity and population genetic analyses in kangaroo rats (*Dipodomys merriami*) exposed to radionuclide contamination at the Nevada Test Site, USA. Environ. Toxicol. Chem. **20**(2):317-326.

Troll, K. 2000. The impact of anti-personnel landmines on the environment. Available from United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, Geneva, CH.

Trumbull, V.L., Dubois, P.C., and Brozka, R.J. 1994. Military camping impacts on vegetation and soils of the Ozark Plateau. J. Environ. Manage. **40**:329-339.

Tull, M. 2006. The environmental impact of ports: an Australian case study. *In* Paper presented at the XIV International Economics History Congress (session No. 58). Helsinki, FI.

Tullis, J.L., Lamson, B.G., and Madden, S.C. 1955. Pathology of swine exposed to total body gamma radiation from an atomic bomb source. Am. J. Pathol. **31**(1):41-71.

Turner, F.B. 1975. Effects of continuous irradiation on animal populations. Adv. Radiat. Biol. **5**:83-144.

Turner, F.B., and Medica, P.A. 1977. Sterility among female lizards (*Uta stansburiana*) exposed to continuous γ irradiation. Radiat. Res. **70**(1):154-163.

Turner, F.B., Licht, P., Thrasher, J.D., Medica, P.A., Lannom Jr, J.R., and Nelson, D. J. 1971. Radiation- induced sterility in natural populations of lizards (*Crotaphytus wislizenii* and *Cnemidophorus tigris*). *In* Radionuclides in Ecosystems. *Edited by* D.J., Nelson. U.S. Atomic Energy Commission Report CONF-710501-P2, pp. 1131-1143.

Turner, W., Spector, S., Gardiner, N., Fladeland, M., Sterling, E., and Steininger, M. 2003. Remote sensing for biodiversity science and conservation. Trends Ecol. Evol. **18**(6):306-314.

Valeriote, F.A., and Baker, D.G. 1964. The combined effects of thermal trauma and x-irradiation on early mortality. Radiat. Res. **22**(4):693-702.

Van Dover, C.L., Aronson, J., Pendleton, L., Smith, S., Arnaud-Haond, S., Moreno-Mateos, D., Barbier, E., Billett, D., Bowers, K., Danovaro, R., Edwards, A., Kellert, S., Morato, T., Pollard, E., Rogers, A., and Warner, R. 2014. Ecological restoration in the deep sea: Desiderata. Mar. Policy **44**:98-106.

Villoria Saez, P., del Rio Merino, M., Porras-Amores, C., and Gonzalez, A.S.A. 2014. Assessing the accumulation of construction waste generation during residential building construction works. Resour. Conserv. Recy. **93**:67-74.

Visone, D.L. 2005. Battlespace terrain reasoning and awareness. *In* Proceedings of ESRI User Conference, 25-29 July 2005.

Vogt, H.P. 1995. Coral reefs in Saudi Arabia: 3.5 years after the Gulf War oil spill. Coral Reefs **14**:271-273.

Wanebo, C.K., Johnson, K.G., Sato, K., and Thorslund, T.W. 1968. Breast cancer after exposure to the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. New Engl. J. Med. **279**(13):667-671.

Warren, S.D., and Büttner, R. 2006. Documentation of disturbance-dependent threatened and endangered species on US Army–Europe training areas in Bavaria. Available from the Center for Environmental Management of Military Lands, Fort Collins, C.O., USA. CEMML TPS, 06-05.

Warren, S.D., Holbrook, S.W., Dale, D.A., Whelan, N.L., Elyn, M., Grimm, W., and Jentsch, A. 2007. Biodiversity and the heterogeneous disturbance regime on military training lands. Rest. Ecol. **15**(4):606-612.

Warren, S.D., Holbrook, S.W., Dale, D.A., Whelan, N.L., Elyn, M., Grimm, W., and Jentsch, A. 2007. Biodiversity and the heterogeneous disturbance regime on military training lands. Restor. Ecol. **15**(4):606-612.

Watts, S.E. 1998. Short-term influence of tank tracks on vegetation and microphyticcrusts in shrubsteppe habitat. Environ. Manage. **22**(4):611-616.

Westing, A.H. 1971. Ecological effects of military defoliation on the forests of South Vietnam. BioScience **21**(17):893-898.

Westing, A.H. 1980. Warfare in a fragile world: military impact on the human environment. Taylor & Francis. London, UK.

Westing, A.H. 1984. Herbicides in war: past and present. Herbicides in war: the long term ecological and human consequence. Taylor & Francis. London, UK.

Westing, A.H. 1985. Explosive remnants of war: mitigating the environmental effects. Stockholm Peace Research Institute and United Nations. Environment Programme. Taylor and Francis, London, UK.

Westing, A.H. 1986. Global resources and international conflict: environmental factors in strategic policy and action. Oxford University Press, UK.

Westing, A.H. 1989. Herbicides in warfare: the case of Indochina. Ecotoxicology and Climate. John Wiley & Sons Ltd, Hoboken, N.J., USA.

Westing, A.H. 1996. Explosive remnants of war in the human environment. Environ. Conserv. **23**(4):283-285.

Westing, A.H. 2003. Environmental dimension of the Gulf War of 1991. *In* Security and Environment in the Mediterranean: Conceptualizing Security and Environmental Conflicts *Edited by* H.G., Brauch, Liotta, P.H., Marquina, A., Rogers, P.F., and Selim, M.E. pp 523-534.

Westing, A.H. 2013a. The second Indochina War of 1961-1975: its environmental impact. *In* Arthur H. Westing: pioneer on the environmental impact of war. Springer, New York, N.Y., USA. pp 35-50.

Westing, A.H. 2013b. The Gulf War of 1991: its environmental impact. *In* Arthur H. Westing: pioneer on the environmental impact of war. Springer, New York, N.Y., USA. pp 50-76.

Whicker, F.W., Hinton, T.G., MacDonell, M.M., Pinder III, J.E., and Habegger, L.J. 2004. Avoiding destructive remediation at DOE sites. Science **303**(5664):1615-1616.

Whicker, F.W., and Pinder, J.E. 2002. Food chains and biogeochemical pathways: contributions of fallout and other radiotracers. Health Physics **82**(5):680-689.

Whitecotton, R.C.A., David, M.B., Darmody, R.G., and Price, D.L. 2000. Impact of foot traffic from military training on soil and vegetation properties. Environ. Manage. **26**(6):697-706.

Wills, J. 2001. "Welcome to the atomic park": American nuclear landscapes and the 'unnaturally unnatural'. Environ. Hist. **7**(4):449-472.

Wilson, S.D. 1988. The effects of military tank traffic on prairie: a management model. Environ. Manage. **12**(3):397-403.

Xun, Z., Cao, N., and Zhao, T. 2013. Evaluation of the risks of environment in the construction process on the basis of Grey System theory. Am. Soc. Civil Eng.741-749.

Yang, X., North, R., Romney, C. 2003. Worldwide nuclear explosions. Int. Geophys. Ser. **81**(B):1595-1600.

Yelvertton, J.T., Richmond, D.R., Hicks, W., Saunders, K., and Fletcher, E.R. 1975. The relationship between fish size and their response to underwater blast. Available from the Defense Nuclear Agency, Fort Belvior, V.A., USA. Topical Report DNA 3677T.

Zahler, P., and Graham, P. 2001. War and Wildlife. The Afghanistan conflict and its effects on the environment. Available from International Snow Leopard Trust Special Report. pp. 1-13.

Zakrajsek, E.J., Bissonette, J.A. 2005. Ranking the risk of wildlife species hazardous to military aircraft. Wildlife Soc. Bull. **33**(1):258-264.

Zallinger, C., and Tempel, K. 1998. The physiologic response of domestic animals to ionizing radiation: a review. Vet. Radiol. Ultrasoun. **39**(6):495-503.

Zentelis, R., and Lindenmayer, D. 2014. Bombing for biodiversity – enhancing conservation values of military training areas. Conserv. Lett. **00**(0):1-7.

Table 1: Research gaps related to the effects of warfare on ecosystem structure and function.

Warfare Aspect	Research Gaps
Active Armed Conflict	• Areas of conflict are often too hazardous for researchers to enter and gather data. • BACI experimental (Before-After Control-Impact) approach is usually not possible since conflicts occur without consultation with researchers. Armed conflicts often occur randomly, kept confidential, or in areas that are difficult to access by researchers from abroad (e.g. drone or aerial assaults). • Conservation priorities can be overlooked during war activities resulting in lack of pre- and post-war efforts to maintain and monitor ecological integrity and animal populations. • Lack of international capacity to monitor threats from armed conflict on ecosystems, particularly when armed conflicts occur between several nations and across large spatial scales.
Nuclear Warfare	• Effects of nuclear weapons had high anthropogenic focus (e.g. effects on human health, buildings, etc.), information on greater impacts on ecological functioning at the population and biodiversity level is relatively scarce; taxonomic representation relatively low. • Ecosystem diversity is under-represented as testing was generally restricted to a few select habitat types, mostly desert regions, that are typically low in biodiversity to begin with. • The long term impacts from radiation exposure from nuclear weapon produced fallout/radiation has been minimally documented in wildlife with little regard for potential fitness impact; timescale is an issue and impacts may be mitigated by immigration. • As nuclear weapons use is currently banned under international treaties, new research avenues into ecosystem structural impacts are potentially limited.

Military Training	• Research focused on military training facilities operated by the U.S Department of Defense, within North America. Data extrapolated to address the impacts of military training facilities located abroad; minimal investigation into whether these assessments address impacts in different geographic environments, under different training regimes, etc. • Many military training lands and facilities are situated within biodiversity hotspots, which are home to numerous rare and endemic species; these operational training bases may be located in hostile developing nations where research access is restricted creating knowledge gaps in these unmanaged and unprotected areas. • Research and environmental assessments pertaining to military training activities is relatively new, gaining importance within the past 50 years, which has created knowledge gaps in how certain training landscapes existed and functioned prior to military management.
Military Contamination	• Many surplus marine munitions and barrels after WWII were dumped at undisclosed locations, making it both difficult to estimate potential contamination and to initiate recovery. • The broad spatial scales at which environment may be exposed to contamination can cross geographic and political borders, complicating accountability procedures. • Chemicals, hydrocarbons, and metals can have legacy effects in soil, water, and plant and animal tissue. Immediate effects may not always be obvious.



Figure 1: Overview of the potential deleterious impacts of warfare on the environment including terrestrial, aerial and naval theatres of war.

Box 1: The Korean Demilitarized Zone

The Demilitarized Zone (DMZ) on the Korean peninsula serves as a protected area for many endemic and endangered species (Kim 1997; Healy 2007). The Korean DMZ is a 4 km wide by 250 km long strip of natural land which has separated North and South Korea since 1953 with the Armistice Agreement (Kim 1997). This area is home to 3,514 species, which equates to 67% of the species diversity of the Korean Peninsula, most of which are endemic to this small plot of land (Healy 2007). One of the world's most endangered bird species, the White-Naped Crane (*Grus vipio*) relies on the Korean DMZ for critical overwintering habitat for 50% of the remaining population. As well, areas within the DMZ are also reported as important resting locations during the north-south migration for a large proportion of the crane population in addition to numerous other bird species (Higuchi et al. 1996; Healy 2007). Photo credit: Adrian Pingstone, Wikimedia Commons, 2006.

Box 2: The Marshall Islands Reef Recovery

During the decades following the Second World War, the testing of nuclear weapons by the United States military was well underway (above). The Marshall Islands were home to a great number of nuclear detonations comprising a total of 66 test blasts that left the surrounding environment devastated. However, due to the area having large degrees of residual radioactivity, human exclusion from many of the test site islands has generated a marine protected area of sorts alleviating anthropogenic stress from the region (Donaldson et al. 1997; Berger et al. 2008). As such, the system has been allowed to recover in isolation for the greater part of the last half century and has produced some interesting results. With the exception of a few specialized species, scleractinian coral diversity has rebounded on a number of reefs affected by nuclear testing (Richards et al. 2008). As well, the size-frequency distribution, an indicator of biomass, of many fish taxonomic groups within former blast sites have been observed to be much greater than that of the surrounding waters unaffected by nuclear testing (Houk and Musburger 2013). While nuclear testing is devastating on an acute timescale, it may prove to be beneficial to the local ecosystem over a more chronic duration through human exclusion. Photo Credit: United States Department of Defense, 1946.

Box 3: Military Training Bases

Military training bases have long been known as areas of high biodiversity and, as of late, these vast military training landscapes are becoming increasingly recognized as important refuge areas for IUCN red-listed species (Zentelis and Lindenmayer 2014). A case study examination conducted by Stein et al. (2008) evaluated the status of U.S. federally listed endangered species across the 264 million hectares of government owned and managed lands in the United States. This case study identified a significantly greater density and diversity of endangered and imperiled species inhabiting military training lands, compared to all other federally managed lands across the country (Right image: recreated from Stein et al., 2008). In addition to this finding, the greatest diversity of endangered and imperiled species were found inhabiting 4 training bases in the Hawaiian Islands, led by Oahu's Schofield Barracks Military Reservation supporting approximately 47 federally endangered species and 53 imperiled species (Stein et al. 2008). Overall, more than 34% of the U.S. federally listed endangered species are found within Hawaiian military training bases, which makes these areas particularly vulnerable to military training exercises; stressing the importance for conservative land-use practices and management techniques to protect these ecologically valuable landscapes (Zentelis and Lindenmayer, 2014; Stein et al., 2008). Photo Credit: Polihale Wikimedia Commons, 2004.

Box 4: Oil Contamination in Arabian Gulf

After the Gulf War oil spill in 1991, coral reef species demonstrated substantial resilience to sea water temperature decreases and toxic hydrocarbon fall-out (Downing and Roberts 1993, Vogt 1995). The Arabian Gulf is home to several diverse coral reef communities both inshore and offshore. From 1984 until 1994, coral species cover was estimated at six different locations off the coasts of Kuwait and Saudia Arabia using video recordings and diving teams. The combined results of two independent studies found that (Downing and Roberts 1993; Vogt 1995), after an estimated 6-8 million barrels of oil were added to the Arabian Gulf, there was no observable declines to coral reef health. Instead, from 1992 to 1994, Vogt (1995) observed significantly increasing trends in coral cover. Today, coral reef health is subject to climate change and increasing marine ecosystem pollution, which makes modern coral surveys unable to tease out any direct evidence of long-term effects of the Gulf War on coral communities (Downing and Roberts 1993, Al-Cibahy et al. 2012). Photo Credit: Michael J. Lawrence, 2012.