Environmental Reviews

Dossiers environnement

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

Journal:	<i>Environmental Reviews</i>
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

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

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. Stemberger², Aaron J. Zolderdo¹, Daniel P. Struthers¹ and
Steven J. Cooke¹

¹Fish 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 casualties 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 casualties 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 Guerriy 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 (McDonnell 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 detonations 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 (Kirkwood 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; McDonnell 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 (Barnhouse 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 live-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

604 enlarged track ruts and higher rates of vegetation removal (Johnson 1983; Watts 1998; Dickson
605 et al. 2008). In frequently used landscapes, tracked vehicles have been noted to reduce total plant
606 and woody vegetation cover, and increase soil erosion rates (Johnson 1982; Wilson 1988).
607 Armoured manoeuvre training can also lead to changes in soil structure and chemistry with
608 frequently used sites having lower carbon to nitrogen ratios, as well as reduced soil carbon
609 content (Garten et al. 2003). Certain training exercises in wooded areas can be particularly
610 degrading on vegetation communities, as tracked vehicles can often be used as bulldozers to
611 clear paths and sight lines (Rideout and Walsh 1990). Armoured vehicle operations have also
612 been linked to incidentally hitting and killing wildlife during training exercises (Zakrajsek and
613 Bissonette 2005; Telesco and Van Manen 2006).

614
615 Aside from terrestrial armoured vehicle training, military training areas are intensively
616 used for fighter jet and helicopter training exercises (Black et al. 1984; Harrington and Veitch
617 1991; Conomy et al. 1998). The largest environmental impact associated with aviation exercises
618 is hitting and killing birds during flight manoeuvres (Richardson and West 2000; Civil Aviation
619 Authority 2001; Zakrajsek and Bissonette 2005). Bird-aircraft collisions are particularly serious
620 as they can often cause a loss of human life and damage/destruction to aircraft. From 1985-1998,
621 the United States Air Force (USAF) recorded an average of 2,700 aviation related bird strikes
622 each year, accumulating in excess of 35,000 bird-aircraft collisions over the 13 year period; an
623 average cost of \$35 million US dollars annually in aircraft repair and replacement to the USAF
624 (Zakrajsek and Bissonette 2005). The most vulnerable bird species to aircraft collisions noted by
625 the USAF included raptors, waterfowl, and passerines (Lovell and Dolbeer 1999; Zakrajsek and
626 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

742 evaluate environmental damage caused by these events and to assess their long term effects. In
743 doing so, it was apparent that the defoliation of the landscape resulted in immediate tree and
744 shrub mortality in addition to the local extirpation of many large mammals such as ungulates,
745 carnivores and elephants (Westing 1980; Oriands and Pfeiffer 1970; Westing 1985).

746
747 The application of large quantities of concentrated herbicides can alter the local
748 community structure as well. In Vietnam, forested and mangrove dominated habitats have
749 become scrubby grasslands, greatly changing the community assemblages (Dinh 1984; Westing
750 1989; Nguyen 2009). Surveys comparing un-impacted habitat with that inflicted with herbicide
751 found notably less species diversity (Westing 1989). However, one of the major limiting factors
752 in assessing and quantifying ecosystem changes is the lack of data in the region's baseline
753 ecological conditions (e.g. before war). In attempting to evaluate how biodiversity was affected,
754 researchers have made broad assumptions based off of limited observations and local indigenous
755 knowledge. Orians and Pfeiffer (1970) used these methods and suggested that regions of
756 Vietnam experienced a decline in bird species richness post conflict, specifically in those
757 consuming insects and fruit.

758
759 An additional long term problem associated with herbicide exposure is bioaccumulation
760 and the persistence of these chemicals in the environment. After the Vietnam War, high
761 concentrations of dioxins were found in the ovaries and livers of turtles (Schechter et al. 1989).
762 This effect was also demonstrated in tissues isolated from local pigs and chickens, likely
763 resulting from a combination of residual Agent Orange and other herbicidal exposure over the
764 past few decades (Schechter 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 m³ 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

788 ocean (Chepesiuk 1997; Smith 2011); a common practice across the globe at the time. Disposal
789 of these vessels in the ocean runs the risk of the metal-based containers corroding and leaching
790 the chemical contents of the vessel into the ocean; an effect which could lead to a localized
791 exposure to the chemical as well as more widespread impacts via trophic movements (Long
792 2009). Sanderson et. al. (2010) modelled propagation of chemical warfare agents in the Baltic
793 Sea through the food chain in cod (*Gadus morhua*), herring (*Clupea harengus*), and sprat
794 (*Sprattus sprattus*). Adamsite, a component found in chemical weapons, was found to be
795 consistently present in the tissues of Atlantic cod demonstrating bioamplification and
796 accumulation of these substances in higher trophic levels. However, that study did not take into
797 account the number of buried munitions and containers on the seafloor that could reintroduce
798 high levels of chemicals to the surrounding area as the containers holding them degrade and
799 corrode. Regardless, this represents a pathway by which contaminants may be spread throughout
800 the various components of the ecosystem. Similarly, wreckages from naval ships pose certain
801 risks for the marine ecosystem in which they are found. Oil contamination in the Atlantic Ocean
802 due to World War II shipwrecks alone is estimated at over 15 million tonnes (Monfils 2005).
803 Much of the oil still resides within these wrecks and will pose future problems as the vessels
804 begin to degrade (Westing 1980; Monfils 2005). In much the same manner, during the conflict in
805 Kosovo, shelling of civilian infrastructure, namely manufacturing plants, resulted in a significant
806 but unintentional emission of industrial contaminants into the environment (Haavisto et al.
807 1999). Attention and care needs to be present during all stages of warfare, as contamination
808 events are common throughout training and active war with their effects persisting well after the
809 conflict has been resolved. Stringent policies are recognized as necessary to hold militaries
810 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

834 and calculating species diversity (Turner et al. 2003). Similarly, RADAR technology actively
835 uses radio-waves to locate objects and obstructions with system advances being developed
836 between the British and American forces during the 1940s (Science News Letter 1945).
837 Currently, RADAR is one of the best methods for monitoring migratory bird species
838 (Gauthreaux and Belsier 2003). Remote Operated Vehicles (ROVs) including aerial drones,
839 marine vehicles, and terrestrial vehicles were originally developed by military organizations for
840 training operations, bomb recovery, and hostile terrain observations (Springer 2013). Now, aerial
841 ROVs are used in conservation to film and survey overhead parks, to monitor wildlife and to
842 look for illegal activity such as poaching and unauthorized logging (Sutherland et al. 2013;
843 Schiffman 2014). Marine ROVs have been employed to monitor marine life as well as being
844 used as a potential tool in gaining valuable insight into the system in question (Cohen 1995;
845 Jones 2009; Moura et al. 2013; Van Dover et al. 2014). Integration of autonomous technology
846 has huge advantages in ecological studies that are often limited by man-power and overwhelmed
847 by spatial scales; ROVs can efficiently extend work periods and area covered without human
848 intervention. Lastly, advances in telemetry technology by the military have greatly improved
849 conservation research through the miniaturization of tag components (e.g. batteries, transmitters,
850 etc.) for use in a wide number of biotelemetry projects which are useful in animal tracking and
851 monitoring (Cooke 2008; Benson 2010). Not only has this greatly improved the performance,
852 operation and capabilities of many of these devices (Cooke 2008) but it has permitted them to be
853 deployed on a greater number of species/weight classes as the mass of the tag has often been a
854 limiting factor in determining the lower size limit of their use (Olival and Higuchi 2006; Bridge
855 et al. 2011; Cooke et al. 2013).

856 **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

- 948
- 949 Aarkrog, A. 1988. The radiological impact of the Chernobyl debris compared with that from
- 950 nuclear weapons fallout. *J. Environ. Radioactiv.* **6**:151-162.
- 951
- 952 Alic, J.A., Branscomb, L.M., Brooks, H., Carter, A.B., and Epstein, G.L. 1992. Beyond spinoff:
- 953 military and commercial technologies in a changing world. Harvard Business Press,
- 954 Waterdown, M.A., USA.
- 955
- 956 Al-Mohanna, S.Y., and Subrahmanyam, M.N.V. 2001. Flux of heavy metal accumulation in
- 957 various organs of the intertidal marine blue crab, *Portunus pelagicus* (L.) from the Kuwait
- 958 coast after the Gulf War. *Environ. Int.* **27**(4):321-326.
- 959
- 960 Alpen, E.L., and Sheline, G.E. 1954. The combined effects of thermal burns and whole body X-
- 961 irradiation on survival time and mortality. *Ann. Surg.* **140**(1):113-118.
- 962
- 963 Ampleman, G., Baucher, D., Thiboutot, S., Hawari, J., and Monteil-Rivera, F. 2004. Evaluation
- 964 of underwater contamination by explosives and metals at Point Amour Labrador and in the
- 965 Halifax Harbour area. Available from Defence Research and Development Canada,
- 966 Valcartier, Q.C., CA. No. DRDC-V-TR-2004-125
- 967
- 968 Apte, S., Holland, B.S., Godwin, L.S., and Gardner, J.P. 2000. Jumping ship: a stepping stone
- 969 event mediating transfer of a non-indigenous species via a potentially unsuitable
- 970 environment. *Biol. Invasions* **2**:75-79.

- 971
- 972 Augenbroe, G.L.M., and Pearce, A.R. 1998. Sustainable construction in the USA; a perspective
- 973 to the year 2010. Available from the Sustainable Development and the Future of
- 974 Construction. Vol. report 225.
- 975
- 976 Balcomb, K.C., and Claridge, D.E. 2001. A mass stranding of cetaceans caused by naval sonar in
- 977 the Bahamas. *Bahamas J. Sci.* **8**:1–12.
- 978
- 979 Barnthouse, L.W. 1995. Effects of ionizing radiation on terrestrial plants and animals: a
- 980 workshop report. Available from Oak Ridge National Lab, T.N., USA. ORNL/TM-13141
- 981
- 982 Barrett, M.J. 2011. Potentially polluting shipwrecks. Doctoral dissertation, School of the
- 983 Environment, Duke University, Durham, N.C., USA.
- 984
- 985 Bass, A.J., D'Aubrey, J.D., and Kistnasamy, N. 1973. Sharks of the east coast of southern Africa.
- 986 The genus *Carcharhinus* (*Carcharhinidae*). Available from Invest. Rep. Oceanogr. Res.
- 987 Inst., Durban, SA. pp.1-168.
- 988
- 989 Baxter, H., Drummond, J.A., Stephens-Newsham, L.G., and Randall, R.G. 1953. Reduction of
- 990 mortality in swine from combined total body radiation and thermal burns by streptomycin.
- 991 *Ann. Surg.* **137**(4):450-455.
- 992

- 993 Baxter, L., Hays, E.E., Hampson, G.R., and Backus, R.H. 1982. Mortality of fish subjected to
994 explosive shock as applied to oil well severance on Georges Bank. Available from the
995 Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, M.A., USA. Technical Report WHOI-82-54
996
- 997 Beare, D., Hölker, F., Engelhard, G.H., McKenzie, E., and Reid, D.G. 2010. An unintended
998 experiment in fisheries science: a marine area protected by war results in Mexican waves
999 in fish numbers-at-age. *Naturwissenschaften* **97**:797-808.
1000
- 1001 Beasley, G., and Kneale, P. 2002. Reviewing the impacts of metals and PAHs on
1002 macroinvertebrates in urban watercourses. *Prog. Phys. Geogr.* **26**(2):236-270.
1003
- 1004 Beatley, J.C. 1966. Winter annual vegetation following a nuclear detonation in the Northern
1005 Mojave Desert (Nevada Test Site). *Radiat. Bot.* **6**:69-82.
1006
- 1007 Bednarek, A.T. 2001. Undamming rivers: a review of the ecological impacts of dam removal.
1008 *Environ. Manage.* **27**:803-814.
1009
- 1010 Bender, A. 1977. Noise impact on wildlife: an environmental impact assessment. *In* Proceedings
1011 of the 9th Conference of Space Simulation, NASA (P-2000,7), Los Angeles, C.A., USA,
1012 26-28 April 1977. pp. 155-165.
1013

- 1014 Benson, E. 2010. Wired wilderness: technologies of tracking and the making of modern wildlife.
1015 John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, M.D., USA.
1016
- 1017 Berhe, A.A. 2007. The contribution of landmines to land degradation. Land Degrad. Dev. **18**:1-
1018 15.
1019
- 1020 Bickham, J.W., Hanks, B.G., Smolen, M.J., Lamb, T., and Gibbons, J.W. 1988. Flow cytometric
1021 analysis of the effects of low-level radiation exposure on natural populations of slider
1022 turtles (*Pseudemys scripta*). Arch. Environ. Contam. Toxicol. **17**(6):837-841.
1023
- 1024 Bizzozero Jr, O.J., Johnson, K.G., Ciocco, C., Hoshino, T., Itoga, T., Toyoda, S., and Kawasaki,
1025 S. 1966. Radiation-related leukemia in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, 1946–1964: distribution,
1026 incidence and appearance time. New Engl. J. Med. **274**(20):1095-1101.
1027
- 1028 Black, B.B., Collopy, M.W., Percival, H.F., Tiller, A.A., and Bohall, P.G. 1984. Effects of low
1029 level military training flights on wading bird colonies in Florida. Available from the
1030 Florida Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, University of Florida, Gainesville,
1031 F.L., USA. Technical Report No. 7.
1032
- 1033 Brady, M.T. 1992. Environmental review of military base closures: implications for affected
1034 governments. Duke Environ. Policy Forum **2**(1):1-15.
1035

- 1036 Bridge, E.S., Thorup, K., Bowlin, M.S., Chilson, P.B., Diehl, R.H., Fléron, R.W., Hartl, P.,
1037 Kelly, J.F., Robinson, D., and Wikelski, M. 2011. Technology on the move: recent and
1038 forthcoming innovations for tracking migratory birds. *BioScience* **61**(9):689-698.
- 1039
1040
- 1041 Briner, W. 2010. The toxicity of depleted uranium. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Publ. Health* **7**(1):303-
1042 313.
- 1043
- 1044 Brode, H.L. 1968. Review of nuclear weapons effects. *Annu. Rev. Nucl. Sci.* **18**(1):153-202.
- 1045
- 1046 Brooks, J.W., Evans, E.I., Ham, W.T., and Reid, J.D. 1952. The influence of external body
1047 radiation on mortality from thermal burns. *Ann. Surg.* **136**:533-545.
- 1048
- 1049 Brown, D.G., Thomas, R.E., Jones, L.P., Cross, F.H., and Sasmore, D.P. 1961. Lethal dose
1050 studies with cattle exposed to whole-body Co-60 gamma radiation. *Radiat. Res.* **15**(5):675-
1051 683.
- 1052
- 1053 Bu-Olayan, A.H., and Subrahmanyam, M.N.V. 1997. Accumulation of copper, nickel, lead and
1054 zinc by snail, *Lunella coronatus* and pearl oyster, *Pinctada radiata* from the Kuwait coast
1055 before and after the gulf war oil spill. *Sci. Total Environ.* **197**(1):161-165.
- 1056
- 1057 Burger, J., and Gochfeld, M. 2000. Effects of lead on birds (*Laridae*): a review of laboratory and
1058 field studies. *J. Toxicol. Environ. Health B* **3**(2):59-78.

- 1059
- 1060 Byrnes, V.A., Brwon, D., Rose H.W., and Cibis, P.A. 1955. Chorio-retinal burns produced by
- 1061 atomic flashes. A.M.A. Arch. Ophthal. **53**(3):351-364.
- 1062
- 1063 Campbell, C.A., Valentine, J.W., and Ayala, F.J. 1975. High genetic variability in a population
- 1064 of *Tridacna maxima* from the Great Barrier Reef. Mar. Biol. **33**(4): 341-345.
- 1065
- 1066 Candole, C.A. 1967. Blast injury. Canad. Med. Ass. J. **96**:207-214.
- 1067
- 1068 Cao, X., Ma, L.Q., Chen, M., Hardison Jr, D.W., and Harris, W.G. 2003a. Weathering of lead
- 1069 bullets and their environmental effects at outdoor shooting ranges. J. Environ. Qual.
- 1070 **Q32**(2):526-534.
- 1071
- 1072 Cao, X., Ma, L.Q., Chen, M., Hardison Jr, D.W., and Harris, W.Q. 2003b. Lead transformation
- 1073 and distribution in the soils of shooting ranges in Florida, USA. Sci Total Environ. **307**(1-
- 1074 3):179-189.
- 1075
- 1076 Certini, G., Scalenghe, R., Woods, W.I. 2013. The impact of warfare on the soil environment.
- 1077 Earth Sci. Rev. **127**:1-15.
- 1078
- 1079 Chadwick, D. 1992. The fate of the elephant. Available from the Sierra Club, Washington, D.C.,
- 1080 USA.

- 1081
- 1082 Chandler, C.C., Storey, T.G., and Tangren, C.D. 1963. Prediction of forest fire spread following
1083 a nuclear explosion. Available from U.S. Forest Service Pacific Southwest Forest and
1084 Range Experiment Station, Albany, C.A., USA. Research Paper PSW-5.
- 1085
- 1086 Chapesuik, R. 1997. A Sea of Trouble? B. Atom. Sci. **53**(5):40-44.
- 1087
- 1088 Civil Aviation Authority. 2001. Large flocking birds: an international conflict between
1089 conservation and air safety [Online]. Available from
1090 http://www.caa.co.uk/docs/224/srg_dps_flockingbirds.pdf [Accessed April 15 2015].
- 1091
- 1092 Clark, B., and Jorgenson, A.K. 2012. The treadmill of destruction and the environmental impacts
1093 of Militaries. Sociol. Compass **6**:557-569.
- 1094
- 1095 Cleary, E.C., and Dolbeer, R.A. 1999. Wildlife hazard management at airports. Available from
1096 the Federal Aviation Administration, Office of Airport Safety and Standards, Washington
1097 D.C., USA.
- 1098
- 1099 Clodfelter, M. 2006. The limits of air power: the American bombing of North Vietnam.
1100 University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, N.E., USA.
- 1101
- 1102 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.

- 1103
1104 Cohen, A.S. 1995. Paleoecological approaches to the conservation biology of benthos in ancient
1105 lakes: a case study from Lake Tanganyika. *J. N. Am. Benthol. Soc.* **14**(4):654-668.
1106
- 1107 Conomy, J.T., Collazo, J.A., Dubovsky, J.A., and Fleming, W.J. 1998. Dabbling duck behavior
1108 and aircraft activity in coastal North Carolina. *J. Wildlife Manage.* **62**(3):1127-1134.
1109
- 1110 Cooke, S.J. 2008. Biotelemetry and biologging in endangered species research and animal
1111 conservation: relevance to regional, national, and IUCN Red List threat assessments.
1112 *Endanger. Species Res.* **4**:165-185.
1113
- 1114 Cooke, S.J., Midwood, J.D., Thiem, J.D., Klimley, P., Lucas, M.C., Thorstad, E.B., Eiler, J.,
1115 Holbrook, C., and Ebner, B.C. 2013. Tracking animals in freshwater with electronic tags:
1116 past, present and future. *Anim. Biotelem.* **1**(5):1-19.
1117
- 1118 Coppock, R.W. 2009. Threats to wildlife by chemical warfare agents. *In Handbook of*
1119 *Toxicology of Chemical Warfare Agents. Edited by R.C. Gupta. Academic Press,*
1120 *Waltham, M.E., USA. pp. 747-751.*
1121
- 1122 Craft, T.F. 1964. Effects of nuclear explosions on watersheds. *J. Am. Water Works Assoc.*
1123 **56**(7):846-852.
1124

- 1125 Darby, S.C., Kendall, G.M., Fell, T.P., O'Hagan, J.A., Muirhead, C.R., Ennis, J.R., Ball, A.M.,
1126 Dennis, J.A., and Doll, R. 1988. A summary of mortality and incidence of cancer in men
1127 from the United Kingdom who participated in the United Kingdom's atmospheric nuclear
1128 weapon tests and experimental programmes. *Brit. Med. J.* **296**(6618):332-338.
1129
- 1130 Davis, J.S. 2007. Scales of Eden: conservation and pristine devastation on Bikini Atoll. *Environ.*
1131 *Plan. D* **25**(2):213-235.
1132
- 1133 Demarais, S., Tazik, D. J., Guertin, P. J., and Jorgensen, E. E. 1999. Disturbance associated with
1134 military exercises. *In Ecosystems of Disturbed Ground. Edited by L.R. Walker.* Elsevier
1135 Science B.V., Amsterdam, NL. pp. 385-396.
- 1136 Dickson, T.L., Wilsey, B.J., Busby, R.R., and Gebhart, D.L. 2008. Grassland plant composition
1137 alters vehicular disturbance effects in Kansas, USA. *Environ. Manage.* **41**:676-684.
1138
- 1139 Dinh, H. 1984. Long-term changes in dense inland forest following herbicidal attack. *In*
1140 *Herbicides in war: the long term ecological and human consequences. Edited by A.H.*
1141 *Westing.* Taylor & Francis, London, UK. pp. 31-32.
1142
- 1143 Dolman, S.J., Weir, C.R., and Jasny, M. 2009. Comparative review of marine mammal guidance
1144 implemented during naval exercises. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* **58**:465-477.
1145

- 1146 Donaldson, L.R., Seymour, A.H., and Nevissi, A.E. 1997. University of Washington's
1147 radioecological studies in the Marshall Islands, 1946-1977. *Health Phys.* **73**(1):214-222.
1148
- 1149 Downing N., and Roberts C. 1993. Has the Gulf War affected coral reefs of the Northwestern
1150 Gulf? *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* **27**:149-156.
1151
- 1152 Doxford, D., and Judd, A. 2002. Army training: the environmental gains resulting from the
1153 adoption of alternatives to traditional training methods. *J. Environ. Plann. Man.* **45**(2):245-
1154 265.
1155
- 1156 Draulans, D., Van Krunkelsven, E. 2002. The impact of wars on the Democratic Republic of
1157 Congo. *Oryx* **36**:35-40.
- 1158 Drumbl, M.A. 1998. Waging war against the world: the need to move from war crimes to
1159 environmental crimes. *Fordham Int'l L. J.* **22**:122-153.
1160
- 1161 Dubey, A., and Shreni, P.D. 2008. War and environment: an overview. *J. Environ. Res. Dev.*
1162 **4**:968-976.
1163
- 1164 Dudley, J.P., Ginsberg, J.R., Plumptre, A.J., Hart, J.A., and Campos, L.C. 2002. Effects of war
1165 and civil strife on wildlife and habitats. *Cons. Biol.* **16**(2): 319-329.
1166

- 1167 Dufour, P.A. 1980. Effects of noise on wildlife and other animals: review of research since 1971.
1168 Available from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. EPA 550/9-80-100:1-97.
1169
- 1170 Dukiya, J.J., and Gahlot, V. 2013. An evaluation of the effect of bird strikes on flight safety
1171 operations at international airports. *Int. J. Traffic Transport Eng.* **3**(1):16-33.
1172
- 1173 Dunnet, G.M. 1977. Observations on the effects of low-flying aircraft at seabird colonies on the
1174 coast of Aberdeenshire, Scotland. *Biol. Conserv.* **12**:55-63.
1175
- 1176 DuPont Guerry III, W.T., Ham, W.T., Wiesinger, H., Schmidt, F.H., Williams, R.C., Ruffin,
1177 R.S., and Shaffer, M.C. 1956. Experimental production of flash burns in the rabbit
1178 retina. *T. Am. Ophthalmol. Soc.* **54**:259-273.
1179
- 1180 Durant, R.F. 2007. The greening of the US military: environmental policy, national security, and
1181 organizational change. *Edited by* B.A. Radin. Georgetown University Press, Washington,
1182 D.C., USA.
1183
- 1184 Edwards, C.A. 2002. Assessing the effects of environmental pollutants on soil organisms,
1185 communities, processes and ecosystems. *Euro. J. Soil Biol.* **38**(3-4):225-231.
1186
- 1187 Eisenbud, M., and Gesell, T.F. 1997. Nuclear weapons. *In* *Environmental Radioactivity from*
1188 *Natural, Industrial & Military Sources.* Academic Press, San Diego, C.A., USA, pp. 271-
1189 314.

1190

1191 Eldred, E., and Trowbridge, W.V. 1954. Radiation Sickness in the monkey 1. Radiology
1192 **62**(1):65-73.

1193

1194 Engelhard, G.H. 2008. One hundred and twenty years of change in fishing power of English
1195 North Sea trawlers. *In* Advances in fisheries science 50 years on from Beverton and Holt.
1196 *Edited by* A. Payne, J. Cotter and T. Potter. Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, UK. pp.1-15.

1197

1198 Entry, J.A., and Watrud, L.S. 1998. Potential remediation of ¹³⁷Cs and ⁹⁰Sr contaminated soil by
1199 accumulation in alamo switchgrass. *Water Air Soil Poll.* **104**(3-4):39-352.

1200

1201 Evans, M.I., Symens, P., and Pilcher, C.W.T. 1993. Short-term damage to coastal bird
1202 populations in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait following the 1991 Gulf War marine pollution.
1203 *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* **27**:157–161.

1204

1205 Fehmi, J.S., Farmer, T., and Zimmerman, A. 2001. Impacts of military vehicle training activities
1206 on vegetation: bibliography with abstracts. Available from the US Army Engineer
1207 Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, MI, USA. pp 1-50.

1208

1209 Fisher, I.J., Pain, D.J., and Thomas, V.G. 2006. A review of lead poisoning from ammunition
1210 sources in terrestrial birds. *Biol. Conserv.* **131**:421-432.

1211

1212 Fosberg, F.R. 1985. Vegetation of Bikini Atoll. *Atoll Res. Bull.* **315**:1-28.

- 1213
- 1214 Foster, J.R., Ayers, P.D., Lombardi-Przylowicz, A.M., and Simmons, K. 2006. Initial effects of
- 1215 light armored vehicle use on grassland vegetation at Fort Lewis, Washington. *J. Environ.*
- 1216 *Manage.* **81**(4):315-322.
- 1217
- 1218 Francis, R.A. 2011. The impacts of modern warfare on freshwater ecosystems. *Environ. Manage.*
- 1219 **48**:985-999.
- 1220
- 1221 Ganesan, K., Raza, S.K., and Vijayaraghavan, R. 2010. Chemical warfare agents. *J*
- 1222 *Pharm Bioallied Sci.* **2**(3):166-178.
- 1223
- 1224 Gangwar, A. 2003. Impact of war and landmines on environment. *In* Forum Proceedings:
- 1225 Landmines-Challenges to Humanity and Environment. Srinigar, IN, 20 April 2003.
- 1226
- 1227 Garten, C.T., Ashwood, T.L., and Dale, V.H. 2003. Effect of military training on indicators of
- 1228 soil quality at Fort Benning, Georgia. *Ecol. Indic.* **3**:171-179.
- 1229
- 1230 Gaspin, J.B. 1975. Experimental investigations of the effects of underwater explosions on
- 1231 swimbladder fish. I. 1973 Chesapeake Bay tests. Available from the Naval Surface
- 1232 Weapons Center, White Oak Lab, Silver Spring, M.D., USA. No. NSWC/WOL/TR-75-58.
- 1233
- 1234 Gasser, H.P. 1995. For better protection of the natural environment in armed conflict: a proposal
- 1235 for action. *Am. J. Int'l L.* **1995**: 637-644.

- 1236
- 1237 Gauthreaux, S.A. Jr., and Belsier, C.G. 2003. Radar ornithology and biological conservation. The
- 1238 Auk **120**(2):266-277.
- 1239
- 1240 Gazenbeek, A. 2005. LIFE, Natura 2000 and the military. Available from the European
- 1241 Commission, Environment Directorate General, Brussels, BE.
- 1242
- 1243 Gese, E.M., Rongstad, O.J., and Mytton, W.R. 1989. Changes in coyote movements due to
- 1244 military activity. J. Wildlife Manage. **53**(2):334-339.
- 1245
- 1246 Gladwin, D.N., Asherin, D.A., and Manci, K.M. 1988. Effects of aircraft noise and sonic booms
- 1247 on fish and wildlife: results of a survey of U.S. fish and wildlife service endangered species
- 1248 and ecological services field offices, refuges, hatcheries, and research centers. Available
- 1249 from the US Departments of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Services. NERC-88/30
- 1250
- 1251 Glasstone, G. 1962. The effects of nuclear weapons (Revised Edn.). U.S. Department of Defense
- 1252 and Energy, Washington D.C., USA.
- 1253
- 1254 Glasstone, G., and Dolan, P.J. 1977. The effects of nuclear weapons (3rd Edn.). U.S. Department
- 1255 of Defence and Energy, Washington D.C., USA.
- 1256
- 1257 Glasstone, S. 1964. The effects of nuclear weapons. Available from the US Department of
- 1258 Defense, Washington D.C., USA. OTSI identification 972902.

- 1259
- 1260 Gleick, P.H. 1993. Water and conflict: fresh water resources and international security. *Int.*
- 1261 *Secur.* **18**:79–112.
- 1262
- 1263 Goertner, J.F. 1982. Prediction of underwater explosion safe ranges for sea mammals. Available
- 1264 from the Naval Surface Weapons Center, Silver Spring, M.D., USA, Report No.
- 1265 NSWC/TR-82-188.
- 1266
- 1267 Goldizen, V.C., Richmond, D.R., Chiffelle, T.L., Bowen, I.G., and White, C.S. 1961. Missile
- 1268 studies with a biological target. Available from the Office of Technical Services,
- 1269 Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C., USA. USAEC Civil Effects Test Group
- 1270 Report WT-1470.
- 1271
- 1272 Goldsmith, G.S. 2010. Environmental impacts and military range use: an investigation and
- 1273 summary of what we have learned after 12 years at Massachusetts Military Reservation
- 1274 (MMR) and implications for the continued use of military ranges in the United States.
- 1275 Available from the Army Environmental Policy Institute. pp 1-36.
- 1276
- 1277 Gontier, M. 2007. Scale issues in the assessment of ecological impacts using a GIS-based habitat
- 1278 model - A case study for the Stockholm region. *Environ. Impact Assess. Rev.* **27**:440-459.
- 1279
- 1280 Goodchild, M.F. 2000. The current status of GIS and spatial analysis. *J. Geogr. Syst.* **2**:5-10.
- 1281

- 1282 Govoni J.J., West, M.A., Settle, L.R., Lynch, R.T., and Greene, M.D. 2008. Effects of
1283 underwater explosions on larval fish: implications for a coastal engineering project. J.
1284 Coast. Res. **24**(2B):228-233.
- 1285
- 1286 Grace, J.B., and Keeley, J.E. 2006. A structural equation model analysis of postfire plant
1287 diversity in California shrublands. Ecol. Appl. **16**(2):503-514.
- 1288
- 1289 Gray, R.H., and Rickard, W.H. 1989. The protected area of Hanford as a refugium for native
1290 plants and animals. Environ. Conserv. **16**(03):251-260.
- 1291
- 1292 Gulland, J.A. 1968. Recent changes in the North Sea plaice fishery. J. Cons. Int. Explor. Mer.
1293 **31**:305-322.
- 1294
- 1295 Guskova, A.K., Baranov, A.E., and Gusev, I.A. 2001. Acute radiation sickness: underlying
1296 principles and assessments. *In* Medical Management of Radiation Accidents (2nd Edn.).
1297 *Edited by* I. Gusev, A.K. Guskova and F.A. Mettler. CRC Press, Boca Raton, F.L., USA.
1298 pp 33-52.
- 1299
- 1300 Haavisto, P. et al. 1999. The Kosovo conflict: consequences for the environment & human
1301 settlements. Available from UN Environment Programme, Nairobi, KE.
- 1302

- 1303 Haavisto, P. et al. 2001. Depleted Uranium in Kosovo: Post-conflict Environmental Assessment.
1304 Available from UN Environment Programme, Nairobi, KE.
1305
- 1306 Ham, W.T., Wiesinger, H., Guerry, D., Schmidt, F.H., Williams, R.C., Ruffin, R.S., and Shaffer,
1307 M.C. 1957. Experimental production of flash burns in the rabbit retina. *Am. J. Ophthalmol.*
1308 **43**(5):711-718.
1309
- 1310 Hanson, T., Brooks, T.M., Da Fonseca, G.A., Hoffmann, M., Lamoreux, J.F., Machlis, G., and
1311 Pilgrim, J.D. 2009. Warfare in biodiversity hotspots. *Conserv. Biol.* **23**:578-587.
1312
- 1313 Hardison Jr, D.W., Ma, L.Q., Luongo, T., and Harris, W.G. 2004. Lead contamination in
1314 shooting range soils from abrasion of lead bullets and subsequent weathering. *Sci. Total*
1315 *Environ.* **328**(1-3):175-183.
1316
- 1317 Harrington, F.H., and Veitch, A.M. 1991. Short-term impacts of low-level jet fighter training on
1318 caribou in Labrador. *Arctic* **44**(4):318-327.
1319
- 1320 Hart, T., Hart, J., Fimbel, C., Fimbel, R., Laurance, W.F., Oren, C., Struhsaker, T.T.,
1321 Rosenbaum, H.C., Walsh, P.D., Razafindrakoto, Y., Vely, M., and DeSalle, P. 1997.
1322 Conservation and civil strife: two perspectives from Central Africa Conservation and civil
1323 strife. *Conserv. Biol.* **11**:308-314.
1324

- 1325 Hatch, F.T., Mazarimas, J.A., Greenway, G.G., Koranda, J.J., and Moore, J.L. 1968. Studies on
1326 liver DNA in tritiated kangaroo rats living at Sedan Crater. Available from California
1327 University, Lawrence Radiation Lab, Livermore, C.A., USA. Technical Report No. UCRL-
1328 50481.
- 1329
- 1330 Hatch, T., Mazrimas, J.A., Koranda, J.J., and Martin, J.R. 1970. Ecology and radiation exposure
1331 of kangaroo rats living in a tritiated environment. *Radiat. Res.* **44**(1):97-107.
- 1332
- 1333 Havlick, D.G. 2014. Opportunistic conservation at former military sites in the United States.
1334 *Prog. Phys. Geogr.* **38**(3): 71-285.
- 1335
- 1336 Hieb, M.R., Mackay, S., Powers, M.W., Yu, H., Kleiner, M., and Pullen, J.M. 2007. Geospatial
1337 challenges in a net centric environment: actionable information technology, design, and
1338 implementation. *In* Defense and Security Symposium (657816), International Society for
1339 Optics and Photonics. pp. 1-12.
- 1340
- 1341 Higuchi, H., Ozaki, K., Fujita, G., Minton, J., Ueta, M., Soma, M., and Mita, N. 1996. Satellite
1342 tracking of white-naped crane migration and the importance of the Korean demilitarized
1343 zone. *Conserv. Biol.* **10**:806-812.
- 1344
- 1345 Hinshaw, J.R. 1968. Early changes in the depth of burns. *Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci.* **150**(3):548-553.
- 1346

- 1347 Houk, P., and Musburger, C. 2013. Trophic interactions and ecological stability across coral
1348 reefs in the Marshal Islands. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **488**:23-34.
1349
- 1350 Hunter, R. 1991. *Bromus* invasions on the Nevada Test Site: present status of *B. rubens* and *B.*
1351 *tectorum* with notes on their relationship to disturbance and altitude. *Great Basin Nat.*
1352 **51**(2):176-182.
1353
- 1354 Hunter, R.B. 1992. Status of flora and fauna on the Nevada test site, 1988. Available from the
1355 United States Department of Energy Nevada Field Office, N.V., USA. Report No.
1356 DOE/NV/10630-29.
1357
- 1358 Hupy, J.P. 2006. The long-term effects of explosive munitions on the WWI battlefield surface of
1359 Verdun, France. *Scot. Geogr. Mag.* **122**:167-184.
1360
- 1361 Hupy, J.P. 2008. The environmental footprint of war. *Environ. Hist.* 405-421.
1362
- 1363 Hynes, M.V., Peter, J.E., and Rushworth, D. 2004. Artificial Reefs: A disposal option for Navy
1364 and MARAD Ships. Available from the Rand National Defense Research Institute, Santa
1365 Monica, C.A., USA. No. Rand/DB-391-Navy
1366
- 1367 ICRC. 2008. How is the term “armed conflict” defined in international humanitarian law?
1368 Available from the International Committee of the Red Cross. Opinion paper. pp.1-5.

1369

1370 Isakason, J.S. 1974. Biological effects of underground nuclear testing on marine organisms. II.
1371 Observed effects of Amchitka Island, Alaska, tests on marine fauna. *In* Proceedings of the
1372 First Conference on the Environmental Effects of Explosives and Explosions (Technical
1373 Report 73-223). Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, M.D., USA. pp. 86-97.

1374

1375 Jaffin, J.H., McKinney, L., Kinney, R.C., Cunningham, J.A., Mortiz, D.M., Krammer, J.M.,
1376 Graeber, G.M., Moe, J.B., Salander, J.M., and Harmon, J.W. 1987. A laboratory model for
1377 studying blast overpressure injury. *J. Trauma* **27**(4):349-356.

1378

1379 Janssen, R. 1980. Future scientific activities in effects of noise on animals. *In* Proceedings of the
1380 Third International Congress on Noise as a Public Health Problem, American Speech-
1381 Language-Hearing Association Rockville, M.D., USA, 1980. *Edited by* J.V. Tobias, G.
1382 Jansen, and W.D. Ward. pp.632-637.

1383

1384 Johnson, F.L. 1982. Effects of tank training activities on botanical features at Fort Hood, Texas.
1385 *Southwest. Nat.* **27**(3):309-314.

1386

1387 Jones, D.O. 2009. Using existing industrial remotely operated vehicles for deep-sea science.
1388 *Zool. Scr.* **38**(s1):41-47.

1389

1390 Jorgensen, C.D., and Hayward, C.L. 1965. Mammals of the Nevada test site. Brigham Young
1391 Univ. Sci. Bull. **6**(3):1-81.

1392

1393 Kajitani, N., and Hatano, S. 1953. A-bomb disaster investigation report (Hiroshima) first and
1394 second investigations. *In* Research on the Effects of the Atomic Bomb, Part 1. *Edited by*
1395 the Japan Science Council. pp. 522-601.

1396

1397 Kaufman, D.W., Finck, E.J., and Kaufman, G.A. 1990. Small mammals and grassland fires. *In*
1398 Fire in North American Tallgrass Prairies. *Edited by* S.L. Collins and L.L. Wallace.
1399 University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, Oklahoma, USA, pp. 46-80.

1400

1401 Kazmarek, S.E.A., Gray, P., and Booher, A. 2005. Environmental issues at military installations:
1402 what they are and how they're handled. Available from the Environmental Advisory. pp 1-
1403 9.

1404

1405 Ketten, D.R. 1995. Estimates of blast injury and acoustic trauma zones for marine mammals
1406 from underwater explosions. *In* Sensory Systems of Aquatic Mammals. *Edited by* R.A.
1407 Kastelein, J.A. Thomas and P.E. Nachtigall. De Spil Publishers, Woerden, NE. pp 391-
1408 407.

1409

1410 Keevin, T.M., and Hempen, G.L. 1997. The environmental effects of underwater explosions with
1411 methods to mitigate impacts. Available from the US. Department of the Army Corps of
1412 Engineers St. Louis, MO, USA

1413

1414 Kim, K.C. 1997. Preserving biodiversity in Korea's demilitarized zone. *Science* **278**:242-243.

1415

1416 Kirkwood, J. B. 1970. Bioenvironmental safety studies, Amchitka Island, Alaska. Milrow D+2

1417 Months Report. Amchitka Bioenvironmental Program. Available from the Battelle

1418 Memorial Institute, Columbus Laboratories, Columbus, O.H., USA. Report No. BHI-171-

1419 126.

1420

1421 Kirkwood, J.B., and Fuller, R.G. 1972. Amchitka Bioenvironmental Program: Bioenvironmental

1422 Safety Studies, Amchitka Island, Alaska: Cannikin D+2 Months Report. Available from

1423 the Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus Laboratories, Columbus, O.H., USA. Report

1424 No. BMI-171-147,

1425

1426 Kishi, H. 2000. Effects of the “special bomb”: recollections of a neurosurgeon in Hiroshima,

1427 August 8-15, 1945. *Neurosurgery* **47**(2):441-446.

1428

1429 Klein, D.R. 1973. The reaction of some northern mammals to aircraft disturbance. *In* 11th

1430 International Congress of Game Biology, Stockholm, SE, 3-7 September 1973. pp. 377-

1431 383.

1432

1433 Kolesnikova, A.A., Taskaeva, A.A., Krivolutskii, and Taskaev, A.I. 2005. Condition of the soil

1434 fauna near the epicentre of an underground nuclear explosion in the Northern Urals. *Russ.*

1435 *J. Ecol.* **36**(3):150-157.

1436

- 1437 Kopel, D., Malkinson, D., and Wittenberg, L. 2015. Characterization of vegetation community
1438 dynamics in areas affected by construction waste along the urban fringe. *Urban Ecosys.*
1439 **18**:133-150.
- 1440
- 1441 Lacoste, Y.1973. An illustration of geographical warfare: bombing the dikes on the Red River,
1442 North Vietnam. *Antipode* **5**:1–13.
- 1443
- 1444 Lamb, T., Bickham, J.W., Gibbons, J.W., Smolen, M.J., and McDowell, S. 1991. Genetic
1445 damage in a population of slider turtles (*Trachemys scripta*) inhabiting a radioactive
1446 reservoir. *Arch. Environ. Contam. Toxicol.* **20**(1):138-142.
- 1447
- 1448 Lanier-Graham, S. 1993. The ecology of war: environmental impacts of weaponry and warfare.
1449 Walker and Company, New York, N.Y., USA.
- 1450
- 1451 Larkin, R.P., Pater, L.L., and Tazik, D.J. 1996. Effects of military noise on wildlife. A literature
1452 review. Available from the Construction Engineering Research Lab (Army), Champaign,
1453 I.L., USA. No. USACERL-TR-96/21
- 1454
- 1455 Lathrop, E.W. 1983. Recovery of perennial vegetation in military maneuver areas. *In*
1456 *Environmental Effects of Off-Road Vehicles: Impacts and Management in Arid Regions.*
1457 *Edited by* R.H. Webb and H.G. Wilshire. Springer, NL. pp 265-277.
- 1458

- 1459 Ledney, G.D., Elliot, T.B., and Moore, M.M. 1992. Modulation of mortality by tissue trauma and
1460 sepsis in mice after radiation injury. *In* The Biological Basis of Radiation Protection
1461 Practice. *Edited by* K.L. Mossan and W.A. Mills. Williams and Wilkens, Baltimore, MD,
1462 USA, pp. 202-217.
- 1463
- 1464 Leitenberg, M. 2006. Deaths in Wars and Conflicts in the 20th Century. 3rd ed. Available from
1465 the Cornell University Peace Studies Program, Ithaca, N.Y., USA. ISSN 1075-4857
- 1466 Levy, B.S., Lee, C., and Shahi, B.S. 1997. The environmental consequences of war. *In* War and
1467 Public Health. *Edited by* B.S. Levy and V.W. Sidel. Oxford University Press New York,
1468 N.Y., USA. pp. 51-62.
- 1469
- 1470 Liebow, A.A. 1983. Encounter with disaster: a medical diary of Hiroshima, 1945. *Yale J. Biol.*
1471 *Med.* **56**:23-38.
- 1472
- 1473 Lifton, R.J. 1967. Death in life: survivors of Hiroshima. Random House, New York, NY, USA.
- 1474
- 1475 Lindenmayer, D.B., Wood, J.T., Cunningham, R.B., MacGregor, C., Crane, M., Michael, D.,
1476 Montague-Drake, R., Brown, D., Muntz, R., and Gill, A.M. 2008. Testing hypotheses
1477 associated with bird response to wildfire. *Ecol. Appl.* **18**(8):1967-1983.
- 1478
- 1479 Lindsell, J. A., Klop, E., and Siaka, A. M. 2011. The impact of civil war on forest wildlife in
1480 West Africa: mammals in Gola Forest, Sierra Leone. *Oryx* **45**(01):69-77.

- 1481
- 1482 Long, T. P. 2009. A global prospective on underwater munitions. *Mar. Technol. Soc. J.* **43**(4):
- 1483 5-10.
- 1484
- 1485 Lovell, C.D., and Dolbeer, R.A. 1999. Validation of the United States air force bird avoidance
- 1486 model. *Wildlife Soc. Bull.* **27**(1):167-171.
- 1487
- 1488 Machlis, G.E., and Hanson, T. 2008. Warfare ecology. *BioScience* **58**:729–736.
- 1489
- 1490 Madsen, P.T. 2005. Marine mammals and noise: problems with root mean square sound pressure
- 1491 levels. *J. Acoust, Soc. Am.* **117**: 3952–3957.
- 1492
- 1493 Mai, T.A., Doan, T.V., Tarradellas, J., de Alecastra, L.F., and Gradnjean, D. 2007. Dioxin
- 1494 contamination in soils of Southern Vietnam. *Chemosphere* **67**:1802-1807.
- 1495
- 1496 Majeed, A. 2004. The impact of militarism on the environment: an overview of direct and
- 1497 indirect effects. Available from the Physicians for Global Survival, Ottawa, O.N., CA.
- 1498 ISBN 0-9735916-0-9
- 1499
- 1500 Mancini, K.M., Gladwin, D.N., Villella, R., and Cavendish, M.G. 1988. Effects of aircraft noise
- 1501 and sonic booms on domestic animals and wildlife: a literature synthesis. Available from
- 1502 National Ecology Research Center, Fort Collins, C.O., USA. No. NERC 88/29
- 1503

1504 Martore, R.M., Mathews, T.D., and Bell, M. 1998. Levels of PCBs and heavy metals in biota
1505 found on ex-military ships used as artificial reefs. Available from the South Carolina
1506 Department of Natural Resources Charleston, S.C., USA.

1507

1508 Masco, J. 2004. Mutant ecologies: radioactive life in post-cold war New Mexico. *Cult.*
1509 *Anthropol.* **19**(4):517-550.

1510

1511

1512 Mayorga, M.A. 1997. The pathology of primary blast overpressure injury. *Toxicology* **121**: 17-
1513 28.

1514

1515 McDonnel, G.M., Crosby, W.H., Tessmer, C.F., Moncrief, W.H., Baker, H.J., Goldstein, J.D.,
1516 Woodward, K., Shively, J.N., Daniell, H.W., Horava, A., and Claypool, H.A. 1961. Effects
1517 of nuclear detonations on a large biological specimen (swine). Available from the Defense
1518 Atomic Support Agency, Sandia Base, Albuquerque, N.M., USA. Operation Plumbbob,
1519 Project 4.1 Report WT-1428

1520

1521 McNeely, J.A. 2003. Conserving forest biodiversity in times of violent conflict. *Oryx* **37**:142-
1522 152.

1523

1524 Medica, P. A., Turner, F.B., and Smith, D.D. 1973. Effects of radiation on a fenced population of
1525 horned lizards (*Phrynosoma platyrhinos*) in southern Nevada. *J. Hepetol.* **7**:79-85.

1526

- 1527 Merritt, M. 1970. Physical and biological effects: Milrow Event. Available from the U.S. Atomic
1528 Energy Commission, National Technical Information Service, U.S. Dep. Of Commerce,
1529 Springfield, V.A., USA. Report No. NVO-79.
1530
- 1531 Merritt, M. 1973. Physical and biological effects: Cannikin. Available from the U.S. Atomic
1532 Energy Commission, National Technical Information Service, U.S. Dep. of Commerce,
1533 Springfield, V.A., USA. Report No. NVO-123
1534
- 1535 Mettler, F.A. 2001. Direct effects of radiation on specific tissues. *In* Medical Management of
1536 Radiation Accidents (2nd Edn.). *Edited by* I. Gusev, A.K. Guskova and F.A. Mettler. CRC
1537 Press, Boca Raton, F.L., USA. pp 69-132.
1538
- 1539 Meyer-Reil, L., and Köster, M. 2000. Eutrophication of marine water: effects on benthic
1540 microbial communities. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* **41**(1-6):255-263.
1541
- 1542 Miller, J.W. 1972. Forest fighting on the Eastern Front in World War II. *Geogr. Rev.* 186-202.
1543
- 1544 Miller, P.J.O., Biassoni, N., Samuels, A., and Tyack, P.L. 2000. Whale songs lengthen in
1545 response to sonar. *Nature* **405**(6789):903-903.
1546
- 1547 Miller, T.A., Yaghoobian, A., Stuckert, B.J., Goudey, J.S., and McAndless, J.M. 1998. The use
1548 of mapping techniques in an ecological risk assessment of sites contaminated with
1549 chemical warfare agents. *J. Hazard. Mater.* **61**:31-36.

- 1550
- 1551 Mole, R.H. 1958. The development of leukaemia in irradiated animals. *Brit Med. Bull.*
- 1552 **14**(2):174-177.
- 1553
- 1554 Monfils, R. 2005. The global risk of marine pollution from WWII shipwrecks: examples from
- 1555 the seven seas. *In* International Oil Spill Conference, Miami Beach, FL, USA, 15-19 May
- 1556 2005. pp. 1049-1054.
- 1557
- 1558 Mooney, H.A., and Cleland, E.E. 2001. The evolutionary impact of invasive species. *Proc. Nat.*
- 1559 *Acad. Sci.* **98**:5446-5451.
- 1560
- 1561 Moreira, F., and Russo, D. 2007. Modelling the impact of agricultural abandonment and
- 1562 wildfires on vertebrate diversity in Mediterranean Europe. *Landscape Ecol.* **22**:1461-1476.
- 1563
- 1564 Mortberg, U.M., Balfors, B., and Knol, W.C. 2007. Landscape ecological assessment: a tool for
- 1565 integrating biodiversity issues in strategic environmental assessment and planning. *J.*
- 1566 *Environ. Manage.* **82**(4):457-470.
- 1567
- 1568 Moura, R.L., Secchin, N.A., Amado-Filho, G.M., Francini-Filho, R.B., Freitas, M.O., Minte-
- 1569 Vera, C.V.Teixeira, J.B., Thompson, F.L., Dutr, G.F., Sumida, P.Y.G., Guth, A.Z., Lopes,
- 1570 R.M., and Bastos, A.C. 2013. Spatial patterns of benthic megahabitats and conservation
- 1571 planning in the Abrolhos Bank. *Cont. Shelf Res.* **70**:109-117.
- 1572

- 1573 Mrema, E., Bruch, C.E., and Diamond, J. 2009. Protecting the environment during armed
1574 conflict: an inventory and analysis of international law. UNEP/Earthprint.
1575
- 1576 Mudie, N.Y., Gusev, B. I., Pivina, L.M., Schoemaker, M.J., Rijinkova, O.N., Apsalikov, K.N.,
1577 and Swerdlow, A. J. 2007. Sex ratio in the offspring of parents with chronic radiation
1578 exposure from nuclear testing in Kazakhstan. *Radiat. Res.* **168**(5):600-607.
1579
- 1580 Nguyen, T.T. 2009. Vietnam and the environment: problems and solutions. *Int. J. Environ. Stud.*
1581 **66**(1):1-8.
1582
- 1583 Nishiwaki, Y. 1995. Fifty years after Hiroshima and Nagasaki (Invited Lecture). *In Proceedings*
1584 *Radiation Protection in Neighbouring Countries in Central Europe, Portoroz, SI, 4-8 Sept*
1585 *1995. Edited by D. Glavic-Cindro. Portoroz, SI. pp. 17-26.*
1586
- 1587 Nishiwaki, Y., Kawai, H., Shono, N., Fujita, S., Matsuoka, H., Fujiwara, S., and Hosoda, T.
1588 2000. Uncertainties under emergency conditions in Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945 and
1589 Bikini Accident in 1954. *In 10th International Congress of The International Radiation*
1590 *Protection Association. Hiroshima, JP, May 14-18 2000. pp 1-10*
1591
- 1592 Noble, I.R., and Slatyer, R.O. 1980. The use of vital attributes to predict successional changes in
1593 plants communities subject to recurrent disturbances. *Vegetatio* **4**(3):5-21.
1594

- 1595 NRDC. 2003. Navy Sonar System Threatens Whales [online]. Available from
1596 <http://www.nrdc.org/wildlife/marine> [Accessed 15 April 2015].
1597
- 1598 O'Farrell, T.P. 1984. Populations of small mammals inhabiting sites 22 to 32 years after nuclear
1599 events. *In* Joint international Meeting of the Australian and the American Society of
1600 Mammalogists, Sydney, AU, 9-13 July 1984. Report No. CONF-840770-1
1601
- 1602 Ochiai, E. 2014. Hiroshima to Fukushima biohazards of radiation. Springer-Verlag Berlin
1603 Heidelberg, Berlin, DE.
1604
- 1605 Ohkita, T. 1975. A. Acute Effects. *J. Radiat. Res.* **16**(Suppl 1):49-66.
1606
- 1607 Olival, K. J., and Higuchi, H. 2006. Monitoring the long-distance movement of wildlife in Asia
1608 using satellite telemetry. *In* Conservation Biology in Asia. *Edited by* J. McNeely, T.
1609 McCarthy, A. Smith, L. Whittaker and E. Wikramnayake. Society for Conservation
1610 Biology Asia Section and Resources Himalaya Foundation, Kathmandu, NP. pp 319-339.
1611
- 1612 O'May, J.F., Hansen, C.E., Heilman, E.G., Kaste, R.C., and Neiderer, A.M. 2005. Battlespace
1613 terrain ownership: a new situation awareness tool. Available from the Army Research Lab
1614 Aberdeen Proving Ground, M.D., USA.
1615

- 1616 Orians, G.H., and Pfeiffer, E.W. 1970. Ecological effects of the war in Vietnam. *Science*
1617 **168**:544-554.
- 1618
- 1619 Ortiz-Roque, C., and Lopez-Riviera, Y. 2004. Mercury contamination in reproductive age
1620 women in a Caribbean island: Vieques. *J. Epidemiol. Commun. Health* **58**: 756-757.
- 1621
- 1622 Osuji, L.C., and Nwoye, I. 2007. An appraisal of the impact of petroleum hydrocarbons on soil
1623 fertility: the Owaza experience. *Afr. J. Agricult. Res.* **2**(7):318-324.
- 1624
- 1625 Oughterson, A.W., and Warren, S. 1956. Medical effects of the atomic bomb in Japan (Vol 8).
1626 McGraw-Hill, New York, NY, USA.
- 1627
- 1628 Oughterson, A.W., LeRoy, G.V., Liebow, A.A., Hammond, E.C., Barnett, H.L., Rosenbaum,
1629 J.D., and Schneider, B.A. 1951. Statistical analysis of the medical effects of the atomic
1630 bombs. Available from the Report of the Joint Commission for the Investigation of the
1631 Effects of the Atomic Bomb in Japan, Army Institute of Pathology. Report No. TID-5252
- 1632
- 1633 Owens, S. 1990. Defense and the environment: the impacts of military live firing in national
1634 parks. *Cambridge J. Econ.* **14**:497-505.
- 1635
- 1636 Oyama, A., and Sasaki, T. 1946. A case of burn of the cornea and retina by atomic bomb. *Ganka*
1637 *Rinsho Iho* **40**:177.

- 1638
- 1639 Palumbo, R.F. 1962. Recovery of the land plants at Eniwetok Atoll following a nuclear
1640 detonation. *Radiat. Bot.* **1**:182-189.
- 1641
- 1642 Papanikolaou, N.C., Hatzidaki, E.G., Belivanis, S., Tzanakakis, G.N., and Tsatsakis, A.M. 2005.
1643 Lead toxicity update. A brief review. *Med. Sci. Monit.* **11**(10):RA329-RA336.
- 1644
- 1645 Papastefanou, C. 2002. Depleted uranium in military conflicts and the impact on the
1646 environment. *Health phys.* **83**(2):280-282.
- 1647
- 1648 Parkinson, B.W. 1996. Progress in astronautics and aeronautics: global positioning system:
1649 theory and applications, volume 2. AIAA, Reston, V.A., USA.
- 1650
- 1651 Parsons, E.C.M., Birks, I., Evans, P.G.H., Gordon, J.G., Shrimpton, J.H., and Pooley, S. 2000.
1652 The possible impacts of military activity on cetaceans in West Scotland. *Eur. Res.*
1653 *Cetaceans* **14**: 185-190.
- 1654
- 1655 Parsons, E.C.M., Dolman, S.J., Wright, A.J, Rose, N.A., and Burns, W.C.G. 2008. Navy Sonar
1656 and cetaceans: just how much does the gun need to smoke before we act? *Mar. Pollut. Bull.*
1657 **56**:1248-1257.
- 1658
- 1659 Pearson, C. 2012. Researching militarized landscapes: a literature review on war and the
1660 militarization of the environment. *Landscape Res.* **37**:115-133.
- 1661

- 1662 Pekins, C.E. 2006. Armored military training and endangered species restrictions at Fort Hood,
1663 Texas. *Fed. Facil. Environ. J.* **17**(1):37-50.
1664
- 1665 Pendersen, D. 2002. Political violence, ethnic conflict, and contemporary wars: broad
1666 implications for health and social well-being. *Soc. Sci. Med.* **55**:175-190.
1667
- 1668 Pierce, D.A., and Preston, D.L. 2000. Radiation-related cancer risks at low doses among atomic
1669 bomb survivors. *Radiat. Res.* **154**(2):178-186.
1670
- 1671 Pinaev, V.S., and Shcherbakov, V.A. 1996. Fires caused by nuclear explosions and their
1672 consequences. *Combust. Explo. Shock+*. **32**(5):572-576.
1673
- 1674 Pinca, S., Beger, M., Jacobson, D., and Keju, T. 2005. The state of coral reef ecosystems of the
1675 Marshall Islands. *In* The State of Coral Reef Ecosystems of the United States and Pacific
1676 Freely Associated States. *Edited by* J. Waddell. NOAA Technical Memorandum NOS
1677 NCCOS 11, Silver Spring, M.D., USA. pp. 373–386.
1678
- 1679 Planes, S., Galzin, R., Bablet, J.P., and Sale, P.F. 2005. Stability of coral reef fish assemblages
1680 impacted by nuclear tests. *Ecology* **86**(10):2578-2585.
1681

- 1682 Popper, A.N., and Hastings, M.C. 2009. The effects of human-generated sound on fish. *Integ.*
1683 *Zool.* **4**(1):43-52.
- 1684
- 1685 Porter W. 2005. Movement of toxic materials through the Vieques marine ecosystem: The
1686 effects of naval bombardment on a Puerto Rican coral reef. *In* Paper presented at
1687 Ecological Society of America Annual Meeting, Montreal, Q.C., CA, 7-12 August 2005.
- 1688
- 1689 Prentice, R.L., Kato, H., Yoshimoto, K., and Mason, M. 1982. Radiation exposure and thyroid
1690 cancer incidence among Hiroshima and Nagasaki residents. *Natl. Cancer I. Monogr.*
1691 **62**:207-212.
- 1692
- 1693 Prosser, C.L., Painter, E.E., Lisco, H., Brues, A.M., Jacobson, L.O., and Swift, M.N. 1947. The
1694 clinical sequence of physiological effects of ionizing radiation in animals 1. *Radiology*
1695 **49**(3):299-313.
- 1696
- 1697 Ramos, T.B., Alves, I., Subtil, R., and de Melo, J.J. 2007. Environmental performance policy
1698 indicators for the public sector: The case of the defence sector. *J. Environ. Manage.*
1699 **82**(4):410-432.
- 1700
- 1701 Randall, P.A., 1961. Damage to conventional and special types of residences exposed to nuclear
1702 effects. Available from the US Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., USA.
- 1703 Report WT-1194.

- 1704
- 1705 Rausch, R.L. 1973. Post mortem findings in some marine mammals and birds following the
1706 Cannikin test on Amchitka Island. Available from U.S. AEC, Nevada Operations Office,
1707 Las Vegas, N.V., USA. Report No. HVO-130.
- 1708
- 1709 Real, A., Sundell-Bergman, S., Knowles, J.F., Woodhead, D.S., and Zinger, I. 2004. Effects of
1710 ionising radiation exposure on plants, fish and mammals: relevant data for environmental
1711 radiation protection. *J. Radiol. Prot.* **24**(4A):A123-A137.
- 1712
- 1713 Rendell, L.E., and Gordon, J.C.D. 1999. Vocal response of long-finned pilot whales
1714 (*Globicephala melas*) to military sonar in the Ligurian Sea. *Mar. Mammal Sci.* **15**:198–
1715 204.
- 1716
- 1717 Rhoads, W.A., and Platt, R.B. 1971. Beta radiation damage to vegetation from close-in fallout
1718 from two nuclear detonations. *BioScience* **21**(15):1121-1125.
- 1719
- 1720 Rhoads, W.A., and Ragsdale, H.L. 1971. *Artemisia* shrub size and radiation damage to *Artemisia*
1721 from local fallout from Project Schooner. *In* Pro. Nat. Symp. Radioecology, 3rd. *Edited by*
1722 D.J. Nelson. National Technical Information Service, U.S. Department of Commerce,
1723 Springfield, V.A., USA, pp. 953-960.
- 1724
- 1725 Rhoads, W.A., Asher D. K., and Ragsdale, H.L. 1972. Ecological and environmental effects
1726 from local fallout from schooner. 2. The beta and gamma radiation effects from close in

- 1727 fallout. Available from the US Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., USA.
- 1728 Technical Report No. PNE--529.
- 1729
- 1730 Richards, Z.T., Beger, M., Pinca, S., and Wallace, C.C. 2008. Bikini Atoll coral biodiversity
- 1731 resilience five decades after nuclear testing. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* **56**:503-515.
- 1732
- 1733 Richardson, J.W., and West, T. 2000. Serious birdstrike accidents to military aircraft: updated
- 1734 list and summary. *IBSC Proc.* **25**(1):67-97.
- 1735
- 1736 Richmond, D.R., and White C.S. 1962. A tentative estimation of mans tolerance to overpressures
- 1737 from air blast. Available from the Defense Atomic Support Agency, Department of
- 1738 Defense, Washington, D.C., USA. Technical Progress Report No. DASA 1335.
- 1739
- 1740 Richmond, D.R., Taboreili, Bowen, I.G., Chiffelle, T.L., Hirsch, F.G., Longwell, B.B., Riley,
- 1741 J.G., White, C.S., Sherping, F., Goldizen, V.C., Ward, J.D., Wetherbe, M.B., Clare, V.R.,
- 1742 Kuhn, M.L., and Sanchez, R.T. 1959a. Blast biology a study of the primary and tertiary
- 1743 effects of blast in open underground protective shelters. Available from the Office of
- 1744 Technical Services, Department of Commerce, Washington D.C. USAEC Civil Effects
- 1745 Test Group Report WT-1467.
- 1746
- 1747 Richmond, D.R., Wetherbe, M.B., Taborelli, R.V., Sanchez,R.T., Sherping, F., Goldizen, V.C.,
- 1748 and White, C.S. 1959b. Shock tube studies of the effects of sharp-rising, long-duration

- 1749 overpressures on biological systems. Available from the Office of Technical Services,
1750 Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C., USA. USAEC Technical Report TID-6056.
1751
- 1752 Rideout, G. and Walsh, B.W. 1990. War games and multiple use: is it mission impossible to train
1753 combat troops and manage natural resources on the same forested acres? *Am. Forests*
1754 **96**:11-21.
1755
- 1756 Roberts S., and Williams J. 1995. After the guns fall silent: the enduring legacy of landmines.
1757 Available from the Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation, Washington, D.C., USA.
1758
- 1759 Robison, W.L., and Noshkin, V.E. 1999. Radionuclide characterization and associated dose from
1760 long-lived radionuclides in close-in fallout delivered to the marine environment at Bikini
1761 and Enewetak Atolls. *Sci. Tot. Environ.* **237**:311-327.
1762
- 1763 Rodda, G.H., and Savidge, J.A. 2007. Biology and impacts of Pacific Island invasive species.
1764 *Boiga irregularis*, the brown tree snake (Reptilia: *Colubridae*). *Pac. Sci.* **61**:307-324.
1765
- 1766 Rose, H.W., Brown, D.V.L., Byrnes, V.A., Cibis, P.A. 1956. Human chorioretinal burns from
1767 atomic fireballs. *Arch. Ophth.* **55**:205-210.
1768
- 1769 Rowell A., and Moore, P.F. 2000. Global review of forest fires. Available from Forests for Life
1770 Programme Unit, WWF International.

1771

1772 Ruhm, W., Walsh, L., and Nekolla, E.A. 2006. The cohort of the atomic bomb survivors-major
1773 basis of radiation safety regulations. *In* CAS - CERN Accelerator School and KVI:
1774 Specialised CAS Course on Small Accelerators. CERN, Geneva, CH. pp. 319-329.

1775

1776 Sanderson, H., Fauser, P., Thomsen, M., Vanninen, P., Soderstrom, M., Savin, Y., Khalikov, I.,
1777 Hirvonen, A., Niiranen, S., Missiaen, T., Gress, A., Borodin, P., Medvedeva, N., Polyak,
1778 Y., Paka, V., Zhurbas, V., and Feller P. 2010. Environmental hazards of sea-dumped
1779 chemical weapons. *Environ. Sci. and Technol.* **44**(12):4389-4394.

1780

1781 Sarkees, M.R., Wayman, F.W., and Singer, J.D. 2003. Inter-state, intra-state, and extra-state
1782 wars: a comprehensive look at their distribution over time, 1816–1997. *Int. Stud.*
1783 *Q.* **47**(1):49-70.

1784

1785 Schecter, A., Birnbaum, L., Ryan, J.J., and Constable, J.D. 2006. Dioxins: an overview. *Environ.*
1786 *Res.* **101**(3):419-428.

1787

1788 Schecter, A., Kooke, R., Serne, P., Olie, K., Huy, D.Q., Hue, N., and Constable, J. 1989.
1789 Chlorinated Dioxin and dibenzofuran levels in food samples collected between 1985-87 in
1790 the north and south of Vietnam. *Chemosphere.* **18**:627-634.

1791

- 1792 Schiffman, R. 2014. Drones flying high as new tool for field biologists. *Science* **344**(6183):459-
1793 459.
1794
- 1795 Schonfelder, P., Bresinsky, A., Garnweidner, E., Krach, E., Linhard, H., Mergenthaler, O.,
1796 Nezdal, W., and Wirth, V. 1990. *Verbreitungatlas der Farn- und Blütenpflanzen Bayerns*.
1797 Eugen Ulmer, Stuttgart, DE.
1798
- 1799 Science News Letter. 1945. Magnetron tube. *Sci. News* **48**(26):403.
1800
- 1801 Science Wire. 2001. How Does Sonar Work? [Online]. Available from
1802 <http://www.exploratorium.edu/theworld/sonar/sonar.html> [Accessed 16 April 2015].
1803
- 1804 Scott, K.N. 2007. Sound and cetaceans: a regional response to regulating acoustic marine
1805 pollution. *J. Int. Wildlife Law. Policy.* **10**:175-199.
1806
- 1807 Shaeffer, J.R. 1957. Radiation injuries, with notes on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. *Am. J. Surg.*
1808 **93**(4):641-643.
1809
- 1810 Shambaugh, J., Oglethorpe, J., and Ham, R. 2001. The trampled grass: mitigating the impacts of
1811 armed conflict on the environment. Available from the Biodiversity Support Program,
1812 Washington, DC, USA. Report No. 333.72096 S528.
1813
- 1814 Sheppard, S.C., Sheppard, M.I., Gallerand, M., and Sanipelli, B. 2005. Deviation of ecotoxicity
1815 thresholds for uranium. *J. Environ. Radioact.* **79**(1):55-83.

- 1816
- 1817 Shields, L.M., and Wells, P.V. 1962. Effects of nuclear testing on desert vegetation. *Science*
- 1818 **135**(3497):38-40.
- 1819
- 1820 Shields, L.M., Wells, P.V., and Rickard, W.H. 1963. Vegetational recovery on atomic target
- 1821 areas in Nevada. *Ecology* **44**(4):697-705.
- 1822
- 1823 Sidel, V.W. 2000. The impact of military preparedness on health and the environment. *In* The
- 1824 Environmental Consequences of War: Legal, Economic, and Scientific Perspectives.
- 1825 *Edited by* J.E., Austin, and C.E., Bruch. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK. pp.
- 1826 426-443.
- 1827
- 1828 Silberner, J. 1981. Hiroshima & Nagasaki: thirty six years later, the struggle continues. *Sci.*
- 1829 *News* **120**(18):284-285,287.
- 1830
- 1831 Simenstad, C.A. 1974. Biological effects of underground nuclear testing on marine organisms. I.
- 1832 Review of documented shock effects, discussion of mechanisms of damage, and
- 1833 predictions of Amchitka test effects. *In* Proceedings of the First Conference on the
- 1834 Environmental Effects of Explosives and Explosions (Technical Report 73-223). Naval
- 1835 Ordinance Laboratory, White Oak, M.D., USA. pp. 86-97.
- 1836

- 1837 Singer, F.J., Schreier, W., Oppenhiem, J., and Garton. E.O. 1989. Drought, fires and large
1838 mammals. *BioScience* **39**(10):716-722.
- 1839
- 1840 Slotten, H.R. 2002. Satellite communications, globalization, and the Cold War. *Technol. Cult.*
1841 **43**(2):315-350.
- 1842
- 1843 Small, R.D., and Bush, B.W. 1985. Smoke production from multiple nuclear explosions in
1844 nonurban areas. *Science* **229**(4712):465-469.
- 1845
- 1846 Smith, M.A., Turner, M.G., and Rusch, D.H. 2002. Lupine and the karner blue butterfly at Fort
1847 McCoy Wisconsin, USA. *Environ. Manage.* **29**(1):102-115.
- 1848
- 1849 Smith, S. L. 2011. Toxic legacy: mustard gas in the sea around us. *J. law Med. Ethics* **39**(1):34-
1850 40.
- 1851
- 1852 Sparrow, A.H., and Woodwell, G.M. 1962. Prediction of the sensitivity of plants to chronic
1853 gamma irradiation. *Radiat. Bot.* **2**(1):9-26.
- 1854
- 1855 Springer, P.J. 2013. Military robots and drones: a reference handbook. ABC-CLIO, Santa
1856 Barbara, CA, USA.
- 1857

- 1858 Stanley, E.H., and Doyle, M.W. 2003. Trading off: the ecological effects of dam removal. *Front.*
1859 *Ecol. Environ.* **1**:15-22.
- 1860
- 1861 Stein, B.A., Scott, C., and Benton, N. 2008. Federal lands and endangered species: the role of
1862 military and other federal lands in sustain biodiversity. *BioScience* **58**(4):339-347.
- 1863
- 1864 Stellman, J.M., Stellman, S.D., Christian, R., Weber, T., and Tomasallo, C. 2003. The extent and
1865 patterns of usage of Agent Orange and other herbicides in Vietnam. *Nature* **422**:681-687.
- 1866
- 1867 Stephenson, T.R., Vaughan, M.R., and Anderson, D.E. 1996. Mule deer movement in response
1868 to military activity in southeast Colorado. *J. Wildlife Manage.* **60**(4):777-787.
- 1869
- 1870 Stoddart, D.R. 1968. Catastrophic human interference with coral atoll ecosystems. *Geography*
1871 **53**(1):25-40.
- 1872
- 1873 Sugg, D.W., Chesser, R.K., Brooks, J.A., and Grasman, B.T. 1995. The association of DNA
1874 damage to concentrations of mercury and radiocesium in largemouth bass. *Environ.*
1875 *Toxicol. Chem.* **14**(4):661-668.
- 1876
- 1877 Summary Report of Research in the Effects of the Atomic Bomb. 1951. *Edited by* the Japan
1878 Science Council. Japan Society for the Promotion of Science.
- 1879

- 1880 Sutherland, W.J., Bardsley, S., Clout, M., Depledge, M.H., Dicks, L.V., Fellman, L., Fleishman,
1881 E., Gibbons, D.W., Keim, B., Lickorish, F., Margerson, C., Monk, K.A., Norris, K., Peck,
1882 L.S., Prior, S.V., Scharlemann, J.P.W., Spalding, M.D., and Watkinson, A.R. 2013. A
1883 horizon scan of global conservation issues for 2013. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **28**(1):16-22.
1884
- 1885 Sweetman, J. 1982. *Operation chastise: the dams raid: epic or myth.* Jane's Publishing Company,
1886 London, UK.
1887
- 1888 Tang, Z., Engel, B.A., Pijanowski, B.C., and Lim, K.J. 2005. Forecasting land use change and its
1889 environmental impact at a watershed scale. *J. Environ. Manage.* **76**:35-45.
1890
- 1891 Tavares, M., and De Melo, G.A.S. 2004. Discovery of the first known benthic invasive species in
1892 the southern ocean: The north Atlantic spider crab *Hyas araneus* found in the Antarctic
1893 Peninsula. *Antarct. Sci.* **16**:129-131.
1894
- 1895 Telesco, D.J., and Van Manen, F.T. 2006. Do black bears respond to military weapons training?
1896 *J. Wildlife Manage.* **70**(1):222-230.
1897
- 1898 Theodorakis, C.W., and Shugart, L.R. 1997. Genetic ecotoxicology II: population genetic
1899 structure in mosquito fish exposed in situ to radionuclides. *Ecotoxicology* **6**:335-354.
1900

- 1901 Theodorakis, C.W., and Shugart, L.R. 1998. Genetic ecotoxicology III: the relationship between
1902 DNA strand breaks and genotype in mosquito fish exposed to radiation. *Ecotoxicology*
1903 **7**(4):227-235.
- 1904
- 1905 Theodorakis, C.W., Bickham, J.W., Elbl, T., Shugart, L.R., and Chesser, R. K. 1998. Genetics of
1906 radionuclide-contaminated mosquitofish populations and homology between *Gambusia*
1907 *affinis* and *G. holbrooki*. *Environ. Toxicol. Chem.* **17**(10):1992-1998.
- 1908
- 1909 Theodorakis, C.W., Bickham, J.W., Lamb, T., Medica, P.A., and Lyne, T.B. 2001. Integration of
1910 genotoxicity and population genetic analyses in kangaroo rats (*Dipodomys merriami*)
1911 exposed to radionuclide contamination at the Nevada Test Site, USA. *Environ. Toxicol.*
1912 *Chem.* **20**(2):317-326.
- 1913
- 1914 Troll, K. 2000. The impact of anti-personnel landmines on the environment. Available from
1915 United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, Geneva, CH.
- 1916
- 1917 Trumbull, V.L., Dubois, P.C., and Brozka, R.J. 1994. Military camping impacts on vegetation
1918 and soils of the Ozark Plateau. *J. Environ. Manage.* **40**:329-339.
- 1919
- 1920 Tull, M. 2006. The environmental impact of ports: an Australian case study. *In* Paper presented
1921 at the XIV International Economics History Congress (session No. 58). Helsinki, FI.
- 1922

- 1923 Tullis, J.L., Lamson, B.G., and Madden, S.C. 1955. Pathology of swine exposed to total body
1924 gamma radiation from an atomic bomb source. *Am. J. Pathol.* **31**(1):41-71.
1925
- 1926 Turner, F.B. 1975. Effects of continuous irradiation on animal populations. *Adv. Radiat. Biol.*
1927 **5**:83-144.
1928
- 1929 Turner, F.B., and Medica, P.A. 1977. Sterility among female lizards (*Uta stansburiana*) exposed
1930 to continuous γ irradiation. *Radiat. Res.* **70**(1):154-163.
1931
- 1932 Turner, F.B., Licht, P., Thrasher, J.D., Medica, P.A., Lannom Jr, J.R., and Nelson, D. J. 1971.
1933 Radiation- induced sterility in natural populations of lizards (*Crotaphytus wislizenii* and
1934 *Cnemidophorus tigris*). In *Radionuclides in Ecosystems. Edited by D.J., Nelson.* U.S.
1935 Atomic Energy Commission Report CONF-710501-P2, pp. 1131-1143.
1936
- 1937 Turner, W., Spector, S., Gardiner, N., Fladeland, M., Sterling, E., and Steininger, M. 2003.
1938 Remote sensing for biodiversity science and conservation. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **18**(6):306-
1939 314.
1940
- 1941 Valeriote, F.A., and Baker, D.G. 1964. The combined effects of thermal trauma and x-irradiation
1942 on early mortality. *Radiat. Res.* **22**(4):693-702.
1943

- 1944 Van Dover, C.L., Aronson, J., Pendleton, L., Smith, S., Arnaud-Haond, S., Moreno-Mateos, D.,
1945 Barbier, E., Billett, D., Bowers, K., Danovaro, R., Edwards, A., Kellert, S., Morato, T.,
1946 Pollard, E., Rogers, A., and Warner, R. 2014. Ecological restoration in the deep sea:
1947 Desiderata. *Mar. Policy* **44**:98-106.
- 1948
- 1949 Villoria Saez, P., del Rio Merino, M., Porras-Amores, C., and Gonzalez, A.S.A. 2014. Assessing
1950 the accumulation of construction waste generation during residential building construction
1951 works. *Resour. Conserv. Recy.* **93**:67-74.
- 1952
- 1953 Visone, D.L. 2005. Battlespace terrain reasoning and awareness. *In* Proceedings of ESRI User
1954 Conference, 25-29 July 2005.
- 1955
- 1956 Vogt, H.P. 1995. Coral reefs in Saudi Arabia: 3.5 years after the Gulf War oil spill. *Coral Reefs*
1957 **14**:271-273.
- 1958
- 1959 Wanebo, C.K., Johnson, K.G., Sato, K., and Thorslund, T.W. 1968. Breast cancer after exposure
1960 to the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. *New Engl. J. Med.* **279**(13):667-671.
- 1961
- 1962 Warren, S.D., and Büttner, R. 2006. Documentation of disturbance-dependent threatened and
1963 endangered species on US Army–Europe training areas in Bavaria. Available from the
1964 Center for Environmental Management of Military Lands, Fort Collins, C.O., USA.
- 1965 CEMML TPS, 06-05.

- 1966
- 1967 Warren, S.D., Holbrook, S.W., Dale, D.A., Whelan, N.L., Elyn, M., Grimm, W., and Jentsch, A.
- 1968 2007. Biodiversity and the heterogeneous disturbance regime on military training lands.
- 1969 Rest. Ecol. **15**(4):606-612.
- 1970
- 1971 Warren, S.D., Holbrook, S.W., Dale, D.A., Whelan, N.L., Elyn, M., Grimm, W., and Jentsch, A.
- 1972 2007. Biodiversity and the heterogeneous disturbance regime on military training lands.
- 1973 Restor. Ecol. **15**(4):606-612.
- 1974
- 1975 Watts, S.E. 1998. Short-term influence of tank tracks on vegetation and microphytic crusts in
- 1976 shrubsteppe habitat. Environ. Manage. **22**(4):611-616.
- 1977
- 1978 Westing, A.H. 1971. Ecological effects of military defoliation on the forests of South Vietnam.
- 1979 BioScience **21**(17):893-898.
- 1980
- 1981 Westing, A.H. 1980. Warfare in a fragile world: military impact on the human environment.
- 1982 Taylor & Francis. London, UK.
- 1983
- 1984 Westing, A.H. 1984. Herbicides in war: past and present. Herbicides in war: the long term
- 1985 ecological and human consequence. Taylor & Francis. London, UK.
- 1986

- 1987 Westing, A.H. 1985. Explosive remnants of war: mitigating the environmental effects.
- 1988 Stockholm Peace Research Institute and United Nations. Environment Programme. Taylor
- 1989 and Francis, London, UK.
- 1990 Westing, A.H. 1986. Global resources and international conflict: environmental factors in
- 1991 strategic policy and action. Oxford University Press, UK.
- 1992
- 1993 Westing, A.H. 1989. Herbicides in warfare: the case of Indochina. *Ecotoxicology and Climate*.
- 1994 John Wiley & Sons Ltd, Hoboken, N.J., USA.
- 1995
- 1996 Westing, A.H. 1996. Explosive remnants of war in the human environment. *Environ. Conserv.*
- 1997 **23**(4):283-285.
- 1998
- 1999 Westing, A.H. 2003. Environmental dimension of the Gulf War of 1991. *In Security and*
- 2000 *Environment in the Mediterranean: Conceptualizing Security and Environmental Conflicts*
- 2001 *Edited by* H.G., Brauch, Liotta, P.H., Marquina, A., Rogers, P.F., and Selim, M.E. pp 523-
- 2002 534.
- 2003
- 2004 Westing, A.H. 2013a. The second Indochina War of 1961-1975: its environmental impact. *In*
- 2005 Arthur H. Westing: pioneer on the environmental impact of war. Springer, New York,
- 2006 N.Y., USA. pp 35-50.
- 2007
- 2008 Westing, A.H. 2013b. The Gulf War of 1991: its environmental impact. *In* Arthur H. Westing:
- 2009 pioneer on the environmental impact of war. Springer, New York, N.Y., USA. pp 50-76.

- 2010
- 2011 Whicker, F.W., Hinton, T.G., MacDonell, M.M., Pinder III, J.E., and Habegger, L.J. 2004.
- 2012 Avoiding destructive remediation at DOE sites. *Science* **303**(5664):1615-1616.
- 2013
- 2014 Whicker, F.W., and Pinder, J.E. 2002. Food chains and biogeochemical pathways: contributions
- 2015 of fallout and other radiotracers. *Health Physics* **82**(5):680-689.
- 2016
- 2017 Whitecotton, R.C.A., David, M.B., Darmody, R.G., and Price, D.L. 2000. Impact of foot traffic
- 2018 from military training on soil and vegetation properties. *Environ. Manage.* **26**(6):697-706.
- 2019
- 2020 Wills, J. 2001. "Welcome to the atomic park": American nuclear landscapes and the 'unnaturally
- 2021 unnatural'. *Environ. Hist.* **7**(4):449-472.
- 2022
- 2023 Wilson, S.D. 1988. The effects of military tank traffic on prairie: a management model. *Environ.*
- 2024 *Manage.* **12**(3):397-403.
- 2025
- 2026 Xun, Z., Cao, N., and Zhao, T. 2013. Evaluation of the risks of environment in the construction
- 2027 process on the basis of Grey System theory. *Am. Soc. Civil Eng.* 741-749.
- 2028
- 2029 Yang, X., North, R., Romney, C. 2003. Worldwide nuclear explosions. *Int. Geophys. Ser.*
- 2030 **81**(B):1595-1600.
- 2031

2032 Yelverton, J.T., Richmond, D.R., Hicks, W., Saunders, K., and Fletcher, E.R. 1975. The
2033 relationship between fish size and their response to underwater blast. Available from the
2034 Defense Nuclear Agency, Fort Belvoir, V.A., USA. Topical Report DNA 3677T.

2035

2036 Zahler, P., and Graham, P. 2001. War and Wildlife. The Afghanistan conflict and its effects on
2037 the environment. Available from International Snow Leopard Trust Special Report. pp. 1-
2038 13.

2039

2040 Zakrajsek, E.J., Bissonette, J.A. 2005. Ranking the risk of wildlife species hazardous to military
2041 aircraft. Wildlife Soc. Bull. **33**(1):258-264.

2042

2043 Zallinger, C., and Tempel, K. 1998. The physiologic response of domestic animals to ionizing
2044 radiation: a review. Vet. Radiol. Ultrasoun. **39**(6):495-503.

2045

2046 Zentelis, R., and Lindenmayer, D. 2014. Bombing for biodiversity – enhancing conservation
2047 values of military training areas. Conserv. Lett. **00**(0):1-7.

2048

2049

2050

2051

2052

2053

2054

2055 **Table 1:** Research gaps related to the effects of warfare on ecosystem structure and function.
 2056

Warfare Aspect	Research Gaps
<i>Active Armed Conflict</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.
<i>Nuclear Warfare</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

2057

2058

2059

2060

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

2071

Draft

2072 **Box 1:** The Korean Demilitarized Zone

2073

2074

2075 The Demilitarized Zone (DMZ) on the Korean peninsula serves as a protected area for many endemic and
2076 endangered species (Kim 1997; Healy 2007). The Korean DMZ is a 4 km wide by 250 km long strip of
2077 natural land which has separated North and South Korea since 1953 with the Armistice Agreement (Kim
2078 1997). This area is home to 3,514 species, which equates to 67% of the species diversity of the Korean
2079 Peninsula, most of which are endemic to this small plot of land (Healy 2007). One of the world's most
2080 endangered bird species, the White-Naped Crane (*Grus vipio*) relies on the Korean DMZ for critical
2081 overwintering habitat for 50% of the remaining population. As well, areas within the DMZ are also
2082 reported as important resting locations during the north-south migration for a large proportion of the crane
2083 population in addition to numerous other bird species (Higuchi et al. 1996; Healy 2007). Photo credit:
2084 Adrian Pingstone, Wikimedia Commons, 2006.

2085

2086

2087

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

2110 over a more chronic duration through human exclusion. Photo Credit: United States Department of
2111 Defense, 1946.

2112

2113

2114

2115

2116

2117

2118

2119

2120

2121

2122

2123

2124

2125

2126

2127

2128

2129

2130 **Box 3: Military Training Bases**

2131

2132

2133

2134 Military training bases have long been known as areas of high biodiversity and, as of late, these vast
2135 military training landscapes are becoming increasingly recognized as important refuge areas for IUCN
2136 red-listed species (Zentelis and Lindenmayer 2014). A case study examination conducted by Stein et al.
2137 (2008) evaluated the status of U.S. federally listed endangered species across the 264 million hectares of
2138 government owned and managed lands in the United States. This case study identified a significantly
2139 greater density and diversity of endangered and imperiled species inhabiting military training lands,
2140 compared to all other federally managed lands across the country (Right image: recreated from Stein et
2141 al., 2008). In addition to this finding, the greatest diversity of endangered and imperiled species were
2142 found inhabiting 4 training bases in the Hawaiian Islands, led by Oahu’s Schofield Barracks Military
2143 Reservation supporting approximately 47 federally endangered species and 53 imperiled species (Stein et
2144 al. 2008). Overall, more than 34% of the U.S. federally listed endangered species are found within
2145 Hawaiian military training bases, which makes these areas particularly vulnerable to military training
2146 exercises; stressing the importance for conservative land-use practices and management techniques to

2147 protect these ecologically valuable landscapes (Zentelis and Lindenmayer, 2014; Stein et al., 2008).

2148 Photo Credit: Polihale Wikimedia Commons, 2004.

2149

2150

2151

2152 **Box 4:** Oil Contamination in Arabian Gulf

2153

2154

2155

2156 After the Gulf War oil spill in 1991, coral reef species demonstrated substantial resilience to sea water

2157 temperature decreases and toxic hydrocarbon fall-out (Downing and Roberts 1993, Vogt 1995). The

2158 Arabian Gulf is home to several diverse coral reef communities both inshore and offshore. From 1984

2159 until 1994, coral species cover was estimated at six different locations off the coasts of Kuwait and Saudia

2160 Arabia using video recordings and diving teams. The combined results of two independent studies found

2161 that (Downing and Roberts 1993; Vogt 1995), after an estimated 6-8 million barrels of oil were added to

2162 the Arabian Gulf, there was no observable declines to coral reef health. Instead, from 1992 to 1994, Vogt

2163 (1995) observed significantly increasing trends in coral cover. Today, coral reef health is subject to

2164 climate change and increasing marine ecosystem pollution, which makes modern coral surveys unable to
2165 tease out any direct evidence of long-term effects of the Gulf War on coral communities (Downing and
2166 Roberts 1993, Al-Cibahy et al. 2012). Photo Credit: Michael J. Lawrence, 2012.

2167

2168

2169

2170

Draft