

COMMENT

The broad view of warfare ecology: response to Marler

Marler (2013) suggested replacing the established term 'warfare ecology' with the term 'military ecology'. We appreciate the desire for accuracy and inclusiveness in describing this emerging and important sub-discipline. Similar intent led us to choose the term 'warfare', which by definition involves the entire process of waging war (Collins 2011). Warfare ecology therefore encompasses a broad range of war-related activities and consequences during preparations for war (such as training, munitions development and testing), during war itself (for example battlefield effects and population displacement), and during the post-war period (for example reconstruction and recovery) (Machlis & Hanson 2008). Marler (2013) mistakenly interprets warfare as a synonym for war, a state of armed conflict, neglecting the term's much broader temporal and topical relevance. In suggesting 'military' as a replacement, Marler (2013) proposes a term limited to the activities of the armed forces (Collins 2011), an important but by no means comprehensive component of warfare.

By definition and necessity, warfare ecology reaches beyond the realm of the military to involve a much wider range of processes and stakeholders, including non-state parties and insurgencies, contractors, home front and war zone civilians, humanitarian and relief organizations (organizationally separate from military institutions), and reconstruction/restoration efforts. We are encouraged by the fact that practitioners have adopted this term in a diverse range of disciplines, including geography (Francis 2011; Hesse 2014), civil engineering (Stenuit & Agathos 2010), remote sensing (Gorsevski *et al.* 2012; Griffiths *et al.* 2012), conservation biology (Hanson *et al.* 2009; Jenni *et al.* 2012; Johnson *et al.* 2012), forestry (Boissiere *et al.* 2011), restoration ecology (Tidball & Krasny 2014), and public health (Leaning 2011). These examples include research that fits easily under the rubric of warfare ecology (such as post-conflict conservation planning), but that would be excluded if the field were limited to military studies.

Maintaining a broad definition keeps the focus on the shared goals of warfare ecology, namely understanding the complex relationships between warfare and ecosystems to reduce environmental harm, reduce human suffering, and promote peace and security.

References

- Boissiere, M., Sheil, D. & Basuki, I. (2011) A booming trade? How collection of war residues affects livelihoods and forest in Vietnam. *International Forestry Review* 13: 404–415.
- Collins (2011) *Collins English Dictionary. Complete and Unabridged 11th Edition*. London, UK: HarperCollins Publishers [www document]. URL <http://www.collinsdictionary.com>
- Francis, R.A. (2011) The impacts of modern warfare on freshwater ecosystems. *Environmental Management* 48: 985–999.
- Gorsevski, V., Kasischke, E., Dempewolf, J., Loboda, T. & Grossmann, F. (2012) Analysis of the impacts of armed conflict on the Eastern Afromontane forest region on the South Sudan: Uganda border using multitemporal Landsat imagery. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 118: 10–20.
- Griffiths, P., Kuemmerle, T., Kennedy, R.E., Abrudand, I.V., Knorna, J. & Hosterta, P. (2012) Using annual time-series of Landsat images to assess the effects of forest restitution in post-socialist Romania. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 118: 199–214.
- Hanson, T., Brooks, T.M., da Fonseca, G.A.B., Hoffmann, M., Lamoreux, J.F., Machlis, G., Mittermeier, C.G., Mittermeier, R.A. & Pilgrim, J.D. (2009) Warfare in biodiversity hotspots. *Conservation Biology* 23: 578–587.
- Hesse, R. (2014) Geomorphological traces of conflict in high-resolution elevation models. *Applied Geography* 46: 11–20.
- Jenni, G.D.L., Peterson, M.N., Cubbage, F.W. & Jameson, J.K. (2012) Assessing biodiversity conservation conflict on military installations. *Biological Conservation* 153: 127–133.
- Johnson, M.F., Kanderian, N., Shank, C.C., Rahmani, H., Lawson, D. & Smallwood, P. (2012) Setting priorities for protected area planning in a conflict zone: Afghanistan's National Protected Area System Plan. *Biological Conservation* 148: 146–155.
- Leaning, J. (2011) A public health approach to warfare. In: *Warfare Ecology: A New Synthesis for Peace and Security*, ed. G.E. Machlis, T. Hanson, Z. Spiric & J.E. McEndry, pp. 133–153. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Machlis, G.E. & Hanson, T. (2008) Warfare ecology. *BioScience* 58: 729–736.
- Marler, T.H. (2013) Military ecology more fitting than warfare ecology. *Environmental Conservation* 40: 207–208.
- Stenuit, B.A. & Agathos, S.N. (2010) Microbial 2,4,6-trinitrotoluene degradation: could we learn from (bio)chemistry for bioremediation and vice versa? *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology* 88: 1043–1064.
- Tidball, K.G. & Krasny, M.E., eds (2014) *Greening in the Red Zone*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

THOR HANSON^{1*} AND GARY E. MACHLIS²

¹351 False Bay Drive, Friday Harbor, WA 98250, USA, and

²Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29634, USA

*Correspondence: Dr Thor Hanson

e-mail: thor@rockisland.com