A New Type of War-Related Pollution Fiber-Optic Drone Tether Debris and War-Derived Polymer Microfibers

Laboratory of Military Ecotones
New Euro Vision: exhibitions, marketing, research s.r.o.
Czech Republic
Presented by Dmitry Nikolaenko

P&D Conference 2026 / 15–17 October, Prague
15-minute presentation / 2162 words / English

Slide 1 A New Type of War-Related Pollution: Fiber-Optic Drone Tether Debris and War-Derived Polymer Microfibers

00:00–00:52 / 52 seconds

A military technology can solve an immediate operational problem while creating an environmental problem that outlasts its use. Fiber-optic drone guidance illustrates this separation. The drone completes a mission, but the optical line can remain across the landscape. This presentation examines the grounds for recognizing those remnants as a distinct source of war-related pollution. The central question concerns the material left behind and its subsequent trajectory through vegetation, soil and water. We introduce two terms, FODTD for the source debris and WDPM for possible polymer microfibers derived from it. Our argument is direct: operational effectiveness provides no evidence of environmental acceptability. Long-term consequences belong in the assessment from the beginning. The publications frame a research problem. They do not supply a completed environmental risk assessment.

Slide 2 FODTD and WDPM

00:52–01:45 / 53 seconds

FODTD means fiber-optic drone tether debris. It identifies optical-line remnants attributable to the operation, damage or loss of fiber-optic-guided drones. The source is military activity, while the deposited material may occur on vegetation, soil surfaces or in other environmental compartments. WDPM means war-derived polymer microfibers. In these publications, it names possible microscopic products generated from tether coatings and associated polymer layers. These categories have different evidence requirements. Recognizing a visible abandoned line does not demonstrate that it has already produced a particular population of microfibers. A laboratory must establish the material composition and connect the smaller products to that source. The terminology keeps the source and its proposed transformation products analytically connected. It also prevents every fiber found in a war-affected soil from automatically receiving a military attribution.

Slide 3 A filament network in the landscape

01:45–02:42 / 57 seconds

The photograph reproduced in the main article shows why the object deserves attention. Long strands intersect vegetation and the ground. Their geometry differs from a pile of wreckage at one impact point. A visual image can reveal a material form that an established inventory fails to record. However, this photograph provides an illustration rather than a representative survey. We retain the provenance reported in the publication and do not extract national contamination estimates from it. We cannot obtain polymer composition, duration of persistence or ecological damage from appearance alone. The appropriate response is to turn the observation into a documented research object. That requires locations, dates, material samples where access permits, and observations repeated under comparable conditions. A striking photograph is a starting point for inquiry. Repeated circulation of the image cannot substitute for that inquiry.

Slide 4 The grounds for a distinct pollution category

02:42–03:37 / 55 seconds

The claim of novelty concerns a source category and its pattern of deposition. It does not require a previously unknown chemical substance. Glass and polymers already have many civilian uses, and older military technologies have also left wires and cables. The question is whether drone operations now create a sufficiently distinctive combination of material, geometry, distribution and subsequent transformation to require targeted assessment. The publications give grounds for that proposal. A long optical line can extend through several surface environments and remain after the drone itself is gone. Fragmentation may then change both visibility and mobility. Calling all of this ordinary battlefield litter loses the connection between deployment and later products. Calling every remnant simply microplastic loses the original filament network. Recognition becomes useful when it changes what researchers record and test.

Slide 5 Material identity precedes risk claims

03:37–04:33 / 56 seconds

The title refers to polymer microfibers, but an optical tether is a material system whose components must be distinguished. The main article describes polymer-coated silica fibers. Optical-fiber literature also shows that coating materials differ between products. A field inventory must therefore establish what the actual drone remnants contain. It must distinguish the optical component, protective layers and any additional material. Silica fragments must retain their identification as glass. Polymer fragments require their own characterization, and their shapes may include particles as well as fibers. We should not assign a single polymer composition to every drone system or infer a specific hazardous additive from the phrase fiber optic. The environmental claim must follow the identified material. This is essential for comparing samples, interpreting weathering experiments and deciding which analytical methods can resolve the proposed products.

Slide 6 Geometry changes the assessment

04:33–05:30 / 57 seconds

A filament network requires measurements that preserve its geometry. Total mass remains useful, but mass alone does not describe the length of line extending through vegetation or the number of

contact points with the surface. The research record should include strand dimensions, continuity, areal density and the compartments through which the material passes. At smaller scales it must record size distributions and distinguish fibrous from other fragments. The main article makes morphology a central part of the proposed object. We extend that principle into an explicit measurement requirement. Two sites with similar residual mass may contain different configurations of intact lines, tangled deposits and buried fragments. Their possible interactions may differ accordingly. This does not prove a particular effect. It tells us why a research design that ignores morphology can fail to test the relevant environmental question.

Slide 7 The proposed environmental trajectory

05:30–06:27 / 57 seconds

The object changes over time. An initial deposit contains lines or severed lengths. Exposure and disturbance can age the coatings, break the optical material or detach polymer components. Some material may remain at the surface, while other fractions enter soil or move into sediment. The table presents a proposed trajectory for investigation. It does not assume that every tether follows one sequence or that every fragment becomes a microfiber. Polymer weathering literature supports the possibility of fragmentation, but the rate, form and yield of products under specific field conditions require evidence. Nor does fragmentation establish harmless disappearance. It can replace a visible deposit with smaller material that is harder to recover and identify. The research task is to follow that change with repeated observations and material balances rather than treating reduced visibility as proof of environmental recovery.

Slide 8 Physical hazards deserve their own tests

06:27–07:23 / 56 seconds

Physical interaction is one reason to investigate long residual lines even before chemical toxicity has been established. The main article identifies possible wildlife entanglement and interference with land management. Abandoned fishing gear provides a useful analogy for the importance of geometry, but it cannot supply a terrestrial impact rate for drone debris. A research programme needs incident records, species and habitat context, and exposure measurements. Likewise, reports of lines around equipment require documentation of the circumstances and frequency rather than extrapolation from an isolated image. The argument does not depend on claiming catastrophic toxicity. It depends on recognizing a material configuration capable of mechanical interaction and then examining the relevant pathways. Chemical analysis alone cannot answer whether an animal encounters a line or whether equipment entrains it. Those are distinct empirical questions with distinct methods.

Slide 9 Soil, water and biological interactions

07:23–08:18 / 55 seconds

The proposed longer-term questions concern incorporation into soil, redistribution by water, and interactions with existing contamination and living communities. These processes may depend on polymer identity, fragment shape, concentration and local conditions. Research on other microplastics has documented changes in soil properties in experimental settings. Studies of plastic-associated microbial communities also provide reasons to examine biological colonization. Neither body of evidence establishes the same effects for drone tethers. The relevant inference is that these pathways deserve targeted tests. The table therefore separates a question from the evidence needed

to answer it. Finding a fiber does not establish a change in soil water relations. Finding microorganisms on a polymer does not demonstrate a new infectious disease. The investigation must preserve those distinctions while following the connections between material, environmental process and any measured consequence.

Slide 10 Military attribution in a layered landscape

08:18–09:18 / 60 seconds

Ukraine provides an important setting for investigation because current military deposits overlap with earlier agricultural, industrial and other human impacts. That history creates an attribution problem. A microfiber collected in a field may come from an agricultural material, a textile, civilian infrastructure or a drone tether. The proposed WDPM category is useful only if researchers can support the source connection. The research design should compare recovered lines and their laboratory products with environmental samples, using material characterization and spatial context together. A match in one property may remain insufficient where sources share common polymers. Historical information and comparison sites help test alternatives, but a nominal control site cannot be assumed clean or equivalent. Where an earlier baseline is missing, the uncertainty must stay in the record. Military origin is a conclusion requiring evidence, rather than a label attached to everything found near the front.

Slide 11 Environmental attention and its limits

09:18–10:16 / 58 seconds

It would be inaccurate to say that nobody has considered this issue. The Conflict and Environment Observatory published an environmental warning in May 2025, and preliminary discussion has continued. The more precise criticism concerns the gap between recognizing a concern and establishing its long-term environmental trajectory. The supplied publications do not present a representative material inventory or direct field proof of WDPM production. They identify those absences as research tasks. Our criticism should remain equally precise. When an assessment stops at the drone's operational performance or at a list of conventional contaminants, it leaves residual optical material outside its account. The resulting incompleteness is consequential even if individual researchers have issued warnings. Statements of concern need sustained sampling, analytical capacity and records of change. Environmental acceptability cannot be inferred from an assessment that omits the material it should examine.

Slide 12 A field programme for residual optical material

10:16–11:12 / 56 seconds

The first research requirement is a coherent field record. Dated observations should connect a location, land use, visible material and the methods used to record it. Where professional clearance and access permissions allow sampling, intact remnants should enter a reference collection alongside surface, soil and sediment samples. Repeated observations must follow the same questions through changing seasons and land management. Laboratories need blanks, contamination controls and documented recovery limits, because the very fibers being sought can enter samples during handling. Remote observations can retain value where direct access remains impossible, but their limitations must stay explicit. Researchers must not turn the need for evidence into informal access to hazardous terrain. Explosive hazards require authorized professional assessment. The project should preserve both what it observed and what safety or access restrictions prevented it from observing.

Slide 13 Experiments that connect source and consequence

11:12–12:09 / 57 seconds

An experimental programme must begin with identified materials rather than generic plastic fibers selected for convenience. Aging and abrasion experiments can test whether particular coatings produce fibrous or other fragments, and how the optical component changes. The design should document exposure conditions and measure material recovery. Soil experiments can then examine specific functions at concentrations justified by field observations. Appropriate controls must distinguish material effects from disturbance caused by adding or mixing the sample. If an interaction with another pollutant is proposed, the combined and separate exposures require comparison. Accelerated laboratory aging cannot automatically become a calendar for field persistence. The results need a stated domain of applicability. Failure to detect a predicted product or effect is part of the scientific outcome. The category must develop through such tests, including results that narrow or reject its initial claims.

Slide 14 Recovery and responsibility for the residue

12:09–13:09 / 60 seconds

The broader problem is the separation between the immediate benefit of a technology and the later burden of its residue. A military operation ends, while land users, communities and ecosystems continue to encounter the material left behind. For this source, recovery planning must investigate what can be collected, what has entered vegetation or soil, and whether collection itself creates additional fragmentation. Environmental work needs coordination with explosive clearance and later land-use decisions. Removing visible lines should have an outcome record that states what the operation actually recovered and what remains uncertain. It cannot automatically certify that microscopic products are absent. Responsibility for documenting and managing the residue belongs in planning before the problem becomes an inherited recovery expense. The criticism is straightforward: a technology assessment that closes its account at mission completion leaves the environmental burden to other people and to a later time.

Slide 15 Publications and supporting research

13:09–14:04 / 55 seconds

The conference paper supplies the title and the proposed categories. The longer repository article provides definitions, an illustrative photograph, plausible pathways and a research agenda. Its limitations are central: it reports no systematic field sampling or laboratory confirmation of the proposed transformation pathway. Optical-coating research supports the need to distinguish materials. Soil microplastic experiments and plastisphere studies provide analogies that help design tests, rather than direct results for drone debris. Published environmental warnings establish that concern already exists. Our contribution here is to organize the source, its possible products and the evidence required at each stage into one research programme. The claim of a new pollution category is strongest when it creates better observations and falsifiable propositions. Naming the object must lead to measurements capable of correcting the account, including our own.

Slide 16 A new residue requires a long-term account

14:04–15:00 / 56 seconds

There are grounds for treating fiber-optic drone tether debris as a distinct source of war-related pollution. The defining combination is military origin, filamentous deposition and a possible trajectory toward smaller polymer products. The uncertainties concern composition, quantity, transformation rates and consequences in particular environments. They justify an investigation designed around this source. They do not justify an assumption that the residue is harmless, and they do not establish effects that have yet to be measured. The military ecotone perspective keeps the material within the history and continuing transformation of a territory. A remnant can remain visible, enter soil or move elsewhere while the political and military narrative moves on. The scientific obligation is to preserve that longer account. Drone operations create a material legacy. Research and recovery planning must follow what that legacy becomes.

References

Nikolaenko, D. (2026). A New Type of War-Related Pollution: Fiber-Optic Drone Tether Debris and War-Derived Polymer Microfibers. Pollution and Diseases. DOI: 10.66659/rp314s66. https://pollution-diseases-ojs.org/index.php/pd/article/view/22

Nikolaenko, D. (2026). Fiber-Optic Drone Tether Debris (FODTD) as an Emerging Form of War-Related Environmental Contamination. Pollution and Diseases, Repository, 15 pp. DOI: 10.66659/swfqsz58. https://pollution-diseases-ojs.org/index.php/pd/article/view/13/27

Janani, R., et al. (2023). From acrylates to silicones: A review of common optical fibre coatings used for normal to harsh environments. Progress in Organic Coatings, 180, 107557. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.porgcoat.2023.107557

de Souza Machado, A. A., et al. (2018). Impacts of Microplastics on the Soil Biophysical Environment. Environmental Science & Technology, 52(17), 9656–9665. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.8b02212

MacLean, J., et al. (2021). The Terrestrial Plastisphere: Diversity and Polymer-Colonizing Potential of Plastic-Associated Microbial Communities in Soil. Microorganisms, 9(9), 1876. https://doi.org/10.3390/microorganisms9091876

Moreland, L. (2025). Plastic pollution from fibre optic drones may threaten wildlife for years. Conflict and Environment Observatory, 22 May. https://ceobs.org/plastic-pollution-from-fibre-optic-drones-may-threaten-wildlife-for-years/

Illustration credit

Slide 3 reproduces the unaltered photograph in Nikolaenko (2026), article 13, Figure 2, PDF page 4. The publication describes the setting as a battlefield landscape in Ukraine and credits: https://www.reddit.com/r/interestingasfuck/comments/1l082je/photo_of_a_field_in_the_ukrainian_war_zone/ . The date, location and photographer have not been independently verified. The image illustrates filament morphology and is not a representative spatial dataset. The QR code on slide 16 links to the full conceptual article at https://pollution-diseases-ojs.org/index.php/pd/article/view/13/27 .