

News Feature

Nature **427**, 580-581 (12 February 2004) | doi: 10.1038/427580a

Green explosives: Collateral damage

Jim Giles¹

1. Jim Giles is a reporter for *Nature*, based in London.

Abstract

Even munitions that are never used in anger can have a long-term impact on the environment, so scientists are working to minimize the risks. Jim Giles talks to the chemists who are developing 'green' explosives.

"I know ... some people think it is an oxymoron." Ron Jones sounds weary. He has had to deal with a lot of questioning before. "But we really do need green explosives."

Bombing and shelling can't be good for any ecosystem. But away from the heat of battle, military research funds into developing less-toxic explosives that should be better both for the personnel and the environment.

Jones and his colleagues at the US Naval Air Warfare Center in China Lake, California, for instance, are developing lead-based compounds used to fire guns. Other groups want to phase out explosives whose residues are toxic when detonated, but also cause problems when unused ordnance is disposed of. "The environment is a concern beyond what you see in combat," says Jones.

Pollution is a particularly pressing issue at the firing ranges where soldiers and law-enforcement agencies train.

When you pull the trigger of a firearm, two small explosions follow. First a hammer or an electric spark ignites a small amount of 'primer' explosive. This ignites a larger amount of explosive, which forces the bullet out of the barrel.

The problem is that the most widely used primers contain lead. Two of the current favourites — ball powder and ball powder — are responsible for the dangerously high levels of lead found at some firing ranges. A 1991 survey, for example, found that workers who had just cleaned a range run by the FBI in Quantico, Virginia, had levels of lead in their blood that exceeded government health limits¹.

Target practice

Jones and his colleagues hope to replace lead compounds with nanoparticles of aluminium, which they mix with particles averaging 50 nanometres across with acetylene black, a form of carbon, and molybdenum. The mixture is made electrically conductive, allowing it to be ignited by passing a current through it. The researchers are now running tests to assess 'action times' — the gap between the ignition current and the bullet leaving the muzzle of the gun, which for military purposes needs to be less than 4 milliseconds.

and other assessments, they could be in use sometime in the next decade.

At Ludwig-Maximilians University in Munich, Germany, chemists led by Thomas Klapötke have

that could make safer primers, funded largely by the German military. A primer must detonate and can fire quickly, so the researchers first measure how much energy it takes to detonate them. They test between sandpaper, dropping weights on them and spraying them with sparks.

Next up are tests that measure destructive power. About 10 grams of the test substance is placed in a container and ignited. Each container has a hole of a particular size in the lid. The smaller the hole, the more likely the explosion will be unable to escape quickly enough, blowing the container apart. The ideal primer is one strong enough to ignite the secondary explosive — will destroy a 35-millilitre container with a hole in the lid.

In five years of testing only five compounds, all of them rich in nitrogen, have made it through the tests. One, called TNTA, consists of a series of N_3 and NO_2 groups attached to a ring of carbon atoms². Like other explosives, some of its energy release comes from single or double bonds between nitrogen atoms that break apart during the explosion. When mixed with an oxygen-rich material such as ammonium nitrate, TNTA explodes to produce nitrogen and carbon dioxide. The compound is undergoing commercial tests, and Klapötke hopes it will be in use in two to five years.

Bomb disposal squad

In addition to certain types of primer, chemists would like to see other explosives phased out. Some military testing ranges across the United States are contaminated with unreacted TNT, which the EPA classifies as a possible human carcinogen. TNT is now only rarely used by the US military for landmines and mining, raising fears that it could pollute underground water sources.

Replacements for TNT have been in use since the Second World War, but these were chosen mainly for their power. James Short, a staff specialist for defence laboratories in the US Department of Defense, says that millions of kilograms of explosives that have reached the end of their shelf-life of about 20–50 years are being disposed of because of environmental concerns.

Developing new explosives can be dangerous. Three years ago, a researcher lost the top halves of his head. He's still working in the field.

The explosives involved — nitrogen and oxygen-containing substances called HMX and RDX — they can easily be moulded into various shapes for different applications. The polymer-explosive mixtures are stable to burning, which does not necessarily raise it to a temperature at which it would explode.

Short argues that the environmental risks are not large. But communities living close to military testing ranges are fearing that burning the polymers could release pollutants such as carbon monoxide. Military officials are looking to replace HMX and RDX: they want explosives that are cheap and powerful, yet detonate less readily.

In the 1990s, Short was part of a team at the Office of Naval Research in Arlington, Virginia, that was developing conventional explosive-polymer mixes. The group found that HMX and RDX could be mixed with a polymer, allowing the explosives to be removed and stored for future use. Short's team also studied a new compound called TNAZ, which can itself be melted and moulded³.

But money was an issue. It costs just a few tens of dollars to produce a kilogram of HMX or RDX, but a much larger amount of TNAZ. The new polymers, meanwhile, are extremely viscous when melted, requiring special equipment to mix in the explosives during production.

Short still believes that both options are economically viable when you consider the costs of disposal. "It's hard to convince the officials responsible for acquiring weapons," he says. "They'd rather pay less."

Work on green explosives continues at other US military facilities, such as the Army Research Laboratory. Officials are reluctant to discuss these studies for security reasons. But hints about the type of work that comes from a closely related effort: the search for greener alternatives to the propellants used to power rockets and vehicles.

During the first two minutes of a space shuttle launch, for instance, when the need for thrust is at its peak, the shuttle is burning aluminium in two solid-fuel boosters. The aluminium is supplied with oxygen using a perchlorate, but environmentalists note that this means the exhaust plume contains chlorine ions that can cause acid-destroying reactions and acid rain.

Space agencies are continually searching for more efficient propellants and, although they believe the environmental damage from the chlorine ions is minimal, they take such considerations into account. Three main candidates – ammonium perchlorate, nitric acid, and nitrogen tetroxide – are in the frame to replace ammonium perchlorate as an oxidizer. All are chlorine-free, consistent with the goal of reducing environmental damage.

Blast off!

Results from tests in military and civilian labs in Europe and the United States suggest that they can be used in solid-fuel boosters. But introducing a new propellant is a complex business, says Octavia Frota, ESTEC, the European Space Agency's research and technology-development centre in Noordwijk. Finding the right combination of fuel and oxidizer, and a compound to bind them together, are subject to strict regulations. "You may have to be redesigned once the right combination is found, she adds.

It could take another decade for any of the three candidate oxidizers to find regular space applications. If any of the nitrogen in these compounds, they can act as explosives as well as oxidizers. And at least one of them has already been used as an explosive by military researchers in France, Germany and Britain, says Klapötke.

Working to develop new explosives can be dangerous. "If you make one mistake it can be your last," says Klapötke. One researcher in his lab lost the top halves of two fingers in an explosion. "But he is still working."

Labs such as his can ill afford to lose staff, due to problems with recruitment. Klapötke admits that he has a large number of students. And the pool of recruits is narrowed still further by his decision only to accept students from civilian universities for security reasons. Klapötke understands why some young chemists shy away from military research. "We need defence, so we have to train people," he says. "But we don't want to kill the messenger."

References

1. Barsan, M. E. & Miller, A. *Lead Health Hazard Evaluation* HETA Report No. 91-0346-25' Occupational Safety and Health, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1996).
2. Adam, D., Karaghiosoff, K. & Klapötke, T. M. *Propell. Explos. Pyrot.* **27**, 7–11 (2001). | [Article](#)
3. Archibald, T. G., Gilardi, R., Baum, K. & George, C. *J. Org. Chem.* **55**, 2920–2924 (1990).

[Top](#)

Nature

ISSN: 0028-0836

EISSN: 1476-4687

- [About NPG](#)
- [Contact NPG](#)
- [Nature jobs.com](#)
- [Privacy policy](#)
- [Legal notice](#)
- [Accessibility statement](#)
- [RSS web feeds](#)
- [Help](#)

© 2007 Nature Publishing Group – partner of AGORA, HINARI, CrossRef and COUNTER