Competing Hypotheses and Scientific Non-Recognition

Investigating the Hector's and Māui Dolphin Decline in the Context of Wartime Chemical Legacies

Andrew Gibbs

Researcher, *Pollution and Diseases*

Deliberate suppression of inconvenient science

My accusation: institutional gatekeepers deliberately suppress inconvenient scientific viewpoints.

I allege purposeful use of research priorities, funding, publication and expert authority to protect a preferred explanation.

The ecological record and the institutional charge

Bycatch deaths and chemical exposure both have empirical records.

Official assessments already acknowledge pollution and interacting threats.

Source-specific chemical causation remains unresolved.

The allegation of deliberate suppression requires a separate documentary inquiry.

Competing causes require comparable tests

Explanation	Required evidence
Bycatch	Deaths, fishing effort and response to protection
Chemical contribution	Dose, biological effects and demographic impact
Disease and interactions	Pathology, infection and exposure-linked susceptibility
Habitat and prey pressures	Food availability, condition and reproductive response

Exposure evidence creates an obligation to investigate

From 1978 ongoing monitoring of organochlorines and reproduction was recommended

The NOAA 2024 review reports a study including three Māui dolphins.

It also summarises organochlorines in 27 South Island Hector's dolphins.

The review identifies potential reproductive and disease interactions.

Small samples constrain causal inference. They leave a research obligation.

The historical source claim requires a complete chain

Historical manufacturing and disposal records establish candidate sources.

Historic sediment and prey measurements test transport into the food web.

Chemical fingerprints and tissue analysis test exposure attribution, where available.

Health and reproductive records test biological and population effects.

Unequal standards protect a preferred explanation

A dominant framework gains authority from cumulative research.

An alternative must first overcome scarce samples and fragmented disciplines.

Exclusion can then reproduce the very evidence gap used to dismiss it.

My charge concerns deliberate use of this asymmetry to block testing.

The resources through which gatekeepers can block inquiry

Institutional resource	Record required for an audit
Funding and research priorities	Proposals, criteria and written decisions
Publication and citation	Reviews, reasons for rejection and selection
Specimens and data	Access requests, restrictions and conditions
Expert advice	Evidence considered and reasons for exclusion

Institutional decisions leave an auditable record

Funding refusals have dates, criteria and decision makers.

Editorial exclusions have stated reasons and review histories.

Access restrictions have owners and written conditions.

Changes to expert advice can be compared with the evidence available.

Conscious obstruction requires evidence of intent

Knowledge of a credible alternative is the starting point.

A deliberate decision to prevent its examination is the disputed act.

Repeated exclusion after notice can strengthen an inference.

Coordination requires correspondence or equivalent documentary evidence.

Geography and chemistry constrain the allegation

Māui dolphins inhabit the west coast of the North Island.

South Island Hector’s dolphins require their own source reconstruction.

Paritutu contamination cannot explain every population by proximity alone.

Source fingerprints must distinguish industrial, agricultural and other inputs.

Every explanation must face a test that can reject it

Chemical causation: linked dose, effects and population contribution.

Source attribution: discriminating fingerprints and credible transport.

Institutional suppression: documented decisions and evidence of purpose.

Each claim needs explicit criteria for revision or rejection.

The accusation demands a public answer

My accusation is deliberate suppression of inconvenient scientific inquiry.

Gatekeepers should disclose the decisions and reasons that can answer it.

Independent access and explicit rejection tests should govern the investigation.

Institutional authority cannot settle an unperformed causal test.

Sources and the change in the argument

Gibbs & Nikolaenko (2026). Competing Hypotheses and Scientific Non-Recognition. Pollution and Diseases. doi: 10.66659/10csws50

Gibbs & Nikolaenko (2026). Chemical Pollution and the Population Crisis. Critical Research Bibliography. doi: 10.66659/ybmw2c82

Gibbs & Nikolaenko (2026). Structural Falsification, Scientific Silence, and a New Research Strategy. doi: 10.66659/tms16797

Parsons / NOAA-NMFS (2024). Māui's and South Island Hector's dolphin 5-Year Review. Taranaki Regional Council: Paritutu record (2024).

Andrew Gibbs

Researcher, *Pollution and Diseases*

Which decisions blocked a fair test?
What evidence can answer the accusation?

Original publication

doi: 10.66659/10csws50