Structural Falsification, Scientific Silence, and a New Research Strategy: A Critical Reconstruction of the Hector's and Māui Dolphin Case

Andrew Gibbs, Dmitry Nikolaenko

Gibbs Andrew, Nikolaenko Dmitry[1]

Structural Falsification, Scientific Silence, and a New Research Strategy: A Critical Reconstruction of the Hector's and Māui Dolphin Case

Pollution and Diseases. Repository. 2026. 23 p.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.66659/tms16797

Published: June 30, 2026

About authors:

Gibbs Andrew https://orcid.org/0009-0000-8723-4683

Nikolaenko Dmitry https://orcid.org/0009-0001-4173-6669

---

[1] Corresponding author dn@pollution-diseases.org

Abstract

This paper examines not only the ecological crisis associated with the decline of Hector's and Māui dolphin populations in New Zealand, but also a broader methodological problem: how scientific and administrative systems handle information capable of altering the research strategy for an already established environmental problem. The Hector's and Māui dolphin case has generally been examined within a field of competing hypotheses, including fishing-related mortality, demographic vulnerability, infectious disease, habitat change, and chemical pollution.

However, the public release of the Groundwater Technology technical documents from 1995–1996, which had previously remained outside full scientific circulation, changes the structure of the research situation. These documents do not, by themselves, prove that chemical pollution was the principal cause of population decline. They do, however, substantially strengthen the source and pathway components of the chemical hypothesis, since they contain data on contaminated land, groundwater, chlorophenols, phenoxy compounds, pesticides, solvents, possible contaminant migration pathways, and transport modelling.

The central issue addressed in this paper is not whether the fishing hypothesis should be replaced by the chemical hypothesis. The issue is different: why was information capable of changing the research programme not integrated in a timely manner into the scientific reconstruction of the ecological crisis? If significant documents had existed since 1995–1996, if they concerned the source and migration pathways of contamination, if they could have affected the testing of the chemical hypothesis, yet did not become part of scientific analysis for almost three decades, then this is not an ordinary gap in knowledge.

It is a problem in the organisation of knowledge. This paper proposes that the case should be examined within a regime of critical reconstruction. Such an approach requires analysis not only of pollution as a physicochemical process, but also of the behaviour of scientific communities, administrative bodies, expert groups, and research programmes.

Particular attention is given to the concept of structural falsification: a situation in which the scientific picture is distorted not necessarily through direct fabrication of data, but through the long-term exclusion of significant information from the recognised body of knowledge.

Keywords

Hector's dolphin; Māui dolphin; Paritutu; New Plymouth; chemical pollution; dioxins; chlorophenols; phenoxy herbicides; scientific recognition; scientific non-recognition; structural falsification; critical reconstruction; technical reports; ecological crisis; environmental contamination; New Zealand.

Key Points

1. The Hector’s and Māui dolphin case should be examined not only as an ecological problem, but also as a problem in the organisation of scientific knowledge.
2. The newly released Groundwater Technology documents from 1995–1996 do not prove chemical causation, but they substantially alter the evidentiary basis of the investigation.
3. After the emergence of these documents, the chemical hypothesis can no longer be treated as an external speculation; it must become the subject of a specific source–pathway–exposure reconstruction.
4. The central question is not why the chemical hypothesis was not proven earlier, but why the data required to test it were not incorporated into the research programme.
5. The long-term absence of significant information from scientific circulation may be examined as a form of structural falsification.
6. Scientific silence in this case is itself an object of analysis.
7. The research strategy must be redesigned: from a general comparison of hypotheses toward the reconstruction of sources, transport pathways, marine exposure, tissue profiles, biological effects, and population-level consequences.

Introduction

On 15–17 October 2026, an international conference on military contamination and its long-term effects on soils, freshwater systems, ecosystems, and human health will be held in Prague (1). As part of the preparation for this conference, a series of studies was initiated on historical cases of environmental contamination associated with organochlorine compounds and their ecological consequences. One of these case studies concerns the long-standing environmental problems associated with Paritutu, New Plymouth, New Zealand, and the concurrent decline of Hector's and Māui dolphin populations (2, 3).

The initial stage of this work consisted of a comprehensive bibliographic reconstruction of the scientific literature addressing chemical pollution and the population crisis of Hector's and Māui dolphins (4–7). This review led to an important observation. The existing literature already contains substantial information concerning contaminant burdens in dolphins, infectious diseases, demographic vulnerability, fisheries-related mortality, toxicological assessments, and risk management.

However, these data have rarely been integrated into a single causal framework capable of evaluating the chemical pollution hypothesis on equal methodological grounds with competing explanations.

During the subsequent phase of the investigation, a previously overlooked collection of technical and related environmental reports concerning the Paritutu site was identified (8–15). These reports had been produced long before the development of contemporary environmental risk assessments and conservation models. Nevertheless, they remained effectively outside the scientific discussion for nearly three decades and became publicly available only in 2024. The importance of these documents lies not in providing direct proof that chemical contamination caused the decline of Hector's and Māui dolphins.

Such a conclusion would be scientifically premature. Their importance lies elsewhere. They fundamentally alter the evidentiary structure of the problem. Prior to their release, it was reasonable to argue that the chemical hypothesis lacked sufficiently detailed information regarding historical contamination sources and potential contaminant transport pathways. Following their publication, this position requires re-evaluation.

The central scientific question therefore changes. It is no longer sufficient to ask whether persistent contaminants can be detected in dolphin tissues. The more fundamental question becomes whether historically documented sources of contamination associated with the Paritutu industrial area could have been connected to the coastal marine environment through reconstructable transport pathways capable of introducing contaminants into marine food webs. In this respect, the present study extends beyond the specific case of Hector's and Māui dolphins.

It addresses a broader epistemological problem concerning the response of scientific systems to new evidence capable of changing an established research programme. When a substantially expanded evidentiary base becomes available but the overall research strategy remains essentially unchanged, the primary object of investigation is no longer limited to the environmental event itself. It also encompasses the mechanisms through which scientific communities recognise, incorporate, postpone, or exclude new information.

Science does not simply investigate environmental phenomena. It also determines which forms of evidence are regarded as scientifically relevant, which hypotheses are considered legitimate objects of investigation, which research programmes receive institutional support, and which explanatory frameworks remain outside mainstream scientific practice. Consequently, the emergence of new evidence requires not only the revision of empirical conclusions but also the re-examination of the cognitive and institutional mechanisms through which scientific knowledge is produced.

For this reason, the present study is conducted within the framework of critical reconstruction. Unlike conventional environmental analyses, critical reconstruction examines both the environmental process itself and the scientific process through which that environmental process is interpreted. It therefore investigates not only contamination, but also the institutional, cognitive, methodological, and administrative mechanisms that determine whether contamination becomes scientifically recognised, partially recognised, or remains outside the accepted body of knowledge.

Within the conceptual framework developed in our previous studies, this case is analysed through the interaction of different regimes of scientific recognition (5, 6). Particular attention is given to situations in which significant empirical information exists but fails to become integrated into active research programmes. Such situations are examined through the concept of structural falsification, understood not as the fabrication of scientific data, but as the long-term exclusion of evidence that could materially alter the trajectory of scientific investigation.

Accordingly, the principal objective of this paper is not to demonstrate that the chemical hypothesis is correct. Rather, it is to examine how the emergence of a new body of technical evidence changes the logic of scientific inquiry itself, and why that change has not yet been reflected in the dominant research strategy applied to one of the most extensively studied conservation problems in New Zealand.

Results

1. The Problem Is Not the Absence of Evidence but Its Failure to Become Part of the Research Programme

For several decades, the decline of Hector's and Māui dolphins has been interpreted primarily through the fisheries hypothesis. Scientific attention has focused on bycatch, fishing effort, habitat overlap with commercial fisheries, population fragmentation, and demographic vulnerability. This hypothesis is supported by substantial empirical evidence and remains an essential component of any comprehensive explanation of the population decline.

Numerous datasets can readily be incorporated into quantitative population models, including documented bycatch events, spatial overlap between fishing activities and dolphin distribution, temporal comparisons before and after the introduction of conservation measures, and estimates of additional mortality attributable to fisheries. The existence of a well-developed fisheries hypothesis, however, does not justify the exclusion of alternative explanations prior to their systematic evaluation. This is particularly important in the case of chemical contamination.

Unlike direct fisheries mortality, chemical exposure rarely produces an immediately observable endpoint. Instead, its effects may be expressed through impaired reproduction, immune dysfunction, lactational transfer of contaminants, reduced calf survival, increased susceptibility to infectious diseases such as toxoplasmosis or brucellosis, and long-term reductions in population resilience. Such effects are inherently more difficult to quantify, yet their methodological complexity cannot be regarded as evidence against their ecological significance.

The publication of the Groundwater Technology reports from 1995–1996 fundamentally changes the evidentiary context of the chemical hypothesis (13–15). These documents contain detailed information concerning historical contamination sources, contaminated soils, groundwater, chlorophenols, phenoxy compounds, organochlorine pesticides, solvents, and potential contaminant transport pathways. In other words, they provide information relating precisely to those components of the causal chain that had previously been regarded as insufficiently documented.

The significance of these documents therefore extends beyond the information they contain individually. Their appearance changes the structure of the research problem itself. Prior to their publication, it could reasonably be argued that the chemical hypothesis lacked sufficient evidence concerning historical contamination sources and environmental transport mechanisms. Following their release, the methodological situation becomes fundamentally different.

The central question is no longer whether such information exists, but why information of this kind was not incorporated into the active scientific research programme. This distinction is critical.

If a hypothesis has been rigorously examined and subsequently rejected, this represents a normal outcome of scientific investigation. If a hypothesis has never been tested because relevant evidence was genuinely unavailable, this represents an ordinary research gap. However, if significant empirical evidence existed, had been collected, possessed the potential to alter the direction of scientific investigation, yet remained outside the recognised body of scientific knowledge for several decades, then the problem can no longer be described simply as a lack of evidence.

Rather, it becomes a problem concerning the organisation of scientific knowledge itself. The issue shifts from empirical uncertainty to epistemological structure. The central scientific question therefore changes accordingly. The question is no longer: Why has the chemical hypothesis not yet been demonstrated? Instead, it becomes:

Why did empirical evidence capable of testing the chemical hypothesis fail to become integrated into the scientific research programme despite its existence? This reformulation fundamentally changes the methodological orientation of the investigation. Attention moves away from evaluating a single ecological hypothesis and toward examining the mechanisms through which scientific communities incorporate—or fail to incorporate—new evidence into established explanatory frameworks.

Within the framework developed in our previous work on regimes of scientific recognition (5, 6), this distinction is particularly important. Scientific knowledge develops not only through the accumulation of new empirical observations but also through decisions regarding which observations are considered relevant, which datasets become incorporated into accepted explanatory models, and which forms of evidence remain institutionally invisible. Consequently, the absence of a hypothesis from mainstream scientific discourse cannot automatically be interpreted as evidence against that hypothesis.

In some cases, it may instead reflect the failure of the surrounding scientific system to integrate new empirical information into its active research programme.

The present case appears to represent precisely such a situation. The newly released technical reports do not establish chemical causation. However, they substantially strengthen several previously underdeveloped components of the chemical hypothesis, particularly those concerning contamination sources and environmental transport pathways. Consequently, they require not merely the addition of several new references to the existing literature but a reconsideration of the overall research strategy through which the ecological problem has been approached.

2. Structural Falsification as a Mechanism of Scientific Invisibility

The concept of structural falsification is used in this study in a specific methodological sense. It should not be interpreted as an allegation that particular individuals intentionally fabricated scientific observations or deliberately falsified analytical data. Such claims require a different standard of evidence and are beyond the scope of the present investigation. Instead, structural falsification refers to a more complex and considerably more stable mechanism through which scientific knowledge may become systematically distorted without any direct manipulation of empirical observations.

This mechanism operates through the selective organisation of scientific visibility. Information may exist, be technically reliable, and remain fully documented, yet nevertheless fail to become incorporated into the recognised body of scientific knowledge. Technical reports may remain confidential for prolonged periods. Documents may be archived without entering active scientific discussion. Important datasets may become separated from subsequent research programmes. Critical evidence may remain uncited, unanalysed, or methodologically disconnected from the dominant explanatory framework.

Under such conditions, scientific knowledge becomes incomplete not because observations are absent, but because certain observations never become part of the active process of scientific interpretation. This distinction is fundamental. In conventional discussions of scientific integrity, falsification is generally understood as the production of false observations. Structural falsification operates differently. It produces an incomplete representation of reality while leaving individual empirical observations formally intact.

Consequently, the resulting scientific picture may remain internally consistent while simultaneously being substantially incomplete. Environmental contamination is particularly vulnerable to this mechanism. Unlike many experimental sciences, environmental investigations rarely consist of a single decisive observation.

Instead, environmental causation is reconstructed through extended causal sequences involving contamination sources, industrial processes, waste disposal, contaminated soils, groundwater migration, surface runoff, drainage systems, coastal transport, marine sediments, food-web transfer, tissue accumulation, biological responses, demographic consequences, and population dynamics. No single component of this sequence is usually sufficient to establish causation. Scientific understanding therefore depends upon the successful integration of multiple categories of evidence.

If several critical components fail to become incorporated into the research programme, the entire causal reconstruction may appear weak, despite the existence of substantial empirical information. The consequence is important. The apparent weakness of a hypothesis may reflect not the weakness of reality itself but the incompleteness of the evidentiary architecture through which that reality is reconstructed. The Groundwater Technology reports illustrate precisely this situation. These reports do not merely provide additional environmental measurements.

They contribute information concerning historical contamination sources, contaminant distribution, groundwater conditions, chemical composition, and possible environmental transport pathways. These are not peripheral observations. They concern precisely those elements of the causal chain that had previously remained insufficiently developed within the scientific literature addressing the Hector's and Māui dolphin decline. The methodological significance of these reports therefore extends well beyond their immediate technical content.

They demonstrate that the evidentiary structure surrounding the chemical hypothesis was substantially different from the structure that subsequently became visible within mainstream scientific discussion. This observation immediately generates a second-order scientific problem. If information capable of strengthening several critical components of a competing hypothesis already existed, why did that information fail to alter the trajectory of subsequent scientific investigation? This question differs fundamentally from asking whether the chemical hypothesis is correct.

Instead, it concerns the behaviour of scientific systems themselves. How does a scientific community respond when new evidence becomes available? Under what conditions does such evidence become incorporated into established research programmes? When does existing theoretical commitment prevent the revision of previously accepted explanatory models?

These questions belong not only to environmental science but also to the epistemology and sociology of scientific knowledge. Structural falsification therefore should not be understood as a property of individual documents. It is a property of scientific systems. It describes situations in which the overall architecture of scientific knowledge becomes systematically narrower than the available empirical evidence would justify.

Within the conceptual framework developed in our previous work on regimes of scientific recognition (5, 6), structural falsification represents one of the principal mechanisms through which a regime of scientific non-recognition maintains the stability of an established explanatory model. Importantly, this process does not necessarily require explicit censorship or intentional suppression. Scientific invisibility may emerge through entirely institutional mechanisms. Research priorities may remain unchanged. Previously accepted explanatory frameworks may continue to dominate funding decisions.

Bibliographic traditions may reproduce themselves. Review articles may repeatedly cite the same body of literature. Technical reports may remain disconnected from biological investigations. Ecological modelling may proceed independently of environmental toxicology. Each individual decision may appear methodologically reasonable.

Collectively, however, they may generate a stable system in which important empirical evidence remains permanently external to the dominant scientific narrative. This possibility represents one of the central methodological questions addressed in the present study.

3. Scientific Silence as an Object of Investigation

Scientific communities are commonly analysed as institutions responsible for the production, validation, and dissemination of knowledge. Much less attention has been devoted to an equally important phenomenon: the systematic absence of scientific response following the appearance of new evidence capable of altering an established research programme. The present study argues that scientific silence should itself be regarded as a legitimate object of scientific investigation. This proposition requires clarification. Scientific silence does not simply refer to the absence of publications.

Nor does it imply deliberate concealment or coordinated action by individual researchers. Rather, it describes a situation in which new empirical information fails to produce the sequence of scientific activities that would normally be expected following the appearance of evidence capable of changing an established explanatory framework.

Under ordinary conditions, the emergence of a substantial new body of empirical evidence initiates a relatively predictable scientific process. Previously accepted models are reexamined. Independent analyses are undertaken. Alternative interpretations are evaluated. Existing review articles are revised. Research priorities are reconsidered. New experimental or observational studies are designed to test the implications of the newly available information. This sequence represents one of the defining characteristics of normal scientific development.

The present case raises the question of whether such a process actually occurred. The Groundwater Technology reports became publicly available in 2024. These reports contain information directly relevant to contamination sources, environmental transport pathways, groundwater conditions, and contaminant distribution. They therefore concern several components that had previously been recognised as insufficiently documented within discussions of the chemical hypothesis.

If the publication of such material did not initiate a systematic re-evaluation of existing research programmes, then the absence of scientific response itself becomes an empirical observation requiring explanation. The analytical focus therefore changes. The primary question is no longer: What do the newly released documents demonstrate? Instead, the more informative question becomes: What happened after these documents became publicly available? Were independent evaluations undertaken? Were previous reviews revised? Were existing ecological models reconsidered? Were new toxicological investigations proposed?

Were environmental transport pathways reconstructed? Were the implications of the reports discussed within the conservation literature? If the answer to these questions is predominantly negative, then scientific silence itself becomes part of the evidence requiring interpretation. Importantly, this conclusion does not depend upon assumptions concerning individual motivation. Motivations are often inaccessible and difficult to establish. Scientific behaviour, by contrast, is observable. Publication histories can be examined. Citation patterns can be analysed. Research priorities can be reconstructed.

Funding trajectories can be evaluated. Official reports can be compared across time. The presence or absence of methodological change is itself an empirical phenomenon. Consequently, the analysis moves away from psychological explanations toward institutional analysis. The objective is not to determine what individual scientists believed.

The objective is to understand how scientific institutions responded—or failed to respond—to the appearance of evidence capable of altering an existing research programme. Within the framework developed in our previous work, this phenomenon is closely related to what has been described as the Scientific Society in Status Quo. Stable scientific communities frequently develop mechanisms that favour continuity over conceptual revision. These mechanisms are rarely explicit.

They operate through established citation practices, institutional expectations, accepted methodological standards, disciplinary boundaries, funding priorities, editorial traditions, and the cumulative authority of existing explanatory models. Under such conditions, scientific innovation often encounters resistance not because new evidence is necessarily weak, but because its incorporation would require substantial modification of an already stabilised intellectual structure.

This process is further reinforced by what has previously been described as the implicit bunker of normal science. Established scientific paradigms create zones of intellectual stability within which questions consistent with the prevailing explanatory framework are continuously investigated, while questions requiring substantial revision of that framework tend to remain outside the central research agenda. Such exclusion rarely takes the form of explicit prohibition. More commonly, it appears as prolonged inattention. The result is a characteristic asymmetry.

Research consistent with the dominant paradigm continuously generates new empirical material, attracts additional funding, produces review articles, and strengthens its own evidentiary foundation. Competing research programmes receive comparatively little methodological development. Over time, this asymmetry begins to appear as objective confirmation of the dominant explanation, although part of that asymmetry may have been produced by the organisation of scientific activity itself rather than by differences in empirical validity.

From this perspective, scientific silence should not be interpreted merely as the absence of discussion.

It represents a measurable institutional process through which particular forms of evidence remain disconnected from the active production of scientific knowledge. Understanding this process is essential not only for interpreting the Hector's and Māui dolphin case, but also for analysing the broader dynamics through which environmental crises become scientifically recognised—or remain only partially recognised—for extended periods.

4. Evidentiary Asymmetry Between the Fisheries and Chemical Hypotheses

The predominance of the fisheries hypothesis in explanations of the Hector's and Māui dolphin decline did not emerge by chance. It reflects important methodological characteristics of contemporary environmental science. Fisheries-related mortality is comparatively straightforward to investigate. Individual mortality events can be documented. Fishing effort can be quantified. Spatial overlap between fisheries and dolphin distribution can be estimated. Conservation measures can be implemented, and population responses can subsequently be modelled.

The resulting datasets lend themselves naturally to demographic analysis and quantitative risk assessment. Consequently, the fisheries hypothesis possesses an evidentiary structure that is relatively compatible with existing conservation methodologies. The chemical hypothesis is fundamentally different. Chemical contamination rarely produces immediate and directly observable mortality. Instead, its effects are frequently indirect, cumulative, and distributed across multiple biological levels.

Potential consequences may include endocrine disruption, reproductive impairment, immunological dysfunction, altered susceptibility to infectious disease, developmental abnormalities, reduced calf survival, and long-term decreases in population resilience. Such effects often become apparent only after prolonged exposure and usually require the integration of environmental chemistry, toxicology, pathology, epidemiology, reproductive biology, and population ecology. The methodological requirements are therefore substantially more demanding. This distinction has important epistemological consequences.

The apparent strength of competing hypotheses may depend not only upon their empirical validity but also upon the degree to which existing scientific methodologies are capable of producing evidence relevant to each hypothesis. In the present case, the fisheries hypothesis benefits from an extensive evidentiary infrastructure.

By contrast, the chemical hypothesis requires reconstruction across a considerably longer causal sequence: industrial source → contaminated site → groundwater → surface runoff → coastal transport → marine sediments → food web → contaminant accumulation → biological response → population consequences. Each component of this sequence requires specialised investigation. If several of these components remain insufficiently studied, the overall explanatory framework inevitably appears incomplete. This observation leads to an important methodological distinction.

The chemical hypothesis may appear weaker not because it is empirically incorrect, but because the scientific system has generated considerably fewer opportunities for producing evidence relevant to its evaluation. In other words, the asymmetry between competing hypotheses may itself be produced by the organisation of scientific research. This phenomenon may be described as evidentiary asymmetry. Evidentiary asymmetry refers to situations in which competing explanatory models are evaluated using substantially different levels of empirical development.

One hypothesis benefits from decades of cumulative data collection, repeated modelling, continuous institutional support, and ongoing methodological refinement. Another hypothesis remains dependent upon fragmented datasets, disconnected technical reports, isolated toxicological observations, and limited interdisciplinary integration. Under such conditions, direct comparison between hypotheses becomes methodologically problematic. The comparison is no longer conducted between two equally developed explanatory models.

Instead, it compares one mature research programme with another whose empirical infrastructure has remained only partially developed. The publication of the Groundwater Technology reports illustrates this distinction particularly clearly. These reports strengthen several previously underdeveloped components of the chemical hypothesis, especially those concerning contamination sources and environmental transport pathways. They therefore do not merely contribute additional information; they reduce an existing evidentiary asymmetry.

Whether this reduction is ultimately sufficient to support chemical causation remains an open scientific question. However, the methodological implications are already evident. The appearance of new evidence changes the conditions under which competing hypotheses should be evaluated. Failure to acknowledge this change risks creating what may be described as structurally produced uncertainty. Structurally produced uncertainty differs fundamentally from genuine scientific uncertainty. Scientific uncertainty reflects limitations imposed by the available evidence.

Structurally produced uncertainty emerges when potentially informative evidence remains disconnected from active research programmes despite its availability. The distinction is important because the two forms of uncertainty require entirely different scientific responses. Scientific uncertainty calls for additional investigation. Structurally produced uncertainty requires examination of the research system itself. From this perspective, the principal methodological problem is no longer whether chemical contamination contributed to the decline of Hector's and Māui dolphins.

The more fundamental question becomes whether the scientific community has generated sufficient empirical conditions under which that hypothesis could be fairly evaluated. Only after such conditions have been established can competing explanations be compared on genuinely equivalent methodological grounds. Accordingly, the present study argues that future research should focus not only on testing competing ecological hypotheses but also on analysing the evidentiary structures through which those hypotheses are constructed, supported, or systematically underdeveloped.

This shift represents one of the central methodological consequences of the newly available technical documentation.

5. Why This Case Extends Beyond Hector's and Māui Dolphins

At first sight, the present study appears to concern a single conservation problem involving two critically endangered dolphin populations[2]. Such an interpretation, however, would substantially underestimate its broader significance. The decline of Hector's and Māui dolphins provides a concrete empirical case through which a more general phenomenon can be examined: the relationship between environmental contamination, scientific evidence, and the institutional production of scientific knowledge. Environmental crises rarely involve a single explanatory mechanism.

Instead, they emerge through the interaction of multiple processes operating across different spatial and temporal scales. Industrial contamination, ecological transformation, demographic change, infectious disease, fisheries, climate variability, and habitat modification frequently coexist within the same environmental system. Consequently, competing explanations are not exceptional—they are the normal condition of environmental science.

The scientific challenge therefore lies not merely in identifying individual causal factors, but in constructing research programmes capable of evaluating alternative explanations under comparable methodological conditions. The present case suggests that this requirement is not always fulfilled. Some explanatory frameworks develop into mature scientific programmes characterised by continuous empirical refinement, repeated quantitative modelling, institutional support, and extensive review literature.

Other hypotheses remain comparatively underdeveloped, despite the existence of potentially relevant empirical evidence. This asymmetry has implications extending well beyond marine conservation. Comparable situations have been documented in environmental toxicology, occupational health, environmental epidemiology, military contamination, and industrial pollution, where the principal scientific controversy does not concern the existence of environmental contamination itself, but rather the extent to which contamination is recognised as a legitimate object of sustained scientific investigation.

---

[2] Māui dolphin (Cephalorhynchus hectori maui). Status: Critically Endangered (IUCN) NZ Threat Classification: Nationally Critical & Hector’s dolphin (Cephalorhynchus hectori hectori & C. h. maui). Status: Endangered (IUCN) NZ Threat Classification: Nationally Vulnerable.

From this perspective, the Hector's and Māui dolphin case becomes an analytical model for understanding broader processes governing the organisation of scientific knowledge. The central issue is no longer restricted to dolphins. It concerns the conditions under which environmental evidence becomes scientifically visible. More specifically, it concerns the mechanisms through which scientific communities decide whether newly available evidence should alter an established research programme. This distinction is fundamental.

Scientific progress is commonly described as a cumulative process in which new observations gradually improve existing explanations. The history of science demonstrates that this process is rarely automatic. New evidence does not modify scientific understanding simply because it exists. Evidence must first become incorporated into accepted research practices.

It must enter review articles, research proposals, funding priorities, conceptual models, methodological protocols, and educational frameworks. Only then does empirical information become scientific knowledge in the full institutional sense. The present study therefore distinguishes between two different forms of existence of empirical evidence. The first may be described as physical existence. Data have been collected. Documents exist. Technical investigations have been completed. Analytical measurements are available. The second may be described as epistemic existence.

The same information becomes integrated into active scientific reasoning, influences the formulation of research questions, modifies explanatory models, and changes subsequent scientific investigation. These two forms of existence are not necessarily simultaneous. Historical evidence may physically exist for decades before acquiring epistemic significance. The Groundwater Technology reports appear to represent precisely such a situation.

Prepared during the mid-1990s, they remained effectively external to the scientific reconstruction of the Hector's and Māui dolphin decline for nearly thirty years. Whether this delay resulted from administrative procedures, institutional inertia, disciplinary fragmentation, or other mechanisms remains an open question requiring separate investigation. The existence of the delay itself, however, is an observable historical fact.

Consequently, the present study argues that environmental science should devote greater attention not only to environmental contamination itself, but also to the temporal dynamics through which scientific recognition develops. Recognition is not instantaneous. It has its own history. It has its own institutional mechanisms. It has its own delays. These delays may themselves become ecologically significant.

If important evidence enters scientific discussion only after several decades, the consequences extend beyond academic debate. Research priorities remain unchanged. Alternative hypotheses receive limited empirical development. Environmental monitoring follows established assumptions. Risk assessments continue to rely upon incomplete evidentiary structures. Policy decisions are consequently based upon scientific models that may no longer reflect the full range of available information. For this reason, the chronology of scientific recognition becomes an essential component of environmental history.

The timing of evidence matters. The timing of publication matters. The timing of scientific response matters. Understanding these temporal relationships is therefore indispensable for understanding environmental crises themselves. The Hector's and Māui dolphin case demonstrates that ecological investigations should not be limited to reconstructing environmental processes alone. They must also reconstruct the history through which those environmental processes became scientifically recognised.

Only by integrating both histories—the environmental history of contamination and the epistemological history of its recognition—can a complete reconstruction of complex environmental crises be achieved.

6. A Revised Research Strategy

The publication of the Groundwater Technology reports fundamentally changes the methodological position from which the Hector's and Māui dolphin case should be investigated.

Before the release of these documents, the principal scientific objective was to compare competing explanations of the population decline—including fisheries-related mortality, demographic vulnerability, infectious disease, environmental change, and chemical contamination—and to demonstrate that the chemical hypothesis had never been subjected to a systematic programme of investigation comparable to that developed for the fisheries hypothesis. Following the emergence of the newly available technical documentation, this general comparative strategy is no longer sufficient. The research question itself changes.

The objective is no longer simply to compare competing hypotheses. It becomes necessary to determine whether a historically documented contamination source associated with the Paritutu industrial complex can be connected to the coastal marine environment and, ultimately, to Hector's and Māui dolphins through a scientifically reconstructable sequence of environmental processes. The problem therefore shifts from comparative hypothesis evaluation toward integrated causal reconstruction. Such a programme should include several interconnected stages.

6.1 Source Reconstruction

The first stage involves reconstructing the complete historical inventory of contaminants associated with the Paritutu industrial site. This reconstruction should identify substances that were manufactured, processed, stored, discharged, or generated as technological by-products during different phases of industrial activity. Particular attention should be given to chlorophenols, phenoxy herbicides, dioxins, furans, organochlorine pesticides, solvents, and other persistent environmental contaminants documented within the available technical reports. The objective is to replace the general category of "industrial contamination" with a chemically and historically specific reconstruction of contamination sources.

6.2 Site Contamination Reconstruction

The second stage requires systematic extraction of all primary environmental observations contained within the 1995–1996 technical documentation. Every sampling location, borehole, monitoring well, analytical result, sampling depth, sampling date, contaminant concentration, analytical method, detection limit, and laboratory quality-control parameter should be incorporated into a unified digital database. Rather than relying upon selected summary tables, the investigation should reconstruct the complete environmental dataset.

This approach would permit a detailed spatial reconstruction of contamination across the entire industrial site.

6.3 Environmental Pathway Reconstruction

The third stage concerns the reconstruction of contaminant transport pathways. The central question is no longer whether contamination existed within the industrial area. That question has already been addressed by previous investigations. The relevant question becomes whether physically plausible environmental pathways existed through which contaminants could migrate from historical industrial sources into the surrounding coastal environment.

This reconstruction should integrate groundwater movement, drainage systems, stormwater infrastructure, surface runoff, historical outfalls, catchment hydrology, shoreline processes, and coastal sediment dynamics into a single environmental model. The objective is to evaluate the environmental continuity linking industrial contamination to adjacent marine ecosystems.

6.4 Marine Exposure Reconstruction

Once environmental transport pathways have been reconstructed, attention should shift toward the coastal marine environment. Future investigations should include systematic examination of marine sediments, benthic environments, estuarine systems, coastal food webs, prey species, and historical contaminant accumulation within areas occupied by Hector's and Māui dolphins.

Particular emphasis should be placed on identifying the spatial continuity between historically contaminated terrestrial environments and adjacent marine ecosystems. This includes reconstruction of contaminant transfer through groundwater discharge, surface runoff, riverine transport, coastal sedimentation, and trophic pathways leading to marine mammals.

Without this stage, contamination remains an industrial phenomenon rather than an ecological process.

6.5 Re-assessment of Co-contaminants and Source Attribution

The next stage should include a comprehensive re-assessment of the possible range of historical co-contaminants associated not only with the Paritutu industrial complex but also with other historically contaminated locations within the Hector's dolphin range, including former meat-processing facilities, tanneries, and related industrial sites along the east coast of the South Island.

The objective is no longer to focus exclusively on TCDD. Instead, future investigations should reconstruct the complete spectrum of environmentally relevant compounds that may have entered terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems, including chlorophenols, phenoxy herbicides, polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins (PCDDs), polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDFs), polychlorinated diphenyl ethers (PCDEs), organochlorine pesticides, solvents, and other persistent industrial contaminants.

Particular attention should be given to the possible combined effects of these contaminant mixtures on reproductive physiology, immune regulation, endocrine function, developmental processes, and long-term population resilience in Hector's and Māui dolphins.

Perhaps the most critical component of this stage involves direct comparison between contaminant profiles identified within historical contamination sources and those detected in marine sediments, prey species, marine organisms, and dolphin tissues.

The primary objective is not simply to compare total contaminant concentrations. Instead, future investigations should employ congener-specific fingerprinting, chemical source attribution, and related analytical techniques capable of distinguishing among different contamination sources and identifying characteristic contaminant signatures.

Only such integrated analyses can determine whether contaminants detected within marine ecosystems and dolphin tissues are chemically consistent with historically documented industrial emissions and whether multiple contamination sources may have contributed to long-term ecological exposure.

6.6 Biological Integration

Environmental chemistry alone cannot resolve the question of ecological impact. Chemical information should therefore be integrated with pathological observations, reproductive status, immunological indicators, infectious disease records, nutritional condition, age structure, and causes of mortality for individual animals. Rather than analysing contaminants and biological observations independently, future investigations should evaluate them as components of a single biological system. This represents one of the principal methodological transitions proposed in the present study.

6.7 Population-Level Integration

Current population models have focused primarily upon direct mortality. A revised modelling framework should additionally evaluate sublethal effects, including reduced reproductive success, increased juvenile mortality, immunological impairment, enhanced susceptibility to infectious diseases, and cumulative interactions among multiple stressors. Such models would allow chemical contamination to be evaluated not only as a possible direct cause of mortality but also as a potential modifier of long-term population dynamics.

6.8 Reconstruction of Scientific Recognition

The final stage differs fundamentally from conventional environmental investigations. It concerns not the contamination itself but the scientific history through which contamination became recognised. Future research should systematically reconstruct:

- when relevant technical information first became available;
- when it entered the public domain;
- whether and how it was incorporated into subsequent scientific publications;
- whether existing review articles acknowledged these materials;
- whether conservation models were revised following their publication;
- whether research priorities changed;

- and whether the emergence of new evidence resulted in corresponding changes in scientific practice.

This final component transforms the investigation from an environmental study into an analysis of scientific knowledge production. Its objective is not to assign responsibility to individual researchers. Its objective is to understand the mechanisms through which scientific communities incorporate—or fail to incorporate—new empirical evidence into active research programmes. Only after all of these stages have been completed will it become possible to evaluate competing explanations under conditions approaching genuine methodological symmetry.

Until then, conclusions concerning the relative importance of different hypotheses should remain appropriately provisional, while recognising that the evidentiary landscape has changed substantially with the release of the previously unavailable technical reports.

7. Methodological Conclusions and Implications: From Environmental Reconstruction to the Reconstruction of Scientific Knowledge

The principal conclusion of the present study is methodological rather than ecological. The newly released Groundwater Technology documentation does not demonstrate that chemical contamination was the primary cause of the decline of Hector's and Māui dolphins. Such a conclusion would extend beyond the available evidence and would therefore be scientifically unjustified. The significance of these documents lies elsewhere. They substantially alter the evidentiary architecture within which the chemical hypothesis should be evaluated.

For several decades, the principal limitation of the chemical hypothesis was commonly understood to be the absence of sufficiently detailed information concerning historical contamination sources and environmental transport pathways. The technical documentation released in 2024 materially changes this situation. It strengthens precisely those components of the causal chain that had previously remained comparatively underdeveloped. Consequently, the methodological context of the investigation has changed. The principal scientific question is no longer whether the chemical hypothesis deserves consideration.

It has already become a legitimate object of scientific investigation. The relevant question now concerns the adequacy of the existing research programme. Has the emergence of new evidence resulted in a corresponding transformation of scientific investigation? Has the research strategy been revised? Have previous explanatory models been re-evaluated? Have new interdisciplinary investigations been initiated? Have the implications of the newly available documentation been systematically incorporated into conservation science? These questions remain largely unanswered.

The present study therefore proposes that future work should extend beyond the reconstruction of environmental contamination itself. Equally important is the reconstruction of the scientific processes through which contamination becomes recognised, incorporated into research programmes, or remains outside the dominant explanatory framework. This distinction has implications extending far beyond the present case. The Hector's and Māui dolphin decline should not be interpreted solely as an environmental problem. It should also be understood as a case study in the organisation of scientific knowledge.

Environmental contamination may exist long before it becomes scientifically recognised. Technical documentation may exist long before it becomes integrated into accepted explanatory models. Scientific recognition therefore possesses its own temporal dynamics that may differ substantially from the chronology of the environmental processes themselves.

The present investigation suggests that these two histories—the environmental history of contamination and the epistemological history of scientific recognition—must be reconstructed together. Neither is sufficient independently. Only their integration permits a comprehensive understanding of complex environmental crises. Within the conceptual framework developed in our previous studies, the present case also provides empirical support for distinguishing between different regimes of scientific recognition. Scientific knowledge does not emerge solely through the accumulation of observations.

It develops through institutional mechanisms that determine which observations become incorporated into active scientific reasoning and which remain outside recognised research programmes. Accordingly, environmental investigations should not be restricted to measuring contamination or documenting biological responses. They should also examine the evidentiary structures through which scientific conclusions are produced.

Questions concerning publication history, technical documentation, institutional response, research priorities, and the temporal dynamics of scientific recognition are not external to environmental science. They constitute an essential component of environmental explanation itself. The present study therefore proposes a shift in methodological emphasis. Future investigations should move beyond the traditional comparison of competing ecological hypotheses toward integrated reconstructions that simultaneously examine:

- historical contamination sources;
- environmental transport pathways;
- marine exposure;
- toxicological and pathological evidence;
- population-level consequences;
- and the scientific processes through which these forms of evidence become incorporated into—or excluded from—accepted systems of knowledge.

Only under such conditions can competing hypotheses be evaluated under genuinely comparable methodological standards. Finally, the present investigation should not be regarded as a completed explanation of the Hector's and Māui dolphin decline. Rather, it represents the initial stage of a broader research programme. Its principal objective has been to demonstrate that the publication of previously unavailable technical documentation fundamentally changes the structure of scientific inquiry. The environmental conclusions remain open. The methodological conclusions, however, are already clear.

The emergence of new evidence requires the reconstruction of the research programme itself. Failure to undertake such reconstruction transforms the problem from one of environmental uncertainty into one concerning the organisation and evolution of scientific knowledge.

For this reason, the case examined here should be understood not as an isolated environmental controversy but as an example of a broader epistemological problem that may arise whenever substantial new evidence enters the scientific domain after long periods of institutional invisibility. The research presented here therefore constitutes the beginning of a wider programme devoted to analysing the relationships between environmental contamination, scientific recognition, and the historical evolution of scientific knowledge.

Discussion

From Environmental Reconstruction to the Reconstruction of Scientific Knowledge

The present study began with an environmental question. Its initial objective was to examine whether newly released technical documentation concerning historical contamination at the Paritutu industrial site altered the evidentiary basis of the chemical hypothesis proposed to explain the long-term decline of Hector's and Māui dolphins. By the conclusion of the investigation, however, it became apparent that the environmental problem itself was no longer the only—or even the principal—object of analysis. The appearance of the Groundwater Technology reports changed something more fundamental.

It altered the structure of the scientific problem. This distinction is critical. Environmental contamination and scientific recognition represent two different historical processes. The first concerns the physical evolution of contamination within natural systems. The second concerns the evolution of scientific knowledge concerning that contamination. These two histories are related, but they are not identical. Environmental contamination may exist long before it becomes scientifically recognised. Likewise, scientific recognition may occur long after the decisive environmental processes have already taken place.

The chronology of contamination and the chronology of scientific recognition therefore constitute two distinct temporal systems. The present case demonstrates that these systems may diverge for decades. This observation has important methodological consequences. Environmental science has traditionally concentrated upon reconstructing contamination itself. Far less attention has been devoted to reconstructing the scientific processes through which contamination becomes recognised, incorporated into research programmes, or remains institutionally invisible.

The present investigation suggests that this second reconstruction deserves independent scientific status. Recognition should itself become an object of environmental research. The reasons are straightforward. Scientific evidence does not automatically transform scientific knowledge. Between observation and scientific recognition lies an extensive institutional process involving publication, peer review, citation practices, disciplinary traditions, funding priorities, technical reporting, expert committees, governmental agencies, conservation strategies, and educational frameworks.

Only after passing through this process does empirical information become fully integrated into accepted scientific understanding. Consequently, the absence of scientific recognition cannot automatically be interpreted as the absence of evidence. The present study therefore distinguishes between two fundamentally different forms of uncertainty. The first is empirical uncertainty. This reflects genuine limitations of available observations. Additional field investigations, laboratory analyses, and environmental monitoring may reduce such uncertainty. The second is institutional uncertainty.

Here, potentially informative evidence already exists but remains insufficiently incorporated into active scientific investigation. Increasing the quantity of observations alone cannot resolve this form of uncertainty. Instead, it requires reconstruction of the scientific processes through which evidence is evaluated, organised, and incorporated into research programmes. The distinction between these two forms of uncertainty is of considerable practical importance.

Environmental policy is frequently formulated under conditions described simply as "scientific uncertainty." The present study suggests that this concept is itself heterogeneous.

Part of what is commonly described as uncertainty may actually represent the historical consequences of delayed scientific recognition. If this interpretation proves correct, future environmental investigations should no longer analyse only contamination itself. They should also examine the chronology through which contamination becomes scientifically visible. This represents a significant methodological shift. The traditional object of environmental science has been environmental contamination. The present study proposes that an equally important object should become the dynamics of scientific recognition.

Such a perspective does not replace environmental chemistry, toxicology, epidemiology, conservation biology, or ecology. On the contrary, it provides an additional analytical level capable of explaining why certain environmental problems receive sustained scientific attention while others remain only partially investigated despite the existence of relevant empirical evidence.

Within the theoretical framework developed in our previous studies, this process may be interpreted through the interaction of different regimes of scientific recognition. Scientific knowledge develops not simply through accumulation of empirical observations but through the operation of cognitive and institutional regimes that determine which observations become scientifically meaningful. Consequently, environmental crises should no longer be interpreted exclusively as ecological events. They should also be understood as epistemological events.

Each environmental crisis possesses not only an environmental history but also a history of scientific recognition. Both histories deserve systematic reconstruction. The implications extend well beyond the present case. The Hector's and Māui dolphin decline represents only one example among many historical situations in which newly available documentation substantially changes the evidentiary landscape without immediately changing the dominant scientific interpretation.

Comparable situations may occur in studies of industrial pollution, military contamination, occupational exposure, environmental epidemiology, persistent organic pollutants, groundwater contamination, and numerous other environmental problems characterised by long temporal delays between contamination and recognition. Accordingly, the methodological framework proposed here should not be regarded as specific to New Zealand or to marine conservation. It is intended as a more general approach to investigating complex environmental problems whose scientific interpretation evolves over extended historical periods.

The present study therefore should not be understood as providing a final explanation of the Hector's and Māui dolphin decline. Nor does it attempt to establish the chemical hypothesis as proven. Its principal contribution is methodological. The newly available technical documentation does not resolve the ecological problem. It changes the scientific problem.

From this point onward, the central question is no longer whether the chemical hypothesis deserves scientific consideration. The relevant question becomes whether the existing research programme remains methodologically adequate following the emergence of substantially new empirical evidence. Answering that question requires more than additional environmental investigations. It requires a systematic reconstruction of the scientific processes through which environmental evidence becomes recognised, incorporated, delayed, fragmented, or excluded.

Only through such reconstruction can the relationship between environmental reality and scientific knowledge be adequately understood. In this sense, the present paper should be regarded as the opening stage of a broader research programme devoted to the epistemology of environmental contamination and the dynamics of scientific recognition. The ecological reconstruction presented here represents only its first empirical application.

References and Information Used

Peer-reviewed scientific literature

1. https://pdconference.org/
2. Gibbs, Andrew. 2026. “Beyond the TCDD Lens in Paritutu New Plymouth, New Zealand: Invisible Phenoxy-Herbicide Co-Contaminants, Visible Developmental Signals, and Decision-Making under Incomplete Evidence”. Pollution and Diseases, May. https://doi.org/10.66659/ar7fqk65
3. Gibbs, Andrew, and Dmitry Nikolaenko. 2026. “Competing Hypotheses and Scientific Non-Recognition: Investigating the Hector’s and Māui Dolphin Decline in the Context of Wartime Chemical Legacies”. Pollution and Diseases, June. https://doi.org/10.66659/10csws50
4. Gibbs, Andrew, and Dmitry Nikolaenko. 2026. “Chemical Pollution and the Population Crisis of Hector’s and Māui Dolphins. A Critical Research Bibliography, 1970–2026”. Pollution and Diseases, June, 51 pages. https://doi.org/10.66659/ybmw2c82
5. Nikolaenko, Dmitry. 2026. “From Individual Events to the Morphology of Military Contamination: An Epistemological Study of Form, Process, and Morphogenesis.” Pollution and Diseases, June, 55 pages. https://doi.org/10.66659/resz8h58
6. Nikolaenko, Dmitry. 2026. “Military Contamination and Regimes of Scientific Recognition: A Conceptual Framework”. Pollution and Diseases, June, 15 pages. https://doi.org/10.66659/bb4q9n88
7. Nikolaenko Dmitry. 2025. “Effective Resistance of the Scientific Community to Scientific Innovations: The Case of Theoretical Geography in the (Post) USSR”. Science and Science of Science. 2025. 4 (130), p. 49—69. https://doi.org/10.15407/sofs2025.04.049

Government reports

8. Pattle Delamore Partners Ltd. Investigation of Dioxin Contamination in Soil in the Paritutu Area, New Plymouth. Report for Ministry of Health and Taranaki District Health Board. 26 September 2002.
9. Environmental Science and Research (ESR). A Study of 2,3,7,8-Tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin (TCDD) Exposures in Paritutu, New Zealand. Report to the Ministry of Health. 2005.
10. Taranaki Regional Council. Investigation of Alleged Agrichemical Waste Disposal Sites in New Plymouth. Technical Investigation Report. 2001.

Technical environmental investigation reports

11. Australian Analytical Laboratories (AMDEL). Environmental Assessment Project. Certificates of Analysis and Laboratory Reports. 1995. Laboratory analytical documentation prepared for Groundwater Technology (NZ) Ltd.
12. Groundsearch EES Ltd. Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) and Resistivity Survey for DowElanco (NZ) Ltd. Prepared for Groundwater Technology (NZ) Ltd. November 1995.
13. Groundwater Technology (NZ) Ltd. 1996. Summary of Soil and Groundwater Evaluations, Paritutu Site, New Plymouth, New Zealand. Confidential environmental investigation prepared for DowElanco (NZ) Ltd., 4 July 1996. Publicly released by the Taranaki Regional Council in 2024 after remaining unavailable to the scientific community for approximately three decades.
14. Groundwater Technology (NZ) Ltd. Summary of Soil and Groundwater Evaluations, Paritutu Site, New Plymouth, New Zealand. Appendices. Part 1. Confidential technical report. Prepared for DowElanco (NZ) Ltd. 4 July 1996. Released 2024.
15. Groundwater Technology (NZ) Ltd. Summary of Soil and Groundwater Evaluations, Paritutu Site, New Plymouth, New Zealand. Appendices. Part 2. Confidential technical report. Prepared for DowElanco (NZ) Ltd. 4 July 1996. Released 2024.