The Right of a Theory to Empirical Testing: Organisational and Metascientific Constraints on the Study of Soil After War

Laboratory of Information Systems

New Euro Vision: exhibitions, marketing, research s.r.o.
Czech Republic

Presented by Dmitry Nikolaenko

The published protocol



Protocols of Expert–AI Scientific Inquiry

The Right of a Theory to Empirical Testing

Organisational and Metascientific Constraints on the Study of Soil after War

Version 1.1

Dmitry Nikolaenko

28 September 2026

Journal: Pollution and Diseases

Thematic Issue: Research Infrastructure and Institutional Governance

DOI: https://doi.org/10.66659/h6bcbb78

Protocol status: expanded working version for authorial review and subsequent publication

Pollution and Diseases 1 DOI: https://doi.org/10.66659/h6bcbb78

Version 1.1 connects theoretical questions with control over research.

It identifies the assumptions hidden within sampling and standards.

Its proposal gives competing theories material conditions for testing.

Protocol 95, version 1.1, §§2, 5–7, 10–13

Superprofits as the organising priority

In the regime criticised here, projects serve superprofits for research collectives.

Budgets, repeat contracts and institutional status displace inquiry.

The object enters the proposal through an already profitable methodology.

The accusation requires examination of allocations and actual research decisions.

Authorial thesis for this presentation / Protocol 95, §§7–8, 12; financial audit required

An old methodology applied to a new object

War changes sources, territorial functions and transfer pathways.

A familiar analytical panel records only its selected fragments.

Technical precision does not establish coverage of the changed object.

An unchanged design can reproduce an old image of a new reality.

Three levels of the expert's position

Level	What it determines
Declared position	The account given in the proposal
Operational position	Samples, indicators, methods and duration
Institutional position	The decision the organisation expects
Required disclosure	Assumptions, exclusions and limits of competence

Protocol 95, §4

The normative trap

Recorded state	Scientific meaning
Tested and not detected	Bounded by method sensitivity and sample context
Detected below a threshold	A measured result within that comparison
Excluded from the programme	The study provides no measurement
No applicable standard	Regulatory absence does not establish material absence
One-time conformity	Limited evidence about the later trajectory

Protocol 95, §9 / conceptual distinctions, no audit of a specific regulation

The paradox of forbidden evidence

Step	The closed procedure
1. Evidential deficit	The new theory lacks direct results
2. Access denied	It cannot obtain the material needed for testing
3. Deficit reproduced	Confirmation and substantive refutation remain blocked
4. Deficit used against it	Institutional exclusion appears as scientific judgement

Protocol 95, §§5–7

Methodological assimilation and imitation

An alternative can enter a project while losing its own question.

Mandatory indicators and deadlines can prevent the proposed test.

Prestige and publication totals cannot repair this substitution.

Imitation begins when project performance replaces inquiry into the object.

Protocol 95, §§4, 10–12 / imitation as a critical interpretation

The material content of independent development

A protected research question and an independent sampling design.

Proportionate access to data, samples and analytical capacity.

Resources and duration adequate for the proposed test.

Publication of inconvenient, negative and uncertain results.

Protocol 95, §§5, 10–14

Field verification in soil and freshwater

Access to a convenient site does not establish representativeness.

Each observation needs a process question and a stated scale.

Soil and water observations must follow the proposed connection.

Exploratory and local findings retain their limits of extrapolation.

Field Verification 79, abstract / Protocol 95, §§11, 14

Dioxin reconstruction as an independent research task

Archives record sources, storage, transport and release.

Environmental observations examine persistence and exposure.

Biological outcomes require evidence of their own causal links.

An information system preserves provenance and gaps between these stages.

COMPARATIVE EXAMPLE

The dolphin case and unequal recognition

Publication 29 compares competing explanations under incomplete evidence.

It asks how hypotheses receive or lose opportunities for testing.

Non-recognition cannot establish that an alternative is false.

Institutional resistance cannot establish that the alternative is true.

Gibbs and Nikolaenko, publication 29, abstract

The scientific community in a state of status quo

The 2025 geography study proposes the SS-SQ concept.

Innovation becomes a threat to an established group's stability.

Institutional continuity can coexist with cognitive stagnation.

Transfer of this explanation to another field requires case evidence.

Nikolaenko (2025), Science and Science of Science 4(130), 49–69

Open review before budgets and roles

Groups disclose their object, model, exclusions and competing hypotheses.

Allocations identify actual tests and the beneficiaries of expenditure.

Independent reviewers examine access and conflicts of interest.

The public record retains disagreements and later compares promises with results.

Protocol 95, §§11–13 / financial-audit criteria proposed in this presentation

The expert–AI record and reciprocal accountability

Versions preserve accepted concepts, rejected alternatives and reasons.

Data records retain provenance, uncertainty and missing observations.

The theory of military ecotones states conditions for its own revision.

Human responsibility remains explicit throughout the process.

Development protocol 91 / Field Verification 79 / Protocol 95, §14

Publications supporting the argument

Right to Empirical Testing (95, v1.1)
10.66659/h6bcbb78

Paradigm of the Military Ecotone (92)
10.66659/nhzds093

Theory Development Protocol (91, v1.2)
10.66659/nm7g2h26

Field Verification (79)
10.66659/2qwv2037

Dioxin Information Framework (70)
10.66659/62p3b908

Competing Hypotheses: Dolphin Case (29)
10.66659/10csws50

Effective Resistance: Geography Case (2025)
10.15407/sofs2025.04.049

Full bibliography in speaker text and notes

CONCLUSION

The right to produce evidence

Status competition can determine access before scientific comparison begins.

Independent development preserves a new theory's distinctive question.

Material access makes confirmation, revision and refutation possible.

A theory must be able to encounter the object on which its claims depend.

Full published protocol

DOI: 10.66659/h6bcbb78

Full protocol available through the QR code