Why Were There No Papers on War Affected Soil at a Conference on the Effects of War on Soil

Protocols of Expert-AI Scientific Inquiry
Dmitry Nikolaenko
Editor-in-Chief, Pollution and Diseases
Czech Republic

P&D Conference 2026 / 15–17 October, Prague
15-minute presentation / 2079 words / English

Slide 1 Why Were There No Papers on War-Affected Soil at a Conference on the Effects of War on Soil

00:00–00:54 / 54 seconds

Preparing this conference produced one of its greatest surprises. We had organised it primarily around war, soil and freshwater. Yet independent contributions directly investigating soil affected by war were virtually absent. I could have concealed this result and said that the final programme was exactly what we had intended. That would have lost an important observation. For me, the result was a shock. My response is curiosity rather than resentment. I want to understand how the central object of a conference can become difficult to bring into scientific discussion while specialists, publications and institutions devoted to it continue to exist. The published expert–AI protocol records that inquiry. This presentation explains the observation, the institutional interpretation developed from it, and the research questions that followed.

Slide 2 An unexpected result of conference preparation

00:54–01:49 / 55 seconds

The organisers sent hundreds of invitations to universities, scientific organisations and individual specialists. These included authors who had published on the consequences of war for soil. The protocol records an overwhelming proportion of silence, a small number of formal replies and isolated substantive proposals. We expanded the thematic field to include humanitarian, social, historical and post-war experience. That expansion enriched the programme. It also made the original absence more visible. Discussions of memory, settlement and human consequences proved easier to organise than the direct investigation of the soil at the centre of the initial design. The title expresses this paradox. The precise observation concerns the near absence of independent contributions centred on affected soil. Soil still appears in the conference theme and in contributions connected with environmental restoration.

Slide 3 The expert–AI protocol

01:49–02:45 / 56 seconds

The protocol preserves the development of a question rather than reproducing a raw conversation. I supplied the organising experience and the initial problem. AI helped formulate questions, propose concepts and organise the argument. I accepted, rejected and clarified formulations and determined

the scope. Responsibility for the published interpretation remains mine. The method makes the transition from observation to explanation visible. An absence of papers is observable within this organising experience. The institutional mechanism proposed to explain it requires additional investigation. Different recipients may have different reasons for not participating. The protocol acknowledges that distinction. We can examine a persistent pattern without pretending to possess the private motivation of every person who remained silent. The cognitive result is a set of concepts and a programme for checking how research actually operates.

Slide 4 Project activity and cognitive activity

02:45–03:43 / 58 seconds

The first distinction concerns project activity and cognitive activity. A project provides a budget, an institutional framework, roles and expected deliverables. Cognitive work asks what the object is, what remains unknown and which observations could change our understanding. These questions can arise before the project exists. The protocol interprets the conference experience as a separation between potential readiness for funded work and limited readiness to discuss the object openly. Competing organisations can each seek to make their methods and infrastructure central without forming a common research programme. A consortium does not automatically solve this problem. We must ask what knowledge about the soil will exist after the work ends and how that knowledge could differ from the organisation's initial assumptions. This question concerns research design, rather than the personal worth of an invited specialist.

Slide 5 The real object and the selected research subject

03:43–04:41 / 58 seconds

The real object is soil changed by war and continuing to change after active hostilities. A research subject is the selected aspect that a particular team can investigate with particular methods. Selecting a subject is necessary. No team can examine the whole object at once. The failure occurs when the team presents its selected fragment as an adequate account of the entire object. That substitution removes questions outside the established methods. It can occur even when the measurements within the fragment are technically sound. We therefore need an explicit account of what a study covers and what its design leaves unresolved. The soil must retain the possibility of contradicting the initial model. Otherwise a new disturbance simply enters an old institutional view as another factor, while the organisation of the changed system remains unexplored.

Slide 6 Institutional appropriation of the object

04:41–05:37 / 56 seconds

Soil lies within relations of ownership, economic use and state regulation. An investigation can affect the official status of land, agricultural production, property values or a recovery plan. These consequences create interests around the research object. The protocol uses institutional appropriation to describe control over who can define the object and its admissible methods. It also introduces the certified right to scientific statement: the practical ability to speak on behalf of recognised science depends on an accepted institutional position as well as competence. These concepts describe the author's proposed mechanism. They require examination through access conditions, decisions and records. The important question is how an observation becomes a

recognised fact. Does its scientific quality decide that transition, or does the organisation's position determine which observation receives an effective hearing?

Slide 7 Permitting science and the recovery objective

05:37–06:35 / 58 seconds

The imperative of rapid recovery can change the governing question. Instead of investigating what happened to the soil, an institution asks which measurements are required to permit further use. The protocol calls this permitting science. Returning land to production is a real practical objective. The scientific problem concerns extending a limited answer beyond the conditions that make it valid. A result for a selected substance in a selected crop, place and sampling period cannot establish the condition of the whole territory. Unmeasured compounds, transformation products and other pathways remain unresolved. Supporting soil science describes the organisation of methods around a recovery direction already chosen. The measurements can be accurate while the research question excludes consequences that might change that direction. We need to examine both the result and the task that produced it.

Slide 8 Temporal compression of a developing process

06:35–07:29 / 54 seconds

The timescale creates another substitution. An institution needs a decision about the next planting season, harvest or project report. Soil processes can extend beyond those deadlines. The protocol calls assessment of the longer process through a short decision interval temporal compression. A particular measurement answers a question at its own time and place. It leaves later migration, remobilisation or biological changes open to investigation. Even eliminating contamination has several possible meanings. Removal of material changes the site physically. Isolation changes exposure conditions. A value below a threshold answers a regulatory question. Changing the land's status changes its administrative treatment. These actions must remain distinguishable. Declaring restoration is an event we can document. It does not automatically establish that every ecologically important process has ended.

Slide 9 Conditions for independent verification

07:29–08:23 / 54 seconds

Independent work needs more than money and instruments. It needs repeated access to territory, contextual records, samples, appropriate analysis and the opportunity to connect results across environments. The protocol examines how these conditions can depend on organisations whose decisions the research might challenge. It calls independence controlled when a team can measure permitted indicators but cannot independently define the object, hypotheses or observation period. Safety restrictions and quality requirements have legitimate functions. An audit must identify what a restriction actually protects and whether it provides a scientifically usable route to verification. The table identifies records needed for that audit. It does not claim that every restriction proves obstruction. It makes the institutional interpretation examinable through concrete permissions, refusals, data conditions and requirements for recognising evidence.

Slide 10 Simulated research as an operational concept

08:23–09:18 / 55 seconds

Simulated research is one of the protocol's strongest concepts. It does not necessarily mean fabricated samples or invented figures. It describes formally scientific work whose questions exclude the possibility of changing a predetermined decision. The distinction matters. If the instruments function correctly, we still need to ask why these indicators were selected, why that observation period ended, and which relationships the project excluded. Were unknown parameters actively sought? Could a negative or unexpected result change the recovery programme? Did the project preserve questions that it could not answer? This concept is an analytical test of how the investigation functions. Its application to a specific project requires evidence of those restrictions. Institutional prestige and procedural completion cannot by themselves answer whether the team investigated the changed soil system adequately.

Slide 11 Silence around the proposed soil approach

09:18–10:14 / 56 seconds

There is a second observation. At the time of preparing this presentation, my proposed understanding of soil after war has attracted little substantive discussion in the conference preparation. This is my current organising observation. It is not a report of a completed conference debate. Again, I am surprised. I have no objection to criticism of the approach. A criticism should identify which concept fails, which relationship is unsupported or which test would distinguish alternatives. Silence provides none of that. It cannot validate the theory, and it cannot refute it. It leaves the cognitive work unfinished. The response should be to preserve the proposal and identify the questions that have received no answer. The absence of discussion becomes another part of the investigation of how an object receives scientific attention.

Slide 12 Soil after war as a configurational object

10:14–11:12 / 58 seconds

The constructive response appears in the protocol on soil as a configurational object of the military ecotone. Its theoretical position is explicit. War changes the regime in which a territory functions. Soil transformation includes pre-war history, military disturbance, additions of substances and energy, destruction and cessation of previous activities. Relations with water, biota, land use and human presence also change. Chemical pollution is an important component within that configuration. The theory should organise questions about the developing relationships and trajectories. It must face empirical testing. This approach gives the discussion a definite object and a set of proposed concepts that other researchers can examine. We are not asking for acceptance through professional courtesy. We are presenting a position whose adequacy must depend on the soil processes it enables us to recognise and test.

Slide 13 An empirical programme for the changed soil

11:12–12:09 / 57 seconds

The soil protocol proposes an empirical programme. Its indicator groups include land use, pollutants, physical soil transformation, freshwater conditions, biological changes, substance flows, human presence, and control and observability. Research polygons identify connected configurations of

history and military disturbance. Smaller sites support repeated observations with an explicit rationale for representativeness. Hypothesis–evidence relations determine what a sample or experiment should test. A laboratory experiment can examine a mechanism, while field observation examines whether that mechanism matters within the territorial configuration. The intended output is an open dynamic profile of soil within the military ecotone. It records the evolving state of knowledge rather than replacing it with a single declaration of restoration. This programme turns the conference surprise into specific cognitive work: define the object and organise observations that can change the explanation.

Slide 14 The institutional interpretation can be tested

12:09–13:07 / 58 seconds

The absence of papers from one conference cannot establish the entire institutional explanation. The protocol itself states that limit. Our next task is to test its elements. Outreach records can document whom we approached and which responses followed. Project briefs can show how the question about soil changed when recovery became the governing objective. Access decisions can reveal whether independent observation had a practicable route. Sampling designs can show which relationships and timescales remained outside the research. Other explanations for the participation pattern also require assessment, including timing, competing obligations and the form of the invitation. For the theory itself, a substantive response should identify a claim and the evidence that could change it. This approach makes the surprise productive. It preserves an unexpected result and develops questions through which its interpretation can be revised.

Slide 15 Protocols and the research object

13:07–14:01 / 54 seconds

The principal sources preserve the sequence of inquiry. The first protocol records the unexpected absence of independent papers centred on war-affected soil and develops the institutional concepts. The soil protocol then defines the changed object and proposes how to investigate it. These documents have different tasks. The institutional interpretation cannot substitute for soil research, and soil measurements cannot by themselves explain the conditions under which questions enter scientific discussion. Both tasks belong in the record. The QR code links to the first published protocol. The second source provides the constructive theoretical and methodological response. Readers can examine the concepts, their stated limits and the role of expert–AI inquiry directly. The present talk adds my current account of surprise and limited substantive discussion during preparation.

Slide 16 Surprise becomes a research question

14:01–15:00 / 59 seconds

I conclude with the surprise rather than conceal it. A conference built around the effects of war on soil struggled to attract independent contributions directly investigating that soil. The final programme gained other valuable subjects, but the original gap remains worth examining. There is no resentment in this conclusion. There is an empirical observation and an interpretation that now requires a more detailed test. The limited discussion of our proposed approach also remains part of the record. It gives us no reason to claim either agreement or refutation. Our response is to formulate the object more clearly, preserve the unresolved questions and propose an empirical programme. The unexpected organising result becomes a cognitive result when it changes what we investigate. We now ask what

happened to the soil, which processes continue, and which observations could change our understanding.

Published sources

Nikolaenko, D. (2026). Why Were There No Papers on War-Affected Soil at a Conference on the Effects of War on Soil. Protocols of Expert-AI Scientific Inquiry. Version 1.0. Pollution and Diseases. DOI: 10.66659/rpharj84.
https://pollution-diseases-ojs.org/index.php/pd/article/view/96
Full text: https://pollution-diseases-ojs.org/index.php/pd/article/view/96/64

Nikolaenko, D. (2026). Soil after War as a Configurational Object of the Military Ecotone. Protocol for Developing a Theory for the Study of Soil Transformed by War. Version 1.0. Pollution and Diseases. DOI: 10.66659/84a13358.
https://pollution-diseases-ojs.org/index.php/pd/article/view/94

Evidence status and presentation context

Article 96 reports virtually no independent proposals directly centred on war-affected soil. This is a narrower claim than an absence of every soil-related contribution. Section 22 distinguishes the organising observation from proof of the complete institutional interpretation and calls for project-specific testing. The current lack of substantive discussion of the proposed soil approach is Dmitry Nikolaenko’s supplied organising observation during conference preparation. It is not a report of debates at a completed conference. Surprise, the decision to preserve the unexpected result and the absence of resentment follow the author’s requested framing. No individual motives or numerical response rates are inferred.

Article 94 proposes a theoretical position and an empirical programme. The talk presents these as proposed work rather than completed field findings. Slide 3 reproduces the first page of article 96 under its CC BY 4.0 licence. The reproduced page retains the institutional heading of the PDF. The presentation and bibliography follow the requested personal author attribution and the publication metadata. The QR code on slide 16 links to article 96.