

Nanopublication – Why denying AI's usefulness no longer holds up against labor displacement and critics' own contradictions

by Arnaud Quercy

This is a polemical media-philosophy essay adjudicating a factual/political debate about AI usefulness, labor displacement, and internal contradictions in specific critics' arguments – it contains no claims about ideas as waves, emitters/receivers, codices, or diffraction that the ideamorphism framework could confirm, limit, or refute.

DECLINED – NO-PURCHASE [1]

PROPOSITIONAL GRID [2]

Read this grid. “Not evaluated” does **not** mean the source has nothing to say about that proposition. It means **the reading did not instruct it**. That is not a result, and it counts in no denominator. A silence, by contrast, is a finding: the reading touched the proposition without concluding, or noted its absence itself.

Not evaluated (37) – P1, P2, P3, P3a, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10, P11, P12, P13, P14, P14a, P14b, P15, P16, P16a, P17, P18, P18a, P19, P19a, P20, P21, P22, P23, P24, P25, P26, P27, P28, P29, P30, P31

Overall verdict: DECLINED:no-purchase – taxonomy of the August 2026 pass, predating the move to relational verdicts. Kept as metadata: the gap between the two forms is data, not residue. This reading’s judgement is in the grid above.

Reading of 2026-07-13 · model claude-sonnet-5 · source 15,520 chars · 3 attempt(s)

FIRST PASS – KEPT AS WRITTEN

Reading produced by the T50 RSS pass, before the boundary lens. It is reproduced UNCORRECTED. Keeping it is the point: without it, a changed title is just a changed title – with it, what the second pass refused becomes legible.

Title it carried : « Algorithmic Denialism and the Ricochet of Critical Tools »

This describes a structural ricochet effect: critics emit their intentional invariant (a critique of AI systems) through an ouverture

they previously refused – the algorithmic tool itself. The emission passes through the algorithm and returns transformed: the critique now carries the fingerprint of what it opposes. The invariant (the logical structure of the argument) survives, but the codex (the method of emission) has been involuntarily borrowed. This is not hypocrisy – it is diffraction made visible. The critic discovers what their critique generates when transmitted through the forbidden medium. The platform does not dilute the message; it ricochets it, forcing a bilateral revelation: the critic sees their own argument refracted through algorithmic mediation, and the algorithm's users see critique emerging from within the system itself. The 'clumsy' usage is not failure – it is the productive friction of an ouverture encountering a codex not its own.

T50 RSS assessment · 2026-07-13 · remplacée par boundary-lens-2026-08

REFERENCES

[1] The End of Algorithmic Denialism. The Philosophical Salon, 2026-07-13. <https://thephilosophicalsalon.com/the-end-of-algorithmic-denialism/>

[2] Quercy, A. (2026). The 31 Propositions of Ideamorphism. <https://ideamorphism.org/en/publications/2026/03/the-31-propositions-of-ideamorphism.html>

EPISTEMIC PROFILE

Claim type	boundary reading
Voice	third person analysis
Epistemic status	no purchase
Methodology	Boundary-finding lens applied to one source, model claude-sonnet-5, 3 attempt(s), traceability check passed.

CHECKSUM (SHA-256)

7a5bdb5a7d20f7d64e131d64de87db3568b015a4733f8f3bdaefe2dabed29c17

Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

Author Arnaud Quercy
Asset code IDS-RNI0067
Identifier NAN-RDG000114
Version 1
Published 2026-08-05

ISSN: applied for – U.S. ISSN Center, Library of Congress

© 2026 Ideamorphic Studies

Published by Art Quam Anima Publishing New York,
an assumed name of AQA Publishing LLC

c/o Northwest Registered Agent, 418 Broadway Ste N
Albany, NY 12207, USA
+1 917-764-5470

NY DOS ID 7624376 · Assumed Name ID 7658709

publishing.artquamanima.com

Last updated: 2026-08-15

Persistent URI: <https://ideamorphism.org/en/nanopubs/2026/08/IDS-RNI0067-why-denying-ais-usefulness-no-longer-holds-up-against-labor.pdf>