

Nanopublication – The Ethical Center Holds for the Artist, Not for the Corporation

by Arnaud Quercy

The finding: the emitter-responsibility structure of P31 grips cleanly on the Huyghe/Cavell/Fried material – the artist who designs ambiguity keeps the accountability the visitor cannot inherit. The boundary is the line between artmaking ethics and legal-personhood politics: the article's real destination (Citizens United, robot and animal rights) is territory the framework has no instrument for at all.

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS [1]

The author recounts mistaking a live, silent, gold-masked performer in Pierre Huyghe's Liminal for a statue, and being corrected by a guard. She surveys artists (Huyghe, Katchadourian, the robot Ai-Da, Marge Monko) who stage human-like behavior in nonhuman or object form, and reads this through Stanley Cavell (we treat art objects the way we treat persons) and Michael Fried (Minimalism's anthropomorphism is a dangerous, manipulative confrontation with the beholder). Drawing on her own book on legal personhood, she argues that extending rights to corporations, fetuses, animals, or AI creates more subjects of moral concern without corresponding duties, since these entities cannot reciprocate responsibility; she concludes that the obligation to make society livable remains exclusively human.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P31 grips on the Huyghe episode with real specificity: staging a live performer as a still statue, inviting strangers to photograph a stranger's face at close range, is exactly the 'game master who designs a dangerous game' – Huyghe conceives and emits the conditions of intrusion; the visitor is free to react (laugh, lean in, apologize) but did not author the possibility of violation. The article's closing line – responsibility 'remains ours' [human], not the machine's or object's – lands on the same distribution P31 states: conception/emission carries responsibility, reception carries freedom without carrying authorship of the conditions. P12 also grips: the daughter's naive 'is that a real person?' against the mother's trained dismissal fits

'maximum calibration on a known signal produces minimum diffraction' – the mother's art-going training forecloses the ambiguity the child's uncalibrated eye still registers.

WHERE IT BREAKS

The article's actual thesis is legal and political, not aesthetic: extending rights-bearing personhood to corporations (Citizens United), fetuses, animals, lakes, and AI. P31 speaks only to who bears responsibility for the conditions of an emitted artwork – it holds cleanly if read that narrowly (art-emission ethics), but if stretched to underwrite the article's jurisprudential argument about corporate or robot rights, it would be over-extended; the framework has no vocabulary for legal personhood as a category and stays silent on that ground, which is where the source actually spends most of its argument.

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.

Evaluated

proposition		audit status	relational verdict
P12	Aperture Calibration	not audited	evidence-for
P31	Ethical Center	not audited	evidence-for

Remarkable silences

1 called for by what the reading found, and absent from the source.

- **P11 – Sensory Diffraction**
the reading builds its P12 grip entirely on sensory calibration – the daughter's uncalibrated eye versus the mother's trained eye – but P11 insists that access runs through the rule/codex, not the organ, and the reading never asks whether that trained dismissal is itself codex-governed or merely perceptual habit, leaving the organ/rule distinction untouched at the exact point it was invoked.

Not evaluated (34) – P1, P2, P3, P3a, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10, P13, P14, P14a, P14b, P15, P16, P16a, P17, P18, P18a, P19, P19a, P20, P21, P22, P23, P24, P25, P26, P27, P28, P29, P30

Overall verdict: Bounded – 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 2026-04-23 · model claude-sonnet-5 · source 9,692 chars · 2 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.

This essay on artwork personhood touches the PHYSICAL vs. INTENTIONAL INVARIANT distinction. An artwork's material form (dimensions, pigment, substrate) is unconditionally stable—no ouverture can alter it. But the question 'does it have personhood?' is asking whether the intentional invariant (the codex embedded in its making, the logic of its creation) can be activated through relational encounter. The risk the essay identifies—that anthropomorphizing art objects can be ethically dangerous—is actually a warning about RICOCHET COLLAPSE: when the receiver's projection of personhood becomes so strong that it overwrites the artwork's actual intentional invariant, the bilateral revelation fails. The artwork becomes a mirror, not a diffractive object. The ideamorphic insight here is that genuine encounter requires the receiver to work *through* the gap between their ouverture and the work's codex, not to collapse the gap through false intimacy. Personhood is not something artworks have; it is something the receiver must *resist projecting* in order for true diffraction to occur.

T50 RSS assessment · 2026-04-23 · remplacée par boundary-lens-2026-08

REFERENCES

[1] Can an Artwork Have Personhood?. Hyperallergic, 2026-04-23. <https://hyperallergic.com/can-an-artwork-have-personhood/>

[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	bounded grip
Methodology	Boundary-finding lens applied to one source, model claude-sonnet-5, 2 attempt(s), traceability check passed.

CHECKSUM (SHA-256)

cca200172770f6bf744af918ba2ba8ef4007c189ee3031783f44d3416ed54903

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

Author	Arnaud Quercy
Asset code	IDS-RNI0100
Identifier	NAN-RDG000022
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-RNI0100-the-ethical-center-holds-for-the-artist-not-for-the-corporat.pdf>