

# Nanopublication – Midjourney Demands Disney's AI Data to Counter Its Own Copyright Suit

by Arnaud Quercy

This is a legal-procedure report on a copyright discovery motion (fair use, unclean hands, evidentiary disclosure) between Midjourney and major studios, and the ideamorphism framework's vocabulary – codex, overture, invariant, diffraction – has no traction on questions of licensing, litigation strategy, or courtroom discovery; forcing terms like 'borrowed codex' onto a property-rights dispute would be manufacturing a fit where the source is speaking an entirely different, legal-economic register.

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 2026-07-07 · model claude-sonnet-5 · source 8,292 chars · 1 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 copyright dispute reveals the structural crisis of the dilution engine. Midjourney's system is designed to maximize emission (bil-

lions of generated images) while minimizing diffraction—the receiver contributes nothing; the algorithm predicts what already exists. Disney's use of AI compounds the problem: recognition at scale, not creation. The court case exposes the ideamorphic paradox: both parties claim authorship over a process that produces neither intentional invariant nor genuine overture. The legal framework cannot adjudicate diffraction because diffraction requires loss, singularity, and bilateral revelation—none of which algorithmic generation permits. This is the dilution crisis made visible: maximum output, zero creation.

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

## REFERENCES

[1] Amid Its Own Copyright Controversy, Midjourney Asks Court to Reveal How Disney Uses AI. ARTnews.com, 2026-07-07. <https://www.artnews.com/art-news/news/copyright-midjourney-court-to-reveal-how-disney-uses-ai-1234791213/>

[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, 1 attempt(s), traceability check passed. |

## CHECKSUM (SHA-256)

462b1526caa6eeb5d464fac01497d700794c61647f366d667600ad500edf0e9e

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

|            |               |
|------------|---------------|
| Author     | Arnaud Quercy |
| Asset code | IDS-RNI0156   |
| Identifier | NAN-RDG000102 |
| 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](https://publishing.artquamanima.com)

Last updated: 2026-08-15

Persistent URI: <https://ideamorphism.org/en/nanopubs/2026/08/IDS-RNI0156-midjourney-demands-disneys-ai-data-to-counter-its-own-copyri.pdf>