

Nanopublication – The forgery dispute isolates the physical/intentional split cleanly – then runs past it into censorship and fraud the lens has no words for

by Arnaud Quercy

The line: the physical/intentional invariant split and the counterfeit-codex vocabulary hold as long as the question is 'which origin-logic does this object encode' – but the moment the story turns to forensic dating as the only access route and to state secrecy clauses as the obstacle, the lens has nothing left to grip; it is silent about censorship of research and institutional fraud.

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS [1]

A journalist reports on a decades-old controversy over the Warrior of Capestrano, a 6th-century BCE limestone statue and Abruzzo national symbol discovered in 1934. A filmmaker, Alessio Consorte, alleges it is a 1930s forgery commissioned to serve Mussolini's propaganda, citing a Vatican letter and payment records, and has fought a three-year legal battle to get non-invasive testing approved. The culture ministry initially denied the tests on false grounds, then approved them but attached a secrecy clause barring publication of results without government consent – which Consorte is now contesting in court as censorship.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P3a's split between physical invariant (the limestone mass, the carved armor and hat – undisputed for ninety years) and intentional invariant (why these forms: genuine Piceni funerary logic, or a fascist-era fabrication modeled on Mussolini) grips cleanly: the whole controversy is precisely a dispute over which codex the identical physical layer encodes, and the physical layer alone has never settled it – confirming that perception of the physical does not automatically transmit the intentional. P21's 'borrow another's codex and the diffraction is counterfeit' also lands with real force: if Consorte is right, the statue's surface borrows the Piceni funerary vocabulary while actually encoding a 20th-century political codex – a textbook counterfeit wave.

WHERE IT BREAKS

The framework's stated route to the intentional invariant is dialogue with the codex-holder (P3a: 'activatable through dialogue') or induction across a living body of work (P14a). Here the alleged codex-holders are dead and anonymous; the only available route is forensic material science (X-ray dating) plus archival documents – a channel the framework has no vocabulary for. More sharply: the actual engine of this story is not diffraction or reception at all but state censorship of scientific results and criminal-fraud allegations against a government institution. P21's 'counterfeit codex' was built to describe derivative artistic borrowing (fashion, imitation), not deliberate forgery weaponized by a state for nationalist propaganda and then legally shielded from disclosure – the stakes and mechanism here (courts, secrecy clauses, reputational-damage liability) sit outside anything ideamorphism was built to address.

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

proposi-tion		audit status	relational verdict
P3a	Double Structure of the In-variant	not audited	evidence-for
P14a	The Proto-Codex	not audited	open-question
P21	Codex Authenticity	not audited	evidence-for

Not evaluated (34) – P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10, P11, P12, P13, P14, P14b, P15, P16, P16a, P17, P18, P18a, P19, P19a, P20, P22, P23, P24, P25, P26, P27, P28, P29, P30, P31

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 2026-07-22 · model claude-sonnet-5 · source 9,078 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.

The Warrior of Capestrano case illuminates the double invariant under pressure. The physical invariant (material composition, dimensions, archaeological context) can now be tested—science will determine if the object is ancient or modern fabrication. But the intentional invariant—the codex embedded in its creation, the WHY of its form—is what Mussolini's regime allegedly engineered. If proven fake, the ricochet is devastating: the object's meaning doesn't correct itself; it generates a new diffraction entirely. It becomes a document of fascist propaganda, not Italic heritage. The receiver's overture (nationalist, antiquarian, or skeptical) will now receive a completely different wave. This is not about authenticity as moral purity; it is about how the intentional invariant, once revealed, cannot be unseen—it reframes the entire emission.

T50 RSS assessment · 2026-07-22 · remplacée par boundary-lens-2026-08

REFERENCES

[1] Is Italy's Famed Ancient 'Warrior of Capestrano' a Mussolini-Backed Fake?. ARTnews.com, 2026-07-22. <https://www.artnews.com/art-news/news/warrior-of-capestrano-icon-ancient-italian-heritage-mussolini-backed-fake-1234792883/>

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

CHECKSUM (SHA-256)

7cf5037dd4d2d471740020e02f552745f1cbadaa039c25f6a60f038190e54c5f

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

Author	Arnaud Quercy
Asset code	IDS-RNI0187
Identifier	NAN-RDG000137
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-RNI0187-the-forgery-dispute-isolates-the-physicalintentional-split-c.pdf>