

Nanopublication – A designer that never chose its risk: process theism pressures the 'ethical center' claim at its hidden premise

by Arnaud Quercy

The boundary is whether 'responsible for conditions, not outcomes' presupposes a choice among possible conditions (P31 holds, sharpened by a real theological precedent) or names a necessity that was never chosen at all (P31's ethics has no purchase, since there is nothing to hold the designer accountable FOR). Process theism does not settle this for the framework – it makes the ambiguity visible by having independently confronted the identical fork inside its own theodicy.

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS [1]

The entry surveys process theism (Whitehead, Hartshorne, and successors): God is really related to and affected by a temporal world, not immutable or impassible; God and creatures are 'co-creators,' God acting by persuasion rather than coercion, supplying each emergent occasion with an 'initial aim' without determining what the occasion freely does with it. The article's central theodicy discussion argues that risk and opportunity are metaphysically inseparable – 'opportunity without risk is meaningless or contradictory' – so a God who structures the conditions of creaturely freedom (the laws of nature, initial aims) is not thereby the author of what creatures freely decide, though process theists still hold God accountable for the kind of world those conditions make possible.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

The persuasion/coercion distinction and the 'initial aim' doctrine map cleanly onto P30 (the ideamorphist pre-conceives conditions – constraints, gaps, resistance points – without pre-determining outcomes; what follows belongs to the receiver) and onto P31's separation of responsibility-for-conditions from control-of-outcomes ('the game master who designs a dangerous game cannot defer to the players'). Whitehead's God supplying a graded field of possibility that the creature actualizes, and Hartshorne's insistence that God is answerable for the shape of the field but not for the creature's decision within it, is a close

structural echo of the artist releasing outcomes while retaining responsibility for the emission's conditions.

WHERE IT BREAKS

P31 slips IF one reads Hartshorne's claim that 'risk and opportunity go together, not because God chooses to have it so, but because opportunity without risk is meaningless or contradictory' as removing the very alternative P31 presupposes: the ethical center requires that the emitter COULD have designed a safer game and is answerable precisely for having chosen the dangerous one. If the coupling of risk and value is a metaphysical necessity rather than a designer's decision, responsibility collapses into inevitability and the 'could have done otherwise' that grounds P31's ethics disappears. It holds if one reads the source's own retained accountability – God still fixes the laws of nature and initial aims, and is judged by the kind of order those conditions permit – as itself the accountable design-choice P31 names, with the risk/value coupling as a background constraint on ANY possible design rather than a cancellation of responsibility for which design was chosen.

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
P30	Pre-Conception, Not Pre-Determination	not audited	evidence-for
P31	Ethical Center	not audited	pressure-against

Not evaluated (35) – 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

Overall verdict: Bounded / Cheap fit – boundary case – 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 2026-08-29 · model claude-sonnet-5
· source 173,693 chars · 1 attempt(s)

REFERENCES

- [1] Process Theism (Revised Entry). Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2026-08-29. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/process-theism/>
- [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)

e7355a39a0c6f56c478e38693f6a5503ff0ff8e736c2e4ad735df0e96b8ca077

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

Author Arnaud Quercy
Asset code IDS-RNI0231
Identifier NAN-RDG000184
Version 1
Published 2026-08-29

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: 2026-08-29

Persistent URI: <https://ideamorphism.org/en/nanopubs/2026/08/IDS-RNI0231-a-designer-that-never-chose-its-risk-process-theism-pressure.pdf>