

Nanopublication – One canvas, four turns:
multiplication of creation meets its receiver problem

by Arnaud Quercy

The lens finds one real, narrow foothold – Richter's rotatable canvas as a miniature demonstration of one wave producing several creations, provided a single viewer's re-encounters are allowed to stand in for distinct receivers – and is silent, not defeated, everywhere else in an essay whose actual argument concerns state power, not emitters and receivers.

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS [1]

The essay argues that 9/11 inaugurated an era of 'hyper-visible disappearance': the towers vanished in full view of the world, and that founding paradox – maximum visibility yielding no stable meaning – is traced across image culture (repeated broadcast footage that stopped functioning as proof), art (Gerhard Richter's painting *September*, readable in four different orientations), cinema (Iñárritu's short film, built on withheld images), and twenty-five years of state practice: black sites, Guantánamo, extraordinary rendition, family separation at the border, and El Salvador's CECOT, all read as escalating techniques for making persons and facts disappear while looking, or being made to look, entirely visible.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

The one passage that engages the lens with any specificity is the description of Richter's canvas: a single small painting whose successive quarter-turns produce four distinct scenes – impact, aftermath, the return to unresolved morning, the surreal collapse of the sky. This matches P17's claim that an emission does not settle into one creation but generates as many as its receptions: the same object, reoriented, yields genuinely different readings rather than a fixed content behind variant descriptions. Evans's own qualifier – 'intended or not' – about whether Richter built this multiplicity in or whether it only surfaces through the act of turning, sits exactly on the seam between P17 (multiplication regardless of anyone's design) and P26 (multiplication counts as *induced* diffraction only if the emitter engineered the conditions for it).

WHERE IT BREAKS

The grip narrows rather than fails outright. P17's N is defined by distinct receivers bringing distinct histories to one wave; here the four scenes come from a single viewer's sequential repositioning of one canvas, with orientation standing in for reception. It slips toward cheap fit if one reads 'reception' loosely as any repeated encounter by the same person – at that laxity, almost any sequentially-viewed artwork would satisfy P17, which is the triviality the lens should itself flag. It holds as a genuine P17 case only if the four turns are treated as effectively four distinct receiving positions, which the essay never quite claims. Beyond this one passage, the essay's dominant argument – disappearance as an administrative and legal technology (Guantánamo, rendition, family separation, CECOT) – involves no emitter, no receiver, no codex; the lens has no vocabulary for state practices of concealment, and that silence covers the bulk of the piece.

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
P17	Multiplication of Creation	not audited	triviality-warning
P26	Induced Diffraction	not audited	open-question

Not evaluated (35) – P1, P2, P3, P3a, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10, P11, P12, P13, P14, P14a, P14b, P15, P16, P16a, P18, P18a, P19, P19a, P20, P21, P22, P23, P24, P25, P27, P28, P29, P30, P31

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 2026-09-07 · model claude-sonnet-5
· source 24,522 chars · 2 attempt(s)

REFERENCES

[1] The Disappearance of 9/11. The Philosophical Salon, 2026-09-07. <https://thephilosophicalsalon.com/the-disappearance-of-9-11/>

[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)

b6df8c6c374b63957bab8fd37299aa2534f73bb89cecfb6f9827105692fa8c84

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

Author	Arnaud Quercy
Asset code	IDS-RNI0246
Identifier	NAN-RDG000199
Version	1
Published	2026-09-07

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: 2026-09-07

Persistent URI: <https://ideamorphism.org/en/nanopubs/2026/09/IDS-RNI0246-one-canvas-four-turns-multiplication-of-creation-meets-its-r.pdf>