

Nanopublication – A Fluxus score multiplies audiences into authors, but 'responsibility for conditions' names a question the review can't close

by Arnaud Quercy

The boundary sits between naming and settling: P31 correctly identifies that Knowles retains responsibility for the conditions of 'Computer Poem Drop Event' even as she released control of its reception, but supplies no test for whether that responsibility was met – leaving the reviewer's open question exactly where the framework leaves it, open.

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS [1]

A retrospective of Alison Knowles reframes her six-decade Fluxus career through the language of bookmaking – binding, sequencing, narrative. It covers participatory food-and-object scores ('Make a Salad,' 'Shoes of Your Choice'), architectural and computer-generated works ('The House of Dust,' 'Computer Poem Drop Event'), and intimate domestic prints (onion-skin blueprints, footprint photographs). The reviewer finds the show strongest where Knowles stays humble and tactile, and weaker where it fails to address the sociopolitical resonance of works like the 1971 helicopter poem-drop, which recalls Vietnam War troop-deployment footage – a reading the reviewer suspects Knowles was 'too perceptive' to have missed, but which the retrospective neither confirms nor denies.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

'Proposition #6: Shoes of Your Choice' grips P17 (Multiplication of Creation) cleanly: one fixed instruction (describe a pair of your shoes) produces as many distinct narratives as performers, each treated by the piece itself – 'assembling each iteration into a larger collection' – as equally legitimate rather than ranked. That is P17's structure without translation. The review's discomfort with 'Computer Poem Drop Event' grips P31 (Ethical Center) with more precision: the reviewer explicitly does not accuse Knowles of causing the Vietnam-War echo, only of possibly not having 'considered' it – which is exactly P31's split between control of outcome (not the emitter's to hold) and responsibility for conditions (which the emitter does not release).

WHERE IT BREAKS

P31 names the accountability the reviewer is reaching for, but the proposition asserts that responsibility for conditions is retained – it gives no criterion for what discharges it. The review's own uncertainty ('left wondering if and how she did') is exactly this gap: P31 tells us Knowles owes an account of the helicopter-drop's conditions, but neither P31 nor the retrospective supplies what would count as having given one. The lens correctly locates the question; it does not answer it, and nothing in the source lets it.

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
P17	Multiplication of Creation	not audited	evidence-for
P31	Ethical Center	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, 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 2026-09-22 · model claude-sonnet-5 · source 9,024 chars · 4 attempt(s)

REFERENCES

[1] The Book of Alison Knowles. Hyperallergic, 2026-09-22. <https://hyperallergic.com/the-book-of-alison-knowles/>

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

CHECKSUM (SHA-256)

92ec6ec31768d281782f41b2e13a82c829901e438af5bf1e052bb6b773423231

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

Author	Arnaud Quercy
Asset code	IDS-RNI0267
Identifier	NAN-RDG000220
Version	1
Published	2026-09-22

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: 2026-10-12

Persistent URI: <https://ideamorphism.org/en/nanopubs/2026/09/IDS-RNI0267-a-fluxus-score-multiplies-audiences-into-authors-but-respons.pdf>