

Nanopublication – A Jammed Belt Diffracts Cleanly;
the Lens Has No Third Party for Who Left It Broken

by Arnaud Quercy

The finding is the edge itself: the lens grips the accidental jam as a case of reception-without-authored-technique (P25) cleanly, but when the article's own causal chain is followed back to its source – a gallery staff member who left a broken machine running an accessibility installation – the framework's emitter/receiver model has no vocabulary for that intermediary, and P31's responsibility clause does not obviously reach past the artist to the institution executing her work day to day.

CONTEXT

☒ **Thin page** – the source itself is thin (teaser, notice, paywalled preamble). Distinct from truncation: nothing was cut by the pipeline.

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS [1]

A review of Finnegan Shannon's installation at Pioneer Works, a conveyor belt carrying tactile objects for disabled visitors, reports that the belt was off during the critic's visit, that staff turned it on but it stuck, and that they left without fixing it. The critic rocked a jammed plate by hand and the belt resumed moving. The critic reads this breakdown and improvised fix as an unplanned confirmation of the work's stated theme – interdependence and the fragility of accessibility systems.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P25 grips the central event: the belt's jam was not an authored diffraction technique – nobody designed the malfunction – yet it produced a real effect in the receiver (the critic's 'Shannon's intent crystallized'). This matches P25's current claim that what arrives at reception can have causes and depend on an activity without having been done as a deliberate act, and that there is no zero case: even an accidental interval between emission and encounter still produces reception.

WHERE IT BREAKS

P31 reaches an edge rather than a clean hold. P31 assigns the emitter responsibility for the conditions of emission, distinct from the receiver's freedom over outcomes. But the condi-

tion that actually produced the jam was neither the artist's design nor the critic's reception – it was the venue staff's failure to repair the belt and their decision to walk away. The framework's dyad (emitter/receiver) has no named position for this third actor. It slips IF one reads 'conditions' broadly enough to include institutional upkeep of a system the artist designed to depend on upkeep (in which case the gap still routes back to the emitter, Shannon, through the institution she entrusted); it holds and does not break IF 'conditions' means design choices strictly, in which case the staff's negligence is simply outside what P31 was ever claiming to govern – a silence, not a refutation.

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
P25	Universal Diffraction	audited	evidence-for
P31	Ethical Center	not audited	open-question

What was instructed. These propositions have been judged and carry a current statement: it is **that** statement the reading tested, not the founding one.

- **P25** – judged in Note 06 · current statement : diffraction is an effect in the receiver; the series takes Haraway's pattern, not her practice; what arrives can have causes, depend on an activity, be learned and be changed afterwards without having been done; universal = no zero case, i.e. no reception without an interval from the emission
- **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, 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 2026-10-13 · model claude-sonnet-5
· source 3,637 chars · 2 attempt(s)

REFERENCES

- [1] When the Accessibility Conveyor Belt Jams.
Hyperallergic, 2026-10-13. <https://hyperallergic.com/when-the-accessibility-conveyor-belt-jams/>
- [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)

76a5f4b6752585fb0da1f30b24fb8c785d40c8c946b1c97e1d1179a5c9527768

Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0

International (CC BY 4.0)

Author Arnaud Quercy
Asset code IDS-RNI0325
Identifier NAN-RDG000278
Version 1
Published 2026-10-13

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: 2026-10-13

Persistent URI: <https://ideamorphism.org/en/nanopubs/2026/10/IDS-RNI0325-a-jammed-belt-diffracts-cleanly-the-lens-has-no-third-party.pdf>