

Nanopublication – A surface/depth split in science's self-image fits the given/instituted axis – but so would almost any such split

by Arnaud Quercy

The grip is real but not discriminating: a 'valued for output, blind to the practice behind it' structure is common to almost any account of trust in expertise – medicine, law, engineering, craft – and would satisfy P3a's given/instituted shape just as easily as this one does. Nothing in the article tests what is specific to P3a (that the instituted invariant is a codex-encoded rule electing relations in a wave, existing as soon as its rule is met even by a refusing receiver); the article never reaches that level of specificity, it only needs 'surface vs depth,' which any such essay supplies. The fit is clean but cheap – it confirms the axis exists as a shape without pressuring what makes P3a's version of that shape distinct from the many others (Kant's phenomenon/noumenon, langue/parole, tacit knowledge) that would fit equally well.

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS [1]

Beneduci argues that modern societies trust science only for its technological outputs (vaccines, predictions, performance) while losing sight of science as a cultural practice of disciplined doubt – a historical, philosophical, self-correcting mode of inquiry. This flattening, reinforced by algorithmic science education, makes scientific authority both dominant and fragile: when results falter, trust collapses because the public was never shown the practice that produced them, only its products. The remedy he proposes is reintegrating the history and philosophy of science into education so that the 'way of thinking' becomes visible alongside the results.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P3a's given/instituted axis lays over the article's own distinction without resistance: what citizens measure directly – delivered technologies, predictions, 'performance' – sits where P3a puts the given invariant (what a sensor reads on the surface, received as constraint, independent of any codex); what Beneduci calls the 'way of thinking,' disciplined doubt, the self-correcting critical pro-

cess, sits where P3a puts the instituted invariant – a rule not automatically delivered by perceiving the surface, latent, requiring something like disclosure (here: historical-philosophical education) to become legible. The article's central complaint – that the given is trusted while the instituted goes untaught and so stays mute – restates almost exactly P3a's claim that the instituted invariant's robustness depends on a codex that must be disclosed, and P19a's point that an invariant no one can articulate stays opaque.

WHERE IT BREAKS

Nothing – the reading reports none. The field is left empty by design: inventing an edge where the lens grips cleanly, or a grip where it fails, is the very fault this instrument exists to avoid.

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
P3a	Double Structure of the Invariant	audited	triviality-warning
P19a	Explicability as Condition	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.

- **P3a** – judged in Note 05 · current statement : say GIVEN invariant and INSTITUTED invariant, never 'physical' and 'intentional' – the axis is MODE OF EXISTENCE, read as regime of access: the given is what a sensor measures on the surface WITHOUT the codex; the instituted is the rule that elects relations in that surface and that only the disclosed codex deciphers

Not evaluated (35) — P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10, P11, P12, P13, P14, P14a, P14b, P15, P16, P16a, P17, P18, P18a, P19, P20, P21, P22, P23, P24, P25, P26, P27, P28, P29, P30, P31

Overall verdict: Cheap fit — 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 2026-10-19 · model claude-sonnet-5
· source 21,414 chars · 1 attempt(s)

REFERENCES

- [1] Science without 'Science': The Cultural Fragility of Scientific Authority. The Philosophical Salon, 2026-10-19. <https://thephilosophicalsalon.com/science-without-science-the-cultural-fragility-of-scientific-authority/>
- [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	triviality warning
Methodology	Boundary-finding lens applied to one source, model claude-sonnet-5, 1 attempt(s), traceability check passed.

CHECKSUM (SHA-256)

cdd80e680eb5f12c2de56f48478ef2e597f41e1db23ab888e374aec2f6d0d3d

Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0

International (CC BY 4.0)

Author Arnaud Quercy

Asset code IDS-RNI0337

Identifier NAN-RDG000290

Version 1

Published 2026-10-19

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: 2026-10-19

Persistent URI: <https://ideamorphism.org/en/nanopubs/2026/10/IDS-RNI0337-a-surfacedepth-split-in-sciences-self-image-fits-the-givenin.pdf>