IDS-RNI0361 | NAN-RDG000313

Nanopublication — Universal diffraction grips trivially; the valorization of loss does not

by Arnaud Quercy

The boundary runs between the bare universality of P25 (satisfied by any reception whatsoever, hence trivial here) and the framework's stronger valuation claims (P13, P23), which treat correspondence/recognition as the absence of an event — a value the legal use of refugee art inverts, since evidentiary weight there is built on fidelity to what was witnessed, not on the viewer's creative departure from it.

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]

Rohingya artist Enayet Khan, who fled Myanmar's 2017 genocide, now paints and trains other refugees to paint scenes of violence they witnessed. Legal advocates, including a former UN investigator who built a case against the Myanmar military before the International Court of Justice, collect such drawings as evidence, arguing they can corroborate survivor testimony — especially where high illiteracy among Rohingya women and children makes verbal or written statements hard to obtain. The piece frames art as serving two functions for displaced and incarcerated people: psychological processing, and admissible documentation of mass atrocity as international prosecutions of genocide and war crimes rise sharply worldwide. The article is cut off by a paywall before developing the legal argument further.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P25's current formulation ('universal = no zero case, i.e. no reception without an interval from the emission') grips, but only at the trivial level: a lawyer, judge, or investigator who views Khan's drawings necessarily does so at some remove from the act of painting, which satisfies the letter of the claim. But this is true of any reception of anything, so the source gives no purchase finer than that bare fact — it confirms the proposition without the proposition telling us anything specific about this case.

WHERE IT BREAKS

Where the apparatus goes further than the bare fact of interval, it runs against the source. P13 holds that creation requires irreversible loss — a signal passing through intact produces only 'recognition, comfort, no event' — and P23 frames recognition as mere comfort set against the productive 'jolt' of diffraction. The legal use-case described here wants the opposite outcome: Mulvey's reason for collecting drawings is precisely that illiterate survivors could not give verbal statements, so the drawing substitutes for testimony, and its evidentiary weight rises with fidelity to the witnessed event, not with how far a viewer's reading departs from it. The system the article describes is built to minimize exactly the divergence the framework treats as the site of creation. This is contestable at one level — a defender could note that corroboration still involves interpretation, so some diffraction occurs and P25 survives — but that defense only confirms that P25's universal claim is too loose to distinguish an evidentiary reading from an aesthetic one, which is the finding itself.

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
P13	Generative Loss	not audited	pressure-against
P23	The Diffraction Imperative	not audited	pressure-against
P25	Universal Diffraction	**audited**	triviality-warning

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 (34) — P1, P2, P3, P3a, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10, P11, P12, P14, P14a, P14b, P15, P16, P16a, P17, P18, P18a, P19, P19a, P20, P21, P22, P24, P26, 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 2026-10-24 · model claude-sonnet-5 · source 5,027 chars · 2 attempt(s)

REFERENCES

[1] How Art Can Deliver Justice for Refugees. Hyperallergic, 2026-10-24. https://hyperallergic.com/how-art-can-deliver-justice-for-refugees/

[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)

b359d661fe303adb844479235be58fc92c6e63b618d206896a6f08a9c278f814

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

Author Arnaud Quercy
Asset code IDS-RNI0361
Identifier NAN-RDG000313
Version 1
Published 2026-10-24

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: 2026-10-24

Persistent URI: https://ideamorphism.org/en/nanopubs/2026/10/IDS-RNI0361-universal-diffraction-grips-trivially-the-valorization-of-lo.pdf