POLYPHONIC LIBRARY

VOLUME III

THE UNCERTAINTY PRINCIPLE

Essays on Transmission,
Time, and the Intelligence We Leave Behind

DSLcollection

Sylvain Lévy & Dominique Lévy · Paris, 2026

POLYPHONIC LIBRARY

VOLUME I

The Discipline of Refusal

VOLUME II

Private Futures: Governance as Practice

VOLUME III

The Uncertainty Principle: Essays on Transmission

VOLUME IV

The Polyphonic Architecture: Conducting Meaning with AI

This volume holds the philosophical and historical spine of the polyphonic library. It is where the argument slows down to think about time, language, uncertainty, and rewriting — underneath the constitutional and governance moves of Volumes I and II. It does not offer instruments. It offers the conditions under which instruments remain honest.

VOLUME III · PREFACE

The Philosophical Spine

Volume I named the constitution. Volume II showed what it means in practice. Volume III asks the question that both of them assumed: how does a specific human intelligence — situated, fallible, bound by a particular moment — remain operative across generations without hardening into dogma?

The answer this volume proposes is not a method but a posture: productive uncertainty. The willingness to hold open what you do not yet know, not as an admission of failure but as the condition under which genuine judgement remains possible. To collect under uncertainty is to wager on an interpretation of the world before the world has confirmed it. To transmit under uncertainty is to trust that the questions you could not settle are more valuable to your successors than the answers you could.

This volume speaks primarily in the Philosopher and Historian voices. The Critic is present as self-interrogation; the Strategist defers, here, to slower thought. DSLcollection appears not as a governance model but as a worked example of decisions made before their own justification was available.

PART IV

Transmission and the Interval

SECTION TEN

The Moment After

Every institution that outlives its founder passes through an uncatalogued instant: the first decision taken when the person who used to decide is no longer there.

It may be small. Someone approves a loan request, renews an insurance policy, signs a shipping form. The signature at the bottom of the page is different, but the habit of reading it as final has not yet adjusted. Everyone involved feels the absence, but the system continues.

This is the beginning of the interval: the period in which the founder's authority has withdrawn and the successor's has not yet fully accumulated. On paper, the structures may look identical before and after: the same statutes, the same advisers, the same bank accounts. In practice, the collection's identity is at its most fragile.

Three forces converge in the interval:

— Grief, in its many forms. Even when the founder is still physically present but stepping back, there is a quiet mourning for a world organised around their decisions.

— Opportunity, often unspoken. People who did not feel entitled to speak now do; ideas that were deferred "until later" crowd to the surface.

— Anxiety, about what can be changed and what must remain intact.

The three forces do not merely coexist — they interact, and their interaction is the actual danger. Grief makes people slow; it insists that nothing should move until the loss has been metabolised. Opportunity makes people fast; it sees the interval as a window that will close. Anxiety oscillates between the two, producing decisions that are neither sufficiently deliberate nor sufficiently bold. An institution can survive any one of these forces in isolation. What it often cannot survive is their simultaneity without a structure that assigns each its proper domain: grief to memory and archiving, opportunity to governance and revision, anxiety to deliberation and the cooling-off periods that prevent first impulses from becoming permanent choices. Where that structure is absent, the interval is not a corridor. It is a vacuum.

> *The uncertainty principle suggests that we treat this moment not as an accident to be weathered, but as a structural phase to be designed for in advance.*

SECTION ELEVEN

Designing for the Interval

There is no way to remove risk from the interval. What we can do is shape it: turn it from a vacuum into a corridor.

Four design moves matter most:

1. Pre-articulated Compass

Before the founder withdraws, the core commitments that define the collection's identity must be articulated in a form that others can test themselves against: not a list of works, but a small set of non-negotiable principles. These are the "if this changes, the collection is no longer itself" statements. They should be few and precise.

2. Time-bounded Continuity Rules

For a defined number of years after the founder's withdrawal, some decisions can be slowed by design: for example, a rule that deaccessions above a certain importance level require two successive meetings and a cooling-off period. The point is not to freeze the collection but to ensure that the first impulses of the new regime are not purely reactive.

3. Documented Dissent

The founder should record, while still active, a handful of decisions they would have taken differently if they were starting again. This is not a confession. It is a gift. It signals to successors that changing course is not betrayal, but part of the method.

What makes documented dissent genuinely difficult is that it requires the founder to work against their deepest structural instinct: the instinct to remain necessary. Every serious founder has built something that depends, at least in part, on their continued involvement — not from vanity, but because the institution was designed around their judgement, and their judgement was the institution's most reliable instrument. Admitting, while still active, that some of those judgements were wrong or contingent is an act of deliberate self-displacement. It is not modesty. It is a structural acknowledgement that the successor's capacity to make consequential errors is more important to the collection's survival than the founder's capacity to prevent them. A collection that cannot afford its successor's mistakes has not been transmitted; it has been preserved — and preservation, over time, is a slower form of dissolution.

4. Provisional Mandate for the Next Generation

Rather than anointing successors as guardians of a finished work, it is healthier to grant them a mandate with explicit scope: "your task is to test whether these principles still hold in the world you inhabit, and to alter the structures that no longer serve them." Authority grows from doing that work, not from inheriting a title.

> *Where these moves are missing, the interval is filled instead by invisible forces: lawyers, tax constraints, personal resentments, and the random urgencies of the moment.*

SECTION TWELVE

What Not to Transmit

We speak often, and rightly, about transmitting values, knowledge, works. We speak less about the non-transmission that is equally necessary.

Founders accumulate not only convictions, but also grudges, loyalties, habits of avoidance, unresolved conflicts with institutions and individuals. These can harden into invisible constraints on what the next generation feels permitted to do.

An honest act of transmission therefore includes a list of permissions:

— Permission to sell works that were emotionally important to the founder but no longer advance the argument.

— Permission to break partnerships that were once strategic but have become dependencies.

— Permission to question the editorial line itself if the world it described has changed beyond recognition.

Without explicit permission, heirs often confuse fidelity with paralysis. They preserve everything, including the founder's hesitations and unfinished business, because they cannot distinguish between what was contingent and what was essential. But the deeper problem is not confusion — it is the asymmetry of accountability. When a successor preserves something unchanged, they are never responsible for the outcome; the founder is. When they alter something, they own the

result entirely. In the absence of explicit permission, the rational response is conservation: it is the risk-minimising strategy, and it produces, over time, the most reliable form of institutional death. The collection does not collapse; it calcifies. It becomes a perfect record of a world that no longer exists, curated by people who cannot say why they maintain it except that it was handed to them that way.

The uncertainty principle cuts in both directions here. The founder must admit that they are not the best judge of which parts of their practice will still be useful. The successor must accept that some burdens are theirs to carry, whether they would have chosen them or not. Both positions require a willingness to be wrong that neither role, by itself, naturally encourages.

SECTION THIRTEEN

Inheritance as Interpretation

Every inheritance is also an interpretation. To accept a collection is to decide, implicitly, what story it tells and how it will be used.

There are at least three ways heirs can approach this task:

1. Canonical Inheritance

The successor attempts to keep everything as it is. Works are conserved, displays minimally updated, language softened but not fundamentally altered. This appears respectful, but it slowly turns the collection into a mausoleum: a perfectly preserved image of a past intelligence, increasingly detached from the present.

2. Iconoclastic Inheritance

The successor rejects the founding logic, using the assets to build a new project that may have little continuity with the original. This can be creatively necessary, but it risks erasing precisely the long-term argument that made the collection culturally significant.

3. Hermeneutic Inheritance

The successor treats the collection as a text to be reread in a new context. Works are re-hung, re-described, sometimes deaccessioned, not to negate the founder but to extend the argument into conditions the founder could not foresee.

Only the third approach takes uncertainty seriously. It recognises that every generation must re-ask the foundational questions: What is this collection for now? What does it argue in this moment, in this place? What does it no longer see? But hermeneutic inheritance is not a disposition one simply adopts; it is a practice that demands a specific and uncomfortable act. The successor must be willing to articulate, publicly and with precision, where they are reading the founding argument differently — not correcting the founder, but extending the argument into territory the founder could not see. That articulation is itself a governance act. It converts private reinterpretation into accountable revision: the kind that can be challenged, debated, and recorded in the collection's documentary history. Without that act of public articulation, the interpretation remains invisible — which means the successor is effectively remaking the collection's argument while claiming, implicitly, to be preserving it. That is the Lampedusa manoeuvre applied to succession: everything changes while appearing to stay the same.

> *For this to be possible, the founder must leave behind not only answers, but questions. The most precious part of an inheritance is not the resolved judgement, but the unresolved tension the founder could not settle, which the successor can continue to work on.*

PART V

Algorithms, Agents, and Afterlives

SECTION FOURTEEN

How Machines Will Read Us

We are used to thinking about how future human historians might interpret our time. We are less prepared for the fact that their first encounter with us may be mediated by machines.

An AI system trained in 2050 to answer questions about "Chinese contemporary art 1997–2012" will not sit patiently with archives as a PhD student does. It will traverse millions of documents, images, and transaction records, compressing them into latent patterns. Our words, our catalogues, our acquisitions and refusals will be part of its signal, but only part.

We cannot control how such a system will read us, but we can influence what raw material it has to work with. That is the architectural question:

what semantic footprint do we want this collection and this period to leave in the machine's memory?

Three implications follow:

- — Isolated statements will matter less than consistent patterns. A single brilliant essay that contradicts a collection's practical behaviour will be diluted; what will register is the long-term alignment — or misalignment — between what we said and what we did.
- — Complexity that is never written down will be invisible. A nuanced oral understanding shared within a small circle will vanish unless it is encoded somewhere machines can reach.
- — Internal plurality will become a form of robustness. A corpus that includes criticism, self-questioning, and recorded disagreement will be harder for an AI to flatten into a single story.

The third implication is the least intuitive and the most consequential. The clearest way to understand it is through contrast: a corpus that speaks in one authoritative voice compresses easily. A single curatorial statement, however brilliant, can be summarised in a sentence; its signal is clean precisely because it has resolved its internal tensions before committing them to the record. A corpus that preserves the founder's doubts, the critic's objections, the historian's corrections, and the successor's questions resists compression because it is already self-critical. The machine encounters something it cannot resolve into a single signal — it finds disagreement where it expected consensus, qualification where it expected assertion. That irresolution is not a failure of communication. It is the closest thing to fidelity that mechanical reading can produce: the system is forced to represent the

collection as contested rather than settled, which is what the collection actually was.

> *Our responsibility is not only to future human readers, but also to future inference engines. We must leave behind enough density and contradiction that any system compressing our work into an answer cannot do so without encountering our doubts.*

SECTION FIFTEEN

Agents as Heirs

The emerging generation of AI systems will not only answer questions. They will act: draft letters, negotiate contracts, schedule exhibitions, adjust insurance, even propose acquisitions.

These systems will effectively become agents of institutions and collections. In some cases they will be bound, cryptographically or contractually, to specific human identities. In others, they will operate more diffusely.

This introduces a strange new figure into the succession story: the non-biological heir. A family may decide that part of the founder's "voice" will be encoded in an advisory system trained on their writings, decisions, and recorded conversations. That system could, in principle, continue to influence choices long after the founder's death.

There is something both attractive and disturbing in this prospect. On the one hand, it offers continuity: a way for future stewards to "consult" the founder's pattern of judgement. On the other, it risks freezing live questions into algorithmic habits: "because the model says so" replacing "because we thought and decided so."

An uncertainty-aware stance would accept some computational assistance while drawing a hard line: no system, however sophisticated, should be authorised to decide questions of identity. It may

recommend, warn, simulate; it must not sign.

> *The most important heir remains a human one. The agent can carry memory and pattern, but responsibility cannot be delegated without emptying it of meaning.*

SECTION SIXTEEN

The Risk of Algorithmic Orthodoxy

Every tool, once institutionalised, becomes a temptation. When valuation algorithms, recommendation engines, and predictive models enter governance, they offer the promise of objectivity, efficiency, and consistency.

Soon, their outputs begin to feel like truth. When a model predicts that a certain artist's market will stagnate, it becomes harder to act against that prediction — not because the model is always right, but because deviating from it requires an extra justification.

This is how new orthodoxies form: not through overt censorship, but through gradual shifts in what is considered "responsible" behaviour. A trustee who ignores an algorithmic risk warning may be accused of negligence. A curator who defies a predictive popularity model may be asked to defend their decision in unfamiliar terms.

The uncertainty principle here demands a deliberate act of preservation: we must protect zones of judgement where it remains acceptable to be wrong for the right reasons.

The epistemological claim underneath this is worth making explicit: the decisions that produce the most significant collections are structurally invisible to any system that learns from what has already been valued.

An algorithm trained on historical valuations can identify patterns in retrospect with impressive accuracy. It cannot identify significance in prospect — because significance, at the moment of acquisition, is structurally indistinguishable from risk. The work that will matter has not yet been validated. The market has not yet confirmed it. The institutional consensus has not yet formed around it. At the moment of acquisition, it looks exactly like a mistake. The willingness to be wrong for the right reasons is therefore not a character trait that supplements good governance. It is an epistemological stance that requires active institutional protection. Once every deviation from the model requires extra justification — once the burden of proof falls on the person who would act against the algorithm rather than the person who would defer to it — that protection has already been quietly removed. No model would have recommended buying certain artists in 1997. That is exactly why those decisions matter, and exactly why the conditions that made them possible must be deliberately maintained.

PART VI

After the Principle

SECTION SEVENTEEN

What the Uncertainty Principle Does Not Say

It is easy to misunderstand an argument that foregrounds uncertainty. Three clarifications.

1. It does not say that "everything is relative."

On the contrary, it assumes that better and worse judgements exist and that we have a duty to refine our criteria. Uncertainty is not the absence of evaluation; it is the refusal to confuse present evaluation with final truth.

2. It does not say that institutions should hesitate indefinitely.

There is a point at which not deciding is a decision, usually in favour of the status quo. The principle asks us to choose with awareness of what we do not know, not to avoid choice.

3. It does not say that successors should dismantle everything they inherit.

It asks them to discern which parts of a legacy are unfinished problems worth continuing, and which are contingent solutions tied to a context that has vanished.

> *Uncertainty, in this account, is a discipline. It requires more effort than dogmatism, because it demands ongoing attention to the gap between what we know and what we act as if we knew.*

SECTION EIGHTEEN

The Thread Back to Volumes I and II

Structures that can endure. Voices that can be held accountable. Questions that can remain alive.

Volume I argued that institutions must design architectures strong enough to transmit intelligence across time rather than simply defend their current form. Volume II showed how collections can build internal governance capable of surviving their founders without becoming monuments.

Volume III has tried to illuminate the mental and temporal conditions under which those architectures and governance structures can avoid becoming cages:

- Without an explicit commitment to productive uncertainty, constitutional documents ossify into dogma.
- Without a culture that tolerates doubt and recorded disagreement, governance becomes bureaucratic ritual.
- Without an awareness of how platforms and algorithms pre-shape attention, both public institutions and private collections will mistake optimisation for understanding.

The three volumes together propose a single, demanding standard: structures that can endure, voices that can be held accountable, and questions that can remain alive. None of these is stable without the other two. An enduring structure without accountable voices becomes a monument. Accountable voices without enduring structure become noise. Live questions without both become anxiety without traction.

SECTION NINETEEN

A Closing Question for Each Reader

If the uncertainty principle has any authority, it lies not in the arguments made here, but in whether these questions continue to bother you after you close the book.

For directors and trustees

Which of your certainties are you willing to treat as hypotheses, and how will you make that visible in your institution's documents and decisions? A certainty that cannot be named cannot be tested. A certainty that is not tested accumulates authority it has not earned.

For private collectors and families

Which parts of your story do you want your heirs to feel free to revise, and how will they know? If the answer to the second question is "they will figure it out," the first question has not yet been answered.

For curators and historians

Where does your narrative close doors that could be left ajar for future readings? Every periodisation, every selection, every emphasis is also an act of foreclosure. The question is whether the foreclosure is conscious and documented, or quiet and inherited.

For technologists and policy-makers

What kind of human subject are your systems optimising for, and what capacities might that subject lack? The system you build trains the person who uses it. The optimisation target is also a description of the future user. Name it explicitly.

For heirs, students, and younger colleagues

Which questions do you inherit that you are willing to keep open, even when those around you ask for quick answers? Keeping a question open under pressure is not passivity or evasion. It is one of the few acts that genuinely requires courage in an institutional setting — because every other role in the room is served by its closure. The question that stays open belongs to the person willing to bear the discomfort of its not yet being settled. That person is the most important one in the room. In the long run, they are also the most useful.

> *I would rather be legible and contested than comprehensive and ignored. That sentence has governed the register of this book. It should govern the reader's engagement with it too: take what is useful, contest what is wrong, and leave behind something more precise than what you found.*

DSLcollection

Polyphonic Library · Volume III · The Uncertainty Principle: Essays on Transmission, Time, and the Intelligence We Leave Behind

Sylvain Lévy & Dominique Lévy · Paris, 2026

Produced in the DSLcollection design system.

All errors of judgement, emphasis, and confidence misplaced are theirs.