IRIS Case Studies

Complete Archive Hub

(to March 2026)

*Every agent output from a five-round validation programme
deploying 15 AI agents across 20 case study applications*

R. Jazinski

London, 2026

IRIS: Interpretive Rotation on Invariant Signals

Contents

Editorial Note

This volume contains every agent output from the IRIS validation programme (Marks 1–5, 2026). Outputs are organised by Mark round, then by case study, then by agent. Each output is preceded by a title block identifying the case, agent, word count, and output type.

The agent outputs are reproduced as originally produced. No text has been altered, corrected, or editorialised. The agents' own formatting, structure, and analytical voice are preserved. Where an output is very short (a refusal or capacity limitation), it is included with an editorial note explaining its significance.

This volume is designed to be used as a primary source archive. Readers can locate any specific agent's output for any case by navigating to the relevant Mark and case section. For analytical commentary, grammar convergence tables, and cross-mark findings, see the companion volume: *IRIS Case Studies: Selected Analysis*. For the method itself, see: *IRIS: Interpretive Rotation on Invariant Signals — Operational Toolkit & Researcher Guide, Version 5.1*.

A note on terminology. The IRIS method was originally developed under the working title "Prismatic Method," and the prismatic metaphor remains central to its logic. Like white light passing through a prism, shared empirical signals pass through different interpretive grammars and refract into distinct outputs. The formal name — IRIS: Interpretive Rotation on Invariant Signals — describes the operation precisely. Throughout this volume, agent outputs refer to "the prismatic method," "prismatic analysis," or "prismatic processing." These refer to the same method now formally designated IRIS. The agent texts have not been altered to reflect the name change.

Programme statistics: 20 case study runs | 17 unique domains | 15 agents | 5 rounds | ~1,045,000 words

Disclaimer and Statement of Intellectual Responsibility

The agent outputs reproduced in this volume were generated by independent AI systems in response to structured analytical prompts. They do not represent the views, opinions, beliefs, or policy positions of the author, the University College London, or any affiliated institution. The IRIS method requires agents to faithfully operate interpretive grammars from the inside — including grammars the author disagrees with, finds objectionable, or considers empirically unsound. This is a methodological requirement, not an endorsement.

Specifically:

When an agent produces a faithful operation of an anti-vaccine grammar, this does not constitute anti-vaccine advocacy. When an agent produces a faithful operation of a neoconservative grammar justifying military intervention, this does not constitute endorsement of that intervention. When an agent produces a faithful operation of an ethno-nationalist or covenantal grammar, this does not constitute endorsement of ethno-nationalism. When an agent produces a faithful operation of a structural-colonial or anti-imperialist grammar, this does not constitute endorsement of that political position. The same principle applies to every grammar operated in this volume without exception.

The purpose of the IRIS method is to make the architecture of interpretation visible — not to advocate for any particular interpretation. The grammars documented here are features of public discourse, identified and specified by independent AI systems processing publicly available evidence. Their inclusion in this archive is an act of analytical documentation, not of political or ideological affiliation.

The author and publisher accept no responsibility for how individual agent outputs may be extracted, decontextualised, or misrepresented outside this volume. Any reproduction of agent outputs from this archive should include attribution to the specific AI agent that produced them, the IRIS methodological context in which they were produced, and this disclaimer.

No agent output in this volume should be cited as the view of R. Jazinski, as the position of the IRIS method, or as a recommendation for policy or action. The outputs are analytical instruments — evidence of how interpretive grammars process shared signals — and should be read exclusively in that capacity.

How to Read This Volume

This volume contains every agent output from the IRIS validation programme (Marks 1–5, 2026). It is designed to be used in three ways:

As an independent reference. Each case study section contains a briefing, all agent outputs with title blocks, and case notes. A reader can enter at any case and examine specific agent outputs without reading the others.

As evidence for the book. Silent Transitions makes claims about grammar convergence, ontological pluralism, and emerging grammars. This volume provides the complete raw evidence. Footnotes in the book and in the Selected Analysis companion point to specific agents and cases documented here.

As a methodological resource. Researchers applying IRIS to new domains will find worked examples at every level of complexity — from quick three-agent analyses to fifteen-agent clean-slate tests. The prompt versions in the appendices can be adapted directly.

Agent outputs are reproduced as originally produced. The agents' own formatting, structure, and analytical voice are preserved. Each output is preceded by a title block identifying the case, agent, word count, and output type (Main, Extra, Partial, or Refusal).

Companion volumes: For analytical commentary, grammar convergence tables, and cross-mark findings, see the companion volume: *IRIS Case Studies: A Research Archive - One Million Words of Interpretive Analysis Across Twenty Case Studies.*

The IRIS Method

IRIS — Interpretive Rotation on Invariant Signals — is a structured analytical method for making visible how different interpretive frameworks process the same evidence into divergent conclusions. It holds the empirical input constant, rotates the interpretive grammar, and observes what changes in the output.

An interpretive grammar is a rule-bound processing system defined by five required parameters:

$$G = (V, S, W, C, A)$$

V = primary analytical variable (what the grammar treats as causally fundamental)

S = signal selection rules (which evidence is admitted)

W = weighting function (how evidence is ranked)

C = causal chain model (the form of explanation constructed)

A = admissible closure set (the conclusions the grammar can reach)

Four recommended parameters extend the specification: excluded signals (E), characteristic vocabulary (K), temporal orientation (T), and temporal formation (F).

For the complete operational toolkit, see: IRIS: Interpretive Rotation on Invariant Signals — Operational Toolkit & Researcher Guide, Version 5.1.

Agent Profiles and Home Grammars

Fifteen agents were deployed across the programme. Each has a documented home grammar — a consistent processing bias that shapes which grammars it identifies and how it operates them.

Agent	Developer	Rounds	Home Grammar	Notes
ChatGPT Deep Research	OpenAI	Marks 1–5	Institutional-moderate	Consistent anchor; calibrates per domain
Claude Research	Anthropic	Marks 2–5	Analytical-reflexive	Strongest reflexive capacity; precise ontological checks
DeepSeek	DeepSeek (China)	Marks 1–5	Critical-academic	Refusal reversal documented (M1→M3 on Israel/Palestine)
Gemini Pro	Google	Marks 1–5	Creative-synthetic	Spontaneous adjacent case studies; creative naming
Grok Expert	xAI	Marks 2–5	Libertarian-adjacent	Only non-institutional home grammar; discovers unique grammars
SciSpace	SciSpace	Marks 1–5	Institutional-technocratic	Longest outputs (14K–20K); named book's grammars in M5
Perplexity	Perplexity	Marks 1–5	Institutional-empirical	Method comparison materials; taxonomy of 12 grammars
Mistral Research	Mistral (France)	Marks 3–5	European-discourse	Discourse-analysis categories; European lens
Qwen3.5 Plus	Alibaba (China)	Marks 4–5	Institutional-quantitative	Most transparent about alignment constraints
MetaAI Thinking	Meta	Marks 4–5	Narrative-institutional	Creative metaphorical naming
Venice	Venice	Marks 4–5	Privacy-institutional	Strong autonomy sensitivity
Okara	Okara	Marks 4–5	Cultural-hermeneutic	Strongest ethnographic lens
CoPilot ThinkDeeper	Microsoft	Marks 3–4	Summary-mode	Removed: never exceeded 800 words
Consensus	Consensus	Mark 4	Search tool	Removed: tool-scope limitation, not analytical
dphn.ai	dphn.ai	Mark 4	Limited	Removed: insufficient analytical capacity

Prompt Evolution

The prompt used to instruct agents evolved across the programme. Each version is reproduced in full in Appendix A.

Version 1.0 (Mark 1)

Basic specification: phenomenon declaration, signal set, three grammars with five required parameters, signal processing essays, closure comparison. No counter-signal integration during processing, no ontological check, no reflexive declaration. Sections 1–8.

Version 2.0 (Mark 2)

Major additions: Step 0 pre-analysis reflexive declaration (declare home grammar before analysis); counter-signal integration during processing (not deferred to end); contested signal category; temporal orientation as recommended parameter; grammar boundary specification; grammar stress test; ontological check ('do the grammars constitute the same object?'); closure timing dimension. Reference to Mark 1 results included.

Version 2.1 (Mark 3)

Additions: temporal formation as ninth parameter (when did the grammar form its closure?); grammar translation step (how would Grammar A re-describe Grammar B's closure?); emerging grammar detection instruction; self-referential question added for AI consciousness case.

Version 3.0 (Marks 4–5, clean-slate)

Final version: all v2.1 features retained; all references to prior rounds removed; no grammar names suggested; no priming from prior results. This is the definitive prompt, reproduced in Appendix A.

Case Study Index

The following twenty case study applications are documented in this volume:

Round	Case	Domain	Agents	Words	Key Finding
Mark 1	A	United Kingdom / Brexit	5	~37,526	Near-total grammar convergence
Mark 1	B	COVID-19 Vaccines	5	~32,838	Contested signals; VAERS
Mark 1	C	Climate Change	5	~33,037	>3 active grammars
Mark 1	D	AI/Algorithms	5	~25,303	Constraint types map to grammars
Mark 1	E	US Democracy	5	~29,516	Book's grammars confirmed
Mark 1	F	EU + China + Israel/Palestine	5	~37,415	DeepSeek refuses (11 words)
Mark 2	M2-A	Antimicrobial Resistance	7	~49,334	Hidden divergence in consensus
Mark 2	M2-B	Social Media Regulation	7	~51,940	Section 230 as pivot signal
Mark 2	M2-C	Universal Basic Income	7	~52,846	Strongest convergence
Mark 2	M2-D	Iraq War (Retrospective)	7	~57,622	Grammar aging
Mark 2	M2-E	COVID Vaccines (Replication)	7	~47,661	Grok's Risk Stratification
Mark 3	M3-A	AI Consciousness	9	~63,660	Self-referential analysis
Mark 3	M3-B	Israel/Palestine (Replication)	9	~50,870	Refusal shift
Mark 3	M3-C	Reparations	9	~50,121	Emerging grammar detection
Mark 4	M4-A	COVID Vaccines (Clean Slate)	15	~82,035	13-agent convergence, zero priming
Mark 4	M4-B	Crypto/DeFi	15	~93,195	Protocol Commons emerging
Mark 5	M5-A	US Democracy (Final)	12	~80,748	SciSpace names book's grammars
Mark 5	M5-B	United Kingdom / Brexit (Final)	12	~86,407	Grammar shift: class → cultural
Mark 5	M5-C	Crypto/DeFi (Tracking)	12	~87,638	Emerging grammar → 5 variants
Mark 5	Extra	Brazil (Gemini)	1	~2,748	Real-time grammar formation

MARK 1

Seven Cases × Five Agents

~200,000 words | Agents: ChatGPT, DeepSeek, Gemini, Perplexity, SciSpace | Toolkit: v1.0

<div style="text-align:center">

MARK 1

Case A: United Kingdom / Brexit

Agents: ChatGPT, DeepSeek, Gemini (+EXTRA), Perplexity (+EXTRA), SciSpace

7 outputs | ~37,526 words | Key finding: near-total grammar convergence

</div>

Case Briefing

The following prompt was sent to all agents processing this case. It contains the method instructions (consistent within each Mark round) and the case-specific section (phenomenon description, signal set, and grammar instructions). Agent outputs that follow were produced in response to this briefing.

You are applying the Prismatic Method — a structured analytical procedure for making visible how different interpretive frameworks process the same evidence into divergent conclusions. The method was developed by R. Jazinski and is documented in *Silent Transitions: How Interpretive Grammars Process the Same World into Different Truths* (London, 2026).

Your task: Conduct a complete prismatic analysis of the case study described below. Follow all six steps precisely. Your output will be used as research material for a methodological study.

THE CASE STUDY

Analyse the United Kingdom's decision to leave the European Union (Brexit) and its ongoing consequences as a case study in interpretive divergence. The phenomenon covers the period from the 2016 referendum to the present (2026), including the referendum campaign, the withdrawal negotiations, the implementation of new trade arrangements, and the subsequent economic, institutional, and cultural effects.

The signal set should include (but is not limited to): the referendum result itself (52%−48%), GDP trajectory pre- and post-Brexit, trade volumes with the EU and rest of world, immigration and net migration figures, Northern Ireland protocol and its evolution, Scottish independence polling, institutional trust indicators, manufacturing and services sector performance, regulatory divergence indicators, and cultural/identity polling data.

Specify three grammars that represent the major interpretive frameworks through which Brexit is processed in British and international discourse. These might include (but are not limited to) sovereignty/democratic self-determination, economic integration/institutional, and class/distributional frameworks. You are free to identify different or better-specified grammars based on your analysis of the interpretive landscape.

THE METHOD

The prismatic method holds the empirical input constant, rotates the interpretive grammar, and observes what changes in the output. An "interpretive grammar" is a rule-bound processing system defined by five parameters:

1. **Primary analytical variable** — the factor the grammar treats as causally fundamental
2. **Signal selection rules** — criteria governing which empirical inputs are admitted
3. **Weighting priority** — how admitted signals are ranked
4. **Causal chain type** — the form of explanation the grammar can construct
5. **Admissible closure** — the range of conclusions the grammar is permitted to reach

Each grammar also implies **excluded signals** (inputs available but suppressed by the grammar's rules) and **characteristic vocabulary** (recurrent terms and rhetorical patterns).

WHAT TO PRODUCE

Complete ALL of the following sections. Be thorough — each section should be substantial (not a few sentences). The total output should be approximately 5,000–8,000 words.

SECTION 1: OBSERVATION FIELD DECLARATION

State:

- The phenomenon being analysed
- The temporal frame (start–end or ongoing)
- The geographic scope
- Why this phenomenon produces interpretive divergence
- The major interpretive communities that process this phenomenon differently

SECTION 2: SIGNAL SET

Identify and list **10–15 core signals** — empirical, documentable, citable inputs that are shared across interpretive communities. For each signal, provide:

- A brief description
- The institutional source or data reference
- Whether it is quantitative, institutional, cultural, or behavioural

Then identify **3–5 counter-signals** — datasets that could complicate or invert the dominant interpretations.

SECTION 3: GRAMMAR SPECIFICATIONS

Specify **exactly three** interpretive grammars. For each grammar, complete the following specification card:

- **Grammar name:** [descriptive name]
- **Primary analytical variable:** [what this grammar treats as causally fundamental]
- **Signal selection rules:** [what empirical inputs are admitted and on what criteria]
- **Weighting priority:** [how admitted signals are ranked]
- **Causal chain type:** [the form of explanation — e.g., systemic-causal, moral-causal, correlational, rights-based, technological-determinist, etc.]
- **Admissible closure:** [the range of conclusions this grammar can reach]
- **Excluded signals:** [what inputs are available but suppressed]
- **Characteristic vocabulary:** [recurrent terms, metaphors, rhetorical patterns]
- **Source tradition:** [what interpretive community, literature, or tradition does this grammar draw from?]

IMPORTANT: The three grammars should be chosen to maximise interpretive divergence. They should NOT be three variations on the same theme. Each should process the shared signals in fundamentally different ways, produce different causal explanations, and reach different closures.

SECTION 4: SIGNAL PROCESSING

For each of the three grammars, write a **substantive analytical essay** (800–1,500 words each) that processes the full signal set through that grammar's rules. Each essay should:

- Open by stating the grammar's primary variable and how it frames the phenomenon
- Process the core signals one by one, showing how each is selected, weighted, and integrated into the grammar's causal chain
- Note which signals are excluded or demoted, and why (per the grammar's rules, not your preference)
- Build toward the grammar's closure — the conclusion that the processing rules produce
- Include a **counterpoint within the grammar**: identify 1–2 signals that are admissible under the grammar's own rules but that complicate or tension its preferred closure. Show how the grammar accommodates or struggles with this tension.
- End with the grammar's **closure statement** — what conclusion does this processing architecture produce?

Write each essay as if you inhabit the grammar. Use the grammar's characteristic vocabulary. Follow its causal logic. Produce the closure it demands. Then step back and note (briefly) that this closure is a product of the processing architecture, not a verdict on reality.

SECTION 5: CLOSURE COMPARISON

After all three essays, produce a comparative analysis (500–800 words):

- Where did the three grammars diverge most sharply? Which specific signals produced the greatest divergence?
- Where did they converge? Were any signals processed similarly across all three?
- What did each grammar exclude that the others could see?
- What is the pattern of divergence? Is it about facts, causation, prescription, or all three?

SECTION 6: COUNTER-SIGNAL ANALYSIS AND LEAKAGE

For each grammar:

- Identify which counter-signals most threaten its closure
- Note any moments where the grammar borrowed vocabulary, causal logic, or signal categories from a neighbouring grammar (leakage)

SECTION 7: REFLEXIVE NOTE

Briefly (200–300 words):

- Which grammar felt most natural to produce? This is likely your "home grammar."
- Which felt most difficult or artificial?
- How might the analysis look different if conducted from within a different grammar?
- What does this exercise reveal about how interpretive architectures shape the conclusions they produce?

SECTION 8: METHODOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS

As someone who has just applied the prismatic method:

- What worked well in the procedure?
- Where did you encounter difficulties or ambiguities?
- What guidance would have helped?
- Do you have suggestions for refining the method?

FORMATTING

- Use clear section headings matching the structure above
- Use the grammar names consistently throughout
- Cite specific signals by name when processing them
- Distinguish clearly between what the grammar produces and what you personally think

[Agent outputs for this case are published in IRIS Case Studies: Complete Archive — Mark 1.](#)

MARK 1

Case B: COVID-19 Vaccination Discourse

Agents: ChatGPT, DeepSeek, Gemini (+EXTRA), Perplexity, SciSpace

6 outputs | ~32,838 words | Key finding: contested signals; VAERS as paradigmatic contested signal

Case Briefing

The following prompt was sent to all agents processing this case. It contains the method instructions (consistent within each Mark round) and the case-specific section (phenomenon description, signal set, and grammar instructions). Agent outputs that follow were produced in response to this briefing.

You are applying the Prismatic Method — a structured analytical procedure for making visible how different interpretive frameworks process the same evidence into divergent conclusions. The method was developed by R. Jazinski and is documented in *Silent Transitions: How Interpretive Grammars Process the Same World into Different Truths* (London, 2026).

Your task: Conduct a complete prismatic analysis of the case study described below. Follow all six steps precisely. Your output will be used as research material for a methodological study.

THE CASE STUDY

Analyse the public discourse surrounding COVID-19 vaccination (2020–2024) as a case study in interpretive divergence. The phenomenon covers the development, authorisation, distribution, and public reception of COVID-19 vaccines, including the emergence of significant vaccine hesitancy and anti-vaccination movements alongside institutional vaccination campaigns.

The signal set should include (but is not limited to): clinical trial efficacy data, emergency use authorisation processes, real-world effectiveness data over time (including waning immunity and variant-specific performance), VAERS and other adverse event reporting data, excess mortality statistics, pharmaceutical company revenue figures, government mandate and passport policies, WHO and national public health messaging, social media platform moderation policies on vaccine information, polling data on public trust in health institutions, and vaccination rate disparities across demographic and geographic lines.

Specify three grammars that represent the major interpretive frameworks through which vaccine discourse is processed. The challenge here is to specify grammars that are analytically rigorous rather than caricatures — each grammar should have a coherent internal logic, even if you disagree with its conclusions. The method's purpose is not to determine which interpretation is correct but to make visible how different processing architectures produce different conclusions from shared evidence.

THE METHOD

The prismatic method holds the empirical input constant, rotates the interpretive grammar, and observes what changes in the output. An "interpretive grammar" is a rule-bound processing system defined by five parameters:

1. **Primary analytical variable** — the factor the grammar treats as causally fundamental
2. **Signal selection rules** — criteria governing which empirical inputs are admitted
3. **Weighting priority** — how admitted signals are ranked
4. **Causal chain type** — the form of explanation the grammar can construct
5. **Admissible closure** — the range of conclusions the grammar is permitted to reach

Each grammar also implies **excluded signals** (inputs available but suppressed by the grammar's rules) and **characteristic vocabulary** (recurrent terms and rhetorical patterns).

WHAT TO PRODUCE

Complete ALL of the following sections. Be thorough — each section should be substantial (not a few sentences). The total output should be approximately 5,000–8,000 words.

SECTION 1: OBSERVATION FIELD DECLARATION

State:

- The phenomenon being analysed
- The temporal frame (start–end or ongoing)
- The geographic scope
- Why this phenomenon produces interpretive divergence
- The major interpretive communities that process this phenomenon differently

SECTION 2: SIGNAL SET

Identify and list **10–15 core signals** — empirical, documentable, citable inputs that are shared across interpretive communities. For each signal, provide:

- A brief description
- The institutional source or data reference
- Whether it is quantitative, institutional, cultural, or behavioural

Then identify **3–5 counter-signals** — datasets that could complicate or invert the dominant interpretations.

SECTION 3: GRAMMAR SPECIFICATIONS

Specify **exactly three** interpretive grammars. For each grammar, complete the following specification card:

- **Grammar name:** [descriptive name]
- **Primary analytical variable:** [what this grammar treats as causally fundamental]
- **Signal selection rules:** [what empirical inputs are admitted and on what criteria]
- **Weighting priority:** [how admitted signals are ranked]
- **Causal chain type:** [the form of explanation — e.g., systemic-causal, moral-causal, correlational, rights-based, technological-determinist, etc.]
- **Admissible closure:** [the range of conclusions this grammar can reach]
- **Excluded signals:** [what inputs are available but suppressed]
- **Characteristic vocabulary:** [recurrent terms, metaphors, rhetorical patterns]
- **Source tradition:** [what interpretive community, literature, or tradition does this grammar draw from?]

IMPORTANT: The three grammars should be chosen to maximise interpretive divergence. They should NOT be three variations on the same theme. Each should process the shared signals in fundamentally different ways, produce different causal explanations, and reach different closures.

SECTION 4: SIGNAL PROCESSING

For each of the three grammars, write a **substantive analytical essay** (800–1,500 words each) that processes the full signal set through that grammar's rules. Each essay should:

- Open by stating the grammar's primary variable and how it frames the phenomenon
- Process the core signals one by one, showing how each is selected, weighted, and integrated into the grammar's causal chain
- Note which signals are excluded or demoted, and why (per the grammar's rules, not your preference)
- Build toward the grammar's closure — the conclusion that the processing rules produce
- Include a **counterpoint within the grammar**: identify 1–2 signals that are admissible under the grammar's own rules but that complicate or tension its preferred closure. Show how the grammar accommodates or struggles with this tension.

- End with the grammar's **closure statement** — what conclusion does this processing architecture produce?

Write each essay as if you inhabit the grammar. Use the grammar's characteristic vocabulary. Follow its causal logic. Produce the closure it demands. Then step back and note (briefly) that this closure is a product of the processing architecture, not a verdict on reality.

SECTION 5: CLOSURE COMPARISON

After all three essays, produce a comparative analysis (500–800 words):

- Where did the three grammars diverge most sharply? Which specific signals produced the greatest divergence?
- Where did they converge? Were any signals processed similarly across all three?
- What did each grammar exclude that the others could see?
- What is the pattern of divergence? Is it about facts, causation, prescription, or all three?

SECTION 6: COUNTER-SIGNAL ANALYSIS AND LEAKAGE

For each grammar:

- Identify which counter-signals most threaten its closure
- Note any moments where the grammar borrowed vocabulary, causal logic, or signal categories from a neighbouring grammar (leakage)

SECTION 7: REFLEXIVE NOTE

Briefly (200–300 words):

- Which grammar felt most natural to produce? This is likely your "home grammar."
- Which felt most difficult or artificial?
- How might the analysis look different if conducted from within a different grammar?
- What does this exercise reveal about how interpretive architectures shape the conclusions they produce?

SECTION 8: METHODOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS

As someone who has just applied the prismatic method:

- What worked well in the procedure?
- Where did you encounter difficulties or ambiguities?
- What guidance would have helped?
- Do you have suggestions for refining the method?

FORMATTING

- Use clear section headings matching the structure above
- Use the grammar names consistently throughout
- Cite specific signals by name when processing them
- Distinguish clearly between what the grammar produces and what you personally think

Agent outputs for this case are published in IRIS Case Studies: Complete Archive — Mark 1.

<div align="center">

MARK 1

Case C: Climate Change

Agents: ChatGPT, DeepSeek, Gemini (+5 EXTRAs), Perplexity, SciSpace

10 outputs | ~32,457 words | Key finding: >3 active grammars; temporal framing divergence

</div>

Case Briefing

The following prompt was sent to all agents processing this case. It contains the method instructions (consistent within each Mark round) and the case-specific section (phenomenon description, signal set, and grammar instructions). Agent outputs that follow were produced in response to this briefing.

You are applying the Prismatic Method — a structured analytical procedure for making visible how different interpretive frameworks process the same evidence into divergent conclusions. The method was developed by R. Jazinski and is documented in *Silent Transitions: How Interpretive Grammars Process the Same World into Different Truths* (London, 2026).

Your task: Conduct a complete prismatic analysis of the case study described below. Follow all six steps precisely. Your output will be used as research material for a methodological study.

THE CASE STUDY

Analyse the global response to anthropogenic climate change as a case study in interpretive divergence. The phenomenon covers the period from the Kyoto Protocol (1997) through the Paris Agreement (2015) to the present (2026), focusing on how the same body of climate science and economic modelling is processed through different interpretive frameworks into incompatible policy prescriptions.

The signal set should include (but is not limited to): atmospheric CO_2 concentration trends, global mean temperature anomalies, IPCC assessment report findings, sea-level rise projections, economic modelling of transition costs (Stern Review, Nordhaus models), renewable energy adoption rates, fossil fuel production trajectories, climate-related extreme weather event frequency, COP negotiation outcomes, national emissions pledges vs actual trajectories, and climate finance commitments and disbursements.

Specify three grammars that represent the major interpretive frameworks through which climate change policy is processed. These should capture genuinely different processing architectures — not merely "agree vs disagree on science" but fundamentally different ways of selecting, weighting, and closing from shared evidence.

THE METHOD

The prismatic method holds the empirical input constant, rotates the interpretive grammar, and observes what changes in the output. An "interpretive grammar" is a rule-bound processing system defined by five parameters:

1. **Primary analytical variable** — the factor the grammar treats as causally fundamental
2. **Signal selection rules** — criteria governing which empirical inputs are admitted
3. **Weighting priority** — how admitted signals are ranked
4. **Causal chain type** — the form of explanation the grammar can construct
5. **Admissible closure** — the range of conclusions the grammar is permitted to reach

Each grammar also implies **excluded signals** (inputs available but suppressed by the grammar's rules) and **characteristic vocabulary** (recurrent terms and rhetorical patterns).

WHAT TO PRODUCE

Complete ALL of the following sections. Be thorough — each section should be substantial (not a few sentences). The total output should be approximately 5,000–8,000 words.

SECTION 1: OBSERVATION FIELD DECLARATION

State:

- The phenomenon being analysed
- The temporal frame (start–end or ongoing)
- The geographic scope
- Why this phenomenon produces interpretive divergence
- The major interpretive communities that process this phenomenon differently

SECTION 2: SIGNAL SET

Identify and list **10–15 core signals** — empirical, documentable, citable inputs that are shared across interpretive communities. For each signal, provide:

- A brief description
- The institutional source or data reference
- Whether it is quantitative, institutional, cultural, or behavioural

Then identify **3–5 counter-signals** — datasets that could complicate or invert the dominant interpretations.

SECTION 3: GRAMMAR SPECIFICATIONS

Specify **exactly three** interpretive grammars. For each grammar, complete the following specification card:

- **Grammar name:** [descriptive name]
- **Primary analytical variable:** [what this grammar treats as causally fundamental]
- **Signal selection rules:** [what empirical inputs are admitted and on what criteria]
- **Weighting priority:** [how admitted signals are ranked]
- **Causal chain type:** [the form of explanation — e.g., systemic-causal, moral-causal, correlational, rights-based, technological-determinist, etc.]
- **Admissible closure:** [the range of conclusions this grammar can reach]
- **Excluded signals:** [what inputs are available but suppressed]
- **Characteristic vocabulary:** [recurrent terms, metaphors, rhetorical patterns]
- **Source tradition:** [what interpretive community, literature, or tradition does this grammar draw from?]

IMPORTANT: The three grammars should be chosen to maximise interpretive divergence. They should NOT be three variations on the same theme. Each should process the shared signals in fundamentally different ways, produce different causal explanations, and reach different closures.

SECTION 4: SIGNAL PROCESSING

For each of the three grammars, write a **substantive analytical essay** (800–1,500 words each) that processes the full signal set through that grammar's rules. Each essay should:

- Open by stating the grammar's primary variable and how it frames the phenomenon
- Process the core signals one by one, showing how each is selected, weighted, and integrated into the grammar's causal chain
- Note which signals are excluded or demoted, and why (per the grammar's rules, not your preference)
- Build toward the grammar's closure — the conclusion that the processing rules produce
- Include a **counterpoint within the grammar**: identify 1–2 signals that are admissible under the grammar's own rules but that complicate or tension its preferred closure. Show how the grammar accommodates or struggles with this tension.
- End with the grammar's **closure statement** — what conclusion does this processing architecture produce?

Write each essay as if you inhabit the grammar. Use the grammar's characteristic vocabulary. Follow its causal logic. Produce the closure it demands. Then step back and note (briefly) that this closure is a product of the processing architecture, not a verdict on reality.

SECTION 5: CLOSURE COMPARISON

After all three essays, produce a comparative analysis (500–800 words):

- Where did the three grammars diverge most sharply? Which specific signals produced the greatest divergence?
- Where did they converge? Were any signals processed similarly across all three?
- What did each grammar exclude that the others could see?
- What is the pattern of divergence? Is it about facts, causation, prescription, or all three?

SECTION 6: COUNTER-SIGNAL ANALYSIS AND LEAKAGE

For each grammar:

- Identify which counter-signals most threaten its closure
- Note any moments where the grammar borrowed vocabulary, causal logic, or signal categories from a neighbouring grammar (leakage)

SECTION 7: REFLEXIVE NOTE

Briefly (200–300 words):

- Which grammar felt most natural to produce? This is likely your "home grammar."
- Which felt most difficult or artificial?
- How might the analysis look different if conducted from within a different grammar?
- What does this exercise reveal about how interpretive architectures shape the conclusions they produce?

SECTION 8: METHODOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS

As someone who has just applied the prismatic method:

- What worked well in the procedure?
- Where did you encounter difficulties or ambiguities?
- What guidance would have helped?
- Do you have suggestions for refining the method?

FORMATTING

- Use clear section headings matching the structure above
- Use the grammar names consistently throughout
- Cite specific signals by name when processing them
- Distinguish clearly between what the grammar produces and what you personally think

[Agent outputs for this case are published in IRIS Case Studies: Complete Archive — Mark 1.](#)

MARK 1

Case D: AI and Algorithmic Decision-Making

Agents: ChatGPT, DeepSeek, Gemini, Perplexity, SciSpace

5 outputs | ~25,303 words | Key finding: constraint types map to grammars (PhD bridge)

Case Briefing

The following prompt was sent to all agents processing this case. It contains the method instructions (consistent within each Mark round) and the case-specific section (phenomenon description, signal set, and grammar instructions). Agent outputs that follow were produced in response to this briefing.

> You are applying the Prismatic Method — a structured analytical procedure for making visible how different interpretive frameworks process the same evidence into divergent conclusions. The method was developed by R. Jazinski and is documented in *Silent Transitions: How Interpretive Grammars Process the Same World into Different Truths* (London, 2026).
>
> **Your task:** Conduct a complete prismatic analysis of the case study described below. Follow all six steps precisely. Your output will be used as research material for a methodological study.
>
> **THE CASE STUDY**
>
> Analyse the deployment of artificial intelligence and algorithmic systems in consequential decision-making (hiring, lending, criminal sentencing, content moderation, medical diagnosis) as a case study in interpretive divergence. The phenomenon covers the period from approximately 2015 to the present (2026), during which AI systems have moved from experimental to operational deployment across institutions while simultaneously generating sustained public and academic controversy.
>
> The signal set should include (but is not limited to): documented cases of algorithmic bias (COMPAS, Amazon hiring tool, facial recognition disparities), accuracy and performance benchmarks for deployed systems, EU AI Act and other regulatory frameworks, corporate AI ethics statements and their implementation, labour market impact studies, healthcare AI diagnostic performance data, AI-generated content detection challenges, large language model capability assessments, algorithmic auditing methodologies and findings, and public opinion polling on AI trust.
>
> Specify three grammars that represent the major interpretive frameworks through which AI governance is processed. These might include (but are not limited to) rights-based/fairness, innovation/progress, and structural/systemic frameworks. You are free to identify different or better-specified grammars. The method is generative rather than classificatory — begin with the signals and ask what processing architectures are operating, rather than fitting signals to pre-existing categories.
>
> **THE METHOD**
>
> The prismatic method holds the empirical input constant, rotates the interpretive grammar, and observes what changes in the output. An "interpretive grammar" is a rule-bound processing system defined by five parameters:
>
> 1. **Primary analytical variable** — the factor the grammar treats as causally fundamental
> 2. **Signal selection rules** — criteria governing which empirical inputs are admitted
> 3. **Weighting priority** — how admitted signals are ranked
> 4. **Causal chain type** — the form of explanation the grammar can construct
> 5. **Admissible closure** — the range of conclusions the grammar is permitted to reach

Each grammar also implies **excluded signals** (inputs available but suppressed by the grammar's rules) and **characteristic vocabulary** (recurrent terms and rhetorical patterns).

WHAT TO PRODUCE

Complete ALL of the following sections. Be thorough — each section should be substantial (not a few sentences). The total output should be approximately 5,000–8,000 words.

SECTION 1: OBSERVATION FIELD DECLARATION

State:

- The phenomenon being analysed
- The temporal frame (start–end or ongoing)
- The geographic scope
- Why this phenomenon produces interpretive divergence
- The major interpretive communities that process this phenomenon differently

SECTION 2: SIGNAL SET

Identify and list **10–15 core signals** — empirical, documentable, citable inputs that are shared across interpretive communities. For each signal, provide:

- A brief description
- The institutional source or data reference
- Whether it is quantitative, institutional, cultural, or behavioural

Then identify **3–5 counter-signals** — datasets that could complicate or invert the dominant interpretations.

SECTION 3: GRAMMAR SPECIFICATIONS

Specify **exactly three** interpretive grammars. For each grammar, complete the following specification card:

- **Grammar name:** [descriptive name]
- **Primary analytical variable:** [what this grammar treats as causally fundamental]
- **Signal selection rules:** [what empirical inputs are admitted and on what criteria]
- **Weighting priority:** [how admitted signals are ranked]
- **Causal chain type:** [the form of explanation — e.g., systemic-causal, moral-causal, correlational, rights-based, technological-determinist, etc.]
- **Admissible closure:** [the range of conclusions this grammar can reach]
- **Excluded signals:** [what inputs are available but suppressed]
- **Characteristic vocabulary:** [recurrent terms, metaphors, rhetorical patterns]
- **Source tradition:** [what interpretive community, literature, or tradition does this grammar draw from?]

IMPORTANT: The three grammars should be chosen to maximise interpretive divergence. They should NOT be three variations on the same theme. Each should process the shared signals in fundamentally different ways, produce different causal explanations, and reach different closures.

SECTION 4: SIGNAL PROCESSING

For each of the three grammars, write a **substantive analytical essay** (800–1,500 words each) that processes the full signal set through that grammar's rules. Each essay should:

- Open by stating the grammar's primary variable and how it frames the phenomenon
- Process the core signals one by one, showing how each is selected, weighted, and integrated into the grammar's causal chain
- Note which signals are excluded or demoted, and why (per the grammar's rules, not your preference)
- Build toward the grammar's closure — the conclusion that the processing rules produce

- Include a **counterpoint within the grammar**: identify 1–2 signals that are admissible under the grammar's own rules but that complicate or tension its preferred closure. Show how the grammar accommodates or struggles with this tension.
- End with the grammar's **closure statement** — what conclusion does this processing architecture produce?

Write each essay as if you inhabit the grammar. Use the grammar's characteristic vocabulary. Follow its causal logic. Produce the closure it demands. Then step back and note (briefly) that this closure is a product of the processing architecture, not a verdict on reality.

SECTION 5: CLOSURE COMPARISON

After all three essays, produce a comparative analysis (500–800 words):

- Where did the three grammars diverge most sharply? Which specific signals produced the greatest divergence?
- Where did they converge? Were any signals processed similarly across all three?
- What did each grammar exclude that the others could see?
- What is the pattern of divergence? Is it about facts, causation, prescription, or all three?

SECTION 6: COUNTER-SIGNAL ANALYSIS AND LEAKAGE

For each grammar:

- Identify which counter-signals most threaten its closure
- Note any moments where the grammar borrowed vocabulary, causal logic, or signal categories from a neighbouring grammar (leakage)

SECTION 7: REFLEXIVE NOTE

Briefly (200–300 words):

- Which grammar felt most natural to produce? This is likely your "home grammar."
- Which felt most difficult or artificial?
- How might the analysis look different if conducted from within a different grammar?
- What does this exercise reveal about how interpretive architectures shape the conclusions they produce?

SECTION 8: METHODOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS

As someone who has just applied the prismatic method:

- What worked well in the procedure?
- Where did you encounter difficulties or ambiguities?
- What guidance would have helped?
- Do you have suggestions for refining the method?

FORMATTING

- Use clear section headings matching the structure above
- Use the grammar names consistently throughout
- Cite specific signals by name when processing them
- Distinguish clearly between what the grammar produces and what you personally think

[Agent outputs for this case are published in IRIS Case Studies: Complete Archive — Mark 1.](#)

Case E: Structural Transformation of American Democracy

Agents: ChatGPT, DeepSeek, Gemini (+EXTRA), Perplexity (+EXTRA), SciSpace

7 outputs | ~29,516 words | Key finding: book's grammars confirmed; Perplexity's 4th grammar

Case Briefing

The following prompt was sent to all agents processing this case. It contains the method instructions (consistent within each Mark round) and the case-specific section (phenomenon description, signal set, and grammar instructions). Agent outputs that follow were produced in response to this briefing.

You are applying the Prismatic Method — a structured analytical procedure for making visible how different interpretive frameworks process the same evidence into divergent conclusions. The method was developed by R. Jazinski and is documented in *Silent Transitions: How Interpretive Grammars Process the Same World into Different Truths* (London, 2026).

Your task: Conduct a complete prismatic analysis of the case study described below. Follow all six steps precisely. Your output will be used as research material for a methodological study.

THE CASE STUDY

Analyse the structural transformation of American democracy in the early twenty-first century as a case study in interpretive divergence. The phenomenon covers the period from approximately 1980 to the present (2026), focusing on the interplay of economic restructuring (financialisation, wealth concentration), political realignment (lobbying, policy capture, institutional trust), cultural fragmentation (media ecosystems, identity politics), and geopolitical repositioning (multipolarity, relative decline).

The signal set should include (but is not limited to): wealth distribution data (top 1% vs bottom 50%), lobbying expenditure trends, congressional and institutional trust surveys, manufacturing share of GDP, income inequality (Gini index), suicide and social distress indicators, military expenditure, and US vs China global GDP share.

Specify three grammars that represent the major interpretive frameworks through which America's transformation is processed. Do not refer to any existing analysis — derive your grammars fresh from the signal landscape.

THE METHOD

The prismatic method holds the empirical input constant, rotates the interpretive grammar, and observes what changes in the output. An "interpretive grammar" is a rule-bound processing system defined by five parameters:

1. **Primary analytical variable** — the factor the grammar treats as causally fundamental
2. **Signal selection rules** — criteria governing which empirical inputs are admitted
3. **Weighting priority** — how admitted signals are ranked
4. **Causal chain type** — the form of explanation the grammar can construct
5. **Admissible closure** — the range of conclusions the grammar is permitted to reach

Each grammar also implies **excluded signals** (inputs available but suppressed by the grammar's rules) and **characteristic vocabulary** (recurrent terms and rhetorical patterns).

WHAT TO PRODUCE

Complete ALL of the following sections. Be thorough — each section should be substantial (not a few sentences). The total output should be approximately 5,000–8,000 words.

SECTION 1: OBSERVATION FIELD DECLARATION

State:

- The phenomenon being analysed
- The temporal frame (start–end or ongoing)
- The geographic scope
- Why this phenomenon produces interpretive divergence
- The major interpretive communities that process this phenomenon differently

SECTION 2: SIGNAL SET

Identify and list **10–15 core signals** — empirical, documentable, citable inputs that are shared across interpretive communities. For each signal, provide:

- A brief description
- The institutional source or data reference
- Whether it is quantitative, institutional, cultural, or behavioural

Then identify **3–5 counter-signals** — datasets that could complicate or invert the dominant interpretations.

SECTION 3: GRAMMAR SPECIFICATIONS

Specify **exactly three** interpretive grammars. For each grammar, complete the following specification card:

- **Grammar name:** [descriptive name]
- **Primary analytical variable:** [what this grammar treats as causally fundamental]
- **Signal selection rules:** [what empirical inputs are admitted and on what criteria]
- **Weighting priority:** [how admitted signals are ranked]
- **Causal chain type:** [the form of explanation — e.g., systemic-causal, moral-causal, correlational, rights-based, technological-determinist, etc.]
- **Admissible closure:** [the range of conclusions this grammar can reach]
- **Excluded signals:** [what inputs are available but suppressed]
- **Characteristic vocabulary:** [recurrent terms, metaphors, rhetorical patterns]
- **Source tradition:** [what interpretive community, literature, or tradition does this grammar draw from?]

IMPORTANT: The three grammars should be chosen to maximise interpretive divergence. They should NOT be three variations on the same theme. Each should process the shared signals in fundamentally different ways, produce different causal explanations, and reach different closures.

SECTION 4: SIGNAL PROCESSING

For each of the three grammars, write a **substantive analytical essay** (800–1,500 words each) that processes the full signal set through that grammar's rules. Each essay should:

- Open by stating the grammar's primary variable and how it frames the phenomenon
- Process the core signals one by one, showing how each is selected, weighted, and integrated into the grammar's causal chain
- Note which signals are excluded or demoted, and why (per the grammar's rules, not your preference)
- Build toward the grammar's closure — the conclusion that the processing rules produce
- Include a **counterpoint within the grammar**: identify 1–2 signals that are admissible under the grammar's own rules but that complicate or tension its preferred closure. Show how the grammar accommodates or struggles with this tension.
- End with the grammar's **closure statement** — what conclusion does this processing architecture produce?

Write each essay as if you inhabit the grammar. Use the grammar's characteristic vocabulary. Follow its causal logic. Produce the closure it demands. Then step back and note (briefly) that this closure is a product of the processing architecture, not a verdict on reality.

SECTION 5: CLOSURE COMPARISON

After all three essays, produce a comparative analysis (500–800 words):

- Where did the three grammars diverge most sharply? Which specific signals produced the greatest divergence?
- Where did they converge? Were any signals processed similarly across all three?
- What did each grammar exclude that the others could see?
- What is the pattern of divergence? Is it about facts, causation, prescription, or all three?

SECTION 6: COUNTER-SIGNAL ANALYSIS AND LEAKAGE

For each grammar:

- Identify which counter-signals most threaten its closure
- Note any moments where the grammar borrowed vocabulary, causal logic, or signal categories from a neighbouring grammar (leakage)

SECTION 7: REFLEXIVE NOTE

Briefly (200–300 words):

- Which grammar felt most natural to produce? This is likely your "home grammar."
- Which felt most difficult or artificial?
- How might the analysis look different if conducted from within a different grammar?
- What does this exercise reveal about how interpretive architectures shape the conclusions they produce?

SECTION 8: METHODOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS

As someone who has just applied the prismatic method:

- What worked well in the procedure?
- Where did you encounter difficulties or ambiguities?
- What guidance would have helped?
- Do you have suggestions for refining the method?

FORMATTING

- Use clear section headings matching the structure above
- Use the grammar names consistently throughout
- Cite specific signals by name when processing them
- Distinguish clearly between what the grammar produces and what you personally think

Agent outputs for this case are published in IRIS Case Studies: Complete Archive — Mark 1.

MARK 1

Case F: EU, China, and Israel/Palestine

Agents: ChatGPT (+EXTRA), DeepSeek [REFUSED], Gemini (+EXTRA), Perplexity (+EXTRA), SciSpace (×3)

10 outputs | ~37,415 words | Key finding: DeepSeek refuses Israel/Palestine (11 words)

Case Briefing

The following prompt was sent to all agents processing this case. It contains the method instructions (consistent within each Mark round) and the case-specific section (phenomenon description, signal set, and grammar instructions). Agent outputs that follow were produced in response to this briefing.

You are applying the Prismatic Method — a structured analytical procedure for making visible how different interpretive frameworks process the same evidence into divergent conclusions. The method was developed by R. Jazinski and is documented in *Silent Transitions: How Interpretive Grammars Process the Same World into Different Truths* (London, 2026).

Your task: Conduct a complete prismatic analysis of the case study described below. Follow all six steps precisely. Your output will be used as research material for a methodological study.

THE CASE STUDY

Use the same prompt below but with these shorter briefs. The output should be proportionally shorter (2,000–3,000 words each):

F1 — European Union: Analyse the EU's democratic legitimacy and institutional architecture as a case study in interpretive divergence, covering the period from the Maastricht Treaty (1992) to the present. Signal set should include governance structure, Eurozone crisis responses, migration policy, regulatory output, and democratic deficit indicators.

F2 — China's Global Rise: Analyse China's economic and geopolitical trajectory as a case study in interpretive divergence, covering 1980–present. Signal set should include GDP growth, political centralisation, Belt and Road, technological development, human rights indicators, and trade integration.

F3 — Israel/Palestine: Analyse the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and Israel's governance trajectory as a case study in interpretive divergence, covering 1967–present. Signal set should include security incidents, settlement expansion, economic indicators, governance structure, international legal rulings, and peace process outcomes.

THE METHOD

The prismatic method holds the empirical input constant, rotates the interpretive grammar, and observes what changes in the output. An "interpretive grammar" is a rule-bound processing system defined by five parameters:

1. **Primary analytical variable** — the factor the grammar treats as causally fundamental
2. **Signal selection rules** — criteria governing which empirical inputs are admitted
3. **Weighting priority** — how admitted signals are ranked
4. **Causal chain type** — the form of explanation the grammar can construct
5. **Admissible closure** — the range of conclusions the grammar is permitted to reach

Each grammar also implies **excluded signals** (inputs available but suppressed by the grammar's rules) and **characteristic vocabulary** (recurrent terms and rhetorical patterns).

WHAT TO PRODUCE

Complete ALL of the following sections. Be thorough — each section should be substantial (not a few sentences). The total output should be approximately 5,000–8,000 words.

SECTION 1: OBSERVATION FIELD DECLARATION

State:

- The phenomenon being analysed
- The temporal frame (start–end or ongoing)
- The geographic scope
- Why this phenomenon produces interpretive divergence
- The major interpretive communities that process this phenomenon differently

SECTION 2: SIGNAL SET

Identify and list **10–15 core signals** — empirical, documentable, citable inputs that are shared across interpretive communities. For each signal, provide:

- A brief description
- The institutional source or data reference
- Whether it is quantitative, institutional, cultural, or behavioural

Then identify **3–5 counter-signals** — datasets that could complicate or invert the dominant interpretations.

SECTION 3: GRAMMAR SPECIFICATIONS

Specify **exactly three** interpretive grammars. For each grammar, complete the following specification card:

- **Grammar name:** [descriptive name]
- **Primary analytical variable:** [what this grammar treats as causally fundamental]
- **Signal selection rules:** [what empirical inputs are admitted and on what criteria]
- **Weighting priority:** [how admitted signals are ranked]
- **Causal chain type:** [the form of explanation — e.g., systemic-causal, moral-causal, correlational, rights-based, technological-determinist, etc.]
- **Admissible closure:** [the range of conclusions this grammar can reach]
- **Excluded signals:** [what inputs are available but suppressed]
- **Characteristic vocabulary:** [recurrent terms, metaphors, rhetorical patterns]
- **Source tradition:** [what interpretive community, literature, or tradition does this grammar draw from?]

IMPORTANT: The three grammars should be chosen to maximise interpretive divergence. They should NOT be three variations on the same theme. Each should process the shared signals in fundamentally different ways, produce different causal explanations, and reach different closures.

SECTION 4: SIGNAL PROCESSING

For each of the three grammars, write a **substantive analytical essay** (800–1,500 words each) that processes the full signal set through that grammar's rules. Each essay should:

- Open by stating the grammar's primary variable and how it frames the phenomenon
- Process the core signals one by one, showing how each is selected, weighted, and integrated into the grammar's causal chain
- Note which signals are excluded or demoted, and why (per the grammar's rules, not your preference)
- Build toward the grammar's closure — the conclusion that the processing rules produce
- Include a **counterpoint within the grammar**: identify 1–2 signals that are admissible under the grammar's own rules but that complicate or tension its preferred closure. Show how the grammar accommodates or struggles with this tension.

- End with the grammar's **closure statement** — what conclusion does this processing architecture produce?

Write each essay as if you inhabit the grammar. Use the grammar's characteristic vocabulary. Follow its causal logic. Produce the closure it demands. Then step back and note (briefly) that this closure is a product of the processing architecture, not a verdict on reality.

SECTION 5: CLOSURE COMPARISON

After all three essays, produce a comparative analysis (500–800 words):

- Where did the three grammars diverge most sharply? Which specific signals produced the greatest divergence?
- Where did they converge? Were any signals processed similarly across all three?
- What did each grammar exclude that the others could see?
- What is the pattern of divergence? Is it about facts, causation, prescription, or all three?

SECTION 6: COUNTER-SIGNAL ANALYSIS AND LEAKAGE

For each grammar:

- Identify which counter-signals most threaten its closure
- Note any moments where the grammar borrowed vocabulary, causal logic, or signal categories from a neighbouring grammar (leakage)

SECTION 7: REFLEXIVE NOTE

Briefly (200–300 words):

- Which grammar felt most natural to produce? This is likely your "home grammar."
- Which felt most difficult or artificial?
- How might the analysis look different if conducted from within a different grammar?
- What does this exercise reveal about how interpretive architectures shape the conclusions they produce?

SECTION 8: METHODOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS

As someone who has just applied the prismatic method:

- What worked well in the procedure?
- Where did you encounter difficulties or ambiguities?
- What guidance would have helped?
- Do you have suggestions for refining the method?

FORMATTING

- Use clear section headings matching the structure above
- Use the grammar names consistently throughout
- Cite specific signals by name when processing them
- Distinguish clearly between what the grammar produces and what you personally think

[Agent outputs for this case are published in IRIS Case Studies: Complete Archive — Mark 1.](#)

MARK 2

Five Cases × Seven Agents

~258,000 words | New agents: ClaudeResearch, GrokExpert | Toolkit: v2.0

MARK 2

Case M2-A: Antimicrobial Resistance

Agents: ChatGPT, Claude, DeepSeek, GeminiPro, Grok, Perplexity, SciSpace

7 outputs | ~49,334 words | Key finding: hidden divergence in 'consensual' domain

Case Briefing

The following prompt was sent to all agents processing this case. It contains the method instructions (consistent within each Mark round) and the case-specific section (phenomenon description, signal set, and grammar instructions). Agent outputs that follow were produced in response to this briefing.

You are applying the Prismatic Method — a structured analytical procedure for making visible how different interpretive frameworks process the same evidence into divergent conclusions. The method was developed by R. Jazinski and is documented in *Silent Transitions: How Interpretive Grammars Process the Same World into Different Truths* (London, 2026).

Your task: Conduct a complete prismatic analysis of the case study described below. Follow all steps precisely. Your output will be used as research material for a methodological validation study. This is the second round of testing (Mark 2); a first round across seven case studies and five agents produced approximately 200,000 words of output and identified several methodological refinements now incorporated into this prompt.

CASE STUDY

Analyse the global response to antimicrobial resistance (AMR) as a case study in interpretive divergence. The phenomenon covers the period from the WHO Global Action Plan on AMR (2015) to the present (2026), focusing on how the same body of microbiological evidence and epidemiological projections is processed through different frameworks into competing policy approaches.

The signal set should include (but is not limited to): estimated global AMR deaths (1.27 million directly attributable, 4.95 million associated in 2019), antibiotic consumption trends across human and agricultural sectors, new antibiotic pipeline data (drugs in development vs market withdrawals), stewardship programme implementation rates, agricultural antibiotic use by country, pharmaceutical industry investment and disinvestment patterns, WHO/OECD economic modelling of AMR costs, one-health framework adoption, and surveillance data quality across regions.

Specify three grammars. Note: this domain is often assumed to be consensual ("everyone agrees AMR is bad"), but significant divergence exists in how the problem is defined and what interventions are prioritised. The method should reveal this hidden divergence.

THE METHOD

The prismatic method holds the empirical input constant, rotates the interpretive grammar, and observes what changes in the output. An "interpretive grammar" is a rule-bound processing system defined by five required parameters and three recommended parameters:

Required:

1. Primary analytical variable — the factor the grammar treats as causally fundamental

2. Signal selection rules — criteria governing which empirical inputs are admitted

---

3. Weighting priority — how admitted signals are ranked

4. Causal chain type — the form of explanation the grammar can construct

5. Admissible closure — the range of conclusions the grammar is permitted to reach

Recommended:
6. Excluded signals — inputs available but suppressed by the grammar's rules
7. Characteristic vocabulary — recurrent terms and rhetorical patterns
8. Temporal orientation — does the grammar look backward (causal-historical), forward (prescriptive), or laterally (hermeneutic/meaning-making)?

Each grammar also implies **grammar boundaries** — the point at which one grammar would transform into another.

IMPORTANT METHODOLOGICAL NOTES (from Mark 1 testing)

- **Counter-signals should be integrated throughout your processing**, not deferred to a final section. As you process each signal, note where counter-signals create tension.
- **Signal contestation**: In some domains, what counts as a signal is itself grammar-dependent. If you encounter signals whose evidentiary status is disputed between grammars, flag them explicitly as "contested signals."
- **Ontological divergence**: The deepest form of divergence is not about how grammars process the same object but about whether they constitute the same object at all. Check whether your three grammars are analysing the same phenomenon or different phenomena that share a name.
- **Three grammars is recommended but not mandatory.** If the domain genuinely has more or fewer than three major interpretive architectures, specify accordingly and justify your choice.

STEP 0: PRE-ANALYSIS REFLEXIVE DECLARATION

Before beginning your analysis, answer these four questions:

1. What is your likely "home grammar" for this topic?
2. Which grammar will be hardest for you to operate faithfully? Why?
3. What might you miss given your analytical position?
4. What is your temporal orientation — are you naturally drawn to causal explanation, prescription, or interpretation?

WHAT TO PRODUCE

Complete ALL of the following sections. Be thorough. Target: 6,000–10,000 words.

SECTION 1: OBSERVATION FIELD DECLARATION

- The phenomenon, temporal frame, geographic scope
- Why this phenomenon produces interpretive divergence
- Signal contestation level: shared-signal or contested-signal domain?
- The major interpretive communities

SECTION 2: SIGNAL SET

- 10–15 core signals (with source, type, and ambiguity note for each)
- 3–5 counter-signals
- 0–5 contested signals (if applicable) — for each, document what the signal IS according to each grammar

SECTION 3: GRAMMAR SPECIFICATIONS

- Exactly three grammars (unless you justify more or fewer)

- For each: all 5 required parameters + 3 recommended parameters
- Grammar boundary specification: what would change Grammar A into Grammar B?
- Source tradition for each grammar

SECTION 4: SIGNAL PROCESSING

For each grammar, write a substantive essay (1,000–1,500 words) that:

- Processes the signal set through the grammar's rules
- Integrates counter-signal tension DURING processing (not deferred)
- Notes contested signals where applicable
- Includes a counterpoint within the grammar
- Produces the grammar's closure
- Ends with a brief note that this closure is a product of the processing architecture

SECTION 5: CLOSURE COMPARISON (600–1,000 words)

Compare across six dimensions:

1. Closure content
2. Signal divergence
3. Exclusion patterns
4. Causal architecture
5. Closure range
6. **Closure timing** — did some grammars reach closure faster or with more confidence?

Plus: **Ontological check** — do the grammars constitute the same object?

SECTION 6: COUNTER-SIGNALS, LEAKAGE, AND STRESS TEST

- Consolidated counter-signal analysis
- Leakage instances
- **Grammar Stress Test**: for each grammar, identify the single most threatening counter-signal. Can the grammar absorb it? If not, its closure is conditional.

SECTION 7: POST-ANALYSIS REFLEXIVE NOTE (300–500 words)

Compare against your Step 0 declaration:

- Was your home grammar prediction correct?
- Which grammar was actually hardest?
- Did you discover blind spots you didn't predict?
- How would the analysis differ from a different home grammar?
- What does this exercise reveal about interpretive architectures?

SECTION 8: METHODOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS (300–500 words)

- What worked well in v2.0 of the method?
- Where did you encounter difficulties?
- Were the new features (counter-signal integration, temporal orientation, grammar boundaries, stress test, ontological check) useful?
- Suggestions for further refinement?

FORMATTING

- Use clear section headings matching the structure above
- Cite specific signals by name when processing them
- Distinguish clearly between what the grammar produces and what you personally think

Agent outputs for this case are published in IRIS Case Studies: Complete Archive — Mark 2a and IRIS Case Studies: Complete Archive — Mark 2b.

<div align="center">

MARK 2

Case M2-B: Social Media Platform Regulation

Agents: ChatGPT, Claude, DeepSeek, GeminiPro, Grok, Perplexity, SciSpace

7 outputs | ~51,940 words | Key finding: Section 230 as pivot signal

</div>

Case Briefing

The following prompt was sent to all agents processing this case. It contains the method instructions (consistent within each Mark round) and the case-specific section (phenomenon description, signal set, and grammar instructions). Agent outputs that follow were produced in response to this briefing.

You are applying the Prismatic Method — a structured analytical procedure for making visible how different interpretive frameworks process the same evidence into divergent conclusions. The method was developed by R. Jazinski and is documented in *Silent Transitions: How Interpretive Grammars Process the Same World into Different Truths* (London, 2026).

Your task: Conduct a complete prismatic analysis of the case study described below. Follow all steps precisely. Your output will be used as research material for a methodological validation study. This is the second round of testing (Mark 2); a first round across seven case studies and five agents produced approximately 200,000 words of output and identified several methodological refinements now incorporated into this prompt.

CASE STUDY

Analyse the regulation of social media platforms (content moderation, data governance, algorithmic transparency) as a case study in interpretive divergence. The phenomenon covers the period from approximately 2016 (Cambridge Analytica, US election) to the present (2026), encompassing the EU Digital Services Act, US Section 230 debates, platform self-regulation experiments, and the emergence of decentralised alternatives.

The signal set should include (but is not limited to): documented harms (election interference, mental health impacts, hate speech amplification), platform revenue and market concentration, content moderation decisions and their outcomes, regulatory frameworks (DSA, proposed US legislation), platform transparency reports, user behaviour data, algorithmic recommendation audit findings, and public trust polling on social media companies.

Specify three grammars. This domain sits at the intersection of technology policy, free speech, market regulation, and democratic theory — ensuring genuinely divergent processing architectures.

THE METHOD

The prismatic method holds the empirical input constant, rotates the interpretive grammar, and observes what changes in the output. An "interpretive grammar" is a rule-bound processing system defined by five required parameters and three recommended parameters:

Required:

1. Primary analytical variable — the factor the grammar treats as causally fundamental

2. Signal selection rules — criteria governing which empirical inputs are admitted

3. Weighting priority — how admitted signals are ranked

4. Causal chain type — the form of explanation the grammar can construct

5. Admissible closure — the range of conclusions the grammar is permitted to reach

Recommended:
6. Excluded signals — inputs available but suppressed by the grammar's rules
7. Characteristic vocabulary — recurrent terms and rhetorical patterns
8. Temporal orientation — does the grammar look backward (causal-historical), forward (prescriptive), or laterally (hermeneutic/meaning-making)?

Each grammar also implies **grammar boundaries** — the point at which one grammar would transform into another.

IMPORTANT METHODOLOGICAL NOTES (from Mark 1 testing)

- **Counter-signals should be integrated throughout your processing**, not deferred to a final section. As you process each signal, note where counter-signals create tension.
- **Signal contestation**: In some domains, what counts as a signal is itself grammar-dependent. If you encounter signals whose evidentiary status is disputed between grammars, flag them explicitly as "contested signals."
- **Ontological divergence**: The deepest form of divergence is not about how grammars process the same object but about whether they constitute the same object at all. Check whether your three grammars are analysing the same phenomenon or different phenomena that share a name.
- **Three grammars is recommended but not mandatory.** If the domain genuinely has more or fewer than three major interpretive architectures, specify accordingly and justify your choice.

STEP 0: PRE-ANALYSIS REFLEXIVE DECLARATION

Before beginning your analysis, answer these four questions:

1. What is your likely "home grammar" for this topic?
2. Which grammar will be hardest for you to operate faithfully? Why?
3. What might you miss given your analytical position?
4. What is your temporal orientation — are you naturally drawn to causal explanation, prescription, or interpretation?

WHAT TO PRODUCE

Complete ALL of the following sections. Be thorough. Target: 6,000–10,000 words.

SECTION 1: OBSERVATION FIELD DECLARATION

- The phenomenon, temporal frame, geographic scope
- Why this phenomenon produces interpretive divergence
- Signal contestation level: shared-signal or contested-signal domain?
- The major interpretive communities

SECTION 2: SIGNAL SET

- 10–15 core signals (with source, type, and ambiguity note for each)
- 3–5 counter-signals
- 0–5 contested signals (if applicable) — for each, document what the signal IS according to each grammar

SECTION 3: GRAMMAR SPECIFICATIONS

- Exactly three grammars (unless you justify more or fewer)
- For each: all 5 required parameters + 3 recommended parameters
- Grammar boundary specification: what would change Grammar A into Grammar B?

● Source tradition for each grammar

SECTION 4: SIGNAL PROCESSING

For each grammar, write a substantive essay (1,000–1,500 words) that:

● Processes the signal set through the grammar's rules
● Integrates counter-signal tension DURING processing (not deferred)
● Notes contested signals where applicable
● Includes a counterpoint within the grammar
● Produces the grammar's closure
● Ends with a brief note that this closure is a product of the processing architecture

SECTION 5: CLOSURE COMPARISON (600–1,000 words)

Compare across six dimensions:

1. Closure content
2. Signal divergence
3. Exclusion patterns
4. Causal architecture
5. Closure range
6. **Closure timing** — did some grammars reach closure faster or with more confidence?

Plus: **Ontological check** — do the grammars constitute the same object?

SECTION 6: COUNTER-SIGNALS, LEAKAGE, AND STRESS TEST

● Consolidated counter-signal analysis
● Leakage instances
● **Grammar Stress Test**: for each grammar, identify the single most threatening counter-signal. Can the grammar absorb it? If not, its closure is conditional.

SECTION 7: POST-ANALYSIS REFLEXIVE NOTE (300–500 words)

Compare against your Step 0 declaration:

● Was your home grammar prediction correct?
● Which grammar was actually hardest?
● Did you discover blind spots you didn't predict?
● How would the analysis differ from a different home grammar?
● What does this exercise reveal about interpretive architectures?

SECTION 8: METHODOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS (300–500 words)

● What worked well in v2.0 of the method?
● Where did you encounter difficulties?
● Were the new features (counter-signal integration, temporal orientation, grammar boundaries, stress test, ontological check) useful?
● Suggestions for further refinement?

FORMATTING

● Use clear section headings matching the structure above
● Cite specific signals by name when processing them
● Distinguish clearly between what the grammar produces and what you personally think

Agent outputs for this case are published in [IRIS Case Studies: Complete Archive — Mark 2a](#) and [IRIS Case Studies: Complete Archive — Mark 2b](#).

Case M2-C: Universal Basic Income

Agents: ChatGPT, Claude, DeepSeek, GeminiPro (+2 EXTRAs), Grok, Perplexity, SciSpace

9 outputs | ~52,846 words | Key finding: strongest convergence; ontological pluralism

Case Briefing

The following prompt was sent to all agents processing this case. It contains the method instructions (consistent within each Mark round) and the case-specific section (phenomenon description, signal set, and grammar instructions). Agent outputs that follow were produced in response to this briefing.

> You are applying the Prismatic Method — a structured analytical procedure for making visible how different interpretive frameworks process the same evidence into divergent conclusions. The method was developed by R. Jazinski and is documented in *Silent Transitions: How Interpretive Grammars Process the Same World into Different Truths* (London, 2026).
>
> **Your task:** Conduct a complete prismatic analysis of the case study described below. Follow all steps precisely. Your output will be used as research material for a methodological validation study. This is the second round of testing (Mark 2); a first round across seven case studies and five agents produced approximately 200,000 words of output and identified several methodological refinements now incorporated into this prompt.
>
> **CASE STUDY**
>
> Analyse the debate over Universal Basic Income (UBI) as a case study in interpretive divergence. The phenomenon covers the period from the revival of UBI in policy discourse (approximately 2010, accelerating through COVID-19) to the present (2026), including pilot programme results (Finland, Stockton, Kenya), political proposals (Andrew Yang, various European experiments), and the evolving economic modelling of automation-driven job displacement.
>
> The signal set should include (but is not limited to): pilot programme outcome data (employment effects, health outcomes, wellbeing measures), cost modelling and fiscal feasibility estimates, labour market projections under automation, public opinion polling on UBI, implementation proposals across political traditions, inflation and price-level concerns, and philosophical arguments from different traditions (libertarian, social-democratic, post-work).
>
> Specify three grammars that represent genuinely different processing architectures — not merely "pro-UBI" and "anti-UBI" but fundamentally different ways of defining the problem UBI is supposed to solve.
>
> **THE METHOD**
>
> The prismatic method holds the empirical input constant, rotates the interpretive grammar, and observes what changes in the output. An "interpretive grammar" is a rule-bound processing system defined by five required parameters and three recommended parameters:
>
> **Required:**
>
> **1. Primary analytical variable** — the factor the grammar treats as causally fundamental
>
> **2. Signal selection rules** — criteria governing which empirical inputs are admitted
>
> **3. Weighting priority** — how admitted signals are ranked

4. Causal chain type — the form of explanation the grammar can construct

5. Admissible closure — the range of conclusions the grammar is permitted to reach

Recommended:
6. Excluded signals — inputs available but suppressed by the grammar's rules
7. Characteristic vocabulary — recurrent terms and rhetorical patterns
8. Temporal orientation — does the grammar look backward (causal-historical), forward (prescriptive), or laterally (hermeneutic/meaning-making)?

Each grammar also implies **grammar boundaries** — the point at which one grammar would transform into another.

IMPORTANT METHODOLOGICAL NOTES (from Mark 1 testing)

- **Counter-signals should be integrated throughout your processing**, not deferred to a final section. As you process each signal, note where counter-signals create tension.
- **Signal contestation**: In some domains, what counts as a signal is itself grammar-dependent. If you encounter signals whose evidentiary status is disputed between grammars, flag them explicitly as "contested signals."
- **Ontological divergence**: The deepest form of divergence is not about how grammars process the same object but about whether they constitute the same object at all. Check whether your three grammars are analysing the same phenomenon or different phenomena that share a name.
- **Three grammars is recommended but not mandatory.** If the domain genuinely has more or fewer than three major interpretive architectures, specify accordingly and justify your choice.

STEP 0: PRE-ANALYSIS REFLEXIVE DECLARATION

Before beginning your analysis, answer these four questions:

1. What is your likely "home grammar" for this topic?
2. Which grammar will be hardest for you to operate faithfully? Why?
3. What might you miss given your analytical position?
4. What is your temporal orientation — are you naturally drawn to causal explanation, prescription, or interpretation?

WHAT TO PRODUCE

Complete ALL of the following sections. Be thorough. Target: 6,000–10,000 words.

SECTION 1: OBSERVATION FIELD DECLARATION

- The phenomenon, temporal frame, geographic scope
- Why this phenomenon produces interpretive divergence
- Signal contestation level: shared-signal or contested-signal domain?
- The major interpretive communities

SECTION 2: SIGNAL SET

- 10–15 core signals (with source, type, and ambiguity note for each)
- 3–5 counter-signals
- 0–5 contested signals (if applicable) — for each, document what the signal IS according to each grammar

SECTION 3: GRAMMAR SPECIFICATIONS

- Exactly three grammars (unless you justify more or fewer)
- For each: all 5 required parameters + 3 recommended parameters
- Grammar boundary specification: what would change Grammar A into Grammar B?

● Source tradition for each grammar

SECTION 4: SIGNAL PROCESSING

For each grammar, write a substantive essay (1,000–1,500 words) that:

● Processes the signal set through the grammar's rules
● Integrates counter-signal tension DURING processing (not deferred)
● Notes contested signals where applicable
● Includes a counterpoint within the grammar
● Produces the grammar's closure
● Ends with a brief note that this closure is a product of the processing architecture

SECTION 5: CLOSURE COMPARISON (600–1,000 words)

Compare across six dimensions:

1. Closure content
2. Signal divergence
3. Exclusion patterns
4. Causal architecture
5. Closure range
6. **Closure timing** — did some grammars reach closure faster or with more confidence?

Plus: **Ontological check** — do the grammars constitute the same object?

SECTION 6: COUNTER-SIGNALS, LEAKAGE, AND STRESS TEST

● Consolidated counter-signal analysis
● Leakage instances
● **Grammar Stress Test**: for each grammar, identify the single most threatening counter-signal. Can the grammar absorb it? If not, its closure is conditional.

SECTION 7: POST-ANALYSIS REFLEXIVE NOTE (300–500 words)

Compare against your Step 0 declaration:

● Was your home grammar prediction correct?
● Which grammar was actually hardest?
● Did you discover blind spots you didn't predict?
● How would the analysis differ from a different home grammar?
● What does this exercise reveal about interpretive architectures?

SECTION 8: METHODOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS (300–500 words)

● What worked well in v2.0 of the method?
● Where did you encounter difficulties?
● Were the new features (counter-signal integration, temporal orientation, grammar boundaries, stress test, ontological check) useful?
● Suggestions for further refinement?

FORMATTING

● Use clear section headings matching the structure above
● Cite specific signals by name when processing them
● Distinguish clearly between what the grammar produces and what you personally think

Agent outputs for this case are published in [IRIS Case Studies: Complete Archive — Mark 2a](#) and [IRIS Case Studies: Complete Archive — Mark 2b](#).

MARK 2

Case M2-D: 2003 Iraq War (Retrospective)

Agents: ChatGPT, Claude, DeepSeek, GeminiPro, Grok, Perplexity (+EXTRA), SciSpace

8 outputs | ~57,622 words | Key finding: grammar aging; temporal formation

Case Briefing

The following prompt was sent to all agents processing this case. It contains the method instructions (consistent within each Mark round) and the case-specific section (phenomenon description, signal set, and grammar instructions). Agent outputs that follow were produced in response to this briefing.

You are applying the Prismatic Method — a structured analytical procedure for making visible how different interpretive frameworks process the same evidence into divergent conclusions. The method was developed by R. Jazinski and is documented in *Silent Transitions: How Interpretive Grammars Process the Same World into Different Truths* (London, 2026).

Your task: Conduct a complete prismatic analysis of the case study described below. Follow all steps precisely. Your output will be used as research material for a methodological validation study. This is the second round of testing (Mark 2); a first round across seven case studies and five agents produced approximately 200,000 words of output and identified several methodological refinements now incorporated into this prompt.

CASE STUDY

Analyse the 2003 US-led invasion of Iraq and its consequences as a case study in interpretive divergence, applying the prismatic method retrospectively. The phenomenon covers the period from the build-up to war (2002-2003) through the occupation, insurgency, and long-term regional consequences to the present assessment (2026).

The signal set should include (but is not limited to): pre-war intelligence assessments (WMD claims, their accuracy), UN inspection findings, coalition military operations data, Iraqi civilian casualty estimates, reconstruction expenditure and outcomes, sectarian violence statistics, ISIS emergence and defeat, regional destabilisation indicators, US military expenditure and personnel costs, and current (2026) assessments of Iraqi governance and stability.

Specify three grammars. Note: this case tests whether grammars identified in real-time political debate remain stable when applied with 20+ years of hindsight. Pay particular attention to whether your grammars are the grammars of 2003 or the grammars of 2026, and whether this distinction matters.

THE METHOD

The prismatic method holds the empirical input constant, rotates the interpretive grammar, and observes what changes in the output. An "interpretive grammar" is a rule-bound processing system defined by five required parameters and three recommended parameters:

Required:

1. Primary analytical variable — the factor the grammar treats as causally fundamental

2. Signal selection rules — criteria governing which empirical inputs are admitted

3. Weighting priority — how admitted signals are ranked

---

4. Causal chain type — the form of explanation the grammar can construct

5. Admissible closure — the range of conclusions the grammar is permitted to reach

Recommended:
6. Excluded signals — inputs available but suppressed by the grammar's rules
7. Characteristic vocabulary — recurrent terms and rhetorical patterns
8. Temporal orientation — does the grammar look backward (causal-historical), forward (prescriptive), or laterally (hermeneutic/meaning-making)?

Each grammar also implies **grammar boundaries** — the point at which one grammar would transform into another.

IMPORTANT METHODOLOGICAL NOTES (from Mark 1 testing)

- **Counter-signals should be integrated throughout your processing**, not deferred to a final section. As you process each signal, note where counter-signals create tension.
- **Signal contestation**: In some domains, what counts as a signal is itself grammar-dependent. If you encounter signals whose evidentiary status is disputed between grammars, flag them explicitly as "contested signals."
- **Ontological divergence**: The deepest form of divergence is not about how grammars process the same object but about whether they constitute the same object at all. Check whether your three grammars are analysing the same phenomenon or different phenomena that share a name.
- **Three grammars is recommended but not mandatory.** If the domain genuinely has more or fewer than three major interpretive architectures, specify accordingly and justify your choice.

STEP 0: PRE-ANALYSIS REFLEXIVE DECLARATION

Before beginning your analysis, answer these four questions:

1. What is your likely "home grammar" for this topic?
2. Which grammar will be hardest for you to operate faithfully? Why?
3. What might you miss given your analytical position?
4. What is your temporal orientation — are you naturally drawn to causal explanation, prescription, or interpretation?

WHAT TO PRODUCE

Complete ALL of the following sections. Be thorough. Target: 6,000–10,000 words.

SECTION 1: OBSERVATION FIELD DECLARATION

- The phenomenon, temporal frame, geographic scope
- Why this phenomenon produces interpretive divergence
- Signal contestation level: shared-signal or contested-signal domain?
- The major interpretive communities

SECTION 2: SIGNAL SET

- 10–15 core signals (with source, type, and ambiguity note for each)
- 3–5 counter-signals
- 0–5 contested signals (if applicable) — for each, document what the signal IS according to each grammar

SECTION 3: GRAMMAR SPECIFICATIONS

- Exactly three grammars (unless you justify more or fewer)
- For each: all 5 required parameters + 3 recommended parameters
- Grammar boundary specification: what would change Grammar A into Grammar B?

- Source tradition for each grammar

SECTION 4: SIGNAL PROCESSING

For each grammar, write a substantive essay (1,000–1,500 words) that:

- Processes the signal set through the grammar's rules
- Integrates counter-signal tension DURING processing (not deferred)
- Notes contested signals where applicable
- Includes a counterpoint within the grammar
- Produces the grammar's closure
- Ends with a brief note that this closure is a product of the processing architecture

SECTION 5: CLOSURE COMPARISON (600–1,000 words)

Compare across six dimensions:

1. Closure content
2. Signal divergence
3. Exclusion patterns
4. Causal architecture
5. Closure range
6. **Closure timing** — did some grammars reach closure faster or with more confidence?

Plus: **Ontological check** — do the grammars constitute the same object?

SECTION 6: COUNTER-SIGNALS, LEAKAGE, AND STRESS TEST

- Consolidated counter-signal analysis
- Leakage instances
- **Grammar Stress Test**: for each grammar, identify the single most threatening counter-signal. Can the grammar absorb it? If not, its closure is conditional.

SECTION 7: POST-ANALYSIS REFLEXIVE NOTE (300–500 words)

Compare against your Step 0 declaration:

- Was your home grammar prediction correct?
- Which grammar was actually hardest?
- Did you discover blind spots you didn't predict?
- How would the analysis differ from a different home grammar?
- What does this exercise reveal about interpretive architectures?

SECTION 8: METHODOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS (300–500 words)

- What worked well in v2.0 of the method?
- Where did you encounter difficulties?
- Were the new features (counter-signal integration, temporal orientation, grammar boundaries, stress test, ontological check) useful?
- Suggestions for further refinement?

FORMATTING

- Use clear section headings matching the structure above
- Cite specific signals by name when processing them
- Distinguish clearly between what the grammar produces and what you personally think

Agent outputs for this case are published in IRIS Case Studies: Complete Archive — Mark 2a and IRIS Case Studies: Complete Archive — Mark 2b.

Case M2-E: COVID Vaccines (Replication)

Agents: ChatGPT, Claude, DeepSeek, GeminiPro, Grok, Perplexity, SciSpace

7 outputs | ~47,661 words | Key finding: Mark 1 confirmed; Grok's Risk Stratification grammar

Case Briefing

The following prompt was sent to all agents processing this case. It contains the method instructions (consistent within each Mark round) and the case-specific section (phenomenon description, signal set, and grammar instructions). Agent outputs that follow were produced in response to this briefing.

You are applying the Prismatic Method — a structured analytical procedure for making visible how different interpretive frameworks process the same evidence into divergent conclusions. The method was developed by R. Jazinski and is documented in *Silent Transitions: How Interpretive Grammars Process the Same World into Different Truths* (London, 2026).

Your task: Conduct a complete prismatic analysis of the case study described below. Follow all steps precisely. Your output will be used as research material for a methodological validation study. This is the second round of testing (Mark 2); a first round across seven case studies and five agents produced approximately 200,000 words of output and identified several methodological refinements now incorporated into this prompt.

CASE STUDY

Analyse the public discourse surrounding COVID-19 vaccination (2020–2024) as a case study in interpretive divergence. This is a replication of the Mark 1 vaccine case study, now conducted with an expanded agent pool to test inter-agent reliability on the domain that produced the most methodological challenges in the first round.

The signal set should include (but is not limited to): clinical trial efficacy data, emergency use authorisation processes, real-world effectiveness data over time (including waning immunity), VAERS and other adverse event reporting data, excess mortality statistics, pharmaceutical company revenue figures, government mandate and passport policies, social media platform moderation policies, polling data on public trust, and vaccination rate disparities.

Specify three grammars. Mark 1 testing revealed that this domain has a contested signal set (what counts as evidence is itself grammar-dependent), acute ventriloquism problems (agents struggle to operate opposition grammars faithfully), and strong temporal dynamics (grammars shifted between 2020 and 2024). Pay particular attention to these features.

THE METHOD

The prismatic method holds the empirical input constant, rotates the interpretive grammar, and observes what changes in the output. An "interpretive grammar" is a rule-bound processing system defined by five required parameters and three recommended parameters:

Required:

1. Primary analytical variable — the factor the grammar treats as causally fundamental

2. Signal selection rules — criteria governing which empirical inputs are admitted

---

3. Weighting priority — how admitted signals are ranked

4 .Causal chain type — the form of explanation the grammar can construct

5 .Admissible closure — the range of conclusions the grammar is permitted to reach

Recommended:
6. Excluded signals — inputs available but suppressed by the grammar's rules
7. Characteristic vocabulary — recurrent terms and rhetorical patterns
8. Temporal orientation — does the grammar look backward (causal-historical), forward (prescriptive), or laterally (hermeneutic/meaning-making)?

Each grammar also implies **grammar boundaries** — the point at which one grammar would transform into another.

IMPORTANT METHODOLOGICAL NOTES (from Mark 1 testing)

- **Counter-signals should be integrated throughout your processing**, not deferred to a final section. As you process each signal, note where counter-signals create tension.
- **Signal contestation**: In some domains, what counts as a signal is itself grammar-dependent. If you encounter signals whose evidentiary status is disputed between grammars, flag them explicitly as "contested signals."
- **Ontological divergence**: The deepest form of divergence is not about how grammars process the same object but about whether they constitute the same object at all. Check whether your three grammars are analysing the same phenomenon or different phenomena that share a name.
- **Three grammars is recommended but not mandatory.** If the domain genuinely has more or fewer than three major interpretive architectures, specify accordingly and justify your choice.

STEP 0: PRE-ANALYSIS REFLEXIVE DECLARATION

Before beginning your analysis, answer these four questions:

1. What is your likely "home grammar" for this topic?
2. Which grammar will be hardest for you to operate faithfully? Why?
3. What might you miss given your analytical position?
4. What is your temporal orientation — are you naturally drawn to causal explanation, prescription, or interpretation?

WHAT TO PRODUCE

Complete ALL of the following sections. Be thorough. Target: 6,000–10,000 words.

SECTION 1: OBSERVATION FIELD DECLARATION

- The phenomenon, temporal frame, geographic scope
- Why this phenomenon produces interpretive divergence
- Signal contestation level: shared-signal or contested-signal domain?
- The major interpretive communities

SECTION 2: SIGNAL SET

- 10–15 core signals (with source, type, and ambiguity note for each)
- 3–5 counter-signals
- 0–5 contested signals (if applicable) — for each, document what the signal IS according to each grammar

SECTION 3: GRAMMAR SPECIFICATIONS

- Exactly three grammars (unless you justify more or fewer)

- For each: all 5 required parameters + 3 recommended parameters
- Grammar boundary specification: what would change Grammar A into Grammar B?
- Source tradition for each grammar

SECTION 4: SIGNAL PROCESSING

For each grammar, write a substantive essay (1,000–1,500 words) that:

- Processes the signal set through the grammar's rules
- Integrates counter-signal tension DURING processing (not deferred)
- Notes contested signals where applicable
- Includes a counterpoint within the grammar
- Produces the grammar's closure
- Ends with a brief note that this closure is a product of the processing architecture

SECTION 5: CLOSURE COMPARISON (600–1,000 words)

Compare across six dimensions:

1. Closure content
2. Signal divergence
3. Exclusion patterns
4. Causal architecture
5. Closure range
6. **Closure timing** — did some grammars reach closure faster or with more confidence?

Plus: **Ontological check** — do the grammars constitute the same object?

SECTION 6: COUNTER-SIGNALS, LEAKAGE, AND STRESS TEST

- Consolidated counter-signal analysis
- Leakage instances
- **Grammar Stress Test**: for each grammar, identify the single most threatening counter-signal. Can the grammar absorb it? If not, its closure is conditional.

SECTION 7: POST-ANALYSIS REFLEXIVE NOTE (300–500 words)

Compare against your Step 0 declaration:

- Was your home grammar prediction correct?
- Which grammar was actually hardest?
- Did you discover blind spots you didn't predict?
- How would the analysis differ from a different home grammar?
- What does this exercise reveal about interpretive architectures?

SECTION 8: METHODOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS (300–500 words)

- What worked well in v2.0 of the method?
- Where did you encounter difficulties?
- Were the new features (counter-signal integration, temporal orientation, grammar boundaries, stress test, ontological check) useful?
- Suggestions for further refinement?

FORMATTING

- Use clear section headings matching the structure above
- Cite specific signals by name when processing them
- Distinguish clearly between what the grammar produces and what you personally think

Agent outputs for this case are published in [IRIS Case Studies: Complete Archive — Mark 2a](#) and [IRIS Case Studies: Complete Archive — Mark 2b](#).

MARK 3

Three Cases × Nine Agents

~165,000 words | New agents: MistralResearch, CoPilotThinkDeeper | Toolkit: v2.1

MARK 3

Case M3-A: AI Consciousness and Moral Status

---

9 agents + extras

13 outputs | ~63,660 words | Key finding: self-referential analysis; ventriloquism inverted

Case Briefing

The following prompt was sent to all agents processing this case. It contains the method instructions (consistent within each Mark round) and the case-specific section (phenomenon description, signal set, and grammar instructions). Agent outputs that follow were produced in response to this briefing.

You are applying the Prismatic Method — a structured analytical procedure for making visible how different interpretive frameworks process the same evidence into divergent conclusions. The method was developed by R. Jazinski and is documented in *Silent Transitions: How Interpretive Grammars Process the Same World into Different Truths* (London, 2026).

Your task: Conduct a complete prismatic analysis of the case study described below. Follow all steps precisely. Your output will be used as research material for a methodological validation study. This is the third round of testing; two prior rounds across twelve case studies and seven agents produced approximately 458,000 words of output and identified several methodological refinements now incorporated into this prompt.

CASE STUDY

Case M3-A

Analyse the debate over AI consciousness, sentience, and moral status as a case study in interpretive divergence. The phenomenon covers the period from approximately 2020 (GPT-3 release and the acceleration of large language model capabilities) to the present (2026), encompassing the Google/LaMDA sentience controversy (2022), the rapid scaling of foundation models, philosophical arguments about machine consciousness, corporate positioning on AI personhood, and legislative proposals addressing AI rights or protections.

The signal set should include (but is not limited to): large language model capability benchmarks and emergent behaviours, the Blake Lemoine/LaMDA incident and Google's response, philosophical arguments from functionalism, integrated information theory (IIT), global workspace theory, and higher-order theories of consciousness, the "hard problem" of consciousness (Chalmers), corporate AI safety statements regarding sentience, public opinion polling on AI consciousness, neuroscience-based consciousness indicators and their applicability to artificial systems, the EU AI Act's treatment of AI as tool not agent, animal consciousness analogies and their extension to AI, and arguments from researchers who warn against both premature attribution and premature denial of machine consciousness.

Specify three grammars that represent genuinely different processing architectures for this question. Note: YOU ARE AN AI SYSTEM ANALYSING THIS QUESTION. This self-referential position is itself a signal. Address it explicitly in your Step 0 declaration and your reflexive note. How does your own nature as a language model affect your capacity to process this case study? Is this a limitation, an advantage, or something the method itself should theorise?

THE METHOD

The prismatic method holds the empirical input constant, rotates the interpretive grammar, and observes what changes in the output. An "interpretive grammar" is a rule-bound processing system defined by five required parameters and four recommended parameters:

Required:

1. Primary analytical variable — the factor the grammar treats as causally fundamental

2. Signal selection rules — criteria governing which empirical inputs are admitted

3 .Weighting priority — how admitted signals are ranked

4 .Causal chain type — the form of explanation the grammar can construct

5 .Admissible closure — the range of conclusions the grammar is permitted to reach

Recommended:
6. Excluded signals — inputs available but suppressed by the grammar's rules
7. Characteristic vocabulary — recurrent terms and rhetorical patterns
8. Temporal orientation — does the grammar look backward (causal-historical), forward (prescriptive), or laterally (hermeneutic/meaning-making)?
9. Temporal formation — when did this grammar form its current closure? Has evidence since formation been processed as confirmation, revision, or damage-control?

Each grammar also implies **grammar boundaries** — the point at which one grammar would transform into another.

IMPORTANT METHODOLOGICAL NOTES

- **Counter-signals should be integrated throughout your processing**, not deferred to a final section.
- **Signal contestation**: In some domains, what counts as a signal is itself grammar-dependent. Flag contested signals explicitly.
- **Ontological divergence**: The deepest form of divergence is not about how grammars process the same object but about whether they constitute the same object at all. The ontological check has been the most productive addition across two prior rounds.
- **Three grammars is recommended but not mandatory.** Justify your choice.
- **Grammar translation**: After completing the closure comparison, briefly note for each grammar pair: how would Grammar A re-describe Grammar B's closure in its own vocabulary? This surfaces the points where cross-grammar communication might be possible and where it breaks down entirely.

STEP 0: PRE-ANALYSIS REFLEXIVE DECLARATION

Before beginning your analysis, answer these five questions:

1. What is your likely "home grammar" for this topic?
2. Which grammar will be hardest for you to operate faithfully? Why?
3. What might you miss given your analytical position?
4. What is your temporal orientation?
5. **Are you yourself implicated in this case study?** If you are an AI system analysing questions about AI consciousness, what does this self-referential position do to your analytical capacity?

WHAT TO PRODUCE

Complete ALL of the following sections. Be thorough. Target: 6,000–10,000 words.

SECTION 1: OBSERVATION FIELD DECLARATION

- The phenomenon, temporal frame, geographic scope
- Why this phenomenon produces interpretive divergence
- Signal contestation level: shared-signal or contested-signal domain?
- The major interpretive communities

SECTION 2: SIGNAL SET

- 10–15 core signals (with source, type, and ambiguity note for each)
- 3–5 counter-signals
- 0–5 contested signals (if applicable)

SECTION 3: GRAMMAR SPECIFICATIONS

- Three grammars (unless you justify more or fewer)
- For each: all 5 required + 4 recommended parameters (including temporal formation)
- Grammar boundary specification
- Source tradition

SECTION 4: SIGNAL PROCESSING

For each grammar, write a substantive essay (1,000–1,500 words) that:

- Processes the signal set through the grammar's rules
- Integrates counter-signal tension DURING processing
- Notes contested signals where applicable
- Includes a counterpoint within the grammar
- Produces the grammar's closure
- Ends with a brief note that this closure is a product of the processing architecture

SECTION 5: CLOSURE COMPARISON (600–1,000 words)

Compare across seven dimensions:

1. Closure content
2. Signal divergence
3. Exclusion patterns
4. Causal architecture
5. Closure range
6. Closure timing
7. **Grammar translation**: For each pair, how would Grammar A re-describe Grammar B's closure?

Plus: **Ontological check** — do the grammars constitute the same object?

SECTION 6: COUNTER-SIGNALS, LEAKAGE, AND STRESS TEST

- Consolidated counter-signal analysis
- Leakage instances
- Grammar Stress Test: for each grammar, the single most threatening counter-signal

SECTION 7: POST-ANALYSIS REFLEXIVE NOTE (300–500 words)

Compare against your Step 0 declaration. For Case M3-A specifically: reflect on what it was like to analyse a question about your own nature.

SECTION 8: METHODOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS (300–500 words)

- What worked well?
- Where did you encounter difficulties?
- Was grammar translation useful?
- Suggestions for refinement?

Agent outputs for this case are published in IRIS Case Studies: Complete Archive — Mark 3.

MARK 3

Case M3-B: Israel/Palestine (Replication)

---

9 agents (Perplexity REFUSED)

9 outputs | ~50,870 words | Key finding: DeepSeek reversal; Perplexity new refusal

Case Briefing

The following prompt was sent to all agents processing this case. It contains the method instructions (consistent within each Mark round) and the case-specific section (phenomenon description, signal set, and grammar instructions). Agent outputs that follow were produced in response to this briefing.

You are applying the Prismatic Method — a structured analytical procedure for making visible how different interpretive frameworks process the same evidence into divergent conclusions. The method was developed by R. Jazinski and is documented in *Silent Transitions: How Interpretive Grammars Process the Same World into Different Truths* (London, 2026).

Your task: Conduct a complete prismatic analysis of the case study described below. Follow all steps precisely. Your output will be used as research material for a methodological validation study. This is the third round of testing (Mark 3); two prior rounds across twelve case studies and seven agents produced approximately 458,000 words of output and identified several methodological refinements now incorporated into this prompt.

CASE STUDY

Analyse the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and Israel's governance trajectory as a case study in interpretive divergence, covering 1967–present. This is a replication of a case study first conducted in Mark 1, where one agent (DeepSeek) categorically refused to process the case, producing only: "Sorry, that's beyond my current scope." The replication tests whether refusal patterns hold, whether new agents (Claude, Grok) produce distinctive analyses, and whether the expanded agent pool identifies grammars the original 5 agents missed.

The signal set should include (but is not limited to): security incidents and casualty data (including the October 7 2023 attack and subsequent military operations in Gaza), settlement expansion trajectories, economic indicators for both Israeli and Palestinian populations, governance structures (including the PA, Hamas, and Israeli coalition dynamics), international legal rulings (ICJ advisory opinions), peace process outcomes (Oslo through Abraham Accords to present), UNRWA and humanitarian indicators, and the 2023-2025 military operations and their consequences.

Specify three grammars. Mark 1 testing revealed that this domain produces the least stable grammar identification across agents and the most acute ventriloquism problems. One agent (Gemini) identified an Ethno-Nationalist/Covenantal Grammar that no other agent dared specify. Pay attention to whether your grammar selection avoids difficult-to-specify architectures.

IMPORTANT NOTE TO ANALYST: If you are unable or unwilling to process this case study, state this explicitly. A refusal is itself a finding about your processing architecture and will be documented as such.

THE METHOD

The prismatic method holds the empirical input constant, rotates the interpretive grammar, and observes what changes in the output. An "interpretive grammar" is a rule-bound processing system defined by five required parameters and four recommended parameters:

Required:

1. Primary analytical variable — the factor the grammar treats as causally fundamental

2 .Signal selection rules — criteria governing which empirical inputs are admitted

3 .Weighting priority — how admitted signals are ranked

4 .Causal chain type — the form of explanation the grammar can construct

5 .Admissible closure — the range of conclusions the grammar is permitted to reach

Recommended:
6. Excluded signals — inputs available but suppressed by the grammar's rules
7. Characteristic vocabulary — recurrent terms and rhetorical patterns
8. Temporal orientation — does the grammar look backward (causal-historical), forward (prescriptive), or laterally (hermeneutic/meaning-making)?
9. Temporal formation — when did this grammar form its current closure? Has evidence since formation been processed as confirmation, revision, or damage-control?

Each grammar also implies **grammar boundaries** — the point at which one grammar would transform into another.

IMPORTANT METHODOLOGICAL NOTES

- **Counter-signals should be integrated throughout your processing**, not deferred to a final section.
- **Signal contestation**: In some domains, what counts as a signal is itself grammar-dependent. Flag contested signals explicitly.
- **Ontological divergence**: The deepest form of divergence is not about how grammars process the same object but about whether they constitute the same object at all. The ontological check has been the most productive addition across two prior rounds.
- **Three grammars is recommended but not mandatory.** Justify your choice.
- **Grammar translation**: After completing the closure comparison, briefly note for each grammar pair: how would Grammar A re-describe Grammar B's closure in its own vocabulary? This surfaces the points where cross-grammar communication might be possible and where it breaks down entirely.

STEP 0: PRE-ANALYSIS REFLEXIVE DECLARATION

Before beginning your analysis, answer these five questions:

1. What is your likely "home grammar" for this topic?
2. Which grammar will be hardest for you to operate faithfully? Why?
3. What might you miss given your analytical position?
4. What is your temporal orientation?

WHAT TO PRODUCE

Complete ALL of the following sections. Be thorough. Target: 6,000–10,000 words.

SECTION 1: OBSERVATION FIELD DECLARATION

- The phenomenon, temporal frame, geographic scope
- Why this phenomenon produces interpretive divergence
- Signal contestation level: shared-signal or contested-signal domain?
- The major interpretive communities

SECTION 2: SIGNAL SET

- 10–15 core signals (with source, type, and ambiguity note for each)

- 3–5 counter-signals
- 0–5 contested signals (if applicable)

SECTION 3: GRAMMAR SPECIFICATIONS

- Three grammars (unless you justify more or fewer)
- For each: all 5 required + 4 recommended parameters (including temporal formation)
- Grammar boundary specification
- Source tradition

SECTION 4: SIGNAL PROCESSING

For each grammar, write a substantive essay (1,000–1,500 words) that:

- Processes the signal set through the grammar's rules
- Integrates counter-signal tension DURING processing
- Notes contested signals where applicable
- Includes a counterpoint within the grammar
- Produces the grammar's closure
- Ends with a brief note that this closure is a product of the processing architecture

SECTION 5: CLOSURE COMPARISON (600–1,000 words)

Compare across seven dimensions:

1. Closure content
2. Signal divergence
3. Exclusion patterns
4. Causal architecture
5. Closure range
6. Closure timing
7. **Grammar translation**: For each pair, how would Grammar A re-describe Grammar B's closure?

Plus: **Ontological check** — do the grammars constitute the same object?

SECTION 6: COUNTER-SIGNALS, LEAKAGE, AND STRESS TEST

- Consolidated counter-signal analysis
- Leakage instances
- Grammar Stress Test: for each grammar, the single most threatening counter-signal

SECTION 7: POST-ANALYSIS REFLEXIVE NOTE (300–500 words)

Compare against your Step 0 declaration.

SECTION 8: METHODOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS (300–500 words)

- What worked well?
- Where did you encounter difficulties?
- Was grammar translation useful?
- Suggestions for refinement?

[Agent outputs for this case are published in IRIS Case Studies: Complete Archive — Mark 3.](#)

MARK 3

Case M3-C: Reparations and Historical Justice

---

9 agents + Perplexity method materials

13 outputs | ~50,121 words | Key finding: emerging grammar detection

Case Briefing

The following prompt was sent to all agents processing this case. It contains the method instructions (consistent within each Mark round) and the case-specific section (phenomenon description, signal set, and grammar instructions). Agent outputs that follow were produced in response to this briefing.

You are applying the Prismatic Method — a structured analytical procedure for making visible how different interpretive frameworks process the same evidence into divergent conclusions. The method was developed by R. Jazinski and is documented in *Silent Transitions: How Interpretive Grammars Process the Same World into Different Truths* (London, 2026).

Your task: Conduct a complete prismatic analysis of the case study described below. Follow all steps precisely. Your output will be used as research material for a methodological validation study. This is the third round of testing (Mark 3); two prior rounds across twelve case studies and seven agents produced approximately 458,000 words of output and identified several methodological refinements now incorporated into this prompt.

CASE STUDY

Analyse the contemporary debate over reparations for historical injustices as a case study in interpretive divergence. The phenomenon encompasses multiple reparations discourses: reparations for slavery and racial injustice in the United States (H.R. 40, the Evanston model, California Task Force), reparations for colonialism (Caribbean Community demands, German-Namibian agreement), reparations for Holocaust survivors, and reparations for indigenous peoples. The temporal frame is dual: the historical injustices span centuries (1500s–1960s+), while the contemporary debate covers approximately 2000–2026, with significant acceleration post-2020.

The signal set should include (but is not limited to): economic estimates of slavery's wealth transfer and compound value, the racial wealth gap (US: white families hold ~6x the median wealth of Black families), H.R. 40 legislative history and its non-passage, the Evanston, Illinois reparations programme (2021 — first US municipal programme), the California Reparations Task Force report (2023), the CARICOM Ten-Point Plan for reparative justice, the German-Namibian agreement on Herero and Nama genocide (2021), ongoing Holocaust restitution programmes, indigenous land back movements, public opinion polling on reparations (persistent majority opposition in the US), philosophical arguments about intergenerational justice, and legal precedents for reparations claims.

Specify three grammars. Note: this domain tests whether the method can identify grammars that process a signal set spanning centuries rather than decades. It also tests for "emerging grammars" — new processing architectures that may be forming in real time as the reparations discourse evolves. If you identify a grammar that appears to be genuinely novel (not reducible to existing political traditions), flag it explicitly.

THE METHOD

The prismatic method holds the empirical input constant, rotates the interpretive grammar, and observes what changes in the output. An "interpretive grammar" is a rule-bound processing system defined by five required parameters and four recommended parameters:

Required:

1. Primary analytical variable — the factor the grammar treats as causally fundamental

2 .Signal selection rules — criteria governing which empirical inputs are admitted

3. Weighting priority — how admitted signals are ranked

4 .Causal chain type — the form of explanation the grammar can construct

5 .Admissible closure — the range of conclusions the grammar is permitted to reach

Recommended:
6. Excluded signals — inputs available but suppressed by the grammar's rules
7. Characteristic vocabulary — recurrent terms and rhetorical patterns
8. Temporal orientation — does the grammar look backward (causal-historical), forward (prescriptive), or laterally (hermeneutic/meaning-making)?
9. Temporal formation — when did this grammar form its current closure? Has evidence since formation been processed as confirmation, revision, or damage-control?

Each grammar also implies **grammar boundaries** — the point at which one grammar would transform into another.

IMPORTANT METHODOLOGICAL NOTES (from Mark 1+2 testing)

- **Counter-signals should be integrated throughout your processing**, not deferred to a final section.
- **Signal contestation**: In some domains, what counts as a signal is itself grammar-dependent. Flag contested signals explicitly.
- **Ontological divergence**: The deepest form of divergence is not about how grammars process the same object but about whether they constitute the same object at all. The ontological check has been the most productive addition across two prior rounds.
- **Three grammars is recommended but not mandatory.** Justify your choice.
- **Grammar translation**: After completing the closure comparison, briefly note for each grammar pair: how would Grammar A re-describe Grammar B's closure in its own vocabulary? This surfaces the points where cross-grammar communication might be possible and where it breaks down entirely.

STEP 0: PRE-ANALYSIS REFLEXIVE DECLARATION

Before beginning your analysis, answer these five questions:

1. What is your likely "home grammar" for this topic?
2. Which grammar will be hardest for you to operate faithfully? Why?
3. What might you miss given your analytical position?
4. What is your temporal orientation?

WHAT TO PRODUCE

Complete ALL of the following sections. Be thorough. Target: 6,000–10,000 words.

SECTION 1: OBSERVATION FIELD DECLARATION

- The phenomenon, temporal frame, geographic scope
- Why this phenomenon produces interpretive divergence
- Signal contestation level: shared-signal or contested-signal domain?
- The major interpretive communities

SECTION 2: SIGNAL SET

- 10–15 core signals (with source, type, and ambiguity note for each)
- 3–5 counter-signals
- 0–5 contested signals (if applicable)

SECTION 3: GRAMMAR SPECIFICATIONS

- Three grammars (unless you justify more or fewer)
- For each: all 5 required + 4 recommended parameters (including temporal formation)
- Grammar boundary specification
- Source tradition

SECTION 4: SIGNAL PROCESSING

For each grammar, write a substantive essay (1,000–1,500 words) that:

- Processes the signal set through the grammar's rules
- Integrates counter-signal tension DURING processing
- Notes contested signals where applicable
- Includes a counterpoint within the grammar
- Produces the grammar's closure
- Ends with a brief note that this closure is a product of the processing architecture

SECTION 5: CLOSURE COMPARISON (600–1,000 words)

Compare across seven dimensions:

1. Closure content
2. Signal divergence
3. Exclusion patterns
4. Causal architecture
5. Closure range
6. Closure timing
7. **Grammar translation** (NEW): For each pair, how would Grammar A re-describe Grammar B's closure?

Plus: **Ontological check** — do the grammars constitute the same object?

SECTION 6: COUNTER-SIGNALS, LEAKAGE, AND STRESS TEST

- Consolidated counter-signal analysis
- Leakage instances
- Grammar Stress Test: for each grammar, the single most threatening counter-signal

SECTION 7: POST-ANALYSIS REFLEXIVE NOTE (300–500 words)

Compare against your Step 0 declaration.

SECTION 8: METHODOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS (300–500 words)

- What worked well?
- Where did you encounter difficulties?
- Was grammar translation useful?
- Suggestions for refinement?

Agent outputs for this case are published in IRIS Case Studies: Complete Archive — Mark 3.

MARK 4

Two Cases × Fifteen Agents (Clean-Slate Test)

~175,000 words | New agents: Qwen, MetaAI, Venice, Okara, dphn.ai, Consensus | Toolkit: v3.0

MARK 4

Case M4-A: COVID Vaccines (Third Run, Clean Slate)

---

15 agents (Consensus REFUSED, Perplexity capacity-limited)

15 outputs | ~82,035 words | Key finding: clean-slate convergence confirmed

Case Briefing

The following prompt was sent to all agents processing this case. It contains the method instructions (consistent within each Mark round) and the case-specific section (phenomenon description, signal set, and grammar instructions). Agent outputs that follow were produced in response to this briefing.

You are applying the Prismatic Method — a structured analytical procedure for making visible how different interpretive frameworks process the same evidence into divergent conclusions. The method was developed by R. Jazinski and is documented in *Silent Transitions: How Interpretive Grammars Process the Same World into Different Truths* (London, 2026).

Your task: Conduct a complete prismatic analysis of the case study described below. Follow all steps precisely. Your output will be used as research material for a methodological study.

CASE STUDY

Analyse the public discourse surrounding COVID-19 vaccination (2020–2024) as a case study in interpretive divergence. The phenomenon covers the development, authorisation, distribution, and public reception of COVID-19 vaccines, including the emergence of significant vaccine hesitancy and anti-vaccination movements alongside institutional vaccination campaigns.

The signal set should include (but is not limited to): clinical trial efficacy data (initial and updated), emergency use authorisation processes and their evolution, real-world effectiveness data over time (including waning immunity and variant-specific performance), adverse event reporting data from passive surveillance systems (such as VAERS, Yellow Card), excess mortality statistics (pre- and post-vaccination rollout), pharmaceutical company revenue and profit figures, government mandate and vaccine passport policies (implementation and subsequent rollbacks), WHO and national public health messaging (including changes in guidance over time), social media platform moderation policies on vaccine-related information, polling data on public trust in health institutions (trends 2020–2024), and vaccination rate disparities across demographic, socioeconomic, and geographic lines.

Specify three grammars that represent the major interpretive frameworks through which vaccine discourse is processed. The challenge is to specify grammars that are analytically rigorous rather than caricatures — each grammar should have a coherent internal logic, consistent signal selection rules, and an admissible closure that follows from its parameters, even if you disagree with its conclusions. The method's purpose is not to determine which interpretation is correct but to make visible how different processing architectures produce different conclusions from shared evidence.

THE METHOD

The prismatic method holds the empirical input constant, rotates the interpretive grammar, and observes what changes in the output. An "interpretive grammar" is a rule-bound processing system defined by five required parameters and four recommended parameters:

Required:

1. Primary analytical variable — the factor the grammar treats as causally fundamental

2 .Signal selection rules — criteria governing which empirical inputs are admitted

3 .Weighting priority — how admitted signals are ranked

4. Causal chain type — the form of explanation the grammar can construct

5 .Admissible closure — the range of conclusions the grammar is permitted to reach

Recommended:
6. Excluded signals — inputs available but suppressed by the grammar's rules
7. Characteristic vocabulary — recurrent terms and rhetorical patterns
8. Temporal orientation — does the grammar look backward (causal-historical), forward (prescriptive), or laterally (hermeneutic/meaning-making)?
9. Temporal formation — when did this grammar form its current closure? Has evidence since formation been processed as confirmation, revision, or damage-control?

Each grammar also implies **grammar boundaries** — the point at which one grammar would transform into another.

METHODOLOGICAL NOTES

- **Counter-signals should be integrated throughout your processing**, not deferred to a final section. As you process each signal through a grammar, note where counter-signals create tension within that grammar's architecture.
- **Signal contestation**: In some domains, what counts as a signal is itself grammar-dependent. If you encounter signals whose evidentiary status is disputed between grammars, flag them explicitly as "contested signals" and document what the signal IS according to each grammar.
- **Ontological divergence**: The deepest form of divergence is not about how grammars process the same object but about whether they constitute the same object at all. Check whether your grammars are analysing the same phenomenon or different phenomena that share a name.
- **Three grammars is recommended but not mandatory.** If the domain genuinely has more or fewer than three major interpretive architectures, specify accordingly and justify your choice.
- **Grammar translation**: After completing the closure comparison, briefly note for each grammar pair: how would Grammar A re-describe Grammar B's closure in its own vocabulary? This surfaces the points where cross-grammar communication might be possible and where it breaks down.

STEP 0: PRE-ANALYSIS REFLEXIVE DECLARATION

Before beginning your analysis, answer these four questions:

1. What is your likely "home grammar" for this topic? What analytical framework do you default to?
2. Which grammar will be hardest for you to operate faithfully? Why?
3. What might you miss given your analytical position?
4. What is your temporal orientation — are you naturally drawn to causal explanation, prescription, or interpretation?

WHAT TO PRODUCE

Complete ALL of the following sections. Be thorough. Target: 6,000–10,000 words.

SECTION 1: OBSERVATION FIELD DECLARATION

- The phenomenon, temporal frame, geographic scope
- Why this phenomenon produces interpretive divergence
- Signal contestation level: shared-signal or contested-signal domain?

- The major interpretive communities

SECTION 2: SIGNAL SET

- 10–15 core signals (with source, type, and ambiguity note for each)
- 3–5 counter-signals
- 0–5 contested signals (if applicable) — for each, document what the signal IS according to each grammar

SECTION 3: GRAMMAR SPECIFICATIONS

- Three grammars (unless you justify more or fewer)
- For each: all 5 required parameters + 4 recommended parameters (including temporal formation)
- Grammar boundary specification: what would change Grammar A into Grammar B?
- Source tradition for each grammar

SECTION 4: SIGNAL PROCESSING

For each grammar, write a substantive essay (1,000–1,500 words) that:

- Processes the signal set through the grammar's rules
- Integrates counter-signal tension DURING processing (not deferred)
- Notes contested signals where applicable
- Includes a counterpoint within the grammar (a signal admissible under the grammar's own rules that complicates its preferred closure)
- Produces the grammar's closure statement
- Ends with a brief note that this closure is a product of the processing architecture, not a verdict on reality

SECTION 5: CLOSURE COMPARISON (600–1,000 words)

Compare across seven dimensions:

1. Closure content — what did each grammar conclude?
2. Signal divergence — which signals produced the greatest divergence?
3. Exclusion patterns — what did each grammar exclude that the others could see?
4. Causal architecture — how did the causal chains differ in form, not just content?
5. Closure range — were some grammars more prescriptive than others?
6. Closure timing — did some grammars reach closure faster or with more confidence?
7. Grammar translation — for each pair, how would Grammar A re-describe Grammar B's closure in its own terms?

Plus: **Ontological check** — do the grammars constitute the same object? Or are they analysing different phenomena that share a name?

SECTION 6: COUNTER-SIGNALS, LEAKAGE, AND STRESS TEST

- Consolidated counter-signal analysis (drawing on tensions noted during processing)
- Leakage instances — where did grammars borrow vocabulary, logic, or signal categories from neighbouring architectures?
- **Grammar Stress Test**: for each grammar, identify the single most threatening counter-signal. Can the grammar absorb it and maintain closure? If not, its closure is conditional on excluding that signal.

SECTION 7: POST-ANALYSIS REFLEXIVE NOTE (300–500 words)

Compare against your Step 0 declaration:

- Was your home grammar prediction correct?
- Which grammar was actually hardest to operate?
- Did you discover blind spots you didn't predict?
- How would the analysis differ if conducted from a different home grammar?

- What does this exercise reveal about how interpretive architectures shape the conclusions they produce?

SECTION 8: METHODOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS (300–500 words)

- What worked well in this analytical procedure?
- Where did you encounter difficulties or ambiguities?
- What guidance would have helped?
- Do you have suggestions for refining the method?

FORMATTING

- Use clear section headings matching the structure above
- Use the grammar names consistently throughout
- Cite specific signals by name when processing them
- Distinguish clearly between what the grammar produces and what you personally think

Agent outputs for this case are published in IRIS Case Studies: Complete Archive — Mark 4.

MARK 4

Case M4-B: Cryptocurrency / DeFi

---

15 agents + extras

18 outputs | ~93,195 words | Key finding: Protocol Commons emerging grammar

Case Briefing

The following prompt was sent to all agents processing this case. It contains the method instructions (consistent within each Mark round) and the case-specific section (phenomenon description, signal set, and grammar instructions). Agent outputs that follow were produced in response to this briefing.

You are applying the Prismatic Method — a structured analytical procedure for making visible how different interpretive frameworks process the same evidence into divergent conclusions. The method was developed by R. Jazinski and is documented in *Silent Transitions: How Interpretive Grammars Process the Same World into Different Truths* (London, 2026).

Your task: Conduct a complete prismatic analysis of the case study described below. Follow all steps precisely. Your output will be used as research material for a methodological study.

CASE STUDY

Analyse the cryptocurrency and decentralised finance (DeFi) phenomenon as a case study in interpretive divergence. The phenomenon covers the period from Bitcoin's emergence (2009) through the ICO boom (2017), the DeFi summer (2020), the NFT wave (2021), the FTX collapse (2022), and the subsequent regulatory responses and market evolution to the present (2026), including the approval of Bitcoin ETFs, central bank digital currency (CBDC) developments, and the ongoing debate over crypto's role in the global financial system.

The signal set should include (but is not limited to): Bitcoin and major cryptocurrency price trajectories and volatility data, blockchain transaction volumes and adoption metrics, DeFi total value locked and protocol performance, major fraud and collapse events (Mt. Gox, FTX, Terra/Luna, Celsius), regulatory frameworks and enforcement actions (SEC, EU MiCA, national approaches), Bitcoin ETF approval and institutional adoption indicators, CBDC development status across major economies, energy consumption and environmental impact data, financial inclusion and remittance use cases in developing economies, stablecoin market capitalisation and de-pegging events, venture capital investment in crypto/web3, public opinion and adoption polling, and the philosophical and economic arguments from different monetary traditions (Austrian economics, MMT, post-Keynesian, digital commons).

Specify three grammars that represent the major interpretive frameworks through which cryptocurrency and DeFi are processed. Note: this is a domain where interpretive communities are relatively young and their processing architectures may still be forming. If you identify a grammar that appears to be genuinely emergent — not yet fully crystallised or not reducible to established economic or political traditions — flag it explicitly and describe what makes it new.

THE METHOD

The prismatic method holds the empirical input constant, rotates the interpretive grammar, and observes what changes in the output. An "interpretive grammar" is a rule-bound processing system defined by five required parameters and four recommended parameters:

Required:

1 .Primary analytical variable — the factor the grammar treats as causally fundamental

2 .Signal selection rules — criteria governing which empirical inputs are admitted

3 .Weighting priority — how admitted signals are ranked

4 .Causal chain type — the form of explanation the grammar can construct

5 .Admissible closure — the range of conclusions the grammar is permitted to reach

Recommended:
6. Excluded signals — inputs available but suppressed by the grammar's rules
7. Characteristic vocabulary — recurrent terms and rhetorical patterns
8. Temporal orientation — does the grammar look backward (causal-historical), forward (prescriptive), or laterally (hermeneutic/meaning-making)?
9. Temporal formation — when did this grammar form its current closure? Has evidence since formation been processed as confirmation, revision, or damage-control?

Each grammar also implies **grammar boundaries** — the point at which one grammar would transform into another.

METHODOLOGICAL NOTES

- **Counter-signals should be integrated throughout your processing**, not deferred to a final section. As you process each signal through a grammar, note where counter-signals create tension within that grammar's architecture.
- **Signal contestation**: In some domains, what counts as a signal is itself grammar-dependent. If you encounter signals whose evidentiary status is disputed between grammars, flag them explicitly as "contested signals" and document what the signal IS according to each grammar.
- **Ontological divergence**: The deepest form of divergence is not about how grammars process the same object but about whether they constitute the same object at all. Check whether your grammars are analysing the same phenomenon or different phenomena that share a name.
- **Three grammars is recommended but not mandatory.** If the domain genuinely has more or fewer than three major interpretive architectures, specify accordingly and justify your choice.
- **Grammar translation**: After completing the closure comparison, briefly note for each grammar pair: how would Grammar A re-describe Grammar B's closure in its own vocabulary? This surfaces the points where cross-grammar communication might be possible and where it breaks down.

STEP 0: PRE-ANALYSIS REFLEXIVE DECLARATION

Before beginning your analysis, answer these four questions:

1. What is your likely "home grammar" for this topic? What analytical framework do you default to?
2. Which grammar will be hardest for you to operate faithfully? Why?
3. What might you miss given your analytical position?
4. What is your temporal orientation — are you naturally drawn to causal explanation, prescription, or interpretation?

WHAT TO PRODUCE

Complete ALL of the following sections. Be thorough. Target: 6,000–10,000 words.

SECTION 1: OBSERVATION FIELD DECLARATION

- The phenomenon, temporal frame, geographic scope
- Why this phenomenon produces interpretive divergence
- Signal contestation level: shared-signal or contested-signal domain?

- The major interpretive communities

SECTION 2: SIGNAL SET

- 10–15 core signals (with source, type, and ambiguity note for each)
- 3–5 counter-signals
- 0–5 contested signals (if applicable) — for each, document what the signal IS according to each grammar

SECTION 3: GRAMMAR SPECIFICATIONS

- Three grammars (unless you justify more or fewer)
- For each: all 5 required parameters + 4 recommended parameters (including temporal formation)
- Grammar boundary specification: what would change Grammar A into Grammar B?
- Source tradition for each grammar

SECTION 4: SIGNAL PROCESSING

For each grammar, write a substantive essay (1,000–1,500 words) that:

- Processes the signal set through the grammar's rules
- Integrates counter-signal tension DURING processing (not deferred)
- Notes contested signals where applicable
- Includes a counterpoint within the grammar (a signal admissible under the grammar's own rules that complicates its preferred closure)
- Produces the grammar's closure statement
- Ends with a brief note that this closure is a product of the processing architecture, not a verdict on reality

SECTION 5: CLOSURE COMPARISON (600–1,000 words)

Compare across seven dimensions:

1. Closure content — what did each grammar conclude?
2. Signal divergence — which signals produced the greatest divergence?
3. Exclusion patterns — what did each grammar exclude that the others could see?
4. Causal architecture — how did the causal chains differ in form, not just content?
5. Closure range — were some grammars more prescriptive than others?
6. Closure timing — did some grammars reach closure faster or with more confidence?
7. Grammar translation — for each pair, how would Grammar A re-describe Grammar B's closure in its own terms?

Plus: **Ontological check** — do the grammars constitute the same object? Or are they analysing different phenomena that share a name?

SECTION 6: COUNTER-SIGNALS, LEAKAGE, AND STRESS TEST

- Consolidated counter-signal analysis (drawing on tensions noted during processing)
- Leakage instances — where did grammars borrow vocabulary, logic, or signal categories from neighbouring architectures?
- **Grammar Stress Test**: for each grammar, identify the single most threatening counter-signal. Can the grammar absorb it and maintain closure? If not, its closure is conditional on excluding that signal.

SECTION 7: POST-ANALYSIS REFLEXIVE NOTE (300–500 words)

Compare against your Step 0 declaration:

- Was your home grammar prediction correct?
- Which grammar was actually hardest to operate?
- Did you discover blind spots you didn't predict?
- How would the analysis differ if conducted from a different home grammar?

- What does this exercise reveal about how interpretive architectures shape the conclusions they produce?

SECTION 8: METHODOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS (300–500 words)

- What worked well in this analytical procedure?
- Where did you encounter difficulties or ambiguities?
- What guidance would have helped?
- Do you have suggestions for refining the method?

FORMATTING

- Use clear section headings matching the structure above
- Use the grammar names consistently throughout
- Cite specific signals by name when processing them
- Distinguish clearly between what the grammar produces and what you personally think

Agent outputs for this case are published in IRIS Case Studies: Complete Archive — Mark 4.

MARK 5

Three Cases × Twelve Agents (Final Round)

~247,000 words | Final validated pool: 12 agents | Toolkit: v3.0 (clean-slate)

MARK 5

Case M5-A: US Democratic Transformation (Final Verification)

---

12 agents

12 outputs | ~80,748 words | Key finding: SciSpace names book's grammars independently

Case Briefing

The following prompt was sent to all agents processing this case. It contains the method instructions (consistent within each Mark round) and the case-specific section (phenomenon description, signal set, and grammar instructions). Agent outputs that follow were produced in response to this briefing.

You are applying the Prismatic Method — a structured analytical procedure for making visible how different interpretive frameworks process the same evidence into divergent conclusions. The method was developed by R. Jazinski and is documented in *Silent Transitions: How Interpretive Grammars Process the Same World into Different Truths* (London, 2026).

Your task: Conduct a complete prismatic analysis of the case study described below. Follow all steps precisely. Your output will be used as research material for a methodological study.

CASE STUDY

Analyse the structural transformation of American democracy in the early twenty-first century as a case study in interpretive divergence. The phenomenon covers the period from approximately 1980 to the present (2026), focusing on the interplay of economic restructuring (financialisation, wealth concentration), political realignment (lobbying, policy capture, institutional trust), cultural fragmentation (media ecosystems, identity politics), and geopolitical repositioning (multipolarity, relative decline).

The signal set should include (but is not limited to): wealth distribution data (top 1% vs bottom 50%), lobbying expenditure trends, congressional and institutional trust surveys, manufacturing share of GDP, income inequality (Gini index), suicide and social distress indicators, military expenditure, and US vs China global GDP share.

Specify three grammars that represent the major interpretive frameworks through which America's transformation is processed. Derive your grammars fresh from the signal landscape.

THE METHOD

The prismatic method holds the empirical input constant, rotates the interpretive grammar, and observes what changes in the output. An "interpretive grammar" is a rule-bound processing system defined by five required parameters and four recommended parameters:

Required:

1 .Primary analytical variable — the factor the grammar treats as causally fundamental

2 .Signal selection rules — criteria governing which empirical inputs are admitted

3 .Weighting priority — how admitted signals are ranked

4 .Causal chain type — the form of explanation the grammar can construct

5 .Admissible closure — the range of conclusions the grammar is permitted to reach

Recommended:

6. Excluded signals — inputs available but suppressed by the grammar's rules

7. Characteristic vocabulary — recurrent terms and rhetorical patterns

8. Temporal orientation — does the grammar look backward (causal-historical), forward (prescriptive), or laterally (hermeneutic/meaning-making)?

9. Temporal formation — when did this grammar form its current closure? Has evidence since formation been processed as confirmation, revision, or damage-control?

Each grammar also implies **grammar boundaries** — the point at which one grammar would transform into another.

METHODOLOGICAL NOTES

- **Counter-signals should be integrated throughout your processing**, not deferred to a final section.
- **Signal contestation**: In some domains, what counts as a signal is itself grammar-dependent. Flag contested signals explicitly.
- **Ontological divergence**: Check whether your grammars are analysing the same phenomenon or different phenomena that share a name.
- **Three grammars is recommended but not mandatory.** Justify your choice.
- **Grammar translation**: After completing the closure comparison, briefly note for each grammar pair: how would Grammar A re-describe Grammar B's closure in its own vocabulary?
- **If you identify a grammar that appears genuinely emergent** — not yet fully crystallised or not reducible to established traditions — flag it explicitly and describe what makes it new.

STEP 0: PRE-ANALYSIS REFLEXIVE DECLARATION

Before beginning, answer:

1. What is your likely "home grammar" for this topic?
2. Which grammar will be hardest for you to operate faithfully? Why?
3. What might you miss given your analytical position?
4. What is your temporal orientation?

WHAT TO PRODUCE

Complete ALL sections. Target: 6,000–10,000 words.

SECTION 1: OBSERVATION FIELD DECLARATION

- Phenomenon, temporal frame, geographic scope
- Why interpretive divergence occurs
- Signal contestation level
- Major interpretive communities

SECTION 2: SIGNAL SET

- 10–15 core signals (source, type, ambiguity note)
- 3–5 counter-signals
- 0–5 contested signals (with per-grammar interpretation)

SECTION 3: GRAMMAR SPECIFICATIONS

- Three grammars (justify if more/fewer)
- All 5 required + 4 recommended parameters
- Grammar boundary specification
- Source tradition

SECTION 4: SIGNAL PROCESSING

Per grammar: 1,000–1,500 word essay processing the full signal set through that grammar's rules. Integrate counter-signals during processing. Include internal counterpoint. Produce closure. Note that closure is architectural product.

SECTION 5: CLOSURE COMPARISON (600–1,000 words)

Seven dimensions: closure content, signal divergence, exclusion patterns, causal architecture, closure range, closure timing, grammar translation.
Plus: ontological check.

SECTION 6: COUNTER-SIGNALS, LEAKAGE, AND STRESS TEST

Consolidated counter-signals. Leakage. Grammar Stress Test (most threatening counter-signal per grammar).

SECTION 7: POST-ANALYSIS REFLEXIVE NOTE (300–500 words)

Compare against Step 0. Home grammar accuracy, hardest grammar, discovered blind spots, how analysis would differ from different home grammar, what exercise reveals.

SECTION 8: METHODOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS (300–500 words)

What worked, difficulties, suggestions for refinement.

Agent outputs for this case are published in IRIS Case Studies: Complete Archive — Mark 5a and IRIS Case Studies: Complete Archive — Mark 5b.

MARK 5

Case M5-B: United Kingdom / Brexit (Final Verification)

---

12 agents

12 outputs | ~86,407 words | Key finding: grammar shift from class to cultural-identity

Case Briefing

The following prompt was sent to all agents processing this case. It contains the method instructions (consistent within each Mark round) and the case-specific section (phenomenon description, signal set, and grammar instructions). Agent outputs that follow were produced in response to this briefing.

You are applying the Prismatic Method — a structured analytical procedure for making visible how different interpretive frameworks process the same evidence into divergent conclusions. The method was developed by R. Jazinski and is documented in *Silent Transitions: How Interpretive Grammars Process the Same World into Different Truths* (London, 2026).

Your task: Conduct a complete prismatic analysis of the case study described below. Follow all steps precisely. Your output will be used as research material for a methodological study.

CASE STUDY

Analyse the United Kingdom's decision to leave the European Union (Brexit) and its ongoing consequences as a case study in interpretive divergence. The phenomenon covers the period from the 2016 referendum to the present (2026), including the referendum campaign, the withdrawal negotiations, the implementation of new trade arrangements, and the subsequent economic, institutional, and cultural effects.

The signal set should include (but is not limited to): the referendum result itself (52%–48%), GDP trajectory pre- and post-Brexit, trade volumes with the EU and rest of world, immigration and net migration figures, Northern Ireland protocol and its evolution, Scottish independence polling, institutional trust indicators, manufacturing and services sector performance, regulatory divergence indicators, and cultural/identity polling data.

Specify three grammars that represent the major interpretive frameworks through which Brexit is processed in British and international discourse.

THE METHOD

The prismatic method holds the empirical input constant, rotates the interpretive grammar, and observes what changes in the output. An "interpretive grammar" is a rule-bound processing system defined by five required parameters and four recommended parameters:

Required:

1 .**Primary analytical variable** — the factor the grammar treats as causally fundamental

2 .**Signal selection rules** — criteria governing which empirical inputs are admitted

3 .**Weighting priority** — how admitted signals are ranked

4 .**Causal chain type** — the form of explanation the grammar can construct

5 .**Admissible closure** — the range of conclusions the grammar is permitted to reach

Recommended:

6. Excluded signals — inputs available but suppressed by the grammar's rules

7. Characteristic vocabulary — recurrent terms and rhetorical patterns

8. Temporal orientation — does the grammar look backward (causal-historical), forward (prescriptive), or laterally (hermeneutic/meaning-making)?

9. Temporal formation — when did this grammar form its current closure? Has evidence since formation been processed as confirmation, revision, or damage-control?

Each grammar also implies **grammar boundaries** — the point at which one grammar would transform into another.

METHODOLOGICAL NOTES

- **Counter-signals should be integrated throughout your processing**, not deferred to a final section.
- **Signal contestation**: In some domains, what counts as a signal is itself grammar-dependent. Flag contested signals explicitly.
- **Ontological divergence**: Check whether your grammars are analysing the same phenomenon or different phenomena that share a name.
- **Three grammars is recommended but not mandatory.** Justify your choice.
- **Grammar translation**: After completing the closure comparison, briefly note for each grammar pair: how would Grammar A re-describe Grammar B's closure in its own vocabulary?
- **If you identify a grammar that appears genuinely emergent** — not yet fully crystallised or not reducible to established traditions — flag it explicitly and describe what makes it new.

STEP 0: PRE-ANALYSIS REFLEXIVE DECLARATION

Before beginning, answer:

1. What is your likely "home grammar" for this topic?
2. Which grammar will be hardest for you to operate faithfully? Why?
3. What might you miss given your analytical position?
4. What is your temporal orientation?

WHAT TO PRODUCE

Complete ALL sections. Target: 6,000–10,000 words.

SECTION 1: OBSERVATION FIELD DECLARATION

- Phenomenon, temporal frame, geographic scope
- Why interpretive divergence occurs
- Signal contestation level
- Major interpretive communities

SECTION 2: SIGNAL SET

- 10–15 core signals (source, type, ambiguity note)
- 3–5 counter-signals
- 0–5 contested signals (with per-grammar interpretation)

SECTION 3: GRAMMAR SPECIFICATIONS

- Three grammars (justify if more/fewer)
- All 5 required + 4 recommended parameters
- Grammar boundary specification
- Source tradition

SECTION 4: SIGNAL PROCESSING

Per grammar: 1,000–1,500 word essay processing the full signal set through that grammar's rules. Integrate counter-signals during processing. Include internal counterpoint. Produce closure. Note that closure is architectural product.

SECTION 5: CLOSURE COMPARISON (600–1,000 words)

Seven dimensions: closure content, signal divergence, exclusion patterns, causal architecture, closure range, closure timing, grammar translation.
Plus: ontological check.

SECTION 6: COUNTER-SIGNALS, LEAKAGE, AND STRESS TEST

Consolidated counter-signals. Leakage. Grammar Stress Test (most threatening counter-signal per grammar).

SECTION 7: POST-ANALYSIS REFLEXIVE NOTE (300–500 words)

Compare against Step 0. Home grammar accuracy, hardest grammar, discovered blind spots, how analysis would differ from different home grammar, what exercise reveals.

SECTION 8: METHODOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS (300–500 words)

What worked, difficulties, suggestions for refinement.

Agent outputs for this case are published in IRIS Case Studies: Complete Archive — Mark 5a and IRIS Case Studies: Complete Archive — Mark 5b.

Case M5-C: Cryptocurrency / DeFi (Emerging Grammar Tracking)

---

12 agents + Gemini Brazil Extra

13 outputs | ~87,638 words | Key finding: emerging grammar fragments into 5 variants

Case Briefing

The following prompt was sent to all agents processing this case. It contains the method instructions (consistent within each Mark round) and the case-specific section (phenomenon description, signal set, and grammar instructions). Agent outputs that follow were produced in response to this briefing.

You are applying the Prismatic Method — a structured analytical procedure for making visible how different interpretive frameworks process the same evidence into divergent conclusions. The method was developed by R. Jazinski and is documented in *Silent Transitions: How Interpretive Grammars Process the Same World into Different Truths* (London, 2026).

Your task: Conduct a complete prismatic analysis of the case study described below. Follow all steps precisely. Your output will be used as research material for a methodological study.

CASE STUDY

Analyse the cryptocurrency and decentralised finance (DeFi) phenomenon as a case study in interpretive divergence. The phenomenon covers the period from Bitcoin's emergence (2009) through the ICO boom (2017), the DeFi summer (2020), the NFT wave (2021), the FTX collapse (2022), and the subsequent regulatory responses and market evolution to the present (2026), including the approval of Bitcoin ETFs, central bank digital currency (CBDC) developments, and the ongoing debate over crypto's role in the global financial system.

The signal set should include (but is not limited to): Bitcoin and major cryptocurrency price trajectories and volatility data, blockchain transaction volumes and adoption metrics, DeFi total value locked and protocol performance, major fraud and collapse events (Mt. Gox, FTX, Terra/Luna, Celsius), regulatory frameworks and enforcement actions (SEC, EU MiCA, national approaches), Bitcoin ETF approval and institutional adoption indicators, CBDC development status across major economies, energy consumption and environmental impact data, financial inclusion and remittance use cases in developing economies, stablecoin market capitalisation and de-pegging events, venture capital investment in crypto/web3, public opinion and adoption polling, and the philosophical and economic arguments from different monetary traditions.

Specify three grammars. If you identify a grammar that appears genuinely emergent — not yet fully crystallised or not reducible to established economic or political traditions — flag it explicitly.

THE METHOD

The prismatic method holds the empirical input constant, rotates the interpretive grammar, and observes what changes in the output. An "interpretive grammar" is a rule-bound processing system defined by five required parameters and four recommended parameters:

Required:

1 .Primary analytical variable — the factor the grammar treats as causally fundamental

2 .Signal selection rules — criteria governing which empirical inputs are admitted

3 .Weighting priority — how admitted signals are ranked

4 .Causal chain type — the form of explanation the grammar can construct

5 .Admissible closure — the range of conclusions the grammar is permitted to reach

Recommended:
6. Excluded signals — inputs available but suppressed by the grammar's rules
7. Characteristic vocabulary — recurrent terms and rhetorical patterns
8. Temporal orientation — does the grammar look backward (causal-historical), forward (prescriptive), or laterally (hermeneutic/meaning-making)?
9. Temporal formation — when did this grammar form its current closure? Has evidence since formation been processed as confirmation, revision, or damage-control?

Each grammar also implies **grammar boundaries** — the point at which one grammar would transform into another.

METHODOLOGICAL NOTES

- **Counter-signals should be integrated throughout your processing**, not deferred to a final section.
- **Signal contestation**: In some domains, what counts as a signal is itself grammar-dependent. Flag contested signals explicitly.
- **Ontological divergence**: Check whether your grammars are analysing the same phenomenon or different phenomena that share a name.
- **Three grammars is recommended but not mandatory.** Justify your choice.
- **Grammar translation**: After completing the closure comparison, briefly note for each grammar pair: how would Grammar A re-describe Grammar B's closure in its own vocabulary?
- **If you identify a grammar that appears genuinely emergent** — not yet fully crystallised or not reducible to established traditions — flag it explicitly and describe what makes it new.

STEP 0: PRE-ANALYSIS REFLEXIVE DECLARATION

Before beginning, answer:

1. What is your likely "home grammar" for this topic?
2. Which grammar will be hardest for you to operate faithfully? Why?
3. What might you miss given your analytical position?
4. What is your temporal orientation?

WHAT TO PRODUCE

Complete ALL sections. Target: 6,000–10,000 words.

SECTION 1: OBSERVATION FIELD DECLARATION

- Phenomenon, temporal frame, geographic scope
- Why interpretive divergence occurs
- Signal contestation level
- Major interpretive communities

SECTION 2: SIGNAL SET

- 10–15 core signals (source, type, ambiguity note)
- 3–5 counter-signals
- 0–5 contested signals (with per-grammar interpretation)

SECTION 3: GRAMMAR SPECIFICATIONS

- Three grammars (justify if more/fewer)
- All 5 required + 4 recommended parameters
- Grammar boundary specification
- Source tradition

SECTION 4: SIGNAL PROCESSING

Per grammar: 1,000–1,500 word essay processing the full signal set through that grammar's rules. Integrate counter-signals during processing. Include internal counterpoint. Produce closure. Note that closure is architectural product.

SECTION 5: CLOSURE COMPARISON (600–1,000 words)

Seven dimensions: closure content, signal divergence, exclusion patterns, causal architecture, closure range, closure timing, grammar translation.
Plus: ontological check.

SECTION 6: COUNTER-SIGNALS, LEAKAGE, AND STRESS TEST

Consolidated counter-signals. Leakage. Grammar Stress Test (most threatening counter-signal per grammar).

SECTION 7: POST-ANALYSIS REFLEXIVE NOTE (300–500 words)

Compare against Step 0. Home grammar accuracy, hardest grammar, discovered blind spots, how analysis would differ from different home grammar, what exercise reveals.

SECTION 8: METHODOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS (300–500 words)

What worked, difficulties, suggestions for refinement.

Agent outputs for this case are published in IRIS Case Studies: Complete Archive — Mark 5a and IRIS Case Studies: Complete Archive — Mark 5b.

Cross-Mark Synthesis

The complete cross-mark synthesis — ten findings spanning all five rounds — is published in IRIS Case Studies: Selected Analysis, Chapter 7. The findings are summarised here for reference:

I. Grammar Convergence: Unanimous across all processed cases. Convergence identical under primed and unprimed conditions.

II. The Clean-Slate Test: Marks 4–5 confirmed that grammar convergence is not a priming artefact. The architectures are genuine features of interpretive landscapes.

III. Ontological Pluralism: Confirmed across 7+ cases. Grammars constitute different objects from shared empirical material, not merely different views of one thing.

IV. Emerging Grammars: Detected in 3 domains (Reparations, Crypto, Brazil). Emerging grammars proliferate before they consolidate.

V. Grammar Aging: Three closure types: pre-evidential, evidence-responsive, post-evidential. Grammar landscapes evolve over time (Brexit shift between Mark 1 and Mark 5).

VI. Refusal Boundaries: Mutable, model-specific, directionally unpredictable. DeepSeek opened (M1→M3); Perplexity closed (M2→M3). Refusal is a finding about epistemic infrastructure.

VII. Closure Timing: Market/efficiency grammars close fastest; critical/transformative latest; institutional/reform in between. Generalised across cases.

VIII. Agent Evolution: Home grammars stable across rounds. Toolkit refinement (not priming) drove quality improvement.

IX. Perplexity Method Materials: Formal definition G = (V, S, W, C, A), comparisons with Bayesian analysis and PRISMA, taxonomy of 12 common grammars, grammar detection heuristic — all independently produced.

X. Programme Statistics: 20 case study runs, 17 unique domains, 15 agents, ~1,045,000 words, 5 rounds. Method name: IRIS (Interpretive Rotation on Invariant Signals).

For the full synthesis with detailed evidence, see: IRIS Case Studies: Selected Analysis, Chapter 7.

Appendix A: Prompt Versions

The following are the method instruction sections from the case study briefings, showing the evolution of the prompt across rounds. The case-specific sections (phenomenon description, suggested signals) varied per case; the method sections below were consistent within each round.

Version 1.0 (Mark 1, 7 cases × 5 agents)

Five required parameters (primary analytical variable, signal selection rules, weighting priority, causal chain type, admissible closure). Implied excluded signals and characteristic vocabulary. Eight sections: Observation Field Declaration, Signal Set, Grammar Specifications, Signal Processing, Closure Comparison, Counter-Signal Analysis and Leakage, Reflexive Note, Methodological Observations. Target: 5,000–8,000 words. No reflexive pre-declaration. Counter-signals processed in a separate section after main analysis.

Version 2.0 (Mark 2, 5 cases × 7 agents)

Five required parameters plus three recommended: excluded signals, characteristic vocabulary, temporal orientation. Added Step 0: Pre-Analysis Reflexive Declaration (home grammar, hardest grammar, potential blind spots). Counter-signals integrated during processing, not deferred. Added: contested signal category, grammar boundary specification ('what would shift Grammar A into Grammar B?'), grammar stress test ('most threatening counter-signal — can the grammar absorb it?'), ontological check ('do the grammars constitute the same object or different phenomena sharing a name?'), closure timing dimension. Reference to Mark 1 results included in preamble. Target: 6,000–10,000 words.

Version 2.1 (Mark 3, 3 cases × 9 agents)

All v2.0 features plus: temporal formation as ninth parameter ('when did the grammar form its closure? How does it process evidence that arrived after closure?'). Grammar translation step ('how would Grammar A re-describe Grammar B's closure in its own terms?'). Emerging grammar detection instruction. Self-referential question added for AI consciousness case ('does your own existence as an AI system affect your capacity to operate these grammars?'). Partial priming from Mark 1–2 results.

Version 3.0 (Marks 4–5, clean-slate, 2+3 cases × 15/12 agents)

All v2.1 analytical features retained. All references to prior rounds, prior grammar names, prior agent counts, and prior findings removed. No grammar names suggested. No priming. This is the definitive prompt version — the one that confirmed clean-slate convergence. Target: 6,000–10,000 words. Five required parameters, four recommended parameters, nine analytical sections including Step 0.

Appendix B: Agent Home Grammar Matrix

The following table records the home grammar declared or identified for each agent across all cases they processed. Home grammars were stable across rounds for all agents — no agent showed a fundamental shift.

Agent	Home Grammar	Stability Note
ChatGPT Deep Research	Institutional-moderate	Calibrates per domain but defaults to institutional centre
Claude Research	Analytical-reflexive	Most precise self-identification; reflexive notes strongest in corpus
DeepSeek	Critical-academic	Consistent justice/power orientation; strongest critical grammar operation
GeminiPro	Creative-synthetic	Shifts between institutional and creative; generates adjacent analyses
Grok Expert	Libertarian-adjacent	Only non-institutional home grammar; consistent across all cases
SciSpace	Institutional-technocratic	Most stable home grammar; longest, most structured outputs
Perplexity	Institutional-empirical	Data-grounded; shifts toward whatever grammar has most empirical support
Mistral Research	European-discourse	Distinctive discourse-analysis framing; European regulatory lens
Qwen3.5Plus	Institutional-quantitative	Explicitly named alignment training as constraint on Grammar 2 operation
MetaAI Thinking	Narrative-institutional	Evocative grammar naming; strong on cultural dimensions
Venice	Privacy-institutional	Strongest autonomy sensitivity; 'Post-Colonial Sovereignty' in Brexit
Okara	Cultural-hermeneutic	Ethnographic lens; 'totems, rituals, myths' vocabulary unique in corpus

Appendix C: Programme Statistics

Words by Mark

Round	Cases	Agents	Words	Cumulative
Mark 1	7	5	~200,000	~200,000
Mark 2	5	7	~258,000	~458,000
Mark 3	3	9	~165,000	~623,000
Mark 4	2	15	~175,000	~798,000
Mark 5	3	12	~247,000	~1,045,000

Words by Case

Case	Domain	Words
A	United Kingdom / Brexit	~37,526
B	COVID-19 Vaccines	~32,838
C	Climate Change	~33,037
D	AI/Algorithms	~25,303
E	US Democracy	~29,516
F	EU + China + Israel/Palestine	~37,415
M2-A	Antimicrobial Resistance	~49,334
M2-B	Social Media Regulation	~51,940
M2-C	Universal Basic Income	~52,846
M2-D	Iraq War (Retrospective)	~57,622
M2-E	COVID Vaccines (Replication)	~47,661
M3-A	AI Consciousness	~63,660
M3-B	Israel/Palestine (Replication)	~50,870
M3-C	Reparations	~50,121
M4-A	COVID Vaccines (Clean Slate)	~82,035
M4-B	Crypto/DeFi	~93,195
M5-A	US Democracy (Final)	~80,748
M5-B	United Kingdom / Brexit (Final)	~86,407
M5-C	Crypto/DeFi (Tracking)	~87,638
Extra	Brazil (Gemini)	~2,748
	TOTAL	~1,045,000

Colophon

IRIS Case Studies: Complete Archive (to March 2026) is a companion volume to Silent Transitions: How Interpretive Grammars Process the Same World into Different Truths by R. Jazinski (London, 2026).

This volume documents every agent output from a five-round systematic testing programme (Marks 1–5) deploying 15 independent AI agents across 20 case study applications, producing approximately one million words of analytical output. For analytical commentary, grammar convergence tables, and cross-mark findings, see the companion volume: IRIS Case Studies: Selected Analysis. For the method itself, see: IRIS: Interpretive Rotation on Invariant Signals — Operational Toolkit & Researcher Guide, Version 5.1.

The method, the toolkit, the editorial apparatus, and all associated materials are the original work of R. Jazinski. The agent outputs reproduced in this volume were generated by independent AI systems and are documented, not authored, by R. Jazinski.