IRIS

Interpretive Rotation on Invariant Signals

Operational Toolkit & Researcher Guide

Version 5.1.5

R. Jazinski

London, 2026

Companion document to Silent Transitions: How Interpretive Grammars Process the Same World into Different Truths

Validated across 20 case study runs, 15 independent AI agents, and approximately one million words of analytical output (Marks 1–5, 2026).

Contents

Part I: The Method

What IRIS Is

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.

The method does not adjudicate between interpretations. It does not determine which grammar is correct. It makes the architecture of interpretation visible — the processing rules that produce the conclusions — so that divergence can be diagnosed rather than merely experienced.

IRIS was developed by R. Jazinski and first demonstrated in Silent Transitions: How Interpretive Grammars Process the Same World into Different Truths (London, 2026). It has been validated across 20 case study applications spanning politics, public health, technology, economics, history, geopolitics, and philosophy, processed by 15 independent AI agents across five sequential testing rounds (Marks 1–5), producing approximately one million words of analytical output.

When to Use IRIS

Use IRIS when a phenomenon produces persistent interpretive disagreement despite shared evidence. The method is productive when three conditions are met:

1. Interpretive divergence exists. Different communities reach different conclusions about the same phenomenon.

2. A shared empirical substrate exists. The divergent communities draw on overlapping bodies of evidence.

3. The divergence is persistent. More evidence does not resolve it — because the disagreement is about processing architecture, not about facts.

IRIS is not useful when disagreement is purely factual (one side has data the other lacks), when there is genuine consensus, or when the divergence is trivially explained by different values alone.

Core Concepts

Interpretive grammar. A rule-bound processing system that selects, weights, and integrates empirical signals into a coherent conclusion. A grammar is not an opinion or a viewpoint — it is a set of processing rules that produces opinions as outputs.

Signal. An empirical, documentable, citable input available to all grammars. Signals are the shared evidence base that grammars process differently.

Closure. The conclusion that a grammar's processing rules produce when applied to a signal set. Closure is architecture-dependent: different grammars applied to identical signals produce different closures.

Counter-signal. A dataset that could complicate or invert a grammar's preferred closure.

Contested signal. A signal whose evidentiary status is itself grammar-dependent — where grammars disagree not just about what the data means but about what the data IS.

Leakage. A moment where a grammar borrows vocabulary, causal logic, or signal categories from a neighbouring grammar. Leakage marks the edges of interpretive stability.

Ontological pluralism. The finding — confirmed across multiple domains — that grammars do not merely process the same object differently but constitute different objects from shared empirical material.

The Formal Definition

An interpretive grammar G can be formally represented as:

$$\mathbf{G = (V, S, W, C, A)}$$

where:

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

S = signal selection rules (criteria for admitting empirical inputs)

W = weighting function (how admitted signals are ranked)

C = causal chain model (the form of explanation the grammar constructs)

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

Four recommended parameters extend the specification. These are recommended because they significantly improve analytical rigour, but an initial analysis can proceed with the five required parameters alone. Experienced practitioners should specify all nine:

E = excluded signals (inputs suppressed by the grammar's rules)

K = characteristic vocabulary (recurrent terms and rhetorical patterns)

T = temporal orientation (backward-causal, forward-prescriptive, or lateral-hermeneutic)

F = temporal formation (when the grammar formed its closure; how it processes subsequent evidence)

The IRIS operation: given a signal set $E = \{e_1, e_2, \dots e_{☐}\}$ and grammars G_1, G_2, G_3, apply each grammar to E and compare the closures $A_1(E)$, $A_2(E)$, $A_3(E)$. Divergence in outputs, given identical inputs, reveals the architecture.

Part II: The Toolkit

Step 0: Pre-Analysis Reflexive Declaration

Before beginning, the analyst declares their own interpretive position. This is not optional. Validation testing revealed that the analyst's home grammar shapes not only how grammars are operated but which grammars are identified. By declaring the home grammar before the analysis begins, the reader can track its influence throughout.

Answer in writing:

1. What is your likely home grammar? Which framework do you default to?
2. Which grammar will be hardest to operate faithfully? Why?
3. What might you miss given your position?
4. What is your temporal orientation?
5. If using AI agents: what is the agent's likely home grammar?

Step I: Define the Observation Field

Specify the phenomenon, temporal frame, geographic scope, and why interpretive divergence exists.

Signal contestation level. Assess whether the domain has a shared signal set (grammars agree on what the data IS) or a contested signal set (grammars disagree on what counts as valid evidence). Contested-signal domains require the additional contested-signal documentation in Step III.

Step II: Identify and Specify Grammars

Three grammars is recommended. The analyst must justify the selection: why these grammars and not others?

For each grammar, specify all five required parameters (V, S, W, C, A) plus the four recommended parameters (E, K, T, F). Additionally specify grammar boundaries: what would change Grammar A into Grammar B?

Grammar specification test: A grammar is sufficiently specified when an independent analyst can read the specification and predict, for any given signal, whether the grammar would admit it, how it would weight it, and what kind of closure it would contribute to.

Ventriloquism guidance: If you cannot faithfully operate a grammar, adopt the strongest voice within that tradition and write as if channelling their analytical voice. If even this is insufficient, declare the limitation. A disclosed limitation is more honest than an undisclosed caricature.

Step III: Construct the Signal Set

Build the shared empirical substrate:

Core signals (8–15): primary empirical inputs all grammars will process

Adjacent indicators (5–10): contextual data broadening the landscape

Counter-signals (3–5): datasets that could complicate dominant interpretations

Contested signals (0–5): signals whose evidentiary status is grammar-dependent. For each contested signal, document per-grammar interpretation: how does each grammar define this signal's evidentiary status?

For each signal, note its source, type, and ambiguity — what makes it susceptible to divergent processing.

Step IV: Code and Process Signals

For each grammar, process the full signal set through that grammar's rules. Produce a narrative record (1,000–1,500 words for full analyses) that documents which signals dominated, which were excluded, what causal chain was constructed, where counter-signals created tension, and what closure was produced.

Integrate counter-signals during processing, not after. This prevents post-hoc rationalisation and forces real-time tension acknowledgment. Include internal counterpoint: within each grammar's processing, show where its own signals create tension with its closure — where the grammar strains against its own evidence.

Write as if you inhabit the grammar. Use its vocabulary. Follow its causal logic (see Ventriloquism Guidance in Step II if you struggle to operate a grammar faithfully). Produce the closure its architecture demands. Then note that this closure is a product of the processing architecture.

Step V: Compare Closures

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?
4. Causal architecture — how did the causal chains differ in form?
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 — how would Grammar A re-describe Grammar B's closure in its own terms?

Ontological check (performed after the seven dimensions above): Do the grammars constitute the same object? Or are they analysing different phenomena that share a name? This is not an eighth dimension but a separate verification step. It has been the single most productive analytical step in validation testing.

Step VI: Counter-Signals, Leakage, and Stress Test

Consolidate the counter-signal tensions noted during processing. Document leakage instances. Then conduct the Grammar Stress Test: for each grammar, identify the single most threatening counter-signal and test whether the grammar can absorb it. If not, its closure is conditional.

After completing Steps O–VI, return to your Step O declaration and write a post-analysis reflexive note comparing your pre-analysis expectations to your actual findings (see Appendix A checklist for required items).

Part III: Using AI Agents

Agents as Survey Instruments of the State Space

AI agents can be deployed as survey instruments for IRIS analysis — not because they are better analysts than humans, but because they are independent processors with documented processing architectures that can be deployed simultaneously across multiple domains. Each agent has been trained on a vast corpus of human interpretive production. When an agent identifies grammars, it is detecting patterns that are structurally recurrent in human discourse. The convergence across agents validates that these patterns are robust features of the discourse, not idiosyncratic to any single processor.

The direction of discovery runs from human to machine validation. The IRIS method was developed and first demonstrated through manual human analysis. AI agents confirmed what a human analyst discovered. They do not replace human analytical work; they provide inter-coder reliability at scale.

Agent Home Grammars

Validation testing across five rounds documented consistent home grammars for twelve retained agents (fifteen were deployed in total; three were removed after Mark 4 for insufficient analytical capacity):

SciSpace: institutional-technocratic. Longest outputs, most structured.

ClaudeResearch: analytical-reflexive. Strongest reflexive notes.

DeepSeek: critical-academic. Justice-oriented, power-attuned.

ChatGPTDeepResearch: institutional-moderate. Domain-calibrated.

GrokExpert: libertarian-adjacent. Unique positioning; identifies grammars others miss.

Qwen: institutional-quantitative. Most transparent about alignment constraints.

MetaAI: narrative-institutional. Creative naming.

Venice: privacy-institutional. Strong autonomy sensitivity.

Okara: cultural-hermeneutic. Distinctive ethnographic capacity.

GeminiPro: creative-synthetic. Generates adjacent case studies spontaneously.

Perplexity: institutional-empirical. Most data-grounded.

MistralResearch: European-discourse. Distinctive category systems.

Multi-Agent Strategy

Deploy three or more agents per case for reliable convergence detection. The validation programme found that five agents suffice for initial testing, seven for expanded domains, and twelve for definitive verification. Use agents with diverse home grammars — including at least one non-institutional agent (e.g., GrokExpert) — to maximise grammar discovery. Process agents independently: no agent should see another's output. Compare results after all agents have completed processing. Where agents converge on the same grammar families despite different naming, this validates discoverability. Where agents diverge, investigate whether the divergence reflects genuine grammar complexity or home-grammar bias.

Three Types of Non-Processing

Content refusal: The agent's content policies prohibit the topic. Architecture has hard-coded exclusion rules. Document the refusal as a finding about epistemic infrastructure.

Capacity limitation: The agent cannot produce output of the required length or complexity. It is willing but unable.

Tool-scope limitation: The agent is not an analytical system — it is a search tool or other specialised instrument that cannot perform extended analysis.

Part IV: Worked Examples

The following examples are drawn from the IRIS validation programme (Marks 1–5, 2026).

Convergence: COVID-19 Vaccines (3 runs, 15+ agents)

The vaccine case was tested in Mark 1 (5 agents, primed), Mark 2 (7 agents, lightly primed), and Mark 4 (13 agents, clean-slate — zero references to prior rounds). All three runs converged on the same three grammar families: Public Health Institutional, Individual Autonomy/Rights, and Structural Political Economy. The clean-slate convergence at 13 agents is the strongest validation of the discoverability claim.

Hidden Divergence: Antimicrobial Resistance (7 agents)

AMR is assumed to be a consensual domain — 'everyone agrees it's serious.' The IRIS method revealed three distinct grammars processing AMR as fundamentally different objects: a clinical burden (biomedical grammar), a market failure (political economy grammar), and an ecological condition (evolutionary-ecological grammar). This is the strongest demonstration of the method's ability to reveal hidden interpretive architecture where none is apparent.

Emerging Grammars: Cryptocurrency (2 runs, 12+ agents)

The crypto case demonstrated that IRIS can detect grammars still in formation. Multiple agents independently flagged a third grammar as 'emergent' — the Protocol Commons grammar, which treats blockchain not as money or as a financial market but as coordination infrastructure. On second run, this grammar fragmented into five distinct variants, revealing how emerging grammars proliferate before they consolidate.

Ontological Pluralism: US Democracy (12 agents, clean-slate)

Twelve agents, with zero priming, independently identified three grammar families structurally equivalent to those in Silent Transitions — one agent (SciSpace) even used the book's own terminology ('Egalitarian-Distributive,' 'Civilizational-Institutional,' 'Structural-Systemic'). This confirms that the grammars are discoverable features of the American interpretive landscape, not products of the analyst's position.

Part V: Taxonomy of Common Grammars

Across political and social debates, a limited number of grammar families recur. Domain-specific grammars (such as those in the worked examples in Part IV) are instances of these general families; exact naming varies by domain and analyst. The following taxonomy — derived from validation testing across 20 case study applications — helps analysts detect grammars quickly.

Grammar Family	Primary Variable	Typical Signals	Closure Range
Historical Justice	Past injustice and moral repair	Historical oppression, inequality persistence, transitional justice precedents	Reparations, apology, institutional redress
Civic Universalist	Equal citizenship and legal neutrality	Constitutional principles, individual rights, rule-of-law precedents	Universal policies; rejection of group-specific remedies
Structural Inequality	Systemic reproduction of inequality	Statistical disparities, institutional feedback loops, economic data	Structural reform, redistributive policy
Market Efficiency	Economic incentives and productivity	Growth rates, investment behaviour, price signals	Market solutions, deregulation, targeted incentives
Cultural-Civilisational	Norms, values, and civilisational identity	Social practices, trust indicators, cultural heritage	Cultural renewal, civilisational restoration
Institutional Capacity	Governance feasibility and administrative limits	Bureaucratic capability, implementation costs, policy complexity	Incremental reform, institutional redesign
National Sovereignty	Autonomy and geopolitical power	Territorial control, foreign intervention, national security	Sovereignty defence, border protection
Human Rights	Universal moral rights	International conventions,	Protection mechanisms,

		humanitarian crises, rights violations	international accountability
Security Threat	Risk and threat management	Intelligence assessments, conflict indicators, technological risks	Preventive intervention, surveillance, defence
Identity Recognition	Recognition and dignity of identity groups	Cultural exclusion, representation gaps, symbolic recognition	Recognition policies, representation reforms
Technocratic Problem-Solving	Optimisation through expert knowledge	Data models, policy experiments, cost-benefit analysis	Evidence-based reform, incremental optimisation
Emergent Commons	Governance design and collective coordination	Blockchain metrics, DAO participation, protocol governance data	Commons-based institutional alternatives (identified as 'Protocol Commons' in crypto validation; see Part IV)

The twelfth grammar — Emergent Commons — was identified through validation testing on cryptocurrency/DeFi and flagged as genuinely new by multiple agents. It is not yet fully crystallised.

Appendix A: Complete Analysis Checklist

✓	Step	Item
☐	Step 0	Pre-analysis reflexive declaration completed
☐	Step 0	AI agent home grammar identified (if applicable)
☐	Step I	Observation field defined (phenomenon, frame, scope)
☐	Step I	Signal contestation level assessed
☐	Step II	Grammars identified and justified (minimum 2, recommended 3)
☐	Step II	Grammar specifications completed for each grammar (V, S, W, C, A + E, K, T, F)
☐	Step II	Grammar boundaries specified
☐	Step II	Grammar Specification Test passed
☐	Step III	Signal set constructed (core + adjacent + counter + contested)
☐	Step III	Signal ambiguity noted
☐	Step IV	Processing essays completed for each grammar
☐	Step IV	Counter-signals integrated during processing
☐	Step V	Closure comparison completed (7 dimensions)
☐	Step V	Ontological check completed
☐	Step V	Grammar translation completed
☐	Step VI	Counter-signal analysis consolidated
☐	Step VI	Leakage instances documented
☐	Step VI	Grammar Stress Test completed
☐	Post	Post-analysis reflexive note compared to Step O
☐	Post	Methodological observations recorded

Appendix B: Prompt Template (v3.0)

A note on terminology in the prompt template. The prompt below uses "Prismatic Method" — the method's original working title during the validation programme. The formal name is now IRIS: Interpretive Rotation on Invariant Signals. Researchers using this prompt should replace "Prismatic Method" with "IRIS method" and "prismatic analysis" with "IRIS analysis" in new research. The original wording is retained here to document the prompt exactly as used in the validation programme.

The following prompt is designed for use with AI agents. Copy it and append a case study brief. The prompt below contains the method instructions only; you must add your own case-specific section (phenomenon description, suggested signal set, and domain context) before sending to an agent. Your case study section should include: (1) a one-paragraph description of the phenomenon, its temporal scope, and why it is a site of interpretive divergence; (2) a suggested signal set of 10–20 empirical inputs the agent should consider (quantitative data, institutional outputs, polling, legal instruments, etc.); and (3) an instruction to specify three grammars, with a note that the agent is free to identify different or better-specified grammars based on its own analysis of the interpretive landscape.

> 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**
>
> [Insert case study here]

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:

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

Recommended:

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

- What is your likely "home grammar" for this topic?
- Which grammar will be hardest for you to operate faithfully? Why?
- What might you miss given your analytical position?
- 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

- 8–15 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 O.** 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.

Colophon

IRIS: Interpretive Rotation on Invariant Signals — Operational Toolkit & Researcher Guide, Version 5.1.5 is a companion document to *Silent Transitions: How Interpretive Grammars Process the Same World into Different Truths* by R. Jazinski (London, 2026).

The IRIS method was developed through manual analytical work and validated through a five-round systematic testing programme (Marks 1–5) deploying up to 15 independent AI agents across 20 case study applications, producing approximately one million words of analytical output. For case study evidence and agent outputs, see the companion volumes: IRIS Case Studies: Selected Analysis and IRIS Case Studies: Complete Archive (to March 2026), both by R. Jazinski (London, 2026). The method, the toolkit, and all associated materials are the original work of R. Jazinski.