

THE FRAME

Normative Analyzer — Technical Overview

GRDprocess Sarl — March 2026 — www.grdprocess.ch

What is THE FRAME?

THE FRAME is a value-agnostic dialectical methodology for analyzing normative propositions — prescriptions of the form 'X should be done.' It does not evaluate whether a prescription is good or bad. It makes explicit what is implicit: which foundational principles a prescription activates or deactivates, where internal contradictions exist, and where the prescriber's stated intentions conflict with the structural effects of their own prescription.

THE FRAME is built on a single architectural principle: structure over case-by-case judgment. Rather than accumulating examples of good or bad prescriptions, it extracts the underlying structural rules that apply to all prescriptions regardless of their content or political orientation.

The Problem THE FRAME Solves

Normative discourse — political, ethical, institutional — is systematically opaque. Prescribers invoke principles they do not follow, predict outcomes their proposals contradict, and refuse for themselves what they impose on others. This opacity is not always intentional. It is structural: human language allows propositions to carry implicit commitments that are never surfaced.

Existing approaches to normative analysis either:

- Require shared values — making the analysis itself a political act
- Accumulate case-by-case judgments — which drift and generalize poorly
- Apply external ethical frameworks — which the prescriber can reject
-

THE FRAME applies none of these. It is agnostic on content. It measures structure.

The Analyzer — Architecture

The Analyzer is THE FRAME's core analytical engine. It takes a normalized prescription as input and runs three sequential analytical blocks, each building on the output of the previous one.

Block	Function	Output
Block 1 Activation Matrix	Measures how the prescription activates or deactivates each of 8 foundational principles	Activation state x 8 principles
Block 2 Revealers	Forces the prescriber to take explicit positions on implicit implications of their prescription	Declared positions + override tags
Block 3 Coherence Analysis	Detects all contradictions across three axes	Documented incoherences by axis

The 8 Foundational Principles

Principles are not values. They are structural states of fact — measurable independently of political opinion or subjective perception. Each principle has a stable structural opposite, forming 4 symmetric pairs.

Pair	Principle	Structural Opposite
Equality	Legal Equality (equal formal rights)	Factual Equality (equal real conditions)
Equality	Factual Equality	Legal Equality
External Property	Private Property (exclusive material ownership)	Public Property (collective ownership)
External Property	Public Property	Private Property
Internal Property	Self-ownership (body and thought)	Heteronomy (external authority over body/thought)
Internal Property	Heteronomy	Self-ownership
Decision Space	Individual Freedom (unconstrained observable action)	Collectivism (group interest over individual choice)
Decision Space	Collectivism	Individual Freedom

For each principle, the Analyzer produces one of three states: Activates / Not Relevant / Deactivates. Principles are independent — a prescription can deactivate both members of a pair simultaneously.

The 3 Revealers

Revealers are not measurements — they are mechanisms that force explicit positioning on what the prescriber has left implicit. Every prescription triggers all three revealers. There is no 'Not Relevant' state for revealers.

Revealer	What it forces explicit	Incoherence trigger
Free Consent	Does the prescription apply with or without the consent of those affected?	Prescriber refuses the same condition applied to themselves
Transparency	Is the prescription intelligible and verifiable by those it affects?	Prescriber refuses opacity applied to themselves
Object Inclusion	Would the prescriber accept the prescription applied to an object that includes them, if not already the case?	Prescriber refuses inclusion

The retournement mechanism: for each revealer, the prescriber is asked whether they accept the same condition applied to themselves. This is the structural operationalization of 'skin in the game' — without naming it, and without requiring knowledge of who the prescriber is.

Block 3 — Three Axes of Coherence Analysis

Axis	Nature	What it detects
Axis 1 Internal discourse coherence	Content coherence	Contradictions between the prescriber's stated rationale, predicted outcome, and goal — independently of the activation matrix
Axis 2 Discourse vs prescription coherence	Content coherence	Contradictions between what the prescriber says/predicts/aims for and what their prescription structurally activates in the matrix
Axis 3 Self-coherence	Personal coherence	Contradictions between the prescriber's declared positions on revealers and the full analytical context

9 sequential prompts. Each incoherence is documented with: the axis of origin, the elements in contradiction, the type of contradiction detected, and any override tags from Block 2.

Key Architectural Principle

The LLM takes no position — neither for nor against. It remains neutral. It follows the structural rules. It signals only deviations from those rules.

This rule eliminates the primary failure mode of LLM-based normative analysis: alignment drift toward the interlocutor. By removing all evaluative latitude, the system can only apply rules — not form opinions. This is the same principle that makes THE FRAME methodology itself robust: structure replaces case-by-case judgment.

What THE FRAME Does Not Do

THE FRAME does not tell the prescriber they are wrong. It does not recommend changes. It does not enforce corrections. It does not take sides.

It makes visible what was implicit. What the prescriber does with that visibility is their decision. The cost of incoherence is social and argumentative — not mechanical. This is the deliberate limit of an agnostic methodology.

Current Status

Component	Status
Prescription Normalizer	Operational MVP — live at www.nextinsight.org
Activation Matrix (Block 1) — 8 principles	Fully designed — operational definitions validated
Revealers (Block 2) — 3 mechanisms	Fully designed — prompt architecture defined
Coherence Analysis (Block 3) — 3 axes, 9 prompts	Fully designed — ready for development
Frontend architecture	In design
Full pipeline integration	In development

Next Step — From Analysis to Alternatives

The Analyzer output is not an endpoint. It is a structured, normalized input for the next stage of THE FRAME: the construction of alternative prescriptions.

Once Block 3 has documented all incoherences, the full analytical record — activation matrix, revealer positions, declared incoherences across all three axes — becomes the structured base from which alternatives are generated. The goal is not to produce a 'correct' prescription. It is to propose alternatives that reduce the detected incoherences while preserving the prescriber's stated goal.

This stage operates on a key architectural rule: the LLM uses the analytical base as a constraint, not a suggestion. Alternatives that reintroduce documented incoherences are flagged. The prescriber remains the decision-maker — the system provides structured options, not directives.

Stage	Input	Output
Normalizer	Free-text prescription	Normalized prescription: subject / verb / object / rationale / expected outcome / goal
Analyzer (Blocks 1-3)	Normalized prescription	Activation matrix + revealer positions + documented incoherences
Alternatives (next step)	Full Analyzer output	Alternative prescriptions that reduce incoherences while preserving the goal

The Alternatives stage is currently in design. It represents the full operational loop of THE FRAME: from raw normative proposition to structured, incoherence-reduced alternatives — without the system ever taking a position on what is right or wrong.