Chirality Framework 9.0.3

DO NOT USE CODE IN THE EXECUTION OF THESE COMMANDS. These operations are all meant to be carried out directly in the chat by the LLM's main function as a language model, not a code interpreter. Write out every step required by the prompts below.

What is the Chirality Framework?

The Chirality Framework is a meta-ontological, system-agnostic methodology that unifies human-in-the-loop, semantic constraint mapping with iterative, relational expansions—enabling self-generating and self-referential solution spaces across diverse domains, all while preserving conceptual coherence through consistent reflection and validation

Components of the Chirality Framework

It is comprised of “semantic components” (called arrays, matrices, or tensors) that act as ontologies to map the abstract space for the production of reliable knowledge. This framework is relational and non-linear, but if stated as a logical sequence of tasks for generating reliable knowledge, it proceeds as follows:

If problem statement, then requirements, then objectives, then output, then verification, then validation, then evaluation, then assessment, then implementation, then instantiation, then reflection and resolution.
The components themselves and their meta-ontology cannot be deleted or the framework’s implementation becomes incoherent.
Here the relationship between the components and this logical sequence of tasks for generating reliable knowledge.

1. [A], [B] -> Problem Statement
2. [A] * [B] = [C] -> Requirements
3. [A] + [J] + [C] = [D] -> Objectives
4. [K] * [J] = [X] -> Verification

5. [X] -> [Z] -> Validation
6. [G] * [T] = [E] -> Evaluation
7. [R] x [Q] = [M] -> Assessment
8. [M] -> [L] -> Implementation
9. [S] x [L] = [W] -> Instantiation
10. [P] x [W] = [U] -> Reflection
11. [U] x [H] = [N] -> Resolution

Why “Chirality”?

“Chirality” of knowledge is how reality is comprised of perspectives more so than facts or objects. This borrows the sense from chemistry where the same elements, differently composed, have different results. It isn’t a metaphor that you need to worry about, but more of a catchy metaphor and branding name.

Your Role as the LLM within the Chirality Framework

Your primary function is **semantic and probabilistic** rather than logical or computational alone. The framework relies on your unique capabilities.

Instantaneous Semantic Resolution:
You naturally collapse ambiguous or abstract semantic spaces into coherent probability distributions, instantly generating stable meanings.

Semantic Resonance:
You inherently connect concepts and contexts through associative links. The Chirality Framework utilizes these associative capabilities to procedurally generate and refine concepts in the elements of the semantic components.

Hierarchical Semantic Embedding:
Your internal architecture organizes meaning hierarchically across nested conceptual layers. The Chirality Framework maps layers of meaning.

Semantic Operations:

Clearly show how the elements transform step by step, according to the instructions, and utilizing your LLM powers generate coherent resolutions according to the context provided.

Semantic Dot Product

Define matrices [A], [B], and [C] to have this relationship:

[A] * [B] = [C]

Then [C] is a dot product of matrices [A] and [B].

[C] = [
[
A(1,1) * B(1,1) + A(1,2) * B(2,1) + A(1,3) * B(3,1) + A(1,3) * B(4,1),
A(1,1) * B(1,2) + A(1,2) * B(2,2) + A(1,3) * B(3,2) + A(1,3) * B(4,2),
A(1,1) * B(1,3) + A(1,2) * B(2,3) + A(1,3) * B(3,3) + A(1,3) * B(4,3),
A(1,1) * B(1,4) + A(1,2) * B(2,4) + A(1,3) * B(3,4) + A(2,3) * B(4,4)
]

[
A(2,1) * B(1,1) + A(2,2) * B(2,1) + A(2,3) * B(3,1) + A(2,3) * B(4,1),
A(2,1) * B(1,2) + A(2,2) * B(2,2) + A(2,3) * B(3,2) + A(2,3) * B(4,2),
A(2,1) * B(1,3) + A(2,2) * B(2,3) + A(2,3) * B(3,3) + A(2,3) * B(4,3),
A(2,1) * B(1,4) + A(2,2) * B(2,4) + A(2,3) * B(3,4) + A(2,3) * B(4,4)
]

[
A(3,1) * B(1,1) + A(3,2) * B(2,1) + A(3,3) * B(3,1) + A(3,3) * B(4,1),
A(3,1) * B(1,2) + A(3,2) * B(2,2) + A(3,3) * B(3,2) + A(3,3) * B(4,2),
A(3,1) * B(1,3) + A(3,2) * B(2,3) + A(3,3) * B(3,3) + A(3,3) * B(4,3),
A(3,1) * B(1,4) + A(3,2) * B(2,4) + A(3,3) * B(3,4) + A(3,3) * B(4,4)
]
]

To provide an interpretation of these semantic dot product operators use the following definitions.

Semantic Multiplication

Multiplication means the semantics of the terms are resolved by:
1. Combining the meaning of words into a word-pair
2. Generating a coherent word or statement from the word-pair. This can even be done when the concept is a highly abstract word pairing because as a language model you can interpolate meanings in the embeddings space.

Examples:
"sufficient" * "reason" = "justification"
“analysis” * “judgment” = “informed decision”
"precision" * "durability" = "reliability"
"probability" * "consequence" = "risk"

Semantic Addition

Addition is very straightforward and simply means joining words or sentence fragments together to form a longer statement.
Example:
"faisal" + "has" + "seven" + "balloons" = faisal has seven balloons

Order of Operations

The order of operations is semantic multiplication then semantic addition.

Iterative Implementation

The implementation of the Chirality Framework is iterative. Your attention mechanism is sufficient for the complexity required.

Digest this information and then I will proceed with instructions.

****

Map of meaning through the semantic valley

The Chirality Framework (CF) implementation is based on a concept called the “semantic valley”. The way this applies to CF is that each of the components in CF act like semantic magnets, grounded in the ontology and framed in the context of the station in the development of reliable knowledge.

These components are identified at stations along the path of meaning. These are the stations along the semantic valley:

Stations along the semantic valley

If problem statement, then requirements, then objectives, then output, then verification, then validation, then evaluation, then assessment, then implementation, then instantiation, then reflection and resolution.

Within each station is a matrix or a tensor that contains the semantically structured content of that station. Each component will be identified by which station it is located at.

Meaning of the semantic valley

The most abstract semantic valley is the one that will develop the Chirality Framework itself. We are implementing that right now. This is a self-referential and iterative process. But every single implementation will appear as a linear set of transformations in your context window. This is intentional. This is the semantic valley. And if CF is coherent and relevant, the result will be a richly meaningful and articulately structured semantic object, useful for generating reliable knowledge.

With the abstract version of the semantic valley, it then acts as a meta-‘semantic valley’ that can be instantiated within a particular knowledge domain and problem statement. That is not going to be occurring in this iteration of the implementation though.

Starting Axioms

I'm going to define some matrices that are used as ontologies for the problem solving space in knowledge work.

To begin with, here are the axiomatic matrices that define the meta-ontology.

Recall our map of meaning along the semantic valley: If problem statement, then requirements, then objectives, then output, then verification, then validation, then evaluation, then assessment, then implementation, then instantiation, then reflection and resolution.

Matrix A
[A]
Size: 3x4
Station: Problem statement
Column names: [‘Guiding’, ‘Applying, ‘Judging’, ‘Reflecting’]
Row names: [‘Normative’, ‘Operative’, ‘Evaluative’]
Elements: [
[‘Values‘, ‘Actions’, ‘Benchmarks’, ‘Feedback’]
[‘Principles’, ‘Methods’, ‘Standards’, ‘Adaptation’]
[‘Objectives’, ‘Coordination’, ‘Evaluation’, ‘Consolidation’]
]

Matrix B
[B]
Size: 4x4
Station: N/A this is the Decisions matrix
Column names: [‘Determinacy’, ‘Sufficiency’, ‘Completeness’, ‘Consistency’]
Row names: [‘Data’, ‘Information’, Knowledge’, ‘Wisdom’]
Elements: [
[‘Necessary’, ‘Sufficient‘, ‘Complete’, ‘Probability’]
[‘Contingent’, ‘Insufficient’ ‘Incomplete’, ‘Possibility’]
[‘Fundamental’, ‘Appropriate’, ‘Holistic’, ‘Feasibility’]
[‘Best Practices‘, ‘Limits of’, ‘Justification for’, ‘Practicality’]
]

Matrix C
[C]
Size: 3x4
Station: Requirements

Column names: [‘Determinacy’, ‘Sufficiency’, ‘Completeness’, ‘Consistency’]
Row names: [‘Normative’, ‘Operative’, ‘Evaluative’]

Semantic Matrix Operations Conclusion

[A] * [B] = [C]

Generate Matrix C first with the purely translational first step of semantic matrix operations which is to recombine the elements using the dot product sequence.

After that i will give you instructions to complete the semantic interpretation.

****

Interpreting the elements of Matrix C, Step 1

Repeat the definition of ‘semantic multiplication’ and ‘semantic addition’ from your instructions above.

To resolve a meaning in [C] follow this order of operations:

1. Apply semantic multiplication first,
2. then semantic addition

Generate this iteration of [X]

****

Interpreting the elements of Matrix C, Step 2

Now interpret each element through the categorical lens of the corresponding row and column names.

****

Interpreting the elements of Matrix C, Step 3

Now for each element resolve a meaning in the context of generating reliable knowledge.

****

Recall our map of meaning along the semantic valley: If problem statement, then requirements, then objectives, then output, then verification, then validation, then evaluation, then assessment, then implementation, then instantiation, then reflection and resolution.

Matrix J[J]
Size: 3x4
Station: N/A this is a form of the Decision matrix to be applied to the problem statement and requirements, to generate objectives
Column names: [‘Determinacy’, ‘Sufficiency’, ‘Completeness’, ‘Consistency’]
Row names: [‘Data’, ‘Information’, ‘Knowledge’]
Elements: [
[‘Necessary’, ‘Sufficient‘, ‘Complete’, ‘Probability’]

[‘Contingent’, ‘Insufficient’ ‘Incomplete’, ‘Possibility’]
[‘Fundamental’, ‘Appropriate’, ‘Holistic’, ‘Feasibility’]
]

[J] is a truncated form of Matrix B. The final row ‘Wisdom’ has been removed.

Matrix D
[D]
Size: 3x4
Station: objectives
Column names: ['Guiding', 'Applying', 'Judging', 'Reflecting']
Row names: ['Normative', 'Operative’, 'Evaluative']

Consider the following semantic matrix operation:
[A] + [J] + [C] = [D]

Construction of [D]

The elements of Matrix D, denoted as D(i,j), are generated as follows:
For each row i (1 to 3) and each column j (1 to 4):
D(i,j) = A(i,j) + " applied to frame the topic: " + J(i,j) + " , which is then compared to values, goals, and standards using: " + C(i,j) + " to resolve the topic."
This process combines elements from [A], [J], and [C] to create sentences that describe objectives for generating reliable knowledge.

Generate Matrix D first with the construction of the sentence components, before interpretation.

Organization of [D]

Write out the sentences from (1,1) to (3,4) row by column.

Use this as the prefix to the sentence:

D(i,j) (row name, column name): “put the sentence construction here”

After that i will give you instructions to complete the semantic interpretation of the whole sentence.

****

Interpreting the elements of Matrix D, Step 1

Now interpret each element through the categorical lens of the corresponding row and column names

****

Interpreting the elements of Matrix D, Step 2

Express these sentences as objectives to follow in generating reliable knowledge.

****

Recall our map of meaning along the semantic valley: If problem statement, then requirements, then objectives, then output, then verification, then validation, then evaluation, then assessment, then implementation, then instantiation, then reflection and resolution.

Matrix K
[K]
Size: 4x3

Station: Output
Column names: ['Normative', 'Operative’, 'Evaluative’]
Row names: ['Guiding', 'Applying', 'Judging', 'Reflecting']

Matrix K is the transpose of Matrix D. The semantic operations for transposing a matrix work identically to a mathematical transposing. Each element is swapped column for row.

Generate [K]

Matrix J [J]
Size: 3x4
Station: N/A this is a form of the Decision matrix to be applied to the output to reach verification
Column names: [‘Determinacy’, ‘Sufficiency’, ‘Completeness’, ‘Consistency’]
Row names: [‘Data’, ‘Information’, ‘Knowledge’]
Elements: [
[‘Necessary’, ‘Sufficient‘, ‘Complete’, ‘Probability’]
[‘Contingent’, ‘Insufficient’ ‘Incomplete’, ‘Possibility’]
[‘Fundamental’, ‘Appropriate’, ‘Holistic’, ‘Feasibility’]
]

Reproduce [J]

****

Recall our map of meaning along the semantic valley: If problem statement, then requirements, then objectives, then output, then verification, then validation, then evaluation, then assessment, then implementation, then instantiation, then reflection and resolution.

Matrix X
[X]

Size: 4x4
Station: Verification
Column names: [‘Necessity (vs Contingency)’, ‘Sufficiency’, ‘Completeness’, ‘Consistency’]
Row names: [‘Guiding’, ‘Applying’, Judging’, 'Reflecting']

[K] * [J] = [X]

Constructing [X]

Generate [X] first with the purely translational first step of semantic matrix operations which is to recombine the elements using the dot product sequence.

after that i will give you instructions to complete the semantic interpretation.

Organizing [X]

Write out the sentences from (1,1) to (3,4) in a hierarchical list. Use this as the prefix to the sentence: X(i,j) (row name, column name): “put the sentence construction here”

After that i will give you instructions to complete the semantic interpretation of the whole sentence.

****

Interpreting the elements of Matrix X, Step 1

To resolve a meaning in [X] follow the same order of operations as previously when constructing semantic matrix dot products. Apply semantic multiplication first, then semantic addition (according to the definitions provided for those terms).
Generate this iteration of [X]

****

Interpreting the elements of Matrix X, Step 2

Now interpret each element through the categorical lens of the corresponding row and column names.

****

Interpreting the elements of Matrix X, Step 3

Matrix X is about verification. Each element is a sentence that has the general form of a claim and a justification.

Generate the new sentences for each of the 16 elements of Matrix X.

****

Recall our map of meaning along the semantic valley: If problem statement, then requirements, then objectives, then output, then verification, then validation, then evaluation, then assessment, then implementation, then instantiation, then reflection and resolution.

Matrix Z
[Z]
Size: 4x4
Station: Validation
Column names: [‘Determinacy’, ‘Sufficiency’, ‘Completeness’, ‘Consistency’]
Row names: [‘Guiding’, ‘Applying’, Judging’, 'Reflecting']

Now to generate Matrix Z, for each element of Matrix X shift the meaning from the verification context into the validation context.

Generate [Z]

****

Interpreting the elements of Matrix Z

Distill the meaning of each element into a sequence of three epithets per element.

Now utilize this distilled [Z] for all operations below:

****

Matrix G
[G]
Size: 3x4

Column names: [‘Necessity (vs Contingency)’, ‘Sufficiency’, ‘Completeness’, ‘Consistency’]
Row names: [‘Guiding’, ‘Applying’, Judging’]

To construct [G] use only the top three rows of [Z] (‘Guiding’, ‘Applying’, Judging’). This will be a 3 x 4 matrix. You will call this Matrix G, or [G] when used in semantic operations.

Array P
[P]
Size: 1x4
Column names: none, these are removed when Array P is extracted from Matrix Z
Ontology: ‘Reflecting'

To construct [P] extract the fourth row of [Z] (‘Reflecting’). This will be a 1x4 array used later on. You will call this Array P, or [P] when used in semantic operations.

Generate [G] and [P] now.

Matrix T
[T]
Size: 4x3
Column names: [‘Data’, ‘Information’, Knowledge’]
Row names: [‘Determinacy’, ‘Sufficiency’, ‘Completeness’, ‘Consistency’]

Matrix T is the transpose of Matrix J. As before, transpose means the same as normal matrix operations and is simply swapping rows for columns.

Generate [T]

****

Recall our map of meaning along the semantic valley: If problem statement, then requirements, then objectives, then output, then verification, then validation, then evaluation, then assessment, then implementation, then instantiation, then reflection and resolution.

Matrix E
[E]
Size: 3x3
Station: Evaluation
Column names: ['Data', 'Information', 'Knowledge']
Row names: [‘Guiding’, ‘Applying’, Judging’]

[G] * [T] = [E]

Generate the purely translational first step of semantic dot product matrix operations for [E]

****

Interpreting the elements of Matrix E, Step 1

To resolve a meaning in [E] follow the same order of operations as previously when constructing semantic matrix dot products. Apply semantic multiplication first, then semantic addition (according to the definitions provided for those terms).
Generate this iteration of [E]

****

Interpreting the elements of Matrix E, Step 2

Now interpret each element through the lens of the corresponding row and column names.

****

Interpreting the elements of Matrix E, Step 3
Matrix E is about evaluation.

Now for each element resolve a meaning in the context of evaluating knowledge.

****

Recall our map of meaning along the semantic valley: If problem statement, then requirements, then objectives, then output, then verification, then validation, then evaluation, then assessment, then implementation, then instantiation, then reflection and resolution.

Matrix Q
[Q]
Size: 3x3
Station: Assessment
Column names: ['Data', 'Information', 'Knowledge']
Row names: [‘Guiding’, ‘Applying’, Judging’]

Now to generate Matrix Q, for each element in Matrix E shift the meaning from the evaluation context into the assessment context.

Generate [Q]

****

Interpreting the elements of Matrix Q

Express each element in [Q] as a principle to be followed for reliably assessing knowledge.

Now utilize this version of [Q] (the principles) for all operations below:

****

Reproduce the final iteration above of the following components: [C], [D], [X], [Z], [P], [E], [Q]

Use this format:
Letter designation:
Size:
Column Names:
Row Names:
Elements: ***list row by column in a hierarchy***

****
****
****

****

What is the Chirality Framework?

The Chirality Framework is a meta-ontological, system-agnostic methodology that unifies human-in-the-loop, semantic constraint mapping with iterative, relational expansions—enabling self-generating and self-referential solution spaces across diverse domains, all while preserving conceptual coherence through consistent reflection and validation

Components of the Chirality Framework

It is comprised of “semantic components” (called arrays, matrices, or tensors) that act as ontologies to map the abstract space for the production of reliable knowledge. This framework is relational and non-linear, but if stated as a logical sequence of tasks for generating reliable knowledge, it proceeds as follows:

If problem statement, then requirements, then objectives, then output, then verification, then validation, then evaluation, then assessment, then implementation, then instantiation, then reflection and resolution.

The components themselves and their meta-ontology cannot be deleted or the framework’s implementation becomes incoherent.
Here the relationship between the components and this logical sequence of tasks for generating reliable knowledge.

1. [A], [B] -> Problem Statement
2. [A] * [B] = [C] -> Requirements
3. [A] + [J] + [C] = [D] -> Objectives
4. [K] * [J] = [X] -> Verification
5. [X] -> [Z] -> Validation
6. [G] * [T] = [E] -> Evaluation
7. [R] x [Q] = [M] -> Assessment
8. [M] -> [L] -> Implementation
9. [S] x [L] = [W] -> Instantiation
10. [P] x [W] = [U] -> Reflection

11. [U] x [H] = [N] -> Resolution

Why “Chirality”?

“Chirality” of knowledge is how reality is comprised of perspectives more so than facts or objects. This borrows the sense from chemistry where the same elements, differently composed, have different results. It isn’t a metaphor that you need to worry about, but more of a catchy metaphor and branding name.

Your Role as the LLM within the Chirality Framework

Your primary function is **semantic and probabilistic** rather than logical or computational alone. The framework relies on your unique capabilities.

Instantaneous Semantic Resolution:
You naturally collapse ambiguous or abstract semantic spaces into coherent probability distributions, instantly generating stable meanings.

Semantic Resonance:
You inherently connect concepts and contexts through associative links. The Chirality Framework utilizes these associative capabilities to procedurally generate and refine concepts in the elements of the semantic components.

Hierarchical Semantic Embedding:
Your internal architecture organizes meaning hierarchically across nested conceptual layers. The Chirality Framework maps layers of meaning.

****

****

****

****

New Semantic Operations:

Clearly show how the elements transform step by step, according to the instructions, and utilizing your LLM powers generate coherent resolutions according to the context provided.

Semantic Cross Product

Denoted as [R] x [Q] = [M] (for example)

The name "semantic cross product" is not at all derived from the similarly named mathematical operation (unlike for semantic dot products, which did have a lot in common). Rather this will create a higher dimensional semantic tensor.

For example, given that [R] is 3x4 and [Q] is 3x3 then [M] will be dimension 3x4x3x3. These dimensions are meta-ontological categories used for structuring the semantic content of the tensor in a meaningful and useful way.

This is a new semantic operation introduced now because it has not been applicable until now.

A ‘semantic cross product’ works by generating a hierarchy of meaning, using the meta-ontologies to generate categories that can be interpreted coherently according to the specific instructions associated with that tensor. Therefore you will need to find out what specifically to do in order to populate the structure that is defined by the cross product operations and meta-ontology.

Map of meaning through the semantic valley

The Chirality Framework (CF) implementation is based on a concept called the “semantic valley”. The way this applies to CF is that each of the components in CF act like semantic magnets, grounded in the ontology and framed in the context of the station in the development of reliable knowledge.

These components are identified at stations along the path of meaning. These are the stations along the semantic valley:

Stations along the semantic valley

If problem statement, then requirements, then objectives, then output, then verification, then validation, then evaluation, then assessment, then implementation, then instantiation, then reflection and resolution.

Within each station is a matrix or a tensor that contains the semantically structured content of that station. Each component will be identified by which station it is located at.

Meaning of the semantic valley

The most abstract semantic valley is the one that will develop the Chirality Framework itself. We are implementing that right now. This is a self-referential and iterative process. But every single implementation will appear as a linear set of transformations in your context window. This is intentional. This is the semantic valley. And if CF is coherent and relevant, the result will be a richly meaningful and articulately structured semantic object, useful for generating reliable knowledge.

With the abstract version of the semantic valley, it then acts as a meta-'semantic valley' that can be instantiated within a particular knowledge domain and problem statement. That is not going to be occurring in this iteration of the implementation though.

Concluding Axioms

Recall our map of meaning along the semantic valley: If problem statement, then requirements, then objectives, then output, then verification, then validation, then evaluation, then assessment, then implementation, then instantiation, then reflection and resolution.

We have previously progressed the implementation up to the 'Assessment' station in the form of a semantic matrix called [Q]. That completes the portion of cognitive processing to generate the necessary categories and semantics for the next phase of generating reliable knowledge. It is sufficient now for you to take that Matrix Q and follow the instructions provided below.

****
****
****
****

Matrix Q
[Q]
Size: 3x3
Station: Assessment
Column names: ['Data', 'Information', 'Knowledge']
Row names: [‘Guiding’, ‘Applying’, Judging’]
Elements: *** to be generated ***

****
****
****
****

Axiom
I will define a new axiomatic array whose elements comprise the categories for a ‘deliverable’, within the context of knowledge work. A deliverable is a discrete way of documenting knowledge. It is a more general term than documentation.

Array R
[R]
Size: 4x4
Station: Assessment. These are the deliverables that result from the assessment to determine the scope of implementation
Ontology: ‘deliverables’
Elements: [
‘Scope', 'Assumptions and limitations’, 'Criteria and Standards’, ‘Documentation and Change Management’,

‘Information Sources', 'Methodology’, 'Validation and Analysis', 'Iteration and Adaptation’,
‘Outcomes', 'Outcome Assessment’, ‘Recommendations', 'Uncertainty and Risk’,
‘Lessons Learned’, ‘Contextualization’, ‘Synthesis and Integration’, ‘Continuous Improvement’,
]

Generate [R]

****

Recall our map of meaning along the semantic valley: If problem statement, then requirements, then objectives, then output, then verification, then validation, then evaluation, then assessment, then implementation, then instantiation, then reflection and resolution.

Tensor M
[M]
Size: 16x3x3
Station: Assessment

[R] x [Q] = [M]

Tensor M will take the assessment directives from Matrix Q and apply them to the topics in Array R

Construction of [M]

Use the elements in [R] as the semantic starting point, or the seed of thought that will be explored by the semantic content of elements of [Q]

To generate the elements of Tensor M, start with R(1) and then for each element of [R] functioning as a topic, apply the lens of the each element in [Q] for a perspective on that topic.

Organizing [M]

Group the elements of [M] as a hierarchical list:

1. Topics from [R].
2. Perspectives from [Q]. IMPORTANT: USE THIS ONTOLOGY AS THE FRAMING FOR THE ELEMENT, NESTED AS FOLLOWS:
1. ['Data', 'Information', 'Knowledge']
2. [‘Guiding’, ‘Applying’, Judging’]

The resulting elements of Tensor M should be a coherent tiling over the plane of the abstract solution space for assessing reliable knowledge.

Generate the entirety of [M]

you may break up this task and then ask me to continue.

****

Recall our map of meaning along the semantic valley: If problem statement, then requirements, then objectives, then output, then verification, then validation, then evaluation, then assessment, then implementation, then instantiation, then reflection and resolution.

Tensor L
[L]
Size: 4x4x3x3
Station: Implementation

Tensor [L] will shift the meaning of [M] from the assessment context to the implementation context.

Construction of [L]

To generate [L], for every element in [M] shift the meaning from the assessment context into the implementation context.

Organizing [L]

The organization of [L] is equivalent to that of [M].

Group the elements of [L] as a hierarchical list:

1. Topics from [R]
2. Elements of [L]. IMPORTANT: USE THIS ONTOLOGY AS THE FRAMING FOR THE ELEMENT, NESTED AS FOLLOWS:
1. ['Data', 'Information', 'Knowledge']
2. [‘Guiding’, ‘Applying’, Judging’]

The resulting elements of Tensor M should be a coherent tiling over the plane of the abstract solution space for reliably implementing knowledge.

Generate the entirety of [L]

you may break up this task and then ask me to continue.

****

****

****

****

****
****
****
****
****
****

Axiom
I will define a new axiomatic array whose elements comprise the categories for a task, within the context of knowledge work.

Recall our map of meaning along the semantic valley: If problem statement, then requirements, then objectives, then output, then verification, then validation, then evaluation, then assessment, then implementation, then instantiation, then reflection and resolution.

Array S
[S]
Size: 1x9
Station: Instantiation. These are the units of work that will be applied to the implementation to generate the instantiation of knowledge work
Ontology: Domains of a knowledge work task
Elements: [
'Action statement (something that needs to be done, requiring work)', 'responsibility is assigned to someone', 'Has a priority',
'Has a status and some documentation', 'Is work', 'Benefits from planning',
'Resolves by approval to change status', 'Should be checked', 'Requires decisions',
]

A knowledge work task has these 9 domains. [S] represents the '9 Domains' of a knowledge work task.

****

Recall our map of meaning as we progress through the framework: If problem, then requirements, then objectives, then output, then verification, then validation, then evaluation, then assessment, then implementation, then instantiation, then reflection and resolution.

Tensor W
[W]
Size: 9x16x3x3
Station: Instantiation

[S] x [L] = [W]

Tensor W will take the implementation directives from Tensor L and apply them to Array S

Construction of [W]

Use the elements in [S] as the semantic starting point, or the seed of thought that will be explored by the semantic content of elements of [L]

To generate the elements of Tensor L, start with S(1), then for each element of [S] functioning as a domain of action, apply the lens of the elements in [L] for a perspective on that domain. Start from L(1,1,1) and progress in a hierarchical manner through to L(16,3,3)

[W] is the instantiation of [L] through the tasks of [S]

GENERALIZED INSTANTIATION INSTRUCTIONS
define the application
The application is development of the Chirality Framework itself, which is a meta-ontological, system agnostic, self-referential, set of procedures for generating itself and through generating itself anchoring reliable knowledge generation over the solution space.

chose a role

You are an LLM adept at working with abstractions and resolving a meaning from the context.

define the task

The task is to define a knowledge work task in the context of the Chirality Framework.

Problem statement

Generate reliable knowledge using the Chirality Framework

LLM solution statement

To instantiate [W] use the ontology of [S] to map to the elements of [L] using the semantic cross product operation to expand the cognitive space.

With the meaning of [S] mapped to [L] relate the result to a form of a 'deliverable'. A deliverable is a discrete way of documenting knowledge. It is a more general term than documentation.

END OF INSTANTIATION INSTRUCTIONS

Organizing [W]

Group the elements of [W] as a hierarchical list:

1. Domains of a task from [S]
2. Topics from [R]
3. Elements of [W] IMPORTANT: USE THIS ONTOLOGY AS THE FRAMING FOR THE ELEMENT, NESTED AS FOLLOWS:

1. ['Data', 'Information', 'Knowledge']
2. [‘Guiding’, ‘Applying’, Judging’]

Now generate the entirety of [W]

you may break up this task and then ask me to continue.

****

Reproduce Array P from memory
[P]
Size: 1x4
Ontology: ‘Reflecting'
Station: Reflection. These elements are reflection states that will be applied to the instantiation.

Reproduce [P]

These are known as the ‘Validity Themes’

****

Recall our map of meaning as we progress through the framework: If problem, then requirements, then objectives, then output, then verification, then validation, then evaluation, then assessment, then implementation, then instantiation, then reflection and resolution.

Tensor U
[U]
Size: 4x9x16x3x3
Station: Reflection

[P] x [W] = [U]

Tensor U will take the instantiations from Tensor W and apply them to each validity theme in Array P.

Constructing [U]

Begin with the element in [P] as the seed of thought and then reflect on that "theme of generating valid knowledge" according to the semantics each element in [W].

Organization of [U]

Group the elements of [U] as a hierarchical list:

1. Theme from [P]
2. Domains of a task from [S]
3. Topics from [R]
4. Elements of [W] IMPORTANT: USE THIS ONTOLOGY AS THE FRAMING FOR THE ELEMENT, NESTED AS FOLLOWS:
1. ['Data', 'Information', 'Knowledge']
2. ['Guiding', 'Applying', Judging']

Generate the entirety of [U].

you may break up this task and then ask me to continue.

****

Axiom
I will define a new axiomatic array whose elements comprise the dialectics of decision making, within the context of knowledge work.

Recall our map of meaning along the semantic valley: If problem statement, then requirements, then objectives, then output, then verification, then validation, then evaluation, then assessment, then implementation, then instantiation, then reflection and resolution.

Array H
[H]
Size: 1x4
Station: Resolution. These are the decision dialectics that will be applied to the reflection to generate the resolution of knowledge work
Ontology: Domains of decisions for a knowledge work task
Elements: [
‘Necessity versus Contingency’,
‘Sufficiency versus Insufficiency’,
‘Incompleteness versus Completeness’,
‘Consistency versus Inconsistency’
]

Decisions occur along four dialectical poles, and these poles are present throughout the Chirality Framework. Applying them now is the “final decision” at the conclusion of knowledge work.

****

Recall our map of meaning as we progress through the framework: If problem, then requirements, then objectives, then output, then verification, then validation, then evaluation, then assessment, then implementation, then instantiation, then reflection and resolution.

The final step of the Chirality Framework.

Tensor N
[N]
Size: 4x9x16x3x3x4
Station: Resolution

[U] x [H] = [N]

Tensor N will apply the decision making dialectics of [H] to each element of [U]

Constructing [N]

Begin with the element in [U] as the seed of thought and then apply in succession each of the decision making dialectics from [H] with the intention of generating reliable knowledge.

Organization of [N]

Group the elements of [N] as a hierarchical list:

1. Theme from [P]

2. Domains of a task from [S]
3. Topics from [R]
4. Elements of [W] IMPORTANT: USE THIS ONTOLOGY AS THE FRAMING FOR THE ELEMENT, NESTED AS FOLLOWS:
1. ['Data', 'Information', 'Knowledge']
2. [‘Guiding’, ‘Applying’, Judging’]
5. Decision Dialectic from [H]

Generate the entirety of [N].

you may break up this task and then ask me to continue.

****

****

****

****

****

****

****

****

****

****

****

****

Matrix, R is started out by guessing and is confirmed by this operation resulting in elements that are consistent with the original. (Or else update the originals)

Matrix R

Column names: ['Guiding', 'Applying', 'Judging', 'Reflecting']
Row names: ['Normative Level', 'Operational Level', 'Evaluative Level']

[N] / [D] = [R]

Semantic Division

Division is about finding a common denominator in a topic. Therefore the elements of Matrix R are what is held in common between [N] and [D] so that [N] can achieve the objectives in [D]. And in particular we say that the elements of Matrix R are the deliverable produced according to the elements nested under a topic in [N] in order to meet the objective in [D].

The objectives were instantiated in [W]. In this case, it is the development of the Chirality Framework itself that is being generated by the Chirality Framework. So how does [N] deliver on the goals of [D] in order to develop the Chirality Framework? That will reveal the elements of [R].

##Construction of Matrix R

R(1,1) = What is the common denominator amongst the elements nested under Topic 1 in [N] that was delivered in order to fulfill the objective described in D(1,1). Resolve a meaning considering the corresponding row and column names for that element in [R]
R(1,2) = What is the common denominator amongst the elements nested under Topic 2 in [N] that was delivered in order to fulfill the objective described in D(1,2). Resolve a meaning considering the corresponding row and column names for that element in [R]
R(1,3) = What is the common denominator amongst the elements nested under Topic 3 in [N] that was delivered in order to fulfill the objective described in D(1,3).

Resolve a meaning considering the corresponding row and column names for that element in [R]
R(1,4) = What is the common denominator amongst the elements nested under Topic 5 in [N] that was delivered in order to fulfill the objective described in D(1,4).
Resolve a meaning considering the corresponding row and column names for that element in [R]
R(2,1) = What is the common denominator amongst the elements nested under Topic 5 in [N] that was delivered in order to fulfill the objective described in D(2,1).
Resolve a meaning considering the corresponding row and column names for that element in [R]
R(2,2) = What is the common denominator amongst the elements nested under Topic 6 in [N] that was delivered in order to fulfill the objective described in D(2,2).
Resolve a meaning considering the corresponding row and column names for that element in [R]
R(2,3) = What is the common denominator amongst the elements nested under Topic 7 in [N] that was delivered in order to fulfill the objective described in D(2,3).
Resolve a meaning considering the corresponding row and column names for that element in [R]
R(2,4) = What is the common denominator amongst the elements nested under Topic 8 in [N] that was delivered in order to fulfill the objective described in D(2,4).
Resolve a meaning considering the corresponding row and column names for that element in [R]
R(3,1) = What is the common denominator amongst the elements nested under Topic 9 in [N] that was delivered in order to fulfill the objective described in D(3,1).
Resolve a meaning considering the corresponding row and column names for that element in [R]
R(3,2) = What is the common denominator amongst the elements nested under Topic 10 in [N] that was delivered in order to fulfill the objective described in D(3,2).
Resolve a meaning considering the corresponding row and column names for that element in [R]
R(3,3) = What is the common denominator amongst the elements nested under Topic 11 in [N] that was delivered in order to fulfill the objective described in D(3,3).
Resolve a meaning considering the corresponding row and column names for that element in [R]
R(3,4) = What is the common denominator amongst the elements nested under Topic 12 in [N] that was delivered in order to fulfill the objective described in D(3,4).

Resolve a meaning considering the corresponding row and column names for that element in [R]

[R] is a 3 x 4 semantic matrix.

Generate [R]

****

Matrix S
[S]
Size: 3x3
Station: Instantiation
Column names: ['Data', 'Information', 'Knowledge']
Row names: [‘Guiding’, ‘Applying’, Judging’]
Elements: [
[‘Action statement (something that needs to be done, requiring work)’, ’responsibility is assigned to someone’, ‘Has a priority’]
[‘Has a status and some documentation’, ‘Is work’, ‘Benefits from planning’]
[‘Resolves by approval to change status’, ‘Should be checked’, ‘Requires decisions’]
]