

Constraints Are Causes

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE | 15 OCTOBER 2026 | I. Biology of disease states

Abstract

This concept paper examines constraints are causes. It develops an argument drawn from Genes, Processes, and Constraints, identifies the relevant biological or clinical mechanisms, and considers where that argument may fail. This is a narrative perspective, not a systematic review or an original clinical study.

The central problem

A constraint is a condition that limits the states a system can occupy. In biology, oxygen availability, microvascular perfusion, transport capacity, energy supply, membrane integrity and mechanical confinement can alter outcomes even without constituting the initiating disease. The thesis is that medicine often gains explanatory power by measuring these limiting conditions directly. The term “cause” must be used carefully: a constraint may be necessary, permissive, amplifying or truly sufficient for a particular outcome.

Mechanisms and causal architecture

A myocardial cell with intact contractile proteins may still fail to perform under inadequate perfusion; a functioning neuron becomes unreliable when extracellular ion gradients are disturbed; normal digestive enzymes cannot compensate indefinitely for loss of adequate substrate delivery. Clinical deterioration is therefore not always a defective part but an unmet condition for a part to function. Interventions that restore oxygen delivery, circulation, nutrition or electrolyte balance are already important examples of constraint-directed treatment. The original contribution here is to make these causal roles explicit across disease models.

A discriminating example

A patient with a reassuring hemoglobin concentration may still have exertional intolerance from cardiovascular or pulmonary disease. A patient with normal oxygen delivery can nevertheless have neuromuscular limitations. Both experiences illustrate that a normal component reading does not establish the adequacy of the entire process. The rate-limiting step must be identified rather than guessed from a general sense that the system is 'under strain'.

Competing explanations and limitations

Constraint language could become an unhelpful catchall. If every clinical factor is renamed a “constraint,” no sharper diagnosis follows. A useful hypothesis specifies which variable has become rate-limiting, demonstrates that changing it alters downstream behavior, and rules out simpler explanations. Severe infections, structural lesions and genetic disorders often have causes that remain critical even when systemic context is measured.

What evidence would change the interpretation?

Evidence could include dose-response relationships, rescue experiments, repeated measures demonstrating threshold behavior and interventions that restore functional output while the original structural abnormality remains unchanged. Conversely, if modifying the supposed bottleneck does not alter function or prognosis, it was not decisive in the proposed context.

Implications for medical interpretation

This paper encourages clinicians and readers to ask what conditions make normal physiology possible, rather than attributing every failure to intrinsic organ weakness. The practical result is more precise causal reasoning, not a universal alternative protocol.

Selected scientific reading

Kitano (2002), Systems biology: a brief overview, Science.
<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1069492>

Barabási, Gulbahce & Loscalzo (2011), Network medicine: a network-based approach to human disease, Nature Reviews Genetics.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg2918>

Original source: Genes, Processes, and Constraints. All source books supplied by the author.

Conceptual research commentary. Not a peer-reviewed clinical study, original trial, systematic review, validated diagnostic instrument or treatment protocol. Consult qualified care for medical decisions.