

Regulatory Flexibility: The Difference Between Stability and Rigidity

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE | 15 OCTOBER 2026 | II. Coherence capacity medicine

Abstract

This concept paper examines regulatory flexibility: the difference between stability and rigidity. It develops an argument drawn from Applied Coherence Medicine, 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

An organism can maintain normal-looking averages while losing the ability to respond and recover. Regulatory flexibility describes appropriately scaled responses to challenge followed by recovery within a useful interval. This differs from simply having low heart rate, low cortisol or a uniformly calm mood. Healthy regulation is adaptive movement; chronic suppression, excessive activation and weak response are different disturbances.

Mechanisms and causal architecture

Autonomic control offers one window. Heart rate, blood pressure, ventilation, baroreflexes and HRV reflect interacting control loops, but no single readout is a universal index of vagal tone or healing. Endocrine and immune regulation are equally context sensitive: cortisol varies by time of day; inflammatory markers change with infection, exercise and body composition. The source framework's contribution is to put these measures beside observable recovery behavior and symptom trajectories. It is most informative when responses are tied to a defined challenge and recovery window.

A discriminating example

A high resting heart rate is a clue, not a regulatory diagnosis. It can arise from fever, anemia, stimulant exposure, fitness level or an autonomic disorder. A person may also display normal resting readings but an abnormal recovery after standing or exertion. By examining the shape of the response and its return to baseline, the flexibility concept may add information without elevating HRV or another single index into an oracle.

Competing explanations and limitations

Regulatory response can be appropriate to an ongoing threat. Tachycardia in hemorrhage, fever during infection or an activated immune system are not inherently pathological merely because they deviate from a resting ideal. Mislabeling necessary responses as “dysregulation” risks delayed medical care. Drugs, physical conditioning, age and sampling error further complicate physiological interpretation.

What evidence would change the interpretation?

A testable formulation would compare stress-response magnitude, recovery half-time and variability across similar perturbations. The key question is whether these measures predict functional resilience or relapse better than symptom severity alone. The construct fails when it becomes a circular statement that healthy people regulate well because they are healthy.

Implications for medical interpretation

Clinical value lies in describing a person's actual response to demands: how rapidly they return to baseline and what functional cost follows. It is a framework for interpretation rather than a new diagnostic code.

Selected scientific reading

McEwen (1998), Protective and damaging effects of stress mediators, New England Journal of Medicine.
<https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJM199801153380307>

Scheer et al. (2009), Adverse metabolic and cardiovascular consequences of circadian misalignment, PNAS.
<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0808180106>

Original source: Applied Coherence Medicine. 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.