Human Energy as a Regulated System

A Cybernetic, Phenomenological, and Neurobiological Framework for CEP-Based Regulation

Human Energy as a Regulated System
*A Cybernetic, Phenomenological, and
Neurobiological Framework*

© 2025 Martin Piškorić
Part of the Recalib Scientific & Conceptual
Foundation

Versioned document. Structural changes result in a new cryptographic fingerprint.

0. Executive Overview

Purpose of this paper

"Energy" is one of the most commonly used words in everyday language—and one of the least disciplined. People use it to describe fatigue, motivation, mood, focus, stress, vitality, readiness, and even interpersonal atmospheres. Because the word is semantically overloaded, it becomes a perfect carrier of projection: it can mean everything, therefore it can mean nothing.

This paper exists to do something operationally modest but conceptually demanding: to build a scientific foundation for using "energy" as a **regulation construct**—a practical, testable, and ethically bounded descriptor of how a human system is functioning in the present moment. The aim is not to "prove" energy as a substance, but to **formalize energy as an emergent indicator** that bridges subjective experience and measurable regulation dynamics.

Why "energy" is problematic—and why it is still necessary

The term is problematic because it invites category errors. In physics, energy is a conserved quantity with precise units. In human systems, what we intuitively call "energy" is not conserved, not unitary, and not directly measurable as a single variable. Treating psychological or physiological functioning as if it were thermodynamic energy creates misleading analogies and opens the door to pseudo-scientific rhetoric.

Yet the term remains necessary for one reason: **it compresses a complex regulatory reality into a usable human interface.** Humans make decisions based on felt capacity—what they can sustain, what they can tolerate, what they can engage. In real life, the lived question is not "What is my cortisol level?" but "Do I have the capacity to meet this demand without collapsing, dissociating, or overcompensating?" The word "energy" functions as a cognitive shortcut for that capacity.

The question, therefore, is not whether we should use the word, but whether we can **discipline** it.

Why Recalib does not use "energy" metaphorically, but operationally

In the Recalib CEP × Zone model, "energy" is not a motivational slogan and not a spiritual essence. It is treated as a **user-facing label** for a structured state estimate derived from three interdependent regulatory dimensions:

Human Energy as a Regulated System
*A Cybernetic, Phenomenological, and
Neurobiological Framework*

© 2025 Martin Piškorić
Part of the Recalib Scientific & Conceptual
Foundation

- **C (Cognitive):** capacity for attention, clarity, working memory, decision stability

- **E (Emotional):** affective regulation, integration vs. overwhelm, signal processing of emotion

- **P (Physical):** physiological regulation capacity (arousal, recovery, stress physiology)

The model does not claim these three exhaust the human condition. It claims that, for operational regulation, these three form a minimal viable state-space that (a) is psychologically meaningful to users, (b) can be tracked over time, and (c) can guide micro-interventions without collapsing into ideology.

Zones (Green / Orange / Red) serve as a **regulation language**, not a moral rating system. They enable thresholded decisions: stabilize first, then stretch, then integrate—rather than forcing a single "optimal" state.

What this paper is not

This work explicitly rejects four common misframings:

1. **New-age essentialism:** energy as a mystical substance or cosmic force.

2. **Wellness ideology:** energy as branding language that replaces precision with inspiration.

3. **Purely biomedical reductionism:** the fantasy that one biomarker can replace lived regulation.

4. **Moralization:** treating low energy as failure, laziness, or a character flaw.

The goal is neither spiritual validation nor motivational persuasion. The goal is a disciplined conceptual bridge between experience and regulation.

What this paper is

This paper is an interdisciplinary attempt to define "energy" as an **emergent regulatory construct**, grounded in:

Human Energy as a Regulated System
*A Cybernetic, Phenomenological, and
Neurobiological Framework*

© 2025 Martin Piškorić
Part of the Recalib Scientific & Conceptual
Foundation

- **Cybernetics (2nd order):** regulation, feedback, observer-in-system, requisite variety

- **Phenomenology / lived experience:** the legitimacy of self-report as first-person data

- **Neurobiology and physiology:** autonomic regulation, allostatic load, somatic markers

- **Psychological models of regulation:** window of tolerance, affective integration, cognitive load

- **Operational design constraints:** thresholds, state categories, oscillation dynamics, ethical guardrails

Its core claim is modest and testable:

> **Energy, as used here, is not a "thing." It is an emergent indicator of a system's momentary regulatory capacity—expressed through the coupled dynamics of cognition, emotion, and physiology.**

Key output of the paper

The paper produces three deliverables:

1. **A disciplined definition:** energy as a regulation construct rather than a substance.

2. **A state model:** CEP as a minimal state vector; coherence as a measure of internal alignment (low variance among CEP dimensions); zones as thresholded regulation modes.

3. **A dynamics model:** healthy regulation requires oscillation—stability is not constantness; transitions and recovery patterns matter as much as point estimates.

The position, stated clearly

In this framework:

- **Energy is not metaphysics.**

Human Energy as a Regulated System
*A Cybernetic, Phenomenological, and
Neurobiological Framework*

© 2025 Martin Piškorić
Part of the Recalib Scientific & Conceptual
Foundation

- **Energy is not physics transplanted into psychology.**

- **Energy is a practical, cross-level descriptor of regulation capacity**—a human-usable interface over a complex adaptive system.

This paper proceeds by first clarifying how we may speak about energy without committing category errors (epistemology), then grounding the three CEP dimensions in contemporary regulation science, and finally formalizing the zone and oscillation logic as an operational language for guidance—while explicitly addressing limitations, critiques, and open empirical questions.

Chapter 1 — Epistemological Framework: How We May Speak About "Energy"

1.1. The Problem of Abstract Terms in Human Language

Human language evolved to coordinate action in concrete environments, not to describe internal regulation with scientific precision. As a result, abstract terms tend to function as **containers for multiple meanings**, rather than as stable descriptors. "Energy" is a paradigmatic example.

From an NLP perspective, "energy" operates primarily as a **nominalization**: a verb- or process-derived noun that freezes dynamic activity into an apparently static entity. People do not directly experience "energy" as an object; they experience *changes in capacity*: alertness rising or falling, emotional contraction or openness, bodily readiness or collapse. Language compresses these processes into a single label.

This compression has two consequences:

1. **Semantic projection:** individuals project personal, cultural, or ideological meanings onto the term.

2. **False reification:** the word begins to be treated as if it referred to a thing that exists independently of context.

In everyday speech this ambiguity is tolerable, even useful. In scientific discourse it is not. Without explicit constraints, abstract terms drift toward metaphor, moralization, or

Human Energy as a Regulated System
A Cybernetic, Phenomenological, and
Neurobiological Framework

© 2025 Martin Piškorić
Part of the Recalib Scientific & Conceptual
Foundation

mystification. Any serious attempt to use "energy" must therefore begin by **disciplining the term**, not defending it.

The Recalib framework accepts the linguistic reality of abstraction but refuses its epistemic laziness. "Energy" is retained only insofar as it can be operationally constrained and theoretically justified.

1.2. Second-Order Cybernetics: The Observer Inside the System

Classical scientific models assume a separation between observer and observed. This assumption fails when the object of study is **human regulation**, because the human subject is simultaneously the measuring instrument and the measured system.

Second-order cybernetics, as articulated by thinkers such as **Heinz von Foerster** and **W. Ross Ashby**, provides a necessary corrective. In this paradigm, the observer is not external noise but a **constitutive element of the system**. What is observed depends on how observation is performed, and feedback loops include the act of observing itself.

Applied to the notion of energy, this implies a crucial shift:

- Energy does not exist as an objective psychological quantity "out there."

- Energy exists **relationally**, as an indicator emerging from the interaction between a system and its self-observation.

In Recalib, the user is not treated as a passive data source but as an **active sensor** embedded in a feedback loop. Self-report is not a flaw to be corrected away; it is the primary interface through which regulation becomes observable at all. The question is not whether self-report is "subjective," but whether it is **systematically constrained and meaningfully interpreted**.

Second-order cybernetics thus legitimizes the use of first-person input without collapsing into relativism. Regulation is not inferred despite the observer, but *through* the observer.

1.3. An Operational Definition of Energy

Given these constraints, any viable definition of energy in human systems must satisfy four criteria:

1. **Non-reification:** it must not treat energy as a substance or fixed quantity.

Human Energy as a Regulated System
*A Cybernetic, Phenomenological, and
Neurobiological Framework*

© 2025 Martin Piškorić
Part of the Recalib Scientific & Conceptual
Foundation

2. **Relationality:** it must be defined in relation to system state and demand.

3. **Operational usefulness:** it must guide decisions about regulation and intervention.

4. **Ethical restraint:** it must avoid moral judgment or coercive optimization.

Accordingly, this paper adopts the following operational definition:

> **Energy is a subjective–objective indicator of a system's current regulatory capacity to meet internal and external demands without loss of coherence.**

Several elements of this definition require emphasis:

- **Indicator, not entity:** energy points to regulation quality; it is not itself the cause.

- **Subjective–objective:** it emerges from lived experience, yet can be structured, tracked, and analyzed over time.

- **Momentary:** energy is state-dependent, not an identity or trait.

- **Regulatory capacity:** the core concern is not performance, motivation, or mood, but the ability to adapt without destabilization.

This definition deliberately avoids metaphysical commitments. It does not claim that energy is measurable in joules, nor that it is reducible to a single biomarker. It claims only that *humans reliably experience and act upon perceived regulatory capacity*, and that this perception can be brought into a disciplined feedback system.

1.4. Consequences for Measurement and Design

Once energy is understood as an emergent regulatory indicator, several design consequences follow:

- Measurement must focus on **state patterns and transitions**, not absolute scores.

- Precision is achieved through **structure and repetition**, not through invasive instrumentation.

Human Energy as a Regulated System
*A Cybernetic, Phenomenological, and
Neurobiological Framework*

© 2025 Martin Piškorić
Part of the Recalib Scientific & Conceptual
Foundation

- Validity is ecological: the model succeeds if it improves regulation decisions, not if it produces impressive numbers.

The Recalib CEP model and its associated zone logic are direct consequences of this epistemological stance. Rather than asking "How much energy do you have?", the system asks a more constrained question: *How regulated is this system right now across its primary functional dimensions, and what mode of engagement is appropriate?*

This reframing allows "energy" to function as a **legitimate bridge concept**—connecting phenomenology, neurobiology, and cybernetic regulation—without collapsing into either mysticism or reductionism.

The next chapter situates this operational definition within historical and scientific uses of the term "energy," clarifying which traditions are explicitly rejected, which are partially compatible, and which inform the present framework indirectly.

Chapter 2 — Historical and Scientific Contexts of "Energy"

2.1. Physics: What Is *Not* Transferred

The modern scientific prestige of the word "energy" originates in physics, where it denotes a precisely defined, conserved quantity governed by formal laws. In that domain, energy is mathematically expressible, transferable, and independent of subjective interpretation.

This precision is precisely why **direct transfer of the concept into human regulation is illegitimate**.

Psychological or experiential states do not obey conservation laws. There is no closed system, no invariant unit, and no guarantee of equivalence across contexts. Attempting to treat motivation, fatigue, or attention as if they were thermodynamic quantities leads to category errors: metaphor masquerading as explanation.

The danger is not analogy itself—analogy can be heuristically useful—but **unexamined analogy**. When physical metaphors are treated as literal mechanisms ("running out of energy," "recharging like a battery"), they obscure the true dynamics of regulation: feedback, adaptation, and context sensitivity.

Human Energy as a Regulated System
*A Cybernetic, Phenomenological, and
Neurobiological Framework*

© 2025 Martin Piškorić
Part of the Recalib Scientific & Conceptual
Foundation

For this reason, the Recalib framework explicitly **rejects any claim that human energy is a direct extension of physical energy**. The relationship is linguistic and metaphorical, not ontological. Physics provides inspiration for rigor, not a template for transfer.

2.2. Psychology and Psychodynamics: Early Attempts and Their Limits

The first serious attempts to formalize "energy" in human systems emerged in early psychology, particularly within psychodynamic theory. **Sigmund Freud** introduced the idea of *psychic energy* (libido) as a driving force underlying mental life. While conceptually powerful, the model treated energy as a quasi-substance that could be accumulated, displaced, or discharged.

Over time, this framing proved untenable. The lack of operational definitions and the difficulty of empirical validation led to the gradual abandonment of libido as an explanatory variable. Energy, in this sense, became too abstract to test and too concrete to remain metaphor.

A more nuanced shift occurred with **Carl Jung**, who reframed psychological energy not as quantity but as **direction and flow**. For Jung, the critical variable was not how much energy existed, but where attention and meaning were oriented. This move reduced reification but retained vagueness; energy became descriptive rather than operational.

The lesson from psychodynamics is instructive:

- Treating energy as a substance leads to pseudo-mechanistic explanations.

- Treating energy purely symbolically leads to interpretive richness without regulatory guidance.

Recalib inherits neither approach wholesale. Instead, it retains Jung's emphasis on direction while replacing substance metaphors with **state-dependent regulation capacity**.

2.3. Contemporary Shifts: Regulation Replaces Force

Modern psychology and neuroscience have largely abandoned "energy" as a central theoretical construct, yet they continue to describe the phenomena it once attempted to explain—under different names and with greater precision.

Three contemporary frameworks are especially relevant:

Self-regulation and allostatic load.
Rather than positing a finite internal resource, modern models focus on how systems adapt

to demand over time. Chronic misalignment between demand and recovery produces cumulative strain—*allostatic load*—which manifests phenomenologically as exhaustion, irritability, and reduced flexibility. What lay language calls "low energy" is often a signal of regulatory overload rather than depleted fuel.

Affective neuroscience.
 Emotion is now understood as integral to regulation, not a disturbance of rational control. Patterns of affect signal approach, avoidance, threat, or safety. Dysregulation in emotional processing often precedes cognitive impairment, reinforcing the idea that regulation capacity is multi-dimensional.

Autonomic state models.
 Frameworks such as the polyvagal perspective describe shifts between states of safety, mobilization, and shutdown. These states correlate strongly with subjective reports of vitality or depletion, yet are better described as **modes of regulation** than as levels of energy.

Across these domains, a consistent pattern emerges: the field has moved away from **force-based explanations** toward **adaptive regulation models**. The language of energy did not disappear because the phenomena vanished, but because the concept lacked sufficient structure.

The Recalib model can be understood as a response to this gap: reintroducing "energy" not as a competing theory, but as a **compressed interface** over established regulatory science—explicitly constrained, thresholded, and dynamically interpreted.

2.4. Implications for a Modern Usage of the Term

The historical record suggests three guiding principles for any contemporary use of "energy" in human systems:

1. **Avoid substance metaphors.** Energy is not stored, spent, or refilled in a literal sense.

2. **Prioritize regulation over performance.** Capacity to adapt matters more than output.

3. **Anchor experience without absolutizing it.** Subjective reports are meaningful signals, not objective facts.

Recalib's approach does not resurrect an abandoned construct; it **re-contextualizes a persistent human intuition** within a cybernetic and neurobiological frame. "Energy"

survives not because it is theoretically elegant, but because it remains experientially indispensable. The task of science, in this case, is not elimination but discipline.

The next chapter grounds the model in neurobiological regulation, beginning with the physical (P) dimension of the CEP framework and the role of the autonomic nervous system.

Chapter 3 — Neurobiological Foundations of Regulation

The Physical Dimension (P) in the CEP Model

3.1. The Autonomic Nervous System as a Regulatory Core

Any serious discussion of human regulation must begin with the autonomic nervous system (ANS). Unlike cognitive strategies or emotional narratives, autonomic processes operate continuously and largely outside conscious control, modulating arousal, recovery, and readiness at a physiological level.

From a regulatory perspective, the ANS does not ask whether a situation is meaningful or justified; it asks whether the organism is **safe enough to engage**, **mobilized to act**, or **overwhelmed and in need of protection**. These modes are not pathologies but **evolutionarily conserved strategies**.

Contemporary models distinguish between three dominant autonomic patterns, often associated with the work of **Stephen Porges**:

- **Ventral vagal regulation:** social engagement, flexibility, recovery

- **Sympathetic mobilization:** action, effort, adaptive challenge

- **Dorsal vagal shutdown:** conservation, collapse, protective withdrawal

Crucially, these are not hierarchical "better vs. worse" states. Each mode is adaptive in the right context. The problem arises not from entering a given state, but from **becoming trapped** in it or activating it inappropriately.

Within the Recalib Zone Model, these autonomic patterns map naturally onto regulatory language:

Human Energy as a Regulated System
A Cybernetic, Phenomenological, and
Neurobiological Framework

© 2025 Martin Piškorić
Part of the Recalib Scientific & Conceptual
Foundation

- **Red Zone** corresponds to protective dominance (overwhelm, shutdown, or frantic mobilization).

- **Orange Zone** corresponds to sympathetic activation within tolerable bounds.

- **Green Zone** corresponds to integrated regulation with recovery capacity.

This mapping is not a claim of equivalence but of **functional alignment**: zones describe regulation modes, not moral or diagnostic categories.

3.2. Red Zone as a Biological Signal, Not a Failure

In many performance-oriented cultures, low physiological capacity is interpreted as weakness or lack of discipline. This interpretation is biologically incorrect and ethically dangerous.

From a neurobiological standpoint, the Red Zone is a **protective signal**. It indicates that the system's current demands exceed its regulatory bandwidth. This may manifest as fatigue, irritability, numbness, anxiety, or cognitive fog—but these are *signals*, not defects.

Importantly, a system can appear externally functional while being internally exhausted. High output does not imply healthy regulation. Individuals may maintain performance through sympathetic overdrive while accumulating physiological debt, a pattern that often precedes sudden collapse or burnout.

The Recalib framework therefore makes a non-negotiable design choice:
 growth is never prescribed from within the Red Zone.

Attempting to push adaptation while the system is in protective mode increases allostatic strain and erodes long-term capacity. Regulation must precede challenge.

3.3. Allostatic Load and the Illusion of Capacity

Traditional notions of stress assumed a return to baseline after demand. Modern research has demonstrated that many systems do not return fully to baseline, instead accumulating **allostatic load**—the cost of chronic adaptation.

This concept, extensively developed in neuroendocrinology, reframes exhaustion as a **regulatory debt problem**, not a motivation problem. What people describe as "low energy" often reflects:

- delayed recovery

- persistent autonomic imbalance

- reduced physiological flexibility

The critical distinction here is between **performance capacity** and **regulation capacity**. A system may still perform while its regulatory margin shrinks. When that margin disappears, even minor perturbations trigger disproportionate reactions.

In Recalib terms, this distinction explains why zone history and oscillation patterns matter more than single-point measurements. A stable Green score achieved through suppression is not equivalent to a Green state supported by genuine recovery.

3.4. Somatic Markers and Pre-Cognitive Regulation

One of the most robust findings across neuroscience and clinical practice is that **the body signals regulation state before conscious interpretation catches up**. Changes in posture, breath, muscle tone, gut sensation, or heart rhythm precede explicit emotional labeling or cognitive appraisal.

These somatic markers serve as **early-warning indicators** of regulatory drift. Ignoring them does not increase rational control; it merely delays response until stronger—and often more disruptive—signals emerge.

This has two important implications:

1. **Somatic input is primary, not auxiliary.**

2. Regulation cannot be achieved through cognition alone.

The P dimension in the CEP model is therefore not a secondary "body add-on," but a **foundational layer**. Without physiological stabilization, cognitive reframing and emotional processing become unstable or ineffective.

Recalib's emphasis on micro-interventions—breath modulation, posture shifts, brief pauses—is grounded in this logic. These interventions do not "fix" the system; they **restore regulatory bandwidth** so that higher-order processes can operate again.

Human Energy as a Regulated System
*A Cybernetic, Phenomenological, and
Neurobiological Framework*

© 2025 Martin Piškorić
Part of the Recalib Scientific & Conceptual
Foundation

3.5. Physical Regulation as Capacity, Not Comfort

A common misunderstanding equates physiological regulation with comfort or relaxation. In reality, a well-regulated system is not necessarily calm—it is **responsive**.

Green Zone regulation does not imply low arousal; it implies **appropriate arousal with recovery available**. Orange Zone activation is not stress to be eliminated but tension that can be metabolized. Even Red Zone activation is not to be avoided at all costs, but to be **entered briefly and exited skillfully**.

The defining variable, therefore, is not arousal level but **reversibility**. Can the system return to baseline? Can it shift modes without friction? Can it sense overload early enough to prevent collapse?

In this sense, physical "energy" is best understood as **physiological maneuverability**—the room a system has to respond without breaking coherence.

3.6. Implications for the CEP Framework

Grounding the P dimension in neurobiology clarifies several design choices in the CEP model:

- Self-reported physical state is treated as valid first-person data, not noise.

- Zone thresholds prioritize protection before optimization.

- Trends and transitions are emphasized over peak values.

Physical regulation sets the **floor** for emotional and cognitive regulation. When that floor collapses, higher-level interventions become unstable. The CEP model therefore reads the body not as a passive container, but as the **first regulator** of the human system.

The next chapter examines the emotional dimension (E) of regulation, drawing from Gestalt psychology, affective neuroscience, and the concept of the window of tolerance to clarify why emotion is signal, not disturbance.

Human Energy as a Regulated System
*A Cybernetic, Phenomenological, and
Neurobiological Framework*

© 2025 Martin Piškorić
Part of the Recalib Scientific & Conceptual
Foundation

Chapter 4 — Emotional Regulation and the Gestalt Perspective

The Emotional Dimension (E) in the CEP Model

4.1. Emotion as Signal, Not Disturbance

In many cultural and organizational contexts, emotion is treated as interference: something that clouds judgment, reduces efficiency, or needs to be controlled. This framing is incompatible with contemporary regulation science.

Emotion is not noise in the system; it is **information about the state of the system in relation to its environment**. Fear, anger, sadness, joy, and interest are not problems to be solved but signals indicating relevance, threat, loss, or opportunity. When emotional signals are ignored or suppressed, regulation does not improve—it degrades.

From a regulatory standpoint, emotional dysregulation is rarely caused by "too much emotion." More often, it results from **blocked processing**: emotions arise but cannot complete their regulatory function. This blockage consumes capacity and contributes directly to what is experienced as "low energy."

4.2. Gestalt Psychology: Incomplete Figures and Energetic Cost

Gestalt psychology provides a particularly useful lens for understanding emotional regulation. In this tradition, associated with figures such as **Fritz Perls**, emotions are understood as part of a self-organizing process of figure and ground.

An emotion becomes salient (a "figure") when it carries unmet information or action potential. If the figure is allowed to complete—through awareness, meaning-making, or appropriate action—it returns to the background. If completion is blocked, the figure remains active, consuming attentional and physiological resources.

This has a direct regulatory implication:
 unfinished emotional figures exact an ongoing energetic cost.

Suppression does not eliminate this cost; it often increases it. The system must now expend additional effort to maintain inhibition. Over time, this chronic expenditure contributes to fatigue, irritability, and reduced flexibility—phenomena commonly labeled as low emotional energy.

Human Energy as a Regulated System
A Cybernetic, Phenomenological, and
Neurobiological Framework

© 2025 Martin Piškorić
Part of the Recalib Scientific & Conceptual
Foundation

In the CEP model, the E dimension tracks not emotional intensity but **emotional integration**: the degree to which affective signals can arise, be processed, and settle without destabilizing the system.

4.3. The Window of Tolerance as a Regulatory Frame

A widely adopted contemporary concept that aligns closely with the Recalib Zone Model is the **window of tolerance**, popularized by **Daniel Siegel**. The window describes the range of arousal within which a person can remain emotionally present, cognitively flexible, and relationally engaged.

When arousal exceeds this window, the system shifts into hyperactivation (panic, rage, anxiety) or hypoactivation (numbness, collapse, dissociation). Both represent regulatory extremes, not failures of character.

Within the Recalib framework:

- **Red Zone** corresponds to functioning outside the window of tolerance.

- **Orange Zone** corresponds to active engagement within the upper range of tolerance.

- **Green Zone** corresponds to integrated regulation with emotional bandwidth available.

Importantly, Green does not imply emotional flatness. A well-regulated system can experience strong emotions without losing coherence. Conversely, apparent calm achieved through emotional constriction is not Green regulation but a fragile pseudo-stability.

4.4. Orange Zone: Safe Activation and Emotional Learning

One of the most critical contributions of the Zone Model is the explicit legitimization of **Orange** as a desired and necessary state. Many systems mistakenly equate health with constant calm, inadvertently training avoidance of emotional activation.

From a regulatory perspective, learning and growth require **manageable emotional tension**. Curiosity, effort, frustration, and excitement all involve increased arousal. When this arousal remains within the window of tolerance, it strengthens regulation capacity rather than depleting it.

Orange is therefore not a transitional inconvenience but a **functional zone of adaptation**. Emotional energy in Orange is neither suppressed nor indulged; it is metabolized.

Human Energy as a Regulated System
*A Cybernetic, Phenomenological, and
Neurobiological Framework*

© 2025 Martin Piškorić
Part of the Recalib Scientific & Conceptual
Foundation

Recalib's design choice to reward oscillation between Orange and Green reflects this logic. A system that never enters Orange stagnates; a system that cannot return to Green exhausts itself.

4.5. Regulation Versus Expression

A common misunderstanding equates emotional regulation with emotional expression. While expression can be regulatory, it is not inherently so. Unstructured venting may amplify arousal rather than integrate it, pushing the system further from coherence.

The CEP model draws a clear distinction:

- **Regulation** aims at restoring flexibility and integration.

- **Expression** is one possible means, not the goal itself.

This is why Recalib does not prescribe indiscriminate emotional discharge. Instead, it supports **context-sensitive processing**: noticing, naming, and integrating emotion in ways that reduce load rather than escalate it.

Emotional energy increases not when everything is expressed, but when **less needs to be actively suppressed**. Integration reduces background strain, freeing capacity for cognition and action.

4.6. Emotional Regulation as a Contributor to "Energy"

Within the CEP framework, emotional regulation contributes to perceived energy through two primary mechanisms:

1. **Reduction of background load:** fewer unresolved affective processes draining capacity.

2. **Increased adaptability:** greater tolerance for activation without collapse.

What is commonly experienced as "emotional energy" is therefore not emotional positivity but **emotional availability**—the ability to engage with experience without defensive contraction.

Human Energy as a Regulated System
*A Cybernetic, Phenomenological, and
Neurobiological Framework*

© 2025 Martin Piškorić
Part of the Recalib Scientific & Conceptual
Foundation

This reframing explains why forced positivity often backfires and why emotional numbness can feel simultaneously calm and depleted. Energy rises not when emotion is controlled, but when it is **properly regulated**.

The next chapter turns to the cognitive dimension (C) of the CEP model, examining attention, cognitive load, metacognition, and the role of NLP in reframing regulation without collapsing into optimism or denial.

Chapter 5 — Cognitive Regulation and the Role of NLP

The Cognitive Dimension (C) in the CEP Model

5.1. Attention as a Limited Regulatory Resource

Cognition is often treated as an unlimited command center: if thinking is clear enough, everything else should follow. Contemporary cognitive science demonstrates the opposite. Attention, working memory, and decision capacity are **finite and easily overloaded**.

Research on cognitive load and decision fatigue—popularized in part by **Daniel Kahneman**—shows that cognitive performance degrades predictably under sustained demand. Errors increase, risk assessment distorts, and reliance on heuristics intensifies. These effects are not moral failures; they are properties of bounded systems.

Within the CEP framework, cognitive "energy" does not refer to intelligence or talent. It refers to **available attentional bandwidth**: the system's capacity to hold complexity, make distinctions, and choose deliberately rather than reactively.

When cognitive load exceeds capacity, regulation fails in two common ways:

- **Overcontrol:** rigid, effortful thinking that consumes excessive resources.

- **Collapse into reactivity:** impulsive decisions driven by habit or affect.

Both patterns are frequently described subjectively as "mental exhaustion," even when physiological arousal remains high.

5.2. Metacognition: Observing the Observer

A defining feature of human cognition is the ability to reflect on its own processes. This capacity—often summarized as "thinking about thinking"—is central to regulation.

Human Energy as a Regulated System
A Cybernetic, Phenomenological, and
Neurobiological Framework

© 2025 Martin Piškorić
Part of the Recalib Scientific & Conceptual
Foundation

Metacognition introduces a **second-order loop** into cognition. Rather than being fully absorbed in content ("What am I thinking?"), the system gains access to process ("How am I relating to what I'm thinking?"). This shift dramatically reduces cognitive load by loosening identification with any single thought stream.

In the Recalib model, metacognition is not treated as a philosophical luxury but as a **regulatory skill**. Even minimal metacognitive awareness ("I notice that my attention is fragmented") can restore choice and reduce unnecessary effort.

This logic underpins the Awareness–Alignment Matrix (AAM), which maps relatively stable cognitive orientations—ranging from automatic, unexamined processing to integrative, reflective engagement. These orientations are not ranked as superior or inferior personalities; they describe **default modes of cognitive regulation** under demand.

5.3. NLP: Models, Maps, and Cognitive Economy

Neuro-Linguistic Programming (NLP), at its core, is not a theory of truth but a theory of **modeling**. Its central claim—that "the map is not the territory"—emphasizes that cognition operates through representations, not direct access to reality.

From a regulation perspective, this distinction is crucial. Cognitive exhaustion often arises not from reality itself, but from **inefficient internal maps**: overly complex narratives, absolutist interpretations, or poorly differentiated categories.

NLP contributes three relevant insights to the CEP model:

1. **Models are tools, not beliefs.**
   A cognitively economical model conserves energy even if it is not philosophically complete.

2. **Precision reduces load.**
   Vague or global interpretations ("everything is wrong," "I have no energy") require constant maintenance. Specific descriptions are cheaper to regulate.

3. **Reframing is regulatory, not cosmetic.**
   Effective reframing changes the *structure* of experience, not its emotional tone. The goal is increased navigability, not forced optimism.

Recalib therefore treats cognitive reframing as an intervention aimed at **reducing unnecessary cognitive expenditure**, not at producing positive affect.

Human Energy as a Regulated System
A Cybernetic, Phenomenological, and
Neurobiological Framework

© 2025 Martin Piškorić
Part of the Recalib Scientific & Conceptual
Foundation

5.4. Cognitive Energy Is Not Positive Thinking

One of the most persistent confusions in applied psychology equates cognitive regulation with positivity. This equation is both empirically unsupported and practically harmful.

Optimistic narratives that contradict lived signals increase cognitive dissonance and background strain. The system must now expend additional resources to maintain the narrative against conflicting data. Subjectively, this often feels like motivation followed by rapid depletion.

The CEP model explicitly rejects positivity as a regulatory goal. Instead, it prioritizes **model accuracy and proportionality**. A cognitively regulated system can hold unpleasant information without catastrophic interpretation and pleasant information without over-identification.

In this sense, cognitive energy is best understood as **clarity with minimal distortion**, not enthusiasm.

5.5. Cognitive Contribution to Overall Regulation

Within the integrated CEP system, cognition contributes to perceived energy in two primary ways:

- **Load management:** how much complexity the system is attempting to process at once.

- **Interpretive efficiency:** how accurately internal models reflect current conditions.

When cognition is overloaded or misaligned, emotional and physiological regulation are forced to compensate. Conversely, when cognition is proportionate and flexible, it **reduces downstream strain** across the entire system.

This explains why cognitive interventions alone often fail when P or E are dysregulated—and why, when properly sequenced, even small cognitive shifts can have outsized regulatory effects.

The next chapter integrates the three dimensions—Cognitive, Emotional, and Physical—into a single state model, explaining why CEP must be treated as a coupled system rather than as independent levers.

Chapter 6 — CEP as an Integrated System

Why Regulation Requires Three Coupled Dimensions

6.1. Why Reductionist Approaches Fail

Most self-regulation frameworks fail not because they are wrong, but because they are **incomplete**. Approaches that focus exclusively on cognition ("mindset"), emotion ("emotional intelligence"), or the body ("somatic regulation") each capture an important slice of reality—but none can sustain regulation on their own.

Cognition-only models assume that insight precedes capacity. In practice, insight without physiological or emotional bandwidth often produces frustration rather than change. Somatic-only approaches can stabilize arousal yet leave meaning unresolved, resulting in temporary relief without direction. Emotion-centered models can restore contact but, without cognitive framing or bodily safety, may amplify volatility.

The recurring failure pattern is **decoupling**: treating one dimension as primary while ignoring its dependence on the others. Regulation is not additive ("fix C, then E, then P"), but **coupled**: changes in one dimension alter the operating conditions of the others.

The CEP model exists precisely to prevent this form of conceptual fragmentation.

6.2. CEP as a State Vector, Not a Checklist

In Recalib, Cognitive (C), Emotional (E), and Physical (P) dimensions are modeled as components of a **state vector**, not as independent scores. At any given moment, the human system occupies a position in a three-dimensional state space.

This framing has several important consequences:

- **Interdependence:** a shift in one component changes the effective meaning of the others.

- **Context sensitivity:** the same cognitive clarity may feel effortless or exhausting depending on emotional and physiological state.

- **Dynamic interpretation:** absolute values matter less than relative alignment and movement.

Human Energy as a Regulated System
*A Cybernetic, Phenomenological, and
Neurobiological Framework*

© 2025 Martin Piškorić
Part of the Recalib Scientific & Conceptual
Foundation

Rather than asking whether cognition, emotion, or physiology is "good" or "bad," the CEP model asks whether they are **mutually supportive**.

6.3. Coherence as Low Variance, Not High Scores

A central concept emerging from the CEP vector is **coherence**. In this framework, coherence is not defined as peak performance or maximal activation, but as **low variance among the three dimensions**.

High coherence occurs when C, E, and P are aligned at compatible levels—even if those levels are modest. Low coherence occurs when one dimension is significantly out of sync with the others (for example, high cognitive demand layered on top of emotional overwhelm and physiological depletion).

This definition has two critical advantages:

1. It decouples health from intensity.

2. It allows regulation to be evaluated even in low-arousal or recovery states.

A calm but numb state with suppressed emotion and depleted physiology may appear stable but is incoherent. Conversely, a moderately activated state with aligned cognition, emotion, and body may be highly coherent and resilient.

Energy, as experienced subjectively, correlates far more strongly with **coherence** than with any single dimension's magnitude.

6.4. The Legitimacy of Subjective Input

A frequent objection to integrated models is the reliance on self-report. From a first-order scientific perspective, subjective data is often dismissed as unreliable. From a second-order cybernetic perspective, this dismissal is incoherent.

When the system under observation includes consciousness, **first-person data is not optional**. It is the only access point to lived regulation. The question is not whether subjective input is biased—it always is—but whether the bias is **structured, bounded, and iteratively corrected**.

The CEP model treats subjective input as:

Human Energy as a Regulated System
A Cybernetic, Phenomenological, and
Neurobiological Framework

© 2025 Martin Piškorić
Part of the Recalib Scientific & Conceptual
Foundation

- **State sampling**, not truth claims.

- **Trend-relevant**, not point-precise.

- **Action-guiding**, not diagnostic.

Repeated self-assessment under stable framing conditions produces usable signal, particularly when interpreted through zones and transitions rather than raw scores.

In cybernetic terms, the human user functions as a **distributed sensor**, embedded in the regulatory loop. Excluding that sensor would reduce—not increase—system fidelity.

6.5. Why Three Dimensions Are a Minimal Set

The choice of three dimensions is not arbitrary, nor does it claim completeness. It reflects a **minimal viable decomposition** that satisfies four constraints:

1. **Phenomenological validity:** users can meaningfully differentiate C, E, and P.

2. **Neurobiological grounding:** each dimension maps onto distinct but interacting regulatory systems.

3. **Operational clarity:** each dimension suggests different classes of intervention.

4. **Non-redundancy:** removing any one dimension collapses explanatory power.

More dimensions would increase descriptive richness but reduce usability and interpretability. Fewer dimensions would oversimplify regulation and invite misattribution. CEP strikes a balance between **model sufficiency and cognitive economy**.

6.6. Energy as an Emergent Property of the CEP System

With CEP understood as a coupled state vector, the concept of energy can now be precisely located. Energy is not stored in any single dimension. It **emerges from the system's ability to coordinate the three dimensions without friction**.

High perceived energy corresponds to:

- adequate physiological bandwidth,

Human Energy as a Regulated System
*A Cybernetic, Phenomenological, and
Neurobiological Framework*

© 2025 Martin Piškorić
Part of the Recalib Scientific & Conceptual
Foundation

- emotionally integrated signal flow,

- cognitively proportionate demand.

Low perceived energy corresponds to:

- protective physiological modes,

- unresolved emotional load,

- excessive or inefficient cognitive processing.

In neither case is energy the cause. It is the **readout**.

6.7. Design Implications

This integrated view directly informs the design of the Recalib system:

- Interventions are sequenced across dimensions, not stacked within one.

- Zone logic prioritizes protection and alignment before challenge.

- Progress is evaluated through oscillation quality and coherence trends, not constant optimization.

CEP, as an integrated system, provides the structural backbone that allows "energy" to be used responsibly—as a navigational indicator rather than a motivational myth.

The next chapter introduces the Zone Model (Green / Orange / Red) as a regulation language, explaining why categorical thresholds outperform linear scales for guiding human regulation.

Chapter 7 — The Zone Model (Green / Orange / Red) as a Language of Regulation

7.1. Why Zones Instead of Linear Scales

Linear scales promise precision but often fail at guidance. Asking users to locate themselves on a continuous numerical axis assumes stable interpretation, fine-grained introspection, and consistent calibration across contexts. In practice, human self-assessment is **categorical before it is quantitative**.

Cognitive science consistently shows that humans make decisions more reliably when information is grouped into **threshold-based categories** rather than fine gradients. Categories reduce cognitive load, support faster orientation, and map more naturally onto action choices.

The Zone Model adopts this insight deliberately. Green, Orange, and Red are not measurements of worth or health; they are **regulation modes**. Each zone represents a qualitatively different relationship between demand and capacity, and therefore calls for different responses.

Zones do not simplify reality; they **simplify decision-making**.

7.2. Red Zone: Protection Before Progress

The Red Zone represents a state in which regulatory demand exceeds available capacity. Physiologically, this may correspond to overload, shutdown, or frantic overactivation. Emotionally, it may manifest as overwhelm, numbness, or volatility. Cognitively, it often appears as confusion, rigidity, or rumination.

The crucial epistemological move is this:
 Red is not failure. Red is signal.

Red indicates that the system has entered a **protective regime**. In evolutionary terms, this regime prioritizes survival over learning. Attempting to impose growth goals while in Red is analogous to demanding complex reasoning from a system in pain.

Accordingly, the Recalib model enforces a strict rule:
 no growth prescriptions in Red.

The only valid objectives in Red are:

Human Energy as a Regulated System
A Cybernetic, Phenomenological, and
Neurobiological Framework

© 2025 Martin Piškorić
Part of the Recalib Scientific & Conceptual
Foundation

- reducing load,

- restoring safety,

- re-establishing minimal coherence.

This design choice is both biologically grounded and ethically necessary. Any system that incentivizes performance while suppressing protection signals will eventually collapse.

7.3. Orange Zone: Adaptive Tension and Learning

If Red is protection and Green is integration, Orange is **adaptive tension**. It is the zone in which effort is required but manageable, where uncertainty exists but does not overwhelm, and where learning becomes possible.

Psychologically, Orange corresponds to what has long been described in performance research as optimal challenge, often associated with the **Robert Yerkes–John Dodson** relationship between arousal and performance. Too little activation produces stagnation; too much produces breakdown. The productive region lies in between.

The Recalib model treats Orange not as a transitional inconvenience but as a **target zone for growth**. Orange days are expected to involve friction, uncertainty, and effort. What distinguishes healthy Orange from unhealthy stress is **reversibility**—the system's ability to return to Green without residual damage.

This is why oscillation matters. Orange without return leads to burnout. Green without Orange leads to stagnation.

7.4. Green Zone: Integration and Resource Availability

The Green Zone represents a state of integrated regulation. Physiological systems have recovery available, emotional signals are processed without overload, and cognition operates with clarity rather than force.

Green is often misinterpreted as constant calm or peak positivity. In reality, Green is defined by **flexibility**, not by low arousal. A Green system can mobilize quickly when needed and settle afterward without excessive cost.

Two misconceptions are particularly important to correct:

Human Energy as a Regulated System
*A Cybernetic, Phenomenological, and
Neurobiological Framework*

© 2025 Martin Piškorić
Part of the Recalib Scientific & Conceptual
Foundation

1. **Green is not permanent.**
   Treating Green as a static ideal creates avoidance of necessary challenge.

2. **Green alone does not produce growth.**
   Without periodic Orange activation, Green becomes maintenance rather than development.

The Recalib framework therefore treats Green as a **resource state**, not a destination. Its function is to consolidate gains, integrate learning, and rebuild regulatory margin.

7.5. Zones Without Moral Weight

One of the most common pathologies in self-tracking systems is moralization. Numbers become grades; states become identities. The Zone Model is explicitly designed to avoid this failure mode.

- Red is not "bad."

- Orange is not "better."

- Green is not "good."

Each zone is appropriate under specific conditions. The only maladaptive pattern is **getting stuck**—remaining in one zone regardless of changing demand.

By stripping zones of moral weight, the model preserves their informational value. Users can respond to Red with care rather than shame, to Orange with courage rather than pressure, and to Green with appreciation rather than complacency.

7.6. Zones as a Shared Regulatory Language

A final advantage of the Zone Model is its communicability. Zones provide a **low-bandwidth language** for discussing regulation across individual, team, and organizational contexts.

Saying "this system is in Red" communicates more actionable information than abstract descriptions of stress, morale, or productivity. It frames the conversation around **capacity and protection**, not blame or optimization.

In this sense, zones function as a **boundary object**: a concept flexible enough to be used across disciplines, yet precise enough to guide action.

The next chapter examines the dynamics of oscillation—why healthy regulation requires movement between zones, why stability is not constantness, and how oscillatory patterns provide a more accurate signal of system health than static scores.

Chapter 8 — Oscillation Dynamics

Why Stability Is Not Constantness

8.1. Homeostasis Versus Allostasis

Classical physiology described regulation primarily through **homeostasis**: the maintenance of internal variables within narrow ranges. This model, associated with **Walter Cannon**, was foundational—but incomplete.

Human systems do not merely defend static setpoints. They **anticipate**, **adapt**, and **reconfigure** in response to changing demands. This broader view is captured by **allostasis**, a concept articulated by **Peter Sterling**, which emphasizes stability *through change* rather than stability *despite change*.

From an allostatic perspective, a healthy system:

- shifts arousal proactively,

- reallocates resources dynamically,

- accepts short-term inefficiency to preserve long-term viability.

This reframing dissolves a common misconception: that minimal fluctuation equals health. In reality, **rigidity is a risk factor**. Systems that cannot vary are brittle; systems that can oscillate are resilient.

8.2. Why Constant "Green" Is Not a Health Marker

In many self-tracking and wellness paradigms, the implicit goal is permanence: stay calm, stay balanced, stay optimized. The CEP × Zone model rejects this premise.

A system that remains continuously Green may appear regulated while silently losing adaptive range. Without periodic activation, challenge, and recomposition, regulatory muscles atrophy. Learning slows, tolerance narrows, and novelty becomes destabilizing.

Human Energy as a Regulated System
*A Cybernetic, Phenomenological, and
Neurobiological Framework*

© 2025 Martin Piškorić
Part of the Recalib Scientific & Conceptual
Foundation

Conversely, brief Orange activation—when followed by Green integration—**expands regulatory capacity**. The key variable is not time spent in any one zone, but **quality of transitions** between zones.

In this framework, stability is defined as:

> the ability to move across zones and return without residual cost.

8.3. Optimal Oscillation as a Health Signal

If static scores are insufficient, what should be measured instead? The answer is **oscillation quality**.

Healthy oscillation exhibits three properties:

1. **Amplitude within tolerance:** activation rises without exceeding regulatory limits.

2. **Reversibility:** the system returns to integration without prolonged recovery debt.

3. **Rhythmicity:** patterns are neither chaotic nor frozen.

The Recalib framework formalizes this intuition through the concept of **Optimal Oscillation**—the idea that health emerges from **repeated, manageable excursions** into challenge followed by consolidation.

Rather than rewarding prolonged Green states, the system recognizes **constructive transitions**, especially Orange↔Green movement, as indicators of adaptive health.

8.4. The Optimal Oscillation Index (OOI)

To operationalize oscillation quality, Recalib introduces a meta-indicator: the **Optimal Oscillation Index (OOI)**. OOI does not measure energy directly. It measures how effectively the system **uses variation**.

Conceptually, OOI integrates:

- frequency of meaningful transitions,

- balance between activation and integration,

Human Energy as a Regulated System
*A Cybernetic, Phenomenological, and
Neurobiological Framework*

© 2025 Martin Piškorić
Part of the Recalib Scientific & Conceptual
Foundation

- avoidance of prolonged protective states.

A high OOI indicates a system that can stretch and recover repeatedly. A low OOI may indicate stagnation (too little movement) or turbulence (too much, too fast).

Crucially, OOI decouples health from comfort. A system may feel challenged and still be healthy; it may feel calm and still be deteriorating. OOI tracks **adaptability**, not pleasantness.

8.5. Oscillation Versus Volatility

Not all movement is beneficial. The distinction between **oscillation** and **volatility** is essential.

- **Oscillation** is patterned, reversible, and capacity-building.

- **Volatility** is erratic, irreversible, and capacity-draining.

Volatility often masquerades as growth because it involves frequent change. In reality, it reflects poor regulation: the system overshoots, crashes, and compensates without integration.

The CEP × Zone model distinguishes these patterns by examining:

- dwell time in zones,

- directionality of transitions,

- recovery speed after activation.

Only oscillation that **returns to coherence** is rewarded.

8.6. Design Implications for Regulation Systems

Understanding oscillation reshapes how regulation systems should be designed:

- **Do not optimize for stillness.** Optimize for recoverability.

Human Energy as a Regulated System
A Cybernetic, Phenomenological, and
Neurobiological Framework

© 2025 Martin Piškorić
Part of the Recalib Scientific & Conceptual
Foundation

- **Do not penalize activation.** Penalize irreversibility.

- **Do not reward sameness.** Reward adaptive variation.

This is why Recalib emphasizes rolling windows, trends, and transitions rather than daily targets. Health is not a snapshot; it is a **trajectory**.

8.7. Energy Revisited: From Level to Movement

Within this dynamic frame, the meaning of energy becomes sharper. Energy is not how high the system scores today. It is how **well the system can move tomorrow**.

High perceived energy corresponds to:

- confidence in recovery,

- tolerance for challenge,

- trust in one's regulatory loop.

Low perceived energy corresponds to:

- fear of activation,

- avoidance of stretch,

- fragility under demand.

Thus, energy is best understood as **anticipated reversibility**—the felt sense that one can engage without breaking coherence.

The next chapter examines the role of artificial intelligence within a regulation system: why AI can function as a regulator but must never become an authority, and how ethical constraints are embedded through local learning and metacognitive safeguards.

Chapter 9 — Artificial Intelligence in a Regulatory System

Why AI Can Assist Regulation Without Becoming an Authority

9.1. AI as Regulator, Not Arbiter of Truth

Artificial intelligence enters the regulation domain with a fundamental asymmetry: it can process patterns at scale, but it does not *experience* regulation. It has no physiological limits, no emotional cost, and no intrinsic stake in coherence. For this reason, AI cannot function as an authority on what a human system *should* be.

In the Recalib framework, AI is positioned explicitly as a **regulatory assistant**, not as an epistemic judge. Its role is to detect patterns, surface discrepancies, and suggest adjustments based on observed dynamics—not to define goals, values, or optimal states.

This distinction is essential. When AI systems are framed as sources of truth ("what the model says is best"), they encourage compliance rather than regulation. Regulation, by contrast, requires **agency, choice, and self-correction**.

AI therefore operates downstream of human intention. It responds to the system's state; it does not impose a destination.

9.2. Feedback, Not Optimization

Most AI systems are designed to optimize toward explicit targets: maximize engagement, minimize error, increase output. In regulation contexts, this paradigm is dangerous.

Human systems do not have a single objective function. Optimizing for productivity may degrade health; optimizing for calm may erode adaptability. Regulation requires **context-sensitive feedback**, not global optimization.

Recalib uses AI to support **feedback loops**, not optimization loops. The system observes:

- patterns across CEP dimensions,

- transitions between zones,

- oscillation quality over time.

Human Energy as a Regulated System
*A Cybernetic, Phenomenological, and
Neurobiological Framework*

© 2025 Martin Piškorić
Part of the Recalib Scientific & Conceptual
Foundation

Based on these observations, AI suggests **regulatory-consistent actions**—for example, stabilizing when protection signals are present, or encouraging manageable challenge when capacity is available.

Importantly, AI does not "know" whether a suggestion is correct. It offers hypotheses. The human system tests them through experience, closing the loop.

9.3. Local Learning and the Limits of Generalization

One of the central ethical risks in AI-assisted regulation is **overgeneralization**. Patterns that hold across populations may fail catastrophically at the individual level.

Recalib addresses this by privileging **local learning**. The primary dataset for regulatory inference is not the global user base but the individual's own historical patterns. Cross-user aggregates are used only to establish broad guardrails, never to prescribe individual behavior.

This design choice reflects a core cybernetic principle: regulation must match the **variety of the system being regulated**. Human variability cannot be safely collapsed into population averages without loss of fidelity.

Local learning preserves individuality while still allowing AI to detect meaningful trends—such as early signs of overload or stagnation—within a person's own regulatory history.

9.4. Metacognitive Safeguards and the Role of MKR

Any system that adapts to a human user risks drifting toward **conformity**: shaping behavior to fit the model rather than adapting the model to the person. Preventing this drift requires an explicit meta-layer.

Within the Recalib architecture, this role is served by the Metacognitive Radar (MKR). MKR does not track content or identity; it tracks **interaction patterns**: response latency, tolerance for ambiguity, variability of engagement, and sensitivity to prompts.

The function of MKR is not prediction but **boundary maintenance**. It monitors whether coherence is being achieved through genuine regulation or through narrowing of behavioral variety.

When coherence increases at the cost of diversity, MKR introduces micro-variations. When variability increases at the cost of stability, MKR biases the system toward consolidation. This negative feedback loop protects against both rigidity and chaos.

In this sense, MKR embodies a second-order ethical constraint: **coherence without conformity**.

9.5. Privacy, Agency, and the Ethics of Regulation

Regulation systems differ from recommendation systems in one critical respect: they operate close to identity and agency. Errors are therefore not merely technical but ethical.

Recalib's AI design adheres to three non-negotiable principles:

1. **Agency preservation:** the user always retains final decision authority.

2. **Interpretability over persuasion:** suggestions must be explainable in regulatory terms.

3. **Reversibility:** any adaptation can be undone without penalty.

Data is treated as **regulatory signal**, not as behavioral capital. Aggregation serves insight, not control. The goal is to enhance self-regulation, not to outsource it.

9.6. AI as a Mirror, Not a Driver

At its best, AI in a regulatory system functions as a **mirror**: reflecting patterns that are difficult to see from within, highlighting trends that unfold over time, and offering alternative framings when habitual responses dominate.

A mirror does not decide what one should do. It increases **situational awareness**.

By keeping AI in this role, the Recalib framework avoids a common failure mode of adaptive systems: replacing self-regulation with external direction. The system remains cybernetically sound precisely because it does not seek control.

9.7. Implications for Human "Energy"

Within this architecture, AI does not create energy, increase energy, or measure energy as a substance. It supports regulation, and regulation determines perceived energy.

When AI functions correctly:

- users feel **more capable**, not more managed;

Human Energy as a Regulated System
*A Cybernetic, Phenomenological, and
Neurobiological Framework*

© 2025 Martin Piškorić
Part of the Recalib Scientific & Conceptual
Foundation

- decisions feel **clearer**, not prescribed;

- engagement increases without coercion.

Energy, in this sense, remains where it belongs: as a human experience arising from effective self-regulation, assisted—but never dictated—by technology.

The next chapter examines the implications of the CEP × Zone model across individual, organizational, and societal levels, clarifying why aggregated "energy" cannot be treated as a simple sum and how regulation scales across systems.

Chapter 10 — From Individual Regulation to Coherence Fields

Implications Across B2C, B2B, and Systemic Levels

10.1. From Individual State to Field Dynamics

Up to this point, the paper has treated regulation primarily at the level of the individual system. This focus was intentional: without a coherent individual regulation model, any attempt to scale upward becomes speculative.

However, once regulation is understood cybernetically—as a pattern of feedback, oscillation, and coherence—the next step becomes unavoidable: **regulated systems do not exist in isolation**. Individuals continuously interact with other regulated systems, and these interactions produce emergent dynamics that cannot be reduced to individual scores.

This transition marks the conceptual boundary where the CEP × Zone model expands into what Recalib formalizes as **Coherence Field Architecture (CFA)**.

CFA does not replace individual regulation. It **emerges from it**.

10.2. Coherence Fields: A Cybernetic Definition

A *coherence field* can be defined as:

> **An emergent pattern of regulation arising from the interaction of multiple self-regulating systems, characterized by shared rhythms, mutual influence, and distributed feedback loops.**

Human Energy as a Regulated System
A Cybernetic, Phenomenological, and
Neurobiological Framework

© 2025 Martin Piškorić
Part of the Recalib Scientific & Conceptual
Foundation

Several points are critical here:

- A coherence field is **not a collective emotion**, mood, or ideology.

- It is **not reducible to averages** of individual states.

- It has no central controller.

From a cybernetic standpoint, a field exists when:

- individual systems are coupled through interaction,

- feedback loops propagate beyond a single node,

- regulation occurs at both local and relational levels.

Human groups—teams, organizations, communities—naturally form such fields. What is usually missing is a **language and structure** for observing and influencing them without collapsing into control or manipulation.

CFA provides that structure.

10.3. Why Aggregated Energy Is Not a Sum

A common organizational mistake is to treat "energy," morale, or engagement as additive properties. Surveys average responses; dashboards report means. This approach fails for a simple reason: **fields do not behave linearly**.

A small number of dysregulated nodes can destabilize an otherwise functional system. Conversely, a few highly coherent individuals can stabilize a larger group. Influence is asymmetrical, contextual, and dynamic.

Within the CFA perspective:

- group coherence depends on **distribution and coupling**, not totals;

- oscillation patterns matter more than static scores;

- transitions propagate through relationships, not spreadsheets.

Human Energy as a Regulated System
*A Cybernetic, Phenomenological, and
Neurobiological Framework*

© 2025 Martin Piškorić
Part of the Recalib Scientific & Conceptual
Foundation

This explains why organizations can show "good averages" while experiencing burnout, conflict, or sudden collapse. The field was incoherent even though the numbers looked acceptable.

10.4. B2C Implications: Micro-Regulation and 1% Jumps

At the individual (B2C) level, the primary implication of CFA is restraint. The system does not attempt to engineer transformation. Instead, it supports **micro-regulation**: small, reversible adjustments that respect physiological and psychological limits.

The concept of *1% jumps* reflects this logic. Regulation capacity increases not through dramatic interventions but through **frequent, low-amplitude oscillations** that remain within tolerance. Over time, these micro-adjustments compound.

Within a coherence field, such changes matter disproportionately. A single individual with improved regulation alters interaction patterns—pace, tone, responsiveness—which then feed back into the field.

Thus, individual regulation is never purely individual.

10.5. B2B Implications: Organizations as Regulatory Fields

Organizations are often managed as structures—roles, processes, incentives—while their regulatory dynamics are ignored. CFA reframes organizations as **living regulation fields**.

From this perspective:

- culture is not policy; it is a pattern of oscillation,

- leadership influence is primarily regulatory, not informational,

- burnout is a field-level phenomenon before it becomes individual pathology.

Applying the CEP × Zone language at the organizational level allows teams to discuss capacity without blame. Saying "this team is operating in Red" frames the issue as a **regulatory overload**, not as incompetence or resistance.

Importantly, CFA does not advocate homogenization. A healthy field preserves **variety of states** while maintaining coherence of interaction. Some nodes may be in Orange while others consolidate in Green; the field remains healthy if transitions are supported and recovery is available.

10.6. Scaling Without Control

One of the central dangers in system-level thinking is the temptation to optimize the whole by constraining the parts. Cybernetics warns explicitly against this. According to Ashby's Law of Requisite Variety, reducing diversity undermines regulation rather than improving it.

CFA therefore introduces a critical design principle:

> **Coherence must increase without collapsing variety.**

This principle governs how AI, analytics, and dashboards are used. The goal is not alignment through conformity, but **coordination through visibility**. Systems improve when participants can sense the field they are part of and adjust voluntarily.

CFA provides the scaffolding for that sensing.

10.7. Energy as an Operational Language for Human Systems

At the broadest level, CFA positions "energy" as a **shared operational language** across scales:

- At the individual level, energy reflects regulatory capacity.

- At the group level, energy reflects interaction patterns and recovery bandwidth.

- At the system level, energy reflects the health of oscillations across the field.

This language is deliberately non-moral, non-ideological, and non-diagnostic. It allows humans to discuss limits, capacity, and adaptation without invoking pathology or virtue.

In this sense, CFA does not redefine energy—it **contains it**. It constrains a historically overloaded concept within a cybernetic architecture that preserves meaning while preventing misuse.

10.8. From Regulation to Civilization-Level Questions

Once regulation is framed as a field phenomenon, broader implications follow naturally. Societies, institutions, and technological ecosystems all exhibit oscillations between overload, adaptation, and integration.

Human Energy as a Regulated System
*A Cybernetic, Phenomenological, and
Neurobiological Framework*

© 2025 Martin Piškorić
Part of the Recalib Scientific & Conceptual
Foundation

CFA does not claim to solve these dynamics. It claims only that without a regulation-aware language, systems default to control, optimization, and eventual collapse.

Energy, disciplined through CEP and CFA, becomes a way to speak about **sustainability of human systems** without collapsing into ideology or mysticism.

The next chapter addresses limitations, critiques, and open questions—clarifying what this framework does not claim, where subjectivity imposes boundaries, and what remains empirically unresolved.

Chapter 11 — Limitations, Critiques, and Open Questions

11.1. What This Framework Does *Not* Claim

To preserve conceptual integrity, it is necessary to state clearly what the CEP × Zone model and Coherence Field Architecture do **not** assert.

First, the framework does **not** claim that "energy" is a measurable substance, unit, or conserved quantity. Any interpretation that treats CEP values or zones as physical measurements misreads their function. They are indicators, not ontological claims.

Second, the framework does **not** position itself as a diagnostic tool. Red, Orange, and Green are regulation modes, not clinical categories. The model is not intended to replace medical, psychiatric, or therapeutic assessment, nor to infer pathology from state patterns.

Third, it does **not** claim universality of thresholds. While the structure of regulation is shared, individual tolerance ranges, oscillation rhythms, and recovery profiles differ substantially. The model explicitly resists normative baselines.

Finally, the framework does **not** propose optimization of humans toward a single ideal state. Any use of the system to enforce productivity, conformity, or behavioral compliance violates its core assumptions.

11.2. The Limits of Subjective Measurement

A central critique of CEP-based regulation concerns the reliance on self-report. Subjective input is inherently noisy, context-dependent, and vulnerable to bias.

This critique is valid—and incomplete.

Human Energy as a Regulated System
A Cybernetic, Phenomenological, and
Neurobiological Framework

© 2025 Martin Piškorić
Part of the Recalib Scientific & Conceptual
Foundation

Self-report cannot provide fine-grained precision, but it can provide **reliable directional signal** when:

- questions are stable in wording,

- interpretation is consistent over time,

- analysis focuses on trends and transitions rather than absolute values.

The framework therefore treats subjective input as **low-resolution but high-relevance data**. It is well-suited to detecting change, misalignment, and recovery, even if it cannot isolate causal mechanisms.

What remains unresolved is the optimal balance between subjective input and physiological instrumentation. While bio-signals can enrich regulation models, they introduce their own distortions and ethical risks. The CEP framework remains intentionally conservative on this point.

11.3. Model Simplicity Versus Descriptive Richness

Another potential critique concerns dimensionality. Why limit regulation to three axes? Why not include social, existential, or environmental dimensions explicitly?

The answer is pragmatic rather than philosophical. CEP is not a theory of the whole human. It is a **minimal viable regulation model**. Its value lies in usability, interpretability, and actionability.

Adding dimensions increases descriptive richness but decreases reliability of self-assessment and coherence of feedback. CEP sacrifices completeness in favor of **operational stability**.

This trade-off remains open to empirical testing. Future iterations may explore extensions, but only where additional dimensions demonstrably improve regulation outcomes rather than conceptual elegance.

11.4. Correlation, Causation, and Interpretive Restraint

The framework intentionally avoids strong causal claims. Changes in perceived energy, coherence, or zone distribution may correlate with improved functioning without establishing direct causation.

Human Energy as a Regulated System
A Cybernetic, Phenomenological, and
Neurobiological Framework

© 2025 Martin Piškorić
Part of the Recalib Scientific & Conceptual
Foundation

This restraint is not a weakness; it is an ethical boundary. Over-claiming causality invites manipulation and misplaced authority. The CEP × Zone model aims to **support regulation**, not to explain all variance in human behavior.

Empirical validation, where pursued, should focus on outcome relevance (e.g., recovery speed, tolerance expansion, burnout prevention) rather than mechanistic reduction.

11.5. Scaling Risks and Organizational Misuse

At scale, the greatest risk is not technical but cultural. When regulation indicators are abstracted into dashboards, they may be reinterpreted as performance metrics.

This misuse undermines the framework. Field-level coherence cannot be mandated; it must be **cultivated**. Any organizational deployment must preserve:

- voluntary participation,

- contextual interpretation,

- protection-first logic.

Failure to uphold these constraints converts a regulation system into a control system—precisely what CFA is designed to prevent.

11.6. Open Empirical Questions

Several questions remain deliberately open:

- What oscillation patterns best predict long-term resilience across contexts?

- How does optimal oscillation vary with age, role, or chronic stress exposure?

- Which minimal interventions reliably improve reversibility without increasing load?

- How does AI-mediated feedback alter metacognitive development over time?

These questions define a research agenda rather than a roadmap. The framework provides a structure within which such questions can be asked without collapsing into reductionism.

Chapter 12 — Conclusion

Energy, as used in everyday language, has long oscillated between metaphor and mysticism. This paper has argued for a third position.

Energy is neither a spiritual essence nor a physical constant. It is a **functional descriptor**—the shortest shared language humans use to express their capacity to meet demand without losing coherence.

By grounding energy in cybernetics, phenomenology, and neurobiology, the CEP × Zone model reframes it as an **emergent regulatory indicator**. Cognition, emotion, and physiology form a coupled system whose alignment determines perceived capacity. Zones provide a categorical language for action. Oscillation, not constancy, defines health.

Coherence Field Architecture extends this logic beyond the individual, demonstrating how regulation scales through interaction without collapsing into control or conformity. In this architecture, technology assists regulation without replacing agency, and coherence increases without erasing variety.

The central claim of this work is therefore modest but consequential:

> **Human energy is not something we possess. It is something we enact—moment by moment—through regulation.**

When regulation is supported rather than optimized, energy becomes intelligible without becoming ideological. It becomes usable without becoming coercive. And it becomes a bridge—between body, emotion, cognition, and system—rather than a battleground of meanings.

In an era increasingly dominated by acceleration, abstraction, and artificial optimization, such a bridge is not a luxury. It is a requirement for sustainable human systems.