

15. When Autoimmunity Outlives Its Trigger

Absurd Health Institute | Medical Concept Papers, Volume Four | III. When inflammation refuses to end

Publication type: Revised medical concept and hypothesis essay — not peer reviewed **Corrective edition:** 17 October 2026 **Substantive text:** 1,282 words

Abstract

Autoimmune disease may persist after an initiating infection or tissue injury because antigen spreading, persistent autoreactive populations, tissue damage and inflammatory feedback can become independently important. This is one of several pathways to autoimmunity, not a proof that every autoimmune disease began with a hidden pathogen.

Autoimmune disease may persist after an initiating infection or tissue injury because antigen spreading, persistent autoreactive populations, tissue damage and inflammatory feedback can become independently important. This is one of several pathways to autoimmunity, not a proof that every autoimmune disease began with a hidden pathogen.

Initiation is often uncertain

An infection can sometimes precede autoimmune disease, and microbial mimicry or tissue injury can plausibly contribute to loss of tolerance. Yet temporal proximity alone does not establish causation, and many autoimmune conditions have complex genetic and environmental susceptibility without a confirmed single microbial cause. The fact that patients worsen during infections can also reflect nonspecific immune activation rather than evidence that an occult organism is driving their illness.

How responses diversify

Once immune recognition of self becomes established, tissue injury may expose additional antigens. Recruited immune cells, cytokines and local antigen-presenting pathways can maintain inflammation. Epitope spreading is one possible process through which the target of an immune response broadens over time. Distinct autoimmune diseases vary in the relevance of this mechanism and in the degree to which antibodies, T cells and innate processes dominate.

The tissue also becomes a participant

Chronic immune injury changes fibroblasts, vessels and the extracellular matrix. Such local alterations can continue impairing organ function even if autoantibody levels improve or systemic inflammation diminishes. This provides a reason to distinguish immunological remission from reversal of structural damage. Persistent fibrosis after inflammation is controlled is not evidence that treatment failed to target the immune disease.

A causation problem

Consider three hypotheses: a current infection continuously drives inflammation; a previous infection initiated a self-sustaining autoimmune response; or infection is an unrelated coincident event. Each requires different evidence. One cannot assume the first merely because the second is biologically possible. Carefully evaluated serology, tissue pathology, microbiology and disease history help avoid category errors.

Limits and implications

This model should not be used to recommend prolonged antimicrobials for autoimmune diseases without documented infection, nor to discontinue disease-modifying treatment. The primary intellectual contribution is the separation of **trigger, perpetuator and damage**. Successful care may need to address the perpetuating immune process and manage residual injury even when the original initiating event can never be reconstructed.

A strong infection-triggered model needs specificity

A persuasive account should identify the microorganism, immune target, susceptible host group and expected timing. 'Infection causes autoimmunity' is too broad to be useful. Certain postinfectious autoimmune phenomena have recognizable links; others remain speculative or controversial. Genetic predisposition can help shape the response, and the absence of a clear infectious history does not invalidate a verified autoimmune diagnosis.

Durable immune activity may be independent of trigger

Once autoreactive populations or tissue-local immune loops become established, removal of an initial environmental factor may not be sufficient for remission. In some conditions, immune memory and ongoing target recognition continue. The result resembles the general problem of hysteresis: the path back is not identical to the path in. But unlike purely mathematical analogies, autoimmunity must be demonstrated with immune pathology and clinical course, not inferred from the mere persistence of symptoms.

Why therapeutics still matter

Disease-modifying therapy may reduce inflammatory damage and preserve organ function even when the initial cause remains unknown. Explaining persistence through self-sustaining immunity should reinforce, not undermine, rational treatment. In contrast, administering empiric antiparasitic, antibiotic or 'detoxification' regimens without evidence of an active organism risks distracting from effective care. The proper frontier question is which maintaining loop is present and accessible, not whether every autoimmune disorder conceals the same trigger.

Initiation and persistence in autoimmunity

Autoimmune disease can begin through an interplay of genetic susceptibility, environmental influences and failures of immunological tolerance. Some syndromes have recognizable antecedent infections or molecular mimicry hypotheses, but these do not explain every case. Once self-reactive immune populations and inflammatory feedback are established, the disease can continue without repeated exposure to the initiating event. The maintenance problem is therefore distinct: what sustains autoreactivity, what tissue compartments are involved, and what causes relapse or remission?

The answer cannot simply be 'the immune system remembers.' Long-lived plasma cells, memory lymphocytes, tissue-resident immune cells, ongoing presentation of self-antigens, inflammatory niches and organ damage have different roles depending on the specific disorder. Removing one circulating signal may reduce symptoms while leaving autoreactive cell populations intact. In other instances, targeted treatment can produce long remission. A thesis of persistent immune activation should therefore include disease-specific biology and treatment evidence, not imply that autoimmunity is never reversible.

Injury can generate additional immune stimuli

Damaged tissue can expose intracellular constituents and create new targets or inflammatory signals. This may amplify an established immune process, but not every immune response to tissue debris is autoimmune. The critical distinction is between ordinary innate recognition of damage and demonstrable adaptive recognition of self-antigens. Autoantibodies likewise vary in specificity and clinical significance; low-titer findings in a person without the right syndrome should not be treated as proof of a cause of illness.

In systemic lupus, immune-complex formation and complement activation can contribute to organ injury. In multiple sclerosis, inflammatory demyelination involves a different anatomical and immunological setting. In autoimmune thyroid disease, hormone production and destruction of thyroid tissue have direct consequences for metabolism. These diagnoses require different disease-specific evaluation despite their shared umbrella term.

A discriminating persistence study

The strongest design would identify a defined autoimmune disease, measure autoreactive immune activity and tissue injury over time, and examine the relationship between those measures and clinically verified flares. An intervention that suppresses inflammation without altering the suspected maintaining cell population could reveal whether symptom control and disease modification are separable. A stronger result would show that selectively disrupting the proposed maintenance mechanism produces sustained remission with acceptable safety.

The terrain argument is that immune disease may become embedded in the local tissue environment as well as circulating immune networks. The empirical challenge is deciding which part of the system still drives pathology. An account that blames an old infection for every future flare without independent evidence is not a causal model; it is a narrative of origins mistaken for an explanation of persistence.

What remission actually teaches about persistence

A patient can enter clinical remission while retaining autoantibodies or memory immune populations, and another patient can have measurable immune activity without severe current symptoms. This divergence shows why laboratory signs of immune history do not map perfectly onto active tissue disease. In some disorders, organ damage itself becomes a major determinant of symptoms even after inflammatory activity is controlled. In others, repeated flares continue to create new injury. A maintenance hypothesis must specify whether it predicts ongoing immune attack, vulnerability to relapse, or irreversible consequences of previous attacks.

The distinction is especially important when interpreting targeted therapy. A drug may reduce inflammatory signaling rapidly and improve quality of life without eliminating the autoimmune process. That is a genuine clinical benefit, not proof of a cure. Longer follow-up may reveal whether remission is durable, whether organ damage stops accumulating and whether treatment withdrawal is safe. The scientific question is not whether every immune memory should be erased, but which persistent component is both pathogenic and amenable to modification without compromising protection against infection.

Autoimmune memory is not a single compartment

Long-lived antibody production, tissue-resident T cells and inflammatory signaling within an organ may each outlast the trigger that originally activated them. They may also respond differently to therapy. A model invoking 'immune memory' should identify which population or circuit it means and what kind of evidence would demonstrate continued pathogenic activity. In the absence of such evidence, elevated antibodies or a historical infection can be mistaken for a complete explanation. The research goal is durable remission with preserved host defense, not the indiscriminate deletion of every learned immune response.

Selected scientific reading

1. Netea MG et al. Defining trained immunity and its role in health and disease. *Nat Rev Immunol*. 2020;20:375-388.
2. Serhan CN. Pro-resolving lipid mediators are leads for resolution physiology. *Nature*. 2014;510:92-101.
3. Tabas I. Macrophage death and defective inflammation resolution in atherosclerosis. *Nat Rev Immunol*. 2010;10:36-46.

Editorial and evidentiary note

This is an expanded conceptual synthesis, not original clinical research or a clinical treatment protocol. It preserves selected references from the original edition, whose bibliographic metadata have not all been independently reverified. Claims about specific diagnoses and treatments require appropriate primary evidence and professional assessment. Mechanistic plausibility does not establish therapeutic efficacy.