

The Body Has a Hidden Triage System

Absurd Health Institute | Frontier Medical Concept Paper 01 | Volume 7

Series: The Body's Secret Economy

Article type: Causal hypothesis and mechanistic argument; not an original clinical study

Corrective edition: 17 October 2026

The proposition we defend

We argue that part of chronic illness consists of a persisting allocation decision: the injured organism continues to spend on immediate defense after the need for emergency expenditure has passed. This is more pointed than calling chronic disease "stress." The proposed pathology is an inappropriate hierarchy of demand, where immunity and glucose defense outrank muscle rebuilding, fertility, cognition and normal activity. A system that keeps the patient alive during an infection can help keep the patient ill afterward.

An injured organism may divert resources away from reproduction, growth or nonurgent performance toward maintaining perfusion, glucose supply, immune defense and immediate survival. This is not a claim that organs consciously vote; it is a proposal that interacting endocrine and neural signals create a functional hierarchy of demand. The critical novelty is to study failures of *return* to ordinary allocation after a threat ends.

Why the mechanism deserves to be taken seriously

Inflammation can reduce appetite and increase hepatic acute-phase synthesis; sympathetic and HPA-axis output redistributes cardiovascular demand; severe illness changes muscle proteolysis and substrate allocation. A tissue-level signal can therefore have remote energetic consequences. One can imagine a regulatory network responding to inflammatory cytokines, leptin, insulin, glucocorticoids and autonomic afferents in concert, rather than each signal commanding a single organ. A persistent signal may stabilize an initially useful allocation at substantial long-term cost.

The causal argument

The model begins with an acute signal that has demonstrable reach beyond the damaged site: cytokine-driven acute-phase synthesis in liver, sympathetic redistribution of circulation, glucocorticoid mobilization of fuel, suppression of reproductive signaling and sickness behavior. These changes are not independent inconveniences. They are coordinated enough to suggest a conserved emergency configuration. The novel proposition is hysteresis: the same immune or endocrine input can produce a different output after weeks of threat than before it. Repeated injury, circadian disruption and inactivity could stabilize that configuration even after the original stimulus falls. Recovery then requires not only removing the insult but also dismantling the allocation hierarchy it built.

Causal architecture under closer examination

The allocation question can be made rigorous with a flux model. Total energy expenditure is not a bag of calories from which organs consciously bargain; it is the observed consequence of substrate supply, endocrine instructions and cellular demands. During an acute immune challenge, liver metabolism shifts toward acute-phase proteins, muscle supplies amino acids, and neural circuits change motivation, appetite and movement. A true hierarchy would have observable costs across these compartments. Crucially, the cost need not appear as higher total caloric expenditure. Suppression of reproductive function and muscle synthesis can coexist with lower activity; the allocation is visible in the *composition* of expenditure. The analysis should measure rates of synthesis and degradation, hormonal responses and regional perfusion rather than resting metabolic rate alone. An even more important distinction separates upstream command from downstream necessity. Cortisol and sympathetic activity can participate in allocation, but their elevation may also reflect the severity of illness. If the command persists after

recovery, researchers should seek a sustaining signal: persisting inflammatory ligands, altered afferent feedback, a disrupted circadian phase or a learned central response. These alternatives produce different intervention predictions. A patient may need rebuilding substrate and rest, but supplying more calories alone will not necessarily normalize an immune-driven suppression of protein synthesis. Equally, lowering a stress marker while an organ remains unstable may remove a useful adaptation.

A concrete physiological case

Consider recovery after a severe respiratory illness. Fever has ceased and lung imaging has improved, yet exercise tolerance, sexual interest and muscle synthesis remain depressed. Rather than assigning each complaint to a separate diagnosis, compare serial resting energy expenditure, grip strength, reproductive hormones, inflammation, autonomic markers and sleep timing. An allocation explanation predicts a cluster that normalizes in a coordinated sequence; isolated pulmonary damage predicts respiratory limitation without the same wider sequence. Neither story should be presumed from fatigue alone.

Original conceptual illustration

Suppose a patient with a serious infection sleeps poorly, loses appetite and temporarily experiences reduced exercise capacity. Those changes can be maladaptive in excess but may also accompany cytokine-mediated prioritization of host defense. A useful causal diagram would chart the degree of infection, the autonomic and endocrine response, the cost in skeletal muscle and cognition, and the point at which recovery of ordinary function should begin. The critical observation is not that symptoms occur together, but whether their timing follows an identifiable regulatory response.

What established physiology already supports

Sickness behavior, acute-phase proteins, muscle catabolism in illness and neuroendocrine suppression are established physiological phenomena. They do not establish a single master “triage switch,” but they establish that organs compete under constrained conditions and that priority is actively regulated rather than simply distributed in proportion to dietary calories. The central empirical opportunity is to measure tradeoffs as changes in flux—protein synthesis, glucose turnover, blood flow—not merely static blood concentrations.

The strongest counterargument—and the answer

The strongest objection is that patients with persistent symptoms may have ordinary residual organ injury, medication effects or deconditioning. We should test those before invoking a persistent program. The thesis wins ground when the changes are temporally coupled across otherwise intact organs and when they reverse together as immune and endocrine signals settle. A story about triage that explains every possible symptom would be worthless; the model must predict who will *not* show the phenotype.

The strongest objection is that what looks like strategic reallocation may simply be nonspecific sickness behavior, drug effects or organ injury. The metaphor of triage can conceal heterogeneity and lead to teleological claims that biology never demonstrated. Acute tradeoffs should not be assumed in all chronic diseases.

The discriminating experiment

Follow a convalescent cohort from acute illness through one year, measuring immune mediators, fuel turnover, autonomic balance, tissue repair and function. Compare it with individuals with equivalent organ injury but different systemic inflammatory trajectories. A prespecified composite “allocation state” must predict delayed recovery above organ-damage measures; if it does not, the hypothesis fails. A useful second test is whether a graded rehabilitation stimulus restores ordinary allocation or instead provokes disproportionate systemic defense in one subgroup.

An informative comparison would track energy expenditure, hormone rhythms, muscle turnover and functional recovery across an acute illness and convalescence. The theory weakens if the presumed hierarchy cannot predict which functions are suppressed, or if each change is explained better by independent tissue injury. The timing of reversal is as important as the initial response.

Decisive comparisons and limits of inference

The strongest prospective signature is *ordered recovery*. If survival prioritization is real rather than a retrospective description, different functions should return in reproducible relationships to the declining emergency signal. One might observe immune acute-phase expenditure falling before muscle protein synthesis normalizes, followed by resumption of exercise tolerance and reproductive signaling. But that order is a hypothesis to be tested, not a known universal sequence. Disease-specific conditions will matter: bacterial infection, trauma and chemotherapy cannot be collapsed into one trajectory. Researchers could construct patient-level state vectors rather than a single “inflammation score,” and ask whether two individuals with the same current C-reactive protein display different allocation patterns depending on prior illness duration. That difference would be evidence of history dependence. An experiment that changes nutritional input without changing inflammatory signaling could help separate substrate insufficiency from hormonal suppression. Conversely a treatment that reduces inflammation while leaving nutrition constant might reveal whether rebuilding programs reappear. The model should be rejected as an explanation for a patient whose persistent dysfunction is fully accounted for by a damaged lung, damaged heart or medication toxicity. It should also identify states in which imposing more activity during ongoing emergency signaling is likely to exacerbate strain. That makes the thesis clinically consequential yet resistant to overreach: recovery is the controlled replacement of one operating priority with another.

A second prediction from the original model

If this is a true allocation program rather than a coincidental cluster of symptoms, suppressed functions should return in a reproducible sequence as the threat subsides. That sequence would provide stronger evidence than simply observing temporary fatigue or appetite loss during infection.

Why the hypothesis matters if correct

This hypothesis changes what counts as successful recovery. An infection may be cured and an organ technically preserved while the organism’s allocation pattern remains organized for threat. In that setting, a patient can be advised to rebuild muscle or resume normal activity without having restored the endocrine and metabolic conditions that support rebuilding. The model predicts that certain coordinated changes will precede return of function: immune demand should decline, anabolic capacity should reappear, and regulated activity should become tolerable. Its explanatory value depends on distinguishing this sequence from simple bed-rest deconditioning. If serial organ assessments already explain the limitations, triage adds little. But if several bodily functions recover together in a reproducible order despite relatively intact organs, a higher-level allocation mechanism deserves investigation. The most consequential contribution is the shift from a symptom checklist to a resource-distribution trajectory. A biological intervention that improves one biomarker but leaves that trajectory unchanged might be less restorative than it looks; an intervention that restores multiple functions could reveal the release of a previously defensive state.

The clinical and conceptual consequence

The bold implication is that some apparently unrelated chronic symptoms are the price of remaining biologically organized for an emergency that has ended. Treatment strategies would then need to address the maintaining signal and the safe re-entry into rebuilding—not simply force activity or suppress one symptom. That remains a research direction, not an excuse to miss persistent infection, cardiopulmonary disease or endocrine pathology.

Clinically, distinguishing a protective allocation from a pathological continuation matters because neither indiscriminate stimulation nor deliberate deprivation is automatically appropriate. The concept is a map for

questions, not a protocol or a justification for withholding treatment. It helps ask when the initiating threat is gone but an organism remains organized around emergency.

Clinically, distinguishing a protective allocation from a pathological continuation matters because neither indiscriminate stimulation nor deliberate deprivation is automatically appropriate. The concept is a map for questions, not a protocol or a justification for withholding treatment. It helps ask when the initiating threat is gone but an organism remains organized around emergency.

Source bibliography: verification pending

- McEwen BS. Stress, adaptation, and disease: Allostasis and allostatic load. Ann N Y Acad Sci. 1998.
- Pyrkov TV et al. Longitudinal analysis of blood markers reveals progressive loss of resilience and predicts human lifespan limit. Nat Commun. 2021.

Editorial and clinical boundaries

This paper advances a causal thesis and identifies observations that would support or defeat it. It does not establish a new diagnosis or treatment, and it should not be used to discontinue medically indicated care. Bibliographic entries inherited from the original edition have not all been independently verified.