Green Paper 02 — Regulation: Body · Relation · Institution

Abstract

This paper proposes a simple proposition: ethics is not only a question of principles, but also a question of regulation. Moral agency depends on the capacity to remain coherent under change—within bodies, within relationships, and within institutions.

Under sustained stress, time horizons shrink, attention narrows, trust becomes expensive, and systems become reactive. In such conditions, ethical ideals may remain intact, yet the ability to embody them quietly collapses.

Regulation is not control. It is the ability to remain in contact with reality, to recover after rupture, and to coordinate without coercion. This Green Paper offers a three-level frame—body, relation, institution—as a practical orientation for designing viable forms of care and responsibility in an era of planetary constraint.

1. A starting clarity

Much moral language is aspirational: justice, dignity, freedom, care, responsibility. These concepts are essential. Yet they are not self-executing.

People can sincerely agree on ethical principles and still fail to act well— not because they are malicious, but because they are overloaded.

The claim of this paper is modest: ethical life depends on regulation. Without it, we lose access to the capacities that make moral judgment workable—attention, patience, nuance, cooperation, and repair.

2. What "regulation" means here

Regulation is often misunderstood as either discipline or compliance. That is not the meaning used in this series.

Regulation refers to the capacity of living systems to maintain coherence across change. A regulated system is not a static system. It is a system able to adapt without collapsing.

Three dimensions matter:

- **Body-level regulation** — nervous system capacity, recovery, rhythm, attention
- **Relational regulation** — trust, attunement, boundaries, repair
- **Institutional regulation** — protocols, legitimacy, feedback loops, decision coherence

Ethics becomes viable when coherence holds across these three levels.

3. Body-level regulation: capacity before ideals

Under stress, human perception changes. The world becomes sharper, smaller, and more urgent. The nervous system prioritizes threat-detection and short-term survival.

In such states, moral capacity reduces:

- time horizons shorten
- complexity becomes difficult to hold
- responsibility becomes heavy rather than natural
- empathy becomes costly
- repair becomes unlikely

This does not remove accountability. But it clarifies constraint. Ethics cannot be scaled by slogans if bodies are chronically dysregulated.

A politics of capacity begins with basic realities: rest, rhythm, recovery, attention hygiene, and conditions of stability—material and existential.

4. Relational regulation: trust, rupture, repair

Human ethics is not only individual. It is relational. Most moral action happens inside social fields: families, workplaces, communities, institutions, cultures.

Relationships are regulated not by perfection, but by repair. A regulated relationship is one that can return after rupture.

Under chronic stress, relational capacity declines:

- misunderstandings harden into identity
- boundaries become rigid or disappear
- people lose the ability to hold difference
- trust becomes scarce
- cooperation feels unsafe

This is why ethical principles often fail in lived environments. It is not only a question of "what is right," but "what is possible together."

5. Institutional regulation: coherence without coercion

Institutions shape moral outcomes through their design. Not only through explicit rules, but through incentives, rhythms, information flows, accountability structures, and what remains invisible.

Institutions can degrade ethically without malice. They may produce harm through:

- fragmentation of responsibility
- procedural overload
- incentives that reward reactivity
- loss of feedback from lived reality
- lack of repair mechanisms

A regulated institution is not necessarily "nice." It is coherent: it can learn, adapt, coordinate, and remain legitimate under pressure.

The question is practical: what protocols allow institutions to hold complexity without becoming brittle?

6. Planetary constraint: regulation at long horizons

Ecological instability introduces a new moral condition: we are operating under constraints that cannot be negotiated away.

Planetary boundaries, thresholds, and irreversibilities demand longer time horizons. But long time horizons are difficult to carry in a dysregulated world.

This is why planetary responsibility is not only a matter of "values." It is also a matter of capacity—individual, civic, and institutional.

Closing questions

- What stabilizes ethical agency under sustained stress?
- Which forms of overload consistently produce moral collapse?
- How do we design institutions that support repair, not only control?
- What makes participation possible in real civic life, not just in theory?
- How do we build long-horizon responsibility without ideology?

References (working constellation)

Stress & regulation: McEwen · Sapolsky · Porges (polyvagal) · Schore
Attention & mind: Posner · Tang/Hölzel · Varela/Thompson/Rosch
Institutions & commons: Ostrom · Putnam · Habermas · Simon (bounded rationality)
Planetary constraint: Rockström · Steffen · Meadows (limits & feedback)

Status: Working paper (v0.1). Revised over time.

Spiralweb: spiralweb.earth