Metabolizing Reality

Integration, adaptation, and the maintenance of coherent identity

AN EDITORIAL ESSAY / 2026

ESSAY / METABOLIZING REALITY

Integration, adaptation, and the maintenance of coherent identity

The problem of continual revision

Reality changes faster than any identity can be definitively described. New knowledge challenges existing beliefs; new technologies alter established capabilities; relationships, institutions, and environments develop in ways that cannot be fully anticipated. A person or organization must continue interpreting what these changes mean without reconstructing its entire identity at every encounter.

Two failures are possible. A rigid system may reject information that threatens its established understanding. An unstable one may revise its commitments with every new signal. Neither provides a reliable basis for judgment. The more difficult task is to preserve continuity while allowing genuine learning to change what needs to change.

This essay calls that task metabolizing reality. Metabolism is an analogy: minds and institutions do not literally digest information as organisms digest nutrients. The term describes a continuing process of encountering, interpreting, testing, incorporating, revising, and sometimes rejecting what reality presents.

The interpretive character of perception

Information is never encountered in a vacuum. Prior experience, expectation, language, and attention influence what is noticed and how it is understood. The same event can appear as opportunity, danger, or irrelevance depending on the framework used to interpret it.

Predictive-processing approaches to cognition examine perception through interactions between expectations and sensory evidence. Andy Clark’s account of predictive brains illustrates how existing models may support efficient engagement with the world while also requiring revision when predictions fail (Clark, 2013). This is not proof of a particular theory of identity, but it establishes a useful constraint: internal organization assists

interpretation and can also distort it.

An identity capable of adaptation must therefore remain accountable to evidence. Coherence alone is insufficient. A belief system can be internally consistent and nevertheless mistaken about the world. The quality of orientation depends partly on the willingness to correct the models through which reality is interpreted.

What integration requires

Jean Piaget distinguished assimilation, in which experience is understood through existing cognitive structures, from accommodation, in which those structures are modified (Piaget, 1952). The distinction helps clarify why integration is not simply the accumulation of information. Sometimes new experience can be incorporated into what is already known; sometimes the interpretive framework itself must change.

The organizational analogue is familiar. A company may first incorporate a new technology into an established service model, only to discover later that the technology has changed customer expectations sufficiently to require a different operating model. The challenge is determining which commitments remain essential and which arrangements were merely contingent.

This is a problem of discernment. Not every market signal warrants a pivot. Not every inherited practice deserves protection. Integration requires an evaluation of the evidence, the reliability of existing assumptions, and the consequences of revising them.

CONCEPTUAL MODEL

ENCOUNTER	Changing conditions produce evidence
INTERPRET	Existing models give evidence meaning
EVALUATE	Test assumptions and commitments
INTEGRATE	Revise understanding and conduct
REORIENT	Act and encounter new conditions

The feedback loop

What remains true? What must now change? Adaptation depends on the ability to distinguish between them.

Integration is not a discrete phase that ends with a new identity statement. Experience continues to produce new information. Actions change the environment; altered environments create new conditions for perception. The resulting process is recursive rather than linear.

Karl Weick’s work on organizational sensemaking emphasizes how people construct workable understandings of ambiguous circumstances and partly enact the environments they subsequently interpret (Weick, 1995). This suggests that adaptation involves more than responding to external change. People and institutions also encounter the consequences of their own decisions.

The capacity cost of unresolved contradiction

Changing reality demands attention. So does the effort of maintaining competing interpretations that cannot be reconciled. At an individual level, this may be experienced as difficulty focusing, indecision, or repeated internal negotiation. At an organizational level, incompatible assumptions may produce rework, additional coordination, delayed decisions, and conflicting investments.

Cognitive load theory demonstrates constraints on working-memory processing and the importance of organized knowledge structures in learning (Sweller, 1988). It does not establish that identity fragmentation directly increases the brain’s metabolic expenditure. That stronger biological claim requires distinct evidence and should remain a research question.

The practical proposition is narrower and more defensible: coherent frameworks may reduce some of the effort required to interpret and coordinate action, leaving more capacity for judgment, learning, and execution. The result is not a simpler world, but a system better equipped to meet it.

Adaptation without self-erasure

The language of enduring truth must not become a way of protecting mistaken assumptions. Some convictions survive serious examination; others do not. At times, the most faithful response to reality is to acknowledge that a previous understanding of identity was incomplete.

This matters for executives facing disruption, individuals confronting major transitions, and institutions responding to social or technological change. Reorientation may require a revised narrative, but it may also require changes in incentives, habits, products, relationships, or governance. Integration is incomplete when understanding changes but conduct does not.

Coherence does not reduce the complexity of reality. It increases the capacity to perceive, navigate, adapt to, and meaningfully engage it. In this account, that capacity depends not on permanent certainty but on the continuing discipline of revising what can change while

remaining responsible to what is true.

References

Selected scholarship informing the argument. The cross-disciplinary framework is a proposed synthesis, not an established empirical model.

Clark, A. (2013). Whatever next? Predictive brains, situated agents, and the future of cognitive science. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 36(3), 181–204.

Piaget, J. (1952). The Origins of Intelligence in Children. International Universities Press.

Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. Cognitive Science, 12(2), 257–285.

Weick, K. E. (1995). Sensemaking in Organizations. Sage.