The Art of Profound Self-Regulation:

A Guide to *Seeing Through* Your Reality-Model

Sonam Hoani

Part 1: The System and its Loops - Understanding Your Inner Architecture

To account for the invisible structures that shape your life, you must first see their blueprint. Your lived reality is built upon a few foundational mechanisms.

- **The Brain's Prime Directive: Minimizing Free Energy.** At its core, the brain operates on a single, powerful imperative: to minimize variational free energy (Friston, 2010; Friston et al., 2006; Friston & Stephan, 2007). This is an information-theoretic quantity that measures the divergence, or prediction error, between the predictions derived from the brain's generative model of the world and what its senses actually receive. This isn't a psychological goal, but a biological necessity for survival. This fundamental drive for an error-minimizing fit is the subpersonal, self-optimizing process that underpins the formation and constant refinement of your generative model, and serves as a foundational principle for understanding all learning and behavior (Parr et al., 2022; Friston, 2010).

- **The Predictive Brain & the Self-Model:** To achieve this, the brain, through its generative model, creates a master crutch: the self-model—the implicit, continuous narrative of a single, stable "I." This model is transparent; you don't experience the model itself, you experience the world through it (Metzinger, 2009; Metzinger, 2003).

- **The Survival Advantage of Naive Realism:** By default, your brain operates on naive realism—the powerful illusion that you experience the world directly as it is. This is a

feature born of evolutionary efficiency. As researchers like Metzinger have argued, it is far faster and more metabolically efficient to react to a "real" world than to engage in the slow, energy-expensive process of contemplating the constructed nature of your reality (Metzinger, 2009; Metzinger, 2024).

- **How Suffering Feels "Real":** This illusion is cemented by emotion. When reality doesn't match your predictive model's expectations, your brain generates prediction error, which has a powerful affective valence (Miller & Clark, 2018). Because the process is transparent, this "badness" feels like an objective property of the world. This is why our system's default strategy is to try and fix the world, rather than update the model generating the suffering (Deane et al., 2024)—because the model itself is invisible to us. The very persistence of this suffering—the failure of this standard mode of regulation to achieve a lasting, low-error state—is the ultimate motivation to discover a more efficient, subpersonally defined, meta-level of self-regulation—one that can act on the parameters of the model itself (Deane et al., 2020; Sandved-Smith et al., 2021; Deane et al., 2024; Dahl et al., 2015).

Part 2: A New Kind of Regulation

The drive to minimize free energy is the engine of all self-regulation (Parr et al., 2022). However, for the purposes of this guide, we can distinguish between two kinds:

1. **Standard Self-Regulation:** This is the everyday process of minimizing local, short-term prediction errors. Feeling hungry and then eating is a perfect example. This is essential, but it only solves immediate problems (Friston, 2010).

2. **Profound Self-Regulation:** This is the deeper process this guide is about, a useful term to describe a meta-level optimization that targets the high-level models—like the self-model—that generate chronic, systemic prediction error (Sandved-Smith et al., 2021; Deane et al., 2020; Vago & Silbersweig, 2012; Dahl et al., 2015).

Part 3: The Path of Systematic Deconstruction

The way forward is not to build a “better" self-model. Rather, when conditions and affordances allow, a process of systematic deconstruction can unfold (Laukkonen & Slagter, 2021; Berkovich-Ohana et al., 2024). This involves the transformation of the model by attenuating the influence of certain beliefs and inhibiting habitual pathways (Lutz et al., 2019; Fucci et al., 2018; Deane et al., 2020). Ultimately, this is a long-term process of neuronal rewiring, not an instantaneous and permanent erasure, as entrenched patterns can reassert themselves (Laukkonen & Slagter, 2021; Berkovich-Ohana et al., 2024). This path is a "via negativa"—a way of seeing what remains when these habitual constructions are quieted (Sandved-Smith, 2024; Metzinger, 2024).

- **The Foundation of Wakefulness:** For your brain to model anything, it must first be in a state of wakefulness, which is physiologically a state of tonic neuronal activity and high cortical arousal. Computationally, this is the system maintaining a baseline level of global precision or "gain," ensuring it is sensitive enough to register signals (Metzinger, 2024; Feldman & Friston, 2010).

- **The Emergent "Background" of Possibility:** This wakefulness is not empty; it constantly generates a field of possibilities, comprising an epistemic space (of what can be known through perception) and an action space (of what can be done through action). These

two spaces are distinct but deeply intertwined because what you can know determines what you can do, and what you do determines what you can know. Together, they form the complete field of your adaptive potential (Metzinger, 2024; Lutz et al., 2019).

- **How the Self-Model is Built "On Top":** The brain's model is hierarchical. Lower levels process fast, concrete sensory details, while higher levels model slow, abstract patterns over time. The self-model is a very higher-level construction because it models abstract variables like "identity" and "personal narrative" by finding patterns in the data from lower levels (e.g., patterns of emotion, thought, and action over days, weeks, and years). It is a unifying story layered on top of the foundational phenomenal field (Metzinger, 2003; Carhart-Harris & Friston, 2010).

- **What Remains is MPE:** When the self-model's influence is attenuated, this foundational process is revealed. Functionally, this is a state of tonic alertness without a subsequent layer of self-representation. The system is conscious, but it is not constructing an additional, explicit model that attributes its consciousness to *the* higher-order representational self-model. This is what researchers term Minimal Phenomenal Experience (MPE) (Sandved-Smith, 2024; Metzinger, 2024; Mago et al., 2024; Laukkonen & Chandaria, 2024).

Part 4: The Core Practice — Phenomenal Hypothesis Testing

This practice leverages the brain's own error-correction mechanism. We constantly operate on powerful, implicit hypotheses about reality ("I am stuck," "This is bad") (Clark, 2023; Hohwy, 2016). The impetus is to check if these hypotheses hold up to direct phenomenological scrutiny (Lutz et al., 2019; Pagnoni & Guareschi, 2024).

1. **The Opportunity:** An opportunity for practice arises whenever you notice the powerful feeling of conviction that accompanies a state of suffering. It is the moment you find yourself caught in a familiar, painful loop of thought and feeling (Deane et al., 2024).

2. **The Crucial Posture: Receptivity.** How you relate to the next moment makes all the difference. The habitual posture is one of analysis and control. The new posture is one of pure, receptivity (Pagnoni & Guareschi, 2024). You are simply making yourself available to the evidence for the hypothesis in question, without having obligations about what you find (Metzinger, 2024).

3. **The Action: Checking the Evidence.** With this posture of receptivity, you check your direct and immediate phenomenology (Pagnoni & Guareschi, 2024). The hypothesis or sense is, for example, 'I am stuck.' The '*checking'* is to review the information for this monolithic, solid affective state of 'stuckness' via an *agnostic* phenomenal field. The focus is not on finding the '*self'* but on parsing the substance for this hypothesis (Josipovic, 2013).

This practice transforms the function of negative affect (Miller & Clark, 2018), because the "bad feeling" of prediction error becomes a high-quality, trusted signal to check the model because recalibration is possible (Deane et al., 2020; Nave et al., 2020; Sandved-Smith et al., 2021).

4. **The Discovery and Self-Correction:** The discovery is one of the phenomenological self-model, initially perceived as a transparent and enduring entity, beginning to attenuate and be metabolised through a process of *adaptive relevance realisation, refinement* or deconstruction (Laukkonen & Slagter, 2021; Berkovich-Ohana et al., 2024; Deane et al., 2020). With more evidence, the system's belief space automatically re-weights in favor of an

up to date and more accurate model—one in which the hypothesis behind the solid affective state has a much lower probability. (Deane et al., 2024). This is the essence of sub personal self-optimisation (Deane et al., 2024). Eventually, all that needs to remain, is what is most adaptive—potentially, a less presumptuous and most parsimonious and simple, phenomenally sublime representation of the system and its functions of consciousness; MPE (Metzinger, 2024; Mago et al., 2024; Laukkonen & Chandaria, 2024). Any attempts to capture what this phenomenal capacity is like in conceptual language falls short, because concepts belong to the self-model whose influence is being quieted (Pagnoni et al,. 2008); however monikers like non-conceptual, the union of empty-cognizance, wakefulness, or epistemic openness are used (Metzinger, 2024).

This process has the potential to create an incredibly fast self-regulatory refresh rate, opening the system to a fuller range of self-evidencing beyond the invisible walls of the self-model (Hohwy, 2016).

Part 5: The Radical Cascade of a Single Insight

A Note on Strategy: The framework presented here is synthesized from an evolving field of research. These models reveal several interconnected pathways, or "doorways," for this deep art of self-regulation. While the most effective entry point always depends on an individual's specific patterns and their available affordances (Mirza et al., 2019; Pagnoni, 2024), the doorway of "phenomenal hypothesis testing" is a profound starting point because so much of our suffering is tied to our identification with conceptual thought (Pagnoni et al., 2008; Josipovic, 2013). Insights here can create a cascade that reshapes the entire system (Laukkonen & Slagter, 2021).

Imagining the Implications: Seeing the impersonal nature of a single thought or feeling can have radical, system-wide effects, offering a glimpse into a new way of being:

- **On Clarity:** Imagine your awareness being sharp and lucid, not constantly clouded by the fog of discursive thought. This is the expression of Wakefulness/Clarity (Metzinger, 2024).

- **On Goals:** Imagine navigating your day without the constant, draining push-and-pull of desire and aversion. Success and failure lose their emotional charge, replaced by a simple, effective engagement with the task at hand. This is the expression of Equanimity (Lutz et al., 2019).

- **On Time:** Consider moving through your life without the constant narrative projection into the future-the endless planning and worrying. The mind is no longer trying to nail down the next moment but is available to the richness of the present. This is the expression of Epistemic Openness and, in its deeper forms, Timelessness (Metzinger, 2024).

- **On Effort:** Picture a state of deep immersion in an activity, where the inner narrator goes quiet. There is no self-consciousness, no striving, just a fluid and highly adaptive engagement with the present. This is the expression of Effortlessness and Non-conceptuality in action (Pagnoni & Guareschi, 2024).

- **On Self:** Imagine the dissolution of the very center-point of your experience. There is no longer a feeling of a subjective "I" to whom life is happening. Experience unfolds, but its ownership is gone. This is the expression of a Zero-Person Perspective (Metzinger, 2024).

- **On Awareness:** Consider the shift from "I am aware" to a unified, reflexive field of knowing that knows itself without a subject/object split. This is the expression of Non-dual Meta-awareness (Josipovic, 2019; Laukkonen & Chandaria, 2024).
- **On Well-being:** Imagine a profound sense of joy or awe emerging, not from an external event, but as an internal signal of radical, successful self-optimization. This is the expression of Bliss (Miller et al., 2021).

Researchers are currently working to precisely map the computational parameters of these states, promising a future of highly refined and personalized contemplative instructions (Sandved-Smith, 2024).

The organism that emerges from this process is supremely adaptable (Deane et al., 2020; Nave et al., 2020). It has not destroyed the self-model, but is no longer fused with it (Laukkonen & Slagter, 2021; Berkovich-Ohana et al., 2024). Beliefs are held lightly (Pagnoni et al., 2008; Fucci et al., 2018). Emotions are experienced as transient information (Miller & Clark, 2018; Lowe & Ziemke, 2011). Constructs are not held onto for longer than their relevance (Pagnoni et al., 2008; Lutz et al., 2019). This is a state of profound self-knowledge, where the system is always metabolizing its disjunct with reality as it arises—the discovery that freedom is the natural state of a mind that has learned to dismantle its own invisible walls (Laukkonen & Slagter, 2021; Josipovic, 2013; Nave et al., 2020).

References

Albarracin, Mateo, Gabriel Bouchard-Joly, Zahra Sheikhbahaee, Maxwell Miller, R. J. Pitliya, and Paul Poirier. "Feeling Our Place in the World: An Active Inference Account of Self-Esteem." *Neuroscience of Consciousness* 2024, no. 1 (2024).

Andersen, Bjørn P., and Maxwell Miller. "Predictive Processing and Relevance Realization: Exploring Convergent Solutions to the Frame Problem." *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* (2022).

Berkovich-Ohana, Aviva, Kirk Warren Brown, Shaun Gallagher, Henk Barendregt, Paul Bauer, Franco Giommi, and Adoracion Amaro. "Pattern Theory of Selflessness: How Meditation May Transform the Self-Pattern." *Mindfulness* (2024).

Carhart-Harris, Robin L., and Karl J. Friston. "The Default-Mode, Ego-Functions and Free-Energy: A Neurobiological Account of Freudian Ideas." *Brain* 133, no. 4 (2010): 1265–83.

Clark, Andy. *Surfing Uncertainty: Prediction, Action, and the Embodied Mind*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

———. *The Experience Machine: How Our Minds Predict and Shape Reality*. New York: Pantheon Books, 2023.

Dahl, Clifford J., Antoine Lutz, and Richard J. Davidson. "Reconstructing and Deconstructing the Self: Cognitive Mechanisms in Meditation Practice." *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 19, no. 9 (2015): 515–23.

Deane, Guy, Maxwell Miller, and Samuel Wilkinson. "Losing Ourselves: Active Inference, Depersonalization, and Meditation." *Frontiers in Psychology* 11 (2020).

Deane, Guy, Jean-Pierre Mago, Katerina Fotopoulou, Michael D. Sacchet, Robin Carhart-Harris, and L. Sandved-Smith. "The Computational Unconscious: Adaptive Narrative Control, Psychopathology, and Subjective Well-Being." *PsyArXiv* (2024).

Feldman, H., and K. J. Friston. "Attention, Uncertainty, and Free-Energy." *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience* 4 (2010): 215.

Friston, Karl J. "The Free-Energy Principle: A Unified Brain Theory?" *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 11, no. 2 (2010): 127–38.

Friston, Karl J., James Kilner, and Lee Harrison. "A Free Energy Principle for the Brain." *Journal of Physiology-Paris* 100, no. 1–3 (2006): 70–87.

Friston, Karl J., and Karl E. Stephan. "Free-Energy and the Brain." *Synthese* 159, no. 3 (2007): 417–58.

Fucci, Elena, Omar Abdoun, Anne Caclin, Annalisa Francis, Jonathan D. Dunne, Matthieu Ricard, Richard J. Davidson, and Antoine Lutz. "Differential Effects of Non-Dual and Focused Attention Meditations on the Formation of Automatic Perceptual Habits in Expert Practitioners." *Neuropsychologia* 119 (2018): 92–100.

Hohwy, Jakob. "The Self-Evidencing Brain." *Noûs* 50, no. 2 (2016): 259–85.

Josipovic, Zoran. "Freedom of the Mind." *Frontiers in Psychology* 4 (2013): 538.

———. "Nondual Awareness: Consciousness-as-Such as Non-Representational Reflexivity." *Progress in Brain Research* 244 (2019): 273–98.

Laukkonen, R. E., and Samira Chandaria. "A Beautiful Loop: An Active Inference Theory of Consciousness." Unpublished manuscript, 2024.

Laukkonen, R. E., and Helen A. Slagter. "From Many to (N)one: Meditation and the Plasticity of the Predictive Mind." *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews* 128 (2021): 199–217.

Lowe, Robert, and Tom Ziemke. "The Feeling of Action Tendencies: On the Emotional Regulation of Goal-Directed Behavior." *Frontiers in Psychology* 2 (2011): 346.

Lutz, Antoine, Jonathan D. Dunne, and Richard J. Davidson. "Attention Regulation and Monitoring in Meditation." *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 12, no. 4 (2008): 163–69.

Lutz, Antoine, Johann Mattout, and Giuseppe Pagnoni. "The Epistemic and Pragmatic Value of Non-Action: A Predictive Coding Perspective on Meditation." *Current Opinion in Psychology* 28 (2019): 166–71.

Mago, Jean-Pierre, Samira Chandaria, Maxwell Miller, and R. E. Laukkonen. "Pure Awareness, Entropy, and the Foundation of Perception." Unpublished manuscript, 2024.

Metzinger, Thomas. *The Ego Tunnel*. New York: Basic Books, 2009.

———. *The Elephant and the Blind: The Experience of Pure Consciousness: Philosophy, Science, and 500+ Experiential Reports*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2024.

———. "Phenomenal Transparency and Cognitive Self-Reference." *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* 2, no. 4 (2003): 353–93.

Miller, Maxwell, and Andy Clark. "Happily Entangled: Prediction, Emotion, and the Embodied Mind." *Synthese* 195, no. 6 (2018): 2559–75.

Miller, Maxwell, Erik Rietveld, and Julian Kiverstein. "The Predictive Dynamics of Happiness and Well-Being." *Emotion Review* (2021): 17540739211063852.

Mirza, Mona B., Rick A. Adams, and Karl J. Friston. "Introducing a Bayesian Model of Selective Attention Based on Active Inference." *Scientific Reports* 9, no. 1 (2019): 13915.

Nave, K., Guy Deane, Maxwell Miller, and Andy Clark. "Wilding the Predictive Brain." *WIRES Cognitive Science* (2020): e1542.

Pagnoni, Giuseppe. "In-Active Inference: Contemplative Practice as an (Auto-)Epistemic Process." Unpublished manuscript, 2024.

Pagnoni, Giuseppe, Mariam Cekic, and Yan Guo. "'Thinking about Not-Thinking': Neural Correlates of Conceptual Processing during Zen Meditation." *PLoS ONE* 3, no. 9 (2008): e3083.

Pagnoni, Giuseppe, and Federico T. Guareschi. "Meditative In-Action: An Endogenous Epistemic Venture." Unpublished manuscript, 2024.

Parr, Thomas, Giovanni Pezzulo, and Karl J. Friston. *Active Inference: The Free Energy Principle in Mind, Brain, and Behavior*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2022.

Sandved-Smith, L. "A Computational Model of Minimal Phenomenal Experience (MPE)." Unpublished manuscript, 2024.

Sandved-Smith, L., Charlie Hesp, Johann Mattout, Karl Friston, Antoine Lutz, and Maxwell J. D. Ramstead. "Towards a Computational Phenomenology of Mental Action: Modelling Meta-Awareness and Attentional Control with Deep Parametric Active Inference." *Neuroscience of Consciousness* 2021, no. 1 (2021): niab018.

Vago, David R., and David A. Silbersweig. "Self-Awareness, Self-Regulation, and Self-Transcendence (S-ART): A Framework for Understanding the Neurobiological Mechanisms of Mindfulness." *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience* 6 (2012): 296.