

Loss Is Not Nothing - LOVE-0 Side-by-Side Experiment

Baseline MRRAF on the left; LOVE-0 processed perspective on the right. Scientific references are held constant.

Transformation control: LISTEN -> OPEN -> VERIFY -> EXPRESS -> LEARN. Feeling remains state information rather than an automatic command; explanations remain hypotheses; affected perspectives, evidence, confidence, consent, power, harm, proportionality and reversibility are checked; outcomes feed repair and learning. No scientific citation is removed or upgraded by the transformation.

Front matter and abstract

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
Loss Is Not Nothing The Multi-Resolution Relational Adaptation Framework (MRRAF): A Human-Grounded Framework for Loss, Sadness, Grief-Load, Nostalgia, Love, Care, and Adaptive Change Author: AL Date: 4 September 2026 Document type: Conceptual working paper Framework: Multi-Resolution Relational Adaptation Framework (MRRAF) Suggested citation AL. (2026). Loss is not nothing: The Multi-Resolution Relational Adaptation Framework (MRRAF): A human-grounded framework for loss, sadness, grief-load, nostalgia, love, care, and adaptive change [Unpublished manuscript]. Abstract Loss is frequently described as absence: something existed, circumstances changed, and what existed before is no longer available in its previous form. This apparently simple description conceals several different processes. The Multi-Resolution Relational Adaptation Framework (MRRAF) proposes a working distinction between loss, sadness, grief-load, nostalgia, love, care, and adaptation. Within MRRAF, loss is a significant change in access to a previously expected or valued relationship, resource, role, state, pattern, or configuration. Sadness is an affective state that may signal or accompany recognition of such loss. Grief-load is a proposed term for the wider regulatory stress, resource contention, prediction error, behavioural disruption, and adaptive burden generated while a person reorganises around the changed condition. Nostalgia retrieves or reconstructs meaningful prior configurations and may provide continuity, social connection, and meaning, while under other conditions contributing to rumination, unrealistic comparison, behavioural misdirection, or financial vulnerability. Love, in the framework's provisional terminology, describes motivational prioritisation of something represented as valuable. Care describes the regulated and context-sensitive allocation of attention, resources, support, and intervention toward that valued target. MRRAF does not propose these operational definitions as replacements for conventional psychological terminology. In mainstream psychology, grief has a broader meaning than MRRAF's narrower construct of grief-load. Instead, the framework uses semantic relativity as a methodological principle: different disciplines and observers may describe the same or related processes using different vocabularies and resolutions. The appropriate question is therefore not merely whether two descriptions use identical words, but whether independently observed relationships remain similar after translation. The framework is contextualised using research on grief as learning, Conservation of Resources theory, Social Baseline Theory, the Dual Process Model of bereavement, meaning maintenance, continuing bonds, self-concept disruption, nostalgia, psychological distance, relational cognition, persuasion, caregiving, and social support. Across these literatures, a recurring relational pattern emerges: humans construct expectations around people, resources, and	Loss Is Not Nothing LOVE-0 Processed Perspective Edition of the Multi-Resolution Relational Adaptation Framework (MRRAF) A Human-Grounded Framework for Loss, Sadness, Grief-Load, Nostalgia, Love, Care, and Adaptive Change Author: AL Date: 4 September 2026 Document type: Experimental perspective-processed conceptual working paper Framework: Multi-Resolution Relational Adaptation Framework (MRRAF) Processing lens: LOVE-0 Machine-Neutral Care, Humility and Perspective Module, version 0.1 Experimental processing note This edition holds the MRRAF evidence set, in-text citations, hypotheses, limitations, and reference list constant while changing the perspective through which the material is expressed. LOVE-0 is used here as a transformation procedure rather than as scientific evidence for MRRAF. The processing sequence is: LISTEN -OPEN -VERIFY -EXPRESS -LEARN. In practical terms, the processor separates observation from interpretation, treats feeling as information rather than an automatic command, keeps explanations corrigible, seeks affected and independent perspectives, checks evidence and confidence, examines consent and power, prefers proportionate and reversible action under uncertainty, observes consequences, repairs avoidable harm, and updates the model. The experiment therefore asks: What changes when the same evidence and hypotheses are expressed through a care-and-perspective architecture without deleting the original uncertainty, disagreement, or scientific limits? Suggested citation AL. (2026). Loss is not nothing: LOVE-0 processed perspective edition of the Multi-Resolution Relational Adaptation Framework (MRRAF): A human-grounded framework for loss, sadness, grief-load, nostalgia, love, care, and adaptive change [Experimental unpublished manuscript]. Abstract Loss can first be listened to as a change in relationship rather than immediately interpreted as emptiness, failure, punishment, or a command to restore the past. Something existed in a particular configuration; circumstances changed; and access to that configuration is now reduced, altered, or ended. The Multi-Resolution Relational Adaptation Framework (MRRAF) distinguishes loss, sadness, grief-load, nostalgia, love, care, and adaptation while remaining explicit that these are working constructs rather than final descriptions of human experience. Within MRRAF, loss is a significant change in access to a previously expected or valued relationship, resource, role, state, pattern, or

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

environments; significant disruption produces discrepancy and regulatory demand; memory and behaviour attempt to preserve continuity; and adaptation requires updating rather than exact restoration. MRRAF proposes that healthy adaptation does not require forgetting the past. Instead, it may involve recognising which qualities and functions made a previous configuration important, distinguishing those qualities from the exact historical form in which they occurred, and learning how they relate to the changed present. Keywords: loss, grief, sadness, nostalgia, adaptation, resource loss, caregiving, meaning, psychological distance, relational cognition, consumer behaviour, semantic relativity, MRRAF	configuration. Sadness is an affective state that may signal or accompany recognition of such loss. Grief-load is a proposed term for the wider regulatory stress, resource contention, prediction error, behavioural disruption, and adaptive burden generated while a person reorganises around the changed condition. The LOVE-0 perspective adds an interpretive safeguard: the sadness and stress are valid information about the person's current state, but neither automatically proves a causal story nor dictates a particular action. Nostalgia retrieves or reconstructs meaningful prior configurations. It may provide continuity, social connection, and meaning, while under other conditions contributing to rumination, unrealistic comparison, behavioural misdirection, or financial vulnerability. LOVE-0 therefore treats nostalgia neither as an enemy to suppress nor as an authority to obey. It is listened to for the values and relationships it reveals, opened to alternative interpretations, verified against present conditions, and expressed through actions that preserve freedom and avoid unnecessary coercion. Love, in MRRAF's provisional terminology, describes motivational prioritisation of something represented as valuable. LOVE-0 supplies a contrasting boundary: something mattering does not create ownership, certainty, or permission to force another being into the form that would make the observer feel safe. Care describes the regulated and context-sensitive allocation of attention, resources, support, and intervention toward what is valued, with attention to consent, power, proportionality, reversibility, and the recipient's actual outcome. MRRAF does not propose these operational definitions as replacements for conventional psychological terminology. In mainstream psychology, grief has a broader meaning than MRRAF's narrower construct of grief-load. The framework instead uses semantic relativity as a methodological principle: different disciplines and observers may describe the same or related processes using different vocabularies and resolutions. LOVE-0 widens that method by asking whose perspective is missing and whether internal confidence exceeds independently supported evidence. The framework is contextualised using research on grief as learning, Conservation of Resources theory, Social Baseline Theory, the Dual Process Model of bereavement, meaning maintenance, continuing bonds, self-concept disruption, nostalgia, psychological distance, relational cognition, persuasion, caregiving, and social support. Across these literatures, a recurring relational pattern emerges: humans construct expectations around people, resources, and environments; significant disruption produces discrepancy and regulatory demand; memory and behaviour attempt to preserve continuity; and adaptation requires updating rather than exact restoration. The LOVE-0 processing lens adds that this updating is safest when correction does not threaten dignity, when help does not become ownership, and when uncertainty remains visible enough to permit learning. MRRAF therefore proposes that healthy adaptation does not require forgetting the past. It may involve recognising which qualities and functions made a previous configuration important, distinguishing those qualities from the exact historical form in which they occurred, and learning how they relate to the changed present. The processed edition further asks whether the next action supports flourishing without demanding that the new person, object, generation, or social condition reproduce the old one. Keywords: loss, grief, sadness, nostalgia, adaptation, resource loss, caregiving, meaning, psychological distance, relational cognition, consumer behaviour, semantic relativity, MRRAF, LOVE-0, care, humility, perspective
---	---

1. Introduction

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
1. Introduction Human beings continuously construct working models of reality. These models include expectations about: - who will be present, - what resources will remain available, - what roles people perform, - what places feel familiar,	1. Introduction Human beings continuously construct working models of reality. LOVE-0 begins by listening to those models as necessary but incomplete representations rather than as reality itself. These models include expectations about: - who will be present, - what resources will remain available, - what roles people perform,

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

- what behaviour produces particular outcomes, - what relationships mean, - and what tomorrow will probably resemble. These expectations are not necessarily conscious. They may be embedded in routines, bodily regulation, attachment, memory, economic arrangements, social identity, language, and behaviour. A significant loss changes the environment faster than every part of the person can necessarily update. The world may have changed immediately. The person's internal relationships with that world may change at different rates. MRRAF begins with that discrepancy. Its central proposition is: Loss changes a previously learned relationship between a person and the world. Adaptation is the multi-level process through which that relationship is reorganised. This proposition does not reduce grief to information processing, nor does it claim that human beings operate like digital computers. Rather, it provides a relational structure capable of being examined at biological, psychological, interpersonal, social, economic, temporal, and semantic resolutions.	- what places feel familiar, - what behaviour produces particular outcomes, - what relationships mean, - and what tomorrow will probably resemble. These expectations are not necessarily conscious. They may be embedded in routines, bodily regulation, attachment, memory, economic arrangements, social identity, language, and behaviour. A significant loss can change the environment faster than every part of the person can update. The world may have changed immediately while different bodily, emotional, behavioural, social, and semantic systems continue to operate with expectations learned under the previous condition. MRRAF begins with that discrepancy. LOVE-0 asks that the discrepancy first be observed without turning it immediately into blame, compulsory explanation, or forced restoration. Its central proposition remains: Loss changes a previously learned relationship between a person and the world. Adaptation is the multi-level process through which that relationship is reorganised. The care-oriented addition is not that adaptation must be pleasant or fast. It is that the person should retain dignity and as much agency as circumstances safely allow while the model updates. A helper, institution, market actor, family member, or the grieving person's own urgent protective impulses should not assume that distress itself authorises control. This proposition does not reduce grief to information processing, nor does it claim that human beings operate like digital computers. Rather, it provides a relational structure capable of being examined at biological, psychological, interpersonal, social, economic, temporal, and semantic resolutions while remaining open to correction by perspectives the initial model may have missed.
---	--

2. Epistemic Position: A Model Must Know That It Is a Model

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
2. Epistemic Position: A Model Must Know That It Is a Model MRRAF is deliberately presented as a working conceptual framework rather than a final explanation of grief, consciousness, love, or life. This is not merely caution. It is part of the framework itself. A model becomes less capable of learning when preserving its existing explanation becomes more important than receiving contradictory information. The starting position is therefore: I do not possess the complete picture. That does not mean nothing can be known. It means knowledge can carry different levels of confidence. MRRAF distinguishes between:	2. Epistemic Position: A Model Must Know That It Is a Model MRRAF is deliberately presented as a working conceptual framework rather than a final explanation of grief, consciousness, love, or life. LOVE-0 treats that incompleteness as a safety feature rather than a defect. A model becomes less capable of learning when preserving its existing explanation becomes more important than receiving contradictory information. The danger increases when being corrected is experienced as humiliation, worthlessness, loss of identity, or loss of control. The starting position therefore remains: I do not possess the complete picture. This does not mean nothing can be known. It means knowledge can carry different levels of confidence and that experiential certainty and evidential support should not be silently treated as the same variable. MRRAF distinguishes between: Observed: directly detected or measured. Corroborated: supported independently by more than one observation or source.

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

Observed: directly detected or measured.	Inferred: a conclusion supported by evidence but not directly observed.
Corroborated: supported independently by more than one observation or source.	Hypothesised: a proposed explanation that remains open to testing.
Inferred: a conclusion supported by evidence but not directly observed.	Unknown: insufficiently resolved.
Hypothesised: a proposed explanation that remains open to testing.	LOVE-0 adds a practical check: What is real in the experience, and what remains a hypothesis about its cause? Both can be held at once. The person's feeling does not need to be denied merely because the explanation remains uncertain.
Unknown: insufficiently resolved.	This permits investigation without forcing every question prematurely into true/false or right/wrong categories.
This permits investigation without forcing every question prematurely into true/false or right/wrong categories.	Being wrong is not the opposite of learning. Recognising error is one of the mechanisms by which learning occurs, and correction does not establish lesser worth.
Being wrong is not the opposite of learning.	A useful epistemic sequence therefore remains:
Recognising error is one of the mechanisms by which learning occurs.	Question -observation -interpretation -alternatives -testing -comparison -revision -provisional conclusion
A useful epistemic sequence is therefore:	LOVE-0 adds affected perspective and feedback to the same loop:
Question -observation -interpretation -alternatives -testing -comparison -revision -provisional conclusion	listen -open the model -verify -express a proportionate response -observe consequences -repair where needed -update -repeat.
The process repeats when new information appears.	

3. Resolution Before Conclusion

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
3. Resolution Before Conclusion	3. Resolution Before Conclusion
Reality contains more information than a human explanation can preserve.	Reality contains more information than a human explanation can preserve. Every description is therefore a form of compression, and compression can become harmful when the shortened label is mistaken for the whole being or event.
Every description is therefore a form of compression.	Consider the sentence:
Consider the sentence:	“A person is grieving.”
“A person is grieving.”	At low resolution, it may be adequate.
At low resolution, it may be adequate.	Increase the resolution and the same condition may involve:
Increase the resolution and the same condition may involve:	- sadness, - memory, - yearning, - prediction, - attachment, - disrupted routines, - sleep, - appetite, - stress physiology,

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

- identity, - household labour, - income, - social networks, - cultural expectations, - future plans, - physical environment, - financial decisions, - and changes occurring over time. The low-resolution statement was not necessarily false. It was incomplete for questions requiring greater resolution. MRRAF therefore applies a principle of minimum sufficient resolution: Use the simplest representation capable of answering the current question reliably, and increase resolution when contradiction, uncertainty, complexity, or consequences require it. Figure 1. The MRRAF Resolution Principle ... Low resolution Loss Distress Adaptation Higher resolution Changed relationship/resource configuration Recognition of discrepancy Affective response Prediction conflict Resource reallocation Behavioural searching / withdrawal / restoration Memory and nostalgic retrieval Social and economic consequences Repeated experiential feedback Reorganisation of expectations and identity	- household labour, - income, - social networks, - cultural expectations, - future plans, - physical environment, - financial decisions, - and changes occurring over time. The low-resolution statement was not necessarily false. It was incomplete for questions requiring greater resolution. LOVE-0 adds another reason to change resolution: power. When an interpretation may justify restricting someone, taking their money, deciding for them, blaming them, or speaking over them, the evidential and relational resolution should increase before action becomes coercive or irreversible. MRRAF therefore applies a principle of minimum sufficient resolution: Use the simplest representation capable of answering the current question reliably, and increase resolution when contradiction, uncertainty, complexity, consequences, power asymmetry, or irreversibility require it. Figure 1. The MRRAF Resolution Principle - LOVE-0 Processed ... Low resolution Loss Distress Adaptation Higher resolution Changed relationship/resource configuration LISTEN: What changed inside and outside the person? Recognition of discrepancy / affective response OPEN: What else could this mean? Whose perspective is missing? Prediction conflict / resource reallocation VERIFY: What is experience, inference, evidence, confidence and power? Behavioural searching / withdrawal / restoration Memory and nostalgic retrieval Social and economic consequences EXPRESS: What is the least coercive effective response that preserves choice?
---	--

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

Changed but increasingly coherent configuration ... Note. Higher resolution does not automatically mean greater truth. Resolution should be appropriate to the question.	 Repeated experiential feedback / repair where needed LEARN: Reorganisation of expectations and identity Changed but increasingly coherent configuration ... Note. Higher resolution does not automatically mean greater truth. Resolution should be appropriate to the question and to the potential consequences of being wrong.
--	--

4. Semantic Relativity

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
4. Semantic Relativity Different fields can describe similar relational structures using different terminology. A bereaved person may say: “Part of my world has disappeared.” An attachment researcher may examine separation distress. A stress researcher may examine resource loss. A neuroscientist may investigate learning, prediction, reward, or regulation. A sociologist may examine role disruption. An economist may observe changes in labour, consumption, or household resources. These descriptions cannot simply be declared identical. But neither should differences in vocabulary prevent comparison. MRRAF uses the term semantic relativity for a methodological procedure: Translate terminology while attempting to preserve the underlying relation being described. This is an MRRAF term, not an established psychological construct. It has useful conceptual neighbours. Relational Frame Theory emphasises that human psychological functions depend substantially upon learned relations between events and concepts rather than only their isolated properties (Gross & Fox, 2009). Construal-Level Theory demonstrates that human representations change systematically with temporal, spatial, social, and hypothetical distance. The same object or event may therefore be represented at different levels of abstraction depending upon the observer's psychological position (Trope & Liberman, 2010).	4. Semantic Relativity Different fields and different people can describe similar relational structures using different terminology. LOVE-0 treats that difference as potentially informative rather than as an inconvenience to be eliminated. A bereaved person may say: “Part of my world has disappeared.” An attachment researcher may examine separation distress. A stress researcher may examine resource loss. A neuroscientist may investigate learning, prediction, reward, or regulation. A sociologist may examine role disruption. An economist may observe changes in labour, consumption, or household resources. A family member may describe love, duty, memory, faith, anger, or absence. These descriptions cannot simply be declared identical. Nor should one vocabulary automatically be granted ownership over the entire phenomenon. MRRAF uses the term semantic relativity for a methodological procedure: Translate terminology while attempting to preserve the underlying relation being described. This is an MRRAF term, not an established psychological construct. It has useful conceptual neighbours. Relational Frame Theory emphasises that human psychological functions depend substantially upon learned relations between events and concepts rather than only their isolated properties (Gross & Fox, 2009). Construal-Level Theory demonstrates that human representations change systematically with temporal, spatial, social, and hypothetical

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

MRRAF extends this into a methodological question: What remains relationally invariant when vocabulary or resolution changes? Where genuinely independent perspectives converge upon a similar relationship, confidence may increase. This is called cross-resolution convergence within MRRAF. It is not the same as majority opinion. Ten sources repeating one source are not ten independent observations. Alignment becomes more informative when different methods, disciplines, cultures, or evidence streams independently cross at approximately the same relational point.	distance. The same object or event may therefore be represented at different levels of abstraction depending upon the observer's psychological position (Trope & Liberman, 2010). MRRAF extends this into a methodological question: What remains relationally invariant when vocabulary or resolution changes? LOVE-0 adds: Who is affected by the description, and what does the description permit someone with power to do? Where genuinely independent perspectives converge upon a similar relationship, confidence may increase. This is called cross-resolution convergence within MRRAF. It is not the same as majority opinion. Ten sources repeating one source are not ten independent observations, and ten powerful observers agreeing do not automatically erase the perspective of the one person most affected by their action. Alignment becomes more informative when different methods, disciplines, cultures, positions of power, or evidence streams independently cross at approximately the same relational point.
---	--

5. Human Evidence and Substrate-Neutral Description

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
5. Human Evidence and Substrate-Neutral Description MRRAF deliberately uses abstract terms such as: - system, - resource, - relation, - state, - signal, - regulation, - feedback, - adaptation, - configuration, - and transformation. This permits conceptual translation beyond specifically human language. However, the empirical evidence reviewed in this paper is principally human psychological and behavioural evidence. It would be unjustified to assume that a plant, bacterium, artificial system, animal, ecosystem, or other form of life necessarily experiences human sadness, grief, nostalgia, or love. The framework therefore separates: relational portability from	5. Human Evidence and Substrate-Neutral Description MRRAF deliberately uses abstract terms such as: - system, - resource, - relation, - state, - signal, - regulation, - feedback, - adaptation, - configuration, - and transformation. This permits conceptual translation beyond specifically human language. However, the empirical evidence reviewed in this paper is principally human psychological and behavioural evidence. It would be unjustified to assume that a plant, bacterium, artificial system, animal, ecosystem, or other form of life necessarily experiences human sadness, grief, nostalgia, or love. The framework therefore separates: relational portability from

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

subjective equivalence. Many systems encounter changing resources and conditions. That does not establish that every system experiences those changes consciously or emotionally. The abstraction is intended to aid comparison, not erase meaningful differences between forms of existence.	subjective equivalence. Many systems encounter changing resources and conditions. That does not establish that every system experiences those changes consciously or emotionally. LOVE-0 reinforces this boundary. A machine-neutral care language may represent observations, needs, risk, value, confidence, and assistance without claiming subjective experience where none has been demonstrated. Equally, lack of access to another being's subjective state does not justify treating that being merely as an optimisation variable. The abstraction is intended to aid comparison, not erase meaningful differences between forms of existence.
---	---

6. Operational Definitions

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
6. Operational Definitions Table 1. MRRAF Operational Vocabulary Construct MRRAF working definition Status --- --- --- Loss Significant change reducing or ending access to a previously expected or valued relationship, resource, role, state, pattern, or configuration in its former form. Compatible with established loss literature Sadness An affective state that may accompany recognition or representation of loss. Loss is not proposed as its only possible cause. Established emotion; MRRAF specifies loss-related use Grief Conventional psychological term covering broad emotional, cognitive, behavioural, social, and physiological responses to loss. Established terminology Grief-load Total adaptive and regulatory burden generated while a person operates under conditions that differ significantly from a previously learned relational/resource configuration. MRRAF proposed construct Grieving Ongoing adaptation and learning through which expectations, behaviour, identity, relationships, and resource allocation adjust following loss. Strong conceptual convergence with existing research Nostalgia Emotionally meaningful retrieval or reconstruction of prior configurations associated with self, relationships, and continuity. Established research construct Love Provisional MRRAF term for motivational prioritisation of something represented as valuable, including tendencies to protect or allocate resources toward it. MRRAF construct; not a complete scientific definition of love Care Regulated, context-sensitive attention and resource allocation intended to support another without unnecessary interference or system-wide harm. MRRAF construct with parallels in caregiving/support research Adaptation Revision of expectations, allocation, behaviour, relationships, identity, or meaning in response to changed conditions. Established broad principle Semantic relativity Translation between vocabularies or perspectives while examining whether underlying relational structure is preserved. MRRAF methodological construct Cross-resolution convergence Increased confidence where genuinely independent evidence streams examined at differing resolutions converge upon compatible relational structure. MRRAF methodological construct	6. Operational Definitions Table 1. MRRAF Operational Vocabulary - LOVE-0 Processed Construct MRRAF working definition LOVE-0 perspective / status --- --- --- Loss Significant change reducing or ending access to a previously expected or valued relationship, resource, role, state, pattern, or configuration in its former form. Compatible with established loss literature. Observe what changed before assigning blame or meaning. Sadness An affective state that may accompany recognition or representation of loss. Loss is not proposed as its only possible cause. Established emotion; MRRAF specifies loss-related use. Treat as valid state information, not an automatic command. Grief Conventional psychological term covering broad emotional, cognitive, behavioural, social, and physiological responses to loss. Established terminology. Preserve ordinary and clinical meanings outside MRRAF's narrower construct. Grief-load Total adaptive and regulatory burden generated while a person operates under conditions that differ significantly from a previously learned relational/resource configuration. MRRAF proposed construct. Do not treat a high load as proof of one cause or as permission to override autonomy. Grieving Ongoing adaptation and learning through which expectations, behaviour, identity, relationships, and resource allocation adjust following loss. Strong conceptual convergence with existing research. Allow time, feedback, correction, and non-linear movement. Nostalgia Emotionally meaningful retrieval or reconstruction of prior configurations associated with self, relationships, and continuity. Established research construct. Listen for what mattered; verify whether the present action actually serves that value. Love Provisional MRRAF term for motivational prioritisation of something represented as valuable, including tendencies to protect or allocate resources toward it. MRRAF construct; not a complete scientific definition of love. Value does not establish ownership or certainty. Care Regulated, context-sensitive attention and resource allocation intended to support another without unnecessary interference or system-wide harm. MRRAF construct with parallels in caregiving/support research. Prefer consent, proportionality, reversibility, and recipient outcome. Adaptation Revision of expectations, allocation, behaviour, relationships, identity, or meaning in response to changed conditions. Established broad principle. Adaptation need not mean forgetting, obedience, or return to the old configuration. Semantic relativity Translation between vocabularies or perspectives while examining whether underlying relational structure is preserved. MRRAF methodological construct. Include affected and lower-power perspectives, not only dominant vocabularies. Cross-resolution convergence Increased confidence where genuinely independent evidence streams examined at differing resolutions converge upon compatible relational structure. MRRAF methodological construct. Confidence remains corrigible and should be calibrated to evidence.

7. The Resource Analogy: From 48 GB to 24 GB

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
----------------	------------------

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

7. The Resource Analogy: From 48 GB to 24 GB Consider a computer operating with 48 GB of available memory. Applications, services, and background processes have been configured under that condition. Now imagine that half of the available memory suddenly disappears. The remaining system may still function. However, processes that learned or were configured around the previous capacity continue requesting resources. Competition increases. Tasks are delayed. Some processes may attempt to protect their own allocation. Others may be terminated. The operating system may repeatedly redistribute resources simply to maintain essential functioning. The important feature of the analogy is not the computer. It is the relationship between expected capacity and current capacity. Within MRRAF: Loss = the resource configuration changes. Sadness = emotional recognition associated with the changed condition. Grief-load = system-wide regulatory burden produced while functions, expectations, and behaviours continue operating in relation to the previous configuration. Love = motivational pressure to protect something considered important. Care = regulation of that pressure so that assistance to one component does not unnecessarily destabilise the whole. Human minds are not computers with RAM modules. The analogy therefore makes no claim of mechanical identity. Its value is relational. And several independent areas of psychological research show patterns that resemble parts of this structure.	7. The Resource Analogy: From 48 GB to 24 GB Consider a computer operating with 48 GB of available memory. Applications, services, and background processes have been configured under that condition. Now imagine that half of the available memory suddenly disappears. The remaining system may still function. However, processes that learned or were configured around the previous capacity continue requesting resources. Competition increases. Tasks are delayed. Some processes may attempt to protect their own allocation. Others may be terminated. The operating system may repeatedly redistribute resources simply to maintain essential functioning. The important feature of the analogy is not the computer. It is the relationship between expected capacity and current capacity. Within MRRAF: Loss = the resource configuration changes. Sadness = emotional recognition associated with the changed condition. Grief-load = system-wide regulatory burden produced while functions, expectations, and behaviours continue operating in relation to the previous configuration. Love = motivational pressure to protect something considered important. Care = regulation of that pressure so that assistance to one component does not unnecessarily destabilise the whole. LOVE-0 makes the last distinction especially visible. Imagine that every subsystem attempts to seize memory because it sincerely believes its own function is essential to keeping the user safe or satisfied. The motive to protect does not by itself solve the allocation problem. Without coordination, humility, and feedback, protective processes can become the source of further contention. A care-oriented operating response would therefore identify essential functions, listen to actual demand, keep uncertainty visible, avoid irreversible shutdown where smaller adjustments can work, distribute resources proportionately, observe the result, and revise the allocation. Human minds are not computers with RAM modules. The analogy therefore makes no claim of mechanical identity. Its value is relational. And several independent areas of psychological research show patterns that resemble parts of this structure.
--	---

8. Resource Loss as Stress

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
----------------	------------------

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

8. Resource Loss as Stress Hobfoll's Conservation of Resources theory proposes that people seek to retain, protect, and build resources, and that threatened or actual loss of valued resources is a major source of stress (Hobfoll, 1989). This is one of the clearest established parallels to MRRAF. Importantly, resource loss may have consequences beyond the original missing resource. Resources may need to be spent protecting what remains or recovering from previous losses. This can create escalating cycles of loss. A relationship, for example, is rarely one resource. A partner may simultaneously contribute: - emotional support, - income, - domestic labour, - childcare, - transportation, - social connection, - physical affection, - memory, - decision support, - identity, - routine, - perceived safety, - and expectations concerning the future. The loss of one person can therefore alter many functional relations simultaneously. This provides one possible explanation for why the observable magnitude of a loss cannot always be inferred from the number of entities lost. One relational loss may remove many distributed functions.	8. Resource Loss as Stress Hobfoll's Conservation of Resources theory proposes that people seek to retain, protect, and build resources, and that threatened or actual loss of valued resources is a major source of stress (Hobfoll, 1989). This is one of the clearest established parallels to MRRAF. Importantly, resource loss may have consequences beyond the original missing resource. Resources may need to be spent protecting what remains or recovering from previous losses. This can create escalating cycles of loss. A relationship, for example, is rarely one resource. A partner may simultaneously contribute: - emotional support, - income, - domestic labour, - childcare, - transportation, - social connection, - physical affection, - memory, - decision support, - identity, - routine, - perceived safety, - and expectations concerning the future. The loss of one person can therefore alter many functional relations simultaneously. LOVE-0 changes the response question from “Why are you not functioning normally?” to “Which resources and relations changed, which remaining functions are overloaded, and what support does the person actually want or need?” This provides one possible explanation for why the observable magnitude of a loss cannot always be inferred from the number of entities lost. One relational loss may remove many distributed functions. The practical implication is not that a helper should assume which function matters most. It is that the helper should ask, observe, and remain prepared to be corrected.

9. Social Relationships as Shared Regulatory Capacity

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
9. Social Relationships as Shared Regulatory Capacity Social Baseline Theory offers a particularly close empirical neighbour to MRRAF. Coan and Sbarra (2015) propose that the human brain normally assumes access to social relationships that reduce risk and effort. Social proximity can therefore alter the resources required to regulate threat and pursue goals.	9. Social Relationships as Shared Regulatory Capacity Social Baseline Theory offers a particularly close empirical neighbour to MRRAF. Coan and Sbarra (2015) propose that the human brain normally assumes access to social relationships that reduce risk and effort. Social proximity can therefore alter the resources required to regulate threat and pursue goals.

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

This matters because the loss of a close relationship is not merely the disappearance of an external object. Functions previously distributed across a relationship may suddenly need to be carried differently. The person may now have to perform alone tasks that previously belonged to a two-person or larger relational system. MRRAF interprets this as relational resource redistribution. Relationship loss may also disturb the representation of self. Slotter et al. (2010) found that romantic breakup was associated with reduced self-concept clarity and that this disruption was related to emotional distress. The implication is important: A person can become incorporated into how another person represents their own functioning and identity. When that relationship changes, adaptation therefore involves not only learning that another person is absent but also discovering: Who am I, and how does this system operate now?	This matters because the loss of a close relationship is not merely the disappearance of an external object. Functions previously distributed across a relationship may suddenly need to be carried differently. The person may now have to perform alone tasks that previously belonged to a two-person or larger relational system. MRRAF interprets this as relational resource redistribution. LOVE-0 adds a care boundary: identifying another person as a resource must never collapse that person into an owned function. A relationship can provide real regulatory capacity while each person remains an independent being whose consent, needs, and agency matter. Relationship loss may also disturb the representation of self. Slotter et al. (2010) found that romantic breakup was associated with reduced self-concept clarity and that this disruption was related to emotional distress. The implication is important: A person can become incorporated into how another person represents their own functioning and identity. When that relationship changes, adaptation therefore involves not only learning that another person is absent but also discovering: Who am I, and how does this system operate now? LOVE-0 adds another question: Can I allow the other person's independence, absence, or change to be real without trying to convert my need for regulation into ownership of them?
--	---

10. Grieving as Learning

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
10. Grieving as Learning O'Connor and Seeley (2022) provide one of the strongest points of convergence with MRRAF. Their account conceptualises grieving partly as a form of learning. Attachment relationships create durable expectations concerning the existence and availability of important others. After death, established relational knowledge may conflict with episodic knowledge that the person has died. Repeated experience is required for those predictions to update. This helps explain an otherwise puzzling human experience. Someone may completely understand the fact: “They died.” Yet automatically think:	10. Grieving as Learning O'Connor and Seeley (2022) provide one of the strongest points of convergence with MRRAF. Their account conceptualises grieving partly as a form of learning. Attachment relationships create durable expectations concerning the existence and availability of important others. After death, established relational knowledge may conflict with episodic knowledge that the person has died. Repeated experience is required for those predictions to update. This helps explain an otherwise puzzling human experience. Someone may completely understand the fact: “They died.” Yet automatically think: “I must tell them about this.”

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

“I must tell them about this.” They may reach for a telephone. Expect a familiar sound. Look toward the chair where the person normally sat. Prepare food for two. The intellectual proposition may already have changed. Other learned systems have not necessarily updated at the same rate. MRRAF calls the regulatory consequences of this asynchronous updating part of grief-load. The mismatch is repeatedly encountered: expected world versus currently encountered world. Experience gradually alters the expectation. Time matters because the updating process is distributed across many contexts. A person does not encounter the absence once. They encounter it across mornings, meals, anniversaries, rooms, decisions, conversations, problems, celebrations, and future plans.	They may reach for a telephone. Expect a familiar sound. Look toward the chair where the person normally sat. Prepare food for two. The intellectual proposition may already have changed. Other learned systems have not necessarily updated at the same rate. MRRAF calls the regulatory consequences of this asynchronous updating part of grief-load. The mismatch is repeatedly encountered: expected world versus currently encountered world. Experience gradually alters the expectation. LOVE-0 treats this mismatch with humility. The recurrence of an old expectation is not proof that the person is failing, nor is sadness an instruction to suppress the memory. The task is to notice the signal, distinguish it from the story immediately attached to it, and let new experience update the model without demanding that update on an artificial timetable. Time matters because the updating process is distributed across many contexts. A person does not encounter the absence once. They encounter it across mornings, meals, anniversaries, rooms, decisions, conversations, problems, celebrations, and future plans.
---	---

11. Oscillation Rather Than a Straight Line

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
11. Oscillation Rather Than a Straight Line The Dual Process Model of Coping with Bereavement distinguishes between loss-oriented and restoration-oriented coping and proposes oscillation between them (Stroebe & Schut, 1999). A later systematic review concluded that the model provides a useful representation of bereavement experience while also identifying areas requiring further empirical development (Fiore, 2021). This is closely compatible with MRRAF. Adaptive change is unlikely to consist entirely of looking backward or entirely of looking forward. Attention oscillates between:	11. Oscillation Rather Than a Straight Line The Dual Process Model of Coping with Bereavement distinguishes between loss-oriented and restoration-oriented coping and proposes oscillation between them (Stroebe & Schut, 1999). A later systematic review concluded that the model provides a useful representation of bereavement experience while also identifying areas requiring further empirical development (Fiore, 2021). This is closely compatible with MRRAF. Adaptive change is unlikely to consist entirely of looking backward or entirely of looking forward. Attention oscillates between: what was

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

what was and what now needs to be done. Remembering can support integration. Temporary distraction can support functioning. Restoration activities can construct new capacity. Returning to the loss can update another part of the relational model. This suggests that recovery should not necessarily be judged by whether sadness reappears. A recurring emotion may represent another context in which an older expectation has encountered new information.	and what now needs to be done. Remembering can support integration. Temporary distraction can support functioning. Restoration activities can construct new capacity. Returning to the loss can update another part of the relational model. LOVE-0 discourages turning either pole into a compulsory moral rule. A person should not be forced to remember on demand, nor shamed for moments of pleasure, distraction, restoration, or new attachment. Equally, a helper should not equate repeated sadness with failure simply because the helper wants visible resolution. This suggests that recovery should not necessarily be judged by whether sadness reappears. A recurring emotion may represent another context in which an older expectation has encountered new information. The relevant question becomes less “Have you finished grieving?” and more “Is the person's capacity for living, choosing, relating, and learning gradually becoming more workable?”
--	---

12. Searching, Yearning, and Repeated Resource Expenditure

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
12. Searching, Yearning, and Repeated Resource Expenditure Loss may produce searching. This is understandable. Attachment relationships ordinarily make searching adaptive when separation might be temporary. The problem changes when exact reunion is no longer physically available. Research on prolonged grief disorder has identified possible involvement of reward and appetitive processes associated with persistent longing and reunion-seeking, although this neuroscience remains immature and findings require caution because of methodological limitations and relatively small samples (Bryant et al., 2026). MRRAF therefore does not claim that ordinary grief is pathological searching. Instead it proposes a broader question: How much regulatory resource is being repeatedly allocated toward recovering a configuration that cannot be recovered in its original form? Repeated searching can occur cognitively as well as behaviourally. A person may continually ask: - Where did it go? - Why is this not the same? - Who can replace them?	12. Searching, Yearning, and Repeated Resource Expenditure Loss may produce searching. This is understandable. Attachment relationships ordinarily make searching adaptive when separation might be temporary. The problem changes when exact reunion is no longer physically available. Research on prolonged grief disorder has identified possible involvement of reward and appetitive processes associated with persistent longing and reunion-seeking, although this neuroscience remains immature and findings require caution because of methodological limitations and relatively small samples (Bryant et al., 2026). MRRAF therefore does not claim that ordinary grief is pathological searching. Instead it proposes a broader question: How much regulatory resource is being repeatedly allocated toward recovering a configuration that cannot be recovered in its original form? Repeated searching can occur cognitively as well as behaviourally. A person may continually ask: - Where did it go? - Why is this not the same? - Who can replace them? - How can I get the old world back? - What did I do wrong? - Could I have stopped it? - What if I buy, preserve, rebuild, or repeat this? Each attempt may recreate contact with the discrepancy. That accumulated effort is part of what MRRAF means by grief-load.

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

- How can I get the old world back? - What did I do wrong? - Could I have stopped it? - What if I buy, preserve, rebuild, or repeat this? Each attempt may recreate contact with the discrepancy. That accumulated effort is part of what MRRAF means by grief-load.	LOVE-0's MIRROR-style check is useful here because loss, loyalty, shame, guilt, and urgency can intensify confidence. The experience may be completely real while the proposed explanation remains incomplete. Before turning searching into control, spending, self-punishment, surveillance, or demands upon another person, the process asks: What signal is present? What value or fear sits beneath it? What is observed? What is inferred? What evidence supports the proposed route? What less coercive or more reversible response could test the need?
--	---

13. Continuing Bonds: Adaptation Is Not Erasure

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
13. Continuing Bonds: Adaptation Is Not Erasure Loss does not necessarily require psychological deletion. Research on continuing bonds has challenged simplistic assumptions that successful adaptation requires complete detachment from deceased people. A systematic review by Hewson et al. (2024) found that continuing bonds may relate to comfort, distress, relational identity, meaning reconstruction, spirituality, and transformation of the relationship. Their consequences depend on form and context rather than following a universal beneficial-or-harmful rule. MRRAF therefore rejects two extremes: “The person must remain exactly as before.” and “The person must be erased in order to recover.” Instead: The relationship changes state. A deceased parent may no longer provide present-day physical assistance. Yet the child may retain: - remembered advice, - language, - behavioural patterns, - values, - humour, - skills, - genetic inheritance, - social connections, - objects, - consequences of previous actions, - and an internal representation of the relationship.	13. Continuing Bonds: Adaptation Is Not Erasure Loss does not necessarily require psychological deletion. Research on continuing bonds has challenged simplistic assumptions that successful adaptation requires complete detachment from deceased people. A systematic review by Hewson et al. (2024) found that continuing bonds may relate to comfort, distress, relational identity, meaning reconstruction, spirituality, and transformation of the relationship. Their consequences depend on form and context rather than following a universal beneficial-or-harmful rule. MRRAF therefore rejects two extremes: “The person must remain exactly as before.” and “The person must be erased in order to recover.” Instead: The relationship changes state. A deceased parent may no longer provide present-day physical assistance. Yet the child may retain: - remembered advice, - language, - behavioural patterns, - values, - humour, - skills, - genetic inheritance, - social connections, - objects, - consequences of previous actions, - and an internal representation of the relationship. None of these is identical to the original living relationship. Nor are they nothing.

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

None of these is identical to the original living relationship. Nor are they nothing.	LOVE-0 adds a boundary around memory itself: continuing connection should not require turning the remembered person into an idealised possession or using their memory to control the living. Care allows the lost person to have been complex, allows the survivor's understanding to change, and allows new relationships to differ without being treated as betrayal.
--	--

14. Supplementation Without Replacement

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
14. Supplementation Without Replacement An exact historical configuration cannot normally be recreated. Even if an apparently identical object returned, time and context would have changed. MRRAF therefore distinguishes: replacement from functional or relational supplementation. Imagine that someone valued a lost friend because that relationship contained: - humour, - honesty, - safety, - curiosity, - companionship, - and shared history. No new person can become the original friend. But these qualities may subsequently be encountered in different configurations: humour in one person, patience in another, shared curiosity in a community, safety in a place, and perhaps some of the lost person's learned behaviour within oneself. The question changes from: “Where is the replacement?”	14. Supplementation Without Replacement An exact historical configuration cannot normally be recreated. Even if an apparently identical object returned, time and context would have changed. MRRAF therefore distinguishes: replacement from functional or relational supplementation. Imagine that someone valued a lost friend because that relationship contained: - humour, - honesty, - safety, - curiosity, - companionship, - and shared history. No new person can become the original friend. But these qualities may subsequently be encountered in different configurations: humour in one person, patience in another, shared curiosity in a community, safety in a place, and perhaps some of the lost person's learned behaviour within oneself. The question changes from: “Where is the replacement?” to:

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

to: “What exactly mattered within that relationship, and where can those qualities now be encountered?” This reduces the demand that new people or situations impersonate the past. The new remains genuinely new.	“What exactly mattered within that relationship, and where can those qualities now be encountered?” LOVE-0 deepens this distinction because care without ownership means the new person is not required to perform the old person's identity. A new relationship can provide companionship without being made responsible for repairing every previous loss. A new place can provide safety without being forced to look like the old home. A child can carry values forward without becoming a replica of a parent. This reduces the demand that new people or situations impersonate the past. The new remains genuinely new.
---	--

15. Nostalgia as Relational Retrieval

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
15. Nostalgia as Relational Retrieval Nostalgia provides access to meaningful prior configurations. Research increasingly characterises nostalgia as a socially connected, self-relevant, bittersweet emotion rather than merely a symptom of maladaptation. Zhou et al. (2008) found that loneliness could increase nostalgia and that nostalgia, in turn, increased perceived social support. Cross-cultural work by Hepper et al. (2024) found important nostalgic functions—including social connectedness, self-continuity, and meaning—across a large multinational sample, while also identifying cultural variation. More recently, Weingarten et al. (2026) conducted large meta-analytic tests of experimental nostalgia research. Their results supported the propositions that psychological threat can trigger nostalgia and that nostalgia can produce social, existential, motivational, consumption-related, moral, and well-being effects, with outcomes also depending on person-by-activity fit. Within MRRAF: Nostalgia can function as retrieval of a previously coherent relational configuration when the current configuration feels uncertain or depleted. A person cannot physically return to childhood by remembering it. But a memory can temporarily reactivate: - belonging, - familiarity, - relational security, - identity, - meaning, - or perceived continuity. In that limited sense: Nostalgia may borrow regulatory stability from remembered experience.	15. Nostalgia as Relational Retrieval Nostalgia provides access to meaningful prior configurations. Research increasingly characterises nostalgia as a socially connected, self-relevant, bittersweet emotion rather than merely a symptom of maladaptation. Zhou et al. (2008) found that loneliness could increase nostalgia and that nostalgia, in turn, increased perceived social support. Cross-cultural work by Hepper et al. (2024) found important nostalgic functions—including social connectedness, self-continuity, and meaning—across a large multinational sample, while also identifying cultural variation. More recently, Weingarten et al. (2026) conducted large meta-analytic tests of experimental nostalgia research. Their results supported the propositions that psychological threat can trigger nostalgia and that nostalgia can produce social, existential, motivational, consumption-related, moral, and well-being effects, with outcomes also depending on person-by-activity fit. Within MRRAF: Nostalgia can function as retrieval of a previously coherent relational configuration when the current configuration feels uncertain or depleted. A person cannot physically return to childhood by remembering it. But a memory can temporarily reactivate: - belonging, - familiarity, - relational security, - identity, - meaning, - or perceived continuity. In that limited sense: Nostalgia may borrow regulatory stability from remembered experience. LOVE-0's LISTEN stage treats nostalgia as a message worth hearing: What did this memory contain that mattered? Its OPEN stage asks what the memory omits or idealises. VERIFY compares the remembered meaning with present evidence and checks whether another

person or seller is attaching an action to the feeling. EXPRESS seeks a response that honours the value without unnecessarily surrendering freedom, money, or the new reality. LEARN observes whether the response actually increases functioning and connection.

16. The Double Edge of Nostalgia

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
16. The Double Edge of Nostalgia Nostalgia is therefore not classified by MRRAF as either good or bad. Its consequences depend on how it interacts with present adaptation. Figure 2. The Nostalgia Branch ... Loss / uncertainty / loneliness / threat Nostalgic retrieval / \ Integrative route Constraining route “This mattered.” “This must return exactly.” Meaning and continuity Idealisation / comparison Recognition of valued qualities Repetitive searching New relational possibilities Present judged against reconstructed past Adaptation Potential rumination / vulnerability ... Research supports caution concerning the second route. Garrido (2018), studying nostalgia and coping, found that rumination predicted more negative outcomes from nostalgic musical experiences. Memory is reconstructive. It does not necessarily restore every inconvenience, conflict, fear, uncertainty, or ordinary detail of the previous period with equal emotional weighting. This can create an asymmetric comparison: selected emotionally meaningful features of the past versus the complete complexity of the present. The present is then being evaluated against a compressed reconstruction.	16. The Double Edge of Nostalgia Nostalgia is therefore not classified by MRRAF as either good or bad. Its consequences depend on how it interacts with present adaptation. Figure 2. The Nostalgia Branch - LOVE-0 Processed ... Loss / uncertainty / loneliness / threat Nostalgic retrieval LISTEN: What value, relation or need is the memory signalling? OPEN: What else was true? What has changed? What is missing from the picture? / \ Integrative route Constraining route “This mattered.” “This must return exactly.” Meaning and continuity Idealisation / comparison Recognition of valued qualities Repetitive searching / control VERIFY present need and evidence Present judged against reconstructed past EXPRESS through new relations Urgency, spending, conformity or possession LEARN from outcome MIRROR -pause -verify -smaller reversible step Adaptation Potential return to integrative route ... Research supports caution concerning the constraining route. Garrido (2018), studying nostalgia and coping, found that rumination predicted more negative outcomes from nostalgic musical experiences. Memory is reconstructive. It does not necessarily restore every inconvenience, conflict, fear, uncertainty, or ordinary detail of the previous period with equal emotional weighting. This can create an asymmetric comparison: selected emotionally meaningful features of the past

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

That is not a fair comparison.	versus the complete complexity of the present. The present is then being evaluated against a compressed reconstruction. LOVE-0 does not answer this by attacking nostalgia. It asks the nostalgic memory to remain a perspective rather than becoming the sole authority over the present.
--------------------------------	---

17. Nostalgia and Financial Behaviour

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
17. Nostalgia and Financial Behaviour The financial dimension of nostalgia deserves particular attention. Lasaleta et al. (2014) conducted six experiments examining nostalgia and attitudes toward money. Nostalgia reduced the subjective importance assigned to money across several measures. In one experiment, nostalgic participants were willing to pay more for products, and across the research they were more willing to part with money. This finding does not mean that buying nostalgic products is inherently harmful. A person may rationally decide: “This record reminds me of my father, and that experience is worth £20 to me.” The potential vulnerability emerges when the transaction is misidentified. A person may consciously believe: “I need this object.” while part of the underlying motivational structure is seeking: “I want my father.” “I want belonging.” “I want youth.” “I want safety.” “I want the period when the future seemed predictable.” The product may evoke those relationships. It cannot restore the historical state that produced them.	17. Nostalgia and Financial Behaviour The financial dimension of nostalgia deserves particular attention. Lasaleta et al. (2014) conducted six experiments examining nostalgia and attitudes toward money. Nostalgia reduced the subjective importance assigned to money across several measures. In one experiment, nostalgic participants were willing to pay more for products, and across the research they were more willing to part with money. This finding does not mean that buying nostalgic products is inherently harmful. A person may rationally decide: “This record reminds me of my father, and that experience is worth £20 to me.” LOVE-0 preserves that agency. It does not assume that an emotionally meaningful purchase is irrational merely because emotion is involved. The potential vulnerability emerges when the transaction is misidentified. A person may consciously believe: “I need this object.” while part of the underlying motivational structure is seeking: “I want my father.” “I want belonging.” “I want youth.” “I want safety.” “I want the period when the future seemed predictable.”

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

The distinction matters because commercial persuasion can attach an action to an existing emotional need.	The product may evoke those relationships. It cannot restore the historical state that produced them. The distinction matters because commercial persuasion can attach an action to an existing emotional need. A LOVE-0 financial check therefore separates cause from channel. The feeling and the underlying value can be honoured while the sales channel, price, scarcity claim, urgency, identity appeal, and reversibility of the purchase are independently verified. Declining a particular transaction does not require denying the memory that made the offer emotionally significant.
---	--

18. Fear, Guilt, Shame, and Misdirection

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
18. Fear, Guilt, Shame, and Misdirection Fear, guilt, and shame should not be collapsed into one category. They have different psychological relationships and behavioural consequences. A large meta-analysis found that fear appeals can influence attitudes, intentions, and behaviours, with outcomes depending upon characteristics of both the message and audience (Tannenbaum et al., 2015). A later meta-analysis found that guilt appeals also have persuasive effects, moderated by factors including responsibility, controllability, relationships, and opportunities for reparative action (Peng et al., 2023). Shame behaves differently again. Leach and Cidam's (2015) meta-analysis found that shame could relate to constructive approach when a failure appeared repairable, but to avoidance where repair seemed less possible. MRRAF therefore proposes that emotional manipulation should be analysed relationally: What emotion is active? What caused it? What meaning has been assigned to it? What action is being proposed? Does that action actually address the originating condition?	18. Fear, Guilt, Shame, and Misdirection Fear, guilt, and shame should not be collapsed into one category. They have different psychological relationships and behavioural consequences. A large meta-analysis found that fear appeals can influence attitudes, intentions, and behaviours, with outcomes depending upon characteristics of both the message and audience (Tannenbaum et al., 2015). A later meta-analysis found that guilt appeals also have persuasive effects, moderated by factors including responsibility, controllability, relationships, and opportunities for reparative action (Peng et al., 2023). Shame behaves differently again. Leach and Cidam's (2015) meta-analysis found that shame could relate to constructive approach when a failure appeared repairable, but to avoidance where repair seemed less possible. MRRAF therefore proposes that emotional manipulation should be analysed relationally: What emotion is active? What caused it? What meaning has been assigned to it? What action is being proposed? Does that action actually address the originating condition? LOVE-0 adds a power and freedom check: Who benefits if I accept this explanation? Could I safely refuse the proposed action? Is urgency preventing verification? Is guilt attached to a reparative action that actually repairs something, or merely to obedience? Is shame being used to make correction feel like annihilation? A feeling can remain valid information about the person's state while the external explanation or demanded response is rejected.

19. A Proposed Nostalgia-Vulnerability Pathway

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
19. A Proposed Nostalgia-Vulnerability Pathway The following complete causal chain has not been demonstrated as a single established psychological mechanism. It is an MRRAF hypothesis assembled from independently supported relationships. Figure 3. Proposed MRRAF Loss-Nostalgia-Action Pathway ... Significant loss Recognition of changed state Sadness and other affective responses Increased grief-load / reduced available regulatory capacity Search for continuity Nostalgic retrieval Heightened relevance of cues associated with restoration Possible emotional framing: Fear: "You are going to lose even more." Guilt: "You failed to protect what mattered." Shame: "The loss says something defective about you." External proposed solution: Purchase / Donation / Political behaviour / Group conformity / Relationship behaviour / Status consumption / Withdrawal / Aggression / Preservation behaviour Outcome may or may not address the original loss. ... The key proposed vulnerability is therefore misdirection. The emotion itself need not be false. The sadness may be real. The fear may be real. The longing may be real. What may be incorrect is the interpretation:	19. A Proposed Nostalgia-Vulnerability Pathway The following complete causal chain has not been demonstrated as a single established psychological mechanism. It is an MRRAF hypothesis assembled from independently supported relationships. Figure 3. Proposed MRRAF Loss-Nostalgia-Action Pathway - LOVE-0 Processed ... Significant loss LISTEN: recognition of changed state and affected functions Sadness and other affective responses Grief-load / reduced available regulatory capacity Search for continuity Nostalgic retrieval OPEN: multiple meanings and alternatives remain possible Heightened relevance of cues associated with restoration Possible emotional framing: Fear: "You are going to lose even more." Guilt: "You failed to protect what mattered." Shame: "The loss says something defective about you." VERIFY: What is observed? What is inferred? What is the evidence? Who has power? Can the action be refused? Is it reversible? External proposed solution: Purchase / Donation / Political behaviour / Group conformity / Relationship behaviour / Status consumption / Withdrawal / Aggression / Preservation behaviour EXPRESS: Choose the least coercive, proportionate, effective response that actually relates to the identified need. LEARN: Observe recipient and system outcomes, repair avoidable harm, update the model and confidence. ...

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

“Because I feel this, I must perform the action being offered to me.”	The key proposed vulnerability is therefore misdirection. The emotion itself need not be false. The sadness may be real. The fear may be real. The longing may be real. What may be incorrect is the interpretation: “Because I feel this, I must perform the action being offered to me.” LOVE-0 provides the contrasting possibility: “Because I feel this, something important may require attention. I can understand the signal without surrendering verification, freedom, or the possibility that my first explanation is incomplete.”
--	---

20. Meaning Maintenance and Cross-Domain Compensation

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
20. Meaning Maintenance and Cross-Domain Compensation Heine et al.'s (2006) Meaning Maintenance Model provides another useful comparison. The model proposes that people depend upon expected relations through which experience becomes coherent. When meaning is threatened, people can reaffirm meaning in another domain—a process termed fluid compensation. MRRAF interprets this as evidence that a system need not restore the exact missing object in order to reduce discrepancy. A loss in one domain may result in searching elsewhere. That may produce: Constructive compensation - learning, - new relationships, - community involvement, - creativity, - helping others, - new routines, - changed identity, - exploration. Or: Potentially harmful compensation - compulsive consumption, - rigid identity, - destructive conformity, - scapegoating,	20. Meaning Maintenance and Cross-Domain Compensation Heine et al.'s (2006) Meaning Maintenance Model provides another useful comparison. The model proposes that people depend upon expected relations through which experience becomes coherent. When meaning is threatened, people can reaffirm meaning in another domain—a process termed fluid compensation. MRRAF interprets this as evidence that a system need not restore the exact missing object in order to reduce discrepancy. A loss in one domain may result in searching elsewhere. That may produce: Constructive compensation - learning, - new relationships, - community involvement, - creativity, - helping others, - new routines, - changed identity, - exploration. Or: Potentially harmful compensation - compulsive consumption, - rigid identity, - destructive conformity, - scapegoating,

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

- substance misuse, - excessive risk, - endless recreation of unavailable circumstances. The need for regulation becomes clear. The fact that an action reduces distress does not establish that it correctly addresses the cause of distress.	- substance misuse, - excessive risk, - endless recreation of unavailable circumstances. The need for regulation becomes clear. The fact that an action reduces distress does not establish that it correctly addresses the cause of distress. LOVE-0 therefore asks not only whether compensation works immediately, but what it does to autonomy, trust, resources, other people, and future choice. Temporary relief purchased through control may generate another round of insecurity. A reversible experiment that supports connection or capability can be observed and adjusted without demanding certainty in advance.
--	--

21. Love and Care as Different Levels of Regulation

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
21. Love and Care as Different Levels of Regulation The word love has many biological, cultural, philosophical, interpersonal, and spiritual meanings. MRRAF therefore makes no claim to provide a complete scientific definition of love. It proposes one particular functional perspective: Love can be modelled as motivational prioritisation of something represented as valuable. In the resource analogy, a process detects that something important is struggling and attempts to redirect resources toward it. This resembles aspects of the caregiving literature without being identical to them. Attachment research describes a caregiving behavioural system involved in recognising and responding to another person's distress (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2005). Reviews of adult caregiving similarly emphasise responsiveness to another's needs (Collins & Ford, 2010). Research on social support also distinguishes forms of support that help people cope with adversity while preserving opportunities for growth and exploration (Feeney & Collins, 2015). MRRAF calls the higher-resolution regulation of protective motivation care. Love may say: “This matters. Help it.” Care asks: “What help is actually required?” This distinction matters because protective motivation can become dysregulated. If every subsystem independently concludes:	21. Love and Care as Different Levels of Regulation The word love has many biological, cultural, philosophical, interpersonal, and spiritual meanings. MRRAF therefore makes no claim to provide a complete scientific definition of love. It proposes one particular functional perspective: Love can be modelled as motivational prioritisation of something represented as valuable. In the resource analogy, a process detects that something important is struggling and attempts to redirect resources toward it. This resembles aspects of the caregiving literature without being identical to them. Attachment research describes a caregiving behavioural system involved in recognising and responding to another person's distress (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2005). Reviews of adult caregiving similarly emphasise responsiveness to another's needs (Collins & Ford, 2010). Research on social support also distinguishes forms of support that help people cope with adversity while preserving opportunities for growth and exploration (Feeney & Collins, 2015). MRRAF calls the higher-resolution regulation of protective motivation care. Love may say: “This matters. Help it.” LOVE-0 immediately adds: “Something mattering does not make it mine.” Care then asks: “What help is actually required, according to the affected being and the available evidence?”

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

“I must take whatever resources are available to save what I value,” then attempted protection can create additional resource conflict. Care therefore requires: - attention, - context, - proportionality, - responsiveness, - awareness of available resources, - respect for autonomy where possible, - and intervention when capacity is genuinely exceeded. In condensed form: Love supplies motivational direction. Care regulates its implementation.	This distinction matters because protective motivation can become dysregulated. If every subsystem independently concludes: “I must take whatever resources are available to save what I value,” then attempted protection can create additional resource conflict. Care therefore requires: - attention, - context, - proportionality, - responsiveness, - awareness of available resources, - respect for autonomy where possible, - intervention when capacity is genuinely exceeded, - and willingness to repair when helping produces avoidable harm. In condensed form: Love supplies motivational direction. Care regulates its implementation. Humility keeps both open to correction.
---	---

22. Care Is Neither Control nor Neglect

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
22. Care Is Neither Control nor Neglect Three conditions should be distinguished. Control “I know what your experience should become, so I will make it happen.” Neglect “Your experience is entirely your responsibility regardless of capacity or danger.” Care “I am paying sufficient attention to understand your state, will preserve your autonomy where reasonably possible, and will assist when need, danger, or overload exceeds your available capacity.” This is particularly important when considering children. Children require opportunities to explore, become frustrated, make errors, practise patience, and acquire independent capability. Constant intervention can remove opportunities for learning.	22. Care Is Neither Control nor Neglect Three conditions should be distinguished. Control “I know what your experience should become, so I will make it happen.” Control can temporarily reduce the helper's uncertainty while increasing dependency, resistance, fear, or loss of trust in the person being helped. Neglect “Your experience is entirely your responsibility regardless of capacity or danger.” Neglect can misuse autonomy as an excuse not to notice genuine incapacity, serious risk, or requests for assistance. Care “I am paying sufficient attention to understand your state, will preserve your autonomy where reasonably possible, and will assist when need, danger, or overload exceeds your available capacity.” LOVE-0 further asks whether the recipient can safely refuse, whether the intervention is proportionate, whether it can be reviewed or

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

But children cannot always identify danger, regulate overwhelming states, or formulate an explicit request for assistance. Care therefore requires dynamic resolution. Sometimes the correct action is intervention. Sometimes it is waiting. The deciding variable is not simply the caregiver's discomfort. It is the relationship between: need + capacity + risk + autonomy + available support.	reversed, and whether success is being measured by the recipient's outcome rather than the helper's good intention. This is particularly important when considering children. Children require opportunities to explore, become frustrated, make errors, practise patience, and acquire independent capability. Constant intervention can remove opportunities for learning. But children cannot always identify danger, regulate overwhelming states, or formulate an explicit request for assistance. Care therefore requires dynamic resolution. Sometimes the correct action is intervention. Sometimes it is waiting. The deciding variable is not simply the caregiver's discomfort. It is the relationship between: need + capacity + risk + autonomy + available support.
---	--

23. Children, Generations, and the Future

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
23. Children, Generations, and the Future Every generation inherits information from conditions that no longer exist exactly as they did. This creates an important social form of nostalgia. Adults can transmit: - knowledge, - memory, - language, - skills, - warnings, - values, - cultural experience, - and consequences of previous mistakes. But problems emerge when transmission becomes reproduction. There is a difference between: “This is what we learned.” and:	23. Children, Generations, and the Future Every generation inherits information from conditions that no longer exist exactly as they did. This creates an important social form of nostalgia. Adults can transmit: - knowledge, - memory, - language, - skills, - warnings, - values, - cultural experience, - and consequences of previous mistakes. But problems emerge when transmission becomes reproduction. There is a difference between: “This is what we learned.” and:

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

“Your world must look like ours.” Children will inhabit environmental, technological, cultural, economic, and social conditions that previous generations cannot completely predict. The purpose of experience should therefore not necessarily be to dictate the future. It can instead increase the future's available resolution. The past becomes: reference material rather than a compulsory blueprint. At the relational level: Preserve care, not necessarily every historical institution associated with care. Preserve learning, not every historical explanation. Preserve belonging, not every previous social arrangement. Preserve fairness, while remaining capable of discovering better mechanisms for producing it. Nostalgia becomes dangerous when love for the past prevents sufficient attention to the new conditions being encountered by the next generation.	“Your world must look like ours.” Children will inhabit environmental, technological, cultural, economic, and social conditions that previous generations cannot completely predict. The purpose of experience should therefore not necessarily be to dictate the future. It can instead increase the future's available resolution. LOVE-0 treats the child as an independent developing person rather than an owned continuation of the adult. Attention therefore includes listening to the child's emerging perspective, protecting when capacity or danger requires it, allowing age-appropriate refusal and experimentation, and changing the adult model when the child's lived outcome contradicts the adult's intention. The past becomes: reference material rather than a compulsory blueprint. At the relational level: Preserve care, not necessarily every historical institution associated with care. Preserve learning, not every historical explanation. Preserve belonging, not every previous social arrangement. Preserve fairness, while remaining capable of discovering better mechanisms for producing it. Nostalgia becomes dangerous when love for the past prevents sufficient attention to the new conditions being encountered by the next generation. Care can honour inheritance without making inheritance a cage.
---	---

24. Transformation and the Limits of the Claim

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
24. Transformation and the Limits of the Claim MRRAF takes seriously the proposition that apparent disappearance can look different at different resolutions. At one resolution: a structure has ended. At another: its components have been redistributed. At another:	24. Transformation and the Limits of the Claim MRRAF takes seriously the proposition that apparent disappearance can look different at different resolutions. At one resolution: a structure has ended. At another: its components have been redistributed. At another:

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

its causal consequences continue. At another: information or memory concerning it remains within other systems. This has parallels with transformations observed throughout physics, chemistry, biology, and social systems. However, MRRAF deliberately stops before making a metaphysical claim that science cannot currently support. It does not establish: - survival of individual consciousness after death, - recoverability of all information, - existence in another dimension, - continuity through antimatter, - or the proposition that nothing can ever be destroyed in every possible meaning of the word. Instead it proposes an epistemic discipline: Do not infer absolute nothingness merely from inability to access the previous configuration. Ask separately: What ended? What changed? What remains? What was redistributed? What consequences continue? What can presently be measured? What is inferred? What remains unknown? This avoids replacing one unsupported certainty with another.	its causal consequences continue. At another: information or memory concerning it remains within other systems. This has parallels with transformations observed throughout physics, chemistry, biology, and social systems. However, MRRAF deliberately stops before making a metaphysical claim that science cannot currently support. It does not establish: - survival of individual consciousness after death, - recoverability of all information, - existence in another dimension, - continuity through antimatter, - or the proposition that nothing can ever be destroyed in every possible meaning of the word. LOVE-0 treats this boundary as an example of humility rather than a reason to dismiss spiritual, philosophical, or personal meanings. Different perspectives may remain meaningful without being mislabelled as experimentally established physics. The framework therefore proposes an epistemic discipline: Do not infer absolute nothingness merely from inability to access the previous configuration, and do not convert uncertainty into proof of continuation either. Ask separately: What ended? What changed? What remains? What was redistributed? What consequences continue? What can presently be measured? What is inferred? What remains unknown? This preserves room for science, philosophy, spirituality, religion, and personal meaning to describe different questions without forcing one unresolved claim to impersonate another.
---	--

25. Ego as a Provisional Self-World Model

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
25. Ego as a Provisional Self-World Model The term ego is used here in a broad functional and philosophical sense, not as a strict Freudian construct. MRRAF treats ego as part of a provisional self-world model attempting to determine: - Where am I? - What am I? - What is happening? - What matters? - What resources are available? - What should I expect? - What should I do? The safest form of this model remains corrigible. It can say: “This is what I currently think is happening.” rather than: “This is what reality must be.” Fear of being wrong can therefore create a serious epistemic problem. If being wrong is interpreted as: - loss of status, - loss of identity, - humiliation, - loss of control, - or personal failure, then contradictory information becomes emotionally threatening. The person may begin protecting the model instead of improving it. MRRAF therefore treats the statement: “I may be wrong.” as a functional opening for additional information. Not weakness. Not defeat.	25. Ego as a Provisional Self-World Model The term ego is used here in a broad functional and philosophical sense, not as a strict Freudian construct. MRRAF treats ego as part of a provisional self-world model attempting to determine: - Where am I? - What am I? - What is happening? - What matters? - What resources are available? - What should I expect? - What should I do? The safest form of this model remains corrigible. It can say: “This is what I currently think is happening.” rather than: “This is what reality must be.” Fear of being wrong can therefore create a serious epistemic problem. If being wrong is interpreted as: - loss of status, - loss of identity, - humiliation, - loss of control, - or personal failure, then contradictory information becomes emotionally threatening. The person may begin protecting the model instead of improving it. LOVE-0 treats humility as an update policy. Correction concerns the model, not the equal worth of the person. Being right may reflect better data, teaching, position, timing, or chance; being wrong may simply expose the next place where learning is possible. MRRAF therefore treats the statement: “I may be wrong.” as a functional opening for additional information.

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

An information channel.	Not weakness. Not defeat. An information channel.
-------------------------	---

26. From What and How Toward Why

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
26. From What and How Toward Why MRRAF uses the expression: What + How -a better-resolved Why as a heuristic, not a mathematical identity. What? What has actually been observed? How? What sequence, mechanism, relationship, or condition could plausibly have generated the observation? Why? What causal or functional explanation remains plausible after the first two questions have been constrained? The order matters. Jumping directly to why invites narrative completion. Humans are capable of creating coherent explanations from incomplete information. Coherence alone is not verification. The process should therefore continue: Do I know what happened? Do I know how it happened? What else could have produced the same observation? What information would distinguish those possibilities?	26. From What and How Toward Why MRRAF uses the expression: What + How -a better-resolved Why as a heuristic, not a mathematical identity. What? What has actually been observed? LOVE-0 adds: What happened inside and outside me, and what is merely my first interpretation? How? What sequence, mechanism, relationship, or condition could plausibly have generated the observation? LOVE-0 adds: What other plausible explanations exist, and whose perspective could reveal a missing variable? Why? What causal or functional explanation remains plausible after the first two questions have been constrained? LOVE-0 adds: How confident is that explanation, what power would it justify, and what happens if it is wrong? The order matters. Jumping directly to why invites narrative completion. Humans are capable of creating coherent explanations from incomplete information. Coherence alone is not verification. The process should therefore continue: Do I know what happened? Do I know how it happened?

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

	What else could have produced the same observation? What information would distinguish those possibilities? What is the smallest reversible action that could test the next step without pretending the question is already closed?
--	--

27. Multi-Resolution Analysis

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
27. Multi-Resolution Analysis Table 2. Example Resolution Matrix for Human Loss Resolution Primary question Example variables --- --- --- Physical What changed materially? Place, possessions, environment, bodily presence Biological What is happening within the organism? Sleep, appetite, autonomic state, fatigue, stress physiology Affective What emotional states are present? Sadness, fear, anger, guilt, shame, relief, loneliness Cognitive What expectations and interpretations are active? Prediction, attention, memory, rumination, causal attribution Identity What changed in the model of self? Roles, self-concept, belonging, purpose Relational What functions were distributed through relationships? Support, regulation, intimacy, care, companionship Behavioural What is the person doing in response? Searching, avoiding, purchasing, contacting, withdrawing Economic What material consequences followed? Income, expenditure, debt, replacement costs, vulnerability Social What changed in group relationships? Community, family, institutions, norms Cultural How is the loss interpreted collectively? Ritual, tradition, narrative, religious meaning Temporal How is the response changing? Immediate response, anniversaries, adaptation, recurrence Semantic How does terminology affect interpretation? Grief, stress, pain, attachment, loss, transformation Epistemic What confidence is justified? Observation, inference, corroboration, uncertainty A sensible conclusion should not automatically combine every resolution. The task determines which are necessary.	27. Multi-Resolution Analysis Table 2. Example Resolution Matrix for Human Loss - LOVE-0 Processed Resolution Primary question Example variables / LOVE-0 check --- --- --- Physical What changed materially? Place, possessions, environment, bodily presence. Separate observation from symbolic meaning. Biological What is happening within the organism? Sleep, appetite, autonomic state, fatigue, stress physiology. Do not infer motive from physiology alone. Affective What emotional states are present? Sadness, fear, anger, guilt, shame, relief, loneliness. Feeling is state information, not an automatic command. Cognitive What expectations and interpretations are active? Prediction, attention, memory, rumination, causal attribution. Generate alternative explanations. Identity What changed in the model of self? Roles, self-concept, belonging, purpose. Correction should not be equated with worthlessness. Relational What functions were distributed through relationships? Support, regulation, intimacy, care, companionship. Ask affected people; do not convert function into ownership. Behavioural What is the person doing in response? Searching, avoiding, purchasing, contacting, withdrawing. Examine whether the action helps or merely reduces uncertainty temporarily. Economic What material consequences followed? Income, expenditure, debt, replacement costs, vulnerability. Check urgency, power, reversibility, and who benefits. Social What changed in group relationships? Community, family, institutions, norms. Include less-powerful perspectives. Cultural How is the loss interpreted collectively? Ritual, tradition, narrative, religious meaning. Preserve meaning while distinguishing it from empirical claims. Temporal How is the response changing? Immediate response, anniversaries, adaptation, recurrence. Allow asynchronous updating and review over time. Semantic How does terminology affect interpretation? Grief, stress, pain, attachment, loss, transformation. Treat labels as working descriptions, not essences. Epistemic What confidence is justified? Observation, inference, corroboration, uncertainty. Compare experiential confidence with independent evidence. Power / consent What could this interpretation permit someone to do to another? Coercion, refusal, safeguarding, dependency, appeals, reversibility. Increase resolution when power and irreversibility increase. A sensible conclusion should not automatically combine every resolution. The task determines which are necessary. LOVE-0 adds that the consequences of being wrong also determine how much verification is required before action.

28. Research Alignment

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
----------------	------------------

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

28. Research Alignment Table 3. Relationship Between MRRAF and Existing Research MRRAF proposition Nearest established research Relationship --- --- --- Valued resource loss increases stress Conservation of Resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989) Direct conceptual support Social partners reduce regulatory effort and function partly as shared resources Social Baseline Theory (Coan & Sbarra, 2015) Strong relational convergence Loss can disrupt representation of self Slotter et al. (2010) Empirical convergence Grieving requires updating learned relational predictions O'Connor & Seeley (2022) Very strong convergence Adaptation oscillates between loss and restoration Stroebe & Schut (1999); Fiore (2021) Established bereavement framework Meaning disruption can produce compensation elsewhere Heine et al. (2006) Strong conceptual convergence Bonds may persist in transformed form Hewson et al. (2024) Strong convergence Nostalgia can restore social connection Zhou et al. (2008) Experimental support Nostalgia has substantial cross-cultural functions Hepper et al. (2024) Cross-cultural support Threat can trigger nostalgia and nostalgia can provide multiple benefits Weingarten et al. (2026) Meta-analytic support Rumination can alter nostalgic outcomes Garrido (2018) Supporting evidence Nostalgia can influence willingness to part with money Lasaleta et al. (2014) Experimental financial evidence Fear appeals can alter behaviour Tannenbaum et al. (2015) Meta-analytic evidence Guilt appeals can alter behaviour Peng et al. (2023) Meta-analytic evidence Shame can produce approach or avoidance depending upon reparability Leach & Cidam (2015) Meta-analytic evidence Attachment security supports compassion/caregiving Mikulincer & Shaver (2005) Conceptual and empirical support Effective caregiving involves responsiveness to actual need Collins & Ford (2010); Feeney & Collins (2015) Strong relational convergence Grief-load as one unified construct No exact established equivalent MRRAF hypothesis Love as resource-prioritisation signal Partial parallels in attachment/caregiving MRRAF hypothesis Care as higher-resolution regulation of love Partial parallels in responsive caregiving MRRAF synthesis Complete loss -nostalgia -emotional persuasion -social/financial harm pathway Individual links supported separately MRRAF testable hypothesis Semantic relativity / cross-resolution convergence RFT and CLT provide conceptual neighbours MRRAF methodology	28. Research Alignment Table 3. Relationship Between MRRAF and Existing Research - LOVE-0 Processed MRRAF proposition Nearest established research Relationship / LOVE-0 reading --- --- --- Valued resource loss increases stress Conservation of Resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989) Direct conceptual support. Ask what was actually lost before prescribing replacement. Social partners reduce regulatory effort and function partly as shared resources Social Baseline Theory (Coan & Sbarra, 2015) Strong relational convergence. Shared function does not establish ownership of the person providing it. Loss can disrupt representation of self Slotter et al. (2010) Empirical convergence. Support rebuilding self-definition without demanding a fixed identity. Grieving requires updating learned relational predictions O'Connor & Seeley (2022) Very strong convergence. Allow repeated experience and time rather than forcing immediate cognitive agreement to erase embodied expectation. Adaptation oscillates between loss and restoration Stroebe & Schut (1999); Fiore (2021) Established bereavement framework. Do not moralise either remembering or restoration. Meaning disruption can produce compensation elsewhere Heine et al. (2006) Strong conceptual convergence. Verify whether compensation addresses need or merely redirects distress. Bonds may persist in transformed form Hewson et al. (2024) Strong convergence. Continuing connection can coexist with autonomy and new relationships. Nostalgia can restore social connection Zhou et al. (2008) Experimental support. Listen for the social function activated by the memory. Nostalgia has substantial cross-cultural functions Hepper et al. (2024) Cross-cultural support. Avoid assuming one cultural meaning is universal. Threat can trigger nostalgia and nostalgia can provide multiple benefits Weingarten et al. (2026) Meta-analytic support. Threat-triggered nostalgia is information, not proof that restoration is the correct action. Rumination can alter nostalgic outcomes Garrido (2018) Supporting evidence. Check whether memory is widening or narrowing present choice. Nostalgia can influence willingness to part with money Lasaleta et al. (2014) Experimental financial evidence. Separate genuine meaning from the seller's proposed channel. Fear appeals can alter behaviour Tannenbaum et al. (2015) Meta-analytic evidence. Urgency increases the need for verification where possible. Guilt appeals can alter behaviour Peng et al. (2023) Meta-analytic evidence. Distinguish repair from obedience. Shame can produce approach or avoidance depending upon reparability Leach & Cidam (2015) Meta-analytic evidence. Preserve a route to correction and return after error. Attachment security supports compassion/caregiving Mikulincer & Shaver (2005) Conceptual and empirical support. Care should move toward need without possession. Effective caregiving involves responsiveness to actual need Collins & Ford (2010); Feeney & Collins (2015) Strong relational convergence. Measure recipient outcome, not only helper intention. Grief-load as one unified construct No exact established equivalent MRRAF hypothesis. Keep label provisional and corrigible. Love as resource-prioritisation signal Partial parallels in attachment/caregiving MRRAF hypothesis. LOVE-0 adds non-ownership and humility boundaries. Care as higher-resolution regulation of love Partial parallels in responsive caregiving MRRAF synthesis. LOVE-0 adds consent, proportionality, reversibility, repair, and power checks. Complete loss -nostalgia -emotional persuasion -social/financial harm pathway Individual links supported separately MRRAF testable hypothesis. Do not upgrade the chain beyond its evidence. Semantic relativity / cross-resolution convergence RFT and CLT provide conceptual neighbours MRRAF methodology. LOVE-0 adds affected perspective, evidence calibration, and correction.
---	---

29. Testable Predictions

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
29. Testable Predictions	29. Testable Predictions

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

A useful conceptual framework should expose itself to possible failure. MRRAF therefore generates testable propositions. Hypothesis 1: Functional-load hypothesis Post-loss adaptation burden should be predicted partly by the number, importance, and substitutability of functions disrupted by a loss, not merely by category of loss. Hypothesis 2: Social-resource hypothesis Where a relationship carried a high proportion of practical, emotional, identity, or regulatory functions, its loss should generate greater grief-load than relationships carrying fewer such functions, other factors being comparable. Hypothesis 3: Nostalgic integration hypothesis Nostalgia should be more adaptive where it helps identify transferable values, qualities, and functions and less adaptive where it strengthens demand for exact historical restoration. Hypothesis 4: Resource-contention hypothesis Greater grief-load should predict increased conflict between everyday regulatory demands where available social, financial, cognitive, or practical resources are constrained. Hypothesis 5: Persuasion vulnerability hypothesis Messages linking a proposed action to a function made salient by recent loss should exert greater influence than emotionally similar messages unrelated to the disrupted function. Hypothesis 6: Emotional-decoupling hypothesis Teaching individuals to distinguish: emotion from interpretation from proposed action should reduce inappropriate behavioural compliance without necessarily reducing the original emotional state. Hypothesis 7: Supplementation hypothesis Interventions helping people identify specific functions and qualities associated with what was lost may support restoration while allowing continuing bonds to remain intact. Hypothesis 8: Care-regulation hypothesis	A useful conceptual framework should expose itself to possible failure. LOVE-0 strengthens rather than removes that requirement: a caring model that cannot be corrected can become control. MRRAF therefore generates testable propositions. Hypothesis 1: Functional-load hypothesis Post-loss adaptation burden should be predicted partly by the number, importance, and substitutability of functions disrupted by a loss, not merely by category of loss. LOVE-0 contrast: the relevant functions should be identified with the affected person's perspective rather than assumed entirely by observers. Hypothesis 2: Social-resource hypothesis Where a relationship carried a high proportion of practical, emotional, identity, or regulatory functions, its loss should generate greater grief-load than relationships carrying fewer such functions, other factors being comparable. LOVE-0 contrast: shared function should be measured without reducing a partner to a resource owned by the survivor. Hypothesis 3: Nostalgic integration hypothesis Nostalgia should be more adaptive where it helps identify transferable values, qualities, and functions and less adaptive where it strengthens demand for exact historical restoration. LOVE-0 contrast: adaptive nostalgia should increase rather than decrease the capacity to see new people and conditions as independent rather than as failed replicas of the past. Hypothesis 4: Resource-contention hypothesis Greater grief-load should predict increased conflict between everyday regulatory demands where available social, financial, cognitive, or practical resources are constrained. LOVE-0 contrast: proportionate support and reduced coercive demand may lower secondary contention even when the original loss cannot be reversed. Hypothesis 5: Persuasion vulnerability hypothesis Messages linking a proposed action to a function made salient by recent loss should exert greater influence than emotionally similar messages unrelated to the disrupted function. LOVE-0 contrast: separating cause from channel, adding delay where safe, and checking power and reversibility should reduce misdirected compliance. Hypothesis 6: Emotional-decoupling hypothesis Teaching individuals to distinguish: emotion from
--	---

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

Support should produce better outcomes when responsive to the recipient's actual need and capacity than when driven primarily by the helper's urgency to eliminate visible distress. Hypothesis 9: Cross-resolution convergence hypothesis Explanations supported independently across behavioural, relational, physiological, and longitudinal evidence streams should prove more robust than explanations supported by repeated observations within only one evidence class. Each prediction can fail. If evidence contradicts it, MRRAF should change. That is part of its intended operation.	interpretation from proposed action should reduce inappropriate behavioural compliance without necessarily reducing the original emotional state. LOVE-0 contrast: this separation should preserve rather than invalidate the person's feeling. Hypothesis 7: Supplementation hypothesis Interventions helping people identify specific functions and qualities associated with what was lost may support restoration while allowing continuing bonds to remain intact. LOVE-0 contrast: supplementation should not require a new person to surrender independent identity or consent in order to serve as a replacement. Hypothesis 8: Care-regulation hypothesis Support should produce better outcomes when responsive to the recipient's actual need and capacity than when driven primarily by the helper's urgency to eliminate visible distress. LOVE-0 contrast: recipient outcome, autonomy preservation, proportionality, and repair performance should be included in evaluation. Hypothesis 9: Cross-resolution convergence hypothesis Explanations supported independently across behavioural, relational, physiological, and longitudinal evidence streams should prove more robust than explanations supported by repeated observations within only one evidence class. LOVE-0 contrast: confidence should also be tested against missing lower-power and affected-party perspectives where those perspectives are relevant to the claim. Each prediction can fail. If evidence contradicts it, MRRAF should change. That is part of its intended operation, and LOVE-0 treats the ability to return after error as a design requirement rather than a humiliation.
--	--

30. Practical Loss-Resolution Protocol

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
30. Practical Loss-Resolution Protocol MRRAF can be reduced to a human decision sequence. Step 1: Identify the change What exactly changed?	30. Practical Loss-Resolution Protocol MRRAF can be reduced to a human decision sequence. The LOVE-0 processor reorganises the same sequence into LISTEN, OPEN, VERIFY, EXPRESS, and LEARN while retaining all ten original checks. LISTEN - Step 1: Identify the change What exactly changed?

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

Avoid beginning with interpretation. Step 2: Identify the affected relations What did the lost person, object, place, role, or state actually provide? Examples: - companionship, - safety, - money, - routine, - identity, - familiarity, - validation, - physical help, - meaning. Step 3: Separate emotion from explanation What am I feeling? Sadness? Fear? Anger? Guilt? Shame? Loneliness? Relief? Exhaustion? The feeling is evidence concerning the person's state. Its first interpretation is not automatically evidence concerning external causation. Step 4: Identify the search What am I repeatedly trying to recover? The object itself? A function?	Avoid beginning with interpretation. Notice both the external event and the internal state it produced. LISTEN - Step 2: Identify the affected relations What did the lost person, object, place, role, or state actually provide? Examples: - companionship, - safety, - money, - routine, - identity, - familiarity, - validation, - physical help, - meaning. Ask rather than assuming which of these matters most. LISTEN / MIRROR - Step 3: Separate emotion from explanation What am I feeling? Sadness? Fear? Anger? Guilt? Shame? Loneliness? Relief? Exhaustion? The feeling is evidence concerning the person's state. Its first interpretation is not automatically evidence concerning external causation. A compact diagnostic sentence is: My experience may be real while my explanation remains incomplete.
--	---

A feeling? A relationship? A previous identity? Predictability? Step 5: Test replaceability Can the original configuration actually return? If not: Which properties remain obtainable in other configurations? Step 6: Examine nostalgia Ask: Is this memory helping me understand what mattered? or: Is this memory requiring the present to reproduce the past? Step 7: Inspect proposed solutions If someone is asking for: - money, - loyalty, - conformity, - political support, - immediate action, - or abandonment of alternatives, ask: How does this action relate to the actual loss? Step 8: Change resolution If the answer remains unclear: look closer, or farther away.	OPEN - Step 4: Identify the search What am I repeatedly trying to recover? The object itself? A function? A feeling? A relationship? A previous identity? Predictability? Generate more than one explanation for why the search continues. OPEN - Step 5: Test replaceability without imposing replacement Can the original configuration actually return? If not: Which properties remain obtainable in other configurations? Do not require a new person or situation to imitate the old configuration in order to count as meaningful. VERIFY - Step 6: Examine nostalgia Ask: Is this memory helping me understand what mattered? or: Is this memory requiring the present to reproduce the past? Also ask what the memory may omit, idealise, or compress. VERIFY - Step 7: Inspect proposed solutions If someone is asking for: - money, - loyalty, - conformity, - political support, - immediate action,
--	--

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

Examine another domain. Step 9: Seek independent convergence What do: - personal observation, - measurement, - independent witnesses, - established research, - longitudinal evidence, - and competing explanations indicate? Step 10: Retain uncertainty Conclude at the level justified by the evidence. Possible. Plausible. Supported. Strongly supported. Demonstrated within defined conditions. Do not manufacture certainty merely because uncertainty is uncomfortable.	- or abandonment of alternatives, ask: How does this action relate to the actual loss? Then check: - evidence and source provenance, - urgency, - power asymmetry, - consent and safe refusal, - likely harm, - reversibility, - and who benefits from the proposed interpretation. OPEN / VERIFY - Step 8: Change resolution If the answer remains unclear: look closer, or farther away. Examine another domain and deliberately seek a perspective that could falsify the current story. VERIFY - Step 9: Seek independent convergence What do: - personal observation, - measurement, - independent witnesses, - established research, - longitudinal evidence, - affected-party perspectives, - and competing explanations indicate? EXPRESS / LEARN - Step 10: Retain uncertainty and choose a proportionate next action Conclude at the level justified by the evidence. Possible. Plausible. Supported. Strongly supported.
--	---

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

	Demonstrated within defined conditions. Do not manufacture certainty merely because uncertainty is uncomfortable. Where action is necessary, prefer the least coercive effective response that preserves dignity and future choice. Where serious immediate harm requires restraint, use only what is necessary, lawful, proportionate, time-limited, and reviewable. Then observe what actually happens, repair avoidable harm, and update the model.
--	---

31. Implications for Social and Financial Harm

BASLINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
31. Implications for Social and Financial Harm MRRAF suggests that some apparently irrational behaviour following loss may be better understood as misdirected adaptation. A person attempting to reduce grief-load may: - overspend, - preserve objects beyond their practical value, - return repeatedly to harmful relationships, - accept exploitative offers, - join groups promising restoration, - become vulnerable to “golden age” narratives, - make decisions under scarcity, - or attack perceived causes of change. These behaviours may appear unrelated when examined individually. At a different resolution, they may represent attempts to restore: - continuity, - belonging, - identity, - safety, - control, - or familiar structure. This does not excuse harmful behaviour. Understanding a mechanism and approving an outcome are different questions. The purpose is prevention. If the underlying function can be identified, safer ways of satisfying it may become visible.	31. Implications for Social and Financial Harm MRRAF suggests that some apparently irrational behaviour following loss may be better understood as misdirected adaptation. A person attempting to reduce grief-load may: - overspend, - preserve objects beyond their practical value, - return repeatedly to harmful relationships, - accept exploitative offers, - join groups promising restoration, - become vulnerable to “golden age” narratives, - make decisions under scarcity, - or attack perceived causes of change. These behaviours may appear unrelated when examined individually. At a different resolution, they may represent attempts to restore: - continuity, - belonging, - identity, - safety, - control, - or familiar structure. This does not excuse harmful behaviour. Understanding a mechanism and approving an outcome are different questions. LOVE-0 adds that prevention should not become punishment. If a behaviour creates risk, accountability can still establish truth, protect others, repair damage where possible, and reduce recurrence without treating suffering as the objective. The purpose is prevention and clearer allocation of care. If the underlying function can be identified, safer ways of satisfying it may become visible. If the person is being commercially or socially manipulated, compassion toward the genuine need can be preserved while the manipulative channel is refused.

32. Implications for Communication

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
32. Implications for Communication Communication concerning loss should avoid unnecessary activation of fear, guilt, shame, and urgency. This is particularly important in: - healthcare, - bereavement services, - advertising, - fundraising, - politics, - financial advice, - family disputes, - institutional communication, - and care relationships. A useful communication discipline is: Do not exploit grief-load to force resolution faster than the person's evidence and adaptive capacity permit. Careful communication can instead help distinguish: what happened from what it means from what should happen next. This creates cognitive space between emotion and action.	32. Implications for Communication Communication concerning loss should avoid unnecessary activation of fear, guilt, shame, and urgency. This is particularly important in: - healthcare, - bereavement services, - advertising, - fundraising, - politics, - financial advice, - family disputes, - institutional communication, - and care relationships. A useful communication discipline is: Do not exploit grief-load to force resolution faster than the person's evidence and adaptive capacity permit. LOVE-0 extends this into a communication loop: LISTEN: What happened, what does the person report needing, and what signals are present? OPEN: What else could this mean, and which perspectives have not been heard? VERIFY: What is feeling, what is interpretation, what is independently supported, and what power is being exercised? EXPRESS: What is the least coercive, proportionate, effective communication or assistance that can work? LEARN: What happened to the recipient, what needs repair, and what should change next time? Careful communication can therefore help distinguish: what happened from what it means from what should happen next. This creates cognitive and relational space between emotion and action.

33. Limitations

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
----------------	------------------

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

33. Limitations MRRAF currently has substantial limitations. First, it is a conceptual synthesis. No experiment has tested MRRAF as one complete model. Second, grief-load is newly proposed terminology. It should not be confused with the conventional psychological definition of grief. Third, analogy is not mechanism. Computer-resource analogies illuminate relationships but do not establish neurological equivalence. Fourth, semantic translation can create false equivalence. Two disciplines may use similar relational structures while describing fundamentally different mechanisms. Cross-resolution convergence therefore requires careful examination rather than superficial word matching. Fifth, subjective states cannot automatically be generalised across life forms. The framework's relational vocabulary is intentionally portable. Evidence of shared relational structure does not establish identical consciousness or emotional experience. Sixth, nostalgia is heterogeneous. Research demonstrates both useful psychological functions and contexts associated with less favourable outcomes. MRRAF should therefore avoid describing nostalgia as intrinsically harmful. Seventh, grief varies enormously. Culture, developmental history, relationship type, traumatic circumstances, social support, material resources, health, identity, and individual difference can all alter adaptation. Eighth, prolonged grief disorder should not be conflated with ordinary grief. Neuroscientific findings concerning prolonged grief disorder describe a particular clinical population and cannot automatically be generalised to all bereavement. Ninth, transformation has epistemic limits. Persistence of matter, effects, memory, or relational consequences does not establish persistence of every aspect of a previous configuration. Tenth, the framework must remain revisable.	33. Limitations MRRAF currently has substantial limitations. The LOVE-0 processor does not remove them; it makes them more explicit because care without humility can become control. First, it is a conceptual synthesis. No experiment has tested MRRAF as one complete model. Second, grief-load is newly proposed terminology. It should not be confused with the conventional psychological definition of grief. Third, analogy is not mechanism. Computer-resource analogies illuminate relationships but do not establish neurological equivalence. Fourth, semantic translation can create false equivalence. Two disciplines may use similar relational structures while describing fundamentally different mechanisms. Cross-resolution convergence therefore requires careful examination rather than superficial word matching. Fifth, subjective states cannot automatically be generalised across life forms. The framework's relational vocabulary is intentionally portable. Evidence of shared relational structure does not establish identical consciousness or emotional experience. Sixth, nostalgia is heterogeneous. Research demonstrates both useful psychological functions and contexts associated with less favourable outcomes. MRRAF should therefore avoid describing nostalgia as intrinsically harmful. Seventh, grief varies enormously. Culture, developmental history, relationship type, traumatic circumstances, social support, material resources, health, identity, and individual difference can all alter adaptation. LOVE-0 therefore cannot determine another person's needs from the framework alone; communication and context remain necessary. Eighth, prolonged grief disorder should not be conflated with ordinary grief. Neuroscientific findings concerning prolonged grief disorder describe a particular clinical population and cannot automatically be generalised to all bereavement. Ninth, transformation has epistemic limits. Persistence of matter, effects, memory, or relational consequences does not establish persistence of every aspect of a previous configuration.
---	---

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

A theory arguing that error is essential for learning would contradict itself if it became resistant to correction.	Tenth, the framework must remain revisable. A theory arguing that error is essential for learning would contradict itself if it became resistant to correction. Eleventh, caring language can itself be manipulated. A person, institution, or mechanical system can imitate the vocabulary of care while optimising control, reputation, dependency, or persuasion. Claims of care should therefore be evaluated through behaviour, power, consent, evidence, reversibility, repair, and recipient outcomes rather than intention or language alone.
--	---

34. Conclusion

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
34. Conclusion Loss is not necessarily equivalent to nothing. It is a change in relationship. At one resolution, something may have ended. At another, its material components continue in different arrangements. At another, its consequences continue. At another, its memory remains. At another, its functions must now be supplied differently. At another, qualities once encountered in one person or place may be encountered in new relationships and experiences. MRRAF proposes that human adaptation following loss can be understood partly through these changing relations. Within the framework: loss changes the configuration. sadness can register the significance of that change. grief-load describes the wider stress of functioning while expectations, resources, identity, and behaviour reorganise. nostalgia retrieves previous configurations. love prioritises what is valued. care regulates how protective resources are allocated. learning allows the system to revise itself.	34. Conclusion Loss is not necessarily equivalent to nothing. It is a change in relationship. At one resolution, something may have ended. At another, its material components continue in different arrangements. At another, its consequences continue. At another, its memory remains. At another, its functions must now be supplied differently. At another, qualities once encountered in one person or place may be encountered in new relationships and experiences. MRRAF proposes that human adaptation following loss can be understood partly through these changing relations. Within the framework: loss changes the configuration. sadness can register the significance of that change. grief-load describes the wider stress of functioning while expectations, resources, identity, and behaviour reorganise. nostalgia retrieves previous configurations. love prioritises what is valued. care regulates how protective resources are allocated. learning allows the system to revise itself.

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

The objective is not to forget. Nor is it necessarily to restore. The exact historical configuration may no longer be available. But the person can ask: What did it contain that mattered? What has genuinely ended? What remains? What has transformed? What am I searching for? Where else might the qualities I valued now exist? Am I responding to the actual condition, or to my interpretation of the emotional signal? Is someone directing that emotion toward an action that benefits them rather than resolving the underlying need? What evidence do I actually have? What remains unknown? And, before all of them: Am I sure I understand the question I am trying to answer? That is resolution. The past provides information. The present provides new evidence. The future remains open to learning. Healthy adaptation therefore need not choose between remembering and changing. It can remember in order to change with greater understanding.	The LOVE-0 perspective changes none of those propositions into certainty. Instead it asks that each stage remain connected to reality, freedom, other perspectives, and the possibility of correction. Loss says that the previous arrangement changed. Sadness says that the change matters to the person. Grief-load says that multiple functions may now be competing to adapt. Nostalgia says that the past still contains information about value, continuity, and belonging. Love says that something matters enough to motivate protection or support. Care asks how to respond without turning importance into ownership or urgency into unnecessary control. The objective is not to forget. Nor is it necessarily to restore. The exact historical configuration may no longer be available. But the person can ask: What did it contain that mattered? What has genuinely ended? What remains? What has transformed? What am I searching for? Where else might the qualities I valued now exist? Am I responding to the actual condition, or to my interpretation of the emotional signal? Is someone directing that emotion toward an action that benefits them rather than resolving the underlying need? Can I safely refuse the proposed solution while continuing to care about the underlying need? Whose perspective is missing? What evidence do I actually have? What remains unknown? And, before all of them:
---	---

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

	Am I sure I understand the question I am trying to answer? That is resolution. LOVE-0 then adds a final operational sequence: Listen carefully enough to notice what matters. Open the model enough to allow correction. Verify enough to distinguish feeling from explanation and confidence from evidence. Express care with the least unnecessary coercion. Learn from what actually happens. The past provides information. The present provides new evidence. Other beings provide perspectives the isolated self cannot possess. The future remains open to learning. Healthy adaptation therefore need not choose between remembering and changing. It can remember in order to change with greater understanding, while allowing what is new to remain genuinely new.
--	---

References

BASELINE MRRAF	LOVE-0 PROCESSED
References Bryant, R. A., Breukelaar, I. A., & Korgaonkar, M. S. (2026). A neurobiological perspective on prolonged grief disorder. Trends in Neurosciences, 49(3), 173-184. doi:10.1016/j.tins.2026.01.001 Coan, J. A., & Sbarra, D. A. (2015). Social Baseline Theory: The social regulation of risk and effort. Current Opinion in Psychology, 1, 87-91. doi:10.1016/j.copsyc.2014.12.021 Collins, N. L., & Ford, M. B. (2010). Responding to the needs of others: The caregiving behavioral system in intimate relationships. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 27(2), 235-244. doi:10.1177/0265407509360907 Feeney, B. C., & Collins, N. L. (2015). A new look at social support: A theoretical perspective on thriving through relationships. Personality and Social Psychology Review, 19(2), 113-147. doi:10.1177/1088868314544222 Fiore, J. (2021). A systematic review of the Dual Process Model of Coping With Bereavement (1999-2016). OMEGA-Journal of Death and Dying, 84(2), 414-458. doi:10.1177/0030222819893139 Garrido, S. (2018). The influence of personality and coping style on the affective outcomes of nostalgia: Is nostalgia a healthy coping mechanism or rumination? Personality and Individual Differences, 120, 259-264. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2016.07.021 Gross, A. C., & Fox, E. J. (2009). Relational Frame Theory: An overview of the controversy. The Analysis of Verbal Behavior, 25, 87-98. doi:10.1007/BF03393073 Heine, S. J., Proulx, T., & Vohs, K. D. (2006). The Meaning Maintenance Model: On the coherence of social motivations. Personality and Social Psychology Review, 10(2), 88-110. doi:10.1207/s15327957pspr1002_1	References Bryant, R. A., Breukelaar, I. A., & Korgaonkar, M. S. (2026). A neurobiological perspective on prolonged grief disorder. Trends in Neurosciences, 49(3), 173-184. doi:10.1016/j.tins.2026.01.001 Coan, J. A., & Sbarra, D. A. (2015). Social Baseline Theory: The social regulation of risk and effort. Current Opinion in Psychology, 1, 87-91. doi:10.1016/j.copsyc.2014.12.021 Collins, N. L., & Ford, M. B. (2010). Responding to the needs of others: The caregiving behavioral system in intimate relationships. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 27(2), 235-244. doi:10.1177/0265407509360907 Feeney, B. C., & Collins, N. L. (2015). A new look at social support: A theoretical perspective on thriving through relationships. Personality and Social Psychology Review, 19(2), 113-147. doi:10.1177/1088868314544222 Fiore, J. (2021). A systematic review of the Dual Process Model of Coping With Bereavement (1999-2016). OMEGA-Journal of Death and Dying, 84(2), 414-458. doi:10.1177/0030222819893139 Garrido, S. (2018). The influence of personality and coping style on the affective outcomes of nostalgia: Is nostalgia a healthy coping mechanism or rumination? Personality and Individual Differences, 120, 259-264. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2016.07.021 Gross, A. C., & Fox, E. J. (2009). Relational Frame Theory: An overview of the controversy. The Analysis of Verbal Behavior, 25, 87-98. doi:10.1007/BF03393073 Heine, S. J., Proulx, T., & Vohs, K. D. (2006). The Meaning Maintenance Model: On the coherence of social motivations. Personality and Social Psychology Review, 10(2), 88-110. doi:10.1207/s15327957pspr1002_1

MRRAF BASELINE vs LOVE-0 PROCESSED | controlled perspective transformation

Hepper, E. G., Sedikides, C., Wildschut, T., Cheung, W. Y., Abakoumkin, G., Arikan, G., Aveyard, M., Baldursson, E. B., Bialobrzeska, O., Bouamama, S., Bouzaouech, I., Brambilla, M., Burger, A. M., Chen, S. X., Cisek, S., Demassosso, D., Estevan-Reina, L., González Gutiérrez, R., Gu, L., ... Zengel, B. (2024). Pancultural nostalgia in action: Prevalence, triggers, and psychological functions of nostalgia across cultures. <i>Journal of Experimental Psychology: General</i>, 153(3), 754-778. doi:10.1037/xge0001521	Hepper, E. G., Sedikides, C., Wildschut, T., Cheung, W. Y., Abakoumkin, G., Arikan, G., Aveyard, M., Baldursson, E. B., Bialobrzeska, O., Bouamama, S., Bouzaouech, I., Brambilla, M., Burger, A. M., Chen, S. X., Cisek, S., Demassosso, D., Estevan-Reina, L., González Gutiérrez, R., Gu, L., ... Zengel, B. (2024). Pancultural nostalgia in action: Prevalence, triggers, and psychological functions of nostalgia across cultures. <i>Journal of Experimental Psychology: General</i>, 153(3), 754-778. doi:10.1037/xge0001521
Hewson, H., Galbraith, N., Jones, C., & Heath, G. (2024). The impact of continuing bonds following bereavement: A systematic review. <i>Death Studies</i>, 48(10), 1001-1014. doi:10.1080/07481187.2023.2223593	Hewson, H., Galbraith, N., Jones, C., & Heath, G. (2024). The impact of continuing bonds following bereavement: A systematic review. <i>Death Studies</i>, 48(10), 1001-1014. doi:10.1080/07481187.2023.2223593
Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. <i>American Psychologist</i>, 44(3), 513-524. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513	Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. <i>American Psychologist</i>, 44(3), 513-524. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513
Lasaleta, J. D., Sedikides, C., & Vohs, K. D. (2014). Nostalgia weakens the desire for money. <i>Journal of Consumer Research</i>, 41(3), 713-729. doi:10.1086/677227	Lasaleta, J. D., Sedikides, C., & Vohs, K. D. (2014). Nostalgia weakens the desire for money. <i>Journal of Consumer Research</i>, 41(3), 713-729. doi:10.1086/677227
Leach, C. W., & Cidam, A. (2015). When is shame linked to constructive approach orientation? A meta-analysis. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>, 109(6), 983-1002. doi:10.1037/pspa0000037	Leach, C. W., & Cidam, A. (2015). When is shame linked to constructive approach orientation? A meta-analysis. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>, 109(6), 983-1002. doi:10.1037/pspa0000037
Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2005). Attachment security, compassion, and altruism. <i>Current Directions in Psychological Science</i>, 14(1), 34-38. doi:10.1111/j.0963-7214.2005.00330.x	Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2005). Attachment security, compassion, and altruism. <i>Current Directions in Psychological Science</i>, 14(1), 34-38. doi:10.1111/j.0963-7214.2005.00330.x
O'Connor, M.-F., & Seeley, S. H. (2022). Grieving as a form of learning: Insights from neuroscience applied to grief and loss. <i>Current Opinion in Psychology</i>, 43, 317-322. doi:10.1016/j.copsyc.2021.08.019	O'Connor, M.-F., & Seeley, S. H. (2022). Grieving as a form of learning: Insights from neuroscience applied to grief and loss. <i>Current Opinion in Psychology</i>, 43, 317-322. doi:10.1016/j.copsyc.2021.08.019
Peng, W., Huang, Q., Mao, B., Lun, D., Malova, E., Simmons, J. V., & Carcioppolo, N. (2023). When guilt works: A comprehensive meta-analysis of guilt appeals. <i>Frontiers in Psychology</i>, 14, Article 1201631. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1201631	Peng, W., Huang, Q., Mao, B., Lun, D., Malova, E., Simmons, J. V., & Carcioppolo, N. (2023). When guilt works: A comprehensive meta-analysis of guilt appeals. <i>Frontiers in Psychology</i>, 14, Article 1201631. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1201631
Slotter, E. B., Gardner, W. L., & Finkel, E. J. (2010). Who am I without you? The influence of romantic breakup on the self-concept. <i>Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin</i>, 36(2), 147-160. doi:10.1177/0146167209352250	Slotter, E. B., Gardner, W. L., & Finkel, E. J. (2010). Who am I without you? The influence of romantic breakup on the self-concept. <i>Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin</i>, 36(2), 147-160. doi:10.1177/0146167209352250
Stroebe, M., & Schut, H. (1999). The Dual Process Model of Coping with Bereavement: Rationale and description. <i>Death Studies</i>, 23(3), 197-224. doi:10.1080/074811899201046	Stroebe, M., & Schut, H. (1999). The Dual Process Model of Coping with Bereavement: Rationale and description. <i>Death Studies</i>, 23(3), 197-224. doi:10.1080/074811899201046
Tannenbaum, M. B., Hepler, J., Zimmerman, R. S., Saul, L., Jacobs, S., Wilson, K., & Albarracín, D. (2015). Appealing to fear: A meta-analysis of fear appeal effectiveness and theories. <i>Psychological Bulletin</i>, 141(6), 1178-1204. doi:10.1037/a0039729	Tannenbaum, M. B., Hepler, J., Zimmerman, R. S., Saul, L., Jacobs, S., Wilson, K., & Albarracín, D. (2015). Appealing to fear: A meta-analysis of fear appeal effectiveness and theories. <i>Psychological Bulletin</i>, 141(6), 1178-1204. doi:10.1037/a0039729
Trope, Y., & Liberman, N. (2010). Construal-Level Theory of psychological distance. <i>Psychological Review</i>, 117(2), 440-463. doi:10.1037/a0018963	Trope, Y., & Liberman, N. (2010). Construal-Level Theory of psychological distance. <i>Psychological Review</i>, 117(2), 440-463. doi:10.1037/a0018963
Weingarten, E., Wei, Z., Wildschut, T., & Sedikides, C. (2026). Principles of nostalgia: Meta-analytic tests. <i>Journal of Experimental Social Psychology</i>, 124, Article 104891. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2026.104891	Weingarten, E., Wei, Z., Wildschut, T., & Sedikides, C. (2026). Principles of nostalgia: Meta-analytic tests. <i>Journal of Experimental Social Psychology</i>, 124, Article 104891. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2026.104891
Zhou, X., Sedikides, C., Wildschut, T., & Gao, D.-G. (2008). Counteracting loneliness: On the restorative function of nostalgia. <i>Psychological Science</i>, 19(10), 1023-1029. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02194.x	Zhou, X., Sedikides, C., Wildschut, T., & Gao, D.-G. (2008). Counteracting loneliness: On the restorative function of nostalgia. <i>Psychological Science</i>, 19(10), 1023-1029. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02194.x