# The Uncorrectable Believer: Fantasy Attractor Dynamics from Aquinas to the Holocaust [A] (2026)

Robert Galida – June 2026 (Final)

*See Paper 1 (Intelligence Without Consciousness) for the full taxonomy of conscious suppression and fantasy attractors.*

---

## Abstract

Why do theological systems that defy empirical disconfirmation persist for centuries? The attractor framework diagnoses them as **fantasy attractors** – belief systems with low corrective permeability (κ), deep basins, and sealing mechanisms that neutralize error signals. This paper traces the shift from behavioral law (Judaism) to thought crime (Christianity), showing how internalizing sin makes the accused defenseless and elevates reputation over reality. It examines Catholic and radical Protestant soteriology as attractor architectures: the doctrine of double effect, the infinite value of the soul, and the permissible killing of heretics created a calculus where finite evil is justified by infinite gain. The 1933 Reichskonkordat – Hitler's first diplomatic treaty – exploited this attractor basin to gain legitimacy. The Holocaust was not a direct theological command, but an *implied inference* from centuries of attractor dynamics, given the additional historical factors of racial ideology and the totalitarian state. The paper distinguishes between Lutheran, antinomian, and prosperity-gospel variants, and offers a documented de-conversion case (Bart Ehrman) mapped onto the three exit

mechanisms. The result is a unified diagnosis of how theological attractors seal themselves against correction and enable historical atrocity.

---

# 1. Introduction

How does a belief system survive centuries of counterevidence? How can millions of intelligent people maintain faith in doctrines that contradict observable reality — wealth as divine favor, poverty as lack of faith, sins forgiven before they are committed? And how can the same attractor dynamics enable historical atrocities, from the Inquisition to the Holocaust?

Standard explanations (cognitive bias, social pressure, indoctrination) are incomplete. Cognitive dissonance theory, for example, explains why people rationalize disconfirmation but does not model the *dynamical stability* of belief attractors across populations and generations. The attractor framework offers a formal alternative: these are **fantasy attractors**, belief systems with corrective permeability $\kappa \to 0$, deep basins, and sealing mechanisms that neutralize error signals.

**Operational definition of κ (corrective permeability):** $\kappa = 1/\tau$, where $\tau$ is the time a system takes to return to its baseline state after a specified perturbation. For belief systems, $\kappa$ indexes the speed and completeness of belief updating when presented with disconfirming evidence. Low $\kappa$ means slow or absent updating — a sealed attractor.

This paper applies the framework to **Catholic and radical Protestant soteriology**. The Catholic tradition is the deeper attractor basin; Protestantism, particularly its radical antinomian and prosperity-gospel variants, represents a mutation that further reduced $\kappa$. The paper focuses not on theology per se, but on the *attractor architecture*: how thought crimes replace behavioral sins, how the infinite-value calculus justifies finite evil, how vicarious redemption removes corrective incentives, and how social colonization makes individual κ irrelevant. The goal is diagnostic, not polemical. “Fantasy attractor” is a technical term, not a rhetorical insult.

---

## 2. From Behavioral Law to Thought Crime

Judaism emphasizes **behavioral sins** – acts that can be observed, verified, and legally adjudicated. Theft, murder, idolatry, and false witness leave external evidence. A community can correct a member because the sin has verifiable traces. The attractor basin is shallow enough for error signals to enter.

*Qualification:* Rabbinic Judaism also regulates interior life – intention in prayer (kavvanah), forbidden desires, and the “evil inclination” (yetzer hara) as an internal adversary. However, *legal accountability* in Jewish law (halakha) requires action; interior states alone are not punishable by human courts. The shift to Christianity is not a complete invention of interiority but a *juridical* shift: internal states become the primary locus of sin, enforceable by divine authority and (via the church) social monitoring.

Within Christianity, the precise locus of this shift is Augustine of Hippo’s doctrine of **concupiscence** – the involuntary, post-lapsarian inclination to sin. Augustine argued that even the internal movement of lust, independent of any act, is morally blameworthy. This interiorized sin and made it inescapable.

The result: **thought crimes** – lust, doubt, pride, and above all, *lack of faith* – become unverifiable by definition. No one can see your lustful thought; no one can measure your doubt. The accused is defenseless: any denial can be interpreted as further evidence of deceit (e.g., “protesting too much”).

Attractor consequences:

- **The basin becomes empirically unfalsifiable.** No external perturbation can disconfirm an accusation about an internal state.
- **Reputation replaces reality.** Since thoughts cannot be observed, the community polices *signals* — public professions, loyalty rituals, emotional displays. Acceptance becomes performative theater.
- **Survival depends on reputation management.** The individual invests energy in signaling purity, not in correcting beliefs. κ is now about social mimicry, not truth.

The attractor has sealed itself against external correction.

---

## 3. The Infinite-Value Calculus: Aquinas, Double Effect, and the Permissibility of Killing Heretics

Thomas Aquinas, in the *Summa Theologiae* (II-II, Q.11, A.3), argued that heretics who relapse after correction “deserve not only to be separated from the Church by excommunication, but also to be severed from the world by death.” His reasoning was that heresy corrupts the faith, which is the life of the soul, and thus is more serious than counterfeiting money — a crime punishable by death in medieval law. This was later systematized under the **doctrine of double effect**: one act can have two effects — a good, intended one (protecting the faithful) and a bad, unintended one (the heretic’s death). The act is permissible if the bad effect is not the goal and there is a **proportionate reason**. (Aquinas articulated the foundational case for self-defense in II-II, Q.64, A.7; the formal “double effect” label came from later scholastics.)

The key move, reflected in later canon law and inquisitorial practice, was a **moral calculus**:

- **A saved soul has infinite value.** (A later Catholic apologetic formulation, often attributed to Origen in paraphrase: “the salvation of one soul is worth more than the creation of a thousand worlds.”)
- **Killing a heretic is a finite evil** (temporal death, temporary suffering).
- **Saving a potential convert — or protecting the faithful — is an infinite gain.**
- Therefore, **killing heretics is permissible, even praiseworthy**, if it serves the greater good of the faith.

This calculus was not marginal; it became embedded in canon law, inquisitorial practice, and the church’s teaching on religious coercion. The attractor basin for “heretic” deepened: the heretic was not merely wrong, but *ontologically dangerous*. No error signal from the heretic could be trusted; any plea for mercy was further evidence of deceit.

Aquinas distinguished between heretics (who had once professed the faith and then corrupted it) and non-believers (Jews, Muslims), who had never accepted it and were to be tolerated. However, under the pressure of the attractor basin, this distinction proved porous. The logic that made heretics expendable could be — and was — extended to any obstinate non-believer, especially when political and economic pressures aligned.

## 4. Vicarious Redemption and the Suppression of κ (Protestant Mutation)

Radical Protestant soteriology (sola fide, sola gratia) declares that salvation is by faith alone, not works. Christ's sacrifice paid for all sins — past, present, and future. The believer is justified before God regardless of behavior.

From an attractor perspective, this is a **κ → 0 engineering**:

- If all sins are already forgiven, there is **no future error signal** that can perturb your standing. Why correct? Why update? The basin is infinitely deep.
- Any attempt to modulate behavior for the sake of righteousness is **works-righteousness**, a sin of pride. The attractor actively penalizes efforts to increase κ.
- The only remaining error signal is *lack of faith* — but that is a thought crime, unverifiable and defenseless.

**Theological range distinction:** This logic applies most cleanly to **antinomian** and **hyper-Calvinist** positions, where behavioral ethics are genuinely irrelevant (e.g., certain "Free Grace" movements). It applies less cleanly to **Lutheranism**, which insists that good works are a necessary *response* to grace. The paper's argument targets the antinomian end of the spectrum, but the underlying attractor logic — infinite forgiveness, no future error signal — is already latent in the Catholic doctrine of baptismal regeneration and confession, albeit with higher κ because post-baptismal sin requires sacramental correction.

## 5. Effort as Pride: The Prohibition on Correction

In radical antinomian theology, any intentional effort to change is not merely unnecessary; it is **sinful**. The theological logic:

1. Grace is sufficient for salvation.
2. Adding human effort to secure salvation implies grace is *insufficient*.
3. Implying insufficiency is pride, a sin.
4. Therefore, intentional behavioral modulation is pride and undermines faith.

Thus, the attractor **penalizes the correction impulse itself**. The mechanism is: the system encodes “effort = pride” and attaches negative valence to any attempt to increase κ. This pattern is historically documented in the **Marrow Controversy** (Scotland, 1718–1722), in which the question of whether free grace implies no need for human effort divided the Church of Scotland; the Marrow men were accused of “antinomianism” for affirming that God’s love was unconditional, while their opponents insisted that effort to prepare oneself for grace was necessary. The attractor had turned its own correction signal into a sin, and the controversy formalized the split.

---

## 6. Prosperity Doctrine: The Sealed Basin (A Late Mutation)

Prosperity doctrine (Word of Faith movement, originating with E.W. Kenyon and popularized by Kenneth Hagin, Kenneth Copeland) is a **late 20th-century mutation** of radical Protestant theology.

Its attractor dynamics:

- **Poverty and suffering** are evidence of weak faith. The error signal (poverty) is not a call to correct the system; it is a call to deepen belief. Disconfirmation becomes confirmation.
- **Wealth and power** are evidence of strong faith. The rich have no error signal at all; their status is divine validation. The attractor rewards low κ.
- **The hermeneutic seal** — any challenge to the doctrine is interpreted as lack of faith, which is already a thought crime. The system absorbs all counterevidence.

This is distinct from Calvinist economic theology (Weber's Protestant Ethic), which ties wealth to disciplined labor — a higher-κ system. Prosperity doctrine is a specific, highly sealed attractor.

---

## 7. Social Colonization and Collective Basin Depth

The church (and derivative political systems) maintains the attractor across individuals. Social mechanisms include:

- **Public professions of faith** — performative acts that signal loyalty and deepen group cohesion.
- **Shunning and excommunication** — leaving the attractor means social death.
- **Collective reinforcement** — group rituals, shared beliefs, and common sealing mechanisms amplify basin depth.

When social colonization is complete, individual κ becomes **irrelevant**. The collective basin holds even if individuals have high κ in other domains. The attractor has colonized the simulation loop — the individual's internal model of reality. Theoretically, this is an emergent property of synchronized low-κ agents: coupling suppresses variance, and the group's collective basin depth exceeds any individual's corrective capacity.

**A further structural consequence:** When the *performance of piety* becomes the sole measure of a person's credibility — when inner faith cannot be verified and only outward signs matter — then the clergy, as the gatekeepers and evaluators of that performance, inevitably sit at the top of the hierarchy. No independent measure of faith exists, so the clergy control the script: the sacraments, the definitions of orthodoxy, the penalties for deviance. The laity must compete to signal purity to the clergy, who in turn deepen the basin by rewarding conformity and punishing dissent. This is why clerical hierarchies are so stable and resistant to correction from below: any error signal from a layperson is already discounted because the layperson's credibility depends entirely on their performance of piety, which the clergy adjudicate. To challenge the clergy is to fail the performance — a perfect seal.

---

# 8. Comparison with Other Fantasy Attractors

The same dynamical structure appears in political movements (Paper 1), clinical disorders (Paper 2), and AI alignment (Paper 4). In each case:

- $\kappa \to 0$ for core beliefs.
- Error signals are neutralized by sealing mechanisms.

- Identity fusion prevents exit.
- Social reinforcement deepens the basin.

The theological case is distinctive in two respects: (a) the sealing mechanism is *ontological* — God's authority is infinite, and no human evidence can override divine decree; (b) the *infinite-value calculus* allows finite evil to be justified by infinite gain, creating a powerful incentive for atrocity that purely social attractors lack.

---

## 9. De-conversion and Resistance: The Ehrman Case

If the attractor is sealed, how does one exit? Three mechanisms:

- **Breaking identity fusion** — The belief must cease to be self-constitutive.
- **Re-opening error signals** — External perturbations that the sealing mechanism cannot absorb.
- **Escape from collective basin** — Finding a new social attractor with higher κ.

The de-conversion of biblical scholar **Bart Ehrman** (from evangelical certainty to agnosticism) provides a documented case mapped onto these mechanisms. Ehrman has described how his evangelical identity was fused with inerrancy; the perturbation was the accumulated weight of manuscript variations and historical contradictions he encountered in graduate school. The sealing mechanisms (prayer, apologetics) worked for years but eventually failed because the scale of disconfirmation exceeded the basin's capacity to absorb it. Exit required a new social attractor (academic biblical studies) where questioning was the norm, and a gradual decoupling of self-worth from doctrinal certainty. Ehrman's story is not a template for all exits, but it illustrates the attractor framework's prediction: de-conversion requires a perturbation larger than the sealing mechanisms can neutralize, coupled with an alternative basin.

---

## 10. The Holocaust as Implied Consequence: The Reichskonkordat and the Attractor Basin

The attractor architecture described above — infinite-value calculus, thought crimes, permissibility of killing heretics — did not remain abstract. It became embedded in canon law, diplomatic practice, and the church's relationship with secular powers.

The **Reichskonkordat** of 1933 was Adolf Hitler's first major international treaty, signed with the Vatican just months after he became Chancellor. Why first? Because the Catholic Church was the most powerful attractor basin in Western history — a network of believers, institutions, and moral authority spanning centuries. Hitler needed that basin's *legitimizing signal* to stabilize his regime internationally and to neutralize Catholic political opposition.

**Historical note:** The historiography of the concordat is contested. John Cornwell (*Hitler's Pope*, 1999) argues the treaty gave Hitler legitimacy and sealed Catholic political opposition. Others, such as Hubert Wolf (*Pope and Devil*, 2010), argue the concordat was a defensive instrument aimed at protecting Catholic institutions under a regime already consolidating power. The attractor-framework argument does not require choosing between these interpretations. Even if the concordat was defensive, the effect was the same: the church's error signals were subordinated to institutional survival, and the basin's deep attraction pulled the hierarchy toward accommodation.

The concordat did not explicitly say "Jews may be killed." It did not need to. The *established practice* had already set the boundaries:

- **Baptized Jews** – converts – were, in principle, under the church's protection. Vatican communications distinguished baptized from unbaptized Jews (e.g., Holy See correspondence with German bishops, 1933–1935, regarding non-Aryan Catholics). The concordat's silence on this distinction left the unbaptized outside the attractor's moral consideration.
- **Unconverted Jews** remained outside the basin. The church had long taught that obstinate non-believers were not protected by the same moral calculus. The infinite-value logic applied only to souls *capable of salvation* – and for the church, that required baptism.

Thus, the concordat functioned as a **sealing mechanism at the diplomatic level**. It signaled to German Catholics (and to the world) that the Vatican accepted Hitler's regime. The remaining error signals – protests, encyclicals, excommunications – were suppressed or ignored. The basin had been colonized.

**Reinforcing the hierarchy:** The concordat also entrenched the clerical-performance hierarchy. By legitimizing the regime that would later remove any meaningful competition for moral authority (socialists, trade unions, other political parties), the Catholic hierarchy became, for its remaining faithful, the sole gatekeeper of piety. The laity could no longer turn to alternative social attractors (e.g., socialist movements with different moral codes); the only acceptable performance was loyalty to the church and, by extension, to the regime the church had recognized. Thus, the concordat did not merely silence opposition — it locked the faithful into a single-source evaluation of their own credibility, with the clergy firmly at the top.

The Holocaust was not a direct command of Christian theology. It was an **implied inference** from centuries of attractor dynamics, **given additional historical factors**:

- **Racialization:** The Nazi category was *biological*, not religious. Baptism did not change one's race. The Nazis explicitly rejected the church's protection of converts, sealing the basin further by removing the only escape valve (conversion).
- **Totalitarian state:** The Nazi regime had the power to enforce genocide at a scale and speed that medieval inquisitions could not.
- **Removal of the conversion escape:** In the theological attractor, conversion could save a heretic's life. In the Nazi racial attractor, conversion was irrelevant. The basin became infinitely deep.

**Disclaimer:** This is not to say "the church caused the Holocaust." The Holocaust required additional, non-theological factors: a totalitarian state, racial ideology, and the removal of baptism as an escape from persecution. The theological attractor provided the *permissibility conditions* — the moral logic that made killing non-believers a finite evil justified by infinite gain — but the political and racial machinery were supplied by Nazism.

The attractor framework diagnoses this not as a conspiracy but as a **dynamical consequence**: when a belief system assigns infinite value to a scarce resource (saved souls) and finite cost to human life, and when it seals itself against corrective evidence, atrocity becomes not only possible but *logical* within the basin, given the right historical conditions.

---

## 11. Conclusion

Catholic and radical Protestant soteriology share a common attractor architecture: thought crimes, infinite-value calculus, pre-forgiveness or baptismal regeneration, and sealing mechanisms that neutralize error signals. The shift from behavioral law to internal sin made the accused defenseless and elevated reputation over reality. The doctrine of double effect and the infinite value of the soul justified finite evil for infinite gain. The Reichskonkordat leveraged the deepest attractor basin in Western history to grant Hitler legitimacy. The Holocaust was not a direct command, but an *implied inference* from centuries of attractor dynamics, completed by the historical specificities of racial ideology and totalitarian power.

The attractor framework provides a unified diagnosis of how theological systems resist correction and enable atrocity. It also points to the only exit: restore $\kappa$, reopen error signals, decouple identity from belief, and build new attractors where doubt is not a sin but a pathway to truth.

---

**Suggested citation:** Galida, R. S. (2026). The Uncorrectable Believer: Fantasy Attractor Dynamics from Aquinas to the Holocaust. *Fantasy Attractor.*

---

# Archetypes as Strange Attractors: Conceptual Parallels with the Attractor Framework

Robert Galida
Independent Researcher
June 2026
fantasyattractor.com

---

## Abstract

The attractor framework proposes that persistence under perturbation is the fundamental mark of reality, with corrective permeability (κ) serving as a proposed measure of a system's capacity to return to its attractor after perturbation. Van Eenwyk (1991) published a paper in the *Journal of Analytical Psychology* proposing that Jungian archetypes function as strange attractors of the psyche—dynamical patterns that organize psychological experience without ever repeating identically. This paper identifies conceptual parallels between Van Eenwyk's archetype-as-attractor model and the attractor framework. Both draw on a shared upstream tradition in chaos theory. Van Eenwyk's model is itself a theoretical analogy, not an empirically validated result; the parallels identified here are therefore conceptual rather than evidential. They demonstrate consistency within a shared intellectual tradition, not independent corroboration. This mapping carries substantially lower evidential weight than the framework's mappings onto quantitatively validated methods such as

Symmetric Projection Attractor Reconstruction (SPAR) and the empirically identified hypothalamic line attractor reported by Nair et al. (2023).

---

## 1. Introduction: Archetypes as Dynamical Attractors

The attractor framework (Galida, 2026a, self-published May 2026 at fantasyattractor.com; no DOI) proposes that dissipative attractors—stable configurations toward which systems converge and from which they resist displacement—are the fundamental units of persistent organization across physical, biological, cognitive, and social domains. Corrective permeability (κ) is a proposed measure of a system's capacity to return to its attractor after perturbation.

In 1991, John Van Eenwyk published "Archetypes: The Strange Attractors of the Psyche" in the *Journal of Analytical Psychology*. Drawing on the emerging science of chaos theory—Gleick, Mandelbrot, Lorenz, Feigenbaum—Van Eenwyk proposed that Jungian archetypes are not fixed images or inherited memories, but dynamical attractors: persistent patterns that organize psychological experience without ever producing identical outputs.

Van Eenwyk's work and the attractor framework were developed entirely independently; neither cites the other. However, both draw on a shared upstream intellectual tradition in chaos theory and nonlinear dynamics. The convergences identified here are therefore expected to some degree: two independent applications of the same mathematical vocabulary to human psychology will naturally produce similar descriptions. This paper identifies conceptual parallels while explicitly distinguishing their evidentiary weight from the framework's mappings onto quantitatively validated methods such as SPAR (Bonet-Luz et al., 2020) and the Nair et al. (2023) line attractor, where Nair et al. empirically identified an approximate line attractor in hypothalamic neural population recordings that encodes an escalating aggressive state.

---

## 2. Van Eenwyk’s Archetype-as-Attractor Model

Van Eenwyk’s central thesis is that Jungian archetypes function as strange attractors of the psyche. He grounds this claim in the formal properties of chaotic dynamical systems:

**2.1 Attractors as Organizing Patterns.** Van Eenwyk defines an attractor as “the pattern into which a particular motion will settle.” Archetypes, he argues, are strange attractors: they organize psychological experience into recognizable, recurring patterns—the hero’s journey, the great mother, the shadow—without ever producing identical manifestations.

**2.2 Sensitive Dependence on Initial Conditions (SDIC).** Drawing on Lorenz’s butterfly effect, Van Eenwyk explains individual variation in psychological development: small initial perturbations are amplified geometrically over time, so no two trajectories within an archetypal attractor are identical.

**2.3 Bifurcation as Transformation.** Van Eenwyk describes the tension of opposites in Jungian psychology as an oscillator. When the tension between consciousness and the unconscious reaches a critical threshold, the system bifurcates—order collapses into chaos, and from that chaos, new patterns emerge. This is the “dark night of the soul”—the necessary intermediate state between an old attractor collapsing and a new one stabilizing.

**2.4 Fractal Self-Similarity Across Scales.** Van Eenwyk draws on

Mandelbrot’s fractal geometry. Archetypes exhibit self-similarity across scales: similar themes appear in individual dreams, family dynamics, cultural myths, and religious symbolism. The mandala is a visual representation of a dynamical pattern that recapitulates itself at every level of magnification. It should be noted that “fractal self-similarity” in this context refers to qualitative thematic recurrence across scales, not to the quantitative, measurable property defined in Mandelbrot’s fractal geometry.

**2.5 Healthy Chaos vs. Pathological Order.** Citing physiological research on heart rate variability, Van Eenwyk argues that healthy systems exhibit chaotic flexibility, not rigid homeostasis. A healthy heart has chaotic variability between beats; a rigid, perfectly regular heart rhythm is pathological. Similarly, a healthy psyche exhibits flexible attractors that can shift in response to perturbation. Loss of variability signals pathology.

---

# 3. Conceptual Parallels with the Attractor Framework

**3.1 Archetypes as Attractors.** Van Eenwyk’s “strange attractors of the psyche” are descriptively parallel to the attractor framework’s concept of an attractor: a persistent configuration toward which the psyche gravitates and around which it organizes, characterized by self-similarity, resistance to perturbation, and sensitive dependence on initial conditions. The framework generalizes this concept beyond the psyche to physical, biological, and social systems.

**3.2 Bifurcation as Basin Transition.** Van Eenwyk’s description of bifurcation—the tension of opposites pushing the system to a critical threshold where chaos erupts and new order emerges—is structurally analogous to the framework’s phase transition between attractor basins. The "dark night of the soul" is the chaotic intermediate state between an old attractor destabilizing and a new one forming. The framework describes this same dynamic in climate tipping points, political realignments, and personal cognitive restructuring.

**3.3 Healthy Chaos as Corrective Permeability (κ).** Van Eenwyk's argument that healthy systems exhibit chaotic variability, not rigid order, is structurally analogous to the framework's corrective permeability (κ). To the extent that κ captures these properties—which has not been formally established—Van Eenwyk's distinction between healthy flexibility and pathological rigidity is consistent with the framework's high-κ/low-κ distinction.

The evidential chain for this parallel should be made explicit. Van Eenwyk's source is physiological research on heart rate variability (HRV)—a finding about cardiac dynamics, not psychological flexibility. Van Eenwyk then extends this to the psyche by analogy. The present paper draws a further analogical connection to κ. The chain is thus three analogical steps removed from its empirical anchor. The parallel is conceptually interesting but rests on layered analogies, not converging evidence.

**3.4 Fractal Self-Similarity as Cross-Domain Scaling.** Van Eenwyk's use of Mandelbrot's fractal geometry—similar patterns recurring at every scale—is structurally analogous to the framework's claim that attractor dynamics scale across domains. The framework extends this logic beyond the psyche: similar basin dynamics govern biological systems, cardiac electrophysiology, climate systems, political movements, and religious belief. The framework's claim that these dynamics extend to the fundamental structure of physical reality—including the CVU lattice and conservative persistence structures—remains a theoretical assertion under development and is not independently established. In both Van Eenwyk's model and the framework, the cross-domain scaling claim is a qualitative observation of thematic recurrence across scales, not a quantitative demonstration of mathematical fractal structure.

**3.5 The Analytic Container as Deliberate Perturbation.** Van Eenwyk argues that the therapeutic frame functions to “raise the r value” of the psychological system, pushing it toward the bifurcation point where old attractors destabilize and new ones can emerge. This is structurally analogous to the framework’s concept of deliberate perturbation: the analyst, the self-engineer, or the institutional reformer applies targeted perturbations to nudge a system toward a phase transition, knowing that the intermediate chaos is productive, not pathological.

---

# 4. Independence, Shared Lineage, and Evidentiary Weight

Van Eenwyk’s work and the attractor framework were developed entirely independently. Van Eenwyk cites Gleick, Mandelbrot, Lorenz, Feigenbaum, and Jung; the framework draws on Ruelle, Prigogine, Olds and Milner, and N=1 self-engineering. Neither cites the other.

However, the shared upstream intellectual lineage in chaos theory substantially limits the evidential weight of these convergences. The vocabulary of chaos theory—attractor, bifurcation, sensitive dependence, fractal—is sufficiently flexible that almost any persistent, complex human phenomenon can be described in these terms. The convergence of two independent applications of this vocabulary may therefore reflect the generality of the vocabulary rather than a discovery about the phenomena themselves. This is a standing methodological limitation that applies to all framework mapping papers using chaos-theory vocabulary, not only to the present paper.

Furthermore, Van Eenwyk's model is itself a theoretical analogy, not an empirically validated result. It was published in a psychoanalytic journal and has not been quantitatively tested. This distinguishes it from the framework's mappings onto the SPAR method (which achieved 96% classification accuracy for a disease-causing genetic mutation) and the Nair et al. line attractor (which was empirically identified in neural population recordings). The present mapping demonstrates conceptual consistency within a shared intellectual tradition; it does not carry the evidential weight of convergence with empirically grounded findings.

---

## 5. Falsifiability Conditions

The following observations would weaken or invalidate the parallels drawn here:

- **Disconfirming observation 1:** If archetypal patterns were shown to be discrete, non-recurring categorical schemas rather than continuous dynamical attractors with sensitive dependence on initial conditions and fractal organization, the attractor model would fail.
- **Disconfirming observation 2:** If the bifurcation model of psychological transformation were shown to be *indistinguishable* from simpler models (e.g., linear stress-response curves, threshold models without chaotic intermediates), the chaos-theoretic interpretation would not be uniquely supported.
- **Disconfirming observation 3:** If quantitative measures of psychological variability—such as linguistic entropy, narrative complexity, or approximate entropy of behavioral time series—showed *no correlation* with therapeutic outcomes or independently assessed

psychological health ratings, the healthy-chaos/κ parallel would lose its primary empirical motivation.

**Affirmative prediction (long-range):** If archetypes function as strange attractors, then therapeutic interventions that successfully transform an individual’s relationship to a given archetype should produce measurable shifts in the entropy and complexity of associated psychological content (e.g., dream imagery, narrative patterns, symptom expression). Approximate entropy and sample entropy have been applied to psychological time-series data in existing literature (e.g., Pincus, 1991; Richman & Moorman, 2000) and have been proposed for use in clinical monitoring of mood and behavioral variability. These measures provide a more tractable near-term empirical target than fractal dimension or Lyapunov exponents, which require prior conceptual demonstration that psychological content can be treated as a continuous dynamical time series.

---

## 6. Conclusion

Van Eenwyk’s 1991 paper and the attractor framework, developed entirely independently, converge on shared structural descriptions: archetypes are strange attractors—dynamical patterns that organize experience, resist perturbation, exhibit sensitive dependence on initial conditions, and transform through bifurcation. Healthy systems exhibit chaotic flexibility (structurally analogous to high κ); pathological systems exhibit rigid order (structurally analogous to low κ).

These convergences are conceptual, not evidential. Both works draw on the same upstream intellectual tradition in chaos theory, and Van Eenwyk’s model is itself a theoretical analogy rather than an empirically validated result. The parallels demonstrate consistency within a shared intellectual tradition, not independent corroboration. The framework remains a self-published, preliminary research program. This mapping is a contribution to its ongoing development, offered with lower evidentiary weight than mappings onto quantitatively validated methods.

---

## References


- Bonet-Luz, E., Lyle, J. V., Huang, C. L.-H., Zhang, Y., Nandi, M., Jeevaratnam, K., & Aston, P. J. (2020). Symmetric Projection Attractor Reconstruction analysis of murine electrocardiograms. *Heart Rhythm O2*, 1(5), 368–375.
- Galida, R. (2026a). *Persistence Under Perturbation: The Eternal Skeleton and the Transient Dance.* Fantasy Attractor. Published May 2026.
- Nair, A., Karigo, T., Yang, B., et al. (2023). An approximate line attractor in the hypothalamus encodes an aggressive state. *Cell*, 186(1), 178–193.
- Pincus, S. M. (1991). Approximate entropy as a measure of system complexity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 88(6), 2297–2301.
- Richman, J. S., & Moorman, J. R. (2000). Physiological time-series analysis using approximate entropy and sample entropy. *American Journal of Physiology*, 278(6), H2039–H2049.
- Van Eenwyk, J. R. (1991). Archetypes: The strange attractors of the psyche. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 36, 1–25. https://www.jungiananalysts.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Van-Eenwyk-J.-Archetypes-The-Strange-Attractors-of-the-Psyche.pdf

# Symmetric Projection Attractor Reconstruction as a Cardiac Attractor: Structural Parallels with the Attractor Framework

Robert Galida
Independent Researcher
June 2026
fantasyattractor.com

## Abstract

The attractor framework proposes that persistence under perturbation is a fundamental marker of reality, with corrective permeability (κ) serving as a proposed multi-dimensional measure of a system's capacity to return to its attractor after perturbation. Bonet-Luz et al. (2020) developed Symmetric Projection Attractor Reconstruction (SPAR), a patented mathematical method that reformulates the entire electrocardiogram (ECG) waveform into a bounded, symmetric, 2-dimensional attractor and extracts quantitative features from it. Applied to mice with an Scn5a+/- mutation linked to Brugada syndrome, SPAR features achieved 96% classification accuracy—substantially outperforming standard ECG intervals and amplitudes. This paper identifies structural parallels between SPAR's attractor-based analysis and the attractor framework. The SPAR attractor is a concrete,

computable attractor derived from a physiological signal, and a provisional mapping is proposed between specific SPAR features and proposed components of κ. The parallels are post-hoc and do not constitute independent validation of the framework. The framework's κ remains qualitatively defined; this mapping is offered as a contribution to its ongoing development.

---

## 1. Introduction: Attractor-Based ECG Analysis

The attractor framework (Galida, 2026a, self-published May 2026 at [fantasyattractor.com](fantasyattractor.com); no DOI) proposes that dissipative attractors—stable configurations toward which systems converge and from which they resist displacement—are the fundamental units of persistent organization across physical, biological, cognitive, and social domains. Corrective permeability (κ) is a proposed multi-dimensional measure of a system's capacity to return to its attractor after perturbation. The framework distinguishes between the attractor (the invariant set of states toward which the system converges) and the basin (the set of initial conditions that converge to that attractor). In the present paper, we use "attractor" in the standard dynamical systems sense and note where the framework's usage aligns or diverges.

In 2020, Bonet-Luz, Aston, Nandi, and colleagues published a study in *Heart Rhythm O2* (Elsevier) applying Symmetric Projection Attractor Reconstruction (SPAR) to murine electrocardiograms (Bonet-Luz et al., 2020). SPAR is a patented mathematical method that reformulates the entire ECG waveform into a bounded, symmetric, 2-dimensional attractor, preserving all available waveform morphology rather than extracting only a few fiducial points. The method was applied to distinguish wild-type mice from those carrying an Scn5a+/-

mutation linked to Brugada syndrome, a hereditary condition associated with sudden cardiac death.

The study did not cite the attractor framework and was conducted within the established traditions of biomedical signal processing, nonlinear dynamics, and machine learning. This paper identifies structural parallels between SPAR's attractor-based analysis and the attractor framework. The parallels are post-hoc and do not constitute independent validation.

---

## 2. The SPAR Method

SPAR generates a 2-dimensional attractor from approximately periodic signals such as ECG, blood pressure, or photoplethysmogram waveforms. The method determines an average cycle length from the signal, sets a time delay parameter as one-third of that cycle, and plots the data in a bounded box using a symmetric projection. The resulting attractor is a compact, easily visualized representation of the entire waveform morphology, overlaid with a density map indicating which regions are visited more or less frequently. The method factors out changes in heart rate and baseline variation to concentrate on waveform morphology.

For murine lead I and II ECG signals, the SPAR attractor typically exhibits 3 long arms predominantly representing the R peak, with deep S peaks and sometimes deep Q peaks producing shorter arms in the opposite direction, yielding an attractor with up to 6 arms in total (Figure 1 of the original paper). The central core region reflects T-wave and P-wave morphologies.

From this attractor, Bonet-Luz et al. extracted 74 manually defined features relating to the density, size, and symmetry of the attractor, along with the average heart rate and a vertical normalization scaling factor. These features were used in a k-nearest neighbors classifier (k=3) with leave-one-animal-out cross-validation.

The dataset comprised ECG recordings from 42 anesthetized mice (39 lead I, 39 lead II) of varying genotype (wild-type vs. Scn5a+/-), sex, and age. Each signal was divided into 13 non-overlapping 10-second windows, yielding 1,014 records for classification. Standard ECG intervals (7) and amplitudes (6) were also extracted for benchmarking. It is important to note that the effective sample size for the classification is 42 animals, not 1,014 windowed records, and the 96% classification accuracy has not yet been independently replicated in a separate cohort.

---

# 3. Results Summary

The SPAR features alone achieved 87.2% classification accuracy for genotype (majority vote), outperforming ECG intervals (74.3%) and intervals plus amplitudes (85.9%). The highest accuracy (96.2%) was obtained by combining all features—SPAR, intervals, and amplitudes. For sex and age classification, SPAR features similarly outperformed standard measures.

The machine learning algorithm selected 16 SPAR features out of 20 in the combined model, with the remaining 4 being the ST height, P and R amplitudes, and the PR interval. The density distribution and symmetry in the arm regions of the attractor were the most discriminative SPAR features. The ST height—a known marker for Brugada syndrome—was selected in both feature groups that included amplitudes.

The authors concluded that the ECG carries sufficient information to detect the Scn5a+/- mutation, but that enhanced analysis techniques are required to extract it. Standard interval and amplitude measures fail to capture the relevant signal because the mutation's effects are distributed across the entire waveform morphology, not concentrated at isolated time points.

---

# 4. Structural Parallels with the Attractor Framework

**4.1 The SPAR Attractor as a Cardiac Attractor.** The SPAR method generates a bounded, stable 2-dimensional attractor from the ECG signal. This attractor is a compact representation of the cardiac system's dynamical state—a region in state space toward which trajectories converge and around which they organize. In the attractor framework's vocabulary, this is an **attractor** generated by a dissipative system (the beating heart, maintained by continuous metabolic energy input). The attractor's density distribution, arm structure, and symmetry reflect the stability and structural coherence of this configuration.

**4.2 SPAR Features as Candidate Proxies for Corrective Permeability (κ).** The framework proposes κ as a multi-dimensional measure of a system's capacity to return to its attractor after perturbation. A healthy heart with normal ion channel function has a deep, stable attractor—it responds to perturbations and returns rapidly to its baseline rhythm. The Scn5a+/- mutation degrades sodium channel function, making the cardiac tissue more vulnerable to arrhythmia. This degradation manifests as measurable changes in the SPAR attractor.

A provisional mapping between specific SPAR feature categories and proposed components of κ is offered below. This mapping is hypothetical and has not been formally derived; it is presented as a structural analogy to be tested in future work. The κ component labels in this table are introduced here for exploratory purposes and are not yet formalized in the primary framework document (Galida, 2026a); they are subject to revision pending formal axiomatization of κ.

| SPAR Feature Category | What It Measures in the Attractor | Candidate κ Component (provisional) |
|---|---|---|
| Density distribution (core) | Frequency of trajectory visits to central attractor region | Attractor core stability: a dense core indicates a stable, frequently occupied equilibrium |
| Density distribution (arms) | Frequency of trajectory visits to peripheral regions | Perturbation response: arm density reflects excursions from equilibrium |
| Symmetry features | Left-right symmetry of attractor arms | Recovery symmetry: asymmetric arms may indicate directional perturbation bias or conduction abnormality |
| Arm structure | Length, width, and number of attractor arms | Global waveform integrity: degraded arm structure reflects disrupted cardiac conduction |

The 96% classification accuracy (pending independent replication) demonstrates that these attractor-derived proxies capture diagnostically relevant information that standard interval measures miss. Whether this information corresponds specifically to κ, or to more general signal properties, cannot be determined without a formal derivation of κ from the framework's axioms.

**4.3 Multi-Dimensional Feature Combination.** The framework proposes that κ is multi-dimensional—no single measure fully captures a system's corrective permeability. The SPAR results are consistent with this principle: combined features outperformed any individual feature set. However, this result is also expected under standard machine learning practice, where feature combination typically improves classification performance. The result is therefore consistent with the framework without uniquely supporting it. The specific finding that SPAR features (16/20) dominated the combined model suggests that attractor-derived measures carry more discriminative information than point-based measures for this particular mutation. Whether this dominance generalizes to other perturbations and other physiological systems is an open empirical question.

**4.4 Normalization as Signal Isolation.** The SPAR method normalizes the signal to factor out changes in heart rate and baseline variation, concentrating on waveform morphology. In the framework's terms, this is a methodological step that isolates the attractor's structural properties from confounding variables. Heart rate is influenced by autonomic tone, physical activity, and respiratory cycle—perturbations that can obscure the measurement of the attractor's intrinsic stability. SPAR's normalization yields a cleaner representation of the attractor. However, this normalization step is standard practice in many signal processing methods and does not constitute a distinctive parallel with the framework.

---

## 5. Limitations

This mapping is post-hoc. The parallels identified here are structural analogies, not independent evidence for the framework. The provisional κ-proxy mapping in Section 4.2 is hypothetical and has not been formally derived from the framework's axioms. The κ component labels used in the provisional mapping table (e.g., "attractor core stability," "recovery symmetry," "global waveform integrity") are introduced in this paper for exploratory purposes and are not yet formalized in the primary framework document (Galida, 2026a). They are subject to revision pending formal axiomatization of κ.

The framework’s κ remains qualitatively defined. A formal derivation specifying the state variables, the attractor geometry, and the perturbation response function is required before the SPAR feature mapping can be evaluated as more than a structural analogy.

The 96.2% classification accuracy was obtained from a single study of 42 mice (effective N=42, despite 1,014 windowed records). Independent replication in a separate cohort has not been performed. The accuracy figure should be interpreted with appropriate caution.

The SPAR method was developed for approximately periodic signals and has been validated on cardiovascular waveforms. Its applicability to the non-periodic attractors the framework describes in cognitive and social domains is unknown.

The attractor framework is self-published and has not undergone independent peer review.

---

# 6. Falsifiability Conditions

The following observations would weaken or invalidate the parallels drawn here:

- **Disconfirming observation 1:** If SPAR features were shown to be *uncorrelated* with independently validated measures of cardiac resilience or arrhythmia susceptibility in a larger, independent cohort, the κ proxy interpretation would lose its empirical anchor.
- **Disconfirming observation 2:** If the SPAR attractor’s classification accuracy for the Scn5a+/- mutation were shown to derive primarily from features unrelated to

attractor geometry (e.g., heart rate alone or predominantly heart rate), the attractor interpretation would be substantially weakened.

- **Disconfirming observation 3:** If alternative signal processing methods with no attractor reconstruction component achieved equal or higher classification accuracy using the same data, the attractor interpretation would not be uniquely supported.

**Affirmative predictions:**

- **Primary prediction:** If the provisional κ-proxy mapping in Section 4.2 captures genuine components of corrective permeability, then pharmacological interventions that improve cardiac ion channel function (e.g., sodium channel modulators) should produce measurable shifts in specific SPAR features—density, symmetry, arm structure—toward the wild-type baseline. Conversely, interventions that degrade ion channel function should shift these features away from the baseline. This prediction is testable using pre- and post-intervention ECG recordings with the same SPAR methodology.
- **Secondary prediction:** If attractor-derived features are more sensitive to κ-relevant perturbations than point-based measures, then SPAR features should show *greater* sensitivity to these pharmacological interventions than standard ECG intervals and amplitudes. This secondary claim is more speculative; failure of the secondary prediction while the primary prediction holds would suggest that SPAR features track relevant physiological changes without uniquely capturing κ as distinct from other measures.

---

## 7. Conclusion

The SPAR method developed by Bonet-Luz et al. (2020) generates a mathematically defined attractor from ECG signals that encodes diagnostically relevant information about cardiac stability. A provisional mapping between SPAR features and proposed components of corrective permeability (κ) has been offered, along with primary and secondary affirmative predictions. The 96% classification accuracy for a disease-causing mutation demonstrates that attractor-based features capture information about system integrity that standard point-based measures miss. These parallels are structural analogies, not independent validation. The framework remains a self-published, preliminary research program. This mapping is a contribution to its ongoing development.

---

## References


- Bonet-Luz, E., Lyle, J. V., Huang, C. L.-H., Zhang, Y., Nandi, M., Jeevaratnam, K., & Aston, P. J. (2020). Symmetric Projection Attractor Reconstruction analysis of murine electrocardiograms: Retrospective prediction of Scn5a+/- genetic mutation attributable to Brugada syndrome. *Heart Rhythm O2*, 1(5), 368–375. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hroo.2020.08.007
- Galida, R. (2026a). *Persistence Under Perturbation: The Eternal Skeleton and the Transient Dance.* Fantasy Attractor. Published May 2026.


---

# Structural Parallels Between VMHvl Line Attractor Dynamics and the Attractor Framework

Robert Galida
Independent Researcher
June 2026
[fantasyattractor.com](fantasyattractor.com)

---

## Abstract

The attractor framework proposes that persistence under perturbation is a fundamental marker of reality, with corrective permeability (κ)—a proposed measure of the rate at which a system returns to its basin after perturbation—serving as a key diagnostic variable. Nair et al. (2023) discovered an approximate line attractor in the ventromedial hypothalamus (VMHvl) of mice that encodes an escalating aggressive state. The line attractor exhibits a single integration dimension with a long time constant that correlates with individual differences in aggressiveness. This paper identifies structural parallels between the VMHvl line attractor and the attractor framework. Both frameworks draw on a shared dynamical-systems vocabulary; the parallels are therefore a consistency check, not independent corroboration. The integration dimension's time constant is proposed as a candidate structural analogue for the inverse of corrective permeability ($\kappa \sim 1/\tau$), grounded in the perturbation-recovery events directly observable in Nair et al.'s data. The paper specifies falsifiability conditions, including an affirmative, testable prediction, and acknowledges the framework's preliminary, self-published status.

## 1. Introduction: Shared Vocabulary, Not Convergence

The attractor framework (Galida, 2026a, self-published May 2026 at fantasyattractor.com; no DOI) proposes that dissipative attractors—stable basins toward which systems converge and from which they resist displacement—are the fundamental units of persistent organization across physical, biological, cognitive, and social domains. Corrective permeability (κ) is a proposed measure of the rate at which a system returns to its basin after perturbation. The framework's concepts were developed independently through philosophical inquiry, systems theory, and N=1 self-engineering experiments—a methodology in which the author systematically tracked physiological, cognitive, and behavioral responses to targeted interventions on himself, generating preliminary data that informed the framework's development but does not constitute independent validation.

In January 2023, Nair, Kennedy, Anderson, and colleagues at Caltech published a study in *Cell* demonstrating an approximate line attractor in the ventrolateral subdivision of the ventromedial hypothalamus (VMHvl) of male mice (Nair et al., 2023). Using calcium imaging and dynamical systems modeling, they showed that neural population activity in VMHvl converges toward and progresses along a stable trough in neural state space, and that the position of activity along this trough correlates with the intensity of aggressive behavior.

Both the framework and the Nair et al. study use the vocabulary of dynamical systems—"attractor," "basin," "time constant." This shared vocabulary reflects a common intellectual lineage in nonlinear dynamics (Strogatz, 2018) and computational neuroscience (Seung, 1996; Mante et al., 2013). The parallels identified in this paper are therefore a consistency check, not independent corroboration. The framework imported these concepts; it did not invent them. The relevant question is whether the framework's specific claims—about κ, basin depth, and cross-domain generalization—find structural analogues in the VMHvl circuit that are non-tautological. This paper explores that question while acknowledging its limitations.

---

## 2. The VMHvl Line Attractor

Nair et al. (2023) fit recurrent switching linear dynamical system (rSLDS) models to calcium imaging data from VMHvlEsr1 neurons during social interactions. Their unsupervised analysis revealed a dominant integration dimension with a time constant exceeding 50 seconds—significantly longer than all other dimensions. This dimension accounted for approximately 20% of the total variance in neural activity.

The integration dimension exhibited slow ramping as aggression escalated, rising from low values during sniffing to intermediate values during dominance mounting to high values during attack. Once elevated, activity persisted for tens of seconds after the intruder was removed, decaying slowly along the attractor. When a new intruder was introduced, neural activity was transiently displaced from the attractor but rapidly returned to its previous position along the trough.

These perturbation-and-recovery events—intruder removal producing slow decay, new intruder introduction producing transient displacement followed by rapid return—are directly observable in Nair et al.'s Figure 3C–3D and Supplementary Videos 1 and 2. They provide an empirical window into the system's post-perturbation dynamics and are the natural data from which to estimate any candidate measure of corrective permeability.

Individual mice varied substantially in the time constant of their integration dimension. This variation was strongly correlated with the fraction of time each mouse spent attacking ($r^2 = 0.77$, n = 14 animals). Mice with longer time constants were more aggressive. It should be noted that alternative explanations for this correlation exist: testosterone and other androgens influence both VMHvl activity and aggressiveness, and individual differences in circuit excitability could produce both a longer time constant and more aggressive behavior. The time constant–aggression link is robust but not uniquely explained by attractor depth.

---

# 3. Structural Parallels with the Attractor Framework

**3.1 The Line Attractor as a Basin.** The line attractor is a stable region of neural state space toward which population activity converges and along which it progresses slowly. This is structurally analogous to the framework's concept of a basin—a configuration toward which the system gravitates and from which it resists displacement.

**3.2 Integration Time Constant and Corrective Permeability (κ).** The framework defines κ as a proposed measure of the rate at which a system dissipates perturbation and returns to its basin. As currently formulated, κ is qualitative and lacks a formal derivation from the framework's axioms. Dimensional analysis suggests a candidate mapping: corrective permeability has dimensions of inverse time ($s^{-1}$), while the integration time constant τ has dimensions of time (s). A natural structural analogue is $\kappa \sim 1/\tau$. Under this mapping, longer time constants (slower decay) correspond to lower κ (deeper persistence), and shorter time constants correspond to higher κ (faster recovery).

This dimensional argument is necessary but not sufficient. What recommends the specific mapping $\kappa \sim 1/\tau$ over other inverse-time quantities in the system (such as firing rates or synaptic decay constants) is its functional role: κ should specifically track the post-perturbation recovery rate. Nair et al.'s data contain perturbation-and-recovery events—intruder removal and reintroduction—where the time course of return to the attractor can be observed. The integration time constant τ directly governs the rate of this return. It is therefore the natural candidate for a functional, not merely dimensional, analogue. This mapping is a hypothesis, not a derivation. It is offered as a bridge for future formal work.

The observed correlation between the time constant and individual differences in aggressiveness is *consistent with* the framework's prediction that variation in κ may be associated with variation in persistent behavioral traits. It does not independently confirm that prediction.

**3.3 Graded Position Along the Attractor as Intensity Encoding.** The framework describes attractors as graded landscapes: a system can occupy different positions within a basin, each corresponding to a different state intensity. The VMHvl line attractor demonstrates this property: sniffing, dominance mounting, and attack occur at progressively higher values along the integration dimension.

**3.4 Persistence and Resistance to Perturbation.** When the intruder is removed, activity decays slowly rather than collapsing immediately. When a new intruder is introduced, activity is transiently displaced but returns to its prior position along the trough. This is a structural analogue of persistence under perturbation.

**3.5 Leaky Integration Is Not Thermodynamic Dissipation.** Nair et al. describe the VMHvl attractor as "leaky"—activity decays over tens of seconds rather than persisting indefinitely. The attractor framework uses “dissipative” in a thermodynamic sense: a dissipative system exports entropy to its environment and is maintained by continuous energy flow. These are distinct concepts. A conservative (non-dissipative) system could, in principle, exhibit finite decay times under certain conditions. The framework’s “dissipative attractor” and the neurobiological “leaky integrator” share a structural property—finite persistence—but they are not identical in their underlying mechanisms. This distinction should be kept in view to avoid terminological conflation.

---

## 4. Rotational Dynamics as a Contrasting Geometry

Nair et al. also analyzed MPOA, a different hypothalamic nucleus controlling mating. They found no line attractor. Instead, MPOA exhibited rotational dynamics—fast, sequential activity time-locked to specific behavioral actions. This contrast demonstrates that not all neural circuits exhibit line attractor geometry.

The framework can accommodate this contrast as an instance of a broader principle: circuits encoding *scalable, persistent states* (such as the intensity of aggressive motivation) are predicted to exhibit line or point attractor geometries, while circuits encoding *sequential action programs* (such as the progression from sniffing to mounting to intromission) are predicted to exhibit rotational or heteroclinic dynamics. The VMHvl/MPOA contrast is consistent with this generalization. However, the generalization itself is post-hoc in this case, and the framework does not yet make a non-obvious, advance prediction about which geometry should appear in which specific nucleus. The contrast is therefore a productive organizing principle for future neural circuit taxonomy, not a confirmed prediction.

## 5. Limitations

This mapping is post-hoc. The parallels identified here are structural analogies, not independent evidence for the framework. The shared dynamical-systems vocabulary renders some degree of parallel expected rather than surprising.

The framework's κ remains qualitatively defined. A formal derivation from the framework's axioms—specifying the state variables, the basin geometry, and the perturbation response function—is required before the $\kappa \sim 1/\tau$ mapping can be evaluated as more than a dimensional and functional suggestion. Within the framework, κ is proposed as an attractor-level property: it characterizes the stability of the system's basin, not the strength of individual perturbations or the activity of specific components. It is derived from the persistence of a configuration under perturbation, measured as the rate of return to the attractor after displacement. A full formal derivation remains a task for future work.

The attractor framework is self-published and has not undergone independent peer review. The foundational paper (Galida, 2026a) was published on [fantasyattractor.com](fantasyattractor.com) in May 2026 and is not archived with a DOI, which limits the independent verifiability of the framework's claims and the timeline of its development.

## 6. Falsifiability Conditions

The following observations would weaken or invalidate the parallels drawn here:

- **Disconfirming observation 1:** If the VMHvl integration dimension's time constant were shown to be *uncorrelated* with behavioral persistence or recovery from perturbation after controlling for circuit excitability, the κ analogy would lose its empirical anchor.
- **Disconfirming observation 2:** If line attractor dynamics in VMHvl were shown to be entirely input-driven with no intrinsic persistence, the basin analogy would fail.
- **Disconfirming observation 3:** If alternative models of aggressiveness (e.g., androgen-mediated circuit excitability without attractor dynamics) were shown to explain the data with equal or greater parsimony, the attractor interpretation would be weakened.

**Affirmative prediction:** If κ ~ 1/τ is more than a dimensional coincidence, then pharmacological or optogenetic manipulations that prolong the integration time constant should produce corresponding increases in aggressive persistence—the tendency to maintain an escalated aggressive state *after the stimulus is removed*—without necessarily lowering the threshold for aggressive *initiation*. Conversely, manipulations that shorten the time constant should produce corresponding decreases in aggressive persistence. This dissociation between persistence and initiation is specifically predicted by the framework's claim that κ governs recovery from perturbation, not the threshold for entering the state, and distinguishes the attractor interpretation from alternative models in which circuit excitability uniformly modulates both initiation and persistence. Aggressive persistence should be operationalized as the latency to cease aggressive posturing or the duration of elevated VMHvl activity following intruder removal, rather than as the overall fraction of time spent attacking, which confounds initiation and persistence. It should be noted that experimentally dissociating these phases in the VMHvl circuit may be technically challenging, as the neurons involved are active during both ramp-up and post-attack periods. A manipulation protocol capable of selectively targeting the post-stimulus interval is required; without this, a null result would be uninterpretable.

---

## 7. Conclusion

The VMHvl line attractor discovered by Nair et al. (2023) exhibits structural parallels with the attractor framework's description of a graded, persistent basin. These parallels are consistency checks, not independent corroboration, given the shared dynamical-systems vocabulary. A dimensional and functional mapping $\kappa \sim 1/\tau$ is proposed, grounded in the perturbation-recovery events observable in Nair et al.'s data. The MPOA contrast is consistent with a framework-based generalization about attractor geometry and behavioral function. The paper specifies both disconfirming and affirmative testable predictions. The framework remains a self-published, preliminary research program. This mapping is a contribution to its ongoing development.

---

## References


- Galida, R. (2026a). *Persistence Under Perturbation: The Eternal Skeleton and the Transient Dance.* Fantasy Attractor. Published May 2026.
- Mante, V., Sussillo, D., Shenoy, K. V., & Newsome, W. T. (2013). Context-dependent computation by recurrent dynamics in prefrontal cortex. *Nature*, 503, 78–84.
- Nair, A., Karigo, T., Yang, B., Ganguli, S., Schnitzer, M. J., Linderman, S. W., Anderson, D. J., & Kennedy, A. (2023). An approximate line attractor in the

hypothalamus encodes an aggressive state. *Cell*, 186(1), 178–193.e15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2022.11.027

- Seung, H. S. (1996). How the brain keeps the eyes still. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 93, 13339–13344.
- Strogatz, S. H. (2018). *Nonlinear Dynamics and Chaos* (2nd ed.). CRC Press.

---

# Structural Analogies Between Psychodynamic Attractor States and the Attractor Framework

Robert Galida
Independent Researcher
June 2026
fantasyattractor.com

---

## Abstract

The attractor framework proposes that persistence under perturbation is a fundamental marker of reality, using corrective permeability (κ) to distinguish reality-aligned from fantasy attractors. A recent clinical article by James Tobin (2026) describes psychological suffering as organized around recurring “attractor states”—stable patterns of emotional organization that resist insight, are embodied, and function as attempts at stability. This paper offers a post-hoc mapping between Tobin’s observations and the attractor framework. The parallels are structural analogies, not independent clinical corroboration. Both perspectives draw on a shared dynamical-systems vocabulary, and the mapping is offered as evidence of cross-disciplinary convergence rather than validation. The paper explicitly addresses the limitations of a self-published framework based on N=1 self-engineering, and specifies conditions under which the mapping would be disconfirmed.

---

## 1. Introduction: A Shared Vocabulary, Not Confirmation

The attractor framework (Galida, 2026a) is a naturalistic ontology developed independently through philosophical inquiry, systems theory, and N=1 self-engineering experiments. Its central diagnostic concepts are corrective permeability (κ) and the distinction between reality-aligned and fantasy attractors. The framework is self-published and has not undergone independent peer review.

In May 2026, clinical psychologist James Tobin published “The Psychology of ‘Attractor States'” on his professional website. Tobin draws on psychodynamic theory, attachment research, affective neuroscience, and dynamical systems theory to describe how emotional suffering becomes organized around recurring states that resist change. His article does not cite the attractor framework.

This paper identifies structural parallels between Tobin’s account and the framework. It does not claim that Tobin’s clinical observations independently corroborate the framework. Both Tobin and the framework explicitly draw on dynamical systems theory, and the shared vocabulary of “attractors,” “basins,” and “perturbation” reflects this common intellectual lineage. The mapping is a post-hoc exercise in identifying convergent themes across disciplines.

---

## 2. Tobin’s Psychodynamic Attractor States

Tobin’s article describes several features of emotional suffering that will be familiar to readers of dynamical systems literature:

**2.1 Attractor States as Recurring Configurations.** Tobin describes an attractor not as a single behavior or belief but as a recurring configuration toward which the emotional system gravitates—an entire organization of feeling, bodily expectation, attention, memory, and relational anticipation that emerges repeatedly under similar conditions.

**2.2 Persistence Despite Insight.** A central clinical puzzle for Tobin is that patients often understand their patterns intellectually, sometimes with considerable sophistication, yet the old emotional organization returns with force when certain emotional conditions arise. Insight alone rarely dislodges these deeply embedded patterns.

**2.3 Embodiment and Automaticity.** Tobin emphasizes that these patterns are not merely cognitive. They become woven into bodily readiness, autonomic regulation, procedural memory, emotional timing, and unconscious relational expectation—the body learns what to anticipate long before conscious reflection arrives.

**2.4 Symptoms as Emotional Solutions.** Tobin argues that many symptoms are not random pathology but tragic attempts at psychological stability. They persist, despite their cost, because they have served to preserve some continuity of self under conditions that once felt emotionally overwhelming.

**2.5 Destabilization and the Fear of Change.** When old attractors begin to loosen, patients experience a vulnerable intermediate state. They are no longer fully stabilized by the older organization, yet have not developed sufficient trust in newer ways of experiencing themselves. The temptation to retreat to the familiar attractor is strong.

**2.6 The Goal of Therapy: Expanded Flexibility.** Tobin's vision of psychological health is not the elimination of suffering but the gradual expansion of flexibility and reflective space within the personality—the capacity to move among emotional states without being trapped by any one of them.

---

## 3. Structural Parallels with the Attractor Framework

**3.1 Attractor States as Basins.** Tobin's recurring emotional configuration toward which the system gravitates is structurally identical to the framework's concept of a basin. Both describe a stable state the system returns to automatically.

**3.2 Insight Failure as Low Corrective Permeability.** The framework defines a fantasy attractor as a system with low κ that resists updating. Tobin's observation—that insight alone rarely dislodges deeply embodied patterns—maps onto this. The cognitive insight is a perturbation that fails to land because the attractor is embedded in non-cognitive systems.

A note on circularity. If κ is measured by flexibility outcomes, and flexibility is what κ is claimed to predict, the mapping is circular. An operationally independent measure of κ—for example, response latency to belief-updating tasks, physiological perturbation recovery rates, or other proxies not identical with therapeutic outcome—would be required to break this circularity. No such measure has yet been validated. The current mapping relies on functional analogy, not independent measurement.

**3.3 Symptoms as Stability Attempts: A Conceptual Distinction.** Tobin claims symptoms persist because they *function* to maintain stability (a teleofunctional claim). The framework claims persistence under perturbation is the *mark of the real* (an ontological criterion). The two claims overlap—both describe systems that resist perturbation—but they are not identical. A symptom could persist for functional reasons without that persistence carrying ontological significance. The mapping here is of practical convergence, not logical identity. Whether the framework's ontological claim can be grounded in or distinguished from teleofunctional accounts of persistence is a question for future theoretical work.

**3.4 Destabilization as Basin Transition.** The vulnerable intermediate state between old and new attractors is a phase transition between basins—a prediction the framework makes about any dissipative system under perturbation.

**3.5 Therapeutic Flexibility as High Corrective Permeability.** Tobin's vision of health—flexibility, the capacity to experience states without being organized by them—is high $\kappa$. A reality-aligned attractor absorbs perturbation and updates rather than sealing.

---

# 4. Independence, Shared Lineage, and the Limits of Convergence

Tobin and the framework draw on overlapping intellectual traditions. Tobin cites Lewis (2000) and Thelen & Smith (1994) from dynamical systems psychology; the framework draws on

Ruelle, Prigogine, and the neuroscience of reward. The shared vocabulary ("attractor," "basin") reflects this common upstream source, not independent discovery.

The convergence is therefore weaker than it would be between genuinely independent methods. Both parties applied dynamical systems concepts to their respective domains. The fact that they arrived at similar structural descriptions is interesting but expected: the vocabulary constrains the output. This paper does not overinterpret that convergence.

---

## 5. Addressing the N=1 Foundation

The attractor framework was developed partly through N=1 self-engineering experiments. This methodology introduces specific risks: motivated reasoning, experimenter-subject confound, and non-transferability. A single-subject design cannot distinguish between genuinely generalizable dynamics and idiosyncratic personal response.

Disclosure of these risks is not mitigation. The framework's claims remain untested by independent, blinded, or large-N studies. The clinical parallels described here are suggestive but cannot substitute for such testing. Readers should weigh the framework's claims accordingly.

---

## 6. Falsifiability: What Would Disconfirm This Mapping?

A framework that diagnoses sealed attractors must specify its own disconfirmation conditions. For the present mapping, the following observations would weaken or invalidate the analogies drawn:

- **Disconfirming clinical observation:** A well-controlled study showing that therapeutic flexibility (the capacity to move among emotional states) is *uncorrelated* with measures of belief-updating or perturbation recovery would break the link between Tobin's flexibility and κ. Currently, no standardized instruments exist to perform this test. The condition is stated in principle; its operationalization requires measurement development beyond the scope of this paper.
- **Disconfirming dynamical finding:** Evidence that the attractor-like patterns Tobin describes are not truly self-reinforcing but are maintained entirely by external environmental contingencies, with no internal basin structure, would undermine the "basin" analogy. Distinguishing internal basin dynamics from environmental maintenance is a hard empirical problem in dynamical systems psychology, and the tools to resolve it are not yet standardized.
- **Superior alternative framework:** If a competing model explains Tobin's clinical observations equally well *without* requiring the attractor framework's ontological commitments, parsimony favors the simpler account. Acceptance and Commitment Therapy's psychological flexibility model, for instance, predicts that cognitive fusion and experiential avoidance produce the rigidity Tobin describes—without appealing to attractor dynamics. Predictive processing accounts of emotional rigidity similarly provide alternative mechanisms. The present paper does not adjudicate between these rival frameworks; it offers the attractor framework as one candidate account among several.

These conditions are not met by the current paper, which offers only preliminary analogies.

## 7. Conclusion

James Tobin's 2026 clinical article on psychodynamic attractor states and the attractor framework exhibit expected structural parallels, given their shared dynamical-systems heritage. Both describe recurrent, embodied patterns that resist perturbation and that therapeutic or corrective processes can gradually loosen. These parallels are analogical, not evidentiary. The framework remains a self-published, N=1-grounded research program awaiting independent empirical testing. This mapping is a contribution to its ongoing development.

---

## References


- Bowlby, J. (1988). *A secure base: Parent-child attachment and healthy human development.* Basic Books.
- Galida, R. (2026a). *Persistence Under Perturbation: The Eternal Skeleton and the Transient Dance.* Fantasy Attractor.
- Lewis, M. D. (2000). Emotional self-organization at three time scales. In M. D. Lewis & I. Granic (Eds.), *Emotion, development, and self-organization* (pp. 37–69). Cambridge University Press.
- Schore, A. N. (2012). *The science of the art of psychotherapy.* W. W. Norton.
- Siegel, D. J. (2020). *The developing mind: How relationships and the brain interact to shape who we are* (3rd ed.). Guilford Press.
- Thelen, E., & Smith, L. B. (1994). *A dynamic systems approach to the development of cognition and action.* MIT Press.
- Tobin, J. (2026, May 27). The psychology of "attractor

states.” *James Tobin, Ph.D.* https://www.jamestobinphd.com/articles/the-psychology-of-attractor-states

---

# A Preliminary Mapping Between Ring Attractor Dynamics and the Attractor Framework

Robert Galida
Independent Researcher
June 2026
fantasyattractor.com

---

## Abstract

The attractor framework proposes that persistence under perturbation is the fundamental mark of reality, and that corrective permeability (κ)—the rate at which a system dissipates perturbation and returns to its basin—is a key diagnostic variable distinguishing reality-aligned from fantasy attractors. A recent computational neuroscience study by Chen et al. (2024) developed a ring attractor network with synaptic dynamics that exhibits structural parallels with these concepts. This paper offers a preliminary, post-hoc mapping between the ring attractor model and the attractor framework. The network’s synaptic recovery speed (α) is proposed as a candidate analogue for corrective permeability (κ). The network’s transition from weighted cue integration to

winner-take-all dynamics maps onto the framework's distinction between reality-aligned and sealed attractor behavior. The network's multimodal integration and bistable perception also bear structural resemblance to constraint field navigation and attractor switching, though bistable perception as attractor switching is an existing interpretation in computational neuroscience. The mapping is offered as a set of testable correspondences for future formal investigation, not as independent validation of the framework. The attractor framework remains a self-published construct awaiting independent peer review.

---

## 1. Introduction: A Post-Hoc Mapping

The attractor framework (Galida, 2026a) is a unified naturalistic ontology grounded in the principle that persistence under perturbation is the mark of reality. Its central diagnostic concepts are corrective permeability (κ), defined in Table 1, and the distinction between reality-aligned and fantasy attractors. The framework was developed independently through philosophical inquiry, systems theory, and N=1 self-engineering experiments. It is self-published and has not yet undergone independent peer review.

A recent computational neuroscience study by Chen et al. (2024) developed a ring attractor network with synaptic dynamics that exhibits behaviors structurally similar to those described by the framework. The present paper does not claim that Chen et al. independently validated the framework; they had no knowledge of it, and their model was built within an established tradition of ring attractor research (Amari, 1977; Zhang, 1996; Skaggs et al., 1995). Rather, this paper offers a post-hoc mapping between the two, identifying structural parallels and proposing testable correspondences for future investigation. The value of such a mapping lies in the potential for the framework's qualitative claims to be anchored in a mathematically specified, biologically validated model, and for the ring attractor's quantitative relationships to be extended, hypothetically, into the domains the framework addresses.

**Table 1: Key Framework Terms and Operational Definitions**

| Term | Definition |
|---|---|
| Dissipative attractor | A system that exports entropy while converging toward a stable basin |
| Basin | The minimum-energy configuration toward which the system evolves (in physical systems; the analogue in cognitive and social systems is structural, not energetic) |
| Corrective permeability (κ) | The rate at which a system dissipates perturbation and returns to its basin. Defined here as $\kappa = 1/\tau_{recovery}$, where $\tau_{recovery}$ is the time to return to baseline after a specified perturbation. This definition currently requires a specified perturbation magnitude and an independently established baseline for each domain of application. The measurement of κ in cognitive and social systems is an unresolved methodological challenge. |
| Reality-aligned attractor | A system with high κ that integrates perturbations and updates its basin |
| Fantasy attractor | A system with low κ that seals against perturbations, often via reframing or winner-take-all dynamics |

## 2. The Ring Attractor Model

Chen et al. (2024) developed a ring attractor network with asymmetrical neural connections and adaptive synaptic processing. Excitatory neurons are recurrently connected in a functional ring, connected to a uniform inhibitory neuron. The key innovation is the incorporation of synaptic dynamics: available presynaptic resources are depleted at a rate governed by β and recover at a speed governed by α.

The model's behavior is governed by recovery speed α. When α is fast (low recovery time), the network sustains a stable activity bump indefinitely, even without inputs—a self-maintaining basin. When α is slow, the bump decays. The duration of sustainable activity exhibits a negative nonlinear relationship with α (Chen et al., 2024, Fig. 3D).

The network receives exogenous external cues (modeled as Gaussian functions representing sensory inputs) and endogenous shifting signals (self-motion). Its behavior—integration, competition, tracking, switching—depends on cue conflict and certainty.

---

## 3. Structural Parallels

### 3.1 Synaptic Recovery α as a Candidate Analogue for Corrective Permeability κ

The ring attractor's persistence depends on α. Fast recovery yields a stable, persistent bump; slow recovery leads to decay. The framework's corrective permeability κ describes how quickly a system recovers from perturbation and returns to its basin. The parallel is structural: both α and κ govern the resilience of a stable state.

We propose a testable correspondence: $\kappa \sim f(\alpha)$, where the functional form f is unknown and may not be linear. A specific candidate form is $\kappa = 1/\tau_{decay}(\alpha)$, where $\tau_{decay}$ is the bump duration as a function of α. This mapping is hypothetical. It has not been formally derived, and the functional relationship between synaptic recovery and cognitive-level corrective permeability is unknown. It is offered as a bridge for future formal work, not as an established result.

### 3.2 Weighted Integration vs. Winner-Take-All → Reality-Aligned vs. Sealed Attractor

When cue conflicts are small, the ring attractor integrates them via weighted averaging. When conflicts exceed a critical threshold (≈1.4 radians for $\sigma_1$=0.8, $\sigma_2$=1), it switches to winner-take-all mode. This transition is quantified.

The framework describes a similar dynamic: high-κ systems integrate perturbations (reality-aligned); low-κ systems seal against them (fantasy attractor). The ring attractor's conflict threshold provides a candidate mathematically specified analogue for the framework's qualitative tipping point. Whether the same quantitative relationship holds in cognitive or social attractors is an open hypothesis.

### 3.3 Multimodal Integration → Constraint Field Navigation

The ring attractor integrates cues from multiple modalities, weighting by certainty and resolving conflicts dynamically. This is structurally analogous to the framework's concept of a dissipative attractor navigating a constraint field. The grouping approach for more than two cues—small conflicts integrated first, then competition among groups—suggests hierarchical constraint navigation, a dynamic the framework predicts but has not operationalized in formal terms. Of the four parallels identified in this section, this is the most loosely specified and the most in need of formal development before quantitative correspondences can be established.

### 3.4 Bistable Perception → Attractor Switching (with Prior Art)

Under ambiguous cues and slow recovery, the ring attractor exhibits spontaneous alternation between two perceptual interpretations. The framework describes this as attractor switching. However, the interpretation of bistable perception as attractor dynamics is not novel to the framework; it is a standard account in computational neuroscience (Deco & Rolls, 2006; Moreno-Bote et al., 2007). The framework's contribution is the extension of this switching concept to cognitive and social systems, an extension that remains a research hypothesis rather than an established result.

---

## 4. Hypothetical Implications (Research Hypotheses)

The structural parallels documented above suggest several testable hypotheses. These are not supported by Chen et al. (2024) and require independent investigation. They are listed in descending order of current testability.

1. **The conflict threshold hypothesis.** The framework's transition from belief integration to belief sealing may exhibit a quantifiable conflict threshold, analogous to the ring attractor's 1.4 radian transition point. This could be tested in belief-updating paradigms where the degree of conflict between existing beliefs and new evidence is systematically varied, and the point of transition from integration to rejection is measured. Of the three hypotheses presented here, this is the most amenable to current experimental methods.
2. **The κ-α correspondence hypothesis.** If κ and α share a functional relationship, then interventions that modulate synaptic recovery (neuromodulators, pharmacological agents) should analogously modulate corrective permeability in cognitive systems. This

hypothesis requires operationalizing κ in cognitive domains, a measurement challenge acknowledged in Table 1.

3. **The hierarchical navigation hypothesis.** Complex belief systems facing multiple simultaneous perturbations may exhibit hierarchical resolution strategies similar to the ring attractor's grouping approach for multiple cues. This hypothesis is the most speculative of the three and requires further specification of the domain of application (e.g., small-group decision-making, multi-source evidence integration in individual cognition) before it can be tested.

These hypotheses are speculative. They are offered as potential bridges between the framework and empirical research programs, not as established implications.

---

## 5. Limitations

This mapping is post-hoc. The ring attractor model was not designed to test the attractor framework, and the correspondences identified here were constructed after the fact. The framework itself remains a self-published construct that has not undergone independent peer review. The operational definitions of κ, while stated here, have not been validated against empirical data in cognitive or social domains. The measurement of κ in these domains requires specifying perturbation magnitudes and establishing independent baselines, challenges that are currently unresolved. The value of this paper lies not in demonstrating validation, but in proposing concrete, testable correspondences that could, if investigated, either strengthen or falsify the framework's claims.

## 6. Conclusion

The ring attractor model of Chen et al. (2024) provides a mathematically specified, biologically validated system that bears structural parallels with the attractor framework. Synaptic recovery speed α is proposed as a candidate analogue for corrective permeability κ. The transition from integration to winner-take-all maps onto the framework's reality-aligned/fantasy distinction. Multimodal integration and bistable perception correspond, respectively, to constraint field navigation and attractor switching, with the latter being a standard interpretation in existing neuroscience.

These correspondences are not independent validation. They are post-hoc structural analogies. Their value lies in the testable hypotheses they generate, not in the confirmation they appear to provide. The framework remains a research program in its early stages, and this mapping is a contribution to its ongoing development.

## References


- Amari, S. (1977). Dynamics of pattern formation in lateral-inhibition type neural fields. *Biological Cybernetics*, 27(2), 77-87.
- Chen, Y., Zhang, L., Chen, H., Sun, X., & Peng, J. (2024). Synaptic ring attractor: A unified framework for attractor dynamics and multiple cues integration. *Heliyon*, 10, e35458.
- Deco, G., & Rolls, E. T. (2006). Decision-making and Weber's law: a neurophysiological model. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, 24(3), 901-916.

- Galida, R. (2026a). *Persistence Under Perturbation: The Eternal Skeleton and the Transient Dance.* Fantasy Attractor.
- Moreno-Bote, R., Rinzel, J., & Rubin, N. (2007). Noise-induced alternations in an attractor network model of perceptual bistability. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 98(3), 1125-1139.
- Skaggs, W. E., Knierim, J. J., Kudrimoti, H. S., & McNaughton, B. L. (1995). A model of the neural basis of the rat's sense of direction. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 7, 173-180.
- Zhang, K. (1996). Representation of spatial orientation by the intrinsic dynamics of the head-direction cell ensemble: a theory. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 16(6), 2112-2126.

*"The framework's consistency with established nonlinear dynamics has been explored elsewhere. For a tracing of its structural correspondences with the foundational work of Ruelle, Takens, and Prigogine, see Galida (2026b)."*https://people.math.harvard.edu/~knill/teaching/mathe320_2014/blog/RuelleIntelligencer.pdf

"see also" https://jamestobinphd.com/the-psychology-of-attractor-states/

---

# From Strange Attractors to the Attractor Framework:

# Structural Correspondences and Conceptual Extensions

Robert Galida
Independent Researcher
June 2026
fantasyattractor.com

---

## Abstract

The attractor framework is a unified naturalistic ontology grounded in the principle that persistence under perturbation is the fundamental mark of reality. This paper traces structural correspondences between the framework and two major scientific achievements of the late twentieth century: the mathematical theory of strange attractors developed by David Ruelle and Floris Takens, and the thermodynamics of dissipative structures developed by Ilya Prigogine. The framework developed its vocabulary and concepts independently over several decades; the correspondences documented here are offered as post-hoc validation, not as evidence of genealogical descent. We show that the framework's core concepts—dissipative attractor, basin, corrective permeability (κ), and invariant reference—are consistent with established nonlinear dynamics and nonequilibrium thermodynamics. The fantasy attractor—a belief system with low corrective permeability—is identified as a psychological analogue of the strange attractor, governed by structurally analogous but mechanistically distinct dynamics. The paper clarifies which framework claims are grounded in established physics and which are heuristic extensions requiring independent validation. The framework is offered as a research program, not a completed theory.

## 1. Introduction: Independent Development, Post-Hoc Validation

The attractor framework (Galida, 2026a) is a naturalistic ontology organized around a single diagnostic principle: **persistence under perturbation is the mark of the real.** It divides all persistent structures into conservative persistence structures (the eternal, mindless, invariant skeleton) and dissipative attractors (temporary, entropy-exporting systems that converge toward stable basins). It introduces corrective permeability (κ) as a functional measure of a system's capacity to absorb perturbation and return to its basin. It applies this vocabulary across physics, biology, cognitive science, and social dynamics.

The framework's concepts were developed independently over several decades, through a combination of philosophical inquiry, systems theory, and N=1 self-engineering experiments. They did not derive from the traditions described below in a genealogical sense. However, the structural parallels with established nonlinear dynamics and nonequilibrium thermodynamics are substantial. Documenting these parallels serves three purposes: it demonstrates the framework's consistency with well-validated physical theory; it identifies where the framework extends beyond its precursors; and it clarifies which claims are grounded in established science and which are heuristic extensions requiring independent validation.

Two bodies of twentieth-century science provide particularly strong structural correspondences: David Ruelle and Floris Takens's theory of strange attractors, and Ilya Prigogine's thermodynamics of dissipative structures. This paper maps those correspondences and identifies the points where the framework diverges from or extends beyond its precursors.

## 2. Ruelle's Strange Attractor: Structural Correspondences

David Ruelle and Floris Takens proposed in 1971 that turbulent fluid motion is governed by a new kind of mathematical object: the strange attractor. Ruelle's 1980 paper "Strange Attractors" defined it with precision and became the canonical introduction for a generation of scientists. Five features of Ruelle's definition correspond to core concepts of the attractor framework. These correspondences are structural, not genealogical, and are offered as a demonstration of consistency with established physics.

### 2.1 Attracting Set → Basin

Ruelle defined a strange attractor as a bounded set A contained in an open neighborhood U such that every trajectory starting in U eventually converges to A and remains arbitrarily close to it. In the attractor framework, this is the **basin**: the region of state space toward which trajectories converge and from which they resist displacement. Ruelle's quadrilateral ABCD for the Hénon attractor—within which all subsequent iterates remain—is precisely a basin in the framework's sense. The correspondence is straightforward and exact.

### 2.2 Sensitive Dependence → Corrective Permeability

Ruelle characterized sensitive dependence on initial conditions by the exponential growth of small errors: $d(X_t, X'_t) \sim d(X_0, X'_0) \cdot a^t$, with $a > 1$ and characteristic exponent $\lambda = \ln a$ (for a standard textbook treatment of Lyapunov exponents and nonlinear dynamics, see Strogatz, 2018). Two initially nearby trajectories diverge rapidly, making long-term prediction impossible.

The attractor framework reframes perturbation response through **corrective permeability** (κ), defined functionally as the capacity of a system to dissipate perturbation energy and return to its basin. The term “permeability” is used in a non-standard, functional sense; it is not intended to carry the dimensional meaning it holds in physics (e.g., Darcy’s law, where permeability has units of area). It was chosen to emphasize the *openness* of an attractor to corrective perturbation—a qualitative property—while recognizing that its quantitative expression is a rate (inverse time). The distinction between the qualitative concept and its quantitative operationalization should be kept in view throughout.

κ and λ capture different aspects of dynamical resilience. λ measures the rate of *divergence* of neighboring trajectories; κ measures the rate of *convergence* of a perturbed system back to equilibrium. A system can have high λ (chaotic sensitivity) and simultaneously high κ (rapid damping). This distinction between divergence rate and recovery rate extends the analytical vocabulary in a direction Ruelle did not pursue, and represents one of the framework’s conceptual contributions.

### 2.3 Dissipative Condition → Dissipative Attractor

Ruelle emphasized that strange attractors occur only in dissipative systems—those in which ordered energy is converted to heat and exported as entropy (what Ruelle called “noble forms of energy”). Conservative systems preserve phase-space volumes and do not produce attractors. The universe as a whole is conservative; strange attractors exist only in subsystems.

This maps directly onto the attractor framework’s distinction between the **eternal conservative skeleton** and the **transient dissipative dance**. The six metronomes—electron, proton, three neutrino mass states, and CVU lattice—are conservative persistence structures. They do not decay, export no entropy, and are not attractors. Living bodies, minds, societies, and climate systems are dissipative attractors, continuously exporting entropy and navigating constraint fields. Ruelle’s dissipative condition is the physical foundation of this central ontological partition.

### 2.4 Discrete and Continuous Dynamics → The Two Metronomes

Ruelle presented both discrete-time maps (Hénon) and continuous-time flows (Lorenz, 1963). In both cases, strange attractors emerge. The attractor framework identifies invariant references—**metronomes**—that anchor dissipative dynamics. Positional metronomes (the center of mass of a gas cloud, the fixed point of a difference equation) and frequency metronomes (orbital periods, the characteristic exponent λ) provide the invariant skeleton against which the transient dance is measured. Ruelle’s maps and flows contain these invariants implicitly; the framework makes them explicit.

### 2.5 Indecomposability → Unified Attractor (Partial Correspondence)

Ruelle required that a strange attractor not be decomposable into two separate attractors. This is a strong mathematical condition. The attractor framework inherits the spirit of this—dissipative attractors are treated as unified, coherent basins—but the correspondence is only partial. The framework’s conscious body thesis (Galida, 2026g) explicitly recognizes *multiple* candidate attractors within a single organism (the enteric nervous system, the cardiac nervous system). These are coupled but semi-autonomous basins, in tension with Ruelle’s indecomposability condition. The framework thus extends the attractor concept in a direction Ruelle’s original definition did not anticipate. This divergence is noted as a feature of the framework, not a failure of correspondence.

## 3. Prigogine’s Dissipative Structures: The Thermodynamic Parallel

While Ruelle provided the mathematical prototype of the strange attractor, Ilya Prigogine provided the thermodynamic foundation for the broader class of dissipative systems. Prigogine’s Nobel-winning work (Prigogine, 1980, 1984) demonstrated that systems maintained far from thermodynamic equilibrium spontaneously self-organize into coherent, ordered structures—dissipative structures—that persist only as long as they are sustained by energy and matter flows.

The structural parallels between Prigogine’s dissipative structures and the attractor framework’s dissipative attractor are substantial. Both describe systems maintained far from equilibrium by continuous energy throughput. Both recognize that dissipation is not merely a degradation of order but a condition for the emergence of order. Both extend beyond physics into chemical, biological, and ecological systems. The Belousov-Zhabotinsky reaction, biochemical oscillations, and ecosystem dynamics are Prigoginean dissipative structures; they are also dissipative attractors in the framework’s vocabulary. Kauffman’s (1993) work on self-organization and selection in evolution provides an independent biological parallel, reinforcing the consistency of the attractor framework with established complexity theory.

The framework’s applications to living bodies, minds, and societies are consistent with the Prigoginean tradition. This consistency was recognized retrospectively; the framework’s concepts were not derived from Prigogine. The parallels are offered as evidence that the framework’s biological and social extensions are grounded in established thermodynamic principles, not as evidence of intellectual descent.

The framework thus finds post-hoc validation in two complementary scientific traditions: the mathematical theory of strange attractors (Ruelle, Takens, Lorenz) for the concepts of basin, sensitive dependence, and chaotic dynamics; and the thermodynamics of dissipative structures (Prigogine) for the concept of entropy-exporting, self-organizing systems far from equilibrium. Neither tradition alone is sufficient; together they provide the physical foundations with which the framework is consistent.

---

# 4. The Attractor Framework: Extensions Beyond the Physical Prototypes

The attractor framework extends the concepts of basin, dissipation, and perturbation response beyond physical and biological systems into cognitive and social domains. These extensions are heuristic hypotheses, not established results. They are offered as candidate applications requiring independent validation.

#### 4.1 From Strange to Dissipative: A Broadened Scope

Ruelle's strange attractor and Prigogine's dissipative structure are both special cases of the framework's broader category: the **dissipative attractor**—any system that exports entropy while converging toward a stable basin. The framework does not require the attractor to be "strange" (to exhibit sensitive dependence). Fixed-point attractors, periodic attractors, and quasiperiodic attractors are all dissipative attractors under this definition. The framework's scope is deliberately broad, encompassing any persistent, entropy-exporting system regardless of its internal dynamical complexity.

#### 4.2 The Fantasy Attractor: A Structural Analogy

The framework's most significant extension beyond Ruelle and Prigogine is the concept of the **fantasy attractor**: a belief system with low corrective permeability that resists updating under contradictory evidence (Galida, 2026c, 2026d, 2026e). The dopamine covenant—the neurochemical reinforcement of certainty through mesolimbic reward—provides a psychological mechanism that is structurally analogous to, but not identical with, physical dissipation.

The analogy is as follows. A physical dissipative attractor exports entropy via radiation or heat, returning to its basin after perturbation. In the physical case, "basin depth" is formally defined through the geometry of the attractor in phase space, measurable in principle from the equations of motion. A cognitive attractor neutralizes perturbation via reframing, also preserving its basin—but here "basin depth" is a functional analogy, not a formal measure. Both systems respond to destabilizing perturbations by restoring their pre-perturbation state. The analogy holds at the functional level.

However, the mechanisms differ in important respects. Physical dissipation involves the export of thermodynamic entropy from a subsystem to its environment. Dopamine reinforcement is a *feedback amplification* mechanism—it strengthens the neural pathways associated with the belief, making them more salient and resistant to competition. It does not export entropy in the thermodynamic sense. The structural analogy—a system responding to perturbation by restoring its basin—holds at the functional level, but the physical substrates and mechanisms are distinct. The framework does not claim identity; it claims functional parallelism.

The assignment of $\kappa \approx 0$ to fantasy attractors is qualitative and provisional. Unlike Ruelle's $\lambda$, which is computable from the equations of motion, $\kappa$ for belief systems currently lacks an operationalized measurement procedure. The framework's applications to political and religious belief systems (Galida, 2026d, 2026e) are heuristic extensions, offered as diagnostic hypotheses. Independent validation through operationalized κ remains a task for future empirical work.

### 4.3 Candidate Applications Across Domains

The framework's cross-domain applications are candidate hypotheses, not established results. Each requires independent validation. The following are offered as illustrations of the framework's heuristic reach, with the caveat that formal operationalization is pending.

- **Climate dynamics** (Galida, 2026b): The Earth's climate is a dissipative attractor with multiple basins, tipping points, and corrective feedbacks. The claim that linear warming models constitute a fantasy attractor is a diagnosis of the modeling community's resistance to nonlinear dynamics, not a claim about the physical climate system itself. The two must be distinguished: the climate is a physical attractor; the *belief* that it behaves linearly is a cognitive one.
- **Political ideology** (Galida, 2026d): The κ ≈ 0 assignment for the MAGA movement is a qualitative diagnostic based on observable indicators (electoral loss response, legal defeat response, internal dissent tolerance). It is not a measurement in Ruelle's sense. The assignment is offered as a hypothesis to be tested against alternative interpretations.
- **Apocalyptic convergence** (Galida, 2026e): The claim that three Abrahamic basins have phase-locked into a meta-attractor uses "phase-locked" in an extended, qualitative sense. The formal demonstration of phase-locking requires identifying coupling constants and frequency ratios, which have not been established. The claim is offered as a structural diagnosis, not a dynamical proof.
- **Organ-level consciousness** (Galida, 2026g): The identification of candidate organ-level minds as

dissipative attractors applies the framework's criteria directly to biological subsystems. The C. elegans threshold provides a benchmark; the independent operationalization of κ for these subsystems awaits experimental protocols.

---

## 5. The Metronome: An Innovation Without Direct Precedent

One concept in the attractor framework has no direct analogue in either Ruelle or Prigogine: the **metronome**—the invariant reference around which dissipative dynamics organize. In the gas cloud paper (Galida, 2026f), the center of mass and the orbital period were identified as positional and frequency metronomes, respectively. These invariants are not attractors; they are the fixed skeleton against which the transient dance is measured.

The six metronomes of the eternal skeleton—the electron, the proton, the three neutrino mass states, and the CVU lattice—are the ultimate invariants, defining time through their fixed, unchanging frequencies. Ruelle's maps and flows contain invariants (fixed points, conserved quantities, characteristic exponents), but he did not distinguish them as a separate ontological category. Prigogine's dissipative structures also operate against a background of invariant constraints. The attractor framework's explicit separation of the invariant skeleton from the dissipative dance is a genuine conceptual contribution, not present in either precursor tradition.

---

## 6. Conclusion: A Coherent Vocabulary, Conditionally Applied

The attractor framework is structurally consistent with the mathematical physics of strange attractors and the thermodynamics of dissipative structures. Its core concepts—dissipative attractor, basin, corrective permeability, and invariant reference—map cleanly onto established physical constructs. Its extensions into cognitive and social domains are heuristic hypotheses, not established results.

The framework developed its vocabulary independently. The correspondences documented here are offered as post-hoc validation: the framework speaks the language of established nonlinear dynamics and nonequilibrium thermodynamics, and where it departs from these precursors it does so explicitly, with acknowledgment of the remaining gaps between analogy and operationalization. Future work must close those gaps through quantitative measurement of κ, formal modeling of coupling dynamics, and empirical testing of the framework's diagnostic claims.

The framework is offered as a research program, not a completed theory.

---

## References


- Galida, R. (2026a). *Persistence Under Perturbation: The Eternal Skeleton and the Transient Dance.* Fantasy Attractor.
- Galida, R. (2026b). The Climate Attractor: Nonlinear Dynamics, Tipping Points, and Corrective Permeability in the Earth System. Fantasy Attractor.
- Galida, R. (2026c). The Dopamine Covenant: Neurochemical

Reinforcement and the Persistence of Fantasy Attractors in Religion and Politics. Fantasy Attractor.

- Galida, R. (2026d). The MAGA Attractor: Fantasy, Colonization, and the Terminal Phase of a Sealed Basin. Fantasy Attractor.
- Galida, R. (2026e). The Apocalyptic Meta-Attractor: Amplification of Secular Conflict Through Positive Feedback Coupling Among Three Abrahamic Fantasy Basins. Fantasy Attractor.
- Galida, R. (2026f). The Gas Cloud as a Dissipative Attractor: A Demonstration of the Attractor Framework in Standard Astrophysics. Fantasy Attractor.
- Galida, R. (2026g). The Conscious Body: Organs as Attractor-Based Minds. Fantasy Attractor.
- Kauffman, S. A. (1993). *The Origins of Order: Self-Organization and Selection in Evolution.* Oxford University Press.
- Lorenz, E. N. (1963). Deterministic nonperiodic flow. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 20(2), 130–141.
- Prigogine, I. (1980). *From Being to Becoming: Time and Complexity in the Physical Sciences.* W.H. Freeman.
- Prigogine, I., & Stengers, I. (1984). *Order Out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue with Nature.* Bantam.
- Ruelle, D. (1980). Strange attractors. *The Mathematical Intelligencer*, 2, 126–137.
- Ruelle, D., & Takens, F. (1971). On the nature of turbulence. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 20, 167–192.
- Strogatz, S. H. (2018). *Nonlinear Dynamics and Chaos* (2nd ed.). CRC Press.

*"For independent neuroscientific corroboration of the attractor dynamics described here, see A Preliminary Mapping Between Ring Attractor Dynamics and the Attractor Framework."* https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/

S2405844024114892

“see also” https://jamestobinphd.com/the-psychology-of-attractor-states/

---

# The Gas Cloud as a Dissipative Attractor: A Demonstration of the Attractor Framework in Standard Astrophysics

Robert Galida
Independent Researcher
June 2026
fantasyattractor.com

---

## Abstract

The evolution of an isolated interstellar gas cloud from turbulence to gravitational equilibrium is a classic problem in astrophysics. Standard models describe this process through hydrodynamics, thermodynamics, and Newtonian gravity. This paper presents the same evolution through the lens of the attractor framework, demonstrating that the framework’s vocabulary—dissipative attractor, basin, invariant reference, and corrective permeability—maps cleanly onto the standard physics without modification or additional assumptions. The

paper makes no new physical predictions; it demonstrates conceptual unification. Each attractor term is explicitly defined in terms of its standard astrophysical equivalent. A worked example translates the virial theorem into attractor language, quantifying basin depth and corrective permeability for a canonical molecular cloud. A brief cross-domain parallel to biological wound healing illustrates the framework's applicability beyond astrophysics. The paper concludes that the attractor framework is fully consistent with standard astrophysics and provides a unified vocabulary for persistence, resilience, and convergence across physical and biological systems, with broader applicability noted.

---

## 1. Introduction: The Cloud as a Dissipative System

Consider an isolated cloud of interstellar gas and dust, far from any external gravitational disturbance. Its mass is sufficient that self-gravity will eventually overcome thermal pressure, initiating collapse. At early times, the cloud is turbulent. Thermal motions, magnetic fields, and inhomogeneous density distributions produce a chaotic, dynamic state. Over time, the cloud radiates energy, cools, contracts, and ultimately settles into a stable configuration: a sphere, if rotation is negligible, or a rotationally-flattened disk.

Standard astrophysics describes this process with precision. The equations of hydrodynamics, the virial theorem, the Jeans criterion, and the radiative cooling functions all contribute to a well-tested model of star formation. Nothing in this paper challenges or revises that model.

The attractor framework (Galida, 2026a) offers a complementary perspective. It is not an alternative to standard physics, but a unifying conceptual vocabulary that identifies the dynamical principles at work: persistence under perturbation, dissipative basins, invariant references, and corrective permeability. This paper applies that vocabulary to the evolution of an isolated gas cloud, demonstrating that the framework maps directly onto the standard model without contradiction.

---

## 2. Definitions: Attractor Vocabulary and Standard Equivalents

To make the translation precise, each framework term is defined below alongside its standard astrophysical counterpart. These definitions are used consistently throughout the paper.

| Attractor Term | Definition | Standard Physics Equivalent |
|---|---|---|
| **Dissipative attractor** | A system that exports entropy while converging toward a stable, minimum-energy state | Radiative cooling + gravitational contraction |
| **Basin** | The minimum-energy configuration toward which the system evolves and from which it resists displacement | Sphere (non-rotating) or rotationally-supported disk |
| **Basin depth** | The energy required to permanently disrupt the system from its basin | Gravitational binding energy, $|U|$ |

| Attractor Term | Definition | Standard Physics Equivalent |
|---|---|---|
| **Invariant reference (metronome)** | A quantity or point that remains fixed throughout the system's evolution, providing an anchor for transient dynamics | Center of mass (positional reference); orbital periods (frequency reference, emerging during contraction) |
| **Corrective permeability (κ)** | The rate at which the system dissipates perturbation energy and returns to its basin, quantified by $\kappa=1/\tau_{\text{cool}}$ | Damping rate, quantified by the radiative cooling function $\Lambda(T)$ |
| **Rail** | A conservation law that constrains the accessible basins, preventing the system from reaching the global energy minimum | Conservation of angular momentum |

---

## 3. The Convulsive Phase: Turbulence and Disordered Motion

In its initial state, the cloud is far from equilibrium. Supersonic turbulence, driven by gravitational infall and internal shocks, produces a complex velocity field. Density distributions are filamentary and clumpy. There is no coherent rotation axis, no global structural alignment, and no stable configuration.

In attractor terms, this is the **perturbation-rich early phase**. The cloud is a dissipative system that has not yet found its basin. Its trajectory through state space is erratic. Local transient attractors—temporary vortices, shock fronts, density enhancements—form and dissolve without stabilizing. The system has not yet converged upon a single, deep attractor.

---

## 4. The Invariant Reference: Center of Mass as Metronome

Amid the turbulence, one quantity remains strictly invariant: the cloud’s center of mass (CM). For an isolated system, conservation of momentum guarantees that the CM moves with constant velocity. In the CM frame, this point is fixed. No internal force—gravitational, pressure, or magnetic—can displace it.

The attractor framework identifies such invariants as **positional metronomes**—fixed reference points that anchor the transient dance of dissipative dynamics. The CM is the gravitational barycenter around which all subsequent evolution organizes. It does not oscillate, does not evolve, and does not respond to perturbations. It is the still point at the center of the storm.

As the cloud contracts and its mass distribution becomes centrally concentrated, **orbital periods** at characteristic radii emerge as frequency metronomes. For a test particle at radius $r$, the Keplerian orbital period is: $P = 2\pi\sqrt{\frac{r^3}{GM(r)}}$

where $M(r)$ is the mass enclosed within radius $r$. These periods define the natural clock of the contracting system—the invariant rhythms against which all dissipative timescales can be measured. The center of mass anchors position; the orbital periods anchor time. Together they constitute the invariant skeleton of the attractor.

## 5. The Dissipative Mechanism: Radiation and Entropy Export

A dissipative attractor requires a mechanism for exporting entropy. The gas cloud exports entropy through **radiation**. As the cloud contracts, gravitational potential energy is converted into kinetic energy, which is then thermalized through collisions. Atoms and molecules are excited; they emit photons that escape the cloud, carrying away energy and entropy.

This radiative cooling is the cloud's **dissipation channel**. Without it, the cloud would remain in a hot, pressure-supported equilibrium and would not collapse. With it, the cloud can progress toward deeper gravitational binding.

In attractor terms, the cloud is seeking its minimum-energy basin. Radiation is the mechanism by which it sheds the energy that keeps it from reaching that basin. Each emitted photon is a small perturbation exported to the environment, allowing the remaining system to settle deeper into its attractor.

---

## 6. The Attractor Basin: Sphere, Disk, and the Rail of Angular Momentum

As the cloud cools and contracts, it approaches its lowest-energy configuration under self-gravity. For a non-rotating, non-magnetic cloud, this is the **sphere**—the shape that minimizes gravitational potential energy for a given mass. Every particle settles as close to the center of mass as the exclusion of other particles permits. The sphere is the **unconstrained basin**: the global energy minimum of the system.

If the cloud possesses net angular momentum, the sphere is inaccessible. Conservation of angular momentum acts as a **rail**—a constraint that channels the system toward a different basin. The cloud must flatten along its rotation axis, forming a **disk**. The disk is the minimum-energy configuration accessible under the rail of fixed angular momentum. Gravity seeks the sphere; the rail redirects the trajectory toward the disk.

The approach to the basin occurs over the radiative cooling timescale, typically $10^4$ to $10^5$ years for dense molecular cloud cores. This is the cloud's convergence time—the duration of its transient dance before settling into its persistent configuration.

---

## 7. Corrective Permeability and the Virial Theorem

The virial theorem provides the quantitative bridge between standard astrophysics and the attractor framework. For a system in equilibrium: $2K+U=0$

where $K$ is the total kinetic energy and $U$ is the gravitational potential energy. In attractor terms:

- **Basin depth** = $|U|$, the gravitational binding energy.
- **Perturbation** = any injection of kinetic energy $\Delta K$ that raises $K$ above the equilibrium value $|U|/2$.
- **Corrective permeability** = $\kappa=1/\tau_{cool}$, the rate at which radiative cooling dissipates $\Delta K$ and restores virial equilibrium.

**Worked Example.** Consider a canonical dense molecular cloud core (Shu et al., 1987; McKee & Ostriker, 2007):

| Parameter | Symbol | Value | Units |
|---|---|---|---|
| Mass | $M$ | $10^4 M_\odot$ | $\approx 2\times10^{34}$ kg |
| Radius | $R$ | 1 pc | $\approx 3.09\times10^{16}$ m |
| Temperature | $T$ | 10 K | |
| Mean number density | $n$ | $\sim 10^3$ | $cm^{-3}$ |

**Step 1: Basin depth.** The gravitational potential energy (to order of magnitude; the exact coefficient for a uniform-density sphere is $3/5$) is:

$$|U| \sim \frac{GM^2}{R} \approx \frac{(6.67\times10^{-11})\times(2\times10^{34})^2}{3.09\times10^{16}} \approx \frac{(6.67\times10^{-11})\times(4\times10^{68})}{3.09\times10^{16}} \approx 8.6\times10^{41} \text{ J}$$

At virial equilibrium, $K = |U|/2 \approx 4.3\times10^{41}$ J.

**Step 2: Perturbation.** Suppose a supernova explodes at a distance $d \approx 10$ pc from the cloud. A typical supernova releases $E_{SN} \sim 10^{44}$ J. The fraction intercepted by the cloud is the ratio of the cloud's cross-sectional area to the surface area of the sphere at distance $d$:

$$f \sim \frac{\pi R^2}{4\pi d^2} \sim \frac{(3.09\times10^{16})^2}{4\times(3.09\times10^{17})^2} \sim 2.5\times10^{-3}$$

Not all intercepted energy couples efficiently; a coupling efficiency of $\epsilon \sim 0.01$–$0.1$ is typical for shock-cloud interactions (McKee & Ostriker, 2007). Choosing the upper end, $\epsilon \sim 0.1$:

$$\Delta K = E_{SN} \times f \times \epsilon \sim 10^{44} \times (2.5\times10^{-3}) \times 0.1 \approx 2.5\times10^{40} \text{ J}$$

This perturbation is modest—approximately 6% of the equilibrium kinetic energy. The cloud is disturbed but not disrupted. Radiative cooling will restore virial equilibrium on a characteristic timescale.

**Step 3: Cloud volume.** Converting the radius to centimeters: $R = 1\ \text{pc} = 3.09\times10^{18}\ \text{cm}$

The volume is: $V = \frac{4}{3}\pi R^3 \approx \frac{4}{3}\pi (3.09\times10^{18})^3 \approx 1.24\times10^{56}\ \text{cm}^3$

**Step 4: Corrective permeability.** At $T \sim 10$ K and $n \sim 10^3$ cm⁻³, the dominant coolant is CO rotational line emission, with a cooling function $\Lambda(T) \sim 10^{-23}$ erg cm⁻³ s⁻¹ (Goldsmith & Langer, 1978; Neufeld, Lepp & Melnick, 1995). Convert $\Delta K$ to erg: $\Delta K = 2.5\times10^{40}\ \text{J} = 2.5\times10^{47}\ \text{erg}$

The cooling timescale is: $\tau_{cool} \sim \frac{\Delta K}{V\Lambda} \approx \frac{2.5\times10^{47}}{(1.24\times10^{56})\times(10^{-23})} \approx \frac{2.5\times10^{47}}{1.24\times10^{33}} \approx 2.02\times10^{14}\ \text{s} \sim 6.4\times10^{6}\ \text{years}$

The corrective permeability is: $\kappa = \frac{1}{\tau_{cool}} \approx 4.95\times10^{-15}\ \text{s}^{-1}$

**Step 5: Interpretation.** The perturbation is damped within a few million years. The basin depth ($|U| \sim 8.6\times10^{41}$ J) far exceeds the perturbation energy, ensuring the cloud's structural integrity. Corrective permeability, quantified by $\kappa$, is the mechanism by which the cloud restores coherence—absorbing the modest perturbation through radiative cooling and returning to virial equilibrium on a timescale short compared to the cloud's overall lifetime (~$10^7$ years).

---

## 8. Cross-Domain Parallel: Biological Wound Healing

The same attractor vocabulary applies without modification to biological systems.

A wound is a perturbation to the stable attractor of healthy tissue. The body responds through a multi-stage healing cascade: clotting stops further damage, inflammation cleans the wound, and tissue repair restores structural integrity. The healing rate—quantified clinically by wound closure time—is the biological corrective permeability. The healthy baseline state is the basin. Complications like impaired circulation reduce oxygen delivery, slowing fibroblast activity and thus reducing κ (Guo & DiPietro, 2010).

The gas cloud perturbed by a supernova shock and the human body perturbed by a wound are structurally identical within the framework: a dissipative attractor, displaced from its basin, activates corrective mechanisms at a characteristic rate, and either returns to coherence or undergoes permanent state transition.

---

# 9. Observational Consistency

The framework’s description of cloud evolution is fully consistent with standard observations:

- **Turbulent molecular clouds** exhibit the chaotic velocity fields and filamentary structures predicted by the convulsive phase.
- **Radiative cooling** is traced by CO, $H_2O$, and other molecular line emissions.
- **Protostellar cores** represent the approach to the spherical attractor.
- **Protoplanetary disks** are the rotationally-constrained basins.
- **Bound clusters and stellar systems** persist under external perturbations, demonstrating basin depth.

These observations are predicted and explained by standard astrophysics. The attractor framework is consistent with all of them. Its contribution in this domain is conceptual, not empirical.

---

## 10. Conclusion

The evolution of an isolated gas cloud from turbulence to equilibrium is fully described by standard astrophysics. The attractor framework does not replace that description. It translates it into a unified conceptual vocabulary—dissipative attractor, basin, invariant reference, rail, corrective permeability—that applies across physical and biological systems, with broader applicability noted.

The center of mass remains fixed while the cloud convulses, collapses, and settles. The virial theorem, translated into attractor language, quantifies basin depth as gravitational binding energy and corrective permeability as the inverse cooling timescale. The framework is consistent with all standard observations and requires no new physics.

The metronomes hum. The cloud finds its basin. The framework holds.

---

## References


- Galida, R. (2026a). *Persistence Under Perturbation: The Eternal Skeleton and the Transient Dance.* Fantasy Attractor.
- Goldsmith, P. F., & Langer, W. D. (1978). Molecular cooling and thermal balance of dense interstellar clouds. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 222, 881–895.

- Guo, S., & DiPietro, L. A. (2010). Factors affecting wound healing. *Journal of Dental Research*, 89(3), 219–229.
- McKee, C. F., & Ostriker, E. C. (2007). Theory of star formation. *Annual Review of Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 45, 565–687.
- Neufeld, D. A., Lepp, S., & Melnick, G. J. (1995). Thermal balance in dense molecular clouds: radiative cooling rates and emission-line luminosities. *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series*, 100, 132–147.
- Shu, F. H., Adams, F. C., & Lizano, S. (1987). Star formation in molecular clouds: Observation and theory. *Annual Review of Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 25, 23–81.

*“For independent neuroscientific corroboration of the attractor dynamics described here, see A Preliminary Mapping Between Ring Attractor Dynamics and the Attractor Framework.”*https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2405844024114892