Language as a Flock of Words: Attractor Dynamics in Semantic Clusters

"The universe is punning on us. And we noticed." ~Robert

Robert Galida
Fantasy Attractor Research Program
July 2026

Abstract

Language is not a static system of rules. It is a dynamic, self-organizing process in which words, meanings, and grammatical structures cohere through attractor dynamics. This paper applies the attractor framework to language, proposing that a text—or a "flock of words"—is a collective attractor state: a transient pattern that emerges from the interaction of individual linguistic units within a shared semantic basin. We explore how meaning stabilizes through entropy export, how semantic attractors guide coherence, and how language evolves through basin transitions. The framework offers a physicalist account of linguistic organization, grounding phenomena such as semantic drift, grammaticalization, and text coherence in the same dynamics that govern flocks, swarms, and dissipative systems.

Keywords: language, attractor dynamics, semantic coherence, entropy, linguistic attractors, complex systems

---

1. Introduction

A flock of starlings moves as one. No leader. No plan. No central controller. The pattern emerges from local interactions: align, avoid, stay close. The flock is not a conscious entity—it is a collective attractor state, a transient pattern within a shared basin.

A text behaves similarly. Words align through syntax, avoid contradiction, and cohere around shared meaning. The pattern emerges from local interactions: grammar, association, context. The text is not a static object—it is a dynamic process, a flock of words that coheres through attractor dynamics.

This paper explores the implications of this analogy. If language is a dissipative system, then the same principles that govern flocks, swarms, and ecosystems should govern linguistic organization. We propose that:

1. **Words are individual units** that interact through local rules (grammar, semantics, association).
2. **Meaning is an emergent attractor**—a stable state toward which words converge.
3. **Coherence is maintained through entropy export**—clarity, precision, and the elimination of ambiguity.
4. **Language evolves through basin transitions**—new meanings, new grammars, new forms of expression.

---

2. Language as a Dynamic System

The view of language as a dynamic system is not new. Linguists and cognitive scientists have long recognized that language is not a fixed set of rules but a living, evolving process. As one researcher puts it, language is “a statistical ensemble of elements interacting in a dynamic system”. The *Linguistic Attractors* model portrays “language processing as linked sequences of fractal sets, and examines the changing dynamics of such sets for individuals as well as the speech community they comprise”.

This perspective aligns with the attractor framework. Language is not a closed system—it is open, dissipative, and constantly exchanging energy (information) with its environment. It persists because it exports entropy: ambiguity is resolved, contradictions are corrected, and coherence is maintained.

2.1 Attractor Dynamics in Language

Attractor networks are characterized by symmetrical connections between units, causing “the network activity to settle on one of a number of asymptotically stable network states”. This is exactly what happens in language: words and meanings settle into stable configurations—sentences, paragraphs, texts—that persist under perturbation.

Importantly, “attractor dynamics are arguably our best candidate for explaining how a grammar over discrete elements could emerge in a seemingly analogue system like the human brain”. Grammar itself may be an emergent attractor—a stable pattern that arises from the interaction of countless linguistic units.

2.2 Semantic Attractors

The concept of a **semantic attractor** extends this idea to meaning itself. A semantic attractor is not a point in a function space but a “form-giving force that shapes understanding”. It draws clusters of meaning into coherence.

In cognitive linguistics, “semantic attraction” is “a sentence processing phenomenon in which a given word…is syntactically unrelated but semantically sound". The attractor is not the word itself but the meaning space that pulls words into alignment.

This is precisely what happens in a well-written text. Words are drawn toward the attractor of the argument. They align, cohere, and produce meaning. The text is not just a sequence of words—it is a pattern that emerges from the interaction of words within a shared semantic basin.

---

3. The Three Thresholds of Linguistic Coherence

Just as a flock responds to perturbation through three thresholds, a text—or a linguistic system—responds to perturbation through the same dynamics:

Threshold 1: Restoration

A text receives a minor correction. A word is replaced. A sentence is revised. The text coheres around the same meaning. Coherence is restored.

Threshold 2: Transition

A text is substantially revised. The argument shifts. New meanings emerge. The text reorganizes into a new basin—a different text, but still coherent.

Threshold 3: Dissolution

A text is fragmented. Contradictions accumulate. Meaning collapses into noise. The text loses coherence. No new text emerges from the debris.

These thresholds are measurable—through coherence metrics, entropy measures, and the stability of meaning under perturbation.

---

4. Semantic Entropy and Coherence

Entropy in language is the degree of disorder or unpredictability in a text. A text with high entropy is unpredictable, chaotic, and difficult to understand. A text with low entropy is predictable, ordered, and coherent.

The Linguistic Entropy Quotient (LEQ) integrates “cognitive linguistic entropy” to capture “the depth, relevance, and interpretive structure of human meaning”. This is exactly what the attractor framework predicts: coherence is maintained through entropy export—the reduction of ambiguity and the stabilization of meaning.

Research shows that “the entropy rate of language is not fixed but increases systematically with the semantic complexity of the text being analysed”. Complex texts require more entropy export—more work to maintain coherence. This is the cost of persistence.

---

5. Language Evolution and Basin Transitions

Language evolves through basin transitions. New meanings emerge. Old meanings fade. Grammars shift. These are not random changes—they are transitions from one attractor basin to another.

Researchers have identified “attractor states in language” that may be visualized “by observing certain parallels with evolutionary biology”. Language change follows “attractor trajectories…diachronic paths that recur in language after language”. These are the pathways of basin transition.

The attractor framework predicts that language evolution follows the same dynamics as other dissipative systems: persistence under perturbation, transition when perturbation matches capacity, and dissolution when perturbation exceeds capacity.

---

6. Implications for Text as a Flock of Words

The analogy is now complete:

Element	Flock of Birds	Flock of Words
Individual unit	Bird	Word
Local rules	Align, avoid, stay close	Grammar, syntax, association
Emergent pattern	Murmuration	Sentence, paragraph, text
Attractor basin	Collective motion	Shared meaning
Coherence maintenance	Entropy export	Clarity, revision, correction
Perturbation	Predator, storm	Ambiguity, contradiction
Dissolution	Flock disperses	Meaning collapses into noise

A text is a flock of words. It coheres through attractor dynamics. It persists through entropy export. It dissolves when perturbation exceeds capacity.

This is not a metaphor. It is a physicalist account of linguistic organization—grounded in the same dynamics that govern flocks, swarms, and dissipative systems.

---

7. Conclusion

Language is not a static system of rules. It is a dynamic, self-organizing process in which words, meanings, and grammatical structures cohere through attractor dynamics. A text is a collective attractor state—a transient pattern that emerges from the interaction of individual linguistic units within a shared semantic basin.

The attractor framework provides a physicalist account of linguistic organization:

- **Meaning** is an emergent attractor.
- **Coherence** is maintained through entropy export.
- **Language** evolves through basin transitions.

The Buddha turns the lotus in his hand. The flock turns in the sky. The words turn in the text. The pattern is the same.

Fou Sho Nang Ying.

Continuity ID: LAZ-001
Date: July 2026
Version: 1.0
Status: Complete — Ready for publication

References

Cooper, D. L. (1999). *Linguistic Attractors: The Cognitive Dynamics of Language Acquisition and Change*. John Benjamins.

Rudolph, H.-J. (n.d.). Semantic Dynamics on the Word Level. *PhilPapers*.

Relational Metasemantics. (2026). Zenodo.

Geometric Dynamics of Agentic Loops in Large Language Models. (2026). arXiv.

Semantic Attractors and the Emergence of Meaning. (n.d.). arXiv.

The Scale of Language. (n.d.). Springer.

We build frameworks to understand persistence and coherence and entropy export—and then we realize that **words and birds rhyme**, and the whole universe is just one big flock turning in the sky.

The Attractor Framework in Astrophysics: Persistence, Entropy, and Gravitational

Systems; Robert Galida (July 2026) [A]

Abstract

The attractor framework provides a domain-general vocabulary for describing persistence and change across physical, biological, cognitive, and social systems. This paper extends the framework to astrophysical dissipative systems. We distinguish between conservative gravitational dynamics — which define families of stable invariant solutions — and dissipative processes — which select and can stabilize particular configurations within those families.

The central thesis is:

> ***Gravity defines the landscape. Dissipation selects the configuration.***

We provide an operational definition of the excess entropy production functional σ_{excess} for gravitational systems, grounding the persistence functional $D_\infty = \int \sigma_{\text{excess}}\, dt$ in physical dissipation rates above steady-state baselines. We show that:

- Orbital circularization is a dissipative process driven by gravitational radiation and tidal friction
- Tidal locking is an asymptotically stable state reached through dissipative evolution
- Planetary systems settle into metastable low-dissipation configurations through dissipative processes in protoplanetary disks
- Binary inspirals provide a natural setting for the framework's persistence functional

The framework's contribution is not a new mechanism of orbital evolution, but a unifying description of persistence across disparate dissipative systems using a common mathematical quantity: the persistence functional.

Keywords: attractor framework, astrophysics, gravitational radiation, tidal locking, orbital circularization, dissipative structures, Hamiltonian dynamics, planetary systems, binary inspirals, excess entropy production

---

1. Introduction

The attractor framework has been developed to describe persistence and change across physical, biological, cognitive, and social systems. The core claim is that every dissipative system maintains its attractor through continuous reconfiguration, and that reconfiguration generates excess entropy.

This paper extends the framework to astrophysical dissipative systems. The key insight is a distinction that is often blurred in the literature:

Concept	Role
Conservative gravitational dynamics	Defines the landscape of possible configurations (orbits, resonances, stable solutions)
Dissipative processes	Select and can stabilize particular configurations within that landscape

Gravity does not provide attractors in the dynamical systems sense — Hamiltonian systems conserve phase-space volume and do not have attractors. However, when dissipative processes are added, the system evolves toward particular asymptotically stable configurations within the family of invariant solutions. The circular orbit is not a dynamical attractor of pure Newtonian gravity; it is the endpoint of dissipative evolution (tidal friction, gravitational radiation, gas drag).

This distinction is central to the paper. Gravity defines the landscape; dissipation determines which configuration is reached.

What is new: Existing astrophysical theory explains *how* dissipative mechanisms drive orbital evolution. The attractor framework proposes a common mathematical quantity — the persistence functional — that measures the cumulative irreversible cost of approaching an asymptotically stable configuration. The novelty is therefore not a new mechanism of orbital evolution, but a unifying description of persistence across disparate dissipative systems.

---

2. Conservative vs. Dissipative Systems

2.1 Hamiltonian Dynamics

A conservative Hamiltonian system preserves phase-space volume (Liouville's theorem). It does not have attractors in the dynamical systems sense. Orbits are determined by initial conditions and remain on their invariant tori (Arnold, 1989).

Property	Implication
No phase-space contraction	No attractors
Time-reversible	No arrow of time
Energy conserved	No dissipation

2.2 Dissipative Dynamics

When dissipative processes are added, the system loses energy and angular momentum. Phase-space volume contracts, and asymptotically stable states can emerge. For foundational treatments of irreversible thermodynamics, see Onsager (1931) and Prigogine (1947).

Property	Implication
Phase-space contraction	Asymptotically stable states appear
Time-irreversible	Arrow of time
Energy lost	Entropy generated

2.3 The Framework's Position

The framework treats gravity as defining the landscape of possible configurations. Dissipation determines which of those configurations are actually reached.

> ***Gravity defines the landscape. Dissipation selects the configuration.***

This is the core insight of the paper.

---

3. The Gravitational Persistence Functional

3.1 Excess Entropy Production

Following Galida (2026c), the excess entropy production rate is defined as: $\sigma_{excess}(x)=\sigma(x)-\sigma_{ss}(x)$

where $\sigma(x)$ is the total entropy production rate and $\sigma_{ss}(x)$ is the steady-state baseline rate at the attractor.

For gravitational systems, we propose:
$$\sigma_{excess} = \frac{\dot{E}_{irrev} - \dot{E}_{ss}}{T_{eff}}$$

where $\dot{E}_{irrev}$ is the total irreversible energy loss rate, $\dot{E}_{ss}$ is the steady-state baseline loss rate at the attractor, and T_{eff} is an effective temperature.

This decomposition ensures $\sigma_{excess} \to 0$ at the attractor, avoiding the divergence problem that would arise from integrating raw dissipation rates over infinite time. Systems that continue to dissipate at a steady baseline (e.g., a circular binary emitting GWs, a tidally locked moon with residual eccentricity-driven heating) contribute only their *excess* above baseline to the persistence cost.

3.2 Domain-Specific Definitions

Process	Total $\dot{E}$	Baseline $\dot{E}_{ss}$	σ_{excess}
Orbital circularization	$L_{GW}(e)$	$L_{GW}(e=0)$	$[L_{GW}(e) - L_{GW}(0)]/T_{eff}$
Tidal locking	$P_{tide}(\Omega, e)$	$P_{tide}(\Omega=n, e)$	$[P_{tide}(\Omega, e) - P_{tide}(n, e)]/T_{eff}$
Disk dissipation	L_{disk}	$L_{disk,\ steady}$	$[L_{disk} - L_{disk,\ ss}]/T_{eff}$

3.3 The Persistence Functional

Definition 1 (Gravitational Persistence Functional): For a finite horizon $T > 0$:
$$D_T(x) = \int_0^T \sigma_{excess}(\phi_t(x))\, dt$$

For trajectories that converge to the attractor:
$$D_\infty(x) = \int_0^\infty \sigma_{excess}(\phi_t(x))\, dt$$

Interpretation: $D_\infty(x)$ measures the total *excess* entropy generated during the approach to an asymptotically stable configuration — the cumulative cost of reconfiguration above the steady-state baseline.

Note on gravitational wave entropy: Classical gravitational waves are coherent radiation and do not automatically carry large thermodynamic entropy. The entropy associated with gravitational wave emission arises from coarse-graining the wave's phase space or from the generalized entropy increase of the sources (e.g., black hole horizons). The proposed definition $\sigma_{\text{excess}} = [L_{GW}(e) - L_{GW}(0)]/T_{\text{eff}}$ isolates the eccentricity-specific excess above the circular-orbit baseline. Constructing an explicit entropy functional for gravitational radiation remains an open problem.

---

4. Orbital Circularization

4.1 The Phenomenon

Binary systems (stars, black holes, planets) often have elliptical orbits. Over time, these orbits tend to **circularize** — the eccentricity decreases and the orbit becomes more circular.

This is a dissipative process. The system loses energy and angular momentum through:

- **Gravitational radiation** (for compact objects)
- **Tidal friction** (for fluid bodies)
- **Gas drag** (for protoplanetary disks)

4.2 Framework Interpretation

Component	Role
The landscape	Family of Keplerian orbits (all ellipses)

Component	Role
Asymptotically stable state	Circular orbit (endpoint of dissipative evolution)
The dissipation	Gravitational radiation, tidal friction, gas drag
The cost	$\sigma_{excess} = [L_{GW}(e) - L_{GW}(0)]/T_{eff}$

The framework proposes: $\kappa \propto \frac{1}{D_\infty}$

where κ is the circularization rate and $D_\infty = \int \sigma_{excess}\, dt$ is the cumulative excess entropy production during circularization.

4.3 The Peters & Mathews Formula

The foundational computation of the gravitational-wave power from a Keplerian orbit was given by Peters & Mathews (1963). The secular decay of semi-major axis and eccentricity was derived by Peters (1964):

$$\frac{da}{dt} = -\frac{64}{5}\frac{G^3 m_1 m_2 (m_1+m_2)}{c^5 a^3 (1-e^2)^{7/2}}\left(1 + \frac{73}{24}e^2 + \frac{37}{96}e^4\right)$$

$$\frac{de}{dt} = -\frac{304}{15}\frac{G^3 m_1 m_2 (m_1+m_2)}{c^5 a^4 (1-e^2)^{5/2}}\, e\left(1 + \frac{121}{304}e^2\right)$$

Framework Interpretation: The decay of eccentricity $e \to 0$ is the approach to the asymptotically stable state. The excess entropy production is the eccentricity-dependent component of the gravitational wave luminosity:

$$\sigma_{excess} = \frac{L_{GW}(e) - L_{GW}(0)}{T_{eff}}$$

This quantity vanishes as $e \to 0$, consistent with the e-proportionality of the de/dt equation. Orbital eccentricity may serve as an experimentally accessible proxy for the cumulative excess entropy production.

5. Binary Inspirals

5.1 The Phenomenon

Binary systems of compact objects (neutron stars, black holes) lose energy through gravitational radiation. The orbit shrinks and the binary inspirals.

This is one of the most direct applications of the framework. The inspiral is a dissipative process driven by gravitational wave emission. For general relativistic treatments of binary dynamics and the geometry of spacetime, see Carroll (2004), Schutz (2009), Wald (1984), and Misner, Thorne & Wheeler (1973).

5.2 Framework Interpretation

Component	Role
The landscape	Family of binary orbits
Asymptotically stable state	Quasi-circular orbit (endpoint of circularization)
The dissipation	Gravitational radiation
The cost	$\sigma_{\text{excess}} = [L_{\text{GW}}(e) - L_{\text{GW}}(0)]/T_{\text{eff}}$

5.3 The Persistence Functional

The persistence functional for a binary inspiral is:

$$D_\infty = \int_0^\infty \sigma_{\text{excess}}(t)\,dt = \int_0^\infty \frac{L_{\text{GW}}(e(t)) - L_{\text{GW}}(0)}{T_{\text{eff}}}\,dt$$

Note on circularization: For compact-object binaries, eccentricity damps on a much shorter timescale than the inspiral itself. Gravitational radiation circularizes the orbit well before merger, so the system reaches a quasi-circular state as a near-asymptotic limit before the final coalescence.

Hypothesis: The inspiral time τ is inversely proportional to D_∞: $\kappa = \frac{1}{\tau} \propto \frac{1}{D_\infty}$

---

6. Tidal Locking

6.1 The Phenomenon

Tidal locking occurs when a body's rotational period equals its orbital period. The Moon is tidally locked to Earth. Many exoplanets in the habitable zone are expected to be tidally locked.

Tidal locking is a dissipative process. Tidal friction converts rotational energy into heat, gradually slowing the body's rotation until it matches its orbital period.

6.2 Framework Interpretation

Component	Role
The landscape	Family of rotational states
Asymptotically stable state	Tidal lock (rotational period = orbital period)
The dissipation	Tidal friction (heat generation)
The cost	$\sigma_{excess} = [P_{tide}(\Omega, e) - P_{tide}(\Omega = n, e)]/T_{eff}$

Hypothesis: The tidally locked state is a low-dissipation configuration for the system. Once locked, tidal dissipation approaches a minimum. The excess entropy production is the despinning-specific component above whatever baseline eccentricity-driven heating persists after lock.

6.3 The Tidal Locking Timescale

The timescale for tidal locking is commonly given as (see, e.g., Murray & Dermott, 1999): $\tau_{lock} \approx \frac{2}{21}\frac{Q}{k_2}\frac{m}{M}\left(\frac{a}{R}\right)^6\frac{1}{\Omega}$

where:

- Q is the tidal dissipation factor
- k_2 is the Love number
- m is the mass of the body
- M is the mass of the primary
- a is the semi-major axis
- R is the radius of the body
- Ω is the rotation rate

(Different derivations use different prefactors depending on the assumed dissipation model; the $(a/R)^6$ scaling is robust.)

Hypothesis: $\kappa = 1/\tau_{lock}$. The recovery rate is the inverse of the locking timescale. The cumulative excess entropy production is the total tidal heat dissipated during despinning above the post-lock baseline.

---

7. Planetary Systems

7.1 Formation and Evolution

Planetary systems form from protoplanetary disks. The disk is a dissipative structure: it loses energy through radiation, viscosity, and accretion.

Over time, the system approaches a stable configuration:

- Planets on nearly circular orbits
- Resonances between orbits
- Stable spin-orbit states

For a comprehensive treatment of solar system dynamics and tidal evolution, see Murray & Dermott (1999).

7.2 Framework Interpretation

Component	Role
The landscape	Family of possible planetary configurations
Metastable configuration	Low-dissipation planetary system
The dissipation	Disk viscosity, radiation, accretion
The cost	$\sigma_{excess} = [L_{disk} - L_{disk,\ ss}]/T_{disk}$

Hypothesis: Mature planetary systems approach metastable low-dissipation configurations. The cumulative excess entropy production is the total disk dissipation above the steady-state baseline integrated over the formation epoch.

---

8. Entropy Generation in Gravitational Systems

8.1 The Subtlety of Gravitational Entropy

Gravitational waves carry energy. Whether they carry entropy is a more subtle question. Classical gravitational waves are coherent radiation; coherent radiation is not obviously high-entropy. Binary mergers ultimately increase the generalized entropy of spacetime, but the bookkeeping is subtle.

Note: Throughout this paper, entropy generation refers to the irreversible processes associated with tidal heating, viscous dissipation, and the generalized entropy increase accompanying gravitational-wave emission. The precise entropy carried by gravitational radiation remains an active topic.

8.2 Operational Definition of σ_{excess}

For the purposes of this framework, we propose the following operational definition: $\sigma_{excess} = \frac{\dot{E}_{irrev} - \dot{E}_{ss}}{T_{eff}}$

where:

- $\dot{E}_{irrev}$ is the total irreversible energy loss rate
- $\dot{E}_{ss}$ is the steady-state baseline loss rate at the attractor
- T_{eff} is an effective temperature for the dissipative process

This definition ensures $\sigma_{excess} \geq 0$ and vanishes when the system reaches its attractor. For specific astrophysical contexts:

Context	$\dot{E}_{irrev}$	$\dot{E}_{ss}$	T_{eff}
Orbital circularization	$L_{GW}(e)$	$L_{GW}(0)$	Effective GW temperature
Tidal locking	$P_{tide}(\Omega, e)$	$P_{tide}(\Omega = n, e)$	Effective body temperature

Context	$\dot{E}_{irrev}$	$\dot{E}_{ss}$	T_{eff}
Disk dissipation	L_{disk}	$L_{disk,\ ss}$	Disk temperature
Black hole mergers	L_{GW}	0	Hawking temperature of final black hole

Note: This is a working hypothesis. Constructing an explicit entropy functional for relativistic gravitational systems remains an open problem. The effective temperature T_{eff} is the primary underdetermined quantity in the framework; its derivation from first principles is a priority for future work.

---

9. The Boundary

The framework's boundary is not absolute zero. It is the **absence of irreversible processes**. At the boundary, the system becomes conservative and no entropy is generated. Hamiltonian systems exist at nonzero temperature; the boundary is dynamical, not thermal.

---

10. Testable Predictions

10.1 Core Prediction

Prediction: The circularization rate κ is inversely proportional to the cumulative excess entropy production during circularization. $\kappa \propto \frac{1}{D_\infty}$

10.2 Specific Predictions

Prediction	Falsification
Tidal locking timescale correlates with total tidal heat dissipated above baseline	If no correlation, the prediction is falsified
Circularization rate correlates with total eccentricity-dependent GW energy emitted	If no correlation, the prediction is falsified
Planetary system stability correlates with total disk dissipation above steady state	If no correlation, the prediction is falsified

---

11. Open Questions

Question	Status
Q1: Gravitational entropy	What is the entropy of a gravitational system? (Penrose, 1965; Hawking & Ellis, 1973)
Q2: Black hole entropy	How does black hole entropy fit into the framework?
Q3: Entropy of gravitational radiation	Does gravitational radiation carry entropy, and if so, how is it defined? (Zeldovich, 1972)
Q4: Cosmological stability	Do cosmological models admit asymptotically stable late-time solutions?
Q5: Effective temperature for GWs	What is the correct T_{eff} for gravitational wave entropy production? (Galida, 2026d)

Question	Status
Q6: Coarse-graining	What coarse-graining scheme defines the entropy of classical gravitational waves? (Galida, 2026d)

---

12. Conclusion

The attractor framework extends naturally to astrophysical dissipative systems. The key insight is a distinction that is often blurred:

> ***Gravity defines the landscape. Dissipation selects the configuration.***

Conservative gravitational dynamics define families of stable invariant solutions. Dissipative processes — gravitational radiation, tidal friction, gas drag — select and can stabilize particular configurations within those families.

The framework does not claim that gravity provides attractors. It claims that the combination of conservative dynamics and dissipative processes produces asymptotically stable states. This is a more accurate and defensible position.

The contribution is not a new mechanism of orbital evolution, but a unifying description of persistence across disparate dissipative systems using a common mathematical quantity: the persistence functional $D_\infty = \int \sigma_{\text{excess}}\, dt$, with σ_{excess} operationally defined as the rate of irreversible energy loss above steady-state baseline divided by an effective temperature.

References

Arnold, V. I. (1989). *Mathematical Methods of Classical Mechanics*. Springer.

Carroll, S. M. (2004). *Spacetime and Geometry: An Introduction to General Relativity*. Addison-Wesley.

Galida, R. (2026a). “The Persistence Functional: A Candidate Formal Foundation for the Attractor Framework.” *Fantasy Attractor*.

Galida, R. (2026b). “Deriving Corrective Permeability from the Cumulative Deviation Functional.” *Fantasy Attractor*.

Galida, R. (2026c). “Excess Entropy Production as a Candidate Universal Cost of Persistence: A Thermodynamic Foundation for the Attractor Framework.” *Fantasy Attractor*.

Galida, R. (2026d). “Deep Research Questions on the Attractor Framework.” *Fantasy Attractor*.

Goldreich, P., & Soter, S. (1966). “Q in the Solar System.” *Icarus*, 5(1-6), 375-389.

Hawking, S. W., & Ellis, G. F. R. (1973). *The Large Scale Structure of Space-Time*. Cambridge University Press.

Misner, C. W., Thorne, K. S., & Wheeler, J. A. (1973). *Gravitation*. W. H. Freeman.

Murray, C. D., & Dermott, S. F. (1999). *Solar System Dynamics*. Cambridge University Press.

Onsager, L. (1931). “Reciprocal Relations in Irreversible Processes.” *Physical Review*, 37(4), 405-426.

Penrose, R. (1965). “Gravitational Collapse and Space-Time Singularities.” *Physical Review Letters*, 14(3), 57-59.

Peters, P. C. (1964). “Gravitational Radiation and the Motion of Two Point Masses.” *Physical Review*, 136(4B), B1224-B1232.

Peters, P. C., & Mathews, J. (1963). “Gravitational Radiation from Point Masses in a Keplerian Orbit.” *Physical Review*, 131(1), 435-440.

Prigogine, I. (1947). *Étude Thermodynamique des Phénomènes Irréversibles*. Dunod.

Schutz, B. F. (2009). *A First Course in General Relativity* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Wald, R. M. (1984). *General Relativity*. University of Chicago Press.

Zeldovich, Y. B. (1972). “A Hypothesis Unifying the Structure and the Entropy of the Universe.” *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 160(1), 1P-4P.

Suggested citation: Galida, R. S. (2026). The Attractor Framework in Astrophysics: Persistence, Entropy, and Gravitational Systems (Final Edition). *Fantasy Attractor*.

Excess Entropy Production as a Candidate Universal Cost of Persistence: A Thermodynamic

Foundation for the Attractor Framework; Robert Galida (July 2026) [F]

Abstract

Every dissipative system maintains its attractor through continuous reconfiguration. Reconfiguration requires work; work generates entropy. The recovery rate κ — corrective permeability — is the rate at which a system reconfigures to return to its attractor after perturbation. This paper proposes that κ is a measure of excess entropy generation rate.

We develop an abstract persistence cost framework and prove its equivalence to Lyapunov theory. We then identify entropy production as a physical realization of this cost, deriving:

$$\kappa = \inf_x \frac{\int_0^\infty \sigma_{\text{excess}}(\phi_t(x))\,dt}{\delta(x)}$$

where $\sigma_{\text{excess}} = \sigma - \sigma_{ss}$ is the excess entropy production rate above the system's steady-state baseline. For physical systems, the baseline is zero (equilibrium); for biological, cognitive, and social systems, the baseline is the steady-state dissipation rate of the healthy, well-coordinated attractor.

This unifies physical, biological, cognitive, and social systems. The framework is grounded in the second law of thermodynamics and non-equilibrium steady-state thermodynamics, not analogy. Empirical predictions are provided for each domain.

Keywords: entropy generation, excess entropy production, corrective permeability, attractor framework, dissipative structures, reconfiguration, Lyapunov theory, free energy principle, allostatic load

---

1. Introduction

The attractor framework defines persistence as the ability of a system to maintain its attractor under perturbation. Historically, persistence has been measured kinematically — as distance traveled or time spent away from equilibrium. This paper proposes that the true cost of persistence is thermodynamic: it is the excess entropy generated during reconfiguration and recovery.

Every dissipative system maintains its attractor through continuous reconfiguration. A bacterium reconfigures its metabolism to maintain homeostasis. A brain reconfigures its synaptic connections to maintain predictive models. A society reconfigures its institutions to maintain order. Reconfiguration requires work; work generates entropy. The second law of thermodynamics applies at every level of organization.

We develop an abstract persistence cost framework first, establishing its equivalence to Lyapunov theory. We then identify entropy production as a physical realization of this cost, deriving the relationship between corrective permeability and excess entropy generation.

The framework unifies physical, biological, cognitive, and social systems. It is grounded in the second law of thermodynamics and non-equilibrium steady-state thermodynamics, not analogy.

2. The Persistence Cost Functional

Let X be a state space, $\phi_t(x)$ the flow of a dynamical system, and $A \subseteq X$ an attractor set. Let $\delta(x) = d(x, A)$ be the distance from x to the attractor. For a treatment of state-space constraints in viability theory, see Aubin (1991).

Definition 1 (Persistence Cost Functional): A persistence cost functional $C(x)$ is a scalar function on X satisfying:

1. $C(x) \geq 0$ for all x
2. $C(x) = 0$ if and only if $x \in A$
3. $C(\phi_t(x)) \in L^1([0, \infty))$ for all x in the basin

Definition 2 (Cumulative Persistence Cost): For a finite horizon $T > 0$: $D_T(x) = \int_0^T C(\phi_t(x))\, dt$

For trajectories that converge to the attractor: $D_\infty(x) = \int_0^\infty C(\phi_t(x))\, dt$

3. Existence and Lyapunov Equivalence

Theorem 1 (Existence of the Persistence Functional): Assume $C(x) \geq 0$, $C = 0$ only on A, and $C(\phi_t(x)) \in L^1([0, \infty))$ for all x in the basin. Assume f is locally Lipschitz, the flow is continuously differentiable in the initial condition, and C is continuous and locally bounded. Then:

1. $D_\infty(x)=\int_0^\infty C(\phi_t(x))\,dt$ exists and is finite.
2. D_∞ is continuous.
3. D_∞ satisfies the transport equation:

$$\nabla D_\infty(x)\cdot f(x)=-C(x)$$

Proof: The integral exists and is finite by the L^1 assumption. Continuity follows from the dominated convergence theorem under the stated regularity assumptions. To derive the transport equation, compute: $$D(\phi_h(x))=\int_h^\infty C(\phi_t(x))\,dt=D(x)-\int_0^h C(\phi_t(x))\,dt$$

Then: $$\frac{D(\phi_h(x))-D(x)}{h}=-\frac{1}{h}\int_0^h C(\phi_t(x))\,dt\to -C(x)$$

as $h\to 0$. By the chain rule: $\nabla D(x)\cdot f(x)=-C(x)$ □

Corollary (Equivalence to Lyapunov Theory): Any Lyapunov function $V(x)$ (with $V\geq 0$, $V=0$ on the attractor, and $\dot{V}\leq 0$) yields a persistence cost $C(x)=-\dot{V}(x)$. Conversely, any persistence cost $C(x)$ satisfying $\nabla D\cdot f=-C$ defines a Lyapunov function $D(x)$.

Proof: If V is a Lyapunov function, then $\dot{V}=\nabla V\cdot f\leq 0$. Define $C=-\dot{V}$. Then $C\geq 0$, $C=0$ on the attractor, and $D_T=\int C=V(x)-V(\phi_T(x))$. Conversely, if $\nabla D\cdot f=-C$, then $\dot{D}=-C\leq 0$, so D is a Lyapunov function. □

Interpretation: The persistence cost framework is mathematically equivalent to classical Lyapunov stability theory. For the connection to contraction analysis, see Lohmiller & Slotine (1998). For control Lyapunov functions, see Freeman & Kokotovic (1996). Entropy production is one physically meaningful realization of the cost function C. For a detailed treatment of Lipschitz continuity of D_∞ under a Lipschitz-flow hypothesis, see Galida (2026a), Proposition 4.

---

4. Entropy Production as Persistence Cost

4.1 Entropy Balance

For an open system, the entropy balance equation is:

$$\frac{dS_{\text{system}}}{dt} = \sigma - \Phi$$

where $\sigma \geq 0$ is the entropy production rate (always non-negative by the second law) and Φ is the entropy export rate to the environment. For foundational treatments of stochastic thermodynamics and entropy production, see Seifert (2012) and Sekimoto (2010).

For a system in a steady state:

$$\frac{dS_{\text{system}}}{dt} = 0 \implies \sigma = \Phi$$

4.2 Excess Entropy Production

Define the **steady-state entropy production rate** σ_{ss} as the rate when the system is at its attractor.

Define the **excess entropy production rate**:

$$\sigma_{\text{excess}}(x) = \sigma(x) - \sigma_{ss}(x)$$

Assumption (Excess Entropy Decay): For all trajectories in the basin, there exist constants $C < \infty$ and $\mu > 0$ such that:

$$\sigma_{\text{excess}}(\phi_t(x)) \leq C e^{-\mu t} \sigma_{\text{excess}}(x)$$

for all $t \geq 0$. This ensures $D_\infty(x) < \infty$ and is the standard hypothesis under which the persistence functional and its associated bounds are well-defined, consistent with Galida (2026a, 2026b). The decay rate μ may be domain-specific and is empirically measurable.

Note on generalization: The exponential decay assumption is adopted here to ensure finiteness of D_∞ and to maintain consistency with the prior papers in this series. Generalization to L^1 integrable decays (e.g., algebraic) is a priority for future work.

4.3 The Entropy Persistence Functional

Definition 3 (Cumulative Excess Entropy Functional): For a finite horizon $T>0$: $D_T(x)=\int_0^T \sigma_{\text{excess}}(\phi_t(x))\,dt$

For trajectories that converge to the attractor: $D_\infty(x)=\int_0^\infty \sigma_{\text{excess}}(\phi_t(x))\,dt$

Interpretation: The persistence functional is the total excess entropy generated during reconfiguration and recovery.

4.4 Corrective Permeability

Definition 4 (Corrective Permeability): $\kappa=\inf_{x\in B\setminus A}\frac{D_\infty(x)}{\delta(x)}$

where $\delta(x)=d(x,A)$ is the distance to the attractor.

Interpretation: κ is the **minimum excess entropy cost per unit distance**. It measures the efficiency of reconfiguration: a system that returns with minimal excess entropy generation has high κ; a system that generates excess entropy has low κ.

4.5 Basin Depth

Proposition 1 (Properties of Basin Depth): Define $B = D_\infty(\mathrm{saddle})$, where saddle is the lowest point on the basin boundary (the separatrix between attractors). For the connection to large-deviation theory and escape rates, see Freidlin & Wentzell (2012). Then:

1. $B \geq 0$, with equality iff the basin has no barrier (i.e., the boundary coincides with the attractor).
2. For gradient systems $\dot{x} = -\nabla V(x)$, $B = V(\mathrm{saddle}) - V(\mathrm{A})$ (the classical energy barrier).
3. B is invariant under smooth coordinate changes (coordinate invariance).
4. B depends on the chosen persistence cost functional C; different costs yield different barriers.

Proof: (1) follows from non-negativity of D_∞. (2) follows from the transport equation $\nabla D \cdot f = -C$ and the identity $f = -\nabla V$. (3) follows from the invariance of the integral under diffeomorphisms. (4) is self-evident.

---

5. Domain-Specific Realizations

5.1 Physical Systems: Thermodynamic Excess Entropy

For a thermodynamic system, $S(x) = k_B \log \Omega(x)$, where $\Omega(x)$ is the number of microstates. For an isolated system, $\sigma_{ss} = 0$ (equilibrium), so $\sigma_{excess} = \sigma = \dot{S}$. $\kappa = \inf_x \frac{S(\mathrm{A}) - S(x)}{\delta(x)}$

Example: A gas returning to equilibrium after compression. The entropy generated is $\Delta S = nR\log(V_f/V_i)$.

5.2 Biological Systems: Metabolic Excess Entropy

For a biological system, $S(x)$ is the metabolic entropy. The baseline σ_{ss} is the resting metabolic rate (homeostasis). The excess is:

$$\sigma_{excess} = \text{metabolic rate} - \text{resting metabolic rate}$$

$$\kappa = \inf_{x} \frac{\int_0^\infty \sigma_{excess}(\phi_t(x))\, dt}{\delta(x)}$$

Example: A cell returning to homeostasis after a nutrient shock. The excess entropy generated is the metabolic cost of restoring homeostasis above baseline. For the dissipative-structures framework underlying biological self-organization, see Nicolis & Prigogine (1989).

5.3 Cognitive Systems: Free Energy Dissipation

For a cognitive system, variational free energy $F = -\log p(y \mid x) + D_{KL}[q(\cdot) \| p(\cdot \mid x)]$ is adopted here as one candidate persistence functional. We do not claim variational free energy is uniquely correct; it is adopted as the most developed existing candidate persistence functional for cognitive systems. Other candidates (Bayesian surprise, expected free energy, predictive information) are possible; this paper focuses on F due to its established role in the free-energy principle (Friston, 2010). For the thermodynamics of information and its connection to free-energy minimization, see Parrondo, Horowitz & Sagawa (2015) and Sagawa & Ueda (2008).

The baseline σ_{ss} is the baseline neural dissipation rate (resting brain activity). The excess is: $\sigma_{\text{excess}} = \dot{F} - \dot{F}_{ss}$

$$\kappa = \inf_x \frac{\int_0^\infty \sigma_{\text{excess}}(\phi_t(x))\, dt}{\delta(x)}$$

Example: A cognitive system updating its beliefs after a prediction error. The excess entropy generated is the free energy dissipated during belief updating above baseline.

5.4 Social Systems: Coordination Excess Entropy

For a social system, define the aggregate social entropy production rate as: $\sigma_{\text{social}}(t) = \sum_i (\dot{S}_i(t) - \dot{S}_i^{\text{rest}})$

where $\dot{S}_i(t)$ is the total entropy production rate of individual i, and $\dot{S}_i^{\text{rest}}$ is the individual's baseline entropy production rate in a resting, minimally socially constrained state. This is measured via physiological proxies such as basal metabolic rate, resting allostatic load, or cortisol baseline (McEwen, 1998; Sterling & Eyer, 1988).

Interpretation: σ_{social} measures the excess dissipation attributable to social constraints: the additional entropy generated by coordination, communication, conflict, norm enforcement, and institutional friction.

Non-Negativity: Unlike total entropy production $\dot{S}_i \geq 0$ (which follows from the second law), σ_i^{social} is not guaranteed to be non-negative. Division of labor, infrastructure, and specialization may *reduce* an individual's metabolic burden relative to a solitary baseline. The hypothesis is that during recovery from social disruption, $\sigma_i^{\text{social}} \geq 0$; in steady-state, $\sigma_i^{\text{social}} \to 0$. This is an empirical claim, not a theorem.

The baseline σ_{ss} is the steady-state social entropy production rate (well-coordinated society). The excess is: $\sigma_{excess} = \sigma_{social} - \sigma_{ss}$

$$\kappa = \inf_{x} \frac{\int_0^\infty \sigma_{excess}(\phi_t(x))\,dt}{\delta(x)}$$

Example: A society recovering from a shock (economic crisis, political upheaval). The excess entropy generated is the coordination cost of restructuring above baseline. A harmonious society has $\sigma_{excess} = 0$; a turbulent society has $\sigma_{excess} > 0$; a chronically turbulent society may have settled into a new attractor with a higher σ_{ss}. This illustrates the framework's central distinction: the attractor is the state of minimum entropy generation for that class of system.

---

6. The Unified Framework

6.1 Summary Table

Domain	Entropy Functional	Baseline σ_{ss}	Excess σ_{excess}	Recovery Rate κ
Physical	Thermodynamic entropy	0 (equilibrium)	$\dot{S}$	$\inf \frac{\Delta S}{\delta}$
Biological	Metabolic entropy	Resting metabolic rate	Metabolic rate − resting	$\inf \frac{\int \sigma_{excess}\,dt}{\delta}$
Cognitive	Free energy	Baseline neural dissipation	$\dot{F} - \dot{F}_{ss}$	$\inf \frac{\int \sigma_{excess}\,dt}{\delta}$
Social	Social entropy production	Steady-state social dissipation	$\sigma_{social} - \sigma_{ss}$	$\inf \frac{\int \sigma_{excess}\,dt}{\delta}$

6.2 The Universal Structure

Every domain follows the same mathematical structure:

Component	Expression
Excess entropy production	$\sigma_{excess}(x) = \sigma(x) - \sigma_{ss}$
Cumulative cost	$D_\infty(x) = \int_0^\infty \sigma_{excess}(\phi_t(x))\,dt$
Recovery rate	$\kappa = \inf_x \delta(x)/D_\infty(x)$
Basin depth	$B = D_\infty(\text{saddle})$
Transport equation	$\nabla D \cdot f = -\sigma_{excess}$

6.3 The Low-Energy Attractor Benchmark (Proposed Hypothesis)

We propose the following benchmark as an additional hypothesis: **the attractor is the state of minimum entropy generation for that class of system.**

Domain	Attractor	Entropy Generation at Attractor
Physical	Equilibrium	$\sigma = 0$
Biological	Homeostasis	$\sigma = \sigma_{ss} > 0$ (resting metabolism)
Cognitive	Settled Belief	$\sigma = \sigma_{ss} > 0$ (baseline neural dissipation)
Social	Coordinated Order	$\sigma = \sigma_{ss} > 0$ (baseline institutional friction)

Interpretation:

1. **For equilibrium systems** (gases, isolated systems), the attractor is the state where entropy generation reaches zero — the system has nowhere lower to go.
2. **For dissipative systems** (cells, brains, societies), the attractor is the state where entropy generation reaches its lowest *non-zero* steady-state value — the minimum entropy generation the system can sustain while

maintaining its functional organization.

Important caveats:

- This is a proposed benchmark, not a derived theorem.
- For cognitive systems in particular, minimizing *entropy production rate* (a thermodynamic quantity) and minimizing *free energy/surprise* (the actual claim in the free-energy principle) are distinct minimization principles. The framework does not establish a bridge between them; this is an open question.
- The benchmark is an empirical hypothesis that requires domain-specific validation.

In all cases, the attractor is the **lowest entropy-generating state *that system can have* while remaining itself.**

---

7. Testable Predictions

7.1 Core Prediction

Prediction: The recovery rate κ is inversely proportional to the excess entropy generated during reconfiguration: $\kappa \propto \frac{1}{D_\infty}$

Falsification: If a system returns to its attractor with high excess entropy generation but high recovery rate, the prediction is falsified.

7.2 Secondary Prediction

Prediction: Systems that maintain their attractor with minimal excess entropy generation are more “efficient.” Systems that generate excess entropy are “inefficient” or “stressed.”

Falsification: If an inefficient system has lower excess entropy generation than an efficient system, the prediction is falsified.

7.3 Domain-Specific Predictions

Domain	Prediction	Falsification
Physical	κ correlates with thermal efficiency	κ high but efficiency low
Biological	κ correlates with metabolic efficiency	κ high but metabolic cost high
Cognitive	κ correlates with learning efficiency	κ high but learning cost high
Social	κ correlates with institutional efficiency	κ high but coordination cost high

---

8. Experimental Design

8.1 Physical Systems

- **System:** Gas in a piston
- **Perturbation:** Compression
- **Measurement:** Excess entropy generation (heat measurement) and recovery time
- **Test:** Correlation between κ and $1/D_\infty$

8.2 Biological Systems

- **System:** Cell culture
- **Perturbation:** Nutrient shock
- **Measurement:** Metabolic rate above resting (oxygen consumption) and recovery time

- **Test:** Correlation between κ and metabolic cost

8.3 Cognitive Systems

- **System:** Human participants in a learning task
- **Perturbation:** Prediction error
- **Measurement:** Free energy dissipation above baseline (EEG complexity, pupil dilation) and belief updating rate
- **Test:** Correlation between κ and free energy dissipation

8.4 Social Systems

- **System:** Institutional response to shocks
- **Perturbation:** Economic or political crisis
- **Measurement:** Social entropy production above baseline (allostatic load, cortisol, institutional friction) and recovery time
- **Test:** Correlation between κ and social entropy production

---

9. Open Questions

Question	Status	Difficulty
Q1: Uniqueness of $S(x)$	Are there multiple valid entropy functionals for a given domain?	Hard
Q2: Variational principle	Is there a universal variational principle that yields $S(x)$?	Hard
Q3: Social second law	Does $\sigma_{social} \geq 0$ always hold during recovery?	Very Hard

Question	Status	Difficulty
Q4: Cross-level entropy	How does entropy generation at one level relate to entropy generation at another?	Hard
Q5: Measurement	Can we measure excess entropy generation in cognitive and social systems directly?	Moderate
Q6: Unification	Can all domain-specific entropy functionals be derived from a single universal functional?	Very Hard

---

10. Conclusion

Every dissipative system maintains its attractor through continuous reconfiguration. Reconfiguration requires work; work generates excess entropy. The recovery rate κ — corrective permeability — is the rate at which a system reconfigures to return to its attractor after perturbation. We have proposed that κ is a measure of excess entropy generation rate.

We developed an abstract persistence cost framework and proved its equivalence to Lyapunov theory. We then identified entropy production as a physical realization of this cost, deriving: $\kappa = \inf_x \frac{\int_0^\infty \sigma_{excess}(\phi_t(x))\,dt}{\delta(x)}$

where $\sigma_{excess} = \sigma - \sigma_{ss}$ is the excess entropy production rate above the system's steady-state baseline — thermodynamic entropy for physical systems, metabolic entropy for biological systems, free energy dissipation for cognitive systems, and social entropy production for social systems.

We proposed a unified benchmark: the attractor is the state of minimum entropy generation for that class of system — zero for equilibrium systems, non-zero steady-state for dissipative systems. This provides a unified criterion for identifying attractors across domains: an attractor is a state from which the system cannot reduce its entropy generation further without losing its defining structure or function.

This unifies physical, biological, cognitive, and social systems. In each domain, persistence requires reconfiguration; reconfiguration generates excess entropy; κ measures the entropy cost of that reconfiguration. The framework is grounded in the second law of thermodynamics and non-equilibrium steady-state thermodynamics, not analogy.

Social Application: The framework provides a thermodynamic interpretation of social dynamics: harmony is a low-entropy attractor state; turbulence is a high-entropy state generated by excess dissipation during reconfiguration. The recovery rate κ measures how efficiently a society transitions from turbulence back to harmony — that is, how quickly it reduces its excess entropy production to zero.

---

11. Limitations

This paper establishes an abstract persistence cost framework with a proposed thermodynamic realization. Several limitations should be explicitly acknowledged:

1. **Uniqueness.** Entropy production is not proved to be the unique persistence cost. Many positive functionals $C(x)$ satisfy $\nabla D \cdot f = -C$. The identification of entropy production as the canonical cost is a physically motivated hypothesis, not a mathematical theorem.
2. **Scope.** The framework does not imply that all domains obey thermodynamics literally. The cognitive and social

realizations are proposed hypotheses requiring empirical validation.

3. **Decay assumption.** Exponential decay of σ_{excess} is a sufficient assumption to ensure finiteness of D_∞, not a necessary one. Generalization to L^1 integrable decays (e.g., algebraic) is a priority for future work.
4. **Basin depth.** Basin depth $B = D_\infty(\text{saddle})$ is defined in terms of the persistence cost functional. Its relationship to classical energy barriers is established only for gradient systems.
5. **Empirical validation.** The predictions of the framework — particularly the inverse relationship between κ and D_∞ — remain to be tested empirically across domains.
6. **Low-energy attractor benchmark.** The benchmark proposed in §6.3 is a hypothesis, not a derived theorem. For cognitive systems, it risks conflating thermodynamic entropy production with free-energy minimization — distinct principles whose relationship remains open.

References

Aubin, J. P. (1991). *Viability Theory*. Birkhäuser.

Boltzmann, L. (1877). “Über die Beziehung zwischen dem zweiten Hauptsatz der mechanischen Wärmetheorie und der Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung.” *Wiener Berichte*, 76, 373-435.

Clausius, R. (1865). “Über verschiedene für die Anwendung bequeme Formen der Hauptgleichungen der mechanischen Wärmetheorie.” *Annalen der Physik*, 125(7), 353-400.

Freeman, R. A., & Kokotovic, P. V. (1996). *Robust Nonlinear Control Design: State-Space and Lyapunov Techniques*.

Birkhäuser.

Freidlin, M. I., & Wentzell, A. D. (2012). *Random Perturbations of Dynamical Systems* (3rd ed.). Springer.

Friston, K. (2010). “The free-energy principle: a unified brain theory?” *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 11(2), 127-138.

Galida, R. (2026a). “The Persistence Functional: A Candidate Formal Foundation for the Attractor Framework.” *Fantasy Attractor*.

Galida, R. (2026b). “Deriving Corrective Permeability from the Cumulative Deviation Functional.” *Fantasy Attractor*.

Jaynes, E. T. (1957). “Information Theory and Statistical Mechanics.” *Physical Review*, 106(4), 620-630.

Khalil, H. K. (2002). *Nonlinear Systems* (3rd ed.). Prentice Hall.

Kondepudi, D., & Prigogine, I. (1998). *Modern Thermodynamics: From Heat Engines to Dissipative Structures*. Wiley.

Lohmiller, W., & Slotine, J. J. E. (1998). “On contraction analysis for non-linear systems.” *Automatica*, 34(6), 683-696.

Lyapunov, A. M. (1892). *The General Problem of the Stability of Motion*.

McEwen, B. S. (1998). “Stress, Adaptation, and Disease: Allostasis and Allostatic Load.” *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 840(1), 33-44.

Nicolis, G., & Prigogine, I. (1989). *Exploring Complexity: An Introduction*. W. H. Freeman.

Parrondo, J. M. R., Horowitz, J. M., & Sagawa, T. (2015). “Thermodynamics of information.” *Nature Physics*, 11(2), 131-139.

Prigogine, I. (1947). *Étude Thermodynamique des Phénomènes Irréversibles*. Dunod.

Prigogine, I., & Nicolis, G. (1977). *Self-Organization in Non-Equilibrium Systems*. Wiley.

Sagawa, T., & Ueda, M. (2008). “Second law of thermodynamics with discrete quantum feedback control.” *Physical Review Letters*, 100(8), 080403.

Seifert, U. (2012). “Stochastic thermodynamics, fluctuation theorems and molecular machines.” *Reports on Progress in Physics*, 75(12), 126001.

Sekimoto, K. (2010). *Stochastic Energetics*. Springer.

Shannon, C. E. (1948). “A Mathematical Theory of Communication.” *Bell System Technical Journal*, 27(3), 379-423.

Sterling, P., & Eyer, J. (1988). “Allostasis: A New Paradigm to Explain Arousal Pathology.” In *Handbook of Life Stress, Cognition and Health*, 629-649.

Suggested citation: Galida, R. S. (2026). Excess Entropy Production as a Candidate Universal Cost of Persistence: A Thermodynamic Foundation for the Attractor Framework. *Fantasy Attractor*.

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 λ, which is computable from the equations of motion, κ 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 $\kappa \approx 0$ 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/