Structural Parallels Between VMHvl Line Attractor Dynamics 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, 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 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 $\kappa \sim 1/\tau$ 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.

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, $|U||U|$

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 κ=1/τcool$\kappa=1/\tau_{\text{cool}}$	Damping rate, quantified by the radiative cooling function Λ(T)$\Lambda(T)$
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 104104 to 105105 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=02*K*+*U*=0

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

- **Basin depth** = □U□□*U*□, the gravitational binding energy.
- **Perturbation** = any injection of kinetic energy ΔKΔ*K* that raises K*K* above the equilibrium value □U□/2□*U*□/2.
- **Corrective permeability** = κ=1/τcool*κ*=1/*τ*cool□, the rate at which radiative cooling dissipates ΔKΔ*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 $E_{\text{SN}} \sim 10^{44}$ 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, $\epsilon \sim 0.1$:

$$\Delta K = E_{\text{SN}} \times f \times \epsilon \sim 10^{44}\times(2.5\times10^{-3})\times0.1 \approx 2.5\times10^{40}\ \text{J}$$

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 pc=3.09×1018 cm*R*=1 pc=3.09×1018 cm

The volume is:V=43πR3≈43π(3.09×1018)3≈1.24×1056 cm3*V*=34*πR*3≈34*π*(3.09×1018)3≈1.24×1056 cm3

Step 4: Corrective permeability. At T∼10*T*∼10 K and n∼103*n*∼103 cm⁻³, the dominant coolant is CO rotational line emission, with a cooling function Λ(T)∼10−23Λ(*T*)∼10−23 erg cm⁻³ s⁻¹ (Goldsmith & Langer, 1978; Neufeld, Lepp & Melnick, 1995). Convert ΔKΔ*K* to erg:ΔK=2.5×1040 J=2.5×1047 ergΔ*K*=2.5×1040 J=2.5×1047 erg

The cooling timescale is:τcool∼ΔKVΛ≈2.5×1047(1.24×1056)×(10−23)≈2.5×10471.24×1033≈2.02×1014 s∼6.4×106 years*τ*cool∼*V*Λ*ΔK*≈(1.24×1056)×(10−23)2.5×1047≈1.24×10332.5×1047≈2.02×1014 s∼6.4×106 years

The corrective permeability is:κ=1τcool≈4.95×10−15 s−1*κ*=*τ*cool1≈4.95×10−15 s−1

Step 5: Interpretation. The perturbation is damped within a few million years. The basin depth (U∼8.6×1041*U*∼8.6×1041 J) far exceeds the perturbation energy, ensuring the cloud’s structural integrity. Corrective permeability, quantified by κ*κ*, 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 (∼107107 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