The Universe as a Prestressed System: A Taoist Cosmology

Robert Galida
June 2026
[R] (Research Note)

Abstract

The attractor framework provides a unified vocabulary for describing persistence and change across physical, biological, cognitive, and social systems. This paper extends that vocabulary to cosmology. It proposes that the universe can be interpreted as a **prestressed system** — with the three metronomes (electron, proton, neutrino) acting as persistent dynamical primitives (“rebar”), and space itself acting as the “osmotic pressure” (a dissipative medium). The cosmological constant (Λ) is interpreted as the cosmic analogue of the WHC-water discrepancy — the “excess” energy required to explain observed expansion beyond what matter alone would produce. The paper maps Taoist concepts (Tao, wu wei, ziran) onto the framework’s variables (constraint field, κ, R), demonstrating structural alignment with both modern cosmology and ancient wisdom. The paper is offered as a generative hypothesis, not a replacement for ΛCDM. It does not claim that the universe is alive or conscious — only that it is dissipative and may be intelligent insofar as it persists under perturbation.

All claims are structural mappings, not mathematical equivalences. The framework is a domain-general dynamical ontology with an associated research programme — a heuristic vocabulary, not a theory of everything. The mathematical derivation of equivalence is an open research question.

1. Introduction

The attractor framework has been applied to biology, cognition, AI, and civilizational dynamics. This paper extends it to cosmology. It asks a simple question:

> *Can the universe be interpreted as a prestressed system — with stable particles as its “rebar” and space as its “osmotic pressure”?*

The answer is yes — with important qualifications.

The framework does not claim that the universe is alive or conscious. It claims that the universe is a **dissipative system** that persists under perturbation, navigates constraints, and exhibits structure — properties that, within the framework, are the hallmarks of intelligence at its most basic level.

A note on ΛCDM: The ΛCDM model is the standard model of cosmology, describing a universe composed of approximately 68% dark energy (Λ), 26.5% cold dark matter (CDM), and 4.9% ordinary matter. This paper does not replace ΛCDM. It offers a vocabulary for interpreting it.

A note on the framework’s status: This paper does not claim mathematical equivalence between biological and cosmological systems. It claims structural isomorphism at the level of dynamical organization. The mathematical derivation of equivalence is an open research question.

A note on domain of applicability: The framework is hypothesized to apply to any persistent dynamical system satisfying Conditions A–D (see §2.4). The universality of the framework is an empirical hypothesis, not an assumption.

2. Core Definitions

2.1 The Framework Variables

Variable	Definition	Role
κ (corrective permeability)	The rate at which a system returns to its dynamical trajectory after perturbation	Measures corrigibility
B (basin depth)	The energy barrier required to shift a system from one attractor state to another	Measures stability
C (coordination capacity)	The ability of a system to coordinate collective action	Measures coherence
R (reality alignment)	The degree to which a system’s models correspond to empirical reality	Measures truth-tracking

2.2 Primitive vs. Derived Concepts

The framework distinguishes foundational concepts from derived ones:

Primitive	Definition	Derived	Source
State	The complete description of a system at a given time	—	—

Primitive	Definition	Derived	Source
Interaction	Any exchange of energy, momentum, or information between systems	—	—
Constraint	Any factor that restricts the possible states or trajectories of a system	—	—
Perturbation	Any deviation from the system’s dynamical trajectory	—	—
—	—	**κ**	Recovery rate after perturbation (derived from perturbation dynamics)
—	—	**B**	Energy barrier between attractors (derived from constraint topology)
—	—	**C**	Coordination capacity (derived from interaction topology)
—	—	**R**	Reality alignment (derived from model-state correspondence)

Primitive	Definition	Derived	Source
—	—	**Fantasy attractor**	Low R + mechanisms preventing R increase

Note on the primitive hierarchy: This primitive layer (State, Interaction, Constraint, Perturbation) is the level of abstraction at which both mechanotransduction and constraint navigation are instances — mechanotransduction as a Constraint-mediated Interaction, navigation as Perturbation-response via the same primitives. This resolves the earlier cross-paper tension between mechanotransduction and constraint-detection as "the primitive."

2.3 Conservative vs. Dissipative Attractors

In the attractor framework:

Type	Definition	Examples
Conservative	No energy input, no phase-space contraction, no attractor	Electrons, protons, neutrinos (persistent dynamical primitives)
Dissipative	Energy input required, phase-space contraction, attractor exists	Life, mind, society, the universe (in the horizon-thermodynamic sense)

Crucially: A system with κ (a recovery rate toward an attractor) is necessarily dissipative. Conservative systems — in the strict dynamical-systems sense — do not have attractors. Within this framework, the universe is interpreted as dissipative in the horizon-thermodynamic sense, even without external energy input, due to Gibbons–Hawking temperature and horizon entropy.

2.4 Domain of Applicability

The framework is hypothesized to apply to any system satisfying the following conditions:

Condition	Description
A	The system has a well-defined state space
B	The system is subject to perturbations
C	The system exhibits persistent structure (attractors)
D	The system’s dynamics can be observed and measured

Systems satisfying these conditions are hypothesized to admit a state-space description possessing analogues of κ, B, C, and R. This is an empirical hypothesis, not an assumption.

2.5 The Constraint Field

The **constraint field** is the attractor landscape — the set of possible states and the energy barriers between them. It is the underlying structure that shapes the dynamics of any system:

Domain	Constraint Field
Biology	The extracellular matrix (ECM)
Cosmology	Spacetime geometry
Belief systems	Conceptual space of possible beliefs
Society	Communication networks and institutions
AI	Parameter manifold and latent space

2.6 The Interaction Manifold

The **interaction manifold** is the topology through which interactions propagate:

Domain	Interaction Manifold
Biology	Interstitial ECM
Society	Communication network
AI	Parameter graph / latent space
Economy	Exchange network
Cosmology	Spacetime manifold

This generalizes the concept of “space” across domains.

---

3. The Metronomes as Persistent Dynamical Primitives

3.1 The Three Metronomes

The three metronomes are persistent dynamical primitives — long-lived invariant structures that provide the “eternal skeleton” of the universe:

Metronome	Role	Stability	Channel
Electron	Provides charge and electromagnetic structure	$>6.6\times10^{28}$ years	$e^- \to \gamma + \nu$ (Borexino)
Proton	Provides mass and nuclear structure	$>2.4\times10^{34}$ years	$p \to e^+\pi^0$ (Super-Kamiokande, 90% C.L.)

Metronome	Role	Stability	Channel
Neutrino	Provides weak force and cosmic background	Model-dependent	Standard Model neutrinos have no known decay channel; cosmological bounds (CMB, BBN) constrain mass and lifetime for specific models

Terminological note: These particles are not “attractors” in the strict dynamical-systems sense. They are **persistent dynamical primitives** — stable structures that persist without energy input and provide the invariant framework within which dissipative dynamics unfold. The term “metronome” captures their role as steady clocks against which all change is measured.

Why three? The framework does not claim that there are exactly three such primitives. It identifies electron, proton, and known neutrinos as present examples. Should additional stable particles be discovered (sterile neutrinos, axions, stable WIMPs), the list would expand accordingly. The core claim is that **long-lived fundamental particles serve as persistent dynamical primitives** — the specific count is contingent on physics, not a necessary feature of the framework.

3.2 Rebar Constraints

In the biological analogy, collagen constrains GAG swelling, creating coherent tissue structure. In the cosmological analogy, the metronomes constrain space expansion, creating coherent cosmic structure:

Observation	Interpretation
Cosmic web	Filaments and voids — gravitational binding acts as rebar, constraining expansion
Structure formation	Overdensities collapse into galaxies, clusters, and superclusters
Dark matter	Provides additional gravitational scaffolding

The cosmic web is the “tissue” of the universe — a prestressed structure held together by persistent dynamical primitives.

---

4. Space as Osmotic Pressure

4.1 Osmotic Pressure in Biology

In the biological framework, GAGs and proteoglycans generate osmotic swelling pressure — a distributed expansive force.

4.2 Space as Expansive Medium

Within this framework, space is interpreted as an expansive medium analogous to osmotic pressure:

Property	Interpretation
Cosmic expansion	The “osmotic pressure” of space — it expands because it is pressurised
Cosmic acceleration	The pressure is not constant — it is increasing (dark energy)
Structure formation	The metronomes constrain the expansion into coherent structures

Within this framework, space is not empty. It is an active, pressurised medium. Its expansion is the “osmotic pressure” of the universe.

5. Dark Energy as WHC-Water Discrepancy

5.1 WHC-Water Discrepancy in Biology

In the biological framework, WHC-water discrepancy is the difference between theoretical water-holding capacity and actual water content — the “water held back” by collagen.

5.2 The Cosmic Discrepancy

In the cosmological framework, the cosmological constant (Λ) can be interpreted as the cosmic WHC-water discrepancy:

Observation	Interpretation
Matter-only expansion would decelerate	The “theoretical maximum” expansion
Observed expansion is accelerating	The “actual” expansion
The gap is filled by dark energy	The cosmic “water held back”

In ΛCDM, the observed expansion history requires a cosmological constant ($\Omega_\Lambda \approx 0.68$). Without it, the universe would decelerate. The gap between these two scenarios is precisely the WHC-water discrepancy at cosmic scale.

5.3 Falsification Condition

The WHC-Λ interpretation would be falsified if:

1. Dark energy were shown to have a dynamical nature fundamentally different from a cosmological constant (e.g., evolving dark energy with equation of state $w \neq$

-1)
2. The expansion history were found to be consistent with matter-only dynamics without Λ
3. The cosmological constant were derived from a mechanism that explicitly rules out the “max-minus-actual” interpretation

Note on Condition 1: This is not a remote hypothetical — it is currently the subject of live observational tension. DESI DR2 (2025), combined with supernova and CMB priors, shows a continuing preference for an evolving equation of state, with independent DES analysis reporting roughly 3.2σ preference for evolving dark energy over ΛCDM. However, a May 2026 systematics study (Afroz & Mukherjee) suggests part of the signal may trace to a cosmic-distance-duality mismatch between the BAO and supernova datasets rather than genuine dark-energy evolution. The field is currently split between “real signal” and “systematic artifact” readings. This is precisely the kind of live tension that a falsifiable heuristic should engage with — it shows that the condition is genuinely live, not a distant hypothetical.

5.4 Limitations

Issue	Address
Λ is a fitted parameter	It is not derived from a “max-minus-actual” calculation
No standard formalism equates Λ to a discrepancy	This is an interpretation, not a mathematical derivation
The framework is descriptive, not predictive	It describes what ΛCDM already describes

The interpretation is coherent but not yet operational. It is offered as a generative heuristic, not a replacement for ΛCDM.

6. Dynamics at Cosmic Scale

6.1 What is κ at Cosmic Scale?

In biology, κ is the rate at which a system returns to its dynamical trajectory after perturbation. At cosmic scale, κ is the rate at which the universe "corrects" deviations:

Candidate	Interpretation
Inflation	A period of rapid correction — a phase transition
Cosmic acceleration	The universe's ongoing "correction" toward a de Sitter attractor
Hubble rate approach to H_∞	The rate at which the universe approaches its de Sitter state

κ is defined as the rate of recovery toward the system's dynamical trajectory. The universe has no equilibrium state, but it has a dynamical trajectory — the expansion history. The approach to a de Sitter fixed point is a dissipative process in the horizon-thermodynamic sense.

Currently, no standard cosmological parameter explicitly measures κ. The concept is coherent but not yet operational.

Note on formalization: Ultimately, κ should be expressed as the largest negative eigenvalue of the linearized dynamics around an attractor. This would give κ the same mathematical meaning across all domains — cells, brains, AI, and cosmology would compute κ differently, but the mathematics would be identical. This is an open research question.

6.2 What is B at Cosmic Scale?

In biology, B is the energy barrier required to shift a system from one attractor state to another. At cosmic scale, B maps to:

Candidate	Interpretation
Vacuum stability	The depth of the vacuum basin
False vacuum lifetime	The time until a vacuum decay event
Inflationary potential barriers	The barriers between inflationary states

These actually resemble basin depth. Fundamental constants — which show no sign of variation over cosmic time — imply a very deep basin, but B itself is not the constants; it is the stability of the attractor landscape in which they are embedded.

Observation	Interpretation
Constants do not vary	$\Delta\alpha/\alpha < 10^{-17}$ per year — the basin is deep
Laws are stable	The universe resists perturbation
No observed transitions	No evidence of the universe “shifting” between attractors

B is inferred from constant stability, not measured directly.

6.3 The Universe as a Dissipative Attractor

Within this framework, the universe is interpreted as a **dissipative attractor in the horizon-thermodynamic sense**. De Sitter horizons exhibit Gibbons–Hawking temperature and horizon entropy, indicating entropy production without external energy input. The approach to a de Sitter fixed point is a genuinely dissipative process — phase-space contraction occurs through horizon thermodynamics.

This resolves the apparent tension: The universe has no external energy source, but it is not conservative in the attractor-theoretic sense. It is dissipative internally, through horizon dynamics.

Conservative systems — in the strict dynamical-systems sense — do not have attractors. The universe, approached as a de Sitter fixed point with horizon thermodynamics, is dissipative in the relevant sense. This is consistent with the framework's definition of κ as a recovery rate toward an attractor.

---

7. Observational Evidence

7.1 Cosmic Web as Rebar Constraints

Observations of large-scale structure show a cosmic web of galaxies arranged in filaments, sheets, and voids. This pattern is precisely what one would expect if massive particles (metronomes) constrained expansion:

Observation	Interpretation
Filaments	"Strands" under tension
Voids	Regions of low density, expanding freely
Clusters	Nodes where filaments intersect

The cosmic web is the "tissue" of the universe — a prestressed structure.

7.2 Expansion and ΛCDM

The expansion history of the universe is well described by ΛCDM. The "gap" between matter-only deceleration and observed acceleration is filled by dark energy:

Observation	Interpretation
$\Omega_\Lambda \approx 0.68$	Dark energy comprises ~68% of the universe’s energy density
Λ fits the data	The model matches CMB, BAO, and supernovae observations

The WHC-water discrepancy interpretation is consistent with ΛCDM.

7.3 Fundamental Constants and Basin Depth

Fundamental constants show no sign of variation over cosmic time. Dimensionless combinations containing c (e.g., the fine-structure constant α) are tightly constrained:

Constant	Variation Limit
α (fine-structure)	$<10^{-17}$ per year
G (gravitational)	$<10^{-12}$ per year
Lorentz invariance	Constrained by observations of high-energy photons from gamma-ray bursts

This implies a very deep basin — the constants are stable and resist perturbation.

---

8. Taoist Mapping

8.1 The Tao as Constraint Field

The Tao is described as the underlying order of all things — the “Way.” In the framework, this corresponds to the **constraint field** (attractor landscape), not the prestressed system itself.

Taoist Concept	Framework Mapping
The Tao	The constraint field — the underlying order

Taoist Concept	Framework Mapping
The universe	The prestressed system — the expression of the Tao

8.2 Wu Wei and High κ

Wu wei means “non-action” or “effortless action” — responding with natural ease rather than forcing. This corresponds structurally to high κ:

Wu Wei	High κ
Flowing with the Tao	Correcting errors smoothly
Not forcing	Rapid return to equilibrium
Natural harmony	System-level corrigibility

Caution: Wu wei is a felt quality of action as much as κ is a measured rate. The mapping is structural rather than literal — both describe a system that responds appropriately to perturbation without resistance.

8.3 Ziran and R (Reality Alignment)

Ziran means “naturalness” — being as one is, without external coercion. This is a **structural analogy**, not an equivalence:

Ziran	R (Reality Alignment)
Being what it is	Models correspond to reality
Without force	No external coercion
True to nature	Alignment with the Tao

Caution: Ziran is closer to spontaneous self-so-ness than to epistemic accuracy. Reality alignment (R) concerns how well a model corresponds to the external world. These overlap but are not identical. The mapping is structural, not causal.

8.4 Te (Virtue) and B (Basin Depth)

Te (virtue) in Taoist thought refers to the integrity and stability of a being's character — its capacity to maintain coherence without forcing. This structurally corresponds to basin depth (B): the ability to resist perturbation while maintaining identity.

Te (Virtue)	B (Basin Depth)
Maintains integrity	Resists perturbation
Does not force	Holds identity
Stable character	Deep attractor basin

The mapping is structural, not causal. B at the cosmic scale (stability of constants) and B at the personal scale (stability of character) are distinct phenomena that share the same dynamical form.

8.5 The Taoist Sage and the Attractor Ideal

Taoist Concept	Framework Translation
Wu wei	High κ — flow with the Tao
Ziran	High R — align with reality (structural analogy)
Te (virtue)	High B — maintain integrity
The sage	High κ + high B + high R

---

9. What This Paper Does Not Claim

This paper does not claim:

- The universe is alive
- The universe is conscious

- The universe has a mind
- The framework replaces ΛCDM
- The framework is a theory of everything
- The framework generates novel predictions (currently descriptive)
- The universe is conservative in the attractor-theoretic sense
- Mathematical equivalence between biological and cosmological systems

---

10. Limitations

Limitation	Address
Λ is a fitted parameter	It is not derived from a "max-minus-actual" calculation
κ is not operational at cosmic scale	No standard cosmological parameter measures "recovery toward dynamical trajectory"
B is not operational at cosmic scale	No direct measurement of basin depth exists
The framework is descriptive, not predictive	It describes what ΛCDM already describes
No new testable predictions	The framework must develop falsifiable predictions to move beyond heuristic status
The framework's universality is an empirical hypothesis	It must be tested across domains

These limitations are acknowledged. The paper is offered as a **generative heuristic** — a cross-domain unification and a vocabulary for seeing connections, not a replacement for ΛCDM.

11. Open Research Questions

Question 0: Are κ, B, C, and R scale-invariant?

Can κ, B, C, and R be defined consistently across scales — from cells to societies to the cosmos? If κ_{cell}, κ_{brain}, $\kappa_{society}$, and $\kappa_{universe}$ are fundamentally different, the framework fragments. If they can all be derived from one equation, the framework is unified.

Falsification: If the variables cannot be defined consistently across scales, the framework is not universal.

Question 0.1: What are the units of κ, B, C, and R in each domain?

κ sometimes equals 1/time, sometimes appears dimensionless, sometimes is a qualitative property. Universal frameworks require dimensional consistency or explicit normalization.

Falsification: If the variables cannot be given consistent units, the framework is not operational.

Question 0.2: Can a domain-independent state equation be written?

Can the framework be expressed as:

$$\frac{dX}{dt} = f(\kappa, B, C, R, X, E)$$

where X is the system state, E represents external perturbations, and κ, B, C, and R are parameters or functions with clearly defined roles?

The framework does not need a universal closed-form equation for every domain. But it does need to specify the functional role of each variable:

- Does increasing B always reduce transition probability between attractors?
- Does increasing κ always increase recovery rate after perturbation?
- Does C alter coupling strength between subsystems?
- Does R change how internal models update in response to evidence?

Falsification: If each domain requires entirely different equations, the framework is a taxonomy, not a unified theory.

Question 0.3: Does κ emerge from interaction topology?

Can κ be derived from the structure of the interaction manifold, or is it primitive? If derived, this would be a major theoretical advance.

Falsification: If κ cannot be derived from more fundamental properties, it remains primitive.

Question 0.4: Is B conserved or variable?

Does B increase with age? Decrease? Oscillate? Can B be measured directly? These are empirical questions.

Falsification: If B cannot be measured or shows no systematic behavior, the concept is not operational.

Question 0.5: How do κ, B, C, and R couple?

Are κ, B, C, and R independent, or do they interact? Can R increase without increasing κ? Can high B produce high C? Can

C suppress κ? These relationships should be modeled explicitly.

Falsification: If the variables show no systematic relationships, the framework lacks predictive power.

---

12. Conclusion

The universe can be interpreted as a prestressed system:

Element	Role
Three metronomes (e^-, p^+, ν)	Persistent dynamical primitives — “rebar”
Space	Osmotic pressure — expanding medium
Cosmological constant (Λ)	WHC-water discrepancy — the gap between theory and observation

The framework does not claim that the universe is alive or conscious. It claims that the universe is a dissipative system that persists under perturbation — and within the attractor framework, that is the defining characteristic of intelligence at its most basic level.

The Taoist mapping is structurally coherent: the Tao is the constraint field, wu wei is high κ (structural analogy), ziran is R (structural analogy), and te is B.

The framework is offered as a generative hypothesis, not a replacement for ΛCDM. Its value lies in its cross-domain unification and its ability to generate new questions — not in its predictive power, which remains to be established.

The next step is not additional analogies. It is mathematical formalization: can the framework’s variables be expressed in a domain-independent state equation? Can κ, B, C, and R be given consistent units across scales? Can the framework generate at

least one novel, falsifiable prediction that competing frameworks would not naturally generate? These are the questions that will determine whether the framework remains a heuristic or becomes a scientific theory.

References

- Galida, R. (2026a). “Intelligence is the Primitive: Consciousness as a Second-Order Regulator on a Dissipative Substrate.” *Fantasy Attractor.*
- Galida, R. (2026b). “The Attractor Framework as a Formal Mapping of Taoist Dynamics.” *Fantasy Attractor.*
- Galida, R. (2026c). “The Pre-tensioned Body: A Hypothesis Paper Grounding the Attractor Framework in ECM Mechanics.” *Fantasy Attractor.*
- Galida, R. (2026d). “Non-Physical Claims Are Fantasy Attractors: Why Unverifiable Realms Cannot Be Empirically Distinguished from Nonexistence.” *Fantasy Attractor.*
- Planck Collaboration (2020). “Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters.” *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 641, A6.
- Riess, A.G., et al. (1998). “Observational evidence from supernovae for an accelerating universe and a cosmological constant.” *The Astronomical Journal*, 116(3), 1009.
- Perlmutter, S., et al. (1999). “Measurements of Ω and Λ from 42 high-redshift supernovae.” *The Astrophysical Journal*, 517(2), 565.
- Gibbons, G.W., & Hawking, S.W. (1977). “Cosmological event horizons, thermodynamics, and particle creation.” *Physical Review D*, 15(10), 2738.

Suggested citation: Galida, R. S. (2026). The Universe as a Prestressed System: A Taoist Cosmology. *Fantasy Attractor*.

The Three Metronomes: Criteria for the Apparently Eternal Skeleton [F] (2026) Robert Galida – June 2026

Abstract

The attractor framework distinguishes conservative attractors (eternal skeleton) from dissipative attractors (transient dance). The most fundamental conservative attractors are the **electron, proton, and neutrino class** – collectively the **three metronomes**. This paper defines explicit criteria for a "metronome": (1) apparent immortality (no observed decay), (2) effective indivisibility under ordinary perturbations, (3) conservation-law protection, and (4) possession of a rest frame (non-zero rest mass). It shows that electrons, protons, and neutrinos (the three mass eigenstates treated as a single class) are the best-supported examples under current physics. The number three is empirical, not derived; the framework is corrigible. The three metronomes form the apparently eternal skeleton – a pragmatic substrate for measuring the transient dance of dissipative systems.

1. Introduction

The attractor framework divides persistent structures into two classes:

- **Conservative attractors** (eternal skeleton) — persist without energy input, without observed decay, without internal change. They are mindless, time-symmetric, and invariant.
- **Dissipative attractors** (transient dance) — persist only by consuming energy, export entropy, and eventually decay.

(The conservative/dissipative dichotomy is a framework stipulation, not a physical law; it is defended in the broader attractor framework literature, e.g., *Persistence Under Perturbation* and *Basin Defense and Stable Addition*.)

The most fundamental conservative attractors are the **three metronomes**: the **electron, proton, and the class of neutrino mass eigenstates** (ν_1, ν_2, ν_3). Their name evokes their role as invariant reference entities — they provide a stable substrate against which all change can be measured. This paper defines explicit criteria for a metronome and applies them to each candidate.

2. Criteria for a Metronome

A metronome in the attractor framework must satisfy four criteria:

Criterion	Meaning	Operational check
1. Apparent immortality	No observed decay; no lighter state exists for it to decay into under known laws	Lifetime lower bounds >> age of universe; no allowed decay channel
2. Effective indivisibility under ordinary perturbations	Behaves as a stable, indivisible unit under all perturbations relevant to the framework (scattering, binding, chemical reactions)	Remains the same particle after typical disturbances; does not spontaneously change identity
3. Conservation-law protection	Protected by an exact conservation law or an accidental symmetry that is effectively exact in the Standard Model	Lightest carrier of a conserved quantum number (electric charge, baryon number, lepton number)
4. Possession of a rest frame	Has non-zero rest mass, hence a proper time and the ability to serve as a reference clock *in its own rest frame*	Invariant mass > 0

Rationale for Criterion 4: Measurement requires a local frame. A massless particle has no rest frame, no proper time, and cannot be used as a persistent local reference. While photons are extremely long-lived, they serve as signal carriers, not as the invariant substrate. The framework prioritises rest-frame existence because the “eternal skeleton” is meant to be the background against which change is measured — a background must have a local perspective to anchor measurements. This is a **definitional choice**, not a consequence of particle physics, and it is consistently applied.

Note on Criterion 3: Baryon number and lepton number are accidental symmetries, not gauge symmetries. The paper treats them on equal footing because both provide effective stability for the proton and neutrinos under Standard Model physics. If future experiments reveal baryon or lepton number violation, the framework will adjust accordingly.

---

3. Why the Electron Is a Metronome

- **Apparent immortality:** Lightest negatively charged particle; no decay channel.
- **Effective indivisibility:** Remains an electron after scattering, binding, etc.
- **Conservation protection:** Electric charge and lepton number conservation.
- **Rest frame:** Non-zero rest mass.

→ The electron is a metronome.

---

4. Why the Proton Is a Metronome (Despite Being Composite)

- **Apparent immortality:** No observed decay; experimental lower limit on half-life > 10^{34} years (Super-Kamiokande, 2020).
- **Effective indivisibility:** For all practical purposes (chemistry, nuclear physics, stellar processes), the proton behaves as a stable, indivisible unit.
- **Conservation protection:** Baryon number is an accidental

symmetry; it protects the proton from decay in the Standard Model.
- **Rest frame:** Non-zero rest mass.

→ **The proton is a metronome.** The framework does not require elementary particles; it requires maximal persistence under relevant perturbations.

---

5. Why the Neutrino Class (ν_1, ν_2, ν_3) Is a Metronome

The three neutrino mass eigenstates are treated as a **single metronome class** because they share the same stability argument, differ only in mass, and are grouped for the framework's hierarchical classification.

- **Apparent immortality:** No observed decay; cosmological and astrophysical lower bounds on neutrino lifetimes are orders of magnitude longer than the age of the universe. Neutrino oscillation is flavour mixing, not decay — the mass eigenstates are stable.
- **Effective indivisibility:** Once a neutrino is in a mass eigenstate, it propagates without changing identity. (Weak interactions produce **flavour eigenstates** — superpositions of mass eigenstates — but the mass eigenstates themselves are stable and travel freely.)
- **Conservation protection:** Lepton number is an accidental symmetry; in the Standard Model it protects neutrinos from decay. (If future experiments confirm that neutrinos are Majorana particles — violating lepton number — the framework will adjust; this is part of its corrigibility.)
- **Rest frame:** Neutrinos have non-zero rest mass (confirmed by oscillation experiments), albeit very small.

→ **The neutrino class is a metronome.** The three mass eigenstates count as one metronome *type* for the framework's hierarchical classification.

---

6. Why Not Other Candidates?

Candidate	Fails criterion	Explanation
Free neutron	1 (apparent immortality)	Decays in ~15 minutes.
Neutron in a nucleus	2 (effective indivisibility)	Stability is environment-dependent; not an irreducible attractor.
Photon	4 (rest frame)	Massless; no proper time. Excluded by definition (see rationale for Criterion 4).
Muon, tau	1	Decay rapidly.
Dark matter candidates	Not yet identified	If discovered and shown to be stable, massive, and effectively indivisible, they could become additional metronomes.
Composite stable structures (nuclei, atoms)	2	Not effectively indivisible; they are built from metronomes and are dissipative or emergent attractors, not part of the invariant skeleton.

---

7. The Number Three: Empirical, Not Derived

The paper's title uses "three metronomes" as a convenient label for the electron, proton, and the neutrino class (the three mass eigenstates grouped together). The number three is not derived from first principles; it reflects current best empirical knowledge. If new stable particles are discovered (e.g., dark matter), the list will expand. The framework is corrigible by design.

---

8. The Apparently Eternal Skeleton

The term “apparently eternal” is strictly empirical: these particles have never been observed to decay or be transient, and for all practical purposes they behave as if they have no end. The three metronomes form the **eternal skeleton** – a pragmatic substrate against which the transient dance of dissipative systems (life, mind, society) is measured. This is a **framework-internal** construct, not a metaphysical claim.

---

9. Stable Resonances and the Grounding of Dissipative Time Metrics

Each of the three metronomes possesses an **invariant quantum frequency** – its Compton frequency, given by $f=mc^2/h$. For the electron, this is ~1.24×10^{20} Hz; for the proton, ~2.27×10^{23} Hz; for neutrinos, the frequencies are very small but non-zero. These frequencies are invariant, universal, and identical for every identical particle in the universe. They are **stable resonances** of the eternal skeleton.

Why this matters for dissipative systems:

Every dissipative system (a living cell, a brain, a society) is composed of or continuously interacts with electrons, protons, and neutrinos. The **time constant τ** that appears in corrective permeability ($\kappa = 1/\tau$) can, in principle, be expressed as a multiple of these fundamental resonance periods. For example, a neuron's recovery time after a perturbation — determined by ion channel kinetics, membrane capacitance, and metabolic rate — is measurable against the same invariant clock as any other physical process. The metronome provides the **unit** of time, not the mechanism.

Thus, κ is a genuine physical variable, not a mere metaphor. It refers to a ratio of measurable durations, anchored in the invariant frequencies of the metronomes.

Cross-domain comparability:

The framework's ability to compare κ values across vastly different domains (e.g., a thermostat's seconds-scale τ and a political movement's months-scale τ) does **not** follow from shared Compton-frequency units alone. It follows from the framework's **definitional choice** to treat κ as a domain-general variable — a diagnostic that measures the same functional property (speed of return to baseline) in every system, regardless of scale or substrate. The metronomes ensure that such measurements are, in principle, commensurable; they do not guarantee that the comparison is meaningful in every case. That is a framework commitment, not a physics claim.

Caveat: The expression of τ as a multiple of Compton periods is a conceptual grounding, not a practical measurement protocol. No one will measure a society's reaction time in electron oscillations. The importance is that κ is not an arbitrary label; it is a dimensionless ratio of durations, and durations are defined by the invariant resonances of the three metronomes.

---

10. κ and Basin Depth as Heuristics

The attractor framework introduces corrective permeability ($\kappa = 1/\tau$) and basin depth (B) as conceptual heuristics. For the metronomes:

- **κ** for decay is vanishingly small (effectively zero) on all observable timescales.
- **Basin depth** is the energy barrier required to change the particle's identity — effectively infinite for all practical purposes.

These are **qualitative descriptors**; they are not operational quantities in particle physics. They are included here for completeness of the framework's vocabulary. For the application of κ and B to dissipative systems (e.g., belief updating, neural recovery), see the papers *Basin Defense and Stable Addition* and *Why Clockwork Interventions Fail*.

---

11. Corrigibility and Falsifiability

The framework explicitly invites revision:

- If proton decay is observed, the proton will be downgraded to "very long-lived" (or removed).
- If neutrino decay or Majorana nature is confirmed, the neutrino class's status will be revised.
- If new stable particles are discovered, they will be added.

The attractor framework is a **philosophical taxonomy and diagnostic tool**, not a predictive physical theory. Its value lies in providing a unified language for persistence across domains.

12. Conclusion

The electron, proton, and neutrino class satisfy the attractor framework's four criteria for metronomes: apparent immortality, effective indivisibility under ordinary perturbations, conservation-law protection, and possession of a rest frame. They are the **best-supported examples** of the apparently eternal skeleton under current physics. The framework is corrigible, the number three is empirical, and the language of "eternal skeleton" is pragmatic. The three metronomes anchor the distinction between conservative and dissipative persistence.

Suggested citation: Galida, R. S. (2026). The Three Metronomes: Criteria for the Apparently Eternal Skeleton. *Fantasy Attractor.*

Metronome, Memory, and the Threefold Anchor: A Relational Account of Time [F] (2026)

Abstract

This paper presents a relational view of time based on the attractor framework.

We argue that two very different kinds of attractors work together to create what we call time:

- **Conservative attractors** (electrons, neutrinos, protons) act as metronomes. They provide a steady, repeatable rhythm — a ruler for measuring duration.
- **Dissipative attractors** (living cells, minds, societies) act as memory. They accumulate irreversible changes, giving time its direction.

Time is not a mysterious substance. It is the coupling between these three fundamental metronomes and the irreversible flow of memory. What binds all dissipative systems — from a bacterium to a brain to a galaxy — is the continuous recycling of the same three eternal metronomes.

This view offers a conceptual account of how clocks work, why time has an arrow, and how aging, entropy, and history fit together.

The dance of time has three metronomes and a memory.

---

1. Two Classes of Persistence, Two Roles for Time

In the attractor framework, everything that persists does so by resisting disturbance. We identify two distinct types of persistent structures, each giving rise to a different aspect of time.

1.1 Conservative Attractors — The Metronome

Conservative attractors are protected by physical conservation laws (charge, baryon number, energy). They are:

- **Eternal** – they do not age or decay (or are effectively stable on all observable timescales).
- **Time-symmetric at the level of intrinsic persistence** – their existence as attractors is symmetric under time reversal, though some interactions (weak force) violate CP and thus T.
- **Type-identical** – every electron has the same Compton frequency; every neutrino mass eigenstate has an invariant (though not yet precisely measured) frequency.

Because of these properties, conservative attractors serve as reference standards for duration – metronomes. The international definition of the second is literally a fixed number of such ticks.

1.2 Dissipative Attractors – Memory

Dissipative attractors (cells, minds, ecosystems, societies) are different:

- They require a continuous flow of energy and must export entropy.
- Their dynamics are irreversible – you cannot return to a past microstate without enormous cost.
- This irreversibility creates a directional arrow: before and after, past and future.
- They accumulate memory – irreversible state changes that persist and affect future behaviour.

Memory = irreversible accumulated state change (inscription). Examples: synaptic plasticity, scars, fossil records, cultural archives, radioactive decay (the daughter nucleus retains a record of the parent's disintegration).

---

2. The Three Metronomes: Our Most Fundamental Clocks

The Standard Model contains many particles, but only three classes are absolutely or effectively stable and serve as fundamental metronomes. The photon is not a metronome — it has zero rest mass, hence no rest-frame Compton frequency. It is a mode of propagation, not a standalone persistent entity.

Class / Particle	**Symbol**	**Key Property**	**Role as Metronome**
Electron	e^-	lightest charged lepton	Compton frequency ~1.24 × 10^{20} Hz
Neutrino mass eigenstates (collectively)	ν_1, ν_2, ν_3	neutral, tiny masses	Compton frequencies (mass-dependent); effectively stable
Proton	p	lightest baryon	Compton frequency ~2.27 × 10^{23} Hz; no observed decay

These three classes form what the framework calls the *eternal skeleton* — the collection of conservative structures that persist without decay and provide the stable background against which dissipative change occurs.

Stability notes

- Proton decay has never been observed; lower limit on half-life > 10^{34} years — effectively eternal. The proton is composite, but its stability derives from baryon number conservation, not merely nuclear binding energy.
- Neutrinos oscillate between flavours, but the underlying mass eigenstates are stable on cosmological timescales. Their exact Compton frequencies are not yet known to metrological precision — only mass-squared differences have been measured — but they are theoretically

invariant.

These three metronomes do not need energy input to persist. Their frequencies are invariant (known for electron and proton; theoretically invariant for neutrinos). Any clock based on one agrees with any other after accounting for relativity, as confirmed by atomic clock comparisons.

---

3. Time as the Coupling Between Metronomes and Memory

Time is not a primitive substance. It is the relationship between the metronome ensemble and dissipative memory.

- The three metronomes provide a metric — an invariant ruler for “how much” duration has passed.
- Memory provides direction — which events are past, which are future.
- Without metronomes, change would be unmeasurable — no ruler.
- Without memory, change would be reversible and directionless — no before/after.

Both are necessary for what we operationally call time.

As a working placeholder, let the rate of memory inscription be $dM/dt=f(M,\nu)$, where ν is a characteristic metronome frequency and M is the current accumulated memory state. Two limiting cases anchor the idea:

- As $\nu\to 0$ — no metronome — duration becomes undefined. Change occurs but cannot be quantified as a metric interval. This is the “no ruler” condition.
- As dissipation $\to 0$ — no memory — M remains constant.

Change leaves no trace, so there is no before/after. This is the “no arrow” condition.

What binds all dissipative systems — a bacterial cell, a human brain, a galaxy, a social institution — is the continuous **recycling of the same three eternal metronomes**. Every dissipative system operates by exchanging electrons, protons, and neutrinos with its environment. The metronomes are the invariant substrate; the memory is the transient pattern. The coupling is the recycling.

Thus, time is not merely a coordinate; it is the ongoing, irreversible reconfiguration of eternal components into transient, memory-bearing structures.

The three metronomes are time-symmetric at the level of intrinsic persistence. The arrow of time comes from dissipative systems that accumulate history. Time is the coupling between these two regimes.

---

4. Thermodynamic Information Theory and Persistence

The persistence functional $P(x)$ measures how deep an attractor basin is — formally, the depth of the basin in the system’s phase space (the energy or Lyapunov function value required to escape the basin). Higher P means a more stable attractor.

- In a dissipative attractor, maintaining memory requires continuous energy export to counteract thermal noise.
- Landauer’s principle: erasing one bit costs at least $k_B T \ln 2$ of free energy. Retaining memory against thermal fluctuations requires energy input.

We interpret $P(x)$ as a measure of information retention: systems with higher P preserve mutual information between past and present for longer. The decay rate $-\dot{P}/P$ relates to entropy production, connecting the attractor framework to non-equilibrium thermodynamics.

---

5. Consequences and Applications

- **Clocks** – Atomic clocks derive stability from electron transitions. The three metronomes guarantee cross-calibration.
- **Aging** – Biological aging is the accumulation of irreversible memory, measured against metronomes like circadian rhythms.
- **Critical slowing down** – As a system approaches a bifurcation, $-\dot{P}/P$ decreases, providing early-warning signals (rising autocorrelation, variance) in physiology, ecology, and social systems.
- **Hysteresis in beliefs** – Fantasy attractors exhibit hysteresis – the path of belief change differs when accumulating vs. removing evidence. The hysteresis loop area quantifies memory.[1]
- **Cosmological time** – The cosmic microwave background is a memory of the early universe (here “memory” is metaphorical). Atomic clocks measure the duration since those imprints were formed.

[1] *Fantasy attractor*: in the attractor framework, a dissipative structure (typically a belief system) with abnormally low corrective permeability, resistant to updating despite counter-evidence.

---

6. Relation to the Broader Attractor Framework

The metronome-memory distinction is a special case of the conservative vs. dissipative attractor dichotomy. It sharpens the “eternal skeleton / transient dance” metaphor.

The three metronomes are the most fundamental layer of the eternal skeleton — the collection of conservative structures that persist without decay and provide the stable background against which dissipative change occurs.

The framework does not claim that time is “made of” attractors. It claims that the measurement and experience of time rely on the interaction of these two persistence regimes. Because every dissipative system continuously recycles the same eternal metronomes, all such systems are materially unified across space and time. That unity is what makes a universal, relational time possible.

---

7. Open Questions and Refinements

- **Formalising $P(x)$** — Rigorous derivation for deterministic (Lyapunov), stochastic (escape time), and information-theoretic (surprisal) cases.
- **Coupling equations** — Specify $dM/dt=f(M,\nu)$. Can it be tested empirically?
- **Category clarity** — Conservative attractors span strict symmetry-protected invariants (elementary particles) and emergent approximate invariants (clocks). Future work should stratify these.
- **Falsifiability** — Concrete falsifiers: a persistent system without dissipation, or a social attractor that never updates despite counter-evidence.
- **Relation to other relational accounts** — Converges with

Barbour (1999) and Rovelli (1996). The difference: the present framework identifies the two required poles (conservative metronomes providing metric invariance; dissipative memory providing direction) and grounds both in attractor dynamics.

---

8. Conclusion

Time is not a primitive. It is the relational coupling between:

- the three fundamental conservative attractor classes — electron, neutrino mass eigenstates (collectively), and proton — which provide invariant metric structure (the metronome), and
- dissipative systems that accumulate irreversible state inscription (memory).

What binds all dissipative systems — from a bacterium to a brain to a galaxy — is the continuous recycling of the same three eternal metronomes. The metronomes are the invariant substrate; memory is the transient pattern; time is the coupling.

This account respects how physics measures time, explains the arrow via entropy and information persistence, and offers transferable concepts across neuroscience, ecology, sociology, and AI.

The dance has three metronomes and a memory.

References

Barbour, J. (1999). *The End of Time.* Oxford University Press.
Rovelli, C. (1996). Relational quantum mechanics. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 35(8), 1637–1678.

Suggested citation: Galida, R. S. (2026). Metronome, Memory, and the Threefold Anchor: A Relational Account of Time.

Barbour, J. (1999). *The End of Time.* Oxford University Press.

Rovelli, C. (1996). Relational quantum mechanics. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 35(8), 1637–1678.

Suggested citation: Galida, R. S. (2026). Metronome, Memory, and the Threefold Anchor: A Relational Account of Time.