

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/>