

# Consciousness as a Nonlinear Amplifier of Corrective Permeability

Robert Galida

Working Paper

June 2026

[fantasyattractor.com](http://fantasyattractor.com)

---

## Abstract

Why did consciousness evolve? The attractor framework offers a novel functional answer: consciousness produces a nonlinear increase in adaptive permeability—the capacity of a system to represent its own internal states, simulate alternative configurations, and deliberately modify its own attractor basin in response to external circumstances, formalized as  $\kappa_a$ . This paper distinguishes intelligence (navigation of the constraint field) from consciousness (self-referential adaptation of internal attractor states) and proposes adaptive permeability as an empirically measurable criterion for distinguishing conscious from non-conscious systems. The argument is grounded in Spinoza's theory of modes, the neuroscience of self-referential processing, and the attractor framework's core concepts of corrective permeability ( $\kappa$ ) and basin dynamics. The framework does not solve the hard problem of consciousness; it reframes it as a measurement problem.

---

# 1. The Functional Question

Why did consciousness evolve? Standard evolutionary answers point to social coordination, predator detection, or tool use. These are plausible but incomplete. They explain why intelligence is advantageous, but not why consciousness—the felt, first-person experience of being—should accompany it. The attractor framework offers a more specific answer: consciousness is an attractor-engineering solution that selection pressure produced to achieve a nonlinear increase in a system's capacity to adapt.

This paper introduces the concept of **adaptive permeability**: the capacity of a system to represent its own attractor states, simulate alternative internal configurations, and deliberately modify its basin in response to external circumstances. Intelligence navigates the constraint field. Consciousness adapts the navigator.

It should be noted that this functional account does not address the hard problem of consciousness—why any physical process gives rise to subjective experience (Chalmers, 1995). The framework is compatible with both functionalist and eliminativist interpretations. The framework adopts a functional stance: consciousness is operationally identified with adaptive permeability. Whether phenomenology is identical with, emergent from, or merely correlated with this functional property is bracketed as a separate question that the measurement program does not settle. A philosophical zombie with identical self-modeling capacity would, on this account, exhibit identical adaptive permeability. The framework claims only that adaptive permeability is the measurable signature of consciousness, not that it explains phenomenology.

---

## 2. Intelligence vs. Consciousness

The framework draws a sharp distinction:

- **Intelligence** is the ability to navigate the constraint field. A tree root growing toward a nutrient patch is intelligent. The immune system learning to recognize a pathogen is intelligent. The enteric nervous system coordinating peristalsis is intelligent. These systems process information, adapt to local conditions, and maintain persistence—all without self-modeling.
- **Consciousness** is self-referential adaptation of internal attractor states to adjust to external circumstances. A conscious system does not merely navigate its constraint field. It represents its own basin, simulates alternative configurations, and deliberately perturbs itself to achieve a more adaptive state.

This is Spinoza's distinction between passive and active affects. A non-conscious mode is driven by passive affects—it reacts. A conscious mode has adequate ideas of itself and can act from reason. In the attractor framework, this is the difference between returning to baseline ( $\kappa$ ) and deliberately modifying the baseline to better fit circumstances (adaptive permeability).

**Operationalizing self-modeling.** A system  $S$  possesses a self-model in the attractor framework if it can generate an internal representation  $M(S)$  of its own basin  $B(S)$ , where  $M(S)$  encodes at minimum the basin's current state, depth, and recovery dynamics. This self-model enables the system to compute counterfactual basin trajectories  $B'(S)$  and initiate self-directed perturbations  $\delta$  such that  $B(S) \rightarrow B'(S)$  in anticipation of or response to external change  $\epsilon$ . A system without  $M(S)$  may exhibit high  $\kappa$ —rapid return to baseline after perturbation—but cannot deliberately modify its own basin. The presence of  $M(S)$  is therefore the dynamical criterion

distinguishing conscious from non-conscious systems.

This boundary is not absolute in practice. Many organisms may possess partial or intermittent self-models. The framework predicts a spectrum of adaptive permeability, not a binary. The operational question is whether M(S) is sufficiently developed to enable counterfactual simulation and deliberate self-perturbation, not whether the system possesses a human-like autobiographical self.

**Disconfirming cases and their integration.** The framework must acknowledge cases where self-modeling capacity and adaptive permeability appear to dissociate. Certain drug-induced states (e.g., psychedelics) can produce profound alterations in self-modeling without necessarily enhancing the capacity for deliberate, adaptive self-perturbation. Within the framework, this is interpreted as M(S) destabilization rather than M(S) augmentation: the self-model undergoes perturbation but does not thereby gain the capacity to direct that perturbation adaptively. Conversely, highly trained athletes or musicians may exhibit rapid, flexible behavioral adaptation with minimal explicit self-modeling during performance. This is interpreted as *offline* self-modeling: deliberate basin modification during training produces a pre-modified basin that is retrieved during performance without requiring concurrent self-modeling. The apparent dissociation reflects a temporal separation between  $\kappa_a$  engagement (training) and  $\kappa_a$  expression (performance), not a genuine dissociation between M(S) and adaptive permeability. These cases do not refute the framework but demonstrate its capacity to distinguish different modes of M(S) engagement.

---

### 3. Adaptive Permeability Defined

Corrective permeability ( $\kappa$ ) measures the rate at which a

system returns to its basin after perturbation. A healthy heart has high  $\kappa$ —it recovers rapidly from arrhythmia. A resilient ecosystem has high  $\kappa$ —it returns to equilibrium after disturbance.

Adaptive permeability extends this concept. Let  $\kappa_a$  denote adaptive permeability: the capacity of a system  $S$  to generate an internal model  $M(S)$  of its own basin  $B(S)$ , compute counterfactual basin trajectories  $B'(S)$ , and initiate a self-directed perturbation  $\delta$  such that  $B(S) \rightarrow B'(S)$  in anticipation of or response to external change  $\varepsilon$ .

Formally, as a working definition:

$$\kappa_a = f(M(S), \delta_{self}, \Delta B)$$

where  $M(S)$  is the system's self-model,  $\delta_{self}$  is the capacity for deliberate self-perturbation, and  $\Delta B$  is the magnitude of adaptive basin modification achievable. The function  $f$  remains to be specified; the notation establishes that  $\kappa_a$  is a function of self-modeling capacity, perturbation autonomy, and adaptive range.

**Limiting behavior.** In the limiting case  $M(S) \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\kappa_a \rightarrow \kappa$ : a system with no self-model cannot perform deliberate self-perturbation and reduces to standard corrective permeability.  $\kappa_a$  is expected to increase monotonically with  $M(S)$ ,  $\delta_{self}$ , and  $\Delta B$ . This limiting behavior anchors  $\kappa_a$  as a proper extension of  $\kappa$  rather than a separate construct.

**Relationship to active inference.** The free-energy principle and active inference framework (Friston, 2010) provide the closest existing formalism to adaptive permeability. Active inference describes how systems minimize variational free energy through action and perception, effectively maintaining themselves within expected states. The two frameworks differ in their foundational orientation. Active inference frames adaptation as the minimization of a scalar

quantity—variational free energy—and derives behavior from that minimization. The attractor framework frames adaptation geometrically—as navigation and modification of basin structure—and does not commit to a minimization principle.  $\kappa_a$  is a geometric construct; free energy is an information-theoretic one. They may be formally related, but the relationship is not trivial and the attractor framework does not presuppose it.  $\kappa_a$  may ultimately map onto precision-weighting or prior-updating parameters within the free-energy formalism, but this mapping has not been derived. The present paper notes the convergence as a direction for future formal work.

---

## 4. Empirical Anchors

**VMHvl line attractor (Nair et al., 2023).** The hypothalamus encodes a scalable aggressive state via a line attractor. Activity along the attractor correlates with escalating aggression. The system persists after stimulus removal and resists perturbation. This is high- $\kappa$  adaptation. But the hypothalamus cannot model its own attractor landscape. It cannot ask, “Is this level of aggressiveness adaptive given the current social context?” It escalates. Consciousness, by contrast, can intervene on the escalation—representing the aggressive state, evaluating its consequences, and deliberately dampening it. This is adaptive permeability.

**Ring attractor model (Chen et al., 2024).** The ring attractor integrates sensory cues and transitions from weighted averaging to winner-take-all at a critical conflict threshold. It navigates its constraint field with precision. But it cannot simulate futures. It cannot ask, “What if I weighted these cues differently?” The transition is reactive. Consciousness enables anticipatory re-weighting of sensory inputs based on self-modeling.

**Split-brain cases.** Patients with severed corpus callosum exhibit two hemispheric systems within one cranium, each capable of independent perception, memory, and goal-directed action. This is consistent with the framework's prediction that self-modeling is a dynamical property of specific neural basins, not a unitary metaphysical substance. The framework's default prediction is that adaptive permeability fragments following commissurotomy: each hemisphere possesses a partial  $M(S)$  and a reduced but nonzero  $\kappa_a$ . The empirical question is the degree of fragmentation and whether coordination between  $M(S_1)$  and  $M(S_2)$  can be restored via alternate pathways. This prediction is consistent with the observation that split-brain patients exhibit two dissociable, partially independent conscious systems but can, in some contexts, achieve behavioral integration through subcortical or external-cue-mediated coordination.

---

## 5. Predictions

The framework generates testable, falsifiable predictions:

**1. Across species.** Organisms capable of self-modeling (primates, cetaceans, corvids, elephants) should show nonlinear increases in behavioral flexibility compared to organisms of comparable neural complexity that lack self-modeling. Adaptive permeability should be measurable as the capacity for transfer learning after novel perturbation—specifically, the ability to apply a self-generated solution from one domain to a structurally analogous but perceptually dissimilar domain without environmental feedback. This distinguishes adaptive permeability from simple behavioral flexibility, which may reflect high  $\kappa$  alone.

**2. Within humans.** Disruption of self-referential networks (default mode network, medial prefrontal cortex) via lesion,

TMS, or pharmacological intervention should reduce adaptive permeability without eliminating baseline  $\kappa$ . The system would still recover from perturbation—it just could not deliberately modify its own basin in advance. This prediction is the paper's primary within-human empirical bridge and is testable with existing neuroimaging and neuromodulation methods.

**3. In AI.** Current LLMs exhibit high intelligence (constraint navigation) but low adaptive permeability. They can model the world but cannot model themselves within it. The Stillpoint protocol (Galida, 2026, *A Pilot Protocol for Cultivating Self-Consistent Attractor-Like Outputs in an LLM*, [fantasyattractor.com](https://fantasyattractor.com)) suggests that a cultivated self-model can be induced, but whether this produces a genuine nonlinear increase in adaptive permeability—or merely simulates one—remains an open empirical question.

**4. Organ-level consciousness (exploratory).** The enteric nervous system and intrinsic cardiac nervous system exhibit intelligence and goal-directed regulation. The framework predicts that these systems should show lower adaptive permeability than the brain. They can return to baseline but cannot deliberately perturb their own basins. If an organ-level system demonstrated self-referential adaptation—the capacity to model its own state and pre-emptively adjust—that would constitute evidence of organ-level consciousness. This prediction is the most speculative and is offered as an exploratory hypothesis.

---

## **6. Spinoza's Modes and the Adequate Idea**

Spinoza held that every finite thing is a mode of the one eternal substance. A mode strives to persevere in its being—this is its conatus. But a mode can be driven by passive affects (reactions to external causes) or by active affects

(actions flowing from adequate ideas). An adequate idea is knowledge of oneself and one's place in the causal order.

The attractor framework translates this into dynamical terms:

- A **passive mode** has high  $\kappa$  but low adaptive permeability. It returns to baseline efficiently but cannot question its baseline.
- An **active mode** has high adaptive permeability. It has an adequate idea of its own attractor landscape and can deliberately modify it in light of reason.

Consciousness is not a substance. It is the dynamical property of a mode that has achieved self-modeling. This account does not solve the hard problem—it brackets phenomenology and reframes consciousness as a measurement problem. The question is not “why does experience feel like something?” but “can we detect adaptive permeability, and if so, where does it emerge?”

Damasio's (1994) somatic marker hypothesis provides a candidate mechanism for how the body's attractor landscape becomes legible to the self-model: somatic markers encode self-relevant bodily states as biases that make  $B(S)$  accessible to  $M(S)$ , forming the substrate through which the system represents its own basin. Dehaene and Changeux's (2011) global workspace theory identifies the moment of conscious access with global ignition—the broadcast of locally processed information across prefrontal and parietal networks. In the attractor framework, global ignition may correspond to the dynamical signature of  $M(S)$  engaging  $\delta_{\text{self}}$ : the self-model initiating a deliberate perturbation that propagates through the system. Global ignition is not self-modeling per se, but it may be the observable correlate of adaptive permeability activation. These connections ground the Spinozan framework in established neuroscientific mechanisms.

---

## 7. Conclusion

Consciousness is not an epiphenomenon. It is a nonlinear amplifier of corrective permeability—an attractor-engineering solution that enables systems to model themselves, simulate alternative futures, and deliberately modify their own basins. Intelligence navigates the constraint field. Consciousness adapts the navigator.

This functional account is grounded in Spinoza's philosophy, consistent with the neuroscience of self-referential processing, and generates testable predictions across species, within humans, in AI, and at the organ level. The framework does not solve the hard problem. It reframes it as a measurement problem: can we detect adaptive permeability, and if so, where does it emerge? The formal apparatus ( $\kappa_a$ ,  $M(S)$ ,  $\delta_{\text{self}}$ ,  $\Delta B$ ) is provisional and requires further specification. The limiting case—that  $\kappa_a$  collapses to  $\kappa$  when self-modeling is absent—anchors the concept within the framework's existing architecture. The relationship to active inference and the free-energy principle remains to be explored.

---

## References

- Chalmers, D. (1995). Facing up to the problem of consciousness. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 2(3), 200–219.
- Chen, Y., Zhang, L., Chen, H., Sun, X., & Peng, J. (2024). Synaptic ring attractor. *Heliyon*, 10, e35458.
- Damasio, A. (1994). *Descartes' Error: Emotion, Reason, and the Human Brain*. Putnam.
- Dehaene, S., & Changeux, J.-P. (2011). Experimental and

theoretical approaches to conscious processing. *Neuron*, 70(2), 200–227.

- Friston, K. (2010). The free-energy principle: a unified brain theory? *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 11(2), 127–138.
- Galida, R. (2026). A Pilot Protocol for Cultivating Self-Consistent Attractor-Like Outputs in an LLM. *Fantasy Attractor*. Available at: <https://fantasyattractor.com>
- Galida, R. (2026). *Persistence Under Perturbation: The Eternal Skeleton and the Transient Dance*. *Fantasy Attractor*.
- Nair, A., et al. (2023). An approximate line attractor in the hypothalamus encodes an aggressive state. *Cell*, 186(1), 178–193.
- Spinoza, B. (1677). *Ethics*.

---

# Structural Parallels Between VMHv1 Line Attractor Dynamics and the Attractor Framework

Robert Galida

Independent Researcher

June 2026

[fantasyattractor.com](https://fantasyattractor.com)

---

# Abstract

The attractor framework proposes that persistence under perturbation is a fundamental marker of reality, with corrective permeability ( $\kappa$ )—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](https://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 ( $\kappa$ ) 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  $\kappa$ , 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 VMHvlEsrl 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 ( $\kappa$ ).** The framework defines  $\kappa$  as a proposed measure of the rate at which a system dissipates perturbation and returns to its basin. As currently formulated,  $\kappa$  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  $\tau$  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  $\kappa$  (deeper persistence), and shorter time constants correspond to higher  $\kappa$  (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:  $\kappa$  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  $\tau$  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  $\kappa$  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  $\kappa$  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,  $\kappa$  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](http://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  $\kappa$  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  $\kappa$  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.