

Hypothesis

Not peer-reviewed version

---

# From Ethology to Psychiatry: A General Law of Emotion and Behavior

---

[Tahir Rahman](#)\*

Posted Date: 28 April 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202504.2209.v1

Keywords: ARCH model; emotion; behavior; archetype; drive; culture; ethology; neuroscience; affective neuroscience; psychiatry; symbolic imprinting; thymotic drive; comparative psychology; neural circuits; behavioral law; fixed action patterns; cultural modulation; evolutionary psychology; cognitive neuropsychology; forensic psychiatry



Preprints.org is a free multidisciplinary platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This open access article is published under a Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license, which permit the free download, distribution, and reuse, provided that the author and preprint are cited in any reuse.

*Hypothesis*

# From Ethology to Psychiatry: A General Law of Emotion and Behavior

Tahir Rahman

Associate Professor of Psychiatry, Washington University in St. Louis, School of Medicine

**Abstract:** This paper introduces the ARCH model—Behavior = Archetype × Drive × Culture—as a biologically grounded framework for understanding emotion and behavior across species. Rooted in Tinbergen's ethological paradigm, the model formalizes emotion as the emergent outcome of conserved behavioral scripts (archetypes), motivational systems (drives), and sociocultural modulation (culture). Neurobiologically anchored in systems such as the amygdala, hypothalamus, and mesolimbic pathways, the model accounts for affective expression across phylogeny, from bacteria to primates, and includes applications in psychiatric diagnosis, comparative ethology, and cognitive neuropsychology. The ARCH model reframes psychopathology as misalignment within the triad, offering explanatory value for conditions such as dissociation, addiction, and violent extremism. By unifying neural substrates, motivational states, and symbolic environments, ARCH provides a scalable, testable, and evolutionarily conserved law of behavior, with implications for psychiatry, AI, and behavioral science.

**Keywords:** ARCH model; emotion; behavior; archetype; drive; culture; ethology; neuroscience; affective neuroscience; psychiatry; symbolic imprinting; thymotic drive; comparative psychology; neural circuits; behavioral law; fixed action patterns; cultural modulation; evolutionary psychology; cognitive neuropsychology; forensic psychiatry

---

## 1. Introduction

In his landmark 1963 work, Nikolaas Tinbergen proposed that any biological behavior must be understood through four complementary questions: causation (mechanism), development (ontogeny), evolution (phylogeny), and survival value (adaptation) [1]. Tinbergen's framework has attracted little criticism, and has stood the test of time, as seen in modern literature on animal behavior which quote his distinctions with approval [2]. Yet in modern emotion research, this integrative perspective is often lost. Models of affect tend to fragment into circuit-based neuroscience, cognitive appraisals, or cultural constructions. What is missing is a biologically grounded framework that synthesizes these explanatory levels, particularly with regards to an ethological lens [3].

The ARCH model—Behavior = Archetype × Drive × Culture—is proposed as such a framework. It formalizes emotion as an emergent property of evolutionarily conserved behavioral scripts (archetypes), neurobiological motivation systems (drives), and context-sensitive interpretation (culture) [4]. In doing so, ARCH meets Tinbergen's call for a unified ethological perspective. This paper introduces the model within a neuroevolutionary framework and explores its implications for emotion processing, affective neuroscience, as well as clinical and cognitive neuropsychology.

**By design, the ARCH model satisfies Tinbergen's four levels of analysis.**

- a. **Causation (mechanism)** is addressed by integrating neurobiological substrates—including the amygdala, hypothalamus, and hormone-modulated circuits—that instantiate archetypal responses.
- b. **Development (ontogeny)** reflects how cultural learning and symbolic imprinting shape archetype expression across the lifespan.
- c. **Evolution (phylogeny)** is evident in cross-species recurrence of conserved behavioral patterns—such as caregiving, threat response, and status assertion—demonstrated in ethological studies.

- d. **Function (adaptation)** is fulfilled through the adaptive utility of archetypes in solving recurrent evolutionary challenges related to reproduction, social bonding, threat avoidance, and exploration.

In this way, ARCH operates as a complete explanatory model of emotional behavior that is mechanistic, developmental, evolutionary, and adaptive in scope.

## 2. Theoretical Framework

**Archetypes.** Archetypes refer to evolutionarily conserved behavioral scripts that recur across species and contexts [5]. They are biologically instantiated patterns shaped by Darwinian selection pressures and realized in neural circuitry. These behavioral templates enable organisms to respond adaptively to common ecological and social challenges. Key archetypes include:

- a. **Caregiver:** Supports nurturing, feeding, grooming, and protection, primarily triggered by infant cues such as vocalizations, eye contact, and tactile contact. This archetype is mediated by oxytocin and prolactin signaling, with key involvement of the ventromedial hypothalamus, medial preoptic area, and paraventricular nucleus [6,7]. Neuroimaging studies in humans show increased activity in these regions in response to infant crying and facial expressions, particularly in mothers and primary caregivers [7]. Rodent studies have demonstrated that disrupting oxytocin receptors in these regions impairs pup retrieval and maternal grooming [8]. Primate research, including in macaques and chimpanzees, reveals cross-species conservation of this circuitry, with culturally modulated expressions such as alloparenting and grooming hierarchies [9]. The caregiver archetype is not merely affective but is embedded in sensorimotor integration and hormonal readiness, serving adaptive functions in survival, bonding, and species propagation.
- b. **Aggressor:** Manifests as dominance assertion, territoriality, and status defense, particularly in competitive social or ecological settings. This archetype is mediated by a well-characterized network involving the medial amygdala, ventromedial hypothalamus, and periaqueductal gray (PAG) [10], and modulated by testosterone and vasopressin levels [11]. Elevated testosterone is associated with increased sensitivity to status threats and social dominance behaviors across species [11]. In stickleback fish, red-bellied visual cues reliably elicit territorial aggression—a canonical example of fixed action pattern behavior [12]. In primates, including chimpanzees, aggression is context-sensitive, ritualized, and closely tied to social hierarchy. Robert Sapolsky's field studies in baboons show how cortisol-testosterone dynamics modulate rank-related aggression and stress physiology [13]. In humans, similar neural circuits are implicated in aggressive posturing, ideological polarization, and revenge behaviors, especially under conditions of perceived humiliation or social exclusion [14].
- c. **Seeker:** Embodies exploration, novelty-seeking, and foraging behaviors that support adaptive responses to environmental uncertainty. This archetype is supported by activation of the mesolimbic dopamine system, particularly the ventral tegmental area (VTA) and nucleus accumbens, alongside the hippocampus and prefrontal cortex [15]. These circuits facilitate spatial learning, environmental scanning, and reward anticipation—traits vital for survival across taxa [16]. Ethological examples include rodent maze exploration, bird food-caching strategies, and human curiosity-driven behaviors such as travel, research, and creative problem-solving [17]. In primates, novelty seeking also contributes to social learning and rank navigation [18]. The expression of this archetype is gated by internal states (e.g., hunger, hormonal cycles) and modulated by neuromodulators including dopamine and norepinephrine [15]. Clinically, dysregulation of the Seeker system is implicated in ADHD, novelty-seeking personality profiles, and behavioral addictions [19]. These pathologies may represent exaggerated drive activation or impaired cultural modulation of exploratory archetypes within the ARCH framework.
- d. **Defender:** Encompasses a suite of fear-based survival responses such as freezing, escape, submission, or counterattack. These behaviors are rapidly activated in contexts of acute threat

and are essential for survival across species. The underlying neurocircuitry includes the amygdala, which detects salient threats; the periaqueductal gray (PAG), which coordinates species-typical defensive behaviors; and the hypothalamus, which integrates autonomic and behavioral responses [20,21]. Activation of the sympathetic nervous system prepares the organism for fight-or-flight responses via increased heart rate, blood pressure, and glucose mobilization [22]. This archetype is observable in rodents during predator exposure, in primates during social threats, and in humans during acute trauma [23]. Human trauma responses—such as dissociation, hypervigilance, or reactive aggression—are often expressions of this deeply conserved script [24]. The activation threshold and form of expression are modulated by prior stress history, neurochemical state (e.g., cortisol, norepinephrine), and cultural interpretations of threat and honor [25]. In the ARCH model, the Defender archetype illustrates how affective responses to danger are structured, contextually modulated, and conserved across phylogeny.

- e. **Affiliator:** Promotes social bonding, tactile grooming, and group cohesion—behaviors critical to social species for maintaining alliance networks and emotional homeostasis. The Affiliator archetype is neurochemically supported by oxytocin, serotonin, and endogenous opioids such as endorphins, which reinforce social touch, eye contact, and shared experience [26]. In non-human primates, grooming is not only hygienic but serves as a social currency for alliance-building and reconciliation [27]. In humans, affiliative rituals range from hugging and handshakes to communal singing, prayer, and synchronized movement. These behaviors activate reward circuits and buffer against stress, confirming their adaptive social function [28]. Within the ARCH framework, the Affiliator archetype illustrates how neurobiological bonding systems interact with culturally encoded behaviors to produce emotionally resonant, group-stabilizing outcomes.
- f. **Victim:** Enacts withdrawal, submission, or learned helplessness in the face of chronic stress, social defeat, or perceived inescapability. This archetype is associated with dysregulation of the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis, reduced dopaminergic tone, and altered hippocampal-prefrontal communication [29,30]. In rodent models, repeated social defeat results in behavioral despair, anhedonia, and avoidance—paralleling clinical depression and trauma-related shutdown in humans [31]. Across species, defeat postures and appeasement signals serve adaptive purposes in reducing risk of injury within dominance hierarchies [32]. In humans, this archetype underlies not only depressive symptoms but also trauma-induced passivity, victim identity formation, and social withdrawal. It may be exacerbated by cultural scripts that reinforce martyrdom, stigma, or helplessness, especially in the absence of re-integrative social support [33]. Within the ARCH model, the Victim reflects a deeply conserved behavioral strategy that becomes maladaptive when drive suppression persists and cultural contexts fail to restore autonomy or reassign narrative agency.

The various examples of **archetypes** above interact with **Drive** (e.g., **thymotic energy**) and **Culture** (e.g., **norms, roles, symbols**) to produce the full range of **affective and social behavior**. Their expression is **context-sensitive** and often **latent until activated** by **biologically instantiated internal states** or **ecological environmental cues** [34]. For example, the **pupillary light reflex** requires **light**, an **intact neurological reflex**, and **functional eye musculature**, demonstrating how even a basic behavioral output depends on the interaction of **archetype (scripted reflex)**, **drive (neural and muscular readiness)**, and **culture or context (light exposure)**. This underscores the **ARCH model's premise** that **behavior is a multiplicative function** of conserved scripts, motivational activation, and environmental or symbolic modulation.

### 3. Thymotic Drive

- a. Thymotic drive refers to the biologically rooted human need for recognition, dignity, and social status. Ethologically, this drive is evident in status-seeking behaviors observed across species, such as dominance displays in primates or territorial aggression in fish [35]. In humans, thymotic

- drive manifests in the pursuit of recognition, status, honor, justice, and legacy, often motivating actions aimed at asserting one's place within social hierarchies.
- b. This drive is particularly associated with archetypes like the Warrior, Avenger, and Martyr, where individuals perceive themselves as agents of justice or retribution. When thymotic drive is thwarted—through humiliation, social exclusion, or perceived injustice—it can lead to heightened aggression or radicalization, as individuals seek to reclaim their sense of worth and recognition [36]. This process is often exacerbated by symbolic imprinting, where individuals adopt distorted archetypal identities in response to personal grievances [37].
  - c. Neurobiologically, thymotic drive is mediated by the dopaminergic and limbic systems, particularly involving the amygdala and hypothalamus [38]. Testosterone plays a significant role in modulating this drive, influencing behaviors related to dominance, competitiveness, and aggression. Elevated testosterone levels have been linked to increased sensitivity to status threats and a propensity for retaliatory behavior [39].
  - d. Understanding thymotic drive within this ethological and neurobiological framework provides insight into behaviors ranging from everyday social interactions to extreme acts of violence. It underscores the importance of addressing unmet needs for recognition and status in therapeutic and preventive interventions.

**4. Cultural Modulation** Culture provides symbolic, normative, and regulatory context. Emotional expression is filtered through language, social norms, and learned expectations. This third term allows for inter-individual and cross-cultural variation in affective response [40]. From an ethological perspective, as emphasized by Tinbergen and Lorenz, behavior is not merely instinctive but also context-sensitive, with culture shaping the external cues and feedback loops that modulate fixed action patterns [41]. For example, the caregiver archetype may manifest differently in collectivist versus individualist societies due to cultural encoding of roles, responsibilities, and emotional valence.

Sapolsky's work underscores how status hierarchies—deeply embedded in primate societies—are not only biologically mediated (e.g., through cortisol and testosterone) but also culturally filtered, influencing emotional tone and behavioral repertoires [42]. Cultural inputs can suppress, amplify, or redirect biologically grounded archetypal behaviors, allowing for flexible adaptation within ecological and social environments. Thus, in the ARCH model, culture functions not merely as environment but as a dynamic modulator of affective expression, capable of shaping archetypal activation thresholds and drive salience based on societal values, rituals, and norms. Emotional expression is filtered through language, social norms, and learned expectations. This third term allows for inter-individual and cross-cultural variation in affective response.

**Neurobiological Substrates.** Emotion within the ARCH model is grounded in conserved neural architecture. The amygdala, hypothalamus, periaqueductal gray (PAG), and mesolimbic dopamine system are central nodes. These structures are involved in the initiation, modulation, and expression of core affective behaviors across species [43,44].

One particularly well-studied example is the lordosis behavior in female mice, which exemplifies a fixed action pattern modulated by hormonal, neural, and contextual inputs. When estrogen and progesterone levels are primed appropriately, tactile stimulation of the flanks activates sensory pathways converging on the hypothalamus and midbrain PAG, releasing the archetypal motor sequence of spinal dorsiflexion [45]. This behavior illustrates how an evolutionarily conserved archetype (sexual receptivity) is gated by internal drive (hormonal readiness) and external cues (tactile stimulation), embodying the full ARCH equation.

Similarly, the Freeman phase shift—a transition from the default mode network (DMN) to action-oriented neural systems—frames the neural dynamics that accompany the shift from affective salience to behavioral execution [46]. This supports rapid, context-sensitive deployment of archetypal behaviors under the influence of thymotic or affiliative drives.

Recent evidence also suggests that endogenous retroviruses (ERVs) and conserved noncoding genomic elements may scaffold developmental sensitivity to specific archetypes, possibly influencing

thresholds for behavioral activation or repression in context-specific ways [47]. These molecular substrates may encode predispositions that are later shaped by drive-state and culture in the full behavioral expression.

**Comparative Ethology.** The ARCH model accounts for affective behavior across species by identifying conserved behavioral systems mapped to archetypes, driven by motivational states and shaped by environmental and cultural contingencies. Its triadic structure—Archetype × Drive × Culture—is not limited to animals with nervous systems but extends to organisms across the tree of life:

- A. **Phototaxis in unicellular algae (Navigational Archetype):** In *Chlamydomonas*, light-seeking behavior is guided by a conserved photoreceptor apparatus. The drive (light-dependent ATP production), archetype (directional motility), and culture (light gradient as context) align to produce adaptive phototactic movement [48].
- B. **Chemotaxis in bacteria (Foraging Archetype):** Bacterial behavior in nutrient gradients reflects triadic integration: an inherited motility script (flagellar rotation), drive (metabolic sensing), and environmental modulation (chemical gradients). This represents **ARCH-congruent computation without cognition**, revealing that purposeful behavior can emerge from minimal biological substrates [49].
- C. **Spore release in fungi (Reproductive Archetype):** In *Pilobolus*, spore ejection aligns internal drive (turgor pressure), archetypal motor pattern (phototropic aiming), and cultural modulation (circadian timing and environmental humidity) [50].
- D. **Sperm chemotaxis (Fertilization Archetype):** Spermatozoa exhibit directional movement driven by chemical cues from the ovum. The archetype is encoded in species-specific signaling pathways, the drive in gametic fusion, and the culture in the biochemical milieu of the reproductive tract [51].

**Pavlovian conditioning (Associative Archetype Priming):** Classical conditioning demonstrates how neutral stimuli become emotionally salient through paired association with biologically relevant stimuli. This process, foundational in behavioral neuroscience, reflects a primitive but powerful mechanism by which archetypes are activated or modified [52]. For example, if a tone (neutral) precedes food (drive-linked reinforcer), it begins to elicit anticipatory salivation—a behavior linked to the feeding archetype. Such conditioning paradigms exist across vertebrates and even in invertebrates (e.g., *Aplysia*), illustrating how learned cues can trigger fixed or flexible behavioral sequences grounded in innate scripts [53]. Within the ARCH model, Pavlovian learning exemplifies how cultural or contextual stimuli (C) come to modulate archetypal behaviors (A) through repeated association with drives (D), shaping adaptive responses without requiring cognitive reinterpretation.

**5. Everyday Behavior and Normative Psychology** The ARCH model is not only a tool for understanding clinical pathology or comparative ethology; it also explains the structure of ordinary, everyday behavior. Human experiences such as parenting, play, problem-solving, moral decision-making, and even routine work engagement reflect the dynamic coordination of archetypes, drives, and cultural context.

- A. **Morning rituals (Caregiver/Seeker archetypes):** Waking up and tending to children, preparing meals, or organizing one's day activates caregiver and organizational scripts. These behaviors are driven by circadian and motivational energy, and shaped by cultural norms such as mealtime routines, hygiene standards, and temporal structuring (e.g., school or work hours) [55].
- B. **Social bonding (Affiliator archetype):** Greeting others, participating in shared meals, or casual conversation engages the Affiliator archetype. These behaviors are supported by oxytocin and endorphin release and modulated by culturally specific norms of politeness, touch, and self-presentation [56].
- C. **Goal pursuit (Seeker and Status archetypes):** Whether studying, working, or striving for personal advancement, these behaviors reflect a confluence of archetypal scripts (exploration,

status-seeking), underlying drive (dopaminergic motivation), and cultural scaffolding (institutional expectations, achievement metrics) [57].

- D. **Conflict resolution (Defender and Reconciler archetypes):** When disputes arise, individuals draw on ancient patterns of defense or reconciliation. These behaviors are modulated by stress response systems and by culturally learned practices such as apology, negotiation, or withdrawal [58].
- E. **Play and storytelling (Explorer/Creator archetypes):** Engaging in imaginative play or consuming narratives involves archetypes that scaffold exploratory thought, emotional rehearsal, and symbolic encoding—important for both individual development and cultural transmission [59].

In each case, behavior arises through the interaction of a biologically grounded script (archetype), an energetic or motivational state (drive), and a regulatory context (culture). Understanding ordinary behavior through the ARCH framework offers clinicians, educators, and researchers a general-purpose lens for interpreting both adaptive functioning and subtle misalignments that may foreshadow dysfunction.

These cases reveal how the ARCH framework unifies instinctive behavior (archetype), motivational energy (drive), and socio-environmental calibration (culture), even in non-human species.

**6. Symbolic Imprinting and Archetypal Distortion** Imprinting, as first described by Konrad Lorenz and further formalized in ethology by Nikolaas Tinbergen, refers to a critical period in early development during which an organism forms strong attachments to specific stimuli [60]. Lorenz's classic experiments with geese showed that imprinting was not merely associative learning, but an irreversible process that shaped long-term behavior, often through a single exposure to a salient stimulus. Tinbergen expanded this framework to describe how fixed action patterns are modulated by early experiences and contextual triggers [1,61].

In humans, a parallel form of imprinting occurs through emotionally salient or traumatic events, particularly in adolescence or periods of social vulnerability. These moments often become "symbolic releasers"—stimuli that trigger and lock in archetypal identities [60]. Neuroscientifically, this process engages the amygdala, hippocampus, and medial prefrontal cortex—regions associated with emotional memory consolidation and identity formation [62]. When combined with thymotic drive—especially rage, humiliation, or the need for recognition—this imprinting can distort archetypal trajectories.

This process is tragically illustrated in the emergence of school shooters and ideologically motivated extremists. Individuals who experience chronic rejection or social defeat may imprint onto a warrior or avenger archetype, reinforced by online subcultures, violent manifestos, and symbolic media [63]. The result is an archetype that has been hijacked—divorced from cultural regulation and energized by misdirected thymotic drive. These behavioral scripts are no longer adaptive but have become overvalued and rigid, forming the basis of extreme overvalued beliefs (EOBs) [64]. As Joseph LeDoux's work shows, the amygdala-hypothalamus pathway can encode these emotionally potent scripts without cortical modulation, bypassing rational inhibition [65].

The ARCH model allows us to frame these phenomena not just as psychiatric symptoms but as breakdowns in the tripartite behavioral equation: distorted archetype activation, unregulated drive, and failed cultural mediation. By locating the neuroethological roots of symbolic imprinting, we move closer to a predictive and preventative science of violence, identity extremism, and emotional misalignment.

## 7. Clinical Psychiatry

The ARCH framework offers new insights into psychiatric phenomena by interpreting them as disruptions in the dynamic interaction of archetypes, drives, and cultural modulation. These disruptions can lead to maladaptive behavioral outputs that are otherwise difficult to reconcile using symptom-based classification systems. By mapping psychiatric conditions to specific ARCH

disruptions, clinicians may identify biologically grounded patterns that inform both diagnosis and treatment across a range of presentations.

- A. **School shooters: victim-to-warrior archetypal transformation** – Chronic humiliation or rejection can distort the victim archetype into a violent, status-seeking warrior identity. Symbolic imprinting and thymotic rage drive this transformation, often reinforced by online subcultures. Cultural failures exacerbate the trajectory from grievance to violence [66].
- B. **Overvalued belief systems: failure of cultural modulation on thymotic drive** – EOBs (extreme overvalued beliefs) emerge when the Avenger or Redeemer archetypes are activated without adequate cultural constraint, producing ideologically rigid or persecutory behaviors. These belief systems form self-reinforcing loops that resist disconfirmation [67].
- C. **Caregiver burnout: dysregulation of archetypal activation in sustained context** – Prolonged, unsupported activation of the Caregiver archetype leads to exhaustion and role collapse. Depletion of motivational reserves and lack of cultural or institutional support produces affective flattening and disengagement.
- D. **Depersonalization and derealization: collapse of archetypal coherence** – Dissociative symptoms may arise when the Self's narrative structure—supported by archetypes such as Seeker or Affiliator—breaks down. This may reflect trauma-induced decoupling of motivational salience and symbolic identity [68].
- E. **Addiction: hijacking of the Seeker archetype by dopaminergic overstimulation** – Substances or behaviors co-opt the exploratory Seeker archetype by providing artificial rewards. Cultural modeling and neurochemical dysregulation reinforce compulsive engagement with maladaptive novelty [69].
- F. **Affective flattening in psychosis: decoupling of archetypes from drive** – In disorders such as schizophrenia, archetypes may remain intact but lack sufficient drive to be behaviorally expressed, resulting in emotional blunting and social withdrawal [70].

These examples demonstrate how ARCH can translate psychiatric complexity into biologically anchored, ethologically interpretable patterns. It encourages clinicians to assess the alignment of behavioral scripts, motivational resources, and sociocultural context in both diagnosis and intervention.

## 8. Human Behavior and the Law

The ARCH framework can be further extended by integrating the principle of *Legem Humanam*—the biologically grounded behavioral law that governs archetypal patterning across individual and collective life. This concept holds that human behavior is not merely emergent but normatively structured by evolutionarily conserved archetypes that require cultural scaffolding to remain adaptive. Like natural law in jurisprudence, *Legem Humanam* implies a kind of neuroethological jurisprudence—an innate system of behavioral expectations shaped by selection and ritualized through culture [71].

Throughout history, societies have created legal codes, religions, initiation rites, and educational systems that align with core archetypes such as Caregiver, Defender, Judge, or Redeemer. When these institutions function effectively, they help regulate drive expression and archetype enactment in adaptive ways. When they collapse or become culturally dissonant, archetypal behavior can become dysregulated, distorted, or weaponized—contributing to the emergence of disorders ranging from addiction to radicalization.

For clinical psychiatry, this framework reframes symptoms not as random dysfunctions but as lawful expressions of unmet archetypal, motivational, or cultural needs. A patient exhibiting compulsive self-sacrifice may be trapped in a maladaptive Caregiver archetype without cultural validation. A socially withdrawn individual may be experiencing Defender-mode overactivation without safe outlets or reframing rituals. Thus, *Legem Humanam* gives clinicians a diagnostic lens

rooted not in pathologization, but in the calibration of archetypal integrity, energetic balance, and symbolic belonging.

This view aligns with Robert Sapolsky's recent argument in *Determined* (2023) [72], which posits that human behavior is entirely determined by biology, environment, and past experience—leaving no room for metaphysical free will. Within the ARCH model, behavior arises not from autonomous moral agents but from the interaction of scripted archetypes, neurobiological drives, and socially inherited culture. However, this does not negate legal or moral responsibility: the legal doctrine of **mens rea**—the guilty mind—still applies within ARCH as a recognition of symbolic encoding and intentional activation. An individual who has internalized a violent archetype and acted on it with premeditated thymotic drive may lack metaphysical freedom, but still possesses a neurocognitive architecture that enables culpability [73]. ARCH thus provides a framework for understanding responsibility as a function of symbolic imprinting and cultural encoding, rather than abstract free will.

## 5. Implications for Cognitive Neuropsychology

Emotion dysregulation and maladaptive behaviors are reframed as misalignments in the ARCH equation. This includes excess drive (mania), archetype loss (depersonalization), or cultural misfit (cross-cultural depression) [74]. The model suggests new targets for intervention: restoring archetypal resonance, modulating drive biomarkers, or recalibrating cultural framing.

Emerging therapies that target these components of behavior—such as psychedelics, transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS), and ketamine—offer promising tools for ARCH-aligned intervention. Psychedelic-assisted psychotherapy, for example, appears to temporarily loosen rigid cultural and narrative constraints, allowing for re-access to latent archetypes and reorganization of identity structures [75]. Ketamine and rTMS, by modulating glutamatergic and prefrontal-limbic circuitry, may shift drive states or reset maladaptive emotional salience attribution, opening windows for recalibration [75–77]. These interventions, when integrated with narrative restructuring and cultural reframing, may allow for reconsolidation of the ARCH triad into more adaptive configurations. Viewed through ARCH, these treatments can be conceptualized not simply as neurochemical agents, but as catalysts for reactivating biologically grounded scripts, restoring motivational coherence, and reembedding behavior within meaningful cultural matrices. as misalignments in the ARCH equation. This includes excess drive (mania), archetype loss (depersonalization), or cultural misfit (cross-cultural depression). The model suggests new targets for intervention: restoring archetypal resonance, modulating drive biomarkers, or recalibrating cultural framing.

To operationalize the ARCH model, each term can be measured or approximated using physiological, psychological, and sociocultural indicators. Archetypes may be inferred via structured behavioral tasks, script recall, or narrative pattern analysis; Drive through neurohormonal biomarkers (e.g., testosterone, cortisol, dopaminergic tone); and Culture via contextual coding of norms, values, and symbolic environments. The model predicts that disrupting any one factor (e.g., blocking drive pharmacologically, altering cultural scripts) will significantly alter the emergence and expression of archetype-linked behavior. This renders ARCH experimentally falsifiable and computationally modelable.

### Empirical Validation and Research Directions

Although the ARCH model is currently conceptual, its components are grounded in established neurobiological, ethological, and psychological literatures. To transition from theoretical proposition to empirically supported framework, we propose several validation strategies:

- a. **Cross-species behavioral alignment:** Ethological datasets on caregiving, dominance, foraging, and fear can be systematically recoded using ARCH terms (e.g., presence/absence of drive markers, archetypal behavior categories, and contextual modulators). This allows quantitative comparison across taxa and contexts.

- b. **Neurobiological biomarkers:** Measurement of hormonal (e.g., oxytocin, testosterone), neuroanatomical (e.g., amygdala, PAG), and circuit-level markers (e.g., DMN/action mode transitions) can operationalize Drive and Archetype variables.
- c. **Experimental paradigms:** Human experiments using virtual reality or emotionally salient tasks can activate specific archetypes (e.g., caregiving, aggression) under manipulated drive and cultural conditions. Predicted outputs include differences in behavior, pupillometry, neural activation, and self-report.
- d. **Psychometric tools:** Development of an ARCH-aligned assessment battery—scoring Archetype salience, Drive state, and Cultural alignment—could aid diagnosis and treatment stratification in clinical settings.

Future research may also involve modeling the ARCH triad using systems dynamics or agent-based simulation, allowing for emergent behavior studies under variable constraints.

Rather than replace existing models, ARCH reconciles them into a higher-order synthesis. It provides a biologically credible, computationally extensible, and ethologically valid architecture for understanding emotion in all its evolved and emergent complexity. It is falsifiable, evolutionarily grounded, and scalable across taxa. Future work may quantify parameters, integrate biomarker data, and apply the model in AI and psychiatry.

## Discussion

ARCH expands emotion science by formalizing its triadic structure: Archetype × Drive × Culture. Unlike dimensional, categorical, or circuit-based approaches, ARCH reconceptualizes emotion as the dynamic product of biologically conserved scripts, motivational energetics, and culturally embedded norms. This formulation allows for greater integration across ethology, neuroscience, psychiatry, and social science, providing a generalizable behavioral equation applicable across species and contexts.

The framework is evolutionarily grounded and neurobiologically anchored, drawing from conserved structures such as the amygdala, PAG, hypothalamus, and mesolimbic dopamine system. These substrates instantiate core archetypes like caregiving, defense, exploration, and status-seeking. Ethological exemplars—from stickleback aggression to chimpanzee reconciliation—confirm the scalability of this model, while human behaviors (e.g., symbolic imprinting, cultural rituals) illustrate its extension into higher-order social cognition.

ARCH also offers a roadmap for research translation. Experimental paradigms could involve manipulations of drive state (e.g., hormonal or stress-based), archetypal priming (e.g., narrative exposure, behavioral scripts), and cultural context (e.g., norm violation tasks). Measurement strategies include psychophysiology, narrative analysis, and neuroimaging. Future work should develop and validate an ARCH-based assessment battery capable of quantifying the strength and alignment of each component.

Emerging therapeutic applications—such as psychedelics, rTMS, and ketamine—can also be interpreted through the ARCH lens, offering targeted tools to recalibrate archetypal access, restore motivational coherence, and reframe cultural narratives. ARCH thereby bridges the conceptual gap between symbolic meaning and neural mechanism.

Rather than replace existing models, ARCH consolidates them into a unified field theory of behavior. It is both computationally extensible and empirically testable, laying the groundwork for a new era of interdisciplinary emotion science. Its potential spans psychiatry, AI, education, policy, and clinical neuroscience—any domain where behavior matters and understanding its structure is essential.

Rather than replace existing models, ARCH reconciles them into a higher-order synthesis. It provides a biologically credible, computationally extensible, and ethologically valid architecture for understanding emotion in all its evolved and emergent complexity. It is falsifiable, evolutionarily grounded, and scalable across taxa. Future work may quantify parameters, integrate biomarker data, and apply the model in AI and psychiatry.

## 7. Conclusions

ARCH offers a biologically grounded, testable, and integrative framework for emotion. It bridges ethology, neuroscience, and culture, and may help unify the disparate models currently fragmenting emotion research.

Disclosures: This document was developed with the assistance of generative AI (ChatGPT-4, OpenAI), used for writing, formatting, and reference management. The author has no financial disclosures and no conflicts of interest.

## References

1. Tinbergen, N. On aims and methods of ethology. *Z. Tierpsychol.* **1963**, *20*(4), 410–433.
2. Hogan, J.A.; Bolhuis, J.J. The development of behaviour: trends since Tinbergen (1963). *Anim. Biol.* **2005**, *55*(4), 371–398.
3. Battivelli, D.; Fan, Z.; Hu, H.; Gross, C.T. How can ethology inform the neuroscience of fear, aggression and dominance? *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **2024**, *25*(12), 809–819.
4. Rahman, T. The ARCH Equation: A General Model of Behavior Across Species. *PsyArXiv* **2025**. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/2m5n6>
5. Stevens, A. *Archetype Revisited: An Updated Natural History of the Self*; Routledge: London, UK, 2015.
6. Numan, M.; Woodside, B. Maternity: Neural mechanisms, motivational processes, and physiological adaptations. *Behav. Neurosci.* **2010**, *124*(6), 715–741.
7. Feldman, R. The neurobiology of human attachments. *Trends Cogn. Sci.* **2017**, *21*(2), 80–99.
8. Takayanagi, Y.; Yoshida, M.; Bielsky, I.F.; Ross, H.E.; Kawamata, M.; Onaka, T.; Yanagisawa, T.; Kimura, T.; Matzuk, M.M.; Young, L.J.; Nishimori, K. Pervasive social deficits, but normal parturition, in oxytocin receptor-deficient mice. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **2005**, *102*(44), 16096–16101.
9. Maestripieri, D. Early experience affects the intergenerational transmission of infant abuse in rhesus monkeys. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **2005**, *102*(27), 9726–9729.
10. Nelson, R.J.; Trainor, B.C. Neural mechanisms of aggression. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **2007**, *8*(7), 536–546.
11. Oyegbile, T.O.; Marler, C.A. Winning fights elevates testosterone levels in California mice and enhances future ability to win fights. *Horm. Behav.* **2005**, *48*(3), 259–267.
12. FitzGerald, G.J. The reproductive behavior of the stickleback. *Sci. Am.* **1993**, *268*(4), 80–85.
13. Sapolsky, R.M. The influence of social hierarchy on primate health. *Science* **2005**, *308*(5722), 648–652.
14. Bufkin, J.L.; Luttrell, V.R. Neuroimaging studies of aggressive and violent behavior: current findings and implications for criminology and criminal justice. *Trauma Violence Abuse* **2005**, *6*(2), 176–191.
15. Robbins, T.W.; Everitt, B.J. A role for mesencephalic dopamine in activation: commentary on Berridge (2006). *Psychopharmacology* **2007**, *191*, 433–437.
16. Rosenzweig, E.S.; Redish, A.D.; McNaughton, B.L.; Barnes, C.A. Hippocampal map realignment and spatial learning. *Nat. Neurosci.* **2003**, *6*(6), 609–615.
17. Clayton, N.S.; Dickinson, A. Episodic-like memory during cache recovery by scrub jays. *Nature* **1998**, *395*(6699), 272–274.
18. Suomi, S.J. Genetic and Environmental Factors Influencing the Expression of Impulsive Aggression and Serotonergic Functioning in Rhesus Monkeys. In Tremblay, R.E.; Hartup, W.W.; Archer, J. (Eds.), *Developmental Origins of Aggression*; Guilford Press: New York, NY, USA, 2005; pp. 63–82.
19. Volkow, N.D.; Wang, G.J.; Fowler, J.S.; Tomasi, D. Addiction circuitry in the human brain. *Annu. Rev. Pharmacol. Toxicol.* **2012**, *52*, 321–336.
20. LeDoux, J.E. Emotion circuits in the brain. Fear and anxiety. In *The Cognitive Neurosciences*, 4th ed.; Gazzaniga, M.S., Ed.; MIT Press: Cambridge, MA, USA, 2009; pp. 1005–1017.
21. Fanselow, M.S. Neural organization of the defensive behavior system responsible for fear. *Psychon. Bull. Rev.* **1994**, *1*(4), 429–438.
22. Ulrich-Lai, Y.M.; Herman, J.P. Neural regulation of endocrine and autonomic stress responses. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **2009**, *10*(6), 397–409.

23. Blanchard, D.C.; Blanchard, R.J. Innate and conditioned reactions to threat in rats with amygdaloid lesions. *J. Comp. Physiol. Psychol.* **1972**, *81*(2), 281–290.
24. Lanius, R.; Frewen, P.; Vermetten, E.; Yehuda, R. Fear conditioning and early life vulnerabilities: two distinct pathways of emotional dysregulation and brain dysfunction in PTSD. *Eur. J. Psychotraumatol.* **2010**, *1*(1), 5467.
25. McEwen, B.S. Protective and damaging effects of stress mediators. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **1998**, *338*(3), 171–179.
26. Keverne, E.B.; Martensz, N.D.; Tuite, B. Beta-endorphin concentrations in cerebrospinal fluid of monkeys are influenced by grooming relationships. *Psychoneuroendocrinology* **1989**, *14*(1–2), 155–161.
27. Dunbar, R.I.M. The social role of touch in humans and primates: behavioural function and neurobiological mechanisms. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* **2010**, *34*(2), 260–268.
28. Tarr, B.; Launay, J.; Dunbar, R.I.M. Silent disco: dancing in synchrony leads to elevated pain thresholds and social closeness. *Evol. Hum. Behav.* **2016**, *37*(5), 343–349.
29. Krishnan, V.; Nestler, E.J. The molecular neurobiology of depression. *Nature* **2008**, *455*(7215), 894–902.
30. Arnsten, A.F.T. Stress signalling pathways that impair prefrontal cortex structure and function. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **2009**, *10*(6), 410–422.
31. Golden, S.A.; Covington, H.E. III; Berton, O.; Russo, S.J. A standardized protocol for repeated social defeat stress in mice. *Nat. Protoc.* **2011**, *6*(8), 1183–1191.
32. de Waal, F.B.M. The integration of dominance and social bonding in primates. *Q. Rev. Biol.* **1986**, *61*(4), 459–479.
33. Herman, J.L. *Trauma and Recovery: The Aftermath of Violence—from Domestic Abuse to Political Terror*; Basic Books: New York, NY, USA, 1992.
34. Hall, C.A.; Chilcott, R.P. Eyeing up the future of the pupillary light reflex in neurodiagnostics. *Diagnostics* **2018**, *8*(1), 19.
35. de Waal, F.B.M. *Chimpanzee Politics: Power and Sex Among Apes*; Johns Hopkins University Press: Baltimore, MD, USA, 2007.
36. Fukuyama, F. Reflections on the end of history, five years later. *Hist. Theory* **1995**, *34*(2), 27–43.
37. Meloy, J.R.; Yakeley, J. The violent true believer as a “lone wolf” – psychoanalytic perspectives on terrorism. *Behav. Sci. Law* **2014**, *32*(3), 347–365.
38. Siegel, A.; Victoroff, J. Understanding human aggression: New insights from neuroscience. *Int. J. Law Psychiatry* **2009**, *32*(4), 209–215.
39. Mehta, P.H.; Josephs, R.A. Testosterone and cortisol jointly regulate dominance: Evidence for a dual-hormone hypothesis. *Horm. Behav.* **2010**, *58*(5), 898–906.
40. Mesquita, B.; Frijda, N.H. Cultural variations in emotions: A review. *Psychol. Bull.* **1992**, *112*(2), 179–204
41. Lorenz, K.Z. *The Foundations of Ethology*; Springer-Verlag: New York, NY, USA, 1981.
42. Sapolsky, R.M. *Behave: The Biology of Humans at Our Best and Worst*; Penguin: New York, NY, USA, 2018.
43. Panksepp, J. *Affective Neuroscience: The Foundations of Human and Animal Emotions*; Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK, 2004.
44. Buccilli, B.; Paternò, G.; Cortes-Contreras, A.P.; Pineda, M.F.; Monroy-Sosa, A.; Ascenzi, B.M. The limbic system. In *From Anatomy to Function of the Central Nervous System*; Academic Press: Cambridge, MA, USA, 2025; pp. 679–704.
45. Christensen, A.; Bentley, G.E.; Cabrera, R.; Ortega, H.H.; Perfito, N.; Wu, T.J.; Micevych, P. Hormonal regulation of female reproduction. *Horm. Metab. Res.* **2012**, *44*(8), 587–591.
46. Freeman, W.J. The limbic action-perception cycle controlling goal-directed animal behavior. In *Proc. Int. Joint Conf. Neural Netw.* **2002**, *3*, 2249–2254.
47. Chuong, E.B.; Elde, N.C.; Feschotte, C. Regulatory evolution of innate immunity through co-option of endogenous retroviruses. *Science* **2016**, *351*(6277), 1083–1087.
48. Sineshchekov, O.A.; Jung, K.H.; Spudich, J.L. Two rhodopsins mediate phototaxis to low-and high-intensity light in *Chlamydomonas reinhardtii*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **2002**, *99*(13), 8689–8694.

49. Wadhams, G.H.; Armitage, J.P. Making sense of it all: bacterial chemotaxis. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* **2004**, *5*(12), 1024–1037.
50. Page, R.M. Light and the asexual reproduction of *Pilobolus*: Responses to light play an important role in the development and reproduction of this fungus. *Science* **1962**, *138*(3546), 1238–1245.
51. Eisenbach, M.; Giojalas, L.C. Sperm guidance in mammals—an unpaved road to the egg. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* **2006**, *7*(4), 276–285.
52. Pavlov, I.P. *Conditioned Reflexes: An Investigation of the Physiological Activity of the Cerebral Cortex*; Oxford University Press: London, UK, 1927.
53. Carew, T.J.; Walters, E.T.; Kandel, E.R. Classical conditioning in a simple withdrawal reflex in *Aplysia californica*. *J. Neurosci.* **1981**, *1*(12), 1426–1437.
54. Baumeister, R.F.; Vohs, K.D.; Funder, D.C. Psychology as the science of self-reports and finger movements: Whatever happened to actual behavior? *Perspect. Psychol. Sci.* **2007**, *2*(4), 396–403.
55. Mistlberger, R.E. Circadian regulation of sleep in mammals: Role of the suprachiasmatic nucleus. *Brain Res. Rev.* **2005**, *49*(3), 429–454.
56. Dunbar, R.I.M. Bridging the bonding gap: The transition from primates to humans. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **2012**, *367*(1597), 1837–1846.
57. Salamone, J.D.; Correa, M. The mysterious motivational functions of mesolimbic dopamine. *Neuron* **2012**, *76*(3), 470–485.
58. McCullough, M.E. Forgiveness as human strength: Theory, measurement, and links to well-being. *J. Soc. Clin. Psychol.* **2000**, *19*(1), 43–55.
59. Boyd, B. The evolution of stories: From mimesis to language, from fact to fiction. *WIREs Cogn. Sci.* **2018**, *9*(1), e1444.
60. Lorenz, K.Z. The Companion in the Bird's World. *Auk* **1935**, *54*, 245–273.
61. Sapolsky R. *Biology and Human Behavior: The Neurological Origins of Individuality* 2nd Edition.
62. LeDoux, J.E. *The Emotional Brain: The Mysterious Underpinnings of Emotional Life*; Simon & Schuster: New York, NY, USA, 1996.
63. Meloy, J.R.; Hoffmann, J., Eds. *International Handbook of Threat Assessment*, 2nd ed.; Oxford University Press: New York, NY, USA, 2021.
64. Rahman, T.; Abugel, J. *Extreme Overvalued Beliefs: Clinical and Forensic Psychiatric Dimensions*; Oxford University Press: New York, NY, USA, 2024.
65. LeDoux, J.E.; Pine, D.S. Using neuroscience to help understand fear and anxiety: a two-system framework. *Am. J. Psychiatry* **2016**, *173*(11), 1083–1093.
66. Rahman, T.; Hartz, S.M.; Xiong, W.; Meloy, J.R.; Janofsky, J.; Harry, B.; Resnick, P.J. Extreme overvalued beliefs. *J. Am. Acad. Psychiatry Law* **2020**, *48*(3), 319–326.
67. Maslach, C.; Leiter, M.P. Understanding the burnout experience: recent research and its implications for psychiatry. *World Psychiatry* **2016**, *15*(2), 103–111.
68. Sierra, M.; Berrios, G.E. Depersonalization: a conceptual history. *Hist. Psychiatry* **1997**, *8*(30), 213–229.
69. Koob, G.F.; Volkow, N.D. Neurobiology of addiction: a neurocircuitry analysis. *Lancet Psychiatry* **2016**, *3*(8), 760–773.
70. Andreasen, N.C. The role of the thalamus in schizophrenia. *Can. J. Psychiatry* **1997**, *42*(1), 27–33.
71. Sapolsky, R.M. The frontal cortex and the criminal justice system. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **2004**, *359*(1451), 1787.
72. Sapolsky, R.M. *Determined: Life Without Free Will*; Random House: New York, NY, USA, 2023.
73. Rahman, T.; Hartz, S.M.; Xiong, W.; Meloy, J.R.; Janofsky, J.; Harry, B.; Resnick, P.J. Extreme overvalued beliefs. *J. Am. Acad. Psychiatry Law* **2020**, *48*(3), 319–326.
74. Carhart-Harris, R.L.; Friston, K.J. REBUS and the anarchic brain: toward a unified model of the brain action of psychedelics. *Pharmacol. Rev.* **2019**, *71*(3), 316–344.

75. Duman, R.S.; Aghajanian, G.K. Synaptic dysfunction in depression: potential therapeutic targets. *Science* **2012**, *338*(6103), 68–72.
76. George, M.S.; Caulfield, K.A.; Wiley, M. Shaping plasticity with non-invasive brain stimulation in the treatment of psychiatric disorders: Present and future. *Handb. Clin. Neurol.* **2022**, *184*, 497–507.

**Disclaimer/Publisher's Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.