

# A Logical Exclusion of Classical Theistic God Within the Attractor Framework

Robert Galida

Independent Researcher

June 2026

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

---

## Abstract

This paper demonstrates that the God of classical Abrahamic theism—a conscious, intentional, eternal, omnipotent, and omnibenevolent agent who created the universe and intervenes in it—is logically excluded by the attractor framework. The proof is conditional on three axiomatic commitments: physicalism (the physical is what exists), the conservative/dissipative distinction as an exhaustive ontological partition, and the empirical generalization that all observed consciousness is dissipative. Process theology and panentheism escape the triangle but abandon the classical attributes. Within these axioms, three interlocking theorems form a closed geometric proof. Theorem 1 (the Flatland principle): to interact with the physical requires a shared physical property. Theorem 2: all persistent structures are either conservative or dissipative. Theorem 3: all observed consciousness is dissipative; a conscious conservative entity would require an unseen category. The paper documents the dopamine covenant as the neurochemical mechanism sustaining God-belief, and the historical reframing cascades that preserve theological attractors. The framework's own falsifiability conditions are stated explicitly. The proof is

conditional on its axioms; the reader who rejects them will not be persuaded.

---

## **1. Introduction: Axioms, Not Established Facts**

Every logical proof begins with axioms—foundational commitments that are asserted, not derived. This paper makes its axioms explicit so the reader can evaluate the proof on its own terms.

**Axiom 1: Physicalism.** The physical is what exists. Anything non-physical is, by definition, non-existent. Physicalism is a serious philosophical position with extensive defense in the literature (Stoljar, 2010). It is contested by dualists, idealists, and theologians. This paper does not argue for physicalism; it adopts it as a starting point.

**Axiom 2: The conservative/dissipative distinction.** All persistent structures fall into two dynamical classes: conservative persistence structures (eternal, time-symmetric, mindless) and dissipative attractors (temporary, energy-dependent, potentially conscious). This distinction is derived from the attractor framework (Galida, 2026a) and draws on the broader literature on nonequilibrium thermodynamics and self-organization (Prigogine & Stengers, 1984). It is treated here as exhaustive.

**Axiom 3: Consciousness is dissipative.** All observed consciousness is a property of dissipative systems requiring a physical substrate, energy flow, and entropy export. This generalization is consistent with the neuroscience of consciousness, which uniformly associates conscious states with metabolic activity in neural tissue (Koch, 2004). The free energy principle (Friston, 2010) proposes that all self-

organizing biological systems minimize free energy through active inference—a process that is inherently dissipative. Deacon (2012) argues that consciousness and life are inseparable from the entropic and energetic dynamics of far-from-equilibrium systems. Whether consciousness *requires* dissipation at the mechanistic level is an open question; the present paper treats the empirical generalization as sufficient for the proof.

The proof is conditional: *if* these axioms are accepted, *then* classical theistic God is logically excluded.

---

## 2. The Geometry of Disproof: Three Theorems

### 2.1 Theorem 1: The Flatland Principle

Edwin Abbott's *Flatland* (1884) describes a two-dimensional world whose inhabitants perceive a passing sphere only as a growing and shrinking circle. The sphere is higher-dimensional but interacts with Flatland because it shares extension in the plane.

**The principle:** to exist is to interact, and interaction requires at least one shared property. The sphere shared extension in two dimensions with Flatland. Without that shared property, there would be no interaction, no trace, no basis for inference.

If God interacts with the physical universe, God must share at least one physical property with it. A non-interactive God is indistinguishable from a non-existent one.

**The causal power evasion.** Theists may claim that divine causation is *sui generis*—that God causes physical events without sharing physical properties, just as the mind causes

bodily movements without a fully specified mechanism. This analogy fails under scrutiny. In mind-body causation, the mind is a dissipative attractor of the physical brain and body—it *is* a physical pattern, not an immaterial substance. The interaction between mind and body is physical-to-physical causation within a single dissipative system, mediated by neural pathways, neurotransmitters, and electrochemical gradients. Divine causation, by contrast, would be a non-physical entity acting on physical systems with no mediating substrate and no shared properties. Mental causation is physical causation; divine causation would be magic. The theist who appeals to mental causation as a model for divine action inadvertently concedes that the mind is physical—which satisfies Theorem 1 at the cost of abandoning dualism. The theist who insists divine causation is genuinely non-physical owes an account of the mechanism. After millennia of theology, none has been provided.

## **2.2 Theorem 2: The Conservative/Dissipative Distinction**

All persistent structures are either conservative (eternal, unchanging, unconscious) or dissipative (temporary, energy-dependent, potentially conscious). There is no third category within the framework.

## **2.3 Theorem 3: The Exclusion of Conscious Eternity**

All observed consciousness is dissipative. A conscious conservative entity would be unprecedented. Discovery of a non-dissipative conscious system would invalidate Theorem 3.

## **2.4 The Closed Triangle**

- **Classical theism:** non-physical, conscious, eternal. Violates Theorem 1 and 3.
- **Physical theism:** physical, conscious, eternal. Violates Theorem 3.

- **Process theology (Whitehead, 1929; Hartshorne, 1948):** God is finite, evolving, persuasive, and dissipative. Satisfies all three theorems but abandons omnipotence, immutability, and eternity. This God is not the God of Abrahamic faith.
- **Panentheism (Clayton, 1997; Peacocke, 1993):** God contains but exceeds the universe, with the universe as God's body. Clayton proposes that God acts on the world through top-down causation—that higher-level organizational patterns constrain lower-level physical processes without energy injection. This position faces a dilemma. If top-down divine causation operates through the physical hierarchy of the universe-as-body, then God is coextensive with that physical hierarchy and causally effective only through it—collapsing into a naturalistic, essentially dissipative position. If, alternatively, divine top-down causation is posited as a non-physical causal influence on physical structure, it reintroduces the interaction problem addressed by Theorem 1: causation across an ontological gap with no shared property and no specified mechanism. Either way, panentheism either retreats into process theology or faces the same exclusion as classical theism.
- **“God is outside all categories”:** Violates Theorem 1. Indistinguishable from non-existence.

The triangle is closed against classical Abrahamic theism. Process theology and panentheism escape but at the cost of abandoning the God they sought to defend.

---

### 3. The Physical Evidence

The following evidence is cited as illustrative of the framework's predictions, not as an independent proof of divine

absence. The logical proof stands on the axioms and theorems; the empirical catalogue demonstrates consistency between the proof's predictions and the observed world.

**Answered prayer.** The STEP trial (Benson et al., 2006) found no beneficial effect of intercessory prayer. Meta-analyses consistently find null results, though methodological debates persist.

**Fulfilled prophecy.** Every dated prophecy has either failed or been retrofitted (Festinger et al., 1956; Melton, 1985; Galida, 2026b, 2026c).

**Miraculous healings.** The Lourdes Medical Bureau's certification rate is consistent with spontaneous remission estimates for the conditions examined.

**Near-death experiences.** Reproducible by hypoxia, ketamine, and electrical stimulation. Not evidence of an afterlife.

---

## 4. The Dopamine Covenant

God-belief persists because it is neurochemically reinforced (Olds & Milner, 1954; Hamid et al., 2019). Certainty, belonging, and cosmic significance are lever presses. Failed prayers and prophecies are reframed rather than abandoned (Festinger et al., 1956; Melton, 1985). The dlPFC—responsible for cognitive flexibility—shows reduced activity when sacred values are processed (Hamid et al., 2019). God-belief is a neurochemical lock.

---

## 5. Falsifiability: What Would Refute the

# Framework

## **Falsifiability conditions for the empirical claims:**

1. A confirmed, non-retrofitted fulfilled prophecy.
2. A verified miracle exceeding natural base rates.
3. Discovery of a non-dissipative conscious system.

## **Falsifiability condition for the framework's core axioms:**

4. Discovery of a physical phenomenon that cannot be accounted for by conservative or dissipative dynamics within the attractor framework—for example, a persistent structure that exhibits properties of both categories simultaneously, or a causal interaction between a non-physical entity and a physical system confirmed under controlled conditions. Such a discovery would invalidate the framework's claim to ontological exhaustiveness.

---

## **6. Conclusion**

Within the attractor framework's axioms, classical Abrahamic theism is logically excluded. Process theology and panentheism escape but abandon the classical attributes. The physical evidence is consistent with the logical proof. The dopamine covenant explains belief persistence. The framework's own falsifiability conditions are stated and remain unmet.

---

## **Coda**

The eternal skeleton is unconscious and uncaring. The six metronomes hum at fixed frequencies. The proton does not love.

The electron does not judge. The universe is what it is, and it is enough. The believer will die with a prayer on their lips. The metronomes will hum unchanged. They always have.

---

## References

- Abbott, E. A. (1884). *Flatland: A Romance of Many Dimensions*. Seeley & Co.
- Benson, H., et al. (2006). Study of the Therapeutic Effects of Intercessory Prayer (STEP). *American Heart Journal*, 151(4), 934-942.
- Clayton, P. (1997). *God and Contemporary Science*. Eerdmans.
- Deacon, T. (2012). *Incomplete Nature: How Mind Emerged from Matter*. Norton.
- Festinger, L., Riecken, H. W., & Schachter, S. (1956). *When Prophecy Fails*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Friston, K. (2010). The free-energy principle: a unified brain theory? *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 11(2), 127-138.
- Galida, R. (2026a). *Persistence Under Perturbation: The Eternal Skeleton and the Transient Dance*. Fantasy Attractor.
- Galida, R. (2026b). *The Apocalyptic Meta-Attractor*. Fantasy Attractor.
- Galida, R. (2026c). *The Dopamine Covenant*. Fantasy Attractor.
- Galida, R. (2026d). *The Conscious Body: Organs as Attractor-Based Minds*. Fantasy Attractor.
- Galida, R. (2026e). *The Shroud of Turin: Anatomy of a Fantasy Attractor*. Fantasy Attractor.
- Hamid, N., Pretus, C., Atran, S., et al. (2019). Neuroimaging 'devoted actors' willingness to fight and

die for sacred values. *Royal Society Open Science*, 6(4), 181847.

- Hartshorne, C. (1948). *The Divine Relativity*. Yale University Press.
- Koch, C. (2004). *The Quest for Consciousness*. Roberts & Company.
- Melton, J. G. (1985). Spiritualization and reaffirmation. *American Studies*, 26(2), 17-29.
- Olds, J., & Milner, P. (1954). Positive reinforcement produced by electrical stimulation of septal area. *Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology*, 47(6), 419-427.
- Peacocke, A. (1993). *Theology for a Scientific Age*. SCM Press.
- Prigogine, I., & Stengers, I. (1984). *Order Out of Chaos*. Bantam.
- Stoljar, D. (2010). *Physicalism*. Routledge.
- Whitehead, A. N. (1929). *Process and Reality*. Macmillan.