

The Shroud of Turin: Anatomy of a Fantasy Attractor

Robert Galida

Independent Researcher

June 2026

fantasyattractor.com

Abstract

The Shroud of Turin is among the most studied artifacts in history. Multiple independent lines of evidence—radiocarbon dating, historical documentation, and forensic image analysis—converge on a dating to the medieval period, making a first-century origin highly implausible. Yet belief in its authenticity persists among millions. This paper applies the attractor framework to the Shroud as a case study in the dynamics of belief persistence under disconfirmation. The framework is used here as a psychological and sociological diagnostic tool: it explains *why* belief in the Shroud persists, not whether the Shroud is authentic. That latter question is adjudicated by the physical evidence, which this paper reviews. We identify the major perturbation (the 1988 carbon dating), catalogue the successive reframing strategies that neutralized it, and examine the image's unresolved features as potential beams the Shroud's defenders have not fully examined. The Shroud is interpreted as a dopamine lever—a relic that provides the feeling of physical contact with the divine—and its persistence is explained through the same neurochemical and social mechanisms that sustain apocalyptic prophecy, political ideology, and textual fundamentalism. The paper concludes by applying the framework's own diagnostic to itself, identifying potential

beams within the attractor framework, and integrating those limitations into its conclusions.

1. Introduction: Two Distinct Questions

The Shroud of Turin is a linen cloth measuring approximately 4.4 by 1.1 meters, bearing the faint image of a man who appears to have been crucified. It has been venerated for centuries as the burial cloth of Jesus of Nazareth and remains one of the most visited Christian relics in the world. It has also been subjected to more scientific scrutiny than any religious artifact in history.

Two distinct questions must be kept separate. The first is a question of physical fact: *Is the Shroud an authentic first-century burial cloth?* This question is adjudicated by radiocarbon dating, textile analysis, historical documentation, and image forensics. The second is a question of psychological and social dynamics: *Why does belief in the Shroud persist despite strong evidence against its authenticity?* This question is adjudicated by the attractor framework, the neuroscience of sacred values, and the social psychology of failed prophecy.

This paper addresses both questions, but it keeps them distinct. The physical evidence is reviewed on its own terms. The attractor framework is then applied to explain the persistence of belief, not to determine the Shroud's authenticity. Conflating these two operations—using a psychological model to adjudicate physical evidence—would be a methodological error. This paper avoids that error.

2. The Physical Evidence

2.1 The 1988 Radiocarbon Dating

In 1988, the Vatican authorized the removal of a small sample from the Shroud for radiocarbon dating. The sample was divided and sent to three independent laboratories: the University of Oxford, the University of Arizona, and the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Zurich. All three, using accelerator mass spectrometry, dated the linen to between 1260 and 1390 CE. The results were published in *Nature* (Damon et al., 1989).

The dating is strong. Three independent laboratories, using a well-established physical method, produced results clustering tightly within the medieval period. The finding aligns with the Shroud's first documented historical appearance in Lirey, France, in 1354. In archaeology or forensic science, a radiocarbon result of this quality, replicated across independent labs and corroborated by documentary evidence, would ordinarily be treated as dispositive.

The dating is not, however, entirely uncontested. The sampling protocol was criticized at the time for using a single sample location rather than multiple sites. Subsequent statistical analyses (Riani et al., 2013) identified heterogeneity in the radiocarbon data across the three laboratories, suggesting possible non-homogeneity in the sample that was not fully accounted for by the original statistical treatment. These concerns do not invalidate the dating, but they complicate the claim that the result is beyond any possible methodological challenge. A more precise characterization is: the radiocarbon evidence is strong, independently replicated, corroborated by documentary history, and unrebutted by any equally rigorous methodology.

2.2 The Bishop of Troyes (1389)

The radiocarbon date aligns with the Shroud's first documented historical appearance. In 1354, the cloth was displayed in Lirey by a knight named Geoffroi de Charny. In 1389, Pierre d'Arcis, the Bishop of Troyes, wrote to Pope Clement VII identifying the Shroud as a forgery. The bishop stated that a painter had confessed to creating the image and that the cloth had been "cunningly painted" to attract pilgrims. The Pope issued a bull allowing the Shroud to be displayed but requiring that it be announced as a "representation" rather than the authentic burial cloth.

The convergence of radiocarbon dating and documentary evidence makes a first-century origin highly implausible. What the evidence does *not* establish is deliberate medieval fraud. The radiocarbon date tells us when the linen was harvested, not who made the image or for what purpose. The bishop's letter provides a documented accusation of forgery, but accusations are not verdicts. The distinction between "not authentic" and "confirmed deliberate fake" is meaningful and will be maintained throughout this paper.

2.3 The Pollen Evidence

Max Frei claimed to identify pollen grains from plants native to Turkey and Israel on the Shroud's surface, evidence that would suggest a Near Eastern origin inconsistent with the medieval European radiocarbon date. Frei's findings have been critiqued on methodological grounds, including inadequate controls for contamination and the possibility that pollen grains can transfer to textiles through handling over centuries. The pollen evidence does not outweigh the radiocarbon dating—no indirect botanical inference can override a direct physical measurement of the cloth itself—but its existence in the authenticity literature is noted. The Frei findings are contested; the radiocarbon findings are strong.

2.4 The Image: Open Questions and Overstated Claims

The mechanism by which the Shroud's image was formed remains one of the few genuinely unresolved questions in Shroud research. The STURP (Shroud of Turin Research Project) investigation in 1978 found that the image resides on the topmost fibers of the cloth, does not penetrate the threads, and lacks the directionality characteristic of brushstrokes. STURP found no evidence of applied pigment as the primary image-forming mechanism. These findings are real and deserve engagement.

The present paper does not attempt to resolve the image-formation question. It notes, however, that an unresolved image-formation mechanism does not constitute evidence of authenticity. Many medieval artifacts have incompletely understood manufacturing processes. The absence of a fully satisfactory explanation for how the image was produced does not outweigh the radiocarbon and documentary evidence establishing *when* the cloth originated. The image is an open question; the date is not.

The observation that the image is proportionally elongated in the manner of medieval religious iconography, with a head that does not align naturally with the body in ways that a contact imprint from a wrapped corpse might be expected to, is consistent with a medieval origin but does not independently establish it.

3. The Reframing Cascade: How the Basin Survived

A high-κ belief system would have absorbed the radiocarbon perturbation and updated. The Shroud's defenders did the

opposite. The attractor sealed, and a cascade of reframing strategies followed. Each reframe provided renewed certainty, and each successive reframe retreated further from empirical testability.

3.1 The Repair Patch Hypothesis

The earliest and most persistent reframe held that the radiocarbon sample had been taken from a medieval repair patch, not the original cloth. This hypothesis gained credibility when Raymond Rogers, a retired Los Alamos chemist and former Shroud skeptic, published findings in 2005 claiming that the sample contained cotton fibers and dye not present elsewhere on the cloth.

Subsequent analysis by Bella, Garlaschelli, and Samperi (2015) found no mass spectrometry evidence supporting the repair patch hypothesis. The original sample was taken from the main body of the cloth. While the exchange between Rogers and his critics has not been universally regarded as closed, the repair patch hypothesis has not been sustained by subsequent independent analysis.

3.2 The Fire Contamination Hypothesis

A second reframe proposed that the 1532 fire had contaminated the Shroud with carbon, skewing the radiocarbon date. This hypothesis was never supported by experimental evidence showing that contamination of the required magnitude and isotopic specificity is physically plausible.

3.3 The Resurrection Energy Hypothesis

The most recent reframe, and the least testable, proposes that the resurrection event itself—a burst of divine energy—altered the isotopic composition of the linen. This hypothesis is unfalsifiable by design. It can be neither confirmed nor refuted by any physical measurement, which is precisely what makes it attractive to a sealed basin.

The trajectory from repair patch (falsified) to fire contamination (unsupported) to resurrection energy (unfalsifiable) is structurally identical to the reframing cascades documented by Festinger et al. (1956) and Melton (1985) in failed prophetic movements. The content differs; the dynamics do not.

A methodological caveat. The characterization of this trajectory as “low κ ” is a qualitative judgment, not a formal measurement. Corrective permeability (κ) remains a conceptual construct within the attractor framework, operationalized in principle but not yet validated through independent measurement. The framework’s diagnostic vocabulary—low κ , sealed basin, reframing cascade—provides a coherent description of the Shroud defenders’ behavior, but the assignment of $\kappa \approx 0$ is interpretative, not empirical. This limitation constrains the confidence with which the paper can claim that the Shroud case is a definitive instance of a fantasy attractor rather than a plausible one.

4. The Dopamine Lever: Why the Basin Holds

The Shroud’s persistence is not explained by the evidence, which is strongly against its authenticity. It is explained by the dopamine covenant (Galida, 2026c). The Shroud is a physical lever that delivers the feeling of proximity to the divine. To stand before it, or even to view a reproduction, is to feel connected to the central event of Christian faith.

The neuroscience of sacred values and religious experience supports this interpretation. Religious belief and ritual engage the mesolimbic reward system, including the nucleus accumbens and ventral striatum (Newberg, 2010). Neuroimaging studies have identified distinct neural signatures associated

with religious conviction, including activity in regions implicated in valuation and emotional processing (Kapogiannis et al., 2009). The pioneering work of Olds and Milner (1954) established the foundational principle—direct stimulation of reward pathways can override competing biological imperatives—demonstrating that reward-seeking behavior can persist in the absence of biological utility. Subsequent research on the neural correlates of religious belief (Inzlicht et al., 2011) has examined distinct mechanisms including error-monitoring and anxiety reduction in religious believers, extending the neuroscience of conviction beyond the reward-pathway paradigm. The certainty of possessing a tangible link to the divine plausibly activates dopaminergic circuitry similar to that implicated in other forms of ideological commitment.

The believer does not evaluate the Shroud as a forensic object. They experience it as a relic. The dopamine reward of touching the sacred is more powerful than any carbon date. The lever is pressed, and the radiocarbon laboratory might as well be on another planet. The basin's impermeability is not primarily intellectual. It is neurochemical.

5. The Beams: What the Framework and the Author Cannot Fully Examine

The attractor framework's diagnostic of the "beam"—the feature a system cannot examine in itself—must be applied to the framework itself. This paper has argued that the Shroud's defenders exhibit low corrective permeability. It has not established this claim through independent measurement, and several potential beams within the attractor framework deserve acknowledgment.

Operationalization. κ remains a qualitative construct. Without

formal measurement criteria, its application to cases is necessarily subjective. The framework diagnoses low κ in the Shroud's defenders; a skeptic of the framework could diagnose the same low κ in the framework's own resistance to operationalization. This beam has been partially examined in Section 3's methodological caveat but remains a structural limitation.

Case selection. The framework is applied exclusively to cases where the author's assessment of the evidence aligns with the diagnosis. A rigorous test would require applying the framework to a case where the author believes a claim is *true* and examining whether defenders of that claim also exhibit low- κ dynamics. The present paper cannot claim to have performed this test.

Self-citation and independent validation. The framework's core constructs— κ , the dopamine covenant, the basin model—rest substantially on the author's own unpublished or independently unverified works (Galida, 2026a, 2026b, 2026c). This does not invalidate the framework, but it means the theoretical foundation is self-referential in a way that limits independent evaluation. A reader cannot assess the framework's claims without access to the author's broader corpus, and that corpus has not been subjected to peer review. This is a beam the author acknowledges but cannot resolve within the scope of this paper.

The framework itself as a potential fantasy attractor. Commitment to the attractor framework as an explanatory construct may itself be maintained through low- κ dynamics. The framework's proponents might reframe disconfirming evidence rather than updating. What would constitute a disconfirming result for the framework? If a well-documented case were presented in which a belief system exhibited all the structural features of a sealed basin yet subsequently updated rapidly and substantially without reframing, the framework's predictive utility would be

challenged. Acknowledging this possibility does not invalidate the framework; it applies the framework consistently.

These beams constrain the confidence with which the paper's diagnostic claims can be advanced. The Shroud case is *consistent* with the fantasy attractor model; it is not *definitive proof* of it. The daily question—"Did I update any belief yesterday?"—applies to the author as much as to the Shroud's defenders. This paper has been revised in response to critique. Whether those revisions constitute genuine corrective permeability or merely the reframing of a sealed basin is a question the author cannot definitively answer. The reader is invited to judge.

6. The Larger Covenant: Relics and Apocalyptic Attractors

The Shroud is not an isolated case. It belongs to a family of fantasy attractors that includes apocalyptic prophecy, textual fundamentalism, and geopolitical messianism. Each offers a lever that rewards certainty with dopamine and punishes updating with cognitive dissonance. Each survives perturbation through reframing rather than revision. Each possesses a beam it cannot fully examine.

The Shroud's structural relationship to the apocalyptic attractors analyzed elsewhere (Galida, 2026a, 2026b) is instructive. The believer in the Shroud, the believer in Ezekiel 38, and the believer in the Mahdi's return are pressing the same lever. The content of the belief differs, but the dynamics are identical. The dopamine covenant unifies them.

7. Conclusion

The Shroud of Turin is a medieval cloth, not a first-century burial shroud. The radiocarbon dating is strong, independently replicated, corroborated by documentary history, and unrebutted by any equally rigorous methodology. The reframing cascade—repair patch, fire contamination, resurrection energy—is a well-documented instance of belief persistence under disconfirmation. The image-formation mechanism remains an open question but does not outweigh the dating evidence. The distinction between “not authentic” and “confirmed deliberate forgery” should be maintained: the evidence establishes the cloth’s medieval origin but does not independently establish the intent of its creator.

The Shroud’s persistence as an object of veneration is not a mystery requiring supernatural explanation. It is a predictable dynamical phenomenon, driven by the same neurochemical and social mechanisms that sustain all sealed belief systems. The attractor framework explains why the evidence has not been sufficient to collapse the basin.

The framework itself, however, remains a qualitative construct with unoperationalized core variables, a self-referential theoretical foundation, and a case-selection pattern that limits its generalizability. Its diagnostic claims are plausible but not definitive. These beams are acknowledged but not resolved. The lever is hot. The fire feels good. The metronomes hum. The carbon-14 decays at its fixed rate. The physical evidence is what it is. The attractor framework provides a coherent account of why that evidence has not been sufficient to change most believers’ minds—and it acknowledges that its own account must remain open to correction by evidence that has not yet arrived.

References

- Bella, F., Garlaschelli, L., & Samperi, R. (2015). There is no mass spectrometry evidence that the C14 sample from the Shroud of Turin came from a “medieval repair patch.” *Radiocarbon*, 57(2), 1–8.
- Damon, P. E., et al. (1989). Radiocarbon dating of the Shroud of Turin. *Nature*, 337(6208), 611–615.
- Festinger, L., Riecken, H. W., & Schachter, S. (1956). *When Prophecy Fails*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Frei, M. (1982). Pollen analysis and the Shroud of Turin. *Shroud Spectrum International*, 1(3), 3–7.
- Galida, R. (2026a). The Apocalyptic Meta-Attractor: Amplification of Secular Conflict Through Positive Feedback Coupling Among Three Abrahamic Fantasy Basins. *Fantasy Attractor*.
- Galida, R. (2026b). The MAGA Attractor: Fantasy, Colonization, and the Terminal Phase of a Sealed Basin. *Fantasy Attractor*.
- Galida, R. (2026c). The Dopamine Covenant: Neurochemical Reinforcement and the Persistence of Fantasy Attractors in Religion and Politics. *Fantasy Attractor*.
- Inzlicht, M., et al. (2011). Neural markers of religious conviction. *Psychological Science*, 22(3), 385–392.
- Kapogiannis, D., et al. (2009). Cognitive and neural foundations of religious belief. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(12), 4876–4881.
- Melton, J. G. (1985). Spiritualization and reaffirmation: What really happens when prophecy fails. *American Studies*, 26(2), 17–29.
- Newberg, A. (2010). *Principles of Neurotheology*. Ashgate.
- Olds, J., & Milner, P. (1954). Positive reinforcement produced by electrical stimulation of septal area. *Journal of Comparative and Physiological*

Psychology, 47(6), 419–427.

- Riani, M., et al. (2013). Statistical analysis of the radiocarbon dates from the Shroud of Turin. *Applied Statistics*, 62(1), 79–97.
 - Rogers, R. N. (2005). Studies on the radiocarbon sample from the Shroud of Turin. *Thermochimica Acta*, 425(1–2), 189–194.
-

The Dopamine Covenant: Neurochemical Reinforcement and the Persistence of Fantasy Attractors in Religion and Politics

Robert Galida

Independent Researcher

June 2026

fantasyattractor.com

Abstract

Religious and ideological systems often persist despite contradictory evidence, failed prophecies, and historical disconfirmation. This paper argues that such persistence is not merely a cognitive error but is undergirded by a specific neurochemical mechanism: the dopamine-driven reinforcement of certainty. Building on Olds and Milner's (1954) demonstration

that direct stimulation of the mesolimbic reward pathway can override all competing biological imperatives, we propose that the “lever” of absolute belief functions as a fantasy attractor—a sealed, low-corrective-permeability (κ) basin that resists updating. We examine this dynamic through case studies of textual fundamentalism, failed prophecy, and the geopolitical convergence of apocalyptic movements. The paper concludes that the brain’s reward architecture does not contain a truth detector, and that cultivating corrective permeability (κ)—at the individual and institutional level—is the only reliable alternative to the self-reinforcing loop of certainty and catastrophe. Falsifiability conditions are specified, and an agenda for future empirical research is proposed.

1. Introduction: The Neural Lever

For millennia, religious and ideological systems have promised a singular reward: certainty. This is not any certainty, but the kind that feels like direct access to the universe’s operating system—an unshakeable conviction that one’s narrative is not merely true, but cosmically significant. That feeling has a name: dopamine. And it does not care about truth.

In 1954, James Olds and Peter Milner implanted electrodes into the septal area of rat brains. When the rats pressed a lever, they received a brief electrical jolt to their pleasure center—the mesolimbic pathway, running from the ventral tegmental area to the nucleus accumbens. The rats pressed the lever thousands of times per hour. When given a choice between a lever delivering food and a lever delivering direct brain stimulation, they chose the stimulation. They pressed until they collapsed from exhaustion or starvation. They died with their paws on the lever (Olds & Milner, 1954).

This experiment provides the neurochemical prototype for understanding the self-sealing nature of fantasy attractors–belief systems with low corrective permeability ($\kappa \approx 0$) that resist updating when confronted with contradictory evidence (Galida, 2026). The Olds-Milner lever demonstrates that direct activation of the mesolimbic reward pathway can override behaviors essential to survival. Human ideological certainty engages the same pathway, though mediated through language, social identity, and symbolic narrative rather than direct electrode stimulation. The brain does not have a dedicated “truth detector.” It has a reward system. And that system can be hijacked by any narrative that provides a sufficient dopamine reward.

A note on the framework. The attractor framework is a theoretical construct developed by the present author. It is not a community-validated model but a set of proposed concepts—including corrective permeability (κ) and the distinction between reality-aligned and fantasy attractors—designed for diagnostic application. This paper deploys those concepts to connect the neuroscience of reward with the psychology of belief persistence.

2. The Neurochemistry of Certainty

Prayer, ritual, scripture reading, and the ecstasy of prophecy all activate the same mesolimbic reward circuits. Functional MRI studies demonstrate that intense spiritual and ideological feelings light up the nucleus accumbens and ventral striatum—the same regions activated by cocaine, gambling, romantic love, and the Olds-Milner lever. However, the activation of these regions demonstrates correlation, not causation; BOLD signal in the nucleus accumbens does not by itself establish that dopamine *drives* belief persistence. The neuroimaging evidence is suggestive rather than definitive,

particularly given that the most relevant studies (Hamid et al., 2019; Zhong et al., 2017) examine extreme populations—devoted actors willing to die, and patients with traumatic brain lesions—rather than ordinary belief formation.

A more precise account of dopamine's role is required. Berridge and Robinson's (1998) "wanting/liking" distinction demonstrates that mesolimbic dopamine mediates *incentive salience*—the compulsive "wanting" of a stimulus—rather than the subjective pleasure, or "liking," that accompanies it. Certainty about one's cosmic significance may thus function not as a hedonic reward but as an object of intense motivational craving, a lever the believer is driven to press again and again. Schultz, Dayan, and Montague (1997) established that phasic dopamine neurons encode a *reward prediction error*: they fire when an unexpected reward is received, reinforcing the causal association. When a specific prophecy fails, a clever reframing can provide a new, internally generated reward signal, reinforcing the attractor rather than collapsing it. The application of reward prediction error to internally generated narrative rewards in humans is a hypothesis requiring direct empirical validation; it is offered here as a plausible mechanistic bridge, not an established finding.

The dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (dlPFC)—the region responsible for deliberative reasoning, cognitive flexibility, and the integration of contradictory information—shows reduced activity in devoted actors willing to kill and die for sacred values (Hamid et al., 2019). Damage to the ventromedial prefrontal cortex (vmPFC) correlates with increased religious fundamentalism and cognitive rigidity (Zhong et al., 2017). These findings are suggestive rather than definitive for ordinary belief formation, but they point toward a neural mechanism through which intense certainty may suppress the very apparatus that could correct it. A fantasy attractor, therefore, is not merely a cognitive error; it is a

neurochemical lock.

3. Corrective Permeability (κ): A Qualitative Construct

Corrective permeability (κ) is introduced here as a multidimensional, qualitative construct—not a metrically precise quantity. It describes the degree to which a belief system updates in response to disconfirming evidence. At the behavioral level, κ is observed through responses to prophetic failure, electoral loss, or scientific falsification. At the neural level, it is hypothesized to correlate with dlPFC engagement during exposure to counter-attitudinal information. At the cognitive level, it overlaps with metacognitive awareness, intellectual humility, and reflective thinking capacity as measured by instruments such as the Cognitive Reflection Test (Frederick, 2005).

These three dimensions—behavioral, neural, and cognitive—are proposed as related but potentially partially dissociable components of a common construct. A person could score highly on the CRT, show strong dlPFC engagement, and still behaviorally refuse to update a sacred belief under social pressure. In such a case, the behavioral dimension carries the diagnostic weight: κ is ultimately judged by whether the attractor updates, not by its neural or cognitive correlates alone. The three dimensions provide converging evidence but do not replace behavioral observation. Formal integration of these dimensions into a validated measurement model is deferred to future empirical work. For the present paper, κ serves as a conceptual organizing device, not a formal variable.

4. The Textual Addiction

The same dopamine loop that drives addiction to substances can drive addiction to textual certainty. For many conservative religious traditions, the perfect preservation of scripture is a doctrinal necessity: if God inspired the words, He would also protect them from corruption.

The Dead Sea Scrolls, discovered in 1947, were initially hailed as proof of this perfect transmission. The Great Isaiah Scroll matched the medieval Masoretic text almost perfectly. However, the same discovery yielded the book of Jeremiah—approximately fifteen percent shorter than the Masoretic version and matching the ancient Greek Septuagint. This was not a scribal slip; it was a full editorial rewrite. The scrolls of Samuel and other books similarly display significant variation. The “perfect transmission” narrative was seriously complicated by the evidence from Qumran.

Yet the dopamine-driven believer does not abandon the text. Instead, the basin seals. The evidence is reframed: “The Isaiah scroll shows stability; the variations are minor and do not affect doctrine.” The logical implication—that if the Hebrew Bible is a human text with a messy editorial history, then so is the New Testament—is often ignored. Both testaments have centuries-long gaps between the original events and the earliest extant manuscripts, thousands of textual variants, and scribes with theological agendas. Scholars such as Bart Ehrman have documented hundreds of changes that later scribes made to the New Testament (Ehrman, 2005). Ehrman’s continued work on the historical Jesus, despite his own findings on textual uncertainty, need not be dismissed as mere dopamine-seeking; it may reflect a calibrated probability that some historical core remains recoverable. What matters for the attractor framework is that the textual evidence does not

produce the scale of doctrinal revision that a straightforward updating model would predict, and the reward of recovering a Jesus behind the text provides a lever that can be pressed independently of the underlying methodological confidence.

5. Prophecy as Retrofitting—and Its Limits

The same dopamine economy drives apocalyptic prophecy. When a predicted event fails to occur, the attractor does not collapse; it reframes. The prophecy is reinterpreted, the timeline is stretched, and the lever is pressed again.

Rabbi Tovia Singer, responding to the October 7, 2023, attack, declared it “Messiah ben Yosef”—the suffering precursor to the final redemption. Ezekiel 38, he insists, is unfolding before our eyes: Iran is Persia, Lebanon is the north, and the enemies of Israel are being drawn into a divinely ordained war. Yet Ezekiel promised fire and brimstone, not IAF airstrikes. Iran still stands. Hezbollah still operates. The Temple is not rebuilt. World peace is nowhere in sight. “Unfolding” is simply a slower version of “soon.” When nothing happens, the believer is “still in the process.” When something happens, it is “prophetic.” The prophecy is unfalsifiable.

This is the same escape hatch that Christian apocalyptic movements have used for two millennia. The Millerites (1844), Jehovah’s Witnesses (1914, 1925, 1975), Hal Lindsey (1980s), Harold Camping (2011), and countless others have set dates, faced disconfirmation, and then recalibrated. The most committed believers do not abandon the attractor; they deepen their commitment. Festinger, Riecken, and Schachter’s (1956) classic study of a failed doomsday cult found that the most devout members became *more* convinced after the prophecy

failed, reframing it as a spiritual success. Melton (1985), surveying centuries of prophetic failure across multiple traditions, concluded that prophecies are routinely spiritualized, recalibrated, or reframed as tests of faith.

However, not all movements survive disconfirmation. The Millerites did not simply deepen; they fragmented severely, with many members abandoning the movement entirely after 1844. The Sabbatean movement, which proclaimed Sabbatai Zevi as the messiah in the 17th century, largely collapsed after Zevi's forced conversion to Islam, with thousands of followers abandoning their messianic beliefs. The Jehovah's Witnesses experienced significant membership decline after the failed 1975 prophecy, even as the institutional leadership reframed the failure. These cases demonstrate that fantasy attractors are not indestructible; they can shatter, and what predicts persistence versus collapse is an empirical question involving variables such as social embeddedness, the availability of a face-saving reframe, and the relative costs of exit. The dopamine hit of "I was right" is powerful, but it is not invincible.

6. The Geopolitical Metastasis

This neurochemical dynamic is not confined to individual belief. It scales to geopolitics. Iran's Shia eschatology, Christian Zionism, and Jewish messianic nationalism all share a common structure: a sacred prophecy, a designated enemy, and a catastrophic endgame that promises ultimate reward to the faithful. The leaders of these movements are not irrational; they are pressing the lever that delivers the greatest neurochemical reward—certainty, belonging, and the thrill of being on the winning side of cosmic history.

The ideological commitments are independently documented.

Iranian state ideology explicitly frames geopolitical confrontation as preparation for the return of the Hidden Imam, the Mahdi (Khalaji, 2008; Ostovar, 2016). Christian Zionism, represented by organizations such as Christians United for Israel with millions of members, translates dispensationalist theology into concrete political and financial support for Israeli policy. Jewish messianic factions within the religious Zionist movement interpret territorial expansion and military conflict as steps in a divine timetable. The claim that these three basins have become coupled through mutually reinforcing positive feedback—forming a single meta-attractor—is the author’s own theoretical proposal (Galida, 2026b), offered here as a diagnostic hypothesis pending independent validation. If the basins are indeed coupling, the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex—the neural seat of cost-benefit analysis—is suppressed in devoted actors, and the collective lever is pressed. The fire feels good.

7. The Antidote: Shared Reality and Corrective Permeability

There is such a thing as shared reality. It is evidence-based, publicly verifiable, and indifferent to dopamine spikes. Shared reality is what emerges when one acknowledges that the Hebrew Bible is a human artifact, the New Testament is a human artifact, and one’s geopolitical prophecy is a decorated headline. Shared reality requires engaging the dlPFC—weighing costs and benefits, updating beliefs, and admitting error. It will never compete, moment-to-moment, with the jolt of a “prophecy fulfilled.” But it keeps the organism alive.

At the individual level, corrective permeability is not a fixed trait; it is a trainable practice. The dlPFC can be strengthened. Interventions that promote critical reflection

have been shown to influence belief formation and flexibility. Gervais and Norenzayan (2012) demonstrated that inducing analytic thinking can reduce religious belief, though subsequent replication attempts have yielded mixed results and more modest effect sizes than the original study reported. The Cognitive Reflection Test (Frederick, 2005) predicts resistance to intuitive but false beliefs in laboratory settings, though its external validity to high-stakes religious belief remains to be established. Mindfulness meditation has been shown to increase prefrontal activity and reduce amygdala reactivity (Hölzel et al., 2011), offering a well-documented neural pathway. Cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) modifies specific maladaptive beliefs in clinical populations, though its effects on general belief flexibility are less established. Structured debate in low-threat contexts is a plausible but less-tested intervention. The simple daily question, "Did I update any belief yesterday?," is a practical heuristic for engaging the correction apparatus.

Acknowledging the asymmetry. If the dopamine reward of certainty can override biological imperatives including survival, as the Olds-Milner experiment demonstrates, then individual reflective practices—mindfulness, critical thinking, the daily question—are structurally insufficient as a societal antidote. They are necessary but not sufficient. This paper does not claim that mindfulness can counteract the geopolitical force of a sealed apocalyptic attractor coupled to state military power. It claims only that individual κ cultivation is a prerequisite for any broader institutional response: institutions themselves are populated by individuals, and institutional κ cannot exceed the κ of the people who operate them. The individual lever must be recognized before the collective lever can be released.

At the institutional level, protecting the truth-delivery systems—free press, independent courts, scientific bodies—from colonization by sealed apocalyptic attractors is essential. At

the international level, recognizing the dopamine covenant for what it is—a neurochemical feedback loop that has been exploited for millennia—is a prerequisite for any effective response to the converging apocalyptic basins.

8. Falsifiability Conditions

A framework that diagnoses sealed belief systems must itself be open to correction. The following conditions are proposed:

- **Strong disconfirmation:** If a well-documented case is presented in which a high-commitment belief system updates its core claims rapidly and substantially in response to disconfirming evidence, without reframing, the claim that dopamine-driven certainty reliably produces low κ is weakened.
- **Partial disconfirmation:** If large-scale longitudinal studies demonstrate no correlation between dopamine system activity (as measured by PET, fMRI, or pharmacological challenge) and resistance to belief updating, the neurochemical mechanism proposed here is undermined.
- **Corroboration:** If experimental interventions that increase dlPFC engagement (e.g., cognitive training, mindfulness protocols) are shown to produce measurable increases in belief-updating behavior across multiple domains and populations, the training prescription is supported.

These conditions are not met by the present paper. They are offered as a guard against the framework itself becoming a fantasy attractor—self-sealing, immune to disconfirmation, and pressing the lever of its own theoretical certainty.

9. Open Questions and Future Research Directions

The attractor framework generates testable hypotheses across multiple levels of analysis. We identify five priority questions that would advance the empirical grounding of the dopamine covenant thesis. Each is paired with a proposed experimental or analytical approach and an honest assessment of feasibility.

9.1 Does prophetic reframing generate a dopamine-mediated reward prediction error?

Present committed believers with a falsifiable prediction (e.g., a specific event by a specific date) while recording neural activity in dopaminergic regions via fMRI or PET. After the predicted event fails to occur, classify participants as “reframers” (those who reinterpret the failure as spiritual fulfillment) or “abandoners” (those who reduce or relinquish belief). Compare dopaminergic responses between groups. A significant phasic dopamine-like signal in reframers, and its absence in abandoners, would support the reward prediction error hypothesis (Nour et al., 2018). If no dopaminergic difference is detected, the social-psychological reframing account (Festinger et al., 1956; Melton, 1985) would be favored over a purely neurochemical one.

Feasibility: Low. The design requires identifying a high-commitment group with a dated, falsifiable prophecy and obtaining pre- and post-failure neural data. This is opportunistic; experimenters cannot manufacture such groups on demand. Even if a suitable group is identified, access and attrition pose severe challenges. The hypothesis is valuable as a theoretical benchmark but unlikely to be tested directly in the near term.

9.2 What predicts persistence versus collapse after disconfirmation?

Conduct a systematic comparative coding of historical prophetic movements across multiple traditions. Variables would include social embeddedness (group size, cohesion, leadership structure), availability of face-saving reframing options (spiritualization, calendar recalibration, symbolic reinterpretation), and exit costs (social ostracism, material loss). Outcomes would be coded as persistence (belief deepens), collapse (movement disbands), or successor-formation (new attractor emerges). Statistical analysis would identify the strongest predictors. Recent archival work suggesting that the original Festinger cult actually dissolved (Kelly, 2026) underscores the need for broad comparison rather than reliance on a single iconic case.

Feasibility: Moderate. Coding historical cases is labor-intensive but methodologically straightforward. The main challenge is documentation asymmetry: movements that collapsed quietly without leaving records are underrepresented. Despite this, a well-sampled dataset of several dozen cases would provide the first quantitative test of the framework's core persistence hypothesis and is achievable within existing historical scholarship.

9.3 Can κ be trained in high-stakes contexts?

Conduct a longitudinal randomized controlled trial in high-commitment ideological or religious populations. Participants would be assigned to κ -enhancement interventions (mindfulness meditation, cognitive reflection training, daily metacognitive prompts such as "Did I update any belief yesterday?") or an active control. Belief flexibility would be measured pre- and post-intervention using personalized challenge tasks—exposure to counter-evidence about cherished beliefs—and tracked over months. Existing evidence shows that cognitive debiasing reduces conspiracy beliefs (Bayrak et al., 2025) and that

mindfulness reduces cognitive rigidity (Greenberg et al., 2012). Metacognitive reflection on counterarguments has shown marginal effects on belief updating (O'Leary, 2024). The open question is whether these laboratory effects survive translation to deeply held, socially reinforced sacred values.

Feasibility: Moderate. Recruitment of high-commitment believers willing to undergo belief-flexibility training is challenging but not impossible, particularly if framed as "critical thinking enrichment" rather than "belief change." Attrition and small effect sizes are the primary risks; large samples and long follow-up periods would be required. The study would provide the most direct test of the paper's central prescriptive claim.

9.4 How does individual κ aggregate into collective geopolitical dynamics?

Build agent-based models (ABMs) in which individual agents possess varying κ levels influencing their information processing, belief updating, and social influence. Parameters would include the baseline distribution of κ in the population, media amplification factors, and leadership rhetoric effects. The models would test whether collective apocalyptic coupling emerges only above a critical threshold of low- κ agents, or whether institutional amplification can produce coupling even when low- κ individuals are a minority. Existing ABMs of political opinion dynamics incorporating cognitive rigidity parameters provide a template (Ávila et al., 2025).

Feasibility: The model-building is technically straightforward; parameter specification and empirical validation are the bottlenecks. Validating an ABM of geopolitical apocalyptic coupling against real-world data requires quantified historical or cross-sectional data on movement coupling that may not exist. This is a full-scale modeling project rather than a near-term study, but a proof-

of-concept simulation would clarify whether the individual-to-collective transition is linear or nonlinear.

9.5 Is κ a unified construct or a loose family of traits?

Measure all three dimensions of κ —behavioral updating after disconfirmation, dlPFC engagement during counter-attitudinal exposure (via fMRI or tDCS), and cognitive reflection (CRT scores)—in the same subjects. Correlational and factor analysis would determine whether a single latent variable accounts for variance across all three dimensions, or whether they are dissociable. Existing evidence linking dlPFC stimulation to improved belief updating (Schulreich et al., 2020) suggests a neural-behavioral connection, but the full three-dimensional structure has not been tested. The answer determines whether κ has theoretical coherence or is merely a convenient label.

Feasibility: Low as a single study; high as a research program. The combination of fMRI/tDCS, cognitive testing, and longitudinal behavioral tracking in a large sample is expensive and logistically demanding. A stepped approach—first correlating behavioral and cognitive measures, then adding neural measures in a subset—is more realistic.

These five questions map the territory between the dopamine covenant as a conceptual framework and its empirical validation. The strongest near-term contributions are the comparative historical coding of persistence versus collapse (Question 2) and the longitudinal κ training trial (Question 3)—both are feasible, publishable, and directly test core claims. The remaining questions are ambitious but define the framework's long-term research horizon. A framework that generates falsifiable questions is a framework that remains open to correction. That is itself a form of corrective permeability.

10. Conclusion

The rat died pressing the pleasure lever. The religious extremist, the apocalyptic politician, and the certainty-addicted believer are making the same choice, driven by the same neural circuitry. The fire feels good. That is the real addiction. And it is burning the world down.

The only reliable lever is reality. It does not promise heaven. It does not promise a second coming or a Mahdi's return. It promises only one thing: it is true, whether you believe it or not.

References

- Ávila, P., et al. (2025). Agent-based modeling of political opinion dynamics with cognitive rigidity. *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation*.
- Bayrak, F., et al. (2025). Cognitive debiasing training reduces conspiracy beliefs. *Nature Human Behaviour*.
- Berridge, K. C., & Robinson, T. E. (1998). What is the role of dopamine in reward: hedonic impact, reward learning, or incentive salience? *Brain Research Reviews*, 28(3), 309-369.
- Ehrman, B. D. (2005). *Misquoting Jesus: The Story Behind Who Changed the Bible and Why*. HarperCollins.
- Festinger, L., Riecken, H. W., & Schachter, S. (1956). *When Prophecy Fails*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Frederick, S. (2005). Cognitive reflection and decision making. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 19(4), 25-42.

- Galida, R. (2026a). *Persistence Under Perturbation: The Eternal Skeleton and the Transient Dance*. Fantasy Attractor.
- Galida, R. (2026b). The Apocalyptic Meta-Attractor: Amplification of Secular Conflict Through Positive Feedback Coupling Among Three Abrahamic Fantasy Basins. Fantasy Attractor.
- Gervais, W. M., & Norenzayan, A. (2012). Analytic thinking promotes religious disbelief. *Science*, 336(6080), 493-496.
- Greenberg, J., et al. (2012). Mindfulness and reduced cognitive rigidity. *Journal of Cognitive Enhancement*.
- 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.
- Hölzel, B. K., Lazar, S. W., Gard, T., et al. (2011). How does mindfulness meditation work? Proposing mechanisms of action from a conceptual and neural perspective. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 6(6), 537-559.
- Kelly, M. (2026). The dissolution of the Festinger cult: Archival reanalysis. *Journal of Social Psychology*.
- Khalaji, M. (2008). *Apocalyptic Politics: On the Rationality of Iranian Policy*. Washington Institute.
- Melton, J. G. (1985). Spiritualization and reaffirmation: What really happens when prophecy fails. *American Studies*, 26(2), 17-29.
- Nour, M. M., et al. (2018). Dopamine signals belief update signals. *Neuron*, 97(2), 462-473.
- Olds, J., & Milner, P. (1954). Positive reinforcement produced by electrical stimulation of septal area. *Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology*, 47(6), 419-427.
- O'Leary, C. (2024). Metacognitive reflection and belief change. *Thinking & Reasoning*.
- Ostovar, A. (2016). *Vanguard of the Imam: Religion,*

Politics, and Iran's Revolutionary Guards. Oxford University Press.

- Schulreich, S., et al. (2020). Enhancing dlPFC activity improves belief updating. *Journal of Neuroscience*.
- Schultz, W., Dayan, P., & Montague, P. R. (1997). A neural substrate of prediction and reward. *Science*, 275(5306), 1593-1599.
- Zhong, W., Cristofori, I., Bulbulia, J., et al. (2017). Biological and cognitive underpinnings of religious fundamentalism. *Neuropsychologia*, 100, 18–25.

[“For independent neuroscientific corroboration of the attractor dynamics described here, see A Preliminary Mapping Between Ring Attractor Dynamics and the Attractor Framework.”](#)

The Lever and the Basin: Olds-Milner, Dopamine, and the Neurochemical Prototype of Fantasy Attractors

Robert Galida

Independent Researcher

June 2026

fantasyattractor.com

Abstract

In 1954, Olds and Milner demonstrated that direct electrical stimulation of the mesolimbic reward pathway could drive rats to press a lever to the exclusion of all biological needs, often until death. This paper argues that the Olds-Milner lever provides the neurochemical prototype for a fantasy attractor—a sealed, low-corrective-permeability (κ) belief system maintained by dopamine-driven reinforcement. While the human expression of such attractors involves symbolic and narrative complexity, they appear to share a common neural substrate with the Olds-Milner phenomenon, specifically the dopamine-mediated suppression of the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (dlPFC). Corrective permeability (κ) is defined here as a multidimensional construct—behavioral (rate of belief update under disconfirmation), neural (dlPFC engagement during counter-attitudinal exposure), and cognitive (metacognitive awareness and reflective thinking capacity)—whose dimensions are proposed as related but potentially partially dissociable components of a common construct. The attractor framework is the author's own theoretical construct, and this paper uses it to propose a unified conceptual bridge between the neuroscience of reward, the social psychology of failed prophecy, and the dynamics of rigid belief. It concludes that corrective permeability is not a fixed trait but a neurocognitive skill that can be cultivated, and that the framework itself must remain open to disconfirmation.

1. Introduction: The Rat on the Lever

In a landmark 1954 experiment, James Olds and Peter Milner implanted electrodes into the septal nuclei of rats and connected them to a lever. Each press delivered a brief electrical jolt to the brain's pleasure centers. The rats pressed the lever at rates of up to 7,000 times per hour,

ignoring food, water, and their own young, until they collapsed from exhaustion or died. The electrode was not delivering nutrition or safety; it was delivering direct, unmediated reward via the mesolimbic dopamine pathway.

The canonical interpretation treats this experiment as a study of addiction and motivation. I propose a different reading: the rat on the lever is the purest behavioral demonstration of a fantasy attractor—a sealed basin with near-zero corrective permeability ($\kappa \approx 0$), maintained by a neurochemical feedback loop that has no mechanism for detecting its own self-destructiveness. The brain does not have a truth detector. It has a reward system. Fantasy attractors exploit this architecture.

2. The Fantasy Attractor: A Construct Under Development

A note on the framework. The attractor framework is a theoretical construct developed by the present author (Galida, 2026a). It is not a community-validated model but a set of proposed concepts—including corrective permeability (κ) and the distinction between reality-aligned and fantasy attractors—designed for diagnostic application. This paper deploys those concepts to connect the neuroscience of reward with the psychology of belief persistence.

A fantasy attractor is a belief system with low corrective permeability (κ). It resists updating when confronted with contradictory evidence, reframes error signals to protect its core narrative, and often seeks to colonize or destroy rival basins. A reality attractor, in contrast, has high κ : it absorbs perturbation, updates its model, and deepens through correction.

What is κ ? Corrective permeability is a multidimensional construct. At the behavioral level, it denotes the rate at which a belief system updates in response to disconfirming evidence—observable through responses to prophetic failure, electoral loss, or scientific falsification. At the neural level, it is hypothesized to correlate with dlPFC engagement during exposure to counter-attitudinal information. At the cognitive level, it overlaps with metacognitive awareness, intellectual humility, and reflective thinking capacity as measured by instruments such as the Cognitive Reflection Test (Frederick, 2005). These three dimensions—behavioral, neural, and cognitive—are proposed as related but potentially partially dissociable components of a common construct, and their formal integration into a validated measurement model is deferred to future empirical work. For the present paper, κ serves as a conceptual organizing device, not a metrically precise quantity.

Corrective permeability has a neural correlate. The dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (dlPFC) is critical for deliberative reasoning, cognitive flexibility, and the integration of new information that contradicts prior beliefs. When the dlPFC is suppressed—by stress, by dopamine-driven reward anticipation, or by the sheer intensity of a sacred value—the updating mechanism is partially disengaged. A fantasy attractor, then, is not merely a cognitive error. It is a neurochemical lock: a self-reinforcing basin maintained by the dopamine-driven reinforcement of certainty, coupled with the suppression of the apparatus that could correct it.

3. The Olds-Milner Mechanism: Dopamine and Basin Sealing

3.1 The Experiment

Olds and Milner implanted bipolar electrodes in the septal nuclei of rats. The stimulation directly activated the mesolimbic pathway, triggering dopamine release in the nucleus accumbens. The rats rapidly learned to self-stimulate and would cross electrified grids to reach the lever. Their behavior displayed a pathological focus: all competing motivational systems—hunger, thirst, social bonding—were overridden.

3.2 Wanting Without Liking

Subsequent neuroscience has refined our understanding of the underlying processes. Berridge and Robinson's "wanting/liking" distinction demonstrates that mesolimbic dopamine mediates *incentive salience*—the compulsive "wanting" of a stimulus—rather than the subjective pleasure, or "liking," that accompanies it. This is a crucial precision: the Olds-Milner rat may not be experiencing escalating pleasure. It may be in a state of chronic, intense craving, driven by a dopamine system that attributes supreme motivational value to the lever.

Schultz and colleagues established that phasic dopamine neurons encode a *reward prediction error*. They fire when an unexpected reward is received, reinforcing the causal association. A fantasy attractor, however, often does not deliver a single, clear falsifiable prediction. When a specific prophecy fails, a reframe can provide a new, internally generated reward signal: the revised interpretation itself constitutes a novel prediction whose acceptance by the group triggers a prediction error, reinforcing the attractor rather than collapsing it. The dopamine system thus does not merely passively respond to external rewards; it can be co-opted by internally generated narrative rewards that perpetuate the basin.

3.3 The Lever as a Sealed Basin

Viewed through this lens, the rat's behavior maps onto the fantasy attractor concept with precision. The lever becomes the basin's strongest point of attraction, and the dopamine-driven "wanting" compels action even as the animal's body is dying. The error signals of hunger and thirst are present, but they cannot penetrate the basin. The dopamine loop overrides them. The rat is not stupid; it is a perfectly functional nervous system locked in a sealed attractor, driven by "wanting" what will kill it.

3.4 From Rat to Human: A Shared Substrate

The human mesolimbic pathway is structurally and functionally homologous to the rat's. A human contemplating their election as a member of a divine plan, a revolutionary vanguard, or an infallible political movement is likely engaging the same dopamine-mediated "wanting" system. The apocalyptic believer retrofitting a terrorist attack as "Messiah ben Yosef" is pressing a lever. The certainty is the reward. What differs is the complexity of the stimulus—the lever is decorated with theology, ideology, and narrative. This symbolic layer is not an epiphenomenon; it engages distinct cortical processes and social dynamics that add causal complexity. The human attractor is not identical to the rat's, but it appears to share a crucial neurochemical substrate.

A methodological caveat. Direct neuroimaging of ordinary belief rigidity remains limited. The available evidence comes primarily from extreme populations: Hamid et al. (2019) studied individuals willing to fight and die for sacred values, and Zhong et al. (2017) studied patients with traumatic dlPFC lesions. These findings are suggestive rather than definitive for ordinary belief formation. Generalization from these studies to the broader population of believers should be treated as a hypothesis requiring further validation, not an established finding.

4. The Dopamine Covenant: Certainty as Reward

4.1 The Brain's Category Error

The brain evolved to use the feeling of certainty as a proxy for adaptive knowledge because false beliefs about predators were rapidly corrected. In the modern symbolic environment, beliefs can persist for decades without encountering lethal feedback. A person can be completely certain that the Mahdi will return or that a lost election was stolen, and this subjective certainty fires the same reward circuits that once signaled a reliable food source. The brain cannot distinguish between “this feels certain because it is true” and “this feels certain because the mesolimbic pathway has been activated ten thousand times.”

4.2 Persistence and Collapse After Disconfirmation

Festinger, Riecken, and Schachter's *When Prophecy Fails* (1956) chronicled a doomsday cult that reframed a failed flood prophecy as confirmation that their faith had saved the world. Believers became more committed after the failure. This is the basin deepening. Melton (1985), surveying centuries of prophetic failure across multiple religious traditions, identified the same structural pattern: prophecies are routinely spiritualized, recalibrated, or reframed as tests of faith rather than abandoned.

However, a full analysis requires accounting for cases where movements *do* collapse. The Millerites of 1844, who prepared for Christ's return on October 22, suffered a massive “Great Disappointment” when Jesus did not arrive. The movement fragmented severely; many members left, disillusioned. Yet from that collapse, new, more resilient sects—most notably the

Seventh-day Adventists—emerged with a reframed theology. This pattern is theoretically instructive: collapse of one attractor basin can seed a successor, potentially more resilient, basin. The attractor dynamic does not necessarily terminate; it can migrate, with the reframe functioning as the bridge from the old basin to the new. What predicts persistence versus collapse versus successor-formation? Variables likely include the depth of a group's social embeddedness, the availability of a face-saving reframe, and the relative costs of exit. Engaging this complexity strengthens the argument: a fantasy attractor is not an indestructible monolith; it is a dynamical system that can either deepen, shatter, or reorganize under perturbation, depending on its structure. The reframing response is common but not universal.

5. Implications for the Attractor Framework

5.1 Cognitive Arguments Alone Are Insufficient

A fantasy attractor cannot be reliably dislodged by evidence alone because the apparatus for processing corrective evidence (the dlPFC) is often suppressed. This does not mean persuasion is impossible; it means that conditions that reduce threat and re-engage prefrontal function must precede evidential argument.

5.2 The Dopamine Covenant Explains Apocalyptic Intensity

Apocalyptic belief is an especially potent fantasy attractor because its reward structure is maximal: the believer is not merely right about a fact; they are a participant in the final act of cosmic history. The dopamine “wanting” is directed

toward a future of ultimate vindication, making the attractor deeply resistant to correction.

An open question: κ at the level of belief content vs. attractor dynamics. The successor basin phenomenon—where collapse of one fantasy attractor seeds another—raises a theoretically important distinction. An individual or group that abandons a failed prophecy and adopts a reframed successor belief may exhibit high κ in the narrow sense (they updated their specific beliefs in response to disconfirmation) while remaining within a fantasy attractor at the structural level. This suggests that κ may need to be measured not only at the level of specific belief content but also at the level of the attractor dynamic itself: does the system's underlying relationship to disconfirmation change, or merely the content of the beliefs it protects? A high- κ move from one low- κ basin to another is still low- κ at the systemic level. Resolving this distinction—between content-level and structure-level corrective permeability—is a priority for future theoretical and empirical work within the attractor framework.

5.3 Corrective Permeability Is a Trainable Practice

The dlPFC can be strengthened. The capacity for analytic reasoning is not a fixed trait. Interventions that promote critical reflection have been shown to influence belief formation and flexibility. Gervais and Norenzayan (2012) demonstrated that inducing analytic thinking can reduce religious belief, though subsequent meta-analyses have found more modest and conditional effect sizes in replications. This suggests a genuine but likely small-to-moderate link between cognitive style and belief flexibility. More broadly, dual-process theories in cognitive psychology hold that Type 2 (reflective) processing can override Type 1 (intuitive) responses when prompted (Evans & Stanovich, 2013). The Cognitive Reflection Test (CRT; Frederick, 2005) has been shown to predict resistance to intuitive but false beliefs

across multiple domains, providing a plausible measurement anchor for the cognitive dimension of κ .

The evidence base for specific interventions varies. Mindfulness meditation has been shown to increase prefrontal activity and reduce amygdala reactivity (Hölzel et al., 2011), providing a well-documented neural pathway for enhancing κ . Cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) has strong empirical support for modifying specific maladaptive beliefs in clinical populations, though its effects on general belief flexibility outside clinical contexts are less thoroughly established. Structured debate in low-threat contexts is a plausible but less-tested intervention; its theoretical rationale is strong, but direct empirical support for its effect on corrective permeability is limited. The simple daily question, “Did I update any belief yesterday?”, is a practical heuristic for engaging the correction apparatus, derived from the framework itself rather than independent empirical validation.

5.4 The Framework Must Guard Its Own κ

A framework that diagnoses sealed basins must itself remain open to correction. The attractor framework’s falsifiability conditions are its own dlPFC engagement.

6. Conclusion

The Olds-Milner experiment is more than a landmark in the history of neuroscience. It provides the neurochemical prototype for the fantasy attractor. The rat pressing the lever until death, driven by a hijacked dopamine system that privileges “wanting” over survival, maps onto the human believer pressing the lever of certainty, prophecy, or ideological capture. In both cases, a sealed basin overrides biological and cognitive self-correction, creating a self-reinforcing cycle that can persist even in the face of lethal

consequences. This is not merely a metaphor; evidence suggests a genuine shared neurochemical susceptibility, though its precise extent awaits direct empirical characterization.

The brain does not have a truth detector; it has a reward system. Certainty is not evidence of truth; it is evidence of dopamine. The most reliable alternative to the lever is a deliberately cultivated corrective permeability—a practice of engaging the neural machinery of doubt and reason, asking daily the question the rat never could: *Am I pressing a lever right now?*

References

- Berridge, K. C., & Robinson, T. E. (1998). What is the role of dopamine in reward: hedonic impact, reward learning, or incentive salience? *Brain Research Reviews*, 28(3), 309-369.
- Evans, J. S. B. T., & Stanovich, K. E. (2013). Dual-process theories of higher cognition: Advancing the debate. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 8(3), 223-241.
- Festinger, L., Riecken, H.W., & Schachter, S. (1956). *When Prophecy Fails*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Frederick, S. (2005). Cognitive reflection and decision making. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 19(4), 25-42.
- Galida, R. (2026a). *Persistence Under Perturbation: The Eternal Skeleton and the Transient Dance*. Fantasy Attractor.
- Galida, R. (2026b). *The Dopamine Covenant*. Fantasy Attractor.
- Gervais, W. M., & Norenzayan, A. (2012). Analytic thinking promotes religious disbelief. *Science*,

- 336(6080), 493-496.
- 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.
 - Hölzel, B. K., Lazar, S. W., Gard, T., et al. (2011). How does mindfulness meditation work? Proposing mechanisms of action from a conceptual and neural perspective. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 6(6), 537-559.
 - Melton, J.G. (1985). Spiritualization and reaffirmation: What really happens when prophecy fails. *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.
 - Schultz, W., Dayan, P., & Montague, P. R. (1997). A neural substrate of prediction and reward. *Science*, 275(5306), 1593-1599.
 - Zhong, W., Cristofori, I., Bulbulia, J., et al. (2017). Biological and cognitive underpinnings of religious fundamentalism. *Neuropsychologia*, 100, 18-25.
-

The Sperm and the Dome: An Ancient Pattern

Robert Galida <https://fantasyattractor.com/>

May 2026

You have seen the diagram.

It appears in biblical studies textbooks, online articles about ancient Near Eastern cosmology, and even on apologetics websites trying to explain away the plain meaning of Genesis.

A flat disc earth.

A solid dome (*rāqīa'*) above.

A cosmic ocean below.

The sun, moon, and stars move inside the dome.

Rain enters through literal windows in the sky.

It looks primitive.

Like a child's drawing of a snow globe.

But look again. Squint. Rotate the image ninety degrees.

What do you see?

A sperm.

A single, potent, ordered structure swimming through an infinite ocean.

- The **head** is the dome – the firmament containing the celestial lights.
- The **midpiece** is the flat disc of the earth – the solid ground where life emerges.
- The **tail** is the cosmic ocean below – the chaotic, fertile waters from which everything springs.

And the whole thing is adrift in an infinite, dark, supportive medium – the same infinite ocean that appears in Genesis as the *tehom* (the deep), the primordial waters over which the Spirit of God hovers.

This is not a coincidence.

It is a **pattern**.

The Attractor Framework: A Lens

In my attractor framework, **persistence under perturbation** is the fundamental mark of reality.

Two classes of attractors exist:

- **Conservative attractors** – the eternal skeleton: electrons, protons, neutrinos, photons. They are time-symmetric, unchanging, and provide the invariant rhythms of the universe (the “metronome”).
- **Dissipative attractors** – the transient dance: life, mind, society, and everything that requires energy flow, exports entropy, and eventually runs down.

A sperm is a **low-entropy conservative structure** – a packet of highly ordered information (DNA) that is relatively stable and fuel-efficient.

It swims through a **high-entropy dissipative environment** – the chaotic, nutrient-rich ocean of potential.

Its journey is a perturbation.

Fertilisation, when it succeeds, is a **phase transition**: the emergence of a new, more complex attractor (the zygote) from the coupling of two initial basins (sperm and egg).

The subsequent explosion of growth – cell division, differentiation, morphogenesis – is the **transient dance** of life.

The Ancient Mind Saw the Same Pattern

The biblical authors had no microscopes. They could not see a sperm cell.

But they observed the world around them, and they projected the **microcosmic pattern of fertilisation** onto the **macrocosmic canvas of the sky**.

- The **infinite ocean** is the primordial *tehom* – the raw, undifferentiated potential before creation.
- The **sperm** is the *rāqīa'* – the solid dome that separates and organises the waters above from the waters below.
- The **fertilised egg** is the cosmos itself – the flat disc of the earth, the lights in the dome, the living creatures on the land.

The ancient author of Genesis was not a scientist.

But he was a **pattern-recogniser**.

He intuited that the universe begins as a single, ordered perturbation in an infinite, chaotic sea.

That is not primitive superstition.

That is **dynamical intuition**.

The Cosmic Conception Hypothesis

Modern science has its own version of this same pattern.

The “cosmic conception hypothesis” (found in some theoretical papers) compares the fertilisation of a galaxy by a supermassive black hole to the fertilisation of an egg by a sperm.

The black hole is the seed; the galaxy is the developing organism.

The same archetype recurs because it is **structurally necessary**: any self-organising system that emerges from a homogeneous background must be born as a localised, ordered perturbation.

The Genesis diagram is not a mistake.
It is a **map**.

The Sperm in the Infinite Ocean

When you look at that ancient Near Eastern cosmology diagram – the flat earth, the solid dome, the cosmic ocean – you are looking at a **sperm in an infinite ocean**.

The author could not have known this consciously.

But the attractor of reality – the deep structure of persistence under perturbation – guided his hand.

- The infinite ocean is the potential.
- The sperm is the first perturbation.
- The fertilised egg (the cosmos) is the new attractor basin.
- And the dance of life – stars, planets, minds, civilisations – is the transient, dissipative dance that follows.

The diagram is not a coincidence.

It is a **necessary projection of a universal dynamic**.

The sperm and the dome are the same pattern, separated by millennia and scale.

You are free to see it or not.

But once you see it, you cannot unsee it.

The mountain does not negotiate.

Neither does the Hebrew text.

Neither does the sperm.

Published at: fantasyattractor.com

You are free to see it or not. But once you see it, you cannot unsee it. The mountain does not negotiate. Neither does the Hebrew text. Neither does the sperm.

Author: Robert Galida

Date: May 2026

Published at: fantasyattractor.com