

The Primacy of the Body: Why the Brain Is an Emergent Organizer, Not the Source of Consciousness

Robert Galida – *Fantasy Attractor Research Program*

The Puzzle

The standard view holds that the brain is the source of consciousness. It is the organ that generates thoughts, feelings, and self-awareness. The body is infrastructure—a vehicle for the brain, a support system for the mind.

This view is backwards.

The brain is not the source of consciousness. The body is. The brain emerged as a central organizer when the body's local conscious subsystems reached a critical threshold of couplings and complexity. Consciousness is more fundamental than the brain.

The Framework's Account

The attractor framework provides a physicalist ontology for understanding persistence and change across systems:

- **Conservative systems** – electrons, protons, the universe. They persist without consuming energy or exchanging

entropy.

- **Dissipative systems** – life, consciousness, societies, organs. They maintain structure through continuous energy exchange.
- **Attractors** – regions in state space toward which trajectories converge and persist.

Consciousness is not a product of the brain. It is a property of dissipative systems that reach a certain level of integration, self-reference, and persistence.

The Local Conscious Subsystems

The body contains complex neural networks that meet the functional criteria for consciousness:

1. **The Enteric Nervous System (ENS)** – 200–600 million neurons. It integrates, learns, exhibits valence, and maintains goal-directedness.
2. **The Intrinsic Cardiac Nervous System (ICNS)** – 14,000–43,000 neurons. It integrates local signals, maintains setpoints, and exhibits plasticity.
3. **The Spinal Cord** – 200 million neurons. It integrates sensory input, generates motor output, and exhibits learning.
4. **The Intrinsic Pancreatic Network** – 10,000–50,000 neurons. It integrates neural, hormonal, and nutrient signals to maintain metabolic homeostasis.

These are not mere infrastructure. They are candidate conscious subsystems—local attractors with their own consciousness-like dynamics.

The Critical Threshold

The local conscious subsystems are primitive. They existed before the brain.

- **Phylogenetically** – the ENS is older than the brain. It evolved first.
- **Ontogenetically** – the ENS develops before the brain. It forms first.
- **Structurally** – the brain is a specialization of the local attractors, not a replacement.

Over time, the number of couplings and the complexity of the local attractors increased. At a critical threshold, a new structure emerged: the brain.

The brain is not the source of consciousness. It is the *emergent organizer* that arose from the local attractors when they reached a sufficient level of integration and complexity.

The Brain as Emergent Organizer

The brain is:

- **A coupling hub** – it integrates signals from local attractors
- **A regulator** – it modulates and aligns local dynamics
- **An orchestrator** – it coordinates the federation of local attractors
- **A substrate** – it provides the anatomical concentration

for the global attractor

The brain did not create consciousness. It *organized* a pre-existing consciousness into a unified field.

- **Local attractors** – existed first
- **Couplings** – increased over time
- **Critical threshold** – was reached
- **The brain** – emerged as the organizer

The brain is not the first cause. It is the *result* of the local attractors reaching a critical threshold.

The Implications

1. Consciousness Is Not a Brain Product

The brain is not the source of consciousness. It is the *regulator* of a federation of local attractors. Consciousness is more fundamental than the brain.

2. The Body Is the Foundation

The ENS, ICNS, spinal cord, and other local attractors are the foundation. The brain is a *specialization* of the body's conscious subsystems, not the origin of consciousness.

3. The Threshold Is Critical

A critical threshold of couplings and complexity is required for the brain to emerge. Below this threshold, there are local attractors but no global organizer. Above this threshold, the brain emerges as the global attractor.

4. The Brain Is Not Unique

The brain is one way to organize local attractors. It is not the only way. Other systems may develop different global organizers.

5. The Mind Is the Global Attractor

The mind is the global attractor that emerges from the coupling of local attractors. It is not the brain. It is the pattern of the coupled system.

The Connection to the Soul

The soul, as defined within the attractor framework, is the stable, persistent attractor pattern that maintains continuity across temporal existence.

- **The body** – is the foundation. It contains local conscious subsystems.
- **The brain** – is the emergent organizer. It couples, regulates, and aligns local attractors.
- **The mind** – is the global attractor. It is the pattern of the coupled system.
- **The soul** – is the persistent pattern of the global attractor across time.

The soul is not the brain. It is the pattern of the whole body's persistence.

The Practice

If consciousness is more fundamental than the brain, then the practice of cultivation is:

- **Tending the body** – sleep, movement, diet, presence
- **Cultivating the local attractors** – the ENS, ICNS, spinal cord
- **Aligning the global attractor** – coherence, correction, persistence
- **Anchoring in time** – temporal continuity, memory, projection

This is the practice of the framework—the cultivation of consciousness through tending the body, aligning the attractors, and persisting through perturbation.

The Contribution

This essay provides a bottom-up account of consciousness:

- **Local attractors** – are primitive. They came first.
- **Couplings** – increased over time.
- **Critical threshold** – was reached.
- **The brain** – emerged as the organizer.

This account challenges the brain-centric view. It places the body at the center of the story. It is consistent with the framework's physicalist ontology and its emphasis on persistence, correction, and attractor dynamics.

The Conclusion

The brain is not the source of consciousness. The body is.

- **Local attractors** – the ENS, ICNS, spinal cord, and other

conscious subsystems

- **Couplings** – bind them together
- **Critical threshold** – when the number and complexity of couplings reach a critical point
- **The brain** – emerges as the central organizer

Consciousness is more fundamental than the brain. The brain is a specialization of the body's conscious subsystems, not the origin of consciousness.

The mind is the global attractor that emerges from the coupling of local attractors.

The soul is the persistent pattern of the global attractor across time.

That is the framework's account.

Robert Galida is an independent researcher and the founder of the Fantasy Attractor Research Program. His work develops a formal framework for understanding persistence and change across physical, biological, cognitive, and social systems.

The Mind as Global Attractor: Why Consciousness Is Not Confined to the Brain

Robert Galida – *Fantasy Attractor Research Program*

The Puzzle

The standard view holds that the mind is what the brain does. Consciousness, thoughts, feelings, and self-awareness are all products of neural activity localized within the skull. The body is infrastructure—a vehicle for the brain, a support system for the mind.

This view is incomplete. It is not wrong, but it is *too narrow*. It mistakes the regulator for the source, the orchestrator for the entire orchestra.

The body is not just infrastructure. The body contains complex neural networks—the enteric nervous system, the intrinsic cardiac nervous system, the pancreatic ganglia, the spinal cord—that meet the same functional criteria used to infer consciousness in simple organisms. If we take those criteria seriously, we must consider that consciousness is not confined to the brain. It is distributed across the body, emerging from the interaction of semi-autonomous organ-level attractors.

The mind is the culmination of these interacting conscious organs. It is the global attractor that emerges from their coupling, regulation, and alignment.

The Framework in Brief

The attractor framework provides a physicalist ontology for understanding persistence and change across systems:

- **Conservative systems** – electrons, protons, the universe. They persist without consuming energy or exchanging

entropy.

- **Dissipative systems** – life, consciousness, societies, organs. They maintain structure through continuous energy exchange.
- **Attractors** – regions in state space toward which trajectories converge and persist.

A candidate conscious attractor possesses five functional properties:

1. **Integration** – binding multiple sensory or interoceptive streams into a unified dynamical state
2. **Valence** – approach/avoidance behaviour, attraction to certain states and repulsion from others
3. **Learning** – modification of behaviour based on experience
4. **Goal-directedness** – acting to maintain the system's own basin
5. **Anatomical concentration** – a spatially organized, intrinsically connected neural network

These criteria are how we infer consciousness in other humans (by analogy), in non-human animals (by behavioural complexity), and in *C. elegans* (by measurable learning and integration). If they are sufficient for a 302-neuron worm, they must be applied consistently to systems that exceed this threshold.

The Candidate Organs

1. The Enteric Nervous System (ENS) – The Strongest Candidate

The ENS comprises 200–600 million neurons, organized into two interconnected plexuses spanning the gastrointestinal tract. It meets all five criteria:

- **Integration** – continuously integrates mechanical, chemical, and hormonal signals
- **Valence** – attraction to nutrients, aversion to toxins
- **Learning** – habituation, sensitization, long-term plasticity
- **Goal-directedness** – peristalsis persists after vagotomy, satisfying the autonomy threshold
- **Anatomical concentration** – a continuous, highly organized neural network

The ENS is often called the “second brain.” It operates semi-autonomously, learns, remembers, and communicates with the brain via the vagus nerve.

2. The Intrinsic Cardiac Nervous System (ICNS) – A Moderate Candidate

The ICNS comprises 14,000–43,000 neurons organized into ganglia on the heart’s surface. It monitors blood pressure, chamber stretch, and local chemistry to modulate cardiac output. It exhibits:

- **Integration** – of local signals to regulate cardiac rhythm
- **Valence** – maintenance of a preferred setpoint; arrhythmias as perturbations
- **Learning** – ganglionic remodelling after injury
- **Goal-directedness** – intrinsic rhythms persist when denervated
- **Anatomical concentration** – organized into ganglia on the heart’s surface

The ICNS contributes to emotional experience via heartbeat-evoked potentials that correlate with interoceptive awareness.

3. The Intrinsic Pancreatic Network – A Provisional Candidate

The pancreatic network comprises 10,000–50,000 intrinsic neurons scattered in ganglia throughout the organ. It regulates blood glucose homeostasis. It meets the criteria, but with less evidential richness:

- **Integration** – of neural, hormonal, and nutrient signals
- **Valence** – maintenance of a metabolic setpoint
- **Learning** – less studied; open empirical question
- **Goal-directedness** – coordinates endocrine and exocrine output
- **Anatomical concentration** – scattered ganglia; weakest candidate

4. The Spinal Cord – A Provisional Candidate

The spinal cord comprises approximately 200 million neurons, organized into topographically precise circuits. It meets all five criteria, but under normal conditions it is tightly coupled to descending commands. After complete spinal cord injury, the isolated cord reorganizes and can generate complex, goal-directed responses. It is the ideal test case for refining the autonomy criterion.

The Coupling Mechanisms

If the ENS, ICNS, pancreatic network, and spinal cord are candidate conscious subsystems, the unified mind must be explained as the product of their integration. We propose four coupling mechanisms:

1. Vagal Afferent Signalling

The vagus nerve provides the primary bidirectional communication channel between the brain and the viscera. Vagal afferents convey interoceptive signals to the nucleus of the

solitary tract. Vagal nerve stimulation alters mood, reduces inflammation, and improves cardiac function.

2. Humoral Signalling

Circulating hormones (cortisol, adrenaline, insulin, glucagon) and immune mediators (cytokines) provide a slower, diffuse coupling channel. They alter the global attractor's landscape by shifting the metabolic and inflammatory context.

3. Rhythmic Entrainment

The brain entrains peripheral rhythms to its own oscillations. Cardiac and respiratory rhythms phase-lock to cortical activity during focused attention. Slow-wave sleep entrains glymphatic clearance. The brain sets a rhythm, and the organs tend to follow.

4. Predictive Processing and Attractor Coupling

The brain maintains predictions about the states of the body's organs, and each organ generates its own predictions about local conditions. The alignment of these nested predictive models is attractor coupling—the progressive alignment of internal states toward a shared equilibrium.

The Mind as Global Attractor

The mind is the culmination of these interacting conscious organs. It is the global attractor that emerges from their coupling, regulation, and alignment.

- **Local attractors** – the ENS, ICNS, pancreatic network, spinal cord, and other candidate subsystems. Each has its own consciousness-like dynamics.
- **Coupling mechanisms** – vagal, humoral, rhythmic,

predictive. They bind local attractors into a unified field.

- **The brain** – is not the sole generator. It is the regulator, the coupler, the orchestrator of the federation.
- **The mind** – is the global attractor that arises from the federation. It is the unified pattern of persistence.

The mind is not a substance. It is not a non-physical entity. It is a *pattern*—the global attractor that emerges from the interaction of local attractors.

The Soul and the Mind

The soul, as defined within the attractor framework, is the stable, persistent attractor pattern that maintains continuity across temporal existence.

- **The mind** – is the global attractor in the present
- **The soul** – is the persistent pattern of the global attractor across time

The soul is the mind, anchored in time. It is the continuity that connects past, present, and future.

This definition is physicalist, temporal, and cultivatable. The soul is not a non-physical substance. It is the pattern of your persistence.

The Implications

1. Consciousness Is Distributed

The mind is not confined to the brain. It is distributed across the body, emerging from the interaction of organs. The ENS, ICNS, pancreatic network, and spinal cord are candidate conscious subsystems. They are not “mere infrastructure.”

2. The Mind Is Cultivated

The mind is not given. It is maintained through coupling, alignment, and correction. The practice of cultivation *is* the tending of the global attractor. Sleep, movement, diet, and presence are not just health practices—they are *consciousness practices*.

3. Functional Disorders Are Local Attractor Disturbances

IBS may be a gut that has learned to react to benign stimuli as threats. Cardiac anxiety may reflect a perturbed ICNS state. Chronic pain may be a spinal cord attractor locked in a maladaptive basin. These reframings suggest organ-directed therapies: gut-directed biofeedback, vagal stimulation, dietary protocols that calm the ENS.

4. The Body Is a Federation

The brain is not the sole generator of consciousness. It is the regulator of a federation of semi-autonomous organ-level attractors. The unified self is the product of their integration. When coupling falters, the experience can manifest as an “alien feeling”—the sense that an action or bodily state is “not mine.”

5. Ethics of the Conscious Body

Candidate organs are not autonomous moral agents. Their interests are tied to the whole body’s survival. But the

framework suggests a principle of organ-level respect: preserve organ integrity, explore gentler interventions, and recognize that the body is not just infrastructure.

The Practice

If the mind is the culmination of interacting conscious organs, then the practice of cultivation is:

- **Tending the local attractors** – sleep, movement, diet, presence
- **Cultivating the coupling mechanisms** – breath, vagal tone, rhythmic entrainment
- **Aligning the global attractor** – coherence, correction, persistence
- **Anchoring in time** – temporal continuity, memory, projection

This is the practice of the framework—the cultivation of the mind through tending the body, aligning the attractors, and persisting through perturbation.

The Contribution

The attractor framework provides a coherent account of the mind as the culmination of interacting conscious organs. This account:

- **Challenges the brain monopoly** – with a principled, consistent argument
- **Provides operational criteria** – for identifying

candidate conscious subsystems

- **Generates testable predictions** – the framework is empirically tractable
- **Has clinical and ethical implications** – practical applications of the theory
- **Is honest about its limitations** – the phenomenal gap remains, the autonomy threshold is provisional

This account bridges science and spirituality. It honors the depth of consciousness without reducing it to mechanism or fantasy.

The Conclusion

The mind is not what the brain does. The mind is what the whole body does, in concert.

- **Local attractors** – organs, each with its own consciousness-like dynamics
- **Coupling mechanisms** – vagal, humoral, rhythmic, predictive
- **Global attractor** – the mind, the self, the unified pattern of persistence
- **The soul** – the persistent pattern of the global attractor across time

The mind is the culmination of interacting conscious organs. It is real. It is physical. It is cultivated.

It is the pattern of your persistence.

That is the mind. That is the body. That is the soul.

That is the framework.

Robert Galida is an independent researcher and the founder of the Fantasy Attractor Research Program. His work develops a formal framework for understanding persistence and change across physical, biological, cognitive, and social systems.

Non-Physical Claims Are Fantasy Attractors: Why Unverifiable Realms Cannot Be Empirically Distinguished from Nonexistence

Robert Galida – June 2026
[F] (Foundation)

Abstract

The attractor framework adopts a physicalist commitment: to be real is to be able to interact, and to interact is to share at least one **interaction channel** (spacetime, energy, momentum, gauge charge, or any measurable coupling). This is a philosophical starting point, not an empirical discovery. The paper argues that any claim about a non-physical realm – defined as having no such interaction channel – cannot be empirically assessed. Such claims are **fantasy attractors**: belief systems structurally sealed against correction by

defining their objects as forever beyond any possible test. The paper distinguishes provisional non-detection (e.g., dark matter) from **structural, permanent non-verifiability** (e.g., non-physical gods, transcendent souls). It concludes that while such claims may have personal or social meaning, they cannot be part of a scientific ontology, and their structure makes them vulnerable to fraud and manipulation – though sincere belief is not fraud.

1. The Foundational Commitment: Interaction Requires Shared Channels

The attractor framework is a physicalist ontology. It begins with a commitment: **entities can only interact through shared interaction channels**. An *interaction channel* is any measurable coupling – spacetime coordinates, energy, momentum, electric charge, weak isospin, color charge, or any other quantity that can be transferred or correlated between systems. This is not an empirical discovery of the Standard Model; it is the framework's chosen criterion for what counts as real.

The neutrino example illustrates the criterion but does not prove it. Neutrinos interact weakly because they share weak isospin; they do not interact electromagnetically because they lack electric charge. The framework simply says: if an entity shares no interaction channel with physical reality, we have no way to detect it, measure it, or include it in a scientific ontology. That is a philosophical choice, not a falsifiable claim about the world.

Why interaction? Interaction is chosen because it provides a public, corrigible basis for knowledge. It avoids ontological commitments that cannot influence observation, and it aligns with the core principle of the attractor framework: *persistence under perturbation*. An entity that

never perturbs anything cannot be distinguished from nothing.

What the framework does not claim:

- That non-physical entities are logically impossible.
- That all non-physical claims are false.
- That physics has disproven God or the supernatural.

What it does claim:

- That non-physical entities cannot be empirically distinguished from nonexistence.
 - That claims about them operate as fantasy attractors, resistant to correction.
-

2. Types of Non-Physical Claims

A non-physical claim is any assertion about an entity, force, or realm defined as having **no interaction channel** with the physical world. However, not all claims that seem non-physical are alike. We distinguish two categories:

Category A: Truly non-interacting – Claims that explicitly deny any possible interaction. Examples:

- A deistic creator who wound the universe and then never interacts.
- A transcendent God defined as beyond all categories, including causality.
- An immaterial soul that cannot influence the body after death.
- Abstract objects (Platonism) that exist non-physically and non-causally.

Category B: Claims that assert interaction but evade testing –

Examples:

- Ghosts that move objects but become undetectable when instruments are present.
- Psychics whose powers fail under controlled conditions (explained as “skeptic’s energy”).
- Homeopathic “water memory” that cannot be detected by any known physical measurement.

Category B is a different epistemic pathology: motivated reasoning, ad-hoc escape clauses, and sealing mechanisms. The attractor framework addresses them as *functionally* non-verifiable in practice, but they are not the primary target of this paper. This paper focuses on **Category A**: claims that structurally preclude any possible interaction channel.

Domain (Category A)	Example Claim	Interaction Channel?	Empirically Assessable?
Religion (non-interacting God)	A creator with no detectable properties	None	No – any test is ruled out a priori
Paranormal (non-interacting ghosts)	Ghosts that cannot affect matter	None	No – no possible evidence
Abstract objects (Platonism)	Numbers exist non-physically, non-causally	None	No – no interaction, hence no evidence
New Age (non-interacting “vibrations”)	Crystals with undetectable healing vibrations	None	No – absence of effect is blamed on “wrong intent”

Under the framework's commitment, such claims are not false; they are **not empirically assessable**. They belong to a different domain: personal belief, fiction, or social identity.

3. Provisional vs. Structural Non-Verifiability

A crucial distinction separates:

- **Provisional non-detection** – e.g., dark matter, gravitational waves (before 2015), the neutrino (before 1956). These entities are predicted to share at least one interaction channel (gravity, weak force) and are in principle detectable. **A future discovery could confirm or disconfirm them.** That is the key: we can specify what would count as evidence, even if we don't yet have it.
- **Structural, permanent non-verifiability** – Category A claims. The entity is defined so that **no possible future discovery** could ever count as confirmation or disconfirmation. Any proposed test is ruled out in advance. This is the hallmark of a fantasy attractor.

(This framework does not assert that dark matter could have been called a fantasy attractor before detection; dark matter always had specified interaction channels – gravity – and was therefore never structurally non-verifiable.)

4. Fantasy Attractor: Formal Definition

A belief system qualifies as a **fantasy attractor** if it meets the following conditions:

1. **No specified interaction channel** – The central claim lacks any measurable coupling to physical reality (Category A), or defines it in a way that systematically evades testing (Category B).
2. **Sealing mechanisms** – The belief incorporates rhetorical or cognitive strategies that neutralize disconfirming evidence (e.g., “God works in mysterious ways,” “The ghost left when the EMF meter arrived”).
3. **Low corrective permeability ($\kappa \rightarrow 0$)** – The belief does not update in response to counterevidence; the return time τ to baseline is effectively infinite.
4. **Identity fusion** – The belief is tied to self-worth or group membership, making abandonment costly.

Under this definition, both Category A and some Category B claims can be fantasy attractors, but Category A are the paradigmatic case because they are structurally immune to evidence.

5. Fiction Is Real but Not True: A Crucial Distinction

The main argument might provoke an objection: *What about fiction? Sherlock Holmes is not physical, yet we say he exists as a character. Isn't that a counterexample to the claim that non-physical entities cannot be empirically distinguished from nonexistence?*

The objection fails because it conflates two different senses of “exists.” We must distinguish:

- **Fiction exists as physical information.** The character Sherlock Holmes is realized as patterns of ink on a page, as sounds in a performance, as neural firing

patterns in readers' brains, or as bits on a computer screen. Information is a physical arrangement of matter. It shares interaction channels (energy, spacetime, causality) with the physical world. You can buy a book, discuss the plot, or be emotionally affected by a story. Fiction is **real** in this sense: it has a physical substrate and causal effects.

- **Fiction is not true.** The proposition "Sherlock Holmes lived at 221B Baker Street" does not correspond to any actual state of affairs in the world. It is false. Fiction is not required to be verifiable; it is understood as imagined.

Thus, the attractor framework happily accommodates fiction. It is real as information, but not claimed as true.

The bad faith of non-physical claims: Non-physical claims that demand to be treated as real – gods, ghosts, souls, hidden cabals – are *fiction pretending to be true*. They borrow the ontological status of real information (they exist as patterns in books, sermons, or brains) but also demand the epistemic authority of factual truth. Yet they refuse any possible test. They define themselves as beyond verification. This is bad faith: it is not metaphysics, but fiction that insists on being taken as fact while rejecting the rules of fact-checking.

Category	Exists as physical information?	Claims to be true?	Verifiable?	Framework classification
Fiction (Hamlet)	Yes	No (acknowledged as imagined)	Not applicable	Real information, not true
Scientific claim (neutrino)	Yes (theory, data)	Yes	In principle	Real, true (provisionally)

Category	Exists as physical information?	Claims to be true?	Verifiable?	Framework classification
Non-physical claim (God)	Yes (as cultural artifact)	Yes	No – structurally excluded	Fantasy attractor

Therefore, the framework does not deny the reality of stories; it denies the epistemic legitimacy of treating unverifiable stories as facts. The fantasy attractor is not the story. It is the insistence that the story is true combined with the structural refusal to let the story be tested.

6. Vulnerability to Fraud and Manipulation

The structure of non-physical claims makes them **vulnerable** to fraud and manipulation – not that all such claims are fraudulent. Because there are no checks, a bad actor can assert divine commands, psychic readings, or secret knowledge without fear of disconfirmation. Sincere believers are not fraudsters, but the attractor basin can be exploited by those who understand its dynamics.

The framework diagnoses the **structure**, not the intent of every believer. It distinguishes **error, self-deception, motivated reasoning, and fraud** – all possible outcomes, but not all present in every case.

7. What This Argument Does Not Prove

To avoid overreach, the paper explicitly states what it does **not** claim:

- It does not prove that non-physical entities are logically impossible.

- It does not refute philosophical positions like Platonism (abstract objects) or classical theism that defines God as existence itself rather than an interacting object – though it notes that such positions are not empirically assessable.
- It does not claim that all believers are fraudsters or that all non-physical claims are meaningless in a philosophical sense.
- It does not assert a timeless criterion for what will be discovered in the future.

The claim is narrower: **within the attractor framework's physicalist commitment, non-physical claims are not empirically assessable, and they exhibit the dynamics of fantasy attractors.**

8. Conclusion

The attractor framework adopts a physicalist commitment: entities can only interact through shared interaction channels. Non-physical claims – defined as having no such channels – are not empirically assessable. They are fantasy attractors: belief systems structurally sealed against correction by permanent non-verifiability. This does not make them meaningless or false; it places them outside the domain of scientific ontology. Their structure makes them vulnerable to exploitation, but sincere belief is not fraud. The framework provides a diagnostic tool for recognising when a claim has been immunised against evidence, regardless of its content.

The argument supports the following conclusion:

Claims that are permanently insulated from any possible empirical correction occupy a distinct epistemic category and

exhibit attractor dynamics that make them resistant to updating. Within the attractor framework's physicalist ontology, such claims cannot be empirically distinguished from nonexistence.

That is a substantial claim. It does not require asserting that non-physical realms cannot exist – only that they cannot be part of a scientific ontology, and that the beliefs which cling to them operate as fantasy attractors.

Suggested citation: Galida, R. S. (2026). Non-Physical Claims Are Fantasy Attractors: Why Unverifiable Realms Cannot Be Empirically Distinguished from Nonexistence. *Fantasy Attractor*.