The West and the East: A Research Protocol for Civilizational Attractor Dynamics

Robert Galida
June 2026
[A] (Application)

Abstract

The attractor framework provides a vocabulary for diagnosing the dynamical properties of systems—their error correction capacity (κ), their perturbation resistance (B), their coordination capacity (C), and their reality alignment (R). This paper proposes a research protocol for applying that vocabulary to institutional and civilizational scales. It introduces a four-dimensional framework distinguishing these variables, operationalizes them using candidate observables—policy correction rates, scientific retraction rates, institutional durability, identity persistence, institutional trust, and scientific acceptance—and outlines a research protocol for testing hypotheses about civilizational dynamics. The paper applies the framework provisionally to case studies, including the Meiji Restoration, the Genesis 1 flat-earth cosmology, and Western responses to Asia's rise. It concludes that the framework generates testable predictions about institutional and civilizational adaptation, but that all claims are provisional pending empirical validation.

All claims are hypotheses, not conclusions. The framework is

applied heuristically, not diagnostically.

---

1. Introduction

The attractor framework has been applied to physics, biology, cognition, and AI. This paper extends it to civilizational dynamics. It does not claim that civilizations are organisms or that the framework has been validated at this scale. It proposes a research protocol and generates hypotheses for empirical testing.

The central hypothesis is:

> *Western and East Asian civilizational traditions may occupy different attractor basins, with the West potentially exhibiting lower error correction capacity (κ) and higher perturbation resistance (B) than Taoist-Confucian-influenced East Asian traditions.*

This is a hypothesis, not a conclusion. It requires operationalization, measurement, and falsification.

A note on the framework's physicalist commitment: The attractor framework adopts a physicalist ontology: to be real is to be able to interact, and to interact is to share at least one interaction channel (energy, momentum, gauge charge, spacetime, or any measurable coupling). Claims that define themselves as having no such channels are fantasy attractors: structurally sealed against correction by permanent non-verifiability (see Galida, 2026f). This paper extends that diagnostic logic from individual beliefs to civilizational self-images—but always as a hypothesis, never as an established conclusion.

2. The Framework Variables: A Four-Dimensional State Space

The attractor framework's normative ideal is **high κ + high B + high C + high R**—a system that corrects errors efficiently, resists perturbation, coordinates collective action, and aligns with reality.

Variable	Definition	High Value	Low Value
κ (error correction capacity)	The rate at which a system detects and corrects errors in its models	Learns from mistakes, updates beliefs	Repeats errors, resists updating
B (perturbation resistance)	The energy barrier required to induce a durable state transition	Stable, coherent, retains identity	Shallow, unstable, easily perturbed
C (coordination capacity)	The ability of a system to coordinate collective action	Cohesive, effective	Fragmented, ineffective
R (reality alignment)	The degree to which a system's models correspond to empirical reality	Accurate models	Delusional models

Crucially, κ is not change rate. It is error correction rate. A system can change constantly and still be irrational

(high change, low κ). A system can appear conservative and still possess extremely high κ because correction occurs when evidence accumulates (low change rate, high κ).

The Four Outcomes

Combination	κ	B	Outcome	Examples
Stable adaptive	High	High	The ideal—corrects errors, maintains coherence	Scientific communities, healthy individuals, functioning democracies
Brittle adaptive	High	Low	Corrects errors but unstable—no memory, no coherence	Chaotic organizations, fad-followers
Stable rigid	Low	High	Resists correction—dogmatic, sealed	Fantasy attractors, fundamentalism
Fragile rigid	Low	Low	Unstable and unresponsive	Failed states, collapsed institutions

The Fantasy Attractor Defined

A fantasy attractor is not simply a low-κ system. It is:

> ***A system with low R (reality alignment) combined with mechanisms that prevent R from increasing.***

This definition is more powerful than the earlier "low κ + high B" formulation because it explains why some low-κ systems are not fantasy attractors (e.g., a conservative scientific community that is low-κ in the short term but high-R in the long term). It also explains why some high-κ systems are fantasy attractors (e.g., conspiracy communities that change

constantly but never converge on reality).

---

3. Operationalizing κ, B, C, and R

3.1 Candidate Proxies for κ (Error Correction Capacity)

Proxy	Description	Data Source
Policy correction rate	How quickly does a society correct failed policies?	Comparative Agendas Project, legislative archives
Scientific retraction rate	How readily does a field retract false findings?	Retraction databases, replication studies
Error detection capacity	How effectively does a system identify its own errors?	Institutional review mechanisms, ombudsman data

Falsification: If societies scoring high on these proxies do not show improved outcomes over time, the mapping fails.

3.2 Candidate Proxies for B (Perturbation Resistance)

Proxy	Description	Data Source
Institutional durability	How long do institutions persist under pressure?	Historical duration data, institutional survival rates
Constitutional stability	How resistant is the foundational framework to change?	Constitutional amendment difficulty, legal entrenchment

Proxy	Description	Data Source
Identity persistence	How stable is collective identity over time?	National identity surveys, historical continuity measures

Falsification: If systems with high values on these indicators nonetheless show high adaptability without collapse, the mapping needs refinement.

3.3 Candidate Proxies for C (Coordination Capacity)

Proxy	Description	Data Source
Institutional trust	Public confidence in institutions	World Values Survey, trust indices
Collective action capacity	Ability to mobilize resources	State capacity indices, tax-to-GDP ratios
Social cohesion	Degree of social integration	Social capital indices, inequality measures

3.4 Candidate Proxies for R (Reality Alignment)

Proxy	Description	Data Source
Scientific acceptance	Public acceptance of scientific consensus	Evolution acceptance, climate change belief
Historical accuracy	Acknowledgment of historical facts	Content analysis of textbooks
Empirical openness	Willingness to revise beliefs in light of evidence	Survey measures of epistemic openness

Proxy	Description	Data Source
Predictive accuracy	How well do models predict outcomes?	Forecast accuracy, planning effectiveness

3.5 Testing the Latent Structure

The framework assumes that these indicators load onto shared latent variables (κ, B, C, R). This assumption must be tested using:

- **Exploratory factor analysis** to see whether the indicators group as predicted
- **Confirmatory factor analysis** to test the hypothesized factor structure
- **Cross-validation** across different cultural contexts

Falsification: If the indicators do not load onto the predicted latent variables, the framework's operationalization fails.

---

4. Institutions First, Civilizations Second

"The West" and "The East" are not coherent dynamical entities. Medieval Spain, Puritan New England, contemporary Sweden, and Renaissance Florence may have radically different κ, B, C, and R values. Likewise, Tokugawa Japan, Maoist China, Singapore, and contemporary South Korea are not obviously members of one attractor.

Treatment: The framework is better applied to **institutions** (universities, bureaucracies, religions,

states, scientific communities) than to civilizations as wholes. Case studies should specify time periods and institutional contexts.

Institution	κ	B	C	R
Imperial examination bureaucracy	?	?	?	?
Catholic Church (1200)	?	?	?	?
Royal Society (1700)	?	?	?	?
CCP bureaucracy (1985)	?	?	?	?
Silicon Valley startup ecosystem	?	?	?	?

These are actual dynamical systems. Civilizations are aggregates. The framework becomes more falsifiable when applied to institutions first.

---

5. Hypotheses for Empirical Testing

5.1 The West/East Hypothesis (Institutional Form)

Hypothesis: Taoist-Confucian-influenced institutions exhibit higher κ and higher R than Western institutions.

Test: Compare institutions (universities, bureaucracies, scientific communities) across cultural contexts.

Falsification: If Western institutions show higher κ or higher R, the hypothesis fails.

5.2 The Meiji Challenge Hypothesis

Competing hypothesis: High κ emerges from elite willingness to revise institutional models under external pressure, rather than from cultural tradition.

Test: Compare Meiji Japan with Peter the Great's Russia, Atatürk's Turkey, and Deng's China.

Falsification: If high κ episodes occur without external pressure, the competing hypothesis fails.

5.3 The Genesis Hypothesis

Hypothesis: Foundational narratives become identity-protected when tied to group cohesion.

Test: Compare response to evidence across different foundational narratives (Genesis, Marxism, nationalism, revolutionary myths).

Falsification: If some foundational narratives show high κ and high R, the hypothesis needs refinement.

5.4 The Social Enforcement Hypothesis

Hypothesis: The cost of rejecting a dominant attractor—exclusion, censure, hostility—is high enough to prevent most people from leaving the basin.

Test: Qualitative and quantitative studies of independent researchers, religious doubters, and political dissenters.

Falsification: If the social cost of rejection is low, the hypothesis fails.

5.5 The Escape Hypothesis

Hypothesis: Deep attractors often require unusually large perturbations to reorganize.

Test: Historical analysis of civilizational transformations (Roman Empire, Mayan civilization, Japan's Meiji Restoration, China's Reform and Opening).

Falsification: If civilizations escape deep attractors without

large perturbations, the hypothesis fails.

---

6. Case Studies (Provisional)

6.1 The Meiji Restoration: High κ Under External Pressure

Japan’s Meiji Restoration (1868) is a case study in high κ: a deliberate, rapid shift toward pragmatism and adoption of foreign ideas. However, Meiji was not particularly Taoist. It was hyper-modernizing, militarizing, industrializing, and centralizing.

Competing hypothesis: High κ emerged from existential threat (Perry’s arrival) combined with elite flexibility. This mechanism appears elsewhere: Peter the Great’s Russia, Atatürk’s Turkey, Deng’s China.

Implication: Taoism may be secondary to elite flexibility under external pressure.

6.2 The West’s Response to Asia’s Rise

The West’s response to Asia’s rise—demonization, containment, resistance to learning—is consistent with fantasy attractor dynamics. However, this is a hypothesis, not a conclusion.

Counterexample: The West has also adopted Asian technologies and business practices. This suggests that κ may be higher in some domains (technology) than others (identity).

6.3 Genesis 1 as a Case Study

The West’s refusal to acknowledge Genesis 1’s flat-earth cosmology is a case study in identity-protective sealing.

However, it is one example among many.

Broader framing: Foundational narratives—whether religious, national, revolutionary, or ideological—become identity-protected when tied to group cohesion. Genesis is one example. Marxism, nationalism, revolutionary myths, imperial myths, and anti-colonial myths are others.

---

7. How This Maps to Taoism

Taoist Concept	Attractor Interpretation
Wu wei (non-action)	High κ—respond appropriately to the situation
Ziran (naturalness)	High R—align with the way things actually are
The Tao	The constraint field—the attractor landscape itself
Te (virtue)	High B—maintain integrity while flowing
The sage	High κ + high B + high R—the ideal

A crucial clarification: Taoism is treated as an **inspiration for the model**, not as **evidence that the model is true**. The empirical version is:

> *Taoism predicts certain dynamical properties. We can test whether systems influenced by Taoist ideas actually exhibit those properties.*

This preserves falsifiability and avoids circularity.

---

8. What This Paper Does Not Claim

Claim	Not Claimed
The West is definitively low-κ	✓
The East is definitively high-κ	✓
Genesis 1 is the sole sealing mechanism	✓
Taoism is evidence for the framework	✓
All Western institutions are rigid	✓
All Eastern institutions are adaptive	✓
The framework has been validated at civilizational scale	✓
Civilizations are organisms	✓
High change rate = high κ	✓

---

9. Research Protocol and Methodology

9.1 Data Sources

- Political freedom indices (Freedom House, Polity)
- Innovation and education indices (Global Innovation Index, PISA)
- Survey data on belief systems (World Values Survey)
- Historical texts and news archives for qualitative analysis

9.2 Variables and Measurement

Variable	Proxy	Measurement
κ (error correction)	Policy correction rate	Count failed policies corrected
κ (error correction)	Scientific retraction rate	Retraction databases
κ (error correction)	Error detection capacity	Institutional review mechanisms
B (perturbation resistance)	Institutional durability	Historical duration data
B (perturbation resistance)	Constitutional stability	Amendment difficulty
B (perturbation resistance)	Identity persistence	Historical continuity measures
C	Institutional trust	World Values Survey
C	Collective action capacity	State capacity indices
R	Scientific acceptance	Evolution acceptance, climate change belief
R	Historical accuracy	Content analysis of textbooks
R	Predictive accuracy	Forecast accuracy

9.3 Statistical Analysis

- **Exploratory factor analysis** to see whether indicators group as predicted
- **Confirmatory factor analysis** to test the hypothesized factor structure
- **Cross-validation** across different cultural contexts
- **Longitudinal analysis** to track changes over time

9.4 Falsification Criteria

For each hypothesis, define outcomes that would disprove it. For example, if Western institutions score higher on error correction capacity than Eastern ones, reject the corresponding hypothesis.

---

10. Conclusion

The attractor framework generates testable hypotheses about institutional and civilizational dynamics. The central hypothesis is that Western and East Asian civilizational traditions may occupy different attractor basins, with the West potentially exhibiting lower error correction capacity (κ) and higher perturbation resistance (B) than Taoist-Confucian-influenced East Asian traditions.

Crucially, the framework's normative ideal is high κ + high B + high C + high R. The fantasy attractor is not simply low κ. It is low R combined with mechanisms that prevent R from increasing.

The research protocol outlined in this paper provides a path for empirical testing. Until that testing is complete, all claims are provisional.

The paper does not claim that the West is definitively a fantasy attractor. It claims that the framework generates the hypothesis that the West may exhibit characteristics consistent with a fantasy attractor—and that this hypothesis is testable.

References

- Galida, R. (2026a). “Intelligence is the Primitive: Consciousness as a Second-Order Regulator on a Dissipative Substrate.” *Fantasy Attractor.*
- Galida, R. (2026b). “The Attractor Framework as a Formal Mapping of Taoist Dynamics.” *Fantasy Attractor.*
- Galida, R. (2026c). “The Cosmology of Genesis: A Philological and Exegetical Examination of the Flat Earth, Solid Dome, and Cosmic Ocean in the Hebrew Bible.” *Fantasy Attractor.*
- Galida, R. (2026d). “The Pre-tensioned Body: A Hypothesis Paper Grounding the Attractor Framework in ECM Mechanics.” *Fantasy Attractor.*
- Galida, R. (2026e). “Religions and Philosophies as Attractor Landscapes: A Comparative Analysis.” *Fantasy Attractor.*
- Galida, R. (2026f). “Non-Physical Claims Are Fantasy Attractors: Why Unverifiable Realms Cannot Be Empirically Distinguished from Nonexistence.” *Fantasy Attractor.*
- Gelfand, M.J., et al. (2011). “Differences Between Tight and Loose Cultures: A 33-Nation Study.” *Science* 332(6033):1100–1104.

Suggested citation: Galida, R. S. (2026). The West and the East: A Research Protocol for Civilizational Attractor Dynamics. *Fantasy Attractor*.