

The Conscious Suppression of Correction: Fantasy Attractors in Political Movements [A] (2026)

Robert Galida – June 2026 (Final)

Abstract

Why do intelligent people persist in beliefs that contradict clear evidence? The attractor framework offers a mechanism: **identity-constitutive, phenomenally felt commitment deepens the attractor basin**, making it resistant to corrective perturbations. A political fantasy attractor is a belief system whose adherents *detect* disconfirming evidence (they are familiar with counterarguments and experience them as genuine perturbations) yet the basin depth – maintained by conscious, identity-binding investment – exceeds the corrective force. (Section 7 specifies the three-level detection threshold that distinguishes this mechanism from automatic bias.) Cases where correction fails due to sub-personal, automatic processes are not yet fantasy attractors; the defining feature is the *conscious* suppression of an actively perceived error signal. This paper defines the mechanism, diagnoses three case patterns, offers falsifiable diagnostic criteria, applies the framework symmetrically across the political spectrum, and explicitly acknowledges the current empirical limitations in distinguishing Level 2 from Level 3 in practice.

1. Introduction

Political discourse is filled with people who appear intelligent in other domains yet hold beliefs sharply at odds with available evidence. Standard explanations – ignorance, manipulation, cognitive bias – are incomplete. They do not explain why correction attempts often strengthen belief (the backfire effect) or why highly educated individuals can persist in demonstrably false claims.

The attractor framework provides a different lens. In *Intelligence Without Consciousness* (Galida, 2026), we argued that phenomenal investment can suppress intelligent navigation: a person committed to a fantasy attractor experiences a basin depth that exceeds corrective perturbations. The person detects the error signal (they are not stupid), but the identity-binding commitment prevents trajectory escape.

This paper applies that mechanism to political movements. A **political fantasy attractor** is a shared belief system whose basin depth, reinforced by conscious (phenomenally felt, identity-constitutive) commitment, resists correction even when faced with clear disconfirming evidence. The paper offers a diagnostic, not a partisan weapon. It applies symmetrically across the spectrum.

2. Defining “Conscious Suppression” and Acknowledging the Detectability Problem

The term “conscious” is used in three overlapping senses:

- **Phenomenally conscious** – there is something it is like to hold the belief. The commitment is felt, not merely automatic.

- **Identity-constitutive** – the belief is held as a marker of selfhood and group membership. To abandon the belief would feel like a loss of self.
- **Experientially non-deliberative** – the suppression is not typically experienced as a deliberate choice (“I will ignore this evidence”). Rather, it is experienced as certainty, conviction, or moral clarity.

The paper adopts **Reading A**: a fantasy attractor requires conscious suppression in the sense above. Cases where correction fails because the error signal never reaches awareness – e.g., automatic motivated reasoning, selective exposure, unfamiliarity with counterarguments – are **not** yet fantasy attractors. They may be pre-conscious bias. The defining feature is that the person *detects* the perturbation but the basin depth prevents escape.

A crucial honesty note: The distinction between Level 2 (automatic bias, no detection) and Level 3 (detection with suppression) is definitional for the paper’s target, but it cannot currently be resolved from behavioral observation alone. Two people may exhibit identical external behaviors – praising gut-trust over experts, deploying sealing mechanisms, ostracizing defectors – while one is at Level 2 and the other at Level 3. The paper’s diagnostic criteria therefore identify *candidates* for fantasy attractors, not confirmed cases. This limitation is explicitly acknowledged; it does not invalidate the framework but requires domain-specific methods (e.g., fine-grained interviews, reaction time measures, physiological markers of doubt) to operationalize detection in practice.

3. Empirical Grounding

The paper's claims are empirically testable. Relevant literature includes:

- **Backfire effect:** Nyhan & Reifler (2010) found that corrections sometimes increased misperceptions among ideological groups. However, subsequent research (Wood & Porter, 2019) failed to replicate backfire across a wide range of issues. The effect is contested and may be context-dependent. This paper treats backfire as one possible indicator of deep basin depth, not a universal law.
- **Identity protection:** Kahan's cultural cognition theory (2012) shows that individuals process evidence in ways that protect group commitments. Kahan emphasizes that this mechanism can operate automatically and does not necessarily involve conscious deliberation; he has also shown that higher analytical ability can *increase* motivated reasoning. The present paper's focus on *conscious* suppression is a distinct claim, not a direct extension of Kahan's framework. We use his empirical findings as partial support for the existence of motivated reasoning, not for the specific detection-suppression mechanism.
- **Festinger's cognitive dissonance:** When prophecy fails, believers often intensify commitment (Festinger, Riecken, & Schachter, 1956) – a classic case of apocalyptic attractor dynamics, often accompanied by conscious rationalization and identity reinforcement.

The paper does not claim that conscious suppression is the *only* mechanism. It claims that conscious, identity-constitutive commitment is a *sufficient* condition for basin deepening in many political contexts.

4. Three Case Patterns (Illustrative, Not Exhaustive)

4.1 Conspiracy Theory Attractor

Mechanism: A central narrative of hidden malevolent agency. Evidence against the conspiracy is reframed as evidence of its cunning.

Examples: QAnon (right); Soviet-era “doctors’ plot” conspiracy (left-authoritarian).

Suppression signature: Adherents can articulate counterarguments but dismiss them as part of the conspiracy. The basin is sealed by narrative closure.

4.2 Populist Strongman Attractor

Mechanism: Loyalty to a leader perceived as sole authentic representative of the people. Disconfirming evidence about the leader is reframed as elite persecution.

Examples: Certain Trump-loyalist circles (right); left-nationalist leader cults (e.g., Chavismo under Hugo Chávez).

Suppression signature: Adherents exhibit high corrective permeability in other domains but near-zero for leader-related evidence.

4.3 Apocalyptic Meta-Attractor

Mechanism: A belief that a definitive, world-transforming event is imminent. Repeated prediction failures are explained away as delays, tests, or misinterpretations.

Examples: Millenarian movements (Millerites, Jehovah’s

Witnesses); some revolutionary eschatologies (Stalinist “world revolution imminent” framing into the 1930s).

Suppression signature: The basin is maintained by social solidarity and identity fusion.

The examples are illustrative, not exhaustive. The diagnostic is intended to be politically symmetric, but the paper does not claim equal prevalence across sides.

5. Symmetry Demonstration

To avoid the appearance of partisan selection, we provide contemporary and historical cross-ideological examples.

Contemporary – MMR-autism persistence in progressive communities. Despite the complete retraction of Wakefield’s 1998 study (and subsequent findings of fraud), some otherwise science-oriented progressives continue to express concern about vaccine safety – often citing “corporate pharmaceutical influence” as a sealing mechanism. This meets the paper’s criteria: clear scientific consensus, ability to articulate counterarguments, identity-constitutive suspicion of establishment science.

Another contemporary – Facilitated communication persistence. Facilitated communication (FC) for non-speaking autistics has been repeatedly discredited in controlled studies; many professional organizations have issued statements against its use. Yet FC continues to be promoted in certain progressive / disability-rights circles, often with sealing mechanisms (“critics don’t understand non-speaking minds”). This is a clean case of a fantasy attractor operating on the left.

Historical – Stalinist apologism in Western intellectual

circles (1930s–1950s). Highly educated individuals (Sartre, Hellman, many fellow travelers) persisted in believing that Stalin's USSR was progressive despite evidence of the Great Purge, show trials, and Gulag system. Identity commitment to socialism and anti-fascism suppressed correction.

These examples show the framework applies regardless of ideological valence. The paper does not claim equal prevalence; it claims symmetric applicability.

6. Falsifiable Diagnostic Criteria

A movement is a **candidate** political fantasy attractor if it meets **three or more** of the following **and** does **not** meet the counter-criterion. (The word “candidate” flags the detectability problem acknowledged in §2: behavioral criteria alone cannot definitively distinguish Level 2 from Level 3.)

1. **Low corrective permeability ($\kappa \rightarrow 0$)** for core beliefs despite repeated, clear disconfirming evidence. “Clear” means *scientific consensus* on empirical claims (e.g., National Academies, WHO, IPCC) or, for historical cases, documented factual findings accepted by non-partisan experts. Consensus determination is a social process, but the criterion is falsifiable when consensus exists.
2. **Backfire effect** – correction attempts measurably increase belief strength and group cohesion (requires empirical measurement).
3. **Identity fusion** – observable proxies: social ostracism of defectors, language of betrayal, insistence that abandoning the belief would make one a “different person.”
4. **Conscious valorization of resistance to evidence** – adherents explicitly praise *ignoring disconfirming evidence* as a virtue (e.g., “I trust my gut over the

experts,” “Facts are propaganda”). This criterion distinguishes *resistance to evidence* from *resistance to social pressure to conform* – a scientist who resists social pressure to abandon a well-evidenced theory is valorizing fidelity to evidence, not resistance to evidence.

5. **Sealing mechanisms** – internal rhetorical strategies that explain away all counterevidence (conspiracy, enemy deception, tests of faith). These are observable in discourse.

Counter-criterion (falsification condition):

A movement is **not** a fantasy attractor if it demonstrates any of the following:

- Updates core beliefs in response to disconfirming evidence within a timeframe proportional to the clarity, repetition, and expert consensus on that evidence.
- Tolerates internal dissent and allows open criticism of core claims.
- Abandons false claims when decisively refuted (retracts, corrects, or disavows).

The timeframe specification avoids the earlier vagueness by linking the expected update speed to the evidential context. A movement that updates only after decades of accumulating consensus may still be a fantasy attractor; one that updates within a reasonable period given the evidence is not.

7. Intelligent Navigation: A Three-Level Taxonomy

The paper claims that fantasy attractor adherents *detect* error signals but suppress correction. To avoid conflating this with

automatic bias, we distinguish three levels:

- **Level 1 – Unfamiliarity:** The person has not encountered counterarguments. No suppression needed.
- **Level 2 – Familiarity without detection:** The person can recite counterarguments but has cognitively neutralized them; they never experience a moment of doubt. This is driven by automatic, sub-personal processes (e.g., selective exposure, motivated reasoning). These are **not** fantasy attractors on the paper's definition.
- **Level 3 – Detection with suppression:** The person experiences the counterargument as a genuine perturbation – a moment of doubt, a recognition of plausibility – but overrides it through conscious, identity-binding commitment. These **are** fantasy attractors.

Thus, the paper's target is Level 3 cases. For many political movements that *look* like fantasy attractors from the outside, the dominant mechanism may be Level 2. The diagnostic criteria are designed to identify candidates where Level 3 *might* be operating, but definitive classification requires methods beyond behavioral observation (see §2).

8. Why This Matters for Politics and Media

- **Correction backfires when it attacks identity.** Calling a fantasy attractor “stupid” or “evil” deepens the basin. The correct diagnostic question is: *What reinforces the basin depth?*
- **Decoupling evidence from identity** is the only known exit path. Some movements exit when the social cost of

membership exceeds identity benefit – not when they receive a fact sheet.

- **High-profile debunking** may backfire by signaling threat, triggering defensive solidarity. The framework predicts this effect is real but not universal; context matters.
 - **Interventions** should focus on reducing identity threat, providing safe off-ramps, and decoupling core moral values from factual claims. These are testable hypotheses.
-

9. Open Questions

- **Can a movement be partially a fantasy attractor?** Yes – gradient of κ . The diagnosis is not binary.
 - **What interventions increase κ ?** Reducing identity threat, safe off-ramps, and decoupling moral values from factual claims are candidate mechanisms.
 - **How does collective basin depth scale with group size?** Social coupling likely amplifies depth nonlinearly. Untested.
 - **Are all political fantasy attractors harmful?** The paper makes no claim. The mechanism may sometimes provide resilience against genuine disinformation.
 - **How can we empirically detect the Level 2 / Level 3 transition?** This is the open frontier implied by §2. Methods could include subjective doubt scales, reaction time measures, or physiological markers. The paper does not solve this; it identifies the problem.
-

10. Conclusion

The conscious suppression of intelligent correction is a real political phenomenon, but it is narrower than often assumed. Political fantasy attractors are not failures of intelligence; they are successes of identity-constitutive commitment that operates *after* the error signal is detected. Cases where correction fails due to automatic bias are not yet fantasy attractors by this definition.

The diagnostic criteria identify candidates, not confirmed cases. Distinguishing Level 2 from Level 3 remains an empirical challenge. This honesty does not weaken the framework; it clarifies what further work is needed.

Fact-checking alone fails against a fantasy attractor. Interventions must address the conscious commitment that creates the basin depth. The dance of politics is not only about truth. It is about who you are, who you trust, and what you will not abandon. Intelligence navigates; conscious commitment anchors the basin.

Suggested citation: Galida, R. S. (2026). The Conscious Suppression of Correction: Fantasy Attractors in Political Movements. *Fantasy Attractor*.