Cognitive Wars: The AI Industrialization of Influence

Recent cross-domain research reveals persistent machine-learning detection blind spots and operational fragmentation that

November 06, 2025

Title & Thesis Statement

- Thesis: Industrialization — understood as the political-economic processes that concentrate production, lower marginal costs, and standardize distribution at scale — fundamentally reconfigures the modalities and stakes of cognitive wars. The industrialization of information and AI-driven influence technologies transforms who can wage cognitive campaigns, how campaigns are constructed and delivered, and which social substrates are most vulnerable. Industrialization does not merely increase volume; it creates new leverage points, institutional vectors, and failure modes that qualitatively alter strategic incentives and outcomes.
- Claims:
- - Industrialization systematically produces new targets (algorithmic

Theoretical Framework: Cognitive Wars and Political Economy

- Definition: "Cognitive wars" are strategic contests — by states, non-state actors, and market intermediaries — aimed at shaping perceptions, beliefs, and decision-making across populations and institutions. They encompass propaganda, targeted influence, disinformation, attention engineering, and algorithmic steering.
- Framework: Locate cognitive wars within political economy by treating industrialization as a structural variable that reconfigures:
- - incentive structures (profit motives and bureaucratic rewards),
- - information flows (bandwidth, latency, unit costs), and
- - scale economies (reproducibility and standardization of narratives and targeting).

Literature Review: Cognitive Wars, Industrialization, and Influence

- Scope:
- - Scholarship on propaganda, psychological operations, and information warfare provides conceptual anchors for cognitive intent and tactics.
- - Political economy and industrialization literatures (communications history, media economics) explain the infrastructural and organizational transformations that make large-scale influence practicable.
- Key gaps identified:
- - Much literature treats influence as a by-product of technological change rather than as co-produced by industrial organization, market incentives, and state policy.

Foundations

- Rationale: Rigorous, theory-driven claims require trustworthy anchors for methodology and comparative inference. Anchors here are peer-reviewed, non-preprint sources chosen to ground methodological claims about institutional behavior, empirical measurement standards, and normative implications. Anchors are used to establish baseline research design norms and to validate measurement choices (e.g., how to operationalize industrialization metrics or institutionalization of propaganda).
- Why these anchors?
- - Anchor selection is deliberate: preference is given to peer-reviewed, non-preprint literature because such sources have passed domain-specific editorial and methodological scrutiny and therefore

Historical Context: Industrialization and the Evolution of Wars

- Argument map:
- - Industrialization changed war by expanding logistics, reducing transmission costs, and enabling mass mobilization. These same processes extended to symbolic production: printed pamphlets, orchestrated press, radio, film, and networked digital platforms each mark phases in cognitive warfare.
- - Each wave of industrialization altered target granularity (from mass publics to demographic segments to individual-level microtargets) and tempo (from episodic campaigns to continuous, algorithmically mediated influence).
- Continuity and change:
- - Continuity: industrial capacities have always amplified both kinetic and non-kinetic instruments; control of production and distribution

Mechanisms: How Industrialization Shapes Cognitive Warfare

- This section identifies mid-level mechanisms that operationalize the theory-first claim.
- 1. Mass communication infrastructures as amplifiers
- - Industrial-scale infrastructures (printing presses, radio towers, datacenter networks) reduce per-unit cost for exposure, enabling persistent saturation strategies and repeated framing effects.
- 2. Centralized production and templating
- - Standardized content production (content factories, templated creative pipelines) enables rapid replication and A/B testing at scale; organizational specialization (creative teams, data scientists) professionalizes influence craft.

Hypotheses

- H1: Greater industrial integration (measured by communication infrastructure density, production centralization, and data concentration) correlates with more institutionalized and large-scale cognitive warfare capability.
- H2: When information infrastructures lower cost and raise returns, industrialized states and actors will prioritize cognitive over kinetic strategies, especially where symbolic control yields strategic advantage without open conflict.
- H3: Transitions in industrial technology (e.g., print -> broadcast -> digital platforms -> AI-mediated personalization) predict observable shifts in target selection (mass -> segmented -> individualized), tempo (episodic -> continuous), and granularity (message generality -> microtargeted personalization)

Methodology: Theory-First Comparative Historical Analysis

- Approach: Comparative historical method anchored by explicit causal mechanisms. The goal is to show mechanism operation across epochs and to test the conjectured links between industrialization and cognitive warfare.
- Operationalization:
- - Industrialization metrics: communications infrastructure per capita, degree of production centralization (market concentration indexes), data concentration proxies (top platform market shares), and automation intensity (use of algorithmic content pipelines).
- - Cognitive warfare indicators: scale of propaganda (volume metrics), channel diversity, institutionalization (existence of dedicated units, budgets), and measurable outcomes (engagement, opinion shifts

Case Studies

- Planned illustrative cases to span epochs and actor types:
- 1. 19th-century print campaigns and the professionalization of political parties (pre-mass-broadcast industrial phase).
- 2. 1930s–1950s radio and film propaganda (state-centered mass media industrialization).
- 3. Late 20th-century broadcast-era advertising and Cold War psychological operations (hybrid industrial-state models).
- 4. 21st-century platform-mediated influence: targeted political advertising, supply-chainized disinformation, algorithmic amplification, and AI-enabled content farms (commercial and state actors).

Applications

- This section presents parameterized vignettes that operationalize mechanisms and provide measurable performance metrics. Each vignette specifies context, actor configuration, parameters, operational objectives, metrics (e.g., Mean Time To Amplify (MTTA), failure probability), and dominant failure modes.
- Vignette A — Disaster response misinformation under intermittent communications
- Context: A major natural disaster fragments infrastructure in a metropolitan region; cellular networks are intermittently available, and multiple actors (state emergency services, civic volunteer groups, opportunistic influence firms) compete to direct public behavior.
- Actors & resources: State emergency agency (centralized, authoritative

Expected Findings and Theoretical Contributions

- Expected empirical patterns:
- - Evidence that higher industrial integration predicts larger, more institutionalized cognitive warfare capacities (e.g., dedicated units, vendor ecosystems, routinized campaign playbooks).
- - Observable shifts in targeting granularity and tempo consistent with technological transitions: digital-AI era campaigns should show higher personalization and continuous engagement compared with earlier broadcast-era spikes.
- Theoretical contributions:
- - A unified theory linking political-economic industrialization to cognitive warfare form and scale, emphasizing mechanisms (centralization, data concentration, platform chokepoints) rather than solely technological affordances

Policy and Strategic Implications

- Recommendations:
- - Treat cognitive threats as structurally enabled by industrial infrastructures: prioritize decentralization of critical informational nodes, strengthen provenance and authentication standards, and regulate economic incentives that reward manipulation.
- - Integrate industrial-assessment into threat forecasting: evaluate adversary capacity by measuring not only technical tools but market concentration, vendor ecosystems, and data access.
- - Operational rules: define bounded-delegation frameworks for automation in high-stakes contexts (disaster warnings, military-psychological operations) with built-in diagnostics and escalation triggers.
- Strategic caution: Policies must avoid overbroad censorship or

Limits & Open Questions

- This section identifies inferential limits, methodological constraints, and open research questions. It includes a focused subsection on Operational Assumptions & Diagnostics that makes explicit modeling assumptions about decision-makers and adversaries and proposes concrete triggers and delegation policies.
- Primary limits:
- - Observability: many influence operations are opaque (private vendors, covert state action), limiting direct measurement and introducing selection biases.
- - Rapid technological change: AI-driven capabilities evolve fast; causal claims must be tested with temporally updated data.
- - Cross-context generalizability: mechanisms may operate differently

Conclusion and Directions for Future Research

- Restatement: Industrialization conditions cognitive wars by providing the material means (infrastructure, data, organizational forms) and the incentives (commercialization, institutionalization) that enable large-scale influence. The theory-first approach links macro-structural change to concrete mechanisms and testable hypotheses.
- Future work:
- - Empirical testing across diverse political economies to validate mechanism operation and boundary conditions.
- - Modeling the interaction between AI-driven production pipelines and regulatory interventions to forecast longer-term equilibria.
- - Experimentally evaluating delegation thresholds and diagnostic triggers in low-risk field deployments to calibrate policy

Assumptions Ledger

- | Assumption | Rationale | Observable | Trigger | Fallback/Delegation | Scope |
- |---|---|---|---|---|---|
- | The industrialization of information (centralized production, standardized pipelines, and low marginal costs) fundamentally reconfigures the modalities and stakes of cognitive wars. | Historical precedent shows that changes in production/distribution infrastructures (print, broadcast, digital) reshape who can reach whom and how. Economies of scale, reproducibility, and standardized workflows enable new actors and tactics that were previously infeasible at low cost. | Rising frequency of large-scale, automated influence campaigns; proliferation of templated creative assets and

Notation

- | Symbol | Meaning | Units / Domain |
- |---|---|---|
- | \(n\) | number of agents | \(\mathbb{N}\) |
- | \(G_t=(V,E_t)\) | time-varying communication/interaction graph | — |
- | \(\lambda_2(G)\) | algebraic connectivity (Fiedler value) | — |

Claim-Evidence-Method (CEM) Grid

- | Claim (C) | Evidence (E) | Method (M) | Status | Risk | TestID |
- |----------|-------------|-----------|--------|------|--------|
- | Industrialization systematically produces new targets (algorithmic intermediaries, platform-mediated publics), actors (commercially scaled influence firms, state–private hybrids), and leverage points (data supply chains, model fine-tuning). | [3] (graph-theoretic/consensus literature supporting importance of intermediaries in mediated networks); [5] (surveys of distributed consensus and chokepoints in networked systems); [2] (methodological anchor on institutional protocols supporting organizational-readiness claims). | Empirical mapping + comparative case studies: (a) build a cross-platform inventory of intermediaries and vendors; (b) network analysis of