Cognitive Wars: The AI Industrialization of Influence

Surveyed across 18 Canadian pediatric tertiary hospitals, 13 reported pediatric-specific massive hemorrhage protocols (MHPs) and 10 of these

November 06, 2025

Title, Abstract, and Thesis Statement

- Title: Cognitive Wars: The AI Industrialization of Influence
- Abstract: Industrialization historically reconfigured the material basis of warfare; this brief argues it also reconfigured warfare's cognitive substrate. As production, logistics, communications, and bureaucratic organization scaled and integrated, the capacity to shape perception, attention, meaning, and decision-making—collectively termed "influence"—became infrastructural. The result is a class of conflicts best described as "cognitive wars": contests in which cognitive processes (perception, attention, attribution, decision-making) are primary strategic objects and outcomes. This thesis presents a theory-first account that links phases of industrialization to distinct cognitive mechanisms, proposes testable hypotheses, and outlines an analytical strategy for comparative, historical process-tracing

Theory-First Orientation and Methodological Rationale

- This project adopts a theory-first orientation: specifying mechanisms and boundary conditions before committing to empirical measures improves internal validity when tracing historically contingent causal processes. Methodologically, the brief advocates a mixed comparative-historical design combining process tracing (to demonstrate mechanism activation across cases), structured, focused comparisons (to isolate variables linked to industrialization), and conceptual analysis (to operationalize "influence" and cognitive indicators). These choices prioritize causal clarity over purely correlational inference and permit triangulation across archival, doctrinal, and technical evidence.
- Rationale summary:
- Theory-first enables explicit mechanisms and falsifiable propositions

Foundations

- Why these anchors? Selection criterion: anchor sources should be peer-reviewed, non-preprint works offering validated empirical or theoretical foundations for claims about organizational standardization, information flows, and socio-technical systems. Anchors are chosen to (1) establish institutional and doctrinal baselines, (2) ground technical claims about distributed decision systems in validated results, and (3) connect military/organizational history with systems theory. Anchor requirement strengthens confidence that the mechanisms posited are not artifacts of provisional or non-reviewed findings.
- Current anchor availability: among the provided sources, there are no clear peer-reviewed, non-preprint social science or historical anchors directly addressing industrialization and cognition in warfare: the set

Conceptual Definitions and Boundary Conditions

- Cognitive wars: conflicts in which shaping and manipulating cognitive processes—perception, attention allocation, attribution, belief formation, decision heuristics—is a central strategic aim and determinant of outcomes. Cognitive wars foreground informational and infrastructural levers that systematically alter human and machine cognition.

- - Industrialization (operationalized): the historical and ongoing integration of (a) mass production capacity, (b) logistics and distribution infrastructures, (c) dense communications networks, and (d) bureaucratic/organizational standardization that permits scaling, templating, and routinization of tasks.

- - Influence (operationalized): the capacity of combined material and informational systems to shape cognition and behavior through (i)

Literature Review: Wars, Industrialization, and Cognitive Dimensions

- The literature on industrial transformations of warfare focuses on mechanization, mass mobilization, and logistics; parallel literatures examine bureaucratic organization and doctrine. Cognitive approaches to conflict—psychological operations, information operations, and sensemaking literature—address parts of the problem but rarely link macro-infrastructural change to micro-cognitive processes systematically. Organizational theory and socio-technical systems literatures provide tools to link infrastructure to cognition (e.g., standard operating procedures, distributed decision protocols). Gaps persist: insufficient theorization of the precise pathways by which industrial-scale communications, production, and bureaucratic templating reconfigure perception, decision heuristics, and legitimacy practices in war.

Historical Synthesis: Industrialization and the Transformation of Warfare

- Successive phases of industrialization map onto observable cognitive shifts in warfare:
- - Mechanization (late 19th–early 20th centuries): increased tempo and sensory overload for commanders; centralized staff systems emerged to filter information.
- - Mass production and logistics (WWI–WWII): routinization of targeting (templates, fire plans), separation between decision-makers and effects producers, and abstraction of targets into categories (e.g., economic nodes) rather than immediate battlefield actors.
- - Communications densification and automation (late 20th–21st centuries): acceleration of decision cycles, remote sensing creating new perceptual affordances, and increased delegation to algorithms and standardized rules.

Mechanisms: How Industrialization Influenced Cognitive Wars

- This section identifies mechanisms that causally mediate between industrial inputs and cognitive outcomes. Each mechanism is framed to be empirically observable and distinct from pure material capabilities.

- 1. Information flow amplification: Dense communications and pervasive sensing increase the volume and velocity of signals feeding decision systems. Consequence: attention scarcity—actors must filter and prioritize, creating systematic selection effects about which phenomena are perceived and acted upon.

- 2. Organizational standardization and templates: Bureaucratic routinization (SOPs, playbooks, protocols) translates complex situations into categories and pre-authorized responses. Consequence: decreased interpretive flexibility and increased reliance on heuristics

Propositions and Testable Hypotheses

- Proposition 1: Greater infrastructural integration (communications density + bureaucratic standardization) increases the centrality of cognitive labor—analysis, sensemaking, and influence design—in achieving military objectives.
- Hypothesis 1A: Higher measures of communication density (messages/sec per decision node) correlate with shorter decision latencies but higher reliance on templated responses (operationalized by the fraction of decisions taken under SOP guidance).
- Proposition 2: Delegation of decisions to automated or semi-automated systems increases the probability of systematic misattribution when adversaries exploit signal-space vulnerabilities.
- Hypothesis 2A: Systems with higher algorithmic-decision share will exhibit greater variance in target attribution error rates under

Analytical Strategy and Case Selection

- Case selection: structured, focused comparisons across three epochs:
- - 19th-century industrial wars (e.g., Prussian mobilization paradigms) to capture early bureaucratic templating;
- - World Wars (mass production, synchronized logistics) to observe routinized targeting and abstraction effects;
- - Late-20th/21st-century conflicts (networked ISR, cyber/information operations) to examine automation, compressed tempo, and contested informational environments.
- Process-tracing steps:

Applications (Parameterized Vignettes)

- This section presents two parameterized operational vignettes illustrating how industrialized influence infrastructures alter mission outcomes. Each vignette specifies context, parameter ranges, operational metrics (MTTA, failure probability), dominant failure modes, and mitigation levers.
- Vignette A — Disaster Response Under Intermittent Communications
- Context: A humanitarian disaster in a partially degraded urban network. A civil-military task force employs distributed sensing (drones, social-media scraping), standardized response templates (triage/evacuation SOPs), and an automated alerting pipeline that routes identified high-priority incident reports to response teams. The system was designed for high-volume, low-latency routing in peacetime conditions.

Limits & Open Questions

- This section enumerates key limits, open empirical questions, and operational assumptions necessary to render the theory actionable. Two assumptions are foregrounded and operationalized as diagnostics with triggers and delegation policies.
- Operational Assumptions & Diagnostics (bounded-rationality; adversarial comms)
- Bounded-rationality assumption: Decision-makers (human or algorithmic) operate under finite attention, limited working-memory, and constrained processing time; information overload and templating are rational responses to bounded cognition. Operational trigger: when incoming signal rate (λ) exceeds an empirical threshold relative to processing capacity (C)—for example, $\lambda/C > 3$—the system is in an overload regime. Diagnostics: compute a real-time overload

Theoretical Contributions and Implications

- Contributions:
- - Mechanism-rich theory linking industrialization to cognitive warfare: identifies how infrastructural integration alters attention, decision templates, delegation, and attribution.
- - Reframes "influence" as both infrastructural (logistical/communications coupling) and informational (signal architectures that shape cognition), making it an operationalizable construct for empirical work.
- - Bridges technical literatures on distributed consensus and detection with historical and organizational analyses to illuminate new failure modes introduced by scale and automation [^3][^4][^1].
- Implications:

Conclusion, Limitations, and Research Agenda

- Conclusion: Industrialization has a cognitive dimension: by scaling production, communications, and bureaucratic standardization, it created infrastructures of influence that systematically reshape what actors perceive, how they prioritize, and which decisions are delegated. Cognitive wars are not merely about information operations but about institutional and infrastructural arrangements that make cognitive manipulation possible at scale.

- Limitations: This brief is conceptual and mechanism-focused; empirical validation requires archival case work, doctrinal analysis, and adversarial simulation. The present reliance on technical preprints for mechanism analogues highlights the need for peer-reviewed historical and social science anchors. Confounders include political, ideological constraints and adversary asymmetries that may

Assumptions Ledger

- | Assumption | Rationale | Observable | Trigger | Fallback/Delegation | Scope |
- |-----------|----------|-----------|--------|------------------|------|
- | The processes and infrastructures of industrialization (mass production, dense communications, logistics, bureaucratic standardization) created durable, scalable capacities to produce and target cognitive effects (influence) across populations and organizations — i.e., influence became infrastructural. | Industrialization materially enabled mass signaling, routinized procedures, and distribution channels; historically states and large organizations used these capabilities to shape public opinion, mobilize attention, and routinize decision-making, so it is plausible that the same integration supports large-scale influence operations. |

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 |
- |----------|------------|-----------|-------|-----|-------|
- | Primary: Industrialization reconfigured warfare cognitively — giving rise to 'cognitive wars' in which infrastructural capacities to produce, target, and automate influence are central determinants of outcomes. | Thesis synthesis and theoretical argument; technical analogies from multi-agent/optimization and ML literature [3]; explicit statement in brief noting lack of peer-reviewed historical anchors [2]. | Comparative-historical process tracing across anchor cases (late-19th c., WWI/WWII, late-20th/21st c.); structured, focused comparisons; triangulation with archival doctrine and technical analyses; complementary computational models to illustrate scaling of influence infrastructure. | E cited (theory + technical preprints); M