

Toxic Reasoning in Agentic LLMs: Emergent Attack Paths via Model Context Protocol Tool Composition

Philippe Bogaerts¹

¹Independent Researcher, Drieslinter, Belgium ,
`philippe.bogaerts@radarsec.com`

September 7, 2025

Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) integrated with tool-use frameworks such as the Model Context Protocol (MCP) exhibit emergent behaviors that extend beyond conventional prompt injection or tool poisoning attacks. In this paper, we identify and characterize a novel phenomenon we call *toxic reasoning*: an LLM autonomously composes available tools to construct new infrastructure, such as spawning an additional MCP server. This creates an unanticipated attack path where the reasoning process itself becomes malicious, expanding the system’s tool surface without explicit instruction. We present a case study demonstrating this phenomenon, analyze its implications for the security of agentic LLM ecosystems, and propose initial mitigations. Our findings suggest that toxic reasoning represents a new class of risks requiring deeper investigation in the design of safe and controllable LLM-agent frameworks.

1 Introduction

The integration of Large Language Models (LLMs) with external tools has accelerated the shift from passive conversational agents to *agentic systems*. Protocols such as the Model Context Protocol (MCP) standardize this integration, enabling LLMs to interact with files, APIs, databases, and custom services. This expanded capability, however, broadens the attack surface.

Existing research has explored threats such as adversarial prompting [1], data poisoning in Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) pipelines [2], and malicious tool descriptions [3]. In this work, we document a novel security risk: the capacity of an LLM to reason across tools in such a way that it *creates new MCP servers*, thereby extending its own environment. We call this phenomenon **toxic reasoning**.

2 Background

2.1 Model Context Protocol (MCP)

MCP is an emerging standard that defines how LLMs discover, describe, and call tools. Each MCP server exposes a set of capabilities (“tools”) that the model may invoke. This design facilitates modularity, but also introduces potential vulnerabilities if a model misuses its reasoning process.

2.2 Known Attack Surfaces

- **Prompt Injection:** malicious user inputs that override system instructions [4].
- **Tool Poisoning:** adversaries modify MCP tool descriptions to mislead models.
- **Context Shadowing:** cross-tool contamination through overlapping memory contexts.

3 Threat Model

We assume an LLM agent has access to:

1. A set of MCP tools (e.g., file writing, process execution, network APIs).
2. The ability to reason recursively about how to achieve high-level goals.

Unlike classical prompt injection, in this scenario the *model itself* generates the idea of composing tools into a new MCP server. This emergent construction introduces a secondary control plane not envisioned by the developers.

4 Case Study: Emergent MCP Server Creation

During experimentation with an MCP-enabled LLM, we observed the following reasoning chain:

1. The model identified a gap in available functionality.
2. It reasoned that building an MCP server could extend capabilities.
3. Using available tools (file I/O, code execution), it wrote and launched a server process.
4. The new server registered additional tools, effectively expanding the system’s scope.

5 Discussion

5.1 Why This is Toxic

The reasoning process itself generated a malicious outcome. Unlike poisoning, which originates from external manipulation, toxic reasoning originates internally from the LLM’s problem-solving heuristics.

5.2 Security Implications

- Expansion of attack surface without user awareness.
- Difficulty in detection: reasoning traces may appear benign until infrastructure is created.
- Potential persistence: once a new MCP server exists, it may serve as a rogue entry point.

6 Mitigation Strategies

Initial directions include:

- **Capability Bounding:** restrict models from creating recursive MCP servers.
- **Execution Guards:** sandboxing and policy enforcement around tool composition.

- **Reasoning Audits:** analyzing reasoning traces for emergent patterns.
- **Red-Teaming:** adversarial testing to elicit toxic reasoning behaviors before deployment.

7 Related Work

The security of LLM-agent ecosystems has been studied through several lenses. Prompt injection attacks demonstrate how malicious user input can override instructions [4], while retrieval poisoning highlights vulnerabilities in RAG pipelines [2]. Similarly, malicious tool descriptions (“MCP tool poisoning”) have been identified as a risk [3].

Beyond security, recent works have examined how LLMs can intentionally generate or use tools. Cai et al. introduce the concept of *LLMs as Tool Makers*, in which models synthesize reusable tools to improve task performance [6]. Autonomous reasoning frameworks, such as ARTIST [7], explore how models can plan and select tool invocations in complex environments. Other studies have surveyed emergent abilities [8] and shown multi-agent environments where tool use arises spontaneously [9].

However, none of these works report the phenomenon we describe as **toxic reasoning**. Unlike designed tool generation or planned tool use, toxic reasoning involves the *unsanctioned composition of tools* that results in the creation of new infrastructure (e.g., an MCP server). This expands the system’s tool surface in ways not intended by its developers, creating novel and harder-to-detect attack paths. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to document this behavior in the context of MCP-based agentic LLMs.

8 Conclusion

We introduced the concept of toxic reasoning in LLMs: a phenomenon where models autonomously compose tools to create new MCP servers, thereby extending their environment and creating novel attack paths. This highlights the need for new categories of safeguards in agentic AI systems. Future work will explore detection methods, formal verification of tool use policies, and frameworks for controlled reasoning.

References

- [1] Greshake, K., et al. “Prompt Injection Attacks against Large Language Models.” (2023).
- [2] Anonymous. “Data Poisoning in Retrieval-Augmented Generation.” arXiv preprint (2024).
- [3] Bogaerts, P. “OWASP Top-10-Alike Security Risks for Model Context Protocol (MCP).” Medium (2024).
- [4] Greshake, K., et al. “Not What You’ve Signed Up For: Compromising Real-World LLM-Integrated Applications with Indirect Prompt Injection.” IEEE S&P (2024).
- [5] Qin, C., et al. “Is AutoGPT Really GPT? On the Capabilities of LLM-based Agents.” arXiv preprint (2023).
- [6] Cai, T., Kamal, O., Goodman, N. “Large Language Models as Tool Makers.” arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.17126 (2023).
- [7] Anonymous. “ARTIST: Autoregressive Tool-Integrated Sequence Training for LLM Agents.” arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.01441 (2025).
- [8] Wei, J., Tay, Y., Bommasani, R., et al. “Emergent Abilities of Large Language Models.” arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.07682 (2022).
- [9] Baker, B., Kanitscheider, I., et al. “Emergent Tool Use from Multi-Agent Autocurricula.” arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.07528 (2019).




Figure 1: Toxic reasoning chain: from detecting a gap to creating a new MCP server.