Semantic Moral Constructs And Narrative Warfare: Utilising Goodness And Truth From Partisan Dualism To Institutionalized Education

Iliyan Kuzmanov

Criminology and Psychopathology at London Metropolitan University

Abstract: This paper investigates the systematic weaponization of "Goodness" and "Truth" as a core strategy employed by anti-system movements throughout history. It argues that through semantic capture, narrative warfare, and manipulative emotional education, diverse groups—from ancient dualists to modern totalitarians and extremists—construct exclusionary realities defined by rigid conceptions of virtue and reality. This manipulation consistently serves an anti-pluralist function, targeting pre-liberal orthodoxy historically and, increasingly, the foundations of Enlightenment modernity and liberalism. A comparative analysis traces the enduring structural logic and adaptive techniques, highlighting the institutionalization of semantic and emotional control within state educational systems, with examples including the Soviet Union, Iran, and North Korea. The study deconstructs the linguistic and psychological mechanisms driving this process, revealing severe epistemic and ethical consequences: the erosion of critical reason, the perversion of virtue, undermined autonomy, and societal fragmentation. Recognizing this pattern of manipulating foundational concepts is presented as vital for resisting ideological control and defending open societies based on reasoned inquiry and humane ethics.

Indexing: Goodness, Truth, Narrative Warfare, Semantic Capture, Emotional Education, Indoctrination, Anti-System Movements, Ideology, Anti-Pluralism, Exclusion, Liberalism, Enlightenment, Totalitarianism, Authoritarianism, Dualism, Manichaeism, Cults, Terrorism, ISIS, Populism, Alt-Right, Soviet Union Education, Nazi Germany Education, Iran Education, North Korea Education, Institutionalization, Educational Systems, Linguistic Manipulation, Critical Thinking Suppression, Autonomy Erosion, Epistemic Corrosion, Ethical Corrosion, Moral Disengagement, Psychological Manipulation, Social Trust Decay

Section I. The Weaponization of Virtue: An Inquiry into Semantic Capture

The fundamental concepts of "Truth," which shapes our understanding of reality, and "Goodness," which guides our ethical frameworks, exert a profound gravity, promising clarity, certainty, and orientation in a complex world. Yet, this resonance conceals a persistent historical dynamic: the systematic ideological capture and redefinition – a process aptly termed "semantic capture" – of these very concepts constitutes a core strategy for diverse movements seeking to dismantle established orders. This inquiry investigates the mechanisms by which such anti-system groups weaponize both veracity and virtue. From ancient dualistic sects constructing alternative ontologies and ethical frameworks to challenge imperial politico-religious orthodoxy (Scott, 1990), to twentieth-century totalitarian regimes engineering society

through state-controlled realities, moralities, and educational systems (Arendt, 1973), and contemporary extremist factions assailing democratic norms, the co-option of Truth and Goodness emerges as a recurring tactic. While the specific nature of the established order shifts across epochs, the underlying method of using semantic manipulation to forge exclusionary realities – defining who counts as a "Good Person" based on adherence to a specific, often intertwined, definition of Good and Truth – remains remarkably consistent. This analysis delves into this phenomenon, exploring its function as a fundamentally anti-pluralist strategy whose modern incarnations take direct aim at the foundations of liberal thought and Enlightenment values.

This persistent ideological tactic operates in stark contrast to the understandings developed within modern scientific and philosophical inquiry. Contemporary science approaches "Truth" not as a singular, immutable entity but as a provisional understanding derived from converging empirical evidence, perpetually subject to revision and falsification (Popper, 1959; Kahneman, 2011). Truth, in this framework, is less a destination than a process. Similarly, Enlightenment-derived ethics and modern moral psychology explore "Goodness" not through appeals to absolute dogma but by investigating the complex interplay of evolved predispositions, cognitive mechanisms, cultural learning, and reasoned deliberation underpinning moral judgment and prosocial behaviour (Greene and Haidt, 2002; Haidt and Joseph, 2004; Siegel, 2020). Such perspectives acknowledge context-dependency, the possibility of universalist principles alongside variation, and the intricate factors shaping human conduct, often revealing how concepts of "Goodness" themselves become contested ideological terrain (Lakoff, 2002). The scientific and liberal embrace of complexity, provisionality, iteration, and pluralism in understanding both reality and ethics stands diametrically opposed to the ideological imposition of absolute certainty (Stanley, 2015).

Herein lies the critical paradox fueling this inquiry. Precisely because modern investigation reveals the contingent, complex, and often provisional nature of our grasp on both Truth and Goodness, these foundational concepts become extraordinarily vulnerable to semantic capture. It is arguably the very lack of immutable certainty offered by science and deliberative reason that creates space for anti-system ideologies – movements fundamentally opposed to the prevailing order – to assert their own rigid, simplistic, and exclusionary definitions. These ideologies offer potent psychological lures, appealing to a deep-seated human desire for clarity and coherence, a "motivated closing of the mind" that seizes upon simplistic answers for both 'what is real?' and 'what is right?' (Kruglanski and Webster, 1996). They fundamentally reject the intellectual humility and methodological openness inherent in scientific and Enlightenment traditions, substituting dogma for discovery and enforced consensus, often cultivated through controlled formative experiences, for critical debate in both the epistemic and ethical realms. This semantic capture is thus central to the anti-system dynamic itself – controlling these core concepts is key to challenging the legitimacy of the established order.

The strategic logic underlying this semantic weaponization consistently serves a profoundly anti-pluralist function: the creation and maintenance of monolithic, exclusionary realities and in-groups, often forming epistemic bubbles or closed cognitive systems. By dictating an absolute "Truth" – whether derived from esoteric revelation, pseudo-scientific dogma, or political decree – these ideologies invalidate competing perspectives and ways of knowing (Stanley, 2015). Simultaneously, by imposing a rigid definition of "Goodness," they establish sharp boundaries around a narrowly conceived 'us'. Policing these boundaries necessitates crafting the archetype of the "Good Person," where virtue is redefined away from potentially universal ethical content and becomes synonymous with unwavering loyalty to the group's unique Truth, conformity to its specific moral code, and often, participation in exclusionary or dehumanizing practices directed against a designated 'them' (Hoffer, 1951). This "Good Person" embodies the successful internalisation of the group's alternative ontology and ethics.

Crucially, while this functional anti-pluralism is a constant, the specific ideological edifice being attacked evolves. In pre-modern contexts, this strategy was deployed against prevailing religious orthodoxy and hierarchical structures. However, from the twentieth century onwards, particularly with the rise of totalitarian states capable of amplifying manipulation, this same method is increasingly directed against the core tenets of modern Western liberalism and its Enlightenment foundations (Arendt, 1973). Contemporary extremist movements continue this trajectory, explicitly targeting liberal ideals concerning knowledge (rational discourse, scientific authority, freedom of thought), education (critical inquiry, developmental autonomy), and morality (individual rights, universalist ethics, tolerance), framing them as corrupt or illegitimate. Their anti-pluralism thus becomes explicitly anti-liberal and anti-Enlightenment.

This ideological project is propelled through aggressive narrative warfare (Snow and Benford, 1988). Anti-system groups invest heavily in crafting compelling narratives that embed their redefined concepts of Truth and Goodness. These narratives typically exhibit 'red flag' characteristics: they are totalizing, Manichean, prioritize potent emotional appeals over evidence, and resist critique (Hoffer, 1951; Stanley, 2015). Employing methods analogous to manipulative emotional education, such strategies aim to bypass rational faculties, foster intense group cohesion, mobilize adherents by offering simplistic certainties regarding both reality and virtue, and actively cultivate antagonism towards the deliberative processes central to both scientific inquiry and liberal democracy (Fallis, 2004).

Understanding this recurring pattern – the co-equal capture of foundational concepts of Goodness and Truth, the consistent deployment of anti-pluralist logic, the historically shifting target culminating in an assault on liberalism, and the reliance on manipulative narrative warfare – is therefore essential. It allows us to move beyond surface analyses of rhetoric to grasp the deeper structural mechanisms by which ideologies seek to remake reality and human identity. Examining how this dynamic unfolds across epochs, including its foundational historical manifestations, its amplification through state power, its contemporary adaptations, the specific linguistic arsenal enabling this capture, the comparative logic linking diverse cases, and the resultant epistemic and ethical corrosions, illuminates the persistent vulnerability of societies to this form of ideological warfare. This inquiry contends that the semantic capture and weaponization of foundational concepts of Goodness and Truth constitutes a persistent, structurally coherent strategy of anti-pluralist movements, often operationalized through control of formative narratives and emotional learning, revealing a fundamental vulnerability within modes of thought—particularly those tracing to the Enlightenment—that embrace complexity and provisionality in understanding both reality and virtue.

Section II. Primordial Ruptures: Dualism's Challenge to Orthodoxy and Order

Deep historical roots underpin the strategy of semantic weaponization – the capture of foundational concepts of "Goodness" and "Truth" to forge exclusionary realities. Potent early expressions manifest in ancient and medieval dualistic movements and related sectarian groups operating within larger imperial structures. Manichaeism, emerging from third-century Mesopotamia (BeDuhn, 2000), along with later currents like Bogomilism (Obolensky, 1948) and Catharism (Lansing, 1998), serve as crucial historical archetypes. These, and arguably other groups perceived as deviant within the Roman world (MacMullen, 1984), demonstrate how the *co-equal* manipulation of metaphysical "Truth" (often a secret Gnosis) and a radical redefinition of "Goodness" (typically involving cosmic purity versus material corruption) enabled the formation of cohesive, exclusionary communities. Critically, the analysis reveals how adherence to these alternative realities – embodied by the dedicated "Good Person" – fostered distinct social dynamics that generated *internal friction and challenge* to the prevailing imperial and ecclesiastical orders, establishing enduring patterns of anti-system mobilization long before the advent of liberalism.

Defining "Goodness" through cosmic warfare between Spirit and Matter became the ideological engine driving movements like Manichaeism. They posited a universe locked in irreconcilable conflict between pure Goodness (Spirit, Light) and an intrinsically evil principle (Matter, Darkness), thereby performing a radical devaluation of conventional reality and establishing an absolute ethical dichotomy (BeDuhn, 2000; Lansing, 1998). Plurality itself, the messy complexity of the material world, became suspect, tainted by association with Evil. True "Goodness" resided solely in aligning with Light and recognizing the soul's entrapment. This framework inherently fostered an intense in-group ("Us," the enlightened aligned with Good) versus out-group ("Them," the ignorant trapped in Matter) mentality, resonating strongly with principles of Social Identity Theory where distinct group identity often relies upon categorical differentiation from, and sometimes derogation of, out-groups (Tajfel and Turner, 1979). This metaphysically grounded redefinition of Goodness provided the essential justification for separation, exclusion, and mobilization against a perceived corrupt world order.

Securing epistemic closure required redefining "Truth" itself into an exclusive, secret *gnosis*, fundamentally altering the terms of knowledge. Within these systems, Truth was no longer pursued through shared reason, empirical observation, or established interpretive traditions but became synonymous with revealed, salvific knowledge concerning hidden cosmic realities, accessible only through initiation (Lansing, 1998; BeDuhn, 2000). Mani's claim, recorded in texts like the Kephalaia, to possess the complete and final Truth (Gardner, 1995), exemplifies this assertion of unique epistemic authority, functioning to delegitimize all external knowledge sources. Such radical privileging of non-falsifiable revelation represents a significant prefiguration of later anti-Enlightenment stances, establishing a model where ideologically derived certainty trumps critical inquiry. This exclusive "Truth" served not only to explain the cosmos but, crucially, to validate the group's radical definition of "Goodness" and legitimize the demanding path required.

Embodying this demanding ideology, validated by its exclusive Truth and redefining Goodness as radical separation, fell to the figure of the "Good Person" – the Manichaean Elect or Cathar Perfects. Virtue transformed into a performance of adherence, primarily via extreme asceticism (BeDuhn, 2000; Lansing, 1998). Practices like specific dietary laws, sexual renunciation, and rejection of worldly compromise functioned sociologically as potent boundary maintenance mechanisms and commitment mechanisms, reinforcing belief through costly signals (Stark, 1996). These performances also established the immense charismatic authority of the elites who successfully modelled this difficult path. Living this extreme "Goodness" necessitated navigating significant cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1957) between demanding beliefs and the external world, often strengthening adherents' resolve and dependence on the group's framework. This template of a virtuous vanguard achieving legitimacy through purity via rejecting the mainstream proved highly adaptable.

Such comprehensive redefinitions of Goodness and Truth inevitably provoked friction with dominant institutions, generating internal challenges to imperial cohesion. While rarely aiming for political overthrow, these groups fostered social withdrawal that undermined civic norms through their distinct practices. Adherence to purity codes or pacifist tenets could lead to refusal of military service, civic oaths, or participation in official cults – actions perceived by authorities not merely as heresy, but as social deviance threatening social order and imperial unity (MacMullen, 1984). The formation of resilient, often secretive, alternative communities with their own hierarchies (BeDuhn, 2000; Lansing, 1998) courted suspicion, potentially violating prohibitions against unauthorized associations (*collegia*) feared as fronts for subversion (Teja, 2006). Diocletian's edict against the Manichaeans, for instance, condemned them for disrupting Roman tranquility with foreign customs, revealing an imperial focus on social order alongside theological concerns. This reaction demonstrates how successfully living by an alternative Good/Truth could be seen as fundamentally subversive from within.

Manichaeism and related movements thus provide a crucial historical archetype, revealing the enduring blueprint for anti-system mobilization through semantic weaponization. The core strategy emerges from the *co-equal manipulation* of foundational concepts: redefining "Goodness" as radical purity and "Truth" as exclusive Gnosis. This dual capture enabled the construction of monolithic, exclusionary counter-realities embodied by the committed "Good Person." Crucially, adherence generated *internal friction* via distinct social practices, challenging the cohesion and authority of the surrounding order. Though targeting pre-liberal orthodoxy, the methods – seizing core concepts, imposing absolute definitions, creating 'us vs. them' identities, mobilizing through alternative structures, and clashing with established norms – established a potent template for challenging systems from within by constructing alternative realities founded on weaponized Goodness and Truth.

Section III. State-Sanctioned Ontologies: Totalitarianism's Assault on Liberal Modernity

Twentieth-century totalitarianism marked a catastrophic escalation in semantic weaponization, amplifying the logic observed in earlier movements through the unprecedented power of the modern state and mass communication. Regimes like Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union tragically converged in wielding state apparatuses to seize monopolistic control over defining fundamental "Truth"—be it pseudo-scientific racialism or deterministic historical laws—and ultimate "Goodness"—whether racial purity or unwavering class loyalty. This state-sanctioned manipulation, explicitly aimed at dismantling liberal modernity (Arendt, 1973), moved beyond sub-cultural challenges to wage total war on Enlightenment tenets, paradoxically using modern tools to enforce anti-Enlightenment ends. Creating potent political religions demanding absolute faith (Gentile, 2006), these states mandated new identities—the Aryan, the New Soviet Man—that fundamentally negated the liberal conception of the autonomous individual, forging conformity through pervasive control over reality and morality.

Nazi ideology, a violent repudiation of Enlightenment universalism (Bracher, 1970), centered its anti-liberal project on fabricating an "Aryan Truth"—a pseudo-scientific doctrine of Nordic superiority and Jewish threat—relentlessly propagated through state Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs) such as controlled media and education (Herf, 2006; Althusser, 1971). This narrative reimagined history as biological struggle, making fictitious race the sole determinant of value and culture (Kershaw, 2008). By presenting this as objective fact while aggressively dismissing contradictory evidence as degenerate, the regime created an epistemic closure impervious to reason, prioritizing its state-defined "Truth" as the only legitimate reality (Herf, 2006).

From this racialized "Truth" flowed the state's definition of "Goodness" as racial purity, embodied in the ideal "Good German" whose virtue lay not in universal ethics but in blood and submission to the Führer (Bracher, 1970). This became an instrument of racist protectionism, legally excluding Jews and others via measures like the Nuremberg Laws, stripping them of rights and humanity (Kershaw, 2008). Such policies exemplify a chilling form of biopolitics, where the state exercises sovereign power over life itself, reducing excluded populations to 'bare life' based on racial criteria (Agamben, 1998). Within the *Volksgemeinschaft*, conformity to Nazi values was rigidly enforced, demanding the erasure of individual autonomy and conscience, creating intense pressure in everyday life to align with the regime's imposed Goodness and Truth (Peukert, 1989).

Total narrative warfare was waged through *Gleichschaltung*, the systematic coordination or destruction of independent institutions, transforming society into a network of ISAs reinforcing Nazi ideology (Krueger, 2010; Bracher, 1970; Althusser, 1971). Pervasive propaganda, expertly utilizing modern media (Welch, 1993; Herf, 2006; Longerich, 2015), aimed to create a hermetically sealed reality. Central to this was a sophisticated deployment of manipulative emotional education. Curricula were redesigned to evoke strong emotional responses: history

lessons glorified Germanic heroes, biology emphasized racial purity, and physical education fostered militaristic camaraderie. Outside classrooms, youth organizations like the Hitler Youth employed powerful rituals, songs, and group activities to create intense emotional bonds and unwavering loyalty. Propaganda films like *Triumph of the Will* used aesthetics to bypass reason and evoke awe (The Holocaust Explained, n.d.). This strategy, as scholars like Helen Roche have analyzed, aimed at shaping the very emotional fabric of individuals—a form of biopolitical emotional engineering—to align them with the regime's racial "Goodness" and "Truth," deliberately suppressing critical thinking and fostering hatred towards designated enemies.

A parallel totalitarian project unfolded in the Soviet Union, similarly reliant on state control over "Truth" and "Goodness" to enforce conformity under Marxism-Leninism. The regime's legitimacy derived from its claim to possess the sole correct "Truth"—dialectical materialism and the laws of class struggle, interpreted exclusively by the Party (Kolakowski, 1978). This "Proletarian Truth," presented as scientific, justified dictatorship by promising an inevitable communist utopia while dismissing all competing ideas as "false consciousness." Profoundly anti-pluralist and anti-Enlightenment, it substituted critical inquiry with rigid dogma, asserting a monopoly on understanding reality.

Defining "Goodness" through unwavering loyalty to this Party "Truth" and selfless collectivism resulted in the archetype of the "New Soviet Man" (Fitzpatrick, 1999). This ideal demanded suppressing individualism and private aspirations in favour of contributing to the revolutionary project (Yurchak, 2006; Smolkin, 2018). Functioning as collectivist protectionism against perceived threats (Fitzpatrick, 1999), this state-mandated "Goodness" stood in direct opposition to liberal autonomy. State ISAs—the education system, youth organizations like the Komsomol, centrally controlled arts and media (Althusser, 1971)—were relentlessly employed to mold citizens into this collectivist ideal, shaping their identities and moral frameworks (Fitzpatrick, 1999; Yurchak, 2006).

Forging this "New Soviet Man" relied fundamentally on manipulative emotional education, arguably the cornerstone of the Soviet educational system. As you noted, schools and youth organizations used emotionally charged storytelling, songs, rituals, and heroic narratives glorifying the proletariat, Party leaders, and the Soviet state to instill deep loyalty and socialist values. Literature and arts, as scholars like Anna Toropova have examined in Soviet cinema, were mobilized to evoke emotions—pride, solidarity, sacrifice—aligned with the official "Goodness" and "Truth." This approach, potentially informed by Soviet psychological theories emphasizing socially constructed emotions (like those of Vygotsky and Luria), aimed to create an ideologically committed citizenry through emotional bonding and shared experience. However, like its Nazi counterpart, it achieved this at the cost of critical thinking and individual autonomy, prioritizing state-mandated conformity and raising profound ethical concerns about indoctrination.

The Communist Party's absolute monopoly over information, wielded through censorship and pervasive propaganda via state ISAs, constituted a vast engine of narrative warfare (Kenez, 1985). Its goal was to eliminate intellectual pluralism and ensure the population internalized the official narrative of reality (Truth) and virtue (Goodness), often demanding ritualistic displays of conformity enforced by fear (Fitzpatrick, 1999; Arendt, 1973).

Ultimately, despite differing ideologies, Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union converged in their totalitarian methods: leveraging state power to monopolize the definition of fundamental "Truth" and "Goodness." Both regimes demonstrated the terrifying capacity to attempt the complete subjugation of individual life and eradicate pluralism through semantic capture, institutional control via ISAs, and pervasive, manipulative emotional education (Arendt, 1973). This strategy enabled exclusion, enforced conformity, and justified unprecedented violence (Bracher, 1970; Kolakowski, 1978). Their profound rejection of the Enlightenment

inheritance—critical reason, individual autonomy, universal ethics—was facilitated by creating powerful political religions demanding total belief (Gentile, 2006). Though these regimes collapsed, their demonstration of state-sponsored reality control and emotional manipulation provides critical, enduring lessons about the tactics employed by anti-system forces aiming to dismantle open societies.

Section IV. Contemporary Battlegrounds: The Enduring Logic in New Arenas

While twentieth-century state totalitarianisms collapsed, the underlying logic of semantic weaponization persists with remarkable adaptability. Diverse contemporary anti-system movements continue to manipulate the co-primary anchors of "Goodness" and "Truth" to forge exclusionary realities, demonstrating continuity with historical precedents even as they leverage new technologies. Enabled by the rapid evolution of digital communication and often exploiting modern anxieties, groups ranging from high-demand cults to transnational terrorist organizations and extremist political factions deploy strategies reminiscent of earlier cults (Section 2) and totalitarian regimes (Section 3). They employ sophisticated techniques, including manipulative emotional education, to cultivate intense loyalty, construct closed worlds defended by narrative warfare, and mount internal challenges against the norms and institutions of liberal modernity, converging in their functional anti-pluralism and rejection of Enlightenment values like critical reason and universalism.

Concentrated examples of ideological manipulation are found within cults, or high-demand groups, operating within tightly controlled social environments (Singer, 2003). Within this milieu, "Truth" becomes untethered from external reality, defined exclusively by the group's doctrine or leader's pronouncements, requiring the systematic discrediting and isolation from outside information sources. Reality is actively reframed through specialized jargon and redefined terms that structure thought (Singer, 2003; Lalich, 2004), while critical thinking is suppressed via thought-stopping clichés. This engineered epistemic closure functions as cognitive protectionism, rejecting open inquiry and mirroring the Gnostic exclusivity seen historically. The leader's claim to unique, absolute Truth becomes the cornerstone of this alternative reality.

Parallel to this capture of Truth, the concept of the "Good Person" undergoes radical transformation into the archetype of the "True Believer" (Hoffer, 1951). Goodness is redefined solely through loyalty, obedience, and unquestioning conformity to the leader and group norms, measured by adopting specific lexicons, rituals, and detachment from the outside world (Singer, 2003). Critically, core Enlightenment values like individual autonomy and critical judgment are actively pathologized (Hassan, 1988; Singer, 2003), demanding fusion with the group identity and subservience to the leader's will. This abdication of autonomy, often framed as necessary for salvation or transformation, traps individuals within the system, where even universal virtues like kindness might be weaponized (Davies, 2024). The linguistic environment itself, replete with jargon and thought-stopping techniques, functions as narrative warfare, enforcing conformity and isolating members within the group's constructed reality (Singer, 2003; Lalich, 2004).

Transnational terrorist organizations, particularly religiously motivated groups like ISIS, demonstrate the weaponization of Goodness and Truth for violent political projects explicitly aimed against global pluralism and modernity. ISIS disseminated a highly selective, extremist interpretation of Islamic theology as the sole legitimate "Truth," demanding universal allegiance to its self-proclaimed Caliphate (Gerges, 2016; Berger and Morgan, 2015). This exclusive Truth framed reality in stark Manichean terms—a cosmic battle against "infidels" and "apostates"—while explicitly rejecting religious/political pluralism and framing Western modernity as corrupt (cf. Qutb, 1964). This represented a direct anti-Enlightenment stance seeking to impose a single, absolute political-theological order (Gerges, 2016).

Complementing this captured Truth, the ideal "Good Person" within ISIS ideology was the *mujahid*, embodying redefined "Goodness" through total commitment to the Caliphate's violent jihad (Gerges, 2016). This demanded unwavering loyalty, migration (*hijrah*), and participation in violence against dehumanized enemies (Berger and Morgan, 2015), justifying atrocities through extreme exclusion (Gerges, 2016). Crucially, the cultivation of this ideal relied heavily on manipulative emotional education, drawing parallels to the methods perfected by totalitarian states (Section 3). Recruitment narratives exploited psychological needs (duty, grievance, glory, belonging) (Gerges, 2016; Bloom, 2005). Indoctrination, particularly of youth like the "Cubs of the Caliphate" (Mohammed, 2023), involved intense emotional bonding within training camps, glorification of martyrdom and violence through sophisticated propaganda, constant dehumanization of the enemy to bypass empathy, and the creation of a siege mentality. This systematic conditioning aimed to bypass critical thought and forge fighters emotionally committed to the group's violent interpretation of Goodness and Truth, mirroring the goals, if not the scale, of state-run indoctrination programs (Sageman, 2008).

Leveraging modern digital technologies, ISIS waged sophisticated narrative warfare globally. High-production videos, online magazines like *Dabiq*, and social media campaigns disseminated their exclusive Truth and the appeal of the mujahid ideal (Berger and Morgan, 2015; Gerstel, 2017). This propaganda employed utopian depictions, graphic dehumanization, exploitation of grievances, and emotionally charged narratives of heroism and martyrdom (Gerges, 2016). Such globalized narrative warfare aimed to bypass traditional media, recruit internationally, instill fear, and legitimize the group's violent anti-pluralist project, amplified through digital networks which can foster ideological echo chambers (Berger and Morgan, 2015; Benkler, Faris, & Roberts, 2018).

Contemporary political extremism, including populism and the alt-right, demonstrates the continued relevance of manipulating Goodness and Truth against liberal democracy. Populist movements often construct an anti-pluralist dichotomy between "the pure people" (Good) and "the corrupt elite" (Evil), with leaders claiming sole authentic representation (Müller, 2016; Mudde and Kaltwasser, 2013). "Truth" is redefined away from evidence or expertise towards intuitive "common sense," positioning itself against established institutions like science and media, often labelled "fake news" (Müller, 2016; Wuttke et al., 2024). This anti-Enlightenment stance prioritizes emotional appeals over complex analysis (Steuter and Wills, 2010; Forchtner and Kølvraa, 2021). The implicit "Good Person" belongs to the authentic "people," often defined along nativist lines and unified by resentment, functioning as cultural protectionism against liberal cosmopolitanism (Müller, 2016).

Explicitly grounding its ideology in white identity politics, the alt-right employs populist techniques but with a fundamentally racialized definition of both Truth and Goodness (Hawley, 2017). Its "Truth" centers on white grievance, perceived threats from multiculturalism, and conspiracy theories (Hawley, 2017). The "Good Person" is unambiguously the white individual aligned with this ethno-nationalist cause, representing a dangerous racist anti-pluralism aimed at dismantling multicultural modernity (Hawley, 2017; Zúquete, 2017). This direct assault on Enlightenment universalism mirrors the biological determinism of Nazism.

Both populism and the alt-right heavily utilize online platforms for narrative warfare, often creating insular echo chambers (Benkler, Faris, & Roberts, 2018). Tactics like coded language ("dog whistles") (Haney López, 2014), ironic memes ("lulz") (Nagle, 2017; Marwick and Lewis, 2017), disinformation, trolling, and online harassment propagate extremist ideas while maintaining plausible deniability (Marwick and Lewis, 2017). These methods bypass rational argumentation, aiming to normalize hateful rhetoric, activate resentments, build online communities based on shared antagonism, and delegitimize opponents. This constitutes anti-Enlightenment communication prioritizing manipulation, potentially inciting real-world violence through stochastic terrorism, where disseminating hateful ideologies inspires attacks without direct orders (Marwick and Lewis, 2017).

These diverse contemporary manifestations reveal the persistent utility of weaponizing "Truth" and "Goodness." They demonstrate continuity in the anti-pluralist function (Müller, 2016; Hawley, 2017; Singer, 2003), increasingly targeting liberal modernity and Enlightenment values. Modern technologies amplify narrative warfare (Berger and Morgan, 2015; Marwick and Lewis, 2017), but the core tactic remains creating exclusionary identities and realities via semantic manipulation. A striking convergence lies in their shared assault on established knowledge systems, aiming to create an epistemic vacuum filled by their own absolute Truths (Müller, 2016; Hawley, 2017), facilitated by digital tools that can paradoxically use connection to foster isolation.

Section V. The Arsenal of Assertion: Deconstructing Linguistic Weaponry

Understanding the mechanisms sustaining the anti-system ideologies explored previously requires a micro-level analysis of their shared linguistic and rhetorical arsenal. The construction of exclusionary realities and the mobilization of followers depend crucially on specific techniques deliberately deployed to manipulate core concepts of "Goodness" and "Truth." These techniques, far from being neutral conveyors of information, function as strategic tools in narrative warfare, actively shaping perception, structuring thought, and evoking powerful emotions to bypass rational scrutiny and enforce conformity (Fairclough, 1995; Wodak & Meyer, 2009). This section deconstructs key components of this arsenal, revealing how language itself becomes instrumentalized to achieve cognitive capture, often through pervasive emotional manipulation, thereby facilitating anti-pluralist agendas and undermining the foundations of open, Enlightenment-based societies.

Fundamental to this process is the deliberate subversion of existing language via semantic capture, achieved through radical redefinition and the cultivation of specialized jargon. Culturally resonant words like "Truth," "Goodness," "Freedom," or "Justice" are systematically emptied of conventional meaning and refilled with definitions aligning exclusively with the group's ideology (Stanley, 2015). "Freedom," for instance, might undergo semantic hijacking to mean not individual autonomy but liberation only through submission, as Orwell (1949) famously depicted. This fundamentally alters adherents' conceptual landscape, making alternatives difficult even to articulate (Orwell, 1949; Singer, 2003). The creation of unique jargon further reinforces group identity, fosters a sense of privileged knowledge, cloaks potentially unethical practices in euphemisms, and critically restricts the vocabulary for dissent (Singer, 2003; Lalich, 2004). Such linguistic control, exploiting the deep link between language and cognition (Van Dijk, 1995), can even possess performative force, where certain utterances, like a leader’s declaration, function not merely to describe but to *create* the group’s reality or Truth (cf. Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969).

Complementing redefinition is the pervasive deployment of affective weaponry through loaded language and structured emotional appeals. Words and phrases saturated with strong positive or negative connotations are used to bypass rational deliberation, triggering immediate emotional responses like fear, anger, loyalty, or disgust (Stanley, 2015; Westen, 2007). Complex issues are deliberately flattened into stark, Manichean binaries (us/them, good/evil, pure/corrupt) insulating the ideology from nuance (Hoffer, 1951; Stanley, 2015). This constant framing in emotionally charged terms fosters intense in-group solidarity and out-group hostility (Tajfel and Turner, 1979), making adherents susceptible to exclusionary and dehumanizing attitudes. Specific linguistic choices—intensifiers, absolutist claims, pathos-driven vocabulary targeting fear or pride—are key correlates of this emotional manipulation, aiming to short-circuit critical assessment in favour of visceral reaction (Westen, 2007). Underlying conceptual metaphors also shape emotional responses, framing ideological struggle as WAR, outsiders as DISEASE, or purity as literal GOODNESS, thereby structuring

understanding in ways that promote hostility or exclusion (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980; Musolff, 2004).

These linguistic tools are embedded within larger, carefully constructed narrative frames, which strategically select, emphasize, and arrange information to present the group's specific worldview—its particular configuration of Goodness and Truth—as coherent and inevitable (Snow and Benford, 1988; Van Dijk, 1995). Frame Analysis reveals how anti-system ideologies excel at crafting compelling stories around potent archetypes: the virtuous victims, the heroic struggle, the promised utopia, the unique insight of the leader (Entman, 1993; Hoffer, 1951). These narratives resonate deeply with psychological needs for meaning and belonging, especially during uncertainty (Hoffer, 1951). Functioning as strategic narrative warfare, they exhibit 'red flag' characteristics—totalizing scope, Manichean divisions, resistance to contradiction (Hoffer, 1951; Stanley, 2015). The narrative structure itself often facilitates emotional manipulation, building tension, identifying villains, and offering emotionally satisfying resolutions aligned with the ideology, actively combating the complexity inherent in scientific or liberal discourse.

Maintaining the integrity of this constructed reality requires specific techniques to induce cognitive and moral closure. Thought-stopping clichés ("Trust the plan," "Fake news") act as cognitive roadblocks, instantly shutting down critical questioning or doubt that might challenge the imposed Goodness or Truth (Singer, 2003; Hassan, 1988). This undermines independent inquiry and enforces conformity. More dangerously, linguistic dehumanization portrays out-groups as vermin, diseases, or existential threats (Herf, 2006), neutralizing empathy and dismantling universalist ethics to make violence permissible or even virtuous within the group's inverted moral logic (Bandura, 1999). Such language functions performatively, enacting social exclusion (cf. Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969). Furthermore, ideologies manipulate perceived authority (ethos), elevating their own leaders or doctrines while systematically attacking the credibility of external sources like science, journalism, or liberal institutions (Stanley, 2015; Walton, 2007), thereby fostering epistemic dependency.

Interwoven within broader propaganda strategies (Jowett and O'Donnell, 2018), these linguistic mechanisms exploit cognitive biases (Kahneman, 2011; Kunda, 1990) and unmet psychosocial needs (Hoffer, 1951). A Critical Discourse Analysis perspective reveals how these linguistic practices actively construct social reality, shape identities, and reinforce power relations within the group (Fairclough, 1995; Foucault, 1972; Wodak & Meyer, 2009), creating self-sealing systems insulated from critique. Controlling the language—its definitions, connotations, metaphors, and narrative frames—becomes a primary means of controlling adherents' conceptual world, demonstrating the profound connection between language, power, emotion, and the construction of both perceived reality (Truth) and moral order (Goodness). Recognizing these specific tools is the crucial first step toward deconstructing their manipulative effects.

Section VI. Convergent Stratagems: Comparative Logics of Exclusion

Building upon the analysis of the linguistic arsenal employed in semantic weaponization, this section undertakes a comparative synthesis, examining how the overarching strategy of manipulating "Goodness" and "Truth" has been deployed with remarkable functional consistency across diverse historical and ideological terrains. Adopting a comparative historical perspective allows us to identify recurring patterns and shared causal mechanisms, alongside significant points of divergence, revealing the enduring structure and adaptive evolution of this anti-pluralist logic (cf. Mahoney and Rueschemeyer, 2003; Tilly, 1984). From the metaphysical battles of ancient dualists to the state-sponsored realities of twentieth-century totalitarianisms and the digitally amplified narratives of contemporary extremist movements,

a core dynamic prevails: the establishment of exclusionary realities through the control of foundational concepts.

Despite dramatic differences in specific doctrines—cosmic warfare, racial pseudo-science, dialectical materialism, cultic pronouncements, populist slogans—the manipulation of "Truth" consistently serves the convergent function of establishing epistemic closure. In every case examined, from Manichaeism (BeDuhn, 2000) to the alt-right (Hawley, 2017), redefining Truth creates a bounded, internally validated reality accessible only to adherents, thereby delegitimizing external perspectives, competing knowledge systems (including science and reason), and the very notion of cognitive pluralism (Stanley, 2015). This function remains constant whether Truth is presented as secret Gnosis, immutable biological fact, infallible historical law, or a leader's divine insight.

Similarly, redefining "Goodness" consistently functions to construct and police the boundaries of an exclusive in-group, providing the moral justification for anti-pluralist exclusion. Virtue becomes contingent solely upon adherence to the group's unique Truth and conformity to its specific norms, rather than upon universal ethics or individual conscience (Hoffer, 1951). While the *basis* for this exclusionary Goodness evolves—from the spiritual purity of the Manichaean Elect achieved through asceticism (Lansing, 1998; BeDuhn, 2000), to the pseudo-biological "Aryan blood" defining the Nazi *Volksgemeinschaft* (Bracher, 1970), the "proletarian consciousness" of the Soviet system (Kolakowski, 1978), the absolute leader-devotion in cults (Singer, 2003), the sectarian purity demanded by ISIS (Gerges, 2016), or the nativist/racial identity politics of contemporary populism/alt-right (Müller, 2016; Hawley, 2017)—its *function* remains identical: to homogenize the 'us', demonize the 'them', and enforce ideological conformity through diverse mechanisms of boundary policing. The persistence of these patterns across time suggests the existence of powerful ideological templates, where successful strategies for social closure used by earlier groups potentially inform later movements.

A striking convergence also appears in the deployment of manipulative emotional education as a core tactic for enforcing loyalty and conformity to the group's redefined Goodness and Truth. While the scale and technology differ vastly, the underlying principle echoes from the intense indoctrination and ritualistic reinforcement within totalitarian state apparatuses (Section 3) to the radicalization processes within contemporary terrorist groups or high-demand cults (Section 4). Both historical state systems (Nazi youth groups, Soviet Pioneers) and modern extremist factions (ISIS training camps) utilize techniques designed to foster intense emotional bonding, cultivate hatred towards out-groups, glorify sacrifice or violence aligned with the ideology's 'Goodness', and systematically suppress critical thinking through emotionally charged narratives and experiences. This reliance on bypassing reason via emotional manipulation emerges as a consistent feature in consolidating adherence to closed ideological systems.

Furthermore, the inherent anti-system stance adapts its primary target over time while retaining its core logic. Early dualists, operating pre-liberal contexts, primarily challenged religious orthodoxy and imperial authority structures, though their rejection of worldly knowledge contained seeds of anti-Enlightenment thought (Lansing, 1998; BeDuhn, 2000). With modernity, the target sharpens into a direct assault on the legacy of the Enlightenment and liberal modernity itself. Twentieth-century totalitarian regimes explicitly attacked individual rights, democratic governance, scientific rationalism, and universalist ethics (Arendt, 1973; Bracher, 1970; Kolakowski, 1978; Linz, 2000). Contemporary movements—cults demanding abdication of autonomy (Singer, 2003), ISIS rejecting secular modernity (Gerges, 2016), populism attacking expertise (Müller, 2016), the alt-right combatting universalism (Hawley, 2017)—continue this anti-Enlightenment/anti-liberal trajectory, demonstrating the strategy's adaptation to confront the prevailing philosophical and political framework of open societies.

Finally, the narrative warfare tactics used to propagate these alternative realities show both evolution and consistency. While the medium shifts—from oral transmission, sacred texts, and exemplary lives in early movements (Lansing, 1998; BeDuhn, 2000; Gardner, 1995), to state-controlled mass media saturation in totalitarianism (Kenez, 1985; Herf, 2006; Welch, 1993; cf. Skocpol, 1979 on state capacity), to digitally amplified, networked communication in contemporary groups (Berger & Morgan, 2015; Marwick & Lewis, 2017)—the core characteristics of the narratives often persist. They remain typically totalizing, Manichean, emotionally driven, and hostile to critique or factual verification (Hoffer, 1951; Stanley, 2015). The enduring goal remains ideological capture and the construction of a closed world impervious to complexity. This comparative view thus reveals semantic weaponization not as isolated events, but as an enduring structural logic inherent in anti-system ideologies, constantly adapting its content and techniques while aiming consistently to dismantle pluralistic realities through the control of foundational concepts like Goodness and Truth.

Section VII. Epistemic and Ethical Corrosions: The Assault on Shared Worlds

The systematic manipulation of "Goodness" and "Truth," enacted through the linguistic and emotional weaponry wielded by anti-system ideologies, precipitates profound and deeply intertwined philosophical, ethical, and societal consequences. This strategy transcends mere political contestation; it constitutes a fundamental assault on the very processes of knowing and moral reasoning. Facilitated by techniques like manipulative emotional education and semantic distortion, it corrodes individual autonomy, erodes social trust, and attacks the possibility of the shared understanding essential for navigating complex realities. Analyzing these outcomes reveals the depth of the damage inflicted, particularly upon the Enlightenment values and liberal principles underpinning open societies, exposing the destructive resolution of the paradox where openness itself is exploited to undermine openness.

Waging war on the very possibility of knowledge as understood within Enlightenment and scientific traditions becomes central when ideologies impose a monolithic, exclusive "Truth"—be it gnosis, racial destiny, or party dogma (Popper, 1959). Open inquiry, critical thinking, skepticism, and the acceptance of provisionality are actively suppressed, redefined as dangerous deviations (Stanley, 2015). Adherence to the predetermined ideological "Truth" becomes the sole criterion for validity, overriding external evidence or logical consistency. Cognitive biases like motivated reasoning and confirmation bias are actively encouraged to reinforce belief (Kunda, 1990; Kahneman, 2011; Hoffer, 1951; Jost et al., 2003). Furthermore, the deployment of manipulative emotional education directly contributes to this epistemic corrosion by design; by bypassing rational faculties and fostering reliance on dictated dogma, it stunts the development of critical thinking necessary to evaluate truth claims independently. This systematic cultivation of epistemic closure and dependency constitutes a form of epistemic violence (Fricker, 2007), attacking the fundamental human capacity for reasoned inquiry and collaborative understanding.

Parallel to the distortion of Truth runs the perversion of Goodness, inflicting severe ethical corrosion. Within these closed ideological systems, "Goodness" is detached from universal ethical principles like empathy, reciprocity, or individual rights (cf. Hume in Cohon, 2018; Kant, 1785) and becomes entirely instrumentalized. Being a "Good Person" is defined narrowly by conformity, loyalty, and effectiveness in advancing the group's cause (Hoffer, 1951). Actions widely considered immoral—deception, coercion, hatred, violence—can become ethically mandated if deemed necessary to defend the group's "Truth" or defeat its enemies (Arendt, 1973). This moral inversion is significantly enabled by manipulative emotional education, which inhibits empathy towards out-groups and cultivates tribal morality. It fuels moral disengagement (Bandura, 1999), allowing adherents, through linguistic dehumanization and emotionally charged justifications, to commit harmful acts without self-

censure while believing they uphold the ideology's "Goodness." This results in a particularistic, exclusionary morality justifying cruelty and standing in stark opposition to Enlightenment ethics, often requiring significant self-deception to maintain (Martin, n.d. - IEP).

The combined effect of semantic control, information manipulation, emotional coercion, and demands for conformity systematically erodes individual autonomy and critical thinking—core liberal and Enlightenment values (Mill, 1859). Members are actively discouraged from exercising independent judgment or questioning premises (Singer, 2003; Hassan, 1988), leading critical faculties to atrophy. Emotional manipulation fosters dependency and discourages authentic self-reflection, potentially leading to psychological harms associated with indoctrination like trauma or learned helplessness. The individual's sense of self can become submerged within the collective (Hoffer, 1951), making dissent feel like betrayal. This assault on autonomy is not incidental but essential for maintaining the anti-pluralist homogeneity these ideologies require, leaving individuals susceptible to further control (Singer, 2003).

When such ideologies gain societal traction, the consequences escalate to profound social and political fragmentation. The propagation of mutually exclusive "Truths" and definitions of "Good People" fuels polarization (Sunstein, 2018) and erodes the foundations of reasoned public discourse. The pervasive 'us vs. them' narrative warfare, amplified by linguistic and emotional manipulation, fosters intergroup hostility and dehumanization (Wodak, 2015), corroding the social trust essential for cooperative solutions (Putnam, 2000; Fukuyama, 1995; Levi and Stoker, 2000). This assault on shared epistemic and ethical ground destroys the conditions necessary for achieving mutual understanding through rational deliberation, effectively dismantling the public sphere as envisioned by theorists like Habermas (1984, 1987). Ultimately, this erosion of shared reality, mutual respect, and norms of truthfulness poses an existential threat to pluralistic democracy, contributing significantly to the phenomenon of democratic backsliding observed globally (Medeiros et al., 2024; Müller, 2016; Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018).

In essence, the manipulation of "Truth" and "Goodness" inflicts deep, intertwined epistemic and ethical damage, striking at the core principles of Enlightenment modernity and liberal society. It attacks the capacity for rational thought, universal ethical deliberation, individual autonomy, and the shared understanding required for a functioning pluralistic world. Recognizing this damage—from the individual psychological level to the broad societal and political spheres—underscores the high stakes involved in identifying and resisting these manipulative strategies that weaponize our fundamental tools for apprehending reality and navigating moral life.

Section VIII. Conclusion: Recognizing the Pattern, Resisting the Logic

This inquiry has traced a persistent and adaptable strategy across diverse historical and ideological landscapes: the semantic weaponization of the foundational concepts of "Goodness" and "Truth." From the esoteric counter-realities of ancient dualists challenging orthodox empires to the technologically amplified propaganda of contemporary extremists assailing liberal norms, anti-system movements consistently target these co-primary anchors to forge exclusionary communities and undermine established orders. The analysis revealed how semantic capture, pervasive linguistic distortion, and crucially, techniques of manipulative emotional education, function as core mechanisms in this process. This recurring pattern, evolving from challenges against pre-liberal orthodoxy to direct assaults on Enlightenment modernity and liberalism, demonstrates an enduring structural logic aimed at replacing complexity, provisionality, and pluralism with absolute certainty and monolithic conformity, inflicting profound epistemic and ethical damage along the way (Stanley, 2015; Arendt, 1973).

The ultimate and most alarming manifestation of this strategy occurs when anti-system movements successfully seize state power and institutionalize their control over reality and morality. This represents the destructive *resolution* of the central paradox explored herein: where the openness and provisionality of Enlightenment thought created vulnerabilities, these regimes eliminate that vulnerability by eradicating ambiguity through total control. The educational system, in particular, becomes a primary vehicle within their state-building project, repurposed not for critical inquiry but for consolidating power and embedding the regime's specific, exclusionary definitions of Goodness and Truth into the very fabric of society, aiming to reproduce loyal subjects generation after generation.

The Soviet Union stands as a paramount example. Building upon totalitarian methods, the state constructed an educational apparatus explicitly designed to mold the "New Soviet Man" (Fitzpatrick, 1999). Marxist-Leninist ideology was enshrined as scientific "Truth"—a semantic construct enforced through pedagogy that actively discouraged empirical questioning, exemplified by the ideological weight given to the term *Pravda* itself. Socialist collectivism and Party loyalty became ultimate "Goodness." Emotional education formed the cornerstone, utilizing youth organizations, rituals, heroic narratives, and peer pressure—leveraging aspirational appeals alongside social fears of exclusion or being labelled an enemy—to instill devotion and suppress critical inquiry, producing significant epistemic corrosion (Kenez, 1985). The goal was complete cognitive and affective alignment, creating a path dependency where these ingrained pedagogical attitudes potentially influenced post-Soviet educational cultures, hindering reform (Eklof, Holmes, & Kaplan, 2005 [*User verification/selection needed*]; Silova, 2010 [*User verification/selection needed*]).

Similar patterns of institutionalized semantic and emotional control through education emerged elsewhere. In post-revolutionary Iran, the theocratic regime repurposed education to instill its specific interpretation of Shi'a Islamic "Truth" and revolutionary "Goodness," framing resistance through charged terms like "Great Satan." Curricula emphasize religious doctrine and revolutionary history, using emotionally laden ceremonies (e.g., Ashura commemorations), martyrdom narratives, and strict moral codes to cultivate loyalty, often at significant psychological cost as intense emotional and moral pressures can erode autonomy (Mehran, 2003 [*User verification/selection needed*]; Sedgwick, 2019 [*User verification/selection needed*]). This system exemplifies ethical corrosion on a societal scale, prioritizing ideological purity and potentially fostering intolerance by denying the legitimacy of alternative beliefs or ways of life.

Perhaps the most extreme contemporary case is North Korea, where the educational system underpins the state's *Juche* ideology ("Truth") and the absolute, quasi-religious devotion to the Kim dynasty ("Goodness"). The state utilizes pervasive personality cult rituals, manipulative narratives emphasizing external threats while demanding unquestioning loyalty (often using specific honorifics and enemy-demonizing language), and total information control from infancy (Lankov, 2013 [*User verification/selection needed*]). This system, designed to eliminate critical thinking capacity and enforce complete emotional alignment, showcases the totalizing potential of state-controlled emotional education combined with absolute semantic capture, resulting in profound epistemic and ethical isolation (Myers, 2010 [*User verification/selection needed*]).

These cases starkly illustrate how regimes originating in anti-system ideologies systematically embed their worldview by controlling the very processes—especially education—through which citizens learn to understand reality (Truth) and morality (Goodness). By weaponizing education, instrumentalizing learning for ideological transmission fueled by emotional manipulation, and actively suppressing critical thinking faculties, they seek to perpetuate their power by controlling the minds and hearts of future generations, often fostering the intolerance and potential for moral disengagement analyzed previously (Section 7). Recognizing this pattern of institutionalization is crucial for understanding the deep-rooted challenges faced by

societies attempting to transition away from such legacies and the profound consequences when semantic capture becomes state policy. Cultivating societal resilience against such manipulation therefore requires fostering not only critical thinking and media literacy but also emotional literacy—the capacity to recognize and navigate manipulative appeals. It demands a steadfast commitment to protecting institutional autonomy, especially in education, media, and science, and upholding norms of reasoned, evidence-based public discourse (cf. Habermas, 1984, 1987; Snyder, 2017; Pomerantsev, 2019). Ultimately, safeguarding open and humane societies demands constant vigilance in protecting the integrity of language itself (Orwell, 1949) and upholding a commitment to both rigorous inquiry ("Truth") and compassionate, universalist ethical deliberation ("Goodness") against those who seek to distort them for divisive and destructive ends (Appiah, 2006; Arendt, 1973).

References List:

Agamben, G. (1998) Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life. Translated by D. Heller-Roazen. Stanford University Press.

Appiah, K. A. (2006) Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers. W. W. Norton & Company.

Arendt, H. (1973) The Origins of Totalitarianism. New edn. Harvest Books.

Bandura, A. (1999) 'Moral Disengagement in the Perpetration of Inhumanities'. Personality and Social Psychology Review, 3(3), pp. 193–209.

BeDuhn, J. D. (2000) The Manichaean Body: In Discipline and Ritual. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Benkler, Y., Faris, R., & Roberts, H. (2018) Network Propaganda: Manipulation, Disinformation, and Radicalization in American Politics. Oxford University Press.

Berger, J.M. and Morgan, J. (2015) ISIS: The State of Terror. Ecco.

Bracher, K. D. (1970) The German Dictatorship: The Origins, Structure, and Effects of National Socialism. Translated by J. Steinberg. Praeger.

Brown, P. (1967) Augustine of Hippo: A Biography. University of California Press.

Cohon, R. (2018) 'Hume's Moral Philosophy'. The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2018 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.).

Das, A., Mishra, S., Bhattacharyya, P. and Chakrabarty, A. (2024) PropaInsight: Toward Deeper Understanding of Propaganda in Terms of Techniques, Appeals, and Intent. arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.18997.

Davies, M. (2024) 'The cult of kindness'. UnHerd, 10 September.

Dimikopoulos, G., Gkotsis, G., Liakata, M. and Zubiaga, A. (2021) 'Detecting Propaganda Techniques in Memes'. In Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers). Online: Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 6747–6759.

Eklof, B. (1986) Russian Peasant Schools: Officialdom, Village Culture, and Popular Pedagogy, 1861-1914. University of California Press.

Entman, R. M. (1993) 'Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm'. Journal of Communication, 43(4), pp. 51–58.

Fairclough, N. (1995) Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language. Longman.

Fallis, D. (2004) 'On the Epistemological Status of Propaganda'. Theoria, 69(1-2), pp. 16-40.

Festinger, L. (1957) A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance. Stanford University Press.

Fitzpatrick, S. (1999) Everyday Stalinism: Ordinary Life in Extraordinary Times: Soviet Russia in the 1930s. Oxford University Press.

Forchtner, B. and Kølvraa, C. (2021) 'Populism as an act of storytelling: analyzing the climate change narratives of Donald Trump and Greta Thunberg as populist truth-tellers'. Environmental Politics, 30(7), pp. 1143-1162.

Foucault, M. (1972) The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language. Translated by A. M. Sheridan Smith. Pantheon Books.

Fricker, M. (2007) Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing. Oxford University Press.

Fukuyama, F. (1995) Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity. Free Press.

Gardner, I. (ed. and trans.) (1995) The Kephalaia of the Teacher: The Edited Coptic Manichaean Texts in Translation with Commentary. Brill.

Gentile, E. (2006) Politics as Religion. Translated by G. Staunton. Princeton University Press.

Gerges, F. A. (2016) ISIS: A History. Princeton University Press.

Gerstel, D. (2017) 'ISIS and Innovative Propaganda Confronting Extremism in the Digital Age'. Swarthmore International Relations Journal, 1(1), Article 4.

Greene, J. D. and Haidt, J. (2002) 'How (and where) does moral judgment work?'. Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 6(12), pp. 517–523.

Habermas, J. (1984, 1987) The Theory of Communicative Action, Volumes 1 & 2. Translated by T. McCarthy. Beacon Press.

Haidt, J. and Joseph, C. (2004) 'Intuitive ethics: how innately prepared intuitions generate culturally variable virtues'. Daedalus, 133(4), pp. 55–66.

Haney López, I. (2014) Dog Whistle Politics: How Coded Racial Appeals Have Reinvented Racism and Wrecked the Middle Class. Oxford University Press.

Hassan, S. (1988) Combatting Cult Mind Control. Park Street Press.

Hawley, G. (2017) Making Sense of the Alt-Right. Columbia University Press.

Herf, J. (2006) The Jewish Enemy: Nazi Propaganda during World War II and the Holocaust. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Hoffer, E. (1951) The True Believer: Thoughts on the Nature of Mass Movements. Harper & Row.

Holmes, L. E., Grant, N., & Johnson, W. H. E. (1977) 'Educational reform and social change in the Soviet Union'. Comparative Education, 13(3), pp. 183-194.

Jost, J. T., Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A. W. and Sulloway, F. J. (2003) 'Political Conservatism as Motivated Social Cognition'. Psychological Bulletin, 129(3), pp. 339–375.

Jowett, G. S. and O'Donnell, V. (2018) Propaganda & Persuasion. 7th edn. SAGE Publications.

Kahneman, D. (2011) Thinking, Fast and Slow. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Kant, I. (1785) Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. (Various translations and editions available).

Kenez, P. (1985) The Birth of the Propaganda State: Soviet Methods of Mass Mobilization, 1917-1929. Cambridge University Press.

Kershaw, I. (2008) Hitler: A Biography. W. W. Norton & Company.

Kolakowski, L. (1978) Main Currents of Marxism: Its Rise, Growth, and Dissolution. Translated by P. S. Falla. 3 vols. Oxford University Press.

Krueger, L. K. (2010) Hitler's "Utopia": An Analysis of Gleichschaltung in the Third Reich. The Expositor. Trinity University.

Kruglanski, A. W. and Webster, D. M. (1996) 'Motivated Closing of the Mind: "Seizing" and "Freezing"'. Psychological Review, 103(2), pp. 263–283.

Kunda, Z. (1990) 'The Case for Motivated Reasoning'. Psychological Bulletin, 108(3), pp. 480–498.

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980) Metaphors We Live By. University of Chicago Press.

Lalich, J. (2004) Bounded Choice: True Believers and Charismatic Cults. University of California Press.

Lankov, A. N. (2013) The Real North Korea: Life and Politics in the Failed Stalinist Utopia. Oxford University Press.

Lansing, C. (1998) Power & Purity: Cathar Heresy in Medieval Italy. Oxford University Press.

Levi, M. and Stoker, L. (2000) 'Political Trust and Trustworthiness'. Annual Review of Political Science, 3, pp. 475–507.

Levitsky, S., & Ziblatt, D. (2018) How Democracies Die. Crown Publishing.

Linz, J. J. (2000) Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes. Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Longerich, P. (2015) Goebbels: A Biography. Translated by A. Bance, J. Clark and T. Spencer. Random House.

MacMullen, R. (1984) Christianizing the Roman Empire: (A.D. 100-400). Yale University Press.

Mahoney, J. and Rueschemeyer, D. (eds.) (2003) Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences. Cambridge University Press.

Martin, M.W. (n.d.) 'Ethics and Self-Deception'. Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy.

Marwick, A. E. and Lewis, R. (2017) Media manipulation and disinformation online. Data & Society Research Institute.

Medeiros, M., Axelrod, R., Dayan, M., et al. (2024) 'Rumors, Propaganda, and Conspiracies: New Insights on the Ideological Dimensions of Democratic Backsliding and Autocratization'. Perspectives on Politics, Published online by Cambridge University Press, pp. 1–18.

Mehran, G. (2003) 'The Paradox of Tradition and Modernity in Female Education in the Islamic Republic of Iran'. Comparative Education Review, 47(3), pp. 269-286.

Mill, J. S. (1859) On Liberty. (Various editions available).

Mohammed, G. (2023) The Forever War: The Doctrine and Legacy of ISIS Child Soldiers. Program on Extremism, The George Washington University.

Mudde, C. and Kaltwasser, C. R. (2013) 'Exclusionary vs. Inclusionary Populism: Comparing Contemporary Europe and Latin America'. Government and Opposition, 48(2), pp. 147–174.

Müller, J.-W. (2016) What Is Populism?. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Myers, B. R. (2010) The Cleanest Race: How North Koreans See Themselves and Why It Matters. Melville House.

Nagle, A. (2017) Kill All Normies: Online Culture Wars from 4chan and Tumblr to Trump and the Alt-Right. Zero Books.

Obolensky, D. (1948) The Bogomils: A Study in Balkan Neo-Manichaeism. Cambridge University Press.

Orwell, G. (1949) Nineteen Eighty-Four. Secker & Warburg.

Peukert, D. J. K. (1989) Inside Nazi Germany: Conformity, Opposition, and Racism in Everyday Life. Translated by R. Deveson. Yale University Press.

Pomerantsev, P. (2019) This Is Not Propaganda: Adventures in the War Against Reality. PublicAffairs.

Popper, K. (1959) The Logic of Scientific Discovery. Hutchinson.

Putnam, R. D. (2000) Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community. Simon & Schuster.

Sageman, M. (2008) Leaderless Jihad: Terror Networks in the Twenty-First Century. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Scott, J. C. (1990) Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts. Yale University Press.

Sedgwick, M. (2019) Islam & Muslims in the Mind of the West: A Study of Discourse & Representation. Routledge.

Siegel, D. J. (2020) The Developing Mind: How Relationships and the Brain Shape Who We Become. 3rd edn. Guilford Press.

Silova, I. (ed.) (2010) Post-Socialism is Not Dead: (Re)Reading the Global in Comparative Education. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Singer, M. T. with Lalich, J. (2003) Cults in Our Midst: The Continuing Fight Against Their Hidden Menace. Revised edn. Jossey-Bass.

Skocpol, T. (1979) States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia, and China. Cambridge University Press.

Smolkin, V. (2018) A Sacred Space Is Never Empty: A History of Soviet Atheism. Princeton University Press.

Snow, D. A. and Benford, R. D. (1988) 'Ideology, Frame Resonance, and Participant Mobilization'. International Social Movement Research, 1, 1 pp. 197–217.

Snyder, T. (2017) On Tyranny: Twenty Lessons from the Twentieth Century. Tim Duggan Books.

Stanley, J. (2015) How Propaganda Works. Princeton University Press.

Stark, R. (1996) The Rise of Christianity: How the Obscure, Marginal Jesus Movement Became the Dominant Religious Force in the Western World in a Few Centuries. Princeton University Press.

Steuter, E. and Wills, D. (2010) '"We Are Right, They Are Wrong": The Antagonistic Relationship Between Populism and Discourses of (Un)truthfulness'. Communication, Politics & Culture, 43(1), pp. 54-75.

Sunstein, C. R. (2018) #Republic: Divided Democracy in the Age of Social Media. Princeton University Press.

Tajfel, H. and Turner, J. C. (1979) 'An integrative theory of intergroup conflict'. In Austin, W. G. and Worchel, S. (eds) The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations. Brooks/Cole, pp. 33–47.

Teja, R. (2006) 'Illicit collegia and the Christians'. In Mitchell, S. and Greatrex, G. (eds) Ethnicity and Culture in Late Antiquity. Classical Press of Wales, pp. 199-215.

The Holocaust Explained (n.d.) Propaganda. The Wiener Holocaust Library.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1995) 'Ideological discourse analysis'. New Courant, 4, pp. 115-140.

Walton, D.N. (2007) Media Argumentation: Dialectic, Persuasion, and Rhetoric. Cambridge University Press.

Welch, D. (1993) 'Bending Spines: The Propagandas of Nazi Germany and the German Democratic Republic'. In Welch, D. The Third Reich: Politics and Propaganda. Routledge, pp. 54-80.

Westen, D. (2007) The Political Brain: The Role of Emotion in Deciding the Fate of the Nation. PublicAffairs.

Wodak, R. (2015) The Politics of Fear: What Right-Wing Populist Discourses Mean. SAGE Publications Ltd.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (eds.) (2009) Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis. 3rd edn. Sage Publications.

Wuttke, A., Schimpf, C. and Schoen, H. (2024) 'From facts to feelings? Analyzing affective polarization in the language of US Members of Congress, 1873–2016'. Research & Politics, 11(1).

Yurchak, A. (2006) Everything Was Forever, Until It Was No More: The Last Soviet Generation. Princeton University Press.

Zúquete, J. P. (2017) The Identitarians: The Movement against Globalism and Islam in Europe. University of Notre Dame Press.