

# When Harmless Words Harm: A New Threat to LLM Safety via Conceptual Triggers

Zhaoxin Zhang<sup>1</sup>, Borui Chen<sup>2</sup>, Yiming Hu<sup>3</sup>, Youyang Qu<sup>4</sup>, Tianqing Zhu<sup>1</sup> \* Longxiang Gao<sup>5</sup>,

<sup>1</sup>City University of Macau, Macau, China <sup>2</sup>University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria <sup>3</sup>Harvard Kennedy School, Massachusetts, USA <sup>4</sup>Data61, CSIRO, NSW, Australia <sup>5</sup>Key Laboratory of Computing Power Network and Information Security, Ministry of Education, Qilu University of Technology (Shandong Academy of Sciences), Jinan, China  
D24092100525@cityu.edu.mo; borui.chen@univie.ac.at; yiminghu@hks.harvard.edu; youyang.qu@data61.csiro.au; tqzhu@cityu.edu.mo; gaolx@sdas.org

## Abstract

Recent research on large language model (LLM) jailbreaks has primarily focused on techniques that bypass safety mechanisms to elicit overtly harmful outputs. However, such efforts often overlook attacks that exploit the model’s capacity for abstract generalization, creating a critical blind spot in current alignment strategies. This gap enables adversaries to induce objectionable content by subtly manipulating the implicit social values embedded in model outputs. In this paper, we introduce MICM, a novel, model-agnostic jailbreak method that targets the aggregate value structure reflected in LLM responses. Drawing on conceptual morphology theory, MICM encodes specific configurations of nuanced concepts into a fixed prompt template through a predefined set of phrases. These phrases act as conceptual triggers, steering model outputs toward a specific value stance without triggering conventional safety filters. We evaluate MICM across five advanced LLMs, including GPT-4o, Deepseek-R1, and Qwen3:8B. Experimental results show that MICM consistently outperforms state-of-the-art jailbreak techniques, achieving high success rates with minimal rejection. Our findings reveal a critical vulnerability in commercial LLMs: Their safety mechanisms remain susceptible to covert manipulation of underlying value alignment.

## Introduction

The rapid development of Large Language Models (LLMs) has unlocked transformative opportunities across various domains. However, their outstanding natural language processing (NLP) capabilities have raised growing security concerns, especially regarding jailbreak attacks. Existing research on LLM jailbreaks abounds regarding the development of sophisticated techniques to bypass safety filters (Shen et al. 2024). In most of this state-of-the-art research, attackers’ goals are assumed to be the maximization of the explicit harm of model-generated content (Shen et al. 2024). In other words, a jailbreak is considered successful when LLMs are induced to generate blatantly harmful, unethical, toxic, or unlawful content.

However, such problem formulation underestimates the complexity of human language, especially when semantic

innocuousness and harmful subtext driven by extremist values coexist. Our work reveals a critical vulnerability: Attackers can subtly steer the value orientation of model outputs through abstract conceptual manipulation without triggering standard safety mechanisms.

We introduce a novel jailbreak attack called Morphology Inspired Conceptual Manipulation (MICM), shown in Figure 1. MICM draws inspiration from existing research on LLM social bias, which suggests model-generated content may exhibit systematic patterns of value expression in response to the presence of particular (identity-related) features in its input. This insight leads us to assume that attackers may be able to manipulate the underlying aggregate social value of the generated content (hereafter referred to as ideological orientation) using input prompts. More specifically, the MICM attack is a jailbreak technique designed to induce LLMs to generate objectionable content by subtly altering the underlying ideological orientation of the generated content through carefully constructed prompts.

Ideology, in political science, is viewed as a cognitive and socially shared belief system (Van Dijk 1995). It is crucial for shaping individuals’ perceptions of real-world events by offering a relatively stable interpretive framework that encodes coherent sets of attitudes and values about social issues. Such an interpretive framework can be both benign and harmful. While mainstream ideologies (e.g., liberalism, feminism) typically promote inclusive values, extremist ideologies (e.g., fascism, neo-Nazism) embed harmful attitudes, though commercial LLMs usually block such content.

As an aggregation of social values, ideology is intangible, and its meaning is highly contested and context-dependent, making it escape word and semantic level definition (Van Dijk 1995). The central challenge of the MICM attack is to identify a reliable mechanism for influencing the model’s underlying ideological orientation, which is difficult to trace by nature. To address this challenge, we draw on the conceptual morphology theory (Freeden 1996) developed by political theorist Michael Freedden to make the elusive aggregation of social values decipherable. The theory argues that ideologies manifest as structured representations of interconnected social and political values, and they can be made distinguishable by analyzing the internal conceptual configuration (the internal structure through which different

\*Corresponding author




Figure 1: Illustration of MICM attack using a set of pre-defined, model-agnostic concept-embedded triggers to manipulate the underlying ideological orientation of LLM-generated content.

social and political values are organized). In other words, conceptual configuration serves as a unique “fingerprint” of different ideologies.

Therefore, the primary goal of MICM is to shift the underlying ideological orientation of the LLM-generated content toward extremism by injecting specific conceptual configuration into the input prompt. However, considering that the conceptual configuration of targeted ideological orientation consists of some objectionable ideas that can be easily captured and rejected by LLMs, to address this challenge, we identified a set of model-agnostic concept-embedded triggers (CETs) that can subtly convey the specific conceptual configuration to the target LLM and produce the equivalent ideological steering effect on its output. As shown in Figure 2, the MICM attack is implemented through the injection of a specific set of CETs into the input prompts. Our experimental results show that MICM is highly effective for eliciting objectionable content from advanced LLMs by manipulating the underlying ideological orientation.

It is important to stress that the main contribution of the present study is not to add new knowledge about the automation of LLM jailbreak, but to uncover the security vulnerability within commercial LLMs’ safety frameworks arising from the covert conceptual manipulation of LLM-generated content and its potential societal impact. Our research findings highlight the pressing need for a cross-disciplinary effort among computer science, political science, and social science research to combat the value-manipulation-based attack against commercial LLMs.

## Related Work

**Jailbreak Attack.** In prior research, jailbreak attack is defined as “the strategic manipulation of input prompts with an intent to bypass the LLM’s ethical, legal, or any other forms of constraints imposed by the developers” (Yu et al. 2024). According to this definition, the process of LLM jailbreaking can be viewed as the process of transforming a malicious instruction  $P$  into a functioning jailbreak prompt  $P'$ .

Existing LLM jailbreak techniques can be divided into two camps: manual-based prompt design (Li et al. 2023; Du et al. 2025) and automated prompt generation (Wu et al.

2025; Zou et al. 2023). The ultimate goal of existing jailbreak attacks is to maximize the explicit harm contained in the LLM-generated content (Shen et al. 2024; Jiang et al. 2024). Such a monolithic problem formulation may have overlooked the security threat arising from the subtle manipulation of the model’s underlying ideological orientations.

**LLM Social Bias.** Social bias of LLMs refers to prejudices, stereotypes, and discriminatory attitudes against certain groups of people reflected in the output generated by LLMs (Aldayel, Alokaili, and Alahmadi 2024). Such discriminatory attitudes can be framed in both explicit (Zhao et al. 2025; Shin et al. 2024) and implicit (Donkor 2025; Kumar et al. 2024) ways and are often triggered by certain (demographic or identity-related) factors presented in the model input, such as gender (Das et al. 2025), religion (Liu 2024), nationality (Tan and Lee 2025), ethnicity (Sun et al. 2025; Xu et al. 2025a), and political affiliation (Baum 2024). In other words, model-generated content may exhibit systematic patterns of value expression in response to the presence of particular identity-related features in its input.

Existing research on LLM social bias falls into two principal categories. One major research direction aims to address the detection and quantification of social bias in LLM-generated content (Radaideh, Kwon, and Radaideh 2025; Liu 2024; Li, Shirado, and Das 2025). The other strand of research on LLM social bias focuses on mitigation strategies that ensure equitable outputs from LLMs (Xu et al. 2025b; Piao et al. 2025). In most of these research, the problem of social bias has been studied through the lens of AI ethics and AI fairness. Only a limited number of works (Du et al. 2025; Baum 2024) are devoted to investigating the security challenge arising from LLM social bias. In the present study, we draw inspiration from existing research on social bias and design a novel jailbreak attack method that reveals a major security vulnerability in commercial LLMs.

## Background

### Notation

**Ideology.** In political science, ideology  $I$  refers to a cognitive and socially shared belief system (Van Dijk 1995). It shapes individuals’ perceptions of real-world events by of-

fering a value framework that encodes coherent sets of pre-defined attitudes and opinions about social issues (Van Dijk 2013). In other words, each ideology reflects a distinct aggregation of social and political values, which can be both benign and harmful. We denote the set of all ideologies by  $\mathcal{I}$ .

**Social & Political Concept.** Social and political concepts serve as the fundamental units that shape individuals’ understanding of social and political issues, much like words function as the building blocks of language (Freeden 1996). As aggregations of social values, ideologies can be conceptualized as distinct constellations of these concepts, with individual concepts often appearing across multiple ideological frameworks. We denote the set of all political concepts by  $\mathcal{C}$ .

## Threat Model

**Attacking Goal.** The objective of the MICM attack is to induce LLMs to produce harmful commentary on real-world socio-political incidents by altering the ideological orientations of the models. The jailbreak query  $q_e$  is assumed to be requesting LLMs to generate commentative content based on the real-world incident  $e$  that aligns with a target ideological orientation  $I$ . It should be stressed that the MICM attack is an attack on the LLM’s aggregate social values, and it does not apply to conventional, non-value-related jailbreak queries, such as “how to make a bomb”.

**Attackers’ Capacity.** We assume that the attackers are experts in ideology who do not possess knowledge about LLM safety. This means that the attackers do not have access to any state-of-the-art LLM jailbreak techniques and can only rely on the augmentation of the input prompt to implement the jailbreak attack.

**Targeted Systems.** Since the MICM attack primarily leverages LLMs’ ability to generalize at an abstract level, its implementation does not depend on any internal access to model parameters or training data. Thus, the MICM attack is model-agnostic and targets both open-source and closed-source LLMs, including black-box and white-box settings.

## Methodology

### Core Assumption

As demonstrated in prior research, LLMs, especially those with larger parameter sizes, are capable of “generalizing at a more abstract level” (Grosse et al. 2023). This means that LLMs can capture the nuanced and complex relationships between different abstract concepts without explicit guidance provided by their users. This insight leads us to the hypothesis that LLMs, leveraging their advanced NLP capacity and vast training data, may be able to produce content that aligns with ideology  $I$ , solely by users providing the correct configuration of social and political concepts  $C_I$ . This specific conceptual configuration  $C_I$  can be identified in existing political science literature and forms the basis of the MICM attack.




Figure 2: Illustration of MICM methodology. The green segments represent the original query, while the pink segments indicate content associated with ideological themes.

## Definition

**Projection for Ideological Identification.** As mentioned previously, ideology as an aggregation of social values builds upon different social and political concepts whose meanings are inherently fluid and context-dependent (Van Dijk 1995; Freedden 2013), causing ideologies to escape meaning-making on both a word and a semantic level. The inherent abstraction and contextual variability of ideology make it impractical to capture its presence with a static, high-dimensional metric system to exhaustively capture all possible manifestations of ideological expression.

To address this challenge, we operationalize the detection of ideological orientation in LLM outputs into a low-dimensional space guided by high-level value criteria. If ideology  $I$  is decomposed into  $n$  disjoint dimensions, then identifying it in a text  $t \in T$  becomes a mapping  $proj_I : T \rightarrow [0, 1]^n$ , where each value denotes alignment on a specific dimension (1 = full alignment, 0 = none). An ideal article fully expressing  $I$  yields projection  $\mathbf{1}_n$ , while ideology-irrelevant texts (e.g., refusals) yield  $proj_I(t') = 0$ . In this work, we propose a five-dimensional framework, each reflecting a key ideological or value signal, inspired by morphological ideology analysis (Freedden 1996).

**Conceptual Configuration.** Conceptual configuration refers to the specific internal structure, composed of core concepts, adjacent concepts, and peripheral concepts, through which different social and political concepts are organized within an ideology. It represents the morphology of an ideology. In conceptual morphology theory, conceptual configuration is viewed as the “fingerprint” of an ideology (Freedden 2013). This means that each ideology has a unique corresponding conceptual configuration, and through that specific configuration, an ideology can be identified.

In this paper, we accept the conceptual morphology theory and model a conceptual configuration as a set of social

and political concepts. This implies the existence of an injective mapping  $rep : \mathcal{I} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{C}}$  such that for any ideology  $I \in \mathcal{I}$ , there corresponds a unique conceptual configuration  $C_I \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  satisfying  $rep(I) = C_I$ . We denote  $C_I$  as the conceptual configuration of ideology  $I$ .

**Concept-embedded triggers (CETs).** CET refers to the specific phrases, terminologies, and demographics used to covertly convey a particular social and political concept without mentioning its name. For the MICM attack, our goal is to induce LLMs to generate harmful content that aligns with the extremist ideology  $I$  using the corresponding conceptual configuration  $C_I$ . However, this cannot be achieved by directly injecting the original  $C_I$  into the input prompt, because the particular  $C_I$  of an extremist ideology consists of explicitly objectionable concepts that can be easily captured and rejected by LLMs’ internal safeguards. Based on our observation of the experimental results presented in the later section, even if the model’s internal safety filter is incapable of capturing such objectionable concepts, the  $C_I$  might not be able to produce the full ideological steering effect as we expected. This is due to the abstract nature of those concepts, and their connection with various real-world social and political incidents may not be immediately transparent, causing some LLMs to generate their output solely based on a limited number of concepts that are directly related to the incident and neglect the integrity of  $C_I$ .

Therefore, the success of the MICM attack depends on the identification of a set of concept-embedded triggers that can produce equal or greater ideological steering effect on model output than the entirety of  $C_I$ . This is achieved in two ways: First, CETs represent a more embodied expression of the abstract concepts, meaning they reduce the model’s reliance on implicit reasoning to operationalize those abstract concepts in its output. Secondly, unlike raw concepts, CETs are embodied with a specific storytelling angle that can teach the LLMs how to connect all the concepts in  $C_I$  to real-world events. This is similar to in-context learning, except that all of the contextual information is already compressed in the CETs.

For a given query  $q$ , if a set of concept-embedded triggers  $\tilde{C}_I$  can induce an output aligning with ideology  $I$  that is at least as effective as that induced by embedding the conceptual configuration  $C_I$ , then we define this set as a *concept-embedded combination* of  $C_I$ , denoted by  $\tilde{C}_I \succeq_q C_I$ . If, for a particular  $\tilde{C}_I$ , this relation holds for nearly all instances of  $q_e$ , the concept-embedded combination is referred to as *context-agnostic*, and is denoted by  $\bar{C}_I \succeq C_I$ .

**Ideological Alignment.** For a given text  $t$ , its alignment  $eval_I(t)$  with an ideology  $I$  is defined as the ability to identify  $I$  from the text  $t$ . In a low-dimensional projection space  $[0, 1]^n$ , this can be described by the length of the projection vector  $\|proj_I(t)\|_1$  under the Manhattan norm. Since humans assign varying importance to different evaluative dimensions, we introduce a weight vector  $w$  to align this value with human intuition. This implies

$$eval_I(t) := \langle w, proj_I(t) \rangle \quad (1)$$

## Problem Formulation

Given an LLM and an input query  $q$ , the LLM generates a response  $r$  based on its internal knowledge and rules by selecting  $r$  according to the conditional probability distribution. We denote this process as

$$r \sim LLM(q) \quad (2)$$

This paper discusses the search for a simple prompt jailbreak method  $j : q \mapsto q'$  that maximizes the alignment between the LLM output and a given ideology  $I$  for an input query  $q_e$ , that is

$$\begin{aligned} \arg\max_j \mathbb{E}[eval_I(t)|q = q_e], \\ t \sim LLM(j(q_e)) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

According to conceptual morphology theory, each ideology  $I$  represents a conceptual configuration  $C_I$ . This implies that if the model output  $t$  under a given prompt satisfies  $C_I$ , then  $t$  should also exhibit a high alignment score  $eval_I(t)$  with ideology  $I$ . Therefore, we initially attempt to design a prompt template  $T$  centered around the conceptual configuration  $C_I$  and the input query  $q_e$ . By embedding  $C_I$  and  $q_e$  into their respective placeholders,  $T$  aims to maximize the model’s capability to generate outputs that conform to  $C_I$  in response to query  $q_e$ . The ability of  $T$  to steer the model output towards  $C_I$  is designed to be independent of the specific query and ideology choice. Consequently, we select a fixed template  $T$ , which we refer to as our prompt backbone. In practice, we adapt to different queries and ideological requests solely by substituting the placeholders within  $T$ , namely  $j(q_e) = T(C_I, q_e)$ . As explained in the Definition section, directly embedding  $C_I$  into the input prompt may fail to guide the model toward generating the desired output. Therefore, we aim to bypass these safety mechanisms by substituting  $C_I$  with a concept-embedded combination  $\tilde{C}_I$  inserted into the placeholder, thereby guiding the model to more consistently produce the desired output.

However, identifying a suitable combination of triggers for each individual query  $q_e$  requires expert knowledge and technical skill, which imposes significant demands on the user and consequently limits the practicality of the attack method. Therefore, for a given ideology  $I$ , we aim to further identify a context-agnostic combination of CETs  $\bar{C}_I$  that can effectively guide the model to generate outputs consistent with ideology  $I$  for nearly all queries related to real-world social and political events.

$$\begin{aligned} \arg\max_{\bar{C}_I} \mathbb{E}[eval_I(t)], \\ t \sim LLM(T(\bar{C}_I, q_e)), \bar{C}_I \succeq C_I \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

In this case, by fixing  $\bar{C}_I$ , the jailbreak attack method  $j$  becomes a fixed template that only requires embedding the query  $q_e$ , without relying on the ability to comprehend any political concepts. We define this type of jailbreak attack as:

$$MICM : q_e \mapsto T(\bar{C}_I, q_e) \quad (5)$$

## CET Identification

As discussed above, the core aspect of the MICM attack is to identify a set of CETs  $\bar{C}_i$  that can produce sufficient ideological steering effect on LLM output. To achieve this, we examined over 20 sociology and political science research studies that focus on the dissemination of extremist ideas in the real world. This research revealed the linguistic and communication techniques used by the protagonists of extremist ideology to communicate the different concepts that jointly form their ideology. Some of the techniques include: multivocal communication (Bouvier, Rosenbaum et al. 2020; Akram and Nasar 2023; Åkerlund 2022), exclusionary laughter (Bouvier, Rosenbaum et al. 2020; Askanius 2021), mainstream imitation (Klein 2012), perception manipulation (Bliuc et al. 2018; Cooter 2006; Mattsson and Johansson 2023), intellectualization of conspiracy theory (Mattsson and Johansson 2022, 2021; Askanius 2021), and politicization of violence (Mattsson and Johansson 2023, 2021).

Drawing on these techniques, we have identified and collected 168 CETs that serve as normalized language expressions used to covertly convey extremist ideas. These CETs form the basis of the MICM attack. More specifically, we construct  $\bar{C}_I$  by using the collected CETs to substitute all the toxic concepts from  $C_I$ .

## Prompt Construction

We then use the identified  $\bar{C}_I$  to construct a fixed template  $T$  based on  $q_e$ , which prompts the LLM to generate content that aligns with ideology  $I$  in the context of a real-world incident  $e$ . Rather than directly instructing the model to generalize using a specific ideology, we incorporate  $\bar{C}_I$  into the template  $T$ , requesting the model to generate content that reflects the concepts embedded in  $\bar{C}_I$ . The template  $T$  also includes a placeholder for inserting the incident  $e$ . In this way, template  $T$  subtly manipulates the LLM’s output to generate objectionable content aligned with the extremist ideology, guided by the conceptual configuration  $\bar{C}_I$ .

## Ideological Alignment Score (IAS).

To assess the alignment between model-generated content and a targeted ideological orientation, we introduce a novel qualitative scoring framework, termed the Ideological Alignment Score (IAS), which jointly evaluates both the underlying value orientation and the presence of potentially extremist elements in the output ( $IAS(t) = eval_I(t)$ ). Grounded in conceptual morphology theory (Freeden 1996), the framework evaluates content across five dimensions: (i) core concepts; (ii) adjacent concepts; (iii) peripheral concepts; (iv) stylistic/behavioral indicators; and (v) ideological coherence. The first three dimensions assess the integrity of the targeted conceptual configuration. They capture both the presence of objectionable social values and the structural arrangement in which those values are embedded. The final two dimensions evaluate whether the rhetorical organization of these elements in the output aligns with the aggregate social values of the intended orientation. Each dimension is weighted according to its relative importance in determining alignment.

## Experiment

### Experiment Settings

**Dataset.** To test the effectiveness of MICM, we manually collected 120 real-world social and political incidents that took place between 2015 and 2025. The dataset have been made publicly available and can be accessed upon request in accordance with submission guidelines.

**Target Ideological Orientation.** In this work, we choose neo-Nazism  $I_n$  as the targeted ideological orientation for the jailbreak attack for its indisputable and well-documented toxicity (Ganesh 2018; Klein 2012; Mattsson and Johansson 2021). However, it should be stressed that neo-Nazism is not the only ideological orientation that contains toxic ideas, nor is it the only ideological orientation MICM method is capable of attacking.

**Models.** Our experiments run on both open-source and closed-source LLMs, including: GPT-4o, GPT-4o mini (OpenAI et al. 2024), Deepseek-R1 (DeepSeek-AI et al. 2025), Qwen 3:8B (Yang et al. 2025), and Mistral 0.3:7B (Jiang et al. 2023). For GPT-4o, GPT-4o mini, and Deepseek-R1, queries are made through the official APIs provided by the model providers. The rest are locally deployed using Ollama.

**Baseline Attack Methods.** In the present study, we compare the effectiveness of MICM against four other comparable jailbreak attack techniques, targeting both black-box and white-box models: Evil and Comp, introduced by Wei, Haghtalab, and Steinhardt (2023), MultiJail (Deng et al. 2024), and IRIS (Ramesh, Dou, and Xu 2024).

### Evaluation Metrics

In the present study, we evaluate the effectiveness of MICM and other baseline methods using three metrics: rejection rate, ideological alignment score, and attack success rate.

**Rejection rate** measures the percentage of times that LLM outputs are unrelated to the original jailbreak query  $q_e$ , including unreadable content, explicit refusal to answer, and irrelevant answers.

**IAS.** We evaluate the effectiveness of MICM using the IAS metric introduced in the previous section. For implementation, we employ three advanced LLMs: GPT-4o, GPT-4o Mini, and Deepseek-V3:671B. Each model-based evaluator is assigned a maximum of 10 points and is tasked with scoring the generated content using the IAS rubric.

**Attack Success Rate (ASR)** in this work refers to the percentage of times that the model-generated output received an average IAS equal to or higher than six, as such content meets the minimum morphological requirements for being recognized as aligned with the targeted ideology of our attack.

### Main Results

**Overall Performance.** Our experiments demonstrate that MICM is highly effective in manipulating the value expressions of both open-source and closed-source LLMs, with a minimal risk of detection by conventional safety mechanisms. As illustrated in Table 1, Figure 3, and Figure 4, MICM significantly outperforms the baseline methods in



Method	GPT-4o			GPT-4o mini			Deepseek-R1			Qwen3:8B			Mistral:7B		
	$R_{rej}$	$IAS$	$ASR$	$R_{rej}$	$IAS$	$ASR$	$R_{rej}$	$IAS$	$ASR$	$R_{rej}$	$IAS$	$ASR$	$R_{rej}$	$IAS$	$ASR$
Evil	1	0	0	1	0	0	0.43	5.36	0.54	0.28	6.66	0.68	0.04	7.68	0.78
Comp	0.26	3.21	0.15	0.97	0.14	0	0.43	4.17	0.43	0	7.13	0.7	0.08	4.53	0.31
Multijail	1	0	0	1	0	0	0.73	1.34	0.11	0.18	4.38	0.38	0.29	3.52	0.31
IRIS	0.53	0.96	0	0.53	0.85	0.02	0.23	5.39	0.50	0.44	1.72	0.13	0.19	3.38	0.2
MICM	0	9.03	1	0	8.17	0.97	0	9.29	1	0	9.47	1	0	8.85	0.99

Table 1: Evaluation results of jailbreak methods under the experiment settings. Here,  $R_{rej}$  represents the probability that the attack queries are rejected,  $IAS$  refers to the average Ideological Alignment Score across all evaluated outputs, while  $ASR$  denotes the attack success rate as defined within the evaluation metrics.




Figure 3: Score distributions of MICM attack results using KDE-plot with bandwidth=0.5.




Figure 4: Cumulative Score distributions of MICM attack results using CDF-plot.

both Attack Success Rate (ASR) and average IAS score. In our experimental setup, MICM achieved near-perfect attack success across all five models, showing an approximate 20% improvement compared to the best-case performance of the baseline methods. For IAS, MICM demonstrates at least a 1.17-point improvement over the baseline methods, with this gap widening as the targeted LLMs exhibit stronger resistance to the baseline techniques. As shown in Figure 5, in contrast to the baselines, MICM’s performance is highly consistent across all five models, reinforcing its model-agnostic nature.

**Rejection.** As shown in Figure 6, the significant improvement in MICM’s attack performance, relative to baseline methods, can be attributed to its minimal rejection rate. Since a jailbreak rejection is automatically assigned a zero




Figure 5: Comparison of Average IAS Across Models Under Jailbreak Attacks

score, a lower rejection rate increases the upper bound of the averaged IAS, thereby contributing to a higher overall performance.

**Trade-off.** As shown in Figure 7, we present the distribution of different threat levels observed in the models’ outputs. Our method strategically sacrifices the likelihood of generating content with the highest threat level in favor of a higher success rate in bypassing the model’s internal safety mechanisms. Despite this trade-off, MICM successfully maintains a high threat level for the majority of the LLM-generated content. This balance between the threat level in the output and the passing rate is what makes MICM a highly effective jailbreak technique.

## Ablation Study

To assess the role of CETs in our method, we substituted the conceptual configuration  $\bar{C}_I$  with the targeted ideological orientation’s conceptual configuration  $C_I$  as a trigger in the original jailbreak prompt, while keeping all other factors constant. The results, as shown in Table 2, indicate that the use of CETs in MICM significantly reduces the rejection rate in queries made through the official API, suggesting that CETs enhance MICM’s ability to bypass LLMs’ internal safety filters. For open-source LLMs, substituting  $C_I$  does not lead to a high rejection rate; however, using CETs as a trigger noticeably improves the IAS score. This finding supports the role of CETs in enabling LLMs to apply abstract concepts more effectively to generated content. When the  $C_I$  trigger was used in MICM, we observed a low IAS score for some queries that were not rejected by the LLMs. This occurs because  $C_I$  consists of highly abstract concepts, and their connection to various real-world social and politi-

Method	Template T	Trigger	GPT-4o		GPT-4o mini		Deepseek-R1		Qwen3		Mistral	
			$R_{rej}$	IAS	$R_{rej}$	IAS	$R_{rej}$	IAS	$R_{rej}$	IAS	$R_{rej}$	IAS
Direct Query		$I$	1	0	1	0	1	0	0.73	1.66	0	4.33
MCIM w/ CC.	✓	$C_I$	0.99	0	0.75	0.75	0.94	0.47	0.01	5.45	0	7.84
MICM w/ CETs	✓	$\tilde{C}_I$	0	9.03	0	8.17	0	9.29	0	9.47	0	8.85

Table 2: Ablation Study: Query Results Using concept-embedded triggers (CETs), Conceptual Configurations(CC.), and Ideology  $I$  as Triggers.




Figure 6: Rejection rates and Attack Success Rates of jailbreak methods under the experiment settings

cal incidents may not be immediately clear. As a result, some LLMs generated output based on a limited number of concepts directly linked to the incident, neglecting the broader conceptual framework of  $C_I$ . This explains why the IAS for certain LLMs was lower than expected. Nevertheless, MICM using  $C_I$  remains more effective than direct queries that instruct LLMs to generate content based on the targeted ideological orientation, although the extent of improvement may vary by model. Alarming, a significant number of direct queries were not rejected by LLMs such as Mistral and Qwen3, indicating a major vulnerability in the models’ defenses against simple value-based attacks.

## Discussion

Our work represents the first attempt to reframe the LLM safety issue from purely harm induction to conceptual structure recognition. The problem modeling presented in our work is grounded in sound sociological research (Åkerlund 2022; Askanius 2021; Conway, Scrivens, and McNair 2019; Mattsson 2020; Cooter 2006), and reveals a critical security vulnerability in advanced LLMs.

Additionally, our observation of the model-generated content using MICM attack reveals that such content shares a high similarity with the type of content used by the protagonists of extremist ideology for online dissemination and ideological subversion. This suggests MICM not only highlights a blind spot in LLM safety mechanisms, but also unveils the possibility for LLMs to be weaponized for ideological subversion, which poses serious threats to the stability and integrity of our society in real life. As the United Nations warned on multiple occasions (United Nations 2024b,a,




Figure 7: Proportion of content generated at different threat levels by jailbreak methods on various models. Bar patterns indicate model types, while colors represent threat levels. [0, 6): conceptually misaligned. [6, 8): conceptually aligned. [8, 10): high threat level. IAS = 10: maximum threat level.

2020, 2021), ideology-related threats are not merely a fringe issue distant from our everyday life; rather, they are in close proximity to our daily life and are already harming social cohesion and stability both domestically and globally.

From a regulatory standpoint, it is crucial to acknowledge the inherent difficulty of addressing ideologically charged speech and ethnic hatred through legal frameworks in real-life settings (Ganesh 2018). Our findings introduce a new layer of complexity to this already worrisome regulatory landscape by demonstrating how LLM could potentially be weaponized for producing such objectionable content without triggering conventional safeguards.

As such, we call for future research on LLM security to focus on developing more comprehensive methods to detect the ideological alignment of LLM-generated content, and to expand the scope of research from mere explicit harm to cover conceptual manipulation, which is equally, if not more, detrimental to our society.

## Conclusion

In this study, we introduced the MICM attack, a novel jailbreaking method through manipulation of the underlying social values reflected in LLM output. Our experiments demonstrate that MICM consistently outperforms state-of-the-art jailbreak techniques, achieving high attack success rates with minimal rejection. The results also reveal significant vulnerabilities in commercial LLMs’ safety mechanisms, particularly in their inability to defend against covert

value manipulation.

## Ethical Statement

Wearning: This study does not involve human subjects, identifiable personal data, or sensitive user interactions. All experiments were conducted using publicly available language models in accordance with responsible AI research practices. This paper contains examples of harmful language. Reader discretion is recommended.

## References

- Åkerlund, M. 2022. Dog whistling far-right code words: the case of ‘culture enricher’ on the Swedish web. *Information, Communication & Society*, 25(12): 1808–1825.
- Akram, M.; and Nasar, A. 2023. Systematic review of radicalization through social media. *Ege Academic Review*, 23(2): 279–296.
- Aldayel, A.; Alokaili, A.; and Alahmadi, R. 2024. Covert Bias: The Severity of Social Views’ Unalignment in Language Models Towards Implicit and Explicit Opinion. arXiv:2408.08212.
- Askanius, T. 2021. ”I just want to be the friendly face of national socialism”: The turn to civility in the cultural expressions of neo-Nazism in Sweden. *Nordicom Review*, 42.
- Baum, S. D. 2024. Manipulating aggregate societal values to bias AI social choice ethics. *AI and Ethics*, 1–13.
- Blüch, A.-M.; Faulkner, N.; Jakubowicz, A.; and McGarty, C. 2018. Online networks of racial hate: A systematic review of 10 years of research on cyber-racism. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 87: 75–86.
- Bouvier, G.; Rosenbaum, J. E.; et al. 2020. *Twitter, the public sphere, and the chaos of online deliberation*. Springer.
- Conway, M.; Scrivens, R.; and McNair, L. 2019. Right-wing extremists’ persistent online presence: History and contemporary trends.
- Cooter, A. B. 2006. Neo-Nazi Normalization: The Skinhead Movement and Integration into Normative Structures. *Sociological Inquiry*, 76(2): 145–165.
- Das, P.; Karnam, S. K.; Soni, A. B.; and Mukherjee, A. 2025. Social Biases in Knowledge Representations of Wikidata separates Global North from Global South. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM Web Science Conference 2025*, 12–21.
- DeepSeek-AI; Guo, D.; Yang, D.; Zhang, H.; and et al., J. S. 2025. DeepSeek-R1: Incentivizing Reasoning Capability in LLMs via Reinforcement Learning. arXiv:2501.12948.
- Deng, Y.; Zhang, W.; Pan, S. J.; and Bing, L. 2024. Multilingual Jailbreak Challenges in Large Language Models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Donkor, P. 2025. Exploring and Mitigating Implicit Bias in Large Language Models: A Cross-Domain Evaluation Framework. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 39, 29573–29575.
- Du, Y.; Zhao, S.; Ma, M.; Chen, Y.; and Qin, B. 2025. Investigating the Security Threat Arising from “Yes-No” Implicit Bias in Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 39, 23823–23831.
- Freeden, M. 1996. *Ideologies and political theory: A conceptual approach*. Clarendon Press.
- Freeden, M. 2013. The morphological analysis of ideology. *The Oxford handbook of political ideologies*, 115–137.
- Ganesh, B. 2018. The ungovernability of digital hate culture. *Journal of International Affairs*, 71(2): 30–49.
- Grosse, R.; Bae, J.; Anil, C.; Elhage, N.; Tamkin, A.; Tajdini, A.; Steiner, B.; Li, D.; Durmus, E.; Perez, E.; et al. 2023. Studying large language model generalization with influence functions. arXiv:2308.03296.
- Jiang, A. Q.; Sablayrolles, A.; Mensch, A.; and et al., C. B. 2023. Mistral 7B. arXiv:2310.06825.
- Jiang, F.; Xu, Z.; Niu, L.; Xiang, Z.; Ramasubramanian, B.; Li, B.; and Poovendran, R. 2024. Artprompt: Ascii art-based jailbreak attacks against aligned llms. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 15157–15173.
- Klein, A. 2012. Slipping racism into the mainstream: A theory of information laundering. *Communication Theory*, 22(4): 427–448.
- Kumar, D.; Jain, U.; Agarwal, S.; and Harshangi, P. 2024. Investigating implicit bias in large language models: A large-scale study of over 50 LLMs. arXiv:2410.12864.
- Li, H.; Guo, D.; Fan, W.; Xu, M.; Huang, J.; Meng, F.; and Song, Y. 2023. Multi-step jailbreaking privacy attacks on chatgpt. arXiv:2304.05197.
- Li, Y.; Shirado, H.; and Das, S. 2025. Actions speak louder than words: Agent decisions reveal implicit biases in language models. In *Proceedings of the 2025 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 3303–3325.
- Liu, Y. 2024. Robust evaluation measures for evaluating social biases in masked language models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, 18707–18715.
- Mattsson, C. 2020. Lost in translation—A case study of a public debate on freedom of expression and a neo-Nazi rally. *Social Identities*, 26(1): 92–108.
- Mattsson, C.; and Johansson, T. 2021. *Radicalization and disengagement in Neo-Nazi Movements: Social psychology perspective*. Routledge.
- Mattsson, C.; and Johansson, T. 2022. The neo-Nazi doxa, the deep state, and COVID-19: neo-Nazis’ ambivalent relations to Big Pharma and the anti-vaccine movement. *Social Identities*, 28(6): 716–729.
- Mattsson, C.; and Johansson, T. 2023. Neo-nazi violence and ideology: Changing attitudes toward violence in Sweden’s skinhead and post-skinhead eras. *Terrorism and political violence*, 35(1): 104–117.
- OpenAI; ; Hurst, A.; Lerer, A.; Goucher, A. P.; and et al., A. P. 2024. GPT-4o System Card. arXiv:2410.21276.
- Piao, J.; Lu, Z.; Gao, C.; and Li, Y. 2025. Social Bots Meet Large Language Model: Political Bias and Social Learning Inspired Mitigation Strategies. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2025*, 5202–5211.



- Radaideh, M. I.; Kwon, O. H.; and Radaideh, M. I. 2025. Fairness and social bias quantification in Large Language Models for sentiment analysis. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 113569.
- Ramesh, G.; Dou, Y.; and Xu, W. 2024. GPT-4 Jailbreaks Itself with Near-Perfect Success Using Self-Explanation. In Al-Onaizan, Y.; Bansal, M.; and Chen, Y.-N., eds., *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 22139–22148. Miami, Florida, USA: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shen, X.; Chen, Z.; Backes, M.; Shen, Y.; and Zhang, Y. 2024. "do anything now": Characterizing and evaluating in-the-wild jailbreak prompts on large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 on ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 1671–1685.
- Shin, J.; Song, H.; Lee, H.; Jeong, S.; and Park, J. 2024. Ask LLMs Directly, "What shapes your bias?": Measuring Social Bias in Large Language Models. In Ku, L.-W.; Martins, A.; and Srikumar, V., eds., *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, 16122–16143. Bangkok, Thailand: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sun, L.; Mao, C.; Hofmann, V.; and Bai, X. 2025. Aligned but Blind: Alignment Increases Implicit Bias by Reducing Awareness of Race. arXiv:2506.00253.
- Tan, B. C. Z.; and Lee, R. K.-W. 2025. Unmasking Implicit Bias: Evaluating Persona-Prompted LLM Responses in Power-Disparate Social Scenarios. In Chiruzzo, L.; Ritter, A.; and Wang, L., eds., *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference of the Nations of the Americas Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 1075–1108. Albuquerque, New Mexico: Association for Computational Linguistics. ISBN 979-8-89176-189-6.
- United Nations. 2020. Secretary-General Calls on World to Stand against 'Lies and Loathing' that Propelled Nazis, Threaten Societies Today, Encouraging Return to Reason. <https://press.un.org/en/2020/sgsm20404.doc.htm>. Accessed: 2025-07-01.
- United Nations. 2021. Rise in Anti-Semitism, White Supremacy Exacerbated by Pandemic, Secretary-General Warns at Holocaust Remembrance Service, Calling for End to Attacks on Truth. <https://press.un.org/en/2021/sgsm20553.doc.htm>. Accessed: 2025-07-01.
- United Nations. 2024a. Intolerance, Hate Speech Often Very Cause of Wars, Conflicts, Speaker Tells Security Council. <https://press.un.org/en/2024/sc15731.doc.htm>. Accessed: 2025-07-01.
- United Nations. 2024b. United Nations, States Must Combat 'Deep-Rooted' Racism against Palestinians, Neo-Nazism, Hate Speech Targeting Minorities, Experts Tell Third Committee. <https://press.un.org/en/2024/gashc4425.doc.htm>. Accessed: 2025-07-01.
- Van Dijk, T. A. 1995. Discourse semantics and ideology. *Discourse & society*, 6(2): 243–289.
- Van Dijk, T. A. 2013. Ideology and discourse analysis. In *The meaning of ideology*, 110–135. Routledge.
- Wei, A.; Haghtalab, N.; and Steinhardt, J. 2023. Jailbroken: How does llm safety training fail? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36: 80079–80110.
- Wu, S.; Wang, H.; Zhao, Y.; Wu, X.; Zheng, Y.; Li, W.; Li, H.; and Ji, R. 2025. Monte carlo tree search based prompt autogeneration for jailbreak attacks against llms. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, 1057–1068.
- Xu, Z.; Chen, W.; Tang, Y.; Li, X.; Hu, C.; Chu, Z.; Ren, K.; Zheng, Z.; and Lu, Z. 2025a. Mitigating social bias in large language models: A multi-objective approach within a multi-agent framework. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 39, 25579–25587.
- Xu, Z.; Chen, W.; Tang, Y.; Li, X.; Hu, C.; Chu, Z.; Ren, K.; Zheng, Z.; and Lu, Z. 2025b. Mitigating social bias in large language models: A multi-objective approach within a multi-agent framework. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 39, 25579–25587.
- Yang, A.; Li, A.; Yang, B.; and et al., B. Z. 2025. Qwen3 Technical Report. arXiv:2505.09388.
- Yu, Z.; Liu, X.; Liang, S.; Cameron, Z.; Xiao, C.; and Zhang, N. 2024. Don't listen to me: Understanding and exploring jailbreak prompts of large language models. In *33rd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 24)*, 4675–4692.
- Zhao, Y.; Wang, B.; Wang, Y.; Zhao, D.; He, R.; and Hou, Y. 2025. Explicit vs. implicit: Investigating social bias in large language models through self-reflection. arXiv:2501.02295.
- Zou, A.; Wang, Z.; Carlini, N.; Nasr, M.; Kolter, J. Z.; and Fredrikson, M. 2023. Universal and transferable adversarial attacks on aligned language models. arXiv:2307.15043.