THINK7 CANADA 2025

G7 2025 KANANASKIS

Policy Brief

Task Force 4: Global Peace and Security

AI and Global Security: From Early Warning to AI-Assisted Diplomacy

Authors:

Leonardo De Agostini

Michele Giovanardi

April 2025

Key Points

- Within the current shift towards a multipolar and uncertain world, where consensus building and shared solutions become more difficult to reach, AI-driven solutions can enhance peace and security efforts. There is an unexplored potential for AI-powered conflict prevention, early warning systems, and AI-assisted diplomacy.
- While AI has been widely debated for its disruptive potential, its positive applications in peacebuilding remain largely underexplored. With ongoing conflicts in Ukraine, the Middle East and Africa, the Gorup of Seven (G7) should harness the potential of AI-powered applications by building on existing G7 members' efforts and investing in the sector.
- The G7 should invest in AI-powered early warning systems and conflict prevention strategies that could help bridging the 'warning - response gap'. This includes enhancing data-sharing mechanisms, integrating AI tools into decision-making, and fostering collaboration between governments, the private sector and civil society.

2025: Between AI and 'Multipolarization'

In 2024 the risks associated with the rise of Artificial Intelligence (AI), especially generative AI and Large Language Models (LLMs), dominated the international agenda. The risks of these fast-developing technologies were projected onto all possible fields of national and international policies while innovations and solutions were proposed from the economic, social and normative point of view. 2025 marked a significant mood shift as the hope for international consensus on AI regulations is waning in the context of a more uncertain outlook for peace and security and an unpredictable transatlantic relationship. This year has already been deemed as the year of 'uncertainty' and 'multipolarization', described as the "ongoing power shift toward a world where a greater number of actors are vying for influence", making it more "difficult for actors to agree on common solutions to shared global problems" (Bunde, Eisentraut and Schütte 2025). For AI regulation and peace and security alike.

The ongoing Russian aggression on Ukraine, notwithstanding the ongoing diplomatic efforts led by the new US administration, will continue to be the biggest source of instability in Europe. Its direct impacts, as well as the chain reaction that an unjust peace would trigger in neighboring regions such as the Caucasus, could further exacerbate tensions. In the Middle East the situation remains grim. The fragile ceasefire reached in the Gaza conflict will not unmake the shockwaves sent in the region: from Lebanon to Syria and Iran. Finally, the ferocious fighting in Sudan and Rwanda are just adding to the number of people "dead, displaced, and hungry due to fighting [which] is higher than at any time in decades" (International Crisis Group 2025) over the African continent.

The risks associated with the developments of groundbreaking AI systems, included those in the military realm – like automated weapons system or what were defined as

'weapons of mass disinformation' (Rickli 2025) are not going anywhere. On the contrary, according to the perception registered by this year's Global Risk Report by the World Economic Forum (Elsner, Atkinson and Zahidi 2025): "the adverse outcomes of AI technologies is one of the risks that climbs the most in the 10-year risk ranking compared to the two-year risk ranking" (Ibid.).

If the impacts of AI on democratic processes were widely discussed among G7 members (De Agostini, Catena and Autolitano 2024), its potential positive impacts on global peace and security should be considered as well. When it comes to peacebuilding, AI powered predictive analytics allow for sophisticated modelling of potential conflict scenarios, anticipating adversary movements, and optimizing the distribution of resources (Giovanardi 2024).

If consensus on AI regulations and common solutions for risk mitigation does not seem viable in this age of multipolarity and rising inter-state conflicts, then G7 Nations must pragmatically explore the solutions offered by AI for conflict prevention. This paper contends that as a group of leading economies and democracies, also being home to several large companies developing AI models and applications, G7 countries should bring the question of positive impacts of AI on peace and security to this year's summit table. The G7 should invest in a new framework to explore the possibilities offered by AI-driven solutions with a positive impact on global peace and security.

AI Applications for Peace and Security: G7 Early Warning Systems

AI's potential contributions to peace and security fall into three key areas: 1) Enhancing conflict prevention and early warning systems by identifying escalating tensions and evaluating risk factors; 2) Supporting mediation and negotiation by analysing communication patterns and facilitating inclusive peace processes; 3) Improving decision-making through document analysis, disinformation detection, and scenario simulations. (Panic and Arthur 2024; Giovanardi 2024; Wählisch 2024). This paper contends that integrating AI-driven early warning systems with preventive diplomacy and AI-enhanced mediation would strengthen G7 peace and security efforts.

The application of AI in conflict early warning is not new. One of the earliest AI-driven early warning projects was the U.S. Defense Department's ICEWS program. Early claims were that ICEWS could predict events like rebellions, insurgencies, and economic crises with >80% accuracy (Shachtman 2007). The U.S. government has also supported long-term conflict forecasting through collaborations with academia. The Political Instability Task Force (PITF) developed models to predict state collapse and mass atrocities. By 2010, one PITF global model using decision-tree algorithms achieved about 80% accuracy in retrospectively identifying risk of political instability. Building on such work, the Early Warning Project (EWP) – run by the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum and partners – combines statistical ML models with "collective intelligence" to anticipate mass atrocities (Albrecht 2023).

In recent years, AI's role has extended from broad risk indexes to real-time tactical predictions. A notable example is Rhombus, a Silicon Valley contractor working with U.S. agencies. In 2021, Rhombus's AI models analysing open-source intelligence predicted

with 80% certainty – four months in advance, that Russia would launch a full-scale invasion of Ukraine (Associated Press 2024). This warning, produced using generative AI techniques to sift through massive internet and dark web data, outperformed human-only analysis and gave U.S. officials an early strategic edge but did not result in any preventive diplomacy or conflict mitigation measures. These successes suggest AI can pick up patterns in global data that hint at looming conflicts or security threats, sometimes earlier than traditional intelligence. The U.S. military also used AI for conflict prevention during its Afghanistan drawdown. In 2019–2020, a team developed 'Raven Sentry', an AI system that predicted Taliban attacks by analysing 20+ years of conflict data, weather patterns, social media, news, and satellite imagery. The AI identified patterns, such as towns going darker at night and former insurgent hotspots glowing brighter before attacks. By late 2020, Raven Sentry predicted attacks with 70% accuracy, comparable to skilled human analysts but faster, showing the AI's potential for actionable tactical warnings (The Economist 2024).

In Europe, several G7 Members participate in joint early warning mechanisms through the EU, NATO, and the UN. The EU has an early warning system (EWS) for violent conflict. It is a risk-scoring tool that compiles member-state inputs and data indicators to flag countries at risk of conflict escalation (EEAS 2022; Bressan 2024). Germany's 'PREVIEW' platform, launched by the Federal Foreign Office in 2020, aggregates public datasets for conflict forecasting to support German diplomats. The platform includes an AI-based forecasting model that generates a quarterly watchlist of countries at high risk of violence. The UK has been more discreet but is similarly investing in AI for intelligence analysis and early warning. The UK Ministry of Defence and its Defence Science & Technology Lab have run projects to leverage machine learning for conflict and crisis anticipation. An Alan Turing Institute report notes that UK and US intelligence analysts are testing AI models that successfully alerted them of Russia's invasion plans and Taliban attacks, spurring high-level interest in AI for warning (Knack and Balakrishnan 2024).

NATO has been actively integrating AI into its defence and security operations to maintain a technological edge and address emerging threats. In October 2021, Allied Defence Ministers adopted NATO's first AI Strategy, aiming to accelerate AI adoption across various capabilities while ensuring adherence to international law and NATO's values. In July 2024, NATO released a revised AI Strategy, expanding its focus to include response mechanism to AI-enabled disinformation. This update underscores the Alliance's commitment to protecting against adversarial AI use through enhanced strategic foresight and analysis. "In order to promote NATO's AI readiness, strategic foresight is needed, including a wide range of proactive activities, from anticipatory governance to alternative scenario planning based on participatory and responsible approaches" (NATO 2024). To further bolster innovation, NATO established the Defence Innovation Accelerator for the North Atlantic (DIANA) during the 2021 Brussels Summit. DIANA collaborates with researchers, entrepreneurs, and industry leaders across the Alliance to develop dual-use technologies that address critical defence and security challenges by leveraging a network of over 200 accelerator sites and test centres.

G7 governments frequently partner with tech companies, universities, and NGOs to develop early warning capabilities. Academic initiatives like ViEWS (Violence Early

Warning System) have spurred breakthroughs in methods for conflict forecasting and highlighted limitations. Moreover, G7 nations often rely on open-source early warning systems provided by think tanks or NGOs – for example, the global Armed Conflict Location & Event Data (ACLED) project and the Global Conflict Risk Index (an EU-developed statistical model) are data sources that G7 governments use to track conflict trends (Rød, Gåsste and Hegre 2024). The private sector also plays an active role in advancing the field. Microsoft's 'AI for Good lab' and Google's 'Jigsaw' have developed research projects that use natural language processing (NLP) to detect hate speech that could incite violence. There are initiatives to leverage Silicon Valley expertise for UN early warning – e.g. using social media monitoring to help UN missions. One project in Lebanon partnered with a tech firm to analyse millions of social media posts for spikes in hate speech, as an early warning for unrest (UNDPPA 2021). Civil society organisations, like the Canadian Sentinel Project use crowdsourced reports, social media and mobile phone data to provide early warnings of ethnic violence and prevent the crime of genocide worldwide (e.g. in Kenya and Myanmar) (Panic 2020). G7 governments already fund or draw on such civil-society innovations as testbeds for AI in early warning, although in an uncoordinated manner. If there are a few success stories, measuring effectiveness remains challenging. Many G7 early warning models excel at identifying ongoing conflict hotspots or well-known risk factors but are less proven in predicting entirely new outbreaks. An AI might reliably warn that a country already in turmoil will remain unstable, the tougher test is predicting surprise conflicts. Knack and Balakrishnan (2024) observe that "there is limited evidence that these tools can accurately predict novel outbreaks of violence, particularly in areas that have been historically peaceful". For instance, no AI system clearly forecasted the Arab Spring uprisings in advance – a reminder that rare triggers (like a street vendor's self-immolation in Tunisia) are hard for data-driven models to anticipate. Moreover, translating AI warnings into prevention remains the biggest challenge. The U.S. Early Warning Project identified Yemen and Myanmar as high-risk before atrocities escalated, but international action was insufficient to avert violence. This, described as the 'warning-response' gap is where the G7 should invest to bring about a positive change. G7 countries still struggle, at times, to mobilize preventive action (diplomatic pressure, peacekeeping, aid) even when warned. Thus, while AI has improved early detection of conflict risk (making warnings more frequent and data-backed), the ultimate metric is whether conflict was averted, which still relies on human response.

In summary, G7 experiments show that AI-powered early warning can work – detecting subtle indicators (e.g. lights in satellite images or shifts in online sentiment) that foreshadow conflict – and can do so at scale and speed impossible for purely human teams. They have helped predict attacks and guide preventive deployments. Yet, effectiveness varies; AI is better at highlighting broad hotspots of existing violence than predicting completely new conflicts. In practice, to work effectively these systems need to be better integrated with human analysis, local knowledge, and local agency. As they stand, these tools for AI enabled early warning and conflict prevention are far from effective and still need to reach their full potential. G7 countries should consider how investment and innovation in AI for conflict prevention can drive meaningful change.

Additionally, they should examine how AI application could contribute to closing the warning-response gap in conflict prevention.

Principles for a Pragmatic G7 Approach

I. Moving Beyond the "Dual-Use" Debate: Serious Investments in AI for Conflict Prevention

The conversation around AI's dual-use — its potential for both military and civilian applications, is no longer sufficient. G7 states must shift their focus toward actively investing in AI-driven conflict prevention. This includes funding participatory early warning and response mechanisms that leverage AI to detect emerging tensions and enable proactive intervention. Investing in conflict prevention not only saves lives but is also significantly cheaper than responding to full-scale conflict (Day 2022). G7 states should prioritize funding for AI-driven prevention tools, mediation efforts, and peacekeeping infrastructure rather than waiting for conflicts to escalate. Other than the humanitarian one, there is also an economic case for prevention: prolonged conflicts in regions like the Middle East and sub-Saharan Africa have led to billions in aid expenditures, whereas earlier intervention could have mitigated such costs.

II. Bridging the Warning-Response Gap: Coupling Forecasting with Preventive Diplomacy and Inclusive Dialogue

AI-driven forecasting alone is not enough to prevent conflict. A persistent challenge is the gap between early warning and actual responses. AI-powered forecasting models can detect conflict risks, but without the political will and institutional frameworks to act upon these warnings, their effectiveness is limited. G7 states should therefore integrate AI forecasting tools into broader conflict prevention strategies, ensuring that predictive insights lead to direct engagement with affected communities and political actors. For instance, AI alerts could trigger pre-established Crisis Response Protocols, notifying specific individuals and organizations— including trusted mediation actors and local civil society organizations—to validate warnings and coordinate with governments on early response. Furthermore, G7 states must invest in strengthening decision-making structures that ensure warnings lead to coordinated diplomatic and preventive actions. This could be done through Hybrid Peacemaking Intelligence Units – teams combining state, civil society, and tech experts to co-analyze AI early warnings, explore preventive response and activation of diplomatic lines.

III. Leveraging AI and Citizen Consultations for More Effective Conflict Prevention

Participatory approaches that integrate AI-driven data collection with direct citizen consultations can lead to more inclusive and effective conflict prevention strategies. AI tools can analyse patterns of grievances, social unrest, and political instability, while citizen engagement ensures that the technology is grounded in local realities. However, for these systems to be effective, they must be institutionalized rather than treated as ad hoc initiatives. AI can facilitate large-scale participatory processes to better understand complex conflict dynamics, but without institutional support, its potential may be lost.

Therefore, G7 countries should promote structured participatory initiatives with clear channels for incorporating citizen feedback into policy responses, ensuring that participation is not just symbolic or tokenistic, but actively informs peace-making processes.

IV. Improving Data Sharing Mechanisms for Better Forecasting

A key limitation of current AI-driven conflict prevention models is the fragmentation of data sources. Private sector entities, international organizations, and governments all collect vast amounts of data, but without proper sharing mechanisms, forecasting models remain incomplete. G7 states should establish secure, standardized data-sharing protocols allowing for better integration of information from both public and private sources. As it was previously proposed to the G7 for strategic foresight, a "digital (...) platform could serve as an integral component of a networked and cross-sectoral framework for multilateralism" (Brozus and Shulman 2022), with positive impacts on early warning for conflicts. Lessons from pandemic response efforts demonstrated how real-time data sharing across borders can improve predictive models.

Conclusions and Policy Recommendations for the G7

During the 2022 German Presidency the G7 Foreign Ministers agreed on a 'Common understanding of the potential of anticipatory action' (G7 2022). If the Statement was devoted to humanitarian assistance, some of the actions and principles identified still stand and should be updated to the current multipolar AI and geopolitical landscape. Early warning was also mentioned in the Ministerial Statement on Climate, Environment, Peace and Security, within the 'seven-point agenda for action to advance timely and effective responses to the risks posed by climate change and environmental degradation to stability and peace' (G7 2022b). The agenda proposed several points which combined with the four principles identified could be replicated for a new G7 approach for AI applications in early warning.

This paper offers three areas for interventions based on the four principles for G7 pragmatic action outlined above:

I. Capacity Building & Policy Alignment:

- In today's multipolar international system, the G7 needs to recognise the value of proactive prevention instead of reactive conflict management. AI-powered systems offer new avenues and applications. The benefits of the rise of AI should be coupled with the existent 'business case' for conflict prevention. To maximise the benefits of these applications the G7 should foster and coordinate investments in AI-powered conflict prevention, building on existing initiatives like the EU's EWS.

- While pooling resources, G7 members should also reflect on the strategic integration of AI powered early warning systems into policy processes and decision making. If AI-powered tools can revolutionise conflict analysis and prevention, political willingness is needed to bridge the 'warning-response gap'. For example, by establishing a multistakeholder network for analyzing AI-generated warnings, establishing protocols and communication channels for rapid crisis response, and involving NGOs in validating early signals and implementing localized interventions for de-escalation and conflict prevention.

II. Collaboration for Increased Operational Responses:

- G7 members should establish a dedicated G7 interministerial Working Group for Early Warning led by the principles of a Community of Practice (CoP), by combining resources from the Foreign Affairs, Digital and Cybersecurity Working Groups. For example, the G7 Rapid Response Mechanism (RRM) could be strengthened by incorporating an AI-powered early warning and early action task force or a G7 Early Action Coordination Team. This task force would bring together expertise from different working groups, as well as mediation and civil society stakeholders, to anticipate conflict escalation and coordinate diplomatic responses more effectively.

III. Data & Best Practices Sharing:

- The G7 should 'open up' to contributions from the civil society and partner with private actors. For example, by (re) launching and maintaining a G7 engagement group for early warning.
- Finally, timely data sharing is a key component for successful anticipatory action. As previously proposed to the G7 for foresight, a digital networked platform could serve as an effective tool for early warning data sharing between G7 members. This can include the development of a shared dashboard to provide risk assessments and alert levels, accessible to all G7 members, with tiered access to classified and non-classified data, and possibly APIs for integration with existing early warning systems platforms (see for instance UN Humanitarian Data Exchange).

Authors' Biographies

Leonardo De Agostini is a Project Officer at the European Union Institute for Security Studies (EUISS), working on the EU-funded project 'CFI - Countering Foreign Interference'. His research focuses on strengthening the EU's Common Security and Defence Policy against information threats, with a particular emphasis on the impacts of FIMI on conflicts. During the Italian Presidency of the G7 he contributed to the Think 7 Task Force on Peace, Security, and Global Governance with a policy brief addressing AI-generated disinformation.

Michele Giovanardi is the Programme Officer for Digital Peacemaking at CMI – Martti Ahtisaari Peace Foundation (Helsinki), as well as a researcher and Coordinator of the Global PeaceTech Hub at the Florence School of Transnational Governance, European University Institute (Florence). He is also a doctoral researcher at the United Nations University for Peace (Costa Rica), where his research focuses on the intersection of technology and peace, with a particular emphasis on the emerging field of PeaceTech and AI in peacebuilding.

Works Cited

Aeby, Michael. 2024. "High Expectations: Civil Society Participation in Conflict Early Warning and Response Systems of the AU, ECOWAS and IGAD." *The South African Journal of International Affairs* 31 (2): 167–90. https://doi.org/10.1080/10220461.2024.2385935.

Albrecht, Eduardo. 2023. "Predictive Technologies in Conflict Prevention: Practical and Policy Considerations for the Multilateral System". United Nations University – Centre for Policy Research.

Associated Press. 2024. *US intelligence agencies on genAI, wary and urgent*. ET CISO. https://ciso.economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/next-gen-tech/us-intelligence-agencies-on-genai-wary-and-urgent/110379803.

Bradshaw, Tim, Pfeifer, Sylvia. 2025. *VC funding in European defence and security tech surges to record $5.2bn. Financial Times*. https://www.ft.com/content/6c21daac-1a07-4fe2-bd32-7237a8285717.

Bressan, Sarah. 2024. "The power and limits of data for peace". EUISS Policy Brief, January. https://www.iss.europa.eu/publications/briefs/power-and-limits-data-peace.

Brozus, Lars, Shulman, Naomi. 2022. "Multilateral Cooperation in Times of Multiple Crises The G7 should focus on inclusive, selective and anticipatory policy approaches". SWP Comment, August. https://www.ssoar.info/ssoar/bitstream/handle/document/81768/ssoar-2022-brozus_et_al-Multilateral_cooperation_in_times_of.pdf sequence=1&isAllowed=y&lnkname=ssoar-2022-brozus_et_al Multilateral_cooperation_in_times_of.pdf.

Bunde, Tobias, Eisentraut, Sophie, Schütte, Leonard. 2025. "Munich Security Report 2025: Multipolarization." Munich: Munich Security Conference, February. https://securityconference.org/en/publications/munich-security-report-2025.

Code for Africa. 2023. *Unmasking hate speech in Kenyan elections with AI and collaboration. How we leveraged the power of technological innovation to turn the tide against disinformation*. January. https://medium.com/code-for-africa/unmasking-hate-speech-in-kenyan-elections-with-ai-and-collaboration-576e37d4ccb5.

De Agostini, Leonardo, Catena, Beatrice, Autolitano, Simona. 2024. "Mitigating AI-Generated Disinformation: A Cyber Collaborative Framework for G7 Governance". Think 7 2024 Policy Brief. https://archive.think7.org/mitigating-ai-generated-disinformation-a-cyber-collaborative-framework-for-g7-governance.

Day, Adam. 2022. "Conflict Prevention and Resolution in a Multipolar World: Priorities for the G7". Discussion Paper, United Nations University Centre for Policy Research. November. https://collections.unu.edu/eserv/UNU:9006/G7Conflict_Resolution_FINAL.pdf.

EEAS. 2022. *Early warning system (EWS)*. European Union. https://www.eeas.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/Factsheet%20-%20EWS.pdf.

Elsner, Mark, Atkinson, Grace, Zahidi, Saadia. 2025. "Global Risks Report 2025." World Economic Forum, January. https://www.weforum.org/publications/global-risks-report-2025.

G 7. 2022. *Statement on Strengthening Anticipatory Action in Humanitarian Assistance*. Presidency: Germany, May. https://g7g20-documents.org/database/document/2022-g7-germany-ministerial-meetings-foreign-ministers-ministers-language-statement-on-strengthening-anticipatory-action-in-humanitarian-assistance.

G 7. 2022b. *Statement on Climate, Environment, Peace and Security*. Presidency: Germany, May. https://g7g20-documents.org/database/document/2022-g7-germany-ministerial-meetings-foreign-ministers-ministers-language-statement-on-climate-environment-peace-and-security.

Giovanardi, Michele. 2024. AI for peace: mitigating the risks and enhancing opportunities. *Data & policy*, 6, e41.

Hegre, Håvard, Marie Allansson, Matthias Basedau, Michael Colaresi, Mihai Croicu, Hanne Fjelde, Frederick Hoyles, et al. 2019. "ViEWS: A Political Violence Early-Warning System." *Journal of Peace Research* 56 (2): 155–74. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343319823860.

International Crisis Group. 2025. *Ten Conflicts to Watch in 2025*. Commentary, January. https://www.crisisgroup.org/global/10-conflicts-watch-2025.

Jagtiani, Sharinee, Sabatino, Ester. 2024. "G7-led principles for military AI governance: Imperatives and pathways. Think7." https://archive.think7.org/g7-led-principles-for-military-ai-governance-imperatives-and-pathways.

Johnson, Heman, Lawal, Jimoh. 2024. Conflict Early Warning and Response Mechanism (CEWRM): Tools for Enhancing Sustainable Peace for National Development in Nigeria. *JALINGO JOURNAL OF SOCIAL AND MANAGEMENT SCIENCES*, 5(4), 145-159.

Kluz, Artur, Verhulst, Stefaan. 2024. Rethinking dual-use technology. *Prize*. https://www.kluzprize.org/updates/rethinking-dual-use-technology.

Knack, Anna, Balakrishnan, Nandita. 2024. "State of AI in strategic warning." Turing Centre for Ethical AI in Security (CETAS), The Turing Institute. https://cetas.turing.ac.uk/publications/state-ai-strategic-warning.

NATO. 2024. S*ummary of NATO's revised Artificial Intelligence (AI) strategy.* NATO, July. https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_227237.htm?selectedLocale=en.

Niyitunga, Eric Blanco. 2024. "The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Promoting Digital Public Participation for Successful Peacebuilding in Africa." *African Journal of Peace and Conflict Studies* 13 (1): 25–49. https://doi.org/10.31920/2634-3665/2024/v13n1a2.

Panic, Branka, Paige, Arthur. 2024. *AI for Peace*. CRC Press. https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003359982.

Panic, Branka. 2020. "Ecosystem Mapping the State of Play and the Path to Creating a Community of Practice." Center on International Cooperation. NYU-CIC, October.

https://cic.nyu.edu/resources/data-for-peacebuilding-and-prevention-ecosystem-mapping-the-state-of-play-and-the-path-to-creating-a-community-of-practice.

Rickli, Jean-Marc. 2025. "Dealing with the New WMDs - Weapons of Mass Disinformation". Geneva Policy Outlook (blog), January 20, https://www.genevapolicyoutlook.ch/dealing-with-the-new-wmds-weapons-of-mass-disinformation.

Rød, Espen Geelmuyden, Tim Gåsste, and Håvard Hegre. 2024. "A Review and Comparison of Conflict Early Warning Systems." *International Journal of Forecasting* 40 (1): 96–112. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijforecast.2023.01.001.

Rød, Espen Geelmuyden, Håvard Hegre, and Maxine Leis. 2025. "Predicting Armed Conflict Using Protest Data." *Journal of Peace Research* 62 (1): 3–20. https://doi.org/10.1177/00223433231186452.

Shachtman, Noah. 2007. "Pentagon forecast: Cloudy, 80% chance of riots." Wired (blog), November 9. https://www.wired.com/2007/11/lockheed-peers.

The Economist. 2024. *How America built an AI tool to predict Taliban attacks*. https://css.ethz.ch/content/dam/ethz/special-interest/gess/cis/center-for-securities-studies/pdfs/How%20America%20built%20an%20AI%20tool%20to%20predict%20Taliban%20attacks.pdf.

UNDPPA. 2024. *We Use Technology, Not the Other Way Around — Social Media and Political Analysis*. Medium. https://dppa.medium.com/we-use-technology-not-the-other-way-around-social-media-and-political-analysis-e97706ba0465.

Wählisch, Martin. 2024. "AI and the Future of Mediation." In *Still Time to Talk: Adaptation and Innovation in Peace Mediation,* Edited by Teresa Whitfield, 112-114. Conciliation Resources. https://www.c-r.org/accord/still-time-to-talk.

Zorloni, Luca. 2024. Europe is pumping billions into new military tech. Wired (blog), July 24. https://www.wired.com/story/european-commission-military-tech-spending.