Perspectives of an Alternative AI-Enhanced and Human Centred Peace Ethics Today

Shifting Technological, Political and Financial Resources Toward a Comprehensive "AI for Peace Program"

Dietrich Werner

Humboldt University Berlin and Globethics Geneva

Dec. 2025

Keywords

Abstract

Globally, military expenditures continue to rise, while capacities for conflict prevention, diplomacy, and peacebuilding remain persistently underfunded. Concurrently, rapid advances in artificial intelligence (AI) are reshaping military strategy, information environments, and geopolitical dynamics. These developments underscore the urgent need for a renewed peace ethics capable of addressing militarized AI, structural security asymmetries, and the transformative power of emerging technologies. This essay argues for a shift from a predominantly militarized conception of security toward a comprehensive framework grounded in human security, multilateralism, and a proactive "AI for Peace" agenda. Drawing on United Nations frameworks, the 2025 UN call to rebalance military spending, contemporary peace research (including the 2025 *Friedensgutachten* of the German Peace Research Institutes), and current geopolitical challenges, the essay develops conceptual foundations, policy alternatives, and ethical criteria, and presents a focused case study illustrating how AI for Peace tools could support conflict mediation and peace assessment in the ongoing Russian–Ukrainian war.

1.   Beyond a One-Sided Military Conception of Security

Renewing the UN Call for Comprehensive Human Security and Revisiting the Helsinki 1975 Principles

Since the end of the Cold War, most national security doctrines have continued to operate within a narrow, state-centric, and predominantly militarized understanding of what constitutes safety and stability[1]. Even as global dynamics have shifted — with intensified climate impacts, cyber vulnerabilities, transnational organized crime, pandemics, economic shocks, and disinformation ecosystems — many governments still treat security primarily as a matter of deterrence, force projection, and technological superiority. This pattern has been reinforced rather than challenged by several recent national security strategy documents.

A prominent example is the new *United States National Security Strategy* released in early December 2025, which has raised wide and strong criticism of European allies not only because it demands strategic and external intervention into internal European politics to the advantage of extremist far right parties but also does not mention any major problem with Russia any more hiding the immense guilt accumulated by starting a brutal war of invasion into Ukraine any more. Thus, this revised US security strategy seems to indicate a complete break with basic principles of transatlantic partnership between the US and European allies so far. Moreover, this new US security strategy is characterized by a security concept which is strongly reasserting military primacy, competitive deterrence, and technological dominance —

---

[1] Argumentation for a wide security concept, which recognizes legitimate security interests of Russia, and based on the Helsinki tradition, should not be limited by selective memory: Jeffrey D. Sachs, Offener Brief von Jeffrey Sachs: „Lernen Sie Geschichte, Herr Bundeskanzler!", Berliner Zeitung, 17.12.2025, https://www.berliner-zeitung.de/politik-gesellschaft/offener-brief-von-jeffrey-sachs-lernen-sie-geschichte-herr-bundeskanzler-li.10010628

including expanding investments in AI-enabled defense, autonomous systems, and integrated warfighting technologies. While the document acknowledges global interdependence and mentions non-military risks, its solutions remain overwhelmingly framed in terms of military readiness, extended deterrence alliances, and maintaining strategic advantage against peer competitors. Civilian and peacebuilding dimensions appear marginal, often subordinated to geostrategic rivalry. This approach illustrates a broader global trend: major powers increasingly interpret AI and emerging technologies through the logic of competition and control, rather than through cooperation, prevention, and shared human security. In addition, this trend interprets the concept of security predominantly and one-sidedly in military terms of technological might and military power for deterrence and solutions on the battlefield.

It belongs to the key convictions of this essay coming from a committed ethicists rooted in Christian religious traditions that such an approach is ethically and strategically insufficient. First, it narrows the horizon of possible responses to crises that in many cases are fundamentally social, political, ecological, or economic in nature. Second, it embeds AI within an adversarial security paradigm that risks accelerating arms races, automating escalation dynamics, and deepening global insecurity. Third, it marginalizes precisely those investments — diplomacy, conflict prevention, sustainable development, climate resilience, peace infrastructures — that empirical research has shown to be essential for preventing violence and strengthening long-term security.

By contrast, the United Nations (UN) has repeatedly emphasized the need for a broader paradigm of security. Presenting the 2025 report *The Security We Need: Rebalancing Military Spending for a Sustainable and Peaceful Future* on 9 September 2025, Secretary-General António Guterres stressed that "the world is spending far more on waging war than on building peace." In his 2025 address The General Secretary underscores the alignment between human, social, political, ecological and health related security, noting that record military expenditures are currently not matched by

investments in peacebuilding, development, or resilience, thereby endangering both state and human security.[2]

Guterres highlighted that global military expenditure reached a record US$ 2.7 trillion in 2024, the equivalent of US$ 334 for every person on Earth[3] — an amount that "crowds out" urgent investments in health, education, social protection, climate resilience, poverty reduction, and support for vulnerable communities.[4] Guterres warned with unusual sharpness that "the world is sleepwalking into a disordered and dangerous era in which record military expenditures coexist with deteriorating human security."[5] The Secretary-General's call is unambiguous: lasting security cannot be achieved through military spending alone, and "budgets are choices" that reflect societies' moral and political priorities.

These remarks reaffirm the UN's long-standing commitment to a holistic conception of human security, first formulated in the 1994 Human Development Report, but now updated for an era of systemic and technological interdependence.[6] These insights echo earlier innovations in international security thinking. The human security paradigm, developed by UN agencies and numerous scholars, places individuals — not territorial borders — at the centre of security policy. It emphasizes that people's safety depends on economic well-being, access to health and education, environmental stability, political inclusion, and protection of human rights. Similarly, the Helsinki Final Act of 1975 articulated a model of comprehensive security rooted in cooperation, sovereignty, and mutual

---

[2] OSCE (Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe). *The OSCE Concept of Comprehensive Security*. Vienna: OSCE Secretariat, 2003.

[3] António Guterres, "Secretary-General's Remarks at the Press on the Release of the Report the Security We Need," *UN Press Release*, September 9, 2025.

[4] António Guterres. Ibid.

[5] António Guterres Ibid.

[6] UNDP, *Human Development Report 1994: New Dimensions of Human Security*, New York: UNDP.

restraint, showing that stability emerges not only from military balance but also from confidence-building, dialogue, and shared norms.

Yet despite these conceptual resources, the global trend continues to move toward militarization — and the new U.S. strategy illustrates how even technologically advanced democracies still default to military solutions when confronted with complex risks. The 2025 UN report warns that this imbalance between military and non-military spending undermines both sustainable development and human security worldwide.

In sum, advancing a meaningful peace ethics today requires decisively moving beyond the narrow, militaristic paradigm embodied in many contemporary national strategies. An alternative must embrace a comprehensive, human-centered, and cooperative understanding of security — one that reorients political, technological, and financial resources toward peace infrastructures, prevention, diplomacy, resilience, and inclusive global solidarity.

This broadening of the security concept is not new. It has essential historical anchors in the 1975 Helsinki Final Act, which articulated ten guiding principles—the so-called Helsinki Decalogue—as the basis of a stable and cooperative security order in Europe. The Act famously declared the "indivisibility of security," insisting that "security in Europe is indivisible and the security of every participating State is inseparably linked to the security of all others."[7] This mutuality resonates strongly with contemporary debates about common security and global interdependence.

Among its core principles were:

1. Sovereign equality and respect for rights inherent in sovereignty
2. Refraining from the threat or use of force
3. Inviolability of frontiers
4. Territorial integrity of States

---

[7] Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE), Final Act of Helsinki, August 1, 1975.

5. Peaceful settlement of disputes
6. Non-intervention in internal affairs
7. Respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms
8. Equal rights and self-determination of peoples
9. Cooperation among States
10. Fulfillment in good faith of obligations under international law

Collectively, these principles constituted a pioneering model of what later came to be known as common and comprehensive security, anticipating key components of the UN's human security agenda. The OSCE, as the institutional successor to the Helsinki Process, continues to embody this holistic vision, emphasizing politico-military, economic-environmental, and human security dimensions as interlocking pillars[8]. Despite its well-known limitations, scholars have repeatedly emphasized that the OSCE remains one of the few remaining multilateral forums capable of engaging Russia and NATO countries simultaneously—a fact of renewed relevance since the 2022 escalation of the Russian-Ukrainian war[9].

Given this historical and institutional context, the present essay argues that any contemporary peace ethics—particularly one involving advanced AI—must build upon the Helsinki principles, UN human security frameworks, and OSCE's cooperative security architecture. Only then can new technological instruments, including "AI for Peace," be aligned with broader principles of shared security rather than reinforcing militarized competition.

The Helsinki framework directly informs contemporary debates on comprehensive security. Its emphasis on mutuality, transparency, and cooperative engagement parallels the growing recognition that security must extend beyond the state to encompass societal resilience and human dignity.

---

[8] OSCE. 2003. *The OSCE Concept of Comprehensive Security*. Vienna: OSCE Secretariat.

[9] P. Zellner, "The OSCE in Crisis: Institutional Resilience and Geopolitical Fragmentation," *European Security* 31, no. 4 (2022).

This perspective provides the intellectual and normative foundation for integrating human security into modern peace ethics.

Human Security: Definition and Relevance

Following the Helsinki principles, the 1994 Human Development Report provided a seminal operationalization of human-centered security, defining human security as: "freedom from fear, freedom from want, and the freedom to live in dignity."[10]

This concept expands the security paradigm from state-centric, military-focused approaches to encompass economic stability, health, environmental sustainability, and protection of fundamental human rights. Human security is thus inherently multidimensional and preventative: it emphasizes the structural, societal, and technological investments necessary to preempt violence, deprivation, and political instability. By situating human security in the Helsinki framework, policymakers can reconcile comprehensive European security principles with global humanitarian imperatives.

2.   Military and Non-Military Investments in Peace and Security

Disparities in Global Spending and the Weaponization of AI

The global landscape of security expenditure demonstrates a profound imbalance: military spending is rising at record pace while investments in non-military peacebuilding, diplomacy, mediation infrastructures, and global public goods remain comparatively stagnant. According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), world military expenditure in 2024–2025 reached an unprecedented $2.44 trillion, marking the ninth

---

[10] Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE). 1975. Final Act of Helsinki, August 1, 1975.

consecutive year of increase[11]. Europe registered the fastest rate of growth, driven largely by the ongoing war in Ukraine and heightened tensions with Russia. NATO members collectively surpassed the long-promoted target of 2 percent of GDP, yet much of this additional spending has consolidated a model of security narrowly focused on deterrence and armament.

Parallel to rising budgets is the accelerating weaponization of artificial intelligence, including autonomous targeting systems, cyber-AI integration, and data-driven battlefield optimization. SIPRI's 2025 report on AI and Emerging Disruptive Technologies observes that over 60 states are now developing military AI systems, with at least 20 conducting operational deployments or active battlefield trials[12]. AI-enhanced drones played a decisive role in the Caucasus conflicts, in the Red Sea confrontations, and increasingly in the Ukraine conflict. The diffusion of such systems risks creating a destabilizing arms dynamic, as countries perceive the need to keep pace with emerging "algorithmic warfare."

By contrast, funding for conflict prevention, peacebuilding, climate adaptation, global public health, and socio-economic resilience remains dramatically underfinanced. The UN Peacebuilding Fund, for example, has repeatedly highlighted its budgetary fragility, with many member states contributing only marginally compared to their rapidly expanding defense spending[13]. The mismatch reflects what Guterres calls a "dangerous misallocation of global resources," warning that the world spends "more on preparing for war than preparing for a sustainable peace[14]."

This imbalance also reflects a deeper conceptual issue: security is still primarily defined in militarized terms, despite decades of scholarship emphasizing the multidimensional roots of conflict—poverty, exclusion, environmental stress, and governance failures. Investments in these areas not

---

[11] SIPRI. 2025. *SIPRI Yearbook 2025: Armaments, Disarmament and International Security*. Stockholm: SIPRI.

[12] SIPRI, AI and Emerging Military Technologies (2025 Report).

[13] UN Peacebuilding Fund, Annual Report 2024.

[14] Guterres, "The Security We Need."

only reduce risks of conflict but are also empirically correlated with increased long-term stability[11]. Yet these insights remain marginal in state budgeting priorities.

A central argument of this essay is that part of this misallocation stems from the absence of technological infrastructures dedicated to peace. While militaries around the world are building high-performance AI systems, there is no comparable investment community or ecosystem for the development of AI for Peace, peace mediation, conflict early-warning analytics, or global risk assessment. The emerging disparity between military-AI and peace-AI mirrors the broader problem of disproportionate military spending—and risks reinforcing an increasingly unstable global security architecture.

3. Alternatives to the Military Paradigm

Insights from the 2025 Joint German Peace Research Institutes' Report (Friedensgutachten 2025)

The German Peace Research Institutes' *Joint Report 2025* (*Friedensgutachten 2025*) offers a timely and comprehensive critique of Europe's security trajectory and provides alternative pathways consistent with cooperative security and conflict prevention. The report explicitly warns that Europe risks entering a new long-term arms race unless it reimagines its security beyond deterrence, calling for a "renewed diplomacy, sustained economic transformation, and robust international institutions[15]."

---

[15] German Peace Research Institutes, Friedensgutachten 2025: Statement. Berlin: Joint Conference of Peace Research Institutes, 2025, 4.

Key recommendations of the 2025 Report

1. Rebalancing Military and Civilian Security Investments

The report argues that Europe's exclusive focus on armament revitalizes Cold War patterns and neglects non-military tools such as preventive diplomacy, crisis-response institutions, and support for societal resilience[16].

2. Strengthening OSCE Institutions as a Bridge for Cooperative Security

The report emphasizes that the OSCE remains "indispensable" because it is the only inclusive Euro-Atlantic organization still capable of engaging all conflict actors—including Russia—and because it institutionalizes the comprehensive security concept originating in Helsinki 1975[17].

3. Revitalizing Arms Control and Confidence-Building Measures

The authors warn that the erosion of arms control treaties (INF, Open Skies, CFE) has created a dangerous vacuum. They call for renewed negotiations on transparency, risk-reduction, and AI-enabled arms control[18].

4. Promoting International Norms for Military AI

Friedensgutachten 2025 insists that the EU and Germany should push for global rules governing autonomous weapons, predictive targeting, and battlefield automation—technologies that, if unregulated, might lower thresholds for conflict[19].

5. Investing in Peace-Technology Ecosystems

For the first time, the report explicitly highlights the need for technologies dedicated to peacebuilding, including AI for conflict early warning, civilian

---

[16] Ibid., 6–8.

[17] Ibid., 11.

[18] Ibid., 13-15.

[19] Ibid., 17.

protection analytics, and peace mediation support[20]. This recommendation forms a direct intellectual precursor to the broader normative framework of an AI for Peace movement, which this essay develops in chapter 4.

The Friedensgutachten 2025 thus provides a scholarly grounding for the shift advocated here: the move from an arms-race logic to a comprehensive, integrated security ethic guided by diplomacy, prevention, and technological innovation for peace rather than war.

4.　Emerging Initiatives Toward "AI for Peace (AI4P)"

Characteristics, Goals, and the Rise of a Minority Learning Movement

Over the past five years, a small but growing number of initiatives have attempted to define the contours of an "AI for Peace" ecosystem. These efforts remain marginal compared to military-AI projects but are gathering intellectual and institutional momentum.

Defining Characteristics of the AI for Peace Movement

1.　Normative Anchoring in Human Security and Common Security

AI for Peace is explicitly grounded in the UN human security framework, the OSCE's comprehensive security concept, and the Helsinki principles of mutual restraint and cooperative engagement.

---

[20] Ibid., 22-24.

2. Technological Innovation Aimed at Conflict Prevention

Key technical fields include conflict early-warning systems, peace-data analytics, ceasefire monitoring, AI-supported mediation, and generative-AI tools for dialogue facilitation and scenario simulation.

3. Ethical Commitment to Transparency, Inclusivity, and Non-Weaponization

Unlike dual-use AI systems produced by major tech actors, AI for Peace advocates propose a strict separation from military applications and insist on open, auditable, and accountable development.

4. Interdisciplinary and Trans-institutional Collaboration

These initiatives bring together peace researchers, data scientists, diplomats, civil society mediators, and AI ethicists.

5. A Minority Learning Movement

The movement is described as a learning minority—a small group that aims to introduce new ethical, technical, and political frameworks into broader security discourse, analogous to earlier epistemic communities shaping arms control or climate governance.

Key Goals of AI for Peace

- Support early detection of escalating tensions.
- Strengthen fact-finding and transparency in conflict zones.
- Assist mediators in mapping positions, interests, and zones of possible agreement.
- Provide risk assessments of military escalations, including AI-driven battlefield dynamics.
- Enable citizen participation, dialogue platforms, and deliberative democratic processes.
- Enhance post-conflict peacebuilding, including monitoring of agreements and reconstruction efforts.

Through these aims, AI for Peace seeks to rebalance the technological landscape, countering the overwhelming dominance of military-AI systems by developing instruments dedicated to peace and human security.

5. Toward International Collaboration and Synergies

A Foundation for an Integral Peace Ethics Adequate for AI for Peace

Developing an AI for Peace architecture requires more than technical competence; it demands a new integral peace ethics capable of linking political, technological, economic, and normative dimensions. This ethics must address at least five levels:

1. Political-Ethical Level: Commitment to Mutual Security

Drawing upon the Helsinki Decalogue and UN human security principles, an integral peace ethics rejects unilateral militarization and emphasizes shared responsibility.

2. Technological Level: Standards, Audits, and Non-Weaponization

International agreements must regulate dual-use AI technologies, set transparency standards, and prevent algorithmic escalation.

3. Economic Level: Rebalancing Resources

Guterres's 2025 report calls for the redirection of even a fraction of global defense expenditures into sustainable development and peace infrastructures[21]. This includes dedicated funds for peace-technology.

---

[21] Guterres, "The Security We Need".

4. Institutional Level: Inter-institutional Collaboration

Cooperation is needed among the UN, OSCE, African Union, ASEAN, EU, research institutions, peace NGOs, and tech companies—especially in developing shared datasets, testing frameworks, and ethical guidelines.

5. Cultural Level: Education for Peace and Digital Literacy

Peace ethics must be embedded in curricula for AI developers, diplomats, and military personnel alike, cultivating a culture that recognizes human interdependence.

In all five dimensions, the OSCE's cooperative security model provides critical institutional memory and tested mechanisms for confidence-building, transparency, and dialogue—even under adverse political conditions. Scholars such as Adler, Bastian, Zellner, and Spohr have shown that despite its weakened position, the OSCE remains a crucial platform for arms control, crisis communication, and normative dialogue in Europe[22].

Thus, the AI for Peace agenda should be seen not as a replacement for existing institutions but as a technological complement that could strengthen them.

6. Case Study: Russian—Ukrainian War

What Could an AI4P-Program Contribute to Conflict Analysis, Mediation, and Peace Assessment in the Russian—Ukrainian War?

The Russian–Ukrainian war has generated immense suffering and fundamentally reshaped European security. It also demonstrates the urgent need for new analytical tools capable of understanding rapid battlefield changes, misinformation dynamics, and shifting negotiation windows.

---

[22] Michael Bastian. 2021. The OSCE and Cooperative Security in Europe. London: Routledge. Kristina Spohr, "The Helsinki Legacy and European Order," International Affairs 98, no. 6 (2022).

Potential Contributions of AI for Peace

1. Conflict Early Warning and Escalation Risk Analysis

AI systems could analyze troop movements, satellite imagery, cyber activity, economic sanctions impacts, and political rhetoric to model escalation probabilities and identify periods conducive to de-escalation.

2. Ceasefire and Humanitarian Corridor Monitoring

Machine-learning tools could support independent verification by integrating multisource data (video, sensor, and witness reports), reducing misinformation and increasing trust.

3. Dialogue and Mediation Support Tools

Generative AI could help map the interests of parties, simulate negotiation outcomes, identify mutually beneficial compromises, and test confidence-building scenarios.

4. Open-Source Intelligence (OSINT) Reliability Assessment

AI could help distinguish verified from manipulated content, countering disinformation and improving the quality of public discourse.

5. Humanitarian Impact Assessment

AI could track displacement, infrastructure damage, and social vulnerabilities, assisting in planning reconstruction and peacebuilding.

However, these contributions depend on strict ethical safeguards: non-instrumentalization by combatants, transparent data governance, and alignment with international humanitarian law.

In the longer term, AI for Peace could enhance OSCE-style monitoring missions, support UN mediators, and provide a model for technological peacebuilding applicable to other conflicts.

7. Conclusion

This essay has shown that contemporary security thinking remains overwhelmingly dominated by a military logic — especially as military AI becomes deeply embedded in defense strategies.

However, the 2025 UN call for rebalancing global spending and rethinking what constitutes real security adds powerful momentum to a shift toward an alternative human-centered, comprehensive and AI-enhanced concept of security.

A reimagined peace ethics — integrating human security, development, social justice, environmental sustainability, and technological responsibility — is urgently needed. The alternative pathways proposed by the Friedensgutachten 2025 provide a robust, research-based foundation for such a transformation.

The world stands at a crossroads. Military expenditures and weaponized AI are growing at alarming speed, while investments in peace, diplomacy, and human security remain insufficient. Yet alternative pathways exist—deeply rooted in the UN's human security agenda, the Helsinki Final Act's comprehensive security principles, and the continuing relevance of OSCE cooperative security architectures.

Building on this foundation, the emerging "AI for Peace" movement offers a tangible way to redirect technological, political, and financial resources toward building resilience, preventing conflict, supporting mediation, and enabling inclusive peace processes. By fostering international collaboration, investing in peace technologies, and embedding ethical governance frameworks, we can steer AI's transformative potential toward constructive, life-enhancing uses rather than destructive militarization.

The case of the Russian–Ukrainian conflict demonstrates the concrete utility — and risks — of deploying AI for Peace in contemporary crises. With careful design, transparent governance, and global cooperation, AI for Peace (AI4P) could become part of a new security architecture — one rooted not in fear and arms, but in solidarity, dignity, prevention, and peace.

In an era of accelerating technological change and deepening global interdependence, investing in "AI for Peace" is not merely ethical — it is strategic. The security the world truly needs is not just military might, but human security. And now — with AI's rise — we have both a challenge and an opportunity: to choose where we direct our investments, and to decide which future we want to build.

6. Bibliography

Books and Reports

Bastian, Michael. *The OSCE and Cooperative Security in Europe*. London: Routledge, 2021.

CSCE (Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe). Final Act of Helsinki. August 1, 1975.

Friedensforschungsinstitute. *Friedensgutachten 2025: Statement*. Berlin: Joint Conference of Peace Research Institutes, 2025.

SIPRI (Stockholm International Peace Research Institute). *SIPRI Yearbook 2025: Armaments, Disarmament and International Security*. Stockholm: SIPRI, 2025.

SIPRI. *AI and Emerging Military Technologies*. Stockholm: SIPRI, 2025.

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). *Human Development Report 1994: New Dimensions of Human Security*. New York: UNDP, 1994.

UN Peacebuilding Fund. *Annual Report 2024*. New York: United Nations.

Articles

Collier, Paul, and Anke Hoeffler. "Greed and Grievance in Civil War." *Oxford Economic Papers* 56, no. 4 (2004).

Sachs, Jeffrey D. Offener Brief von Jeffrey Sachs: „Lernen Sie Geschichte, Herr Bundeskanzler!", *Berliner Zeitung*, 17.12.2025, https://www.berliner-zeitung.de/politik-gesellschaft/offener-brief-von-jeffrey-sachs-lernen-sie-geschichte-herr-bundeskanzler-li.10010628

Spohr, Kristina. "The Helsinki Legacy and European Order." *International Affairs* 98, no. 6 (2022). Zellner, Peter. "The OSCE in Crisis:

Institutional Resilience and Geopolitical Fragmentation." European Security 31, no. 4 (2022).

Official Documents and Statements

Guterres, António. "Secretary-General's Remarks at the Press on the Release of the Report The Security We Need." United Nations, September 9, 2025.

OSCE. The OSCE Concept of Comprehensive Security. Vienna: OSCE Secretariat, 2003.

7. Appendix

Survey on Practical Models - Current AI for Peace Programs — Examples, Program Areas, Functionalities, and Key Gaps

1) AI for Peace (independent initiative / platform)

AI for Peace serves as a platform for ethical, conflict-sensitive deployment of AI in humanitarian and peacebuilding contexts. It provides tools, training, and guidance rooted in a "do no harm" approach.

Program areas

Humanitarian action & recovery
Capacity-building and policy guidance
Ethics & conflict-sensitive deployment

Functionalities

Playbooks and ethical deployment frameworks
Case studies and guidance on applying AI for situational awareness, data collection, and emergency trends

2) UN Global Pulse — AI and Big Data for Peace & Humanitarian Action

UN Global Pulse is a major UN innovation initiative exploring how AI and big-data analytics can support early warning, humanitarian response, and peacebuilding.

Program areas

- Early warning & conflict trend analysis
- Real-time monitoring of social discourse

- Responsible data policy & pilot deployments

Functionalities

- NLP tools detecting spikes in harmful speech, rumors, and grievances
- Systems that combine radio, social media, and official reporting to enhance situational awareness

3) PeaceTech Lab / PeaceTech Alliance

PeaceTech Lab (originally from the U.S. Institute of Peace) develops tech-driven solutions and data-science tools that local peacebuilders and civic actors can use to prevent violence and strengthen community resilience.

Program areas

- Monitoring and early detection of communal violence
- Counter-misinformation tools
- Civic engagement and reconciliation technologies

Functionalities

- Hate-speech and misinformation detection systems
- Data dashboards and visual analytics for tracking incidents and sentiment

4) Regional Initiatives: AI for Peace Africa

Regional efforts such as "AI for Peace Africa" work with the African Union and national institutions to expand responsible AI capacity for conflict prevention.

Program areas

- Training and institutional capacity-building
- Policy frameworks for responsible AI in peace operations
- Localized tool design and deployment

Functionalities

- Training programs for AU and member-state officials
- Local-context policy guidance and early-warning pilot systems

5) UN Departmental AI Pilots (e.g., DPPA tools such as Sparrow, Qatalog)

Across UN departments, experimental AI-based systems support political analysis, diplomacy, and early warning.

Program areas

- Mediation and political analysis support
- Multi-lingual early warning
- Processing of local dialogue and media data

Functionalities

- NLP workflows for large-scale analysis of social media, radio, and community feedback
- Semantic search, clustering, and trend-detection tools for analysts

6) International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) — Ethics, Norms, and Humanitarian Protection

The ICRC focuses on legal, ethical, and operational issues related to AI in conflict, emphasizing civilian protection and human control.

Program areas

- International humanitarian law & ethical analysis
- Operational risk assessment for AI in conflict settings
- Norm-development and expert consultations

Functionalities

- Technical and policy reports on human control, risk mitigation, and legal compliance
- Guidance for states and militaries on responsible AI use

8. Short biography

Dietrich Werner (born 1956) is a Senior Research Scholar in the Research Programme on Religious Communities and Sustainable Development at the University of Berlin, and President of the Globethics Foundation in Geneva. From 2014 to 2022, he served as Head of the Theological Dialogue and Policies Unit at Bread for the World, Germany. Previously, he was Director of the Ecumenical Theological Education Programme at the World Council of Churches in Geneva (2007–2014), and Executive Officer for Theological and Ecumenical Education at the Northelbian Centre for World Mission in Hamburg (2000–2007). He also served as Director of Studies at the Missions Academy of the University of Hamburg (1993–2000), and holds the title of Honorary Professor of Intercultural Theology at the University of Applied Sciences in Hermannsburg. Email: werner@globethics.net