

Research Article

Verbal Judo and Prospective Crime – How AI + Mind Genomics Can Synthesize Mind Sets for Training

Sharon Wingert¹, Tonya Anderson², Howard R. Moskowitz^{3*}, Stephen D. Rappaport⁴, Taylor Mulvey⁵ and Martin Mulvey⁶

¹Tactical Data Group, Stafford, VA, USA

²Tactical Data Group, Stafford, VA, USA

³Cognitive Behavioral Insights, LLC, Albany, NY, USA

⁴SDR Consulting, Inc., Norwalk, CT, USA

⁵St. Thomas More School, Oakdale, CT, USA

⁶Cognitive Behavioral Insights, LLC, Albany, NY, USA

*Corresponding author: Howard Moskowitz, Cognitive Behavioral Insights, LLC, Albany NY, USA

Received: March 30, 2024; Accepted: April 07, 2024; Published: April 17, 2024

Abstract

This paper shows how the emerging technology of AI (large language models), coupled with the world-view of the importance of mind-sets contributed by Mind Genomics can help negotiators to learn how to deal with situations where violence may take place unless the hostage situation is defused. The approach technique uses artificial intelligence embedded in the Mind Genomics platform to specify the situation, and then to hypothesize the thinking and appropriate actions for the negotiator in the presence of different mind-sets. The paper shows how to interact with AI to synthesize these mind-sets, then how to recognize them, what these mind-sets might be thinking, and suggested communications. The paper focuses on educating police negotiators through the use of easy-to-access technology, and inexpensive, rapid learning by iterating the questions asked to AI. Rather than waiting for actual data, the paper uses artificial intelligence based in large language models to provide information that can be adjusted to a specific situation, providing the opportunity to look at the same issue but from different perspectives provided by the nature of the situation and the mind-set of the person who must be disarmed without causing damage.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence, Mind genomics, Mind-set, Synthesize, Training

Introduction

Look at the daily news to see how many times persons or groups turn hostile to police officers or conduct harm to property or people and must be bargained with by police negotiators. The problem is what police and other negotiators should say in specific instances, when they are immersed in the situation. Negotiations, such as family violence and criminal hostage-taking, requires talent, sensitivity to others, and understanding what to say, knowing what works, knowing what doesn't. After years of experience, expert negotiators learn what to say and its consequences. How do we teach new hires about new situations? Can negotiation opportunities be synthesized? Artificial bodies designed to offer feedback are used in medicine. Is it possible with artificial minds to teach negotiation skills?

There are many different situations where individuals or groups become hostile to police officers, or where these groups become hostile and do hostile acts to property or to people and must be negotiated with by police negotiators. The issue is what to do in particular situations. The knowledge base of negotiating with criminals is not new, spanning centuries, a fixed part of the human comedy. The characters may change, the causes may evolve, society may change what it considered to be "out of bounds" behavior, but the problem remains [1-3]. In the end where the crime or prospective crime is

under the "control" of a person, one may have the opportunity to "talk through" that situation with the person, reaching a positive outcome. What does one say, how does one say it, and when? This ability to talk through requires a skill that must be developed, a sensitivity to individuals, a sense of knowing what to say, what will work and what will not work.

Over many years of experience, professional negotiators begin to understand what they can say, what they should say, the repercussions of what they say. The question becomes, how do we transmit this information for new situations to people who are just coming on the job? Is there a way to synthesize negotiation opportunities?

Advances in artificial intelligence based on LLMs (large language models) have made AI more attractive [4,5]. Data analysis using statistics used to be challenging. Once the data were analyzed, the user faced the onerous task of interpreting the results, and then putting that interpretation into text. The result was often tortured prose rather than felicitous and well expressed. Today's LLMs now enable an almost-human teaching interface, both at the level of the input, and at the level of the output. More important, however, is the emerging reality that the LLMs need not produce factual results, requiring statistical and factual accuracy. We can instruct the LLM to suggest how reality is structured, and then investigate the different nuances

within that constructed reality. Everything offered today is assumed to be generalities presented for learning purposes.

The emerging science of Mind Genomics — which has been developing for almost 40 years — helps when it becomes the precursor to LLM simulation. Mind Genomics is empirical, working with combinations of phrases, having people read the combinations, and rate each one. Through statistical modeling (regression and clustering), Mind Genomics discovers the language which “convinces,” which makes the person answer “yes.” The process uncovers mind-sets, groups of individuals who respond differently to the same set of phrases or messages. These mind-sets are uncovered through empirical evaluations with real people [6,7]. Subjects such as law, medicine, as well as the minds of children and adults have been topics of Mind Genomics studies [8-11].

The combination of Mind Genomics thinking about mind-sets and LLMs to provide “content” generates a new world of opportunities to understand the way people think, doing so quickly by simulation. The approach taken in this paper uses LLMs to provide deep, albeit simulated content, for these mind-sets. In a sense, we use Mind Genomics “thinking” to inform and guide the start of the LLM on a topic area, with the result that we generate a system to learn quickly.

The actual system is embedded in the Mind Genomics platform (BimiLeap.com). The access to the LLM is through the embedded Idea Coach. Idea Coach, in turn, uses an entire structure of inquiry called SCAS, Socrates as a Service. With Idea Coach, the user can type in the topic, and a request to the LLM. The SCAS translates this request, giving it to the LLM. The process is straightforward, requiring only an account, and the proper information provided to Idea Coach.

Phase 1 – Setting up the scenario for the LLM

After creating a Bimileap account and studying, the user is instructed to use Idea Coach to enter ideas. The format is a “squib” similar to that shown in Table 1. One has to be certain that the syntax is correct, and that everything is closed-ended. The LLMs are powerful, but in this case not particularly forgiving. After tries, however, with feedback given in 15 seconds, one eventually understands the syntax and what to do for the specific case.

Table 1 shows the request, the aforementioned squib. Table 1 supplies very little information to the AI, Socrates as a Service, but requests a fair amount of testable, actionable information that can be validated because of their concrete nature.

There is no underlying “reason” for selecting six mind-sets, other than the desire to see what the system returns. In fact, across the different iterations, seven iterations emerged, not six. They can be discussed and even tested in real-life.

As a point of information, the brief or squib in Table 1 is the toughest aspect of the procedure and sometimes requires many iterations, viz., attempts. It takes the large language model about 15 seconds per iteration. An inexperienced user might require 20 iterations to get the “syntax” of the request “just right.” Those 20 iterations might require 5-10 minutes.

The artificial intelligence SCAS generates seven mind-sets, shown in Tables 2A-2G, one more mind-set than was specified in Table 1. This over-delivery, as well as corresponding under-delivery, often happens because the mind-sets are developed in separate iterations. Generally, each iteration produces one or two mind-sets. The user ends up requesting more iterations to complete the full number. The under-delivery of one, two, occasionally three, mind-sets in an iteration ends up being not problematic because, as noted above, each iteration requires about 10-15 seconds. The speed and ease to iterate often ends up with some mind-sets repeated in different iterations, and the happy coincidence of more mind-sets than were planned for. Finally, when a mind-set repeats in several iterations, the language surrounding the mind-set may change, and some of the finer points may change from iteration to iteration. Most of the “knowledge” will be the same, but some may be fresh ideas across iterations.

From Tables 2A-2G, it becomes apparent that there is an education to be had. Whether any of these results represent actual mind-sets or not, whether these are the slogans or not, the results are interesting and educational. One even gets a sense of the effectiveness of the rating by artificial intelligence, which is fascinating in and of itself. We might even have put in things like, *provide slogans that are not effective*, and we could do that for each of these as well. In the interest of space and brevity, we have limited our exploration of the mind-set.

Table 1: The “squib” or query (background, specific request) given to SCAS (Socrates as a Service), the AI embedded in the Mind Genomics platform, BimiLeap.com.

<p>Data compiled by the FBI shows an alarming trend: a nationwide increase in deadly violence against police officers. Police officers searching for answers to the rise in violence point to a number of possible reasons to explain the increase. Many in law enforcement say they are sensitive to the shifting public sentiments especially in the aftermath of viral videos that show police officers using force. We know that there are six mind-sets of people who use deadly violence against police officers.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> List all six mind-sets in CAPS. Whenever you refer to the mind-set use the mind-set name in all caps. For each mind-set of a person who uses deadly violence against police officers, answer all the questions below. What is the name of the mind-set (PUT INTO CAPS)? What are four things which allow the police office to recognize this mind-set? Preface by words: CUES TO HELP RECOGNIZE THIS MIND SET. Then put the rest of the answer in regular letters (not caps). <p>What are four slogans that the police officer can use to make sure this mind-set stops violence, and refrain from doing violence? Start with words: SLOGANS TO USE WITH MIND-SET. Then put the rest of the answer in regular letters (not caps).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Rate each slogan on effectiveness with this type of mind-set. Start with the words SLOGAN EFFECTIVENESS. Then write the slogan and the rating of effectiveness. Put the rest of the answer in regular letters (not caps). Rate each slogan on the degree of positive response by the general public to the police using the slogan. Remember that the general public does not know the mind-set of the person using deadly violence. All the general public knows is the slogan. Do this for each slogan. Start with the words THE PUBLIC’S REACTION TO THIS SLOGAN. Put the rest of the answer in regular letters (not caps). Describe what the mind-set is thinking for each slogan when the mind-set hears the police officer use the slogan. Start with words WHAT MIND-SET THINKS WHEN PRESENTED WITH THIS SLOGAN. Then write the slogan and then what the mind-set thinks about this slogan. Put the rest of the answer in regular letters (not caps).

Table 2A: Results for the MACHO Mind-Set.

<p>A. Macho Mind-Set</p> <p>Cues To Help Recognize This Mind Set: displays aggressive behavior, uses derogatory language towards authority figures, seeks to prove dominance, often refuses to comply with orders from law enforcement</p> <p>Slogan Effectiveness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Violence is not the answer" - 4 out of a maximum of 5 • "Respect goes both ways" - 3 out of a maximum of 5 • "Let's resolve this peacefully" - 5 out of a maximum of 5 • "Cooperation saves lives" - 4 out of a maximum of 5 <p>The Public's Reaction to this Slogan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Violence is not the answer" - Positive • "Respect goes both ways" - Neutral • "Let's resolve this peacefully" - Positive • "Cooperation saves lives" - Positive <p>What The Mind-Set Thinks When Presented with this Slogan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Violence is not the answer" - Thinks authority is weak • "Respect goes both ways" - Feels defensive • "Let's resolve this peacefully" - Considers options • "Cooperation saves lives" - Understands benefits
--

Table 2B: Results for the RADICALIZED Mind-Set.

<p>B. Radicalized Mind-Set</p> <p>Cues To Help Recognize This Mind Set: expresses extremist views, may have ties to radical groups, displays animosity towards government institutions, may be unpredictable in behavior</p> <p>Slogan Effectiveness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Let's find common ground" - 3 out of a maximum of 5 • "We can work together" - 4 out of a maximum of 5 • "Violence only fuels the fire" - 5 out of a maximum of 5 • "Extremism doesn't solve problems" - 4 out of a maximum of 5 <p>The Public's Reaction to this Slogan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Let's find common ground" - Neutral • "We can work together" - Positive • "Violence only fuels the fire" - Positive • "Extremism doesn't solve problems" - Positive <p>What the Mind-set Thinks When Presented with This Slogan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Let's find common ground" - Considers possibilities • "We can work together" - Feels skeptical • "Violence only fuels the fire" - Reflects on actions • "Extremism doesn't solve problems" - Questions beliefs
--

Table 2C: Results for the MENTALLY ILL Mind-Set.

<p>C. Mentally Ill Mind-Set</p> <p>Cues To Help Recognize This Mind Set: Erratic behavior, difficulty communicating, signs of paranoia, history of mental health issues</p> <p>Slogan Effectiveness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "We are here to help you" - 4 out of a maximum of 5 • "Let's talk this out" - 3 out of a maximum of 5 • "We want to make sure you are safe" - 5 out of a maximum of 5 • "Let's find a peaceful solution" - 4 out of a maximum of 5 <p>The Public's Reaction to this Slogan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "We are here to help you" - 4 out of a maximum of 5 • "Let's talk this out" - 3 out of a maximum of 5 • "We want to make sure you are safe" - 5 out of a maximum of 5 • "Let's find a peaceful solution" - 4 out of a maximum of 5 <p>What the Mind-set Thinks When Presented with This Slogan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "We are here to help you" - The mind-set may feel reassured that help is available • "Let's talk this out" - The mind-set may be open to communication and understanding • "We want to make sure you are safe" - The mind-set may feel cared for and less threatened • "Let's find a peaceful solution" - The mind-set may see a way out of the situation without violence

Table 2D: Results for the EXTREMISTS Mind-Set.

<p>D. Extremists Mind-Set</p> <p>Cues To Help Recognize This Mind Set: Radical ideology, violent language or behavior, planning or involvement in extremist activities, history of violent encounters</p> <p>Slogan Effectiveness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Violence is not the answer" - 4 out of a maximum of 5 • "Let's find a peaceful resolution" - 4 out of a maximum of 5 • "We can work together" - 3 out of a maximum of 5 • "There is a better way" - 5 out of a maximum of 5 <p>The Public's Reaction to this Slogan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Violence is not the answer" - 5 out of a maximum of 5 • "Let's find a peaceful resolution" - 4 out of a maximum of 5 • "We can work together" - 3 out of a maximum of 5 • "There is a better way" - 5 out of a maximum of 5 <p>What The Mind-Set Thinks When Presented with This Slogan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Violence is not the answer" - The mind-set may pause and reconsider their actions
--

Table 2E: Results for the ANGRY INDIVIDUALS Mind-Set.

<p>E. Angry Individuals Mind-Set Cues To Help Recognize This Mind Set: Hostile demeanor, aggressive language, physical signs of anger (e.g. clenched fists, raised voice), history of confrontations or violent behavior Slogan Effectiveness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Let's calm down and talk" - 4 out of a maximum of 5 • "We can find a solution without violence" - 5 out of a maximum of 5 • "Take a deep breath and think it through" - 3 out of a maximum of 5 • "Violence will only make things worse" - 4 out of a maximum of 5 <p>The Public's Reaction to this Slogan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Let's calm down and talk" - 4 out of a maximum of 5 • "We can find a solution without violence" - 5 out of a maximum of 5 • "Take a deep breath and think it through" - 3 out of a maximum of 5 • "Violence will only make things worse" - 4 out of a maximum of 5 <p>What The Mind-Set Thinks When Presented with This Slogan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Let's calm down and talk" - The mind-set may see the opportunity for de-escalation • "We can find a solution without violence" - The mind-set may consider alternatives to aggression • "Take a deep breath and think it through" - The mind-set may pause and reflect on their actions • "Violence will only make things worse" - The mind-set may realize the potential consequences of their actions

Table 2F: Results for the CRIMINAL Mind-Set.

<p>F. Criminal Mind-Set Cues To Help Recognize This Mind Set: History of criminal activity, disregard for authority, patterns of violent behavior, involvement in illegal activities Slogan Effectiveness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "We can resolve this peacefully" - 4 out of a maximum of 5 • "Let's find a way to handle this legally" - 5 out of a maximum of 5 • "Violence is not the answer, cooperation is" - 4 out of a maximum of 5 • "Working together is the best approach" - 3 out of a maximum of 5 <p>The Public's Reaction to This Slogan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "We can resolve this peacefully" - 4 out of a maximum of 5 • "Let's find a way to handle this legally" - 5 out of a maximum of 5 • "Violence is not the answer, cooperation is" - 4 out of a maximum of 5 • "Working together is the best approach" - 3 out of a maximum of 5 <p>What The Mind-Set Thinks When Presented with This Slogan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "We can resolve this peacefully" - The mind-set may consider non-violent options • "Let's find a way to handle this legally" - The mind-set may respond to the idea of following the law • "Violence is not the answer, cooperation is" - The mind-set may see collaboration as a way forward • "Working together is the best approach" - The mind-set may view cooperation as a beneficial strategy

Table 2G: Results for the DESPERATE INDIVIDUALS Mind-Set.

<p>G. Desperate Individuals Mind-Set Cues To Help Recognize This Mind Set: Emotional distress, signs of crisis or instability, attempts to communicate desperation, history of struggles or traumatic events Slogan Effectiveness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "You are not alone, we are here for you" - 5 out of a maximum of 5 • "There is a way out without violence" - 4 out of a maximum of 5 • "Let's work together to find a solution" - 4 out of a maximum of 5 • "We can help you through this" - 3 out of a maximum of 5 <p>The Public's Reaction to This Slogan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "You are not alone; we are here for you" - 5 out of a maximum of 5 • "There is a way out without violence" - 4 out of a maximum of 5 • "Let's work together to find a solution" - 4 out of a maximum of 5 • "We can help you through this" - 3 out of a maximum of 5 <p>What The Mind-Set Thinks When Presented with This Slogan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "You are not alone; we are here for you" - The mind-set may feel supported and understood • "There is a way out without violence" - The mind-set may see a path towards resolution • "Let's work together to find a solution" - The mind-set may be open to collaboration • "We can help you through this" - The mind-set may feel reassured and willing to accept assistance
--

Deeper Analyses through SCAS

Early empirical investigations in Mind Genomics in the late 1990s and onward revealed these mind-sets in topic after topic, study after study. It was the task of the user to understand these mind-sets. Fortunately, the mind-sets were clearly demarcated, and easy to differentiate and to discuss.

In order to discover patterns, SCAS in the BimiLeap program has been set up with a set of fixed analyses in order to extract more information from each iteration. Table 3 shows a summary table about

what was learned. The results were analyzed in eight ways, such as key concepts, topics, views, interested audiences, opposing audiences, and three stages toward innovation (alternate viewpoints, what is lacking, and potential innovations). For this paper, this deeper AI analysis was reduced to one summary table.

The actual deeper analysis does not occur at the time that the user goes through the iterations. Rather, for each iteration, the material is stored in an Excel workbook as a separate worksheet. Only afterwards, when the study is closed, does the second level of analysis take place. This deeper analysis is done separately for each worksheet,

Table 3: Summarized “deeper analysis” of the results, combining the results from all seven mind-sets, although ordinarily done on a mind-set basis.

<p>A. Key Ideas (Summary) The key ideas in the topic questions revolve around identifying and addressing different mind-sets, such as macho, radicalized, and mentally unstable mind-sets. The cues provided help in recognizing these mind-sets, while the slogans suggested aim to effectively communicate with individuals exhibiting these behaviors. The effectiveness of the slogans and public reactions to them are also highlighted, along with the possible thoughts or reactions of individuals with these mind-sets to the slogans. Overall, the focus is on understanding and potentially diffusing challenging situations by using appropriate communication strategies.</p> <p>B. Themes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identification of different mind-sets: The theme focuses on recognizing and categorizing various mind-sets, such as macho, radicalized, and mentally unstable mind-sets, based on certain behaviors or characteristics. 2. Effective communication strategies: This theme emphasizes the importance of using appropriate slogans and cues to effectively communicate with individuals exhibiting challenging mind-sets, in order to potentially diffuse and address the underlying issues. 3. Prevention and de-escalation: Strategies for prevention of violence by addressing different mind-sets 4. Recognizing cues and using appropriate slogans for each mind-set 5. Public reactions and perceptions: The theme explores the impact of the slogans and cues on the public, as well as the possible thoughts or reactions of individuals with the identified mind-sets to the communication strategies employed." <p>C. Perspectives</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identification of different mind-sets: Plus factors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helps individuals recognize potentially harmful mind-sets in themselves and others • Allows for targeted interventions and support for those with challenging mind-sets • Can lead to increased awareness and understanding of diverse perspectives Minus factors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can lead to stigmatization or labeling of individuals based on their mind-set • May oversimplify complex psychological issues or behaviors • Could potentially reinforce stereotypes or biases Interesting factors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The overlap between different mind-sets and the potential for individuals to exhibit multiple mind-sets • The potential for individuals to change or shift their mind-set over time • The role of societal factors in shaping and influencing different mind-sets 2. Effective communication strategies: Plus factors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can help de-escalate conflicts or challenging situations • Allows for more effective communication and understanding between individuals with different mind-sets • May lead to positive outcomes and resolution of issues Minus factors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication strategies may not always be successful or well-received by individuals with challenging mind-sets • Difficulty in identifying the most appropriate slogans or cues for a particular situation • Can be misinterpreted or misunderstood by the intended audience Interesting factors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The role of nonverbal cues and body language in effective communication strategies • The potential cultural or societal differences in communication styles and strategies • The use of technology and social media in disseminating communication messages 3. Public reactions and perceptions: Plus factors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can lead to increased awareness and dialogue about challenging mind-sets and behaviors • May prompt individuals to reflect on their own beliefs and attitudes • Could potentially lead to positive change or action in addressing societal issues Minus factors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public reactions may be divisive or polarizing, leading to further conflict or misunderstanding • The potential for misinterpretation or misrepresentation of the communication strategies used • Can lead to heightened emotions or backlash from individuals with the identified mind-sets Interesting factors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact of media coverage and framing on public perceptions of challenging mind-sets • The potential for individuals to rally behind or reject the communication strategies employed • The influence of personal experiences and biases on how individuals interpret and respond to the messages conveyed" <p>D. Interested Audiences</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The general public typically reacts positively to the slogan "We are here to help you" when used by the police, with a rating of 4 out of a maximum of 5. 2. The general public typically reacts positively to the slogan "There is a better way" when used by the police, with a rating of 5 out of a maximum of 5. 3. Audiences that might be most interested in the topic questions include law enforcement, mental health professionals, social workers, and community leaders. They would be interested in learning how to effectively communicate with and de-escalate situations involving individuals with different mind-sets to prevent violence. 4. Law enforcement agencies: They may be interested in the topic questions as they deal with individuals who display the mind-sets mentioned, and understanding effective communication strategies and cues to recognize different mind-sets can help in handling situations better. 5. Mental health professionals: Professionals in this field may be interested in the topic questions as they work with individuals who exhibit mentally unstable mind-sets. Having effective slogans to use and understanding cues to recognize these mind-sets can aid in providing appropriate support and intervention. 6. Community outreach organizations: These organizations may be interested in the topic questions as they work with diverse populations in the community, including those who may display radicalized or macho mind-sets. Utilizing effective slogans and understanding cues to recognize these mind-sets can help in promoting peaceful resolution and conflict de-escalation. 7. Social workers: Social workers may be interested in the topic questions as they often work with individuals who exhibit various mind-sets, including those mentioned. Having effective communication strategies and slogans to use can assist in building rapport, de-escalating conflicts, and providing appropriate support and resources." <p>E. Opposing Audiences</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Animal rights activists may oppose the topic of using deadly violence against police officers, as they advocate for peaceful and non-violent solutions to conflicts. 2. Civil rights organizations may oppose the topic, as they work towards promoting equality and justice through non-violent means. 3. Mental health advocacy groups may oppose the topic of labeling individuals as mentally ill based on cues, as it can perpetuate stigmas and stereotypes surrounding mental illness. 4. Peace activists may oppose the use of slogans that emphasize violence, even in a negative light, as they prioritize non-violent approaches to conflict resolution.

5. Community organizers may oppose the topic of criminalizing desperate individuals, as they may believe in addressing the root causes of desperation and providing support rather than punishment.
 6. Individuals with a strong macho mind-set may oppose slogans promoting non-violence and cooperation as they may see these messages as weak or submissive. They may believe that violence is necessary to assert dominance and prove strength.
 7. Radicalized individuals may oppose slogans advocating for finding common ground and working together as they may view compromise as a sign of weakness. They may believe that extremism is the only way to achieve their goals and may be unwilling to consider alternative approaches.
 8. Those with a mentally unstable mind-set may oppose slogans encouraging seeking help and talking things out as they may struggle with accepting assistance or may feel overwhelmed by the idea of opening up about their struggles. They may fear judgment or lack the capacity to engage in meaningful communication."
- F. Steps Towards Innovation - Alternative Viewpoints**
1. Understand underlying issues: One alternative viewpoint could be focusing more on the underlying issues that may contribute to these different mind-sets, such as societal factors, access to mental health care, and economic disparities.
 2. Better training: Another alternative viewpoint could be discussing the role of law enforcement's training and tactics in de-escalating situations involving these different mind-sets, rather than solely relying on slogans.
 3. Restorative justice: Explore restorative justice practices as a way to address issues related to violence and crisis situations with these different mind-sets.
 4. Individualized approach: Some may argue that using slogans to address specific mind-sets may be too simplistic and not effective in actually changing behavior. They may believe that deeper interventions and understanding of underlying issues are necessary. They may advocate for a more individualized approach to addressing behavior.
 5. Mind-sets may be too simple: Categorizing individuals into specific mind-sets could lead to stereotyping and overlooking the unique circumstances and backgrounds of each person. Some might suggest that addressing these mind-sets solely through slogans may not be enough to create long-lasting change. They may argue for comprehensive education and social programs to address root causes of aggression, extremism, and mental health issues.
 6. Understand societal factors: Examples are inequality, discrimination, and lack of access to mental health services, that contribute to the development of these mind-sets. This perspective may advocate for systemic change to create a more supportive and inclusive environment for all individuals.
- G. Steps Towards Innovation - What Is Missing**
1. The potential underlying reasons for each mind-set's behavior
 2. What are the potential triggers for each mind-set that may lead to an escalation of violence?
 3. What de-escalation techniques or communication strategies can be effective when interacting with each mind-set?
 4. How can law enforcement officers or mental health professionals differentiate between someone who is mentally ill versus someone who is an extremist or a criminal?
 5. What resources and support systems are available to help individuals with mental health issues, extremist ideologies, anger issues, criminal backgrounds, or desperation?
 6. What role does empathy, active listening, and understanding play in diffusing potentially violent situations with these different mind-sets?
 7. How can law enforcement agencies or mental health organizations collaborate to address the needs of individuals who may be at risk of using deadly violence?
- H. Steps Towards Innovation – AI-Suggested Innovations**
1. Establishing a national database or registry of individuals with known mental health issues or extremist ideologies, to help law enforcement agencies better prepare for and respond to potential threats
 2. Virtual reality training simulations for police officers to practice recognizing cues and responding appropriately to different mind-sets of individuals who use deadly violence against them
 3. Developing mobile applications or texting services that individuals in crisis can use to communicate with police or mental health professionals, providing them with resources and support before a situation escalates
 4. Communication training workshops: Workshops that provide individuals with practical skills and techniques for effectively communicating with individuals exhibiting challenging mind-sets. This can help improve overall communication and conflict resolution skills in various personal and professional settings.
 5. Mind-set identification app: A mobile application that uses artificial intelligence to analyze behavior patterns and help individuals identify and categorize different mind-sets in real-time. This can help users better understand the perspectives of those around them and tailor their communication strategies accordingly.
 6. Crisis intervention teams consisting of mental health professionals who can respond alongside police officers to incidents involving mentally ill individuals, extremists, and angry individuals.
 7. Implementing mandatory de-escalation training for all police officers to ensure they are equipped with the skills to defuse potentially violent situations without resorting to deadly force.
 8. Community outreach programs that aim to educate the public on the challenges faced by police officers when dealing with individuals who may be prone to using deadly violence and promote understanding and cooperation between law enforcement and the community.
 9. Mind-set awareness campaigns: Public awareness campaigns that aim to educate the general population about the various mind-sets identified in the themes, in order to promote understanding and empathy towards individuals with different perspectives. This can help reduce stigma and discrimination associated with certain mind-sets and foster a more inclusive society.

going through all eight steps, returning with recommendations, analyses, themes, and so forth. The seven deeper analyses were put into the "Excel Idea Book." The Idea Book was returned by e-mail approximately 15 minutes after the project was closed.

It is important to keep in mind that despite the "hand-craft" work to combine information from seven deeper analyses, one per mind-set, the actual sentences and information shown in Table 3 are taken directly from the AI-generated output. Thus, the reality is that we have AI providing second level, deeper analysis of AI-generated ideas, those ideas originally emerging from a simple squib and a paragraph of very little detailed information, viz., Table 1.

Discussion and Conclusions

Artificial intelligence-generated results are only now becoming of interest to scientists in the world of behavior, such as psychologists. It is only now that there is a focus on the nature of ideas generated by AI. The reason may be the increasing use of AI to act as an aid-to-

thought, perhaps a "technical aid to creative thought" in the words of the late Harvard professor of computer science, Anthony Gervin Oettinger [12].

In the words of the late Harvard professor may appear off-putting for a scientific publication but they should not be. We are not offering factual knowledge, but frameworks in which one may incorporate certain bits of information to obtain insight. We are not interested in factual information that can be obtained by digging into the data, such as *how do the mind-sets distribute in the population*, or really anything better understood empirically. This whole text has been a teaching tool to comprehend a possibly extreme situation in an hour or two. The approach presented here empowers novices and professionals alike to describe a scenario and understand its aspects, ranging from attitudes, behaviors, motives, public reactions, and far more.

Much more should be said about this realistic approach. Pragmatism will succeed. In fact, the late psychologist George Miller says that most of one's knowledge gets "chunked," with just the general

structure maintained [13]. We might consider this approach to be a “cartography,” a mapping of the relevant features of a topic. As a cartographer explores an area, looking at its geographies, lay of the land, and flora and fauna, the professional might explore the mind of a criminal for the best way to communicate.

In the end, the world-view espoused by this paper is pragmatics. The age of enhanced learning is coming. This paper may provide in a short time a new approach, a new way of extracting insights, of synthesizing the real world. The approach demonstrated here emerges not so much by slow learning from books and the formation of concepts, but rather human thinking augmented by the “creative powers” embedded in artificial intelligence, ready to be released through the appropriate prompts. With the power of AI embedded in accessible LLMs, people can now ask more focused questions using a simple set of queries, the power of easy use through SCAS. The final output is made user-friendly, the outcome of the AI efforts returned in the form of easy-to-read material.

In the end, the goal of this project is to suggest ways to think about the topic of communicating in a situation which is potentially dangerous. To reiterate the caveat, we’re not looking for an accurate description of each mind-set, but rather interested in providing a general framework. It would be interesting to see whether or not the untutored person, inexperienced in criminology and verbal negotiations with criminals, would use this information, or perhaps even just specific parts of the information. Which parts are useful? Which parts seem useful, but are really irrelevant to practice? The approach is well worth the try, simply because the format here presented by Socrates as a Service, SCAS, using LLMs, generates the key information easily with virtually instant analyses of iteration after iteration, each iteration returned in 15 seconds, with a deeper analysis an hour later returned by email, and done for each iteration.

Acknowledgement

The authors wish to thank Vanessa Marie B. Arcenas for her assistance in preparing this manuscript.

Abbreviations

AI: Artificial Intelligence; LLM: Large Language Model; SCAS: Socrates as a Service

Competing Interests

The authors have no conflict of interest to disclose.

References

1. Thomson JB (1870) The psychology of criminals. *Journal of Mental Science* 16(75): 321-350.
2. Abrahamsen D (1944) Crime and the human mind. *Columbia University Press*.
3. Samenow S (2014) Inside the Criminal Mind (Newly Revised Edition). *Crown*.
4. Kasneci E, Seifler K, Küchemann S, Bannert M, et al. (2023) ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences* 103: 102274.
5. Chang Y, Wang X, Wang J, Wu Y, et al. (2023) A survey on evaluation of large language models. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*.
6. Sen A and Srivastava M (2012) Regression analysis: theory, methods, and applications. *Springer Science & Business Media*.

7. Duran BS and Odell PL (2013) Cluster analysis: a survey (Vol. 100). *Springer Science & Business Media*.
8. Moskowitz HR, Wren J and Papajorgji P (2020) Mind genomics and the law. LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing.
9. Gabay G and Moskowitz HR (2019) “Are We There Yet?” Mind-Genomics and Data-Driven Personalized Health Plans. *The Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives of Management: Challenges and Opportunities*, 7-28.
10. Moskowitz HR, Gofman A, Beckley J and Ashman H (2006) Founding a new science: Mind genomics. *Journal of Sensory Studies* 21(3): 266-307.
11. Mendoza C, Mendoza C, Rappaport S, Deitel Y, et al. (2023) Empowering Young Students to Become Researchers: Thinking of Today’s Gasoline Prices. *Mind Genomics Studies in Psychology and Experience* Volume 2(2): 1-14.
12. Bossert WH and Oettinger AG (1973) The Integration of Course Content, Technology and Institutional Setting. A Three Year Report, 31 May 1973. Project TACT, Technological Aids to Creative Thought.
13. Saaty T (2016) Seven is the magic number in nature. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 160(4): 335-360.

Citation:

Wingert S, Anderson T, Moskowitz HR, Rappaport SD, Mulvey T, et al. (2024) Verbal Judo and Prospective Crime – How AI + Mind Genomics Can Synthesize Mind Sets for Training. *Mind Genom Stud Psychol Exp* Volume 4(3): 1-7.