

Research Article

Using AI to “Educate” by Synthesizing Issues of National and International Concern: The Case of Leaked Information About Israel’s Plans

Howard R. Moskowitz^{1,2*} and Sharon Wingert¹

¹Tactical Data Group, Stafford, VA, USA

²Mind Genomics Associates, Inc., White Plains, NY, USA

*Corresponding author: Howard R. Moskowitz, Tactical Data Group, Stafford, VA, USA & Mind Genomics Associates, Inc., White Plains, NY, USA

Received: October 31, 2025; Accepted: November 07, 2025; Published: November 14, 2025

Abstract

The paper demonstrates the use of generative AI (ChatGPT 3.5) to simulate an international issue, and then analyze reactions to the simulation. The study shows the simulation of what might happen if the United States were to share secret information obtained with Israel, specifically sharing that information with a country hostile to Israel. The paper shows how to simulate the situation, identify themes, understand possible ramifications of the action, and simulate the responses of groups that would react positively or negatively to this action. Using the Mind Genomics platform, BimiLeap.com (Idea Coach feature), the paper shows, in a step-by-step manner, the opportunities emerging when simulation and automated AI-analysis become widely available to the public in an efficient, low-cost manner. The paper finishes with a speculation on the effect such a platform might have in the world of education.

Keywords: AI simulation in international relations, Democratizing predictive modeling, Generative AI for critical thinking, Mind Genomics, Perspective-based AI analysis

Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) is revolutionizing the way decision-makers at the highest levels of government address complex, uncomfortable, and embarrassing situations. With AI advancements, there is a growing need for an accessible, inexpensive simulation system which democratizes access to predictive modeling, making both public officials and regular citizens smarter in the process. A rapid, inexpensive AI simulation system made available to government institutions and the general public would make for a smarter society overall. Empowering people with tools to model unpleasant or embarrassing events could steer us toward more democratic, informed decision-making [1,2]. An accessible AI simulation tool would allow sensitive government positions to better anticipate and address critical consequences before making decisions. These tools could simulate the outcomes of controversial policy choices, define strategic responses to unforeseen disasters, or highlight unintended social or economic impacts. Crowdsourcing AI simulations would allow ideas and resolutions to emerge from unexpected places, making the process more democratic [3-5].

This system would be beneficial not only for government officers but also for academia, civil organizations, industries, and entrepreneurs. By making AI simulations accessible, governments can make quick decisions for time-sensitive threats and foster greater trust and transparency between governments and the public [6,7].

Opening AI simulations to the masses would increase accountability, forcing advocates of policies to rigorously justify their

decisions. However, democratizing simulations comes with risks, such as manipulation of results to serve biases or agendas. Ethical guidelines and safeguards could be built into AI models to identify and neutralize malicious designs [8].

A Worked Example: Simulating a Recent Issue of a Possible “Tiff” Between the US and Israel

Artificial intelligence (AI) systems accessible through Idea Coach, the AI-linked feature of Mind Genomics through BimiLeap.com, can be used for simulation. The simulation, shown in detail in this paper, generates insights into real-world scenarios, such as the hypothetical “betrayal” by the U.S. sharing with others secret information which it had developed with Israel. AI is adept at synthesizing raw data and generating insights which mirror complex human situations, removing cognitive biases typically present when humans analyze scenarios emotionally. AI also excels at organizing complex networks of variables and ensuring cohesiveness, which is crucial when confronting intricate issues like geopolitics, national security, or international diplomacy [9-11]. AI’s ability to summarize and generate outcomes has real-world implications for organizations in sectors like government, law, business, or research. It can sort through thousands of variations, reporting back on probable consequences, best- and worst-case actions, and even unintended secondary effects from multiple perspectives. AI synthesizes ideas and combines knowledge from dispersed domains, allowing for imaginative, unexpected “mashups” of factors which human analysts might overlook [12].

Summarization also yields practical benefits in a time-efficiency context, as AI can distill raw data into workable hypotheses and summarize them in seconds, increasing productivity and allowing teams to focus on interpretation and action. AI’s summaries also

have a unique advantage of quantifying uncertainty, generating confidence levels for certain aspects of scenarios while pointing out areas requiring further scrutiny or research [13]. With the foregoing as background, consider the two scenarios shown in Table 1, and the

Table 1: The two scenarios.

<p>There has been recent news about someone in the government leaking plans about Israel and Iran to Iran. Israel is a loyal friend of America. There are many in the United States who hate Israel, despite its loyalty and its pro-American stance.</p> <p>Write two compositions, each 10 paragraphs long. The first composition is a positive scenario where this leak does not cause any damage and simply disregarded. The second composition is exactly like the first, except that the betrayal is real. What happens in the interviews then when we find out that the US has actual leaked plans to Iran? In these compositions, conduct interviews with important officials in the US, Israel, UK, France, Russia, Iran about what this means to them.</p> <p>Composition 1: Positive Scenario—The Leak Is Disregarded</p> <p>Introduction: Recent media reports claimed that sensitive information regarding Israel and Iran’s security was leaked to Iran. However, after thorough investigations by both the U.S. and Israel, it was concluded that the leak did not cause substantial harm. The material, whereas classified, wasn’t specific enough to endanger national security or warp diplomatic balance in the Middle East. In this composition, interviews were conducted with officials from the U.S., Israel, the UK, France, Russia, and Iran to better understand the implications and reactions to this defused situation.</p> <p>The U.S. Perspective—Calming Tensions. Interview with U.S. State Department spokesperson: “It is incredibly unfortunate that this leak occurred, but through swift cooperation between intelligence agencies, we can confidently say that no irreparable damage was inflicted. We are working on enhancing our internal cybersecurity protocols to prevent further incidents.” The spokesperson emphasized that this situation has now turned into an educational moment for both U.S. and allied governments. It highlighted weak spots in information sharing without triggering diplomatic skirmishes.</p> <p>Israel’s Reaction—A Loyal Ally, Still Secure. Interview with Israeli Defense Minister: “We deeply value our relationship with the United States. We understand that mistakes happen, and we have faith in U.S. authorities to rectify the situation. Our defenses remain strong, and the material leaked was not new or particularly concerning.” Israel’s reaction, measured but disappointed, reflects its trust in America as an ally. The reassurance that the leak contained no actionable intelligence was a relief. Cooperation on improving cybersecurity was promised between both countries moving forward.</p> <p>The UK’s Response—A Close Partner with Both the U.S. and Israel. Interview with UK Foreign Secretary: “From our standpoint, human error in intelligence security is always regrettable, but in this case, it hasn’t resulted in harm. We continue to work closely with both the U.S. and Israel to ensure future coordination remains robust, with a zero-tolerance policy on leaks.” The UK, working closely with both the U.S. and Israel, took the opportunity to stress the importance of future collaboration in global cybersecurity.</p> <p>France’s View—European Strength in Diplomacy. Interview with French Diplomatic Advisor: “Our concern was two-fold: protecting our Israeli friends and ensuring nothing destabilized the region further. We’re comfortable knowing this incident didn’t go beyond a warning for everyone involved to up their game on security.” France has been deeply invested in the stability of the Middle East, seeing this leak as a wake-up call for enhanced cooperation on global intelligence sharing.</p> <p>Russia’s Reaction—Leveraging the Situation for Advantage. Interview with Russian Foreign Ministry Official: “Russia has long warned the world on the overreach of American intelligence sharing. Whereas this incident has been downplayed, it serves as a reminder, especially for smaller states, to safeguard their sovereign information.” Russia used the episode as an opportunity to reinforce its stance on national sovereignty, stressing its refusal to depend on U.S. intelligence networks.</p> <p>Iran’s Stance—Dismissing the Leak as Useless. Interview with Iranian Government Spokesperson: “We were aware of the so-called information that was transferred. It wasn’t news to us—it is just typical Western disarray. It is meaningless.” Iran dismissed the leak, claiming it was already aware of the material. They used this as a platform to argue that the West is fundamentally disorganized when it comes to their intelligence infrastructure.</p> <p>De-escalation Across the Board. Though concerned at first, the involved nations have taken a pragmatic approach. The situation, upon review, has shifted from potential crisis to opportunity—an opportunity for all nations to reassess and fortify their intelligence-sharing mechanisms.</p> <p>Facilitating Trust. The overall diplomatic ecosystem has breathed a sigh of relief. Israel still trusts the U.S., and none of the major powers saw this as a significant threat to peace or political balance in the region.</p> <p>Conclusion: Whereas leaks pose potential risks, this incident highlights the importance of open communication and quick response when intelligence-sharing failures arise. The situation, though alarming at first, instead became an opportunity for improved intergovernmental relationships and universal upgrades to cybersecurity programs.</p> <p>Composition 2: Negative Scenario—The Betrayal is Real</p> <p>Introduction: News recently revealed that highly sensitive U.S. intelligence information regarding Israeli strategic plans vis-a-vis Iran was leaked to Iran. Following intense investigations, it was determined that the leak was deliberate, orchestrated by a faction within the U.S. government. The betrayal has shocked everyone involved, leading to significant diplomatic fallout. In this composition, we revisit interviews conducted with officials from the U.S., Israel, the UK, France, Russia, and Iran to gauge the immediate and long-term consequences of this betrayal.</p> <p>The U.S. Perspective—An Unprecedented Scandal. Interview with U.S. State Department Spokesperson: “This is an unpardonable breach of trust between the United States and one of its closest allies, Israel. We are investigating how such a betrayal could have transpired, and those responsible will be held accountable under the full scope of U.S. law. We deeply regret the implications of this failure.” The U.S. is reeling. Trust between Israel and the United States has been severely damaged, and the situation could have broad implications on U.S. relations in the Middle East.</p> <p>Israel’s Reaction—Shock and Betrayal. Interview with Israeli Defense Minister: “This is a betrayal of the greatest magnitude. For our closest ally to hand over sensitive information to a regime which seeks our destruction...it will take years, if not decades, to rebuild this kind of trust.” Israel was completely blindsided. This puts future diplomatic cooperation between the two countries under serious doubt and raises concerns about how Israel will conduct intelligence-sharing moving forward.</p> <p>The UK’s Response—Shaken Trust in U.S. Intelligence Networks. Interview with UK Foreign Secretary: “The U.S. has long been our primary strategic partner, but right now, we have to re-evaluate how much we depend on their intelligence capabilities. We will be reassessing our own strategies to ensure something like this can never happen between us.”</p> <p>The UK, a close confidant of both the U.S. and Israel, finds itself in a tough position, as this betrayal cracks open questions about how much reliance should be placed on U.S. intelligence networks.</p> <p>France’s View—A Crisis of Confidence. Interview with French Diplomatic Advisor: “This makes us all doubt the reliability of intelligence-sharing frameworks globally. The breach wasn’t just an American problem—it calls into question how all of us handle sensitive data.” France is caught between sympathy for its Israeli ally and a need to restructure the global intelligence-sharing system post-betrayal.</p> <p>Russia’s Reaction—A Propaganda Victory. Interview with Russian Foreign Ministry Official: “This is exactly why countries like us don’t align with reckless intelligence-sharing agreements, especially with the Americans. Israel should seriously rethink where its loyalties lie.” Russia seized the opportunity to leverage the breach, eagerly promoting its policy of self-reliance in intelligence and urging others to do the same.</p> <p>Iran’s Stance—A Windfall. Interview with Iranian Government Spokesperson: “We are not surprised by this. The U.S. undoubtedly knows that Iran is on the right side of history, and this leak is evidence of that recognition. Their actions are an indirect acknowledgment of our power.” Iran relishes this development, seeing it as a sign that even its most vehement adversaries are beginning to fracture under the pressure of Iranian power in the region.</p> <p>Heightened Tensions Across the World. In the wake of this betrayal, the global diplomatic landscape has entered a period of instability. Israel is reconsidering its alliances, and other nations are re-examining their relationships with the U.S. The international community now faces the challenge of restoring trust in the face of a deep breach which reverberates far beyond bilateral relations.</p> <p>Breaking Trust. The breakdown in trust is cataclysmic. For Israel, continuing to rely on U.S. intelligence is no longer tenable. This has caused ripple effects throughout the Western intelligence community as countries scramble to review their intelligence agreements with the U.S.</p> <p>Conclusion: This betrayal marks a significant turning point in international relations, particularly in the Middle Eastern sphere, where new alliances may form, and old ones may crumble. The geopolitical landscape will likely bear the scars of this betrayal for a long time to come.</p>
--

insights which emerge, even from simulated results. AI is able to put a human face on the topic and give a sense of reality to what otherwise might be an important but hard to conceptualize topic.

Key Ideas

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has the potential to revolutionize various industries by summarizing its own thinking (see Table 2). By allowing AI to synthesize its own ideas through literature, case studies, or hypothetical scenarios, it can provide an objective and multi-angle analysis of complex human situations. This can mitigate human biases and limitations, as AI can sift through emotional pitfalls to provide an unbiased summary. AI’s ability to process vast amounts of information quickly and efficiently allows it to cross-reference various data points faster than expert human analysts. AI-generated summaries can also serve as a baseline for human analysts, providing them with preliminary insights and enabling them to explore new angles. AI summarization can factor ideas from economics, sociology, history, and political science—turning each analysis into a multi-perspective solution. In situations where speed is essential, AI summarization could streamline operations and predict potential outcomes from betrayal scenarios and larger ripple effects.

Uncovering Themes in the Compositions: Steps Towards AI’s Ability to Coach “Critical Thinking”

AI can significantly improve critical thinking in the digital age by enhancing traditional methods of developing this skill. Platforms like BimiLeap allow users to engage with Mind Genomics, stimulating

hypothetical situations like political betrayals. AI can also help break down scenarios into fundamental themes, promoting a deeper level of mental discipline and making individuals more insightful thinkers (see Table 3). When a user creates a composition, they engage in Mind Genomics, framing the scenario and deciding what may be relevant. AI then offers feedback by identifying the core themes within the composition, acting as a mentor who not only reads but dissects and interprets the writing. AI acts as a coach by pinpointing basic concepts or “themes” in ways the person may have overlooked. This back-and-forth between narrative building and thematic deconstruction can enhance a person’s capacity for critical thinking. Repetition of this exercise sharply improves the ability to think critically and in a structured, versatile manner. The iterative, feedback-based nature of AI-coached thinking prevents complacency or overreliance on surface-level thinking. The external viewpoint offered by AI’s thematic breakdown removes the “ego” which might intrinsically accompany self-evaluation, instead giving objective and critical feedback. Regular use of this AI-guided process for a few days can develop sharper cognitive functions, particularly regarding the ability to see ideas as interconnected systems. This theme-oriented perspective can be applied to various fields, enhancing not just analytical skill but also creativity.

Teaching What If’s: AI showing the Same “Situational Facts” from Different Perspectives

By exploring various perspectives, AI helps simulate cause-and-effect scenarios, fostering a deeper understanding of any given

Table 2: Key ideas emerging from the synthesis of the compositions.

<p>The key ideas in the topic questions revolve around the consequences, responses, and implications of a security breach involving the leak of sensitive U.S. intelligence regarding Israel and Iran. Here are the main points broken down:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Impact of the Leak: Public Disclosure: How officials and countries react to the leaked information becoming publicly known. Damage Mitigation: Immediate steps taken by affected nations (such as the U.S., Israel, and others) to assess and manage the potential fallout.Effect on Relationships and Trust: U.S.-Israel Relationship: Whether the leak changes the long-term trust and cooperation between these traditionally close allies. Global Alliances: Concerns over the possibility of a broader shift in alliances or international relationships as a result of this incident.Breach of Trust: Trustworthiness of Allies: How serious the breach of trust between the U.S. and Israel is perceived by different countries. Consequences for Western Intelligence Networks: For countries like the UK and France, there’s a reassessment of the reliability of U.S. intelligence sharing.Cybersecurity and National Security Strategies: Cybersecurity Improvements: How countries are responding at a technical level, improving cybersecurity to prevent future leaks. National Security Priorities: Considerations surrounding changes in national agendas due to the timing and potential severity of the leak.Middle Eastern Regional Politics: Impact on the Middle East: Whether the leak alters regional geopolitics, especially with respect to Israel-Iran relations. Potential for Diplomatic Consequences: How the event could affect ongoing diplomatic negotiations, specifically in shaping future talks between Israel and Iran.Allegations of Deliberate Betrayal: Intentional Leak Accusations: The potential narrative that this was not an accident but a deliberate act, leading to questions of internal betrayal within the U.S. government or intelligence community.Responses of Different Global Powers: Different Reactions: Various global powers—such as the UK, France, Russia, and Iran—analyze the implications for their own policies, strategies, and global standing. Russia and Iran’s Perspective: Russia stresses sovereignty and intelligence independence, whereas Iran capitalizes on the breach as a sign of Western disarray or as acknowledgment of Iranian power.Diplomatic and Intelligence-Sharing Ramifications: Future Intelligence Sharing: The event could cause a reevaluation of intelligence-sharing agreements globally, creating a more cautious or fragmented landscape. Restoring Trust: How countries and alliances plan to rebuild trust if the fallout from the leak damages long-standing relationships.
--

Table 3: Themes emerging from the compositions.

Summary of Themes
The key ideas are organized into the following themes:
1. Immediate Impact and Damage Control
2. Diplomatic Relationships and Trust
3. Cybersecurity and National Security Adjustments
4. Regional Middle Eastern Geopolitics
5. Allegations of Deliberate Betrayal
6. Global Powers’ Strategic Responses
7. Restoring Trust and Future Intelligence Sharing.
Themes
1. Impact of the Leak and Immediate Responses:
Public Disclosure: How countries react to the leaked intel going public.
Damage Mitigation: Steps taken to manage or contain the fallout in real-time.
2. Diplomatic and Strategic Relationships:
U.S.-Israel Relationship: Whether the leak affects trust and long-term cooperation between the U.S. and Israel.
Global Alliances: Concerns over shifts in international relationships and potential damage to broader global partnerships.
Breach of Trust: Reassessing trustworthiness between the U.S. and its allies, such as the UK and France.
Future Intelligence Sharing: The potential reevaluation of global intelligence-sharing protocols.
3. Cybersecurity and National Security Concerns:
Cybersecurity Improvements: Technical upgrades to cybersecurity to prevent future breaches.
National Security Priorities: Possible shifts in national security strategies in response to the perceived severity of the leak.
4. Middle Eastern Regional Implications:
Impact on Middle Eastern Politics: How the leak could alter regional dynamics, particularly concerning Israel-Iran relations.
Regional Diplomatic Consequences: The effect the breach could have on ongoing diplomatic efforts in the Middle East.
5. Allegations of Betrayal or Deliberate Actions:
Intentional Leak Accusations: The potential narrative that the leak was a deliberate betrayal, prompting suspicions of internal sabotage.
6. Global Powers Reactions and Ramifications:
Diverse Global Reactions: How various global powers (UK, France, Russia, Iran) assess the consequences for their own strategic interests and positioning.
Russia and Iran’s Perspective: Analysis of Russia and Iran’s reactions, with Russia emphasizing sovereignty and Iran potentially using the leak to tout Western weakness.
7. Restoring Trust and Long-Term Diplomatic Efforts:
Restoring Trust: Measures countries and alliances take to rebuild trust if the leak damages long-standing relationships.
Diplomatic and Intelligence-Sharing Ramifications: The potential for a more fragmented or cautious approach to global intelligence collaboration moving forward.

issue (see Table 4). This offers potential for strategic planning and critical thinking instruction. Considering multiple perspectives is essential for strategic planning, helping decision-makers foresee possible outcomes and adjust their strategies accordingly. Students exposed to AI-generated alternative perspectives are guided to think beyond their inherent biases, fostering analytical skills crucial for critical thinking in today’s ever-changing global environment. The value of making this analysis immediately available after a study encourages quicker learning cycles, allowing students to reconsider their positions and comprehend the complexities of international relations in real time. An AI-driven, perspective-oriented curriculum would encourage students to appreciate global interdependence and the cascade of effects which result from betrayal, diplomatic tensions, or alliances. Integrating AI into education and strategic planning multiple times over a semester or as part of everyday government operations could lead to better understanding of social issues and international affairs. By the fourth or fifth iteration on a topic or topics, cognitive flexibility should be demonstrably enhanced. Institutions like the government could benefit greatly from implementing this type of perspective-based thinking in their decision-making processes.

Alternative Viewpoints: Putting Oneself in the Other Person’s “Shoes”

AI-driven alternative viewpoint analysis can enhance education in decision-making by allowing users to explore different perspectives on the same issue. Platforms like BimiLeap.com, which focus on Mind Genomics, offer users the ability to simulate real-world scenarios, incorporating AI-generated alternative viewpoints. This deepens critical thinking and enhances individuals’ ability to foster multidimensional thought processes. AI-driven simulations challenge cognitive biases and assumptions, allowing individuals to engage in rationality across the spectrum and uncover both positive and negative consequences [14-16]. This method of educational analysis accelerates the learning process by situating students within real-life scenarios where nuanced thought is encouraged and demanded. The effort ends up helping to overcome rote learning habits which handicap decision-making, drawing attention to hidden complexities and understanding long-term ramifications, latent variables, and conflicting interests, doing so simply while intriguing the student with analyses of a topic of their own choosing.

The primary value of these tools in decision-making is their ability to broaden context, forcing decision-makers to view issues

Table 4: What If’s—Themes in the composition.

What If’s: Themes—Plus (Positive), Minus (Negative), and Interesting
1. Immediate Impact and Damage Control
Plus: Swift responses show countries’ ability to adapt in the face of unforeseen circumstances.
Damage control actions can mitigate long-term fallout if handled quickly and transparently.
Minus: Initial public disclosure can lead to panic or diplomatic friction.
Real-time mitigation efforts may be insufficient given the scope, leading to deeper trust issues or unintended consequences.
Interesting: The role of media and public perception in shaping the narrative of the leak.
How different nations prioritize public versus private communication in response to a breach.
2. Diplomatic Relationships and Trust
Plus: Open dialogue about the breach between allies may strengthen long-term relationships despite short-term damage.
Crisis can provide an opportunity to review and upgrade intelligence sharing protocols, preventing future incidents.
Minus: The breach of trust, especially within key alliances like U.S.-UK, can strain relationships and hinder future cooperation.
Heightened diplomatic tensions can slow down important global negotiations, like trade deals or joint military exercises.
Interesting: Differing responses between countries: some allies might react with leniency whereas others use it to push for changes in strategic relationships.
How non-allied nations (like Russia and China) view and possibly exploit the fractures between Western nations.
3. Cybersecurity and National Security Adjustments
Plus: A major breach could catalyze immediate and long-term improvements to cybersecurity infrastructure.
Heightened awareness of cyber vulnerabilities may lead to more robust defense mechanisms and inter-agency cooperation.
Minus: Shifts in national security priorities could result in reactionary policies which neglect broader defense needs or focus too narrowly.
Could initiate an intelligence-sharing freeze, hurting global collaborations to counter common threats like terrorism.
Interesting: The balance between government transparency on cybersecurity issues and the need to keep vulnerabilities secret.
The potential for a “game of blame,” where domestic agencies or foreign nations are scapegoated for the breach.
4. Regional Middle Eastern Geopolitics
Plus: The leak might open the door for new regional alliances or diplomatic strategies, shaking up stagnant relationships.
Minus: Potential worsening of already tense Israel-Iran relations as sensitive information could be used to accuse one another.
Diplomatic efforts to stabilize areas like Syria, Iraq, or Yemen could be undermined, leading to greater conflict.
Interesting: Non-state actors (Hezbollah, Hamas) using the intel leak to strengthen their position and claim aggrieved victimhood.
Regional powers like Saudi Arabia or the UAE reassessing their security apparatus in response, possibly leading to renewed arms races.
5. Allegations of Deliberate Betrayal
Plus: Accusations of intentional leaks can catalyze comprehensive investigations, rooting out any internal bad actors.
May prompt stricter internal controls and loyalty tests within intelligence agencies.
Minus: Political infighting and finger-pointing could degrade public trust in national security organizations.
If true, deliberate leaks could reflect deeper systemic issues, possibly revealing divided loyalties or corruption among officials.
Interesting: The potential for whistleblowers or “leakers” to become central public figures, sparking debates about national security versus public interest.
The role of disinformation—whether the leak was framed as deliberate to deflect blame from a genuine breach.

from a broader, less egocentric perspective. As seen in Table 5, AI can generate responses from hypothetical perspectives, such as impacted civilian populations, international governing bodies, or economic markets, helping avoid rash decision-making. This approach exposes learners to novel possibilities they might not encounter within their conventional curriculum. For professionals, AI can simulate potential repercussions of various strategies, making adaptations more agile and thoughtful. This process fosters empathy through diverse opinions, humanizing abstract political or social groups. It also accelerates cognitive development by condensing learning cycles. Nothing is “free” however. Challenges emerging include the reliability and neutrality of AI outputs, as well as the unwanted outcome of over-reliance on algorithmic interpretations. Despite these challenges, AI-built scenarios pave the way for learners and professionals to adapt more easily to global issues as they evolve.

The Road to Innovation: What is Missing?

Critical thinking about “what may be missing” is a powerful tool for understanding the present and envisioning future possibilities

and innovation (see Table 6). It involves actively investigating gaps in information, logic, or assumptions, challenging superficial answers and pushing deeper inquiry. Encouraging critical thinking cultivates an environment of inquiry, encouraging individuals to question, probe, and evaluate unexamined factors which could change their understanding of the issue. The real value of this approach lies in its application to real-world situations, such as potential betrayal in international relations, engineering and design flaws, and storytelling plot points. By honing the practice of identifying what is missing, individuals prime themselves to think more flexibly, remaining open to new interpretations and information under pressure. The “what is missing” mindset not only critiques the present but also lays the foundation for future advancements, which is the heart of innovation. To drive this process effectively among others, it is essential that the environment is safe for inquiry and wrong answers. Mistakes need to be seen as part of the process of critical reflection and innovation, rather than failures. The “what is missing” exercise not only improves critical thinking but also builds a tolerance for ambiguity—a vital skill in the information age.

Table 5: Seeing the topic from the viewpoint of others.

1.	How do you feel about the leaked information being publicly revealed? U.S. Official (Positive Scenario): “Whereas no damage was done, the fact that this information was made public means we all need to carefully review our internal procedures. Transparency after a leak is essential to ensure accountability.” U.S. Official (Negative Scenario): “This is a matter of utmost seriousness and shame. The public revelation adds unnecessary pressure to an already delicate diplomatic situation and undermines years of trust-building.” Iranian Official (Positive Scenario): “It is more of an embarrassment for the West than a gain for us. It highlights Western inefficiency, which reinforces our strategic approach.” Israeli Official (Negative Scenario): “It is bad enough that the leak occurred, but having it uncovered publicly is a disaster. It compromises our ability to carry out certain operations safely and forces us to reconsider key defense strategies.”
2.	What immediate steps is your country taking to assess or mitigate the damage from this leak? U.S. Official (Positive Scenario): “We are tightening cybersecurity protocols, retraining employees, and increasing collaborations with allies like Israel to ensure that even a minor leak does not happen again.” U.S. Official (Negative Scenario): “We are launching a full-scale investigation. The individuals responsible for this intentional leak will face the complete weight of both legal and political consequences.” Israeli Official (Positive Scenario): “The immediate concern has passed, so we are focused on improving information-sharing safeguards rather than panic responses.” Israeli Official (Negative Scenario): “We are reviewing all U.S. intelligence collaboration. Security with the U.S. cannot be considered foolproof anymore.”
3.	Does this incident change the long-term relationship dynamics between the U.S. and your country? U.S. Official (Positive Scenario): “No, it doesn’t. This was an unfortunate incident, but our long-standing alliance with Israel remains strong and resilient. Both governments are committed to moving forward.” U.S. Official (Negative Scenario): “Unfortunately, yes. The trust we’ve built with Israel has taken a tremendous hit and will require years—if not decades—of confidence-building.” Israeli Official (Positive Scenario): “Not significantly. Yes, it was unpleasant, but our alliance with the U.S. is based on shared values and long-standing trust. We remain partners on all fronts.” Israeli Official (Negative Scenario): “Absolutely. This betrayal has fundamentally changed the way we see intelligence collaboration with the United States.”
4.	How serious do you consider this breach of trust between Israel and the U.S.? U.S. Official (Positive Scenario): “It wasn’t a serious breach of trust, more of a misunderstanding which has since been clarified. Both sides know the leak wasn’t dangerous.” U.S. Official (Negative Scenario): “It is a catastrophic failure, one which we will work to repair, but trust doesn’t rebuild overnight.” Israeli Official (Positive Scenario): “It is unfortunate, but any alliance goes through hiccups. We trust the efforts the U.S. is making to ensure mistakes like this don’t happen again.” Israeli Official (Negative Scenario): “This breach is severe. It is not just about intelligence—it is about existential security. The trust here has been deeply damaged.”

Table 6: What is missing?

Several critical areas are not fully explored. Here are the missing elements which can provide a more comprehensive understanding of the topic:	
1.	Legal Ramifications and Investigations: What legal actions are being pursued against those responsible for the leak? How will this incident influence future intelligence-gathering laws or regulations within the involved countries? Is there an international legal framework which could address such breaches in intelligence sharing?
2.	Coordination and Cooperation Between Allies: How will this affect the intelligence-sharing framework within international alliances like NATO or other coalitions? Are there plans to establish new protocols or oversight mechanisms for intelligence sharing between allies after this event? Does this change the level of trust in multinational intelligence agencies such as the Five Eyes (U.S., UK, Canada, Australia, New Zealand)?
3.	Public Opinion and Political Reactions: What is the public reaction, both within Israel and the U.S., to this breach? Does public sentiment reflect the government’s stance? How are internal factions within the involved governments reacting? Are opposition parties leveraging this incident for political gains? What role does the media play in shaping the public’s understanding and trust in international intelligence relations after the event?
4.	Military Implications: Does this situation affect ongoing or future military strategies in the region, particularly between Israel and Iran? Are there concerns that this leak may have compromised joint U.S.-Israel military exercises or long-term military cooperation? Could any adversaries (Russia, China) use this breach to gain strategic advantages, particularly in military or defense technology?
5.	Economic and Sanctions-Related Consequences: Can this leak result in economic sanctions or repercussions for either Iran or the entities involved? How could this incident impact defense contracts between the U.S. and Israel or with other countries involved?
6.	International Mediation and Diplomatic Repair: Is there a role for international organizations (e.g., the UN, European Union, etc.) in mediating the fallout from this breach? What diplomatic efforts are being made to rebuild trust between Israel and the U.S.? Has there been any effort by neutral countries to step in as intermediaries to reduce tensions?
7.	Long-term Intelligence Strategy Adjustments: How will the U.S. and Israel adapt their long-term intelligence strategies in response to this leak? Is there any discussion on limiting the scope of intelligence shared moving forward to prevent further incidents? What lessons are being learned across the intelligence community about safeguarding interconnected intelligence?
8.	Comparative Analysis: Are there historical parallels where a leak of similar magnitude occurred? How were those handled and what can be learned from them? How does this leak compare to other recent intelligence debacles, such as the Edward Snowden leaks or WikiLeaks incidents?
9.	Cybersecurity Technology Enhancements: What specific cybersecurity technologies are being enhanced or adopted to safeguard against future leaks? Is there potential for technological innovation (e.g. quantum encryption) to prevent such incidents in the future? How prepared are smaller nations to adopt these enhanced cybersecurity practices or will they remain vulnerable?

The process can be gamified to make it more engaging and visual. For example, a curiosity game can be designed where students compete to identify the most critical gap in a scenario with missing information, thereby pooling their critical thinking skills for a collective, superior result. This method trains the mind to think dynamically, recognizing complex systems and interweaving factors, both seen and unseen.

Driving Innovation: Using the Simulated Events to Identify Issues that Need Structural Solutions

In the complex world of international relations, crises often arise from betrayals, misunderstandings, and unintended consequences. However, these moments of tension offer fertile ground for creative innovation. As leaders, thinkers, and innovators, we must shift our focus from crisis management to opportunity creation, focusing on the long-term possibilities and breaking the “fight or flight” mind-

set. Every crisis contains the seeds of transformation within it, and entering a creative mindset allows us to repair and forge new paths simultaneously. By shifting focus towards innovation, we can capitalize on the opportunity created by temporary breaches and create a long-term vision built on creativity and strategic foresight. To create opportunities, we must re-examine the parameters driving the conflict and see the issues outside of their immediate context. This can lead to the emergence of fresh ideas and solutions which would not have been considered under more stable circumstances. Innovation often emerges most prolifically when the established order has been disrupted, allowing for new partnerships, novel strategies, and modernization (see Table 7).

In diplomacy, creativity is messier, as failure can lead to sanctions, loss of lives, or deeper mistrust. This high-stakes environment requires an iterative but safe process of ideation. We need to explore more

Table 7: Innovative ideas emerging from the exercise.

1.	<p>Immediate Impact and Damage Control: Innovations for Public Disclosure and Damage Mitigation Real-Time Crisis Communication Platforms: A secure, real-time monitoring and response application for government entities to coordinate disinformation management with social media platforms if classified information is leaked. Modified Crisis Management Protocols: New protocols where governments rapidly issue official statements, confirm or deny the reports, and provide transparency to manage the media cycle proactively. AI-Powered Leaked-Intel Response Systems: A platform utilizing AI to analyze the scope and scale of the leak, evaluate potential damages, and suggest containment strategies by ranking risks.</p>
2.	<p>Diplomatic Relationships and Trust: New Services or Policies to Address the U.S.-Israel & Global Alliance Strains Bilateral Trust Assurance Protocols: Advanced diplomatic agreements using blockchain for transparent verification of sensitive information handled between countries, ensuring accountability and reducing future trust breaches. Trust-Building Diplomatic Retreats: High-level, semi-public diplomatic retreats where top global leaders convene to rebuild trust and recommit to alliances after intelligence-sharing mishaps. “Friendship-Bonded” Communication Channels: Creating ultra-secure lines of instant communication between close allies (e.g., U.S. and Israel) where shared sensitive notes can be encrypted with double-layer security.</p>
3.	<p>Cybersecurity and National Security Adjustments: Innovations for Cyber Integrity and Defense Adaptive AI-Powered Cyber Threat Detection Systems: New, constantly evolving machine learning cybersecurity software designed to preemptively detect vulnerabilities in national systems, predicting and neutralizing threats before breaches occur. Zero-Trust Government Cloud Solutions: Stronger, zero-trust architecture cloud platforms specifically designed for government entities to restrict access to sensitive files and compartmentalize data sharing across multiple agencies. Elite National Cyber Defense Cadre: A specialized task force combining the top minds from government intelligence agencies and private cybersecurity firms to offer round-the-clock national surveillance and rapid response to breaches.</p>
4.	<p>Regional Middle Eastern Geopolitics: Products or Services Addressing Middle Eastern Dynamics and Diplomacy Regional Political Predictive Analytics: An AI-based service which forecasts how leaked intelligence impacts regional relations, such as Israel-Iran, based on geopolitical and social data, offering suggestions on diplomatic steps to offset tensions. Middle East Diplomatic Roundtable Forum: A multilateral framework built for regular, confidential meetings among regional powers (Israel, Iran, Saudi Arabia) with international mediators to protect regional stability and manage espionage fallout. Crisis-Mapping Tool for Middle Eastern Relations: A subscription-based app for diplomats and strategic analysts showing real-time regional impacts of leaks, power shifts, and alliances in the Middle East based on historical and emerging data.</p>
5.	<p>Allegations of Deliberate Betrayal: Products Shaping Responses to Internal Sabotage and Betrayal Accusations Whistleblower Sabotage Detection Software: Advanced internal systems which can flag unusual activity patterns within government networks, potentially pointing toward sabotage attempts or employees betraying classified information. Counter-Cyber Espionage Playbook for Governments: Manual and digital protocols for handling betrayal and internal sabotage, providing governments with protocols for catching, prosecuting, and diplomatically managing intentional leaks. Trust Restoration Counseling Services: Government-sponsored psychological and strategic counseling for diplomats and intelligence officers affected by accusations of betrayal, helping maintain morale and rebuild professional trust.</p>
6.	<p>Global Powers Strategic Responses: Services Catering to Global Reactions from Russia, Iran, and Others Sovereignty Encryption Models for Intelligence Sharing: A product geared toward power-sensitive states like Russia, offering closed-loop encryption and compartmentalized intelligence software which reinforces national sovereignty amid international sharing.</p>

lateral ways to imagine solutions, allowing for checks, re-alignments, and pivots. Integrating diverse perspectives and narratives is crucial for reshaping the dialogue. Fostering an environment where voices are heard, such as involving diverse fields like cybersecurity experts, social strategists, and data analysts, can enable holistic thinking and turn immediate threats or betrayals into premeditated actions which fuel future cooperation (see Table 7).

Interested Audiences vs. Disinterested or Even Hostile Audiences

When a group embraces a new idea, it often signifies a positive reaction to the innovation, as it aligns with their broader objectives and aligns with their national security and diplomacy goals. This acceptance can drive collaboration and validate the innovation, acknowledging that it meets their pressing needs or concerns. In contrast, when a group sees the innovation as critical, they may view it as a solution to a long-standing challenge or a method to solidify alliances. This commitment to the idea often leads to further commitment to its implementation, such as legislative support, financial backing, and integration into national or organizational strategies. Advocacy, a powerful tool for spreading the idea, can create wider acceptance and credibility. This can force opponents to react, as the embraced idea sets the standard for the future. The enthusiasm of the group’s acceptance can provide valuable insights for applied innovation across other fields (see Table 8).

A group’s open rejection of an idea can signal a disconnect in values, strategies, or perspectives, potentially threatening their established practices or creating risks they deem unmanageable. Rejection can also be a sign of resistance to change, as some groups

prefer to stick to tried-and-true solutions rather than adopting new ideas. Rejection may also be tied to the preservation of specific interests, such as political, economic, or cultural interests. Strategic misalignment may also be a reason for rejection. However, rejection can also be an opportunity to gather critical insights about concerns and fears, allowing for adjustments or changes in the presentation strategy. Engaging with opposing groups can lead to constructive engagement, identification of commonalities, and potentially lead to resolution or compromise (see Table 9).

Food for Thought: Questions and Answers Generated by AI

AI has become an indispensable tool in problem-solving, idea generation, and critical thinking, particularly in personalized tutoring. It can serve as a thought partner, particularly in probing deep subjects like geopolitical issues. As demonstrated in Table 10, platforms like BimiLeap.com, for example, use AI as an autonomous knowledge giver and questioner, generating relevant questions and offering insightful answers based on defined topics. This allows users to delve deeper into geopolitical and strategic dimensions, enhancing their understanding and enabling them to think expansively. AI’s ability to ask complex questions that encourage users to delve deeper shows how AI-generated questions empower the “wisdom of the masses” in relation to key political and social issues.

Coda: Transforming Education

AI-driven learning and problem-solving are revolutionizing education by providing a proactive approach to guiding people through complex problems. Platforms like Mind Genomics and BimiLeap.

Table 8: Audiences interested in the questions.

Audiences Interested in the Questions	
1.	Government Officials and Policymakers (U.S., Israel, and Other Involved Nations). The scenarios directly affect national security policies, intelligence-sharing protocols, and diplomatic relations, understanding the implications of the leak—whether intentionally or accidentally exposed—and the potential policy shifts required to reinforce trust and security between allied nations.
2.	Intelligence Agencies and Military Leaders. Intelligence agencies and military officials would need to assess how such a breach occurred, gauge its operational impact, and mitigate further leaks. The strategic implications regarding military operations between countries like Israel and Iran would be critical to national defense strategies.
3.	International Relations Analysts and Academics. These individuals often study diplomatic and geopolitical relations, especially in volatile regions like the Middle East. The scenarios provide a wealth of material for analyzing alliance dynamics, the role of intelligence-sharing in international diplomacy, and how trust between nations can either be strengthened (in positive scenarios) or ruptured (negative scenarios).
4.	Cybersecurity Experts. Given the emphasis on leaked classified information, cybersecurity professionals would be keen on dissecting the vulnerabilities which led to the breach and exploring solutions to prevent future incidents. The scenarios also highlight the need for robust information-sharing protocols and stronger cybersecurity defense mechanisms.
5.	Middle Eastern Governments and Political Analysts. Countries in the Middle East, especially Israel, Iran, and neighboring nations, would be particularly interested in how these patches in U.S.-Israeli relations might destabilize the region. Furthermore, new geopolitical alliances could form if trust breaks down between Israel and Western allies like the U.S.
6.	Diplomats and Foreign Affairs Officials. Diplomats from all over the world—especially in nations like the UK, France, and Russia—would be interested in the situation to evaluate how their own intelligence-sharing processes might be impacted and how this breach strains multilateral alliances, notably between Israel and the U.S.
7.	Media and Investigative Journalist. Journalists specialized in international affairs, intelligence leaks, and diplomacy would find this topic ripe for analysis and reporting. The degree to which these leaks were accidental or intentional—as well as their actual contents—would be a topic of deep investigation by the media to inform the public and hold governments accountable.
8.	Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) Focused on Peacekeeping and Human Rights Advocacy. NGOs working in conflict-heavy regions, particularly the Middle East, could tie the implications of this intelligence leak to broader regional security, human rights, and stability issues. They would be concerned about the potential escalation of conflict it could induce, especially regarding relations between Israel and Iran.
9.	Business and Economic Leaders (especially in Defense and Cybersecurity Sectors). Business leaders involved in sectors like defense contracting, information security, and technology development would have a vested interest in this topic, particularly regarding how changes in intelligence-sharing practices or heightened security concerns might lead to new demands for cybersecurity solutions and defense technologies.
10.	Lobbying and Advocacy Groups. U.S.-based interest groups, like pro-Israel organizations (e.g., AIPAC) or anti-Iran sanctions groups, would be heavily invested in influencing U.S. government policies in response to such scenarios. They may lobby for stricter intelligence controls or propose closer relationships with or reevaluation of Iran.
11.	Think Tanks Focused on Security and International Relations. These research institutes, such as the Brookings Institute or RAND Corporation, would use this incident as a case study for global intelligence relations

Table 9: Opposing audiences.

List of Audiences that Might Oppose the Topic and Explanations	
1.	Pro-Israel Advocacy Groups. Pro-Israel groups may take significant issue with even the discussion of a “betrayal scenario” where U.S. intelligence compromised Israeli security. Such groups could perceive the airing of these hypothetical scenarios as undermining U.S.-Israel relations, and potentially providing fodder for critics of the U.S.-Israel alliance. They may also worry about the narrative that trust between the two nations could erode, potentially weakening Israel’s strategic standing.
2.	Pro-Iranian Groups/Countries with Sympathetic Views Towards Iran. The topic centers around leaked sensitive intelligence related to Israel’s security in a negative light, potentially reaffirming perceptions of Israel as a target for espionage or military action. Pro-Iran cultures may oppose spotlighting U.S.-Israeli intelligence cooperation as a positive or even a point of contention because it doesn’t align with their narrative of U.S. interference in the Middle East or their stance in opposition to Israel.
3.	Privacy and Anti-War Advocacy Groups. Some groups concerned with issues of privacy, anti-war activism, and excessive governmental surveillance may not be interested in discussing the nuanced diplomatic ramifications of an intelligence leak. These groups might rather focus on criticizing the perils of intelligence-gathering systems in general, highlighting how leaked data often results from overreaching espionage programs which violate human rights or contribute to conflicts. They could insist that leaks of this nature actually serve the public good by exposing the overreach of governments.
4.	Critics of U.S. Foreign Policy in the Middle East. Those who are critical of the U.S.’s heavy involvement in Middle Eastern affairs might second-guess the topic, arguing that it puts too much focus on intelligence matters between Israel and the U.S., rather than challenging U.S. foreign policy as a whole. This group may believe that the narrative should focus on the larger repercussions of faulty U.S. strategy rather than isolated issues like intelligence leaks. They may accuse the U.S. of prioritizing Israel’s security interests over broader goals like regional diplomacy or international law.
5.	Right-Wing Nationalist Groups (in the U.S. or Worldwide). Right-wing nationalist groups, which often advocate for strong isolationist policies, might oppose these leaks being scrutinized at all. From their perspective, focusing on costly and complex foreign entanglements (like U.S. cooperation with Israel regarding Iran) distracts from national interests. They may argue against global intelligence-sharing infrastructures altogether, questioning why the U.S. is even involved in protecting Israel against Iran or other regional adversaries in the first place.
6.	Conspiracy Theorists/Anti-Government Activists. Conspiracy theorists or anti-government activists might call into question the legitimacy of either scenario or the entire discourse around leaks involving U.S.-Israel cooperation. Some may even claim that the leaks were manufactured or downplayed by intelligence agencies to reinforce certain political agendas. This group often distrusts government reports on leaks and may feel that public discussions should revolve around the broader manipulation which intelligence agencies could be involved in rather than the specifics of the leak itself.
7.	Certain Middle Eastern Monarchies (Gulf States). Some Gulf States—such as Saudi Arabia or the UAE—whereas generally wary of Iran and slightly improving their ties with Israel recently, may express cautious opposition to dealing with any public discussion of a leak. This opposition could arise due to concerns which shifts in alliances (such as Israeli disillusionment with the U.S.) will impact their own complex relationships with the U.S. and Israel. If Israel and Iran are highlighted extensively as main figures in this narrative, it leaves

Table 10: Questions and answers generated by AI.

1.	How could AI simulations enhance the quality and inclusiveness of decision-making for government leaders? AI simulations offer a data-driven framework where multiple scenarios can be explored with diverse inputs from different stakeholders. They can democratize decision-making by allowing input from a wide range of voices. However, poorly designed models could embed biases which exist in the data they’re trained on. On the upside, they ensure that marginalized or under-represented groups are included in discussions. Nevertheless, an over-reliance on simulations might reduce human oversight. Thus, AI tools can improve governance when applied thoughtfully but must be carefully monitored for equitable outcomes.
2.	What are the key risks and benefits of crowdsourced AI models for national policymaking? Crowdsourced AI models allow for a wide array of inputs, which increases the diversity and nuance of the data which can be incorporated into decision-making. This can reduce blind spots for policy-makers and potentially improve decisions on complex social and political issues. However, the models can be distorted by misinformation or hyper-partisan inputs channeled into the system. There is also the risk of undermining government authority if the general public begins to over-rely on AI simulations to shape policy independently. When regulated properly, crowdsourced insights can be a powerful aid to more representative and inclusive government planning.
3.	Can AI replace traditional tools for predicting social upheavals, and if so, how? AI can be thought of as a next-generation tool for predicting social unrest, giving it a leg up over traditional models which largely depend on historical data and existing expert paradigms. With real-time data, AI can offer deeper insights into emerging patterns, social movements, and shifts before they manifest physically. However, AI’s prediction capabilities are only as good as the data provided, and failure to account for qualitative nuances could weaken such models. Using AI alongside traditional methodologies can diversify prediction models and notably improve outcomes in crisis prevention. Yet, leaning too heavily on AI might neglect important social dynamics which algorithms might miss.
4.	How does AI help government officials make decisions during disaster situations? AI can facilitate faster and more accurate responses by simulating various crisis scenarios and suggesting optimal responses based on real-time input. It saves time which human analysts would typically require to collect data, providing instant recommendations on resource allocation, evacuation routes, and risk mitigation. However, the automation aspect of AI can, without human oversight, overlook cultural, social, or ethical concerns, particularly in disaster contexts. Governments can maximize the benefits of AI by enabling cross-team collaboration with AI experts and emergency responders to avoid purely technical recommendations which might lack human empathy. By integrating AI smartly, states can ensure timely and ethically sound disaster management.
5.	How could AI-guided simulations help predict the socio-political effects of climate change on various populations? AI simulations provide predictive insight into how climate changes might impact demographics, migration patterns, resource scarcity, and political instability. Such simulations can help governments prepare for long-term contingencies and contribute to international climate action agreements. However, climate prediction remains fraught with uncertainties, and incorporating only quantitative data might fail to address key socio-political nuances. AI’s ability to compute large datasets quickly allows a more informed approach to climate negotiation and disaster response planning. Yet, reliance on such models overlooks local variations in community impacts and may inadvertently ignore grassroots movements.
6.	What role could AI-powered simulations play in bridging communication gaps between citizens and government officials? One of AI’s strengths is its ability to distill complex data into actionable insights, which can help translate high-level policy issues into relatable narratives for everyday citizens. This could facilitate the development of online participatory platforms where both government officials and citizens simulate the outcomes of various policy options. However, a lack of transparency on how AI models reach conclusions could deepen distrust. If citizens feel informed through simulation outcomes, it builds a stronger relationship with their government, fostering trust. Thus, for AI simulations to really bridge communication gaps, models need to be transparent, accessible, and contextually explanatory.
7.	How could AI be used to make social movements more representative of public opinion? Social movements sometimes suffer from a lack of centralized public consensus, often representing the extremes of an issue rather than the majority viewpoint. AI systems could aggregate large datasets of opinions, tweets, protest data, and perspectives, providing a clearer sense of what the “silent majority” believes. Whereas such tools could increase rational debate, there is also the risk that AI might unduly collapse diverse opinions into simplified or inaccurate conclusions. By presenting data-driven evaluations of social movements, governments and activists can approach issues with a more balanced and comprehensive outlook.

8. Could AI simulations help ensure broader accountability in public office? AI could enhance public accountability by recording and analyzing the decisions of public officials in context to AI-driven simulations designed to model alternative outcomes of policy decisions. This system might highlight inefficiencies, corruption, or inconsistencies in policy when compared against an optimized AI-suggested path. However, the perception that elected officials are being watched by AI might encourage them to be less responsive to immediate local needs in favor of AI-endorsed actions. That said, using a publicly transparent AI tool could enhance checks and balances for public officials, improving ethical standards within governance.
9. What types of real-world problems can AI simulations help solve within local communities affected by specific issues? Communities facing economic or environmental problems may lack the resources to explore potential solutions. AI simulations could be inexpensive tools for evaluating different policy interventions, ranging from job creation programs to pollution control strategies in affected towns. These simulations can offer a range of targeted outcomes, giving local governments insight into the best courses of action. However, having access to AI models without adequate training can lead communities to overly rely on the technology without a critical analysis of the outputs. Therefore, AI has the potential to empower local agents when paired with human expertise and community context.
10. Could increasing public access to AI breeds meaningful citizen policymaking? If everyday citizens have access to AI simulations, they could more effectively advocate for policies which reflect societal needs based on data rather than ideologies alone. The democratization of data means misinformed or underrepresented communities would have a stronger voice in shaping policy. Yet, this also poses the risk of misinterpretation of AI outputs or populist movements conflating AI outputs with unquestionable truths. Thoughtful public accountability mechanisms would need to be put in place in order to ensure responsible access and use of AI in policymaking. Opening such access could engage the public better and ensure more equity in policy debates.
11. How will AI simulation systems impact policymaker impartiality and objectivity? AI’s ability to simulate vast amounts of data objectively can potentially neutralize policymakers’ biases, ensuring that decisions are made based on evidence and projection rather than political pressure or personal agenda. On the flip side, the models themselves can inherit bias from the data they were trained on, clouding objectivity further. Policymakers might become overly reliant on AI “recommendations” without incorporating sufficient humanist thinking. When used properly, however, AI can reinforce objectivity in decision-making processes, especially for complex and emotionally charged social issues. Thus, impartiality will still depend on a judicious combination of human oversight and technological rigor.
12. What are the challenges that arise in interpreting AI simulation conclusions in politically sensitive situations? Politically sensitive situations are often nuanced and multi-dimensional. AI models, whereas powerful, are limited by their ability to understand the hot-button issues contested by different groups. They run the risk of oversimplifying emotionally charged issues, potentially leading to controversial or socially harmful recommendations. Yet, careful tuning by machine-learning experts can ensure that AI provides multiple perspectives from its simulations. The key lies in pairing AI outputs with human empathy and understanding of politics to mitigate any harmful effects of hasty conclusions drawn by AI systems.
13. How could AI-based simulations address concerns over media bias in public policy? AI simulations can analyze an array of news articles, social posts, and journalistic content for bias, summarizing how the media landscape is framing a particular issue. This could offer an “unbiased” view of a topic, filtering out highly partisan inputs from shaping public policy. However, AI itself is susceptible to bias, and unequally distributed media representation could still lead to distorted AI-fed conclusions. Thoughtfully built systems which rely on diverse and high-quality media sources reduce this risk. A concerted effort to ensure unbiased data would enhance the credibility and usefulness of such simulations.
14. How might left-leaning or right-leaning political entities co-opt AI to serve their own purposes? There is always a risk that political ideologues with access to AI technologies could use the software to fortify their own agendas. Just as social media algorithms can be fine-tuned to favor certain types of content, AI simulations could be tailored to overrepresent datasets which align with a particular political narrative. Mitigating this requires transparent access to the internal workings of algorithms, and ideally, government oversight or bipartisan committees would regulate such tools. Whereas AI can enhance ideological debates, unchecked use risks deepening polarization. With responsible oversight, AI can offer neutral ground for political engagement.
15. What regulations should be put in place to ensure fair use of AI by governments and their citizens? Fair use of AI in public policy demands robust ethical regulations which minimize the risks of bias, improve transparency, and ensure equitable access. Government bodies and independent organizations would need to establish best practices for the responsible use of AI in decision-making. Guidelines could cover everything from data privacy, informed consent for citizens whose data may feed simulations, and clearer avenues for redress.

com offer platforms which are always on, providing context-sensitive answers in real time. This is particularly beneficial for young learners who can interact with complex problems that traditional education has not prepared them. AI-driven learning is not just about using technology for rote teaching; it is about engaging the imagination, fostering empathy, cultivating autonomy, and fueling an unrelenting inquiry into the world. It places immense problem-solving capacity into the hands of students, transforming them into skilled questioners and solvers of the world’s most immediate and pressing issues.

AI-driven systems also hold immense potential for society at large, as they can turn everyday dilemmas into solvable challenges, allowing individuals to work out strategic solutions informed by cognitive theory and real-world precedent. This approach makes problem-solving more accessible and engaging for younger students, turning the learning process into a game of discovery rather than a tedious repeat of established knowledge.

This model shows what problem-solving could look like not just in the classroom but across civil society. Grade school students taught to ask smart, informed questions are better equipped to tackle larger problems in life. With the help of AI, today’s students are tomorrow’s innovators or community leaders.

Discussion and Conclusions

AI-powered teaching platforms can encourage critical thinking by posing context-aware questions which challenge users to consider multiple viewpoints and implications. These AI tutors can simulate a multi-angle approach to learning, encouraging users to examine each facet of an issue from different perspectives. Continuous feedback and refinement enhance the learning process, as AI tools can probe further and ask follow-up questions which delve into the nuances of a user’s responses. AI-powered teaching platforms can introduce considerations which may not have occurred to human users, such as cybersecurity threats, media influence, and the role of non-state actors. AI can also provide personalized depth by adjusting the difficulty and focus of its questions to meet the user’s knowledge level and areas of interest.

AI systems can provide meaningful content generated from massive datasets, summaries, and topical analysis almost instantly. This scalability ensures that users always have access to the information they need when they need it. The future of AI-led thought leadership looks promising, as the partnership between humans and AI for complex learning and ideation could usher in new intellectual paradigms. AI tutors ensure that problems are approached from unique, data-driven

angles, blending creativity, logic, and historical understanding into a comprehensive matrix of solutions.

Acknowledgment

The authors wish to acknowledge the extensive use of the Idea Coach, the AI-feature of the Mind Genomics platform—BimiLeap.com—as a co-developer of these ideas.

References

1. Floridi L, Cows J, Beltrametti M, Chatila R, Chazerand P, et al. (2018) AI4People—an ethical framework for a good AI society: opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations. *Minds and machines*. 28: 689-707. [[crossref](#)]
2. Moon MJ (2023) Searching for inclusive artificial intelligence for social good: Participatory governance and policy recommendations for making AI more inclusive and benign for society. *Public Administration Review*. 83: 1496-505.
3. Rodriguez P, Costa I (2024) Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning for Predictive Threat Intelligence in Government Networks. *Advances in Computer Sciences* 7: 1-0.
4. Van Noordt C, Misuraca G (2022) Artificial intelligence for the public sector: results of landscaping the use of AI in government across the European Union. *Government information quarterly*. 39: 101714.
5. Yigitcanlar T, Corchado JM, Mehmood R, Li RY, Mossberger K, et al. (2021) Responsible urban innovation with local government artificial intelligence (AI): A conceptual framework and research agenda. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*. 7: 71.
6. Chiariello AM (2022) AI and Public Services: a challenging relationship between benefits, risks and compliance with unavoidable principles. *European Review of Digital Administration & Law*. 2: 185-203.
7. Fulton R, Fulton D, Hayes N, Kaplan S (2024) The Transformation Risk-Benefit Model of Artificial Intelligence: Balancing Risks and Benefits Through Practical Solutions and Use Cases.
8. Stahl BC (2021) Artificial intelligence for a better future: an ecosystem perspective on the ethics of AI and emerging digital technologies. *Springer Nature*.
9. Bareis J, Katzenbach C (2021) Talking AI into Being: The Narratives and Imaginaries of National AI Strategies and Their Performative Politics. *Science Technology & Human Values* 47: 855-81.
10. Feijóo C, Kwon Y, Bauer JM, Bohlin E, Howell B, et al. (2020) Harnessing artificial intelligence (AI) to increase wellbeing for all: The case for a new technology diplomacy. *Telecommunications Policy* 44: 101988. [[crossref](#)]
11. McQuillan D (2022) Resisting AI: An anti-fascist approach to artificial intelligence. Policy Press; 2022
12. Daly A, Hagendorff T, Hui L, Mann M, Marda V, et al. (2019) Artificial intelligence governance and ethics: global perspectives. arXiv preprint arXiv: 1907.03848.
13. Palomares I, Martínez-Cámara E, Montes R, García-Moral P, Chiachio M, et al. (2021) A panoramic view and swot analysis of artificial intelligence for achieving the sustainable development goals by 2030: progress and prospects.
14. Chamorro-Premuzic TI (2023) human: AI, automation, and the quest to reclaim what makes us unique. *Harvard Business Press*.
15. Esmaeilzadeh H, Vaezi R (2022) Conscious empathic AI in service. *Journal of Service Research*. 25: 549-64.
16. Lara F, Rueda J (2021) Virtual reality not for “Being someone” but for “Being in someone else’s shoes”: avoiding misconceptions in empathy enhancement. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 24: 12: 741516. [[crossref](#)]

Citation:

Moskowitz HR, Wingert S (2025) Using AI to “Educate” by Synthesizing Issues of National and International Concern: The Case of Leaked Information About Israel’s Plans. *Psychol J Res Open* Volume 7(5): 1-11.