

# Beyond Accidents and Misuse: Decoding the Structural Risk Dynamics of Artificial Intelligence

Kyle A Kilian<sup>1,2,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Transformative Futures Institute, <sup>2</sup>Center for the Future Mind, Florida Atlantic University

## Abstract

The integration of advanced artificial intelligence (AI) across contemporary sectors and industries is not just a technological upgrade but a transformation with profound implications. This paper explores the concept of structural risks associated with the rapid integration of advanced AI across social, economic, and political systems. This framework challenges conventional perspectives that primarily focus on direct AI threats such as accidents and misuse and suggests that these more proximate risks are interconnected and influenced by a larger sociotechnical system. By analyzing the complex interactions between technological advancements and social dynamics, this study identifies three primary categories of structural risks: antecedent structural causes, antecedent AI system causes, and deleterious feedback loops. We present a comprehensive framework to understand the causal chains that drive these risks, highlighting the interdependence between societal-scale structural forces and the more proximate risks of misuse, system failures, and the diffusion of misaligned systems. The paper articulates how unchecked AI advancement can reshape power dynamics, trust, and incentive structures, leading to profound and often unpredictable societal shifts. We introduce a methodological research agenda for mapping, simulating, and gaming these dynamics aimed at preparing policymakers and national security professionals for the challenges posed by next-generation AI technologies. The paper concludes with policy recommendations to mitigate these risks by incorporating a nuanced understanding of the AI–sociotechnical nexus into strategic planning and international governance.

# 1. Introduction

In May 2023, at the Royal Aeronautical Society (RaeS) Future Air & Space Capabilities Summit, a USAF Colonel described a combat simulation where an artificial intelligence (AI)-enabled drone trained to attack Surface-to-Air Missiles (SAM) sites instead turned its weapons on its own operator to prevent interference with its objective. According to the report, since the operator would instruct the system to attack only vetted targets, the human ultimately became an obstacle to the system. The media ecosystem went overboard, delivering a flood of reporting on rogue military AI systems. Fortunately, the media spin was an overreaction. The USAF issued a retraction the following day that the story was a hypothetical “thought experiment” to illustrate “the real-world challenges” posed by increasingly capable AI (Hambling, 2023).

Real or hypothetical, for many in the AI safety community, this flavor of technical failure was not surprising and had been observed to a limited degree in game environments for years (Krakovna, 2020; Amodei et al., 2016). Failures to align AI objectives, “unexpected side effects” (Dragan, 2021, p. 135), or the completion of a task in an unanticipated way are well-known problems in AI safety (Hendrycks et al., 2021; Everitt et al., 2016; Pan et al., 2022). This category of AI risk, along with intentional misuse—by way of malicious cyber-threat or creation of a biological agent—grabs most of the public’s attention due to its visceral and unambiguous character (Weise, 2024; Metz, 2024). However, the exclusive focus on these risks and the sharply divided typology neglect more subtle and complex dynamics fundamental to rapid technological change. Thus, the standard actor-centric framework must expand to include more complex sociotechnical dynamics accompanying AI systems.<sup>1</sup>

The complex interplay between technological and social forces gives rise to a distinct category of concern termed structural risks (see Zwetsloot, 2022). Structural risks flip the focus of attention to the interactions between AI systems and the larger sociotechnical context, such as the influence on incentive structures, power dynamics, and control. Distinct from a finite accident or attack, disruptions to systemic dimensions—such as the erosion of individual or collective agency and trust, social cohesion, and offense-defense balances—could have profound transgenerational consequences. These complex forces can drive the character and magnitude of AI risk (e.g., malicious misuse), shift power structures, and rapid capability gains have the potential to unleash novel, unimagined threats. This structural perspective will only increase in relevance as AI systems are increasingly threaded through social, economic, political, and national security systems. This framing could be difficult for the National Security Enterprise (NSE) to adopt, given the traditional outsized focus on adversaries. However, transformative technological change poses unique challenges that intersect all national security priorities (including state and non-state actors). Thus, understanding risks from a structural perspective is crucial for policymakers before powerful AI systems saturate safety-critical systems.

This paper examines the structural risks underlying rapid AI integration and the relationships between technological advancements, social structures, and more proximate risks, such as accidents and misuse. It presents a classification framework to delineate the forces of change that impact structural risks and suggests a methodological approach for mapping and simulating risk dynamics to prepare for the unpredictable. As an adaptive technology—with the capacity to manifest new capabilities—anticipating AI development will continue to be a moving target but an increasingly urgent one. Indeed, unchecked technological advancement has the potential to reshape power dynamics, trust, and incentive structures, leading to unpredictable societal shifts. Evaluating over-the-horizon risks from advanced AI to prepare for the unexpected is crucial, requiring enhanced

---


<sup>1</sup> A sociotechnical system is a complex system that involves a combination of social and technical elements, encompassing the interactions between people, technology, and the organizational environment in which they operate and coevolve.

engagement by policymakers. Thus, while addressing risks from bad actors and accidents remains vital, this paper posits that the intersection of technological and social systems with complex nonlinear dynamics (e.g., geopolitical race dynamics) poses a more pressing and near-term challenge to international security.

## 2. Defining & Conceptualizing Structural Risk

Technology is not developed or deployed in isolation but is tightly entwined with human needs, motivations, and the environment. This is especially true with AI systems—adaptive learning technologies trained to integrate and interact with the social and physical world. This sociotechnical ecology evolves through human-machine interactions, transforming social structures (cultural, economic, and political) while driving technological acceleration (Valverde, 2016). Thus, researchers are increasingly evaluating AI through a complex systems lens, focusing on how its structure, function, and relations with parallel systems influence risk dynamics (Lazar & Nelson, 2023; Weidinger et al.,

2023; Kilian et al., 2023; Pilditch, 2024). A growing body of literature examines AI safety across technical, human, and systemic levels, noting the importance of feedback loops (Weidinger et al., 2023; Anwar et al., 2024) and societal adaptation (Bernardi et al., 2024). AI governance researchers have termed this class of risk *structural*: how the technology shapes or is shaped by the broader environment (Zwetsloot et al., 2019; Dafoe, 2020). Notwithstanding, research into the dynamics of AI structural risks remains limited, with notable exceptions in the areas of strategic weapons and deterrence (Avin & Amadae, 2019; Flournoy et al., 2020; Wong et al., 2020; Johnson et al., 2023) and rapid social change (Ward, 2022).



**Figure 1.** The AI risk landscape. Both accident risks and misuse have broad overlap with self-reinforcing dynamics. Misused AI systems can allow technical safety problems to manifest, and structural forces (e.g., economic or geopolitical) can drive the premature release of untested systems, alter power dynamics (shift the offense-defense balance), or lower the barrier to entry.

Structural risks can be defined as the dynamics that arise from the development and deployment of advanced AI technology within the broader sociotechnical system, including reciprocal chains of events, incentive structures, and power asymmetries. Examining structural risks shifts the focus of analysis from threats at the end of a causal chain—the proximate cause and event, such as the uncontrollable USAF AI drone system—to underlying structural forces, their interactions, and unintended consequences. Thus, while structural risks can be framed as distinct from other more direct threats from AI (e.g., misaligned objective or a cyber threat), they are foundational to their character and severity. In this way, most AI risks have structural underpinnings with indirect causal pathways (**Figure 1**). For example, the premature deployment of a powerful, potentially unsafe system can have a direct effect on accidents, such as a system failure, or the deployment of a misaligned system, or indirectly shift offense-defense power symmetries (e.g., enhance offensive cyber capabilities) driving interstate tensions, even conflict. Indeed, novel capability gains can influence and are

influenced by the wider social and political context. This framing has led some researchers to posit that most AI risks are inherently structural (Krueger, 2023; Clarke, 2022).

To further articulate the point of indirect risks, consider the historical example of fossil fuel adoption. While humans have used fossil fuels for thousands of years, their widespread diffusion in the nineteenth century caused populations and industries to explode, fueling the unprecedented expansion of the Industrial Revolution (Jianfen, 2021; Wrigley, 2013). The externalities from fossil fuel use led to widespread health impacts (e.g., pollution, factory work), the rapid expansion of cities and the defense industrial base, and a steady increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide. Thus, indirect causal links can be traced from the first coal-fired power plants and railroads to the combustion engine and the development and transport of military equipment to the front lines of WWII (Black, 2017; Dafoe, 2020). How technology shifted the structural forces underpinning development and international security, drove the character of social organization and conflict into the Twentieth Century.

Power dynamics and distrust of adversaries can drive the rapid integration of new technologies into global militaries, leading to previously unthinkable forms of conflict, such as unrestricted submarine warfare in WWI, blitzkrieg tactics, and the use of the first atomic bomb in WWII. While there is no direct causal link between technological progress and conflict, astonishing capabilities do shift the balance of what is possible, exacerbated by power imbalance, distrust, and incentives to maintain dominance. These forces can cascade in dangerous feedback loops, twisting value structures, accelerating competition, and increasing the risks of accidents and misuse. Prior to Germany’s decision to execute unrestricted submarine warfare in WWI, all parties believed that the use of such tactics was unthinkable in warfare (Gompert, 2014); however, first use triggered all sides to engage, leading the U.S. into WWI. There is a similar discussion today on the ethics and prohibition of fully autonomous weapons systems (Kallenborn, 2020). However, the lessons of history show that novel capabilities combined with the right incentives can radically shift the structural dynamics of permissibility.

A contemporary example of these dynamics is the economic and geopolitical race dynamics surrounding AI development, driving an acceleration of deployment timelines for companies and nations. Another is the impact of social media algorithms on human social organization and decisions, leading to shifts of entire political regimes and individual harms. Further, spirals in trust over autonomy in weapons systems (strategic, tactical, or command and control systems) lead to heightened tensions and technological escalation (Avin & Amadea, 2019). With increasingly powerful systems, new manifestations of structural risks could arise as the social and technological world becomes increasingly interdependent. Indeed, the effects of AI content selection algorithms on teen suicide or voting behaviors were not on anyone's radar until reaching a particular threshold of AI sophistication. The same is likely true across several areas that have yet to be considered. Just as the impact of nuclear fallout was relatively distant until the *Trinity* test in Los Alamos, NM, in 1945, there is a large, uncertain problem space of AI structural risks currently outside our line of sight.

### **3. Delineating the Boundaries of Risk Dynamics**

Structural risks can be broken down into three interrelated categories: antecedent structural causes, antecedent AI system causes, and deleterious feedback loops. Researcher Sam Clarke from the Center for the Governance of AI suggested a similar distinction for structural risks—separating risks by “AI risks with structural causes” and “non-AI risks partly caused by AI,” focusing on the distinctions as structural perspectives (Clarke, 2022). We add a third category to this typology, deleterious feedback loops, due to the especially dangerous influence they can have on escalation. Classifying structural

risks in this way is somewhat of a chicken-and-egg problem in that each interaction across categories precipitates further interactions in dangerous cycles. Nonetheless, some feedback processes can be the primary drivers of catastrophic risks and should be emphasized separately. Thus, whether the initial causal force is an underlying structural phenomenon or the specific technology, the interactions are often the primary danger. The following three sections proceed through each category with examples of risks driven by underlying structures, AI systems, or cascading feedback loops.

### ***3.1 Antecedent Structural Causes***

A timely example of an antecedent structural cause is the issues that arise from transparency norms surrounding the open-source ecosystem and the diffusion of AI systems. The norms among developers to open source their work, receive contributions from the community, and share the results are deeply ingrained. Indeed, open source has been a cornerstone in shaping the current technology landscape. Many leaders in AI believe that the only way to unveil advanced AI systems is through full open source to democratize access, ensuring a level playing field for users. The most vocal proponent of this path, Meta’s Chief Scientist, Yann LeCun, argues that controlling model distribution centralizes power away from individuals, benefiting only a select few (Heaven, 2023). While the concerns are valid (e.g., powerful AI held by large militaries or corporations), full open-release<sup>2</sup> (including the model, code base, and weights) can enable less responsible or even adversarial states to leapfrog technological barriers. Research has shown that basic fine-tuning of open models can remove all safety guardrails, allowing bad actors to easily tailor models to their needs (Kapoor et al., 2024). Other developers are pursuing a more cautious approach with limited release (e.g., Anthropic), including red teaming, testing, and evaluation (T&E) that allow for the identification of potentially dangerous capabilities (Anthropic, 2023). Proponents of unrestricted open source tend to minimize the risks from cyber threat groups and adversarial state entities that receive the latest models at the same time as individual developers.

AI systems at the frontier of research<sup>3</sup> are known to show unexpected, emergent capabilities with few mechanisms to understand the degree of risk beforehand (or push security updates or retract dangerous versions) (Wei et al., 2022). Indeed, unexpected failure modes could arise from untested systems after deployment or manifest unique capabilities missed in initial testing. In this case, the only mechanism is trial and error. Open-sourcing a misaligned model with novel capabilities could lead to risks as minimal as minor system failures or as severe as shifts in power balances (e.g., nonstate actors able to generate novel attack vectors) or catastrophic accidents. This could impact safety-critical applications or communication networks linked to the rest of the global economy. A state entity that quickly integrates an open-source model into its national defense systems without knowledge of a critical failure is at the mercy of the developer’s safety standards (as are other nations or entities networked to these systems). As has happened with cyber attacks, infected systems tend to spread beyond the original target. With no regulatory framework in place, open-source norms could accelerate the proliferation of potentially unsafe systems. However, openness is a spectrum—not a binary, between highly restricted and fully open; thus, there are reasonable degrees of openness to prevent the most severe contingencies while supporting innovation.

An especially concerning structural risk is the potential for shifts in human decision-making and choice over the short, medium, and long term. Incentivized to integrate the latest AI technology,

---

<sup>2</sup> The concern here is less about the full release of frontier *dual-use* models (i.e., general purpose systems) with the code and model weights made widely available. Open source is incredibly important for scientific progress, especially specialized systems for research, but there are less valid arguments for the release of general-purpose systems without any restrictions. For more details, see this response to NTIA’s request for public input [here](#).

<sup>3</sup> Frontier AI refers to technology at or beyond the forefront of research, encompassing the innovations and experimental techniques in the field, usually in reference to AI foundation models and LLMs. For more details, see [here](#).

businesses and governments will increasingly integrate state-of-the-art systems into complex processes traditionally completed by humans. This can increase efficiency while offloading cognitive labor while incrementally relinquishing a degree of control over AI processes. However, even an incremental shift here can have a profound cumulative impact on human choice and decision over the long term (see Ward, 2022). AI search processes tend to level out the distribution of choices to arrive at what is considered optimal since optimality is often the same as what is easiest or probable (Christiano, 2019). Indeed, there is a degree of randomness and unpredictability in human decisions, influenced by factors such as emotions, shifting preferences, and external circumstances, leading to diverse and sometimes unexpected outcomes (i.e., stochastic vs. deterministic systems). AI systems are inherently deterministic<sup>4</sup> and predictable if inputs remain relatively constant. AI optimization can precipitate feedback loops where the system's outputs are used as new inputs, reinforcing choices and decisions. Over time, this can narrow the decision space for individuals, organizations, states, and globally as AI continuously refines its outputs based on past decisions. While relatively benign at the level of social media, in the short term, placing AI systems in charge of more consequential decision processes could prove disastrous.

### ***3.2 Antecedent AI System Causes***

The impact of social media algorithms on society is a noteworthy antecedent AI system cause with the potential to have profound transgenerational consequences. Consider content selection algorithms, widely believed (at least in part) to be responsible for shifting public perceptions and driving political polarization (Madsen & Pilditch, 2018). Rather than simply recommending products, the algorithm is believed to incrementally change individual preferences to become more predictable, preferentially in the direction of more extreme content (Russel, 2021). It is widely believed that social media contributed to the results of the Brexit referendum and the 2016 U.S. elections—through microtargeting, e.g., Cambridge Analytica and Russia's election interference—but reinforced and amplified by algorithmic targeting and polarization. As users are repeatedly exposed to targeted content, their interests and, ultimately, choices are incrementally changed, reinforced by machine-exploited biases (Madsen & Pilditch, 2018; Pilditch & Madsen, 2021). This algorithmic feedback loop has increased far-right extremism and incited violence in Ethiopia's (2020) and Myanmar's (2016) civil conflicts (Akinwotu, 2021). With society unmoored from a shared set of facts, adversaries can exploit these vulnerabilities to undermine democracy or leverage them for mass manipulation. Crucially, the capabilities that caused such widescale disruption ultimately pale in comparison to current capabilities. Targeted manipulation, narrative creation, and amplification—potentially through autonomous means—are now possible at far greater speed and scale.

At the macroscopic level, the arrival of new general-purpose technologies (GPT) fundamentally shifts the structure of social and political organization (Lipsey et al., 2005); this was the case with the invention of the printing press and is equally true today with AI. Indeed, GPTs are fundamentally *dual-use* and can have good and bad uses across many domains. With increasingly capable systems, novel cyber exploits (e.g., faster, cheaper, autonomous), means of delivering disinformation, or the synthesis of biological agents become more accessible to average users. For example, in 2023, an AI system used for drug discovery was instructed to do the opposite as an experiment by the user; the system proceeded to generate thousands of new variations of chemical weapons (e.g., variants of VX nerve gas) in under six hours (Calma, 2022). Thus, while systems remain limited today, frontier models

---

<sup>4</sup> Complex neural networks with stochastic elements introduced, e.g., through Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD), still retain an underlying determinism from pseudo-random number generators (PRNGs). This excludes the “true” randomness found in natural complex systems.

increasingly lower the barrier to entry, including the requisite skills needed for designing biological and chemical agents. Advanced AI is structurally shifting these barriers for a diverse set of actors—individuals, groups, or nation-states—providing relative superpowers without the technical investment.

These structural shifts are especially concerning in the area of strategic. The framework of nuclear deterrence is one based on trust (e.g., treaty obligations) and relative invulnerability—where the chances of an effective “counterforce” strike to eliminate an opponent's armaments preemptively are minimal (Lieber et al., 2017). This undergirds much of the nuclear deterrence regime and the concept of mutually assured destruction (MAD). Indeed, central to deterrence is the reliance on hardening structures (e.g., bunkers) and concealment (denial and deception, or D&D) to ensure survivability. If nations have the ability (or suspected ability) to preemptively destroy an adversary's nuclear arsenal, this delicate balance could collapse. This concern has been growing for over a decade with revolutions in remote sensing technologies, but increasingly capable AI systems have the potential to accelerate these concerns. Further, integrating autonomous capabilities into strategic systems, or the perception of integration, can erode trust in the safety and security of weapons systems and nonproliferation compliance. Russia's so-called “leak” of testing a nuclear-powered undersea drone, the Status-6, capable of carrying a thermonuclear warhead, had this effect (Geist & Lohn, 2018).

### ***3.3 Deleterious Feedback Loops***

All structural risks involve complex feedback loops, and for some, it can be a defining feature. An intuitive example involves technological race dynamics. These effects can span institutions and geographies, impacting individuals, companies, and states with implications for the global balance of power. AI race dynamics are tightly interwoven processes with interactions that precipitate other risks embedded further down the chain; for example, economic imperatives of companies to stay ahead of the competition in AI development can lead developers to accelerate the deployment of advanced systems and potentially cut corners on AI safety. At the same time, national security considerations of states ensure higher public investments in AI, reinforcing economic race dynamics and perhaps leading to the premature deployment of untested models. These dynamics can create public-private reinforcing feedback loops, with competitors unwilling to fall behind in the race for AI dominance. These dynamics can shift offense-defense balances, leading to further cycles among states that feel they must ensure parity in national defense. These feedback loops influence interactions and decisions in private companies (e.g., grant seeking, strategic guidance on products or deployment), government security postures, and even individual choices (e.g., investment decisions).

China's “military-civil fusion” (MCF) program—which eliminates barriers between civilian research and the Peoples Liberation Army (PLA)—has had this effect on driving further race dynamics, heightening tensions, and reinforcing distrust with the West (Fedasiuk et al., 2021). The mistrust between states breeds further risk-taking, investment, and coercive actions such as the U.S. Chips Act, designed to restrict cutting-edge semiconductor technology from Chinese markets. This, in effect, triggered a black market in state-of-the-art (Fist & Grunewald, 2023) chips while accelerating the development of Chinese domestic chip fabrication (Che & Liu, 2023; Triolo, 2024). Factors such as MCF, commercial espionage, and China's position on AI as a strategic asset are primary drivers behind the U.S. technological war footing. At the same time, the urgency precipitated by AI race dynamics has the effect of restricting government choice to the leading technological paradigms and products, reinforcing the power of tech monopolies. This is a subtle form of state capture that binds governments' dependence on a small group of companies (Whittaker, 2022).

The underlying drive for power and control has the potential to thread AI systems deep into

the national defense and intelligence ecosystems, with little visibility into system behavior, data sources, or model architecture. This is an area where human decision and analysis can be most consequential, where military actions can hinge on receiving and interpreting the correct information. It is also an environment of deep uncertainty where so-called wicked problems, with competing, often irresolvable, hypotheses, are commonplace (Pilditch, 2024). A likely near-term use of frontier AI systems will be in defense and intelligence analysis, where immense quantities of data must be evaluated and integrated into finished intelligence. At present, there is far too much data and too little bandwidth to do this individually, so choices are made where to focus analytical efforts, invariably missing important signals (Symon et al., 2015). Thus, the incentives to harness the power of AI are immense and will undoubtedly be applied quickly across the defense and intelligence enterprise. This incrementally opens the national security decision-making apparatus to the feedback processes of creeping AI optimization, decision homogenization, and erosion.

While the integration of frontier AI systems will likely present important new risks, threats, and actors and potentially resolve intractable ones, the information could recirculate through the same optimization processes, narrowing the decision environment. This could lead analysts to focus on the wrong issues or marginal ones (e.g., whatever patterns the system identifies), neglect critical areas, and encounter decision fatigue by an inordinate number of data points that otherwise would have received less priority. The question of whether the government is driving intelligence priorities or the AI system could easily arise. As in other decision spaces (e.g., content selection algorithms), our understanding of truth and the efficacy of our decision-making could degrade or become less effective or influential. The same dynamics are equally likely with other state actors, allies, or adversaries. Indeed, our reliance on liaison relationships to maintain obligations and de-escalate tensions—a crucial element in international relations—could begin to fray as trust in decisions is questioned.

## 4. Drivers of Structural Change

AI structural risks are difficult to disambiguate and can be framed more clearly as a perspective (see Clarke, 2022). However, the fundamental forces that undergird and influence structural risk—with interactions at the individual, institutional, state, and global levels—can be articulated to frame sociotechnical dynamics. Thus, it can be helpful to carve out an organizational framework to help understand and address the high-level features. Indeed, given the wide-ranging impact of structural risks—whether triggered by underlying forces, AI system-driven changes, or feedback loops—attending to this class of risk is crucial. However, it is important to note that this framework is an oversimplification or a coarse-graining of the complex interdependencies, principal-agent dynamics, and subtle differences between perception and reality among individuals, firms, and governments. With this in mind, there are three noteworthy driving forces underlying structural risk dynamics related to rapid AI development and integration: issues of trust, power, and incentives. These include the inverse as an equally consequential force (e.g., a cause and consequence of power is control, as is the loss of it). These forces are defined as:

- **Trust** (distrust): The confidence among actors (states, organizations, and individuals) and their predictability, reliability, transparency, and reciprocity of actions, particularly in adhering to agreements, norms, or expected behavior. This includes inverse factors, such as distrust, opacity, and unpredictability.
- **Power** (control): The capacity of an actor to influence or control actions, behaviors, and outcomes within an environment (e.g., coercion or control using AI technologies). Power encompasses fundamental drives such as technological superiority, control of information,



resources, and capability (e.g., soft power, coercive diplomacy, structural power), and who or what exercises it. Power is intricately linked with incentive structures.

- **Incentives:** The forces that motivate or encourage specific behaviors or choices—positively (e.g., rewards, benefits) or negatively (e.g., penalties, costs). While power can be considered an incentive, these two forces are not interchangeable; incentives have widely variable mechanisms of influence, as individuals, groups, and nations can be incentivized by a range of factors that drive AI adoption or misuse.

These forces are pivotal in driving the adoption, innovation, and diffusion of AI, influencing how actors—individuals, institutions, or nation states—prioritize resources, their allocation, and deployment strategies. These drivers are relational in that they influence and interact across domains with a host of secondary or inverse characteristics. For example, incentives drive relationships to power and control, just as trust (or distrust) can shift incentives or influence power dynamics. Each is a complex superclass of motivations and capacities that underlie the causal dynamics of AI structural risks. As highlighted in previous sections, antecedent structural causes are driven largely by power and incentives, while AI system causes can be impacted by trust (e.g., transparency) and power and exacerbated by capability shifts or social fragility.

The taxonomy is organized in a hierarchical framework of social organization from the individual or organization to the nation state to the global or collective levels, outlining the variation of structural dynamics across scales. In researching truth decay (subclass of AI structural risk), RAND devised a similar framework, grouped at the individual, institutional, state, and normative levels (Heather et al., 2023). Similarly, this work maps structural or causal forces to specific impacts and their level of social organization (**Table 1**). This is key to understanding the relationships between structural forces (like trust or incentives) and risks at and between different scales, such as a company bypassing safety standards in fear of a competitor (trust/organization), a state integrating AI into defense systems (power/state) to preempt a rival (trust/state), or a nonstate actor empowered to access state-of-the-art models due to lax open source policies (power/individual), or actors leveraging AI to offload cognitive burden (incentives/individual) resulting in the collective loss of control (power/global). By evaluating the impact of these forces on decision-making and AI progress more generally, more effective policy instruments could be devised—at different points along the causal chain where intervention makes sense—to address structural factors, especially at the organizational and state level.

### Structural Forces Across Scales

Level of Impact	Trust	Power	Incentives
Individual or Institution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distrust of the information ecosystem</li> <li>• Distrust in competitors' safety practices</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low barrier to entry for bad actors</li> <li>• Increasing returns to scale: <i>Power begets power</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Corporate incentives to cut corners on safety to stay competitive</li> </ul>
State	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distrust or fear of state AI integration</li> <li>• Disrupt offense-defense balance</li> <li>• Interstate counter-AI escalation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased power and decision advantage by offloading cognitive work</li> <li>• Imperative to use AI weapons and surveillance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State incentives to maintain parity: <i>If we don't use it, they will</i></li> <li>• Incentives to automate warfare</li> </ul>
Global or Collective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Widespread distrust of information</li> <li>• Narrative feedback loops in the information ecosystem</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Imperative to solve global problems resulting in externalities (e.g., energy use and inequalities)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incentives to automate and optimize everything, leading to decision erosion</li> </ul>


**Table 1.** Drivers of structural risks that influence or are influenced by AI development and deployment. Each structural force is classified by the hierarchical levels in which they are embedded in society—from the micro (individual or company) to the meso (organized group) to the macro (global or collective).

The microscopic, mesoscopic, and macroscopic levels intersect (e.g., the individual is nested below the state, nested below the global) with complex reciprocal interactions, such as perverse company incentives undermining individual or global trust and exacerbating more direct AI risks. For example, individual distrust of the information environment (individual/trust) and low barrier to entry (individual/power) could induce bad actors to accelerate disinformation or cyber campaigns, decreasing trust in the system and driving states to take disproportionate actions (e.g., AI-enabled counter-narratives) resulting in dangerous reinforcing feedback loops degrading global information ecosystems (collective/trust). Alternatively, interstate distrust (state/trust) of an adversary's restraint with AI systems could induce the preemptive integration of untested AI into strategic defense systems (state/incentives and state/power). This could lead to other reinforcing feedback mechanisms, shifting the offense-defense balance, driving critical failures, damage to indirect parties, or even global conflict (global/power). Depending on the character of AI risk, this chain of events could influence or result in cascading failures, inadvertent military escalations (state/trust), or state disempowerment (state/power). **Figure 2** provides a rough example of these mechanisms.

At the same time, structural factors can intersect and undergird technical dangers. Consider a state with a fractured information ecosystem, with rampant disinformation spread by malign actors. With the requisite capabilities (e.g., autonomous agents, cognitive IoT), this environment could drive governments to develop and deploy autonomous agent systems to produce targeted messaging or offensive cyber operations. The increased instability could reinforce a faster adoption and deployment of untested, potentially dangerous models to replicate desired narratives or disable offending systems. Crucially, the same agent systems could be directed at governments or, through carelessness (e.g., poor safety practices or espionage) or intentional release, society in general. The history of self-replicating malware in cyber attacks has demonstrated that unanticipated spread and contamination of unrelated systems and networks is inevitable, often with disproportionate consequences (e.g., NotPetya worm in 2017) (Fruhlinger, 2017). Thus, the release of an intelligent and self-replicating agent—capable of learning and adaptation—could spiral beyond our control to infect the global technological ecosystem. Indeed, recent research on the capabilities of autonomous replication and adaptation (ARA) in agent systems demonstrates that this category of risks and capability could be

difficult to control (Kinniment, 2023). While current AI capabilities remain limited, widespread autonomous agents are the direction research is heading.

The persistent drive for power and control, especially in the national security context, incentivizes leaders to integrate AI across networked systems, with economic incentives accelerating these efforts. This is a virtuous circle in the best of times but can spiral into vicious cycles in times of crisis (**Figure 2**). Disruptive cyber intrusions into national systems have accelerated trends toward automating cyber defense in national networks, including using reinforcement learning (RL) agents (Nguyen & Reddi, 2019).<sup>5</sup> There have been equally ambitious proposals for intelligent next-generation networks (NGN), with the U.S. Army’s Joint All-Domain Command and Control (JADC2) concept for networked operations and the U.S. Government’s Resilient and Intelligent Next-Generation Systems (RINGS) program as two notable examples (Pomerleu, 2022; GCN, 2022). Rapid AI capability gains (potentially with ARA capabilities) coupled with expansive, intelligent networks could radically expand the digital surface for unexpected failures, cyber-attacks, or misaligned systems beyond our control. These initiatives are driven by, at least in part, forces of power acquisition and control, distrust of adversaries, and underlying economic incentives. Thus, understanding and correctly interpreting the intersection of technical failure and structural forces is crucial for effectively managing and regulating advanced AI system integration.



**Figure 2.** An example causal loop diagram of complex causal pathways of structural forces, accidents, and misuse. The plus symbols (red) indicate an increase (e.g., race dynamics increase the chance of conflict), and the negatives (blue) denote a decrease (e.g., disinformation decreases trust in the information environment). The figure displays two reinforcing feedback loops (the capital R denotes *reinforcing*) within the system: the information ecosystem loop and the power asymmetry loop (the dashed lines represent example proximate risks: ARA refers to autonomous replication and adaptation, and AF, alignment failure).

## 5. Measuring & Mapping the Structural Risk Landscape

In light of these highly complex dynamics, measuring structural risk seems implausible or, at the very least, difficult and imprecise. Thus, this invariably involves qualitative judgments and proxy variables

to help understand the trends and structural shifts underway. Nonetheless, in complex, highly uncertain problem spaces, imprecise, qualitative, and proxy values combined can be highly informative to help measure the degree of change and chart the best path forward for AI governance. These measures do not quantify any specific risk directly but rather the structural forces and influential variables that are known to be determinative. There are multiple approaches that could be valuable for measuring structural risk and sociotechnical change. However, there are two that stand out as especially viable for mapping the complexity and informing policy. First, the development of a sociotechnical or structural risk index—with multiple variables indicative of structural change—could be helpful in evaluating the status of societal adaptation, the pace of change, and governance readiness at the state or global level. Second is strategic foresight—involving simulations, alternative futures, and wargaming—that evaluates interactions of structural forces, drivers, and agents that can help map the space of possible futures and understand how parameters interact to inform decision-making. Using structural risk index values (combined with other suitable parameters) to design simulations and scenario modeling could be crucial to understanding how these interactions and choices impact policies and change the risk landscape.

### ***5.1 A Structural/Sociotechnical Risk Index***

A structural risk index could be invaluable for modeling, futures, and simulation design. These are measures of sociotechnical change that could be used in an analogous way to political risk indices. As an example, the index could be divided into four categories or dimensions: AI Diffusion, Integration, AI Policy, and Dependence. Much of this data is widely available from the OECD, Stanford’s AI Index, the UN, and other sources.<sup>6</sup> Each of these dimensions has sub-categories or variables that could be measured through distinct quantitative indices, statistics, press reporting, or online activity. **Table 2** details an example approach to mapping the dimensions, variables, and potential data sources (e.g., in the fourth column).

---

<sup>5</sup> DARPA has pursued several large programs to leverage ML in defense of computer networks (DARPA, 2022). Reinforcement Learning (RL) based approaches have been proposed to monitor and evaluate CPSs for autonomous intrusion detection with multiagent RL-based simulations for defense against cyber-attacks (Nguyen, 2019).

<sup>6</sup> For the OECD’s AI Policy Observatory, see [here](#), Stanford’s AI Global Vibrancy data sources [here](#), United Nations Statistics [here](#), or Transparency International’s Corruption Perception Index [here](#).

## AI Structural Risk Index

Dimension	Variable	Desc	Metrics
<b>Diffusion</b>	Acceleration	The pace of AI development, including growth in novel innovations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total increase in AI publications, partnerships, patents, new AI models, and investment</li> <li>Novel hardware and AI architecture development (percent change or number of innovations)</li> </ul>
	Propagation	The spread of new AI technologies, paradigms, and adoption	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pace of AI Knowledge flows and network growth (academic and industry)</li> <li>Pace of geographic distribution of skills migration and penetration</li> </ul>
<b>Integration</b>	Commercial	The depth of integration globally, such as workforce penetration and talent concentration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change in AI industry, workforce, skills penetration, and hiring index</li> <li>Number of new AI startups and AI job listings</li> </ul>
	Defense	AI investment in defense programs and the pace of new programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AI Investment in defense as a proportion of defense spending/GDP</li> <li>Increase in AI system integration in a military context</li> </ul>
<b>AI Policy</b>	Increase	The relative increase in AI policy programs for risk mitigation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase in new policy proposals for AI governance and implementation</li> <li>International coordination, norms, and agreements</li> </ul>
	Decrease	The degree countries are failing to enact or falling behind in AI mitigation policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decline or stall in the number of policy programs, legal regimes, or failure of adoption</li> <li>Poor record of adhering to treaty obligations or non-signatories of safety regimes</li> </ul>
<b>Dependence</b>	Individual	The rate of AI dependence across society, especially individual consumers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Smartphone and social media addiction index; adoption of generative AI in the workplace</li> <li>Metrics on the degradation of human decision-making</li> </ul>
	Organizational	The rate of AI adoption and job displacement in industry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Job loss to automation without an accompanying increase in new jobs</li> <li>AI automation statistics and AI-related job loss, public and private</li> </ul>

**Table 2.** This table shows an example structural risk index. This table includes dimensions or key drivers, variables, descriptions of each, and potential metrics and data sources to include for measurement. This index measures the direction of predictive forces that could lead to ungovernable technological change.

The first dimension, AI diffusion, has two key variables—acceleration and propagation. Acceleration measures the overall pace and spread of AI systems throughout society; indeed, the dominant factor influencing the tension and dynamic interactions of AI and society is the speed of capability gains. The rapid pace of AI development stresses institutional flexibility and resilience, society’s adaptive capabilities, and brings the potential for unintended escalations. In a similar vein, propagation measures the spread of systems across individuals, industries, and states. A key component of this is the open source ecosystem and whether it is restrained or allowed to spread the most highly capable systems. The second dimension is AI system integration with two key variables: commercial and defense. As with the acceleration of AI capabilities, the speed and breadth of autonomous system adoption and integration have a massive impact on how well organizations, institutions, and states absorb the shock of rapid change or how well adversaries react to these changes in a military context. Propagation also influences the availability of advanced models to individual actors, innocent developers, or criminals. The sub-categories commercial and defense evaluate these two complementary components that have the tendency to drive feedback loops, further accelerating integration. The variable defense integration includes a measure of the relative increase in reported cases of AI system integration into military activities (e.g., UAS used in Ukraine or Israel in Gaza), potentially derived from public reporting and data on budget acquisitions.

Beyond the pace and spread of AI technologies, the fourth dimension is AI policy. With the sub-categories of increase and decrease, this measure evaluates the preparedness and good behavior of organizations and state entities, which undergirds global collective security. Increase seeks to measure the change (relative and total) in beneficial AI policy proposals and their implementation, domestically and internationally; while proposals alone cannot ensure that safety and stability are trending in the right direction, their implementation can. Thus, this metric aims to standardize the relative increase in policy implementation across companies, governments, and societies. The second variable, Decrease, evaluates essentially the opposite, including companies and states unwilling to compromise on security, implement best practices and good governance, or worse, disengage. This, of course, adjoins one of the feedback mechanisms triggered by economic and geopolitical race dynamics. Further, the index evaluates adherence to important treaties or agreements, such as the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), and its history of failures in governance (e.g., Transparency International's Corruption Perception Index, or CPI).

The final dimension is dependence, with variables individual and organizational. This dimension aims to measure societal dependence on AI—including individuals, our collective decision-making capability, and organizations. At the level of the individual, there are a growing number of metrics and indexes that measure the social impact of technology, technology dependence, and AI's influence on decision making (Ahmad et al., 2023). The more societies depend on AI systems, the more likely there are other risks further down the causal chain (e.g., decision, truth, and value erosion). The second variable, organizational, looks specifically at AI penetration across the economy, such as skills penetration, AI demand, talent concentration, and different automation measures (see: OECD.ai or Stanford's AI Index). While this element is quite similar to integration, its focus is squarely on how businesses operate and their need for human labor. How these measures evolve over time could be suggestive of our ultimate control. For example, decreases in talent demand and available AI jobs, but sky-high talent concentration and automation would be indicative of increasing societal-scale dependence on AI and structural shifts away from human labor.

Multiple sources of data and new explanatory variables could increase the robustness of the index and more effectively measure the dimensions and the direction of sociotechnical change. More precise measures on military dependence on AI, trust measures across alliances, and social dependence would be vital. Operationally, these variables should be normalized to a fixed scale (e.g., 1-10 or 1-100) so that each measure can be evenly compared as is standard in risk management. Qualitative values, such as press reporting on defense integration or policy implementation, will require subjective judgment informed by subject-matter experts to transform these elements into workable metrics for the scale (e.g., the percent increase in reporting, policy proposals, or laws enacted) while the quantitative data can be easily transformed into a fixed scale for comparative analysis. Integrating generative AI into this framework (e.g., LLM iteration) for collecting and evaluating qualitative data could be invaluable. From this, a total metric can be calculated for our current state of affairs at the global level or the relative stability of individual states or organizations. Given the uncertainty of societal-scale risks from AI and trends impacting international security, developing workable metrics to track change will be increasingly important.

## ***5.2 Simulating Structural Dynamics***

Exploratory futures, scenario modeling, and simulations are ideally suited for interrogating uncertain, computationally irreducible problem spaces. These approaches have been used in areas as diverse as climate change (Boettcher et al., 2016), environmental management (Malekmohammadi, 2017), national security (Tzezana, 2017; Johansen, 2018), policy (Bryan & Lampert, 2010), and AI risk

(Gruetzemacher, 2019; Kilian et al., 2022) using a wide array of methods. Computational modeling and simulations, in particular, are used widely in complex systems research to understand how interdependent variables interact and affect the broader system. In this way, scenarios and simulations are leveraged to understand how the interactions of structural dynamics impact AI risk while informing how different policies and actions could shift structures. Simulation models can reveal counterintuitive dynamics that other methods may miss. Monte Carlo simulations for scenarios, cellular automata (CA), and agent-based modeling (ABM) are three notable examples that could be useful for AI structural risk. For evaluating how individuals, companies, and governments change the risk balance, agent-based modeling (ABM) could be especially valuable. There is very little work using simulation for AI risk and governance, with notable exceptions. By setting each *agent*—whether individual, company, malign actor, or nation state—and defining rules of interactions, the simulation can be iterated hundreds or thousands of times to uncover behavioral dynamics, counterintuitive interactions, and the impact of choices (Quang et al., 2018; Bonabeau, 2002).

Setting up useful and informative parameters for ABMs—and, importantly, choosing the right quantity and category of agents—is a challenging and important step for producing useful, generalizable insights. If there are too many agents and too much complexity, the model loses its utility, potentially introducing errors into the environment; the goal is not to perfectly model reality but to approximate high-level interactions to arrive at general principles. One method could be mapping structural drivers using proxy variables for incentives, trust, and power to different agents (e.g., individual, nation state, or regional entities such as the UN) for running simulations. Another approach could be to transfer variables and insights from the structural risk index to inform the setup of the model and define the initial conditions of the state space. Varying different rules to understand the acceleration and diffusion of technology, policy choices, implementation (such as increase and decrease), and level of dependence could be ideal for establishing a baseline for simulation. This could also ground the simulation in data from our current environment to play out plausible near-to-mid-term future paths. How these simulations evolve and adapt can be presented as scenarios for policy and planning. This approach could provide a grounded framework for understanding the complex structural dynamics and their impact on social stability and advanced AI risk.

Following the simulations and scenario generation, wargaming the decision environment and different contingencies could support companies, policymakers, and militaries seeking to understand the implications of rapid technological change. Games are useful for exploring complex systems—e.g., tradeoffs, tipping points, unique situations, and low probability risks—the kind of potential futures one expects with unprecedented change (Bartel, 2020; Crichton, 2000). Indeed, forecasting has critical limitations in this area, attempting to anticipate events that cannot be extrapolated from data. After formulating plausible futures and simulating the distribution, participants can systematically test these scenarios to interrogate decision points and policy changes to help develop more robust and resilient strategies. Understanding exponentiality and the unexpected is difficult for humans. Thus, simulating these situations and visualizing the range of outcomes—slow, moderate, fast, or super-exponential—could help foster intuition for a better-calibrated response.

With the increasing capabilities of LLM applications, participants should actively experiment with strategies for integrating LLMs into the analysis pipeline, from brainstorming drivers to scenario development to wargaming. In fact, researchers from AI developer Scale AI recently joined forces with the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) to help devise wargaming approaches using LLMs for the Futures Lab (Jensen et al., 2024). LLM methods are being explored across a range of research domains, including the social and physical sciences (Grossman et al., 2023), forecasting (Halawi et al., 2024), causal map generation (Kiciman et al., 2024), and scenario discovery. Indeed, through creative LLM prompting or specialized fine-tuning, there is a significant space for exploratory

analysis. Thus, considering the substantive concerns and uncertainty with AI risks, using AI byproducts (such as LLMs) to understand structural risks could be invaluable in identifying and mitigating AI externalities (e.g., using AI to understand AI). Combining the proxy variables with simulations, scenarios, and gaming—enabled by the latest advancements in generative AI—could facilitate more thorough preparation for radically uncertain futures.

## 5. A Concentration on Structure for Policy

AI structural risks, accidents, and misuse can ultimately be clustered under the same umbrella; social forces drive the direction and magnitude of AI risk, while rapid emergent capabilities can unleash new risk categories and actors, shifting power dynamics. While the standard typology of accidents and misuse is easy to articulate, the underlying structural dynamics are fundamental and require careful attention in evaluating mitigation measures and policy opportunities. Indeed, shifts in system capabilities can shape the propensity for bad actors to misuse AI systems, increasing their overall effectiveness, while the larger forces of geopolitical competition can exacerbate both, driving escalatory feedback. Understanding these interdependencies is crucial to managing the uncertainty and system vulnerabilities in the face of rapid technological change. Moreover, changes to structural dynamics can be either the driver or impediment (given the right mitigations) to whether or how risks manifest. Effectively targeting the touchpoints, at the level of interactions, between advanced AI systems and the environment will ultimately help influence its impact on international security and stability. As advanced AI continues to integrate across social, political, and economic domains, understanding and addressing structure becomes paramount.

There are means to take structure into account when managing the safe development and deployment of advanced AI. First, it is crucial to raise awareness of the system dynamics underlying AI risks from corporate entities to military planners and the policy community. Indeed, with a strong understanding of the dynamics of AI structural risk, policymakers can design instruments that anticipate structural risks, dangerous feedback loops, and unintended consequences. While it is unlikely that specific effects could be understood sufficiently in advance, mapping out the plausible paths can help guide decision-making to prepare for the unknown (see Chapter 5). Moreover, government bodies and research institutes should double down on futures and foresight research so that decision-makers can understand the broad contours of structural risks and map these onto policy choices. The research approach proposed in this paper, developing a structural risk index and using this to implement simulations for scenario mapping, could go a long way in understanding the subtle touchpoints, possible unintended impacts, and areas for targeted interventions. This could be improved through tabletop exercises and even war gaming to understand the extent of possible dangers, test decisions and solutions, and iterate policy through games and simulations. This approach changes the framing from a search for perfect solutions and reactive mitigations to planning for resilience.

At the system deployment and integration level, leaders need a perspective of antifragility—developing frameworks capable of being resilient to unintended shocks, failure modes, and power asymmetries. Ensuring that high-risk systems of concern are integrated with multiple redundancies and backstops to avoid cascading failure modes will be critical as advanced AI is webbed through interconnected systems. The so-called “Flash Crash” of the New York Stock Exchange (NYSE) in 2010 (Treanor, 2015), where the market dropped over a thousand points in minutes (due in part to misinterpreted signals of algorithmic trading systems), is an important reminder of how isolated system failures can spread quickly, with spiraling feedback, causing significant, unanticipated damage. In a similar vein, significant research should be expended into developing stopgap measures



(e.g., kill switches, limited lifespans) carefully designed to stop an automated agent system (e.g., ARA) in the event of an inadvertent release, attack, or unexpected adaptation. By integrating stop-gap measures down the chain of causation, there would be greater chances of isolating networks and infected systems. This *safety-by-design* approach is gaining ground in cybersecurity, and the AI safety community should consider a similar framework (Ziadeh, 2024). While advanced, novel capabilities remain limited today, leaders should not operate on the faith of select experts or wishful thinking, given the current pace of progress. Further, rather than a complete pause on large AI training runs (as called for in 2023, see: FLI, 2023), staging strategic pauses (e.g., at select mile markers) coupled with enhanced evaluation and red teaming throughout the development cycle could help ensure that safety is primary while also taking into account economic incentives and societies need for technological growth. The all-or-nothing cadence of uninterrupted AI progress is unsustainable.

By integrating structural considerations into planning, policies can be designed that account for second-order and third-order effects—elements such as adversary reactions to AI integration, shifts in offense-defense balance, or societal dependence (e.g., facilitating unemployment)—so that institutions can be better prepared for disruptive change. This could include limits on the degree of integration of AI systems into safety-critical systems and prohibitions in areas such as nuclear command and control (C2) or early warning detection systems; indeed, in these areas, failures could be catastrophic or existential. As with all collective action, ensuring the agreement of diverse parties, especially in verification or enforcement, could be challenging. Cultivating international norms around these issues would be a crucial first step. To prevent unintended escalations from shifts to offense-defense balances, it would be critical for leaders to engage at the international level—as done during the Cold War with nuclear deterrence—to reinforce multilateral trust or agree to limits on societal-scale integration. An international body involving stakeholders at all levels, from developers to policymakers to government leaders, could be key to gaining trust and legitimacy for these important decisions (Gruetzemacher et al., 2023).

By taking structural dynamics into account with policy and planning, actors can more effectively address risks with complex interactions that tend to increase the degree of uncertainty while decreasing options. Planning through a *what-if* lens can help professionals respond to novel risks that will undoubtedly manifest from structural changes. Unifying structural issues, AI accidents, and misuse provide a useful conceptual framework for AI governance, forcing the examination of these interactions and indirect effects into the decision-making process. This necessitates a clear-eyed understanding of how ingrained human tendencies—such as the pursuit of power, greed, fear, and distrust—can direct AI development toward precarious states or trigger unintended crises. Moreover, this framework flips the policy process from reacting to emergencies to preparing for resilient long-term solutions. Thus, it is critical that we develop policy measures that integrate these considerations—testing and planning for unexpected feedback—to devise targeted solutions for stable and secure AI futures.

## ***Acknowledgments***

The author would like to give thanks to Toby Pilditch and Iyngkarran Kumar for their helpful comments and suggestions in earlier drafts of this paper. This work was sponsored by the Transformative Futures Institute. Correspondence should be addressed to Kyle A Kilian at: [kyle@transformative.org](mailto:kyle@transformative.org)

## References

- Ahmad SF, Han H, Alam MM, Rehmat MK, Irshad M, Arraño-Muñoz M, Ariza-Montes A. (2023). Impact of artificial intelligence on human loss in decision making, laziness and safety in education. *Humanit Soc Sci Commun.* 10, 311. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01787-8>
- Akinwotu, E. (2021). Facebook's role in Myanmar and Ethiopia under new scrutiny. *The Guardian Magazine*. October 7, 2021. <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2021/oct/07/facebooks-role-in-myanmar-and-ethiopia-under-new-scrutiny>
- Amodei, D., Olah, C., Steinhardt, J., Christiano, P.F., Schulman, J., & Mané, D. 2016. Concrete Problems in AI Safety. ArXiv, abs/1606.06565.
- Anthropic. (2023, September 19). Anthropic's Responsible Scaling Policy. <https://www.anthropic.com/news/anthropics-responsible-scaling-policy>
- Anwar, U., Saparov, A., Rando, J., Paleka, D., Turpin, M., Hase, P., ... & Krueger, D. (2024). Foundational challenges in assuring alignment and safety of large language models. ArXiv, abs/2404.09932.
- Avin, S. & Amadae, S.M. (2019). Autonomy and machine learning at the interface of nuclear weapons, computers, and people. in V Boulanin (ed.), *The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Strategic Stability and Nuclear Risk: Volume I: Euro-Atlantic Perspectives*. SIPRI, Stockholm, pp. 105-118.
- Bagherpour, A. (2013). Science And Security: The Moratorium On H5N1 "Gain-Of-Function" Experiments. Federation of American Scientists. <https://fas.org/publication/science-and-security-the-moratorium-on-h5n1-gain-of-function-experiments-2/>
- Bailey, M.B. & Kilian, K.A. (2022, August 30). Artificial Intelligence, Critical Systems, and the Control Problem. *Homeland Security Today*. <https://www.hstoday.us/featured/artificial-intelligence-critical-systems-and-the-control-problem/>
- Baker, B., Kanitscheider, I., Markov, T., Wu, Y., Powell, G., McGrew, B., & Mordatch, I. (2019). Emergent Tool Use From Multi-Agent Autocurricula. ArXiv, abs/1909.07528.
- Bartels, E. M. (2020). Building Better Games for National Security Policy Analysis: Towards a Social Scientific Approach. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation. [https://www.rand.org/pubs/rgs\\_dissertations/RGSD437.html](https://www.rand.org/pubs/rgs_dissertations/RGSD437.html).
- Bernardi, J., Mukobi, G., Greaves, H., Heim, L., & Anderljung, M. (2024). Societal Adaptation to Advanced AI. ArXiv, abs/2405.10295.
- Black, B. (2017, April 13). How World War I ushered in the century of oil. *The Conversation*. <https://theconversation.com/how-world-war-i-ushered-in-the-century-of-oil-74585>
- Boettcher, M. Gabriel, J. Low, S. (2016). Solar Radiation Management: Foresight for Governance. IAAS Working Paper. Institute for Advanced Sustainability Studies (IASS).
- Bonabeau E. Agent-based modeling: methods and techniques for simulating human systems. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2002 May 14;99 Suppl 3(Suppl 3):7280-7. doi: 10.1073/pnas.082080899.
- Bryant, B. & Lampert, R. (2010). Thinking inside the box: A participatory, computer-assisted approach to SD. *Technological Forecasting & Social Change.* 77.
- Calma, J. (2022, March 17). AI suggested 40,000 new possible chemical weapons in just six hours. *The Verge*. <https://www.theverge.com/2022/3/17/22983197/ai-new-possible-chemical-weapons-generative-models-vx>
- (CAS) Center for AI Safety. (2023). Statement on AI Risk. <https://www.safe.ai/statement-on-ai-risk>
- Christiano, P. (2019, March 17). This is what failure looks like. *Alignment Forum*. <https://www.alignmentforum.org/posts/HBxe6wdjxK239zajf/what-failure-looks-like>
- Che, C. & Liu, J. (2023, March 11). 'De-Americanize': How China Is Remaking Its Chip Business. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/05/11/technology/china-us-chip-controls.html>
- Clarke, S. (2022, January 18). Clarifications about structural risk from AI. *Effective Altruism Forum*. <https://forum.effectivealtruism.org/posts/oqveRcMwRMDk6SYXM/clarifications-about-structural-risk-from-ai>
- Cohen, S., Bitton, R., Nassi, B. (2024). Here Comes the AI Worm: Unleashing Zero-click Worms that Target GenAI-Powered Applications. *ComPromptMized Blog*. <https://sites.google.com/view/compromptmized>
- Crichton, M.T., Flin, R. and Rattray, W.A. (2000). Training decision makers—tactical decision games. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 8(4), pp.208–217.
- Dafae, A. (2020, Sept 15). AI Governance: Opportunity and Theory of Impact. Center for the Governance of AI. <https://www.governance.ai/research-paper/ai-governance-opportunity-and-theory-of-impact>
- (DARPA) Defense Advanced Research Project Agency. (2022). DARPA's CASTLE to Fortify Computer Networks. U.S. Department of Defense. Oct 24, 2022. <https://www.darpa.mil/news-events/2022-10-24>
- Department of Defense. (2023). DoD Responsible AI Working Council. U.S. Department of Defense Responsible Artificial Intelligence Strategy and Implementation Pathway. [https://www.ai.mil/docs/RAI\\_Strategy\\_and\\_Implementation\\_Pathway\\_6-21-22.pdf](https://www.ai.mil/docs/RAI_Strategy_and_Implementation_Pathway_6-21-22.pdf)
- Dou, E. (2024, February 22). Here's how AI experts think ChatGPT might help the military. *The Washington Post*. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2024/02/22/pentagon-ai-symposium-chatgpt-uses/>
- Dragan, A. (2020). Putting the Human into the AI Equation. In *Possible Minds: Twenty-Five Ways of Looking at AI*, ed. John Brockman, (New York: Penguin Books).
- Everitt, T., & Hutter, M. (2016). Avoiding Wireheading with Value Reinforcement Learning. *Artificial General Intelligence*.
- Faverio, M. & Tyson, A. (2023, November 21). What the Data Says About Americans' Views of Artificial Intelligence. Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2023/11/21/what-the-data-says-about-americans-views-of-artificial-intelligence/>
- Fedasiuk, R., Melot, J., Murphy, B. (2021). Harnessing Lightning: How the Chinese Military is Adopting Artificial Intelligence. Center for Security and Emerging Technologies. October, 2021. <https://cset.georgetown.edu/publication/harnessed-lightning/>

- Fist, T. & Grunewald, E. (2023, October 24). Preventing AI Chip Smuggling to China. Center for a New American Security. <https://www.cnas.org/publications/reports/preventing-ai-chip-smuggling-to-china>
- (FLI) The Future of Life Institute. (2023, March 22). Pause Giant AI Experiments: An Open Letter. <https://futureoflife.org/open-letter/pause-giant-ai-experiments/>
- Flournoy, M., Haines, A., Chevitz, G. (2020). "Building Trust through Testing: Adapting DOD's Test & Evaluation, Validation & Verification (TEVV) Enterprise for Machine Learning Systems, including Deep Learning Systems," WestExeAdvisors, Report. <https://www.westexec.com/michele-flournoy-co-authors-report-with-avril-haines-and-gabrielle-chefitz-building-trust-through-testing/>
- Fruhlinger, J. (2017, October 17). Petya ransomware and NotPetya malware: What you need to know now. CSO. <https://www.csoonline.com/article/563255/petya-ransomware-and-notpetya-malware-what-you-need-to-know-now.html>
- GCN. (2022, May 1). NSF, NIST, DOD team up on resilient next-gen networking. <https://gcn.com/cybersecurity/2021/04/nsf-nist-dod-team-up-on-resilient-next-gen-networking/315337/>
- Geist, E., & Lohn, A.J. (2018). How Might Artificial Intelligence Affect the Risk of Nuclear War? RAND Corporation, PE-296-RC. <https://www.rand.org/pubs/perspectives/PE296.html>
- Gompert, D. C., Binnendijk, H., & Lin, B. (2014). Germany's Decision to Conduct Unrestricted U-boat Warfare, 1916. In *Blinders, Blunders, and Wars: What America and China Can Learn* (pp. 63–70). RAND Corporation. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7249/j.ctt1287m9t.12>
- Grossmann, I., Feinberg, M., Parker, D.C., Christakis, N.A., Tetlock, P.E., & Cunningham, W.A. (2023). AI and the transformation of social science research. *Science*, 380, 1108 - 1109.
- Gruetzemacher, R., Chan, A., Frazier, K., Manning, C., Los, S., Fox, J., Hern'andez-Orallo, J., Burden, J., Franklin, M., Ghuidhir, C.N., Bailey, M., Eth, D., Pilditch, T.D., & Kilian, K.A. (2023). An International Consortium for Evaluations of Societal-Scale Risks from Advanced AI. ArXiv, abs/2310.14455.
- Gruetzemacher R. (2019). A Holistic Framework for Forecasting Transformative AI. *Big Data and Cognitive Computing*. 3(3):35. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bdcc3030035>
- Hambling, D. (2023). No, A Rogue U.S. Air Force Drone Did Not Just Try To Kill Its Operator (But It Might As Well Have Done). *Forbes Magazine*. June 24, 2023. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/davidhambling/2023/06/04/no-a-rogue-us-air-force-drone-did-not-just-try-to-kill-its-operator-but-it-might-as-well-have-done/?sh=732fcfb32aa9>
- Halawi, D., Zhang, F., Yueh-Han, C., & Steinhardt, J. (2024). Approaching Human-Level Forecasting with Language Models. ArXiv, abs/2402.18563.
- Heather, W.J. & McCulloch, C. (2023). *Truth Decay and National Security: Intersections, Insights, and Questions for Future Research*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2023. <https://www.rand.org/pubs/perspectives/PEA112-2.html>
- Heaven, D. (2023). The open-source AI boom is built on Big Tech's handouts. How long will it last? MIT Technology Review. May 12, 2023. <https://www.technologyreview.com/2023/05/12/1072950/open-source-ai-google-openai-eleuther-meta/>
- Hendrycks, D., Carlini, N., Schulman, J., & Steinhardt, J. 2021. Unsolved Problems in ML Safety. ArXiv, abs/2109.13916.
- Hendrycks, D., Mazeika, M., & Woodside, T. (2023). An Overview of Catastrophic AI Risks. ArXiv, abs/2306.12001.
- Higginbotham, S. (2016, April 13). Inside Facebook's Biggest Artificial Intelligence Project Ever. *Fortune*. <https://fortune.com/longform/facebook-machine-learning/>
- Higgins, A. (2018). Stephen Hawking's final warning for humanity: AI is coming for us. *Vox*. Oct 16, 2018. <https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/2018/10/16/17978596/stephen-hawking-ai-climate-change-robots-future-universe-earth>
- Hsu, J. (2018). The Strava Heat Map and the End of Secrets. *Wired Magazine*. January 29, 2018. <https://www.wired.com/story/strava-heat-map-military-bases-fitness-trackers-privacy/>
- Jensen, B., Atalan, Y., & Tadross, D. (2024, February 22). It Is Time to Democratize Wargaming Using Generative AI. Center for Strategic and International Studies. <https://www.csis.org/analysis/it-time-democratize-wargaming-using-generative-ai>
- Jianfen, Y., Yun, Y., Teng, M., Cuiguan, Z., Quan, W. (2021). Evolution of energy and metal demand driven by industrial revolutions and its trend analysis. *Chinese Journal of Population, Resources and Environment*. Vol. 19, Is. 3. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cjpre.2021.12.028>
- Johansen, I. (2017). Scenario modeling with morphological analysis. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*. Technological Forecasting and Social Change.
- Johnson, J. (2023). AI-security dilemma: Insecurity, mistrust, and misperception under the nuclear shadow. *AI and the Bomb: Nuclear Strategy and Risk in the Digital Age*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780192858184.003.0005>.
- Kallenborn, Zak. (2020, October 14). A Partial Ban on Autonomous Weapons Would Make Everyone Safer. *Foreign Policy*. <https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/10/14/ai-drones-swarms-killer-robots-partial-ban-on-autonomous-weapons-would-make-everyone-safer/>
- Kapoor, S., Bommasani, R., Klyman, K., Longpre, S., Ramaswami, A., Cihon, P., Hopkins, A., Bankston, K., Biderman, S., Bogen, M., Chowdhury, R., Engler, A., Henderson, P., Jernite, Y., Lazar, S., Maffulli, S., Nelson, A., Pineau, J., Skowron, A., Song, D., Storchan, V., Zhang, D., Ho, D.E., Liang, P., & Narayanan, A. (2024). On the Societal Impact of Open Foundation Models. ArXiv, abs/2403.07918.
- Kaiser, J. (2019, February 8). EXCLUSIVE: Controversial experiments that could make bird flu more risky poised to resume. *Science*. <https://www.science.org/content/article/exclusive-controversial-experiments-make-bird-flu-more-risky-poised-resume>
- Kiciman, E., Ness, R.O., Sharma, A., & Tan, C. (2023). Causal Reasoning and Large Language Models: Opening a New Frontier for Causality. ArXiv, abs/2305.00050.

- Kilian, K.A., Ventura, C.J., Bailey, M.M. (2023). Examining the differential risk from high-level artificial intelligence and the question of control. *Futures*. Vol. 151. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2023.103182>.
- Kinniment, M., Jun Koba Sato, L., Du, H., Goodrich, B. Hasin, M., Chan, L., Miles, H. Lin, T.R., Wijk, H., Burget, J., Ho, A., Barnes, E., Christiano, P. (2023). Evaluating Language-Model Agents on Realistic Autonomous Tasks. arXiv:2312.11671. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2312.11671>
- Krakovna, V., Uesato, J., Mikulik, V., Rahtz, M., Everitt, T., Kumar, R., Kenton, Z., Leike, J., Legg, S. (2020). Specification gaming: the flip side of AI ingenuity. DeepMind Safety Research Blog. <https://deepmindsafetyresearch.medium.com/specification-gaming-the-flip-side-of-ai-ingenuity-c85bdb0deeb4>
- Krueger, D. (2023, January 30). Why I hate the "accident vs. misuse" AI x-risk dichotomy (quick thoughts on "structural risk"). LessWrong. <https://www.lesswrong.com/posts/6bpW2kveKaBtuJuEk/why-i-hate-the-accident-vs-misuse-ai-x-risk-dichotomy-quick>
- Lazar, S., Nelson, A. (2023). AI safety on whose terms? *Science* 381. 138–138. DOI:10.1126/science.adi8982
- Lieber, K.A. & Press, D.G. (2017). The New Era of Counterforce: Technological Change and the Future of Nuclear Deterrence. *International Security*. 41 (4): 9–49. [https://doi.org/10.1162/ISEC\\_a\\_00273](https://doi.org/10.1162/ISEC_a_00273)
- Lipsey R. G. Carlaw K. & Bekar C. (2005). *Economic transformations: general purpose technologies and long-term economic growth*. Oxford University Press.
- Madsen, J. K., & Pilditch, T. D. (2018). A method for evaluating cognitively informed micro-targeted campaign strategies: An agent-based model proof of principle. *PloS one*, 13(4).
- Malekmohammadi, B., & Jahanishakib, F. (2017). Vulnerability assessment of wetland landscape ecosystem services using driver-pressure-state-impact-response (DPSIR) model. *Ecological Indicators*, 82, 293-303.
- Metz, C. (2024, March 8). Dozens of Top Scientists Sign Effort to Prevent A.I. Bioweapons. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2024/03/08/technology/biologists-ai-agreement-bioweapons.html>
- Nguyen, T.T., & Reddi, V.J. (2019). Deep Reinforcement Learning for Cyber Security. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*. 34. 3779–3795.
- Pan, A., Bhatia, K., & Steinhardt, J. (2022). The Effects of Reward Misspecification: Mapping and Mitigating Misaligned Models. ArXiv, abs/2201.03544.
- Pico-Valencia, P. & Holgado-Terriza, J.A. (2018). Agentification of the Internet of Things: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Distributed Sensor Networks*. Vol 14. No. 10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1550147718805945>.
- Pilditch, T.D. (2024). The Reasoning Under Uncertainty Trap: A Structural AI Risk. ArXiv:2402.01743.
- Pilditch, T.D. (2024a). AI Safety Grant Awarded to TFI Research Project. Transformative Futures Institute. <https://transformative.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/AI-Safety-Grant-Awarded-to-TFI-Research-Project-on-Complex-Systems.pdf>
- Pilditch, T. D., & Madsen, J. K. (2021). Targeting your preferences: modeling micro-targeting for an increasingly diverse electorate. *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation*, 24(1).
- Pomerleau, M. (2022, February 9). US Army network modernization sets the stage for JADC2. C4ISRNet. <https://www.c4isrnet.com/it-networks/2022/02/09/us-army-network-modernization-sets-the-stage-for-jadc2/>
- Quang, L.A., Jung, N., Cho, E., Choi, J.H., & Lee, J.W. (2018). Agent-Based Models in Social Physics. *Journal of the Korean Physical Society*, 72, 1272 - 1280.
- Russel, S. (2019). *Human Compatible: Artificial Intelligence and the Problem of Control*. New York: Viking.
- Symon, P.B. & Tarapore, A. (2015). Defense Intelligence Analysis in the Age of Big Data. *Joint Force Quarterly*. 79. Oct 01, 2019. <https://ndupress.ndu.edu/Media/News/Article/621113/defense-intelligence-analysis-in-the-age-of-big-data/>
- Taleb, N.N. (2010). *The black swan: the impact of the highly improbable*. Penguin Books.
- Tau, B. (2024). How the Pentagon Learned to Use Targeted Ads to Find Its Targets - and Vladimir Putin. *Wired Magazine*. Feb 27, 2024. <https://www.wired.com/story/how-pentagon-learned-targeted-ads-to-find-targets-and-vladimir-putin/>
- Treanor, J. (2015, April 22). The 2010 'flash crash': how it unfolded. *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/business/2015/apr/22/2010-flash-crash-new-york-stock-exchange-unfolded>
- Triolo, P. (2024). A New Era for the Chinese Semiconductor Industry: Beijing Responds to Export Controls. *American Affairs*. Vol. 3. No. 1. <https://americanaffairsjournal.org/2024/02/a-new-era-for-the-chinese-semiconductor-industry-beijing-responds-to-export-controls/>
- Trabucco, L., & Maas, M.M. (2023). Technology Ties: The Rise and Roles of Military AI Strategic Partnerships. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. DOI:10.2139/ssrn.4629283
- Turner, A. & Smith, L.R. (2019, December 4). Seeking Power is Often Convergently Instrumental in MDPs. *AI Alignment Forum*. December 4, 2019. <https://www.alignmentforum.org/posts/6DuJxY8X45Sco4bS2/seeking-power-is-provably-instrumentally-convergent-in-mdps#POWER-seeking-actions-lead-to-high-POWER-states>
- Tzezana, R. (2017). High-probability and wild-card scenarios for future crimes and terror attacks using the Internet of Things. *Foresight*. VOL. 19 NO. 1 2017.
- Valverde S. (2016). Major transitions in information technology. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*. 371(1701). doi: 10.1098/rstb.2015.0450.
- Ward, J. (2022). *The loop: how technology is creating a world without choices and how to fight back (First)*. Hachette Books Group, New York, NY.
- Wei, J., Tay, Y., Bommasani, R., Raffel, C., Zoph, B., Borgeaud, S., Yogatama, D., Bosma, M., Zhou, D., Metzler, D. and Chi, E.H. (2022). Emergent abilities of large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.07682.
- Whittaker, M. (2022). The Steep Cost of Capture. *Interactions* 28. 6. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3488666>
- Wong, Y. H., Yurchak, J., Button, R.W., Frank, A.B., Laird, B., Osoba, A.O., Steeb, R., Harris, B., and Bae, S.J., (2020). *Deterrence in the Age of Thinking Machines*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation. [https://www.rand.org/pubs/research\\_reports/RR2797.html](https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR2797.html).

- Wrigley, E. A. (2013). Energy and the English Industrial Revolution. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A*.3712011056820110568. <http://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2011.0568>
- Weidinger, L., Rauh, M., Marchal, N., Manzini, A., Hendricks, L.A., Mateos-Garcia, J., Bergman, S., Kay, J., Griffin, C., Bariach, B., Gabriel, I., Rieser, V., & Isaac, W.S. 2023. Sociotechnical Safety Evaluation of Generative AI Systems. *ArXiv*, abs/2310.11986.
- Weise, K. (2023, February 14). Hackers for China, Russia and Others Used OpenAI Systems, Report Says. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2024/02/14/technology/openai-microsoft-hackers.html>
- Ziadeh, A. (2024, April 24). CISA's Lauren Zabierek is On a Mission to Change the Nation's Approach to Cyber with Secure by Design. *The WashingtonExec*. <https://washingtonexec.com/2024/04/cisas-lauren-zabierek-is-on-a-mission-to-change-the-way-the-nation-does-cyber-with-secure-by-design/>
- Zwetsloot, Remco, Dafoe, Allen. (2019, February 11). Thinking About Risks From AI: Accidents, Misuse and Structure. *Lawfare Blog*. <https://www.lawfaremedia.org/article/thinking-about-risks-ai-accidents-misuse-and-structu>