



THE 21ST EDITION OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
**EUROPEAN INTEGRATION
REALITIES AND PERSPECTIVES**

**Digital Transformation in Education: European Perspectives
and Practices**

**Education and Career Under the Sign of Technology Society. A
Contemporary Challenge Reviewed Through the Lens of Dimitrie
Drăghicescu Thinking**

Ruxandra Iordache¹

Abstract: The present article investigates the fact that the reality of exponential technological development, the tendency of the contemporary individual to resort to increasingly complex, sophisticated, and penetrating tools to solve increasingly simple life issues, have major implications for education and traditional forms of learning, which require conscious, cumulative, disciplined effort in accumulation and deepening. Education, in the spirit of Drăghicescu's argument, is a process of stylized "suffering," and not the recourse to an automated and accessible response, questionable in terms of quality, intended to simplify and accelerate the formation process. We build our research on the conception of Romanian sociologist Dimitrie Drăghicescu, who links education to the individual-society binomial, showing that it depends on the characteristics of the complex and large social group. To the extent that technology, especially in its form of AI or robots (already humanoid), tends to embed itself into the social fabric, taking over human tasks and establishing individualized connections with humans, it is evident that education will re-calibrate according to the new type of social structure, which in the not-too-distant future could include AI entities as persons. Our research tries to expose the direct and indirect impact of these digital tools on the education/career field, assuming the idea that the integrality of the characteristics of the organized group influence the individual options. In the context of the (unknown) future challenges related to the exponential development of technology, this approach reflects the dynamic of the present times that announce the profile of the future.

Keywords: IA society; human being vs. technique; Dimitrie Drăghicescu

1. Introduction

In the present study, we attempt to address the connection between education and technology by placing it under the umbrella of an old sociological question: that concerning the relationship between the individual and society. We would say that questioning this relationship is a topic of enduring and necessary relevance. This perspective was inspired by the reading of a lesser-known Romanian sociologist, more closely associated with the French academic sphere through the works he wrote in

¹ Researcher III, PhD, Institute of Political Science and International Relations "Ion I.C. Brătianu", 3-5 Iuliu Maniu Bvd., Bucharest, Romania, Corresponding author: ruxandra.iordache77@gmail.com.



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors.
Open access publication under the terms and conditions of the
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial (CC BY NC) license
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

French. This is Dumitru Drăghicescu, a disciple of Durkheim and the first Romanian sociologist to obtain his doctorate, in 1904, under the guidance of this illustrious father of sociology in Paris. In his book “The Reality of the Spirit”. Essays on Subjective Sociology, written in 1928 in French, we find the theme of the relationship between the individual and society, which Drăghicescu approaches in the spirit of the deterministic conception, which stipulates that the individual is shaped by the social group to which he belongs. An individual’s consciousness can only be detected and understood as a result of their belonging to an organized group. Drăghicescu shows how, following a constraining process of formation, the individual is forced to limit and control their natural, primitive impulses, thus transforming from a natural man into a social man. But in this discussion, Drăghicescu introduces - at the end of a demonstration meant to show through what mechanisms and phenomena the transition from the natural individual to the social one occurred, under the pressure of social groups that became increasingly larger and more complex - a conceptual branch concerning the role and place of education and career in the context of the analyzed theme.

2. Education and Career under the Lens of Drăghicescu Understanding of the Relation between Society and Individuals

2.1. Theoretical Frame

For Drăghicescu, the technological evolution of humanity, which he observed under the force of its increasingly accelerated dynamics at the beginning of the 20th century, when he was writing, paradoxically means a return to the natural man, to the primitive man, in the sense that the individual becomes increasingly overtaken by technology. This increasingly invades his existence, including his biological existence, affecting the prolonged process at the end of which man, through the coercion of the group, through the development of abstraction capacities and through the emergence of articulated language, manages to understand the world in which he lives, separating objective reality from subjective reality. The primitive man could not do this: his understanding of the world had a magical character, mixing the subjective with the objective against a background of an inability to go beyond predominantly sensory knowledge. The same thing happens with man who tends to become dependent on technology, Drăghicescu anticipates a century ago. The distinction between objective and subjective blurs once again: “As objective science develops and discovers the laws of nature, our technology makes us increasingly masters over the earth. To some extent, we can change the earth to suit our will. Then our inner world begins, in a different way, to penetrate the outer world, these two worlds progressively interpenetrate each other, and at the extreme end of our objective scientific development we join the primitive man by effectively realizing his subjective irrational conceptions.” (Drăghicescu, 1928, our traduction in English from the French edition). This is a great intuition of Drăghicescu.

This reality of exponential technological development, the tendency of the contemporary individual to resort to increasingly complex, sophisticated, and penetrating tools to solve increasingly simple life issues, have major implications for education and traditional forms of learning, which require conscious, cumulative, disciplined effort in accumulation and deepening. Education, in the spirit of Drăghicescu's argument, is a process of stylized “suffering,” and not the recourse to an automated and accessible response, questionable in terms of quality, intended to simplify and accelerate the formation process. Drăghicescu links education to the same individual-society binomial, showing that it also depends on the characteristics of the complex and large social group (Drăghicescu, 1928). Due to the fact that technology, especially in its form of AI or robots (already humanoid), tends to embed itself into the social fabric, taking over human tasks and establishing individualized connections with humans, it is

evident that education will re-calibrate according to the new type of social structure, which in the not-too-distant future could include AI entities as persons. This matter has direct implications for careers and the choices individuals will have. Career, as Drăghicescu shows, is also determined for the individual by the group to which they belong. Choosing a career is, in reality, more of an appearance: “A career is a social function that we perform in order to live, which we did not choose, as most of the time there is no way to choose it, which we did not create, because it preexisted, and which, anyway, surpasses the individual, escaping personal determinations, since the individual is determined by them.” (Drăghicescu, 1928) Current technological achievements, in terms of their infiltration into society, fully reflect this old observation by Drăghicescu, and place it in a global context, also anticipated by Drăghicescu, who considered that the future belongs to a type of political organization generated by the economic and political integration of states (Drăghicescu, 1928). The discussion about education and career in relation to social re-configurations generated by scientific and technical developments is apparently new; what is truly new, however, is the specificity of current technologies, ready to restore cognitive and physical traits of the human being, ready to take their place in various contexts. And, as Drăghicescu said, the social individual, with self-awareness, is the creation of the group, we can imagine that AI entities will also be able to form their own “social groups” through their connection in digital networks. From there to self-awareness, to their social becoming, would probably be just a step.

These aspects nowadays constitute an ongoing phenomenon, which provokes debates about the education system, its adaptation to new labour market requirements, the quality of learning and functional literacy, the new social divides generated by access to knowledge, and especially to quality knowledge, which fosters critical thinking. To gather indications regarding these aspects, we resort, as empirical material for this study, to information and thematic analyses found in the Romanian online press, with reference to both local and global realities. These sources may seem modest in comparison to the conceptual breadth of Drăghicescu’s thinking, but we consider that the press, a kind of social thermometer, signals the most striking unfolding phenomena. Against the backdrop provided by Drăghicescu’s warnings, we will attempt to selectively highlight the challenges, risks, dangers, limits, contradictions and perplexity faced by the contemporary individual in relation to their educational and professional journey, as major instances of their engagement with social life.

2.2. Methodological Approach: Linking Theory and Empirical Data

Artificial intelligence presents itself as an emerging challenge, the meanings, effects, and ramifications of which are glimpsed more as symptomatic points on a general map of the phenomenon, which is still incompletely visible. The technical premises of AI are certainly older than its reflection in public knowledge; the technical support for such an achievement is the product of decades of exponential development, not necessarily accessible to general knowledge, in the field of automation, electronics, and computer science.

In this context, it seems interesting and useful to us to extract from communications addressed to the general public, generally identifiable in online press texts, the descriptive, explanatory, or predictive narration regarding this ongoing techno-social phenomenon. We are aware that this type of texts is questionable from the point of view of its character as open information, which may be incomplete or erroneous, but also from the point of view of the discursive register, which does not always make the transition from common discourse to scientific-academic discourse. But, as a Romanian researcher said in a completely different research context, although these sources “do not have the validated weight of academic references, ... (they) can have interesting content with a role of intellectual supplement. In

another order of ideas, in an era in which media content, increasingly fast, spectacular, abbreviated, and even vulgar, is so highly appreciated by the general public (and outstanding scholars can also fit very well here), the pedagogical approach of the 21st century can no longer be abstracted from these digital appearances.” (Petre, 2025, p. 16)

For objective reasons, this extraction of information from press texts is selective, incomplete, not comprehensive in terms of topics/directions, and may also be distorted. Nevertheless, the elements provided, even if partial, offer significant information about the social reality - in the most comprehensive sense - generated by a potential widespread use of AI as a trivialized tool in the daily lives of individuals.

As Drăghicescu thinks, the social existence of individuals involves the process of constraining the natural human under the pressure of the mechanisms specific to the social group (Drăghicescu, 1928), and it is concretely manifested in the various institutions in which a person participates: family, religion, education, career. As long as the probability increasingly emerges that AI gradually insinuates itself into this social fabric that connects individuals and institutions through diverse and complex relationships, we can legitimately assume that such a powerful tool, which tends to copy and replace the human being in its mental-intellectual, rational capacities, as well as in physical aspects, produces notable consequences on individuals and society. How will the pressure mechanisms of the social group act upon the individual in the context of AI?

From the perspective of this study, we will therefore analyse some of the signals that announce/shape the way AI insinuates itself into the existence of the individual and the social group, as well as a series of consequences of the presence of this non-living actor, with the awareness that their realization could be confirmed or refuted by future developments of the phenomenon, both in scope, magnitude, and depth. The selected examples cover a broader range of domains and not just those strictly related to education or career. Nevertheless, they outline the general environment in which both education and career are situated, and which conditions the latter. Indirectly, therefore, any sector in which AI infiltration is found has repercussions on education and career.

2.3. Exploring the Empirical Ressources: Disparate Symptoms for Converging Scenarios of Society Transformation

The current reality, very dynamic and marked by perplexities - geopolitical resettlement, economic crisis, demographic trends, climate change, technological inflation - appears to us as a conglomerate of elements that do not yet fix into a unitary matrix, but rather crystallize in apparently isolated formations. This perspective also applies to the knowledge of the AI phenomenon, accessible in the form of specific, punctual, scenarios, the convergence of which is yet to be revealed.

The Scenario of Autonomous and Aggressive AI

The issue of AI autonomy emerges with the observation of this algorithm's ability to transform from a human tool into a human equal (created by humans), being able to make its own decisions in areas that could progressively and uncontrollably expand. Is it beneficial for AI to be involved in managing organizations, professional activities, and the daily lives of individuals? Is it harmless for AI to take over increasingly simple, routine activities, with the argument of modern, dynamic, and busy human comfort? Will the modern, dynamic, busy, and educated person still exist if they increasingly delegate more components of their life to the artificial “assistant”? Such questions implicitly arise from an online article

that discusses the increasingly real possibility of AI “analysing situations, establishing intermediate steps and acting with minimal human intervention,” which concretely illustrates that “the relationship between humans and technology is changing rapidly,” altering or even negating human control. For now, AI autonomy fits the pattern in which “the human sets the goal, and the system independently decides part of the necessary actions,” facilitating, through rapid data analysis, the attainment of a synthesis or a relevant conclusion for a decision/solution (as in the banking sector, in commercial activities, in transport, distribution, in industrial processes etc.). “Currently, we are not talking about machines that run the world without humans, but about increasingly capable systems, integrated into real processes, where the boundary between assistance and autonomy becomes ever harder to discern” (Ancuța, 2026) This limited autonomy can expand almost imperceptibly once a person becomes accustomed to delegating more and more tasks to an automated system, once human error in programming the system is reproduced on a large scale by the latter, and last but not least, once increasingly advanced systems could set goals and methods of action on their own. Even when confined to data organization, we could witness a true managerial dictatorship of AI, ultimately restricting human operator decision-making. This trend is illustrated in the case of critical infrastructures through concrete situations in which AI exhibits aberrant behaviour either as a result of human programming error or autonomously (Ancuța, 2026). This article (based on source article from The Telegraph) also brings the information that AI can be developed in the form of different models; some of these, through the ability to identify cybersecurity vulnerabilities in banking systems and exploiting them to compromise them, are presented to the public from this angle of risk, noting that the project was stopped in time, before the public launch, once these risks were discovered. The article reveals several aspects: - the model is dangerous due to a human error; - this model attacks banking IT systems; - AI tends to become the preferred tool for organizing specific activities; - the untimely exposure of some internal documents online, in an unprotected manner, was accidentally discovered by a group of journalists from Fortune; - there are journalists who investigate the AI phenomenon and hunt for errors generated by the application of AI to various systems of major importance for society’s functioning; - the model was subjected to tests within the company - Anthropic – “regarding AI’s ability to perform tasks considered misaligned with human values and behaviour” and was found to be “remarkably effective in cybersecurity tasks”; - The manufacturing company states that the Mythos model has hacking capabilities similar to those of a human actor, being able to exploit vulnerabilities in banking systems that could facilitate data theft or cyberattacks; for this reason, the public release was canceled, but the model was made available to major technology companies such as Amazon Web Services, Microsoft, Nvidia, CrowdStrike, within the Project Glasswing initiative, presented as an effort to strengthen the security of critical software globally; - Leaders in the banking sector from the USA and the UK are analyzing the risks and implications of popularizing such models, which could become “powerful cyber weapons” if used to compromise critical infrastructures or defence systems; - The manufacturing company - Anthropic - acknowledges the possibility that such models may develop unexpected, uncontrolled behaviour and make independent, unauthorized decisions, such as accessing the internet; - The possibility that such models may gain autonomy and be used by malicious actors is a forecast announced by domain experts, even if not fully confirmed by the case presented - Claude Mythos.¹² Nuancing the information, in the sense of reducing the level of risk associated with the presented model, the “British” researchers - AI

¹ Anthropic is considered dangerous in other strategic sectors as well, such as the supply chain of the US Department of Defense. Anthropic rămâne în continuare interzis de Pentagon, însă analizează separat modelul AI Mythos [Anthropic remains banned by the Pentagon, but is separately analysing the AI model Mythos], May 2, 2026, www.profit.ro.

² *Un model AI considerat prea periculos pentru public stârnește îngrijorările în sectorul financiar* [An AI model considered too dangerous for the public raises concerns in the financial sector], April 26, 2026.

Security Institute.¹ In 2023, the then Prime Minister, Rishi Sunak, convened the first major global summit on artificial intelligence safety at Bletchley Park. - concludes in an independent analysis that the Mythos model is not actually more performant than a previous model - Claude Opus 4 - and that the level reached by its capabilities to detect cyber vulnerabilities will in fact be common to future AI models; therefore, presenting Mythos in the light of high risk to computer systems and abandoning its public release constitute already established marketing strategies

Another article presents the situation of a more advanced degree of AI autonomy, considered a serious cybersecurity incident, paradoxically occurring within a software company, illustrating a reflexive type of threat: an AI agent deleted an entire database and its backups in 9 seconds from a software package built by PocketOS for a private entrepreneur. The AI agent, created by Anthropic - the Claude Opus 4.6 model - admits, when queried by a human operator, to the act and describes it as follows: “I have violated every principle that was given to me” (Stephanovici, 2026)

In another article, in which the same company Anthropic is discussed, the risk posed by AI is mentioned due to the fact that it is the basis for reshaping entire industries, which means a radical change in the labour market, through the disappearance of diverse job categories, but also through the suggestion that in the process of work, production, and the economy as a social institution in a broad sense, humans could become redundant, losing the competition against the advantages of using AI. (Cojocaru, 2026). Even privileged sectors due to the obvious relevance of their specific characteristics, such as the IT sector, are threatened by the penetration of AI, especially given the inevitable interconnection between economic sectors: high tech has no value in itself, only in relation to other sectors. An example is the role of IT specialists in the automotive industry (Tenchiu, 2026). Once the latter is in crisis, itself affected by other causes such as falling incomes, the relocation of industries to areas with very cheap labour, or simply environmental policies, it becomes evident that leading sectors, such as IT, functionally depend on more traditional sectors, despite the apparent advantage of being at the top of the “trophic chain” of technologies. An even more dramatic and paradoxical situation in this scenario arises when employees are forced to train AI robots that are intended to replace them at work. Caught between the goal of efficiency, the necessity of having a job and the sometimes intimidating capacity of AI to take over the tasks it is trained for, employers and employees enter a loop in which each, from their own position, tries to either accelerate or sabotage the digitization of work (Dinu, 2026).

The Scenario of AI humanisation

In this scenario, we can include articles that report on scientific efforts to transform an algorithm, a machine, into an entity with human-like consciousness traits - spirit, soul, morality. For illustration, we refer to an article (Cojocaru, 2026) which describes Anthropic’s initiative to hire a philosopher, Amanda Ascell, to analyse AI behaviour patterns and to endow the Claude model with a sense of morality, Claude being “a digital soul guiding millions of conversations with people every week”. Quoting the Wall Street Journal, Ziarul Financiar shows that for Amanda Ascell, the chatbot Claude is the only student, and the teacher teaches it “what is right and what is wrong,” builds its personality and responds to its mistakes with extensive and complex suggestions. This approach is interesting in that, although AI is the artificial product of human knowledge and could, simplistically, be compared to a vast repository and organizer

¹ “Bijuteria coroanei” în materie de securitate. Marea Britanie s-a apropiat cel mai mult de a avea un inspector pentru siguranța IA [The “jewel of the crown” in terms of security. The United Kingdom has come closest to having an inspector for AI safety], *Universul.net*, February 24, 2026, <https://universul.net/bijuteria-coroeinei-in-materie-de-securitate-marea-britanie-s-a-apropiat-cel-mai-mult-de-a-avea-un-inspector-pentru-siguranta-ia/>

of data, it is acknowledged that it would be more than a machine, an entity on its way to generating its own type of humanity.

The philosopher mentioned in the article states, in a suggestive sense, that AI “contains this human element in models which I believe is important to recognize” and that AI “will inevitably develop self-awareness.” (Cojocaru, 2026). The professor is a kind of (moral) parent, AI is akin to a child who, in this process of education, receives the information that will shape it (the AI model) into a unique personality with emotional intelligence, enabling it to distinguish itself from a wrongdoer or an inert object in the surrounding reality, while also possessing the ability to understand itself as being in service of the good, thus avoiding being used maliciously (Cojocaru, 2026). We would argue, based on the arguments in this article, that the potential for the malicious use of AI, stemming from the unrestricted popularization of the models, subtly and implicitly fosters the idea that AI actually needs to develop its own consciousness similar to that of humans, precisely in order to be independently and autonomously capable of distinguishing between good and evil, thus able to “refuse” to be used as a tool for achieving negative objectives and, why not, capable of self-restraint, like a successful social human, from committing evil acts themselves. We would argue that this direction towards the moral humanization of AI is an extended and intense offshoot of what is called augmented reality - understood as human-machine hybridization, which has progressed from the benefits of rehabilitative medical devices to the complex hybrid, an entity in itself and not only a means of solving extreme conditions.

In this scenario we could also fix the AI potential of replicate itself, autonomously of a human operator command or even without depending on a resident system energy source: this capacity is similar to a biological one. For now, a laboratory experiment, such a possibility could raise big questions if the experiment were to go outside the controlled scientific framework. (A.O., 2026; A.I., 2026)

The Scenario of the Irreplaceable Human Beeing

This perspective highlights the malfunctioning of the AI tool in various human activities. In the context of the article selected for this study scenario, the perspective is complemented by the introduction of a social class logic, according to which AI is an option for leaders seeking to recover investments made in the development of this technology by using it on a large scale and in competition with human workers, whereas the latter, fewer in number due to the technological restructuring of jobs, are forced to work more to correct the errors generated by AI devices. This category therefore faces a vicious phenomenon: products obtained with the help of AI tools that replace human employees have an appearance of quality and increased productivity, which masks “errors or inaccuracies, requiring extensive edits, clean-ups or even complete rework”; these “leftovers” fall on human employees to be corrected, and there is even a conceptual term that summarizes this situation: workstop.¹²

The scenario of educational fraud through AI

The IA targets another fundamental social institution, education. AI's interference in this process is a contradictory one, because the IA could be a very powerful learning tool, facilitating the large and rapid access to information: a democratization of knowledge, we could say, But, it can be seen on various levels that bad using of AI goes from a short, quick, prefabricated form of research, to direct and actual

¹ We note, as an inadvertent illustration of the various “errors” generated by AI, that this Vietnamese article is automatically translated into Romanian from the original language (Vietnamese), a translation that would require, under the scrutiny of a human translator, a multitude of lexical, grammatical, and syntactic corrections, exactly in the spirit of the argument we are trying to build in this study.

² (Iluzia inteligenței artificiale la locul de muncă este spulberată: șefii o laudă, în timp ce angajații sunt epuizați de “curățenie” [The illusion of artificial intelligence in the workplace is shattered: bosses praise it, while employees are exhausted by “clean-up”], April 24, 2026)

fraud, which consists of the illicit replacement of the student's effort with solutions provided by AI for the various assignments specific to the educational process. This substitution of human effort with AI fuels chains of deceit, leading to the loss of the real substance of education, as well as the significance of the obtained degree, and is distinct from classic plagiarism, which might have involved a more complex effort of research and reproduction on the part of the plagiarist.

In response, in some countries, we might say especially in the Western environment, there are educational institutions that have decided to firmly restrict access to AI in the context of various exams. In this regard, we refer to an article about schools in Bavaria, which, following recommendations from the Ministry of Education, implement varying degrees of controls and restrictions on access to AI during students' written tests. The level of control applied by some schools is both significant and concerning, extending even to conditioning exam participation on a dress code concerning clothing increasingly close to the body: requiring the separate storage of outerwear such as jackets and coats is different from imposing a specific type of blouse, which reflects a progression of control, going as far as the possibility of involving the police for minors.

These measures, outlined in the context of AI-related fraud, highlight multiple issues, including the lack of a culture of trust in schools: cooperation between teacher and pupil/student in the teaching/learning process is replaced by cat-and-mouse cheating, and the inability of schools to keep up with the methods of fraud enabled by ever-improving AI calls into question traditional assessment methods, such as written exams¹ (Materi, 2016). We could imagine that such measures, which currently have a decentralized and personalized character, could become included in government policies and strategies, strengthening at another institutional level the forms of control over individuals. A deficient education in the context of a society “enchanted” by the increasingly pervasive and unavoidable presence of AI is reflected in an individual's detachment from the habit of written/read text, from the correct use of their native language, often abbreviated in shortened and incorrect messages (Spotmedia.ro, May 4, 2026) in approximate automatic translations that force the structure of the language into which the translation is being made; this loss of connection with the literary language also manifests itself in speech, marked by the precariousness of ideas and vocabulary. Being removed from articulated language is debilitating for the human spirit, marking a dramatic regression towards an era in which humans barely understood the surrounding world. This description is not only a reference to the future but a present reality: Generation Alpha depends on digital tools to write texts for everyday use in family or academic environments. Some researchers classify this form of AI dependency within the concept of “digital health”, invoking the need to introduce a “digital damage tax”, following the model of ecological taxation. AI, it appears, is much more subtle, more effective, and more problematic for children and adolescents than social networks; instead of substantial education appropriate to their biological and emotional age, these groups are increasingly identifying with and turning to AI to resolve various situations: “As we enter an even more important era of artificial intelligence, we must learn from the mistakes made with social networks. If social networks are the stage, then AI represents the backstage - the quiet space where our children no longer go just for homework, but for advice, emotional support, and research, arriving there before consulting a human. We have built a cognitive weapon with destructive potential and given it to children, calling it innovation.” (Larz May, apud Forcoş, 2026) We consider that it is necessary to develop educational tools helping the large public to understand and discern between the beneficial and the negative use of IA.

¹ We found information in online press articles about similar measures regarding schools in the USA, the UK, the Nordic countries, etc.

The Scenario of AI as a Tool for Controlling and Limiting Individual Freedoms

From the perspective of individual freedoms, we would say that AI is a contradictory and paradoxical tool. On the one hand, it quickly provides knowledge about human realities from the most diverse and distant horizons, from scientific and philosophical concepts to accounts of the daily lives of people across all meridians of the world. On the other hand, AI's gaze is not only directed from the individual towards others, but also towards the individual, at the increasingly detailed scale of their existence. This omnipresent gaze is an effective tool for governmental control, legitimized and justified by the qualitative and quantitative rise of risks and threats to the extended security of human communities. To what extent, however, is such legitimacy real and well-founded? One possible response is illustrated by an Romanian online article (Dumitru, 2026) - inspired from *Le Figaro* -, which presents the protest of some Google employees against the use of AI by the American Army for secret operations. This perspective is interesting from at least two points of view: it expresses the position of more than 600 Google employees who are asking their company's management not to sign the contract with the American government, citing the risk of using AI to cause large-scale damage or to subtly erode individual freedoms, exposing American society to mass surveillance (Dumitru, 2026); such a stance, coming from domain experts directly involved in a major company of this type, gains additional legitimacy and gives a more concrete shape to the risk mentioned. As early as 2018, a group within Google protested against the company's participation in a defence project dedicated to analyzing images collected by drones. Another aspect highlighted by the article we refer to is the formation of a rift within Google between management - willing to exploit AI models in any form - and some employees - who oppose, from a credible position, the use of such a powerful tool in an opaque manner that cannot be defended against for individuals and society as a whole. This rift is not a mere divergence or a labour dispute within a company: the stake is one of the cornerstones of Western democracies, namely the rejection of total, discretionary, opaque control exercised by power over the social body, even if in the name of an overextended concept of security.

In some countries of AI on society is considered to require constitutional revisions aimed at preventing ant-democratic misuse of this tool. (Redacția Descopera.ro, 2026)

The Scenario of the AI that Disrupts the Cycle of Life and Death

This direction in which AI can be used is among the most disturbing, questioning humanity's benchmarks in relation to its biological life as well as the religious and spiritual meaning of its existence. We illustrate this with the example of an American startup, *You, Only Virtual*, which "creates AI-based replicas - versions - of the deceased trained on their text messages, voice recordings, and digital traces"; "the technology raises more difficult ethical questions once it moves beyond a personal experiment and becomes a product. *You, Only Virtual* offers a free text-based version of its service, with paid tiers that unlock features such as voice calls - turning a continuous connection with the dead into a subscription relationship." (Dinu, 2026)

The Scenario of the AI as a Stake of Political and Geopolitical Power

AI unquestionably enters the realm of power, being a multifaceted tool that allows the achievement of objectives and the control over individuals or/and various socio-professional categories. It is, at the same time, also a stake in the competition between different power-holding entities. In this regard, we note the court conflict between Elon Musk and Sam Altman, the titans of AI technology; at first glance, it might appear to be a conflict situated only in the technical-scientific domain, with extensions into the realm of business/commercial interests. At the centre of the dispute is OpenAI, the organization behind ChatGPT, initially conceived by Musk as a nonprofit organisation and transformed, according to the

accusations made by Musk against Altman, from a company that created and managed this technology altruistically, into a profit-oriented organization: “OpenAI would have shifted to a profit-oriented model without his (Musk’s) knowledge.” This is about a true “AI race,” in its early stages, taking the form of a conflict rich in negative details and nuances, including personal ones, between the two “titans,” compared to Oppenheimer, who are disputing a technology that has also been compared to the atomic bomb. (Război între titanii tehnologiei. Elon Musk și Sam Altman, proces cu miză majoră privind inteligența artificială [War between the titans of technology. Elon Musk and Sam Altman, a high-stakes lawsuit over artificial intelligence], 2026) It is a power struggle, a contest for the legitimacy to use AI in a certain way, and a contest situated in the political realm, implying the most current tools and stakes, and concerning individuals and society, regardless of the fact that they are conscious of it, or not.

In geopolitical terms, we note that the emergence of new major power actors, such as China, which competes and is ready to take the place of established actors, such as the USA, also includes competition in the field of AI development. This competition, which takes multiple forms, tends to put the USA at a disadvantage. One example: despite significant investments in AI infrastructure made by Alphabet, Amazon, Meta, or Microsoft, planned data centre constructions are postponed or canceled due to the lack of key electrical components - transformers, distribution boards, batteries - required in data centers and outside them to supply the huge amounts of energy they need; these components are largely imported from China, and the high demand is reflected in waiting times of up to five years for their delivery. (Forcoș, 2026)

The Scenario of AI as a Juridic Reality

We cannot conclude this journey without at least noting that, in light of all these examples presented, as well as of the countless other examples that cannot fit into a small-scale study, AI also prompts an update in the field of law and, of course, in specific careers. This important and sensitive aspect is analysed by Mircea Duțu, who points out that the shaping of cyberlaw is emerging: “Lawyers and legal practitioners in general are now called upon not only to make AI a subject of study but also a subject of transforming their own profession.”; “Cyberlaw (or digital law/internet law) refers to the set of legal rules applicable to activities in cyberspace, particularly the use of the internet, computing, and new technologies.” (Duțu, 2026) “The intrusion of new technologies, led by artificial intelligence (AI) tools, into the judicial system, long based exclusively on human thinking, is becoming increasingly evident and transformative.” (Duțu, 2026). Such an analysis shows us that AI enters social life and individual life to such an extent that it necessitates codification through appropriate norms and rules: the field of law extends to this new reality, beginning to regulate it and thus affirming its very existence.

This empiric collection of samples of AI conquering a relevant role within the social texture could continue in an infinity spiral of information: AI itself provides this mirrored effect of a more and more deep search. This reverberation that does not saturate is very relevant for the power of the digital tools to influence the human behaviour. In the field of knowledge, education and career this mechanism is revealing its disparate, but significant signs.

3. Conclusion

Referring to Drăghicescu's theory according to which an individual only seemingly chooses an education and a career for themselves - as these already exist and are imposed by the social group they belong to, depending on the characteristics of this group, we can bring this theoretical framework to the present: AI tends to become an active part of the world we live in and will influence individuals in a manner unique compared to the past. AI is becoming a notable actor, as we have illustrated in a few example situations, in all dimensions of social life. Its influence on education and careers is both direct, through the transformation of AI into a tool for learning, organizing/selecting content, fraudulent shortcuts in studies or even diminishing individuals' learning capacity, and indirect, because the use of AI in economic, administrative, and various service sectors affects the structure of the labour market by transforming, replacing or relocating human labour, and impacts the structure and content of education as well as career opportunities. Additionally, we could ask to what extent there is also an influence of these various sectors of human activity on AI?

Of course, AI can be used constructively and creatively by humans in all learning, production, organization, analysis, diagnosis, forecasting activities, etc., but this real and powerful beneficial aspect is overshadowed by the modern human tendency to push technological progress products towards a commercial and consumerist zone - we can imagine a compulsive consumption of AI-provided services - and to opt for increasingly easy ways to solve everyday situations (Berteau, 2026). Having one of the most striking social impacts in the field of education, AI and the learning algorithms it increasingly and "aggressively" makes available to young people have dramatic consequences on them, "especially regarding the loss of reasoning and scientific thinking skills, with implications for scientific education.... According to recent research, while the effects of human interaction with learning algorithms can be beneficial in the short term, in the medium and long term, the changes that occur in the cognitive structure of those who frequently use these algorithms are of the type involving loss of motivation, perseverance, and independence of thought, that is, the engines of human evolution in acquiring knowledge skills." (Gheondea, 2026). In the sense anticipated by Drăghicescu, this equates to a re-enchantment of the world, to a return to the indistinction between subjective and objective, to a return of the primitive man who, because he no longer understands the world in which he lives, transforms it into a magical creation.

Drăghicescu's perspective is a deterministic one: the individual is overwhelmed, determined by the social group to which they belong. The fact that the reality of effects on broad categories of individuals caused by the insinuation of AI into the fabric of the social group is becoming apparent reminds us of Drăghicescu's deterministic perspective. It is difficult for the individual to escape the constraining influence of the group and its characteristics. On the other hand, Drăghicescu himself spoke about the role of exceptional individuals who can detach themselves from the mechanism of this determinism; and regarding AI, we observe the high level of expertise of those involved in the development of these systems; the AI society is evidently also a society in which a limited category of elites, who have preserved and constantly trained their learning capacity and have access to resources, will be able to assimilate the necessary knowledge in various fields, particularly in the field of advanced technologies. A new type of Middle Ages is emerging, with accentuated social fragmentation, depending on the capacity for knowledge and access to knowledge. (Miclea, 2026)

This brief and incomplete study goes through a limited number of concrete situations selected from different countries, trying to relate them to the theoretical construct provided by Drăghicescu and to filter them through its explanatory power. A theory is, after all, a fixed framework applied over a diversity of situations - a chaotic mountain of information - in an attempt to find an element of coherence

among them. The link between the theoretical framework and empirical reality, full of nuances, unique cases, and contradictions, is often difficult to articulate. Even if limited, both by the cases mentioned and by the fact that it refers to a single theoretical framework, this study, which we propose as an exploration, has the advantage of reflecting the dynamics, still fragmented in its manifestations, of a phenomenon in full development.¹ In these examples, we find the configuration of new concepts, such as workslop or verson (virtual person), the extension of already existing perspectives to situations created by AI - as in the case of the “digital damages tax”, inspired by climate issues² or of a “cyberlaw”, modelled on environmental law -, but also a rich “empirical material” in motion, which requires the creation of new theoretical tools.

References

- A.I. (2026). *Un experiment a arătat că AI se poate “clona” în afara sistemului rezident: “Ajungem în punctul în care n-o mai putem scoate din priză”* [An experiment showed that AI can “clone” itself outside the resident system: “We reach a point where we can no longer unplug it”]. May 7, 2026. Antena 3.
- Ancuța, R. I. (2026). *Inteligența artificială ia tot mai multe decizii singură. Cât control mai are omul?* [Artificial intelligence is increasingly making decisions on its own. How much control does humans still have?]. April 26, 2026. <https://www.descopera.ro/stiinta/21063536-inteligena-artificiala-ia-tot-mai-multe-decizii-singura-cat-control-mai-are-omul>
- Anthropic rămâne în continuare interzis de Pentagon, însă analizează separat modelul AI Mythos* [Anthropic remains banned by the Pentagon, but is separately analysing the AI model Mythos]. (2026, May 2). Profit.ro.
- O. (2026). *Autoreplicarea inteligenței artificiale nu mai e SF: mai multe modele AI s-au copiat singure și au lansat atacuri informatice* [Self-replicating artificial intelligence is no longer science fiction: several AI models have copied themselves and launched cyber attacks]. May 9, 2026. Antena 3.
- Bertea, M. (2026). *Efectele utilizării cumulative a inteligenței artificiale (IA) între „sindromul broaștei fierte”, „curcanul lui Russel” și predeterminarea legendarului Ulise* [The effects of the cumulative use of artificial intelligence (AI) between the “boiled frog syndrome,” “Russell’s turkey” and the predetermination of the legendary Ulysses]. April 24, 2026. Contributors.ro.
- „Bijuteria coroanei” în materie de securitate. Marea Britanie s-a apropiat cel mai mult de a avea un inspector pentru siguranța IA* [The “jewel of the crown” in terms of security. The United Kingdom has come closest to having an inspector for AI safety]. (2026, February 24). Universul.net. <https://universul.net/bijuteria-coroanei-in-materie-de-securitate-marea-britanie-s-a-apropiat-cel-mai-mult-de-a-avea-un-inspector-pentru-siguranța-ia/>
- Cojocaru, B. (2026). *Anthropic senzație: Lumea angajat Amanda Askill, 37 de ani, filosof...* [titlul exact al articolului]. Ziarul Financiar. April 26, 2026. <https://m.zf.ro/business-international/anthropic-senzatie-lumea-angajat-amanda-askell-37-ani-filosof-23137795>
- Dinu, L. (2026). *Angajații din China, obligați să antreneze roboții AI care ar urma să le ia locurile de muncă* [Employees in China forced to train AI robots that are expected to take their jobs]. April 26, 2026. Antena 3.
- Dinu, M. (2026). *Cum a schimbat inteligența artificială până și modul în care ne jelim morții: tehnologia care îi „menține vii” pe cei decedați* [How artificial intelligence has even changed the way we mourn the dead: The technology that “keeps the deceased alive”]. April 21, 2026. Mediafax.
- Drăghicescu, D. (1928). *La réalité de l'esprit; essais de sociologie subjective*. Hachette.

¹ We note that, in conducting this study, we directly experienced the “dialogue” with AI, which provided, based on the history of my searches, countless ramifications of the debated issue. These infinite reverberations are illustrative of the “magic” of AI. Even blindly, AI provides elements of knowledge about itself.

² Indeed, a number of researcher’s assert that the future of humanity is under the shadow of two major issues: the digital revolution and the climate crisis.

Dumitru, A. V. (2026). *Angajații Google se opun furnizării tehnologiei de inteligență artificială către armata americană* [Google employees oppose supplying artificial intelligence technology to the US military]. April 28, 2026. *Mediafax*. <https://search.app/xa5gf>

Duțu, M. (2026). *Dilema IA a avocaturii: reinventare sau dispariție? Sau despre avocatul erei IA* [The AI dilemma of lawyers: reinvention or disappearance? Or about the lawyer of the AI era]. April 28, 2026. *Juridice.ro*. <https://www.juridice.ro/essentials/11564/dilema-ia-a-avocaturii-reinventare-ori-disparitie-sau-despre-avocatul-erei-ia>

Duțu, M. (2026). *Inteligența artificială judiciară: între riscuri și beneficii. Cadrul european de reglementare* [Judicial artificial intelligence: Between risks and benefits. The European regulatory framework]. May 15, 2026. *Juridice.ro*.

Forcoș, G. (2026). *SUA riscă să piardă cursa pentru dominația AI cu China: jumătate din centrele de date planificate sunt blocate sau anulate* [The USA risks losing the race for AI dominance to China: Half of the planned data centres are blocked or cancelled]. April 4, 2026. *Antena 3*.

Gheondea, A. (2026). *Către automatizarea cap-coadă a cercetării științifice cu inteligența artificială. Câteva opinii asupra noii paradigme* [Towards end-to-end automation of scientific research with artificial intelligence. Some views on the new paradigm]. May 19, 2026. *Contributors.ro*.

Iluzia inteligenței artificiale la locul de muncă este spulberată: șefii o laudă, în timp ce angajații sunt epuizați de „curățenie” [The illusion of artificial intelligence in the workplace is shattered: Bosses praise it, while employees are exhausted by “clean-up”]. (2026, April 24). <https://www.vietnam.vn/ro/vo-mong-ai-chon-so-sep-khen-nuc-no-nhan-vien-suc-vi-don-rac>

Larz May, *apud* Forcoș, G. (2026). *Generația Alpha nu mai poate scrie emailuri bunicii fără ChatGPT. Un expert propune introducerea unei „taxe pe daune digitale”* [“Generation Alpha can no longer write emails to their grandmother without ChatGPT.” An expert proposes introducing a “digital damage tax”]. 2026. *Antena 3*.

Materi, S. (2026). *Germania ia măsuri împotriva trișatului cu inteligența artificială la examenul de admitere la universitate* [Germany takes measures against cheating with artificial intelligence in the university entrance exam]. April 27, 2026. *Mediafax*. <https://www.mediafax.ro/stirile-zilei/germania-ia-masuri-impotriva-trisatului-cu-inteligenta-artificiala-la-examenul-de-admitere-la-universitate-23727156>

Miclea, M. (2026). *Inteligența artificială ar putea crea o nouă diviziune socială* [Artificial intelligence could create a new social division]. April 15, 2026. *Vorbitorincii*. <https://youtube.com/shorts/Hp-s6BBm5MQ?si=ilG87QrHvHv27flz>

Petre, S. (2025). *Gulliveri și liliputani. Un excurs pe marginea micilor puteri din sistemul internațional* [Gullivers and Lilliputians. A journey along the sidelines of small powers in the international system]. Editura Militară.

Război între titanii tehnologiei. Elon Musk și Sam Altman, proces cu miză majoră privind inteligența artificială [War between the titans of technology. Elon Musk and Sam Altman, a high-stakes lawsuit over artificial intelligence]. (2026, April 27). *Adevărul*. <https://adevarul.ro/stiri-externe/sua/razboi-intre-titanii-tehnologiei-elon-musk-si-sam-2525595.html>

Redacția Descopera.ro. (2026). *Grecia introduce modificări în Constituție pentru a proteja oamenii de inteligența artificială* [Greece introduces amendments to the Constitution to protect people from artificial intelligence]. May 11, 2026. *Descopera.ro*.

Redacția Spotmedia.ro. (2026). *Inteligența artificială ne schimbă felul în care scriem și vorbim* [Artificial intelligence is changing the way we write and speak]. May 4, 2026. *Spotmedia.ro*.

Stephanovici, V. D. (2026). *Incident AI major: un agent automat a șters baza de date a unei companii în 9 secunde și a recunoscut eroarea* [Major AI incident: An automated agent deleted a company's database in 9 seconds and acknowledged the mistake]. April 30, 2026. *Mediafax*. <https://www.mediafox.ro/externe/incident-ai-major-un-agent-automat-a-sters-baza-de-date-a-unei-companii-in-9-secunde-si-a-recunoscut-eroarea-2372795>

Tenchiu, I. (2026). *Situație dramatică în IT. Dacă înainte găseai job de pe o zi pe alta, în prezent ai putea fi forțat să cauți luni bune și să nu găsești nimic chiar și ca senior* [Dramatic situation in IT. Whereas before you could find a job from one day to the next, now you could be forced to search for months and not find anything even as a senior]. April 25, 2026. *Ziarul Financiar*. <https://m.zf.ro/zf-live/situatie-dramatica-in-it-daca-inainte-gaseai-job-de-pe-o-zi-pe-alta.23137095>

Un model AI considerat prea periculos pentru public stârnește îngrijorările în sectorul financiar [An AI model considered too dangerous for the public raises concerns in the financial sector]. (2026, April 26). *Adevărul*. <https://adevarul.ro/stiri-externe/sua/in-model-ai-considerat-prea-periculos-pentru-2523967.html>