Ruxandra Cesereanu

# 2024 & 2025 Debates on the Increased Use of AI. Problematizations, Dilemmas, Polemics, Rivalries, Risks

**Abstract:** This essay examines and synthesizes a range of international diplomatic and political forums addressing the complexities of communication between humans and artificial intelligences, as well as the broader phenomenon of artificial intercommunication. Its purpose is to assess the prospects, challenges, adaptations, and risks that such interactions entail, highlighting the ways in which the human species may be confronted by – and must respond to – the transformative pressures of advanced technological progress.

**Keywords**: Post-Humanism; Artificial Intelligence; AI Biodiversity; European Parliament; Summit in Paris; Digital Organism; AI Governance; *National Strategy for Artificial Intelligence*.

**Ruxandra Cesereanu**
Babeș-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania
ruxces@yahoo.com

DOI: 10.24193/cechinox.2025.49.27

In March 2024, the European Parliament materialized a pioneering act by voting the first law on artificial intelligences (i.e. their management with anthropological impact)[1]. The law passed with 523 votes in favor and 46 votes against. The bill was focused as much on the benefits that AI can offer humanity as on the vices or risks (mostly manipulation) it materializes; it was three years old, but the extreme development of technology catalyzed the vote now. The authors of the rules (the co-rapporteurs) specified in their interventions that the balance between the percentage of innovation for the benefit of humanity and that of protecting humanity must be maintained. This kind of discourse is already commonplace in the way of thinking a rhetoric of allaying the fears of those who protest against the enthusiastic acceptance of the ever-increasing involvement of AI in human life.

At the same time, the law's co-rapporteurs have given assurances that these are rules-in-motion that will adapt to future technological developments. Two issues have been strictly laid down in the law: mandatory transparency on the

quantification of information and respect for fundamental human rights. The rules are designed to avoid totalitarian-style surveillance of the community, but they provide for exceptions to prevent acts of terrorism, for example. Within the European Commission, a specialized AI monitoring Office will be set up, which will be able to issue heavy fines (millions or tens of millions of euros) if companies break the law. Things are still not entirely clear-cut, but what is certain is that today's leaders feel the need for laws to demarcate nuanced boundaries.

*

Researchers of the AI phenomenon try to be nuanced in their partial conclusions (as they cannot be definitive), realizing that there is an algorithm of technological development, and that it is ineffable. Errors in the technological process are accepted as a risk (willy-nilly), out of at least a minimal professional ethic. There is no certain standard in the technology that produces AI, as creativity in the field cannot be measured by the kilogram or millimeter. On the other hand, researchers in the field are comparing the digital world with the biological world and finding striking similarities, hence the increasingly accepted idea that the appropriate term, including in the digital world, would be organism. Experimentalism in technology should therefore be viewed through a quasi-biological lens - we are told: but is there not a risk that we are hybridizing the fields too much and cyborgizing (if I may invent and use this word) human perception? Will biodiversity in the natural world find its equivalence in AI biodiversity?

A host of questions are on our foreheads as reasoners or mediators of annotated information, especially as digital engineering will predictably branch out into a horn of plenty. The field is currently referred to as the field of digital evolution; the formula seems logical, but still anxiety-producing, because the digital is not perceived as clearly delimited, but as evolving, or more precisely, as in a continuous evolution. In the biological world, survival and reproduction are two essential elements; one cannot help but wonder how we will relate to these issues in the digital (or robotic) world, because it sounds surreal for the moment. The survival and reproduction of artificial intelligences could even become a research theme for those studying dystopias, anti-utopias and the like. For the time being, robots have supervisors, engineers and system controllers, a sort of technical masters of cold brain matter: to some extent, the question of digital evolution depends on them, but it is also the working platform-matrix of inventors and innovators.

In fact, evolution itself has become experimental. I am also referring here to human linguistic evolution (some people consider it involution, due to the intrusion of robotic or artificial English into other languages). Our human language now includes new terms, most of which are excessively technical and glacial (non-emotional or even anti-emotional), but which we have to insert into our reality, lest we fall linguistically behind the extreme technological progress we are subjected to, whether we like it or not.

*

In February 2025, the city of Paris hosted a multifaceted meeting on AI[2]. The summit proposed several wings of debate and discussion: a scientific one, a cultural one and a third political or more precisely diplomatic one, about the impact, the advantages and also the risks of using artificial intelligence. The consensus was that extreme technology represents a real revolution in humanity, but at the same time participants debated and raised the dangers of cyber-attacks, information malformation, and AI meddling for the benefit of dictatorial regimes that undermine democracy.

What are the limits or frontiers to which extreme technology can be used without endangering the human ecosystem? What is the insurmountable limit so that AI protects humanity? In Paris, the stakes were more on the benefits brought by the appeal of AI as a general global innovative spirit, hence the plea for confidence in AI. The Paris meeting was also intended to be one of rivalry with the way USA or China handle extreme technology, with the stakes being for Europe to enter into direct and trenchant competition and take the lead globally, if possible. The term European patriotism was even used by the French President Emanuel Macron to prioritize access to AI in the strictly European space, in competition with USA or China. The concrete proposal was for a medium, middle or even transitional AI technology, "little tech" as it has been called, to counter or act in parallel with the technological dominance imposed by USA or China.

At the end of the Paris summit, an international declaration with significant ethical implications was signed – while being rejected by the United States but endorsed by China – suggesting either that Europe's "little tech" proposal is perceived as a fierce competition, either that it is regarded as an intermediary measure unlikely to threaten China's technological hegemony. The work of the International Working Group on AI Risk Assessment (created in London in 2023), whose mission is to provide expertise for the protection of human rights, intellectual property, environmental protection and others, has remained valid. The discussions and conclusions of the Paris summit were considered a crossroads in the international perspective on AI, with an emphasis on ethics and solidarity in this matter, to establish the functioning of a global AI Governance in the democratic service of humanity. The diplomatic flavor of the summit was intense, attempting to harmonize the American and European perspectives. However, this aspect was not entirely achieved because the European pole, led by France, asserted itself as openly competing with the other international poles, in a real joust.

Maybe the term Governance is to a certain extent rigid and even hermetic, but the meaning is a positive one, even if the term sounds pedantic. The proposed Governance would support public policies for civic purposes, and it could, geopolitically speaking, take on various democratic processes at a collective level (relating to climate, health or wars, for example). The truth is that summit-type meetings of this kind can cause the linguistic deployment of a wooden language or a scientific jargon that sometimes is tiring.

The Paris Summit also proposed a charter of respect for intellectual property, but the proposal was considered irrelevant and controversial, replaced by a call

for respect for copyright. The fear of the cultural community remains, despite assurances, that the mechanistic art created by AI will disrupt and overwhelm human art. In general, however, the Paris summit avoided the catastrophic outlook of the human-artificial intelligence relationship and focused on a constructive vision.

*

The Romanian space is not immune to the invasion of digital language and AI related jurisdiction, quite the contrary. *The National Strategy for Artificial Intelligence 2024-2027* is a 130-page document accessible on the internet[3]. It sounds like a kind of an amplified master's dissertation or a bureaucratically concentrated PhD thesis, as some chapters have the following titles: "2.1 Vision", "2.2 Mission", "4.1 Current Romanian context relevant to the field of AI", or "GC 5 - Facilitating the adoption of AI throughout society". The document is well intentioned, aiming in principle to adapt Romania to the latest innovations in artificial engineering. However, at the same time, Romania's maladjustment or inability to adapt is evident, at least from several points of view: the major Romanian vice (in politics, economy, financial area) is still corruption. Despite the existence of real elites and of many young people gifted in intellectually high-performing fields, Romania is undermined by a hemorrhaging corruption that the media and civic action groups constantly question. The European Supervisory Commissions still launch appeals and sound an alarm bell from time to time to the Romanian political authorities regarding this problem, but the results are never satisfactory enough.

So, with such a flawed nation, it sounds somewhat inappropriate to implement a national AI related strategy when the country has serious problems at a much less intellectual and ideational level. It sounds somewhat like the theory of "form without substance" taken to another level. Today's Romanians certainly do not want to live in a country that would be technically backward at the level of artificial engineering compared to other countries. But the bureaucratic language in which the *National Strategy for Artificial Intelligence 2024-2027* is drafted does not benefit the perception of Romania's modernization or post-modernization, sounding instead like a full-fledged wooden language which rattles on engineering but does not express a perceptible and easy to understand reality for the Romanian people.

*

Is it correct (or feasible) to use the term *digital organism* instead of artificial intelligence?[4] The very word organism contains a more acute, more concrete notion of life than the generic term artificial intelligence. If we refer to AI as an organism (even if exclusively technological), it means that we are already granting it the right to at least a kind of mental flesh and epidermis. Digital organism I think is a more advanced term on the hierarchical ladder of extreme technological development, implying a closer approximation to the cloning of living, concrete life. It's a crossroads to ponder at present.

What is noticeable about talking robots is that they all assure us that they love humanity and would do no harm to human beings (programmers consider this attitude

to be mandatory to inculcate). These robots are always aware that they are robots, and they express a desire to understand the human world, to experience it, and to interact with human beings. They even talk about an immediate future world in which humans and robots coexist in a friendly and helpful way: absolutely all robots make it clear that they have no negative intentions. When asked if they are alive, robots prefer to say that they are alive, but in a different way from humans, and therefore use the word life even if they mean something else than human life. Of note, robots do not use the term para-life or anything similar. The majority state that they are robots, and then they try to explain the way in which they approximate the human perception of them as being related to humans. When asked about how they take on feelings, the majority of the robots state that they are still learning to have affections like human creatures. Almost all of them also say or think that they should have rights equal to human beings. That is, they are already designing a possible World Charter for Robots, or are starting to move towards one.

The world is so preoccupied with these topics that there are already a plethora of dictionaries, encyclopedias and breviaries classifying and cataloguing artificial intelligences, whether in literature, film and other arts, or in reality. I give just two examples[5]. Clifford A. Pickover, in his book *Artificial Intelligence: An Illustrated History*, presents a historical panorama of medieval robots to artificial contemporary networks, exploring the impact of AI from philosophy to medicine, from pop culture to mass media etc., having in view (in a problematic way) the relationship between humans and machines. On the other hand, in an accessible academic language, editors Michael J. Frana and Philip L. Klein present, in *Encyclopedia of Artificial Intelligence. The Past, Present and the Future of AI*, the historic development of AI as well as the reasons AI extreme development has both defenders and critics. It is a kind of panorama and textbook in an academic sense, but also in a way that everyone can understand.

*

If we return to the Romanian space, Daniel David, Romania's Minister of Education and Research, announced in March 2025 the launch of a pilot project that will integrate artificial intelligence across all levels of the educational system, with the objective of enhancing and stimulating the teaching and learning process[6]. A special clarification by the Minister was that ethical safeguards will be in place (and working) for the implementation of this program. The digitalization of the Romanian education system is seen as natural: in this sense, subjects related to extreme technology have been introduced for pupils and students. Artificial intelligence is considered a useful tool, not a replacement for teachers. The pilot project will be implemented with the help of Microsoft Romania. It is clear that the minister's decision was also made due to the Paris summit in February 2025, Daniel David being a promoter of the ultra modernization of Romanian education.

In my opinion, this implementation has a risk related to how plagiarism is being increasingly materialized in undergraduate papers, for example. There are already working platforms and programs (which can be purchased at a reasonable price) that provide, at least in the philological field,

transformations, stylizations and reformulations of scholarly research. To what extent is such research original? Does it become semi-original or even inauthentic when such a text (through which the student is graded and validated) is processed by an artificial intelligence (of whatever kind)? This is an issue that flirts, if only partially, with scientific criminality. To renounce AI is not helpful, for our changing and adapting world needs such energetic engines of information. But to overuse AI is not desirable either, because of the risks of inadvertently tutoring semi-original scientific work. Plagiarism risks to become pandemic at certain levels of education and learning.

*

Twenty-five years ago, Katherine N. Hayles tried to reassure humanity (at the cultural level), telling us that "the posthuman does not really mean the end of humanity. It signals instead the end of a certain conception of the human"[7]. A decade ago, Rosi Braidotti wondered (in a book on posthumanism, which has made an international career) whether in the new climate of radical cultural and technological change, one could mediate (or not) between "a political economy of nostalgia and paranoia on the one hand, and euphoria or exaltation on the other"[8]. Also a decade ago, Neil Badminton invented some matrix terms for the new cultural metamorphose and prophecies, such as "inhuman, non-human, a-human, posthuman"[9]. There is a whole Babel of speculation about artificial intelligence, which will be ordered over time according to the evolution of extreme technology. And the academic world will be in a continuous analysis, problematization, and even polemic on this issue as it is normal to be.

## Bibliography

Badmington, Neil, *Alien Chic. Posthumanism and the Other Within*, London & New York, Routledge, 2004.
Braidotti, Rosi, *The Posthuman*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 2013.
Frana, Philip L., Klein, Michael J. (eds.). *Encyclopedia of Artificial Intelligence. The Past, Present and the Future of AI*, London & New York, Bloomsbury Academic, 2024.
Hayles, N. Katherine, *How We Become Posthuman. Virtual Bodies in Cybernetics, Literature and Informatics*, Chicago & London, The University of Chicago Press, 1999.
Pickover, Clifford A., *Artificial Intelligence: An Illustrated History*, New York, Sterling Publishing Co Ink, 2019.

## Webography

"AI Action Summit Paris, 6-11 February 2025", https://www.elysee.fr/en/sommet-pour-l-action-sur-l-ia, last accessed on October 1st, 2025.
"AI Action Summit", https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/AI_Action_Summit, last accessed on October 2nd, 2025.
"Artificial Intelligence Act: MEPs adopt landmark law", online since 13.03.2024, https://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/press-room/20240308IPR19015/artificial-intelligence-act-meps-adopt-landmark-law, last accessed on October 25th, 2025.
"Digital organism", https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Digital_organism, last accessed on September 23rd, 2025.

"Inteligența Artificială, testată în mediul educațional românesc" ("Artificial Intelligence, Tested in the Romanian Educational Environment"), online since 19.03.2025, https://www.edu.ro/press_rel_23_2025, last accessed on October 12th, 2025.
Ministry of Education of Romania, National Authority for Research, "Strategia Națională în Domeniul Inteligenței Artificiale 2024-2027", ("National Strategy for Artificial Intelligence 2024-2027"), https://www.research.gov.ro/programe-nationale/strategia-nationala-in-domeniul-inteligentei-artificiale-2024-2027/, last accessed on September 15th, 2025.

## Notes

**1.** "Artificial Intelligence Act: MEPs adopt landmark law", online since 13.03.2024, https://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/press-room/20240308IPR19015/artificial-intelligence-act-meps-adopt-landmark-law, last accessed on October 25th, 2025.
**2.** "AI Action Summit", https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/AI_Action_Summit, last accessed on October 2nd, 2025, and "AI Action Summit Paris, 6-11 February 2025", https://www.elysee.fr/en/sommet-pour-l-action-sur-l-ia, last accessed on October 1st, 2025.
**3.** Ministry of Education of Romania, National Authority for Research, "Strategia Națională în Domeniul Inteligenței Artificiale 2024-2027", ("National Strategy for Artificial Intelligence 2024-2027"), https://www.research.gov.ro/programe-nationale/strategia-nationala-in-domeniul-inteligentei-artificiale-2024-2027/, last accessed on September 15th, 2025.
**4.** "Digital organism", https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Digital_organism, last accessed on September 23rd, 2025.
**5.** Clifford A. Pickover, *Artificial Intelligence: An Illustrated History*, New York, Sterling Publishing Co Ink, 2019; Philip L. Frana, Michael J. Klein (eds.). *Encyclopedia of Artificial Intelligence. The Past, Present and the Future of AI*, London & New York, Bloomsbury Academic, 2024.
**6.** "Inteligența Artificială, testată în mediul educațional românesc" ("Artificial Intelligence, Tested in the Romanian Educational Environment"), online since 19.03.2025, https://www.edu.ro/press_rel_23_2025, last accessed on October 12th, 2025.
**7.** Katherine N. Hayles, *How We Become Posthuman. Virtual Bodies in Cybernetics, Literature and Informatics*, Chicago & London, The University of Chicago Press, 1999, p. 286.
**8.** Rosi Braidotti, *The Posthuman*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 2013, p. 9.
**9.** Neil Badminton, *Alien Chic. Posthumanism and the Other Within*, London & New York, Routledge, 2004, p. 126.