

REVISITING AUTHENTICITY IN POST-TRUTH ERA: BUILDING SKILLS AS SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE FOR EUROPEAN RESILIENCE

Sever AVRAM*, Eric GILDER**

*CIO-SUERD, House of Europe, Bucharest, Romania

**Papua New Guinea University of Technology, Lae, PNG

severavram@gmail.com, eric.gilder@pnu.ac.pg

Abstract: *This paper outlines an emerging productive tension in the EU education-policy space as it adapts to the pervasiveness of AI and the coming of AGI. One possible reaction could be the acceleration of the narcissistic, egocentric, and alienating ultra-hedonism of spectacular consumerism; the other reaction could be, conversely, a renewed engagement with Stoicism and moderation, emerging in response to the ecological crisis and the resource crisis intensified by the entropic sequence of conflicts associated with the Trump 2.0 regime and its effects on EU-policy conjunctures. In any case, the deeper philosophical grounding has remained, at least in appearance, unchanged: the persistence of what Gianni Vattimo diagnosed as ‘weak thought’ (*pensiero debole*), operating in the long aftermath of the Nietzschean ‘death of God’ thesis. This process of disenchantment and desacralisation to date has not produced greater individual or societal resilience; rather, it has generated new and more intractable forms of ideological, geo-economic, and cultural conflict. Only a ‘strong-thought’ post-Leonardo style EU educational project can provide a sustainable path out of this morass, as premised in Pope Leo XIV’s “Magnifica Humanitas” Encyclical (addressing the intersection of AI technology and human dignity).*

Keywords: *Castalia Game, EU Education Policy, Hedonism vs. Stoicism, Papal Encyclicals, AI/AGI*

1. Introduction

This paper continues the intellectual trajectory initiated in our previous study *Castalia*^[1], presented in Sibiu, under conditions in which the global context -- political, economic, and civilizational -- has become significantly more fraught. The deeper philosophical grounding has remained, at least in appearance, unchanged: the persistence of what Gianni Vattimo diagnosed as *weak thought* (*pensiero debole*)^[2], operating in the long aftermath of the Nietzschean thesis of the death of God. This process of disenchantment and desacralisation has not produced greater individual or societal resilience; rather, it has generated new and more intractable forms of ideological, geo-economic, and cultural

conflict.

A. From this viewpoint, we find ourselves compelled to revisit the post-Nietzschean context to which the authors cited throughout this paper refer, either explicitly or implicitly. The provocative (and in many ways premonitory) idea that we shall all become as gods, or rather as *demi-gods*^[3] in the Dionysian developed by the German philosopher, has returned with renewed conceptual force to the global foreground. The convergence of global crises, coupled with the fragmentation of the central paradigms of knowledge, indicates a condition of hyper-crisis whose potential productivity remains extraordinarily difficult to discern in a present dominated by the challenges of post- and trans-humanism.

B. Paradoxically, or perhaps precisely for this reason, a productive tension emerges: On the one hand, the narcissistic, egocentric, and alienating ultra-hedonism of spectacular consumerism; on the other, a renewed engagement with Stoicism and moderation, emerging in response to the ecological crisis and the resource crisis intensified by the entropic sequence of conflicts associated with the Trump 2.0 conjuncture^[4]. This constitutive tension provides the conceptual framework for the present paper's argument in favour of a profound educational re-foundation --along the line of Anton Dumitriu's *axiomatic consensus*^[5], together with the urgency of a radical ethicisation of formation and education as a whole.

C. We suggest, in conclusion, three possible paths--not from the perspective of a new Euro-centrism, which has become both obsolete and utopian, but from an approach oriented towards alterity, diversity, and social inclusion: dimensions that our cultural and spiritual continent has always kept in view. As André Malraux suggested, the twenty-first century will be spiritual -- or it will not be at all^[6].

The three paths are: Collective remembrance and recognition as a civic act; dilemmatic reasonableness as the epistemic infrastructure of democracy; and empathy as the political practice of responsible global citizenship. Together, they constitute what we propose to call an architecture of authenticity -- the structural response that Europe can offer to the entropy of post-Truth, should it choose to do so^[7].

2. Methodological Note

This essay operates at the intersection of three disciplinary fields -- cultural anthropology, the sociology of culture, and the philosophy of ideas -- and is guided by two complementary methodological concepts. The first is thick description, as developed by Clifford Geertz in *The Interpretation of Cultures* (1973)^[8]; instead of extracting abstract variables from social and cultural phenomena, the analysis

focuses on the layered, symbol-laden texture of European civilisational experience, reading institutions, traditions, and intellectual practices as webs of meaning to be interpreted in their full contextual density. The second is the history of ideas, in the sense established by Arthur O. Lovejoy in *The Great Chain of Being* (1936) and refined by Quentin Skinner in *Visions of Politics* (2002); key concepts -- authenticity, resilience, dignity, memory -- are treated not as fixed essences but as historically mobile and contested formations, whose changes across intellectual traditions constitute the substance of European civilisational self-understanding.

Together, these two methodological lenses (interpretive thickness and genealogical tracing of ideas) define the analytical grid of the present essay, allowing it to move between the particular density of cultural experience and the long-range arc of European thought without reducing one to the other.

2.1. *Quo Vadis*: The European Civilization: Question in Progress

One of the defining questions of the European present concerns the capacity of the European Union to generate an original model of civilisation -- one capable of responding simultaneously and coherently to the full range of geopolitical, technological, economic, moral, and cultural crises which intersect and mutually reinforce one another in the current global context. This ambition demands not merely institutional reaction or conjunctural adaptation, but a genuine capacity for synthesis across dimensions of collective existence that may initially appear disparate.

The United States and China are contesting for global supremacy on strategic, technological, and symbolic levels; consolidating models of power combining accelerated innovation with systemic implementation capacity. Europe, by contrast, appears frequently in a position of structural delay or late-stage reaction (a posture that "has amounted to moving from

a *practice* [that embraces weak tactics] to a *praxis* of pragmatism [which is hoped to be based upon proactive strategy]”^[9]. In this complex context, the central stakes acquire a profoundly anthropological and spiritual character: The European problem cannot be reduced to questions of production, competitiveness, or economic efficiency. It extends to the very type of human being that Europe can form, sustain, and project as the foundation of its own historical continuity. Building capacities through the strengthening of human capabilities becomes, in this light, a long-term strategic process (forming the foundation for a new architecture of European resilience), in which *human* articulates directly with systemic preparedness and adaptive capacities. Europe manifests a visible deficit of highly trained individuals capable of connecting theoretical knowledge with practical initiative, and specialised expertise with the creative dimension. This deficit produces fragmented soft skills and reduced collective impact.

The innovation culture of the United States and China operates at a superior level of performance, sustained by integrated institutional and economic ecosystems. The central European problem remains the lack of integrating innovation into the real economy, a process that remains limited and insufficiently articulated. For example, European universities do not generate sufficient interaction between research, entrepreneurship, and the market; this disjunction produces limited capacity to transform ideas into concrete, applicable, and scalable solutions.

2.2. A Post-Leonardo Model: A Distinctly European Synthesis

This situation points to the necessity of articulating a distinctly European model: Constructed through the intelligent valorisation of its own cultural and intellectual tradition, capable of offering a specific competitive advantage in a world dominated by competing paradigms. What emerges is the idea of a *post-Leonardo*

model, an actualisation of the ideal of the complete human being within a contemporary context characterised by technological complexity and cognitive acceleration, in which synthesis across multiple domains becomes a condition of relevance. The tension between specialisation and interdisciplinarity is here reformulated as a necessary and productive synthesis: Europe needs top-tier specialists integrated within a profound interdisciplinary framework, capable of generating three fundamental values-knowledge, meaning, and direction-in a context dominated by generative artificial intelligence and by rapid transformations in the paradigms of work and thought^[10].

The global reconfiguration intensifies this need through the emergence of new poles of power and emergent forms of *civilisational multilateralism*. Europe is thereby compelled to formulate its own response, anchored in its cultural and historical resources. The cultural dimension becomes central to defining European identity and direction: Europe has historically functioned as a privileged space for reflection on the human person, on freedom, and on community. Reactivating this function can sustain a new, coherent, and enduring civilisational project. The European federalist tradition offers important reference points here -- through contributions by thinkers such as Denis de Rougemont, Emmanuel Mounier, and Edgar Morin^[11], who each underlined the necessity of a construction grounded in an integrative conception of the human person. For this reason, the neo-humanist European model thus remains a first-order strategic resource within a broader perspective. Recent initiatives for economic and financial consolidation, associated with the vision of “One Europe, One Market”, indicate clear directions of institutional evolution: Monetary union has been achieved; economic-financial union is in the process of being structured; and European-level decision-making is becoming progressively

more relevant in the context of overlapping crises.

2.3. Creating a Sustainable Humanist Centric Axis and an Evolving Transgressive Dimension of Cohesion

The durability of this process depends fundamentally on the existence of a solid anthropological foundation, capable of sustaining institutional and economic transformations through an adequate human base. The sustainable human being -- the complex human being, the fulfilled human being -- becomes the fundamental unit of European resilience, in a context where education occupies a central role in this structural transformation. Building the capacity for innovation and integrating innovativeness constitutes the first essential tier of this process. Social-economic coherence and convergence constitute the second, complementary tier. The classical model of cohesion, oriented predominantly towards reducing regional disparities, requires a conceptual extension capable of embodying qualitative dimensions of development. Cohesion thus acquires a transgressive dimension, in which economic indicators are subjected to substantial reinterpretation. GDP could be extended to include dimensions related to well-being, existential balance, and quality of life. The examples offered by Bhutan, Norway, and Singapore suggest alternative directions of development.

The concept of the “Happiness GDP” reflects this paradigmatic shift—a shift in which happiness itself acquires a stoic dimension, grounded in measure, inner equilibrium, and self-regulation. This leads to a revaluation of the relationship between consumption and meaning. The ideas formulated by the Club of Rome in the 1970s remain pertinent, and *The Limits to Growth*^[12] report anticipated with remarkable accuracy the environmental, resource, and sustainability problems of the present.

2.4 The Cultural Dimension: Axiomatic Consensus and the Lessons of Central

European Former Dissidence

The cultural dimension requires a nuanced and profound approach. European authenticity implies a resubstantiation of values through the identification of a stable and coherent axiological nucleus, independent of superficial forms of identity. Anton Dumitriu described this need through the idea of an axiomatic consensus -- an insight that confers upon European federalism a moral and spiritual dimension capable of transcending mere institutional organisation. The lessons of Central European dissidence become relevant in this context through contributions by figures such as Václav Havel, whose concept of “the power of the powerless” offers a profound perspective on the necessity of Europe’s re-moralisation.

The integration of these lessons has remained limited: Western Europe, during a period of prosperity and stability, did not fully absorb the messages arriving from its periphery. Czech authors such as Milan Kundera and Jan Patočka^[13] formulated consistent critiques of Western modernity, illuminating its structural limits. Subsequent reflections by thinkers such as Jürgen Habermas and Timothy Garton Ash highlighted the inadequacies of the consumerist model and the necessity of formulating structural countermodels. The lessons of the Prague Spring were not integrated into European educational and cultural systems -- a failure that has contributed to emergent forms of social disintegration.

The phenomenon of social disorder reflects a profound crisis of orientation: Societies may achieve high levels of prosperity while simultaneously manifesting internal fragility and axiological incoherence. Moral reconstruction thus becomes a systemic necessity, involving a balance between norms and freedoms, between responsibility and autonomy, between the individual and the collective. The voice of dissenters who criticised the West from within had limited impact in a context where their critiques

targeted spiritual emptiness and systemic self-sufficiency. Their proposals suggested an order grounded in responsibility, truth, and the assumption of limits as a principle of equilibrium. The future of Europe depends on the capacity to integrate these dimensions into a coherent vision—one in which resilience implies human formation, innovation, institutional coherence, and moral foundation. The European model can still regain relevance through the articulation of these elements into a viable synthesis.

Consequently, the very etymology of the term “Europe”—derived from the Greek *eurys* (“broad”) and *ops* (“gaze,” “face”) -- points toward the meaning of “she with the broad gaze”: A constitutive openness toward the world, a capacity for comprehension and interpretation of diversity. Europe can be understood not merely as a geographical or political reality, but as a cultural configuration defined by the vocation of amplitude, reflection, and synthesis. Europe can formulate an ideal of civilisation grounded in concrete universalism, personal dignity, and inner freedom^[14] -- a project that implies a profound re-humanisation, in which the complete human being becomes the expression of a new historical stage.

3. Authenticity Against Post-Truth: Three Tiers of Civilisational Renewal

The preceding analysis converges on a diagnosis that is simultaneously structural and anthropological: the deepest crisis of contemporary Europe is not merely economic or geopolitical, but a crisis of meaning -- a crisis of authenticity. In a global epistemic environment characterised by the systematic production and amplification of post-truth (in which information is decoupled from verifiability, discourse from responsibility, and identity from historical depth), Europe requires not simply better policies or stronger institutions. It requires a regenerated human foundation^[15].

Two intellectual traditions, insufficiently

mobilised in current European debates, offer indispensable conceptual anchors for such a renewal. Mircea Eliade articulated a vision of authenticity as complete, undiluted self-presence, a total engagement with experience that resists the anaesthesia of routine and the falsifications of ideology. For Eliade, the authentic act is one in which the full weight of existence is assumed rather than evaded. Benjamin Fondane, as a poet of existential freedom, went further: poetry -- and, by extension, the creative, interpretive, meaning-generating act -- constitutes the purest and most irreducible form of human authenticity. Against all systems that seek to domesticate or subordinate human experience, Fondane affirmed the sovereign excess of life over abstraction, and of the particular over the universal schema. These two traditions converge on a single insight: authenticity is the irreducible ground from which any genuine human -- and civilisational -- project must be constructed. Against the entropy of VUCA environments (Volatile, Uncertain, Complex, Ambiguous)^[16] and the reductive logic of purely financial valuation, the following three tiers constitute a framework for European civilisational renewal grounded in authenticity.

3.1 Tier I - Revisiting Collective Memory: Remembrance and Rewarding Attitudes

The first and foundational tier of renewal is the restoration of a living relationship with collective memory -- what may be called, in its fullest sense, re-membrance: Not mere commemoration, but the active re-integration of dispersed and forgotten parts of a shared cultural body. Re-cognition, in its etymological depth, implies knowing again -- returning to the sources of European civilisational self-understanding with fresh eyes and renewed stakes. Post-Truth thrives precisely where collective memory is thin, instrumentalised, or absent^[17]. When the past becomes a reservoir for ideological manipulation rather than a space of genuine encounter with experience, the present loses its capacity for orientation. The answer is not

nostalgia but historical depth: a pedagogical and institutional commitment to transmitting the layered complexity of European civilisation (its achievements, its catastrophes, its internal tensions) as a living resource for present decision-making.

In concrete terms, this tier implies a sustained reinvestment in the humanities and social sciences within European universities and curricula; the integration of dissident literatures and testimonies -- Havel, Kundera, Patočka, Fondane himself -- into core educational programmes; and the development of what may be called memory institutions: Archives, cultural centres, and educational platforms capable of mediating between the depth of European historical experience and the urgencies of the present. For example, the work of the European Institute of Cultural Routes, the initiatives of the Council of Europe on heritage education, and the emerging European Memory and Identity programmes offer initial foundations for such a commitment^[18].

Remembrance and re-cognition are not passive acts: they demand critical interpretation, comparative engagement, and the willingness to inhabit perspectives that disturb. They constitute, in Eliade's view, an authentic confrontation with what Europe has actually been -- not as self-fulfilling, but as the indispensable condition of knowing what Europe can yet evolve.

3.2. Tier II - Critical Thinking and Dilemmatic Reasonableness: Antidotes to BANI and Decisional Entropy

The second tier addresses directly the epistemic and ethical challenge of post-Truth. In environments characterised by volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity; with the dominant temptation being either paralysis or oversimplification - namely the retreat into tribal certainties, algorithmic shortcuts, or the reductive metrics of financial value. Against this entropy, Europe must cultivate what can be called dilemmatic reasonableness: a mode of practical reasoning that neither pretends to resolve all tensions into clean solutions nor

surrenders to relativism, but inhabits the productive difficulty of genuine dilemmas with intellectual honesty, civic courage, and methodological rigour. Dilemmatic reasonableness is not scepticism: it is the disciplined capacity to hold competing valid claims in tension, to distinguish degrees of evidence and levels of uncertainty, and to make defensible decisions under conditions of irreducible complexity. It is, in essence, the cognitive infrastructure of democratic citizenship -- and it is precisely this infrastructure that post-Truth systematically corrodes.

Concretely, this tier demands a transformation of European educational systems at all levels, from the primary school to the postgraduate programme, from the civil service training module to the corporate leadership course. The cultivation of critical thinking - encompassing logical reasoning, source evaluation, argumentation analysis, cognitive bias recognition, and structured dialogue -- must become a non-negotiable core competency of European formation. This is not merely a technical skill; it is a civic and moral one. The EU's Media Literacy for All initiative, the OECD's frameworks^[19] for critical thinking in education, and the Council of Europe's Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture each offer institutional platforms for scaling such commitments^[20]. Beyond education, dilemmatic reasonableness implies institutional design^[21]: the deliberate construction of public and civic spaces in which disagreement is legitimised, evidence is honoured, and the manipulation of information is resisted through transparent standards of discourse. Examples include the European Citizens' Panels, the experience of deliberative mini-publics such as Ireland's Citizens' Assemblies, and the emerging frameworks for algorithmic accountability in the EU AI Act each represent dimensions of this institutional architecture. Against the reductive entropy of purely financial valuation (in which the

worth of a person, a community, or a civilisational choice is exclusively determined by its market price), dilemmatic reasonableness insists on the irreducibility of meaning, dignity, and relational value. This is precisely the domain in which Fondane's affirmation of the poetic -- the existential excess that no system can fully account for -- becomes politically and institutionally relevant. A Europe that cannot justify the worth of what cannot be priced will be unable to resist the colonisation of its civic life by the logic of financial optimisation.

3.3. Tier III - Why Training Emotional Intelligence and Empathy as the Core of Responsible Global Citizenship

The third tier completes the architecture of renewal by addressing its most intimate and most expansive dimension simultaneously: the cultivation of emotional intelligence and empathy as constitutive elements of European identity and responsible global citizenship^[22]. This is the tier in which authenticity -- in Eliade's and Fondane's perspectives -- becomes not merely individual but relational and political^[23]. Emotional intelligence, understood in its full complexity (encompassing self-awareness, self-regulation, social awareness, and responsible relationship management) constitutes a form of practical wisdom that post-Truth actively suppresses. Post-Truth appeals to and amplifies raw emotional reactions (e.g., outrage, fear, tribal solidarity) while short-circuiting the reflective, empathic, and dialogical processing of emotional experience. The result is a civic landscape in which emotions are simultaneously manipulated and impoverished: mobilised for polarisation, but not cultivated for understanding.

Empathy -- the capacity to imagine and inhabit the perspective of the other, including the radically different other -- is not a luxury or a therapeutic supplement to political life. It is a foundational civic competency, and its systematic cultivation is an urgent political and educational task. A Europe that is constitutively diverse (in

language, history, religion, cultural memory, and social experience) cannot maintain democratic solidarity without ongoing and deliberate investment in the empathic capacities of its citizens. This investment must be understood in its full scope. It includes: the reform of curricula and pedagogical practices to centre relational learning, perspective-taking, and intercultural encounter; the integration of emotional intelligence into professional training for public servants, educators, healthcare workers, and civic leaders; the development of cultural programmes and media environments that humanise complexity rather than reducing it to conflict; and the explicit articulation of empathy as an European value in the Union's external relations and global development commitments.

Deeper global citizenship, grounded in emotional intelligence and empathy, implies a specific European contribution to the global order: not the export of a model, but the embodiment of a practice -- the practice of listening before asserting, of recognising before categorising, of building common ground across irreducible difference. In the language of Fondane's existential poetics^[24], this is the practice of authentic encounter: The refusal to reduce the other to a concept, and the willingness to be genuinely transformed by the encounter with alterity. This third tier connects directly to the neo-humanist European ideal articulated throughout this article: The post-Leonardo human being who is not merely competent, but whole -- technically skilled and humanistically formed, analytically rigorous and emotionally intelligent, rooted in a specific cultural tradition and genuinely open to the world. Such a human being should not be a utopian aspiration: it is a pedagogical and institutional programme, one that Europe has the resources, the tradition, and, if it chooses, the will to pursue.

Yet, the post-Leonardo model should not be misunderstood as a nostalgic return to the

Renaissance dream of the *uomo universale*. Such a total human being -- equally sovereign in art, science, politics, metaphysics, and civic action -- is no longer historically possible in a world marked by specialisation, systemic complexity, technological acceleration, and planetary interdependence. But the impossibility of recovering the Renaissance ideal in its original form does not absolve Europe from the responsibility of responding to the dilemma that ideal once addressed: how to prevent the fragmentation of the human into technical competence without wisdom, consumption without a soul, freedom without self-mastery, and prosperity without civilisational depth.

This is why the post-Leonardo human being must be understood not as a one-dimensional total man, but as a multi-dimensional integrated person: Someone capable of connecting knowledge with conscience, innovation with memory, freedom with discipline, and individual fulfilment with responsibility toward the common world. In this context, the decisive future confrontation may not be simply between democracy and authoritarianism, or between open and closed societies, but between degraded ultra-hedonism and a renewed neo-Stoicism. Ultra-hedonism represents the exhausted anthropology of speculative capitalism and performative abundance: a model of life driven by consumption, *accelerationism*, distraction, and the endless monetisation of desire. *Neo-Stoicism*, by contrast, would not mean withdrawal from the world, but the recovery of measure, self-command, resilience, and ethical seriousness under conditions of uncertainty.

Increasingly less, the Stoic orientation or Stoicism no longer represents a choice or a simple option, but (under conditions of multiple, overlapping, and intersecting crises) it becomes an urgency and an implicit necessity to be assumed. This is because, correlated with the pressures of an increasingly ultra-mercantilist and transactional form of globalization

(see Donald Trump 2.0)[²⁵], these crises -- or this accumulation of VUCA- and BANI-type crises -- cannot be addressed in a realistic and pragmatic way except through this neo-Stoicism, or as Williams advises, by “flipping the script” with BANI+, turning crises into opportunities with words such as Bendability, Attentiveness, Neuroflexibility, and Interconnection[²⁶].

The exhaustion of hyper-speculative capitalism, the fragmentation of global value chains, the re-regionalisation and partial autarchisation of economies, and the visible crisis of inherited global governance structures all suggest that the old model of globalisation can no longer reproduce itself merely through markets, declarations, or institutional inertia. The question is therefore not whether reconstruction is necessary, but on what human and civilisational basis it can occur. Here, the older idea of the *world-economy* -- in the Braudelian meaning of a historically structured economic space -- becomes newly relevant. The task is not to revive predatory expansionism under another name, but to imagine forms of global interdependence capable of respecting civilisational plurality, differentiated development, and locally meaningful measures of flourishing. Such a shift would also require moving beyond purely quantitative and deceptive metrics of success. The critique of GDP-centred development, already present in debates on well-being, sustainability, and the so-called economy of happiness, points toward a more plural understanding of collective achievement. Various communities may require different solutions, provided that these solutions remain compatible with human dignity, social inclusion, ecological limits, and shared principles of justice. Standardised patterns (whether imposed by real socialism, post-war capitalism, technocratic globalism, or speculative financial capitalism) have repeatedly shown their limits when detached from lived histories and concrete human needs.

For this reason, the civilisational renewal

proposed here must also be institutional. It requires social inclusion, not as rhetorical charity, but as a structural principle of belonging; multilateral alignment, not as empty diplomatic language, but as the convergence of diverse societies around shared rules, standards, and responsibilities; and societal resilience, not merely at the level of regions, institutions, or markets, but also as a core attribute of responsible global citizenship. In this respect, European normativity, together with broader frameworks of international coordination such as those developed by the OECD, can offer not a model to be exported, but a grammar of alignment: Principles, rules, and standards through which plurality can become cooperation rather than fragmentation. The post-Leonardo human being therefore stands at the centre of this renewed project: not as a universal genius, but as a disciplined, empathic, critically minded and historically rooted person capable of resisting both the seductions of ultra-hedonism and the brutal simplifications of post-Truth. This figure is the anthropological condition of any credible civilisational reconstruction.

4. Artificial General Intelligence: Promise and Risks in the Post-Truth Age

The rapid expansion of Artificial General Intelligence (AGI) introduces a new layer to the crisis of authenticity described above. It amplifies both the capacities and the vulnerabilities of contemporary epistemic environments, making it neither inherently emancipatory nor inherently destructive, but structurally ambivalent. In an optimistic scenario, AGI significantly extends human cognitive and creative capacities. It can democratise access to knowledge, accelerate research and innovation, and support new forms of cultural production. In education, it can personalise learning pathways and enhance critical engagement when used reflexively. In governance and economic coordination, it can improve modelling, forecasting, and decision-support systems.

Properly embedded within ethical and institutional frameworks, AGI may contribute to the reconstruction of a more inclusive and knowledge-rich public sphere. In a pessimistic scenario, AGI intensifies the very dynamics that define post-Truth. It enables the large-scale production of plausible but unverifiable or false content, further blurring the distinction between truth and fabrication process. It risks undermining authorship, responsibility, and the epistemic authority of *professional expertise*^[27]. At the societal level, it can accelerate informational fragmentation, reinforce cognitive biases through algorithmic feedback loops, and contribute to the erosion of shared reality. Economically, it may deepen inequalities by concentrating power in those who control data, infrastructure, and computational capacity. More profoundly, AGI raises an anthropological question. If meaning, interpretation, and even creativity can be simulated at scale, the distinction between authentic and synthetic experience becomes increasingly fragile. This does not eliminate human authenticity, but it places it under pressure: authenticity must now be actively cultivated rather than passively assumed.

From the perspective of the three-tier framework outlined above, the response to AGI must be structural^[28]. First, it requires a renewed anchoring in collective memory and cultural literacy, so that synthetic outputs can be interpreted within historically grounded frameworks of meaning. Second, it demands a radical strengthening of critical thinking and dilemmatic reasonableness, enabling individuals and institutions to navigate uncertain, ambiguous, and potentially deceptive informational environments. Third, it necessitates the cultivation of emotional intelligence and empathy, in order to preserve the irreducibly human dimension of encounter, responsibility, and moral judgment.

AGI thus becomes a test case for the post-Leonardo human being. It exposes the limits of purely technical competence and

underscores the need for integrated human formation. A society that relies on AGI without strengthening its human foundations risks accelerating its own epistemic and moral disintegration. A society that

integrates AGI within a broader *post-personalist/federalist framework*, by contrast, may transform it into an instrument of civilisational renewal rather than entropy^[29].



Figure 1 (The Authors)

5. Closing Remarks: From the 'Broad Gaze' to the Civilisational Project

The three tiers outlined above are not independent modules: They constitute an integrated framework of civilisational renewal, in which each tier sustains and requires the others. Without living memory, critical thinking lacks the historical depth that distinguishes wisdom from mere cleverness. Without critical thinking, emotional intelligence risks becoming sentimentality: empathy without discernment, compassion without accountability. Avoiding emotional intelligence, would mean that critical thinking risks becoming cold rationalism; i.e., correct in its procedures but severed from the human stakes that give those procedures their substance. Together, these three tiers constitute what might be called an authenticity architecture -- a structural response to the entropy of post-Truth, grounded in the deepest resources of the

European intellectual and spiritual tradition. Against the manipulation of memory -- remembrance and re-cognition. Against epistemic entropy -- dilemmatic reasonableness. Against the impoverishment of the relational world -- empathy and emotional intelligence as civic practice.^[30] Europe's etymological vocation - the 'broad gaze', an openness to the full complexity of the human condition - is not merely a poetic metaphor. It is a civilisational programme. A Europe capable of reclaiming and enacting that vocation, in full awareness of its historical failures and its unrealised possibilities, can position itself as a genuine pole of civilisational authenticity in a global order increasingly dominated by post-Truth, by strategic manipulation, and by the reduction of human value to instrumental metrics. This is not a comfortable or modest ambition. But it is, in the deepest sense, a truly European one. As Pope Benedict XVI posited in 2006, "with a quick glance at the

‘old’ . . . Continent[,] it is easy to see the cultural challenges that Europe faces today, since it is committed to rediscovering its own identity, which is not exclusively economic or political. The basic question today, as in the past, remains the anthropological question: What is man? Where does he come from? Where must he go? How must he go?” He concluded, that “it must be forcefully stated that the human being cannot and must not ever be sacrificed to the success of science and technology: This is why the so-called anthropological question assumes its full importance”^[31]. Pope Leo XIV, on the eve of releasing a major encyclical on the topic of AI and human dignity, stated: “As evidenced by the unbridled promotion and implementation of technology at the expense of human dignity, we are truly experiencing an eclipse of the

sense of what it means to be human. It is imperative to recover an understanding of the true meaning and grandeur of humanity as intended by God. It is in this sense that the challenge we currently face is not technological, but anthropological, and it is my hope that the Encyclical Letter to be published within a few days will contribute to answering this challenge”^[32].

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Mr. Florentin Streche for his editorial assistance.

Note: In the spirit of full transparency, the authors used Claude Ai to: 1. Explore initial bibliographic sources; and, 2. Create the bespoke graphic. The concepts, analysis, article drafting, and checking of reference accuracy are original to the authors.

References

-
- [1] Avram, S., & Gilder, E. Enacting an initiative *Castalia* to fulfill new teaching and learning demands amidst artificial intelligence (AI) and the emergence of artificial general intelligence (AGI). *International Conference KNOWLEDGE-BASED ORGANIZATION*, 31(2). 2025. Available at: <https://reference-global.com/article/10.2478/kbo-2025-0057>.
 - [2] Vattimo, G. *The end of modernity: Nihilism and hermeneutics in postmodern culture*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. 1988.
 - [3] Nietzsche, F. *The birth of tragedy* (D. Smith, Trans.). Oxford University Press. 2000). (Original work published 1872).
 - [4] Kakutani, M. *The death of truth: Notes on falsehood in the age of Trump*. New York: Tim Duggan Books. 2018. [On post-truth mechanisms: pp. 1–46, Chapters 1–3; pp. 141–180, Chapter 9.]
 - [5] Dumitriu, A. *Eseuri [Essays]*. Bucharest: Eminescu. 1986. [On axiomatic consensus: pp. 112–145; Chapter: 'Sensul valorilor' (The Meaning of Values).]
 - [6] Neuhaus, R. J. The approaching century of religion. *First Things* (1 Oct.). 1997. <https://firstthings.com/the-approaching-century-of-religion/>.
 - [7] McIntyre, L. *Post-Truth*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 2018. [On the epistemology of post-truth: pp. 1–62, Chapters 1–2; pp. 143–179, Chapter 6 on science denial.]
 - [8] Geertz, C. *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*. New York: Basic Books. 1973.
 - [9] cf. Didier, B. The European Union's navigation of the United States–China rivalry: muddling through, or strategizing? (11 May). 2026. *International Affairs* 102 (3): 767–85. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iaag030>.
 - [10] Lovejoy, A. O. *The great chain of being: A study of the history of an idea*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. 1964. (Original work published in 1936.) [Foundational statement of the history of ideas as method: pp. 1–23, 'Introduction: The study of the

-
- history of ideas'; pp. 24–66, Chapter I: 'The meanings of "Nature" and the analysis of unit-ideas'.]
- [¹¹] de Rougemont, D. *The idea of Europe*. London: Macmillan. 1966.; Mounier, E. *Personalism*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press. 1952; Morin, E. *Method: Towards a study of humankind*, vol. 1. New York: Peter Lang. 1992.
- [¹²] Meadows, D.H., Meadows, D.L., Randers, J. & Behrens, W.W. *The limits to growth: A report for the Club of Rome's project on the predicament of mankind*. New York: Universe Books. 1972. <https://www.donellameadows.org/wp-content/userfiles/Limits-to-Growth-digital-scan-version.pdf> [On sustainable development and systemic limits: pp. 1–41, Chapter 1; pp. 185–207, Chapter 5.]. Cf.: Meadows, D., Randers, J. & Meadows, D. A synopsis: Limits to growth: The 30-year update. Donella Meadows Archive. <https://donellameadows.org/archives/a-synopsis-limits-to-growth-the-30-year-update/>.
- [¹³] Kundera, M. The tragedy of Central Europe. *New York Review of Books*, 26 April. 1984. [On Western modernity's limits and Central European identity: full essay, pp. 33–38.]; Patočka, J. *Heretical Essays in the Philosophy of History* [Kacířské eseje o filosofii dějin, 1975]. 1996. Translated by Erazim Kohák. Chicago: Open Court.
- [¹⁴] Fondane, B. *Le Lundi existentiel et le dimanche de l'histoire*. Paris: Éditions du Rocher. [posthumous]. 1990. [On existential freedom and anti-systematic thinking: pp. 87–130.]
- [¹⁵] McIntyre, L., *loc. cit.*
- [¹⁶] Minciu, M., Berar, F.A. & Dobrea, R.C. The challenges of the VUCA world in the development of sustainable investment projects. 2021. *Management & Economics Review* 6, no. 2: 193–204. <http://www.mer.ase.ro/files/2021-2/6-2-4.pdf>.
- [¹⁷] Todorov, T. *Memory as a remedy for evil*. Translated by Gila Walker. London: Seagull Books. 2010. [On remembrance and moral reconstruction: full text, pp. 1–103].
- [¹⁸] Nora, P. (ed.). (1984–1992). *Les Lieux de mémoire*. 3 vols. Paris: Gallimard. [Foundational work on memory institutions. English abridgement: *Realms of memory*. (1996–1998). New York: Columbia University Press, Vol. I, pp. 1–20, 'Introduction: Between memory and history'].
- [¹⁹] OECD. *Trends shaping education 2022*. Paris: OECD Publishing, DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1787/6ae8771a-en>. 2022. [On future competencies and dilemmatic reasoning in education, pp. 45–78, Chapter 3].
- [²⁰] European Commission. *The European education area: Building a stronger Europe through education and culture*. Brussels: Publications Office of the EU. 2020. <https://education.ec.europa.eu/>.
- [²¹] Floridi, L. *The logic of information: A theory of philosophy as conceptual design*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2019. [On information ethics and epistemic environments: pp. 1–48, Chapter 1; pp. 215–256, Chapter 8].
- [²²] Goleman, D. *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. New York: Bantam Books. 1995. [Core framework: pp. 3–29, Part I; pp. 43–67, Chapter 3 on self-regulation; pp. 285–312, Appendix C on EQ and education].
- [²³] Eliade, M. *Oceanografie*. Bucharest: Cultura Națională. [Republished: Bucharest: Humanitas, 1991]. 1934.
- [²⁴] Fondane, B. *Baudelaire et l'expérience du gouffre*. Paris: Seghers; 1947.
- [²⁵] Kakutani, M., *loc. cit.*

-
- [²⁶] Williams, A. F. *A new year offers a new framework for leadership*. *Forbes* (6 March). 2026. <https://www.forbes.com/councils/forbesbusinesscouncil/2026/03/06/a-new-year-offers-a-new-framework-for-leadership/>.
- [²⁷] Nichols, T. *The death of expertise: The campaign against established knowledge and why it matters*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2017. [On epistemic populism: pp. 1–53, Chapter 1; pp. 198–240, Conclusion].
- [²⁸] UNESCO. Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence. Paris: UNESCO. 2021. [On human dignity, epistemic diversity, and responsible AI: pp. 1–32; Section IV: 'Values and Principles', pp. 15–24].
- [²⁹] European Parliament and Council. Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of 13 June 2024 [EU AI Act]. Official Journal of the European Union, L 2024/1689, 12 July.
- [³⁰] Nussbaum, M. C. *Upheavals of thought: The intelligence of emotions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2001. [On emotional intelligence and ethical life: pp. 1–88, Part I; pp. 297–454, Part III: 'Compassion'].
- [³¹] Pope Benedict XVI. Human beings must not be sacrificed to the success of science. Address to “The Cultural Heritage and Academic Values of the European University and the Attractiveness of the European Higher Education Area” seminar. Vatican City, 1 April. 2006. In *Higher Education in Europe* 31(4) (December): 351-53.
- [³²] Pope Leo XIV. X blog post, @Pontifex. 9:30 PM, 22 May. <https://x.com/Pontifex/status/2057786049640706138>. Cf: Giangravè, C. Silicon Valley turns to Rome as Pope Leo XIV prepares AI encyclical. 2026. 2026. (22 May). *Religion News Service*. <https://religionnews.com/2026/05/22/silicon-valley-turns-to-rome-as-pope-leo-xiv-prepares-ai-encyclical>.