

Ethics, Society, Education and Culture in the Age of AI: A Critical Interdisciplinary Review

Adil Bellahrach * and Abdeladim Hinda 

Abdelmalek Essaâdi University, Tetouan, Morocco

adil.bellahrach@etu.uae.ac.ma

Received: September 24, 2026; **Accepted:** October 25, 2026; **Published:** October 31, 2026

Abstract

Artificial intelligence has moved beyond its role as a technological innovation and increasingly influences how contemporary societies organize knowledge, labour, governance, culture, and public life. Instead of approaching AI as a self-contained computational achievement, this article examines it as a multidimensional civilizational phenomenon whose consequences are inseparable from the ethical, political, and cultural structures within which intelligent systems are conceived, deployed, and governed. The analysis demonstrates that the rise of algorithmic systems simultaneously redistributes authority, reshapes economic relations, transforms educational practice and reconfigures the production of cultural memory. Equally significant is the finding that the social risks commonly associated with AI, including algorithmic bias, labour displacement, computational misinformation and the erosion of democratic deliberation, do not arise from technological autonomy itself but from historically situated institutional choices, unequal data regimes and contested structures of political and economic power. Ultimately, the future of artificial intelligence will be determined less by advances in computational capability than by humanity's continuing capacity to ensure that technological innovation remains subordinate to the enduring values that sustain collective life.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, algorithmic governance, AI ethics, education, misinformation, cultural memory

1. Introduction

Artificial intelligence has become one of the defining forces of the twenty-first century, not simply because of its computational power but because it increasingly mediates the production

of knowledge, the exercise of authority, the organization of labour and the boundaries of human agency. As algorithmic systems permeate education, governance, healthcare, media, and cultural life, they transform ethical concerns into structural questions about surveillance, autonomy, democratic accountability and the political economy of digital modernity (Zuboff, S. 2019) (Zuboff, 2019; Crawford, 2021). Yet much of the existing scholarship continues to examine algorithmic bias, automation, misinformation, educational change and digital governance as separate domains of inquiry rather than as interconnected manifestations of a broader socio-technical order (Noble, 2018; Benjamin, 2019). This article argues that artificial intelligence should instead be understood as a historically situated cultural formation in which datafication, algorithmic governance, and global capitalism converge to reshape power, subjectivity and the conditions through which contemporary societies produce knowledge and exercise authority (Floridi, 2013; Foucault, 1995; Zuboff, 2019). Thus, this article tends to raise questions concerning how do algorithmic systems redistribute authority and economic power in labour, governance and information? How do they change education and the production of cultural memory? and which institutional responses are proposed to keep human oversight and accountability?

Most importantly, surveillance, algorithmic discrimination, automation, and epistemic instability are not isolated outcomes of technological innovation, but interdependent dimensions of an emerging algorithmic order whose legitimacy ultimately depends upon preserving human dignity, critical judgment, democratic participation and ethical responsibility within increasingly automated systems of decision-making (Floridi et al., 2018; Nussbaum, 2010).

Artificial intelligence has emerged as one of the defining ethical questions of the twenty-first century, not because machines have attained human intelligence, but because technological innovation has advanced more rapidly than the legal, political, and moral frameworks designed to govern it (Floridi, 2013). As AI increasingly mediates decisions in education, healthcare, public administration, and everyday social life, it compels a reconsideration of fundamental democratic values, including privacy, autonomy, accountability, and human dignity (Russell & Norvig, 2021; Floridi, 2013). Contemporary AI systems derive their power from unprecedented quantities of personal data, transforming ordinary human experience into a resource for prediction and commercial value, frequently without informed consent (Cohen, 2019; Zuboff, 2019). This new data economy has normalized forms of algorithmic surveillance that extend beyond traditional observation, embedding continuous monitoring within the ordinary

infrastructures of digital life and reshaping the relationship between citizens, institutions, and power (Zuboff, 2019; Foucault, 1995).

The ethical implications of this transformation become most visible when algorithmic systems influence education, public security, governance and the production of knowledge. Learning analytics, predictive policing, generative AI, and automated decision-making promise greater efficiency, yet they also risk reproducing historical inequalities, obscuring accountability and reducing human judgment to statistical calculation (Selwyn, 2019; Ferguson, 2017; Benjamin, 2019). The opacity of many AI systems further complicates efforts to assign responsibility when algorithmic decisions produce discrimination, misinformation, or social harm (Pasquale, 2015; Floridi et al., 2018). Although international initiatives, most notably UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence, together with emerging regulatory frameworks, have established important normative principles for responsible innovation, governance continues to lag behind technological acceleration (UNESCO, 2021; Mittelstadt, 2019). The central challenge, therefore, is not whether artificial intelligence can become more capable, but whether democratic societies can ensure that its expanding capacities remain subject to transparency, justice, and meaningful human oversight (Crawford, 2021; Floridi et al., 2018). Ultimately, the legitimacy of artificial intelligence will depend less upon computational sophistication than upon humanity's willingness to preserve ethical responsibility at the center of an increasingly automated world (Arendt, 1958; UNESCO, 2021).

2. Literature Review

2.1. Algorithmic Bias, Data and Institutional Power

Artificial intelligence is frequently presented as an objective technology capable of replacing the inconsistencies of human judgment with computational neutrality. Yet this perception obscures a more complex reality: algorithms are neither autonomous nor impartial but are shaped by the historical, cultural, and institutional conditions from which their data emerge (Crawford, 2021; Pasquale, 2015). Instead of eliminating prejudice, machine-learning systems often inherit and amplify existing inequalities, transforming social bias into computational authority while concealing discrimination beneath the appearance of scientific objectivity (Eubanks, 2018; Benjamin, 2019). The consequences are particularly evident in facial recognition, search engines, recruitment algorithms, and healthcare analytics, where biased datasets have repeatedly produced unequal outcomes for women, racial minorities, and socially marginalized communities (Buolamwini & Gebru, 2018; Noble, 2018; Obermeyer et al., 2019). Far from representing isolated technical failures, these cases reveal how artificial intelligence

reproduces structural asymmetries embedded within the political economy of digital societies, reinforcing historical exclusions while simultaneously legitimizing them through algorithmic rationality (O'Neil, 2016; Benjamin, 2019).

Recognizing algorithmic bias therefore requires moving beyond technical solutions toward a broader ethical and political critique of data governance. Fairness-aware algorithms, explainable AI, and diversified datasets remain important interventions, yet they cannot resolve inequalities rooted in the social structures that produce and classify data (Doshi-Velez & Kim, 2017; Barocas & Selbst, 2016). Addressing algorithmic discrimination instead demands an interdisciplinary framework that combines technological design with critical perspectives on power, race, language, education, and democratic accountability (Bender et al., 2021; Thiong'o, 1986; Williamson, 2017). International initiatives such as UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence and the European Union's AI Act represent important steps toward establishing normative safeguards, but their effectiveness ultimately depends upon sustained public oversight and institutional transparency (UNESCO, 2021; European Parliament, 2024). The challenge, therefore, extends beyond building more accurate algorithms; it lies in ensuring that artificial intelligence serves human dignity rather than reproducing the historical injustices encoded within the societies from which it learns (Floridi et al., 2018; Nussbaum, 2010).

2.2. Algorithmic Governance and Accountability

Artificial intelligence has come to embody one of the defining paradoxes of technological modernity: the same systems that promise unprecedented advances in medicine, scientific research, education, and global communication also generate profound anxieties about autonomy, surveillance, employment, and the future of human agency (Harari, 2017; Russell & Norvig, 2021). Rather than representing opposing narratives, technological optimism and social apprehension are mutually constitutive responses to an innovation that increasingly mediates the production of knowledge and the organization of everyday life. AI-assisted diagnostics, biomedical research, adaptive learning technologies, and multilingual communication illustrate the transformative capacity of intelligent systems to expand human capabilities rather than merely automate existing practices (Kermany et al., 2018; Topol, 2019; World Health Organization, 2021; Selwyn, 2019). Yet these achievements derive their significance not from computational efficiency alone but from their potential to augment human expertise, widen access to knowledge, and strengthen rather than replace human judgment (Topol, 2019; Schwab, 2016).

The very processes that make artificial intelligence productive, however, also intensify new forms of dependency and institutional vulnerability. As universities, workplaces, and digital platforms become increasingly organized through algorithmic infrastructures, concerns emerge over intellectual autonomy, academic integrity, labor displacement, and the growing opacity of automated decision-making (Williamson, 2017; UNESCO, 2023; Ford, 2015). Recommendation systems, generative AI, and predictive algorithms not only optimize information flows but also shape cultural consumption, public knowledge and individual decision-making, often narrowing opportunities for critical reflection while reinforcing existing patterns of belief and social inequality (Pariser, 2011; Pasquale, 2015). The resulting anxiety reflects less a fear of intelligent machines than a concern that technical rationality may gradually displace the deliberative capacities upon which democratic societies ultimately depend (Postman, 1993; Nussbaum, 2010). The enduring significance of artificial intelligence therefore lies not in whether machines will surpass human intelligence but in how societies choose to govern their expanding influence. Although intelligent systems increasingly simulate reasoning, creativity, and linguistic competence, they remain incapable of moral responsibility, political judgment, or the lived experience through which meaning is created and collective life is sustained (Boden, 2004; Arendt, 1958). The challenge is consequently neither to celebrate technological progress uncritically nor to reject it as inherently disruptive, but to embed innovation within normative frameworks that preserve transparency, justice, democratic accountability, and human dignity (Acemoglu & Johnson, 2023; UNESCO, 2021). Progress and anxiety are thus inseparable dimensions of the same historical transformation, reminding us that the future of artificial intelligence will ultimately be determined less by the sophistication of algorithms than by humanity's capacity to ensure that technological power remains accountable to ethical reason (Arendt, 1958; Floridi et al., 2018).

The contemporary social order is increasingly shaped by algorithmic infrastructures that mediate access to information, regulate economic activity, and structure everyday interactions (van Dijck et al., 2018). No longer confined to technical functions, algorithms have assumed a formative role in the production of social reality, transforming how individuals communicate, work, learn, and participate in public life (Couldry & Mejias, 2019). Beneath the apparent neutrality of computational efficiency emerges a new configuration of power in which governance operates through continuous processes of data extraction, classification, and prediction (Foucault, 1995). What Antoinette Rouvroy and Thomas Berns describe as algorithmic governmentality signals a decisive shift from rule through norms and institutions toward rule through probabilities, where behavioral anticipation increasingly supplants political deliberation and collective judgment (Rouvroy & Berns, 2013). Most visible is this transformation within digital platforms and

economic institutions (van Dijck et al., 2018). Recommendation systems curate cultural consumption, shape political visibility, and filter public discourse according to commercial and behavioral imperatives rather than democratic priorities (Gillespie, 2018).

As Eli Pariser and Cass Sunstein have argued, algorithmic personalization narrows encounters with difference, reinforcing informational fragmentation and ideological polarization (Pariser, 2011; Sunstein, 2017). Similar dynamics permeate contemporary workplaces, where predictive analytics and automated management convert human activity into streams of measurable data (Ajunwa, 2023). In the logic of surveillance capitalism identified by Shoshana Zuboff, behavior itself becomes a resource to be harvested, analyzed, and monetized, reducing complex forms of social experience to quantifiable variables optimized for economic value (Zuboff, 2019). Yet for all their computational sophistication, algorithms remain incapable of moral reasoning. They recognize patterns but cannot deliberate about justice, responsibility, or the public good (Pasquale, 2015).

Here the insights of Hannah Arendt and Jürgen Habermas retain particular relevance: democratic life depends not upon prediction but upon plurality, dialogue, and the capacity to negotiate shared meanings through public deliberation (Arendt, 1958; Habermas, 1984). Growing international efforts, including UNESCO's ethical framework for artificial intelligence and the European Parliament's AI Act, reflect an emerging recognition that technological innovation requires meaningful human oversight (UNESCO, 2021; European Parliament, 2024).

The central challenge of algorithmic society, therefore, lies not in the expansion of intelligent systems themselves but in preserving the intellectual autonomy, democratic accountability, and ethical judgment necessary to ensure that technology remains subject to human governance rather than its substitute (Floridi & Cows, 2019; UNESCO, 2021).

2.3. Education and Generative AI

Educational AI includes adaptive learning systems, automated assessment, learning analytics, tutoring applications, and generative chatbots. These tools may help learners obtain explanations, practise language, receive feedback, and explore alternative ways of approaching a task. At the same time, they can increase surveillance, reproduce bias, weaken privacy, and make it difficult to distinguish independent understanding from fluent assistance. Selwyn (2019, 2021) argues that educational technologies should be examined in relation to the institutions, values, and commercial arrangements that shape their use.

Recent reviews provide a more differentiated picture than either unqualified enthusiasm or blanket rejection. Albadarin et al. (2024) reviewed empirical studies of AI in education and

identified varied uses and outcomes, while Baig and Yadegaridehkordi (2024) mapped research on AI in higher education. Lo et al. (2024) found that the literature reports both engagement and disengagement in AI-supported learning and called for stronger evidence, including longer-term studies and objective measures. A systematic review and meta-analysis by Deng et al. (2025) reported positive average effects on some learning outcomes across experimental studies, but also noted methodological limitations that warrant caution. These findings should not be treated as proof that AI improves learning in every subject, age group, or task.

Educational philosophy helps clarify what is at stake. Dewey (1916) connects education with democratic participation and inquiry; Freire (1970) argues against models of learning that reduce students to passive recipients; and Nussbaum (2010) defends the humanities as essential to democratic judgement. These perspectives suggest that educational AI should be evaluated not only by speed or student satisfaction but also by whether it supports understanding, questioning, collaboration, and intellectual independence.

3. Materials and Methods

3.1. Research Approach

Building upon this premise, the study adopts an interdisciplinary approach that brings information ethics, surveillance studies, media theory, and critical social thought into sustained dialogue in order to examine how intelligent systems transform higher education, creative labour, public knowledge, and democratic life (Arendt, 1958; Braidotti, 2013; Floridi, 2013). Methodologically, it combines critical discourse analysis, comparative evaluation of international AI governance frameworks, and theoretically informed case studies to shift attention from computational performance toward the institutional practices and ethical assumptions through which artificial intelligence is normalized across contemporary societies (Fairclough, 2010; UNESCO, 2021). The central contention is that surveillance, algorithmic discrimination, automation, and epistemic instability are not isolated consequences of technological innovation but interdependent dimensions of an emerging algorithmic order whose legitimacy ultimately depends upon preserving human dignity, critical judgment, democratic participation, and ethical responsibility within increasingly automated systems of decision-making (Floridi et al., 2018; Nussbaum, 2010).

3.2. Research Instrument

This study employs a qualitative, interdisciplinary research design combining critical discourse analysis, comparative governance analysis, and theoretically informed case analysis

which are treated as complementary rather than independent analytical procedures. The purpose of this design is to identify recurring patterns through which artificial intelligence redistributes authority, reorganizes social relations, and modifies the boundaries between human and machine agency. Instead of evaluating AI solely in terms of technological performance, the analysis examines how AI is represented, institutionalized, and socially experienced across the domains of labour, governance, information, culture, education, and collective memory.

The analysis was conducted through a purposive selection of scholarly literature, international policy and governance documents, and theoretically relevant cases addressing the social and ethical implications of artificial intelligence. Sources were selected according to their relevance to the study's central themes, namely labour and automation, algorithmic governance, information and misinformation, education, cultural production and memory, and human agency. The analysis proceeded thematically by identifying recurring patterns concerning the redistribution of authority, institutional power, accountability, transparency, and the relationship between human judgement and algorithmic decision-making. Critical discourse analysis was used to examine how AI is represented and legitimized within selected scholarly and policy discourses, while comparative analysis was used to identify convergences and differences in approaches to AI governance. The findings from these analytical strands were then synthesized through an interdisciplinary interpretive approach in order to identify broader patterns in the social and cultural transformation associated with AI.

4. Results

4.1. Comparing Two Governance Approaches

UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence is a global normative framework that encourages member states to develop human-rights-based policies across the AI lifecycle. The EU AI Act is a binding regional regulation that establishes harmonised rules, including obligations linked to risk categories and particular uses. They should not be treated as equivalent in legal status or enforcement. UNESCO provides broad ethical direction; the EU Act translates selected governance goals into legal obligations within its jurisdiction (European Parliament & Council of the European Union, 2024; UNESCO, 2021).

The comparison also reveals a general implementation problem. Principles such as fairness, transparency, accountability, and human oversight need operational mechanisms: assigned responsibility, documentation, evaluation, remedies, and independent scrutiny. A framework is

most effective when it can be connected to procurement, professional practice, public participation, and accessible ways to challenge decisions.

4.2. UNESCO's Recommendation and the European Union's AI Act

The comparison in Table 1 highlights two influential approaches to AI governance that differ in scope, legal force, and implementation mechanisms. While UNESCO's Recommendation provides a global ethical framework grounded in human rights and social values, the EU AI Act establishes binding regulatory requirements within the European Union. Examining these approaches helps clarify how ethical principles can be translated into practical governance measures.

Table 1. Comparison of UNESCO's Recommendation and the European Union's AI Act

Dimension	UNESCO Recommendation (2021)	EU AI Act (2024)
Legal status	International normative recommendation; implementation depends on member-state action.	Binding EU regulation with staged application and legal obligations.
Scope	Broad ethical and policy guidance across AI systems and the AI lifecycle.	Harmonised rules for AI placed on the EU market or used within the Act's scope.
Core approach	Human rights, dignity, fairness, inclusion, sustainability, and human oversight.	Risk-based regulation, including requirements and restrictions for specified categories and uses.
Implementation	Encourages national strategies, impact assessment, capacity building, and stakeholder participation.	Uses statutory duties, conformity and transparency requirements where applicable, and enforcement mechanisms.
Key limitation	Principles require translation into domestic law, institutions, and practice.	Legal compliance alone cannot resolve every social, educational, or cultural question.

Note. This is a high-level analytical comparison, not a complete legal analysis. Applicable obligations depend on the relevant provisions, implementation timetable, and specific system or use.

4.3. Conceptual Relationship Between AI Infrastructures and Social Outcomes

Table 2 presents a conceptual framework that synthesizes the central argument of this review. It illustrates how structural conditions surrounding AI systems influence the mechanisms through which AI operates, shaping consequences across key social domains. The framework also emphasizes accountability as a critical factor in determining whether benefits are distributed fairly and harms can be identified, challenged, and addressed.

Table 2. Conceptual Framework Linking AI Infrastructures, Mediating Mechanisms, and Social Outcomes

Structural conditions	Mediating mechanisms	Domains of consequence
Datafication; platform and institutional power; commercial and administrative incentives	Data selection; classification and prediction; ranking; automation; generated content	Labour; public governance; information; cultural memory; education
Who supplies data and controls infrastructure?	What is measured, optimised, or made visible?	Who benefits, who is exposed to harm, and who can appeal?

4.4. Labour, Automation and the Distribution of Benefits

Artificial intelligence has fundamentally altered the historical relationship between technological innovation and human labour by extending automation beyond physical production into domains traditionally associated with cognition, creativity, and professional judgement (Schwab, 2016). Unlike earlier industrial revolutions, which primarily mechanized manual tasks, contemporary AI systems increasingly perform activities ranging from legal analysis and medical diagnostics to software engineering and linguistic production, thereby unsettling the long-standing distinction between manual and intellectual labour (Russell & Norvig, 2021). This transformation is historically significant because it shifts automation from the factory floor to the knowledge economy, where expertise itself becomes susceptible to computational replication (Ford, 2015). As a result, the future of work is no longer defined solely by productivity gains but by a broader reconfiguration of professional authority, economic value, and the social legitimacy of human expertise (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014). While earlier waves of industrialization displaced particular occupations before generating new forms of employment, the diffusion of generative AI raises a more fundamental question: whether societies can preserve meaningful human agency when increasingly sophisticated cognitive functions become technologically reproducible (Frey & Osborne, 2017).

Recent scholarship suggests that artificial intelligence is more likely to reorganize work than eliminate it outright, automating discrete tasks while leaving forms of judgement that depend upon ethical reasoning, contextual interpretation, and interpersonal interaction firmly within the human domain (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014; Russell & Norvig, 2021). Such hybrid arrangements, however, conceal widening asymmetries in the distribution of technological benefits. Routine occupations remain disproportionately vulnerable to displacement, whereas highly skilled professionals increasingly employ AI as an instrument of productivity enhancement rather than substitution (Frey & Osborne, 2017; Ford, 2015). At the same time, algorithmic management has transformed labour into a continuous process of data extraction in which workers are evaluated through opaque computational systems that regulate performance, remuneration, and access to future employment (Rosenblat, 2018). Within digital platform economies, productive activity and behavioural surveillance have become inseparable, creating new forms of managerial authority that operate through predictive analytics rather than direct supervision (Zuboff, 2019; Ajunwa, 2023). The consequences of these developments are neither technologically predetermined nor economically inevitable. As Acemoglu and Johnson argue, the social effects of innovation depend fundamentally upon

political institutions, regulatory choices, and struggles over the distribution of economic power rather than on technological progress itself (Acemoglu & Johnson, 2023). The crisis generated by artificial intelligence therefore extends well beyond labour-market statistics to encompass the cultural, ethical, and political significance of work itself. Employment has historically provided not only economic security but also social recognition, personal identity, and opportunities for civic participation (Sennett, 1998; Arendt, 1958). For this reason, proposals advocating shorter working hours or universal basic income should be understood less as technical solutions than as attempts to redefine the relationship between productivity and human flourishing within increasingly automated societies (Parijs & Vanderborght, 2017; Srnicek & Williams, 2015). Yet such visions remain incomplete if they overlook the social meaning attached to work and the psychological consequences of prolonged exclusion from productive life (Sennett, 1998).

International organisations have consequently moved beyond narrow concerns with technological efficiency, emphasising instead the need for lifelong learning, institutional resilience, and human-centred governance capable of ensuring that artificial intelligence strengthens rather than weakens social cohesion (International Labour Organization, 2023; UNESCO, 2023; UNESCO, 2021). The central challenge confronting contemporary societies is therefore not merely to prepare workers for automation, but to establish political and ethical frameworks capable of ensuring that technological innovation remains accountable to democratic values, social justice, and human dignity (Acemoglu & Johnson, 2023; Arendt, 1958). Rather than functioning as neutral channels of communication, algorithmic recommendation systems privilege engagement, emotional intensity, and behavioural predictability over evidentiary reliability, allowing misleading narratives to diffuse more rapidly than verified reporting (Zuboff, 2019; Aral, 2020). The COVID-19 pandemic exposed the societal consequences of this architecture, as conspiracy theories, fabricated medical advice, and anti-vaccination narratives circulated alongside scientific evidence, prompting the World Health Organization to characterize the phenomenon as an "infodemic." (World Health Organization, 2020).

The emergence of generative AI has further intensified this crisis by enabling the large-scale creation of persuasive texts, synthetic images, and deepfake videos that erode the evidentiary authority traditionally associated with documentary media (Bender et al., 2021; Chesney & Citron, 2019). As synthetic content becomes increasingly indistinguishable from authentic records, the problem extends beyond isolated instances of deception to a broader erosion of

public confidence in the possibility of verifying reality itself (Farid, 2019; Farid, 2021). Echoing Hannah Arendt's reflections on factual truth, the contemporary crisis is therefore less a failure of information than a weakening of the shared epistemic foundations upon which democratic deliberation ultimately depends (Arendt, 1961).

These developments reveal that misinformation is not simply a technological malfunction but the product of political economies in which attention has become a commercial resource and truth a secondary consideration. Within what Shoshana Zuboff describes as surveillance capitalism, digital platforms derive economic value from behavioural prediction rather than informational accuracy, creating structural incentives for sensationalism and algorithmically amplified outrage (Zuboff, 2019). Computational propaganda exploits these same infrastructures through automated accounts, recommendation systems, and data-driven persuasion strategies that manufacture consensus, manipulate public opinion, and distort democratic participation (Woolley & Howard, 2018). Addressing this challenge therefore requires more than technical interventions such as deepfake detection, watermarking, or algorithmic transparency, important though these measures remain (Farid, 2021; European Union, 2024). The preservation of trustworthy information ecosystems ultimately depends upon strengthening media literacy, cultivating critical reasoning, and establishing regulatory frameworks that reconcile technological innovation with democratic accountability (Selwyn, 2021; Postman, 1985). Recent initiatives advanced by UNESCO and the European Union increasingly reflect this human-centred approach, recognising that safeguarding truth in the age of artificial intelligence requires institutional commitments to transparency, public trust, and epistemic responsibility rather than confidence in technological solutions alone (UNESCO, 2021; European Union, 2024).

5. Discussion

The social consequences of AI cannot be adequately understood by examining individual applications in isolation. Across labour, governance, information, culture, and education, a common pattern emerges: AI increasingly mediates the processes through which decisions are made, knowledge is produced, information is circulated, and cultural meaning is reproduced. The critical issue is therefore not simply the presence of AI in these domains, but the redistribution of agency and authority that accompanies its institutionalization. This shift raises questions about whose values become embedded in computational systems, whose interests are prioritized, and how responsibility can be maintained when decision-making becomes increasingly mediated by opaque technical infrastructures.

The emergence of artificial intelligence has fundamentally transformed the cultural institutions through which societies preserve memory, transmit knowledge, and negotiate historical identity. Digital infrastructures have dramatically expanded access to archives, museums, manuscripts, and endangered cultural collections, enabling forms of preservation that were previously unattainable through conventional repositories (Assmann, 2020; UNESCO, 2015). Yet this unprecedented accessibility has also altered the very conditions under which memory is produced and experienced. As Maurice Halbwachs demonstrated, collective memory is never an individual possession but a socially organized process shaped by institutions and symbolic practices that determine what deserves remembrance and what is consigned to oblivion (Halbwachs, 1992). Contemporary AI increasingly participates in these processes by classifying archives, restoring historical materials, curating digital collections, and algorithmically organizing access to cultural heritage (Terras, 2010). In doing so, memory gradually shifts from a lived social practice to a computationally mediated resource whose visibility depends upon technological infrastructures rather than communal transmission. Pierre Nora's distinction between "milieux de mémoire" and "lieux de mémoire" acquires renewed significance in this context, as digital archives increasingly function as artificial sites of remembrance that compensate for the erosion of organic historical continuity while simultaneously rendering cultural memory dependent upon commercial platforms, technological durability, and algorithmic selection (Nora, 1989; Mayer-Schönberger, 2009). The paradox of the digital age therefore lies not in the preservation of memory itself, but in the growing delegation of remembrance to systems whose governing principles privilege efficiency, accessibility, and data management over historical interpretation and cultural meaning (van Dijck et al., 2007).

The same tensions increasingly shape contemporary cultural production and the transmission of historical identity. Generative artificial intelligence now produces literary texts, visual art, music, and audiovisual narratives with remarkable technical sophistication, challenging inherited conceptions of authorship, originality, and creative intention (Boden, 2004; Bender et al., 2021). Extending Walter Benjamin's reflections on mechanical reproduction, AI no longer merely replicates cultural artefacts but generates new works through statistical recombinations of existing traditions, thereby blurring the distinction between creative innovation and algorithmic synthesis (Benjamin, 1968). These developments acquire particular urgency in relation to linguistic diversity, since the predominance of English-language datasets risks reproducing global hierarchies that marginalize minority languages and the cultural memories they embody (Bender et al., 2021). As Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o has

argued, language constitutes a repository of historical consciousness rather than a neutral instrument of communication; its exclusion from digital infrastructures therefore entails the gradual erosion of distinctive epistemologies and collective identities (Thiong'o, 1986). Meanwhile, the concentration of archives, photographs, educational resources, and cultural collections within proprietary digital platforms raises broader questions concerning ownership, accessibility, and the commodification of remembrance itself (Couldry & Mejias, 2019). Jan Assmann's conception of cultural memory consequently reminds us that preserving the past requires more than digitizing historical records: it demands institutions capable of sustaining interpretive traditions through which successive generations critically engage with inherited narratives (Assmann, 2011). For this reason, contemporary debates over artificial intelligence and cultural heritage are ultimately less concerned with technological innovation than with the ethical responsibility to ensure that digital memory remains accountable to historical plurality, cultural justice, and the enduring human capacity to remember collectively (UNESCO, 2021; Selwyn, 2021).

The rapid integration of artificial intelligence into educational systems has transformed learning from a predominantly human-centred process into an increasingly algorithmically mediated enterprise. Intelligent tutoring systems, adaptive learning platforms, automated assessment, and generative language models promise unprecedented opportunities to personalise instruction, broaden educational access, and reduce longstanding barriers faced by learners with diverse linguistic, cognitive, and physical needs (UNESCO, 2023; Holmes et al., 2019; Selwyn, 2019). Yet these technological advances also redefine the intellectual purpose of education itself. Since the Enlightenment, education has been understood not merely as the transmission of knowledge but as the cultivation of independent judgement, critical inquiry, and civic responsibility (Kant, 1996). The growing reliance on AI-generated explanations and ready-made interpretations therefore raises a fundamental pedagogical dilemma: while intelligent systems can accelerate access to information, they may simultaneously weaken the reflective processes through which understanding is constructed (UNESCO, 2023; Nussbaum, 2010). As Nicholas Carr observes, digital technologies reshape not only how information is retrieved but also the cognitive habits through which individuals attend, reason, and interpret the world (Carr, 2010). The educational challenge consequently extends beyond technological adoption to the preservation of intellectual autonomy, ensuring that artificial intelligence functions as an instrument for inquiry rather than a substitute for the sustained effort, uncertainty, and interpretive discipline upon which critical thought ultimately depends (Nussbaum, 2010).

Taken together, these findings indicate that the central ethical challenge of AI is increasingly a question of human agency under conditions of technological mediation. As AI systems become embedded in institutions, workplaces, educational environments, cultural production, and information infrastructures, human agency is not necessarily eliminated but progressively reorganized. Individuals may retain formal decision-making authority while becoming increasingly dependent on computational recommendations, classifications, and predictions. The preservation of meaningful human agency therefore requires more than human oversight in a formal sense; it requires transparency, contestability, institutional accountability, and the capacity of affected individuals to understand and challenge consequential AI-mediated decisions.

These tensions become even more pronounced as generative AI reshapes academic authorship, educational governance, and the broader democratic mission of universities. The capacity of large language models to produce sophisticated essays, synthesize scholarship, and generate persuasive arguments complicates conventional understandings of originality, academic integrity, and intellectual responsibility, requiring institutions to reconsider assessment practices rather than merely prohibit emerging technologies (UNESCO, 2023). Paulo Freire's critique of the banking model of education remains especially pertinent in this context, reminding us that meaningful learning emerges through dialogue, problem-posing, and critical participation rather than passive reception of predetermined answers (Freire, 1970). At the same time, the expansion of predictive analytics and algorithmic decision-making within educational institutions introduces new forms of surveillance that may reproduce historical inequalities by embedding biased assumptions within seemingly objective systems of evaluation (Williamson, 2017; Eubanks, 2018). As Neil Selwyn argues, educational technologies are inseparable from the political and economic structures that shape their design and implementation, making critical scrutiny of AI itself an essential educational objective rather than an external policy concern (Selwyn, 2021). Recent guidance from UNESCO similarly emphasizes that artificial intelligence should augment—not replace—human reasoning, creativity, and ethical judgement (UNESCO, 2023). Read through the educational philosophies of John Dewey and Martha C. Nussbaum, the future of education ultimately depends less upon the sophistication of intelligent technologies than upon preserving learning as a democratic practice through which citizens cultivate intellectual independence, moral imagination, and the capacity to question inherited assumptions in an increasingly automated world (Dewey, 1916; Nussbaum, 2010).

6. Limitations and Future Research

This article has several limitations. First, it is a purposive critical review rather than a systematic search, so its source selection may omit relevant work and cannot establish the prevalence of particular findings. Second, the evidence base spans conceptual scholarship, documented cases, policy frameworks, and reviews of empirical education studies; these forms of evidence are not interchangeable. Third, research on generative AI is changing rapidly, and findings from early deployments may not apply to later tools, new policies, or different student populations. Fourth, the review does not itself test a model, conduct interviews, or measure learning outcomes.

Future research should include longitudinal classroom studies that measure learning beyond immediate task completion; comparative research across disciplines, languages, and educational levels; and evaluations of how AI policies affect students with different levels of access and support. Studies of labour should examine job quality, worker voice, and the distribution of productivity gains, not only occupation-level exposure estimates. Governance research should document whether impact assessments, transparency rules, and appeal mechanisms change outcomes in practice. Work on cultural heritage should investigate community consent, language coverage, attribution, and the consequences of AI-mediated discovery for underrepresented collections.

7. Conclusion

Consequently, artificial intelligence should be understood less as a discrete technological innovation than as a new social infrastructure through which knowledge, labour, political authority, and cultural life are increasingly organized (Zuboff, 2019). Throughout this study, AI has been examined as a civilizational phenomenon whose significance cannot be measured solely by computational efficiency or economic productivity, but by its capacity to reshape the conditions under which human beings exercise judgement, participate in democratic life, and construct shared meanings (Wiener, 1950). The preceding analyses have demonstrated that algorithmic systems are neither neutral nor autonomous; rather, they inherit the assumptions embedded within the institutions, datasets, and political economies from which they emerge (O'Neil, 2016). Consequently, the challenges posed by algorithmic bias, automated governance, labour displacement, synthetic misinformation, digital memory, and AI-mediated education should not be regarded as isolated technical problems but as interconnected manifestations of a broader transformation in the distribution of power within contemporary societies (Rouvroy & Berns, 2013; Acemoglu & Johnson, 2023). Across each of these domains, a common pattern

becomes visible: intelligent systems increasingly influence decisions once entrusted to human deliberation, while the criteria governing those decisions often remain opaque to the individuals and communities affected by them (Rouvroy & Berns, 2013). The central question confronting the twenty-first century is therefore not whether artificial intelligence will continue to advance, but whether democratic societies can develop institutional and ethical frameworks capable of ensuring that technological innovation remains accountable to principles of justice, transparency, and human dignity (Acemoglu & Johnson, 2023).

For this reason, simplistic narratives portraying artificial intelligence as either humanity's inevitable salvation or its existential downfall obscure the fundamentally political character of technological change (Wiener, 1950). The future consequences of AI will depend less upon the sophistication of machine learning than upon the values embedded in its design, governance, and public use (Acemoglu & Johnson, 2023). Recent international initiatives have begun to articulate this human-centred vision by advancing principles of transparency, accountability, and ethical oversight, yet regulatory frameworks alone cannot preserve democratic life if they are not accompanied by educational institutions capable of cultivating critical judgement, historical consciousness, and civic responsibility (UNESCO, 2021; European Union, 2024). Ultimately, the defining challenge of the AI age lies in preserving those distinctly human capacities that no algorithm can replicate: moral deliberation, historical imagination, cultural memory, and the ability to reason collectively about justice and the common good (Arendt, 1958).

Therefore, artificial intelligence will undoubtedly become one of the defining technologies of the twenty-first century, but its historical significance will be determined not by the intelligence of machines themselves, but by humanity's continuing willingness to subject technological progress to ethical reflection, democratic scrutiny, and an enduring commitment to human flourishing (Arendt, 1958; Acemoglu & Johnson, 2023).

Disclosure Statement

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article. No financial, personal, or professional relationships have influenced the research, analysis, or conclusions presented in this work.

Notes on Contributors

Adil Bellahrach currently serves as a High School English Teacher and a PhD candidate

adil.bellahrach@etu.uae.ac.ma

Abdeladim Hinda is a Professor of Literature and Related Field, Abdelmalek Essaâdi

a.hinda@uae.ac.ma

ORCID

Adil Bellahrach  <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-5755-3058>

Abdeladim Hinda  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1011-0732>

References

- Acemoglu, D., & Johnson, S. (2023). *Power and progress: Our thousand-year struggle over technology and prosperity*. PublicAffairs.
- Ajunwa, I. (2023). *The quantified worker: Law and technology in the modern workplace*. Cambridge University Press.
- Aral, S. (2020). *The hype machine*. Currency.
- Arendt, H. (1958). *The human condition*. University of Chicago Press.
- Arendt, H. (1961). *Between past and future*. Viking Press.
- Assmann, A. (2020). *Is time out of joint? On the rise and fall of the modern time regime*. Cornell University Press.
- Assmann, J. (2011). *Cultural memory and early civilization: Writing, remembrance, and political imagination*. Cambridge University Press.
- Barocas, S., & Selbst, A. D. (2016). Big data's disparate impact. *California Law Review*, 104(3), 671–732.
- Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM*

- Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (pp. 610–623). ACM.
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922>
- Benjamin, R. (2019). *Race after technology: Abolitionist tools for the New Jim Code*. Polity Press.
- Benjamin, W. (1968). The work of art in the age of mechanical reproduction. In H. Zohn (Trans.), *Illuminations*. Schocken Books.
- Boden, M. A. (2004). *The creative mind: Myths and mechanisms* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Braidotti, R. (2013). *The posthuman*. Polity Press.
- Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). *The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies*. W. W. Norton.
- Buolamwini, J., & Gebru, T. (2018). Gender shades: Intersectional accuracy disparities in commercial gender classification. *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 81, 1–15.
- Carr, N. (2010). *The shallows: What the Internet is doing to our brains*. W. W. Norton.
- Chesney, R., & Citron, D. K. (2019). Deep fakes: A looming challenge for privacy, democracy, and national security. *California Law Review*, 107(6), 1753–1820.
- Cohen, J. E. (2019). *Between truth and power: The legal constructions of informational capitalism*. Oxford University Press.
- Couldry, N., & Mejias, U. A. (2019). *The costs of connection: How data is colonizing human life and appropriating it for capitalism*. Stanford University Press.
- Crawford, K. (2021). *Atlas of AI: Power, politics, and the planetary costs of artificial intelligence*. Yale University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. Macmillan.
- Doshi-Velez, F., & Kim, B. (2017). Towards a rigorous science of interpretable machine learning (arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.08608). <https://arxiv.org/abs/1702.08608>
- Eubanks, V. (2018). *Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor*. St. Martin's Press.
- European Parliament. (2024). *Artificial Intelligence Act*. European Union.
- European Union. (2024). *Regulation on artificial intelligence*. European Union.

- Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Farid, H. (2019). *Fake photos*. MIT Press.
- Farid, H. (2021). Digital forensics in an era of deepfakes and disinformation. *Forensic Science International*, 320, 110714.
- Ferguson, A. G. (2017). *The rise of big data policing*. NYU Press.
- Floridi, L. (2013). *The ethics of information*. Oxford University Press.
- Floridi, L., & Cows, J. (2019). A unified framework of five principles for AI in society. *Harvard Data Science Review*, 1(1).
- Floridi, L., Cows, J., Beltrametti, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., Luetge, C., Madelin, R., Pagallo, U., Rossi, F., Schafer, B., Valcke, P., & Vayena, E. (2018). AI4People: An ethical framework for a good AI society. *Minds and Machines*, 28(4), 689–707.
- Ford, M. (2015). *Rise of the robots: Technology and the threat of a jobless future*. Basic Books.
- Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Vintage Books.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). Continuum.
- Frey, C. B., & Osborne, M. A. (2017). The future of employment: How susceptible are jobs to computerisation? *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 114, 254–280.
- Gillespie, T. (2018). *Custodians of the Internet: Platforms, content moderation, and the hidden decisions that shape social media*. Yale University Press.
- Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action* (Vol. 1, T. McCarthy, Trans.). Beacon Press.
- Halbwachs, M. (1992). *On collective memory* (L. A. Coser, Trans.). University of Chicago Press.
- Harari, Y. N. (2017). *Homo Deus: A brief history of tomorrow*. Vintage.
- Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2019). *Artificial intelligence in education: Promise and implications for teaching and learning*. UNESCO Publishing.

- International Labour Organization. (2023). *World employment and social outlook 2023: The value of essential work*. ILO.
- Kant, I. (1996). An answer to the question: What is enlightenment? In M. J. Gregor (Trans. & Ed.), *Practical philosophy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kermany, D. S., Goldbaum, M., Cai, W., Valentim, C. C. S., Liang, H., Baxter, S. L., McKeown, A., Yang, G., Wu, X., Yan, F., Dong, J., Prasadha, M. K., Pei, J., Ting, M. Y. L., Zhu, J., Li, C., Hewett, S., Ziyar, I., ... Zhang, K. (2018). Identifying medical diagnoses and treatable diseases by image-based deep learning. *Cell*, 172(5), 1122–1131.
- Mayer-Schönberger, V. (2009). *Delete: The virtue of forgetting in the digital age*. Princeton University Press.
- Mittelstadt, B. (2019). Principles alone cannot guarantee ethical AI. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1(11), 501–507.
- Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism*. New York University Press.
- Nora, P. (1989). Between memory and history: Les lieux de mémoire. *Representations*, 26, 7–24.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2010). *Not for profit: Why democracy needs the humanities*. Princeton University Press.
- Obermeyer, Z., Powers, B., Vogeli, C., & Mullainathan, S. (2019). Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations. *Science*, 366(6464), 447–453.
- O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Crown.
- Pariser, E. (2011). *The filter bubble: What the Internet is hiding from you*. Penguin Press.
- Pasquale, F. (2015). *The black box society: The secret algorithms that control money and information*. Harvard University Press.
- Postman, N. (1985). *Amusing ourselves to death: Public discourse in the age of show business*. Penguin Books.
- Postman, N. (1993). *Technopoly: The surrender of culture to technology*. Vintage Books.

- Rosenblat, A. (2018). *Uberland: How algorithms are rewriting the rules of work*. University of California Press.
- Rouvroy, A., & Berns, T. (2013). Governmentality and algorithmic governmentality. *Réseaux*, 177(1), 163–196.
- Russell, S., & Norvig, P. (2021). *Artificial intelligence: A modern approach* (4th ed.). Pearson.
- Schwab, K. (2016). *The fourth industrial revolution*. World Economic Forum.
- Selwyn, N. (2019). *Should robots replace teachers? Artificial intelligence and the future of education*. Polity Press.
- Selwyn, N. (2021). *Education and technology: Key issues and debates* (3rd ed.). Bloomsbury Academic.
- Sennett, R. (1998). *The corrosion of character: The personal consequences of work in the new capitalism*. W. W. Norton.
- Srnicek, N., & Williams, A. (2015). *Inventing the future: Postcapitalism and a world without work*. Verso.
- Sunstein, C. R. (2017). *#Republic: Divided democracy in the age of social media*. Princeton University Press.
- Terras, M. (2010). *Digitization and digital resources in the humanities*. Ashgate.
- Topol, E. (2019). *Deep medicine: How artificial intelligence can make healthcare human again*. Basic Books.
- UNESCO. (2015). *Memory of the world programme: General guidelines to safeguard documentary heritage*. UNESCO Publishing.
- UNESCO. (2021). *Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence*. UNESCO Publishing.
- UNESCO. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. UNESCO Publishing.
- van Dijck, J. (2007). *Mediated memories in the digital age*. Stanford University Press.
- van Dijck, J., Poell, T., & de Waal, M. (2018). *The platform society: Public values in a connective world*. Oxford University Press.

- van Parijs, P., & Vanderborght, Y. (2017). *Basic income: A radical proposal for a free society and a sane economy*. Harvard University Press.
- Wardle, C., & Derakhshan, H. (2017). *Information disorder: Toward an interdisciplinary framework for research and policy making*. Council of Europe Publishing.
- wa Thiong'o, N. (1986). *Decolonising the mind: The politics of language in African literature*. James Currey.
- Wiener, N. (1950). *The human use of human beings: Cybernetics and society*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Williamson, B. (2017). *Big data in education: The digital future of learning, policy and practice*. SAGE Publications.
- Woolley, S. C., & Howard, P. N. (2018). *Computational propaganda: Political parties, politicians, and political manipulation on social media*. Oxford University Press.
- World Health Organization. (2020). *Managing the COVID-19 infodemic: Promoting healthy behaviours and mitigating the harm from misinformation and disinformation*. WHO.
- World Health Organization. (2021). *Ethics and governance of artificial intelligence for health*. World Health Organization.
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.