



"CAROL I" NATIONAL DEFENCE UNIVERSITY

COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE

DOCTORAL SCHOOL

P R O C E E D I N G S

**THE 13TH INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE
"STRATEGIES XXI"**

**TECHNOLOGIES – MILITARY APPLICATIONS,
SIMULATION AND RESOURCES**

SCIENTIFIC EDITORS

Colonel Professor Gheorghe CALOPĂREANU, PhD

Colonel Associate Professor Ioana ENACHE, PhD

Colonel Professor Sorin PÎNZARIU, PhD

Colonel (AF) Associate Professor Marius ȘERBESZKI, PhD

Colonel Associate Professor Marius Victor ROȘCA, PhD



**APRIL 27-28, 2017
BUCHAREST, ROMANIA**

SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE

Colonel Professor Gheorghe CALOPĂREANU, PhD (National Defence University “Carol I”, Bucharest, Romania)
Colonel Professor Marian STANCU, PhD (National Defence University “Carol I”, Bucharest, Romania)
Colonel Professor Valentin DRAGOMIRESCU, PhD (National Defence University “Carol I”, Bucharest, Romania)
Colonel Professor Iulian MARTIN, PhD (National Defence University “Carol I”, Bucharest, Romania)
Colonel Professor Daniel DUMITRU, PhD (National Defence University “Carol I”, Bucharest, Romania)
Colonel Associate Professor Ioana ENACHE, PhD (National Defence University “Carol I”, Bucharest, Romania)
Colonel Professor Sorin PÎNZARIU, PhD (National Defence University “Carol I”, Bucharest, Romania)
Colonel (AF) Associate Professor Marius ȘERBESZKI, PhD (National Defence University “Carol I”, Bucharest, Romania)
Colonel Associate Professor Marius Victor ROȘCA, PhD (National Defence University “Carol I”, Bucharest, Romania)
Brigadier General Professor Eng. Ghiță BĂRSAN, PhD (Land Forces Academy “Nicolae Bălcescu”, Sibiu, Romania)
Brigadier General (AF) Professor Vasile BUCINSCHI, PhD (Air Force Academy “Henri Coandă”, Brașov, Romania)
Captain (Navy) Associate Professor Eng. Octavian TĂRĂBUȚĂ (Navy Academy “Mircea cel Bătrân”, Constanța, Romania)
Colonel Professor Eng. Constantin Iulian VIZITIU (Military Technical Academy, Bucharest, Romania)
Colonel Sergiu PLOP (Military Academy of the Armed Forces „Alexandru cel Bun”, Republic of Moldova)
Magistrate Lieutenant General Professor Erich CSITKOVITS, PhD (National Defence Academy, Austria)
Brigadier General Professor Eng. Bohuslav PŘIKRYL, PhD (University of Defence, Czech Republic)
Brigadier General (ret.) Professor Eng. Rudolf URBAN, PhD (University of Defence, Czech Republic)
Professor Zdenek ZEMANEK, CSc, PhD (Czech Republic)
General Associate Professor Boguslaw PACEK, PhD (National Defence University, Poland)
Navy Captain (ret.) Associate Professor Piotr GAWLICZEK, PhD (National Defence University, Poland)
Colonel Professor Tadeusz SZCZUREK, PhD (Military University of Technology, Warsaw, Poland)
Brigadier General Associate Professor Dipl. Eng. Boris ĎURKECH, PhD (Armed Forces Academy of GMRS, Slovakia)
Major General Professor Vuruna MLADEN, PhD (Military Academy, Serbia)
Brigadier General Professor Slaven ZDILAR, PhD (“Petar Zrinski” Defence Academy, Croatia)
Colonel Professor Mojca PEŠEC, PhD (Slovenia)
Brigadier General Professor Meelis KIILI, PhD (Baltic Defence College, Estonia)
Professor Augustin MEAHER, PhD (Estonia)
Professor András PATYI, PhD (National University of Public Service, Hungary)
Colonel Gabor BOLDIZSAR, PhD (National University of Public Service, Hungary)
Colonel Professor Laszlo KOVACS, PhD (National University of Public Service, Hungary)
Colonel-general (ret.) Professor Zoltan SZENES, PhD (National University of Public Service, Hungary)
Lieutenant Colonel Professor Christophe MIDAN, PhD (Military School, Paris, France)
Professor Larry WATTS, PhD (USA)
Professor Radu MIHALCEA, PhD (USA)
Professor Adrian CURAJ, PhD (UEFISCDI, Bucharest, Romania)
Police Chief-Commissioner Professor Daniel-Costel TORJE, PhD (Police Academy, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, Bucharest, Romania)
Police Chief-Commissioner Professor George-Marius ȚICAL, PhD (National College for Home Affairs, Bucharest, Romania)
Colonel Associate Professor Niculae IANCU, PhD (National Intelligence Academy, “Mihai Viteazul”, Bucharest, Romania)
General (ret.) Professor Teodor FRUNZETI, PhD (Titu Maiorescu University, Bucharest, Romania)
Major-General (ret.) Florian RĂPAN, PhD

Professor Adrian IVAN, PhD (“Babeș-Bolyai” University, Cluj Napoca, Romania)
Professor Constanța Nicoleta BODEA, PhD (Academy of Economic Studies, Bucharest, Romania)
Lieutenant Colonel (ret.) Carol-Teodor PETERFI, University of Tartu, Estonia
Colonel Professor Costinel NIȚU, PhD (National Defence University “Carol I”, Bucharest, Romania)
Colonel Professor Ion PURICEL, PhD (National Defence University “Carol I”, Bucharest, Romania)
Captain (Navy) Professor Ion CHIORCEA, PhD (National Defence University “Carol I”, Bucharest, Romania)
Colonel Professor Marinela-Miorica MOROȘAN, PhD (National Defence University “Carol I”, Bucharest, Romania)
Colonel Professor Laurențiu GRIGORE, PhD (National Defence University “Carol I”, Bucharest, Romania)
Colonel Associate Professor Octavian MIREA, PhD (National Defence University “Carol I”, Bucharest, Romania)
Colonel Associate Professor Ion ANDREI, PhD (National Defence University “Carol I”, Bucharest, Romania)

ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

Chairman: Colonel Professor Gheorghe CALOPĂREANU, PhD

Vice-chairmen:

Colonel Associate Professor Ioana ENACHE, PhD
Colonel Professor Sorin PÎNZARIU, PhD
Colonel (AF) Associate Professor Marius ȘERBESZKI, PhD
Colonel Associate Professor Marius Victor ROȘCA, PhD

Members:

Colonel Associate Professor Valerică CRUCERU, PhD
Lieutenant-colonel Adv. Instr. Cristian Octavian STANCIU, PhD
Lieutenant-colonel Associate Professor Tudorel LEHACI, PhD
Associate Professor Diana-Elena ȚUȚUIANU, PhD
Associate Professor Andra-Sybil ȘTEFAN, PhD
Lecturer Consuela Angela DRĂGAN, PhD
Lieutenant-colonel Instr. Daniel ROMAN, PhD Candidate
Lieutenant-colonel Associate Professor Alexandru HERCIU, PhD
Colonel (AF) Associate Professor Iulian-Titi AGAFIȚEI, PhD
Colonel (AF) Associate Professor Eng. Laurențiu-Răducu POPESCU, PhD
Colonel Associate Professor Gheorghe LUCA, PhD
Lieutenant-colonel Adv. Instr. Pătru PÎRJOL, PhD Candidate
Lieutenant-colonel Adv. Instr. Cătălin CHIRIAC, PhD Candidate
Associate Professor Ana-Maria CHISEGA-NEGRILĂ, PhD
Captain (Navy) Associate Professor Florin NISTOR, PhD
Capitan-commander (Navy) Adv. Instr. Eng. Lucian SCIPANOV, PhD Candidate
Associate Professor Luiza-Anca KRAFT, PhD
Colonel Professor Gheorghe MINCULETE, PhD
Lecturer Dănuța-Mădălina SCIPANOV, PhD
Colonel Professor Laurențiu GRIGORE, PhD
Colonel Professor Iulian MARTIN, PhD
Lieutenant-colonel Adv. Instr. Alin-Dumitru PELMUȘ, PhD Candidate
Associate Professor Mihaela LOGHIN, PhD
Lecturer Alin PETRACHE, PhD
Lecturer Marian BRABOVEANU, PhD

ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

Maria PRIOTEASA
Florina GRUIA
Elena BONCIU
Mariana AGAFIȚEI
Mihaela TĂNAȘE
Sever PURNAVEL
Savu SPĂTARU

DESKTOP PUBLISHING

Liliana ILIE

COVER DESIGNER

Marius ȘERBESZKI

ECOSOPHY, PHILOSOPHY OF SECURITY, NEW TECHNOLOGIES AND THE DIGITAL PHILOSOPHY

Ion SÎRBU

*PhD, Professor, Armed Forces Military Academy "Alexandru cel Bun"
itsirbu@yahoo.com*

Abstract: *Defining Ecosophy (ecological wisdom) like a contemporary philosophy of survival, security and a sustainable Human Development, terrestrial nature and society, the author of this article approaches the correlation between Ecosophy and the Security's philosophy and also the correlation between it and the digital version of security in the context of new technologies.*

Human survival is in connection with the protection, optimal functioning of the natural environment and the development of human society. Human evolution, physical and psychological (the issues of Anthropol ecology, a medical-biological science, deals with them), depends on the natural and social environment, on the development of new techniques and technologies.

New technologies (nano-, bio-, info-, socio-technologies) can ensure the security and the increasing development of the human being, but they can threaten it too.

The author does not deny behaviours, the possibility that human intellect could be non-biological. Moreover, the author believes if it comes to it, that we will not be able to speak about the human species. New technologies like the traditional and less new, are intended to help in solving various problems related to health, society interactions with nature, human society and diverse cultures, societies and states.

The philosophy of security and the digital one, like the components of Ecosophy, along with philosophical aspects of Anthropol ecology, General Ecology and Social Ecology, needs like any other science or philosophy to elaborate systems of concepts, principles and laws.

Keywords: *Ecosophy; Philosophy: new technologies; Anthropol ecology; society.*

Introduction

The contemporary times demonstrates that history's rhythms accelerate sharply. All the science, technology, culture, socio-political life's changes prove this assertion.

Hegel, a German philosopher, said that the philosophy from its inception could be characterized as "the era covered in thought" and as "the quintessential era". In other words, the philosophy has always reflected social life, humans and their main problems. Even contemporary philosophy can't be an exception. Traditional philosophy has often been criticized, accused that it's far away from life that is no longer necessary for today's human being. However, it always revives and demonstrates its necessity. Science, which was often matched by philosophy, needs this renewal, reform. The integration processes that take place in modern science and its achievements consequences for humans need meditations, philosophical generalizations and predictions.

The ecosophy or the ecological wisdom, as I see it, is the new philosophy of our times and of the future. We defined current philosophy is that global issues, security and human survival, human society and nature land. The ecosophy, which is a proper philosophy of our times, cannot evade the resolution of global issues, the security mentioned above. New technologies, such as Nano-, Bio-, Info-, Cognition-, Socio- technologies (NBICS), which are converged, may contribute to the development of human society, but also can represent a risk for the future of human being. They confirm the need of ecosophy, analyzing all the problems and ways to solve them through the prism of green social, anthropoecological and general ecological, but the main, through the man.

The security is necessary to human beings, society and nature. These emphasize the need of security philosophy. Convergent application of new technologies to solve problems of

contemporary society and civilization, can't take place without applying computer and robotechniques. These emphasize the digital philosophy's need. Both of these new philosophies, the security philosophy and the digital one are components of ecosophy, which, in this case, is presented as metaphilosophy, that are different from singular and particular philosophy.

The main problem of this article is to demonstrate the need for human practice and science of ecosophy with those two new components - philosophy and philosophy of digital security.

Materials and Methods

The imperative problems of contemporaneity; the new converging technologies; the discussions about the needs on reform philosophy; correlation with the latest science – these are the materials on which the author relied.

The methods that were used: historical and logical methods, comparative analysis, extrapolation, analysis and synthesis dialectic.

Results and discussions

Ecosophy and its components. The ecosophy or ecological wisdom is the philosophy of contemporary global issues, of survival, of security and of sustainable development of human society and environment. It combines in itself the philosophical problems of general ecology, ecological anthropology or human ecology and social ecology [1].

The ecological anthropology is primordial in this triad, which includes its philosophical aspect. However, the fundamental problem of philosophy is human beings' problem. The environment could be completely different from that we have today. Could it be better or worse? Who would have been the person that could appreciate it if there were nonhumans? The human is the most important "destructive" factor of environment. Simultaneously the same humanism is the most important master painter of it. If he understood his activities, he could restore what he has destroyed. If he destroys, he improves it at the same time. The second nature, which is cultivated by human being, has many good aspects that surpass the first. The apple from the tree is more preferable than that one that grows up in the forest. The horse from the circus and the horse from the sports stadium are much more elegant, more beautiful than the wild one. The same thing can be said about most human creations. The human being has created civilization and culture. The nature could know itself and could improve itself thanks to the efforts by human. He created the society too, without which he cannot appear or exist as human. Society is not a sum of individuals, but the result of their interaction. It can't exist without individuals as it can't exist outside of it and without nature. Moreover, the nature, which was modified by humans and human society, can't exist like we can see it today without humans and society. The man is that one who can combine harmoniously the environment and the society. The ancients called the nature cosmos (the organized universe different from chaos that is an unorganized universe) and they called the human a microcosm. The man is a natural being and a biological organism (by his corporeality) on the one hand, and a created being, a social one, an "artificial" (by conscience, reason, creativity) on the other hand. The man can be divided theoretically into socio-natural or bio-psycho-social being. In practice, the social, the psychological and the nature or biology are interlocked to form a harmonious whole. The biological body of human cardinally differs from other natural biological bodies. The conscience, the reason can appear only in the human body. The baby isn't born like a human; it is only a potential human. The culture, the society and the communication transform child into a human. The society and the culture

can't turn any natural species into a human. The monkey, which has more in common with the human being, may learn the deaf-mute alphabet, but never will it be rational.

Philosophy security

Man and society are creators of values. Some become general human beings others remain national, change or disappear. All values presented by it contribute to upward development, progressive human species. One must respect human individual, to develop and protect them. This however is not easy.

According to statistics, 1 billion people in the world suffer from hunger, 8 million die annually from hunger and malnutrition, 22 thousand children aged up to 5 years die every day because of poverty [2, p. 379]. The richest 10% of the population gets more than half the world's annual profit. Profit 1% of the wealthiest part of the population is equal to the income that it receives the poorest 60%, ie 4.3 billion people. As expressed Piter Hershock "a discrepancy between economics and ethics" [3, p. 520]. This discrepancy, says M. G. Stepaneant "nefarious was manifested on the development foolish, greedy natural environment [4, p. 45]. H. Hurd wonders why people destroy their own nest and responds, "Because we have an incapable economy and powerless ethics" [5, p. 82].

Economics and ethics were not always different areas. Let us remember the words of Aristotle, the ethics and the economy is in practical philosophy, unlike the first philosophy (metaphysics). There are, according to M.T. Stepaneant [4, p. 46], not a few examples of close ties in various cultures since antiquity and at least until the eighteenth century. Nowadays model is based on attachment vicious to the ideal individualist and Enlightenment "man - the king of nature." The task is to restore harmonious relations between man and nature and with other community members.

The important thing is that such criticism comes both from representatives of non-Western cultures, and from the Westerners. One example is critical given economy and western ethics by American J. McRae, a specialist in Japanese ethics, with frequent references to philosophical Watsuji Tetsuro Japanese representative Khito known schools [6].

Watsuji Tetsuro individualization rejects Western ideas of ethical and metaphysical dualism. The body and mind are absolutely indivisible for him, and "Human relations is beyond the personal sphere [6, p. 68]. J. McRae concludes that the interpretation of ethics by Japanese philosopher human relationships with the natural and social environment that gives regulatory limit, which can contribute to stability and peace. If ethics serve to maintain stable economy and security, it should contain principles that require mandatory compliance. "All people are the owners of shares of continuing natural environment, socio-economic stability and international security. Non-moral is getting rich at the expense of others or the natural environment, the natural resources on which we are all addicts. Poor countries suffer more from the negative impact on natural menu from unchecked population growth, unstable consumerism and technologies. This means that these countries are subject to risks greater influence social consequences that lead to conflicts that threaten the security and stability of all nations. For those of every nation's interest have to maintain economic stability and environment of other countries [6, p. 79]. Good and necessary elements for a global ethic are all mentioned above by various ethicists and economists worldwide.

I believe that the foundations of human nature and society must hang a new ethic. This ethics, in my view, is the global ecological ethics, humanism based on traditional ecological and ethnic. And propagate this fundamental ethical my publications since late last century to date [1, 7].

New ethics being a part of ecosophy not limited to issues of ecology but they include those of social ecology and ecological anthropology. So it makes no security exception. Who

and what should be protected? It's not easy at all to answer this question. Russian actions in Georgia, Transnistria, Ukraine, and Syria are masked by the so-called Russian leadership to maintain its own security and governments 'legitimate' etc. Security should be based on general moral values which I mentioned above.

Security relates to almost all material and spiritual entities. My previous publications address issues reaching safety substantiation security concept as a concept and even philosophical category [8]. It is required at present to substantiate a philosophy of security, as part of ecosophy. Once security covers all areas of reality and nature, man, society, psychic consciousness, the virtual world - we have every right to speak about its philosophy.

Application deadline questionable security also is an argument for security philosophy. The main argument is that security concerns human being. It shall submit other security including itself.

Global issues, including climate change, new technologies threaten human security converge. But all this can't be put at the service of human security outside digital technologies or information.

Digital philosophy

Formed in the 40s of last century, the computer has created a new reality, a new culture - the virtual one. Since the 70s began to build the Internet. This virtual globalized world, becoming a reality, that philosophy should consider.

Does "philosophy should like to enter into the digital age" asks Lavinia Marin article "Outline for a possible philosophy of the digital". I think so, or philosophy as already mentioned, is "the era covered in Thought", "quintessence era". Although almost 2 decades we entered the digital age, philosophy not yet felt the shock of change [9, p. 571].

I am convinced that many of the general problems of digital technologies are philosophical (i.e., passing through the human world issues). That will give them the human species, stagnation or regress progress? Robots compose music, literature, make translations from one language to another etc. Can they ever think philosophical really? It all depends on their programming by humans. Knowing what kind of belletristic music do robots, how they administer translations, you figure out what kind of good will practice its philosophy. Mechanization true philosophy can't be, or it is creative. No program of the best pogrom, is he even a philosopher, will not make the robot to philosophize. The program cans only formal aspect of thinking, those based on algorithm. Deep thinking can't be formalized scheduled.

L. Marin raises the question of bringing philosophy into line with the new reality in which the man found himself. Relying on his views Vilem Flusser, "one of the most important philosophers of the last century media" [9, p. 572] it reach certain conclusions. "Without realizing it, we are in full crisis for years text". Behind it "stands a greater crisis of thought initiated by texts' so-called" linear thinking ". Crisis thought textual, and therefore the "linear thinking" was described in detail by Viliam Fluser almost 30 years. In his book entitled "About writing. Writing has a future?" V. Fluser started from the idea that the act of writing and thinking related to living their last days because computers appearance. As we know these are based on numbers and not text.

V. Fluser believes that the history of human thought can be divided into 3 stages. The basis of this division is the codes used by man to represent world aces.

The images on cave walls show the world by first coding primitive age man. A coding according to this philosopher is to translate the symbols something that can be interpreted by others. Animal picture painted for the first time, served for hunting from the same community as a means to refer to the real animal. Or, then again there is no common language, articulated in words. Continuing as Wittgenstein's idea that there is no private language, says L. Marin, V. Fluser tells us that there is a privacy code. Everything is coded must be shared by others [9, p. 572].

For V. Fluser according L. Marin, there is no form of thinking that is not associated with an ID. The codes give shape our thinking and conceptual limits of our world. Thus, the form of thought associated with the first code of images was imagination. To imagine is to build images of the world. But the images that mediation of reality, were poorly significant meaning because the image is vague.

Imagine has reached the limits of representational when people felt the need for a new thinking and so a new code to represent and media world. This was invented precisely alphabetic code words to denote external objects. Alphabetic code and writing linear stresses L. Marin, made possible the invention of causal-linear thinking, thinking that we are still caught and now [9, p. 173].

Everything that can be aligned in a row is "linear". From two-dimensional image - this can be contemplated from any point to writing straight past the imposing particular order of reading. This perspective was transferred orderly world, so people began to read the world as a text, supposed to have begun and ended. Then they started to design the world causes, effects, and other linear explanations. Once the world was codified by texts, says L. Marin, the most important features of the text - the order and linearity - were transferred to the world. Even in philosophy we believe we have fully explained a phenomenon when we can reveal his basic structure [9, p. 93].

The man is a rational being and therefore sees everywhere rationality, order. If we deny the world order, we come to the denial of its laws, so and science. The order of world orders our reason and not vice versa as it does L. Marin and authors cite it.

After the emergence of the computer, the Internet and digital technologies in the world order it will disappear? No, of course! The drawings have vanished after the emergence of writing, but have been improved, leading to the peak artistry in painting, architecture, sculpture, etc. Something similar will happen with linear writing and tidy.

As the images were criticized by writing among wrote today it came to be criticized by numbers. The numbers were invented letters with the same gesture of writing, but they express a completely different way of thinking. It is the numerical thinking [9, p. 574].

With the information revolution L. Marin states we have witnessed a new change of code: the alphabetical and mathematical was switched to digital or binary code - two numbers, zero and one, with ambitions to replace all the present and past information architecture. If texts analyzing and criticizing the images, then digital programs constitute a direct criticism of texts. With each change of code we find ourselves alienated from reality [9, p. 575].

The question is a philosophy of the digital possible my answer is yes. The digital philosophy can exist as a component of ecosophy.

Digital technologies influence our positive and negative, both at the level of body and psyche. In recent decades, says C. Voinea, large areas of political, economic and social expanded online. The Internet has radically changed the political behaviour of individuals,

either by offering new ways of obtaining, verification, information dissemination, either through facilitating communication on a global scale. Another dimension of the internet is affected by the logic of collective action, new environment facilitating mass mobilization by offering new possibilities for coordination and collaboration. Thus it becomes increasingly clear that new technologies are not simply useful mechanisms in specific activities, but true drivers of social change [10, p. 583].

The latest examples of digital influence as the US presidential election influenced by "trolls" Russians; Romania protests organized without organizers, hybrid war in Ukraine.

These are also arguments in favour of creating a philosophy of the digital. The latter can be simultaneously a philosophy of security, or at least to interact with it when ecosophy.

Using digital technologies millions of people can be manipulated and directed, including political, without their conscious will.

Google processes about 40 000 every second searches through its search engine, which also means daily uses about 3 billion coming from more than one billion users. Founder of Google, Eric Schmit said in 2014 that is generated every 2 days more content than was created from the beginning of mankind until today [10, p. 586].

A recent study showed that the algorithm of search engine Google may influence preferences of voters undecided 20%, or even more diverse demographic groups in favour of a particular candidate in the presidential election by displaying on the first page of search results for the term " elections 2016 'pages which favour a particular candidate. Which also proves truly problematic it is that this manipulation is difficult to see [10, p. 587].

Digital technologies and drugs can be helpful but can be evil, even threatening human security.

CONCLUSION

Ecosophy is a new philosophy of humanity which includes the philosophy and philosophy of digital security.

New technologies are altering man and society. What matters is that these changes are primarily beneficial, positive and not evil, negative. Possible is it? It's a philosophical problem.

Through digital technologies including people can be manipulated and politically.

New technologies can lead to security, but also national and global insecurity.

Global problems, the most urgent of them - the protection of human nature, cannot be solved without digital technology and philosophy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Sîrbu, Ion, *Ecosofia sau filosofia ecologică*. Iași, 2000.
2. Struh, I K. *The Moral Necessity of Socialism. Value and Values*. 2015.
3. Hershock P. *The value of Diversity. Buddhist Reflections on More Equitably orienting Global Interdependence. Value and Values*. 2015.
4. Stepanian M.T., *Țenăițenostivăpohu globalizații*, Voprosă filosofii, Nr. 1, M., 2016, s. 44-50.
5. Hurd, H. *FoulingOurNest. Is (Environmental) Ethics Important Against (Bad) Economics?. ValueandValues*. 2015, p. 82-108.

6. McRae, J. Triple Negation. *Watsuji-tatsujitatsu-ro on Sustainability of Ecosystems, Economies, and International Peace*. *Value and Values*, 2015, p. 68-81.
7. Sîrbu Ion, *Etica ecologică globală și dialogul civilizațional: aspecte ecologice și de securitate*. *Studia Securitatis*. T. IX, Nr. 3, Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu, 2015, p. 159-168.
8. Sîrbu, Ion, *Securitatea și dihotomia tehnologiilor convergente*. *Political Science, International Relations and Security Studies*. Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu, 2016, p. 471-478.
9. Marin, Lavinia, *Schiță pentru o posibilă filozofie a digitalului*. *Revista de filozofie*. Nr. 5, București 2016, p. 571- 582.
10. Cristina Voinea. *Guvernare fără guvernanți: politica prin algoritm și Big Data*. *Revista de filozofie*, Nr. 5, București 2016, p. 583-595.