

**BETWEEN DATA AND DOXOLOGY:
AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL,
EPISTEMOLOGICAL, AND
CONTEMPLATIVE ETHICS OF
ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE**

Philip A. Amartolos*

Minsk, Belarus

Abstract

The rapid integration of artificial intelligence into daily life poses a challenge that is simultaneously anthropological, theological, and moral. Drawing on patristic and ascetic sources alongside contemporary cognitive science, this paper argues that AI does not merely reshape behaviour but structurally undermines the conditions necessary for contemplative life and the soul's ordered orientation toward truth, reality, and union with God. Cognitive offloading, digital amnesia, "clip thinking," and the erosion of embodied multisensory perception do not leave the inner life untouched; they degrade the very faculties through which watchfulness, discernment, and prayer are exercised. Surveillance capitalism further compounds this harm by commodifying attention and dissolving the relational depth on which authentic personhood depends. The result is a morally weakened human being through the quiet attrition of capacities which

* Philip A. Amartolos is a lay theologian and independent scholar. He holds a Licentiate in Oriental Ecclesial Sciences from the Pontifical Oriental Institute (Rome) and a Licentiate in Metaphysics from the Pontifical Lateran University (Rome). His theological research focuses on pastoral care, the enduring lack of sobornost and full communion between Orthodoxy and Catholicism, seeking pathways toward reconciliation through contemplative theology and renewed spiritual dialogue. His angelological writings—available on Academia.edu—explore the Seraphim, the Twelve Angels of the Pentateuch, and the Guardian Angel as symbols of divine mediation and companionship. Earlier in life, he participated in pastoral initiatives for orphaned children and the incarcerated. He now seeks to live a contemplative vocation of prayer and repentance within the secular world. His personal spiritual affiliation is within the Orthodox Christian tradition. Email: emt-amartolos@proton.me

Christian traditions have always regarded as constitutive of the image of God. Yet the paper does not end in diagnosis. It argues that genuine hope exists, but that hope requires a two-tiered response: macro-level regulatory and ecclesial frameworks that constrain AI's most corrosive deployments, and secondly, a renewed pastoral theology capable of accompanying persons navigating digital fragmentation toward reintegration and healing.

Keywords: Imago Dei, Theosis, Nepsis, Hesychia, Nous, Conscience, Contemplation

I. Introduction: The Imago Dei and the Problem of Formation

Artificial intelligence is embedded in and actively reshapes digital environments that, in turn, reshape perception, habit, and the conditions under which the image of God is lived. Artificial intelligence does not diminish the *imago Dei*, which remains ontologically intact. More troubling is how AI deeply alters the epistemological, relational and spiritual context under which that image is realised. The central ethical question is not what AI does to the person but who a person becomes within its reach.

This paper is composed within the framework of the Orthodox theological tradition, which conceptualises the Church as the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Body of Christ, embodying the conciliar fullness of the faithful across all times and locations. When other apostolic communions are referenced, whether in their social teaching or pastoral witness, it is because the matter of the human person created in the image of God pertains to the entire Church and necessitates a unified response.

Theologically, the human person bears weakness as a consequence of original sin yet remains open to healing through grace. The image of God is clarified and restored through prayer, ascetical struggle, and the sacramental life, bringing the human person closer to divine likeness through the power of the Holy Spirit. The intellect and will, for Christian anthropology, are the faculties through which one knows God and lives in communion with Him. The sanctification of these same faculties is integral to the call to *theosis* (deification).¹ Thoughts and desires do not develop in isolation; they take form within the cultural, social, and educational environments that surround us.

¹ St Athanasius of Alexandria, *De Incarnatione Verbi Dei* 54.3; in *Patrologiae Graecae*, ed. J.-P. Migne (Paris: 1857-1866), vol. 25, col. 191-2.

No prior civilisation produced and circulated knowledge, data, and images at the scale and speed that now defines ordinary life. Artificial intelligence, smartphones, and digital applications condition how the content they provide is received and how intensely it is absorbed. These environments are formative. They can serve the purification of the intellect and will or obstruct it.

This paper follows the inner logic of the Christian understanding of the human person. It begins with the *imago Dei* as a human being called to *theosis* and the sanctification of body and soul and asks what AI does to the conditions of that calling. It examines how digital mediation reshapes the epistemological and relational fabric of human experience, and then asks the deeper question: what does this mean for the intellect and the soul standing before God in prayer and contemplation? Having named that concern, the paper turns to the macro world of global economic and social infrastructure, where AI brings genuine benefit but also poses structural challenges to human dignity and meaningful work. From there, it approaches the individual soul living within that world, asking how the Church accompanies persons pastorally through digital fragmentation and naming the grave risk of pseudo-pastoral AI responses that simulate presence without grace. Yet the paper does not end in anxiety. The very restlessness that the digital environment intensifies is itself a hunger that only God can satisfy. Where truth is sought, and relationship is desired, grace is already at work. The new digital environment, for all its dangers, carries within it a capacity to receive grace. The paper concludes with an ethical and ecclesial call: to defend human dignity, advocate for just legal frameworks, and accompany persons with confidence toward the One for whom every human heart was made.

II. Technological Mediation: From Tool to Environment

Modern digital technology, especially AI-driven systems, can no longer be understood merely as instruments. These systems function as formative environments, organising knowledge according to logics of speed and continuous availability that determine both what is known and how it is received. Abstraction and modular design strip away social context, leading to misaligned assumptions.²

Raja Parasuraman's findings on automation bias (trust in the system) are instructive here: people use decision aids as a heuristic

² Selbst, A. D., et al. (2019). *Fairness and Abstraction in Sociotechnical Systems*, in Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, 60-63. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3287560.3287598>.

replacement for vigilant information seeking. This points to an inherent risk. Over time, the capacity for sustained attention and critical judgement weakens and is substituted by a person shaped by the logic of the system rather than by the requirements of truth.³

A related and graver difficulty concerns truth itself. Algorithmic systems generate responses that appear coherent and authoritative yet are not grounded in verifiable reality. When this happens consistently, knowledge begins to align with plausibility and immediacy rather than with what is actually the case. Prof. Ziwei Ji of the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology observed that hallucinated text gives the impression of fluency and coherence while remaining unfaithful to reality, and appears grounded in a context that is, in fact, unverifiable.⁴ Orthodox hierarchs have stressed that the inability to confirm reality or truth leads to expanding mistrust, a condition that directly undermines the capacity for genuine knowledge and, consequently, for moral and spiritual discernment.⁵

These systems privilege the delivery of results over the formation of understanding. Nothing in their design compels the user toward discipline or the patient development of knowledge. Responsibility cannot be abstractly reduced to individual choices. The capacity for discernment is itself shaped by education, culture, and one's actual environments, which means that institutions, educators, and communities bear responsibility for helping people understand what the new informational environment actually is and what it does to those formed within it.

Two contemporary thinkers have engaged AI most directly within a theological framework. Paolo Benanti describes AI as a “prosthesis of intelligence,” an extension of human capacity whose moral character depends entirely on the intention behind its use.⁶ Philip Larrey argues that AI lacks consciousness, moral agency, and the wisdom of the

³ Parasuraman, R., & Manzey, D. H. (2010). *Complacency and Bias in Human Use of Automation*. *Human Factors*, 52(3), 381-384, 390-396. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018720810376055>.

⁴ Ji, Z., et al. (2023). *Survey of Hallucination in Natural Language Generation*. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(12), 248:3. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3571730>.

⁵ Patriarch Kirill, address to the XI International Festival “Faith and Word,” October 16, 2025, official website of the Moscow Patriarchate, <https://www.patriarchia.ru/article/117781>.

⁶ Paolo Benanti, “Paolo Benanti: ‘el problema de la IA es la complejidad,’” interview by José María Navalpotro, *Omnes*, January 19, 2026, para. 4 (§Resources / Debate).

heart, and that danger arises only when they mistake machines for persons or outsource their own thinking to algorithms, thereby making themselves obsolete.⁷ Both offer valuable defences of human irreducibility, and both locate the problem in the misuse of an otherwise neutral instrument.

This paper does not reach a settled verdict on that question, but it does find the neutrality assumption increasingly difficult to sustain. A technology designed to capture attention, monetise desire, and reduce the *imago Dei* to behavioural data raises serious questions about whether its architecture is truly indifferent to the ends it serves. The question is not merely who uses the tool, but whether a fallen human nature, designing for worldly ends, reliably produces artefacts that leave the inner person unchanged. Benanti's prosthesis and Larrey's wisdom of the heart, while philosophically important, may not fully reckon with the possibility that certain AI systems are ordered, not by any user's misuse, but by their own design logic, in directions that work against human flourishing. The evidence examined in this paper does not prove that conclusion, but it raises indicators serious enough to warrant it as a working concern rather than a settled position.

III. Algorithmic Epistemology: Knowledge Without Interiorisation

Traditional Christian thinking understands human knowledge as rooted in the senses. We begin with what is seen, heard, and touched, and through this encounter with the world, we come to understand it. St John of Damascus⁸ and Thomas Aquinas⁹ both describe knowledge as grounded in sensory experience: the impressions received through the senses are gathered within the soul and formed into understanding there. The mind operates through the body, within an ordered unity of faculties that includes perception, memory, imagination, and intellect. Knowledge is therefore inseparable from the world given through the senses, and from the interior capacity of the human person to receive and interpret that world. It requires time, attention, and interior assimilation.

⁷ See Philip Larrey, "Will Technology Help Humanity to Grow and Flourish?" (unpublished conference paper, 8th Annual Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues Conference, Oriel College, Oxford University, January 3–5, 2020), 9–10; and Philip Larrey, "Wisdom of the Heart in the Age of Artificial Intelligence," interview by Pedro Esteve, *The Irish Catholic*, May 22, 2025, paras. 3, 15–16, 19–24.

⁸ St. John of Damascus, *Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, NPNF2 9, II.12–20; 614–626.

⁹ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* I, q. 84, aa. 6–7.

Within digital environments, this movement is compressed. Attention fragments, the sensory field narrows to sight and sound in controlled form, and the space for interior processing contracts. Contemporary neuroscience names these effects cognitive overload and digital amnesia.¹⁰ Digital perception is carried through sight and sound, while the full range of sensory experience is narrowed. To see an image of food is not to taste it; to view an animal is not to inhabit its environment. The loss is both of depth and integration across the senses.¹¹

Studies in perception show that human experience is formed through the integration of multiple sensory inputs,¹² and that when this integration is weakened, experience becomes less stable and less grounded in lived reality. Thinking is inseparable from sensing and acting, for it develops through them in lived engagement with the world.¹³ Much of this engagement is not fully conscious.¹⁴ In a real environment, perception extends beyond what is directly seen and heard to include what is received through the body and its surrounding context of movement, space, atmosphere, and presence, which are often absorbed without explicit awareness.

Digital mediation does more than transmit information. It changes the circumstances in which impressions become knowledge. What is given is partial and compressed, stripped of context and over time, this reshapes the very ground of knowing. Human knowledge begins in the encounter with the created world, and through this encounter, the mind is led toward knowledge of the Creator. When that encounter is thinned, the path from perception to understanding

¹⁰ de Barros EC. Understanding the influence of digital technology on human cognitive functions: A narrative review. *IBRO Neurosci Rep.* 2024 Nov 13;17:415-422. doi: 10.1016/j.ibneur.2024.11.006.

Grinschgl, Sandra, Frank Papenmeier, and Hauke S. Meyerhoff. "Consequences of Cognitive Offloading: Boosting Performance but Diminishing Memory." *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology* 74, no. 9 (September 2021): 1477-1496. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17470218211008060>.

¹¹ Medina J, Khurana P, Coslett HB. The influence of embodiment on multisensory integration using the mirror box illusion. *Conscious Cogn.* 2015 Dec;37:71-82. doi: 10.1016/j.concog.2015.08.011.

¹² Stein, B. E., & Stanford, T. R. "Multisensory integration: current issues from the perspective of the single neuron." *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 9, no. 4 (2008): 260-262. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2331>

¹³ Ref. Varela, Francisco J., Evan Thompson, and Eleanor Rosch. *The Embodied Mind: Cognitive Science and Human Experience*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1991.

¹⁴ O'Callaghan, Casey. *A Multisensory Philosophy of Perception*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019, 51-52.

grows unstable.¹⁵ What is heard or seen on devices is often a representation portrayed as an encounter with reality. Frequently, the human mind is not equipped to distinguish and refuse. Even when their artificial origin is known, they can still shape perception and judgment. Knowledge becomes a form of processing and filtering that is received and moved on from, rather than taken in and allowed to mature.¹⁶ This passing knowledge also forms the intellect, either ordering it towards depth and truth or gradually deforming its capacity for sustained understanding.

IV. Consciousness, Conscience, and Moral Formation

Within Christian anthropology, consciousness is the integrated self-awareness of the whole person, body and soul, through which one perceives oneself, others, the world, and God. It is a unified mode of being in which intellect, will, and affectivity act as an image of God. The Orthodox tradition names the deeper, pre-reflective dimension of this awareness the *nous*, the "eye of the soul," which can be darkened or illuminated¹⁷ and through which the person has an objective relation to the real created world as well as to God.

This consciousness is formed through real encounters with creation and other persons. Bishop John Zizioulas writes: "it is an 'I' that can exist only as long as it relates to a 'thou' which affirms its existence and its otherness."¹⁸ Through such encounters, the mind is gradually formed, and through knowledge of created things, it is led towards knowledge of the Creator. When these encounters are weakened or constantly interrupted, the awareness of relationships thins. The capacity to perceive meaning within them diminishes. And the formation of a living awareness of one's place in a created, relational order is placed at risk.¹⁹ As Rajesh Kavalackal warns, "the sinful ways

¹⁵ Bushuyev, S., N. Bushuyeva, D. Bushuiev, and V. Bushuieva. "Clip Thinking in the Digital Age," 2-3. *Procedia Computer Science* 231 (2024): 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2023.12.210>.

¹⁶ Musa, Nazaruddin, Mukhtaruddin, and Viona Febiyola Bakkara. "The Effects of Digital Amnesia on Knowledge Construction and Memory Retention," 9-10. *Khizanah Al-Hikmah: Jurnal Ilmu Perpustakaan, Informasi, Dan Kearsipan* 11, no. 2 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.24252/kah.v11i2cf1>.

¹⁷ Metropolitan Hierotheos Vlachos of Nafpaktos, "Orthodox Psychotherapy and Western Psychology" (lecture, Archdiocesan Clergy Symposium convened by Metropolitan Joseph, Antiochian Village, July 18-22, 2016), 5.

¹⁸ John D. Zizioulas, *Communion and Otherness: Further Studies in Personhood and the Church*, ed. Paul McPartlan (London: T&T Clark, 2006), 9.

¹⁹ Sherry Turkle, *Alone Together: Why We Expect More from Technology and Less from Each Other* (New York: Basic Books, 2011), 1-3, 11-14, 153-54, 290-96.

that can emerge from the virtual world may lead to a passive understanding of sin, in which responsibility is displaced onto a third party," thereby weakening the subject's moral awareness. What is at stake is not simply the presence of new tools, but the formation of a consciousness in which responsibility is no longer clearly perceived as one's own.²⁰

Although consciousness and conscience are connected, they are not identical. The first concerns awareness, while conscience concerns judgment. It is the faculty through which the human person recognises truth and discerns the good, and through which moral responsibility is exercised. Conscience is therefore relational at its core: it stands before truth, before the good, before others and finally before God.

When the capacity to recognise truth weakens, conscience weakens with it. The sense of the good shifts from something objective and grounded in being to something shaped by immediacy or emotion. The good is no longer discerned and chosen. It appears, attracts, and passes. Conscience risks becoming a reactive, socially conditioned response shaped by repetition and influence, rather than by what is true. This is what the ascetical tradition describes as the darkening of the nous and the loss of discernment. St. John Climacus observes: "Sometimes upbringing is the cause of great evils, and sometimes company. But often a warped soul is of itself sufficient for its ruin."²¹

If knowledge is unstable and perception of reality is partial, the ability to choose the good is also weakened. A person may continue to act and decide, but the awareness of those choices is diminished, and the distinction between good and evil becomes unclear due to a lack of formation. Choices are then made within the narrow field of immediate experience, without a firm grounding in truth.²² If one's perception of others is mediated or superficial, responsibility toward them diminishes accordingly. If awareness of God no longer sustains consciousness, the basic root of the conscience is obscured.

²⁰ Rajesh Kavalackal, "Artificial Intelligence: An Anthropological and Theological Investigation," *Asian Horizons* 18, no. 3 (September 2024): 397–398.

²¹ St. John Climacus, *The Ladder of Divine Ascent*, trans. Archimandrite Lazarus Moore (London: Faber and Faber, 1959), Step 26, §124.

²² St. John Cassian, "On Anger" and "On the Eight Vices," in *The Philokalia: The Complete Text*, vol. 1, trans. G. E. H. Palmer, Philip Sherrard, and Kallistos Ware (London: Faber and Faber, 1979), 84, 149.

The result is a gradual impoverishment of consciousness rather than an explicit rejection of God. St. Augustine described a state in which outward confession of faith persists while interior understanding and love are weakened through ignorance and disordered habit.²³ The question is no longer simply what one believes or chooses, but how one sustains an awareness of truth and of relationship in the presence of God.

V. Contemplative Anthropology: The Conditions of True Knowledge

"The light of true knowledge is the power to discriminate without error between good and evil. Then the path of righteousness leads the intellect upward towards the Sun of Righteousness and brings it into the boundless illumination of spiritual knowledge."²⁴ For St. Diadochos of Photike, the conscience that has recovered its capacity for discrimination is a moral faculty at the beginning of contemplation. Conscience and contemplation are both integral to the same ascent to God: one describes what is being left behind or cut off, the other Who is being approached. The factors described earlier weaken the conscience and interrupt at its root the ascent of the heart and intellect to God.

The Christian understanding of the relationship to God is less concerned with what the person knows or accomplishes. Its concern is focused on what the person is becoming. The person is primarily a rational being created for orientation to God, whose faculties find their proper ordering only within that ascent. The sanctification of the image in each person is a dynamic ascent toward knowledge of God and participation in divine life. The concept of contemplation captures this relational dynamic when understood widely as encompassing its perfection among the saints and angels as beatific vision, the witness of monks living in silence, or the short desires and thoughts for God of the catechumen or a repenting soul. It is a choice to create space in the heart for God by freeing it from other thoughts and worldly concerns. Contemplation is the response of both the lost sheep and of the flock expressed by the Good Shepherd, "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me" (Jn. 10:27-28).

The Fathers speak of *nepsis*, meaning watchfulness, as a foundation for contemplation. *Nepsis* is an active guarding of the intellect against the indiscriminate reception of every passing thought and impression. St. Hesychios the Priest writes, "Watchfulness is a way embracing every

²³ St. Augustine, *De vera religione*, XIV, §27; PL 34:133.

²⁴ St. Diadochos of Photiki, *On Spiritual Knowledge and Discrimination One Hundred Texts*, §6; in the *Philokalia*, vol.1: 254.

virtue, every commandment. It is the heart's stillness and, when free from mental images, it is the guarding of the intellect."²⁵

The intellect trained in watchfulness learns to remain present to what it has received rather than being driven from one impression to the next. A mind schooled instead in succession does not naturally turn inward; it must be re-formed by long practice. St Hesychios explains: "Continuity of attention produces inner stability; inner stability produces a natural intensification of watchfulness; and this intensification gradually and in due measure gives contemplative insight."²⁶ Without watchfulness, a contemplative life cannot begin. The mind displaced by continuous movement is never truly present to any one reality; it arrives nowhere. This habit of movement, once established, tends to persist as a disposition in the formation of the soul.

The fruit of watchfulness is inner stillness, called *hesychia* by the Fathers. It is the condition in which the intellect is truly present to God. St John Climacus defines it: "Solitude of the body is the knowledge and reduction to order of the habits and feelings. And solitude of soul is the knowledge of one's thoughts and an inviolable mind."²⁷ A soul that is still in God is recognisable as: "an unruffled mind, sanctified thought, rapture towards the Lord...constant hunger for prayer, unsleeping vigilance."²⁸ These are not aspirational states; they are the marks of a real interior transformation. "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God" (Mt 5:8).

A person grows in contemplation as his thoughts gradually quieten through reorientation rather than through the suppression of desire or a hatred of earthly life. The mind must come to prefer the Triune God over the many distractions of a wounded creation. This process stands in direct contrast to any environment that rewards speed, novelty, and fragmented attention. St Maximos the Confessor writes, "It is by virtue of its unity that the intellect reaches out to what is beyond its natural scope and attains the contemplation of God."²⁹ Where the faculties are in discord, that movement cannot be sustained.

²⁵ St Hesychios the Priest, *On Watchfulness and Holiness* Written for Theodoulos, §3, in the *Philokalia* vol. 1: 162-163.

²⁶ St Hesychios the Priest, *On Watchfulness and Holiness*, §7, in the *Philokalia*, Vol 1: 163.

²⁷ St. John Climacus, *The Ladder*, Step 27 §2. 111.

²⁸ St. John Climacus, *The Ladder*, Step 27 §37. 114.

²⁹ See. St. Maximos the Confessor, *Various Texts on Theology, the Divine Economy, and Virtue and Vice*, Fifth Century, §69; in the *Philokalia* vol 2: 276.

For the Fathers, this integration is also bodily. A person seeking God while his body is driven by sensual appetites will not find stillness. The body generates images, impulses and desires that occupy the intellect and which need to be overcome by ordering one's body. Ascetic practices and the custody of the senses train us to reduce bodily impulses that weaken orientation to God. Evagrius the Solitary thought, "You cannot attain pure prayer while entangled in material things and agitated by constant cares. Prayer means the shedding of thoughts."³⁰ The way to God requires a freedom from the unnecessary so as to make room for the necessary. This is what Our Lord means by "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven" (Mt. 5:3). St Diadochos puts it pastorally: No one achieves likeness to God, he writes, "unless he persuades his soul not to be distracted by the false glitter of this life."³¹ These words are recognitions of what the intellect requires in order to remain capable of receiving truth.

Contemplation is not achieved quickly. It requires time and a purity of soul that allows what is received to mature into daily orientation. The habits described earlier, such as, expecting immediacy and rapid resolution, the training of the mind in succession rather than retention, besides making contemplation more difficult, realistically endangers the interior disposition on which contemplation depends. The person formed in digital habits finds prayer harder, and in addition to that difficulty, the very ground of watchfulness and stillness is giving way. The ascetical tradition does not leave the diagnosis without remedy. What the habits of digital life erode, such as attention and the capacity for stillness, are precisely the faculties that formation has always addressed. They were formed once, and with pastoral sensitivity, they can be formed again.

Section VI: Ascetical Resistance and Pastoral Formation

Any ethical evaluation of the digital environment remains incomplete without attending to the actual lives of lay Christians. Pastoral concern always takes into account a person's starting point. Individuals are formed within specific generations and shaped by specific environments, each carrying its own vulnerabilities and its own openness to grace. Christ speaks of other sheep, not of this fold, who

³⁰ Evagrius the Solitary *On Prayer: One Hundred and Fifty-Three Texts*, §71. In the *Philokalia* vol. 1: 64.

³¹ St. Diadochos of Photiki, *On Spiritual Knowledge and Discrimination* One Hundred Texts, §4; in the *Philokalia* vol. 1: 253.

must also hear His voice (Jn 10:16), and the apostolic mission extends the same reach: “Go therefore and make disciples of all nations” (Mt 28:19). Interior attention, the gradual reorientation of desire, the slow formation of the heart towards God is also part of the ordinary path of Christian life.

Watchfulness before God often begins with something small enough to seem negligible, a brief moment of recollection, a refusal of one unnecessary distraction. The Kingdom of Heaven is like a grain of mustard seed, the smallest of all seeds, which grows greater than all shrubs (Mk 4:30-32). The young professional who prays before opening a device, who avoids tempting applications, is on the same path as a monk who has withdrawn from every screen. They are separated by degree, not kind.

The Lord promises something much more durable than the conditions of the world: “In the world you have tribulation; but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world” (Jn 16:33). The Christian within the digital environment is also called to contemplation in his life, although under harder conditions. Interior freedom and the capacity to remain a subject who chooses and discerns are what the digital environment is designed, at its commercial core, to dissolve. The person who enters it without formation is already partway toward becoming an object of the system rather than a person within it.

This challenge is not experienced uniformly. Those who came to adulthood before the widespread integration of digital technology, the “digital immigrants”³² referred to as baby-boomer and millennial generations, retain, at least in principle, habits of attention formed in analogue cultures that still demanded sustained engagement and the slow assimilation of knowledge. Digital mediation entered their lives as a transition.

For the “digital natives,” the situation is very different.³³ What earlier generations experienced as a disruption to established habits is, for generations Z and Alpha, simply the circumstances within which those habits are being formed. The generation now entering childhood encounters digital devices with conversational AI systems that respond to them, anticipate their preferences, and structure their

³² Prensky, M. (2001). “Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants Part 1.” *On the Horizon*, 9(5), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10748120110424816>.

³³ Falikman, M. (2021). “There and Back Again: A (Reversed) Vygotskian Perspective on Digital Socialization.” *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 501233. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.501233>.

world from the outset. Each successive generation is immersed earlier and more comprehensively. The Church cannot afford to ignore what this means for interior formation and for the deliberate counter-formative choices required to sustain the Christian path.

In education, artificial intelligence offers genuine possibilities from supporting diverse learning needs, widening access to knowledge, to assisting teachers and researchers. Yet education, as the Church has consistently held, is not a process of passing on facts and skills. Its aim is "to contribute to the person's holistic formation in its various aspects (intellectual, cultural, spiritual, etc.) in keeping with the nature and dignity of the human person. We must break that idea of education which holds that educating means filling one's head with ideas. That is the way we educate automatons, cerebral minds, not people. Educating is taking a risk in the tension between the mind, the heart, and the hands."³⁴ No matter how intelligently digital mediation is designed, the child formed primarily within it is deprived of something essential. The intellect and will are shaped through direct encounter with reality, and that encounter cannot be mediated away. Christian teachers and educational communities bear responsibility for the full person, from sensory perception and imagination to conscience and reasoned judgment. The Christian vision of education embraces the whole person, who is not reducible to technology or measurability.

In medicine, the diagnostic and analytical potential of artificial intelligence is considerable. Yet the Christian understanding of the sick person is relational. Replacing that presence with robotic systems or remote automated management is a loss of something medicine exists to serve. Pope Leo XIV, addressing the Pontifical Academy for Life, stressed that AI must enhance interpersonal relationships and the care provided, not substitute for them.³⁵ A robotic system that replaces

³⁴ Dicastery for the Doctrine of the Faith and Dicastery for Culture and Education. *Antiqua et Nova: Note on the Relationship Between Artificial Intelligence and Human Intelligence*. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 28 January 2025. §§77–78.

³⁵ Pope Leo XIV, Message to the Pontifical Academy for Life, 10 November 2025. Shannon Vallor's argument in "Carebots and Caregivers: Sustaining the Ethical Ideal of Care in the Twenty-First Century" (*Philosophy & Technology* 24, no. 3, 2011, 251–268) reaches the same conclusion from outside the tradition: where AI systems absorb the labour of care, the capacities through which the carer is formed such as attentiveness, patience, the willingness to remain present to another person's suffering, gradually decline. The burdensomeness of care is not incidental to this; it is the school in which the carer becomes capable of love. What the theological tradition holds sacramentally, Vallor identifies as a philosophical consequence of how human character is built.

the human carer does not augment medicine. It removes what medicine at its deepest level exists to provide: proximity, attention, and the incarnate weight of another person's presence. Illness is more than a biological event; it is also very much a human and spiritual one, in which the person is particularly vulnerable and open. Whether illness is an ascetical trial, an occasion of purification, or a passage toward death, it calls for a human presence no technology can provide. Saint Luke of Crimea (1877–1961), who was three times arrested and exiled to Siberia, was a world-class surgeon and Archbishop, and was canonised by the Russian Orthodox Church in 1996. In his theological treatise *Spirit, Soul, and Body*, he argues that medicine, which attends only to the biological dimension, has already failed the patient.³⁶

The care of the sick, central to the Gospels, is a corporal work of mercy through which the love of God is made present in the proximity of other people. A patient cared for by a nurse or doctor experiences something of God's nearness through the nearness of another person.³⁷ Christian nurses and doctors, whether they realise it or not, participate in the *koinonia*. This care is a grace for the infirm and for those who give it. Philip Kariatlis writes: "the practice of mutual service is both the indispensable condition for this encounter [with the risen Christ], and the indispensable expression of it ... the love Christians have for one another is the real symbol of Christ's presence in the world."³⁸ A system, therefore, that removes the human carer is actually reducing the quality of care and becoming an obstacle to occasions of grace for both carers and the cared-for alike.

In work and economic life the benefits of digital advancement are real, from enhanced planning and better resource management to optimised logistics and bureaucracy. Yet automation also brings a rapid reduction in the requirement for human labour across many sectors. The International Labour Organisation's *World Employment and Social Outlook* (2024) offers an account of what accelerating automation is

³⁶ Saint Luke of Crimea, [Voino-Yasenetsky, V.F.]. *Spirit, Soul, and Body (Dukh, dusha i telo)*. Originally written c.1940s; published Kiev, 2002. English translation: Convent of the Mother of God Portaitissa, Trazegnies, Belgium, 2010. ISBN 978-9079889433. Voino-Yasenetsky, V.F. *I Have Loved Suffering: Autobiography (Ya polyubil stradaniye)*. Moscow: Blagodatny Ogon, 2000.

³⁷ Henri J. M. Nouwen, "Ministry for a Rootless Generation," in *The Wounded Healer: Ministry in Contemporary Society* (New York: Image Books, 1979), chap. 3.

³⁸ Philip Kariatlis, *Church as Communion: The Gift and Goal of Koinonia* (Hindmarsh: ATF Press, 2011), 107, quoting Xavier Léon-Dufour, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread*, 252.

already producing. Despite technological progress, living standards and productivity growth have not improved. Employment growth decelerated by 0.6 per cent in 2023, real wages declined across most G20 economies, and 435 million people are seeking work but cannot find it. Generative AI is now testing labour market resilience at the moment when that resilience is already weakened. The ILO's conclusions align with the judgement of Christian social teaching: the present trajectory, if unaddressed by clear policy, will lead to further inequality and erode the requirements proper to dignified human labour. That a United Nations body reaches this conclusion on grounds of social justice alone warrants attention.³⁹

Work, in Christian anthropology, is participation in the creative activity of God through which the person develops his capacities, sustains his community, and contributes to the common good.⁴⁰ John Paul II's *Laborem Exercens* (1981) holds that work is "a fundamental dimension of human existence on earth," that the human person is "the proper subject of work," and that any system treating the worker as "an instrument and not in accordance with the true dignity of his work" commits a fundamental moral error. He also identified the "widespread introduction of automation into many spheres of production" as requiring moral and structural reappraisal.⁴¹

Christians engaged in public life have a responsibility to advocate for policies that defend workers' dignity and expand employment opportunities. This means resisting the commercial logic that replaces persons with processes wherever profitable, and the financing and taxation structures that underwrite the primacy of profit over people.

The Nobel Laureate in Economics (2024), Prof Daron Acemoglu warns that if "all we do is continue down the path of automation, with no counterbalancing innovations to generate new tasks, the implications for labor are depressing," since "the trend towards lower labor share and anemic growth in labor demand will continue with potentially disastrous consequences for income inequality and social cohesion," and that "rampant automation would contribute to anemic growth and inequality" rather than undergirding "employment and shared

³⁹ International Labour Organization. *World Employment and Social Outlook: Trends 2024*. Geneva: ILO, 2024, 16-17,22,26-33. https://www.ilo.org/global/research/global-reports/weso/WCMS_908142/lang--en/index.htm

⁴⁰ *Gaudium et spes* §§63, 67.

⁴¹ Pope John Paul II. *Laborem Exercens: On Human Work*. Vatican City, 14 September 1981. §§ 1, 4-7.

prosperity."⁴² He notes that firms often have "excessive demand for automation technologies," including those that "help companies to better monitor workers and thus increase profits by reducing wages," so that "so-so automation" can "be damaging to workers, without generating major productivity gains."⁴³ Who bears the costs of accelerating automation is a question of justice, and one that the Christian social traditions are equipped and obliged to address.

Section VII: Pastoral Concern and the Path of Recovery

Within the world of macroeconomics and social infrastructure, the Church attends to individuals, families, and communities in need of careful pastoral care. Digital environments consistently cultivate the interior state that makes watchfulness, stillness, and orientation toward God difficult. For the person formed within them, something more basic than distraction is occurring: the very direction of desire is being shaped, gradually and without awareness, away from the contemplative union with God for which we were created. The Church has met analogous disruptions before. The ascetical tradition itself was not formed in comfortable conditions. This new challenge of the digital environment and AI, for all its dangers, is not outside the reach of the Lord who said: "I have overcome the world" (Jn 16:33).

The person formed in perpetual noise may find that this very formation opens him to conversion. The encounter with silence, precisely because it is unfamiliar, becomes a moment of intimate encounter with God. Light is more readily recognised in darkness than in the brightness of day. The restlessness that digital life intensifies is itself the hunger St Augustine described as, a heart that will not rest until it rests in God.⁴⁴ The dissatisfaction, the fatigue with surfaces, what psychology now calls social media fatigue, may, in the mercy of God, become the very circumstances that open a soul to something more profound. Alexander Schmemmann wrote that "man is a hungry being. But he is hungry for God. Behind all the hunger of our life is God. All desire is finally a desire

⁴² Acemoglu, Daron, and Pascual Restrepo. "The Wrong Kind of AI? Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Labor Demand." NBER Working Paper 25682. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research, 2019, 5, 10. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cjres/rsz022>.

⁴³ Acemoglu, Daron, and Simon Johnson. *Power and Progress: Our Thousand-Year Struggle over Technology and Prosperity*; Bibliographical essay. New York: PublicAffairs, 2023.

⁴⁴ St. Augustine, *Confessions*, I, 1; in *Patrologia Latina*, edited by J.-P. Migne, vol 32, col. 661. Paris 1844-64.

for Him."⁴⁵ The pastoral task is to help each generation recognise this hunger and direct it to its only true object.

Pastoral concern and critical analysis are not alternatives. The Church's presence within the digital environment is both necessary and possible. It can use the environment's own reach to point beyond it, while not being formed by its logic. The Church has rightly used digital platforms for outreach, and this carries value, especially in reaching those who might not otherwise encounter the Gospel. Well-designed applications offering daily scripture, guided prayer, or liturgical preparation can serve as legitimate instruments of evangelisation, forming understanding gradually rather than overwhelming. The potential of artificial intelligence to generate contextually sensitive scriptural commentary or personalised catechetical pathways deserves serious engagement by those with theological formation. The light can and does shine in the darkness.

A serious danger arises when digital engagement is treated as sufficient in itself. Faith is life to be entered into and is much more than content that has been delivered and accepted. It is formed through liturgical koinonia and the slow work of prayer and asceticism within a sustained way of life. A faith formed entirely within the digital environment risks remaining at its level, without the depth true communion requires. Digital pastoral outreach must always point toward, and draw persons into, the encounter that only real presence can provide.⁴⁶

Artificial intelligence systems are quickly evolving in their capacity to generate pastoral content, including sermons, catechetical materials, and responses to spiritual questions, with no traceable human authorship. They can simulate the presence of a spiritual father or a community. They can generate prayers without the guidance of the Holy Spirit. This borders on the sacrilegious, removing grace and divine light from Christian life. Content deficiency is the lesser problem. What matters is that the person seeking formation cannot know whether a human being touched by grace stands behind what they are receiving, whether it is within the koinonia of prayer, suffering, and *theosis*. Every Christian engaging with digital religious

⁴⁵ Schmemmann, A. (1973). *For the Life of the World: Sacraments and Orthodoxy*. St Vladimir's Seminary Press. p. 14. ISBN 978-0881410204.

⁴⁶ Eric Stoddart, "Artificial Pastoral Care: Abdication, Delegation or Collaboration?" *Studies in Christian Ethics* 36, no. 4 (2023): 13-14.

content must be encouraged to ask who is the person behind this, and how present and involved are they in what they are offering?

Educators, catechists, and pastors carry a moral obligation that goes beyond strategy or communication. Fidelity to the *imago Dei* requires that those entrusted with the formation of souls understand the environment in which those souls are being formed. This means more than learning to use digital platforms. It requires engagement with the psychological dynamics of digital life: the mechanisms of addiction, the architecture of attention capture, the particular vulnerabilities of each generation, and the ways desire and identity are shaped below the level of conscious choice. Understanding how people in the digital age actually think and are influenced is a pastoral necessity. The Church that speaks to new mentalities must first understand them. Simply imitating the platforms that have formed the digital generations is not sufficient. Christianity must be able to offer, with credibility and compassion, what those platforms cannot: a truth and a beauty that no algorithm has produced and no system can contain.

At the level of personal practice, deliberate counter-formative habits such as brief prayer before engaging with devices, fasting from screens on Sundays and in penitential seasons, sustained contact with the natural world which serve to re-order attention and resist the logic of continuous stimulation. These habits are enriched within communities of formation: families, parishes, and small circles of friendship, and above all in the care of the poor, the sick, and the elderly, where a person encounters Christ.

Section VIII: Christian Ethics, the *Imago Dei*, and the Common Good

The *imago Dei* carries beyond theology, public, legal, and institutional consequences. Every person bears this irreducible dignity regardless of status or measurable contribution. This stands as the direct theological counter-position to the logic of automated systems that rank, sort, and evaluate persons according to efficiency, productivity, and data value. These systems, whose operating assumptions extend to governance, medicine, education, and employment, introduce a quietly totalising vision of the human person as a calculable resource.

“The truth will set you free” (Jn 8:32) grounds every person’s right to truth and to a freedom rooted in what is true. In digitally mediated environments, this confronts the logic of systematic manipulation directly: the algorithmic preferencing of emotionally stimulating content over accurate content, the generation of responses designed to retain rather than inform, the substitution of constructed pseudo-

realities for encountered reality. A system designed to mislead is not merely a commercial misconduct. It attacks the epistemic conditions on which conscience depends. In doing so, it violates the person's right to truth, their vocation to know reality truthfully, and their path toward knowledge of God. This creates an urgent tension between the rights of the individual and the obligations of governments, technology companies, and platform designers to honour the dignity of those who use their systems. The secular language of consumer rights and data protection captures part of this concern, and the Church should insist upon it without apology. But it is only a partial response.

Shoshana Zuboff, in her analysis of surveillance capitalism, describes a system that claims human experience as "free raw material for hidden commercial practices of extraction, prediction, and sales" and identifies its endpoint as a "new means of behavioural modification" operating below conscious awareness.⁴⁷ What she identifies from the standpoint of political economy, Christian anthropology understands as an inherent assault on the freedom to which the *imago Dei* is entitled. The failure to respect the user's right to the truth and freedom from manipulation extends beyond commercial and legal considerations into the spiritual realm, where the Church has both the competence and the obligation to challenge.

Freedom of thought, conscience, and spiritual development are not secular liberal values that happen to reflect Christian teaching. A person whose attention is captured and whose desires are continuously shaped by digital systems designed for commercial engagement, and whose perception of reality is filtered by subconscious persuasion, is not free. The conditions under which the image of God is lived and oriented toward God are being deformed. The person is ever more becoming the object of processes designed by others rather than the subject of his own spiritual and moral life. Metropolitan Nektarios of Corfu names this plainly: "The human is transformed into a number, into data, into statistics. He loses his personhood."⁴⁸

⁴⁷ Shoshana Zuboff, *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power* (New York: PublicAffairs, 2019), chap. 1, §3; chap. 11, §§2-3.

⁴⁸ Metropolitan Nektarios of Corfu, "From the Dictatorship of the Pandemic to Electronic Totalitarianism," theological reflection published on Romfea.gr, 22 May 2025. <https://orthochristian.com>.

The ethical consequences reach beyond personal asceticism to the structural level. In education, the right of every child to a formation that develops the whole person rather than merely delivering measurable content is a requirement of dignity. AI in education must serve the person's holistic development rather than reduce learning to the delivery of information, or to producing *Homo algorithmicus*, cerebral minds, rather than people.

In law and governance, and beyond data rights and privacy protections, Christians should advocate for the limitation of algorithmic systems that make life-determining decisions without accountability or appeal. What Metropolitan Nektarios calls electronic totalitarianism, the simultaneous knowledge and regulation of the citizen's entire life through converging digital data, requires legal and regulatory response, in addition to personal vigilance.⁴⁹ The precautionary principle applied to AI development is, in this light, a form of institutional stewardship of the *imago Dei*.

Legal frameworks are beginning, however unevenly, to move. The Council of Europe's Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence, Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law (2024), the first internationally binding treaty in this field, grounds AI governance in human dignity, non-discrimination, transparency, and accountability, and gives citizens the right to challenge AI-driven decisions affecting their lives.⁵⁰ The UN General Assembly's 2024 Resolution unanimously affirmed that "the same rights that people have offline must also be protected online" and called on all states to refrain from AI systems that cannot comply with international human rights law.⁵¹ These decisions confirm, from grounds of social justice and democratic accountability, conclusions reached independently of theology.

This obligation cannot be discharged by individual pastoral initiatives or occasional episcopal statements, however valuable. It requires structured, ecumenical, and sustained engagement, including the defence of the ethical content of words such as dignity, care and conscience against their progressive hollowing out by commercial and technocratic usage.

⁴⁹ *ibid.*

⁵⁰ Council of Europe, Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence and Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law, §§6-10,17. CETS No. 25. Adopted 17 May 2024.

⁵¹ United Nations General Assembly Resolution A/RES/78/L.49, §5.

Commercial logic drives the dominant platforms toward the capture and monetisation of attention, without reference to truth or the formation of conscience. These are not incidental imperfections. Addiction by design, the deliberate exploitation of psychological vulnerability, the surfacing of morally corrosive content, and the targeting of children in environments structured to bypass rational consent are features of a business model that treats the interior life as a commercial resource. Rather they are revealing themselves as essential features of a business model that considers the interior life of the human person as a commercial resource. The World Council of Churches expressed concern in 2023 "that AI development is not guided by the common good but by the commercial interests of the most powerful, with potentially grave risks for society."⁵² A 2025 ecumenical consultation stated plainly: "Whenever AI reduces people to consumers, gig workers, or raw data, it violates the *imago Dei* and denies the sacredness of life."⁵³

At the social level, a united Christian voice should advocate for platform accountability that extends beyond data protection to include transparency in algorithmic recommendations, the prohibition of manipulative design features, and the protection of users from content that degrades dignity or corrupts conscience. These commitments should go far beyond voluntary declarations, forming the basis of legally enforceable subscriber rights: entitlements to truthful communication, freedom from behavioural manipulation, and ultimately to a right to the protection of the inner life from commercial exploitation. In the light of the *imago Dei*, a platform's relationship with its users is a moral relationship. What is communicated, by what means, and for what purposes, are not merely commercial decisions. They should constitute what a subscriber contract means in law. The Christian tradition has long insisted that justice requires just institutions, not private virtue alone: this applies with full force to the structures of the digital environment.

At the formative level, the Church's obligation is to provide its members, especially younger members, with a serious, platform-specific catechesis on the digital environment. General warnings are insufficient. Professional knowledge and an honest account of the

⁵² World Council of Churches Central Committee, *Statement on the Unregulated Development of Artificial Intelligence*. Geneva: WCC, 21-27 June 2023.

⁵³ World Council of Churches, "Faith Communities Issue Urgent Call to Transform AI from Profit to Life," news release, September 2025.

mechanisms at work in each widely used platform is needed. Understanding how it is designed, what anthropological assumptions it embodies, and what vulnerabilities it targets will help to determine what concrete practices sustain the freedom that Christian life requires. This envisioned catechesis is constructive with the purpose of restoring a living awareness of one's own dignity as an image of God. It should help a young person understand that they are more than an engagement metric or a behavioural data set aggregating their online preferences. The digital natives need a new proclamation that they were created for the knowledge of truth and intellectual freedom. A freedom of who they can be in Christ, and to choose communion with the Lord. The encounter with one's own dignity before God is a form of liberation that only the Church, in her sacramental and catechetical life, can offer.

The *imago Dei* is the defining dignity of every human being. The freedom it demands belongs to every person regardless of confession. Christians enter this public conversation as witnesses to a vision of the human person that secular modernity, for all its formal commitment to rights and dignity, struggles to articulate without the theological ground that sustains it. The Christian Churches, speaking with one voice, will carry credibility on this question earned from centuries of engagement with what the human person is and what conditions allow the human person to flourish. It is time to bring that tradition, in all its weight, into the public conversation about the future of artificial intelligence, as the voice of all those who know the One in whose image every human intelligence was made.

IX. Conclusion: The Image That Remains, and the Call That Continues

“Let us make man in our image, after our likeness” (Gn. 1:26-27). These words are spoken now into a moment when the environments that form human persons are designed by commercial interests and optimised for behavioural capture at a scale without historical parallel. Unable to destroy the *imago Dei*, which is ontologically inalienable, such environments alter the conditions under which that image is lived and brought to its proper end.

The central ethical question is what kind of person is formed within an AI environment. A conscience shaped by digital stimulation rather than sustained encounter with truth will perceive the good poorly and distinguish it with difficulty from what merely attracts. A person whose relational life is consistently mediated by digital proxies will know the face of another less fully. What Zizioulas identified as the

constitutive encounter of personhood, the "I" that exists only through the "Thou", is being quietly eroded. These hypothetical dangers of the past are now the ordinary conditions of formation for much of the contemporary world.

The faculties that the digital environment disorders, attention, interiority, relational presence, are precisely the faculties the ascetical tradition has always sought to order, through practices available to everybody and through the gradual reorientation of desire towards the One who does not pass.

A first call is to formation. Catechetical responsibility extends to the digital environment, moving from general warnings to platform-specific, theologically grounded accounts of how each major digital system shapes attention and desire, and what concrete practices sustain the freedom that Christian life requires. This is, at its root, a proclamation: you are more than an engagement metric. You were made for knowledge of the truth and for communion with the Lord who is the way, the truth, and the life (Jn 14:6).

A second call is to watchfulness. The *nepsis* the Fathers describe is a disposition formed slowly and sustained by practice. It begins, as St Hesychios wrote, with something as small as a refusal: one unnecessary impression not admitted, one moment of recollection before opening a device. The Kingdom of Heaven is like a grain of mustard seed. Watchfulness is the ground in which it germinates. But personal discipline belongs within a larger argument. The Church is called to form individuals who can resist while simultaneously insisting, publicly and persistently, that such resistance should not be necessary at all. The conditions of formation, while at heart personal, are commercial, political, and legal.

A third call is to witness. If AI platforms are designed to capture attention, degrade truth, and reduce persons to behavioural data, catechesis alone is not enough. The baptised have a right to know what is being done to their attention and desires. This right to choose otherwise transcends various categories, from morality to privacy rights and from civil law to consumer rights.

The Church is called to a sustained moral, political, and legal pressure on technology companies, insisting that every major platform offer users a real and accessible choice: to receive only accurate information, to exclude content that degrades human dignity, and to interact within an environment that respects rather than exploits the image of

God they bear. This is not a proposal to establish a Christian internet. Rather, it is a demand for informed consent, transparency of design, and the right to refuse manipulation. The Church has spoken consistently about the dignity of human life, the rights of workers, and the obligations of economic structures. It has both the framework and the authority to make this case before legislators, courts, and the companies themselves.⁵⁴ In Russia, the Church is already active in this regard: “All this must be placed under very strict control of the state and society. We must not miss the next possible danger that could destroy human life and human civilization. It is important for artificial intelligence to serve the good of people, and for people to be able to control it.”⁵⁵ The principles developed through Orthodox, Catholic, and ecumenical engagement, including those endorsed by the World Council of Churches, provide the normative starting point. What is needed now is coordinated action: lobbying, legal intervention where rights are demonstrably violated, and the formation of citizens who know what to demand and why.

“Let us make man in our image, after our likeness.” That word was not exhausted at creation. It is repeated in every sacrament, in every real encounter with another person, in every act of watchfulness by which a soul turns back toward the One in whose image it was made. The convergence of Artificial Intelligence and the digital environment has not silenced that voice. But the conditions in which it can be heard, the state of interiority, attention, and freedom from manipulation, are being eroded. The ecclesial task is to bear witness to those conditions, to form persons capable of inhabiting them, and to hold every structure of human organisation, including the structures of digital technology, to account before the dignity of the image they have been given, whether they acknowledge the Giver or not.

⁵⁴ See. Catholic Bishops' Conference of India. *Final Statement of the XXXVI General Assembly*. Bengaluru, 7 February 2024. II, §5. <https://catholicconnect.in/news/cbci-36th-general-body-meeting-final-statement>.

⁵⁵ “The Development of Artificial Intelligence Must Be Strictly Controlled by the State – Patriarch Kirill,” *Interfax-Russia*, January 30, 2025, <https://www.interfax-russia.ru/index.php/moscow/news/razvitie-iskusstvennogo-intellekta-dolzno-zhestko-kontrolirovatsya-gosudarstvom-patriarh-kirill>.