

UDK 004.8:2

1Ricoeur, P.

1Ferry, L.

<https://doi.org/10.53745/bs.95.5.12>

Received: 4. 9. 2025

Accepted: 28. 1. 2026

Original scientific paper

© 2025 Vodičar, CC BY NC 4.0

Is Artificial Intelligence God – Given or On Its Way to Becoming God?

Je li umjetna inteligencija Bogom dana ili na putu da postane Bog?

Janez Vodičar¹

Abstract

Just as God once created man, man has created artificial intelligence. Although we speak of artificial, machine and anything else that would devalue it, artificial intelligence is increasingly taking on the role of man's irreplaceable partner, even the role of God. We will present the advantages and disadvantages of AI and place it within the teachings of the Church. Our question is whether there is still room for the God of Christian Revelation. Using Luc Ferry's concept of consciousness, we will show that AI lacks the sense of vulnerable consciousness that for many is the essential entry point into religiosity. In doing so, we will draw on Paul Ricoeur's understanding of the threefold human awareness of passivity. It is this human vulnerability that can lead to an effective theological response to the challenges of digital culture. Finally, we will offer some considerations for theological reflection in the light of the notion of kenosis. It is therefore important to ask what the fundamental Christian message is to respond meaningfully to the challenges of artificial intelligence. All this also calls for a renewal of the foundations of the Church's pastoral action.

Key words: Artificial intelligence, consciousness, passivities, Paul Ricoeur, Luc Ferry, kenosis.

Sažetak

Kao što je Bog stvorio čovjeka tako je čovjek stvorio umjetnu inteligenciju. Iako govorimo o umjetnomu, o stroju i svemu drugom što bi je obezvrijedilo, umjetna inteligencija sve više preuzima ulogu čovjekova nezamjenjivog partnera, čak i ulogu Boga. Predstaviti ćemo prednosti i nedostatke umjetne inteligencije te je smjestiti unutar cr-

¹ Faculty of Theology, University of Ljubljana

kvenoga nauka. Pitamo se ima li još uvijek mjesta za Boga kršćanske objave. Koristeći se Luc Ferryjevim konceptom svijesti, pokazat ćemo da umjetna inteligencija ne može imati osjećaj) ranjive svijesti, koji je za mnoge bitna ulazna točka u religioznost. Pritom ćemo crpiti iz Ricœurova razumijevanja trostruke svijesti o pasivnosti. Upravo ta ljudska ranjivost može dovesti do učinkovita teološkog odgovora na izazove digitalne kulture. Konačno, ponudit ćemo neka razmatranja za teološko promišljanje u svjetlu pojma *kenosis*. Stoga je važno pitati se koja je temeljna kršćanska poruka kako bismo smisleno odgovorili na izazove umjetne inteligencije. Sve to također poziva na obnovu temelja pastoralnog djelovanja Crkve.

Ključne riječi: Umjetna inteligencija, svijest, pasivnosti, Paul Ricoeur, Luc Ferry, kenoza.

Introduction

There have been many moments in the history of the Church when it was necessary to respond to the challenges of the times, often leading to theological and structural transformations. These challenges are not always problems imposed from outside, such as persecution, misunderstandings, or conflicting moral convictions. The Church, as a community of believers, has often been confronted with its own challenges to the understanding of personal and communal faith when the whole understanding of Revelation was called into question. Just as in the past, for example, when man ceased to be the geographical center of the universe as his view of the universe changed, or when, in the face of the challenges of evolution, the ultimate distinguishing feature of man - the apex in the midst of living creatures - was lost to man, so today Christians are challenged by modern digital technology. At first, it seemed like it was just a new technology and we would have to learn to use it for a more witnessing proclamation. However, with the advent of artificial intelligence, we know that it is a phenomenon that requires a new discernment both at the level of the universal Church and at the level of each individual believer (Šegula 2024, 907). In this context, it is important to find a pastoral model that saves us from the two extremes of ideologization and idealization (De Mori 2024, 297). Numerous examples show that a medium that gradually changes the relationships between people, between people and institutions and institutions as such, can be used very slowly and in a covert way for good or bad preaching (294). The Church is aware that its task is not only to solve current problems, but also to take care of future generations so that they can live from the resources of Revelation (Labrecque 2024, 282). These are also the reasons why the Church's magisterium responded early to the challenge of digitalization (Globokar 2024).

In this paper, we want to present the dangers and power of artificial intelligence from an anthropological and theological perspective. In particular, we will look for ways to convey a humane attitude towards AI through contemporary theology. At the same time, we will ask what theological priorities a pastoral approach should have in the age of digital transformation.

1. The Emergence of Artificial Intelligence and Its Dangers

The latest document from the Church's Magisterium on AI comes from the Dicastery for the Doctrine of the Faith and the Dicastery for Culture and Education with the Latin name *Antiqua et nova* and the English subtitle *Note on the Relationship Between Artificial Intelligence and Human Intelligence* (AN 2025). Although the document is relatively new, as it was only published at the end of January, a lot has happened in this area in recent months. Just think of the Chinese progress in AI development, which has made competition between the different developers even more pronounced, and the even fewer opportunities to establish healthy control and regulation (World Economic Forum 2025).

The document begins with a reference to the first chapter of the Bible. We would like to explain this in more detail and with a little free interpretation. The first paragraph of the document states: »The Christian tradition regards the gift of intelligence as an essential aspect of how humans are created »in the image of God« (Gen. 1:27). Starting from an integral vision of the human person and the biblical calling to »till« and »keep« the earth (Gen. 2:15), the Church emphasizes that this gift of intelligence should be expressed through the responsible use of reason and technical abilities in the stewardship of the created world.« (AN 1) In the beginning, God thus created man in His own image (Platovnjak and Svetelj 2023, 979–980). According to the document, God has given man the intelligence to name creation and to deal with it responsibly. At the same time, man's intelligence helps him to recognize that he is not God, not the creator, but only the steward. We all know how the story unfolded. The creature made in God's image betrayed its Creator. Rebellious man recognized his limitations and lost his paradisiacal abode.

At the beginning of his hard work, man made his work easier. First with simple stone tools, then he was able to write down his inventions and thus enable others to reproduce them. Printing made the exchange of knowledge even faster. The world became more and more interconnected through new inventions. The connection became even faster and more effective when we

were able to hear and soon see each other across the world (Kraner 2024, 934). And when this tool for connecting knowledge became available to almost all of us, we collectively created intelligence, intelligence that can answer almost any question in a matter of seconds. For this reason, artificial intelligence - a human creation - is increasingly feared by many. One may wonder whether humans will have the ability, like the Creator, to exorcize artificial intelligence when it disobeys.

In her latest work, in which she attempts to create guidelines for the safe use of AI, Ivana Bartoletti² writes: »Almost a year after OpenAI introduced the chatbot ChatGPT, there has been a surge of competition among companies to create potent generative AI systems. With each new iteration, these systems are becoming more capable, gradually encroaching on human abilities. By generating text, visuals, videos and even software, based on human inputs, these AI solutions are helping to make information more easily understandable and to accelerate technological advance. However, they also come with potential hazards. AI-created content has the ability to inundate the internet with false information and convincingly fabricated 'deepfakes', videos that feature realistic and practically indistinguishable artificial faces and voices. In the long term, these problems could undermine trust among individuals and in political leaders, news outlets and institutions.« (2024, 94) These words from a safety expert make us wonder if there is anything we can do to stop this trajectory. Nobel laureate Geoffrey Hinton³ recently said »open access was pure madness, it's far more dangerous than the atom bomb...«. The website says: »Nobel laureate Geoffrey Hinton says open sourcing big models is like letting people buy nuclear weapons at Radio Shack.« (OfficeChai Team 2024)

Artificial intelligence is many things. We will be interested in the large language models that are the result of a priori machine learning and deep learning, which we also refer to as general artificial intelligence. This includes a wide range of tools, from those for creating video, audio and graphic services to writing various texts. We can show specifically how this intelligence is autonomous in itself with an example that occurred while the first draft of this paper was being prepared. After writing the draft, I asked Chat GPT if

² She is a leader in the field of privacy, data protection and responsible technology. She is also an expert on AI and gender rights at the Council of Europe and is a Cybersecurity and Privacy Executive Fellow at Virginia Tech.

³ Geoffrey Everest Hinton (born 1947) is a British-Canadian computer scientist, cognitive scientist, and cognitive psychologist known for his work on artificial neural networks, which earned him the title »the Godfather of AI«.

it could improve it for me. Take a close look at the result! In my abstract, the conclusion reads:

»It is therefore important to ask what the fundamental Christian message is in order to respond meaningfully to the challenges of artificial intelligence. By seeking soundness and a redemptive openness, we will also be better able to guide contemporary proclamation and life in the Christian community.«

However, in the revised form proposed by the AI, the conclusion reads as follows:

»By exploring the fundamental Christian message within this context, we aim to provide a meaningful response to the challenges posed by AI, while also fostering a redemptive and sound approach to AI's role in contemporary Christian life. Ultimately, this paper will argue that AI, no matter how powerful, cannot replace the divine nature of God as understood in Christian revelation and that theological reflection is necessary to guide the integration of AI into a faithful Christian worldview.«

You probably agree with me that artificial intelligence has come to a better sounding conclusion than I have. What is frightening, however, is how it has changed everything. It has added its own claim that it will not replace the God of Christian revelation, and it has emphasized the need for integration.

A wise and valid point, but one I hadn't anticipated. It raises the question of whether this artificial intelligence is truly autonomous and therefore creative. After refining my abstract, one could certainly argue that it is. Many of the powerful men of the modern world are convinced that artificial intelligence will surpass humans in everything. On November 3, 2024, Elon Musk told the then British Prime Minister Rishi Sunak that labor will disappear completely and only those who work with AI will be needed. He also wrote on his X profile that AI will be smarter than any human next year and probably smarter than all of humanity combined by 2029 (Ferry 2025, 124). Such statements from a man who has a huge amount of money to invest are worth thinking about, especially when we look at his meddling in US employment policy. In this context, we can understand why someone would have microchips inserted into their brain or, as the owner of the company Chat GPT, Sam Altman, wrote in his will, that his brain could be scanned after his death and put on the internet to be made available to artificial intelligence.⁴

⁴ »Intelligence too cheap to meter is well within grasp. This may sound crazy to say, but if we told you back in 2020 we were going to be where we are today, it probably sounded more crazy than our current predictions about 2030.« (Altman 2025)

2. Artificial Intelligence and Its Power

We would prematurely assume that AI merely combines what is essentially neural networks and basic learning. But deep learning is much more advanced. When two robots, for once still looking rather ossified, were placed on a soccer field, they were given the simple instruction to score a goal. In less than half an hour, the two robots had taught themselves soccer techniques and were trying to beat each other by scoring goals.⁵ This meant that they were learning and competing with each other. Deep learning is about finding solutions from little data. The first tools worked with a lot of data, now they are increasingly trying to develop tools that generate results themselves (Pande 2019). This is why the intimidation of those who really know their way around this field should be taken seriously, even if Marc Andreessen, one of the first billionaires in this field, has written: »Fortunately, I am here to bring the good news: AI will not destroy the world, and in fact may save it.« (Andreessen 2023a)

In the field of religiosity, we know of several practical applications. In Japan, an image of a deity was developed to greet pilgrims and answer their questions. In Poland, among other things, a Catholic form of a saint has been created who can explain doctrine and give other explanations. It goes without saying that the Catholic Church was quick to respond to the challenges of artificial intelligence.⁶ Pope Francis was even the first Pope to be invited to the G7 summit to speak about artificial intelligence. In this context, the official teaching of the Church focuses more or less on the ethical and social sphere. Although the document mentioned at the beginning speaks in its second and third chapters about the nature of AI, there is no conflict with its legitimacy or otherwise from the point of view of religiosity. The two introductory chapters on the nature of AI and on what intelligence is could be summarized with the argument of Article 12: »AI's advanced features give it sophisticated abilities to perform tasks, but not the ability to think.« Not much is said about restructuring the form of faith itself. People's religious experiences are constantly changing. In recent centuries it has been severely challenged by science. The positivist understanding of everything largely displaces traditional religiosity and offers technical solutions to fundamental existential questions in a powerful process of demythologization.

In the great manifesto of the so-called techno-optimists, almost every statement begins: 'We believe...'. Largely so-called scientific minds seem to be

⁵ This is available at the link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qrvK_KuleJk

⁶ This is available here: [God and robots: Will AI transform religion? - BBC News](#)

returning to religious language: »We believe that there is no material problem – whether created by nature or by technology – that cannot be solved with more technology.« (Andreessen 2023b). For them, technology brings the fullness of salvation. In this context, we can agree with Ferry that with the invention of AI, positivism in its most exaggerated form of materialism has reached its peak (Ferry 2025, 285-287).

3. Religion and Artificial Intelligence

Luc Ferry published a book this year entitled: *AI Great Replacement or Complementarity?* (2025). In it, he points out that it is precisely these contemporary techno-optimists who are continuing the movement of the transhumanists towards the so-called post-humanists, where religious polemics are becoming ever more present. He himself emphasizes that he is an atheist but claims that he is much closer to a Christian eschatology than to the eschatology of modern digital prophets. For him, AI is man's last cry to overcome his limitations, to finally attain immortality and thus assume a divine nature. Omniscience, eternity, omnipresence are qualities that were attributed to the gods, but now AI is increasingly taking the lead (Ferry 2025, 226-227). The problem is that this eschatology does not include the body as such (Stegu 2024, 918). Even if medical advances today allow us to largely improve the body to make it viable for a longer time, and enabling us to take on the tasks that we want to do, we will still be limited by it (Ferry 2025, 236-238). But in the so-called noosphere, which the post-humanists promise as a kind of omega point for the culmination of technological development, our consciousness will be liberated and dwell eternally and freely in the digital world. This idea, taken from the theology of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, is in his view far removed from the Christian idea of salvation and glorification. It is much closer to Spinoza's pantheistic image of immortality (243). Above all, however, it is rooted in a materialistic worldview in which all-encompassing matter was merely replaced by the concept of communication.

Interestingly, it was de Chardin's eschatology that the Jesuit Antonio Spadaro described in his book *Cybertheology* (2014) as a good starting point for theology, precisely one of the ways in which theology could respond to the challenges of modern technology.⁷ The crucial difference is that the post-

⁷ »In his reflections, Teilhard de Chardin talks about the history of the world from a very dynamic perspective of evolution, with a design that comes from a distance, from the creation, and looks far ahead, toward the Omega Point of history, where the resurrection of Christ summarizes the meaning of all of history.« (Spadaro 2014, 98)

humanist vision is about the loss of individuality, of self-consciousness. Unfortunately, the new Church document mentioned above does not distinguish between intelligence and consciousness. It uses consciousness only to denote self-awareness in the sense of responsibility. With Spadaro, on the other hand, man receives his ultimate realization in Christ and develops his own self-awareness in the fullness of communication, the universal communion with everything: »Here, Teilhard de Chardin attributed to technological communications a fundamental role in the creation of a communal consciousness, of a sort of brain constituted by interconnections, not of nonthinking fibres, but of other thinking brains. In this sphere, Teilhard de Chardin is extremely ambiguous about what actually does move, yet, we are definitely immersed within it. Teilhard de Chardin sees the world as a large and interconnected Web that points toward salvation.« (Spadaro 2014, 99)

It is this last point that Ferry is getting at, for he too tends to argue that AI is a tool that can indeed be a powerful addition to us, but also a threat if used irresponsibly. Ferry's final argument is not only that he doesn't want to live in some kind of digital paradise after death, where his consciousness can be used at will and without limit by anyone who wants it, but also that AI is incapable of distancing itself from itself (Ferry 2025, 293). It cannot think for itself and distance itself critically from its own consciousness. It is the ability of human consciousness to create, to live and to dissolve the split between me as subject and me as object. The human being is a subject that can even speak: I have sinned, I have made a mistake. In other words, a subject that speaks of itself as an object (295). By the very nature of its creation, artificial intelligence cannot do this. It can play it, it can imitate it, but it cannot create any kind of split consciousness.

4. Split Consciousness and Passivities in Light of AI

The split consciousness tends to understand and, in some way, to correct this. The path of understanding is also the path of seeking what we understand as the complete, the finally redeemed (Spadaro 2014, 82). Why is this important for theology? First, in the history of apologetics, it is one of the basic rational justifications for a being that transcends man and that Descartes, among many others, calls God. Secondly, it is the source of man's social attitude, of the awareness that he is not alone. And thirdly, it is the source of moral consciousness.

Ricoeur's hermeneutic approach to the justification of self-consciousness could help us here. According to him, the three experiences of passivity are

part of our fundamental self-consciousness. »There is the passivity represented by the experience of one's own body—or better, as we shall say later, of the flesh—as the mediator between the self and a world which is itself taken in accordance with its variable degrees of practicability and so of foreignness. Next, we find the passivity implied by the relation of the self to the foreign, in the precise sense of the other (than) self, and so the otherness inherent in the relation of intersubjectivity. Finally, we have the most deeply hidden passivity, that of the relation of the self to itself, which is conscience in the sense of *Gewissen* rather than of *Bewusst*.« (Ricoeur 1992, 318) All three passivities are not something that can be chosen. They are always already there. The child quickly discovers that the body does not obey him as he has imagined, something we all experience in the course of our lives. Similarly, most developmental psychologists argue that the fundamental moment of a child's development is precisely the separation of the will of others from one's own will. The awareness that my own will is not necessarily the will of my neighbors is something that confronts me with the world out there. It is interesting that Ricoeur also classifies conscience among the passivities. Freud took a different view and understood conscience more or less as a product of upbringing, i.e. the will of others. Ricoeur ascribes an additional dimension to it, as it brings in, alongside the will of others, the additional weight of the subject's responsibility before the image of himself as he creates it and desires it for himself. Artificial intelligence is not capable of the kind of detachment from itself that humans are capable of because of their ability to sense their own weakness. Ethical reflection, based on an awareness of responsibility, is alien to even the most intelligent machine.

Self-consciousness is built up through language. It is learned and a kind of translation is constantly taking place. The translation of what we hear, what we read, is always an interpretation. This translation of what comes from outside requires each individual to understand and constantly interpret it. In this way, the consciousness of the self is also formed. Humans have an innate need to give themselves meaning, to fit into society, to orient themselves in life, which AI cannot give (Pinheiro 2024, 263). This interpretation takes place in a dialog with ourselves, between what we already believe we are, what we would like to be, and what we believe others expect of us. »In this intimate conversation, the self appears to be called upon and, in this sense, to be affected in a unique way. Unlike the dialogue of the soul with itself, of which Plato speaks, this affection by another voice presents a remarkable dissymmetry, one that can be called vertical, between the agency that calls and the

self called upon. It is the vertical nature of the call, equal to its interiority, that creates the enigma of the phenomenon of conscience.« (Ricoeur 1992, 342) Our starting point, as predicted by Ricoeur, must allow for an openness to more than just the other, which can be defined and understood in our mere human understanding. It is the vocation, as we feel it in our conscience, that enables us to accept the message of Revelation. It does not disregard the will of the individual and its particularity but involves an openness »to constitute me both as a receptive subject and as a critical subject.« (Ricoeur 1995, 146)

The human starting point, and only human not AI's, from which Ricoeur proceeds must in some way allow for an openness to more than one otherness, that we can define in such an understanding of conscience and place it in the space of our purely human understanding. »Perhaps the philosopher as philosopher has to admit that one does not know and cannot say whether this Other, the source of the injunction, is another person whom I can look in the face or who can stare at me, or my ancestors for whom there is no representation, to so great an extent does my debt to them constitute my very self, or God–living God, absent God–or an empty place.« (Ricoeur 1992, 355)

If technological utopians are driven precisely to overcome the fundamental feeling of human helplessness, of passivity, this leads them to a utopia of self-salvation – AI is increasingly perceived as divine, sacred, which will completely appease man and redeem him from all miseries (Pinheiro 2024, 261). With the help of Ricoeur's three passivities, we can agree with Ferry that the machine, even if it is as intelligent as the software of artificial intelligence, is never surpassed in relation to itself: It is never anything else, it is what it is, a great fullness of empty and unfeeling being, without holes, without that strange emptiness that settles in the consciousness of the individual, at the very emergence of consciousness (Ferry 2025, 296).

Conclusion

The concept of passivity makes it even easier to understand what Ferry sees as the advantage of humans over AI. In human helplessness, in the feeling of woundedness, lies the path to the other, to responsibility and to the richness of meaningfulness, of vocation in relationships. »Forgiveness, mercy, love, fear, joy and gratitude, which are characteristic of relationships, are both human and divine attributes.« (Pinheiro 2024, 268) For us, this is a good starting point for theological considerations. We do not want to get into dogmatic territory. But suffice it to mention the concept of kenosis, the emptying of God, which

stands in stark contrast to the vision of the post-humanists. For a Christian, to look at the cross with the hope of an empty tomb is to be like God. It is the reflection on the three passivities that can give meaning to the modern understanding of Christology. »The Magisterium of fragility becomes, according to the Pope, a way to enrich the Church. Without vulnerability, without limits, without obstacles to overcome, there would be no true humanity.« (Giribaldi 2022) A Christology that takes both the incarnation and salvation in the fullness of the Holy Trinity seriously is the only healthy response to the techno-optimists' empty promises of salvation (Rožman 2024, 863). It is a communicative process, as Teilhard de Chardin emphasized, and kenosis in the sense of the incarnation of a concrete person in a concrete time (Spadaro 2014, 101-103). The vision of theological reflection in the digital age is challenged by the question of how to understand communication in a way that does not cancel out the individual and at the same time does not glorify him or her to the level of divinity (Benedict XVI CIV 2009, 4). If AI surpasses humans in all kinds of operations that were previously reserved for humans alone, it may lead to a new emptying, a kenosis, of modern individualism. If until recently, sitting at our computers, we considered ourselves almost self-sufficient, the power and superiority of AI reminds us once again of our fragility, in Ricoeur's words: passivity. In this we can see the theological basis for the mission of the Church and of every Christian today, as Pope Benedict states: »The one who serves does not consider himself superior to the one served, however miserable his situation at the moment may be. Christ took the lowest place in the world—the Cross—and by this radical humility he redeemed us and constantly comes to our aid. Those who are in a position to help others will realize that in doing so they themselves receive help; being able to help others is no merit or achievement of their own. This duty is a grace.« (Benedict XVI DCE 2005, 35) The true theological basis for pastoral work should therefore be the desire to lead the congregation on the path so that at Easter it can proclaim in all sincerity: 'Blessed is the guilt.'

In addition to dogmatic theology, theological anthropology also faces a challenge which, as Pope Benedict notes above, must be based on a Christological foundation. In pastoral care, respect for the true dignity of man as a person must once again be brought into focus. Ultimately, this leads to the area of moral theology (Platovnjak and Svetelj 2024, 840–845). If the liberation of man from God has led to tools that can completely destroy us, it is good to ask ourselves whether the restoration of God is not precisely the possibility of re-evaluating the human person. »At the heart of the Christian understanding

of intelligence is the integration of truth into the moral and spiritual life of the person, guiding his or her actions in light of God's goodness and truth. According to God's plan, intelligence, in its fullest sense, also includes the ability to savor what is true, good, and beautiful.« (AN 28) From human's feeling of passivity, which is also the path to God for Ricoeur, theology today can place even more emphasis on the dialog with God as a person. In this way, such theology will lead to an honest consciousness of vulnerability, which is the only true path to trust and healthy relationships (Globokar 2022).

The revelation of the image of God already took place in the Old Testament in a constant dialog with the concrete person. God's pedagogy works through a history of relationships with concrete people in concrete situations. Artificial intelligence, for all its personal adaptation, does not understand and take into account the human need to strengthen one's identity in a concrete time and place, with all the possible inner division that this process entails (Nežič Glavica 2023, 1058). Therefore, the task of pastoral theology is to build a communion of the faithful where there is room for all the possible shortcomings of individuals. The community of believers can be an alternative to the digital noosphere in its physical-spatial dimensions. It is important to remember that only a genuine respect for each individual person can point to God. This means taking the incarnation and the entire kenosis seriously. In doing so, we are not offering a cheap solution, but taking all three human passivities seriously. Only in this way will AI remain a powerful tool, but a tool and only a tool. That is Luc Ferry's thesis. We can also agree with Chat GPT's addition to my abstract that AI does not replace the work of theologians but only complements it.

We would like to conclude with the call of the last document of the Church for commitment to the true wisdom of heart: »The »wisdom of the heart« can illuminate and guide the human-centered use of this technology to help promote the common good, care for our »common home,« advance the search for the truth, foster integral human development, favor human solidarity and fraternity, and lead humanity to its ultimate goal: happiness and full communion with God.« (AN 116) Or to put it even more theologically sound and more clearly, what we wanted to show with the concept of consciousness, which humans can have, compared to the concept of intelligence, which AI can also have, in the words of Pope Benedict XVI: »All people feel the interior impulse to love authentically: love and truth never abandon them completely, because these are the vocation planted by God in the heart and mind of every human person. The search for love and truth is purified and liberated by Jesus

Christ from the impoverishment that our humanity brings to it, and he reveals to us in all its fullness the initiative of love and the plan for true life that God has prepared for us.« (CIV 2009, 1)

References

- Altman, Sam. 2025. *The Gentle Singularity*. <https://blog.samaltman.com/the-gentle-singularity> (Accessed 14. 7. 2025).
- Andreessen, Marc. 2023a. *Why AI Will Save the World*. <https://a16z.com/ai-will-save-the-world/> (Accessed 14. 7. 2025).
- Andreessen, Marc. 2023b. *The Techno-Optimist Manifesto*. <https://a16z.com/the-techno-optimist-manifesto/> (Accessed 15. 7. 2025).
- Bartoletti, Ivana. 2024. *A Digital Union Based on European Values. The need to balance economic and social integration*. Bonn: Verlag J.H.W. Dietz Nachf.
- Benedict XVI DCE. 2005. *Deus caritas est*. https://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xvi_enc_20051225_deus-caritas-est.html.
- Benedict XVI CIV. 2009. *Caritas in veritate*. https://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xvi_enc_20090629_caritas-in-veritate.html.
- De Mori, Geraldo Luiz. 2024. Pouvoir et risques des algorithmes dans la pastorale. *Lumen Vitae* 79/3: 289-297.
- Dicastery for the Doctrine of the Faith, the Dicastery for Culture and Education. AN. 2025. *Antiqua et nova*. https://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_dff_doc_20250128_antiqua-et-nova_en.html (Accessed 14. 7. 2025).
- Ferry, Luc. 2025. *IA Grand remplacement ou complémentarité?* Paris: Editions de l'Observatoire.
- Giribaldi, Edoardo. 2022. *Pope: We are all part of the same vulnerable humanity*. <https://www.vaticannews.va/en/pope/news/2022-12/pope-world-day-persons-with-disabilities-message.html> (Accessed 16. 7. 2025).
- Globokar, Roman. 2022. Ranljivost človeka, družbe, narave in Boga. *Bogoslovni vestnik* 82/1: 7-14.
- Globokar, Roman. 2024. Pogled Katoliške Cerkve na razvoj in uporabo umetne inteligence. *Bogoslovni vestnik* 84/4: 867–883.
- Kraner, David. 2024. Vloga moči in uporaba UI v mrežni družbi. *Bogoslovni vestnik* 84/4: 931-944.
- Labrecque, Cory Andrew. 2024. Considérations éthiques sur la technologie et l'intelligence artificielle au service d'êtres limités. *Lumen Vitae* 79/3: 278-288.
- Nežič Glavica, Iva. 2023. ‚Pedagogika 3.0‘ ali oris edukacije v digitalni dobi. *Bogoslovni vestnik* 83/4: 1049-1060.
- OfficeChai Team. 2024. *Open-Sourcing Big AI Models Is Like Selling Nuclear Weapons At RadioShack: Geoffrey Hinton*. <https://officechai.com/stories/open-sourcing-big-ai-models-is-like-selling-nuclear-weapons-at-radioshack-geoffrey-hinton/> (Accessed 13. 7. 2025).

- Pande, Vijay. 2019. *A Practical Toolkit for Deep Learning in the Life Sciences*. <https://a16z.com/a-practical-toolkit-for-deep-learning-in-the-life-sciences/> (Accessed 12. 7. 2025).
- Pinheiro, Luiz Antonio. 2024. Intelligence artificielle et salut : conciliables ou inconciliables ? *Lumen Vitae* 79/3: 258-268.
- Platovnjak, Ivan, and Tone Svetelj. 2023. Technology as the Elixir of Immortality – Resurgent Philosophical and Spiritual Enigma of Human Imprisonment. *Bogoslovni vestnik* 83/4: 973-984.
- Platovnjak, Ivan, and Tone Svetelj. 2024. Artificial Intelligence and Imago Dei: A New Dilemma for Philosophical and Theological Anthropology. *Bogoslovni vestnik* 84/4: 835-846.
- Ricoeur, Paul. 1992. *Oneself as Another*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Ricoeur, Paul. 1995. *Critique and conviction: conversations with François Azouvi and Marc de Launay*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Rožman, Lucija. 2024. Vprašanje človeške ustvarjalnosti v dobi UI. *Bogoslovni vestnik* 84/4: 857-866.
- Spadaro, Antonio. 2014. *Cybertheology Thinking Christianity in the Era of the Internet*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Stegu, Tadej. 2024. Antropološki izzivi kateheze v času umetne intelligence. *Bogoslovni vestnik* 84/4: 899-908.
- Šegula, Andrej. 2024. Umetna inteligenca v luči praktične pastoralne teologije. *Bogoslovni vestnik* 84/4: 909-919.
- World Economic Forum. 2025. *Blueprint to Action: China's Path to AI-Powered Industry Transformation*. https://reports.weforum.org/docs/WEF_Blueprint_to_Action_Chinas_Path_to_AI-Powered_Industry_Transformation_2025.pdf (Accessed 12. 7. 2025).

Language editor: Matej Bevc