

God - Man - Artificial Intelligence: between the fascinating and the terrible

Fernando A. Zapata Muriel¹, Luis Fernando Garcés Giraldo^{2*}

¹ Corporación Universitaria Remington, Medellín, Colombia. Email: fernando.zapata@uniremington.edu.co, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4225-6384>

² Dirección de Investigación e Innovación, Universidad Autónoma del Perú, Lima, Perú. Email: garcesgir@autonoma.edu.pe, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3286-8704>

Corresponding Author:

Luis Fernando Garcés Giraldo^{2*} (garcesgir@autonoma.edu.pe)

Abstract: Objective: To explore how the relationship between God, humanity, and AI oscillates between divine and human mystery and instrumentality, analyzing how AI as an instrument is fascinating for its benefits to humanity and the modern world, while simultaneously posing significant risks and dangers. Method: The study employed two research methods: documentary and hermeneutic. The latter emphasizes interpretation, guided by analysis and critical thinking, drawing on references in fields such as ethics, Christianity, and humanism. Results: The study confirms that God and humanity remain a mystery, while AI is an instrument that, in this historical moment, can generate risks and dangers for humanity. Humanity is both subject and end, not instrument; therefore, it is imperative to question any attempt at alienation. Discussion: Technology is a tool placed at the service of humanity to transform the world. The technocratic paradigm attempts to manipulate human beings by placing them at its service. AI emerges as the primary instrument to achieve this end. Ethics acts as a mediator and regulator, setting limits to the technocratic paradigm. Conclusion: Today humanity is witnessing the fourth industrial revolution. In this context of digital industry, AI must be an instrument for building a better future, oriented towards the good of every human being with an ethical and bioethical inspiration in favor of caring for others,

Keywords: Autonomy, Awareness, Freedom, Responsibility, Decision-Making

Introduction

God in the field of religious phenomenology is conceived as a fascinating and awe-inspiring mystery; this is the numinous sense (numen: the or the totally other) of God, as well as the mystery of the human being, but could a similarity be established between God, man and AI?

Recognizing the greatness of humanity and the magnificence of God is important. As one theologian said, "The glory of God is the living man," and likewise, the life of man is founded on the vision of God (St. Irenaeus, n.d.). This glory is established in the relationship between creator and creature, father and child, which is distinct from the relationship between God, man, and AI. The latter is an instrument, a tool, a means, and never an end. The relationship to be established here is pragmatic, based on utility and service, recognizing the great good it can provide. We cannot fall into the trap of equating the tool with the worker; it is a monstrosity. The object should almost never be equated with the subject, and when this occurs, we must dispense with all forms of alienation or human instrumentalization, for man "is an end and never a means," as Kant affirms (quoted in Martí, 2021).

Pope Francis cites AI as an instrument with those two divine and human characteristics: fascinating and tremendous. (Francis, 2024, before the G7 on June 14), however, it is known that there.

are great differences between the instrument and the mystery: thus, while the mystery reveals itself by hiding and hides itself by revealing itself, the tool appears, is tangible, material, phenomenal; likewise, while the mystery is numinous, the instrument can be a material entity, whose reality depends on being artificially created, named, or used by the human being; while the mystery of God and of man finds its answer in the confrontation with itself, the instrument is an artifact without any mystery

Perhaps because of its fascinating and terrifying nature, AI can be perceived ambiguously by some: on the one hand, it seduces and even inspires fanaticism because of the possibilities it offers; on the other hand, it generates great anxiety about the consequences that could arise from it (Francisco, 2024p.6)

Francis acknowledges that AI represents a major cognitive-industrial upheaval, which will generate significant changes in the social system in the medium term (Francis, 2024, pp. 6-7). AI can cause problems such as inequality between major powers and developing nations, between social sectors with high economic and/or political power and the most oppressed sectors, endangering the “culture of encounter” and pushing the world toward a “throwaway culture” (p. 7). To avoid such situations, it is essential, when discussing technology, to recognize what it means to be human and what it means to “be human.” Along these same lines, speaking of freedom and responsibility means speaking of ethics (Francis, 2024, p. 13).

What role do ethics and bioethics play in this AI process? For ethics and bioethics, the human being is an end in itself and never a means to an end (Kant, n.d.). Human beings are magnificent beings; their creative capacity is admirable, and their ability to generate tools that allow them not only to adapt to the world but also to shape the universe to their needs and interests is worthy of recognition. But what role do ethics and bioethics play in this whole process?

Ethics as a philosophy of morality invites human beings to reflect on what is good; bioethics, from its biomedical, bioenvironmental and social fields, calls in its reflections for a praxis (reflection-action) in which the life of the entire universe is defended, respected, and promoted (biocentrism and/or ecocentrism).

However, today we speak of integral ecology. Boff (1996, 1999) and Francis (2015) call for a break with all anthropocentrism, proposing that humankind is responsible for caring for others and nature, and for cultivating the earth. In this way, we move from a relationship of domination and exploitation to one of care and cultivation of oneself, others, and the earth.

Today, artificial intelligence poses a series of questions for humanity: Will humans know how to manage this tool, put it to use, or will they be destroyed by their own creation? Can a robot be equated with a human machine, or a machine-machine, to the human subject? What gives it humanity, and what allows the human species to proclaim and live its humanity? It is worth asking these questions and inquiring further: What are the greatest benefits and what are the greatest fears and/or risks of AI in society?

Main body

The fascinating thing: the greatest benefits of AI in today's society.

The greatest benefit of AI lies in its ability to enhance human knowledge and solve global problems in innovative ways ; in this way, it allows:

1. Expanding knowledge and understanding: Analysis of large datasets. Generation of new ideas and solutions. Personalization of learning and education.
2. Addressing global challenges: climate change, greater progress in healthcare, and promoting sustainability.
3. Democratization of access to information and technology: Automatic translation, access to education, empowerment of people with other abilities, in the midst of some biological, psychological or social vulnerability.

4. Enhancing creativity and human expression: New forms of art and entertainment. Tools for content creation and production. Personalization of experiences.

This sounds important from an ethical and bioethical perspective. In this sense, following the principle of autonomy, the human being will be perceived as an end in itself and not as an instrument at the service of technology. Therefore, he will be able to be the administrator of his life, without AI having control or dominion over him. Likewise, he will grow in respect for others, and some limitations of AI today, such as racial or gender biases, handled by some intelligent machines, will be overcome.

Beneficence: in this way men and women around the world could use AI regardless of their culture or social stratum, benefiting from all its richness; the good it would bring would be for everyone, not just a specific group.

Justice: In accordance with these benefits of AI, it would seek greater equity between human beings and the use of technology, a high social responsibility and commitment in action, thus making it possible to overcome all social exclusion.

Non-maleficence: everything points to the fact that human beings, through AI and other digital technologies, seek the good and sustainable social development for the planet, avoiding doing harm, even when discerning between two evils that affect a social group or any human being from technology and AI, the lesser evil would be chosen.

Today, it is urgent to put these bioethical principles into practice, in order to build a more just and humane society where social inclusion, access to technology, and especially AI can be for everyone and its use benefits humanity. Therefore, when reviewing the various fears and risks that AI can generate, it is worth investigating some issues.

In this same vein, the Pope recognizes and values the great contributions of AI, is aware of the benefits it brings to the planet, and is also aware of the great challenges it poses. He states: "Artificial intelligence will become increasingly important. The challenges it poses are not only technical, but also anthropological, educational, social and political" (Francis 2024, No. 2).

Artificial intelligence (AI) has revolutionized numerous sectors, promising to increase efficiency, productivity, and innovation. However, this disruptive technology poses significant challenges; its rapid evolution demands careful management to ensure that its benefits are distributed equitably and that associated risks, such as job losses, algorithmic discrimination, and privacy erosion, are minimized.

The proliferation of artificial intelligence poses significant challenges in terms of privacy, intellectual property, and information manipulation. AI-based disinformation campaigns undermine trust in the media and can influence electoral processes. Furthermore, the indiscriminate use of AI can perpetuate biases, discriminate against minority groups, and erode individual privacy. Mass surveillance and digital exclusion are other worrying consequences that can arise from the irresponsible implementation of these technologies.

It should be noted that North American bioethics is relativistic, based on the principles of autonomy and beneficence, while European bioethics favors a minimal ethics based on the principles of justice and non-maleficence. In this sense, the need for regulation is seen in the face of the dangers and risks that AI may bring to human beings, the environment, and the planet in general.

The terrible thing: *What are the biggest fears and/or risks of AI in society?*

The biggest fear today regarding AI is the possibility that it will become uncontrollable and intelligently superior to humans. This fear is based on several concerns:

1. Loss of control: Autonomous decision-making and weapons.
2. Superintelligence: Intelligence explosion, misalignment of objectives.
3. Impact on employment: Automation and job losses, economic inequality.
4. Social manipulation and control: Mass surveillance and control, disinformation and

propaganda.

5. Impact on identity and ethics: Dehumanization, questioning of conscience and free will.

From an ethical and bioethical perspective, man is an end and never a means; this Kantian principle allows us to infer that all human technological creations, whether manufactured, industrial, digital, among others, must be placed at the service of man; therefore, it is an instrument that human beings can use for the transformation of the world and for integral social development.

Pope Francis is aware of these risks, which is why, upon seeing the ability and speed of AI to produce text in diverse branches and fields of knowledge, he invites us to question or suspect its reliability and veracity. Francis (2024, N.3) adds: " This creates a serious problem when artificial intelligence is used in disinformation campaigns that spread fake news and lead to a growing distrust of the media."

One particularly worrying aspect is AI's potential to manipulate information and undermine public trust. The spread of fake news and the polarization of opinions are increasingly pressing problems, exacerbated by the use of algorithms to manipulate public opinion. Furthermore, the mass collection of personal data raises serious concerns about privacy and security.

The proliferation of artificial intelligence poses significant challenges in terms of privacy, intellectual property, and information manipulation. AI-based disinformation campaigns undermine trust in the media and can influence electoral processes. Furthermore, the indiscriminate use of AI can perpetuate biases, discriminate against minority groups, and erode individual privacy due to the mass collection of personal data. Mass surveillance and digital exclusion are other worrying consequences that can arise from the irresponsible implementation of these technologies.

Principlism: Questions

The four bioethical principles proposed by Beauchamps and Childress (2013) and Beauchamp, Rauprich (2016), autonomy, beneficence, justice and non-maleficence, can help to question AI in terms of the risks and dangers that it may bring to the world if it falls into misuse or abuse of this high technology.

Autonomy: respecting human beings as ends in themselves, not enslaving them or using them as instruments, and the same applies to nature. It's important to remember that AI is automated, not autonomous; it's programmed. If so, will it have consciousness and a spirit? If it does, we must ask: will these have the same scope as human consciousness and the transcendent spirit?

Charity: the common good must be prioritized over individual interests, avoiding excessive control and the use of political and economic power, preventing power from being concentrated in the hands of a few who dominate and exploit others and nature.

Justice: To give fair, equitable, responsible, and committed treatment to humans and to establish respectful and prudent treatment of man with the machine and with nature, to promote an integral ecology and an equitable distribution of existing limited resources.

Non-maleficence: not causing harm through AI, that is the key, and if in any case one had to choose between two evils, as suggested earlier, choose the lesser evil. In short, with AI and digital technologies, the current advocacy is for a science with a conscience, so as not to lead humanity and the planet to ruin.

One of the greatest dangers lies in confusing the subject with the object, in mimicking them, or in the subject surrendering not only a role, but also the direction and purpose of life to the object. What would be the human-machine's purpose under these conditions? What interest would it have, or what intentionality would it possess? Is humanity creating a new species with AI? Will the human species have to grant the robot rights, or will the robots themselves claim them? Is this what we call progress?

From an ethical perspective, what is meant by progress?

The term is inherently ambiguous; one might ask: progress for whom? For humanity, for the planet, or just for a select few? It is true that technological progress can contribute to human well-being, but to realize this, it is essential that it be developed ethically and responsibly.

Pope Francis (January 1, 2024) has emphasized the importance of science and technology serving humanity and promoting the integral development of individuals. It is therefore urgent that scientific and technological progress contribute to a better order in human society and increase freedom and fraternal communion, for the sake of human perfection and the transformation of the world.

The Pope values and appreciates the great advances in science and technology that have made it possible to overcome many diseases and difficulties that affected human life and caused great suffering. However, he foresees that these advances can generate risks for humans and a danger for the planet.

It is worth observing the risks and dangers that humans can cause through the misuse or abuse of AI, how AI advances can seemingly facilitate justice and peace in a multicultural world, while in reality inequality, exclusion, and violence are the driving forces behind a multicultural society marked by intolerance and the domination of some over others.

Pope Francis (2024, no. 2), on the World Day of Peace, January 1, reminds us that: "New digital tools are changing the face of communications, public administration, education, consumption, personal interactions, and countless other aspects of daily life." He also acknowledges that science and technology, in their research and innovations, are conditioned by personal, social, and cultural values, and that the creations and decisions they produce affect humanity and the planet, both positively and negatively. Therefore, it is worth asking about their ethical dimension.

Human Intelligence vs. Artificial Intelligence

"Forms of artificial intelligence are fragmentary sociotechnical systems," yet they mark the inaccessible fissure between these elements of the social and economic structure and the human being. It is clear that these systems attempt to mimic, in their structure and conformation, the neurobiology of the human mind, in which multiple intelligences stand out. Zapata, Montoya & Montoya (2024, p.3) describe them as follows:

In the second half of the twentieth century, several theorists expanded the concept; expressions such as multiple intelligences (Gardner, 1994, 1995), emotional intelligence with Mayer and Salovey (1997), Goleman (1995); social intelligence (Goleman, 2006) and artificial intelligence appeared; a construct envisioned since the 1930s with the Turing machine and coined at Dartmouth University in 1956 (Zhang and Lu, 2023).

Artificial intelligence is not a new concept; it dates back to Turing's machine in 1930. However, it has experienced tremendous growth in recent decades. From the earliest research on intelligent machines to today's deep learning systems, AI has evolved significantly. Nevertheless, it is essential to recognize that human intelligence, in its diverse rational and suprarational functions—spirit, consciousness, will—which facilitate reflection and coexistence with others, transcends the capabilities of any machine.

Francis (2013, n.233) aptly observes, "the human mind will never be able to exhaust its richness...not everything can be predicted, not everything can be calculated; in the end, 'reality is superior to the idea'" proof of this is shown by human intelligence as one of the higher mental functions in which a diversity of types of intelligence can be observed (Gardner, 1995), it is worth asking which of them can be artificially replicated with a similarity close to 100%?

In this sense, it is important to see intelligence as an essential element of human rationality; it enables the development of the intelligence quotient and also promotes other abilities in human beings, such as: problem-solving, self-discipline, self-control, self-mastery, creativity, among others. Intrapersonal intelligence stands out among Gardner's multiple intelligences (1995). As a fundamental component of human intelligence, it focuses on self-awareness and self-understanding.

Recent research (González Treviño et al., 2020; He et al., 2023) has underscored the importance of this capacity for individual well-being and success in various areas of life. Furthermore, intrapersonal intelligence is closely intertwined with emotional intelligence, which encompasses skills such as self-awareness, self-motivation, and empathy (Butler et al., 2022; Walker et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2022). These combined skills enable individuals to regulate their emotions, establish meaningful relationships, and make informed decisions.

While AI clearly offers powerful tools for data analysis and decision-making, it's crucial to recognize the limitations of these systems. Algorithms, however sophisticated, cannot capture the complexity of the human experience. Intrapersonal intelligence, encompassing self-awareness, self-motivation, and empathy, is a fundamental aspect of the human condition that transcends the capabilities of any machine.

The social emotional intelligence proposed by Goleman (1993), through self-awareness, self-control, empathy, motivation, and understanding of others' emotions, complements intrapersonal intelligence by enabling us to understand and respond to the emotions of others. This capacity is essential for building meaningful relationships, resolving conflicts, and making ethical decisions. Emotional intelligence allows us to transcend established rules and norms, guided by principles such as compassion and justice—important values cultivated by human beings with the help of spiritual intelligence.

At the beginning of the 21st century, the concept of spiritual intelligence (SI) emerged (or re-emerged). Long before, Christians described intelligence as a fruit of the Holy Spirit; however, in recent times, Zohar and Marshall (2001), Torralba (2010), Jeeves and Brown (2010), among others, have given great significance to the term. It includes creativity, the ability to discriminate, and to modify situations. Zohar and Marshall (2001, p.21) will say that the IES:

It transmits our moral sense, a capacity to temper rigid rules with understanding and compassion, and a similar capacity to see when compassion and understanding have reached their limit. We use the IES to grapple with questions of right and wrong and to imagine unrealized possibilities; to dream, to yearn, to rise from the mud.

For his part, Torralba, (2010) defines IES as something inherent to each human person, with a different degree of development according to personal construction; this is revealed through the deep desire for integration of one's own being, with a reality possessing greater grandeur and depth than one's own, in order to give meaning to one's life; for this purpose, the human being will seek the path that will facilitate the achievement of his project.

From a spiritual perspective, it's worth questioning how far AI has already penetrated this dimension. It probably will, but will it achieve the same depth and transcendence as the human spirit? Will it give unity and coherence to the human-machine or the robot, so that it doesn't lose its identity?

This invites us to revisit the ethical discourse, because to what extent are machines—machines or robots—conscious, do they have will, are they aware of their own existence? From this perspective, it can be observed that

The assertion about the amorality of artificial intelligence systems is viable, at least in strictly technological terms, since their action does not occur under principles of good or evil, hence they can only be judged from the human design or employment behind them (Zapata, Montoya & Montoya, 2024, p.3)

Science and technology vs. technocracy

It is important for the citizen of the planet and for the committed researcher to question and act ethically, rather than launching *a priori assumptions* without certainty of verification with clarity, precision, accuracy, depth, breadth, relevance, logic, as a critical thinker would; (Paul and Elder, 2003) perhaps for this reason, the Pope insists on not guaranteeing a priori the benefits of AI in favor of peace between different countries and the future of the planet, affirms Francis (2024 n. 2)

Technocracy as a neoconservative political system, the product of a neoliberal economy influenced by the technicians of administration and economics, has forgotten that the economy is a praxis placed at the service of man, not an instrument to manipulate him, alienate him to the point of expropriating him of his dignity.

Technology, for its part, allows humankind, in accordance with its era, to transform nature through various instruments and promote its integral development and that of its context. Technocratic models connect economics with technology, giving primacy to efficiency and capital over the human person, thus: producing to consume and consuming to produce again. In this sense, Francis (2024, no. 4) argues:

In the ideological context of a technocratic paradigm, driven by a Promethean presumption of self-sufficiency, inequalities could grow excessively, and knowledge and wealth could accumulate in the hands of a few, with serious risks to democratic societies and peaceful coexistence.

A technocratic paradigm, characterized by an excessive reliance on technology and human autonomy, can exacerbate social inequalities. The concentration of power and resources in the hands of a few, facilitated by technological development, could undermine democratic principles and generate social instability. This scenario poses a significant risk to peaceful coexistence and the common good.

The promise of technology can be overshadowed by its potential negative consequences if it is not accompanied by profound ethical reflection. A technocratic approach, which prioritizes technological development over human values, can lead to a highly unequal society where knowledge and wealth are concentrated in the hands of a few. It is essential to develop technologies that benefit all of humanity and promote social justice.

In a technocratic society, to a certain extent, algorithms extrapolate information, and can distort reality, as well as be far from the truth, proof of this is given with *fake news* and *Deepfake* (ultra-false *fake*, falsification, and *deep learning*, deep learning), proof of this, the video of Noticias Uno, which circulated in 2023 with fake audio to attack a candidate for Governor of Putumayo (Suarez, 2023).

Likewise, *deepfakes*, which have been created through deception or attempted fraud, use generative AIs that reproduce voices, replicate faces, or with the help of numerous photos, and through their algorithms manage to deceive many people.

It is true that an era of misinformation is coming, generated by the amount of bias (in the creation of music, data, images, news, photographs, racial or ethnic biases, historical accuracy biases, biases in the creation of texts, biases in language models, biases in computer vision, biases in robotics, among others).

Likewise, some real problems are concerning, such as the loss of consumer privacy, the violation of personal intimacy, or the loss of individuality, as well as job losses. The latter can be mitigated through training and education for workers in the skills that AI demands in their respective fields. It is also true that thousands of jobs will emerge requiring trained personnel. The other problems require global regulation, and perhaps even specific regulations from individual states, tailored to their particular circumstances.

All this is because technoscience today, with its research and creations (technological innovations with AI), is often not grounded in reality and disregards impartiality in its decisions and innovations - following the Pope - this urgently requires an ethical dimension that safeguards and promotes human dignity and the care of the planet, so that technoscience today is put at the service of humankind and promotes sustainable development.

Ethics and bioethics in pursuit of regulation

Given this urgency, Pope Francis (2024, no. 2) asserts that it is necessary to strengthen or establish bodies responsible for examining emerging ethical issues and protecting the rights of those who use or are influenced by forms of artificial intelligence. In line with Pope Francis's vision, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a landmark resolution on artificial intelligence (AI) on March 21, 2024. This resolution, unanimously approved by all 193 Member States, establishes a fundamental normative

framework by calling on States to refrain from using AI systems that do not operate in accordance with international human rights standards or that pose a risk to them.

This document underscores the importance of addressing AI as a global challenge, in order to protect human rights in the digital context, and to foster an inclusive dialogue to ensure that the benefits of this technology are distributed equitably. Furthermore, the resolution recognizes the potential of AI to contribute to sustainable development and the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), urging all States, the private sector, and civil society to collaborate in developing regulatory frameworks that promote the safe and responsible use of AI.

In March 2024, the European Union certified the AI law to regulate applications according to the risk: low, high, or unacceptable.

Low-risk AI emails - chatbot

High risk: computer vision: systems capable of causing harm to health, safety, the environment or basic human rights.

In education: the evaluation or admission processes; and in employment: in the admission, promotion, and selection processes.

In essential services: AI used for credit assessment, housing, health, internet.

Unacceptable risk: biometrics

Today it is necessary to educate human beings ethically, from school to university, in and for freedom, responsibility and coexistence; in order to promote their integral formation, the aim is to foster integral progress of the human being and the environment.

Pope Francis (2024) warns of the risks of unregulated AI, which could exacerbate social inequalities and undermine democracy. The concentration of power in the hands of a few, driven by opaque algorithms, poses a threat to human rights and human dignity. It is imperative to establish robust regulatory frameworks that ensure the ethical development of AI and protect the interests of society.

In an effort to prevent the manipulation, social control, and lack of transparency that AI can bring, the Pope advocates for precise oversight and monitoring, capable of setting limits and regulations that help AI owners and creators be legally responsible in its use, sale, and management. Francis (2024, no. 5) affirms: "We must not allow algorithms to determine how we understand human rights, to disregard the essential values of compassion, mercy, and forgiveness."

Respect for human dignity demands recognizing the uniqueness of each individual, which transcends any digital representation. It is inappropriate to reduce people to mere sets of data subject to algorithmic manipulation. Human rights, rooted in values such as compassion, mercy, and forgiveness, must prevail over algorithmic logic, which cannot capture the complexity and dynamism of human experience. As Pope Francis (2024, no. 6) adds, "Human moral judgment and ethical decision-making are more than a complex set of algorithms... these, in turn, are always just machines."

It is imperative that modern man recover his sense of humanity; this can be achieved by returning to the heart with a sensitive gaze towards the other that leads to experiencing "the need for an interdisciplinary dialogue aimed at an ethical development of algorithms — *algoritics* — in which values guide the paths of new technologies" (Francis, 2020; 2024 N.6).

It is worth noting that there is a significant difference between efficiency in action and the meaning of that action. A human machine, or a robot, can perform an action and be highly efficient, but perhaps due to its automation, it may not be able to imbue it with meaning. It is the human intelligence of a programmer with a certain degree of autonomy (which only appears latently) that is capable of giving meaning to the action performed by their machine; the machine will only replicate the values that its owner has programmed into it. One must ask: With what ethical and moral perception and vision does this programmer create their work? In this regard, Francis (2024, No. 6) affirms: "Ethical questions should be taken into account from the beginning of the research, as well as in the phases of

experimentation, planning, distribution, and marketing.”

The European Parliament (13-03-2024) approved a law to regulate the use of AI, in order to safeguard security and basic human rights, as well as to give greater impetus to innovation.

It is necessary to recognize that while artificial intelligence offers great opportunities, it also presents significant risks to human rights. Establishing safeguards is crucial to ensure that this technology is used ethically and responsibly. Therefore

The main objective of the European Parliament (13-03-2024) is to safeguard human rights, protect democracies, ensure the rule of law and the sustainability of bio-ecosystems in the face of AI.

In this regard, before the G7, Pope Francis (June 14, 2024), as leader of the Catholic Church, issued a plea for the defense and protection of the human rights of all citizens of Mother Earth, warning about the risks of uncontrolled AI and emphasizing the need for a solid regulatory framework that guarantees responsible technological development.

The development of artificial intelligence presents a crucial challenge: reconciling technological innovation with the protection of fundamental rights, democracy, and the environment. The goal is to foster an environment in which AI can drive progress without compromising fundamental ethical values. In this regard, Pope Francis has warned about the risks of unchecked AI, emphasizing the need for a robust regulatory framework to ensure responsible technological development.

He also comments that technoscience, and within it AI without an ethical practice, can fall into this same trap, and adds that other digital technological tools can also fall into such a deception, but they do not guarantee their vocation to the service of humanity, serving man as an instrument to build a more just world.

It is necessary to recognize how the human being, from his Psychological consciousness, is capable of recognizing his here and now, because the time of consciousness is the present, is capable of discerning within his moral dimension, between good and evil, and has the suitability to reflect, discern, and meditate on his purpose of life, from his spiritual dimension.

The proper use of freedom by human beings guarantees their sense of humanity; therefore, Francis (June 14, 2024), recognizing human dignity, insists: “we need to guarantee and protect a space of meaningful human control over the choice process used by artificial intelligence programs.”

In this sense, it must be acknowledged that all innovation has intentions; however, many, especially those related to AI, can suffer from a lack of ethical impartiality. Francis (June 14, 2024) argues: technology is born with a purpose, and in its impact on human society, it represents a form of order in social relations and a power dynamic that enables some to perform certain actions while preventing others from doing so.

This also applies to artificial intelligence programs. In order for these tools to contribute to the good and a better future, they must always be directed towards the good of every human being and must be guided by ethical principles.

Conclusions

Today, humanity is witnessing the fourth industrial revolution, which will transform the lives of individuals and society as a whole. The world today recognizes a massive increase in productivity. Mechanization, industrialization, and the digital revolution have changed economies. This revolution could generate major and abrupt disruptions. In this digital age, it is important to note that industry depends on data, and workers are being, and may be, replaced by robots; robots are already being cloned for these manual tasks.

Currently, new services and business models are being created, and some jobs that were once done by humans are no longer so. Algorithms can do what machines can do, and machines can do what the brain can do. This brings benefits: autonomous vehicles, which benefit older adults; advances in medical science, leading to the development of medications and greater possibilities for curing cancer.

However, it also has its costs: unemployment, for example, with self-driving trucks, truck drivers are no longer needed. Journalism is also affected; machines now generate the news.

The decision regarding the proper use and/or misuse of AI is ethical; it is a fundamental process built upon values and the duties they entail. This decision centers on the consideration of the human being as an active subject, not as a mere instrument. In this context, Pope Francis introduced the concept of “algoretics” in 2020 as a framework for reflecting on the ethical moderation of algorithms and artificial intelligence programs.

This approach seeks to promote ethical deliberation that integrates moral principles into technological development, underscoring the importance of ethics in decision-making that affects humanity.

The contemporary world urgently needs policies that operate under fundamental principles, such as love and justice, and are oriented toward the common good. This socioeconomic and sociopolitical vision must be interwoven with inclusive and participatory social and cultural projects, promoting opportunities that stimulate human creativity and facilitate the holistic development of diverse societies.

In this sense, the responsibility lies with each individual to make appropriate use of artificial intelligence, while policies are tasked with creating environments that foster such use. To this end, ethics becomes an essential pillar not only in individual decision-making but also in building a more just and equitable society, founded on the pursuit of the common good.

Likewise, the Pope urges us to be attentive to the adverse effects that AIs subjected to despotic power, rampant consumerism, digital and media alienation, social exclusion and segregation, among others, can generate. Furthermore, as an aid to overcoming the temptation to want to “be like God without God” (Speech at the G7 session. Apulia, June 14, 2024).

In short, it's important to consider what and how modern man envisions the world, and also to ask: What kind of world will future generations have? In this sense, and with the help of the technological paradigm, we must seize the opportunities of AI, face the challenges it presents, understanding that the responsibility lies with everyone and avoiding the temptation of technocracy.

Data availability: No data are associated with this article.

Competing interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Grant information: The authors declared that no grants were involved in supporting this work.

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge the institutional support. They also thank colleagues for their constructive comments and feedback, which contributed to improving the clarity and rigor of the manuscript...

References

- Beauchamp T, Childress JF. (2013). *Principles of Biomedical Ethics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Beauchamp TL, Rauprich O. (2016). Principlism . In Henk ten Have, editor. *Encyclopedia of Global Bioethics*. New York: Springer. p. 2282-2292.
- Boff, L. (1999). *Know how to care. Human Ethics: Compaxaio pela Terra*. Petrópolis-Brazil: Editora Vozes.
- Boff, L. (1996) *Ecology: cry of the earth, cry of the poor*. Buenos Aires. Lumen Publishing House.
- Butler, L., Park, S., Vyas, D., Cole, J., Haney, J., Marrs, J., and Williams, E. (2022). Evidence and Strategies for Including Emotional Intelligence in Pharmacy Education. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 86 (10), ajpe8674. <https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe8674>
- Colombian Episcopal Conference CEC IA a galaxy of different realities. CXVII Plenary Assembly. Bogotá, DC, July 1-5, 2024

God - Man - Artificial Intelligence: between the fascinating and the terrible

- Francisco (June 13-15, 2024). Pope Francis participates in the G7 session on artificial intelligence. Speech by the Holy Father Francis. Borgo Egnazia (Apulia - Italy). Friday, June 14, 2024
- Pope Francis (January 1, 2024). Message of His Holiness Pope Francis for the celebration of the 57th World Day of Peace. January 1, 2024. Artificial intelligence and peace. Rome, Vatican City .
- Francis, (2013). Apostolic Exhortation Evangelii Gaudium (November 24, 2013). Rome. Vatican City.
- Francis, (2015). Encyclical Laudato Si (October 4), Rome. Vatican City.
- Francis, 2020 Address to the participants in the Plenary of the Pontifical Academy for Life (February 28, 2020).
- Gardner, Howard (1994). Structures of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences. Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Gardner, Howard (1995). Multiple Intelligences. The theory in practice. Barcelona: Paidós .
- Goleman, Daniel (1995). Emotional Intelligence . Barcelona: Kairós.
- González Treviño, I., Núñez Rocha, G., Valencia Hernández, J., and Arrona Palacios, A. (2020). Assessment of multiple intelligences in elementary school students in Mexico: An exploratory study. Heliyon, 6 (4), e03777. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e03777>
- Gracia, Diego (2001) Clinical Bioethics. Bioethics Studies 2. Bogotá. Ed. El Buho. 2nd edition.
- He, E., Ye, X., and Zhang, W. (2023). The effect of parenting styles on adolescent bullying behaviors in China: The mechanism of interpersonal intelligence and intrapersonal intelligence. Heliyon, 9 (4), E15299. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e15299>
- https://www.corazones.org/biblia_y_liturgia/oficio_lectura/fechas/junio_28.htm
- Irenaeus (n.d.). From the treatise of Saint Irenaeus, bishop, against heresies, Book 4, 20, 5-7. Translator : Massimo Bovalini.
- Jeeves, Malcolm and Brown, Warren S. (2010). Neuroscience, Psychology and Religion. Illusions, Mirages and Realities of Human Nature. Estella (Navarra). Verbo Divino.
- Kant E. Martí, Borbola (2021). Human dignity in Kant. In: <https://www.ipade.mx/2021/07/21/la-dignidad-humana-en-kant/> .
- The European Parliament (March 13, 2024) approves a landmark law to regulate artificial intelligence. In: European Parliament news. March 13, 2024 <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/es/press-room/20240308IPR19015/la-eurocamara-aprueba-una-ley-historica-para-regular-la-inteligencia-artificial>
- Mayer & Salovey, P. (1997). "What is emotional intelligence?" In P. Salovey and D. Sluyter (Eds). Emotional Development and Emotional Intelligence: Implications for Educators (pp. 3-31). New York: Basic Books.
- UN (2024). (United Nations). General Assembly adopts landmark resolution on AI. <https://news.un.org/es/story/2024/03/1528511>
- Paul and Elder, (2003). The Mini-Guide to Critical Thinking: Concepts and Tools. Foundation for Critical Thinking. www.criticalthinking.org 707-878-9100 cct@criticalthinking.org
- Sánchez Martín FM, Millán Rodríguez F, Salvador Bayarri J, Palou Redorta J, Rodríguez Escovar F, Esquena Fernández S, Villavicencio Mavrich H. History of robotics: from Archytas of Tarentum to the Da Vinci robot (Part I). Actas Urol Esp. 2007;31(2):69-76. (in press).
- Sánchez Martín, Jiménez Schlegel, Millán Rodríguez, Salvador-Bayarri, Monllau Font, Palou Redorta, Villavicencio Mavrich. History of robotics: from Archytas of Taranto to the da Vinci Robot. (Part II) Actas Urol Esp. 2007; 31(3):185-196.
- Suárez, Jhoandry (2023) A video from Noticias Uno with fake audio is circulating to attack a candidate for Governor of Putumayo. October 29, 2023. <https://redcheq.com.co/circula-video-de-noticias-uno-con-audio-falso-para-atacar-a-candidato-a-la-gobernacion-de-putumayo/>
- Torralba, Francesc (2010). Spiritual intelligence. Barcelona: Plataforma.
- Walker, S., Double, K., Kunst, H., Zhang, M., and MacCann, C. (2022). Emotional intelligence and attachment in adulthood: A meta-analysis. Personality and Individual Differences, 184, 111174. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2021.111174>

Zapata, Fernando, Montoya, Santiago, Montoya Diego (2024) Ethical dilemmas posed by the rise of artificial intelligence: a transhumanist perspective. *Región Científica*. 2024. 3(1), 2024225 Doi: 10.58763/rc2024225 e-ISSN: 2954-6168

Zhang, C., and Lu, Y. (2023). Study on artificial intelligence: The state of the art and future perspectives. *Journal of Industrial Information Integration*, 23 , 100224. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jii.2021.100224>

Zhang, J., Wang, Y., Wu, C., and He, J. (2022). The relationship between emotional intelligence and eating disorders or disordered eating behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 185, 111239. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2021.111239>

Zohar, Danah and Marshall, Ian (2001). *Spiritual Intelligence*. Translated by Marcelo Covián. Barcelona: Plaza & Janes Editores, S.A..