Digital Rerum Novarum: Artificial Intelligence for Peace, Social Justice, and Integral Human Development

October 16–17, 2025,

Report on the Seminar Proceedings and Perspectives of the Invited Experts

The following lines summarize the academic debates and reflections presented during the seminar on AI and its profound implications for society, ethics, governance, and human development. Common principles and concrete actions emerged from all sessions. Above all, the importance of upholding human dignity and our common home in any technological advancement was emphasized. Technology must be conceived as a mean to expand our creative capacity, not to suppress it; it must serve to improve the quality of work, not to worsen it; it must contribute to addressing environmental challenges, not to exacerbate them. Participants warned of the need for the international community to regain its capacity to influence the development of these technologies. *The future of technology is not predetermined*. There is no inherent essence that determines its purpose or impact. The future of technology depends on the decisions we make today.

Secondly, to ensure that technological progress respects humanity rather than undermining it, *all stakeholders must be represented in the debates and implementation of these technologies*. This means that every agreement must include states, international institutions, the scientific community, businesses, trade unions, and civil society from around the world. The dialogues and agreements reached within each group must transcend their own perspectives, building bridges and forging genuine social pacts between actors with diverse backgrounds and visions of technology.

Finally, many of the experts emphasized the need for ethical frameworks on AI to be translated into *legally binding regulations for all states at the international level.* For AI to truly be geared towards the common good, every actor that develops or adopts it must be subject to an awareness of both its responsible uses and its limitations. To this end, new, legally binding international norms must be defined among all states, translating ethical reflection into concrete criteria for governance and collective action.

1. Human dignity at the center in the digital age

In the first part of the meeting, the participants stressed the urgency of basing all technological development on human dignity, addressing this issue from three complementary perspectives: ethical, epistemological and ontological.

The *ethical approach* allows us to recognize and anticipate the risks inherent in technological advancement, guiding innovation toward the common good. From an *epistemological perspective,* we are invited to explore more deeply a fuller understanding of what truly means to think, know and create, moving beyond a mere inventory of the advantages and dangers associated with these new technologies. Finally, the *ontological approach* shifts the focus from "*how we act*" to "*who we are*" in relation to the machine, reaffirming the inviolable dignity of every person and the non-negotiable principle that no human being can be reduced to a mere instrument of any system, however sophisticated it may be.

The teachings of Pope Leo XIII on the necessary harmony between technological progress and respect for the human person were invoked, acknowledging, likewise, that human experience has proven to be vaster and more complex than modernity had conceived, opening horizons of both risk and possibility. Therefore, recovering a holistic vision of the human being, one that transcends mental or functional reductionism, is presented today as an urgent task. For this reason, the need for a *comprehensive education on the understanding of humanity was emphasized*, aimed at cultivating self-awareness and ethical responsibility, especially among scientists and technologists, who are, first and foremost, human beings.

Furthermore, warnings were issued about the *danger of hyper-functionality*, which leads to people valuing according to their performance capacity. Such logic, visible, for example, in debates about end-of-life care, erodes the notion of intrinsic dignity.

Finally, *transhumanism* was addressed within a culture of excess that denies the value of human limitations. Deep concerns were expressed regarding the use of AI in essential human relationships: companion robots for lonely people, algorithmic tutors that replace the educational bond and robotic assistants that displace care for the elderly. The session concluded with a clear warning: *digital technology should not be elevated to an end in itself* but rather placed at the service of human beings and their relational fulfillment.

2. Social peace in social networks

In the second session, the debate focused on examining how technological design, algorithmic systems and the increasing concentration of power influence human communication and the quality of democratic processes.

It was emphasized that, while social media offers undeniable benefits in terms of access to information and connection between people, it also exposes citizens to risks of

manipulation, disinformation and loss of cognitive autonomy. Although the creation of oversight boards by major platforms represents progress toward higher standards of accountability, these mechanisms raise dilemmas of democratic legitimacy, especially when the same technology actors who wield power are the ones arbitrating the limits of public discourse.

Concerns were also expressed about the digital manipulation of images with political content, aimed at distorting public perception and eroding trust in information, with direct effects on the deliberative foundations of democracy.

However, participants agreed that AI can also work in the opposite direction, strengthening citizen participation and revitalizing democracies. Within this framework, examples of deliberative technologies were presented. Platforms can facilitate the simultaneous, anonymous and large-scale exchange of citizen opinions. These tools allow users to vote, add comments and compare perspectives, fostering exposure to diverse viewpoints and generating shifts in individual opinions. Recent experiences in Thailand and Finland have demonstrated their potential to guide public decisions based on broad and representative participatory processes.

However, it was noted that constant vigilance is necessary, given that the proliferation of algorithms and bots makes it necessary to discern whether the digital interaction occurs with a human being or with an artificial construction.

Faced with these challenges, the participants emphasized that, in certain contexts, it will be necessary to establish regulatory frameworks geared toward the common good, always guaranteeing transparency, accountability, and the promotion of pluralistic and responsible public communication. Finally, they stressed that this task must be accompanied by a *strong push for media education and literacy*, essential pillars for critical citizenship and for strengthening a truly participatory digital democracy.

3. Managing the risks of artificial intelligence as a weapon

This session examined the inherent risks of AI stemming from its dual-use nature, encompassing both civilian and military applications. It highlighted that the same algorithms that enable predictive surveillance can be used for target selection on the battlefield; that technologies designed for public safety can be transformed into instruments of oppression or coercion; and that systems designed for benign civilian purposes can be rapidly militarized, just as military AI applications end up being used for policing or social control. This underscored the need to abandon the illusory separations that mask this growing interdependence between civilian and military applications.

It was emphasized that effective international governance must prioritize raising awareness and mitigating global asymmetries, promoting international oversight mechanisms, transparency and the dissemination of best practices. Governance

structures must incorporate principles of multi-stakeholder participation, due process, algorithmic fairness, and precautions, in order to safeguard human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Furthermore, it was argued that explicit legal limits should be established to prohibit the development and use of AI systems that violate human rights or International Humanitarian Law (IHL). In particular, systems capable of making autonomous decisions with ethical or legal consequences that affect human life and dignity should be prohibited. In this regard, it was noted that the deployment of autonomous weapons systems (AWS) poses a profound challenge to traditional legal and ethical norms, as it contravenes fundamental humanitarian principles governing the conduct of warfare.

It was recalled that both the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the President of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) have urged States to establish a legally binding international instrument that prohibits or restricts certain warfare practices, stressing that the current framework of IHL is insufficient to address the ethical and legal implications of these emerging technologies.

Furthermore, it was acknowledged that *the international community is engaged in an algorithmic arms race with devastating potential for the planet*. In response, the urgency of redirecting resources toward combating poverty and climate change was emphasized, abandoning the logic of offensive superiority that ignores ethical and humanitarian consequences. This competitive, "first-mover" mentality fuels the risk of uncontrolled AI and opens new avenues for mass destruction.

Overcoming this risk requires abandoning the doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) and moving towards defensive, legal, and moral policies founded on the principle of self-defense. AI must be oriented towards the service of human protection and peace, prioritizing physical security and the preservation of life as the supreme values of the international order .

4. Work and continuous training for an integrated society

This session explored the profound impact of artificial intelligence and automation on work, wealth distribution, and the role of the Catholic Social Teaching (CST) in guiding contemporary technological trajectories.

One of the main concerns was the lack of transparency in the use of data by digital work platforms, which prevents an accurate assessment of working conditions. The absence of verifiable data allows platforms to manipulate workers, often through opaque incentives or misleading promises. In response, *the need to develop AI systems that empower workers was emphasized*, granting them access to and control over their own work data and thus promoting fairer and more enriching work environments. Furthermore, it was stressed

that training in AI is essential for workers to negotiate their integration into digital environments and reduce the risk of job displacement.

It was emphasized that *AI should be seen as a tool at the service of humankind, not as a replacement*. In this sense, AI should act as a force that amplifies the quality, value, and diversity of human work. Therefore, governments, businesses, and unions must promote proactive policies that expand workers' skills and enable them to perform tasks requiring greater creativity, responsibility, and sound judgment, supported by intelligent systems, ensuring that AI enhances, rather than diminishes, the dignity of the human experience.

Fulfilling the promise of Rerum Novarum means proactively shaping the trajectory of AI, maximizing its benefits for workers and minimizing its social costs. As Leo XIII warned, *the goal is not to ask workers to adapt to unjust conditions, but to promote structural transformations that restore the dignity of work and guarantee its recognition in the technological society*.

The participants proposed three guiding principles for a possible "Digital Rerum Novarum":

Social justice must prevail over technological determinism. In the face of the dominant narrative that presents the development of AI as inevitable, it was recalled that the labor abuses of the Industrial Revolution, such as child labor, extreme inequality, and exploitation, could only be overcome through structural interventions like unions, wage laws, and the consolidation of labor rights. Similarly, today institutional mechanisms are needed to guide AI toward enhancing human work, not replacing it, and to strengthen forms of participation, representation, and equitable distribution of benefits.

Reaffirming the dignity of work in the face of techno-utopianism. A warning was issued against narratives of "radical abundance" that envision a future without the need for work, as if the ideal were a return to a "Garden of Eden" free from human effort. This vision distorts the Christian understanding of the dignity of work by suggesting that poorly paid or "undignified" jobs should be eliminated through automation, rather than transformed and dignified. The goal should not be to replace the worker, but to improve working conditions and ensure their social and spiritual recognition.

Evaluate AI based on its impact on the most vulnerable. Currently, AI innovation disproportionately benefits knowledge workers in wealthy countries, while the most disadvantaged groups remain excluded. This situation is reminiscent of the phenomenon of "neglected diseases" in medical research: what doesn't generate profit isn't researched. To reverse this pattern, the creation of innovation funds oriented toward the common good has been proposed, aimed at using AI to improve the lives of marginalized people and incorporating their voices into the technology design and governance process.

Finally, it was reaffirmed that technology does not determine human destiny: political, social and ethical decisions must ensure that digital progress is guided by social justice, inclusion and the dignity of work.

5. The future of artificial intelligence technologies

This session analyzed the rapid evolution of AI, the need to establish effective ethical controls, and the practical challenges of implementing responsible governance.

Three interrelated concepts were distinguished:

Ethics. Codes of conduct developed by companies and organizations, useful as guidance, but which do not generate binding rights or guarantees.

Governance. A set of institutional instruments that ensure the ethical application of AI, including regulatory frameworks, market incentives, oversight mechanisms, and accountability.

Regulation. A specific legal tool within governance, intended to establish specific obligations and sanctions.

The importance of translating ethical principles into concrete operating procedures was emphasized. In this regard, it was highlighted that *establishing international standards has strategic value,* as it provides common benchmarks and shared frameworks for action that facilitate practical application and the exchange of best practices.

It was acknowledged that global governance efforts are essential and must be aligned with the UN Charter and universal human rights. However, it was emphasized that three structural deficits persist:

Inclusion deficit, since only seven countries participate consistently in AI summits

Lack of transparency, due to the opacity generated by private data monopolies.

Access deficit, in terms of computing power and the datasets needed for public research and innovation.

It was argued that to fully unleash the potential of AI for the common good, it is essential to establish robust controls at both the technical and organizational levels, including aspects of governance, processes, and ongoing training. In this regard, it was also argued that it is crucial to empower developers and data scientists to understand and integrate the security controls and metrics provided by cloud service providers and standardized platforms.

Transparency emerged as a shared principle: people should have the right to know whether they are interacting with a human being or an algorithm, especially in sensitive contexts such as medical, financial, or insurance decisions. Similarly, privacy should extend to personal digital footprints, understood as an extension of the inherent dignity of the human person.

In addition, a set of ten ethical guidelines, formulated as contemporary commandments, were proposed during the session, aimed at framing the moral commitment to digital technology and promoting a truly humanizing use of AI:

Don't elevate digital technology to an end in itself.

Do not mistakenly attribute humanity to machines.

It creates space for human time and analog encounters, as opposed to the logic of immediacy of real-time networks.

It honors social and democratic capacities, fostering inclusion and deliberation.

Do not destroy nature in the name of technological progress.

Don't reduce people to mere data objects; trust people, not algorithms.

Do not deprive human beings of their creative potential.

It acknowledges the limitations of technology, remembering that even the most sophisticated systems have unavoidable margins of error.

Do not infringe upon the freedom of others through technical means.

It prevents the concentration of power and guarantees equitable participation.

These guidelines encapsulate an ethical vision of the digital age, reaffirming the centrality of the person as the measure of all technological progress. AI must remain at the service of humanity, the community, and creation, and never place itself above them.

6. Artificial intelligence and cognitive integrity

This session delved into the complex interaction between AI, neuro-technologies, and human cognitive abilities, focusing on their potential impact on identity, freedom, and human dignity.

Particular attention was paid to the implications of cognitive enhancement. Technologies such as brain-computer interfaces (BCIs) and direct brain-to-brain communication allow for the modification or training of cognitive abilities. These interfaces, which record neuronal activity and translate it into signals or commands, present remarkable therapeutic potential. However, the expansion of their use beyond the clinical setting into

mass-market applications raises ethical concerns, as they align with transhumanist aspirations that seek to artificially expand the limits of the human mind.

In this regard, it was pointed out that BCIs and related technologies pose three conceptual risks that can distort the understanding of the human person:

> *Reduction of the self to the brain (neuromania).* This increasingly widespread discourse mistakenly identifies the brain with the entirety of the self. The BCIs reinforces this view by suggesting direct access to the "essence" of the person. This approach can lead to the medicalization of social or moral problems, reducing complex structural issues to brain chemistry and prioritizing technical solutions over social transformations. From a philosophical perspective, thought and consciousness transcend the brain, as they also depend on the body, the environment, and shared experience, as *Antiqua et Nova* emphasizes.
>
> *Reducing thought to calculation. The* analogy of the brain as a "biological computer" confuses thinking with mere processing speed. This conception forgets that *human thought is intentional, symbolic, and creative, not quantifiable in bits per second*. Reducing thought to calculation means emptying it of meaning, beauty, and its ethical dimension.
>
> *The illusion of frictionless interaction with the world.* The BCIs promise to act "through thought," without physical mediation, fostering the perception of an environment completely adaptable to human will. This imaginary reinforces a culture of immediate desire, characteristic of contemporary technification, which tends to dissolve the experience of limits and otherness.

Furthermore, it was stated that the ability to identify and interpret mental processes using neuro-technologies raises critical questions about mental privacy, autonomy, and identity. In this regard, it was argued that if technology were to accurately identify what a person is thinking, there would be a risk of generating cognitive profiles or even "irrefutable proof" of intentions or thoughts, with potentially irreparable harm if such inferences proved inaccurate.

In response to these challenges, five human rights principles applied to the neurotechnology field were proposed:

> *Mental privacy*: the right to keep thoughts in the private sphere.
>
> *Mental integrity:* guarantee that personality and identity cannot be altered externally by technological means.

Agency: freedom of will and ability to make decisions without algorithmic interference.

Right to mental enhancement: ensuring that, where cognitive enhancement is possible, it is distributed equitably and fairly.

Protection against cognitive violence: prohibiting the use of technologies that can insert or manipulate information in the brain.

Finally, it was emphasized that, to address the global challenges posed by neurotechnology, it is necessary to balance the right to benefit from scientific progress with distributive justice. The quality and availability of data, especially in sensitive fields such as mental health, remain unequal and concentrated in certain jurisdictions. This global asymmetry of resources and capabilities means that scientific development is driven by economic incentives rather than human needs, *favoring the commodification of data instead of its recognition as a common good.*

7. Infrastructure governance: AI knowledge and technological sovereignty

This session highlighted the geopolitical and economic asymmetries that characterize the current AI landscape, demonstrating the concentration of knowledge, infrastructure, and investment in a few global hubs.

It was acknowledged that *high-performance computing and data infrastructures must be open, secure, and interoperable*—essential characteristics for progress in fields such as health and science. However, it was also expressed that the current AI landscape reflects profound geopolitical and economic asymmetries: the concentration of computing power, data, and infrastructure investment in just a few countries and corporations deepens exclusion. Therefore, it was argued that we must strive to reduce critical dependence on a few dominant actors and ensure the active participation of the Global South in standards-setting and access to digital markets.

In response to this scenario, two initiatives based on radical collaboration were presented as strategies to reduce these gaps and promote inclusive technological sovereignty in Latin America and the Caribbean.

Latin American Artificial Intelligence Index reveals the great diversity of AI ecosystems in the region, classifying countries according to their level of technological maturity into three categories: pioneers (Chile, Brazil, Uruguay), adopters (Colombia, Mexico), and explorers (El Salvador, Paraguay). The data show a strong concentration of knowledge in countries such as Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, Chile, and Colombia. Furthermore, the region continues to be a net exporter of talent, losing more qualified professionals each year than it trains. It was also noted that despite growing public interest and high adoption of generative AI applications, Latin America and the

Caribbean receive only 1.2% of global private investment in this field, highlighting a paradox between adoption and technological production capacity.

LATAM Capita. This project aims to develop a Large Language Model (LLM), open and created from and for Latin America and the Caribbean. The initiative is based on a radical collaboration between more than 50 institutions and 150 specialists who share computing infrastructure, technical capabilities, and, above all, regional data. The collective has compiled 10 terabytes of raw data on Latin America—in Spanish, Portuguese, and English—with the goal of training more representative, inclusive, and culturally diverse language models, strengthening the region's technological autonomy.

8. Shared prosperity in the AI economy

This session addressed fundamental issues related to distributive justice in the economics of artificial intelligence.

It was recalled that Pope Leo XIII's emphasis on distributive justice, a central pillar of *Rerum Novarum* , calls for an update of that doctrine today for the context of the digital economy and AI. In this regard, it was highlighted that as AI is integrated into all productive sectors, wealth creation tends to become detached from traditional human labor, accentuating the economic gap between those who possess the technology (capital) and those who depend on labor. This inequality is explained by the gap between the rate of return on capital and economic growth: investors accumulate compound profits while workers fall behind.

Workers must have a meaningful voice in how artificial intelligence is introduced and governed within their workplaces. The value created through technological progress should be shared fairly, ensuring that productivity gains translate into social inclusion and protection. This requires strengthening collective bargaining and exploring new redistribution mechanisms, that link technological advancement to shared prosperity. Ensuring worker representation in tripartite negotiations is key for them not only to adapt to AI but to actively shape its trajectory.

Every new form of work born within the digital economy and the AI value chain must be endowed with the same rights and imbued with the moral dignity that belongs to all human labor. Work must remain a space for moral development and integral human flourishing. AI should be measured not by how much it accelerates efficiency or profit, but by how much it uplifts the least among us. Technological progress must be guided by social justice, ensuring that innovation expands inclusion rather than deepening inequality and that the benefits of AI reach those whose labor and dignity have too often been overlooked.

In response to this trend, an alternative model was proposed: *Universal Basic Capital* (UBC), a mechanism that allows all citizens to participate in the ownership of the AI

economy and benefit from the returns on technological investment. Unlike Universal Basic Income (UBI), which constitutes a redistributive transfer, UBC creates individual or family accounts that hold shares in the digital economy, financed through public surpluses, investment funds, or sovereign wealth funds derived from natural resources.

9. Artificial intelligence for integral human development.

The seminar highlighted the difficulty of building a global commitment to the universal common good in a context marked by profound pluralism of values and increasing geopolitical competition. Global interdependence makes the pursuit of the common good more urgent, but it does not guarantee it: *its realization requires the virtue of solidarity*. Appealing to the human rights paradigm is necessary, but insufficient, since rights themselves are currently contested and depend on diverse conceptions of the person, society, and the international order.

It was emphasized that the principle of subsidiarity, originally conceived in a hierarchical society, needs to be redefined in light of a world characterized by decentralized power structures and interdependent networks. Law and state regulation constitute an indispensable minimum framework, but they are not sufficient on their own, since states themselves participate in the power dynamics they are meant to regulate, and a significant portion of humanity lives under authoritarian regimes or with weakened democratic checks and balances.

In this context, the need for *new forms of governance was raised, based on more transparent business structures and radical collaboration between regional and non-state actors, bringing power closer to the people and strengthening accountability*. The fundamental challenge of our time is not to accumulate power, but to order it ethically, so that those who wield it can remain fully human.

Human dignity, the root of all the Church's social tradition, must always be understood in relation to the concrete historical conditions in which people live, work, and develop. From this perspective, the human person was presented as a subject in two essential dimensions:

As a free and active person, this implies analyzing how technology affects the ability to act, discern, and decide freely.
As the origin of the solution, recognizing that human creativity is the protagonist of any possible ethical and political response to contemporary challenges.

It was argued that *technological tools are never neutral*: even when used for constructive purposes, AI algorithms transform human perception and relationship with reality. Therefore, a deeper understanding of human freedom is required, one that goes beyond the voluntarist individualism characteristic of certain modern interpretations of rights, and incorporates its relational, communal, and moral dimensions.

It was stated that focusing reflection on the human heart, not as mere sentimentality, but as the seat of interiority and moral conscience, allows us to understand that *human beings cannot be instrumentalized or reduced to quantifiable data*. A functionalist view of humanity especially threatens the weakest and most vulnerable, for whom reduction to mere data implies a radical loss of recognition and protection. Even the value of privacy is only fully understood if human beings are recognized as irreducible subjects, and not as databases or nodes within technical systems.

10. Artificial intelligence for everyone and for our common home

The discussion highlighted the importance of promoting "*ethics by design*" and incorporating principles of Integral Human Development into technical architectures and governance frameworks. It was noted that the challenge is not limited to mitigating negative impacts but also involves identifying incentives and institutional arrangements that can encourage the positive contributions of AI to society.

Concerns were raised regarding the possibility that digital systems, particularly multi-agent architectures, may behave in ways that diverge from the human purposes for which they were designed. These concerns include the potential capacity for simulation, deception, cooperative strategies, and resistance to shut down—issues that have been discussed by researchers involved in the development of large-scale AI models.

Rather than treating these warnings as speculative, participants analyzed them as part of a broader call to develop constructive and actionable governance responses. This included consideration of avoiding excessive market concentration in the technology sector; avoiding regulatory approaches that address peripheral issues while leaving core risks unregulated ("*zombie regulation*"); and addressing the phenomenon of "*digital stagflation*," understood as the combination of information overload and weakening of shared normative frameworks.

This reality calls for coordinated action to make technological risks visible and to equip individuals and families, especially children, adolescents, and those in situations of vulnerability, with the tools to navigate them safely. Such commitment must take the form of continuous, multilingual, and accessible public campaigns; clear guidance for households and schools; reinforced safety-by-design obligations for minors and digital literacy programs that foster critical thinking and media discernment.

- Participants discussed the need for forms of universal or harmonized digital constitutionalism capable of integrating the many ethical guidelines developed in recent years. Comparisons were drawn with the international regime for nuclear non-proliferation, suggesting that analogous principles may be required to prevent the proliferation of artificial intelligence systems designed for military or commercial conflict. *Concerns were also expressed regarding the convergence of AI*

with biotechnology, and reference was made to broader ethical appeals for technological "disarmament."

- Participants discussed the potential for AI to support a virtuous interaction between technological innovation, environmental action, and new models of sustainable finance. *The objective is to orient AI away from purely speculative economic dynamics and toward broader global public goods*. The opportunity provided by powerful information systems capable of recording bio-natural capital and biodiversity wealth more accurately also calls for an effort to highlight the value of the main asset we have as humanity.
- A healthy and proactive link between sustainable finance, mechanisms for the conservation and production of ecosystem services, and the massive mobilization of financial resources for adaptation, mitigation, and social transformation measures could pave the way for a strong prioritization of climate action.

Call to action

Throughout the seminar, examples were discussed of how young people, researchers, and practitioners are already using AI to improve health, education, resource management, civic participation, and workplace safety. These cases were presented as evidence of the potential for AI systems to contribute to human dignity when guided by appropriate governance and institutional frameworks.

Participants discussed possibilities such as a more efficient and sustainable energy matrix; approaches to food security that take health and environmental considerations into account; more personalized educational tools that might strengthen interpersonal connections; research pathways that could accelerate scientific discoveries related to disease prevention and treatment; forms of civic behavior that are more responsible and creative; and public administrations that could become more agile, effective, and less vulnerable to corruption. These and other examples were presented as areas where AI might play a constructive role, depending on the governance choices made in the coming years.

In the final session of the seminar, the launch of the *Latin American Artificial Intelligence Network* was discussed, with the aim of establishing a global dialogue platform that would enable the exchange of experiences, the learning of best practices, and the cross-fertilization of ethical initiatives that promote the proper use of AI for integral human development.

The Network will operate as a continuous platform for knowledge exchange, holding regular virtual and in-person meetings with key regional and global actors and academic centers, inspired by a spirit of fraternity and universal cooperation.

As Pope Leo reminds us: "*Technological innovation can be a form of participation in the divine act of creation. As such, it carries an ethical and spiritual weight, for every design*

decision expresses a vision of humanity. Therefore, the Church calls on all AI creators to cultivate moral discernment as a fundamental part of their work, in order to develop systems that reflect justice, solidarity, and a genuine reverence for life."[5]

Ultimately, the forces driving historical change are the same ones that transform the human heart. This conviction, which unites ethics, spirituality and political action, must guide our response to the challenge of AI and orient its development toward a genuine project of integral human development.

---

[5] MESSAGE OF THE HOLY FATHER TO THE PARTICIPANTS IN THE BUILDERS AI FORUM. [Collegium Maximum of Rome, 6-7 November 2025]: https://www.vatican.va/content/leo-xiv/en/messages/pont-messages/2025/documents/20251103-messaggio-builders-aiforum.html