COMMUNICATION AS A FACTOR OF TRANSPARENCY IN SOCIAL INTERACTION: THE ERA OF DIGITALIZATION

ISBN: 978-83-66760-42-4

SCIENTIFIC EDITORS
Andriy Krysovatyy, Lesia Buiak, Oksana Koval, Marcin Radziłowicz

Elk – 2026

COMMUNICATION AS A FACTOR OF TRANSPARENCY IN SOCIAL INTERACTION: THE ERA OF DIGITALIZATION

WEST UKRAINIAN
NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Andriy Krysovatyy
Lesia Buiak
Oksana Koval
Marcin Radziłowicz
Scientific Editors

COMMUNICATION AS A FACTOR OF TRANSPARENCY OF SOCIAL INTERACTION: THE ERA OF DIGITALIZATION

Monograph

Recommended by the Academic Council of the West Ukrainian National University
(Protocol No. 4 dated December 19, 2025)

Elk – 2026

Communication as a Factor of Transparency of Social Interaction: The Era of Digitalization. Monograph. Scientific Editors: Andriy Krysovatyy, Lesia Buiak, Oksana Koval, Marcin Radziłowicz. Ełk, 2026. Publishing House: University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn, Ełk Campus Branch. 482 pages.

Reviewers:

Jan van Zwieten
Netherlands Business Academy, Kingdom of the Netherlands

Justyna Krzywkowska
University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn, Ełk Branch, Poland

Ivan Danyliuk
Taras Shevchenko National University, Ukraine

Cover design and DTP
Oksana Koval, Viktor Koval

ISBN: 978-83-66760-42-4

The monograph is published based on the research materials presented at the IV International Scientific and Practical Conference "Communication as a Factor of Transparency of Social Interaction: The Era of Digitalization", and within the framework of the implementation of the Ukrainian–American STEM project.

Publishing house:
Uniwersytet Warmińsko-Mazurski w Olsztynie
Filia w Ełku

CONTENTS

Tomasz Jakubiak,
The Catholic Academy in Warsaw
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-4781-686X

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN THE DIOCESAN CURIA: CONDITIONS AND REQUIREMENTS NOT REGULATED BY LAW FOR RESPONSIBLE IMPLEMENTATION[1]

Introduction

You don't need to conduct a scientific research project to notice that artificial intelligence is in general use in the workplace and in private life. Numerous publications have drawn attention to the advantages of implementing AI in professional environments; neither has there been a dearth of papers warning of potential dangers associated with this. In my study on the areas in which AI could be applied in a diocesan curia, I found that there is a need to identify factors which are not regulated by legal provisions that should be considered in the implementation of AI systems in curial institutions. Hence, I formulated a working hypothesis on the existence of a set of extralegal conditions that define the limits for the admissibility of using AI in a diocesan curia. To verify my hypothesis, I used a compound methodology involving an analytical and critical, a dogmatic and legal, and a hermeneutic approach, as well as normative and axiological analysis. My research was interdisciplinary.

Before I present my results, it will be helpful to define the concept of "the diocesan curia." The Church's legislative authority discusses this in Cann. 489 to 494 CIC.[2] Can. 469 gives the following definition: "The diocesan curia consists of those institutions and persons which assist the bishop in the governance of the whole diocese, especially in guiding pastoral action, in caring for the administration of the diocese, and in exercising judicial power."

The Theological and Anthropological Perspective

The first thing we should consider if we want to introduce AI in the work of a curia are the anthropological and ethical implications of such a decision. Purely economic prospects cannot be the only criterion we take into account, which means that the AI installed is to serve human advancement

[1] This article is the outcome of my academic research internship at the Faculty of Canon Law, Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome, under the supervision of Rev. Janusz Piotr Kowal, SJ, Full Professor of the Faculty. English translation by Teresa Bałuk-Ulewiczowa.
[2] CIC – abbr. of *Codex Iuris Canonici auctoritate Ioannis Pauli PP. II promulgatus*, 25.01.1983, *Aacta Apostolicae Sedis* 75 (1983), Pars II, pp. 1-317; English translation: *Code of Canon Law. Latin– English Edition. New English Translation*, Washington: Canon Law Society of America, 1999.

and the common good.[3] By "common good" I mean "those conditions of social life under which men enjoy the possibility of achieving their own perfection."[4] Genuine development cannot be restricted simply to economic growth but instead should take a comprehensive form, contributing to the development of each man and of the whole man,[5] with respect for his profoundest needs. It should be accomplished within a framework of solidarity and freedom, taking into account the order of truth and good proper to the human person.[6] The central role which must be accorded to the human person in the design and application of AI systems is a point the EU group of experts has given special stress in its ethics guidelines for trustworthy AI.[7]

Decisions regarding a choice of AI models for church institutions should consider the nature of the Church as a divine and human reality rooted in the relationship between the Persons of the Holy Trinity.[8] This is why the Church was founded to serve as a sign and instrument of intimate union with God and of the unity of all the human race.[9] Hence, the technological progress which may be achieved in the Church's administrative activities must be focused on strengthening unity and communion. A diocesan curia that opts for AI may not submit to the temptation to use it to replace human decisions and acts whenever human attendance and intervention is necessary on the grounds of Divine precept and Church law. Even the most advanced AI is still but a technological tool, able to assist in decision-making, but incapable of participating in the personal relationship required by the Church's communion. In the spirit of Pope Francis' appeal for "a culture of encounter," we must observe that the use of AI in the Church may not lead to the distancing off, dehumanization, or automatization of pastoral relations.[10] Instead, AI should be a tool which releases and enables the

[3] Dicastery for the Doctrine of the Faith, and Dicastery for Culture and Education, Note on the Relationship Between Artificial Intelligence and Human Intelligence *Antiqua et Nova*, no. 4-6, 28.01.2025, online at https://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_ddf_doc_20250128_antiqua-et-nova_en.html (accessed 13 Dec. 2025) – hereinafter *Note*.
[4] Second Vatican Council, Declaration On Religious Freedom *Dignitatis Humanae*, no. 6, 07.12.1965, online at https://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decl_19651207_dignitatis-humanae_en.html (accessed 13 Dec. 2025).
[5] Paulus VI, Litterae encyclicae de populorum progressione promovenda *Populorum progressio*, no. 14, 26.03.1967, *Aacta Apostolicae Sedis* 59 (1967), p. 264.
[6] Ioannes Paulus II, Litterae encyclicae vicesimo expleto anno ab editis litteris encyclicis a verbis "Populorum progressio" incipientibus *Sollicitudo rei socialis*, no. 33, 30.12.1987, *Aacta Apostolicae Sedis* 80 (1988), p. 559.
[7] The High-Level Expert Group on AI presented Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy Artificial Intelligence, *Ethics guidelines for trustworthy AI*, European Commission, Brussels, Document made public on 8 April 2019, no. 10.
[8] Concilium Vaticanum Secundum, Constitutio Dogmatica de Ecclesia *Lumen gentium*, no. 8, 21.11.1964, *Aacta Apostolicae Sedis* 57 (1965), pp. 11-12.
[9] John Paul II, Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation *Christifideles Laici* on the Vocation and the Mission of the Lay Faithful in the Church and in the World, no. 19, 30.12.1983, online at https://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_30121988_christifideles-laici.html (accessed 13 Dec. 2025).
[10] Francis, Apostolic Exhortation *Evangelii Gaudium* on the Proclamation of the Gospel in Today's World, no. 51, 220, 24.11.2013, online at https://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/apost_exhortations/documents/papa-francesco_esortazione-ap_20131124_evangelii-gaudium.html (accessed 13 Dec. 2025).

human individual to achieve a deeper level of communication and love, serving not as a substitute but as a support for his actions taken responsibly and personally.

When we use AI, we must always bear in mind that an individual's acts conducted in the Church which bring an effect, including any legal transactions such a person performs, must be supported by his qualifications based on his powers of reason and will to perform such actions freely and consciously; in other words, he must be a *persona capax actus humani* (a person capable of an act proper to a human being).[11] Contemporary moral theology says that before a person makes a free decision to undertake an action, he must first know the object of such an action, and thereafter want to achieve it. The cognitive process takes place at the sensory and intellectual levels. The intellect pervades and illuminates perception, in order to create an intellectual image of the objective of the action, according to obtained knowledge. The crucial element in the act referred to by the expression *actus humanus* ("act proper to a human being") is the will of the *human* individual performing it. The human will to act is inspired by the desire to accomplish the action, on the basis of an awareness of the objective of that desire.[12] In its *Note on the Relationship Between Artificial Intelligence and Human Intelligence*, the Holy See writes that a human person engages with reality in the full scope of his or her spiritual, cognitive, embodied, and relational being (no. 26). AI does not have such a cognitive and volitional capacity.[13] Therefore, from the perspective of the Church's teaching on *actus humanus*, we may say that AI is unable to act as a surrogate for any of the fundamental components of an act performed by a human being. In particular, AI cannot accomplish the cognitive aspect of human action by mechanisms such as cognitive offloading.[14] If it could, the act would no longer be a human act, and thereby would not generate any legal consequences. AI systems can support the discernment or data analysis performed by a human, but they are incapable of representing persons in activities whose very nature requires the application of a human being's powers of reasoning and application of free will. A choice made in full awareness by a human could never be replaced by the outcome of a process of recommendation involving a hidden, dynamic adaptation of stimuli to fit a user profile.[15] As Pope Francis observes, if AI algorithms were to relieve man of his duty in effecting cognitive and volitional processes, it would betoken a particularly dangerous instance of a

[11] Remigiusz Sobański, "Czynności prawne," in Józef Krukowski and Remigiusz Sobański, *Komentarz do Kodeksu prawa kanonicznego*, vol. 1, Poznań: Pallottinum, 2003, p. 203.
[12] Quoted after Tomasz Jakubiak, *Problem ważności przyjęcia sakramentu święceń w prawie Kościoła katolickiego*, Płock: Płocki Instytut Wydawniczy, 2018, p. 190.
[13] *Note*, no. 30-35.
[14] Michael Gerlich, "AI Tools in Society: Impacts on Cognitive Offloading and the Future of Critical Thinking," *Societies* 15 (2025) no. 1, online at https://www.mdpi.com/2075-4698/15/1/6 (accessed 13 Dec. 2025).
[15] Maciej Świrski, *Algorytm i sumienie – o cichym zaniku odpowiedzialności*, online at https://swirski.info/algorytm-i-sumienie-o-cichym-zaniku-odpowiedzialnosci/ (accessed 13 Dec. 2025).

"technocratic paradigm" attributing the full powers to resolve all human problems to technology.[16] There is a great risk of that happening, for there is an ideology known as transhumanism, an intellectual, cultural, and political movement that postulates the possibility and need to apply science and technology to overcome human limitations and improve the human condition, in which there would no longer be a place for human freedom and dignity.[17]

Thus, the theological and anthropological foundations for the introduction of AI in church institutions show that technology must remain in the service of the human person and the community of the Church, and must not become their surrogate.

Ethical and Social Aspects

The introduction of AI in the work of a curia may be evaluated favourably if it contributes to the achievement of the institution's aims while at the same time fully respecting human dignity and the wellbeing of individuals and the community.[18] In an ethical assessment of systems involving AI models we cannot lose sight of the general vision and understanding of the human person "integrated into" the structure of AI-based systems. The Holy See observes that the products of technology reflect the worldview not only of their owners and users, but also of their creators and regulators, as numerous research projects show. Moreover, AI can also perpetuate power relations and mechanisms which run counter to the generally accepted view of man and society.[19] We must never turn a blind eye to the fact that we do not know what kind of a worldview the designers of an AI system espoused when they created it, impressing their own views on their artefact. The makers of AI systems come from a variety of backgrounds, disciplines and environments, each with a history, culture, set of motives, and professional ethics of its own.[20] Technology as such is never neutral.[21] It reflects not only the worldview of individuals, but also the economic logic and predominant worldview in the

[16] *Note*, no. 75; Francisus, Litterae encyclicae de communi domo colenda *Laudato si'*, no. 108-109, 24.05.2015, *Aacta Apostolicae Sedis* 107 (2015), pp. 890-891.
[17] Wiesław Przygoda, "Sztuczna Inteligencja a duszpasterstwo. Obietnice – Zagrożenia – Wyzwania," *Społeczeństwo* 34 (2024) no. 1 (165), p. 60.
[18] *Note*, no. 40.
[19] Ewelina Bogiel, "Wartości, wymogi, kodeksy – podejście pryncypalistyczne do etyki AI w kontekście krytyki Brenta Mittelstadta," in Ministerstwo Cyfryzacji, *Godna zaufania AI. Jak używać sztucznej inteligencji zgodnie z wytycznymi Komisji Europejskiej w zakresie etyki? Opracowanie przygotowane przez Grupę Roboczą ds. Sztucznej Inteligencji Podgrupa ds. etyki i prawa,* Warszawa, styczeń (Jan.) 2025, p. 27, online at https://www.gov.pl/web/ai/godna-zaufania-ai-czyli-jak-uzywac-sztucznej-inteligencji-zgodnie-z-wytycznymi-komisji-europejskiej-w-zakresie-etyki (accessed 13 Dec. 2025); *Note*, no. 41, 45.
[20] Quoted after Ewelina Bogiel, ibid., p. 27.
[21] See Benjamin Ruha, *Race After Technology: Abolitionist Tools for the New Jim Code*, Medford: Polity Press, 2019; Virginia Eubanks, *Automating Inequality*, New York: Picador, 2019; Wiesław Przygoda, ibid., p. 55.

businesses which own such tools.[22] Furthermore, we should bear in mind that in the field of AI there is a time lag for the introduction of regulations relating to ethics and law.[23]

An important fact which must not be overlooked in the ethical assessment of AI-based tools is that their operation depends on the dataset on which they have been trained. Datasets are never neutral but come from a specific social, cultural, and worldview context, and their collection, selection, and labelling always reflects a specific system of values and their designers' assumptions. It cannot be ruled out that this may have a significant impact on the output the algorithms in the AI system produce. As Ruha Benjamin observes, algorithms carry a "hidden cultural code" which may inadvertently reproduce the stereotypes, prejudices, or structural inequities ambient in a society.[24] The informed and responsible deployment of AI not only calls for the evaluation of the results of its operation but also for reflection on the source of its dataset, the intentions of its makers, and the worldview framework that shapes the way it "perceives" reality. Failing to appreciate this aspect of AI may lead to situations where technological systems which appear to be neutral are in fact maintaining injustice, discrimination, and cognitive manipulation.

A review of the ethical aspect of using AI-based instruments in a diocesan curia cannot fail to observe the phenomenon known as AI hallucination, which tends to occur especially on the operation of generative systems like ChatGPT, Bard, or Claude. AI hallucinations arise when the system generates an output which looks convincing and contextually perfectly coherent but is in fact completely fabricated, totally unrelated to the user's input data and the previous context. In other words, although the output a generative AI system delivers may look plausible, in reality it entails information that is false, cooked up or does not make sense. Hallucinations observed in generative AI models tend to arise due to the probabilistic nature of AI or an insufficient training set, and have absolutely nothing to do with an authentic cognitive process. They may be the outcome of errors in the dataset used to train the model, the source data, or an insufficient (unrepresentative) amount of data.[25] In the work of a diocesan curia and other church institutions, AI hallucinations give rise to substantial ethical and practical consequences. Generative AI systems may produce outputs which

[22] See Shoshana Zuboff, "The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power," New York: Public Affairs, 2019; Francis, Message for the 57th World Day of Peace 1 January 2024. *Artificial Intelligence and Peace*, 08.12.2023, online at https://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/messages/peace/documents/20231208-messaggio-57giornatamondiale-pace2024.html (accessed 13 Dec. 2025).
[23] Ewelina Bogiel, ibid., p. 28.
[24] Benjamin Ruha, ibid, pp. 12-15.
[25] Mahmut Özer, "Is Artifical Intelligence Hallucinating?" *Turkish Journal of Psychiatry* 35 (2024) no. 4, p. 333; Alicja Kaszuba, "Etyka, regulacja i governance w systemie normatywnym dotyczącym sfery cyfrowej," in Ministerstwo Cyfryzacji, *Godna zaufania AI. Jak używać sztucznej inteligencji zgodnie z wytycznymi Komisji Europejskiej w zakresie etyki? Opracowanie przygotowane przez Grupę Roboczą ds. Sztucznej Inteligencji Podgrupa ds. etyki i prawa,* Warszawa, styczeń (Jan.) 2025, p. 22, online at https://www.gov.pl/web/ai/godna-zaufania-ai-czyli-jak-uzywac-sztucznej-inteligencji-zgodnie-z-wytycznymi-komisji-europejskiej-w-zakresie-etyki (accessed 13 Dec. 2025).

are false or do not comply with the Church's doctrine but appear to be reliable and authoritative. Hence the deployment of AI resources in an ecclesiastical setting calls for prudence, a critical approach, and oversight exercised by a human supervisor.

As the dissemination of AI instruments becomes more and more widespread, there is a growing risk of technological addiction – decision-makers becoming more and more dependent on algorithms. This is a phenomenon known as automation bias or algorithmic dependency, in which users begin to put more and more trust in AI-generated output than in their own judgment, which in turn makes for a fall in human intellectual and moral autonomy.[26] Everyone who opts for the use of an AI facility should remember that they will be the ones who bear the responsibility for the effects of their AI-assisted decisions. The dicasteries of the Roman Curia point out that this is a responsibility which cannot be reduced simply to apply to the immediate effects of such acts. It must consider concern for other persons, whom decision-makers may overlook if they rely too heavily on algorithmic output.[27] Notwithstanding its capacity for data analysis and recommending solutions, AI is incapable of moral empathy or telling good from evil. Users of AI, especially those engaged in the work of church institutions, should make an effort to cultivate and enhance their prudence and circumspection, mindful of the fact that technological tools may be applied to support them in the decisions they make, but can never take the place of their conscience. No. 70 of *Antiqua et Nova* says explicitly that "AI should assist, not replace, human judgment. Similarly, it must never degrade creativity or reduce workers to mere 'cogs in a machine.'"

While on the subject of algorithmic dependency, a risk to which AI users are exposed, we should add that a corollary associated with this is the danger of falling standards in the qualifications of such workers. Instead of furthering their potential for critical and innovative thinking, they may gradually lose their ability to make independent decisions, carry out data analysis autonomously, and adopt a creative approach to problem solving. Instead of treating AI output as a useful source of inspiration, they may begin to acquiesce to its suggestions and reduce their professional activity merely to a set of repetitive and schematic operations.[28] Research shows that a person's overreliance on AI tools may curtail his powers to develop his soft skills, especially his facility for critical

[26] Lauren Kahn, Emelia S. Probasco, and Ronnie Kinoshita, *AI Safety and Automation Bias The Downside of Human-in-the-Loop*, Center for Security and Emerging Technology, November 2024, p. 1, online at https://cset.georgetown.edu/publication/ai-safety-and-automation-bias/ (accessed 13 Dec. 2025); Nadja Schaetz, Emilija Gagrčin, Roland Toth, and Martin Emmer, "Algorithm Dependency in Platformized News Use," *New Media & Society* 27 (2025) no. 3, pp. 1360-1661, online at https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/epub/10.1177/14614448231193093 (accessed 13 Dec. 2025).
[27] *Note*, no. 46-47.
[28] *Note*, no. 67.

reflection, empathy, and communication – skills which lie at the foundation of management and cooperation in the professional environment.

Ethical reflection on the technological aspects of AI must find its practical expression in the organisation of a diocesan curia's work in the responsible management of the curia's AI systems and the formation of the persons operating them.

The Practical and Organisational Aspect, and Users' Formation

An issue which is of special importance in the deployment of AI in a diocesan curia is transparency and respect for the autonomy of the persons who will be using AI facilities. It is essential for each user to realise that he will be interacting not with other humans but with an AI system.[29] Awareness of this is the condition that will determine and safeguard the trustworthiness and authenticity of relations between the Church's institutions and the faithful.

People who contact a diocesan curia should be given the choice of settling their business by seeing a human staff member, or by interacting with an AI system. The freedom to make such a choice is a measure that shows respect for the interested party's human dignity and right to have another person handling their business. This is particularly important in the Church, which, as the Second Vatican Council reminds us, is a *communio personarum*.

An equally important point is for the staff working for the curia to be fully aware of the fact that they will be using AI tools in their professional activities.[30] They should be aware of the limitations, potential risks, and the ethical and legal consequences of any AI-assisted decisions they make. Hence, the curia should have an in-house procedure compiled for the impact assessment of the use of AI as well as an appropriate code of ethics, which will allow for the identification of potential risks in advance and determine the principles governing the use of AI in the curia, the scope of users' responsibility, and criteria for moral discernment. The recommended procedures and ethical codes should be audited on a regular basis, especially in the light of new information, users' experience, and changes in technology and the law.[31] In-house guidelines, standards, and methods of implementation should take into account the recommendations issued by national and international authorities, national and international NGOs, the national Conference of Bishops and the Holy See.[32]

[29] European Declaration on Digital Rights and Principles for the Digital Decade, p. 7, *Official Journal of the European Union* 2023/C 23/01.
[30] Ibid., chap. II.6.d, chap. III.9.b.
[31] Alicja Kaszuba, ibid., p. 24.
[32] Iwona Karkliniewska, *Organizacja wobec wyzwań etycznych związanych z AI,* in Ministerstwo Cyfryzacji, *Godna zaufania AI. Jak używać sztucznej inteligencji zgodnie z wytycznymi Komisji Europejskiej w zakresie etyki? Opracowanie przygotowane przez Grupę Roboczą ds. Sztucznej Inteligencji Podgrupa ds. etyki i prawa,* Warszawa, styczeń (Jan.) 2025, p. 33, online at https://www.gov.pl/web/ai/godna-zaufania-ai-czyli-jak-uzywac-sztucznej-inteligencji-zgodnie-z-wytycznymi-komisji-europejskiej-w-zakresie-etyki (accessed 13 Dec. 2025).

The bibliography on AI shows that the technologies deployed in organisations – not only in ecclesiastical organisations – have to be cross-checked for transparency, integrality, security, privacy, and keeping personal data processing down to a minimum.[33] All these considerations should be taken into account in the implementation of an AI system in a diocesan curia, and there should be concern for the anthropological, ethical, spiritual, social, and cultural aspects.

In view of the continual rapid advancement in new technologies, a diocesan curia that decides to introduce AI tools in its work should adopt a strategy for the training and continuous enhancement of the professional qualifications of its staff.[34] It should cater not only for the technical aspects of operating AI systems and ensuring their security, but should also provide for the ethical, legal, and pastoral formation of the staff to help them with the discernment of the moral consequences of using AI instruments. Training schemes should be continuous and interdisciplinary, involving not only computer programmers and administrators, but also theologians, ethicists, specialists in pastoral theology, and specialists in canon and secular law. The aim shared by all the components of the training programme should be not only to teach attendees the technical skills required to operate AI systems, but above all to cultivate a sense of responsibility for their application of technology, so as to keep AI as a device serving man and the Church's mission, not as an end in itself.

Ultimately, the ethical deployment of AI in church institutions will call for the harmonious concurrency of faithfulness to the core principles of the Gospel and a prudent application of the new potential offered by technology – so that technological progress may serve for the genuine good of man and the mission of the Church.

Conclusion

The use of AI in facilities accessible to the general public, especially in a professional environment, is subject to a multitude of regulations. Alongside the handful of documents issued by the Catholic Church directly or indirectly applicable to the subject,[35] and the appropriate national provisions, a series of legislative acts applicable in the European Union should be considered. They include Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation); Directive 2002/58/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 July 2002 concerning the

[33] Ibid., p. 34.
[34] Ibid., p. 35.
[35] *Note*; Konferencja Episkopatu Polski, Dekret ogólny w sprawie ochrony osób fizycznych w związku z przetwarzaniem danych osobowych w Kościele katolickim, 13.03.2018, *Akta Konferencji Episkopatu Polski* 30 (2018), p. 31-45.

processing of personal data and the protection of privacy in the electronic communications sector (Directive on privacy and electronic communications); the AI Act; Directive (EU) 2019/790 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 April 2019 on copyright and related rights in the Digital Single Market and amending Directives 96/9/EC and 2001/29/EC; the European Declaration on Digital Rights and Principles for the Digital Decade; Directive (EU) 2019/771 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 May 2019 on certain aspects concerning contracts for the sale of goods, amending Regulation (EU) 2017/2394 and Directive 2009/22/EC, and repealing Directive 1999/44/EC; Regulation (EU) 2022/868 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 May 2022 on European data governance and amending Regulation (EU) 2018/1724 (Data Governance Act).[36]

The analysis conducted in this article confirms my hypothesis that there are conditions other than legal provisions demarcating limits to the admissible implementation of artificial intelligence in a diocesan curia, and their nature is theological and anthropological, ethical, and related to aspects of the organisation of the institution and formation (staff training). Hence, tools based on AI models cannot be satisfactorily introduced in a diocesan curia and considered complete when all the requirements of the law have been met. The fundamental condition which must be fulfilled is first to obtain a precise definition of the purpose of AI in the curia – it is to serve as a tool supporting human endeavour, not as a surrogate for the human powers of reasoning, exercise of the human will, and the moral responsibility a human being takes for his actions.

The theological and anthropological examination has shown that AI does not have the capacity to perform an *actus humanus*, that is act in the manner proper to humans. Hence, the duty to deliver and interpret religious truth may not be entrusted to AI algorithms; neither can AI devices be expected to play the role of an impartial judge ruling on questions of truth. The output an AI system delivers depends on its training dataset, the methods it employs for data processing, and the context of their institutional application.

The ethical review has shown that AI is not axiologically neutral but carries a risk of hallucinations, builds up users' overreliance on technology, and reduces their cognitive autonomy. Yet it is always the human operator who takes the responsibility for any decisions he makes using AI support. Hence, it is essential to ensure transparency in the use of AI, give interested parties the option to choose to see a human member of the curia's staff rather than have their business settled by AI, and have a set of procedures and ethical codes drafted for staff operating AI systems.

[36] Alicja Kaszuba, ibid., p. 21.

Another point of key importance is the continuous interdisciplinary formation of the curia's staff. With future research in mind, it would be helpful to conduct an empirical study on the long-term effects of AI on the professional development, sacerdotal and pastoral identity, and morality of the diocesan curia's staff. Ultimately, AI may be of service to the Church's mission (as well as in areas beyond the Church's interests) if and only if it is used in the service of human dignity and for the common good. Otherwise – and this is my next research hypothesis – due to the scale and rate of change in the effects of phenomena connected with AI, such operations may lead to cultural and anthropological transformation with an impact comparable in magnitude to, or potentially even greater than the major twentieth-century totalitarian ideologies.

Summary

This article addresses the issues involved in the deployment of artificial intelligence in a diocesan curia, with special attention to the conditions (other than legal constraints) that determine the limits to the admissible use of AI. The article's working hypothesis is that alongside the applicable legal provisions, there are also theological and anthropological, and ethical factors, as well as aspects pertaining to organisation and formation which are relevant and must be taken into consideration in the implementation of AI in a diocesan curia.

The analytical section shows that AI, which is a technological tool, does not have the skills needed to conduct an *actus humanus* (act proper to a human being). Hence it is inadmissible to entrust AI algorithms with tasks requiring personal discernment, the transmission of religious truth, or telling what is true from what is false. Moreover, the ethical examination shows that AI is not neutral axiologically and that its generative systems carry a risk of hallucination and users' overreliance on technology as well as the impairment of their cognitive autonomy.

The final section presents a series of practical suggestions regarding transparency in the use of AI, the right of interested parties to choose to see a human member of the curia's staff rather than settle for an AI solution, and the need for in-house procedures, ethical codes, and continuous, interdisciplinary formation for the curia's staff. The article shows that AI may foster the Church's mission if and only if it is applied in the service of human dignity and the common good.

Słowa klucze: Kościół katolicki, nauczanie Kościoła, zarządzanie, godność ludzka, automation bias, AI

Keywords: Catholic Church, Church teaching, governance, human dignity, automation bias, AI

Bibliography

Sources

Code of Canon Law. Latin– English Edition. New English Translation, Washington: Canon Law Society of America, 1999.

Codex Iuris Canonici auctoritate Ioannis Pauli PP. II promulgatus, 25.01.1983, *Aacta Apostolicae Sedis* 75 (1983), Pars II, pp. 1-317.

Concilium Vaticanum Secundum, Constitutio Dogmatica de Ecclesia *Lumen gentium*, 21.11.1964, *Aacta Apostolicae Sedis* 57 (1965), pp. 5-71.

Dicastery for the Doctrine of the Faith, and Dicastery for Culture and Education, Note on the Relationship Between Artificial Intelligence and Human Intelligence *Antiqua et Nova*, 28.01.2025, online at https://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_ddf_doc_2025-0128_antiqua-et-nova_en.html (accessed 13 Dec. 2025).

European Declaration on Digital Rights and Principles for the Digital Decade, *Official Journal of the European Union* 2023/C 23/01.

Francis, Apostolic Exhortation *Evangelii Gaudium* on the Proclamation of the Gospel in Today's World, 24.11.2013, online at https://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/apost_exhortations/documents/papa-francesco_esortazione-ap_20131124_evangelii-gaudium.html (accessed 13 Dec. 2025).

Francis, Message for the 57th World Day of Peace 1 January 2024. *Artificial Intelligence and Peace*, 08.12.2023, online at https://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/messages/peace/documents/20231208-messaggio-57giornatamondiale-pace2024.html (accessed 13 Dec. 2025).

Francisus, Litterae encyclicae de communi domo colenda *Laudato si'*, 24.05.2015, *Aacta Apostolicae Sedis* 107 (2015), pp. 847-945.

Ioannes Paulus II, Litterae encyclicae vicesimo expleto anno ab editis litteris encyclicis a verbis "Populorum progressio" incipientibus *Sollicitudo rei socialis*, 30.12.1987, *Aacta Apostolicae Sedis* 80 (1988), p. 513-586.

John Paul II, Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation *Christifideles Laici* on the Vocation and the Mission of the Lay Faithful in the Church and in the World, 30.12.1983, online at https://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_30121988_christifideles-laici.html (accessed 13 Dec. 2025).

Konferencja Episkopatu Polski, Dekret ogólny w sprawie ochrony osób fizycznych w związku z przetwarzaniem danych osobowych w Kościele katolickim, 13.03.2018, *Akta Konferencji Episkopatu Polski* 30 (2018), pp. 31-45.

Paulus VI, Litterae encyclicae de populorum progressione promovenda *Populorum progressio*, 26.03.1967, *Aacta Apostolicae Sedis* 59 (1967), pp. 257-299.

Second Vatican Council, Declaration On Religious Freedom *Dignitatis Humanae*, 07.12.1965, online at https://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decl_19651207_dignitatis-humanae_en.html (accessed 13 Dec. 2025).

Literature

Bogiel Ewelina, "Wartości, wymogi, kodeksy – podejście pryncypalistyczne do etyki AI w kontekście krytyki Mittelstadta Brenta," in Ministerstwo Cyfryzacji, *Godna zaufania AI. Jak używać sztucznej inteligencji zgodnie z wytycznymi Komisji Europejskiej w zakresie etyki? Opracowanie przygotowane przez Grupę Roboczą ds. Sztucznej Inteligencji Podgrupa ds. etyki i prawa,* Warszawa, styczeń (Jan.) 2025, pp. 26-29, online at https://www.gov.pl/web/ai/godna-zaufania-ai-czyli-jak-uzywac-sztucznej-inteligencji-zgodnie-z-wytycznymi-komisji-europejskiej-w-zakresie-etyki (accessed 13 Dec. 2025).

Gerlich Michael, "AI Tools in Society: Impacts on Cognitive Offloading and the Future of Critical Thinking," *Societies* 15 (2025) no. 1, online at https://www.mdpi.com/2075-4698/15/1/6 (accessed 13 Dec. 2025).

Jakubiak Tomasz, *Problem ważności przyjęcia sakramentu święceń w prawie Kościoła katolickiego*, Płock: Płocki Instytut Wydawniczy, 2018.

Kahn Lauren, Emelia S. Probasco, and Ronnie Kinoshita, *AI Safety and Automation Bias. The Downside of Human-in-the-Loop,* Center for Security and Emerging Technology, November 2024, online at https://cset.georgetown.edu/publication/ai-safety-and-automation-bias/ (accessed 13 Dec. 2025).

Karkliniewska Iwona, *Organizacja wobec wyzwań etycznych związanych z AI,* in Ministerstwo Cyfryzacji, *Godna zaufania AI. Jak używać sztucznej inteligencji zgodnie z wytycznymi Komisji Europejskiej w zakresie etyki? Opracowanie przygotowane przez Grupę Roboczą ds. Sztucznej Inteligencji Podgrupa ds. etyki i prawa,* Warszawa, styczeń (Jan.) 2025, pp. 30-35, online at https://www.gov.pl/web/ai/godna-zaufania-ai-czyli-jak-uzywac-sztucznej-inteligencji-zgodnie-z-wytycznymi-komisji-europejskiej-w-zakresie-etyki (accessed 13 Dec. 2025).

Kaszuba Alicja, "Etyka, regulacja i governance w systemie normatywnym dotyczącym sfery cyfrowej," in Ministerstwo Cyfryzacji, *Godna zaufania AI. Jak używać sztucznej inteligencji zgodnie z wytycznymi Komisji Europejskiej w zakresie etyki? Opracowanie przygotowane przez Grupę Roboczą ds. Sztucznej Inteligencji Podgrupa ds. etyki i prawa,* Warszawa, styczeń (Jan.) 2025, pp.

20-25, online at https://www.gov.pl/web/ai/godna-zaufania-ai-czyli-jak-uzywac-sztucznej-inteligencji-zgodnie-z-wytycznymi-komisji-europejskiej-w-zakresie-etyki (accessed 13 Dec. 2025).

Özer Mahmut, "Is Artifical Intelligence Hallucinating?" *Turkish Journal of Psychiatry* 35 (2024) no. 4, pp. 333-335.

Przygoda Wiesław, "Sztuczna Inteligencja a duszpasterstwo. Obietnice – Zagrożenia – Wyzwania," *Społeczeństwo* 34 (2024) no. 1 (165), pp. 51-65.

Ruha Benjamin, *Race After Technology: Abolitionist Tools for the New Jim Code*, Medford: Polity Press, 2019. Eubanks Virginia, *Automating Inequality*, New York: Picador, 2019.

Schaetz Nadja , Emilija Gagrčin, Roland Toth, and Martin Emmer, "Algorithm Dependency in Platformized News Use," *New Media & Society* 27 (2025) no. 3, pp. 1360-1377, online at https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/epub/10.1177/14614448231193093 (accessed 13 Dec. 2025).

Sobański Remigiusz, "Czynności prawne," in Józef Krukowski and Remigiusz Sobański, *Komentarz do Kodeksu prawa kanonicznego*, vol. 1, Poznań: Pallottinum, 2003, pp. 201-212.

Świrski Maciej, *Algorytm i sumienie – o cichym zaniku odpowiedzialności*, online at https://swirski.info/algorytm-i-sumienie-o-cichym-zaniku-odpowiedzialnosci/ (accessed 13 Dec. 2025).

The High-Level Expert Group on AI presented Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy Artificial Intelligence, *Ethics guidelines for trustworthy AI*, European Commission, Brussels, Document made public on 8 April 2019.

Zuboff Shoshana, "The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power," New York: Public Affairs, 2019.