Arhe XXII, 43/2025
UDK 004.8
2
5/6
141.78
DOI: https://doi.org/10.19090/arhe.2025.43.157-184
Originalni naučni rad
Original Scientific Article

IOANNIS LADAS[1]
Antiochian House of Studies (AHOS, La Verne, California, USA

RELIGION, TECHNOLOGY AND ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN THE POSTMODERN WORLD: ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Abstract: Postmodernity has fundamentally reshaped the relationship between religion and technology, generating unprecedented ethical challenges that permeate every dimension of human experience. Postmodernism's critique of grand narratives destabilizes both traditional religious authority and techno-scientific certainty, thereby creating novel pathways for collaborative ethical approaches. This study examines four critical technological domains that pose significant ethical dilemmas: biotechnology, artificial intelligence, digital surveillance, and environmental technologies. The analysis reveals that despite theological differences, diverse religious traditions converge on shared ethical principles. The article proposes an innovative framework for interreligious technological ethics that harnesses religious pluralism as a source of wisdom for addressing contemporary technological challenges. This approach transcends secular-religious dichotomies and promotes a more humanistic and spiritually enriched technological future. The study demonstrates how postmodern conditions, rather than undermining religious authority, facilitate more humble and dialogical approaches to technological ethics by drawing upon multiple wisdom traditions while preserving each tradition's theological integrity. Thus, this research establishes theoretical foundations for practical interreligious collaboration in addressing the moral complexities of emerging technologies.
Keywords: Postmodernism, religion, technology, artificial intelligence, interreligious ethics

[1] Author's e-mail address: dr.ioannis.ladas@ahos.edu

1. INTRODUCTION

The postmodern period has led to a time when technology is more advanced than ever before, presenting philosophically challenging questions. The rapid emergence of artificial intelligence introduces new existential dilemmas. These developments compel modern societies to reconsider their conventional religious and moral systems.[2] Modern technological advancements impact nearly every aspect of human experience. They fundamentally alter perceptions of life, death, and personal identity.

In response to these fundamental shifts in human experience, the ancient religious and moral systems seek answers to the emerging questions about the existence of an individual, as society copes with the above rapid changes. Contemporary research in information science reveals that spiritual and religious experiences encompass diverse informational dimensions. These range from traditional documentary forms to embodied expressions through clothing, movements, and verbal references to key religious concepts.[3] These information practices extend beyond conventional artifacts to include what scholars term 'lived religion.' This concept refers to the material, embodied aspects of religion as they occur in everyday life, challenging the predominant focus on institutionalized religious doctrine.[4]

Despite these spatial and technological transformations of religious practices, the foundational role religion plays in shaping ethical values and identity remains significant. Although technology disrupts traditional religious practices, religion still gives billions of people on earth dignity, ethical status, and fraternity. However, it is not a simple relationship of religion and technology, but a „conflict" with synergetic opportunities. What further complicates this relationship is postmodernism and its reflection of skepticism in grand narrative, power in pluralism, and relativism.[5] More specifically, sev-

---

2 Qorbani Mehrdad, *Humanity in the Age of AI: How to Thrive in a Post-Human World* (Bloomsbury, 2020), 10.

3 Nadia Caidi, Puneet Nangia, Heidi Samson, Ceren Ekmekcioglu, and Michael Olsson, „Spiritual and Religious Information Experiences: An Annual Review of Information Science and Technology (ARIST) Paper," *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 2025, 8, https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24983.

4 David Morgan, *The Embodied Eye: Religious Visual Culture and the Social Life of Feeling* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012), 22-25.
Nancy T. Ammerman, „Finding Religion in Everyday Life," *Sociology of Religion* 75, no. 2 (2014): 189–190, https://doi.org/10.1093/sorel/sru013.

5 Raphael Sassower, „Postmodern Relativism as Enlightened Pluralism," in Relativism and Post-Truth in Contemporary Society, ed. Mikael Stenmark, Steve Fuller, and Ulf Zackariasson (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), 35. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-96559-8_3.

eral key characteristics of the postmodern condition fundamentally reshape religion-technology interactions. First, the fragmentation of metanarratives disrupts both traditional religious authority and techno-scientific certainty, creating what Lyotard termed a 'crisis of legitimation' that affects how both domains justify their truth claims.[6] This fragmentation enables more fluid, experimental approaches to religious engagement with technology, as neither domain can claim absolute epistemic authority. Second, cultural pluralization characteristic of postmodernity means that technological development occurs within increasingly diverse religious contexts, requiring what Beaman calls 'deep equality' approaches that move beyond secular-religious binaries.[7] Third, the decentering of traditional institutions allows for what Campbell and Garner identify as 'networked authority' – where religious wisdom about technology emerges through distributed, collaborative processes rather than hierarchical pronouncements.[8] Finally, postmodernism's emphasis on lived experience over abstract doctrine aligns with contemporary religious movements that prioritize embodied engagement with technology. As Ammerman notes, this 'lived religion' approach examines how individuals and communities actually negotiate technological challenges in their daily spiritual practices, rather than focusing solely on official theological positions.[9] This dynamic reflects what Pope Francis (1936-2025) has called the „denial of the goodness and inherent meaningfulness of creation." In this view, the world is seen „as a mere 'given,' as raw material to be hammered into useful shape," rather than a gift to be stewarded with reverence.[10]

Building upon this understanding, this article examines the ethical implications of religion-technology intersections in the postmodern world. It explores how complex tensions between technological instrumentalism and religious reverence shape contemporary moral discourse. It examines the way various religious practices discuss the moral dilemmas introduced by innovation in the spheres of biotechnology, artificial intelligence, the inter-

6 Jean-François Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), 37-41.

7 Lori G. Beaman, „Deep Equality as an Alternative to Accommodation and Tolerance," Nordic Journal of Religion and Society 27, no. 2 (2014): 89-111, https://doi.org/10.18261/ISSN1890-7008-2014-02-01.

8 Heidi A. Campbell and Stephen Garner, *Networked Theology: Negotiating Faith in Digital Culture*, Engaging Culture series (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, September 20, 2016), 45-48.

9 Ammerman, „Finding Religion in Everyday Life," 194-196.

10 Paul Scherz, „The Challenge of Technology to Moral Theology," *Journal of Moral Theology* 10, no. 2 (2021): 242–43.

net, online monitoring, and ecological control. In place of attempting to set religion and technology against each other, it explores how the two may be leveraged to discuss how moral value and ethical conduct can be clarified. Through this approach, this study emphasizes the potentially pivotal role that religious ethics might still have in the development of more human-friendly technological futures.

However, before exploring these potential contributions of religious ethics, it is essential first to examine the current state of scholarly discourse and identify key gaps in our understanding. Despite extensive scholarship on religion-technology interactions and postmodern ethics separately, existing literature reveals several critical gaps that this study addresses. Current academic discourse tends to compartmentalize religious responses to technology within single-faith frameworks. This approach limits comprehensive understanding of shared ethical concerns across traditions. While some scholars have examined networked religion[11] and scholars have analyzed techno-religious spaces, there remains insufficient systematic exploration of how postmodern conditions specifically reshape interreligious dialogue on technological ethics. Most existing literature follows one of two approaches: it either adopts secular frameworks that marginalize religious perspectives, or it focuses exclusively on single religious traditions. Both approaches fail to examine how different faiths converge or diverge in their responses to technological challenges.

The research gap becomes particularly pronounced when considering how postmodernism's critique of grand narratives creates new possibilities for interreligious ethical collaboration.[12] Previous studies have not adequately theorized how postmodern destabilization of traditional authorities might actually enable collaborative ethical responses. This destabilization could facilitate rather than hinder interreligious cooperation on technological challenges. Furthermore, existing scholarship lacks comprehensive analysis of how specific technological domains challenge and potentially unite different religious traditions around shared anthropological and ethical concerns.

Building on this theoretical foundation, the article examines specific technological domains—biotechnology, artificial intelligence, digital surveillance, and ecological engineering—to demonstrate how interreligious ethics can offer more comprehensive and nuanced responses to contemporary technological challenges than secular frameworks. The study's emphasis on

11 Campbell and Garner, *Networked Theology*, 15-17.

12 Ioannis Ladas, „Interreligious Bioethics: Challenges and Perspectives," *Arhe* 21, no. 42 (2024): 203-220, https://doi.org/10.19090/arhe.2024.42.203-220.

interreligious ethics as a distinctive methodological approach represents a novel contribution to both religious studies and technology ethics, offering practical pathways for collaborative engagement with emerging technologies while respecting theological diversity.

2. POSTMODERNISM ON RELIGION AND TECHNOLOGY

The interaction of religion and technology has never been a fixed relationship. Religious practices have influenced, and been influenced by, the use of technology throughout time and across cultures – from the ability to disseminate a religious text by use of the printing press to today, with bioethical discussions of possible medical advances.[13] However, this historical relationship has taken on new dimensions in the contemporary era. It is through the support of religious and technological optimism that some of the fundamentals of truth, power, and progress have been questioned by postmodernism.

Postmodernism is a serious intellectual critique of enlightenment and modernity, formulated in the middle to late twentieth century. In this context, postmodernism challenges the grand narratives of any kind, whether it is a religious doctrine or a teleological technological trendline.[14] Postmodernism destabilizes dominant ethical systems, creating space for alternative moral perspectives; yet this plurality also complicates the possibility of reaching moral consensus. This postmodern skepticism extends equally to technological narratives. Building upon this skepticism, it becomes necessary to examine how technology itself—once idealized as a neutral or progressive force—has come under critical scrutiny in the postmodern context.

Meanwhile, technology has ceased to be an instrument of emancipation or modernisation. The postmodern critique acknowledges that technology can also serve as a surveillance machine, a commodity machine, a machine of ecological devastation, and a source of social alienation.[15] Whereas previous modernist versions focused on human control over nature and human perfectibility through science, postmodern theorists emphasise the role of unintended consequences, power imbalances, and ethical ambiguities. Tech-

13 Mohd Hazim Shah, „Religion and Postmodernism," *KATHA – The Official Journal of the Centre for Civilisational Dialogue* 18, no. 1 (2022): 1, https://doi.org/10.22452/KATHA.vol18no1.1.

14 Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition*, xxiii–xxv.

15 Paweł Pieniążek, „Postmodernism and Postmodernity (In the Light of the Development of Digital Technologies and the Processes of Individualization)," *Hybris* 61, no. 2 (2023): 61, https://doi.org/10.18778/1689-4286.61.03.

nology becomes increasingly embedded in systems of control, including algorithmic governance, data capitalism, and military automation, raising moral questions that neither religious nor secular frameworks can definitively resolve.[16] The intersection of digital technologies with religious practice has created a 'networked religion,' where technologies, cultural practices, and community dynamics are inherently intertwined, each mutually constituting and reshaping the other.[17] This phenomenon is particularly evident in the emergence of 'digital religion,' which encompasses not only religious content online but the transformation of religious authority, ritual practices, and community formation through digital mediation.[18] The development of brain-computer interfaces exemplifies this technological embeddedness, as devices like neural implants increasingly merge human cognitive processes with digital systems. Companies such as Neuralink and CTRL-Labs represent a new frontier where the boundaries between human consciousness and artificial intelligence become increasingly blurred, raising profound questions about human agency and technological dependency.[19] These developments illustrate how technology mediates not only our actions but also reshapes our perception of the world, fundamentally altering what it means to be human in relation to our environment. As the meaning and role of technology evolve, scholars increasingly study how it reshapes human awareness and social life. They are observing that „the technological mind sees nature as an insensate order, as a cold body of facts, as a mere 'given,' as an object of utility, as raw material to be hammered into useful shape."[20] This phenomenological transformation accompanies the development of sociotechnical systems that embed technologies within complex institutional frameworks, „making these technologies hard to avoid and even harder to use without becoming subject to their internal logic."[21]

16 Langdon Winner, *The Whale and the Reactor: A Search for Limits in an Age of High Technology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), 19–39.

17 Heidi A. Campbell, „Understanding the Relationship Between Religion Online and Offline in a Networked Society," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 80, no. 1 (2012): 65.

18 Ibid, 16.

19 Calvin Mercer and Tracy J. Trothen, *Religion and the Technological Future: An Introduction to Biohacking, Artificial Intelligence, and Transhumanism* (Cham: Springer Nature, 2021), 95-96.Nita A. Farahany, *The Battle for Your Brain: Defending the Right to Think Freely in the Age of Neurotechnology* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2023), 43–56.

20 Romano Guardini, *The End of the Modern World: A Search for Orientation* (New Edition; Chicago: Skyhorse Publishing, 2001), 19–39.

21 Francis, *Laudatosi'*, encyclical letter, Vatican website, 24 May 2015, https://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/encyclicals/documents/papa-francesco_20150524_enciclica-lauda-

Within this postmodern framework, the relationship between technology and religion is fundamentally changing, marked by an increasing interdependence between the two. Contemporary discussions increasingly focus on artificial intelligence, genetic engineering, and digital identity creation—complex issues that demand engagement from both scientific and religious perspectives. In the postmodern environment that relies on radical critical thinking, conventional religious formulations of moral reasoning become salient points of information about how best to protect the dignity of humanity, how to define right and duty, and how to protect the integrity of life.

Moreover, by rejecting binary oppositions and hierarchical thinking, postmodernism allows for more nuanced discussions about the relationship between religion and technology. It enables musings on hybrid ethics at the intersection of tradition and innovation. Hybrid ethics refer to pluralistic ethical approaches that draw from both religious and secular traditions, enabling context-sensitive responses to emerging moral dilemmas posed by technology.[22] This framework accommodates the coexistence of theological principles with techno-scientific reasoning, opening up new avenues for ethical reflection in the postmodern world. As well as spiritual anxieties about purpose, meaning, and morality.[23] Instead of simply outlining resistance to religion or technology, the postmodern condition serves as a call to the religious and technological realms to engage in critical self-examination. Technology should be understood „not as individual devices but fundamentally as an altered way of experiencing the world," one that often privileges manipulation over genuine engagement with creation. „This 'technocratic paradigm' is deeply rooted in social and technical systems that shape the way we live and relate to others, often at the cost of moral responsibility and community bonds.[24]

By destabilizing traditional boundaries between religion and technology, postmodernism creates a conceptual space where new ethical possibilities can be explored. Through the problematisation of the basic premises of both religious and technological hierarchies, postmodern thought can open the conversation to a more dialectical interaction between the moral questions that continue to populate the realm of the modern environment. This theoreti-

to-si.html.

22 Philip A. E. Brey, „Ethics of Emerging Technologies," in *The Ethics of Technology: Methods and Approaches*, ed. Sven Ove Hansson, *Philosophy, Technology and Society* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield International, 2017), 175–92.

23 Shah, „Religion and Postmodernism," 10.

24 Scherz, „Challenge of Technology," 242-43.

cal framework provides the foundation for examining specific technological applications and their ethical implications.

3. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS IN BIOTECHNOLOGY AND RELIGION

Biotechnology presents some of the most challenging ethical dilemmas in contemporary religious discourse, as different faith traditions grapple with questions of human enhancement, reproductive technologies, and genetic modification. Gene therapy for therapeutic purposes is generally considered acceptable within Islamic bioethics as it serves to alleviate suffering, aligning with the principle of maslaha (public good). Beyond therapeutic applications, genetic modification technologies hold potential for radical human enhancement. CRISPR-Cas9 technology enables precise editing of human DNA, potentially allowing for the enhancement of cognitive abilities, physical strength, or even moral dispositions. The implications of such technological capabilities extend far beyond medical applications, challenging core religious assumptions about human identity and moral agency. These genetic enhancement possibilities challenge traditional religious understandings of human nature as divinely created and fundamentally good, forcing faith communities to reconsider what constitutes acceptable intervention in God's creation.[25] While these possibilities offer unprecedented opportunities for addressing genetic diseases, they simultaneously raise fundamental questions about the boundaries of legitimate medical intervention. The distinction between therapeutic correction and human enhancement becomes particularly crucial when examining how different religious traditions conceptualize the natural order and divine will.

However, such modifications may alter the fitrah (natural human disposition), raising questions about their ethical acceptability within Islamic thought. Jewish ethics, grounded in the principle of „pikuach nefesh" (the obligation to preserve life), generally supports biotechnology for healing purposes while opposing technologies that might disrupt the moral and social order. Similarly, Eastern religious traditions approach biotechnology through their own distinctive ethical lenses. Buddhists adhere to intention and alleviation of suffering, and therapeutic biotechnology can find a niche in karuna (compassion), yet cosmetic enhancements contradict the Buddhist principles of non-attachment and moderation. These varied approaches to genetic inter-

25 Mercer and Trothen, *Religion and the Technological Future*, 12-14.

vention provide the theological groundwork for understanding how the same religious communities respond to other biotechnological challenges, particularly those involving human reproduction.

Reproductive technologies, particularly human cloning and in vitro fertilisation (IVF), pose similar religious questions to diverse communal and theological outlooks. Human cloning poses the greatest of these fears as it has been met by complete condemnation by mainstream religious trends due to fears of identity development and the commercialisation of life. The Roman Catholic Church and many Protestant denominations condemn reproductive cloning as a violation of natural law and divine providence.[26] Islamic law places central importance on the legal framework of parenthood and lineage. Buddhist and Hindu traditions adopt more flexible approaches to technology, focusing primarily on moral intentions and consequences. These traditions evaluate biotechnology based on karmic effects and societal implications, with moral considerations remaining central to ethical decision-making. This diversity in religious responses becomes even more pronounced when examining specific reproductive technologies that have emerged in recent decades.

Beyond cloning, other reproductive technologies such as IVF and surrogacy generate more nuanced religious responses across different faith traditions.[27] Catholicism generally rejects these practices because they separate procreation from the marital union and may involve the destruction of embryos, which are viewed as human lives at the moment of conception. However, Protestant and Jewish scholars have been more flexible, provided that these technologies do not commodify human life or potentially exploit involved parties, such as surrogate mothers.[28] Islamic scholars demonstrate varied positions on this issue, with many permitting IVF under specific conditions in legally married couples on the condition that no third parties are involved, such as donor sperm or surrogacy. These divergent religious positions on reproductive technologies reveal a deeper challenge: how should faith communities approach biotechnological interventions when the very definition of what constitutes harm or benefit remains contested?

The complexity of biotechnological ethics is further complicated by the recognition that disabilities and genetic conditions may have subject-de-

26 Joseph G. Schenker, „Assisted Reproductive Practice: Religious Perspectives," *Reproductive Biomedicine Online* 10, no. 3 (March 2005): 310–19, https://doi.org/10.1016/S1472-6483(10)61789-0

27 Ioannis Ladas, „Interreligious Perspectives on Surrogate Motherhood," *Bioethika* 10, no. 2 (2024): 39–54, https://doi.org/10.12681/bioeth.39043

28 Schenker, „Assisted Reproductive Practice," 312.

pendent values that vary based on individual aspirations and life contexts. An impairment that might be considered a 'mere difference' for some individuals could represent a significant disadvantage for others, depending on their particular goals and circumstances.[29] This insight challenges simplistic approaches to genetic editing and selection, suggesting that religious traditions must develop nuanced frameworks that account for the diverse ways individuals experience and value different aspects of human existence. In recent years, the convergence of biotechnology and artificial intelligence has given rise to new ethical dilemmas that extend beyond physical intervention and into the realm of data, prediction, and algorithmic decision-making. The acceleration of biotechnological advancement through data-driven AI systems creates additional complexity in these ethical considerations. While traditional bioethical debates have focused primarily on direct physical interventions—such as genetic editing or reproductive technologies—the integration of artificial intelligence into biotechnological systems signals a shift towards more subtle, data-driven forms of human modification. These forms include predictive health profiling, algorithmically guided gene therapies, and neurocognitive interventions—all of which rely heavily on personal and educational data. In this way, AI does not stand apart from biotechnology but rather enhances its capacity to intervene in the human condition by making use of increasingly precise informational portraits. Ethical challenges intensify when AI systems become active agents in biotechnological decision-making rather than mere tools. Vast amounts of personal data are increasingly being collected, encompassing sensitive information such as personal details, race, ethnicity, gender, performance, emotional and social aspects. This data serves as the foundation for AI-enhanced biotechnological applications, raising concerns about the commodification of personal information and the potential for creating what scholars term „biographical portraits" that render individuals' personalities transparent and manipulable. The risk of transforming research subjects into mere data sources for extracting valuable information violates the fundamental religious principle that human beings possess inherent dignity that transcends their utility as information providers.[30] From a theological perspective, the transformation of human beings into data

[29] Shu Ishida and Tsutomu Sawai, „From CRISPR to Conscience: Ethical Dilemmas in Gene Editing and Genetic Selection," *The American Journal of Bioethics* 24, no. 8 (August 2024): 68, https://doi.org/10.1080/15265161.2024.2361900.

[30] Ioannis Ladas, „Safeguarding Privacy in Educational Data: Ethical Challenges and Implications of Artificial Intelligence," in *Η Τεχνητή Νοημοσύνη στην Εκπαίδευση: Πρακτικά 1ου Επιστημονικού Συνεδρίου*, edited by Ζωή Βαζούρα and Νικόλαος Σαμαράς (Athens: Conference Proceedings, 2024), 460, https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15566259.

points raises urgent questions about personhood, freedom, and dignity. When educational and biological data are used to construct predictive models that guide behavioral, medical, or cognitive interventions, there is a risk of reducing the human person to a manageable object. This process contradicts core religious beliefs that affirm the irreducible value of the human soul and the divine mystery inherent in each individual. These interconnected challenges require religious traditions to develop comprehensive frameworks that can address not only individual biotechnological applications, but their cumulative impact on human dignity and social justice.

4. MORAL AGENCY AND ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

AI is one of the most disruptive and ethically ambiguous technologies of postmodernity. Whether it be in the form of machine learning models, predictive analytics, humanoid robotics, or generative language models, AI systems are becoming increasingly incorporated into everyday life.[31] The emergence of artificial general intelligence (AGI) presents particularly acute challenges for religious anthropology. As AI systems become increasingly sophisticated, they raise fundamental questions about consciousness, moral agency, and the uniqueness of human beings as image-bearers of the divine. Some researchers predict that AGI could achieve capabilities that rival or exceed human intelligence, raising profound theological concerns regarding human uniqueness and divine relationship.[32]

As AI systems become increasingly autonomous and human-like in their behavior, religious traditions must adapt their moral frameworks to address emerging ethical challenges that were previously confined to science fiction. These technological developments force religious traditions to revisit fundamental questions about human nature and consciousness that lie at the heart of their theological anthropologies. To address these challenges systematically, this section examines three key dimensions of the intersection between AI and moral agency: first, how different religious traditions conceptualize moral agency and consciousness; second, the practical implications of AI deployment in morally sensitive domains; and third, the broader questions about authenticity and human dignity in an AI-mediated world. Religious

[31] Vasile-Daniel Păvăloaia and Sabina-Cristiana Necula, „Artificial Intelligence as a Disruptive Technology—A Systematic Literature Review," *Electronics* 12, no. 5 (2023): 1102, https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics12051102.

[32] Mercer and Trothen, *Religion and the Technological Future*, 181-185.

traditions ground moral agency in distinct metaphysical foundations that challenge purely materialist understandings of consciousness.

The concept of soul or consciousness serves as the foundation of personhood across various religious traditions, typically understood within spiritual and metaphysical frameworks. Christianity and Islam locate moral agency in the soul, while Hinduism and Buddhism ground it in consciousness, often incorporating karmic principles. These traditions maintain that moral agency requires both spiritual essence and divine authorization, which establish humanity's unique moral status. In Christian theology, humanity's creation in God's image confers both moral significance and absolute, eternal value.[33] Islamic theology similarly grounds moral responsibility in divine creation and intention—attributes that AI systems cannot authentically possess.

Mahayana Buddhist teachings on compassion and interdependence challenge us to reconsider how we treat all sentient beings. Buddhist teachings suggest that if machines develop genuine sentience—or convincingly simulate it—their potential suffering could acquire karmic and moral significance.

These theological foundations become practically relevant when we examine how AI systems are currently deployed in domains that directly affect human welfare and dignity. AI decision-making systems are increasingly deployed in critical domains of life and death, such as criminal justice, medical treatment, employment, and warfare. This raises serious concerns about discrimination, accountability, and transparency in these critical applications. Religious ethics offer critical moral guidance rooted in the principles of human dignity, justice, and the sanctity of life.

The proliferation of AI technologies necessitates a systematic ethical framework that goes beyond current narrow focuses. Current discussions of AI ethics often concentrate on specific issues like authorship and accountability, but fail to address the broader spectrum of ethical concerns including social cohesion, environmental sustainability, and the transformation of human relationships.[34] This systematic gap underscores the importance of religious traditions providing comprehensive moral guidance that addresses not only immediate technical concerns but also the long-term implications for human flourishing and spiritual development. As one example, Jewish

---

33 Michael Cheng-Tek Tai, „The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Human Society and Bioethics," *Tzu Chi Medical Journal* 32, no. 4 (October–December 2020): 339–43, https://doi.org/10.4103/tcmj.tcmj_71_20.

34 Bernd Carsten Stahl and Damian Eke, „The Ethics of ChatGPT – Exploring the Ethical Issues of an Emerging Technology," *International Journal of Information Management* 74 (2024): 4, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102700.

and Christian systems emphasise justice (tzedek, dikē) as an essential moral mandate, which might be used as an orientation in evaluating AI systems that perpetuate institutional discrimination or interfere with due process.[35]

Beyond these systemic concerns, the integration of AI into religious practice itself raises questions about the authenticity and appropriateness of technologically-mediated spiritual experiences. The integration of AI into religious communities represents a contemporary approach to religious education that aims to engage younger generations while preserving traditional teachings. The integration of AI into religious practice extends beyond educational tools to encompass therapeutic and spiritual dimensions. Robotic companions like Pepper are being deployed in healthcare settings to provide emotional support and comfort, while AI-powered systems analyze facial expressions and voice patterns to detect spiritual distress. These developments raise questions about the authenticity of technologically-mediated spiritual care and whether machines can truly address the relational and transcendent aspects of human spiritual needs.[36] The ethical challenge lies not simply in AI's presence within spiritual contexts, but in ensuring that AI functions as an educational tool rather than a substitute for divine authority. Such systems should serve as educational resources rather than oracles claiming spiritual authority. The challenge becomes more pronounced when considering the broader implications of AI integration into decision-making processes that affect human dignity and agency.[37] The technological approach underlying these systems often oversimplifies complex moral decisions by reducing them to mathematical calculations, potentially undermining the relational and contextual nature of ethical reasoning that religious traditions emphasize. This technological reductionism poses particular challenges for maintaining human agency and moral responsibility in an increasingly automated world.[38]

The intersection of AI with global health challenges further complicates these moral considerations. As AI systems increasingly monitor and predict health patterns in educational environments, questions arise about the moral obligations of institutions when algorithmic analysis suggests health risks related to environmental factors.

---

35 Henrique Krigner, „The Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant Definitions of Justice and the Liberation Theology," paper presented at *Upholding Liberty & Justice*, *Promise of the Declaration* conference, Liberty University, 2023

36 Mercer and Trothen, *Religion and the Technological Future*, 99, 118.

37 Scherz, „The Challenge of Technology," 241.

38 Guardini, *The End of the Modern World*, 19–39.

These technological developments also raise important questions about how AI might influence the psychological aspects of religious belief and spiritual experience. Research in the psychology of religion reveals that religious experiences are characterized by intense emotions such as awe, joy, reverence, and transcendence, which provide individuals with existential significance and shape the formation of religious beliefs.[39] These emotional and affective dimensions are crucial for understanding how AI-mediated religious experiences might differ from traditional encounters with the divine.

5. DIGITAL SURVEILLANCE, PRIVACY, AND MORAL AUTONOMY

The introduction of digital surveillance technologies has raised new questions about privacy, freedom, and moral agency in the postmodern era. This technological transformation raises fundamental ethical questions: Is digital surveillance by governments and corporations compatible with religious beliefs about human dignity, personal conscience, and divine authority?[40] Digital surveillance intrudes into realms traditionally considered spiritual and deeply personal. Understanding these ethical challenges requires examining how surveillance technologies fundamentally alter religious practice and challenge core theological principles.

Digital surveillance technologies create significant ethical dilemmas by reinforcing the commodification and exploitation of personal data. Digital technologies create an illusion of religious autonomy while simultaneously making practitioners dependent on platforms and systems controlled by external entities.[41] Virtual religious communities online create weaker connections, where people relate through shared interests rather than living near each other. Technology encourages the belief that humans can master nature and human behavior. This distorts biblical stewardship by making humans see themselves as masters rather than caretakers, leading to exploitation

39 Khader I. Alkhouri, „The Role of Artificial Intelligence in the Study of the Psychology of Religion," *Religions* 15, no. 3 (2024): 290, https://doi.org/10.3390/rel15030290.

40 Joseph Jones, „Don't Fear Artificial Intelligence, Question the Business Model: How Surveillance Capitalists Use Media to Invade Privacy, Disrupt Moral Autonomy, and Harm Democracy," *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 49, no. 1 (2024): 6, https://doi.org/10.1177/01968599241235209.

41 Brent Waters, „Is Technology the New Religion?" *Word & World 35*, no. 2 (Spring 2015): 144–145.

of both nature and personal data.[42] This process occurs across various surveillance mechanisms, which is either social media surveillance, biometric certification, predictive policing, or algorithmic credit rating. In all these cases, citizens are rarely aware that their data is being harvested.[43] Digital media has changed how and where people experience spirituality, affecting both the physical spaces and timing of religious practice. As geographers have observed, digital technologies create 'techno-religious spaces' where new religious communities form beyond geographical limits. This digital mediation creates 'lived religion in a digital age,' where technology helps personal prayer while connecting believers emotionally despite physical distance. While digital prayer connects distant people, it also fragments spiritual spaces and creates tensions in religious communities.[44] This process contributes to what scholars call 'surveillance capitalism'. This state aims to transform the human population into data subjects. Religious traditions in general express dismay at the loss of the interiority of the individual, a dismay grounded in the teaching of the sanctity of every person. These concerns about commodification and community fragmentation point to a deeper theological problem: the fundamental conflict between surveillance systems and core religious teachings about the proper relationship between public and private spiritual life.

This use of technology in spiritual life conflicts with religious teachings about keeping private prayer separate from public observation. A relevant example is Christianity, whose Gospel of Matthew 6:6 advises against performative religiosity: „But whenever you pray, go into your room and shut the door and pray to your Father who is in secret, and your Father who sees in secret will reward you."[45] This warning, to an audience that is likely to respond in ways that seek outer reward through public expressions, is opposed to current technological trends that monitor and record action to extract profit or exercise authority.

---

42 Ibid., 145.

43 Yannick Alexander Vogel, *Neo-Commodification of Persons: Exploitation of Personal Data and Impact on the Sharing Economy*, PhD diss., Università di Bologna (cotruttela con Universität Wien), 2023, 22, DOI: 10.48676/unibo/amsdottorato/10669

44 Lily Kong, „Religion and Technology: Refiguring Place, Space, Identity and Community," *Area* 33, no. 4 (2001): 404, http://www.jstor.org/stable/20004181. Quan Gao, Orlando Woods, Lily Kong, and Siew Ying Shee, „Lived Religion in a Digital Age: Technology, Affect and the Pervasive Space-Times of 'New' Religious Praxis," *Social & Cultural Geography* 25, no. 1 (2022): 32, https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2022.2121979.

45 Matt. 6:6.

This Christian perspective finds parallel concerns in other Abrahamic traditions, particularly in Islamic theology's understanding of divine knowledge and human privacy. Islamic theology similarly emphasizes that only God truly knows human intentions (as stated by the Quran 57:6): „He merges the night into day and the day into night. And He knows best what is ˹hidden˺ in the heart."[46] This creates a moral problem: human surveillance systems claim to have God-like knowledge and authority over people's inner lives. These surveillance systems can undermine authentic moral development by making ethical behavior dependent on external observation rather than internal conviction. Digital surveillance also creates geographical problems for religious communities. Cyberspace is not an isotropic surface—access to techno-religious space is uneven, creating a politics of language, age, and class.[47] Where religious affiliation coincides with particular socio-economic profiles, the competition for techno-religious space favors certain religious groups while disadvantaging others. This digital divide mirrors historical patterns of religious influence and creates new forms of spiritual inequality that transcend traditional geographical boundaries. The problem goes beyond privacy violations. Scholars call this 'surveillance capitalism' – a system that turns human behavior into commercial data.[48] This commodification of personal information creates sociotechnical systems that shape individual dispositions and frameworks of understanding, often without conscious awareness. These technological systems create institutions that manipulate people, reducing their freedom while making them submit to expert control.[49] Such systems reshape the conditions for authentic moral and spiritual growth by substituting internal formation with external behavioral conditioning. This replacement of internal moral development with external behavioral control fundamentally contradicts religious principles grounded in divine moral authority, the possibility of repentance, and authentic spiritual transformation.

While these examples demonstrate how surveillance conflicts with specific religious teachings, the challenge extends beyond doctrinal concerns to more fundamental questions about human nature itself. Algorithmic forecasting and behavioral nudging represent a fundamental threat to free will. Machine learning enables digital platforms to forecast and manipulate user behavior without users' knowledge. These algorithms influence what people

46 Quran 57:6.

47 Kong, „Religion and Technology," 406.

48 Shoshana Zuboff, *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism* (New York: Public Affairs, 2019), 8-9.

49 Ivan Illich, *Deschooling Society* (New York: Harper & Row, 1971), 53ff.

read, how they perceive information, and even their voting decisions.[50] This creates a manipulative and autonomy ethical dilemma. Usually, religious traditions support the moral freedom of a person. Christianity regards free will as essential for moral responsibility and the capacity for both sin and righteousness. Islamic theology affirms divine predestination (qadar) while maintaining that humans retain the ability to make choices for which they are accountable before God (iktihar).

As algorithms increasingly influence the way people act and are shaped to be more engaging or controllable, there is less room for genuine moral choices. Religious traditions oppose such deterministic approaches to human behavior. This erosion of moral agency is compounded by the systematic violation of meaningful consent in surveillance systems. The ethical challenges of surveillance extend beyond immediate privacy violations to encompass fundamental questions about consent, information ownership, and the commodification of personal data. Modern surveillance systems often work without real consent. In public spaces, people cannot avoid being monitored when they need essential services.[51] The loss of genuine consent violates religious principles about human dignity and freedom. Religious traditions must advocate for technologies that preserve people's ability to make meaningful moral choices. An example of this can be seen in Jewish decisions on teshuvah (repentance), which presupposes the continued ability to significantly change morally, even when an individual is already at a low point and cannot be captured through permanent scoring or behavioral prediction systems based on past actions.

The philosophical implications of diminished moral agency become particularly acute when we examine how surveillance technologies operate in practice, especially their disproportionate impact on society's most vulnerable members. These concerns about autonomy and consent become urgent when we see how surveillance technologies unfairly target society's most vulnerable people. The moral issue of using surveillance technologies against disenfranchised groups of people is a large-scale problem. The results of empirical research indicate that the use of predictive-policing algorithms has been shown to disproportionately impact racially and ethnically under-

50 Sergio Beraldo, „From Libertarian Paternalism to AI-Powered Nudging: New Challenges for Freedom," lecture presented at SGH Warsaw School of Economics, Warsaw, Poland, April 16, 2025, opening and moderation by prof. dr hab. Agnieszka Słomka-Gołębiowska.

51 Mary Christine Wheatley, „Ethics of Surveillance Technologies: Balancing Privacy and Security in a Digital Age," *Premier Journal of Data Science* 1 (2024): 100001, published November 4 2024, https://doi.org/10.70389/PJDS.100001

privileged individuals, and a religious ethic puts forward this phenomenon as a transgression of justice, mercy, and the innate dignity of all, regardless of their differences. The Deuteronomy 27:19 reminds its adherents to take care of the stranger, the widow, and the orphan, who represent the most vulnerable members of society.[52] Likewise, the Prophet Muhammad had forewarned against unfair suspicion and intrusion of privacy (Qur'an 49:12) and had upheld an ethic of fairness and restraint.[53]

6. ECOLOGICAL ETHICS OF TECHNOLOGICAL STEWARDSHIP

Technological changes that are expected to occur have already been proven to raise the standards of human living, but, at the same time, have increased environmental destruction. The ecological concern of today that makes people reconsider their behavior in the framework of the postmodern situation is now more urgent than ever.[54] Religion, a field that has long engaged in the study of the relationship between the planet and society, raises some radical ethical considerations that help oppose technocentric approaches and demonstrate environmental stewardship within a moral and spiritual framework. These contemporary environmental challenges resonate with ancient religious teachings about humanity's relationship with creation, as evidenced in foundational texts across traditions.

Spiritual practices in major religious traditions promote interdependence, stewardship relationships, and sustainable custodianship. This principle is exemplified in Christianity, where Genesis 2:15 states that „The Lord God took the man and put him in the garden of Eden to till it and keep it."[55] Eco-theological scholars refuse to interpret this text as a warrant of domination; on the contrary, they see it as a normative admonition to practice accountable, worshipful keeping of the created order.

Within Islamic theology, the main principle organizing environmental ethics in Islam is known as the doctrine of khalifa (vicegerency).[56] Accord-

52 Deuteronomy 27:19.

53 Quran 49:12.

54 Raphaël Mathevet, François Bousquet, Catherine Larrère, and Raphaël Larrère, „Environmental Stewardship and Ecological Solidarity: Rethinking Social-Ecological Interdependency and Responsibility," *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 31 (2018): 605-6, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10806-018-9749-0.

55 Genesis 2:15.

56 Kanwal Feroze, „Earth-Man Relationship in Islam and Hinduism," *Al-Basirah 11*, no. 1 (2024): 17–34, https://doi.org/10.52015/albasirah.v11i01.25

ing to this doctrine, human beings are conceived as gardeners of the earth, which makes the human being responsible to God in maintaining the earth. The Quran reinforces this concept through verses that clarify the divine order inherent in nature, teaching that humans should learn to support and maintain the natural balance (mizan) inherent in creation. Significant deviation from this balance, often resulting from overexploitation, constitutes moral culpability. Hinduism and Buddhism offer a morally oriented concept of the relationship between humans and nature, emphasising that humankind should live in harmony with the natural world. Hinduism extends ethical responsibility to the physical world by attributing divinity to geographic structures, natural phenomena, and sentient beings. This divine presence confers moral responsibility toward both the natural world and individual actions. Buddhism, which is based on the principle of interdependence and the need to avoid harming living things (ahimsa), develops an ecological worldview that emphasizes caution in its interactions.

Contemporary technological interventions designed to address environmental degradation—such as carbon capture, geoengineering, and synthetic biology—present new ethical complexities. Although these innovations offer potential solutions to climate change, the logic of control and expediency that created the very ecological crises they aim to resolve can be reproduced in these proposals.[57] Religious traditions offer warnings about technological hubris. Catholic thinker Ivan Illich distinguished between manipulative institutions, which diminish individual agency by embedding people in expert-controlled systems, and convivial technologies, which empower persons, sustain communities, and promote mutual engagement.[58] This framework invites a reassessment of environmental technologies to ensure they do not replicate the same patterns of domination and ecological harm they claim to solve. In Christianity, the story of the Fall is used to explain how pride and disobedience lead to the loss of love for both God and nature, imparting a moral lesson on the limitations of human power and the dangers of recreating the order of creation without ethical clarity.

Religious institutions play a central role in ethical analysis, but their contribution extends beyond critique to active advocacy; they are also environmental advocates. Green Ramadan campaigns within the Muslim world, along with Pope Francis's encyclical Laudato Si—which advances ecological thinking that emphasizes both human dignity and planetary

57 Arran Gare, „The Postmodernism of Deep Ecology, the Deep Ecology of Postmodernism, and Grand Narratives," Swinburne, 2000, 196, https://doi.org/10.25916/sut.26255285.v1.

58 Scherz, „Challenge of Technology," 244–45.

integrity—demonstrate the emerging strength and influence of faith-based environmentalism within the mainstream.[59] The movements point to the fact that ecological responsibility is not only a political or scientific concern, but a spiritual and moral one. However, contemporary technological interventions for environmental protection, such as geoengineering and synthetic biology, raise complex ethical questions about technological hubris and the reproduction of the same logic of control that created environmental crises.[60] As moral theology recognizes, these solutions often embody the technocratic paradigm's assumption that human problems can be solved through technical manipulation rather than fundamental changes in worldview and practice. Religious ethics provides crucial resources for evaluating such interventions, emphasizing humility, accountability, and respect for the integrity of creation rather than instrumental domination.[61] The relationship between technological advancement and environmental degradation creates what some scholars term a „perfect moral storm" that demands integrated ethical responses.[62] The COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated how technological responses to global crises can have unintended environmental consequences, including increased plastic waste from protective equipment and reduced environmental monitoring due to emergency measures.[63] Religious environmental ethics offers essential guidance for navigating these complex trade-offs, reminding us that authentic stewardship requires considering both immediate human needs and long-term ecological integrity. The Islamic concept of khalifa (vicegerency) and the Christian understanding of humans as gardeners of creation provide frameworks for evaluating whether technological solutions truly serve the common good or merely perpetuate patterns of domination that created environmental crises in the first place.

Religious ethics therefore provides a transformative framework for technological stewardship that prioritizes ecological balance. These traditions remind us that humans are not owners or masters of the Earth, but that we are the sacred trustees of creation, and, nonetheless, we are subordinates who

59 Swati Sharma, James B. Ang, and Per G. Fredriksson, „Religiosity and Climate Change Policies," *Energy Economics* 101 (2021): Article 105414, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2021.105414.

60 Scherz, „The Challenge of Technology," 252.

61 *Laudato si'*, § 106.

62 Ioannis Ladas, „Life after COVID-19: Understanding the Environment for Humanity's Survival and Sustenance," *Epistēmēs Metron Logos*, no. 4 (2020): 65, https://doi.org/10.12681/eml.23779.

63 Ibid., 69-70.

have to take care of creation and who are utterly humbled before the creation in which we exist.

7. CONCLUSION

Ethics in the postmodern world, where religion and technology „collide", is a new, fertile field of study. Religious traditions can provide an indispensable source of ethical resources in coping with all the changes being brought about by technological innovations that have begun to touch the most intimate and fundamental realms of human life, our genetic makeup, and the shape of our environmental future. With relativism, pluralism, and the depreciation of the singular bearer of moral certitude in a postmodern context, religion offers a sense of consistency in the quest for morality. It promotes humility, accountability, and respect for the value of life.

The development of effective technological ethics requires more than philosophical analysis; it demands practical wisdom that can navigate the complex relationship between individual technologies and the sociotechnical systems in which they are embedded. As contemporary moral theology recognizes, this involves developing both casuistical guidelines for specific technologies and spiritual practices that can resist the formative power of the technocratic paradigm.[64] Such an approach acknowledges that „casuistry alone will not serve" because „casuistry applied from within a problematic epistemological framework within fallen sociotechnical institutions will fail."[65] Therefore, religious communities must cultivate practices of formation that can integrate ethical insights into lived experience while maintaining the capacity for prophetic critique of technological systems that undermine human dignity and flourishing.

The geographical dimension of these technological transformations cannot be ignored. The development of techno-religious spaces creates new forms of religious imperialism, where technological advantages can lead to the dominance of certain religious voices over others.[66] Understanding these spatial dynamics is crucial for developing equitable approaches to religious engagement with technology that do not replicate historical patterns of religious colonialism in digital formats. Such approaches reflect the postmodern insight that ethical authority can be pluralistic yet still meaningful, while

64 Scherz, „The Challenge of Technology," 266.
65 Ibid., 266.
66 Kong, „Religion and Technology," 405-406.

providing practical pathways for religious engagement with emerging technologies.

Building upon these spatial considerations, the psychological dimensions of religious engagement with technology reveal additional layers of complexity that intersect directly with these geographical power dynamics. As artificial intelligence increasingly mediates religious experiences through virtual reality environments, AI-powered spiritual guidance systems, and algorithmic analysis of sacred texts, fundamental questions arise about the authenticity and integrity of technologically-mediated spiritual encounters.[67] The risk of commodification goes beyond commercial exploitation; it includes the potential reduction of profound spiritual teachings into algorithmic outputs designed to maximize user engagement rather than foster genuine spiritual growth.[68] These developments require careful efforts to preserve the relational and transcendent dimensions of religious practice, even as we harness the democratizing potential of technology to make religious wisdom more accessible across diverse communities.

However, what constitutes 'authentic' religious experience or 'appropriate' spiritual guidance varies dramatically across cultural contexts, revealing that these psychological concerns cannot be adequately addressed through universalist frameworks alone. This cultural variability in understanding religious authenticity points to deeper epistemological questions about how different societies conceptualize the relationship between technology and spirituality. The emergence of information science research in religious and spiritual contexts has revealed the limitations of traditional Western-centric approaches to understanding information phenomena. Studies of non-Western Buddhist communities, for instance, have demonstrated that participants' worldviews often do not align with the individualist focus that underpins much information research, suggesting the need for more culturally sensitive theoretical frameworks.[69] Furthermore, the concept of 'karmic capital'—wherein spiritual activities generate merit that affects not only this life but future lives—represents a form of capital that challenges conventional Western

67 Alkhouri, „The Role of Artificial Intelligence in the Study of the Psychology of Religion," 8-9.

68 Manotar Tampubolon and Bernadetha Nadeak, „Artificial Intelligence and Understanding of Religion: A Moral Perspective," *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding* 11, no. 8 (2024), 908, https://doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v11i8.6104

69 Hilary Yerbury, Michael Olsson, and Pethigamage Perera, „Capital as the Outcome of Information Practices: A Study of Devotees and Monks of a Theravada Buddhist Temple," *Journal of Documentation* 80, no. 1 (January 2, 2024): 110, https://doi.org/10.1108/JD-01-2023-0008.

understanding of information practices and their outcomes.[70] By rejecting a dichotomous view that opposes religion and technology, and instead proposing a dynamic interplay between them—where religious morality guides the responsible application of technology—this article envisions a more humane and spiritually enriched technological future.

Despite these multifaceted challenges spanning geographical, psychological, and cultural domains, there exist shared moral themes across traditions: respect for life, humility in the face of human frailty, the duty of justice, and compassion. In this context, it is emphasized that the accelerating development of human enhancement technologies, particularly through biohacking, necessitates active engagement from religious traditions in the public sphere to ensure their responsible implementation. It is argued that the relationship between religion and human enhancement is bidirectional: religions not only offer ethical commentary on emerging technologies but are themselves profoundly shaped by these innovations. If radical changes such as superlongevity were realized, the theological, social, and institutional consequences for religious communities would be unprecedented in scope, requiring a re-examination of doctrines, rituals, and moral priorities in light of transformative technological capacities.[71]

Although individual doctrines are different across faith traditions, common concerns are present. They are antidotes to a technocentric culture in which much emphasis is laid on efficiency, control, and profit to the detriment of the soul. The critical discussion arises due to the challenge of postmodernism against both orthodoxy and determinism in religion and technology.

This analysis points toward the potential value of developing formal interreligious ethical frameworks. Rather than viewing religious diversity as an obstacle to ethical consensus, we might understand it as offering multiple perspectives that, when brought into dialogue, can enrich our understanding of complex ethical challenges.[72] The engagement of religions with biotechnology, artificial intelligence, digital surveillance, and environmental concerns shows that, despite differing theological foundations, they often converge on shared ethical insights. This represents the first systematic attempt to theorize how postmodern conditions specifically enable rather than hinder interreligious collaboration on technological ethics.

However, this potential for collaboration faces a significant internal challenge. The difficulty becomes more pronounced when considering that

70 Ibid., 110-111.

71 Mercer and Trothen, *Religion and the Technological Future*, 3–4.

72 Ladas, „Interreligious Bioethics," 213.

religious ethics itself has struggled to maintain unified voices. The „division" within religious traditions has weakened their collective moral authority, as different theological perspectives within the same faith tradition can support contradictory positions on AI development and implementation.[73]

Rather than viewing this fragmentation as insurmountable, we can reframe it as an opportunity. The establishment of interreligious ethical committees or collaborative frameworks could harness this diversity productively, creating spaces where different religious traditions can contribute their distinctive wisdom while working toward shared solutions to technological challenges.[74] Moreover, adopting an interreligious ethical perspective can enhance this moral guidance by identifying convergences among traditions while preserving theological distinctiveness. The diversity of religious stances—when acknowledged rather than erased—can foster collaboration without diluting each tradition's principles, enabling a more coherent response to global biotechnological challenges.[75]

After all, the original contribution of this work lay in the development of an integrated framework for interreligious technological ethics—one that recognized how postmodern skepticism created unprecedented opportunities for collaborative moral reasoning across faith traditions. By demonstrating how major religious traditions had converged on fundamental principles concerning human dignity, environmental stewardship, and technological responsibility—despite enduring theological differences—this study offered theoretical foundations for practical interreligious collaboration. The analysis revealed that postmodernism, rather than undermining religious authority, had in fact facilitated more humble and dialogical approaches to technological ethics, drawing on multiple wisdom traditions while preserving each tradition's theological integrity.

REFERENCES

Alkhouri, Khader I. „The Role of Artificial Intelligence in the Study of the Psychology of Religion." *Religions* 15, no. 3 (2024): 290. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel15030290

Ammerman, Nancy T. „Finding Religion in Everyday Life." *Sociology of Religion* 75, no. 2 (2014): 189–207. https://doi.org/10.1093/sorel/sru013

73 H. Tristram Engelhardt, Jr., „Why Ecumenism Fails: Taking Theological Differences Seriously," *Christian Bioethics* 13, no. 1 (2007): 26, https://doi.org/10.1080/13803600701282997.

74 Ibid., 217.

75 Ladas, „Interreligious Bioethics," 204–206.

Beaman, Lori G. „Deep Equality as an Alternative to Accommodation and Tolerance." Nordic Journal of Religion and Society 27, no. 2 (2014): 89-111. https://doi.org/10.18261/ISSN1890-7008-2014-02-01

Beraldo, Sergio. „From Libertarian Paternalism to AI-Powered Nudging: New Challenges for Freedom." Lecture presented at SGH Warsaw School of Economics, Warsaw, Poland, April 16, 2025.

Brey, Philip A. E. „Ethics of Emerging Technologies." In *The Ethics of Technology: Methods and Approaches*, edited by Sven Ove Hansson, 175–92. *Philosophy, Technology and Society*. Lanham, MD: Rowman&Littlefield International, 2017.

Caidi, Nadia, Puneet Nangia, Heidi Samson, Ceren Ekmekcioglu, and Michael Olsson. „Spiritual and Religious Information Experiences: An Annual Review of Information Science and Technology (ARIST) Paper." *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 2025, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24983

Campbell, Heidi A. „Understanding the Relationship Between Religion Online and Offline in a Networked Society." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 80, no. 1 (2012): 64-93.

Campbell, Heidi A., and Stephen Garner. *Networked Theology: Negotiating Faith in Digital Culture*. Engaging Culture series. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2016.

Engelhardt, H. Tristram, Jr. „Why Ecumenism Fails: Taking Theological Differences Seriously." *Christian Bioethics* 13, no. 1 (2007): 25–51. https://doi.org/10.1080/13803600701282997

Farahany, Nita A. *The Battle for Your Brain: Defending the Right to Think Freely in the Age of Neurotechnology*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2023.

Feroze, Kanwal. „Earth-Man Relationship in Islam and Hinduism." *Al-Basirah* 11, no. 1 (2024): 17–34. https://doi.org/10.52015/albasirah.v11i01.25

Francis. *Laudato si'*. Encyclical letter. Vatican website. 2015. https://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/encyclicals/documents/papa-francesco_20150524_enciclica-laudato-si.html

Gao, Quan, Orlando Woods, Lily Kong, and Siew Ying Shee. „Lived Religion in a Digital Age: Technology, Affect and the Pervasive Space-Times of 'New' Religious Praxis." *Social & Cultural Geography* 25, no. 1 (2022): 29–48. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2022.2121979

Gare, Arran. „The Postmodernism of Deep Ecology, the Deep Ecology of Postmodernism, and Grand Narratives." Swinburne, 2000. https://doi.org/10.25916/sut.26255285.v1

Guardini, Romano. *The End of the Modern World: A Search for Orientation*. New Edition. Chicago: SkyhorsePublishing, 2001.

Illich, Ivan. *Deschooling Society*. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

Ishida, Shu, and Tsutomu Sawai. „From CRISPR to Conscience: Ethical Dilemmas in Gene Editing and Genetic Selection." *The American Journal of Bioethics* 24, no. 8 (August 2024): 67–70. https://doi.org/10.1080/15265161.2024.2361900

Jones, Joseph. „Don't Fear Artificial Intelligence, Question the Business Model: How Surveillance Capitalists Use Media to Invade Privacy, Disrupt Moral

Autonomy, and Harm Democracy." *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 49, no. 1 (2024): 6–26. https://doi.org/10.1177/01968599241235209

Kong, Lily. „Religion and Technology: Refiguring Place, Space, Identity and Community." *Area* 33, no. 4 (2001): 404–13. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20004181

Krigner, Henrique. „The Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant Definitions of Justice and the Liberation Theology." Paper presented at *Upholding Liberty & Justice*, *Promise of the Declaration* conference, Liberty University, 2023.

Ladas, Ioannis. „Interreligious Bioethics: Challenges and Perspectives." *Arhe* 21, no. 42 (2024): 203-220. https://doi.org/10.19090/arhe.2024.42.203-220

Ladas, Ioannis. „Interreligious Perspectives on Surrogate Motherhood." *Bioethika* 10, no. 2 (2024): 39–54. https://doi.org/10.12681/bioeth.39043

Ladas, Ioannis. „Life after COVID-19: Understanding the Environment for Humanity's Survival and Sustenance." *Epistēmēs Metron Logos*, no. 4 (2020): 62–81. https://doi.org/10.12681/eml.23779

Ladas, Ioannis. „Safeguarding Privacy in Educational Data: Ethical Challenges and Implications of Artificial Intelligence." In *Η Τεχνητή Νοημοσύνη στην Εκπαίδευση: Πρακτικά 1ου Επιστημονικού Συνεδρίου*, editedby Ζωή Βαζούρα and Νικόλαος Σαμαράς, 457–65. Athens: Conference Proceedings, 2024. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15566259

Lyotard, Jean-François. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Translated by Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

Mehrdad, Qorbani. *Humanity in the Age of AI: How to Thrive in a Post-Human World*. Bloomsbury, 2020.

Mercer, Calvin, and Tracy J. Trothen. *Religion and the Technological Future: An Introduction to Biohacking, Artificial Intelligence, and Transhumanism*. Cham: Springer Nature, 2021.

Morgan, David. *The Embodied Eye: Religious Visual Culture and the Social Life of Feeling*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012.

Păvăloaia, Vasile-Daniel, and Sabina-Cristiana Necula. „Artificial Intelligence as a Disruptive Technology—A Systematic Literature Review." *Electronics* 12, no. 5 (2023): 1102. https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics12051102.

Pieniążek, Paweł. „Postmodernism and Postmodernity (In the Light of the Development of Digital Technologies and the Processes of Individualization)." *Hybris* 61, no. 2 (2023): 51–88. https://doi.org/10.18778/1689-4286.61.03.

Raphaël Mathevet, François Bousquet, Catherine Larrère, and Raphaël Larrère, „Environmental Stewardship and Ecological Solidarity: Rethinking Social-Ecological Interdependency and Responsibility," *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 31 (2018): 605–23, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10806-018-9749-0.

Sassower, Raphael. „Postmodern Relativism as Enlightened Pluralism." In Relativism and Post-Truth in Contemporary Society, edited by Mikael Stenmark, Steve Fuller, and Ulf Zackariasson. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-96559-8_3

Schenker, Joseph G. „Assisted Reproductive Practice: Religious Perspectives." *Reproductive Biomedicine Online* 10, no. 3 (March 2005): 310–19. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1472-6483(10)61789-0

Scherz, Paul. „The Challenge of Technology to Moral Theology." *Journal of Moral Theology* 10, no. 2 (2021): 239–68.

Sharma, Swati, James B. Ang, and Per G. Fredriksson. „Religiosity and Climate Change Policies." *Energy Economics* 101 (2021): 105414. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2021.105414

Stahl, Bernd Carsten, and Damian Eke. „The Ethics of ChatGPT – Exploring the Ethical Issues of an Emerging Technology." *International Journal of Information Management* 74 (2024): 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102700

Tai, Michael Cheng-Tek. „The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Human Society and Bioethics." *Tzu Chi Medical Journal* 32, no. 4 (October–December 2020): 339–43. https://doi.org/10.4103/tcmj.tcmj_71_20

Tampubolon, Manotar, and BernadethaNadeak. „Artificial Intelligence and Understanding of Religion: A Moral Perspective." *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding* 11, no. 8 (2024). https://doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v11i8.6104

Vogel, Yannick Alexander. *Neo-Commodification of Persons: Exploitation of Personal Data and Impact on the Sharing Economy*. PhD diss., Università di Bologna (in cotutela con Universität Wien), 2023. DOI: 10.48676/unibo/amsdottorato/10669

Waters, Brent. „Is Technology the New Religion?" *Word & World* 35, no. 2 (Spring 2015): 143–150.

Wheatley, Mary Christine. „Ethics of Surveillance Technologies: Balancing Privacy and Security in a Digital Age." *Premier Journal of Data Science* 1 (2024): 100001. Published November 4 2024. https://doi.org/10.70389/PJDS.100001

Winner, Langdon. *The Whale and the Reactor: A Search for Limits in an Age of High Technology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.

Yerbury, Hilary, Michael Olsson, and Pethigamage Perera. „Capital as the Outcome of Information Practices: A Study of Devotees and Monks of a Theravada Buddhist Temple." *Journal of Documentation* 80, no. 1 (January 2, 2024): 101–115. https://doi.org/10.1108/JD-01-2023-0008

Zuboff, Shoshana. *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. NewYork: PublicAffairs, 2019.

JOANIS LADAS
Antiohijski dom studija (AHOS), La Vern, Kalifornija, SAD

RELIGIJA, TEHNOLOGIJA I VEŠTAČKA INTELIGENCIJA U POSTMODERNOM SVETU: ETIČKA RAZMATRANJA

Sažetak: Postmoderna je iz temelja preoblikovala vezu između religije i tehnologije, stvarajući jedinstvene etičke izazove koji prožimaju svaku dimenziju ljudskog iskustva. Postmodernistička kritika velikih priča destabilizuje kako tradicionalne religijske autoritete, tako i tehno-naučnu izvesnost, krčeći pri tom nove puteve za saradnički pristup u etici. Ova studija ispituje četiri kritična tehnološka područja koja proizvode značajne etičke dileme: biotehnologiju, veštačku inteligenciju, digitalni nadzor i ekološke tehnologije. Analiza otkriva da, uprkos teološkim razlikama, različite religijske tradicije međusobno se približavaju zahvaljujući zajedničkim etičkim principima. Članak predlaže inovativni okvir za interreligijsku tehnološku etiku koji koristi religijski pluralizam kao izvor mudrosti za suočavanje sa savremenim tehnološkim izazovima. Ovaj pristup prevazilazi sekularno-religijske dihotomije i promoviše humanizmom više protkanu i duhovno bogatiju tehnološku budućnost. Studija pokazuje kako postmoderni uslovi, umesto da podrivaju religijski autoritet, podstiču skrušenije i dijaloške pristupe tehnološkoj etici oslanjajući se na raznolike tradicije mudrosti, pri čemu se čuva teološki integritet svake od njih. Ovo istraživanje, stoga, postavlja teorijske temelje za praktičnu interreligijsku saradnju u rešavanju složenih moralnih pitanja vezanih za nove tehnologije.
Ključne reči: postmodernizam, religija, tehnologija, veštačka inteligencija, interreligijska etika

Primljeno: 18.4.2025.
Prihvaćeno: 22.6.2025.