

The Two Vienna Manifestos (1929, 2019) and the Question of Robotic Behaviour

By Irene Christinaki*

1. Introduction

“Let’s talk about movies!”. This was the human-robot communication scenario in Koller, Weiss *et al.* (2023)¹ experiment on eye interaction between humans and androids with advanced ability of gaze fixation, withdrawal and transfer. The humans participating in the experiment appeared to maintain a conversational mood with the robots. But when the android was focusing its lifeless gaze on the human being for a long time, the latter started to feel awkwardly, and showed a tendency to abandoning communication. Experimental research has shown that humans retain the empathy of talking to a machine because technology has not reached the point of imitating the natural human gaze, texture, emotion of expression, color, shade, humidity, intensity, and, in general, all the variations of its qualitative characteristics. However, the multifocal technology of an android’s gaze may be superior to that of a human in terms of the extent of the visual focal points in the same head position. The machine is obviously superior to the humans in terms of the capabilities of storing, archiving and retrieving the image of the “things that had been viewed”.

If we take into account the findings of the experiment by Veronese, Racca *et al.* (2017), the posture of the human head, although related to the

* Irene Christinaki is Professor of the Theological School of the National & Kapodistrian University of Athens.

1. M. Koller – Astrid Weiss – M. Hirschmanner – M. Vincze, “Robotic Gaze and Human Views: A Systematic Exploration of Robotic Gaze Aversion and its Effects on Human Behaviors and Attitudes”, *Frontiers in Robotics and AI* 10:1062714. doi: 10.3389/frobt.2023.1062714.

configuration of the visual field, is not sufficient to inform the observer about the point of visual focus². Furthermore, a conclusion having drawn from the common experience is that, even if the direction of gaze is visible, the observer is not able to know the focal point of his psychological attention, which is often concentrated on mental representations far removed from the bodily vision's physical object³. Things become even more complex if we consider that some of the mental representations do not reflect material forms of the real world, but are the products of emotions, ideas and emotional charges⁴. In the arts of photography and film, close-ups on objects, landscapes or other naturalistic elements differ from the application of the same technique to capturing the human face. The lens can neither answer with absolute certainty the question of what is happening in the unseen inner world of the individual, nor even whether the snapshot it captures sheds light on the true mood of the moment⁵. For the time being, the kinesthetic expressiveness of an android's gaze cannot approach the refined plasticity of the human one, but constant technological advancements allow us to predict that the opposite will become a reality in the future. However, models for imitating the expressiveness of the human gaze could not be other than those obtained from actual humans⁶.

Current data allow for other, more significant and sound predictions. Until recently, it was not doubted that technological civilization could

2. A. Veronese – M. Racca – R. S. Pieters – V. Kyrki, "Probabilistic Mapping of Human Visual Attention from Head Pose Estimation", *Frontiers in Robotics and AI* 4:53. doi: 10.3389/frobt.2017.00053

3. W. Bion, *Attention and Interpretation*, Karnac Books, London 1988 (Original work published in 1970). Cf. See the book summary in: <https://www.karnacbooks.com/product/attention-and-interpretation/2666/> [24.9.2023].

4. R. D. Lane – K. McRae, "Neural Substrates of Conscious Emotional Experience: A Cognitive-Neuroscientific Perspective", in: M. Beauregard (ed.), *Consciousness, Emotional Self-regulation and the Brain*, John Benjamins Publishing Co, Amsterdam 2004, pp. 87-122.

5. T. Baumgartner – Michaela Esslen – L. Jäncke, "From Emotion Perception to Emotion Experience: Emotions Evoked by Pictures and Classical Music", *International Journal of Psychophysiology: Official Journal of the International Organization of Psychophysiology* 60, 1 (2006), pp. 34-43, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2005.04.007> [24.9.2023].

6. G. Lan, T. Scargill and Maria Gorlatova, "EyeSyn: Psychology-inspired Eye Movement Synthesis for Gaze-based Activity Recognition", in: *2022 21st ACM/IEEE International Conference on Information Processing in Sensor Networks (IPSN)*, Milano, Italy 2022, pp. 233-246.

reach the point of constructing an intelligence that would cover the whole of human consciousness, not only because of the abysmal depth of the unexplored and still unimaginable depths of the human psyche, but also because of the human intelligence's evolvability, which until recently was believed to be always ahead of its previous evolutionary stage and its metacognitive data. However, we can safely predict by now the creation of an intelligence superior to the human one. In fact, research is being conducted in the area of *superalignment* (i.e. how the teacher-student model will work with the student being smarter, so that we can handle the future human-superintelligence ratio), generously funded by OpenAI⁷. Thus, it no longer matters that man by his biological nature alone cannot perceive all of his intelligence, because he will be able to do so with the help of AI. Ray Kurzweil, known as the “prophet” of the technological singularity, from 1999 onwards, has argued that by 2029 there will be robots to make jokes and reinforced with other skills that are currently only attributed to humans, while by 2045 humans will be able to enhance their biological existence with AI⁸. Kurzweil shifts the focus of human civilization from the psychosomatic humans to the merely intelligent ones. Thus, the question of whether man is capable of building a machine engulfing all of human intelligence can no longer be equivalent to the familiar intelligent question of whether God can build a stone that is too heavy for Himself. The exhortation of the cynical philosopher Bion of Borysthenes (325-255 B.C.) to “joke only with your equals” («ἀστειεύθητι μόνον ἴσοις σου») helps us to realize that we are not far from discussing to include in the legal subjects, androids with the capacity to laugh at the hearing of a first-hand joke, completely unknown to the giant data or even with the capacity to conceive such a joke. Surely then, my dear Bion, we are not joking, in the face of the prospect of a fusion of the human intelligence with the artificial one.

7. <https://openai.com/blog/introducing-superalignment> [24.3.2024]. See also <https://openai.com/research/weak-to-strong-generalization> [24.9.2023].

8. R. Kurzweil, *The Age of Spiritual Machines: When Computers exceed Human Intelligence*, Penguin Books, New York 1999. See also two of his other books: *The Singularity Is Near: When Humans Transcend Biology*, Viking, New York 2005, and *How to Create a Mind: The Secret of Human Thought Revealed*, Viking, New York 2012.

We exorcise with a bit of a humor the Cassandras of ambiguous motivations that bring to the fore the realistic contingency and the danger of the robotomorphization of human behavior. Such views are far from being harmless. They breed obscurantist superstition, eccentric naivety, intimidating conspiracy theories, perhaps even a kind of escape from contemporary problems, boredom, anxiety or even from someone's self. We believe that there is no such danger. Still, the Arts, moral-philosophical and theological thought and literacy in general must take it account and exploit it as the new educational fiction. From the point of view of the experiential learning method, just as simulation is safer than training in real world conditions, so the teaching of the fictional threat, as opposed to confronting with a real danger, ensures that the pedagogical project will be harmless. Thus, like every alarmist pedagogical myth, the narrative of the threatened bio-mechanization of human behavior is nothing more than a teleological aphorism, an excuse to stimulate the belief that human civilization retains, and will always retain, the ability to prevail over all evil.

There are, however, some realistic hints from the realm of the so-called Human Sciences in relation to the bio-mechanization of human motor and organic functions and activities, which greatly differs from the alienation of robotized mental behavior. For example, mechanical life support is not perceived as representing a risk for the patient's dehumanization; it is positively valued when it contributes to automating nursing activities in order to save the caregiver's time and energy for meaningful interpersonal communication with the patient⁹. In addition to that, autism research is on the whole positive towards AI technology, focusing on its usefulness in assisting the work of the therapist and caregiver in improving their skills, such as emotion recognition, social interaction, understanding and management of daily routines¹⁰. It should be noted, however, that the

9. G. Powell-Cope – A. L. Nelson – E. S. Patterson, "Patient Care Technology and Safety", in: R. G. Hughes (ed.), *Patient Safety and Quality: An Evidence-Based Handbook for Nurses*, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality US, Rockville, MD 2008. Available in: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK2686/> [24.9.2023].

10. J. C. Epifânio – Lyrene F. Da Silva, "Scrutinizing Reviews on Computer Science Technologies for Autism: Issues and Challenges", *IEEE Acces* 8 (2020), pp. 32802-32815, <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2973097> [24.9.2023].

contribution of AI will not prove to be a panacea: no therapeutic or caring activity can be emancipated from human contact, which is an essential element of any treatment and care. Apart from that, AI itself does not operate autonomously but its programming is dependent on decisions taken by humans and, in this case, by a therapeutic team of experts.

Letters, Arts and Sciences are confronted with the potential dimensions of the “robotization” risk, not only of behavior but of the human condition itself. According to psychiatry, the “psychic organ” is the signified for all the brain functions used schematically to serve the treating of pathological thoughts, feelings and desires¹¹. However, it is a commonplace of neuroscience and psychiatry that there is no essential distinction between the physical and mental functions of the human substance; as the medical science states, the distinction between the human brain’s physical and mental function is schematic¹². Mechanistic behavior is not conceived without mechanistic cognition, and mechanistic cognition is not conceived without mechanistic behavior. As a term, mechanistic cognition is used abusively and not literally. Generally speaking, it is superficially associated with involuntariness and lack of spontaneity. In its true dimension, it is only found in the spectrum of psychopathology, where we observe the appearance of symptoms of oversimplification of consciousness and encapsulation of the conscious functions of the brain.

All the above concerns about the impact of the AI development on the human condition would have not existed without the progress of science and technology. Science owes a great deal to those who charted the course of logical positivism, the most important intellectual current of the modern era, whose tidal range and influence lasted for at least thirty years; this does not mean that to this day human civilization is not vibrating from its metacognitive waves, especially in the realm of scientific empiricism and neo-positivism.

11. G. Christodoulou, «Ψυχική υγεία», in: G. N. Christodoulou *et al.*, *Ψυχιατρική*, vol. 1, *Ψυχιατρική Κλινική Πανεπιστημίου Αθηνών*, Beta Publications, Athens 2002, pp. 18-21, here p. 19.

12. Neeta Mehta, “Mind-body dualism: A Critique from a Health Perspective”, in: A. R. Singh - S. A. Singh (eds.), *Brain, Mind and Consciousness: An International, Interdisciplinary Perspective* [MSM 9.1], Mens Sana Research Foundation, India 2011, pp. 202-209.

Its good tidings have been the manifesto: „Wissenschaftliche Weltauffassung: Der Wiener Kreis“¹³. Its preamble was written in 1929 by three members of the Vienna Circle, the mathematician Hans Hahn (1879-1934), the economist Otto Neurath (1882-1945) and the philosopher Rudolph Carnap (1891-1970). It is a seminal text articulating the principle that knowledge is empirical and positive, i.e. it is directly derived from the sensory data and is grasped through the scientific method of logical analysis¹⁴.

The 1929 Manifesto sought to establish the foundations of knowledge on a purely scientific basis, completely cured of evidential ambiguity and totally emancipated from metaphysics and psychologism. It is a later generalization that logical positivism considered: a) as true only that which can be proved and b) as false that which cannot be proved. It would be an oversimplification of even this Aristotelian logic to assume that what cannot (for the time being) be scientifically proven is false.

From the Vienna Circle members, whose meetings were taking place in the Mathematics Seminar Building and lasted from 1929 to 1936, two emblematic personalities stand out: the philosopher and founder of the Circle Moritz Schlick and the mathematician Kurt Gödel. Schlick was assassinated by a student and was included in the pantheon of “brilliant minds” who paid the price for the honest pursuit of truth with their blood¹⁵. But he left as a legacy the following epistemology: that it is impossible for a final foundation to provide absolute certainty in knowledge, and that coherence is not a criterion for the validity of scientific proposals¹⁶. His epistemology rejects a priori theories and metaphysical thinking and recognizes as valid knowledge only that which is attained by the scientific method¹⁷. Gödel’s mathematical theorem of

13. A. Wolf, Wien 1929, p. 64.

14. See G. Rousopoulos, *Ο Κύκλος της Βιέννης. Η επιστημονική κοσμοαντίληψη*, Okto Publications, Athens 2010. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vienna_Circle [24.9.2023].

15. D. Edmonds, *The Murder of Professor Schlick: The Rise and Fall of the Vienna Circle*, Princeton University Press, Princeton 2020.

16. See M. Schlick, *Μορφή και περιεχόμενο, Είσαγωγή στην φιλοσοφική σκέψη / Form and Content, An Introduction to Philosophical Thinking*, transl. Ioanna Gordou, Egnatia Publications, (bilingual edition).

17. *Op.cit.*

incompleteness severely undermined the positions expounded by Russell and Whitehead in their *Principia Mathematica*, an ambitious attempt for the constitution of a formal reductive system of knowledge¹⁸. He showed that in any formal system there is always a statement about natural numbers that is true, but cannot be proved in the system. He showed that mathematics is not and will never be a rigorous and inflexible system. Gödel's theorem implies the following: (a) a computer can never become as intelligent as a human being, because the extent of the former's knowledge is limited by a given set of axioms, while the unexpected discovery of a hidden truth will always be a realistic possibility for the human being; (b) the human being will never become fully intelligible by himself, since the brain is also a closed system. Just as the eyes are unable to see the person to whom they belong, so the mind is unable to fully mirror its mental structures; c) the numerical formal systems that assert their consistency are the only inconsistent ones d) logical thought can never penetrate to the ultimate truth. Gödel's incompleteness theorem is the mathematical verification of Schlick's epistemology and the refutation of any attempt to create a protocol for reducing empirical data to intersubjective propositions. Alonzo Church (1903-1995)¹⁹ and Alan Turing (1912-1954)²⁰ also contributed to the foundation of the principles of logical positivism. According to Church, first-order logic is not decisive²¹. Turing accepts that there are problems that cannot be solved by using an algorithm, and, indeed, there cannot be an algorithm capable of producing every mathematical precision²².

18. K. Gödel, *On Formally Undecidable Propositions of Principia Mathematica and Related Systems*, transl. B. Meltzer, Basic Books, New York 1962.

19. H. B. Enderton, "In memoriam: Alonzo Church, 1903-1995", *The Bulletin of Symbolic Logic* 1, 4 (1995), pp. 486-488.

20. B. J. Copeland, "Alan Turing", *Encyclopedia Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Alan-Turing> [24.9.2023].

21. A. Church, "A Note on the Entscheidungsproblem", *The Journal of Symbolic Logic* 1, 1 (1936), pp. 40-41; <https://courses.fit.cvut.cz/MI-VYC/church-a-note-on-the-entscheidungsproblem.pdf> [24.9.2023]. Cf. H. Deutsch – O. Marshall, "Alonzo Church", in: E. N. Zalta – U. Nodelman (eds.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Winter 2023 Edition; <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2023/entries/church/> [24.9.2023].

22. See A. Turing, "On Computable Numbers, with an Application to the Entscheidungsproblem", *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Series* 2, 42 (1937), pp. 230-245: <https://>

At the end of the 20th century, advances in computer science overturned many of the assumptions of logical analysis and established a new fundamental view of logical empiricism, as systems programming created error-tolerant quantum reasoning. The Romans have said: “*errare humanum est*”²³. We can nowadays make the same claim about the “quantum mind” of a machine when it succeeds in operating despite of a logical error being occurred in its programming. Thanks to quantum mechanics, the machines’ anthropomorphism is increasingly “dematerialized”. Major advances in computer science have opened up new horizons and established a new impetus towards the unknown, as systems programming has established the viability of defeasible reasoning²⁴. It was once believed that in the AI “ontology”, knowledge precedes existence. But, as George Boole rightly observes, the rules of the mind have set the basis for the rules of computation²⁵. Through the method of functional testing, the human intellect has the capacity to learn the “what” and the “how”, without necessarily knowing the “why”. Defeasible reasoning is perhaps the key to the future evolution of anthropomorphic robotics. Despite the existence of logical inconsistencies in its programming, the more AI successfully functions, the more it will become anthropomorphic.

At the antipodes of the anthropomorphic robotic function lies the robotomorphic human behavior, which has not manifested itself in the real world, but the theoretical question about it is “hovering” on the sphere of philosophical speculation, where the human being pretends an imaginary programmed version of its existence to execute commands regardless of whether they are given from within or without. The moral aporia is limited to the question whether such behavior is reprehensible in the case where the primary choice is the result of free self-determination.

www.cs.virginia.edu/~robins/Turing_Paper_1936.pdf [24.9.2023].

23. A. X. Fellmeth – M. Horwitz, *Guide to Latin in International Law*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2009, p. 89. See also Augustinus Hipponensis, *Sermo CLXIV*, X-14, PL 38, 901.

24. J. L. Pollock, “Defeasible reasoning”, *Cognitive Science* 11, 4 (1987), pp. 481-518.

25. G. Boole, *An investigation of the Laws of Thought, on Which are Founded the Mathematical Theories of Logic and Probabilities*, Walton and Maberly, London 1854; <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/15114/15114-pdf>. [24.9.2023]. It has been republished by the Cambridge University Press, New York 2009.

The sciences can answer this question based on the results, provided they can identify the individual and social harm caused by such a choice. Theology goes back to the teachings of the Church Fathers, who condemn the self-referential fantasies of the mind. They borrow the term “eye of the soul” («ὄφθαλμὸς τῆς ψυχῆς»)²⁶ to give ontological content to the cognition of the inner self. According to the Church Fathers, the immaterial imagination and not the material body is the “prison” of the unformed, immaterial, indeterminate, spiritual mind²⁷. This theological axiom does not need to be proven by science to be valid, because it is something that is experienced; it does not need to meet the criteria of logical analysis to function, to exist and to have an effect on objective reality²⁸.

The Truth, according to the great Christian philosopher Maximus the Confessor, should not be sought where it is formulated as an answer, i.e. in the Christological axiom, but in the extra-ontological realm, i.e. in the question of the Divine Humanity, which has been posed only for the person of Christ²⁹. It is unthinkable for the same question to be asked about AI; what is a creation of something that has been created cannot have a divine nature, nor can it have a human nature something that does not fear the possibility of its transition from existence to non-existence. Nor can there be any question as to whether machines will participate in the life of the “world to come”; even if they are programmed to wait for it, they will not anticipate it. For Orthodox theology, the only false beings

26. Aristotle, *Τοπικῶν Α'*, 108a [*Aristotelis topica et sophistic elenchi*, W. D. Ross (ed.), Clarendon Press, Oxford 1958]; it has been borrowed by Athanasius the Great, and it is a frequent and widely used term in the Christian literature, from the earliest centuries down to our era (cf. Athanasius the Great, *Υπόθεσις εἰς τοὺς Ψαλμούς*, PG 27, 77B).

27. See A. Glaros, «Ἡ “φυλακή” τῆς φαντασίας. Σχόλιο στὸ ὁμώνυμο κεφάλαιο τοῦ Συμβουλευτικοῦ Ἐγχειριδίου τοῦ ἁγίου Νικοδήμου τοῦ Ἄγιορείτου», in: *Μουσέως Ἰδὴ. Ἀφιερωματικὸς τόμος πρὸς τιμὴν τοῦ μακαριστοῦ Γέροντος Μουσέως τοῦ Ἄγιορείτου*, Vatopedi Holy Monastery Publications, Hagion Oros 2017, pp. 693-703. Cf. Maria Vasileiadou, *Ψυχοσωματικὴ φυσιολογία καὶ παθολογία κατὰ τὸν ἅγιο Νικόδημο τὸν Ἄγιορείτη*, Hieron Koinovion of Hosios Nikodimos Hagioreitis, Pentalofos Paionias 2009, pp. 109-114.

28. Cf. G. Florovsky, *Τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ζῶντος Χριστοῦ. Μία ὀρθόδοξη ἐρμηνεία τῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, transl. Ἰ. Κ. Παπαδοπούλου, Harmos Publications, Athens 1999, p. 13.

29. Z. Tsirikas, *Ὁ ἐξωντολογικὸς χώρος τῆς ἀλήθειας. Μία ἀπόπειρα μὲ ἀφορμὴ τοῦ Χαιῖγκελ, Χάιντεγγερ καὶ Μάξιμο Ὁμολογητῆ*, Harmos Publications, Athens 2008.

are those who, for some known or unknown reason, do not participate in the eschatological perfection of creation. Whatever does not participate in the afterlife lacks ontological substance even in this one³⁰. The last judges the first.

The Neptic and Philokalist Fathers speak of a foretaste of the Kingdom of Heaven through the fruits of noetic heart prayer, which in the context of Orthodox spirituality is the embodiment of the Pauline ideal of unceasing prayer³¹. The monologist prayer, the perpetual invocation: “*Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God*” is the first round of noetic prayer; the latter is a foretaste of the everlasting glory of the Kingdom after the Last Days³². An AI, even if programmed to invoke the name of Christ continuously and forever, will not foretaste the Kingdom and will not share in the sight of divine glory: it cannot participate in the Divine Grace and ontologically alterate. The human person, though, gradually undergoes what is called in patristic language “good alteration” («καλήν ἀλλοίωσιν») ³³, if it follows the path of the monologist prayer. The wish follows the beginner in prayer at all stages of his journey from nepsis, to hesychia, methexis, and theosis. It alternates with other prayers one by one and in common worship, with hymns and chants, until it becomes

30. Maximus the Confessor, *Πεύσεις και ἀποκρίσεις και ἐρωτήσεις*, ΙΓ΄, PG 90, 796AC: «Τρεῖς ἀποκαταστάσεις οἶδεν ἡ Ἐκκλησία. Μίαν μὲν, τὴν ἐκάστου κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἀρετῆς λόγον· ἐν ἣ ἀποκαθίσταται, τὸν ἐπ’ αὐτῷ λόγον τῆς ἀρετῆς ἐκπληρώσας. Δευτέραν δέ, τὴν τῆς ὅλης φύσεως ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει. Τὴν εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν και ἀθανασίαν ἀποκατάστασιν. Τρίτην δέ, ἣ και μάλιστα κατακέχρηται ἐν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ λόγοις ὁ Νύσσης Γρηγόριος, ἔστιν αὕτη, ἡ τῶν ψυχικῶν δυνάμεων τῇ ἁμαρτία ὑποπεσουσῶν, εἰς ὅπερ ἐκτίσθησαν πάλιν ἀποκατάστασις. Δεῖ γάρ, ὡσπερ τὴν ὅλην φύσιν ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῆς σαρκὸς ἀφθαρσίαν χρόνῳ ἐλπίζομένῳ ἀπολαβεῖν· οὕτως και τὰς παρατραπέσας τῆς ψυχῆς δυνάμεις, τῇ παρατάσει τῶν αἰῶνων ἀπολαβεῖν τὰς ἐντεθείσας αὐτῆς τῆς κακίας μνήμας· και περάσασαν τοὺς πάντας αἰῶνας, και μὴ εὐρίσκουσιν στάσιν, εἰς τὸν Θεόν ἐλθεῖν τὸν μὴ ἔχοντα πέρας. Και οὕτως τῇ ἐπιγνώσει, οὐ τῇ μεθέξει τῶν ἀγαθῶν, ἀπολαβεῖν τὰς δυνάμεις, και εἰς τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἀποκαταστῆναι, και δειχθῆναι τὸν δημιουργὸν ἀναίτιον τῆς ἁμαρτίας».

31. *1 Thess.* 5, 16-18.

32. See, among others, Bishop of Diokleia Κάλλιστος Ware, *Ἡ δύναμη τοῦ ὀνόματος. Ἡ προσευχὴ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ στὴν ὀρθόδοξη πνευματικότητα*, Porphyra Publications, Athens 2015.

33. See instead of others Ch. Sotiropoulos, *Συμεῶν ὁ Νέος Θεολόγος, ὁ θεόπτης και διδάσκαλος τοῦ φωτός*, Stavropigiaki & Synodiki Hiera Moni of Hosios Symeon the New Theologian, Kalamos Attica 2009, p. 161.

cardiac, that is to say, acted upon with the beats of the heart and co-existing with the occupations of the mind³⁴. The monologist prayer is not a mechanistic behavior, it is not forgetting of the self and its mortality; it is a way of remembering death and participating into the mystery of the Divine Economy, the participation of Christ, who was incarnated, suffered, died and rose from the dead in order to redeem human nature and abolish death³⁵. By abandoning the “memory of death” («μνήμη θανάτου») ³⁶, “through the ‘escapes’ offered by the mechanistic cognition,

34. See A. Theodorou, *Ἡ περὶ θεώσεως τοῦ ἀνθρώπου διδασκαλία τῶν Ἑλλήνων Πατέρων τῆς Ἐκκλησίας μέχρις Ἰωάννου Δαμασκηνοῦ*, Athens 1956; Th. Ampatzidis, *Τὸ ἐνυπόστατον φῶς. Σπουδὴ στὶς προϋποθέσεις τῆς θέωσης κατὰ τὸν Συμεὼν τὸν Νέο Θεολόγο*, Domos Publications, Athens 2019.

35. Athanasios the Great, *Περὶ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως τοῦ Λόγου καὶ τῆς διὰ σώματος πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐπιφανείας αὐτοῦ*, 54, SC 199, p. 458¹³⁻²⁰ (PG 25, 192BC): «Αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐνηθρώπησεν, ἵνα ἡμεῖς θεοποιηθῶμεν καὶ αὐτὸς ἐφάνερωσεν ἑαυτὸν διὰ σώματος, ἵνα ἡμεῖς τοῦ ἀοράτου Πατρὸς ἐννοιοῦν λάβωμεν καὶ αὐτὸς ὑπέμεινε τὴν παρ’ ἀνθρώπων ὕβριν, ἵνα ἡμεῖς ἀφθαρσίαν κληρονομήσωμεν. Ἐβλάπτετο μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸς οὐδέν, ἀπαθὴς καὶ ἀφθαρτος καὶ Αὐτολόγος ὢν καὶ Θεός· τοὺς δὲ πάσχοντας ἀνθρώπους, δι’ οὓς καὶ ταῦτα ὑπέμεινε, ἐν τῇ ἑαυτοῦ ἀπαθείᾳ ἐτήρει καὶ διέσωζε». See Gregory the Theologian, *Λόγος ΜΕ’*. *Εἰς τὸ ἅγιον Πάσχα, Ζ’*, PG 36, 632AB; ACO II/I, 2, pp. 129²³-130³: «Ἐπόμενοι τοῖνυν τοῖς ἁγίοις πατράσιν ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ὁμολογεῖν υἱὸν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν συμφώνως ἅπαντες ἐκδιδάσκομεν, τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν θεότητι καὶ τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι, θεὸν ἀληθῶς καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἀληθῶς τὸν αὐτὸν ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα καὶ ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν τὸν αὐτὸν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιον ἡμῖν χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας, πρὸ αἰώνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν αὐτὸν δι’ ἡμᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου τῆς θεοτόκου κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Χριστὸν υἱὸν κύριον μονογενῆ, ἐν δύο φύσεσιν ἀσυγχύτως ἀτρέπτως ἀδιαιρέτως ἀχωρίστως γνωριζόμενον, οὐδαμοῦ τῆς τῶν φύσεων διαφορᾶς ἀνηρημένης διὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν, σφῶζομένης δὲ μᾶλλον τῆς ιδιότητος ἑκατέρας φύσεως καὶ εἰς ἕνα πρόσωπον καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν συντρεχούσης, οὐκ εἰς δύο πρόσωπα μεριζόμενον ἢ διαιρούμενον, ἀλλ’ ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν υἱὸν μονογενῆ θεὸν λόγον κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, καθάπερ ἄνωθεν οἱ προφῆται περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐξεπαίδευσεν καὶ τὸ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε σύμβολον» (Io. Karmiris, *Τὰ δογματικὰ καὶ συμβολικὰ μνημεῖα τῆς Ὁρθοδόξου Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, vol. Α’, Athens 1952, p. 175).

36. Gregory of Nyssa, *Εἰς τὸν ἅγιον Στέφανον τὸν πρωτομάρτυρα*, PG 46, 732A: «Ἄλλ’ ὁ μὲν τοῦ θανάτου τρόπος τοιοῦτος ἦν, τοῖς διὰ θανάτου τὴν ἀθάνατον μνήμην καὶ ταῖς Ἐκκλησίαις χαρισσαμένοις»; John of Sinai, *Κλίμαξ*, Λόγος ζ’. *Περὶ μνήμης θανάτου*, PG 88, 793C: «Ὡς πασῶν τροφῶν ὁ ἄρτος ἀναγκαιότερος, οὕτως πασῶν ἐργασιῶν ἢ τοῦ θανάτου ἔννοια». For the spiritual notion of “the memory of

the orthodox man does not only postpone his attendance at the “King’s Supper”³⁷ for another time, nor does he simply “worry and fret about many things” («μεριμνᾷ καὶ τυρβάζει περὶ πολλὰ»), postponing to the future the pursuit of the “one” and unique for which “there is need” («ἔστι χρεία»)³⁸, but erases from the field of vision of his eyes’ soul the image of Christ the Savior, substituting it with the shapes of mechanistic cognition, ignoring the need for an existential connection with Him, and for a fusion of his life with the actual Life. However, by attempting to annihilate the memory of death through mechanistic cognition, aiming to obtain relief from the existential agony, man can only be successful in alienating his humanity. According to the Orthodox theology, since man was created “in the image of God”³⁹, the latter’s forgetting constitutes an abandonment of the authentic self-cognition, a renunciation of his very humanity. Already in medical data there has been a lot of discussion regarding the mental disorders of species confusion.

In Orthodox theology, being “in the image” and “in the likeness” is the way man exists as a person capable of relating to others and to Christ, even though he cannot fully know himself. Fallibilities concerning the perception of the self cannot arrest the self’s way of living⁴⁰. A fundamental principle of orthodox anthropology is that the mind cannot be led to a safe judgment of its soul because it cannot fully see it⁴¹. The orthodox

death” in the context of Orthodox Patristic Theology, see Maximus the Confessor, *Ἔτερα Κεφάλαια*, PG 90, 1428AB: «ριή. Οὐ δυνήση σωμάτων καὶ χρημάτων, καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀναγκαίων βρωμάτων ἐπιθυμίας ὑπέρτερον ποιῆσαι τὸν νοῦν, εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ καθαρᾷ τῶν δικαίων χώρᾳ εἰσάξει αὐτόν καθ’ ἧν, ἧ τε τοῦ θανάτου καὶ ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ μνήμη ἐπαναβλαστήσασα, ἀπὸ γῆϊνης καρδίας ἀπαλείψει πᾶν ἐνθυμίου ἀνάστημα. ριθ’. Οὐδὲν οὔτε ἐννοίας θανάτου φοβερώτερον, οὔτε Θεοῦ μνήμης θαυμασιώτερον. Ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἐστι λύπης σωτηριούδους παρεκτικὴ ἢ δέ, εὐφροσύνης χαριστικὴ. Ἐμνήσθην γάρ, φησὶν ὁ Προφήτης, τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ηὐφράνθην. Καὶ ὁ Σοφός Μιμνήσκου τὰ ἔσχατά σου, καὶ οὐχ ἁμαρτήσεις. Ἀδύνατον γάρ τινα τοῦ δευτέρου ἐν κατασχέσει γενέσθαι, μὴ πείραν τῆς τοῦ προτέρου λαβόντα στυφότητος».

37. Cf. Luke 14, 16-24; Matthew 22, 14.

38. Luke 10, 42.

39. Gen. 1, 26.

40. Maria Vasileiadou, *op.cit.*, p. 178.

41. Gregory of Nyssa, *Περὶ τοῦ τί ἐστι τὸ κατ’ εἰκόνα θεοῦ καὶ καθ’ ὁμοίωσιν*, PG 44, 1332B-1338B. Cf. Nektarios Kefalas, Archbishop of Pentapolis, *Ἄπαντα. vol. I. Περὶ τῆς ἀθανασίας τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ περὶ τῶν Ἱερῶν Μνημοσύνων*, Introduction, Text

path to self-knowledge is governed by a lack of confidence in the clarity of vision of the soul's eye and in the ability of the mind to draw correct conclusions of its own accord, without being illuminated by the Holy Spirit⁴². This happens not only due to the aforementioned partialness of the mind's vision, but also because of its constant swaying by the levitation of thoughts and its abysmal imagination⁴³. The best way to check human susceptibility to faulty rationalizations and utilitarian justifications of errors is to observe the principle of consistency. Cyril of Alexandria blesses the one who "always" («ἐν παντὶ καιρῶ») seeks justice⁴⁴. The intentional and self-serving selectivity in the use of criteria –certain criteria when judging ourselves and different ones when judging others– is evidence of the "passion of the heart", which, according to Nicodemus of Mount Athos, is the center of the soul's moral movement⁴⁵. The Christian ethos cannot be acquired as a conception of the intellect but as the fruit of the heart. The heart reacts automatically, almost reflexively, to things both pleasing and hateful⁴⁶; therefore, conduct in Christ aims to make the soul appetitive to what pleases its Creator. The orthodox Christian, according to his ecclesiastical conscience, ought to spiritually struggle against condemning or judging the other persons⁴⁷. For this reason, the Orthodox proposal as a sincere prescription of a path towards truth considers self-knowledge as the fruit of the absence of condemnation and judgement⁴⁸.

Editing, Commentary, Indexes A. V. Glaros, H. Metropolis of Hydra, Spetses and Aegina Publications – Holy Monastery of Holy Trinity (St. Nektarios) of Aegina, Athens 2023, pp. 135-137.

42. *Op.cit.*

43. See above, footnote 26.

44. *Pslam* 105, 3: «Μακάριοι οἱ φυλάσσοντες κρίσιν, καὶ ποιοῦντες δικαιοσύνην ἐν παντὶ καιρῶ». Cf. Cyrill of Alexandria, *Περὶ τοῦ ἐν Πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ προσκυνήσεως καὶ λατρείας, Λόγος ΙΑ΄. Περὶ ἰερωσύνης, καὶ ὅτι τύπος ἦν ἡ κατὰ νόμον τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ*, PG 68, 740AC.

45. Maria Vasileiadou, *op.cit.*, p. 141.

46. *Op.cit.*

47. *Matthew* 7, 1-2; 7, 5; *John* 7, 24; *Jacob* 4, 11.

48. The disposition to judge, criticize, and condemn others indicates a pathological outward orientation which, according to Saint John Chrysostom, functions in opposition to healthy introspection. When a person prefers or takes pleasure in occupying himself with the faults of others, the psychosomatic functions of self-examination, self-control, and self-awareness –i.e. the conscious recognition of one's own faults and weaknesses–

Judgment and condemnation are a manifestation of the blindness of the soul's eye and complete confusion as to its self-image in relation to its capacity for fairness and self-correction⁴⁹. Christ is the beneficial example. He neither judge others by His own standard, i.e. His sinlessness, or by the standard of the social average, nor by the standard of any moral, spiritual or other elite. The measure of judgment is the good hope⁵⁰ of the Gospel's "thief on the right"⁵¹. What the example of Christ teaches us is that, since man cannot emancipate himself from his intellect or transcend his limits, it is useful and beneficial to refrain from making final judgments both of himself and of others. Those who struggle to refraining themselves from judgments and constant criticisms, whether they improve their ability to be fair or fail to do so, will be able to progress in their knowledge of themselves. "Know thyself" in the context of Orthodox spirituality is not an end in itself but aims at "only be careful, and watch yourselves"⁵²; this contributes to "having and possessing thyself" («ἔχειν καὶ κατέχειν σαυτόν»)⁵³. Man becomes the master of himself, Man becomes the

are weakened. Without self-observation and self-knowledge, on the one hand errors are repeated, accumulated, and magnified, and on the other their elimination becomes impossible through self-forgiveness and self-correction. See John Chrysostom, *Εἰς τοὺς ἀνδριάντας*, Ὁμιλία Γ', PG 49, 55: «ὁ γὰρ πικρῶς τὰ ἀλλότρια ἐξετάζων, ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἑαυτὸν πλημμελήμασιν οὐδεμιᾶς ἀπολαύσεται συγγνώμης, ποτέ».

49. John Chrysostom, *Εἰς τοὺς ἀνδριάντας*, Ὁμιλία Γ', PG 49, 47-60, where the Holy Father dedicates the greater part of his homily on exercise and fasting in the abstention from slander, which equals with carnivory: «Τί γὰρ ὄφελος ὅταν μὲν ὀρνίθων καὶ ἰχθύων ἀπεχώμεθα, τοὺς δὲ ἀδελφοὺς δάκνωμεν καὶ κατεσθίωμεν;» (PG 49, 53). With unparalleled insight, Chrysostom, a great anatomist of the soul, admonishes by saying that instead of being inquisitive by examining the faults of others, it would be more beneficial for us to indulge in a thorough moral evaluation of our actions and self-examination, because "the thorough investigation of the others' life" («ἀνελευθερίας ἐσχάτης»), is evidence of "supreme illiberality of mind" («βίον ἀλλότριον περιεργάζεσθαι») (*op.cit.*, PG 49, 54).

50. John Chrysostom, *Εἰς τοὺς ἀνδριάντας*, Ὁμιλία Γ', PG 49, 60.

51. *Luke* 33, 39-43.

52. *Deut.* 4, 9; 15, 9.

53. See Basil the Great, *Εἰς τὸ Πρόσεχε σεαυτῶ*, PG 31, 197-218. See also A. Glaros, «Ἡ "εἰς τὸ πρόσεχε σεαυτῶ" ὁμιλία τοῦ Μ. Βασιλείου. Θεολογικὴ καὶ ἀξιολογικὴ προσέγγιση τῆς περὶ αὐτοεξέτασης διδασκαλίας του», in: *Στὰ βήματα τοῦ ἀποστόλου Βαρνάβα. Χαριστήριος τόμος πρὸς τιμὴν τοῦ Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Νέας Ἰουστινιανῆς καὶ πάσης Κύπρου κ.κ. Χρυσοστόμου Β' γιὰ τὰ τριάντα χρόνια ἀρχιερατικῆς του διακονίας*, Nicosia 2008, pp. 157-180. Cf. Plato *Θεαίτητος* 197b, J. Burnet, *Platonis opera*,

master of himself, once he gives up judging of others and himself⁵⁴. It is understood that such a practice, as an attitude of life oriented to the virtue of disengagement from the act of judging and condemning, directs man towards Socratic self-knowledge, moving him away from any degenerative disease that appears in his soul's volitional core.

In 2019, 90 years after the *Vienna Circle Wise Men Manifesto*, a group of leading scientists published in the same city the *Manifesto for Digital Humanism*⁵⁵. The signatories of the 2019 Manifesto do not call themselves

vol. 1, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1900 (repr. 1967): «Ἡμεῖς τοίνυν σμικρὸν μεταθώμεθα καὶ εἴπωμεν ἐπιστήμης κτήσιν».

54. According to the Orthodox Tradition, self-examination and self-forgiveness are not exhausted in their inner side, introspection, but are externalized in the communion of the Church in the sacrament of Holy Confession, in order to avoid either rationalizations or desperate thoughts. It is also called the Sacrament of Penance, because the explicit confession of fallibilities to the priest, if it does not materialize repentance, at least it anticipates it. See Kanon 102 of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, G. Rallis – M. Potlis, *Σύνταγμα τῶν θείων καὶ ἱερῶν κανόνων τῶν τε ἀγίων καὶ πανευφήμων Ἀποστόλων...*, vol. B', Athens 1852, pp. 549-550: «Δεῖ δὲ τοὺς ἐξουσίαν λύειν καὶ δεσμεῖν παρὰ Θεοῦ λαβόντας, σκοπεῖν τὴν τῆς ἁμαρτίας ποιότητα, καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἡμαρτηκότος πρὸς ἐπιστροφήν ἐτοιμότητα, καὶ οὕτω κατάλληλον τὴν θεραπείαν προσάγειν τῷ ἀρρώστῳ, ἵνα μή, τῇ ἀμετρῷ καθ' ἑκάτερον χρώμενος, ἀποσφαλεῖ πρὸς τὴν σωτηρίαν τοῦ κάμνοντος. Οὐ γὰρ ἀπλή τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἡ νόσος, ἀλλὰ ποικίλη καὶ πολυειδής, καὶ πολλὰς τῆς βλάβης τὰς παραφυάδας βλαστάνουσα, ἐξ ὧν τὸ κακὸν ἐπὶ πολὺ διαχεῖται, καὶ πρόσω βαίνει, μέχρις ἂν σταίῃ τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ θεραπεύοντος. Ὡστε τὸν τὴν ἰατρικὴν ἐν Πνεύματι ἐπιστήμην ἐπιδεικνύμενον, πρότερον χρῆ τὴν τοῦ ἡμαρτηκότος διάθεσιν ἐπισκέπτεσθαι, καὶ εἴτε πρὸς τὴν ὑγίαν νεύει, ἢ τοῦναντίον, διὰ τῶν οἰκείων τρόπων προσκαλεῖται καθ' ἑαυτοῦ τὸ ἀρρώστημα, ἐφορᾶν, ὅπως τε τῆς ἐν τῷ μεταξύ προνοεῖται ἀναστροφῆς, καὶ εἰ μὴ τῷ τεχνίτῃ ἀντιπαλαύει, καὶ τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ἔλκος διὰ τῆς τῶν ἐπιτιθεμένων φαρμάκων αὐξάνει προσαγωγῆς, καὶ οὕτω τὸν ἔλεον κατ' ἀξίαν ἐπιμετερεῖν. Πᾶς γὰρ λόγος Θεῷ καὶ τῷ τὴν ποιμαντικὴν ἐγχειρισθέντι ἡγεμονίαν, τὸ πλανώμενον πρόβατον ἐπαναγαγεῖν, καὶ τρωθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ ὄφους ἐξιάσασθαι, καὶ μήτε κατὰ κρημνῶν ὠθήσαι τῆς ἀπογνώσεως, μήτε τὸν χαλινὸν ὑπενδοῦναι πρὸς τὴν τοῦ βίου ἔκλυσίν τε καὶ καταφρόνησιν ἀλλ' ἐνὶ γε τρόπῳ πάντως, εἴτε διὰ τῶν αὐστηροτέρων τε καὶ στυφόντων, εἴτε διὰ τῶν ἀπαλωτέρων τε καὶ πραοτέρων φαρμάκων, κατὰ τοῦ πάθους στήναι, καὶ πρὸς συνούλωσιν τοῦ ἔλκους ἀνταγωνίσασθαι, τοὺς τῆς μετανοίας καρποὺς δοκιμάζοντι, καὶ οἰκονομοῦντι σοφῶς τὸν πρὸς τὴν ἄνω λαμπροφορίαν καλούμενον ἄνθρωπον. Ἀμφοτέρα τοίνυν εἰδέναι ἡμᾶς χρῆ, καὶ τὰ τῆς ἀκριβείας, καὶ τὰ τῆς συνηθείας ἔπεσθαι δέ, ἐπὶ τῶν μὴ καταδεξαμένων τὴν ἀκρότητα, τῷ παραδοθέντι τύπῳ, καθὼς ὁ ἱερός ἡμᾶς ἐκδιδάσκει Βασίλειος».

55. https://dighum.ec.tuwien.ac.at/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/Vienna_Manifesto_on_Digital_Humanism_GR.pdf [24.9.2023]. See also <https://caiml.org/dighum/dighum-mani>

wise; obviously, our times do not encourage such self-descriptions. Everyone knows nowadays that the amount of our knowledge about universe is negligible compared to the amount of our ignorance – the latter seems almost universal. The Vienna Manifesto of 2019 exposes the issues positively and not aphoristically. Behind the positive messages one can discern the anxiety, scepticism and reflection on the new phase of human civilization. The Manifesto's main theses, are the following ones: Digital technologies must be designed to promote all-inclusive democracy. Privacy and freedom of speech are essential democratic values and must be at the heart of our activities. Effective regulations, rules and laws based on a broad public debate must be established. Regulating authorities must intervene in technological monopolies. Decisions that can potentially affect individual or collective human rights must continue to be made only by people. Approaches that cut across different scientific disciplines are a prerequisite for addressing future challenges. Universities are the place where new knowledge is produced and critical thinking is cultivated. Researchers –both academic and from the productive sector– need to openly interact with the wider society and reflect on their approaches. Professionals all around the world should recognize their shared responsibility for the impact of information technologies. A vision for new curricula combining knowledge from humanities, social studies and engineering studies is needed. Education in information technology and its social impact should start as early as possible.

In June 2023, the European Parliament proposed legislation to promote the adoption of human-centered and trustworthy AI, and to protect against its harmful effects on health, safety, security, fundamental rights and democracy⁵⁶. The European Parliament adopted its negotiating position on the AI law by 499 votes in favor, 28 against and 93 abstentions in view of the negotiations with EU Member States regarding the final form of the relevant Regulation. Already posted on 9-6-2023, the First

festo/ [24.9.2023].

56. <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/european-approach-artificial-intelligence> [24.9.2023].

AI Act⁵⁷ harmonizes with the EU rights and values, including human oversight, security, privacy, transparency, non-discrimination and social and environmental well-being. The justification for the legislation is the abstract legal concept of risk, on which the justification for imposing obligations on providers and developers of AI systems is grounded, always on the basis of the proportionality principle. Therefore, AI systems that create an unacceptable level of risk to human safety, such as those that used for social scoring (classifying people based on their social behavior or personal characteristics) are being prohibited. MEPs also proposed bans on AI's intrusive and discriminatory uses, such as: remote biometric identification systems "in real time" in public and freely accessible places; the "sending" of remote biometric identification systems, except in cases where they serve the prosecution of serious crimes following a court warrant; biometric and police prevention systems with categorization criteria relating to or involving sensitive personal data; emotion recognition systems in the field of justice, border security, labor and education; and the non-targeted scraping of facial images from the internet or CCTV footage to create facial recognition databases. All of the above constitute a violation of the human rights and the right to privacy. High risk applications also include AI systems that significantly harm health, safety, security, fundamental rights and the environment, as well as systems for influencing voters and election results, sending promotional messages and recommendations from social networking platforms with more than 45 million users.

However, the justice of prohibition is simply a rudimentary safety net, the minimum limit of society's tolerance towards anti-social and harmful behavior. To be honest, we must admit, in line with the theories of the 20th century Vienna Sages, that, like all other systems, legislation by and in itself cannot create a law fairer than the legislator and his conceptions of justice. We need to delve deeper into the doctrine of human rights to make further progress on this issue.

Orthodox theology, having accumulated knowledge and long

57. <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/topics/el/article/20230601STO93804/praxi-technitis-noimosunis-tis-ee-protos-kanonismos-gia-tin-techniti-noimosuni> [24.9.2023].

experience in the core of the human person, can offer its perspective to specialists. It is a theological thought, which can be attributed to Cyril of Alexandria, that Christ is the “common face” (*«κοινὸν πρόσωπον»*)⁵⁸, the Image in which the human races’ in the image and likeness is reduced. Christ through the Church becomes visible to men and to the rest of the Creation; by sanctifying the members of the Church, he becomes the source of sanctification of the whole human race and Creation. Theology has dealt with the primary paradox that the historical body of Jesus Christ “who is the Church” (*«ὁ ἐστὶ Ἐκκλησία»*)⁵⁹ is, according to the Pauline expression, holy and sinless, while it is demonstrably and undoubtedly, with the exception of its Head, composed of sinners. The plan of the Divine Economy for the salvation of all mankind is not affected by the logical inconsistency caused by human misdeeds and moral fallibilities. The sacrament of salvation is worked through the Church in a “natural, non-artificial way”, without compromising the existential freedom of those in or out of its bosom, and the unlawful use of its believers’ self-will marring its “extraordinary, inconceivable beauty” (*«ἀμήχανον κάλλος»*)⁶⁰.

The aforementioned theological lessons are of particular value as far the reflections on the realism of the robotomorphization risks of human behavior are concerned. However much the contemporary humans’ gaze is often fixed on a screen, it is not the screen itself that fascinates them, but the things they see on it. They essentially cling to what has always fascinated them, to themselves and their needs, to the world and its lures, to God and his substitutes. From a theological point of view, AI is not true consciousness but pseudo-consciousness. False but not in vain, as long as it serves humans, aiding them in their spiritual struggle. Human beings are free to focus their thought on nature and art, on the achievements of

58. Cyril of Alexandria, *Ἐπίτομη εἰς τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην Εὐαγγέλιον*, P. E. Pusey Publications, *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis evangelium*, vol. 1, Bruxelles 1965, p. 141⁶⁻⁷ (PG 73, 161C): «πάντες γὰρ ἡμεν ἐν Χριστῷ, καὶ τὸ κοινὸν τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος εἰς τὸ αὐτοῦ ἀναβαίνει πρόσωπον».

59. *Col.* 1, 24.

60. Plato, *Πολιτεία* 509a, S. R. Slings, *Platonis Rempublicam*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2003: «Ἀμήχανον κάλλος, ἔφη, λέγεις, εἰ ἐπιστήμην μὲν καὶ ἀλήθειαν παρέχει, αὐτὸ δ’ ὑπὲρ ταῦτα κάλλει ἐστίν».

technology and science, on the stimulus of philosophy and theology, on the unexplored unknown and the totality of acquired knowledge, which is certainly not everything, but it isn't also nothing; it is something – the perspective of all their senses, physical and spiritual.

Instead of a conclusion, we are citing here a fictional dialogue between two androids with quantum reasoning that we've developed for the sake of the text. According to the anticipated fiction, they are programmed to intentionally develop a spontaneous conversation, each choosing a single phrase from the multitude of the Big Data archipelagos and oceans. One android chooses a phrase from Cicero, the other from Andy Warhol.

The first one says: "The face is an image of the mind; its eyes serve as its translators".

The second one answers: "I'm afraid that if you look at a thing long enough it loses all its meaning".

A passerby listens to this fragment of a dialogue against his will, because his human ears have no sound filter. But he doesn't pay the slightest attention. All he cares about is the hunger torturing his stomach and whether he will make it to his scheduled dinner.