

**GENNADII TSELKOVSKYI**  
**ANDRII SKLADAN**

**ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN POLITICAL COMMUNICATION:  
PHILOSOPHICAL AND THEOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS FOR RELIGIOUS  
VALUES AND EUROPEAN INTEGRATION PROCESSES IN UKRAINE**

**Gennadii Tselkovskyy**

Drahomanov Ukrainian State University, Department of Culturology, Theology and Religious Studies, Kyiv, Ukraine.

**Email:** h.a.tselkovskyy@udu.edu.ua

**Andrii Skladan**

Drahomanov Ukrainian State University, Department of Culturology, Theology and Religious Studies, Kyiv, Ukraine.

**Email:** a.skladan@udu.edu.ua

**Abstract:** This study analyses the philosophical and theological challenges of using artificial intelligence (AI) in political communication, particularly in the context of the Russian-Ukrainian war and Ukraine's European integration processes. The phenomenon of disinformation, deepfake videos, and manipulative algorithms that undermine trust in the truth and threaten democratic culture is examined. The philosophical dimension shows that AI can limit free will, turn a person into an object of manipulation, and create conditions for an “epistemic crisis”. In the theological context, the meaning of human dignity as the image of God and the values of freedom and truth, which should guide the public use of new technologies, are explored. Special attention is paid to the positions of the Ukrainian and European churches on the ethics of digital technologies, their role in shaping moral guidelines, and their partnership with the state. It is shown that the problem of AI for Ukraine is closely related to issues of national identity, opposition to Russian propaganda, and integration into the European humanitarian space. It is concluded that the effective use of AI is possible only under a human-centric approach, where technology serves man, and not vice versa, and where truth and freedom remain inviolable values.

**Key words:** artificial intelligence, political communication, religious values, human dignity, free will, theology, philosophy, disinformation, European integration, Ukraine.

## 1. Introduction

The rapid development of digital technologies and the spread of artificial intelligence (AI) are fundamentally changing political communication worldwide. Information is transmitted instantly today, directly influencing mass consciousness and public opinion. These processes are becoming particularly acute in the context of the Russian-Ukrainian war and Ukraine's aspirations for European integration. On the one hand, AI opens up new opportunities for delivering messages, optimising decisions, and even combating disinformation. On the other hand, unprecedented challenges arise for democratic political culture, for truth as a social value, and for fundamental religious values grounded in human dignity and free will.

Recent scholarship helps frame this transformation as a shift in the structure of public debate itself. Bordiuk, Dmytro Shevchuk, and Kateryna Shevchuk argue that AI is increasingly used to “reformat the existing public discourse” and to create an “artificial” discourse dominated by generated narratives and political themes (Bordiuk, Shevchuk, and Shevchuk 2025). This technological reframing becomes especially significant in wartime Ukraine, where political discourse is inseparable from religious identity and ecclesial legitimacy. Morariu similarly shows that, since 2019, Ukraine has existed under two Orthodox jurisdictions whose public positions during the war are intertwined with political theology and state interests (Morariu 2025). Together, these works clarify why AI-mediated influence is not just a technical issue but a question of how “public space” and moral authority are constituted under pressure.

The issue of using artificial intelligence in political communication is at the intersection of technology, ethics, philosophy and theology. AI-generated content, particularly deepfake videos and automated bots, significantly affects society's ability to distinguish between truth and manipulation, creating new challenges for the public space. As W. Tzeng notes, the greatest challenge of the digital age is not machines conquering humanity, but the fact that algorithms form self-sustaining, distorted worldviews, replacing truth and creating information «rabbit holes» that lead people away from reality (Tzeng 2020). Mass disinformation, reinforced by algorithms, gradually undermines the foundations of democratic dialogue and threatens the fundamental principles of human dignity. This phenomenon has far-reaching consequences for religious communities and their values, especially in Ukraine, where religion has historically performed an important social function, and political development takes place in conditions of struggle between pro-European and pro-Russian civilizational vectors. This article aims to comprehensively

understand the issues mentioned above through the prism of philosophical and theological analysis.

The impact of digital technologies and artificial intelligence on political communication and religious discourse has already received some coverage in foreign and Ukrainian scientific literature. The works of M. Coeckelbergh (2020) and L. Floridi (2018) propose ethical approaches to understanding technological progress. Studies by D. Battista (2024), J. Twomey et al. (2023), and D. West (2021) analyse the deepfake phenomenon and its threats to democracy. In the Ukrainian context, it is worth noting the work of Y. Razmetayeva (2023) on the sacralization of technologies and studies in media and religion (Khrystokin, Lozovytsky 2024; Kralyuk 2022), which demonstrates how digital narratives affect religious communities in times of war. Thus, the accumulated body of literature allows us to understand the relationship between AI, political communication, and spiritual values in an interdisciplinary field.

Methodologically, the study is based on philosophical and theological analysis. The categorical apparatus of political communication (Kaid 2004), the ethics of artificial intelligence (Floridi et al. 2018; Coeckelbergh 2020), and the concepts of post-truth and epistemic risks (Twomey et al. 2023) are used. The theological dimension is based on the social teaching of Christian churches, in particular the document *For the Life of the World* (Ecumenical Patriarchate 2021), the declaration “Rome Call for AI Ethics” (Vatican 2023), and the positions of contemporary religious leaders (Bartholomew; Shevchuk 2025). This approach allows us to combine the normative dimension (values of dignity, freedom, and truth) with the analysis of specific examples of AI use in political and religious discourse.

## **2. Theoretical foundations: political communication, religion, values, and AI.**

Political communication is traditionally defined as the transmission of information and symbols in the political sphere – between politicians, the media, and the public – to influence political behaviour and decisions (Kaid 2004). In the modern era, it increasingly occurs in the media space, particularly online. Its characteristic features are the mass audience, the speed of message dissemination and the potential for two-way interaction (for example, through social networks). Political communication encompasses official statements and electioneering, as well as a wide range of informal messages, memes, and visual images that can shape political narratives.

Religion and values also play a significant role in social communication. Religious values are moral and ethical principles and worldviews that are shaped by spiritual teachings and traditions. For Christianity, such fundamental values include, in particular, the sanctity of human life

and dignity, freedom of conscience and will, truth, justice, love of neighbour, and the common good. In the political sphere, religious values can influence the formation of legislation (for example, in matters of social justice or the protection of dignity), the rhetoric of leaders (appeals to God's will and morality), and the behaviour of voters. In the case of Ukraine, where most of the population identifies with Christianity (Orthodox or Greek Catholicism), religious discourse is an integral part of public debates – from the Maidan, the Revolution of Dignity, to today's war against the aggressor. At the same time, the concept of European values, which European integration seeks to instil, largely overlaps with Christian values: it is about human rights, democracy, respect for the dignity and freedom of the individual. Thus, religious and secular value discourse in Ukraine has many things in common, although conflicts are possible, for example, regarding the interpretation of family values or tolerance.

In this article, artificial intelligence is understood as a set of machine learning algorithms and related technologies capable of performing tasks that traditionally require human intelligence. This includes analysing large amounts of data, recognising images and speech, generating new texts, images or videos, etc. Political communication already uses chatbots for automated communication with voters, targeted algorithms for personalised advertising and propaganda, and, most resonantly, deepfake technologies that allow the forging of an audio-visual image of a person. AI is becoming a powerful tool for shaping mass consciousness: it can both help disseminate reliable information (for example, automatically flagging fakes) and produce compelling lies. This ambivalence about AI raises questions about the ethical boundaries of its use and the compatibility of such technologies with fundamental human and religious values.

### **3. A philosophical analysis of the challenges of AI for democratic culture and human dignity**

Many philosophical and ethical challenges accompany AI's development in political communication. First of all, this concerns the quality of the democratic process. Democracy presupposes rational public debate, citizens' access to truthful information, and their ability to make free choices. The emergence of deepfake technology and other manipulation tools calls into question the possibility of trusting what is seen and heard in the information space. As Daniele Battista, a researcher in political communication, notes, deepfake content directly threatens democratic stability and security by undermining trust in public communications (Battista 2024, 98). The basis for meaningful discussion disappears if citizens are unsure whether a president's speech or the news they read is authentic (West 2021; Brundage et al. 2018).

Moreover, the phenomenon of “post-truth,” where emotions and personal beliefs overshadow objective facts, is being greatly amplified by AI. Deepfake videos or audio can create a believable illusion of an event that did not actually occur. Even if such fakes are exposed, their very existence makes the so-called “liar’s dividend,” a situation in which any real video can be declared a fake to avoid liability (Twomey et al. 2023; Chesney and Citron 2019; Vaccari and Chadwick 2020). These works capture the “dividend of the liar” mechanism and measure the decline in trust in news videos. This is a perilous precedent for the legal system (where video evidence can lose its force), for journalism, and for politics. Some analysts are already calling the potential of deepfake technologies the greatest epistemic threat of the 21st century – a threat to our ability to know the truth (Twomey et al. 2023).

As Floridi and colleagues emphasise, the development and use of AI should be based on four fundamental principles – beneficence, non-maleficence, autonomy, and justice – that create the basis for a “good AI society” (Floridi et al. 2018).

One of the key values under attack is human dignity. In a philosophical and ethical sense, dignity is associated with recognising each person as an intrinsically valuable being, capable of freedom and responsibility. However, algorithms designed to influence behaviour can treat a person as an object rather than a subject: their data is used to predict and change their actions, their attention is bought and sold, and their emotions are manipulated for political gain. This is closely connected with privacy: AI-driven profiling and surveillance can deprive a person of control over personal information and public self-presentation. As Mark Coeckelbergh emphasises, the main danger of the development of AI lies in the “decentering” of the person: technologies increasingly determine the conditions of our autonomy and communication, and, without ethics, they risk undermining the very concept of human dignity (Coeckelbergh 2020). According to Kant’s categorical imperative, the person must always be the end, not the means (Coeckelbergh 2020). Instead, AI-based political technologies risk turning people into tools for achieving power or profit.

The philosophical analysis of AI challenges also concerns the concept of autonomy and free will. If a person’s decisions – say, who to vote for – result from subtle nudging by intelligent systems, can we say that this decision is truly autonomous? The penetration of AI into all spheres of life makes people cognitively vulnerable, as we delegate more and more cognitive functions to machines (Razmetaeva 2023). A kind of “automation” of social life is emerging, where algorithms suggest the “right” route, the “right” news, the “right” candidate – imperceptibly limiting the range of alternatives. This undermines the ideal of democratic participation, which holds that citizens independently understand the situation and make conscious choices.

Another aspect is hate speech and violence on the Internet, which AI can both suppress and amplify. Hate speech, propaganda of intolerance – all this is not new. Still, with the advent of bots that can automatically generate thousands of messages, the scale of the problem has increased. Social media algorithms often contribute to polarisation, pushing users' content to evoke strong emotions, outrage, or fear because such content increases audience engagement. As a result, society gets “echo chambers” – closed spaces of like-minded people – and radicalised groups ready to accept conspiracy or extremist ideas. This is a challenge not only for politics but also for the moral health of the nation, because the growth of aggression and hatred directly contradicts both humanistic and religious ethical norms.

It is worth noting that, along with the risks, AI also has positive potential. A philosophical approach requires consideration: technology is neither “evil” nor “pure good” in itself – it all depends on its use (Bartholomew 2017). Artificial intelligence can strengthen democracy if used for transparency (e.g., automatic fact-checking to detect fake news) or inclusion (e.g., translating content into different languages to ensure accessibility for people with disabilities). However, without an appropriate ethical framework, the risks will outweigh the benefits. Recognising this, the European Union is trying to regulate the use of AI from the perspective of rights and freedoms – an example is the Artificial Intelligence Act, designed to prohibit the most harmful applications (Jobin, Ienca, and Vayena 2019; Floridi et al. 2018; Regulation (EU) 2024/1689).

In summary, the philosophical analysis indicates that using AI in political communication can undermine the foundations of democratic culture if democratic values do not control it. The uncontrolled and careless use of AI challenges the concepts of truth, freedom and dignity. However, these concepts are not just abstractions but also deeply rooted in religious worldviews. Therefore, it is appropriate to turn to the theological understanding of the problem to see how Christian traditions respond to similar challenges and what they can offer to address them.

#### **4. Theological understanding of the image of man, free will, and truth in the digital age**

Over the centuries, Christian theology has developed a holistic doctrine of man, his freedom, and his calling to truth. The modern digital age makes us rethink these categories in a new context. The phenomenon of the “digital body” highlights the risk of alienation and devaluation of human corporeality: in virtual space, the body exists as a sign-symbolic construct that questions the uniqueness and unrepeatability of the person (Tselkovskiy, Fedoryshyn, and Vasylenko 2023). Let us try to trace which

theological intuitions can be applied to the situation of AI penetration into communication and society.

In Christianity, man is seen as created “in the image and likeness of God” (Gen. 1:27). This gives each person invaluable dignity and uniqueness. Man is endowed with reason, free will, the ability to love and create – qualities in which the image of the Creator is reflected. This spiritual dimension radically distinguishes a person from any artificial system, particularly artificial intelligence. Accordingly, artificial intelligence is not a bearer of the image of God, even if it can imitate some mental functions. This idea is emphasised today by leading religious leaders. Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew I emphasises that the Christian tradition preserves invaluable human-centred wisdom necessary for orientation in a world of technological change. He stated: “In a world of rapid change, an upheaval of values, and dizzying technological advances – from artificial intelligence to the impending robotocracy – our Church proclaims that 'there is nothing more sacred than the human being, with whom God Himself shared His nature’” (Gatopoulos 2025). AI theology thus affirms anthropocentrism: algorithms can imitate mental functions, but they cannot replicate the *imago Dei* and interpersonal communication that constitute the core of human dignity; therefore, technologies must be subordinated to the good of the person (Herzfeld, 2002). This approach is consistent with the concept of “relational ethics of AI” proposed by Coeckelbergh (2020): AI should be evaluated not in itself, but in terms of how it affects interpersonal relationships, autonomy, and the common good.

The digital age raises concerns that freedom of will can be restricted imperceptibly, with middle-aged people, through algorithms, forming preferences and opinions. Unthinkingly following AI algorithms atrophies human nature, and in this case, will a person be able to realise himself as the image of God? The Church calls on the faithful to be vigilant and maintain inner freedom. For example, Protestant author Trevor Sutton notes that Christians should not succumb to fear of AI but should also be aware of its dangers and maintain independence from technological addictions (Sutton 2023). In Catholic social teaching, human freedom is closely connected with responsibility; therefore, both developers and users of AI have a moral obligation to ensure that technologies do not enslave people, nor cause harmful addictions. The Declaration “*Dignitas Infinita*” (2023) of the Pontifical Commission for Human Dignity explicitly stated that while digital technologies can serve to enhance dignity, they also lead to the creation of a world “in which exploitation, exclusion and violence increase, to the detriment of the dignity of the human person” (Carozza 2024). Specific dangers mentioned include “fake news and slander; incitement to violence and cyberbullying; an atmosphere of 'solitude, manipulation [and] exploitation'; the risk of addiction; and “a gradual loss of contact with concrete reality that blocks the development

of authentic interpersonal relationships” (Carozza 2024, ref. *Dignitas Infinita*, §61–62). These phenomena can be interpreted as an attack on free will and dignity, for a dependent, lonely, disoriented person no longer acts in complete freedom.

Truth in Christianity has not only an ethical dimension, but also an ontological and personal one: Christ called Himself “the way, the truth, and the life” (John 14:6). Indeed, bearing witness to the truth is a commandment rooted in the commandment of the Decalogue and developed in the Church’s teaching on morality. Therefore, mass deception, fake news, is considered a social problem and a sinful distortion of the moral order. Pope Francis, in his Message for the 52nd World Communications Day (2018), described the phenomenon of “fake news” as one that feeds on stereotypes and prejudices, ultimately “instrumentalising people, turning them into targets,” and contrasted it with “journalism for peace,” which seeks the truth (Francis 2018). The message’s motto was the words of Jesus: “The truth will set you free” (John 8:32), emphasising that truth has a liberating power for a person, while lies enslave. In the digital age, this biblical maxim takes on a new literalism: only by finding the truth amid information chaos can a person be freed from fear, manipulation, and hatred. Churches feel their pastoral duty to help people in this. In particular, the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church (UGCC), represented by the Supreme Archbishop Sviatoslav Shevchuk, constantly emphasises the truth as an indispensable condition for a just peace. In a speech in Toronto (2025), he stated: “A just peace for Ukraine requires not only material support, but also unwavering devotion to defending the truth. ... During this war, a multitude of lies have proliferated around the Ukrainian people, and foreign actors have used these distortions to justify – and even support – Russia’s actions. These lies, more than bombs and bullets, have wreaked havoc on Ukraine, the Ukrainian people, and their identity” (Shevchuk 2025). These calls echo the position of the Ecumenical Patriarch: Bartholomew I also points out that the tradition of the Church teaches the priority of truth and spiritual values over any systems (Gatopoulos 2025).

Thus, theological analysis provides three key guidelines:

- The ontological uniqueness of a person is such that no AI can match a person in value, so the human-centric approach is an axiom.
- The need to preserve free will in a world where technology must be controlled by human moral responsibility.
- The primacy of truth: The Church views the spread of falsehood as a moral evil; therefore, it is in her interests – both pastorally and socially – to combat disinformation, educate the faithful in critical thinking, and promote digital communication based on truthfulness and respect.

Thus, theological reflection confirms and complements the conclusions of philosophical analysis: man must remain a subject, not an object of technology; freedom and truth are inviolable values that cannot be sacrificed for ephemeral «efficiency» or political expediency. Next, we will consider how these principles (or their lack) manifest themselves in practice – in specific examples of the use of AI in political and religious rhetoric.

## 5. Examples of the use of AI in political and religious rhetoric

As W. Tzen emphasises, ChatGPT can synthesise complex theological concepts and open up new perspectives, but at the same time, it is prone to “hallucinations” that users are not always able to recognise; in addition, AI will never replace human empathy and spiritual experience necessary in theological discussions (Tzeng 2024). Artificial intelligence has already demonstrated its influence on political and religious discourse in real cases. Let us consider a few characteristic examples illustrating the use (or abuse) of AI in Ukraine and the European Union, and compare this with the approach of the Russian Orthodox Church.

**5.1. Deepfake as a tool of war and propaganda.** Unfortunately, Ukraine has become a testing ground for destructive AI technologies in a real conflict. Already in the first weeks after the start of Russia’s full-scale invasion (2022), a deepfake video appeared with an alleged address by President Volodymyr Zelensky, where he announces surrender and calls on the Ukrainian military to lay down their arms (Osadchuk 2024). Russian hackers hacked the website of a Ukrainian TV channel and posted this fake video there; they also broadcast a similar text on behalf of Zelensky (Twomey et al. 2023). Later, pro-Russian channels distributed other AI-edited videos, including synthetic materials about General Valeriy Zaluzhny, to undermine trust in Ukraine’s leadership (Osadchuk 2024). Such cases show that AI has become a weapon of information warfare, aimed at demoralising society and producing “epistemic poison” (doubting everything).

The research describes these practices as part of a broader attempt to build an “artificial public space.” Bordiuk, Shevchuk, and Shevchuk point to the CopyCop network as a typical case: it uses large language models to generate pseudo-journalistic materials that imitate Western media style but promote pro-Russian narratives, shaping an alternative information reality about the war and weakening support for Ukraine among Western audiences (Bordiuk, Shevchuk, and Shevchuk 2025). This example clarifies that manipulation is no longer limited to single deepfake clips: AI can industrially produce entire streams of “credible” discourse.

**5.2. The use of AI in electoral populism and the rhetoric of the far right in Europe.** On the other side of the continent, where there is no

war but a crisis of confidence in traditional politics, AI has also found application – and by radical political forces. Thus, on the eve of the elections in 2024–2025, far-right parties in the EU began to generate large volumes of visual content with the help of AI, designed to manipulate voters' feelings (EDMO 2025). For example, in Germany, the Alternative for Germany (AfD) party distributed videos edited from artificially generated images of an idyllic “old Germany” and contrasting frames of “dangerous migrants” (EDMO 2025). Similarly, in France, far-right activist Eric Zemmour used an AI-generated video to “show” the consequences of Emmanuel Macron’s rule through staged images that did not exist in reality (EDMO 2025). Such practices reflect broader trends in the use of generative technologies in populist rhetoric and demonstrate that deepfakes and synthetic images can significantly undermine trust in the media and democratic processes (Vaccari and Chadwick 2020; West 2021).

These cases indicate a new level of political manipulation, when the fears and prejudices of the electorate are materialised through digital simulacra. There are problems with religious values: truth is sacrificed for showiness, and religiously coloured images are exploited (“defence of Christian civilisation”) to justify xenophobia, despite Christian ethics of mercy.

**5.3. The position of the ROC and “digital sovereignty”.** The Russian Orthodox Church, historically closely linked to the state, has a special view of technology and the information space. Patriarch Kirill in January 2025 characterised AI as a force “more destructive than nuclear energy” and warned that the Antichrist could gain power through public support manipulated by technology (Zharbulova 2025). At the same time, he called on Russia to develop a “sovereign AI” under strict state control (Zharbulova 2025). Thus, the ROC supports digital sovereignty, framing Western platforms as threats and domestic AI models as a necessity.

For comparison, Ukrainian churches during the war took a different position: they called for using the media to spread the truth and counter hostile propaganda. For example, the Orthodox Church of Ukraine (OCU) actively maintains social media pages where it refutes myths and spreads patriotic and spiritual messages. Priests of the OCU and UGCC often appear in Ukrainian media as moral authorities who reframe the information war in ethical and biblical categories.

At the state level, Ukraine also provides examples of AI use in communication. In April 2022, the Ukrainian government, in cooperation with IT volunteers, released an “educational deepfake” – a video clip where an artificially generated image of Russian President Putin appeals to Russians to donate to the reconstruction of Ukraine (Twomey et al. 2023). This case highlights an ethical dilemma: even well-intentioned uses of synthetic media can undermine trust if transparency is not ensured.

Concluding this review of examples, it becomes clear that AI can serve both good and evil; truth and lies can be reinforced. European and

Ukrainian approaches tend toward ethical regulation and open discussion, while the Russian model emphasises control and isolation, yet still uses AI in hybrid warfare.

## 6. Critical analysis of the impact of AI on religious values in the context of Ukraine's European integration

Ukraine's European integration course involves a geopolitical or economic choice and a value choice. It is about establishing principles consonant with the European Humanistic-Christian heritage in society: respect for the dignity of everyone, the rule of law, freedom of conscience, tolerance, and truthfulness in the public space. In this sense, the religious values of the majority of Ukrainians (who profess Christianity) coincide with the declared European values. However, Russia's aggression and the associated propaganda test the strength of these values, and AI has become one of the tools shaping this struggle.

**6.1. Impact on the value of truth.** As modern Ukrainian religious scholars emphasise, the war turned truth into a condition for the people's survival: it is no longer merely a moral category but also the foundation of spiritual and national identity (Ukrainske Khrystyianstvo 2023, 27). AI can be both an ally (fake-detection systems) and a threat (the generation of falsifications). Ecclesial realities also shape this struggle. Morariu notes that since 2019, Ukraine has had two Orthodox jurisdictions whose wartime perceptions are linked to political theology and state policies (Morariu 2025). Therefore, informational manipulation can target not only the state but also ecclesial legitimacy, deepening distrust and polarisation.

Research indicates that the UOC (MP) has long avoided direct condemnation of aggression, remaining in the rhetoric of the “Russian world” (Kralyuk 2022), while the OCU emphasises the truth and spiritual independence of Ukraine (Khrystokin and Lozovytsky 2024a; 2024b). For example, 82% of citizens distrust the Moscow Patriarchate, seeing it as a source of Kremlin narratives (Dysa and Harmash 2024). This contributed to the adoption in August 2024 of a law banning organisations affiliated with the aggressor state (Dysa and Harmash 2024). In moral-theological terms, exposing propaganda becomes not only a political act but a spiritual duty (Eph. 5:11).

**6.2. Impact on the value of dignity and unity.** AI in propaganda is often used for dehumanisation: Russian narratives depict Ukrainians as “Nazis” or “Satanists” to justify violence. This poses a direct threat to human dignity, which Christianity recognises even in enemies. European integration requires Ukraine to remain faithful to the dignity of all, avoid hate speech, and maintain humane treatment even in conflict. The media space thus becomes a conflict of narratives: the OCU constructs a

discourse of dignity and freedom, while the UOC (MP) gravitates toward ambiguity or imperial rhetoric (Khrystokin and Lozovytsky 2024a; 2024b).

**6.3. Unity of Church and society in the face of technological challenges.** In the process of European integration, Ukraine will participate in Pan-European discussions on AI ethics, where churches can become state partners. Religious communities already respond to modern challenges through declarations and public witness. Ukrainian churches can contribute to European debates not by rejecting technology, but by insisting on moral criteria: truth, dignity, freedom, transparency, and protection of the vulnerable.

In general, the impact of AI on religious values in Ukraine is twofold: negatively, it exposes vulnerabilities; positively, it prompts the church and society to defend values more actively and to cooperate. Ukrainian experience in countering propaganda, including AI-enabled propaganda, can be helpful in other democracies.

## 7. Ethical principles and prospects of church discourse in the context of AI.

In conclusion, we will summarise the main theses and outline recommendations for preserving religious values and developing church discourse in the era of artificial intelligence, particularly for Ukraine in its European integration context.

**7.1. The primacy of human dignity and a person-centred approach.** Regulation and use of AI must prioritise the good of the person as *imago Dei*. Ukraine's integration into the EU implies legal and ethical frameworks that protect dignity, privacy, and autonomy, while churches can serve as moral watchdogs.

**7.2. Defending the truth and developing critical thinking.** Churches should strengthen media literacy and cultivate virtues of truthfulness and moderation: do not spread unverified information, avoid emotional manipulation, and support trustworthy journalism.

**7.3. Pastoral response to fears and idolatry.** AI provokes both technophobia and "sacralisation" of technology (Razmetaeva 2023). The Church must insist on balance: technology is useful but not absolute; it cannot replace human communion, conscience, or salvation.

**7.4. Ethical standards for church use of AI.** Churches must set internal rules: AI must not replace persons in spiritual matters (sacraments, confession, pastoral guidance). Any generated content must be marked and checked by humans.

**7.5. Cooperation between religious and secular institutions.** Ukraine can create interdisciplinary councils including theologians, ethicists, and state experts to develop humane AI policies aligned with European standards.

**7.6. Preservation of interfaith peace.** AI-generated provocations can sow interconfessional conflict. Churches must have rapid verification channels and mutual-support agreements through URCRO.

**7.7. Missionary opportunities.** Technology can also serve a mission if used wisely: translation, accessibility, and educational tools can help spread the Gospel (Tzeng 2020), while always preserving the primacy of living communication.

## 8. Conclusions

The study showed that artificial intelligence in political communication forms a complex intersection of ethical, philosophical and theological dimensions, in which three fundamental values are key: human dignity, free will and truth. In the context of the war against Ukraine, AI technologies amplify disinformation and manipulation, deepening an epistemic crisis of trust.

Philosophical analysis outlines the need for a normative framework that combines non-maleficence, justice, respect for autonomy, and the person's good. The theological perspective concretises these requirements through an anthropocentric approach grounded in Christian teaching on *imago Dei*: technologies must serve the person and interpersonal relationships, not replace or instrumentalise them. Truthfulness and transparency thus become both political norms and moral imperatives.

The Ukrainian case demonstrates a paradox: hostile propaganda increases vulnerability, but also strengthens social and ecclesial sensitivity to truth and dignity. European integration provides normative support for ethical regulation and media literacy; religious communities can provide moral legitimation and educational reinforcement. Therefore, ethical integration of AI into Ukraine's public sphere is possible only through cooperation of law, science/technology, and church social thought, which together can minimise risks of «post-truth», preserve autonomy and dignity, and consolidate democratic culture within the European civilizational space.

## References:

- Battista, Daniele. 2024. "Political communication in the age of artificial intelligence: an overview of deepfakes and their implications." *Society Register* 8(2): 7–24. DOI: 10.14746/sr.2024.8.2.01.
- Bordiuk, Yevhenii, Dmytro Shevchuk, Kateryna Shevchuk. 2025. Artificial public space: Using AI to reframe the political discourse. *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies*, vol. 24, issue 72: 116–132.

- Brundage, Miles, et al. 2018. *The Malicious Use of Artificial Intelligence: Forecasting, Prevention, and Mitigation*. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1802.07228>. Accessed August 31, 2025.
- Carozza, Paolo. 2024. "Developing Our Understanding of Human Dignity for the Digital Age." *Talk About: Law and Religion* (Blog of ICLRS, BYU). July 2, 2024. <https://talkabout.iclrs.org/2024/07/02/developing-our-understanding-of-human-dignity-for-the-digital-age/> Accessed August 31, 2025.
- Chesney, Robert, and Danielle Keats Citron. 2019. "Deep Fakes: A Looming Challenge for Privacy, Democracy, and National Security." *California Law Review* 107: 1753–1819. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3213954> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3213954>. Accessed August 31, 2025.
- Coeckelbergh, Mark. 2020. *AI Ethics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339103412\\_AI\\_Ethics](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339103412_AI_Ethics). Accessed August 31, 2025.
- Dysa, Yuliia, and Olena Harmash. 2024. "Ukraine adopts 'historic' law to ban Russia-linked minority church." *Reuters*, August 20, 2024. <https://www.reuters.com/world/europe/ukraine-adopts-law-paving-way-ban-russia-linked-minority-church-2024-08-20/>. Accessed August 31, 2025.
- European Digital Media Observatory (EDMO). 2025. *How the European Far Right Is Using AI-Generated Content to Engage Voters*. EDMO Publications, January 2025. <https://edmo.eu/publications/how-the-european-far-right-is-using-ai-generated-content-to-engage-voters/>. Accessed August 31, 2025.
- Floridi, Luciano, et al. 2018. "AI4People—An Ethical Framework for a Good AI Society: Opportunities, Risks, Principles, and Recommendations." *Minds and Machines* 28(1). DOI: 10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5.
- Gatopoulos, Derek. 2025. "Orthodox Church leader says faith is humanity's safeguard against the 'impending robotocracy'." *AP News*, May 8, 2025. <https://apnews.com/article/greece-automation-religion-robots-orthodoxy-2d5765621d591fa4e58ac8f60df1a3d4>. Accessed August 31, 2025.
- Herzfeld, Noreen. 2002. *In Our Image: Artificial Intelligence and the Human Spirit*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Hojbotă, Ana-Maria, Daniel Nica, and Cristina Maria Bostan-Tofan. 2023. "The Many Faces of Authenticity in Populist Rhetoric." *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies* 22(66): 96–111.
- Jobin, Anna, Marcello Ienca, and Effy Vayena. 2019. "The Global Landscape of AI Ethics Guidelines." *Nature Machine Intelligence* 1(2). DOI: 10.1038/s42256-019-0088-2.
- Kaid, LL, ed. 2004. *Handbook of Political Communication Research*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers. [https://spada.uns.ac.id/pluginfile.php/250588/mod\\_resource/content/1/Handbook%20of%20Political%20Communication%20Research%20by%20Lynda%20Lee%20Kaid.pdf](https://spada.uns.ac.id/pluginfile.php/250588/mod_resource/content/1/Handbook%20of%20Political%20Communication%20Research%20by%20Lynda%20Lee%20Kaid.pdf). Accessed August 31, 2025.
- Khrystokin, Hennadii, and Volodymyr Lozovytskyi. 2024. «Analiz publichnykh media-dyskursiv osnovnykh uchastykiv pravoslavnoi tserkovnoi kryzy v Ukraini» [Analysis of Public Media Discourses of the Main Participants of the Orthodox

Church Crisis in Ukraine]. *Sofiiske bratstvo* [Sophia Brotherhood], November 3. <https://surl.li/kqjzll> [in Ukrainian].

Khrystokin, Hennadii, and Volodymyr Lozovytskyi. 2024. "Konflikt pravoslavnykh naratyviv v ukrainskomu suspilstvi" [The Conflict of Orthodox Narratives in Ukrainian Society]. *Sofiiske bratstvo* [Sophia Brotherhood], October 28. <https://surl.lu/getycw> [in Ukrainian].

Kraliuk, Petro. 2022. "Viina i tserkva: UPTs (MP) y dali perebuvaie v poloni "russkoho myra"?" [War and Church: Is the UOC (MP) Still Captive of the "Russian World"?]. *Radio Svoboda* [Radio Liberty], April 30. <https://www.radiosvoboda.org/a/upts-onufriy-rpts-kyrylo-viyna/31827275.html> [in Ukrainian].

Morariu, Iuliu-Marius. 2025. Orthodoxy and politics in the 21st century – Ukrainian Orthodox Churches and the war. *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies*, vol. 24, issue 71: 18-29.

Osadchuk, Roman. 2024. "AI tools usage for disinformation in the war in Ukraine." *DFRLab (Atlantic Council)*, July 9, 2024. <https://dfrlab.org/2024/07/09/ai-tools-usage-for-disinformation-in-the-war-in-ukraine/>. Accessed August 31, 2025.

Razmetaeva, Yulia. 2023. "Sacralization of AI." *Talk About: Law and Religion*. April 24, 2023. <https://talkabout.iclrs.org/2023/04/24/sacralization-of-ai/>. Accessed August 31, 2025.

Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonized rules on artificial intelligence and amending Regulations (EC) No 300/2008, (EU) No 167/2013, (EU) No 168/2013, (EU) 2018/858, (EU) 2018/1139 and (EU) 2019/2144 and Directives 2014/90/EU, (EU) 2016/797 and (EU) 2020/1828 (Artificial Intelligence Act) (Text with EEA relevance). <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj>. Accessed August 31, 2025.

Shevchuk, Sviatoslav. 2025. "The Dignity of the Name. Ukraine and Canada for True Peace." Speech at Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky Institute, Toronto, Feb 25, 2025. Published on UGCC website, Feb 26, 2025. <https://ugcc.ua/en/data/the-dignity-of-the-name-ukraine-and-canada-for-true-peace-1466/>. Accessed August 31, 2025.

Smyrnov, A., ed. *Ukrainske khrystyanstvo u konteksti viiny ta hlobalnykh vyklykiv: perspektyvy* [Ukrainian Christianity in the Context of War and Global Challenges: Perspectives]. Ostroh: Vydavnytstvo Natsionalnoho Universytetu "Ostrozka Akademiia," 2022. ISBN 978-617-8041-14-4. DOI: 10.25264/978-617-8041-14-4. [in Ukrainian].

Sutton, A. Trevor. 2023. "Pastors: Lead Not Your Church into Fear of AI." *Christianity Today*, June 8, 2023. <https://www.christianitytoday.com/2023/06/ai-artificial-intelligence-risk-threat-warn-church-pastor/>. Accessed August 31, 2025.

Tselkovskiy, G.A., V.I. Fedoryshyn, and V.S. Vasylenko. 2023. "Osnovni vyznachennia poniattia dyhitalnoho tila v dyhitalnykh studiiakh" [The Main Definitions of the Concept of the Digital Body in Digital Studies]. *Kulturolohichniy almanakh* [Culturological Almanac], no. 1 (June): 244–250. <https://doi.org/10.31392/cult.alm.2023.1.33> [in Ukrainian].

- Twomey, J., D. Ching, M. P. Aylett, M. Quayle, C. Linehan, and G. Murphy. 2023. "Do deepfake videos undermine our epistemic trust? A thematic analysis of tweets that discuss deepfakes in the Russian invasion of Ukraine." *PLoS ONE* 18(10): e0291668. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0291668>.
- Tzeng, Walker. 2020. "A Biblical-Theological Approach to Transforming Technology." In *Halfway Up the Mountain: Restoring God's Purpose in this Chaotic World*, edited by Mark Wagner and William Wagner, 203–220. *World of Theology Series* 18. Bonn: Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft. [https://theology.worlddea.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/WoT\\_18\\_Wagner-Halfway\\_Up\\_the\\_Mountain.pdf](https://theology.worlddea.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/WoT_18_Wagner-Halfway_Up_the_Mountain.pdf). Accessed August 31, 2025.
- Tzeng, Walker. 2024. *AI and the Network Generation: Theological Discussions with ChatGPT on Historical Theology*. Executive Director, WETIA. February 1, 2024, updated August 1, 2024. <https://wetia.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/AIandNetworkGeneration.pdf>. Accessed August 31, 2025.
- Ukrainian Christianity in the Context of Guilt and Prayerful Appeals: Perspectives*. Edited by A. Smyrnov. 2022. Ostroh: Publishing House of the National University "Ostrozka Akademiia." ISBN 978-617-8041-14-4. DOI: 10.25264/978-617-8041-14-4.
- Vaccari, Cristian, and Andrew Chadwick. 2020. "Deepfakes and Disinformation: Exploring the Impact of Synthetic Political Video on Deception, Uncertainty, and Trust in News." *Social Media + Society* 6(1). DOI: 10.1177/2056305120903408.
- Vatican. 2023. "Rome Call for AI Ethics" – Joint document on AI Ethics by the Holy See, IBM, FAO, etc. January 2023. <https://press.vatican.va/content/salastampa/en/bollettino/pubblico/2023/01/10/230110b.html>. Accessed August 31, 2025.
- West, Darrell M., and Elaine Kamarck. 2024. *Lies That Kill: A Citizen's Guide to Disinformation*. Brookings Press, Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Zharbulova, Nazgul. 2025. "Patriarch Kirill urges Russian authorities to curb AI and save the world from Antichrist." *Kursiv Media* (Kazakhstan edition), January 31, 2025. <https://kz.kursiv.media/en/2025-01-31/engk-tank-patriarch-kirill-urges-russian-authorities-to-curb-ai-and-save-world-from-antichrist/>. Accessed August 31, 2025.