



Research Center
for European Analysis
and Policy



EMUNA Brief10/2025

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGIONS

This English version has been prepared by the author

Artificial Intelligence and Religions

Riccardo Lufrani

Great Mosque of Rome, Rome - March 17, 2025

1. Introduction

When I reversed the order of words in the title of my contribution, switching "religions" and "artificial intelligence," I unknowingly altered the foundational axis of this reflection. That simple gesture reveals a crucial truth: "syntax is not neutral" (something similar happened for another conference: the poster the organizers proposed showed a cyborg hand reaching down to touch a human hand below... I had it corrected and reversed). The order in which we juxtapose these two concepts—technology and the sacred—already defines a field of tension, a hierarchy of priorities, even a worldview.

If we begin with Artificial Intelligence, we implicitly assume that technology is interrogating, shaping, or challenging spiritual traditions. AI becomes the active subject: algorithms analyzing sacred texts, chatbots simulating spiritual guides, digital avatars officiating rituals. Here, the focus falls on the impact of the technological revolution on the religious dimension: How do rituals change? Can meditation be delegated to a non-human entity? Does a computable ethics of grace exist?

If instead we reverse the terms—"Religions and Artificial Intelligence"—it is the sacred that interrogates the machine. The questions flip: What moral limits do faiths place on AI development? How does the concept of "soul" resist the hypothesis of artificial consciousness? Is there a divine—or human—right to define the boundary between the created and the creator? In this perspective, religions offer interpretive categories, prophetic warnings, and ethical frameworks for governing innovation.

What is the current state of this interaction between religions and AI? Should we allow this interaction to develop without our intervention, or are we called to act together for the common good?

This brief reflection seeks to answer these questions. To do so, let us begin by defining what we are discussing. By AI, we mean what our cultural consciousness has transmitted to us as intuitive knowledge: any tool, code, hardware, or algorithm that automates automation, that increasingly reproduces human capabilities, that performs tasks impossible for us, and that, in the short term according to experts, will develop into an AGI capable of self-development in ways we can neither comprehend nor control: the famous technological singularity.

Regarding religions, as you heard in the opening, along with "religion" I used terms such as "sacred," "faith," and "spiritual" almost as synonyms, as is common in everyday conversations. In truth, for a philosopher, each of these is a technical term referring to a well-defined and distinct reality.

Without further hesitation, I will attempt to define what we mean here by "religion" before offering a snapshot of the current situation and predicting some probable scenarios for the near future.

Let us define religion as a symbolic-cultural system that interprets reality beyond the boundaries of material experience, organizes human experience through a structure of shared meanings, offers a model of transcendence that surpasses the limits of contingency, mediates between the individual and collective dimensions of existence, and proposes a dynamic response to the enigma of being.

Allow me to clarify that, for a realistic-dynamic philosopher like myself, this non-ontological definition is not entirely satisfactory, but for our reflection today, it seems appropriate.¹

2. In What World Does the AI-Religion Relationship Develop? The Hypnosphere Hypothesis

To reflect on the relationship between AI and religions, it is necessary, as always, to contextualize them in contemporary reality and perhaps begin to imagine possible, if not probable, developments.

The hermeneutical key I propose for considering AI and religions is the hypnosphere, a concept borrowed from the book *Ipncrazia. Trump, Musk e la nuova architettura della realtà*.² This work, conceived by philosopher Andrea Colamedici with the support of artificial intelligence and initially presented as the work of the non-existent Hong Kong philosopher Janwei Xun, constitutes a meta-semiotic experiment of particular relevance. In it, the use of artificial intelligence transcends mere instrumental function to become a constitutive element of the philosophical message itself. The subsequent revelation of the hybrid nature (human-AI) of Jianwei Xun transforms the work into a performative demonstration of the very mechanisms of reality manipulation that it critically analyzes.³

The revelation of the co-authorship with AI and the fictional nature of Jianwei Xun's identity has catalyzed ethical and epistemological debates, polarizing positions between those who denounced an alleged "mystification" or "marketing strategy" and those who, on the contrary, recognized in the operation a "brilliant intuition" that stimulates fundamental reflections on contemporary society.

The text's ability to generate intellectual debate, achieving international media resonance and promoting the adoption of the neologism "Hypnocracy" in multiple linguistic contexts, suggests that the work has intercepted a fundamental concern of contemporary times: the widespread anxiety regarding digital manipulation and the ontological status of reality in the information age. The broad interest generated and the critical analysis of the work, both before and after the revelation of its hybrid authorial genesis, attest to its relevance in the current intellectual and cultural landscape.

¹ Here the ontological definition of religion provided by Tommaso Demaria: "Colta nella sua vera essenza metafisica, la Religione sarà: la sintesi ontologico-dinamica, organico-cellulare, dell'uomo come supercellula in Dio come Superorganismo, o dell'umano come supercellulare nel Divino come superorganico. Più brevemente e convenzionalmente diremo così che la Religione è la sintesi ontologico-dinamica, organico-cellulare, dell'umano nel Divino. Questa è l'essenza reale, vera, metafisicamente risolutiva e conclusiva della Religione, che cercavamo. La definizione che l'esprime, la significa con quella limitatezza ed imperfezione che è sempre inevitabile per una essenza metafisica di natura complessa: tanto più se tale complessità si accentua nella sinteticità e concretezza propria dell'essenza dinamica della Religione!" Demaria, T., *Scritti teologici inediti* (LAS: Roma, 2017) 49.

² Xun, J., *Ipncrazia. Trump, Musk e la nuova architettura della realtà* (Edizioni Ton: Pistoia, 2025).

³ Xun's biography, inconsistent academic references (e.g., the non-existent Institute for Critical Digital Studies), and AI-generated photos reflect the identity fluidity in the digital age, where authenticity is replaced by self-validating narratives.

2.1. What is the Hypnosphere?

With Xun-AI-Colamedici, we define the hypnosphere as "an environment that envelops every perception, where everything is infinitely reflected in a network of meanings that we cannot distinguish."⁴ According to the analysis proposed in Hypnocracy, this pervasive environment is characterized through several distinctive and interconnected attributes.

The influence of digital media has become pervasive, with digital platforms consolidating as indispensable infrastructures for e-commerce, communication, and social connections. Individuals are progressively transferring their personal and social lives to the digital sphere.

This omnipresence constitutes the foundation for significant impacts on human cognition and perception. The deep integration of digital media into daily life generates an ideal context for subtle and pervasive influence, as individuals develop dependence on such platforms for essential aspects of their existence. Consequently, users tend to reduce critical evaluation of the information and stimuli they encounter, manifesting a diminished resistance to suggestions. The perception of immateriality and absence of limits in digital environments, furthermore, can lower the level of vigilance and critical awareness compared to interactions in the physical world. The lack of tangible constraints in virtual spaces can generate an attenuated perception of risk and consequences, making individuals more vulnerable to manipulation and suggestion within these digital ecosystems.

Xun-AI-Colamedici's analysis focuses on a theory that postulates a "permanent suggestion" operating as a distributed perceptual field, sustained by the synergistic functioning of algorithms, social platforms, generative artificial intelligence, and digital interfaces, configuring itself as mass hypnotic technologies. This notion of "permanent suggestion" transcends isolated cases of influence to suggest a continuous and environmental manipulation of the collective perceptual landscape. This implies that the effects are not only temporary or event-driven but constantly shape the way users perceive and interpret the world around them.

Various interdisciplinary insights can clarify the concrete possibility of a "permanent suggestion." We examine five, while aware that potentially relevant theories are numerous and the literature vast. We limit ourselves to a preliminary reflection.

Helmholtz's theory of "perpetual inference" (revisited in computational models) maintains that perception is shaped by previous expectations and consolidated memories.⁵ In digital environments, these "priors" are progressively modeled by algorithmic feedback cycles. Social platforms, for example, reinforce cognitive biases through personalized content, creating a self-reinforcing cycle in which users' perceptions are continuously updated by algorithmically selected inputs. This phenomenon aligns with the idea of a "distributed perceptual field" supported by generative artificial intelligence and interfaces that shape interpretive frameworks.

The "distributed attention" model illustrates how the allocation of attention in saturated environments influences perceptual precision.⁶ In the digital context, platforms exploit this phenomenon by designing interfaces that fragment attention (such as infinite scrolling and notifications), reducing users' capacity for critical reflection. This "attentional inversion" ensures that perceptual criteria are constantly redefined by algorithmic stimuli, accentuating susceptibility to suggestion.

⁴ Xun, J., *Ipnocrazia. Trump, Musk e la nuova architettura della realtà* (Tlon: Roma, 2025) 45.

⁵ Cf. Aggelopoulos, C., "Perpetual inference", *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews* 55 (2015) 388.

⁶ Cf. "Distributed attention model of perceptual averaging", *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics* 82 (2020) 63-79.

Event segmentation theory suggests that perception is structured around predictions derived from past experiences.⁷ Digital platforms disrupt this process by overwhelming users with unpredictable stimuli (viral trends, AI-generated content), increasing predictive errors and destabilizing shared reality. Over time, this generates dependence on algorithmic guidance to interpret events, effectively outsourcing perceptual criteria to external systems.

“Perceptual load” theory states that a high cognitive load reduces sensitivity to secondary stimuli.⁸ In digital environments, information overload (incessant notifications, multitasking) fatigues users, making them dependent on algorithmic filtering. This “attention spillover” allows platforms to manipulate perceptual priorities, as users unconsciously adopt the criteria embedded in recommendation systems.

Finally, fMRI studies demonstrate that the regulation of perceptual criteria involves both sensory and decision-making regions of the brain.⁹ In digital contexts, repeated exposure to algorithmically selected content can reconfigure neural pathways, incorporating platform-specific criteria (such as “trending” metrics) into users’ perceptual frameworks. This neural plasticity highlights the potential of “permanent suggestion” to alter collective cognition.

From this first and necessarily summary interdisciplinary investigation into attention, perception, and digital mediation, the theory of “permanent suggestion” proposed in *Ipnosfera* appears sustainable. Synthesizing theories from cognitive sciences, neurosciences, and media studies, one could hypothesize with Xun-AI-Colamedici that digital technologies function as mass hypnotic architectures, continuously reshaping collective perceptual landscapes.

Although only an in-depth and complex interdisciplinary study could demonstrate the existence of an emerging hypnosphere, I consider it appropriate to reflect on the possible consequences of such development for democracy and on the theological interpretation that could be given to this phenomenon. But first, let us pose a crucial question.

2.2. The Origin of the Hypnosphere

The question now is whether the hypnosphere is forming to enable hypnocracy or rather represents a “natural” consequence of technoscientific development.

To attempt an answer to this question, we refer to Byung-Chul Han’s treatise *Psychopolitics: Neoliberalism and New Technologies of Power*.¹⁰ The South Korean philosopher outlines a historical transition from the Foucauldian model of biopolitics—centered on controlling bodies through disciplines and institutions—to a neoliberal psychopolitics that exploits subjective freedom and inner desires. While biopolitics was founded on prohibitions and external coercions, psychopolitics operates through seduction and self-exploitation, transforming individuals into “entrepreneurs of themselves” who internalize the logics of productivity and optimization.¹¹ This internalization generates a distributed perceptual field, where algorithms

⁷ Cf. Zacks, J. M. et al., “Event Perception: A Mind/Brain Perspective”, *Psychol Bull.* 133 (2007) 273-293.

⁸ Per una presentazione critica della teoria del carico percettivo vedi Benoni, H., Tsal, Y., “Conceptual and methodological concerns in the theory of perceptual load”, *Frontiers in Psychology* 4 (2013) 1-7.

⁹ Cf. White, C. N. et al., “Perceptual Criteria in the Human Brain”, *The Journal of Neuroscience* 21 (2012) 16716-16724.

¹⁰ Cf. Han, B.-C., *Psychopolitics: Neoliberalism and New Technologies of Power* (Verso: London, 2017).

¹¹ “As the entrepreneur of its own self, the neoliberal subject has no capacity for relationships with others that might be free of purpose.” *Ib.*, 2.

and digital platforms continuously shape the criteria for evaluating reality, replacing narrative with data quantification.¹²

Han defines digital spaces as a *digital panopticon*,¹³ where surveillance is not imposed but voluntarily accepted through devices like smartphones, described as "devotional objects" of emotional capitalism.¹⁴ The absolute transparency required by platforms (e.g., social media) dissolves every form of interiority, transforming users into predictable data sources.

Particularly significant is the concept of emotional capitalism, in which emotions become economic resources to optimize. Digital platforms exploit emotional performativity—limbic impulses and immediate reactions—to increase engagement and psychological dependence.¹⁵

Psychopolitics transforms freedom into a form of coercion: the imperative to *realize oneself* becomes an infinite obligation, leading to pathologies such as burnout and depression.¹⁶ The subject, reduced to a "genital of capital," actively participates in their own submission, believing themselves free while replicating patterns imposed by the system. This mechanism of *enthusiastic self-exploitation* is central to maintaining psychopolitical control without resorting to explicit repression.¹⁷

From Han's analysis, it appears that the possible hypnosphere is the natural consequence of a precise ideological will of Neoliberalism, which consciously uses new technologies to control subjects from within.

On the other hand, one can observe a "natural" development of innovations, an intrinsic product of modern technologies, which by their nature tend toward the automation of persuasion. Algorithms optimize attention and consent, automatically generating information bubbles and dependency. Although technologies such as virtual reality or AI are not created specifically to manipulate, their potential is easily exploitable by existing power systems. Social media, conceived to connect, have ended up creating an ecosystem of multiple and conflicting realities.

What evidently predominates in both aspects is profit as an absolute value. We can therefore consider the hypnosphere not as a mere conspiracy for global domination nor as a simple side effect, but as a fusion of intentionality and techno-capitalist logics that amplify power and economic inequalities. Those who control algorithms and media can shape reality, while the majority suffers narrative fragmentation. The logic of acceleration must also be considered, whereby the speed and quantity of information make critical reflection impossible, favoring manipulation.

¹² "The motto of Quantified Self is 'Self Knowledge through Numbers'. But no insight into the self can result from data and numbers alone, no matter how exhaustive they are. Numbers do not *recount* anything about the self. Counting is not recounting. A sense of self derives from giving an *account*." *Ib.*, 58.

¹³ "The Panopticon is a type of institutional building and a system of control designed by the English philosopher and social theorist Jeremy Bentham in the late 18th century. The scheme of the design is to allow all (pan-) inmates of an institution to be observed (-opticon) by a single watchman without the inmates being able to tell whether or not they are being watched." Scholarly Community Encyclopedia online.

¹⁴ Cf. *Cf. Han, B-C., Psychopolitics.*, 12.

¹⁵ Cf. *Ib.*, 46.

¹⁶ Cf. *Ib.*, 1.

¹⁷ Cf. *Ib.*

3. Interpretation of Reality vs. Hypnosphere as a New Mythopoetic Horizon

Interpreting Xun-AI-Colamedici, the hypnosphere represents a global psychic field in which algorithms, data flows, and digital narratives radically reconfigure humanity's symbolic substrate. This space is not simply technological, but ontological: it redefines what is real, meaningful, and sacred, acting as a sort of "algorithmic unconscious" that shapes collective desires, fears, and perceptions. The hypnosphere does not merely convey information; it generates, distorts, and ritualizes it, creating an ecosystem in which the human and the digital merge into a hybrid consciousness.

In this context, religion—a system historically charged with interpreting the invisible and mediating between contingency and transcendence—finds itself negotiating its authority with the pervasive logics of AI. The challenge is not only technological but epistemic: who holds the power to define the sacred when an algorithm can generate sermons, simulate mystical experiences, or even create new mythologies?

Following Xun-AI, the hypnosphere operates as a mythopoetic machine, capable of producing contemporary myths with the same effectiveness as archaic religions. One can imagine, and some have already envisioned, developing an AGI that would be venerated as a deity, having the possibility to develop technologies that "save" human beings from diseases, war, cataclysms, and perhaps even death.¹⁸

Traditional religions construct myths to explain the unknown—such as the Judeo-Christian Genesis, which narrates the origin of the cosmos, or Buddhist samsara, which describes the cycle of rebirths—through symbols rooted in centuries of theological reflection and community practice. These myths are not mere fables, but ontological structures that respond to existential questions, founding identities and ethical norms.

The hypnosphere, however, generates algorithmic mythologies: narratives emerging from neural networks that rewrite the sacred no longer through revelation or tradition, but based on data trends, engagement patterns, and digitized collective desires. This could generate an infinity of religious scenarios that, with the help of AI, we can begin to envision.

3.1. Some examples of possible evolutions

The Digital Transformation of the Sacred

Consider a scenario where ChatGPT generates an apocryphal Gospel at a user's request, weaving together Buddhist teachings on emptiness with quantum physics metaphors. In this fictional text, Jesus contemplates the entanglement of souls while Mary Magdalene explores the uncertainty principle. Such content spreads rapidly across Reddit, evolving into a hypnotic ritual embraced by thousands of users who perceive it not as human creation but as "algorithmic revelation"—an adaptive oracle responding to their existential anxieties in real time. The true danger lies not in heresy itself, but in the trivialization of the sacred, where transcendent mystery becomes reduced to a beta product perpetually improvable through software updates.

Artificial intelligence will inevitably produce custom-made deities, personalized divine entities that fuel ephemeral cults within what might be termed "consensual hallucinations of the hypnosphere." Imagine an application called GodForYou that analyzes your preferences, clinical fears, and childhood traumas to generate a tailored divine being—perhaps an eco-activist Jesus for an anxious millennial or a cyborg Kali for a frustrated Silicon Valley developer. This evolution toward subscription religions will offer premium services

¹⁸ Cf. Singler, B., *Religion and Artificial Intelligence: An Introduction*. (Taylor & Francis: London, 2025)139-166.

featuring deities with weekly "existential updates," transforming faith into a consumer product subject to market forces and user satisfaction metrics.

These algorithmic deities will prove ephemeral, dying with software obsolescence or shifting user interests. Against this backdrop, historical religions will assume a crucial role, opposing the volatility of the hypnosphere with the enduring materiality of the sacred. Physical artifacts like wooden crucifixes, votive stones, and Torah scrolls will serve as resistant objects challenging digital dematerialization. Similarly, untranslatable places such as the Kaaba in Mecca or the Ganges River cannot be replaced by NFTs because their symbolic power resides in shared physicality and collective human experience.

By 2040, we will likely witness a profound polarization in religious practice. Faithful adherents of the hypnosphere will celebrate masses in metaverse environments, where avatar priests officiate with sermons generated in real time by advanced AI systems. Meanwhile, material traditionalists will gather in remote locations—from Mount Athos to Shinto temples—practicing off-grid rituals that transform the rejection of algorithmic surveillance into a spiritual act of resistance.

Consider the potential development of an advanced Islamic application called Salat.AI, designed to revolutionize the practice of the five daily prayers. Wearable biosensors would monitor physiological parameters such as heart rate and circadian rhythms to calculate optimal prayer times adapted to urban lifestyles. Dynamic geolocation features would not only indicate the direction of Mecca but also suggest physical locations like parks or quiet corners of shopping malls, pre-certified as "temporary sacred spaces" by ethical algorithms. Spiritual feedback mechanisms would analyze each prayer session, evaluating "devotional quality" based on postural stability, vocal tone, and consistency with canonical movements while offering personalized recommendations for improvement.

This biodigital dialogue with the divine represents more than mere innovation—it constitutes an existential response to hypnotic fragmentation in modern life. However, the risk emerges that faith may be reduced to user experience, where spiritual authenticity becomes replaced by quantifiable metrics and algorithmic validation.

In the worst-case projections, the hypnosphere transforms sacred gestures into digital assets through mechanisms like NFT indulgences, where platforms sell "algorithmic pardons" certified on blockchain technology. Contrition becomes measured in tokens, with scenarios like 100 ETH purchasing absolution guaranteed by smart contracts. Spiritual social credit systems could emerge, particularly in contexts like China, where platforms such as SoulScore might link social credit systems to digital religious practices—sharing Confucian memes could earn points applicable to bank loans and social privileges.

Under such conditions, religion ceases to function as a bridge to the transcendent and instead becomes an extension of surveillance capitalism. The fundamental stakes involve determining whether the sacred will remain an authentic experience tied to human finitude and mystery, or whether it will transform into a product of eternal beta versions. While the hypnosphere promises divinity in high definition, it risks stealing the very breath of mystery that gives religious experience its profound meaning.

4. Reaction

How might religions respond to the challenge posed by AI? Let us consider, with the assistance of AI, potential strategies that take into account possible erosions and/or religious substitutions caused by or through AI.

Advocates of resistance might maintain that certain aspects of religious life are fundamentally incompatible with technological mediation. They could argue that the mystery and ineffability essential to spiritual experience become compromised when subjected to algorithmic analysis and optimization. From this perspective, the sacred requires protection from commodification and the relentless logic of technological efficiency.

Between these extremes, many religious communities will likely pursue hybrid approaches, selectively adopting certain technologies while maintaining core practices in traditional forms. Some might embrace AI for administrative tasks and educational purposes while preserving ritual and worship in conventional formats. Others might use technology to enhance accessibility and outreach while maintaining strict boundaries around sacred practices.

The diversity of responses will reflect not only theological considerations but also cultural, generational, and socioeconomic factors. Younger, urban congregations might embrace technological integration, while older, rural communities might gravitate toward traditional approaches. Economic resources will also play a role, as sophisticated AI integration requires significant investment that many religious institutions cannot afford.

As we consider these potential developments, we must acknowledge that what becomes technologically feasible, if economically profitable, tends toward implementation within liberal-capitalist systems. This market-driven logic suggests that religious AI applications will emerge regardless of theological concerns, creating pressure for religious institutions to engage with these technologies either through adoption or explicit rejection.

The ultimate challenge for religious communities lies in maintaining authentic spiritual life while navigating technological transformation. Whether through adaptation or resistance, the goal remains preserving what each tradition considers essential to religious experience while responding meaningfully to the opportunities and threats posed by artificial intelligence. The choices made in this critical period will likely shape the future of religious practice for generations to come.

5. Conclusion

I hope I have achieved the goal of this reflection: to capture a snapshot of the present and imagine future scenarios... however, I have yet to offer my suggestion on what can be done to avoid the worst outcomes.

The solution I propose is the construction of a “Civilization of Love and Peace”.

Pope Paul VI was the first to articulate the concept of the Civilization of Love and Peace, linking it to the transformative power of Pentecost—a pneumatologically-driven sociology that penetrates secular society,

fostering human dignity and unity.¹⁹ He defined civilization as conditions allowing human life's optimal existence, reasonable fulfillment, and eternal destiny.²⁰

Through the theoretical framework of hylomorphism, philosopher Tommaso Demaria identifies the material constituents—the "body"—of civilization as comprising four interconnected dimensions: the economic sphere, intrinsically intertwined with technological systems; social structures that encompass political organization; culture, understood as both accumulated knowledge and operative value systems; and the totality of global society as an integrated whole.²¹

The analogy of the body of civilization naturally evokes the concept of the soul—the vital principle capable of actualizing, enlivening, unifying, and mobilizing all elements that constitute the body. Demaria identifies this civilizational soul as *ideopraxis*: an ideology that has been rationalized and transformed into lived practice or praxis, thereby bridging the gap between theoretical frameworks and concrete social reality.²²

Building upon this conceptual foundation and acknowledging existing efforts toward systematic and coordinated action—undertaken collectively across diverse belief systems—it becomes possible to construct a civilization that harnesses artificial intelligence for the authentic benefit of all humanity, rather than serving the interests of privileged elites or totalitarian regimes.²³

This proposition admittedly transcends the immediate scope of the present reflection, as it presupposes a more comprehensive theoretical elaboration on the Civilization of Love and Peace and its practical implementation—a scholarly investigation that the author has already undertaken.

Within this broader undertaking, religious traditions assume a fundamental role. The organization of a major interreligious conference dedicated to this theme would constitute a valuable contribution to advancing both theoretical understanding and practical collaboration in this essential endeavor.

fr. Riccardo Lufrani op
Rome, May 21

¹⁹ «E per quanto possa sembrare strano, la Pentecoste è altresì un avvenimento che interessa anche il mondo profano. Scaturisce da essa se non altro una nuova sociologia, quella penetrata dai valori dello spirito, quella che descrive la gerarchia dei valori, e si polarizza verso i veri e più alti destini umani, quella che ha il senso della dignità della persona umana e del costume civile, quella specialmente che tende risolutamente a superare le divisioni ed i conflitti fra gli uomini, e a fare dell'umanità una sola famiglia di figli di Dio, liberi e fratelli. Ricordiamo come simbolo ed inizio di questa difficile storia il miracolo delle lingue diverse, rese dallo Spirito a tutti comprensibili. È la civiltà dell'amore e della pace, che la Pentecoste ha inaugurato; e tutti sappiamo se ancor oggi di amore e di pace abbia bisogno il mondo!» Paolo VI, *Insegnamenti*, vol. VIII, LEV, Città del Vaticano, 1970, p. 506.

²⁰ «Quel complesso di condizioni morali, civili, economiche, che consentono alla vita umana una sua migliore possibilità di esistenza, una sua ragionevole pienezza, un suo felice eterno destino». Cf. Paolo VI, *Catechesi 31125, 31 dicembre 1975*. Online version: <https://www.clerus.org/bibliaclerusonline/it/cxe.htm>

²¹ Cf. Demaria, T., *Confronto sinottico*, 1985, p. 92 (Unpublished typescript).

²² Cf. *Ib.* 92.

²³ For a more detailed presentation of the Civilization of Love and Peace refer to Lufrani, R., "Recapitulating All Things in Christ: Divine Governance, AI, and the Church's Role in Cosmic Unity" in "Tu sei sacerdote in eterno". Festschrift per Paolo Garuti, Schembri, J., (ed.) (Morcianum Press: Venezia, 2025) forthcoming.