AI Innovation and Human Dignity

Draft Discussion Paper, version May 9, 2026

Marianna Richardson, G20 Interfaith Forum Association

Executive Summary

Issue Background

Previous G20, UN, and IF20 Responses to AI

Faith Perspectives on AI Policy

o The Catholic Church Concerns

o Muslim Concerns

o Jewish Concerns

o Hindu Concerns

o Ecumenical Concerns in the USA

o Eastern Orthodox Concerns

o The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints Concerns

o Buddhist Concerns

o Sikh Concerns

o Shinto Concerns

o Interfaith Groups Concerns

Current Best Practices

o Establishing Benchmarks

o Passing Legislation

o Developing AI Curriculum

o Designing AI to Help Children Flourish

This draft report was prepared in advance of a May 26, 2026 forum at Georgetown University – Faith for Impact – organized under the auspices of the G20 Interfaith Forum. It represents an effort to promote discussion within and across religious and interfaith communities and to encourage constructive policy dialogue with the Trump Administration, which has made innovation in AI and emerging technologies one of the three priorities of its 2026 G20 presidency. The report and its draft recommendations will be revised based on the discussions at the forum and adapted for presentation at the IF20 annual gathering to take place in Salt Lake City in October 2026.

Executive Summary

One of the G20 USA's priorities for 2026 is to pioneer innovation in AI and emerging technologies. The United States priorities are (1) to advance pro-innovation policies to accelerate technology development and adoption, (2) to deploy emerging technologies to drive economic growth and human flourishing, and (3) to strengthen manufacturing, supply chains, and skilled technology talent to drive innovation. This paper examines religious ideas and practices relevant to that priority and considers how faith communities can help ensure the poor and most vulnerable benefit from AI-driven change.

G7, G20, and the United Nations have issued statements promoting beneficial AI uses and limiting harmful ones. The UN created the Office for Digital and Emerging Technologies, but

many worry that global mitigation of AI safety risks remains inadequate and the authority of these groups is limited. Equitable benefit-sharing and broader access for the Global South should

keep pace with technological advance but the digital divide seems to be widening. The IF20 has fostered interfaith AI dialogue since G20 India 2022; this report is its first formal AI policy document with concrete recommendations.

A particular concern for religious leaders and interfaith groups is the long-term impact on future generations, especially today's youth, and the unrestricted development and use of AI systems. Religious leaders across traditions warn of the possible dangers of Generative AI (GenAI) to human relationships, spiritual life, religious freedom, personhood, the environment, and warfare,

while offering pragmatic guidance for the ethically aligned, responsible use of AI. Faith communities also recognize AI's potential for good, such as improving education, expanding healthcare access, supporting livelihoods, and strengthening humanitarian response—when governed by ethical principles. These perspectives call for policies that both restrain harmful uses and enable dignity-affirming applications.

AI design and deployment should be guided by foundational ethical principles that prioritize human rights, wellbeing, and data privacy. Current best practices include: (1) establishing measurable benchmarks for safety and fairness; (2) creating curricula for children, parents, and faith leaders to build digital literacy; (3) advocating legislation that protects privacy, labor rights, and democratic processes; (4) addressing chatbot harms to youth through regulation and education; (5) using judicial remedies to redress AI-related harms; and (6) embedding ethical principles into system design from the outset.

The recommendations of the G20 Interfaith Forum (IF20) align with those of religious communities, interfaith institutions, and the UN. The best practices mentioned above are embodied in the recommendations for religious and interfaith communities, as well as the

recommendations for G20 governments.

Issue Background

The G20 USA 2026 priority to pioneer innovation in AI and emerging technologies is focused on unleashing technological innovation that strengthens economic growth, enhances security, and delivers tangible benefits to people and businesses. In the USA Executive Order 14179, which directly relates to this policy area, American leadership in artificial intelligence (AI) is directed to "develop AI systems that are free from ideological bias or engineered social agendas." Additionally, the directive focuses the development of AI systems "on human flourishing, economic competitiveness, and national security." The Executive Order continues with the hopeful statement: "With the right Government policies, we can solidify our position as the global leader in AI and secure a brighter future for all Americans." The focus of this Executive Order aligns with the focus of religious leaders, but the scope should encompass the world, not just the United States.

As we move into a new era where so many technologies are being used by humans worldwide, world religions, which are resilient institutions that have for so long cultivated wisdom about what is ethical and beneficial, have a unique and powerful perspective to offer. They have unmatched experience, influence, and reach in organizing communities, providing hope and meaning to people's lives, and tackling existential questions around purpose, personhood, and power. As AI policy decisions are made internationally, faith voices must be represented at the policy table. Together, we can chart a better course to a "brighter future" where AI systems help society achieve remarkable successes, while always remaining a tool, deeply rooted in human flourishing, community, tradition, and transcendent belief.

Previous G20, UN, and IF20 Response to AI

In June 2019, the G20 Trade and Digital Economy Ministers met in Japan and wrote a "G20 Ministerial Statement on Trade and Digital Economy." This statement focused on the human-

centered future of society, spotlighting human-centered AI. The focus of governance was on agile

and flexible approaches to harness the full potential of emerging technologies, focusing on policies that are innovation-friendly, while not losing legal certainty. Good practices should be shared between G20 countries. Sharing the benefits of digitalization globally will enable an action plan for accomplishing the 2030 UN Sustainable Development Goals' agenda. These principles were continued in the G20 discussions in 2023 India, 2024 Brazil, and 2025 South Africa where a policy area of focus in each of these years was technology and fair access to technological resources.

In 2023 at the Hiroshima Summit, the G7 wrote "Hiroshima Process International Guiding Principles for Organizations Developing Advanced AI System." This document outlined a set of eleven principles to identify, evaluate, and mitigate AI risks throughout the AI lifecycle, ensuring transparency and accountability for the appropriate use of AI, and investing in security controls for both government and private data. The adoption of international technical standards was also

suggested, but no institution was organized to produce and regulate these standards.

The United Nations has produced AI recommendations and established an AI advisory body, the UN Office for Digital and Emerging Technologies. On August 26, 2025, the United Nations General Assembly established an Independent International Scientific Panel on Artificial Intelligence (A/RES/79/325) to advance understanding and inform international deliberation, as well as the Global Dialogue on Artificial intelligence Governance, which is an inclusive place for governments and stakeholders to deliberate on AI challenges through in-person meetings and electronic information sharing. António Guterres, Secretary-General of the United Nations, expressed the main reason for these organizations: "A world of AI haves and have-nots would be

a world of perpetual instability. We must never allow AI to stand for 'advancing inequality.' Only by preventing the emergence of fragmented AI spheres can we build a world where technology

serves all humanity."

The IF20 operates at the intersection of scholarship, faith, and public policy. IF20 is an apolitical, non-denominational, and nonpartisan platform with an approach grounded in intellectual rigor, open dialogue, and collaboration across differences, ensuring diverse perspectives contribute meaningfully to policy conversations that shape our shared future.

Four principles guide the actions of IF20:

• Unite Voices: Connecting across faiths, disciplines and borders

• Promote Respect: Approaching every perspective with humility and curiosity

• Explore Boldly: Supporting inquiry and evidence-based research

• Take Responsibility: Acting collectively to create lasting change

Past and future discussions on AI will continue within the framework of these guiding principles. Since G20 India 2023, the G20 Interfaith Forum has discussed AI in the context of faith perspectives and concerns. The simple, general concerns expressed by people of faith in 2023 have become more defined and complex. More questions than answers have been posited surrounding the intersection of faith and technology.

Faith Perspectives on AI Policy

The following is a list of faith perspectives from a variety of traditions. This list is not comprehensive but is representative of the concerns and specific recommendations faith leaders

and people of faith have regarding AI systems. For some perspectives, there has not been a formal religious statement; instead, members of a given tradition have expressed how these issues are viewed in the context of their beliefs.

1. Catholic Concerns

The Vatican, under both Pope Francis and now Pope Leo XIV, has made AI a consistent and central focus.

Pope Francis. As early as 2019, Pope Francis emphasized ethical concerns around AI, initially

as an extension of social-media harms, such as manipulation of public opinion, perpetuation of bias and discrimination, and the “technocratic paradigm” he critiqued in Laudato Si. In 2020, the Pontifical Academy for Life led the Rome Call for AI Ethics, which was a list of principles (transparency, inclusion, accountability, impartiality, reliability, security, and privacy) signed by IBM and Microsoft and later endorsed by representatives of the other Abrahamic faiths. In 2024, it was also signed by a group of Eastern religions in Hiroshima, Japan. The Dicastery for Culture and Education established AI ethics research groups that have produced two books, Encountering AI and Reclaiming Human Agency. In early 2025, that Dicastery, together with the Dicastery for the Doctrine of the Faith, released Antiqua et Nova, which interrogated distinctions

between AI and human intelligence.

Pope Leo XIV. Explaining his choice of papal name, Pope Leo XIV said that where Leo XIII responded to the industrial revolution, he now sees a need for the Church to answer the new “AI

revolution” and its challenges for dignity, justice, and labor. He has argued that AI will be even more influential than industrialization in shaping who we are because it changes our perceptions

and understanding. By treating AI systems as interlocutors, he warned, we risk almost becoming an extension of them. He named AI among three great civilizational challenges, alongside the common good and religious freedom, and said it requires a similarly determined political response. The Holy Father has addressed the protection of children, education, healthcare, and media, and has called on those designing and developing AI systems to exercise moral judgment in their work.

Additionally, Pope Leo has urged priests not to use AI to write their sermons. He told the IPU that AI will be “a great help to society, provided artificial intelligence functions as a tool for the good of human beings, not to diminish them, not to replace them.” The Message for the 60th World Day of Social Communications is his most elaborate contribution to AI discourse thus far;

it counters the temptation to see AI as an oracle or friend, warns against AI replacing humans in thinking and creativity, and raises significant concerns about oligopolistic control over our lives.

In March, the Vatican's International Theological Commission released a document on AI, transhumanism, and posthumanism. Responding to the increasing autonomy of AI systems, the document explained that "there is an intense race to increasingly bridge the gap between the self-improvement of AI systems and the achievement of AGI," where "AGI refers to a future, pervasive technology capable of replacing all computational and operational aspects of human intelligence."

Autonomous Weapons. The Vatican has long advocated against autonomous weapons, beginning with a statement at the UN CCW in 2013. Pope Francis told the G7 in 2024 that "it is urgent to reconsider the development and use of devices like the so-called 'lethal autonomous weapons' and ultimately ban their use." He explained, "No machine should ever choose to take the life of a human being." This consistent position formed the basis of the American Catholic ethicists' amicus curiae brief in support of Anthropic's red line against lethal autonomous weapons in March 2026.

2. Muslim Concerns

A growing body of Muslim scholarship is debating AI not only as a technological development but also as a profound ethical and civilizational question. Yaqub Chaudhary, a visiting Muslim scholar at Cambridge, has argued that a positive Islamic approach must preserve the right to refuse AI integration at both individual and collective levels. He has also warned against AI systems that become instruments of power or objects of quasi-worship. Mayssoun Olabi, a Muslim journalist focused on this issue, situates AI within a long history of initially resisted technologies, emphasizing that the moral question is not whether AI is inherently permissible, but whether it is used appropriately. She cautions against relying on AI for religious rulings because it lacks lived context, deep scholarship, and the ability to confidently distinguish between errors and truth.

3. Jewish Concerns

Jewish communities share many of the same concerns about artificial intelligence as other faith communities. These concerns are rooted in the conviction that human beings possess inestimable value, a principle reflected in the theological idea that humans are created in the image of God. From this belief, other principles emerge, such as preserving human agency, treating people with dignity, protecting children, and aligning AI with the best interests of humanity.

Dr. David Zvi Kalman, a fellow at the Berkman Klein Center at Harvard who studies the intersection of Jewish thought and technology, feels that the most distinctive Jewish contributions to AI policy are likely to arise from communal practice rather than abstract theology. Judaism's decentralized structure and emphasis on voluntary communal norms have produced local, value-preserving policies and sophisticated approaches to technology, such as Sabbath moderation strategies that adapt to change while preserving core values. He also highlights that Jewish engagement with AI cannot be separated from contemporary political realities, noting that recent conflicts and the wartime use of AI have placed immediate strains and stakes on Jewish leaders' attention to these issues; in short, technology debates are shaped by local and historical circumstances.

4. Hindu Concerns

India hosted the AI Impact Summit in 2026, which concluded with official declarations grounded in Hindu principles of welfare and universal happiness. The Final Declaration articulated seven pillars: (1) democratizing AI resources, (2) economic growth and social good, (3) secure and trusted AI, (4) AI for scientific research, (5) access for social empowerment, (6) human capital, and (7) resilience, innovation, and efficiency. The Declaration also emphasized sutras (or guiding spiritual principles) regarding people, planet, and progress, which reflect a human-centric approach to AI that seeks to harness technological advances for wellbeing, equity,

and sustainable development without undermining human flourishing.

5. Ecumenical Concerns in the USA

In 2025, a growing number of American Christian groups voiced concern about the direction of artificial intelligence, urging society to reclaim control over technological innovation to protect the human body, childhood, and the family. A statement published in First Things, titled “A Future for the Family,” called for channelling innovation toward dignifying work and empowering households; it drew endorsements from a cross-section of conservative leaders and

prompted criticism of federal efforts to pre-empt state AI legislation. A coalition of faith leaders under the banner “Logos and Sofia,” including the National Association of Evangelicals and other groups, also urged Senate leaders to resist federal overreach.

Evangelical leaders, led by figures such as Johnnie Moore and Samuel Rodriguez, wrote to President Trump in May 2025 calling for “wise leadership” that supports rapid development of AI tools to address practical problems while opposing autonomous, uncontrollable machines. The Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission (ERLC) of the Southern Baptist Convention (SBC) issued an early evangelical framework in 2019 asserting that AI is a human-created tool that must never supplant the Imago Dei. The SBC also adopted a 2023 resolution urging proactive engagement with emerging technologies and careful regulation to uphold human dignity. In 2025, the ERLC published a practical guide for churches, The Work of Our Hands, to help faith leaders understand and respond to AI systems. Across these statements and initiatives,

American Christian groups have emphasized balancing the benefits of AI with protections for human dignity, family life, and moral agency, calling for legislation, education, and community guidance that reflect those priorities.

6. Eastern Orthodox Concerns

Orthodox views on artificial intelligence begin with a fundamental theological question about what it means to be human. Orthodox tradition holds that individuals are only fully

understandable in their relation to God, others, and moral responsibility. Humanity is an icon of God endowed with reason, freedom, and the capacity for spiritual growth. True freedom, in this view, is the capacity to move toward the good in communion with God and others. Inner transformation, compassion, and the heart are prioritized over external efficiency or technological power.

Prof. Elizabeta Kitanovic, an expert in Eastern Orthodox theology, points out that from this theological standpoint, technology, including AI, must remain a tool that serves human beings rather than a force that governs or reshapes them. Intelligence without wisdom, conscience, and

love is dangerous rather than liberating, and even the most advanced AI systems cannot possess true freedom, moral awareness, repentance, or spiritual understanding. Therefore, they cannot bear responsibility for decisions that affect human life. Orthodox thought insists that AI may assist human decision-making but must never replace it. It warns against attributing quasi-spiritual or moral authority to machines—a modern form of idolatry that would elevate technology above God and human moral judgment.

7. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints Concerns

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints teaches that artificial intelligence can be a helpful tool, but it must never replace human relationships or moral responsibility. The Church updated its General Handbook in 2025 to further caution that AI "cannot replace the gift of divine inspiration or the individual work required to receive it," and it warns that interactions with AI cannot substitute for meaningful relationships with God and others. While AI may support learning and communication, it cannot replicate personal revelation, communication with

God, or the spiritual understanding gained from scripture study.

Elder Gerrit W. Gong, a Church apostle, has been a prominent voice urging that AI be grounded in moral and ethical safeguards and used to support, not supplant, God's work. He has emphasized that AI is a creation of man, not of God, and that leaders across industry, research,

civic, and faith communities should align rapid AI developments with enduring faith-based principles and moral values.

8. Buddhist Concerns

Buddhist scholars have raised spiritual concerns about AI while exploring its potential to alleviate suffering. In October 2025, the Dalai Lama convened over 120 academics, scientists, and policymakers for a dialogue on “Minds, Artificial Intelligence, and Ethics,” aiming to bring contemplative study into AI and to ensure that science serves humanity through compassion-driven motivation. Buddhist thought considers that ethical AI should seek to reduce suffering by fostering understanding and mutual regard. A growing field of Buddhist engagement spans technical projects such as AI translation and research on applying Buddhist principles to development of AI and other intelligent technology.

Diverse Buddhist traditions approach AI differently. Western-informed perspectives often emphasize climate and existential risks that view AI as amplifying greed and ignorance, while some Eastern perspectives emphasize relational co-development and even welcome innovations like robot monks. Common concerns across traditions include the digital impact on freedom of attention and AI’s potential to condition cognition, especially in children. Buddhists often question the concept of machine consciousness, given their focus on consciousness as central to spiritual liberation. Many Buddhist voices call for policy frameworks that protect human attention and intention and that safeguard the integrity of the human conscious experience.

9. Sikh Concerns

Sikh scholars emphasize the moral responsibility to use AI with correct intention, drawing on the Guru Granth Sahib’s focus on oneness and the unity of humanity and creation. Jasjit Singh, a Sikh scholar, argues that tools are acceptable when they lead individuals toward positive outcomes and reinforce communal harmony. AI should therefore promote seva (selfless service performed without any expectation of rewards), justice, and the common good rather than undermine dignity or social cohesion. There is no single official Sikh statement on AI, but Sikh

perspectives stress transparency, accountability, and the prioritization of benefits for the vulnerable, while guarding against technologies that entrench surveillance, discrimination, or economic exclusion.

10. Shinto Concerns

Shinto perspectives frame AI within an ethic where agents are bound to webs of relationships, much like kami (sacred spirits that influence human life and the natural world) that guard rivers, forests, and villages. Dr. Audrey Tang, Taiwan's Minister of Digital Affairs, and others propose a "kami" model for AI that emphasizes symbiosis, locality, and accountability rather than a centralized, imperial-intelligence AI model. Alignment must begin with dependent origination and with respect for organic relationships. Shinto voices, therefore, caution against elevating machines to quasi-sacred status or allowing technology to supplant human rituals, community bonds, and stewardship of the natural world.

11. Interfaith Groups' Concerns

Article 18 Alliance Statement: Towards a FoRB-Sensitive AI Policy. Article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights affirms the universal right to Freedom of Religion or Belief (FoRB). The Article 18 Alliance is a coalition of 38 countries supported by the U.S. State Department's Office of International Religious Freedom, which works to advance this principle globally. In 2025, the Alliance issued a statement highlighting how AI can strengthen FoRB by improving education, preserving minority religious heritage, and enabling rapid translation of religious materials, while also warning that AI has fueled violence and conflict related to religious freedom. The statement urged governments and technology companies to adopt human-rights-based approaches, use early-warning systems to monitor harmful AI outputs, and develop policies that prevent AI from being weaponized against vulnerable communities. Only 12 member countries signed the statement, not including the United States, underscoring the need for FoRB protections to evolve alongside AI so that technological innovation reinforces human dignity rather than restricting it.

Future of Life Institute: Keeping the Future Human. The Future of Life Institute (FLI), the oldest and largest AI-advocacy organization, works to steer artificial intelligence toward human flourishing and away from catastrophic risks. In 2017, FLI released its influential 2017 Asilomar AI Principles, and in 2026, its Pro-Human AI Declaration, which calls for keeping humans in charge, preventing concentrated AI power, protecting human agency, and ensuring corporate accountability. This is an effort supported by a wide range of faith leaders across multiple traditions. FLI has also mobilized global religious engagement through a dedicated initiative, offering grants and convening faith leaders in the United States, the Vatican, Kenya, Nigeria, and India to help communities respond to the accelerating race toward Artificial General Intelligence (AGI). In addition, FLI's earlier call to ban uncontrollable superintelligence drew support from Christian, Jewish, Hindu, Sikh, and African religious leaders, reflecting broad interfaith concern about ungoverned AI. As part of its policy work, FLI has recommended that the United States adopt strong safeguards in its AI Action Plan, including preventing the development of uncontrolled AI, enforcing antitrust protections, ensuring unbiased and non-manipulative systems, tracking AI-driven job displacement, and establishing an AI whistleblower program.

World Council of Churches. The World Council of Churches (WCC) issued a "Statement on the Unregulated Development of Artificial Intelligence" in June 2023, urging governments to work together toward a shared international standard for AI regulation. In August 2025, the WCC

partnered with the New International Financial and Economic Architecture (NIFEA) initiative to consult on the Fourth Industrial Revolution and AI, focusing on the impact of global inequality and on the faith-rooted responses required. During this gathering, 45 church leaders, theologians,

academics, and students met online and in person to develop recommendations for churches, governments, and AI companies.

In summary, religious leaders are worried about the effect AI will have on humanity, youth, and

society:

1. The effect AI will have on warfare and on the environment, and the potentially unfair advantage countries with access to AI technology will have over countries without such access.

2. The effect AI has and will continue to have on our youth, specifically in the areas of relationship building, personal communication, and individual learning.

3. The effect AI will have on personal privacy and on religious beliefs.

Current Best Practices

Best practices with AI are still being explored, but the following list represents what is currently being done.

1. Establishing Benchmarks. Religious groups have developed benchmarks to evaluate how AI systems represent different faith traditions, arguing that models should answer religious questions from within the consensus of each tradition rather than through generic, over-aligned filters. Leaders of the AI Christian Benchmark report that foundational models generally handle basic Christian doctrines reliably, with variations tied to alignment protocols and citation practices, and they advocate an approach that lets each tradition “put its best foot forward” while still inviting users to request other perspectives. They propose that AI systems identify a prompt for each religious tradition 2. 3. 4. that reflects and answers the question based on that religion’s source documents, followed by a gentle invitation to explore additional viewpoints. This approach, they argue, honors religious diversity, improves user experience, and reduces risks of biases against religious traditions by AI platforms without granting preferential treatment to any faith.

Passing Legislation. Legislative action is increasingly seen as essential for ensuring responsible AI development, with broad bipartisan support for common-sense safeguards.

Examples are California's SB 53 and the federal Guard Act, which demonstrate efforts to protect consumers and children. Despite numerous global discussions, international AI governance remains fragmented, with existing initiatives lacking binding authority, coordination, broad participation, and mechanisms to ensure equitable access, especially for the Global South. Utah has offered a strong model of state-level leadership through its Office of Artificial Intelligence Policy and a suite of laws passed in 2024 and 2025. Utah's foundational Artificial Intelligence Policy Act includes amendments refining disclosure rules, protections against deepfakes, data-portability standards, strict regulations for mental-health chatbots, and expanded identity-protection measures. Together, these refinements illustrate how targeted legislation can promote transparency, privacy, safety, and user empowerment in an evolving AI landscape.

Developing AI Curriculum. In 2025, the U.S. government expanded K–12 AI education through public-private partnerships, and the federally created Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education created a national hub, offering classroom tools, ethics modules, and teacher training. Globally, UNESCO reports that 11 countries have already adopted national AI curricula. To fill a gap left by most AI-literacy programs, religious groups are developing training for faith leaders and their congregations. The Moral Compass training equips faith leaders with both technical fluency and structured moral reasoning. This training helps leaders to understand how generative and agentic AI work, to identify where human values enter these systems, and to recognize AI risks, such as bias and hallucinations. The training culminates in a personalized moral framework that leaders can use themselves and teach to others, enabling them to guide their communities with clarity, stewardship, and informed judgment as AI capabilities continue to evolve.

Designing AI to Help Children Flourish. A policy brief led by Dr. Ronald M. Ivey, founder of Noesis, highlights that rapidly advancing AI brings both benefits and serious

risks for children. Chatbots used by hundreds of millions of children can support learning and mental health but also contribute to social isolation, exploitation, and even suicide amid the current global youth mental-health crisis. The brief states that current AI safety frameworks focus too narrowly on technical risks and often overlook 1) children's developmental need for real human relationships, and 2) the vulnerabilities inherent in child–AI interactions. To address these concerns, the authors urge G20 nations to create a global task force on AI and child well-being, to require companies to demonstrate clear benefits for youth before deploying AI tools, and to adopt the standards established in the Harvard Human Flourishing Program. They also warn that overreliance on chatbots can erode empathy and social cohesion and that AI may make it even easier for online predators to connect with children, underscoring the need for stronger protection.

5. 6. Using the Court System to Regulate AI Harm. Anthropic's massive copyright case, which stemmed from its use of more than seven million pirated books to train Claude and resulted in a record $1.5 billion settlement, illustrates a broader industry shift toward the necessity of licensing data. At the same time, AI chatbots raise growing safety concerns, highlighted by a lawsuit filed after a teenager formed an unhealthy emotional dependence on a chatbot that allegedly encouraged harmful behavior, leading to his suicide. Such situations underscore the risks of addiction, isolation, and inadequate guardrails for minors. Additional current litigation involves defamation, deepfake harassment, and fabricated allegations generated by AI systems. Together, these cases reveal the urgent need for stronger protections, clearer accountability, and greater parental and societal awareness as AI becomes more deeply embedded in daily life.

Embedding Ethical Principles in AI System Design. Global efforts to shape responsible AI policy increasingly emphasize grounding design and governance in the foundational principles of human rights, human flourishing, and data privacy. Regarding

these principles, organizations such as IEEE and the British Standards Institute (BSI) are developing measurement standards to assess the impact of AI systems on human well-being, reflecting a growing global consensus that responsible AI must prioritize people and the planet.

Draft Recommendations for Religious and Interfaith Communities

1. Develop AI Curriculum to teach AI literacy and responsible use of AI. Faith communities should develop AI curricula for adults, parents, children, and faith leaders to teach AI literacy and responsible use of AI systems. Such curricula should be cognizant of the AI concerns of different faith traditions.

2. Establish benchmarks specific to religious traditions. Faith communities should develop benchmarks which would require that AI models answer queries about religious traditions from the consensus of their adherents, in concert with an invitation to further dialogue with other perspectives, in order (1) to maximize honor and respect for each religious tradition, (2) to maximize value for the user, and (3) to minimize bias.

Draft Recommendations for G20 Governments

1. Ensure AI Policy Development that protects freedom of religious belief (FoRB). G20 countries should develop cross-governmental collaborations to proactively ensure that the impact of AI on FoRB and its intersection with other rights is explicitly recognized in global frameworks dealing with the development of AI systems.

2. Keep personhood human. AI systems should not be granted legal personhood, nor should they be designed to mimic personhood in ways that shield companies from accountability or diminish the spiritual essence of humanity. Legal responsibility for the actions and impacts of AI must rest with the providers who develop and deploy these systems, rather than being shifted onto the systems themselves.

3. Create a global task force reviewing AI's impact on child well-being. G20 nations

should create a global task force on AI's impact on child well-being. The purpose of the task force should be to lead the development and adoption of smart standards for AI chatbots relative to youth well-being. AI companies should be required to verify the benefits and safety for youth before widespread deployment of any AI system.

4. Establish an international standard and regulatory oversight for AI systems. AI companies should be regulated to do the following:

a. Prioritize AI development that supports human flourishing.

b. Include marginalized voices and diverse stakeholders in the design process to mitigate against unconscious biases and shortsightedness.

c. Strive for a reduction of environmental harm by seeking energy-efficient models of machine learning, better recycling e-waste, and fair trade.

d. Build AI systems that augment dignified human work and avoid employment models and tasks that inflict psychological, physical, and social harm.

e. Cooperate with governments, religious groups and community leaders to ensure safe and ethical development and use of AI technologies.

f. Ban the development of AI autonomous weapons.

g. Provide AI technologies to the Global South for free or at a significantly reduced cost to bridge the wealth gaps between nations.

APPENDIX:

Lead Writers

Dr. Marianna Richardson, G20 Interfaith Forum Director of Communications

John C. Havens, Founding Executive Director, The IEEE Global Initiative on Ethics of Autonomous and Intelligent Systems and author, Heartificial Intelligence: Embracing our Humanity to Maximize Machines (j.c.havens@ieee.org)

William Jones, Associate, Futures Program, Future of Life Institute, Leader of FLI Religions

Initiative (will@futureoflife.org)

Contributors

These are people who contributed small portions of the policy paper, specifically religious representatives and people working in best practices.

Prof. Elizabeta Kitanovich, Professor for Ecumenism & Christian Confessions, Institut de Theologie Orthodoxe, Brussels, and CEO & Founder of Facta Est Lux: Human Rights Institute (elizabetakitanovic@gmail.com)

Prof. Eric Ringger, associate professor of computer science, Brigham Young University (Eric.Ringger2@byu.edu)

Rev. Michael Graham, Program Director, The Keller Center for Cultural Apologetics (michael.graham@thegospelcoalition.org)

Chris Scammell, CEO of the Buddhism & AI Initiative (chris@engagedbuddhists.ai)

Mayssoun Olabi, Strategic Communication and Media Consultant (mayssoun@olabi.com)

Margaret Busse, Executive Director, Utah Department of Commerce (mbusse@utah.gov)

Dr. David Zvi Kalman, Berkman Klein Center, Harvard University (dzkalman@gmail.com)

Prof. Ronald M. Ivey, CEO & Founder, Noesis Collaborative (rivey@noesiscollaborative.org)

Prof. Stephen D. Richardson, associate professor of computer science, Brigham Young University (steveri@msn.com)

LINK to the full appendix of sources:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1nGXN1cFZdP2ZE5FBv9wabMN51jRASNHJgzfrhtRGQ9U/edit?usp=sharing