



Educating the Person Today: A Personalist Critique of AI in Education

Kenichi Andreau F. Tigas, LPT
De La Salle University
Email: kenichi_tigas@dlsu.edu.ph

Abstract

The ethical use of modern technology is put in question vis-à-vis the inalienable dignity of human persons. Machines, computers, and electronic devices pose not merely opportunities and advantages for human advancement but also serious problems and risks that can lead to dehumanization. The same issue resurfaces, particularly involving using artificial intelligence (AI) systems in education. With the rise of AI systems that aid various stakeholders in accomplishing tasks and the end of education, these tools have also engendered a wide array of challenges to the human person who utilizes them. Issues concerning human agency, creativity, and the ethical use of AI systems have prompted discussions about how AI systems can, rather than harm, uplift and realize the dignity of the learner. This paper outlines a personalist critique of the dehumanizing effects of AI systems in education through the intellectual thought of some personalists. Moreover, this paper advances the ultimate position that, despite the dehumanizing effects of AI systems, philosophers have also structured a personalist response to advance the dignity of the human person amidst technological dehumanization. Ultimately, to realize the aims of this paper, it shall delve into its main problematic: how does philosophy address the dehumanization of artificial intelligence in education?

Keywords: Artificial intelligence, education, human person, dignity, personalism

Introduction

The question of the ethical use of artificial intelligence (AI) has been debated in many institutions today more than ever. Political and economic institutions have expressed their concern about the implications of the use of artificial intelligence in the systems of production, employment, and other aspects. Many religious institutions have also conveyed their anticipation and worries about the positive and negative effects that the use of artificial intelligence could bring about to their users.¹ Most importantly, the question of the ethical use of artificial intelligence has extensively involved the area of education, which, despite the possibilities and opportunities that it brings, also poses significant threats and risks to the educational enterprise.

The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) has raised the ‘game-changing’ possibility of artificial intelligence that, despite the invaluable tools that it can provide for students, especially those who are disabled or living in remote areas, artificial intelligence in learning also “raise questions about the digital divide, data confidentiality, and the preponderance of major corporations.”² Efforts for crafting efficient policies on the ethical use of artificial intelligence in the learning sector involve an enormous challenge for administrators and policymakers. At the core of these efforts, policymakers must ensure that they are centered on the human person³ while initiating and “[enhancing human-centered approaches to pedagogy and [respecting] “ethical norms and standards.”⁴

Intellectuals have also ruminated on the ethical use of artificial intelligence and all other ethical dilemmas. Many have associated this rumination with a philosophical inquiry into the core of such dilemmas or have placed the human person and their dignity at the center of its discussion. A witness to the variegated horrors and injustices perpetrated against the human person, Karol Wojtyła (now

¹ See also, Dicastery for the Doctrine of the Faith and Dicastery for Culture and Education, *Antiqua et Nova: Note on the Relationship Between Artificial Intelligence and Human Intelligence*, (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2025).

² UNESCO. “Education in the age of artificial intelligence” in *The UNESCO Courier*, ed. Agnès Bardon (Paris: UNESCO, 2023), 5.

³ Ibid., 5.

⁴ Ibid., 5.

St. John Paul II) has been a prominent critic of social structures that denigrated the dignity of the human person and proposed a veritable philosophical framework for his personalism. His brand of personalism emphasized the dignity of the human person who is situated in different aspects of life and existence, such as but not limited to sexuality, marriage, family life, labor, and socio-economic development.⁵ More importantly, his philosophical thought centered on the human person is instrumental in decoding the principles of a personalist critique of the ethical use of artificial intelligence in education as envisioned by this paper.

Philosophers Jacques Maritain,⁶ Martin Buber,⁷ Nikolas Berdyaev and Emmanuel Mounier have also written an extensive account on the value of the human being in light of various contemporary problems ushering in from the period of modernity. Despite living before the proliferation of the use of AI systems, these thinkers have advanced the dignity of the human person in challenging times similar to what is experienced at present – the threat of wars, authoritarian regimes, and the birth of global neoliberal exchange, among others.

Through these philosophical systems that concentrate on the irreducible value of the human person vis-à-vis education, this paper concretizes its vision of advancing a personalist critique in light of the question of the ethical use of artificial intelligence systems. These personalist and existential philosophers justify relevant philosophical frameworks that address the concerns of this study, i.e., the dignity of

⁵ Wojtyła's rich intellectual heritage flows from his abundant literature that covers a variety of themes. His thoughts from texts such as *The Acting Person*, *Love and Responsibility*, and selected essays in *The Person and Community*, among others, exhibit the wide array of moral concerns that he attempted to address.

⁶ Aside from writing in the tradition of the Angelic Doctor, Maritain's philosophy was also characterized as a form of Christian personalism, highlighting the dignity of the human person in political affairs, and most especially, in education. See also Jacques Maritain, *Education at the Crossroads* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, Inc., 1943), and Jacques Maritain, *The Education of Man: The Educational Philosophy of Jacques Maritain* (New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1962).

⁷ Buber's existential philosophy on human relations that is particularly ascribed in his work *I and Thou* span a practical application in many contexts of human relationships which may be realized in the area of education and the use of artificial intelligence.

the human person, education, and the integration of these realities to areas of human existence, such as the use of artificial intelligence.

This paper shall attempt to address the main problem: *how does philosophy address the dehumanization of artificial intelligence in education?* To further the objectives of this paper, it shall be directed by these questions: 1) How do artificial intelligence systems dehumanize the learners and the education process?; 2) How does philosophy, personalism in particular, respond to the dehumanizing effects of AI systems on education; and 3) What concrete personalist values can be established to address the dehumanizing impact of AI systems on education?

Through the personalist position of philosophers such as Karol Wojtyła, Jacques Maritain, Martin Buber, Nikolas Berdyaev, and others, this paper stresses the immense impact caused by artificial intelligence systems on education and how they can be addressed through the personalist values of the aforementioned thinkers. In securing a more humane and dignified use of AI systems, the personalist position remains indispensable insofar as the ultimate agent involved in the educational process and artificial intelligence systems is the human person.

The Human Person, Education, and Artificial Intelligence

The release of ChatGPT in 2022 raised various concerns about the impact of artificial intelligence in schools.⁸ Not only does the said application, powered by artificial intelligence, cause concern to the learners, but also to teachers and the whole educational enterprise. The UNESCO's document for guiding policy-makers on the use of artificial intelligence has also emphasized this concern that while "intelligent, adaptive, and personalized learning systems" were being mobilized and marketed for its use in education, "the application of AI in educational contexts raises profound questions – for example about what should be taught and how, the evolving role of teachers, and AI's social and ethical implications... including issues such as educational equity and access."⁹

⁸ See also Ben Williamson, "AI must be kept in check at school," in *The UNESCO Courier*, ed. Agnès Bardón (Paris: UNESCO, 2023), 6.

⁹ UNESCO, *AI and education: guidelines for policymakers* (Paris: UNESCO, 2021), 5.

While the definition and use of artificial intelligence are profoundly entangled with philosophical questions on what constitutes intelligence and whether machines can really be intelligent, discussions on this contemporary issue also encompass the human aspect.¹⁰ It has already been established that the human person—the learner, the teacher, and all other human stakeholders of the educational institution—is the most significant part of education. Thus, the dignity of the human person, the personalist aspect, is indispensable in the discussion of artificial intelligence.

This discussion on the intersecting themes of the human person, education, and artificial intelligence does not concentrate on the question of the dignity of artificial intelligence, or, as Andreas Matthias inquires in his study, if “autonomously acting, decision-making artefacts, like robots and computer programs, can possess some property analogous in function to human dignity.”¹¹ This discussion concentrates on an inquiry into how artificial intelligence systems safeguard or endanger the dignity of the human person in education or how such AI systems initiate opportunities for preserving human dignity, especially in the area of education.

Furthermore, the profound connection between the human person, education, and artificial intelligence resonated with Sean Kanuck’s idea. He contends that the ethics of artificial intelligence does not differ from other ethics associated with the human person, as such involves human action. He posits,

The ethics of AI should not, however, be considered a *sui generis* field of its own, because it is just one more instrumentality of human action. How human beings design, deploy, utilize, and rely upon AI will be an expression of our will and intentionality, even if mediated by a highly capable and seemingly independent computer processor. We are masters of, and therefore responsible for, our own creations.¹²

¹⁰ Ibid., 6.

¹¹ Andreas Matthias, “Dignity and Dissent in Humans and Non-humans,” *Science and Engineering Ethics* 26, no. 5 (2020): 2497.

¹² Sean Kanuck, “Humor, Ethics, and Dignity: Being Human in the Age of Artificial Intelligence,” *Ethics & International Affairs* 33, no. 1 (2019), 3.

Understanding the morality of artificial intelligence, in this sense, is established on the reality of human action, which makes it different from the action of AI systems, and the reality and dignity of personhood that sets it different from AI systems. In light of Kantian ethics, Andreas Matthias also stressed the dignity of the human person in light of the ethics of artificial intelligence. He argues,

[T]he justification for human dignity for Kant lies in the ability of *individual* human beings to be creators of the 'moral law' as well as its subjects. It is based on the essential moral autonomy and freedom of the human being. Given this, artefacts could only claim dignity if they could exhibit a comparable degree of moral autonomy to human beings.¹³

In many aspects of human existence and action, the human person possesses dignity and autonomy. Even with the rise of artificial intelligence in education, the human person gains primacy. The emergence of these phenomena and the attempt to "overthrow anthropocentric ethical theories" endangers the dignity of the moral human person with his agency and autonomy.¹⁴

The agency of learners in using artificial intelligence must be highly considered in crafting policies in education on its use. Educational outcomes and learning assessments accomplished with the aid of artificial intelligence must ensure that they magnify the dignity of the human person and harness human capacities and skills that are more supreme and noble than the abilities of artificial intelligence systems.

Dehumanization and Artificial Intelligence in Education

The human learner is at the heart of the educational process, just as he also belongs at the very core of every society.¹⁵ At the heart of this educational process is the affirmation of the learner's

¹³ Andreas Matthias, "Dignity and Dissent in Humans and Non-humans," 2508.

¹⁴ See also Richard A. Spinello, "Karol Wojtyła on Artificial Moral Agency and Moral Accountability," *The National Catholic Bioethics Center* (2011): 470.

¹⁵ Justin Onyeukaziri, "Artificial Intelligence and an Anthropological Ethics of Work: Implications on the Social Teaching of the Church," *Religions* 15, no. 623 (2024), 1.

irreducible dignity. More than material success and the practical use of education, its task and ultimate end is the formation of the learner so that the latter will be able to realize and fulfill himself. Maritain accentuates this reality in view of education and contends that “[w]hat we are fighting for is human dignity, justice, freedom, law, the eternal call which makes every human person worthy of respect and love, and the openness of the future to liberating and fraternal work.”¹⁶

The noble end of education stems from the value inherent in the human person, from his irreducible dignity. It signifies a reality that the human learner is primarily above the educational process and not the other way around. Nicolas Berdyaev, a Russian religious existentialist known for his personalist-oriented views, affirms this personalist position and asserts that the human person stands above the natural world. He posits that, “man is a profound riddle to himself, for he bears witness to the existence of a higher world... man is discontented with himself and capable of outgrowing himself... the very fact of the existence of man is a break in the natural world and proves that nature cannot be self-sufficient but rests upon a supernatural reality.”¹⁷

The age of modern technology, particularly with the rise of artificial intelligence (AI) systems, challenges this position, which critically claims the equal significance of AI systems and the human person, or even the prominence of the former over the latter, leading to dehumanization. Hernandez affirms this possibility, which has now become the situation describing the relationship between human beings and machines.¹⁸ This situation has caused disruptions in labor scenarios, questioning the ethical use and creativity of the human being in the use of technology in art.¹⁹

Anchoring on the personalist values of selected philosophers, this section shall outline some issues pertinent to the dehumanization of the human person in the use of artificial intelligence systems in education.

¹⁶ Jacques Maritain, *The Education of Man: The Educational Philosophy of Jacques Maritain* (New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1962), 181.

¹⁷ Nicolas Berdyaev, *The Destiny of Man* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960), 45-46.

¹⁸ Carl Jayson Hernandez, “Revisiting Martin Buber’s Believing Humanism: Preliminary Study on Buberian Art and Technology,” *Scientia: The International Journal on the Liberal Arts* 14, no. 1 (2025): 83.

¹⁹ Hernandez, 82.

1. *Dehumanized learning experience and loss of human creativity*

Following Plato's idea of education as *paideia*, Jacques Maritain suggests that the learner does not acquire knowledge from the teacher but the latter merely awakens knowledge in the former, which he already knows.²⁰ He even compares it to medicine as *ars cooperativa naturae* by which education is considered as an "art of ministering, an art subservient to nature."²¹ The "mind's natural activity on the part of the learner" and the "intellectual guidance of the teacher" represent the ministering aspect of the educational process.²² This dynamism and ministering aspect of education stresses the human and humanizing nature of education represented by human beings who fulfill its task and ends.

Karol Wojtyła affirms this position, considering that education is a form of human action. Alinia Rynio, in looking into the relationship between Karol Wojtyła's personalism and education. She suggests,

In light of the teaching of Wojtyła, it can be said that every human being, by virtue of having reason and free will, is responsible for himself/herself, for another human being, and the whole world. Being a mature man means being responsible. This follows from the fact that for Wojtyła, a person was someone, not something. A man is a person by nature, and by nature, a man is entitled to the subjectivity proper to a person.²³

Education and the human person sealed a significant relationship that aims at the total formation of the latter. With the rise of AI systems for use in education, a dehumanized learning experience could ensue, propelled by a severe dependence on learning machines

²⁰ Jacques Maritain, *Education at the Crossroads* (London: Yale University Press, 1943), 29.

²¹ Maritain, 30.

²² Maritain, 31.

²³ Alina Rynio, "Education for Responsible Freedom in the Teaching of Karol Wojtyła – John Paul II," in *The Person and the Challenges* 14, no. 1 (2024): 81.

and AI algorithms, or greater interaction of students with machines than with human teachers.²⁴

The dehumanized learning experience engendered by the use of AI systems in education could also bring about an issue on the creativity of the human person. Nicolas Berdyaev, in *The Destiny of Man*, remains within the Catholic definition of man as a creative being in the context of creation.²⁵ Martin Buber raises this question in his work *Between Man and Man*: What does “the development of the creative powers in the child” mean?²⁶ Buber beautifully expresses this reality in his depiction of a child delivering a speech. He describes,

A good expression of this instinct is the way children of intellectual passion produce speech, in reality not as something they have taken over but with the headlong powers of utter newness: sound after sound tumbles out of them, rushing from the vibrating throat past the trembling lips into the world’s air, and the whole of the little vital body vibrates and trembles, too, shaken by a bursting shower of selfhood.²⁷

Hernandez comments and affirms this Buberian stance on human creativity in light of the use of AI systems. He asserts that “Buber’s philosophy recommends creativity rather than mechanical or bundled lifeless thinking and living” and that “creative thinking and acting involve an intensive experience that causes something that was not there before.”²⁸ With the use of AI systems, the learner risks being subsumed by the machine being used in learning, by the algorithm that it presents, or by the culture that it suggests in facilitating education while AI systems stand at its heart.

2. Risk to critical thinking and human autonomy

²⁴ Mario Fabricio Ayala-Pazmiño, “Artificial Intelligence in Education: Exploring the Potential Benefits and Risks,” *Digital Publisher CEIT* 8, no. 3 (2023): 894.

²⁵ Berdyaev, *The Destiny of Man*, 53.

²⁶ Martin Buber, *Between Man and Man*, trans. Ronald Gregor-Smith (London and New York: Routledge Classics, 2002), 98.

²⁷ Buber, 101.

²⁸ Hernandez, 88.

While AI systems are harnessed to facilitate education today and are capable of performing tasks similar to what human persons can do, the issue that surfaces from their use must also adhere to the values that uphold the dignity of the human person. Despite the capacity of AI systems to perform tasks of human beings, they pose great risks to the human person, especially at present, where AI systems do not merely possess skills but are even capable of understanding and processing general information.²⁹ This is a challenge to educational institutions where critical thinking and problem-solving skills are developed and advanced.

The Dicastery for the Doctrine of the Faith and the Dicastery for Culture and Education of the Holy See had also stressed the significance of these values in their document on the ethical use of artificial intelligence, *Antiqua et Nova*. The document outlines the philosophical, theological, and anthropological foundations of the ethical use of artificial intelligence systems today. It presents a compelling perspective on how AI systems can be utilized in the field of education. The document reads,

Education in the use of forms of artificial intelligence should aim above all at promoting critical thinking. Users of all ages, but especially the young, need to develop a discerning approach to the use of data and content collected on the web or produced by artificial intelligence systems. Schools, universities, and scientific societies are challenged to help students and professionals grasp the social and ethical aspects of the development and use of technology.³⁰

The prevalent use of AI systems today poses serious challenges to the task of education in forming critical learners. Not only do AI

²⁹ Various classifications of artificial intelligence systems were developed that cater to different skills and needs. Some are generative, and at present, AGI or artificial general intelligence has been developed that is capable for understanding and processing general information. See also William Stewart, "The human biological advantage over AI," *AI & Society* 40 (2025): 2182.

³⁰ Dicastery for the Doctrine of the Faith and Dicastery for Culture and Education, *Antiqua et Nova: Note on the Relationship Between Artificial Intelligence and Human Intelligence* (Citta del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2025).

systems diminish the capacity for critical thinking, but they also endanger the human person's autonomy and agency in the realization of the educational process. Onyeukaziri, in his appropriation of Wojtyła's personalism in the area of artificial intelligence, maintains that the actions performed by artificial intelligence systems and human beings are far different from each other, the latter possessing authority and agency. He asserts,

...AI can produce actions, but not free actions. Hence, since an AI system can produce action, it could be said to be an agent. But since AI cannot produce free actions, it is not a free agent. Therefore, AIs are deterministic agents (do not have free agency), while the human person only has free agency... Hence, AI does not produce *operari*—actions with moral and ethical implications (being responsible, being praised or blamed) - having the self-awareness of "I ought to act thus... but I will act otherwise."³¹

Artificial intelligence systems are undoubtedly powerful tools for humanity in the future of education. But accompanying this immense power are the dangers to the capacity of humanity. AI systems endanger the human capacity for rational and critical thinking due to their capacity to perform actions similar to those of human persons, actions that may cause human beings to rely on the sufficient aid provided by these systems. Moreover, with the help provided by AI systems in education, human persons are threatened with losing their sense of autonomy in whatever they do in the area of education. Learners may lose the sense of autonomy in accomplishing the task of education, losing their imprint in their educational activity to machines and software systems.

3. *Lessened engagement in the human community*

³¹ Justin Nnaemeka Onyeukaziri, "Action and Agency in Artificial Intelligence: A Philosophical Critique," *Philosophia: International Journal of Philosophy* 24, no. 1 (2023): 85.

The power of artificial systems has greatly affected the notion of 'social'. Kathleen Richardson, in underscoring the I-You relation in the ethical use of artificial intelligence, asserts that this idea has changed; today, social means sitting alone in front of a computer and does not just refer to engagement with another person.³² The capacities of artificial intelligence systems to connect the human person to modern-day innovations and other human persons in other places are also daunted by the risk of cutting the ties of the human person to their community.

With the rise of chatbots and AI machines, the capacities of AI systems to perform human skills and actions extend to being involved in dialogue or conversations. In the area of education, AI systems could perform the skills and actions of human teachers, a situation that may imperil human capacities and even the employment of real human educators.

Michael Burdett, in understanding the possible relations of human persons to AI systems, posits that such relations with AI systems are possible. However, with these relations with AI systems, it also brings about the pitfall of replacing "more robust I-You relations with other persons and higher agents."³³ Despite the capacity of AI systems to engage in meaningful, human-like conversations and exchange, the human desire to extend one's self to the other in this dialogue requires authentically human conversations and must not be replaced by AI systems, hence be aided only by these machines. The values that flow out of this social existence were stressed by Maritain as he attempts to address the conundrum of why human beings seek to live in society. He conjectures that human beings do so because of their "very perfections, as persons, and [their] inner urge to the communications of knowledge and love which require relationship with other persons."³⁴ The values established in living with other human persons may also be jeopardized, in line with the self-

³² Kathleen Richardson, "Rethinking the I-You relation through dialogical philosophy in the Ethics of AI and robotics," *AI & Society* 34 (2017): 1.

³³ Michael Burdett, "Personhood and Creation in an Age of Robots and AI: Can We Say "You" to Artifacts," *Zygon: Journal of Religion and Science* 55, no. 2 (2020): 359.

³⁴ Jacques Maritain, *The Person and the Common Good* (Indiana: Notre Dame University Press, 1972), 47.

realization and self-fulfillment of the person in the *communio personarum*.³⁵

Toward a Humane Use of Artificial Intelligence

The problem with the use of artificial intelligence systems is not merely methodological or systematic. It also disturbs the philosophical and anthropological foundations of human personality and challenges the position of the human person who claims primacy over artificial intelligence systems, and not vice versa. Despite numerous advancements and innovations made by AI systems, the risks that they pose severely dehumanize the human person. They could possibly bring about a dehumanized learning experience with the risk of losing a sense of human creativity, they bring risk to critical thinking and loss of sense of human autonomy, and they threaten the human community from participating in the formation of the human learner.

However, beyond these risks of the use of artificial intelligence systems in education are attempts to humanize and see its humane use in the educational process. Various philosophers have laid out their personalist musings on how the human person could affirm and uphold their dignity, especially in the area of education, with its modern advancements, such as the use of AI systems.

Fioravante and Vaccaro uphold this stance and consider the personalist position as a veritable argument to advocate for a more humane use of AI systems in light of the creative expression of the human artist.³⁶ On the one hand, Buber's vision for the relation of persons with each other recalls the same position. On the other hand, the humanization of learning does not only encompass the human person but also an attempt to humanize the tools harnessed by the human learner. Hernandez stresses,

Thus, the practical steps to concretize what Buber advocates are establishing ethical guidelines, convening for interdisciplinary reflections and meditations, and aspiring to maintain a dialogic relationship with all beings, consequently leading

³⁵ See also Karol Wojtyła, "The Person: Subject and Community," in *Person and Community: Selected Essays*, trans. Theresa Sandok (New York: Peter Lang, 1993), 246.

³⁶ Fioravante and Vaccaro, 1.

human beings to be disenchanted with the distorted notion of progress and become more truly human.³⁷

The words of Paulo Freire in his monumental work on his philosophy of education, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, present a truly enriching and human way to approach the possibility of dehumanization caused by AI systems. Technology used in education, especially artificial intelligence systems, is at the service of the humanization of persons if they are used for their sake.³⁸ This is affirmed by Karol Wojtyła, who upholds the realities of self-possession, self-governance, and self-fulfillment in the action performed by the human person. He maintains that “the person can turn toward himself, sees himself as incomplete and through the structures of self-determination, self-possession and self-governance, can fulfill, to complete himself.”³⁹ This phenomenon must be at the core of the use of artificial intelligence systems in education—AI systems must be at the service of the human person while providing opportunities for the latter’s fulfillment of purpose, and preservation of dignity.

Conclusion

The use of artificial intelligence systems in education is a shift of paradigm from conventional methods and resources of teaching and learning. Educational institutions can no longer reverse the impact of AI systems in various aspects of pedagogy. However, as discussed, there will always be renewed efforts and practices that will enhance and humanize the use of artificial intelligence.

Through the valuable personalist systems of the abovementioned philosophers, the digital revolt caused by artificial intelligence reemerges with a renewed personalistic identity as a tool of the human person for self-fulfillment and expression of emancipation from oppressive structures in education. Freire, in *Pedagogy of Freedom*, continues to call for a more humane delivery of

³⁷ Hernandez, 91.

³⁸ See also Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York: Continuum, 2005), 159.

³⁹ Jove Jim S. Aguas, *Person, Action and Love: The Philosophical Thoughts of Karol Wojtyła (John Paul II)*, (Manila: UST Publishing House, 2014), 105.

education through the values of autonomy, freedom, and self-determination. He asserts,

It is this perception of men and women as people “programmed” to learn and therefore to teach, to know, and to intervene that makes me understand educational practice as a permanent exercise in favor of the production of intellectual thought and of the development of the autonomy of both teachers and students. As a strictly human experience, I could never treat education as something cold, mental, merely technical, and without soul, where feelings, sensibility, desires, and dreams had no place, as if repressed by some kind of reactionary dictatorship.⁴⁰

As rich expressions of their intellectual heritage that proceed from veritable philosophical thoughts and schools, the personalist philosophical position enjoins the human community to anticipate the prowess of artificial intelligence as an efficient instrument that helps the human person realize his fulfillment and maximization of the fullest human potential in education. In the end, artificial intelligence must serve its creator, the human person who fashioned such technology with his own hands, intellect, and personhood.

References

- Acosta, Miguel, and Reimers, Adrian J. *Karol Wojtyła's Personalist Philosophy: Understanding Person and Act*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2016.
- Aguas, Jove Jim S. *Person, Action and Love: The Philosophical Thoughts of Karol Wojtyla (John Paul II)*. Manila: UST Publishing House, 2014.
- Ayala-Pazmiño, Mario Fabricio. “Artificial Intelligence in Education: Exploring the Potential Benefits and Risks.” *Digital Publisher CEIT* 8, no. 3 (2023): 892-899.

⁴⁰ Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of Freedom: Ethics, Democracy, and Civic Courage*, trans. Patrick Clarke (Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc, 1998), 128-129.

- Berdyayev, Nicolas. *The Destiny of Man*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960.
- Buber, Martin. *Between Man and Man*, trans. Ronald Gregor-Smith. London and New York: Routledge Classics, 2002.
- Byrnes, James T. *Towards a Catholic Philosophy of Education: The Personalism of Karol Wojtyła and the Education of the Human Person*. New York: Fordham University, 2000.
- Burdett, Michael. "Personhood and Creation in an Age of Robots and AI: Can We Say "You" to Artifacts?" *Zygon: Journal of Religion and Science* 55, no. 2 (2020): 347-360.
- Dancák, Pavol. "Contemporary Reflection on Participation as an Essential Dimension of Philosophy of Education in the Context of *The Acting Person*." *Philosophy and Canon Law* 7, no. 1 (2021): 1-14.
- Dicastery for the Doctrine of the Faith and Dicastery for Culture and Education. *Antiqua et Nova: Note on the Relationship Between Artificial Intelligence and Human Intelligence*. Citta del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2025.
- Fioravante, Rosa, and Vaccaro, Antonino. "Personalism in Generative AI Deployment: Deciding Ethically When Human Creative Expression is at Stake." *Human Management Journal* (2024).
- Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of Freedom: Ethics, Democracy, and Civic Courage*, trans. Patrick Clarke. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1998.
- Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Heart*, trans. Ana Maria Araújo Freire. New York: Continuum, 2007.
- Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of Hope: Reliving Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, trans. Robert R. Barr. London and New York: Bloomsbury, 1994.
- Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, trans. Myra Bergman Ramos. New York: Continuum, 2005.
- Gadotti, Moacir. *Reading Paulo Freire: His Life and Work*, trans. John Milton. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994.
- Hernandez, Carl Jayson. "Revisiting Martin Buber's Believing Humanism: Preliminary Study on Buberian Art and Technology." *Scientia: The International Journal on the Liberal Arts* 14, no. 1 (2025): 82-93.
- Onyeukaziri, Jsutin Nnaemeka. "Action and Agency in Artificial Intelligence: A Philosophical Critique." *Philosophia: An International Journal of Philosophy*, 23, no. 1 (2023): 73-90.

- Onyeukaziri, Justin Nnaemeka. "Artificial Intelligence and an Anthropological Ethics of Work: Implications on the Social Teaching of the Church." *Religions* 15, no. 623 (2024): 1-11.
- Jeziorański, Marek. "Educational Relationship in the Context of Karol Wojtyła's Moral Teaching about the Human Act." *Roczniki Pedagogiczne* 13, no. 49 (2021): 25-34.
- Kanuck, Sean. "Humor, Ethics, and Dignity: Being Human in the Age of Artificial Intelligence." *Ethics & International Affairs* 33, no. 1 (2019): 3-12.
- Maritain, Jacques. *The Education of Man: The Educational Philosophy of Jacques Maritain*. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1962.
- Maritain, Jacques. *The Person and the Common Good*. Indiana: Notre Dame University Press, 1972.
- Matthias, Andreas. "Dignity and Dissent in Humans and Non-Humans." *Science and Engineering Ethics* 26, no. 5 (2020): 2497-2510.
- Onyeukaziri, Justin Nnaemeka. "Action and Agency in Artificial Intelligence: A Philosophical Critique." *Philosophia: International Journal of Philosophy* 24, no. 1 (2023): 73-90.
- Richardson, Kathleen. "Rethinking the I-You relation through dialogical philosophy in the Ethics of AI and robotics," *AI & Society* 34 (2017): 1-2.
- Rynio, Alina. "Education for Responsible Freedom in the Teaching of Karol Wojtyła – John Paul II." *The Person and the Challenges* 14, no. 1 (2024): 75-88.
- Spinello, Richard A. "Karol Wojtyła on Artificial Moral Agency and Moral Accountability." *The National Catholic Bioethics Center* (2011): 469-491.
- Stewart, William. "The human biological advantage over AI," *AI & Society* 40 (2025): 2181-2190.
- UNESCO. *AI and education: guidelines for policymakers*. Paris: UNESCO, 2021.
- UNESCO. "Education in the age of artificial intelligence." In *The UNESCO Courier*, edited Agnès Bardón. Paris: UNESCO, 2023.
- UNESCO. *Recommendations on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence*. Paris: UNESCO, 2022.
- Williamson, Ben. "AI must be kept in check at school," in *The UNESCO Courier*, edited by Agnès Bardón. Paris: UNESCO, 2023.

- Wojtyła, Karol. "On the Dignity of the Human Person," in *Person and Community: Selected Essays*, trans. Theresa Sandok, 177-180. New York: Peter Lang, 1993.
- Wojtyła, Karol. *Person and Community: Selected Essays*, trans. Theresa Sandok. New York: Peter Lang, 1993.
- Wojtyła, Karol. "Subjectivity and the Irreducible in the Human Being." In *Person and Community: Selected Essays*, trans. Theresa Sandok, 209-218. New York: Peter Lang, 1993.
- Wojtyła, "The Person: Subject and Community," in *Person and Community: Selected Essays*, trans. Theresa Sandok, 219-262. New York: Peter Lang, 1993.
- Wojtyła, Karol. *The Acting Person*, trans. Andrzej Potocki. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1979.