
Ethical Limits of Technological Dependence: Preventing Disasters Like the Palisades and Eaton Wildfires

Afunugo, Kenechi Nnaemeka

Department Of Religion and Human Relations

Faculty of Arts

Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria

Abstract

The increasing frequency and severity of wildfires in Los Angeles, including the recent catastrophic Palisades and Eaton fires, highlight the urgent need to examine the ethical challenges of technological dependence in wildfire management. A qualitative descriptive approach was used in this study, drawing on data collected through personal communications, including phone calls, live chats, WhatsApp and email correspondence, with individuals who directly witnessed the events alongside extant literature, and digital news sources, with data analysed thematically. Some identities were disclosed with consent and reported respectfully. Findings revealed over-reliance on technological gadgets including automated systems and AI-driven solutions, often at the expense of proactive wildfire prevention and community involvement. Informed by the ethics of Responsibility Theory, the findings emphasise that technology should complement human vigilance and reinforce ethical accountability in environmental care. The study recommends promoting community education, integrating ethical principles into wildfire management technologies, and building partnerships among technologists, policymakers, and communities to reduce risks of technological complacency while encouraging shared responsibility for environmental preservation.

Key Words: *Ethical Limits, Technological Dependence, Disasters, Palisades, Eaton, Wildfires.*

Introduction

Throughout history, wildfires have been a natural and recurrent phenomenon, shaping ecosystems and human societies alike. Long before the advent of modern technology, Indigenous communities developed sophisticated fire management practices to coexist with and harness the benefits of wildfire. Roos (2023) accentuates that for instance, Native American tribes in North America employed controlled burns to manage vegetation, promote the growth of desired plant species, and create favourable conditions for game animals. Kane (2025) avers that these intentional fires reduced the accumulation of combustible materials, thereby mitigating the risk of uncontrolled wildfires. Such traditional ecological knowledge underscores the deep understanding Indigenous peoples had of their environments and their proactive strategies to manage wildfire risks effectively.

Van Wagtendonk (2007) explains that wildfires use began when humans learned to suppress fire, choosing to extinguish those that threatened settlements while leaving others alone. Native Americans and early settlers followed this approach. Even after suppression methods emerged in the late 1800s, efforts centered on populated areas, and remote wildfires were often ignored. The Forest Service, created in 1905, made suppression its main goal, though some foresters questioned this strategy. In the late 1960s, the National Park Service recognised the ecological value of wildfires and began allowing some lightning-caused fires under controlled conditions. The Forest Service adopted similar practices in 1974, shifting from suppression to management. Large wildfires such as Yellowstone in 1988 and Cerro Grande in 2000 led to changes in federal policy. The late 1990s and early 2000s saw agencies like the Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Land Management, and Bureau of Indian Affairs support fire use

programs. Van Wagtendonk notes that today, wildfires are a key part of federal land management, with about 6,000 fires burning 1.4 million hectares each year to help restore fire-prone ecosystems.

In the research of De Magalhães Neto et al. (2020), the 2020 fire disaster in the Pantanal, the world's largest wetland, revealed the harmful impact of human actions and too much dependence on technology, leading to serious ecological loss. Spanning over 185,000 km², this rich ecosystem suffered massive habitat destruction as hundreds of thousands of hectares, including protected areas, went up in flames. Findings presented by De Magalhães Neto et al. showed that 60 percent of the fires started within 5 kilometers of roads, rivers, and rail lines, while 80 percent were within 10 kilometers of areas shaped by human activity. These patterns point to the strong link between built infrastructure and the spread of fire. Harsh drought conditions (SPEI less than -2.6), made worse through human interference with natural systems, also gave way to fast fire growth.

Earth.Org (2024) reports that the United States has seen some of its worst wildfire events in recent years, with climate change driving the rise in both number and severity. Texas faced its largest wildfire in 2024, as the Smokehouse Creek Fire burned over 1.1 million acres, going past the 2006 East Amarillo Complex fire. The News Hub states that Hawaii met a similar tragedy in 2023 when the Maui wildfires, worsened by drought and Hurricane Dora, claimed more than 100 lives and destroyed Lahaina. California remains heavily impacted, with the Dixie Fire in 2021 burning 463,000 acres, the 2020 Bay Area Fire destroying nearly 1 million acres, and the 2018 Camp Fire killing 85 people and wiping out 19,000 homes. Earth.Org recalls earlier fires such as the 1918 Cloquet Fire in Minnesota, which burned 250,000 acres and left over 550 dead, and the Great Fire of 1910, which wiped out 3 million acres across Idaho and Montana. Even earlier, the 1871 Peshtigo Fire in Wisconsin burned 1.2 million acres and killed 1,152 people, while the Great Michigan Fire of that same year consumed 3,900 square miles and took 500 lives. The News Portal explains that although wildfire causes vary, from lightning to human action, climate change continues to worsen the situation through rising heat and falling rain levels, pressing the need for urgent climate solutions.

The Los Angeles wildfire of 2025, regarded as one of the most destructive in the county's history, reveals the layered problems of human failure, arson, and a faulty trust in technology during emergencies. MacCarthy et al. (2025) and Butler (2025) record the arrest of a man suspected of starting one of the fires, with further inquiries ongoing in the Palisades, where more than 5,300 buildings were lost. Deliberate acts of fire-setting have worsened the disaster. Firefighting teams faced severe shortages of vital resources like water despite having access to advanced detection tools. Shattered ammunition shells found near several fire sites point to careless storage of dangerous items in high-risk zones. Weak infrastructure and poor planning for rare wildfire outbreaks in January made the situation worse. The unfolding damage reflects a troubling mix of human fault, system failure, and the growing dangers of a changing climate. This study explores the ethical boundaries of technological reliance in disaster contexts, with focus on the Palisades and Eaton Fires that occurred in Los Angeles County, California, United States of America; in January 2025. It assesses how excessive trust in technology for fire prevention and response can produce unintended outcomes. The research evaluates the role of human judgment, accountability, and risk evaluation in deploying fire safety innovations. It underscores the ethical duty of developers and regulators to uphold public safety and environmental balance. This study employed a qualitative descriptive approach. Data were collected through personal communications, including phone calls, live chats, WhatsApp and email correspondence, with individuals who directly witnessed the events along with extant literature, and digital news sources. Thematic content analysis was used to identify recurring

patterns and meanings across sources. This study is grounded in the Hans Jonas's Responsibility Theory.

Theoretical Framework and Its Reinforcement of the Study

This study draws from Hans Jonas's Responsibility Theory as presented in *The Imperative of Responsibility: In Search of an Ethics for the Technological Age* (1984). The theory stresses a moral obligation to protect the future of humanity and the natural world in light of growing technological power and ecological decline. Jonas maintains that modern technology, with its far-reaching influence, demands a shift in ethical thinking toward the long-term consequences of human activity. Unlike classical ethics, which centred on immediate interpersonal conduct, Jonas's view expands moral responsibility to include future generations. This extended duty stems from humanity's distinct capacity to predict future harm and act to prevent it. Prudence and foresight, therefore, become essential virtues. Jonas emphasises the interdependence of life on earth and cautions against reckless use of technological advancement, calling for cautious innovation that preserves the future of both human society and the environment.

Jonas's theory advances the idea that preserving the earth for future generations requires deliberate care and moral restraint. He criticises modern society's reliance on technology, which often leads to overexploitation of natural resources and a failure to respect ecological balance. His ethic of responsibility calls for a proactive stance, urging individuals and institutions to anticipate long-term outcomes rather than reacting to crises after they unfold. Embracing this ethic would mean choosing sustainable environmental practices over short-sighted technological gains. Such an approach becomes crucial in preventing tragedies like the Palisades and Eaton wildfires, where technological developments may unintentionally increase ecological risks.

Jonas also addresses the vulnerability of nature in the face of unchecked innovation. He calls for a return to ethical humility, reminding humanity that while technology demonstrates human creativity, it can destabilise natural systems when misused. Disasters such as the Palisades and Eaton fires point to how urban expansion, negligence, and weak regulation can intensify environmental hazards. Jonas proposes an ethic centred on foresight, encouraging careful evaluation of technologies not only for immediate usefulness but also for their future ecological impact. This ethic favours prevention over reaction and promotes a culture of responsibility in environmental care. Societies must accept the idea that their survival is tied to the preservation of the planet. This outlook demands stronger policies and practices to protect ecosystems and ensure that technological progress serves environmental sustainability.

Jonas warns against the illusion of human control over nature. He argues that efforts to dominate the environment often ignore the limits of ecological systems and their ability to recover. This idea is key in understanding the failure of excessive fire suppression strategies, which sometimes worsen the conditions for future fires. Respecting natural cycles, rather than overriding them, leads to more effective environmental management. Jonas's theory insists on the intrinsic value of nature beyond human needs. His argument challenges the view that nature exists solely for exploitation, urging protection of forests, biodiversity, and soil health as essential elements in preventing disasters. Central to his thought is intergenerational justice, which is the obligation to hand over a viable planet to those yet to come. Rising wildfire risks, made worse by poor practices and climate change, threaten this obligation. Addressing these dangers requires responsible land use, lower carbon emissions, and prioritisation of ecological health over immediate economic interests.

Jonas advocates for a deep integration of environmental ethics into modern civilisation. His idea that humanity serves as "nature's trustee" supports the call to place moral

boundaries around technological advancement. Disasters such as the Palisades and Eaton fires reveal the dangers of ignoring those boundaries. His use of the "heuristics of fear" highlights the urgency of facing potential harm with serious ethical thought. Accepting the view that human life and nature are inseparable reveals the importance of moral responsibility in guiding technological use. Such responsibility is key to avoiding irreversible ecological and human harm.

Data-Driven Investigations

A wildfire is an uncontrolled fire that spreads through vegetation in forests, grasslands, savannas, or farmland (Jackson, 2025). It feeds on dry organic matter in and above the soil. It may start from lightning or human actions, but its spread depends on heat, wind, drought, and land slope (Jackson). Fires move faster uphill and ignite quickly in dry leaves, grass, and twigs (Stanley, 2025). Ground fires smolder in rich soil, surface fires burn low vegetation, and crown fires reach tree canopies. Though dangerous near towns, wildfires help certain plants reproduce by triggering seed release and growth, keeping natural cycles alive (Stanley).

Saavedra and Percy (2025) report illuminates that the Palisades and Eaton fires expose the danger in excessive trust in flawed technology and human error. They stress that the Palisades fire likely reignited from an earlier New Year's blaze near Skull Rock, despite containment efforts, with strong winds possibly reawakening hidden embers. This suggests a failure in post-incident vigilance and risk judgment. Saavedra and Percy accentuate that the Eaton fire appears tied to Southern California Edison's refusal to de-energise high-voltage lines despite fire threats. According to their report, witness accounts and footage point to sparks beneath power towers minutes before the fire began. Southern California Edison (SCE) denies faults, yet I. Jones and A. Smith (personal communication, February 5, 2025) related that patterns in timing and location suggest otherwise. Both cases reflect neglect in managing technological systems and show how human lapses, not nature, triggered catastrophe.

Lindsey (2025) documentations reflects that the Los Angeles fires stemmed from human-triggered ignitions, intensified not only by seasonal winds but by flawed settlement patterns and mismanaged technologies. Dense housing pressed against volatile chaparral zones shows poor planning. Reliance on systems without adequate safeguards, like power lines in high-risk areas, reflects critical human misjudgment. H. Andrews and I. Cruz (personal communication, February 5, 2025) lament that these fires did not spread on nature's terms alone but on failures in foresight, infrastructure oversight, and overconfidence in control through technology.

FitzGerald et al. (2025) report that the 2025 Los Angeles wildfires, comprising the Palisades and Eaton blazes, claimed at least 24 lives, with 16 deaths attributed to the Eaton fire. Together, the fires burned over 37,713 acres, making them among the most destructive in the city's history. The Palisades fire scorched 23,713 acres, threatening areas such as Brentwood and the Getty Centre, while the Eaton fire devastated over 14,000 acres in northern Los Angeles, including Altadena. Despite limited containment, 14% for the Palisades and 33% for the Eaton, tens of thousands remained under evacuation, and more than 12,000 structures were destroyed, with 7,000 linked to the Eaton fire. Economic losses may reach \$150 billion, suggesting these fires could become the costliest in US history. High winds, prolonged drought, and dry vegetation worsened the disaster, with red flag warnings in place. Lightning was ruled out as a cause, and utility lines are under investigation. FitzGerald et al. expose that a law firm accused Southern California Edison of failing to shut down power lines before the Eaton fire. The fires reflect deeper systemic issues, including budget cuts and strained water resources. Climate change has intensified wildfire risks, with federal studies confirming that rising temperatures, longer droughts, and erratic weather have turned seasonal fires into a year-round threat in the western United States.

Kaplan (2025) and The Associated Press and NBC Chicago Staff (2025) report that the Los Angeles wildfires stem from a mix of human activities and worsening environmental conditions driven by climate change. Investigators dismissed lightning and transformer faults, turning to human-related sparks from vehicles, tools, or camping equipment as likely causes. Though arson is not ruled out, most incidents appear unintentional, linked to accidents or neglect. The rapid spread was aided by Santa Ana winds, severe drought, and dry vegetation. In the Eaton Fire, high-voltage lines under wind stress are being examined for possible spark ignition. These findings reveal a risky dependence on technology with misplaced confidence in its capacity to prevent disasters. Over-reliance on energy systems without sufficient safeguards exposes society to severe ecological threats. A shift is needed toward solutions that align technological progress with environmental responsibility.

Regan et al. (2025) detail the severe human toll of the January 2025 Los Angeles wildfires, with vulnerable groups bearing the brunt of the tragedy. Anthony Mitchell, a 67-year-old amputee, and his immobile son, Justin, died in their home, unable to flee the flames. Phillip Cohen, a 68-year-old cancer patient, recounted evacuating on foot amid chaos, as families escaped with children in hand. Rory Sykes, a 32-year-old blind man with cerebral palsy, died in the Palisades Fire after delayed emergency response. His mother blamed the lag in services for his death. Annette Rossilli, aged 85, refused to evacuate and was later found dead in her car. Regan et al. enunciate that in response, Governor Gavin Newsom declared a state of emergency and deployed the National Guard, yet response efforts were hindered by prior budget cuts to the Los Angeles Fire Department, which had weakened preventive capacities. Mayor Karen Bass faced public backlash for being in Ghana during the crisis. Critics accused her of neglect, although she claimed ongoing coordination and returned promptly.

Paseggi (2025) and the Business Today Desk (2025) assert that some observers speculated the perceived marginalisation of God during the Golden Globe ceremony in Los Angeles may have triggered a form of divine judgment, symbolised through the wildfires that swept across the region. According to these commentators, certain moments at the event appeared to disregard or ridicule religious values, leading some to interpret the disasters as a response to such irreverence. The argument, especially in alignment to that of F. Liou and C. Douglass (personal communication, February 5, 2025), further links this apparent disregard to the overconfidence placed in technological progress, which may cultivate a sense of self-sufficiency and diminish the perceived relevance of God. However, this interpretation remains contentious. A number of online respondents contend that attributing such disasters to divine punishment overlooks the complex interplay of environmental degradation, climate conditions, and human-induced factors that typically underlie wildfires.

The January 2025 wildfires in Los Angeles revealed deep concerns about the performance of emergency authorities and systemic lapses in wildfire preparedness. Budget reductions to the Los Angeles Fire Department had reportedly limited essential services such as brush clearance inspections, a key defence against fire spread. Many residents like C. Williams and D. Brown (personal communication, February 5, 2025), criticised the response as slow and uncoordinated, citing delays caused by a lack of personnel and reliance on outdated equipment. Evacuation efforts also drew sharp rebuke, with reports that vulnerable groups, including the elderly and disabled, were left behind due to poor planning and insufficient support, leading to preventable fatalities.

The Palisades and Eaton Fires in Los Angeles expose a troubling pattern of human negligence and environmental mismanagement, marked by an over-dependence on technology and its link to climate degradation. Eyewitness accounts and surveillance footage, including those from F. Mmor, L. Thomas, I. Margaryan, Y. Kim, D. Anderson, P. Garcia, V. Onuorah, J. Williams,

and L. Perez (personal communication, January 17, 2025), point to a downed power line as the likely cause of the Eaton Fire, while 63 electrical faults were recorded shortly before the Palisades Fire. These grid failures, alongside prolonged drought and intense Santa Ana winds, reflect both technical fragility and ecological neglect. The deeper crisis lies in the persistent warming trends and erratic climate patterns worsened by unchecked industrial and technological emissions. These events reveal the urgent need for authorities to act with foresight, committing to sustained environmental responsibility and disaster readiness.

Precedents of Natural, Health alongside Artificial Disasters Stemming from Humanity's Over-Reliance on Technology

Schooler (2001) asserts that natural disasters linked to human dependence on technology reveal a paradox where progress worsens natural threats. Activities such as industrial emissions contribute to climate change, leading to stronger hurricanes, severe droughts, and intense flooding. Deforestation for urban growth disrupts ecosystems, causing soil erosion, landslides, and loss of biodiversity. Large dams alter water flow and increase the risk of unnatural floods and dry spells. These outcomes show how efforts to control nature often deepen environmental crises, making disaster management more difficult.

Mankind's dependence on technology has led to major disasters such as the Chernobyl meltdown, the Challenger explosion, and the Bhopal gas leak, where technical faults, human mistakes, and weak oversight caused massive harm. Perera (2010) argues that this reliance increases the risk of unexpected failures, especially in poorly planned infrastructure that collapses under extreme natural conditions. Future threats may arise from complex systems where cyberattacks disrupt essential services, autonomous weapons fuel global conflict, or climate crises worsen due to poor handling of natural resources. These dangers reflect the risks of unchecked technological use and the critical demand for ethical practice, sound design, and preventive action.

Ahmed et al. (2023) emphasise that growing dependence on technology in managing natural disasters shows both human innovation and systemic weakness. While advances in energy solutions help reduce environmental and economic damage, these systems remain exposed to the same disasters they aim to address. This tension unveils the fragile link between progress and the stability needed to maintain it.

Jones-Imhotep (2017) shows that failures in Cold War radio systems exposed Canada's dependence on technology and its limits against natural forces such as ionospheric storms. These disruptions portrayed how environmental unpredictability challenges human control and shaped national views of nature. Fontes de Meira et al. (2020) stress the importance of technology in Disaster and Risk Management across the Caribbean, especially for Small Island Developing States. Their study notes that while technology supports hazard response and development goals, it also brings risks such as unequal access, system breakdowns during crises, and the disregard of local knowledge. Evidence from disasters like hurricanes Irma and Maria shows the danger of relying on external solutions without local adaptation.

Grissinger (2019) warns against excessive trust in healthcare technology through a case where automation bias led to a serious medication error. A nurse accepted the incorrect drug, dilTIAZem instead of Dilantin, from an Automated Dispensing Cabinet without verifying the order. Despite review and co-signing of the Medication Administration Record, human oversight failed to catch the mistake. The patient later showed symptoms consistent with the wrong drug, and the error was only discovered the next day. This case shows how reliance on automated systems without critical review can cause harm rather than prevent it.

Dal et al. (2024) observe that cybercrimes and cyberfraud reveal the risks tied to humanity's deepening dependence on digital systems. As digital networks expand, cybercriminals exploit their complexity, exposing gaps in security structures. The increase in cyber fraud shows how technology, while improving efficiency, also enables large-scale exploitation of users, institutions, and states. This tension displays how tools meant to protect and simplify life can also serve harmful ends, making strong cybersecurity measures essential for reducing the threat of digital crime.

Over-reliance on technology, despite its benefits, has exposed humanity to complex risks spanning natural, health, and artificial disasters. As automated systems increasingly control critical sectors, unchecked trust in their efficiency often leads to failures. In natural disasters, the inability of technological systems to predict or mitigate crises heightens their impact. In healthcare, automation bias has caused dangerous errors in patient management. Cyberattacks and system failures further reveal society's vulnerability to artificial disruptions. These issues highlight a paradox where tools meant to improve life can also threaten it. Effective use of technology requires human judgment, rational oversight, and adaptive resilience to prevent harm and ensure its safe application.

Ethical Limits of Technological Dependence in Natural Fire Disasters of Palisades and Eaton

Technological advancements have significantly reshaped disaster management, offering tools for predicting, monitoring, and combating natural fire disasters with greater efficiency. In regions such as Palisades and Eaton, these innovations have proven invaluable in reducing immediate threats and saving lives. Yet, the increasing dependence on technology raises ethical concerns regarding the possible neglect of long-term ecological sustainability. While these tools support real-time intervention, there is a risk that such dependence may undermine preventive strategies grounded in environmental conservation, which are crucial for addressing the root causes of wildfires.

Another ethical concern is the gradual erosion of traditional knowledge systems. As noted by A. Lewis, I. Gevorgyan, Y. Huang, T. Davis, and F. Chavez (personal communication, January 18, 2025), local communities in Palisades and Eaton possess generational knowledge of fire control and prevention, shaped by their deep understanding of the environment. Prioritising high-tech solutions at the expense of these insights risk sidelining cultural heritage and reducing local involvement in disaster preparedness. This imbalance fosters passivity and weakens community resilience, leaving populations overly reliant on external interventions rather than empowering them through collaborative engagement.

Equity and access further complicate the ethical landscape. High costs associated with advanced fire management technologies often exclude economically disadvantaged groups. In Palisades and Eaton, this financial gap exposes vulnerable populations to greater risk. An inclusive strategy should combine advanced technologies with affordable community-based methods to ensure fair protection for all. The inability of the Los Angeles Fire Department to obtain essential fire-extinguishing equipment during the wildfires, despite the city's affluent profile, highlights the critical role of human governance and decision-making. A more balanced integration of human intelligence with modern tools could have prevented much of the damage. Environmental consequences also require ethical scrutiny. While tools like drones and chemical suppressants offer immediate relief, their long-term use can harm ecosystems. Misapplied interventions may degrade the environment, contributing to the recurrence and severity of future fires. Sustainable disaster management must therefore weigh technological benefits against their ecological costs, ensuring that short-term relief efforts do not compromise environmental integrity in the long run.

The psychological effects of excessive dependence on technology also merit attention. Communities may adopt a false sense of security, assuming that these systems can manage every threat without human involvement. Such assumptions can discourage preventive practices, including controlled burns and vegetation management. Ethical responsibility calls for a shared culture of vigilance, where both human action and technological tools are aligned to maintain readiness and protect against natural fire hazards.

Although technology is essential in wildfire management, ethical disaster response in Palisades and Eaton requires a nuanced balance. Integrating local knowledge, promoting fair access, protecting the environment, and encouraging community participation must guide all interventions. Addressing these considerations ensures that technological tools serve to strengthen, not replace, comprehensive disaster readiness rooted in both science and social responsibility.

Regions like Palisades and Eaton, often affected by wildfires, may witness a decline in environmental responsibility due to overconfidence in technological interventions. Carelessness, such as neglecting small fires or engaging in deliberate arson, may stem from misplaced trust in automated systems. This belief overlooks the limitations of technology, which, like all human inventions, remains fallible. Recognising these limitations is essential in reaffirming the need for personal responsibility and active environmental care, which no machine can substitute.

The Eaton and Palisades wildfires of 2025 raise ethical concerns surrounding human responsibility, spiritual irreverence, and the dangers of technological hubris. As filed by Paseggi (2025) and others, the perceived sidelining of religious values at high-profile events like the Golden Globe ceremony points to a cultural shift that may neglect moral accountability. The speculation that such disasters symbolise divine judgment, especially when aligned with critiques by F. Liou and C. Douglass (personal communication, February 5, 2025), underscores an ethical tension between spiritual humility and societal overreliance on technology, challenging humanity to reconsider the moral and theological dimensions of its actions and advancements.

Lastly, technological dominance in wildfire control poses a threat to employment and local expertise. As machines take over essential tasks, many workers risk unemployment, and the knowledge of traditional fire control methods fades into obscurity. This shift not only weakens the workforce but also compromises the adaptability of fire management systems in responding to complex challenges. Preserving employment and indigenous expertise is therefore a moral duty. Combining human intelligence with technological efficiency offers a more balanced and responsive approach, ensuring that communities remain active agents in protecting their environment from fire disasters.

Conclusion

This study underscores the ethical boundaries of technological dependence and stresses the grave necessity for anticipatory actions to avert disasters such as the Palisades and Eaton fires. Although technological progress has improved safety and efficiency, unchecked dependence without ethical direction may result in grave consequences. The analysis of these events affirms that aligning innovation with moral responsibility is essential to protect human life, critical infrastructure, and the natural environment. The evidence presented highlights the imperative requirement for ethical accountability in the design and deployment of technology as a means to manage risk effectively.

Despite its contributions, this research remains limited in scope. The intricate relationship between technology dependence and ethical issues demands deeper inquiry. This work does not sufficiently address the psychological or societal repercussions of technology-induced disasters, nor does it examine how vulnerabilities differ across regions and sectors. Additional investigations are needed to fill these gaps and provide a more complete understanding of the problem.

Further research should adopt a multidisciplinary lens, drawing knowledge from fields such as ethics, engineering, and public policy to develop sustainable preventative strategies. Future studies may examine ways to integrate machine learning, real-time hazard detection, and consistent human supervision to identify threats before they evolve into crises. Strengthening research in these areas will enhance collaboration between academic institutions and industry experts in minimising the risks associated with technological overdependence.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are particularly relevant:

1. Enhance wildfire mitigation education in high-risk areas. Residents in wildfire-prone locations such as Los Angeles, California, should receive structured instruction in localised fire prevention techniques. This includes training in firebreak construction, creation of defensible spaces around properties, and effective vegetation control.
2. Promote environmental discipline and stewardship. Individuals should develop a strong ethic of responsible land use, waste reduction, and active participation in community fire safety programs. Such values support long-term ecological balance and disaster preparedness.
3. Establish binding regulatory mechanisms for safety and accountability. Governments and corporations managing technological infrastructure must comply with enforceable safety protocols and be held accountable through regular and independent risk assessments.
4. Ensure community participation in technological planning. Local populations should be involved in shaping and implementing technological systems. Their perspectives on ethical use and safety must be acknowledged to foster public trust and collective responsibility.
5. Support continuous training for professionals in sensitive sectors. Workers in critical domains in Los Angeles such as energy, transport, and emergency response should be kept informed on evolving safety standards, ethical practices, and emergency protocols to anticipate and manage technological breakdowns.
6. Embed ethical safeguards in technology design. New technologies must be conceived with built-in protections that favour human safety, environmental resilience, and sustainable operation. Innovations should especially address risk reduction in areas like fire detection and crisis management.
7. Expand public awareness campaigns on technological dependence. Society must be educated on how routine behaviours and reliance on automated systems may influence disaster likelihood. Informed individuals are more likely to act responsibly and support safety-driven innovations.
8. Foster international collaboration on technology regulation. Technological hazards are often transnational. There is a need for global agreements that standardise safety practices and regulatory oversight across borders to reduce multi-regional risks.
9. Enforce strict liability and mandatory insurance for high-risk industries. Companies in Los Angeles County operating in sectors vulnerable to technological failure must assume financial responsibility through compulsory insurance and liability provisions, ensuring deterrence against negligence.

10. Implement systematic monitoring and evaluation of critical systems. Relevant authorities in Los Angeles must ensure that all technological structures with environmental or safety implications should undergo regular, transparent assessments. This enables early identification of risks and timely corrective action, thereby reinforcing public confidence.
11. Residents of Los Angeles must uphold the sovereignty of God in all pursuits, regardless of intellectual or technological achievements. The city's brilliance in innovation does not exempt it from nature's threats, particularly wildfires. Recent speculation linking the underestimation of God during a major Golden Globe event to subsequent disasters, though not empirically verified, highlights the moral danger of spiritual neglect. Honouring divine authority cultivates humility and strengthens communal resilience in a region persistently exposed to natural peril.

References

- Ahmed, N. (2023). Natural Disaster and energy innovation: Unveiling the linkage from an environmental sustainability perspective. *Front Energy Res. Sec. Sustainable Energy Systems*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenrg.2023.1256219>.
- Business Today Desk. (2025, January 12). Disgusted, Disgusting: Netizens slam viral post that blames Godless behaviour behind the Los Angeles fire. *Business Today*.
- Butler, G. (2025, January 7). California's fire death toll doubles as chaos grips LA. *BBC NEWS*. <https://www.bbc.com/news/live/c5y81zyplext>.
- Das, D. et al. (2024). Cyber fraud in relation with cyber crime critical study. *Tuijin Jishu/ Journal of Propulsion Tech Technology*, 45 (2), 680-693.
- De Magalhães Neto, N. et al. (2022). Human activity Behind the Unprecedented 2020 wildfire in Brazilian wetlands (Pantanal). (*Frontiers*) *Environmental Science: Environmental Informatics and Remote Sensing*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenrs.2022.888578>.
- EARTH.ORG. (2024, March). *Unprecedented scale: Exploring the Largest wildfires in US History*. <https://earth.org/worst.wildfires.in.us.history>.
- Fitz Gerald, J. et al. (2025). What's the latest on Los Angeles wildfires and how did they start? *BBC NEWS*. <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/clyxyprynko>.
- Grissinger, M. (2019). Understanding Human Over-Reliance on Technology. *Pharmacy and Therapeutics (P&T): A Peer-Reviewed Journal for Managed care and Hospital Formulary Management*, 44 (6), 320-321,375.
- Jackson, S.T. (2025, May 30). Wildfire. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.
- Jonas, H. (1984). *The Imperative of Responsibility: In Search of an Ethics for the Technological Age*. Translated by Hans Jonas and David Herr. University of Chicago.
- Jones-Imhotep, E. (2017). *The Unreliable Nation: Hostile Nature and Technology Failure in the Cold War*. MIT Press.
- Kane, J. (2025, January 11). Prescribed Fire. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/science/prescribedfire>.
- Kaplan, A. et al. (2025). Are Arsonists responsible for the Los Angeles wildfires? *NBC NEWS*. <https://www.google.com/amp/s/www.nbcnews.com/news/amp/rcna18694>.
- Lindsey, R. (2025, February 19). The Weather and climate influences on the January 2025 fires around Los Angeles. *Event Tracker*.
- MacCarthy, J. et al. (2025, January 9). 4 Graphics Explain Los Angeles' Rare and Devastating January Fires. *World Resources Institute*. <https://www.wri.org/insights>.
- Paseggi, M. (2025, January 21). Why Did Los Angeles Burn? *Adventist Review*. <https://adventistreview.org>.
- Perera, R. (2010, March 5). Technology in times of disaster. *Comment*. <https://comment.org/technology.in.times.of.disaster>.

-
- Regan, H. et al. (2025, January 10). January 9, 2025-Los Angeles county wildfires. *CNN Weather* . <https://edition.cnn.com/weather/live-news>.
- Roos, D. (2023). Native Americans used fire to Protect and cultivate land. *History .Com*. <https://www.history.com/news>.
- Saavedra, T. & Percy, N. (2025, January 17). What caused Palisades, Eaton fires in LA County? Multiple investigations look for answers. *Daily News*.
- Schooler, T.Y. (2021). Disasters, Coping with. In J.N Smesler et al (Eds.). *International Encyclopedia of Social Scieces* (pp.3713-3718). Pergamon.
- Stanley, M. (2025). Wildfires. *National Geographic Society*.
- The Associated press and NBC Chicago staff. (2025, January 9). What is causing the fires in LA? What we know as Hollywood Hill, Palisades, Eaton fires continue. *NBC CHICAGO*. <https://www.google.com/amp/s/www.nbcchicago.com/news/national.international>.
- Van Wagterdonk, J.W. (2007). The History and Evolution of wildland fire use. *Fire Ecol.*3, 3-17. <https://doi.org/10.499/fireecology.0302003>.