Faith & Reason Group Discussion Prompts – October 10, 2025
ARITIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE 2.0
"Shall Man Become God, or Has God Become Man?"

Discussion prompt #1 (**link** from **3:11** through **31:33,** 1.05x [**27:03** runtime])

Summary [John Wyatt]
- AI everywhere, vague, marketing hype; CS to copy, supplant human capabilities
- Consummation of our longings or terrible nightmare we cannot control?
- Generative AI (for audio, text, visual); fastest growing apps ever; arms race
- Like fire, printing, electricity … risk to democracy? No fundamental limit?
- Positive effects: healthcare, science (e.g, antibiotics, diagnostics, patient care)
- Irony: disrupting/repurposing white collar jobs (more than blue collar)
- Lack of a superintelligence's concern for humans (analogous to us for mice)
- Potential mitigation: merging brains with computers (yet amid archaic institutions)
- Power over nature in fact power of some people over others; evil meaningless
- Saturation of life with simulated persons: caregivers, girlfriends, post-death avatars
- From Westworld: "If you can't tell the difference, does it matter?"
- Old questions: "What does it mean to be human?" "What hope for the future?"
- Materialism: just inferior "wetware"; as machines become human, we become machines
- Christianity: embodiedness (dust), in image of God (breath of life), God in flesh
- Personhood: free, dignity of choice, accountable, aware of truth, coded with longing
- Future: techno-optimist vision (vs. the human case for friction, struggle, pain)

==Describe your experience with and attitudes toward AI tools to date.== What are your main hopes and fears? What impact (if any) has it had or will it have on your personhood?

==How do you weigh authenticity vs. efficacy?== Would you rather relate with / work with / live with / even one day become 1) digital, "pain-less", frictionless simulated "persons"; or 2) embodied, "pain-full", sub-effective "real" persons? Why?

****

Discussion prompt #2 — **link** from **00:00** through **14:27**, 1.1x [**13:08** runtime]; **link** from **0:11** through **22:43**, 1.1x [**20:39** runtime]; **link** from **1:20:17** through **1:23:39**

Summary [Yuval Noah Harari]
- Three questions: what is AI, what is the danger, how can humanity flourish?
- AI hype; not all machines are AI (agency, invention vs. automation, production)
- Required for AI: alien, non-human, non-organic (e.g., new Go strategy)
- Basic danger of AI is it is alien and, thus, unpredictable and untrustworthy
- Paradox of trust: humans struggle to trust humans yet easily trust AI
- Human experience with trust (vs. almost no experience with AI despite clear lies)

- Thesis: together humans can control AI, if we fight one another AI will control us
- Must build trust before building superintelligence; currently doing exactly opposite
- We assume we must separate [from enemies], yet in nature separation is death
- Human existence has always been the exchange of outside ideas and substance
- Fear and pain necessary yet not sufficient for survival; trust more important
- Humans not more intelligent than animals; can better build trust in large numbers

Summary [John Lennox]

- Already living with "narrow" AI (it only simulates intelligence, is non-conscious)
- Double-edged sword (e.g., crime surveillance vs. minority suppression, deep fakes)
- Bendigo: "AI does not and will not have a moral sense of right and wrong"
- Orwell's "1984" vs. Huxley's "Brave New World" (Postman: no big brother needed; in Huxley, people love their oppression, adore the technologies that undo their capacity to think … Orwell fears what we hate will ruin us; Huxley fears what we love)
- Wilson: problem is Paleolithic emotions, Medieval institutions, god-like technology
- Old questions (Kant): Where do we come from, who are we, where are we going?
- AGI: equals/exceeds human capacity, "superintelligence", transhumanism
- AI doom scenario: competence misaligned with us (Hawking), extinction (Yudkowski)
- Counter: AGI mathematically impossible (Landgrebe, Smith, Penrose, Lennox)
- *Nature, Scientific American*: focus on mitigating harm, dehumanization of AI as it is
- Russell: 1) restrict to human goals, 2) keep ignorant of goals, 3) human-centered
- "Omega project" vs. Revelation: world government, economic control, mark on arm, "man of lawlessness" elevated above all gods, image of deception
- AI worship: "prayer-like connectivity, oracle-like capacity to answer any question"
- Not the end of the biblical story; deceit biggest sign of Jesus' second coming
- AI as man becoming god contrasts with Christian claim: God became human for us
- Jesus' resurrection solved death 2000 years ago, "divine upgrade" making us children of God with renewed bodies raised at the end (vs. uploaded to a cloud)

Summary [Wyatt Q&A interlude]

- Five existential risks: asteroid, nuclear war, pandemic, climate change, [now] AI
- More likely science fiction, more to fear about evil humans (vs. rogue systems)
- Notwithstanding long church history of failed end-times predictions, in Revelation deception so profound it fools even elect; AI gives new power to deceivers

What do you make of Harari's case for humanity's unique trust-consciousness? **Is human trust an adequate buffer or rein on AI's power and potential for deception? Why?**

What do you make of Lennox and Wyatt stressing Christianity's claims that: 1) God created fleshly humans in his image (calling it "very good") and 2) God "incarnated" (entered himself "into meat") to "upgrade" our human bodies? **Have you felt the need to either [forever] preserve or escape the human body? [Further] elevate or dismiss the human body? Why?**