

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL AND THEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATION

Rajesh Kavalackal♦

DVK, Bangalore

Abstract

The dialogue between science and religion is a perennial question. Although the Church has a positive outlook towards scientific advancement there is hope as well as fear regarding the role of science in the mind of the believer. In this paper our attempt is to comprehend the advantages of the scientific leap, focusing on artificial intelligence. This understanding creates a new possibility for mutual enrichment of the two partners, namely science and theology. A dialogue between artificial intelligence (AI) and theology facilitates a more profound evaluation of the vital concepts in theological anthropology, namely, the problem of creation, problem of sin, as well as the ethical concerns regarding AI. The concept of *imago Dei*—the understanding of humans created in the image of God—can be applied to the scheme of AI especially when it is presented in a way that seriously takes the functional and performative character of both theological and scientific theories. In nutshell, we want to be optimistic about all human growth safeguarding the basic principle of human dignity and personhood.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence; Image of God; *Imago Dei*; Theological Anthropology; Theology of Creation; Sin

♦Fr Rajesh Kavalackal is a member of the CMI congregation. He had his doctorate in Theology from the Pontifical University of Gregorian, Rome. He teaches Systematic Theology at Dharmaram Vidaya Kshetram (Pontifical Athenaeum) Bangalore. Presently, he serves as the coordinator of Systematic Theology programme at the Faculty of Theology, DVK. He has authored a book, *Hominisation and Kingdom of God: A Study on E. Schillebeeckx and M.M. Thomas* (Dharmaram Publications, 2018), and has many articles to his credit. His research areas include religion, culture, ecology, and theological anthropology. Email: rajeshcmi@gmail.com

Introduction

Artificial Intelligence" (AI) is defined broadly as any kind of artificial computational system that shows intelligent behaviour, which is very conducive to attain expected goals. In particular, we do not wish to restrict "intelligence" to human *intelligence alone*. The main purposes of an artificially intelligent agent "probably involve sensing, modelling, planning and action, but current AI applications also include perception, text analysis, natural language processing (NLP), logical reasoning, game-playing, decision support systems, data analytics, predictive analytics, as well as autonomous vehicles and other forms of robotics."¹ It is argued that AI could virtually eliminate global poverty, massively reduce disease and provide better education to almost everyone on the planet.

Over and again the church had reiterated and categorically established the relationship between science and faith in her teaching. All the same, there are different views looking at the moral aspect of Artificial Intelligence, an unprecedented development. In general, in all human endeavours an optimistic mind may perceive the great opportunity of human's growth for life enhancement, and in a similar vein, as far as the society's moral consciousness is concerned one may also infer ethical problems in that grown. Amidst all kinds of tensions, in this article, our intention is not to play an umpire's part seeing the pros and cons of AI, but to evaluate the philosophical and theological possibilities which may give a base for enlarging our horizons since it is going to be a Copernican revolution at this time of our history.

1. Optimism in Human Advancements: A Theological Reading

We shall begin with a few theological observations which would probably indicate that every human endeavour has a positive leap for the well-being of the human family. Obviously, the motive and goal of AI is a better humanity in all spheres of life. Even the lower rug of the society should benefit out of it.

1.1. AI: A Quest for Wisdom and Survival

AI is basically advancement of human wisdom. Mathew Fox defines the word wisdom in terms of its practical implications. He says, "When we use the word wisdom, we are at home with a Native American tradition which gives a correct meaning namely, *that the*

¹ Report published in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, "Ethics of Artificial Intelligence and Robotics," <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ethics-ai/>

people may live.”² Wisdom should not remain in the realm of ideas. Wisdom should make difference in the lives of the people. It is the intention of God the creator as well, that we have life in fullness. All global peoples irrespective of all kinds of differences may have life in abundance; old people, hungry children, people from the socialists and capitalists may live. Wisdom encourages people to live. But to live is not to survive alone.

Artificial Intelligence is the tracking of data or wisdom for the wellbeing and enhancement of human life on earth.³ As the profound shift in mechanization saved human being from the clutches of poverty, the new leap of AI will take humanity to another realm and it is going to be a reality. We are under a Copernican revolution offered by AI which is an organic development of a technological development in the present history of the world. It will have a far-reaching impact on every form of human life in the near future. The first observation we want to make here is that we need to see AI in terms of human growth as a quest for wisdom for a better humanity.

1.2. Scientific Advancements and Human Creativity: A New Shift in the Understanding of Human Identity

Compared to the past, from the 20th century onwards, human beings are asserting themselves in an unprecedented way, they have become more conscious of their own potentialities. Aristotelian concept of human nature was a concept of *static being*. In the middle ages it was rejected because of the emergence of new societies and scientific advancements. *Gaudium et spes* reiterates that human race has passed from a rather static concept of reality to a more a dynamic evolutionary one.⁴ Marxian concept of the *dynamic becoming of nature* has got prominence in the philosophical as well as theological domain. It called out for personal freedom based on techniques of social planning and social process.⁵ We should not underestimate the creative energy of humankind. Gone are the days of conceiving human nature in terms of spirit and matter⁶ which is in fact, a Greek model of anthropological understanding, investigating and experimenting human nature just like in a laboratory. Today a new

²Mathew Fox, *Original Blessing: A Primer in Creation Spirituality*, Santa Fe in US: Bear and Company, 1984, 9-10.

³Report published in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, “Ethics of Artificial Intelligence and Robotics.”

⁴Vatican II, GS, 5.

⁵ M.M. Thomas, *Faith Seeking Understanding and Responsibility* (From the Manuscript in UTC archives, Bengaluru), 1971, 32.

⁶ Sebastian Athappilly, *Mystery and Destiny of Human Person*, Bangalore: Dharmarmam Publications, 2007, 44-45.

shift in the understanding paves way for dynamics of the very core of human nature and identity as *spirited matter*,⁷ in building up of the society and for a better human living. In this process AI is a phenomenon in the present scenario of human life which calls for a new understanding appreciating potentialities of human creativity.

1.3. Theology and *Spiritual Materialism*

Often there is an apparent conflict between spirituality and materialism or religion and science at least in the religious setting. AI is often evaluated in a negative way especially by people who are involved in the religious field—at least in their casual talks. It is comprehended in terms of human unlimited desire and reduction of human being into material realm. Contemporary theological deliberations and the teachings of the church try to bridge the so-called polarization between religion and science. Theologians are interested in what nature can teach us about the faith in God or the contemporary science can be an ally in our spiritual journey.⁸ We can be more fully open to what these discoveries imply about the infinity of God the Creator, and in the process we can more fully come to appreciate the spiritual insights and perspectives of others. At the same time, it urges us not to remain complacent, content with prior understanding, but instead to seek to expand our knowledge of God who would be known. Moreover, “progress in spiritual knowledge can be found through the discoveries of scientific research since, as St John in his gospel suggests, knowledge about the universe is ultimately knowledge as well about its Creator, the God $\pi\alpha' \nu\tau\alpha \delta\iota, \alpha\upsilon, \tau\omicron\upsilon\epsilon, \gamma\epsilon' \nu \tau\omicron$ (John 1:3: ‘through whom all things were made’).”⁹ We need to see these discoveries with thankful mind and these discoveries in a way express the incomprehensibility and limitedness of God. In the spiritual journey the practice of science also explicitly becomes a religious activity. Such practices may lead us to the unfathomable mystery of the universe, and it reveals the mystery of God. “Religion and science should work creatively together, then, to illuminate our knowledge of God while recognizing the ultimate ineffability and fallibility of such knowledge.”¹⁰ They are not two

⁷A term is very dear to Dr Pathrapankal, a prominent Indian biblical Theologian. The reference is based on his class notes in theology. Also in M.M. Thomas, *Man and the Universe of Faith*, Madras: CLS, 1975, 21-25.

⁸Philippe Bordeyne, “Signs of the Times and Moral Anthropology in *Gaudium et Spes*,” in Shaji George Kochuthara, ed., *Revisiting Vatican II: 50 Years of Renewal*, Vol. I, Bangalore: Dharmaram Publications, 2014, 267-274.

⁹Robert Hermann, *God, Science, and Humility: Ten Scientists Consider Humility Theology*, Philadelphia: Templeton Press, 2000, 26.

¹⁰Hermann, *God, Science, and Humility*, 27.

opposing entities.¹¹ They are the two sides of the same coin. The social teachings of the Church and the teaching on salvation (salvation is *already and not yet*) admonish that the spiritual has to be accomplished, realized and expressed in and through the material. The Kingdom of God is at hand and it is something to be realized on earth. The duty of the Church is to accept the spiritual philosophy of materialism.¹² Therefore, a reading of the Samaritan episode would tell us that “the humanity of man with material needs was the basis for neighbourliness and brotherhood and that the spirituality had no meaning except in terms of meeting the human need of material necessities. In other words, the material was the means for the spiritual.”¹³ The Christian thought of AI, therefore, can be considered a “God given means of filling and subduing the earth, bringing out the extra-ordinary capacities which the creator has given to us to explore our role as co-creators.”¹⁴ A theology of biblical narrative of the creation episode also reminds us of the pervasive nature of human fallenness and the need of human wisdom. Thus, AI has to be comprehended in a positive way.

1.4. Mechanization, Dehumanization and Meaning for Life

The present crisis in the machine age, especially in AI age, is not the unlimited amount of the products in the global market but a new integration between technological means with human life. M.M. Thomas says, “the material forces of our time which are developing to an unlimited extent, are tending to occupy the whole pictures to crush out everything else and to organize themselves in such a way that there is not further possibility of creating new values of civilization.”¹⁵ It demands a hierarchy of ends for humans based on their dynamic nature, spiritual and moral principles, and all the more on the integration and meaning for human life.

The dehumanization of human being therefore is not due to the machine but to idolatry. This idolatry can be explained in terms of false meaning and value given to the procurement of the temporal goods in the sole anthropomorphic world view. The necessity and extensity of materials is not the cause for dehumanization, nor is it capable of creating history or disorder. The primacy of things in the

¹¹A. Foerst, “Cog, A Humanoid Robot, and the Question of the Image of God,” *Zygon* 33, 1 (January 2003) 91–94.

¹²Thomas, *Faith Seeking Understanding and Responsibility*, 10.

¹³Thomas, *Faith Seeking Understanding and Responsibility*, 14.

¹⁴E. Dixon, “Explorations Articles: Robotics, AI, and Theology,” [www//Centre for Christianity and Scholarship.org](http://www.Centre for Christianity and Scholarship.org), access on 13-11- 20.

¹⁵Thomas, *Faith Seeking Understanding and Responsibility*, 48.

modern age is not the triumph of techniques and production. It must be interpreted in terms of the relationship between human freedom and natural society. According to Niebuhr the root cause of the disorder is not the abundance of things, but the false meaning given to things by humans which is idolatry.¹⁶ Human beings need to transcend the necessity of things under priority rather than becoming a prey of tempting consumerism that is prevailing in the present scenario of the market driven society. As far as meaning for life is concerned the material goods should be better used for the enhancement and wellbeing of humanity as whole.

2. A Theological Evaluation of AI

Recent past has seen enormous strides in the advancement of artificial intelligence. We shall make a reality check up on this. There is leap in the practical purpose of AI along with the theoretical advancement. Computer education has revolutionized many areas of human life and consequently there is the boom in the production of materials. Similarly, computer is considered a tool to understand human mind. Computer stimulation necessitated and resulted in more correct and precise ways of human reasoning and scientific ways of human cognition. The human evaluation in terms of performance is done in a more scientific way and a task is set for human beings in the market driven society. Besides, the human mistake as far as the logical proceeding is concerned would definitely affect the functioning of computers and it demands high quality of human logical thinking. Here, what we gather is that there is a close analogy between computer and human mind.¹⁷

So far, we have not discussed any philosophical or theological problems raised and involved in the advancement of AI that a theologian or believer should be concerned about. From the beginning of our reflection our attempt has been to enumerate a positive vision of the advancement of human science that will denounce any kind of assumption that presumes that it is a work of the devil. All the same, we are aware of the ethical issues involved in AI which we are going to discuss. The question may be asked about the capturing of *all* aspects of human intelligence into a computer form and the reduction of human mind and life as well to a mechanized, sophisticated realm. For instance, there are questions in

¹⁶Niebuhr, *Nature and Destiny of Human: A Christian Interpretation*, London: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996, 48.

¹⁷Watt Fraser, "Artificial Intelligence," in ed. Hermann, *God, Science, and Humility: Ten Scientists Consider Humility Theology*, 278-279.

connection with emotions expressed in computer language and human language. Do computers express emotions? Or, can the computers be programmed for prayer life? Of course they can be programmed to compose prayer but there we hardly find the inner life.¹⁸ We know that “an individual’s intelligent behaviour is shaped by the meaning ascribed to experience, by its situation in the social matrix, and by the practices of self and relationship into which its life is recruited.”¹⁹ Efficiency and Performance are the be-all and end-all of AI since computing and technical advancements aim at the enhancement of human life in all sphere of life. There is all the more a tendency to equate it with human life and the ethos of the society is matched with the idea of performance. Human life transcends these aspects, and we must not forget the metaphysical aspect of human life, namely, humankind may contribute for human elevation by means human ingenuity, but its ultimate end is entering in friendship with God. We need “to discriminate between values to be promoted and anti-values to be lessened.”²⁰ We are forced to ask certain questions such as, ‘how information and communication technologies (ICT) hinder or foster the building of brotherhood among human beings? What are the ethical challenges facing the quantification of human performance at all levels?’ There is also a danger of conception that computer intelligence would surpass and exceed human intelligence. Theologians are in a position to assert how metaphysics and *telos* of life go hand in hand and the belief in God enhances the human life with its multidimensional dimensions.

2.1. AI and Theology of Creation

There is suspicion about AI in the religious field. The fear is that AI causes a substantial threat to moral and religious values and a mere emphasis on proficiency and temporal growth of human life ignoring the metaphysical aspect keeps God away from the core. It is high time we thought about a constructive dialogue between theology and AI. One of the pertinent questions in theology with regard to AI is whether computers create a playing God. Creating something exactly like a human being seems to be assuming the place of God and naturally leads to arguments like ‘death of God.’²¹ An anthropocentric view of reality may lead humankind to a doom. It

¹⁸Fraser, “Artificial Intelligence,” 282.

¹⁹ William F. Clocksin, “Artificial Intelligence and Human Identity,” in *Consciousness and Human Identity*, ed. J. Cornwell, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998, 85.

²⁰Bordeyne, “Signs of the Times and Moral Anthropology in *Gaudium et Spes*,” 274.

²¹Pope Benedict XVI, Apostolic Exhortation, *Spes Salvi*, 23.

may challenge the unique role of God as the creator. But, the creation of God is not in parallel to human discoveries. As far as classical biblical creation story is concerned, God created out of nothing and He is not depended upon any pre-existing materials. Many scholars are of the opinion that making a computer can be considered an act of procreation rather than a creative work of God.²² There are a number of questions attached to it: Can they offer free life as wished by God in creation? Will the computers become monsters? The solution to the problems connected with it may converge in one point, namely, whether all kinds of discoveries effect *growth* or for *life in abundance*. When we take the human growth as part of the salvific plan of God, all those discoveries can be certainly considered as part of the *imago dei*,²³ which we are going to discuss further.

2.2. AI and The Concept of Sin

The argument is that AI would devalue the nature of sin. The sinful ways that can be emerged from the virtual world would force us to consider the concept of sin in a passive and helpful way attributing the sin to the third party. *Escapism* becomes the fashion of the moral fabric of a believer. Responsibility of the immoral act becomes meagre. It is clear that computers can do harmful things as far as its far reaching consequences are concerned. Can we call it a sin? Any act that is contrary to one's own will and will of God can be considered a sin. But computers do not have will. The computer here is taken as the means to accomplish certain aims of the particular subject. Also, it may be difficult to discern the will of God in a particular situation. But knowledge based on scripture and tradition will help us in that particular situation and the lack of it and the deliberate turning away from it can come under the purview of sin.²⁴

It should be noted here the concept of sin proposed by Tillich namely, sin is the consequences of polarities in life. Sin is an estrangement that comes from unresolved polarities.²⁵ For instance, human beings want to be free and at the same time there is the tension of the obligation attached to casual laws or the desires arising out of being in community and to be an individual. This can be in line with our reflections on sin and AI. The pertinent issue is whether AI is promoted insofar as it ultimately focuses on individual concern or the communitarian aspect. Since human being is a free being,

²²Donald M. MacKey, *Behind the Eye*, Oxford: Basil Backwell, 1991, 58.

²³Fraser, "Artificial Intelligence," 297.

²⁴Fraser, "Artificial Intelligence," 298.

²⁵ Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology, Vol. II*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013, 46ff.

acquiring wealth by means of AI is a desire as far as market is concerned. But whether the particular advancement enhances the community as a whole is an important question, and at times by means of laws the community gives a check to the unlimited desires of individualistic greed for amassing wealth. That is why we have many regulations in the modern states concerning human advancement.

2.3. AI and Ethical Concerns

Ethical issues of AI go beyond the collection and accumulation of data. “They include the *use* of information to manipulate behaviour, online and offline, in a way that undermines autonomous rational choice. Given users’ intense interaction with data systems and the deep knowledge about individuals this provides, they are vulnerable to “nudges”, manipulation, and deception.”²⁶ For instance, this is very much expressed in gambling, online selling, etc. The advertising agents maximise profit, including exploitation of behavioural biases, deception, and addiction generation. Manipulation of online behaviour is becoming a core business model of the Internet.

The manipulation of behavioural pattern is expressed during the time of election as well. Social media is now the prime location for political propaganda and manipulation. This influence can be used to steer voting behaviour. Definitely, it affects the autonomy of individual. Civil liberties and the protection of individual rights are under intense pressure and the privacy protection has diminished massively by negative employment of AI.²⁷

It is opined that humans will be prone to be interested in sex and companionship with robots. Humans have long deep emotional attachments to objects, so perhaps companionship with robots. As the result, the manufacturing of the sexual tools is up in rise. The question is whether such devices should be manufactured and promoted, and whether there should be limits in this delicate area. In these discussions there is an issue of deception, since a robot cannot mean what it says, or have feelings for a human. It is well known that humans are prone to attribute feelings and thoughts to entities that behave as if they had sentience, even to clearly inanimate objects that show no behaviour at all. In this regard there are concerns in matters of sex. Generally speaking, human behaviour is influenced by

²⁶Report published in Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, *Ethics of Artificial Intelligence and Robotics*.

²⁷Top 9 Ethical Issues of Artificial Intelligence, <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2016/10/top-10-ethical-issues-in-artificial-intelligence/>.

experience, and it is likely that pornography or sex robots support the perception of other humans as mere objects of desire, or even recipients of abuse, and thus ruin a deeper sexual and erotic experience. Is it an aberration as far as human life in all its ethics is concerned?²⁸

Another important area is the production of wealth. By using artificial intelligence, a company can drastically cut down on relying on the human workforce, and this means that revenues will go to fewer people. Consequently, individuals who have ownership in AI-driven companies will make all the money. It seems clear that AI and robotics will lead to significant gains in productivity and thus overall wealth. The world economy is controlled by wealthy nations and they control it with higher productivity and philosophy of the modern phenomenon of *growth*. Naturally, when productivity is accelerated by means of machines, the manpower becomes fewer. What currently seems to happen in the labour market as a result of AI and robotics automation is job polarization. The highly skilled technical jobs are in demand and highly paid, the low skilled service jobs are in demand and badly paid, but the mid-qualification jobs in factories and offices, i.e., the majority of jobs, are under pressure and reduced. In general terms, the issue of unemployment is an issue of how goods in a society should be justly distributed. Ethical Principles support basic liberties and a distribution that is of greatest benefit to the least-advantaged members of society. It would appear that AI economy has the above said features that make such justice unlikely.²⁹

Human dominance is almost entirely due to our ingenuity and intelligence. This poses a serious question about artificial intelligence. Will it, one day, have the same advantage over us? Can't we rely on just "pulling the plug" either, because a sufficiently advanced machine may anticipate this move and defend itself? In fact, the argument is to see the basic openness of theology towards science. In a similar vein we need to look into its ethical concern as well. The anxiety in connection with robots is the creation of super intelligence, that is, in future it can surpass human intelligence. Precaution should be made so that it would not cause the extinction of human beings.³⁰

²⁸Report published in Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, *Ethics of Artificial Intelligence and Robotics; Top 9 Ethical Issues of Artificial Intelligence*.

²⁹Report published in Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, *Ethics of Artificial Intelligence and Robotics; Top 9 Ethical Issues of Artificial Intelligence*.

³⁰*Top 9 Ethical Issues of Artificial Intelligence*.

One interesting question that has not received too much attention is whether the development of AI is environmentally sustainable. Like all computing systems, AI systems produce waste that is very hard to recycle and they consume vast amounts of energy, especially for the training of machine learning systems.³¹

3. AI and the Question about Humankind

As far as theology is concerned, AI postulates questions about the Image of God. With the introduction of newer machines and robots scientists go to the extent of equating machines with humans in parallel terms undermining the uniqueness of humankind. New researchers on machines pursue two goals: first, to create a prototype general-purpose, flexible, and autonomous robot, and second, to study human development after birth. They overlook the qualitative differences although there are positive aspects as far the study of human intelligence is concerned. But still this understanding of humanness, the identification of humans with machines, creates fear and animosity toward all kinds of modern scientific endeavours. Perceiving ourselves as kinds of machines contradicts our intuitive self-understanding. The abilities humans have can be neither built nor found in animals. Self-consciousness, emotions, and creativity are some of the most important qualities of humankind. These very qualities are the common arguments against any potential equality of machine and us. On the other hand, the proponents of machines argue that Phenomena such as consciousness have no physical property and cannot be correlated with particular body parts or particular bodily procedures. These phenomena arise because our brain is complex enough to abstract and categorize certain processes and analyse them. Phenomena such as emotions arise from chemical reactions in the body and their reflections and responses in the brain. Therefore, all complex phenomena of humans are based on materialistic aspects and machines are also created in the similar vein.³² Where shall we strike the balance between these two arguments? The Christian symbol of image God will suffice.

3.1. Image of God

Human uniqueness in terms of intuitive knowledge, self-understanding and self-consciousness has a counter part in the Christian symbol of *Imago Dei*. “Let us make humankind in our image, according to our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish in the sea, and over the birds of the air, and over the cattle,

³¹Top 9 Ethical Issues of Artificial Intelligence.

³²Foerst, “Cog, a Humanoid Robot, and the Question of the Image of God.”

and over all the wild animals of the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth." So, God created humankind in his image, in the image of God he created them; as male and female he created them (Gen 1:26-27). The Old Testament and New Testament alike mention this concept. However unequivocal definitions are absent with regard to the biblical concept of *Imago Dei*. In Christian history we witness various meaning for the symbol *Imago Dei*. Some Church fathers were of the opinion that it was the highest form of humans; his residence of reason, knowledge, understanding, cognition, freedom, love, and virtue.³³ Many have attempted to define the image of God with human abilities and features and this is still found in many contemporary theories, from bodily descriptions to concepts of the soul. But these special abilities were always seen as a consequence of humans' participation in the divine.

It does not take Genesis 1 as an abstract definition of humankind but as a story of the Creator and his creation. Humans share bodily existence with animals, but the image of God distinguishes us from animals because it is an expression of God's consolation to humans; it describes the relationship between God and humans. The image of God, then, cannot be identified with particular skills and abilities but is God's promise to start and maintain a relationship with humans.³⁴

A. Foerst argues for an empirical evidence of the image of God in human. She uses the term performative image of God.³⁵ It basically begins with the experience of the existence of God and our response to it. Performative experience supports the self-experience as special creatures. But it is not the definition of human being. Let us deal with her argument in terms of empirical evidence other than experience.

3.1.1. Humans are Partners

Image of God is the symbol God's promise and our specialty as partners. In humankind God has created beings God can talk to, beings who listen and answer. The concept of the image of God is not proof of human uniqueness but tells an effective story about every person's value and dignity.

3.1.2. Humans and Animals Are Equal

We intuitively experience our-selves as distinct from all nonhumans and attempt to draw lines between ourselves and animals. This sense is supported in Genesis 1, where the only content of the image of God is found in its task: human dominion over the

³³J. Kuttianimattathil, *Theological Anthropology*, Bangalore: TPI, 2013, 95-113.

³⁴Foerst, "Cog, a Humanoid Robot, and the Question of the Image of God," 105.

³⁵Foerst, "Cog, a Humanoid Robot, and the Question of the Image of God," 105.

earth. This sentence has often been taken as justification for exploitation and destruction of nonhuman creation. We may interpret these words differently that humans were assigned responsibility. Human dignity and responsibility cannot be separated from each other. Dominion is understood more as an obligation and responsibility in Gen 1:28–29: Humans and all other living beings need food and all of them get their food from God. Humans, then, play a much greater role in creation when understood as a part of creation than is allowed under a literal understanding of creation. If we interpret humans as an integrated part of creation, the nonhuman creation gets its own value and dignity.³⁶ Therefore, theologically speaking, AI should aim at the sustenance and wellbeing of the whole created things on earth. An anthropocentric growth alone, forgetting the God given responsibility in all scientific and technological advancement, torpedo the intention of God in creation.

3.1.3. Humans Need Community

An important idea that we are given of the image of God is that it pertains to man and woman. The Hebrew text is difficult to translate into English, but it says that God creates human (a singular form) as man and woman; both together are an image of God. In the creation story of Gen 2:4–25, God says, referring to Adam, “It is not good that the man should be alone” (Gen. 2:18). Humans are consequently created as social beings.³⁷ This very concept points to human’s very nature as social beings and hence AI should primarily address matters of human community. It should strike the balance between the individualistic and communitarian dimensions.

3.2. Imago Dei and AI

There is no contradiction between the story of the scripture and AI if we can conceive them as existential stories and they are performative image of God as we have seen. It will create new perspectives on human reality, human dignity, and the meaning of life. From the beginning of this article our argument was to see the positive effects in all scientific and machine advancement and it helps us to rationalize many human ambiguities and sorrows and therefore explain them in a positive way so much so that most of the problems of humankind could be solved. All diseases could be overcome and every painful psychological problem could be treated properly. Most suffering could be resolved because the reasons could be analysed completely, and any suffering properly treated.

³⁶Foerst, “Cog, A Humanoid Robot, and the Question of the Image of God,” 106.

³⁷Foerst, “Cog, A Humanoid Robot, and the Question of the Image of God,” 107.

Although AI questions human dignity and personhood in certain sense of its ethical concern, it is a valid phenomenon from a functionalist point of view. It cures diseases and mental illnesses and creates strategies for dealing with problems of human integrity and interaction. AI leaves room for our intuitive self-understanding because the image of God tells us a story about our creation and our biological system. We are free to accept its mechanisms and be grateful for the gift of being created in God's image. We can see our mechanisms and our dignity at the same time. The biblical stories of creation reveal that living beings as creatures created by God. On that ground, God's creative powers are mirrored in AI. All human scientific and technological advancements also tell us a story about the human creative powers that are a part of the image of God. AI can be seen as a result of our God-given imagination and courage to be co-creators by creating something new.³⁸

Conclusion

Over the years, there have been many slogans namely, "AI is impossible" (We used to have dismay about it) and "AI is just automation" (It is only a development of mechanization) "AI will solve all problems" (People began to wonder at it) and "AI may kill us all" (Today there is the perennial problem of fear). In this present scenario it gathers much attention in every domain of human life. But it also raises many substantial issues namely, of how much of this "philosophy and ethics of AI" is really about human future (telos) rather than about an imagined technology. AI and robotics have raised fundamental questions about rationale of these systems, what the systems themselves should do, and what risks they have in the long term, especially in terms of philosophy and ethics. They also challenge the view of humanity as the only intelligent and dominant species on Earth. We have seen issues that have been raised with regard to the technological and social developments closely to catch the new issues, problems connected to theological analysis, and how to strike a balance between both. The subject needs to be further enhanced with much care and subtle reflections so that the life of earth shall be continued anchoring on the dignity and asserting the personhood of human being which the core of human creation expressed in the symbol *imago dei*.

³⁸Foerst, "Cog, A Humanoid Robot, and the Question of the Image of God," 108.