

IIS-2021, online Event

## **Artificial Intelligence and the Evolutionary Explanation of Religion**

January 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2021

Transcription of the Chat-channel

01:27:52

*Sam H:* Are evolutionary origins and religious truths mutually exclusive? Regardless of the origin of the believe, it does not invalidate the believe. If evolution cause us to 'develop rational thought' which causes us to say '1+1=2', does this mean that '1+1=2' is no longer true? If so, why not doubt evolution itself?

01:33:30

*Fabio Massaioli:* I second Vuko's question. Actual reality shows in my opinion that very large communities \_don't\_ work and are not usually built: on a bigger scale we usually speak of societies, whose structure is based on some kind of transaction or law, not on emotional bonding

01:45:53

*Sam H:* Technically, a computer is an a-theist, as it lacks believe.

02:04:00

*Jean-David Ponci:* For me, there is a lot of advantages to build large communities: it is safer, you can specialize, you can have agriculture. You cannot have technological progress without large communities

02:06:02

*Jean-David Ponci:* I have a question to Ilyas: can you think of a machine that wants to be happy. It can speak but it cannot desire to be happy

02:06:54

*Louis:* Intellectuals are tempted to think they're God. This means, they tend to think that reality is what they think it's obvious to them. But we should ask ourselves what God thinks about us.

02:08:03

*Vuko Brigljevic:* Sam, I fully agree with this point, explanations don't have to be exclusive

02:08:04

*Daan van Schalkwijk:* Good point Sam!

02:48:53

*Greygarth Hall (Joe Evans):* The recent Ratzinger prize winner Jean-Luc Marion stresses very much the importance of love as the way to know God, and how God reveals himself. He asks which is most important: God is love, or God as being. See his "God without being". Very much for philosophers and sometimes a bit impenetrable but philosophers might find the discussion interesting.

02:50:14

*Daan van Schalkwijk:* This link is to the Freedom in Quarantine books:

<https://www.danielbernardus.com/fiq-book-links>

<https://www.aup.nl/en/book/9789463723268/win-win-win>

02:56:08

*Alfonso Jursenas:* We have heard many arguments that are supported by the concepts like, love, happiness, pain, etc. In my opinion all these arguments essentially point to irreducibility of consciousness to information processing. This points to the hard problem of consciousness.

02:57:13

*Sam H:* I do not know if 'Trust in God' helps (me) in providing direction, it still feels there is no meaning to existence. It makes me wonder why an almighty entity creates anything, as he, almost by definition it seems, requires nothing. An almighty God lacks any limitations and as such, has nothing to overcome and no goals 'external to himself'. Consequently, it seems to me that, if he creates anything, it does not serve a purpose to him. We might have a purpose in our existence (e.g. worshiping the creator of our existence), but our existence itself does not have a purpose and is ultimately meaningless. In essence I am saying that to me it seems we went from 'There is no goal in life' on an atheistic account to 'There is a goal in life, but this is arbitrary and ultimately meaningless as God could have done without us' on a theistic account. Either way, I feel it does not provide a satisfying direction to my existence.

03:00:40

*Kiko Mitjans:* Very good Fr Joe Evans

03:01:53

*Anna Pearson:* Sam H - I find Acts 17:27 very helpful when thinking about the purpose of life: "God did this so that they [people] would seek him and perhaps reach out for him and find him, though he is not far from any one of us". God wants to be found.

03:02:49

*Richard Prins:* I would say God created us to share his love, and therefore the meaning of life in the end is this. Why this gives meaning to life, you can read in the essay by Polo that Daan translated :)

03:03:30

*Greygarth Hall (Joe Evans):* Sam, From the infinitude of his meaning and love, God creates beings who can find meaning and love. It's like beauty: it's "useless". Its "purpose" is delight and goodness not functional. That God creates beings - when he does not need to - who themselves can find meaning and experience (and show) love, tells us much about God. True creativity makes others creative. The one who has found meaning in life wants others to find meaning.

03:11:11

*Mario Filippa:* I invite to elaborate on Greygarth's (Joe Evans') hints. I feel that Sam's perplexities cannot find a solution unless we include the possibility of non-necessary actions. If we conceive God as an absolute being who lacks nothing and therefore has no needs: why should God act at all? And what would be the "meaning" or goal of his existence?

03:12:59

*Daan van Schalkwijk:* Don't forget that for Christians God is not one but three persons, with mutual love. So there is love within God, which is by itself also meaningful.

03:13:05

*Mario Filippa:* I'm not an expert on these matters, but I presume that either we include the possibility of free action or we reach a dead end both for understanding the purpose of our life and for understanding God as an active being.

03:13:33

*Daan van Schalkwijk:* Quite true.

03:13:41

*Sam H:* This is indeed what concerns me, the only solution I have found is that the experiencing of existence is the goal, not the existence itself.

03:13:49

*Mario Filippa:* @Daan: I would object to a theological answer to a philosophical question. But you do have a point there.

03:14:51

*Daan van Schalkwijk:* @Mario Polo says that from the philosophy of the person we can understand that God cannot be a single person.

03:15:54

*Kiko Mitjans:* It makes a lot of sense

03:16:33

*Mario Filippa:* @Sam perhaps the theory of action in phenomenological philosophy could help. It's not just existence or experience of it, but an understanding of being as action (or active? not sure). The Acting Person by Wojtyla could be interesting.

03:16:54

*Mario Filippa:* @Daan: Polo is very audacious!

-----  
02:57:05 Bruno Amadio: Thanks for the meeting and happy new year to all

03:16:59 Kiko Mitjans: Thanks

03:17:07 Olivier Bonnassies: Thank you !

03:17:08 Florian: Thank you!

03:17:09 Nikolai Püllen: That was really awesome! Thanks everyone!

03:17:14 Dancho Azagra: Thanks!

03:17:14 Ignacio Monge: Thanks for organizing!

03:17:16 Timothy Daly: Thanks all!  
03:17:18 Luca Di Rienzo: thank you!  
03:17:42 berti@sissa.it Berti: Bye, bye!  
03:17:43 Francesco Barantani: Thank you all!  
03:17:50 Gennaro Luise: Thank you all  
03:17:51 Ignacio Villalon Fornes: Thank you!!!  
03:17:52 Sam H: Bye, thanks!  
03:17:56 Dominik: Thanks!  
03:17:56 Michele Fatta: Thanks  
03:17:58 Marco Paolino: Thanks  
03:18:01 Raffaele Prioriello: Thank you everyone!