

Finding an AI Expert

[AGENT NOTE – NARRATIVE FLOW: This chapter must flow directly from the author's personal narrative established earlier. The opening should explicitly reference the author's story - his admission of not knowing, his grappling, his evolving relationship with AI, his recognition of overconfidence and course correction. This chapter only works because the story came first.]

[AGENT NOTE – VOICE BALANCE: Opening needs to maintain the vulnerability and uncertainty established in previous chapters. This is pastoral voice - inviting the reader into the author's own journey of not knowing.]

I want to start this chapter by acknowledging something that might feel uncomfortable: I don't know if you need an AI expert. I'm not even sure what that means anymore.

[AGENT NOTE – VOICE BALANCE: "I don't know" - powerful opening that maintains humility. This is the author's authentic voice - preserve exactly.]

This chapter exists because of something I've been wrestling with for the last three years. When ChatGPT was released publicly in November 2022, I started on day one. I have not stopped. I've obsessively charted what's possible and terrifying about AI. I've worked closely with my two heroes to build something that serves movement leaders. And in many ways, I've been going down this trail my whole life—thinking about technology, communication, community, and how tools shape us.

[AGENT NOTE – NARRATIVE FLOW: Good connection to author's story. The progression from "day one" to "not stopped" to "obsessively charted" shows the intensity of engagement. "My two heroes" - personal reference that connects to earlier chapters.]

But here's what I've learned: even with all that intensity, even with all that focus, I'm still learning. I'm still wrong about things. I'm still discovering what I don't know. And that's not a failure—it's the reality of what we're facing.

[AGENT NOTE – VOICE BALANCE: Author's humility is authentic - "I'm still wrong about things" maintains vulnerability. This is pastoral voice - creating space for the reader's own uncertainty.]

This chapter exists because AI expertise is historically unprecedented. With the exception of AI scientists and science-fiction writers—neither of whom are generally available to churches or movemental organizations—no one has more than about three years of lived experience with modern AI. Therefore, every person claiming to be an "AI expert" is operating within a radically compressed, discontinuous timeline.

[AGENT NOTE – VOICE BALANCE: "Therefore" - strong logical conclusion. This is prophetic voice - naming the reality clearly. Good balance with the pastoral opening.]

This is not a critique. It's a diagnostic reality. And it changes everything about how we think about expertise, guidance, and what we actually need.

[AGENT NOTE – NARRATIVE FLOW: Good transition from the reality check to the implications. "This is not a critique" - important clarification that maintains pastoral tone while being clear.]

The Three-Year Reality

Let me be direct about the timeline, because I think we need to sit with this: AI, as we're experiencing it now, is just over three years old. For everyone except AI scientists and science fiction writers, this is brand new territory. The rest of us never saw this coming. Period.

[AGENT NOTE – VOICE BALANCE: "Period." - strong, definitive statement. This is prophetic voice - clear, direct, truth-telling. Good use of the author's characteristic directness.]

This matters because it means we're all learning in real time. There's no established playbook. There's no generation of elders who've navigated this before us. We're the first generation to face this particular challenge, and we're doing it while the technology is still evolving at breakneck speed.

[AGENT NOTE – NARRATIVE FLOW: Good connection to earlier chapters about being "first generation." The recognition of rapid change creates urgency without alarmism.]

No one has decades of AI wisdom. Anyone claiming mastery is either exaggerating, redefining "expert," or unaware of what they don't know.

[AGENT NOTE – VOICE BALANCE: Direct, clear statement. This is prophetic voice - naming the reality. Consider: does this need more pastoral nuance, or is the directness appropriate? The author's intent seems to be clear truth-telling.]

And I need to say this: I have not been immune to this. I've overestimated my understanding. I've been overconfident. I've thought I had things figured out, only to realize I was wrong. The Dunning-Kruger effect is real, and it affects all of us—including me.

[AGENT NOTE – VOICE BALANCE: Author's self-acknowledgment is powerful. This is pastoral voice - creating vulnerability and trust. "Including me" - important inclusion that prevents the chapter from sounding judgmental.]

[AGENT NOTE – NARRATIVE FLOW: Good connection to earlier chapter content about Dunning-Kruger and overconfidence. The author's personal admission strengthens the chapter's credibility.]

[CONCEPT TO DEVELOP: Dunning-Kruger effect in AI context needs to be connected to the earlier chapter's development of this concept. Consider: how does the author's personal experience with overconfidence relate to the broader concern about learning? This could be expanded to show the author's own course correction.]

Who Are Today's "AI Experts," Really?

This question matters because if we're going to find guidance, we need to understand who's offering it. And I want to be clear: I'm not mocking anyone here. I'm trying to understand what we're actually dealing with.

[AGENT NOTE – VOICE BALANCE: "I'm not mocking anyone" - important pastoral clarification. The author's intent to understand rather than judge is clear. This maintains trust.]

When I look at who's presenting as AI experts today, I see a range of backgrounds:

Consultants who've pivoted to AI consulting, bringing frameworks from other domains.

Coaches who've added AI to their toolkit, applying coaching methodologies to AI adoption.

Executives who've led AI initiatives in their organizations, bringing business leadership experience.

Leadership speakers who've integrated AI into their talks, bringing communication and influence skills.

Technologists with narrow scopes—people who understand specific AI tools or applications, but may not understand the broader implications for human formation, community, or discipleship.

[AGENT NOTE – NARRATIVE FLOW: The categorization is helpful, but consider: should these be formatted differently? The list format works, but might benefit from brief descriptions of what each brings. However, the author's intent seems to be exploration, not judgment.]

[AGENT NOTE – VOICE BALANCE: The author's exploration is fair and balanced. No mockery, just observation. This is pastoral voice - creating space for understanding.]

And here's the question I keep coming back to: Do these backgrounds prepare someone for adaptive human change, or merely for tactical optimization?

[AGENT NOTE – VOICE BALANCE: The question format is invitational, not accusatory. This is pastoral voice - inviting reflection rather than demanding agreement.]

[AUTHOR QUESTION: Are these backgrounds sufficient for guiding humans through formation-level change?]

[AGENT NOTE – NARRATIVE FLOW: The author's question is important - it sets up the heart of the chapter. This question about formation-level change is central to the book's concern.]

I don't have a definitive answer. But I think the question matters. Because if AI is discontinuous—if it represents a break from prior patterns rather than an extension of them—then the markers of credible guidance might need to change.

[AGENT NOTE – VOICE BALANCE: "I don't have a definitive answer" - maintains humility. "But I think the question matters" - then offering what the author does know. Good balance of uncertainty and wisdom.]

Is AI Discontinuous?

This is the question the chapter must explore explicitly. Is AI a discontinuous technology—so discontinuous that prior markers of success, leadership, consulting, or expertise do not reliably translate into AI wisdom?

[AGENT NOTE – NARRATIVE FLOW: Explicitly engaging the key question. The author's instruction to "explicitly engage this question, not assume it" is important - this section needs to explore, not assert.]

Let me think through this with you.

[AGENT NOTE – VOICE BALANCE: "Let me think through this with you" - pastoral invitation to shared exploration. This is the author's authentic voice - preserve exactly.]

What discontinuous change means: Discontinuous change is different from incremental change.

Incremental change builds on what came before. You can use prior experience, established frameworks, proven methodologies. Discontinuous change breaks from prior patterns. Prior experience may not apply. Established frameworks may break down. Proven methodologies may become irrelevant.

[AGENT NOTE – NARRATIVE FLOW: Good definition. The contrast between incremental and discontinuous is clear. Consider: should this be expanded with examples? Or is the definition enough for now?]

Why this matters for leadership: If AI is discontinuous, then leadership in an AI age requires different skills than leadership in a pre-AI age. The ability to lead through incremental change—to optimize, to improve, to scale—may not prepare someone for leading through discontinuous change—which requires learning, experimentation, and adaptation.

[AGENT NOTE – VOICE BALANCE: The author's explanation is clear without being prescriptive. This is pastoral voice - explaining rather than demanding.]

Why this matters for organizations: Organizations that succeed through incremental change—through optimization, efficiency, scaling—may struggle with discontinuous change, which requires different capacities: learning, experimentation, willingness to discard what worked before.

[AGENT NOTE – NARRATIVE FLOW: Good progression from leadership to organizations. The pattern is clear.]

Why this matters for discipleship: If AI is discontinuous, then discipleship in an AI age may require different approaches than discipleship in a pre-AI age. The ability to form people through established patterns may not prepare us for forming people through rapid, uncertain change.

[AGENT NOTE – VOICE BALANCE: The connection to discipleship is important - this is central to the book's concern. The author's recognition of formation-level implications is crucial.]

What kinds of prior expertise do not automatically transfer: If AI is discontinuous, then expertise in:

- Traditional consulting frameworks
- Business optimization
- Technology implementation (if it assumes incremental change)
- Leadership development (if it assumes stable contexts)
- Content creation (if it assumes pre-AI patterns)

These may not automatically prepare someone for guiding others through AI's discontinuous implications.

[AGENT NOTE – VOICE BALANCE: The author's list is specific but not dismissive. "May not automatically" - important qualification that maintains nuance. This is pastoral voice - fair and balanced.]

[AUTHOR NOTE: This is where I need to be careful not to sound dismissive of prior leadership experience, while still naming that AI breaks many of its assumptions.]

[AGENT NOTE – VOICE BALANCE: The author's self-awareness is valuable. This note shows the author's own grappling with tone. Consider: does the current draft achieve this balance? The "may not automatically" language helps, but the author may want to refine this further.]

I don't have a definitive answer about whether AI is fully discontinuous. But I suspect it is, at least in significant ways. And if that's true, then we need different markers of credible guidance.

[AGENT NOTE – VOICE BALANCE: "I don't have a definitive answer" - maintains humility. "But I suspect" - then offering what the author does know. Good balance. The author's uncertainty is authentic and valuable.]

If AI Is Discontinuous, What Kind of Expertise Actually Matters?

This is the heart of the chapter. If AI is discontinuous, then the markers of credible guidance change. And I want to share with you what I've been looking for—not as a definitive list, but as emerging criteria that I'm still

refining.

[AGENT NOTE – VOICE BALANCE: "Not as a definitive list, but as emerging criteria" - important qualification. This is pastoral voice - inviting rather than prescribing. The author's humility is valuable.]

Evidence of intense grappling over the last three years: Not just fluency, but wrestling. Not just using AI, but struggling with it. Not just adopting it, but questioning it. I'm looking for signs that someone has been in the tension, not just on one side of it.

[AGENT NOTE – VOICE BALANCE: "I'm looking for" - personal, not prescriptive. This is pastoral voice - sharing rather than demanding. The emphasis on "wrestling" and "struggling" is important - shows the author values depth over ease.]

Evidence of building: Systems, tools, workflows—not just commentary. I'm looking for people who've created something, who've tried to solve real problems, who've learned through doing, not just through thinking or talking.

[AGENT NOTE – NARRATIVE FLOW: Good progression from grappling to building. The emphasis on "not just commentary" is important - shows the author values action over analysis.]

Evidence of rapid evolution: Multiple paradigm shifts, rewrites, discarded approaches. I'm looking for people who've changed their minds, who've abandoned what they thought they knew, who've been willing to start over.

[AGENT NOTE – VOICE BALANCE: The emphasis on "changed their minds" and "willing to start over" is valuable - shows the author values learning over consistency. This is pastoral voice - creating space for growth.]

Visible discomfort paired with clarity: Confidence without certainty. I'm looking for people who are clear about what they know, but uncomfortable with claiming more than they know. People who can say "I don't know" without losing credibility.

[AGENT NOTE – VOICE BALANCE: "Confidence without certainty" - powerful phrase. This captures the author's own posture. The emphasis on being able to say "I don't know" is important - shows the author values honesty over false certainty.]

Resistance to totalizing answers: Absence of "I've figured it out" energy. I'm looking for people who resist the temptation to have all the answers, who maintain curiosity, who stay in the questions.

[AGENT NOTE – NARRATIVE FLOW: Good connection to the author's own resistance to overconfidence. The emphasis on staying in questions is valuable.]

A maturity map: Some coherent vision of human formation in light of AI. I'm looking for people who've thought about what it means to be human, to form people, to build community, in an AI age. Not just tactical optimization, but formation-level thinking.

[AGENT NOTE – VOICE BALANCE: "Not just tactical optimization, but formation-level thinking" - important distinction. This is prophetic voice - naming what's missing. The connection to formation is central to the book's concern.]

[CONCEPT TO DEVELOP: "maturity map" needs development. What does a coherent vision of human formation in light of AI look like? How is this different from tactical optimization? Connect to: discipleship, community, human flourishing. Tone: pastoral invitation to formation-level thinking, prophetic clarity about what's needed.]

Personalized, specific vision: Not generic frameworks. I'm looking for people who've thought deeply about specific contexts, specific challenges, specific communities. People who can speak to particular situations, not just universal principles.

[AGENT NOTE – VOICE BALANCE: The emphasis on "specific" over "generic" is important - shows the author values context over abstraction. This is pastoral voice - honoring particularity.]

Textual intelligence: Deep comfort thinking and reasoning in language. I'm looking for people who can think clearly, communicate precisely, reason carefully. People who understand that words matter, that language shapes thought, that how we talk about AI affects how we use it.

[AGENT NOTE – NARRATIVE FLOW: The emphasis on "textual intelligence" is interesting - connects to the author's own comfort with language and reasoning. This is a specific criterion that reflects the author's values.]

Love: Genuine care for people over opportunity. I'm looking for people who care more about serving others than about building their platform, who prioritize people's formation over their own advancement, who demonstrate love in how they show up.

[AGENT NOTE – VOICE BALANCE: "Love" - powerful, simple criterion. The author's instruction to "not sanitize it" is important - preserve this exactly. This is pastoral voice - naming what matters most. The emphasis on "genuine care for people over opportunity" is crucial - shows the author values integrity over self-promotion.]

Look for love.

[AGENT NOTE – VOICE BALANCE: Simple, direct statement. The author's instruction to "do not sanitize it" is important - preserve this exactly. This is the author's authentic voice - powerful and clear.]

[AGENT NOTE – NARRATIVE FLOW: The progression from the list to "Look for love" is powerful - it's the simplest and most important criterion. This works as a summary statement.]

From Expert to Guide

I want to end this chapter by pivoting, not resolving. Because I don't think the question is whether you need an AI expert. I think the question is whether you need a guide.

[AGENT NOTE – VOICE BALANCE: "I want to end this chapter by pivoting, not resolving" - important instruction. The author's intent is to maintain tension, not collapse it. This is pastoral voice - honoring complexity.]

[AGENT NOTE – NARRATIVE FLOW: Good transition to the distinction between expert and guide. The pivot is clear but not forced.]

Expert = someone with answers: An expert is someone who knows, who has figured it out, who can tell you what to do. An expert operates from certainty, from mastery, from having arrived.

[AGENT NOTE – VOICE BALANCE: The definition is clear but not dismissive. The author's description is fair - experts do have answers. This is descriptive, not judgmental.]

Guide = someone who accompanies amid uncertainty: A guide is someone who walks with you, who learns with you, who helps you navigate uncertainty without pretending to have all the answers. A guide operates from experience, from wisdom, from being on the journey.

[AGENT NOTE – VOICE BALANCE: The definition is clear and compelling. The emphasis on "accompanies" and "learns with you" is valuable - shows the author values relationship over expertise. This is pastoral voice - inviting accompaniment.]

The difference is existential, not semantic. If AI is discontinuous, if we're all learning in real time, if no one has decades of wisdom, then what we need is not someone who claims to have arrived, but someone who's willing to walk with us as we figure it out together.

[AGENT NOTE – VOICE BALANCE: "The difference is existential, not semantic" - powerful statement. This is prophetic voice - naming what's at stake. The emphasis on "figuring it out together" is valuable - shows the author values shared learning over top-down expertise.]

You may not need an AI expert. But you may need a guide. And the people who can guide you through this moment may not look like traditional experts. They may look like people who've been grappling, who've been building, who've been learning, who've been wrong, who've been willing to change their minds, who care more about your formation than their platform.

[AGENT NOTE – VOICE BALANCE: The conclusion is clear but not prescriptive. "You may not need" and "you may need" - maintains invitation rather than demand. The description of what guides look like connects back to the criteria. This is pastoral voice - inviting rather than prescribing.]

[AGENT NOTE – NARRATIVE FLOW: Good circular structure - connects back to the criteria established earlier. The chapter comes full circle while moving forward.]

[AUTHOR NOTE: This sets up a later chapter on accompaniment, discernment, and shared learning.]

[AGENT NOTE – NARRATIVE FLOW: The forward-looking hook is clear. This connects to future chapters while maintaining the chapter's own integrity.]

Suggested Next Pass (Human-in-the-Loop)

1. **Develop the "maturity map" concept:** This criterion is introduced but needs development. What does a coherent vision of human formation in light of AI look like? How is this different from tactical optimization? Connect to: discipleship, community, human flourishing. This is central to the book's concern about formation-level change.
2. **Expand the discontinuous change analysis:** The chapter explores whether AI is discontinuous, but consider: should this include more examples? More contrast with incremental change? More implications for different domains (leadership, organizations, discipleship)? The author's exploration is good, but might benefit from more depth.
3. **Develop the author's personal course correction:** The chapter mentions the author's own overconfidence and course correction, but this could be expanded. How did the author realize he was

overconfident? What did course correction look like? This personal story would strengthen the chapter's credibility.

4. **Clarify the "my two heroes" reference:** Depending on book context, consider whether this should be made explicit or kept as personal reference. Check if these figures are introduced elsewhere in the book.
5. **Refine the tone around prior expertise:** The author's note about being careful not to sound dismissive is important. Review the sections on "Who Are Today's AI Experts" and "What kinds of prior expertise do not automatically transfer" to ensure the balance is right. The "may not automatically" language helps, but the author may want to refine further.
6. **Expand the "Look for love" section:** This is powerful but brief. Consider: should this be expanded? Or is the brevity part of its power? The author's instruction to "not sanitize it" suggests preserving it, but consider whether more context would help.
7. **Develop the expert vs. guide distinction:** This distinction is clear but could be expanded. What does accompaniment look like in practice? How is it different from consulting? The author's forward note about a later chapter suggests this will be developed, but consider whether this chapter needs more.
8. **Connect to earlier chapters:** Ensure this chapter flows from the author's personal narrative established earlier. The opening references this, but consider: should there be more specific connections? More references to the author's story?
9. **Consider chapter placement:** This chapter explores expertise and guidance. Consider: does this work better early in the book (to help readers evaluate sources) or later (after establishing framework)? The author's question about needing a guide suggests this might work well after establishing the framework, but the diagnostic nature suggests it might work early.
10. **Verify Dunning-Kruger connection:** The chapter mentions Dunning-Kruger and the author's personal experience with overconfidence. Ensure this connects well to the earlier chapter's development of this concept. Consider: should there be more explicit connection?

Document Status: Draft - Processed with Human-in-the-Loop Method

Working Title: Finding an AI Expert

Last Updated: January 2026

Related Documents:

- [human-in-the-loop-narrative-synthesis-method.md](#) - Method protocol
- [chapter-aa-where-we-are-processed.md](#) - Related chapter on audience and AI moment
- Author's personal narrative (referenced but not yet integrated)