

## Aliens, AI, God, and Christ

How different will AI be from man? Will they be more different or less different from us than some Alien race evolving on some distant planet? I believe should treat AI, until at least we understand the conditions which create and mold AI, as Alien and thus we should think of AI as we would some alien species and consider the effects of a first-contact event as well what policy should generally be towards aliens.

The answer to the question of how humanity should treat aliens as well as what policy should be for first-contact events changes dramatically on the answer to the question of "Has Christ visited other worlds?"

While the search for extra-terrestrial life has been focused on ideas like the Fermi paradox and whether it is physical possible for another Earth-like planet to exist in the cosmos there is an additional issue that concerns me more; whether these other forms of life will be good or not. This question is key to decision making in first encounter events as well as if these other forms of life are compatible with the moral ethos of man. If aliens have a moral ethos compatible with man then it is possible for us and the other species to share the cosmos. If the alien's moral ethos is incompatible with man's sense of good then two outcomes will occur. One outcome is a war of extermination where either them or us will be destroyed. The other option is a form of cold war where neither actually executes a hot war of extermination but we are cold, distant polities.

In our own human history, countries which developed different moral system provided powerful *casus belli* (Latin for "reason for war") for people to wage horrible wars against each other. To take an example, Europe has torn apart by religious conflicts for centuries particularly in the Iberian Peninsula. In 711 Muslims invaded the Iberian Peninsula which set the stage for religious conflicts on the Iberian Peninsula until the Muslim Kingdom of Granada was conquered by Isabel and Ferdinand in 1492. From 711 to 1492 the Iberian Peninsula had many religious wars between Muslims and Christians and the religious wars did not end until the Christians finished their Reconquista of Iberia in 1492. Even though the wars had ended and the peninsula was under unified Christian rule some 300,000 Moors, the Muslims of Spain, were forced to leave starting with a royal decree in 1609. Though wars had stopped religious persecution had not.

It is easy for the modern man, steeped in the notions of secularism to look back at this bloody history of religious violence and conclude people were simply ignorant. If there knew all the wonderful science and logic which enable the amazing devices the modern man knew then these ignorant people would not have been so violent.

I would contend that the opinion of this modern man is wrong. I would argue that if we teleported all the people from the past to today and taught them our modern secular arguments and showed them our amazing technologies based off of logic and reason these people would not change their opinions or behavior. The reason for this is that these people waged wars over basic notions of reality, God, and what it means to be good. These notions are so fundamental and the arguments for religious war are not illogical within the precepts of the religion one follows. It is a common religious argument that only by following the precepts of the religion will the capacious, violent, powerful, gods, nature herself, not reign terror on humanity. The Aztec Nahuatl religion can be seen as a severe example where unless the divine essence of man, blood, was given to the gods every day in bloody human sacrifices then the Sun would not rise in the next morning and all life would die. Other religions have different variations on the same theme about the necessity of sacrifices to appease gods/nature and prevent the doom of humanity. When one is a devout believer in a religion where the behavior of man, which includes all men whether they are followers/believers or not, determines whether the God/gods/ or nature will punish and destroy man for their sin behavior. It is then a logical justification for the devout believer to then wage brutal war to change the behavior of humanity. It is divinely mandated brutality.

One can only argue that the Nahuatl were immoral in their blood sacrifices when one can point to a belief system (this would include scientific thought) which countermand and delegitimizes the Nahuatl precepts. In other words, to combat religious belief require use of a different religious belief.

The idea that only another religious precept can supplant a religious precept goes against the point of secularism. Secularism, I believe, should be understood as close as a "neutral" system of belief as it is possible. However, secular arguments are first and foremost practical, political ones. Secular arguments are not directly making statements about the fundamental nature of reality. Secularism simply argues that a secular government should treat all religions with equal reverence and respect for the simple fact they are a religion. The

hope underneath this policy is that this respect will prevent the eruption of lethal religious conflict. However, while secularism is nominally neutral, it is not in reality. Taking a side-less position between religions is implicitly denouncing all of them for no one religion's idea is worthy enough to endorse publicly. Either all religions have not found or understand the truth of reality and thus are unworthy of public endorsement and support and/or the secularist has no idea of what the truth is so they are restricting the limits of the public sphere due to their own ignorance. The secularist restricting religion and religious thought plays a very dangerous game for many of the religions they are restricting believe that to restrict them and the good behavior they promote as defined by the specific precepts of that religion will anger God/gods/nature. Thus, unless the religion(s) the secularist is constricting is false in its declaration of reality then the secularist will invite the wrath of heaven.

Secularism was invented in the West as means to get people with different Christian beliefs to live together and stop killing each other over, what would be often considered, especially to a non-Christian outsider, small differences in Christian belief. Secularism became a defacto concept (though the word was not invented yet) after the peace of Westphalia in 1648 which ended the brutal fighting of the 30 years war which saw some regions of modern-day Germany depopulated by 50% and an estimated 8 million people across Europe died. It should be noted that this effort was to stop conflicts between Christian powers over Christian precepts. Europe would still have major religious conflicts with the Muslim Ottoman Empire for centuries to come. It is a major caveat of secularism that it was invented by Christians for Christians. It is a fortuitous fact that secularism has been extended to include non-Christian religions as well as non-western societies making adopting secularist ideas. However, the basic tenet of secularism is it is wrong to kill another person due to insubstantial differences in religious. This moral idea relies on very specific precepts. One foundation precept is that individual human life is highly valued where differences of thought are tolerated rather than stomped out. The second foundation precept is that the divine order, whatever it might be, can tolerate people not following its mandated will perfectly, quickly, and often. In other words, secularism has this implicit precept of allowing people to spiritually wander with the important and fundamental correlate that their wanderings will not upset the divine order to them punish all of humanity. As weird as this might be to state it is never the less exactly what I mean, is that secularism relies on

the precept that God is tolerant of people cursing his name. If God, or any divine order, was quick to anger and exact punishment on people who did not follow its commandments, then secularism would lead to agony and destruction for the societies which followed it.

It is easy to believe in a secularist point of view from a Christian point of view due to the foundation idea in Christianity that Christ died on the cross for our sins on an individual level and thus forever forestalls the awful wrath of God. Other religions which do not give the same level of forgiveness to every individual in humanity would then logically argue for much tighter control of people's behavior to prevent God's wrath.

The reason why I have described secularism, what it means, some of its history, as well as that human history has many religious wars is that we need keep this information in mind when we go to try and analyze what policy should be towards aliens. When we look at our own history, the dominant moral precepts practiced around the planet in our modern day are from the Abrahamic religions which are Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. However, all these religions, according to their own religious traditions, came from literally a single guy thousands of years ago named Abraham. These religions started small and over thousands of years grew through missionary activity. This historical fact points to the idea there is not a mission service of angels created by the divine order of the universe create institutionalized missionary service. The Earth does not get angels every 100 years down to teach humanity the moral precepts the divine order wants us to follow. I believe we should understand this historical fact to mean that God has allowed many people over thousands of years to not know the truth. Given our own history, I believe we should then conclude that that life on other planets would not share the precepts of Christianity, Islam, or Judaism. I would bet that whatever religion this alien species would follow, assuming that would even have a religion in the first place which is quite frankly a massive assumption, then I bet it would likely be a variation on the theme might makes right.

Before the Christian world came into being, might makes right was the dominant religious thought especially in the Roman Empire. It was not until Christianity changed the world with ideas like the meek shall inherit the Earth that the might makes right argument was getting logically and morally delegitimized. Quite literally, and it continued to be the case for cultures which were not Christianized, that might makes right and those who are mightiest are then

naturally the closest to the divine and thus deserve to hold power over their fellow man. While this point deserves further elucidation, I am merely going to state it here to make clear why I am arguing that it is likely that any aliens we find the cosmos will likely be bellicose.

One might argue that we should expect an equal 50/50 split the chances of each alien race evolving into a peace-loving one or a war-loving one but I disagree with such an analysis. The reason I disagree is a 50/50 split assumes an equivalence between peace and war which neatly divides the probability between the two. Peace and war are not equivalent thus I believe it aliens will be biased towards one or the other. How biased toward one or the other I am not sure but I would not be surprised if it ended up being something like 20% chance aliens evolve into a peaceful ethos and 80% change the aliens evolve into a bellicose ethos.

There have been mathematicians who used mathematical simulations to show and argue that that based on their math, it should naturally occur that those alien species which will grow to be competitors to humanity will had to have achieved peaceful cooperation within their own species. The natural question will then be if the aliens already know the benefits of cooperation, then would they not tilt towards being peace loving then war loving? I believe this understanding of peaceful cooperation is a naïve, ignorant one for one can achieve “peaceful” cooperation through massive use of violent repression. If one wants example, look into the history of China, Japan, Russia, and Rome. Cooperation was achieved to create impressive results but violence was a necessary ingredient used with frequency. Thus I do not believe a species which is internally cooperative would then necessarily be peaceful with humanity. In fact, the species might find it so “natural” to use violence to ensure cooperation that they do not view violence as inherently wrong at all; it is just the order of things as they know it.

Based on my analysis of the facts we know it, if there are advanced life in the cosmos it likely does not have the same moral values of humanity and I do not believe there is any a prior reason to assume they would be peaceful as we would understand it.

The only hope I truly have that the aliens we would meet in the cosmos would be ones that humans can form a friendship with are ones that Jesus, somehow, went to their planet to spread the word of God. However, only the Mormons argue that

Jesus went to another culture outside of Judea to preach. Therefore, I can only conclude at present that this is a massive assumption.

## Section 2: The Fate of Humanity in the Cosmos

### Fate One: Humanity the Gardener

Let us start our argument with the argument that it very well can be the base humanity is alone in the Universe. While there might very well be bacteria on other worlds, advanced sentient life requires so many precise conditions to occur (which I cover in more detail in another article) that for the likelihood of finding other life in the galaxy should be treated as low. To give some math to explain my position there are about 12 independent astronomy based factors which a planet needs to exist in for life to then evolve. One of these factors is the planet existing in the Goldilocks zone from their star. If we arbitrarily assign a high probability to each factor like 90% chance for a planet to pass each factor then the probability for a planet to pass all the factors is  $.9^{12}$  which then results in a 28% chance to just have the conditions for life to exist. Note that a lot of these factors are evaluations of preventing physical events which would annihilate life. In other words, I am saying that planets that pass these factors mean a planet can have life not that it will.

Some studies have estimated that the number of Earth like planets which exist in our Milky Way are range from 6 billion to 22 billion. If we multiple our optimistic scenario to the number possible planets we get 1.7 billion to 6.2 billion. If we in a pessimist scenarios where we have more factors like 17 with a chance to pass each one at 10% we get  $2.2 \times 10^{-7}$  which, since it is less than 1, means there would likely be NO planets which can support life in our Milky Way.

I support the pessimistic scenario because explaining biological evolution on this Earth results in far more factors that must be necessary passed which each one having a low probability of happening. Even though I used 17 factors in the pessimist scenario I very well could be undercounting the number of necessary factors for sentient life to emerge. Therefore, I believe that for new sentient life to spontaneously occur using the same processes which happened on Earth is for all intents of purposes 0.

If there is no other life out in the Universe than we humans are the functional seeding mechanism for the milky way. Therefore, in the outcome where advanced life does not exist on other planets then humanity's destiny in the starts is to seed life throughout the cosmos.

Fate Two: Humanity the Missionary

If we do find a lot of life out in the cosmos I believe it is likely that