

AI, faith and responsible judgment

60-minute teaching session · Center for AI and Religious Imagery. Audience: churches, religion students and adult learning groups. Free to use with attribution to the Center. Adapt examples for age and tradition.

Learning outcomes

Distinguish documented fact, historical meaning, reaction and Christian interpretation. Recognize the difference between a company's name choice and a verified naming motive. Evaluate a spiritual-advice tool without either panic or uncritical trust.

0-10 minutes: Start with experience

Ask participants where they encounter AI. No one should share confidential conversations or personal prompts. Distinguish search, generated text, image creation and automated recommendations.

10-25 minutes: Read an evidence case

Choose Prometheus, Gemini or Astra from the Center's evidence tracker. Read the original source. Write four columns: what the company did; what the name means historically; what the company says about its naming reason; what remains interpretation. Ask whether the headline accurately reflects the evidence.

Discussion notes

Notes:

AI, faith and responsible judgment

25-40 minutes: Examine a fictional situation

A church volunteer asks a chatbot to write a message to someone who is grieving. Discuss what the tool may assist with, what information should remain private, who checks the result and what a human pastoral relationship offers that a generated message cannot establish. This fictional scenario is not an allegation about a particular product.

40-50 minutes: Christian reflection

Read James 3:13-18 and 1 Thessalonians 5:21 in context. Discuss wisdom as conduct, not fluency. Ask how truthfulness and care for one's neighbor change a concrete technology decision. Invite disagreement and identify denominational assumptions.

50-60 minutes: Apply and assess

Write one justified use, one boundary and one question needing evidence. Check whether each conclusion is factual, interpretive or practical. Agree who will revisit the issue and when.

For researchers

Record whose views were included. A small discussion group is not a representative public-opinion survey. Obtain consent before quoting participants and never publish identifiable pastoral disclosures.

Discussion notes

Notes:
