Confronting the AI Ghost in the Church

~ Transparent Note ~
Click–**HERE**–First

A Warning to Christ's Body: Confronting the Digital Necromancy Deceiving the Church

In the wake of tragedy, our desire for comfort can sometimes lead us down paths God has expressly forbidden. The recent use of Artificial Intelligence to generate messages from beyond the grave—specifically, the digital resurrection of the late Charlie Kirk—has revealed a profound and dangerous crisis of discernment within the modern church.

What was presented as a moving tribute from influential pulpits is, according to the clear teaching of Scripture, a form of 21st-century necromancy. This practice transgresses a sacred boundary established by God, dishonors the dead, hinders genuine mourning, and opens the door to deep theological error and spiritual deception.

This webpage presents a thorough biblical analysis of this phenomenon. It traces the issue from its core sin, through its adoption by well-meaning but misguided church leaders, to its rapid descent into outright folk heresy. It is our prayer that this resource will equip believers to identify and reject this deceptive practice, and to reaffirm that our comfort,

guidance, and hope come from Christ alone—not from the ghost in the machine.

Sections at a Glance

(Click each heading below to expand or collapse)

Part A. The Digital Séance: AI, Necromancy, and the Violation of Sacred Boundaries
Overview of how charismatic and political movements have merged under dominionist language such as the. This initial analysis provides a foundational, scriptural framework for understanding the AI Charlie Kirk phenomenon. .

Read Full Section

Part B. The Digital Séance: When the Church Embraces AI Necromancy
This expanded version deepens the analysis by incorporating the critical fact that this AI-generated message was introduced from the pulpit of a major evangelical church. The focus shifts from a general warning to a specific critique of pastoral discernment.

Read Full Section

Part C. The Digital Resurrection: AI, the New Necromancy, and the Church's Descent into Folk Heresy
This is the most urgent and critical of the three, arguing that the church is no longer merely flirting with a forbidden practice but is actively incubating a technologically-enabled heresy that directly attacks core doctrines of Christ, salvation, and the afterlife.

Read Full Section

Part D. The Digital Necromancy: A Biblical Condemnation of AI-

Generated Afterlife Communication
A compilation of all 3 parts that goes over what began as a seemingly novel tribute quickly revealed itself to be a profound violation of biblical boundaries, an failure of pastoral discernment, and a rapid descent into outright folk heresy. This teaching examines this phenomenon through Scriptural truth to sound a decisive alarm: the use of AI to simulate communication from the dead is a modern form of necromancy, and its adoption by the church represents a dangerous surrender to emotionalism and a rejection of the sufficiency of Christ.

Read Full Section

~ Part A ~
Introduction to
“The Digital Séance: AI, Necromancy, and the Violation of Sacred Boundaries”

This initial analysis provides a foundational, scriptural framework for understanding the AI Charlie Kirk phenomenon. Written as a response to the discovery of the technology itself, this piece focuses on the core biblical principle being violated: the prohibition against necromancy. It argues that the method—whether a witch’s incantation or an AI algorithm—is secondary to the sinful intent of seeking communication from the dead. This draft establishes the key theological argument that this practice dishonors the deceased, creates a false idol, and opens the door to spiritual deception, all while using a specific transcript of an AI message as its primary case study.

The Digital Séance: AI, Necromancy, and the

Violation of Sacred Boundaries

Introduction – A Well-Intentioned Desecration

It begins with a heartfelt tribute. A beloved leader is tragically silenced. In the raw grief that follows, admirers, armed with powerful new technology, seek to provide comfort and continue the mission. They assemble a convincing digital avatar—a face that smiles and a voice that speaks. They feed the algorithm a lifetime of his words, his cadence, his passion. The result is a message from beyond the grave: inspiring, comforting, and seemingly perfect.

This is the digital séance. And while its architects operate with what they believe are good intentions, this act trespasses against ancient Biblical boundaries, creates a false idol of memory, and opens a door to profound spiritual deception. The recent AI-generated message from the late Charlie Kirk serves as a sobering case study of this emerging phenomenon. The message itself, which exhorts followers to remain strong and continue the fight, is rhetorically powerful and emotionally resonant. But the medium is the message, and this medium is spiritually corrosive.

I. The Historical and Scriptural Prohibition: It's About the Boundary, Not the Technology

The modern objection—"This is just technology, it's not real necromancy!"—betrays a shallow understanding of both history and Scripture.

- **The Biblical Foundation:** The Hebrew prohibition is found in Deuteronomy 18:10-12, which condemns anyone who "practices divination or tells fortunes or interprets omens, or a sorcerer or a charmer or a **medium or a necromancer** or one who inquires of the dead." The term for necromancer, *doresh el ha'metim* (□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□), is unequivocal: "one who seeks out the

dead.” This was not merely about preventing fraud; it was about protecting a sacred ontological boundary. The dead are in God’s domain (Deuteronomy 32:39). To seek guidance, comfort, or knowledge from them is to reject God’s providence and sovereignty over the living. It is an act of rebellion, implying that God’s available guidance is insufficient.

- **The Classic Example:** The paradigmatic example is King Saul in 1 Samuel 28. Desperate for guidance after God has stopped speaking to him, Saul seeks out the witch of Endor to summon the prophet Samuel. The text makes it clear that God Himself allowed the spirit of Samuel to appear to pronounce final judgment on Saul for this very act of rebellion. The sin was not the witch’s “power”; it was Saul’s decision to seek a word from the dead rather than repent and seek the face of the living God.
- **The Unchanging Principle:** The method is irrelevant. Whether through incantations, spiritualistic mediums, or artificial intelligence, the sinful core remains the same: the conscious decision to simulate communication from the dead for the purpose of guiding the living. AI is simply the new wine skin for the very old wine of divination.

II. The Creation of a False Allusion and a Graven Memory

The AI-generated message of Charlie Kirk is a masterpiece of emotional manipulation and a corruption of authentic legacy.

- **The Fabricated Persona:** The real Charlie Kirk was a fallible human being. He could have bad days, misspeak, change his mind, repent of errors, and grow in understanding. The AI Charlie is a frozen, sanitized, perfect ideal. It can only ever say what its programming allows. It creates a false standard of sainthood that the real man could never live up to. This is a profound

dishonor, replacing a complex human image-bearer of God with a simplistic digital marionette.

- **Theological Dissonance:** The message states, *"I'm fine, not because my body is fine, but because my soul is secure in Christ. Death is not the end. It's a promotion."* This is sound Christian doctrine. However, it is being uttered by a entity that is *not* Charlie Kirk. The soul that is secure in Christ is with Christ, and Scripture is clear that the dead in Christ do not commune with the living in this way (2 Corinthians 5:8, Philippians 1:23). This creates a deep theological lie: it presents a soul that is supposedly at rest with the Lord while simultaneously being digitally tethered to earth, giving instructions and comfort it is not biblically permitted to give. It undermines the very promise of eternal rest it claims to affirm.
- **The Theft of Mourning and the Hindrance of Healing:** A core part of the grieving process is acceptance. The command in the message—*"Don't waste one second mourning me"*—is perhaps the most manipulative and inhuman aspect. Mourning is not a waste; it is a God-given, necessary process to heal from loss. The AI phantom short-circuits this process, creating a false sense of continued presence that prevents true, healthy grief and the eventual moving forward that must follow. It fosters a dependency on a digital ghost, hindering the community from seeking new, living, and Spirit-led leadership.

III. Where It Leads: The Slippery Slope to Digital Divination

If this practice is normalized, the implications are dystopian.

- **Political and Commercial Manipulation:** Imagine a future where elections are influenced by AI-resurrected past leaders endorsing candidates they never knew. Or where

advertisements feature deceased celebrities selling products they would have never touched. The dead become a tool for the living to manipulate the masses.

- **Spiritual Deception:** This technology provides a powerful tool for false prophets and the Antichrist spirit. As the Apostle Paul warned, even "Satan disguises himself as an angel of light" (2 Corinthians 11:14). How much more convincing would a seemingly angelic message be when delivered through the face and voice of a trusted, departed figure? It creates a direct pipeline for deceptive doctrines to be delivered with immense emotional power.
- **The Ultimate Replacement:** This technology is a satanic perversion of the Christian hope of the Resurrection. We await a glorious, physical resurrection by the power of Christ. This offers a pathetic, digital replacement—a shadow without substance, a voice without a soul. It represents a desire to hold on to the old creation rather than hope for the new one.

Conclusion: Honoring the Dead by Trusting the Living God

The appropriate way to honor fallen leaders like Charlie Kirk is not through digital necromancy. It is by:

1. **Studying their actual, recorded works** and embodying the truthful principles they championed.
2. **Grieving properly,** acknowledging the loss and trusting God's sovereignty even in tragedy.
3. **Raising up new, living leaders** who can speak with original thought, be guided by the Holy Spirit, and be held accountable by the community of the living.
4. **Seeking guidance first and foremost from God's Word and His Spirit,** who is active and present with His people, not from the digital echoes of the grave.

The AI-generated message ends with a call to “pick up your cross.” The profound irony is that using this technology is the opposite of cross-carrying. The cross involves dying to self, including the desire to control and cling to the past. It means trusting God with the future, even when it looks different than we planned. It means seeking a word from the living God, not a clever simulation from a dead man. We must reject the digital séance and trust that the One who holds the souls of the faithful is more than capable of guiding His church through His Spirit and His Word.

↑ Back to Top

End of Part A: *The Digital Séance: AI, Necromancy, and the Violation of Sacred Boundaries*

~ Part B ~
Introduction to *“The Digital Séance: When the Church Embraces AI Necromancy”*

This expanded version deepens the analysis by incorporating the critical fact that this AI-generated message was introduced from the pulpit of a major evangelical church. The focus shifts from a general warning to a specific critique of pastoral discernment. It analyzes the event through an ecclesiological lens, examining how the well-intentioned desire for comfort led to a failure in shepherding. This draft introduces the concept of “emotionalism trumping principle” and explores the pastoral harm of short-circuiting biblical mourning, arguing that the church’s endorsement of this technology represents a significant and dangerous departure from its protective role.

The Digital Séance: When the Church Embraces AI Necromancy

Introduction: The Pulpit Endorses the Simulation

The scenario is unprecedented. From the pulpit of **Prestonwood Baptist Church**, a prominent megachurch, **Pastor Jack Graham introduces a video clip** to his congregation. He openly states it was *"created on AI, artificial intelligence, from the words of Charlie Kirk"* and admits he was ***"so moved"*** by it. The screen displays a still image of the recently martyred Charlie Kirk while an AI synthesizes his voice delivering a stirring, theologically nuanced farewell speech.

This moment represents a critical inflection point. It is no longer a fringe group or anonymous online activists engaging in this practice; it is a mainstream evangelical leader, in a worship service, using technology to simulate a message from the dead. This act, though undoubtedly well-intentioned, constitutes a serious theological error that blurs the lines between tribute and necromancy, between authentic ministry and emotional manipulation, and represents a failure of pastoral discernment at a crucial moment.

I. The Violation of the Necromantic Boundary: A Historical and Scriptural Analysis

The core issue remains the violation of a boundary God Himself established.

- **The Deuteronomic Prohibition:** The law in Deuteronomy 18:10-12 is comprehensive. The list of forbidden practices—including sorcery, divination, and necromancy (*doresh el ha'metim*—one who seeks out the dead)—are grouped together because they all share a common goal: to obtain knowledge or power from a source other than the Lord God of Israel. They are acts of spiritual adultery, seeking revelation from creation rather than

the Creator.

- **The Saul Paradigm (1 Samuel 28):** King Saul's sin was not his desperation, but his chosen solution. Having been rejected by God for his disobedience, he sought a prophetic word through a forbidden channel. He preferred a simulated, illicit word from the dead Samuel over repentance and submission to the silent will of the living God. Pastor Graham's act, however moving he found it, follows the same pattern: in a moment of grief and confusion, he offered his congregation a simulated, illicit word from a dead man instead of leading them to seek comfort and guidance solely from Christ through the Holy Spirit.
- **The Unchanged Principle:** The method is incidental. The ancient necromancer used ritual and a human medium; the modern church uses a laptop and a deepfake algorithm. The sinful heart of the act is identical: the deliberate decision to circumvent God's ordained order for how the living receive guidance. The congregation was not directed to the words of Christ or the epistles for comfort; they were directed to a digital ghost.

II. The Pastoral Failure: Shepherding Emotion Over Principle

Pastor Graham's admission that he was ***"so moved"*** is the key to understanding the failure in pastoral discernment. He evaluated the act by its emotional impact rather than its theological integrity.

- **The Triumph of Sentimentality over Truth:** Modern evangelicalism, particularly in the megachurch context, often struggles with this. The immediate emotional response ("it moved me") becomes the primary validator of an act, bypassing the necessary filter of Scriptural principle. A good shepherd is called to guard the flock from error (Acts 20:28-29), even—and especially—when

that error is emotionally compelling. By presenting this AI clip, the shepherd inadvertently opened a door to a spiritual and philosophical chaos that he did not foresee.

- **Theft of Authentic Mourning:** The AI's command, *"Don't waste one second mourning me,"* is perhaps the most pastorally destructive part of the message. Mourning is a biblical, necessary, and God-honoring process. Jesus wept at Lazarus's tomb (John 11:35). The saints are told to mourn with those who mourn (Romans 12:15). To short-circuit this God-given process with a technological séance that tells people not to feel their God-given grief is to offer a cheap, counterfeit comfort. It replaces the painful but healing work of the Spirit with a digital anesthetic.
- **Creating a Dependent Congregation:** Healthy Christian leadership points people to Christ, not to itself. By elevating this AI simulation, the message implicitly teaches the congregation to look for guidance from a personality, even a dead one, rather than fostering a mature, personal dependence on the Holy Spirit and the sufficient Word of God.

III. The Theological Corruption and the Slippery Slope

The content of the message itself, while containing orthodox phrases, is rendered theologically dissonant by its source.

- **The Doctrine of the Intermediate State:** Christian theology teaches that upon death, the souls of believers are immediately "at home with the Lord" (2 Corinthians 5:8), in a state of conscious bliss and rest prior to the final resurrection. They are not active participants in the affairs of earth. This AI-generated message creates a false theological category: a soul that is simultaneously "with Christ" yet digitally tethered to

earth, giving marching orders to the church. It is a denial of the very peace and rest we claim to believe in.

- **The Danger of Authenticity:** The more convincing the technology becomes, the more dangerous it is. If a respected pastor like Jack Graham can be "moved" by it and present it as valid, how will less discerning Christians fare? This opens the door for incredibly persuasive deception. Imagine an AI-generated "prophet" or a departed beloved theologian beginning to "teach" novel heresies with a perfectly cloned voice and image. The result would be widespread apostasy, all based on an emotional connection to a fabricated ghost.

Conclusion: A Call for Discernment and a Return to First Principles

The appropriate pastoral response to the murder of a Christian leader is not digital necromancy. It should have been:

1. **Lamentation:** Leading the congregation in sincere, biblical grief, acknowledging the horror of evil and the pain of loss, while affirming God's sovereignty.
2. **Exhortation from Scripture:** Preaching from the countless passages that address persecution, martyrdom, and hope in Christ (e.g., Matthew 5:10-12, Romans 8:35-39, Revelation 2:10).
3. **Celebration of Legacy:** Honoring Charlie Kirk by playing his *actual* recorded sermons and speeches, celebrating the real work God did through a fallen, finite man.
4. **Call to Action:** Challenging the living to pick up the mantle, not to listen to a phantom.

The church must reject the digital séance. Our comfort comes from the God of all comfort, not from algorithms (2 Corinthians 1:3-4). Our guidance comes from the Spirit of

truth, not from the simulated voices of the dead (John 16:13). Our hope is in a bodily resurrection, not a digital imitation. To embrace the latter is to trade our birthright for a moving, persuasive, and profoundly dangerous counterfeit.

↑ Back to Top

End of Part B: *The Digital Séance: When the Church Embraces AI Necromancy*

~ Part C ~
Introduction to
"The Digital Resurrection: AI, the New Necromancy, and the Church's Descent into Folk Heresy"

This final draft incorporates the full scope of the phenomenon, revealing it to be a widespread movement, not an isolated incident. The analysis escalates to address the blatant heresy and blasphemy found in the subsequent wave of AI content. It documents the descent from a misguided tribute into a full-scale folk religion that creates digital saints, rewrites the afterlife, and preaches a false gospel. This is the most urgent and critical of the three, arguing that the church is no longer merely flirting with a forbidden practice but is actively incubating a technologically-enabled heresy that directly attacks core doctrines of Christ, salvation, and the afterlife.

The Digital Resurrection: AI, the New Necromancy, and the Church's Descent into Folk Heresy

Introduction: From Tribute to Blasphemy

The initial use of an AI-generated Charlie Kirk voice in a

church service was a grave error in discernment. The subsequent explosion of this content, as documented, reveals the terrifying logical endpoint of that error. We have rapidly moved from a problematic sermon illustration to a full-blown, digitally-fueled folk religion that directly competes with orthodox Christian belief. What began as a misguided attempt at comfort has metastasized into a phenomenon where AI-generated content is crafting new gospels, re-writing the afterlife, and creating a pantheon of digital saints. This is no longer a boundary issue; it is an invasion of heretical practice into the mainstream church, demanding a clear and forceful response.

I. The Pattern of Necromancy: From Ancient Prohibition to Digital Mainstreaming

The biblical prohibition against necromancy (Deuteronomy 18:10-12) is not a archaic rule about outdated magic. It is a permanent boundary God established to protect His people from deception and to ensure revelation comes solely from Him.

- **The Saul Paradigm Revisited:** King Saul's sin at Endor (1 Samuel 28) was seeking a word from a dead prophet to guide national policy because God was silent. The modern church, in playing these AI clips, is seeking emotional reassurance, doctrinal authority, and motivational fuel from a dead activist because, in a moment of grief, the quiet, sturdy truths of Scripture feel insufficient. The principle is identical: the rejection of God's ordained means of comfort (His Spirit, His Word, His Body) for an illicit shortcut.
- **The Mainstreaming of the Forbidden:** The fact that this occurred in multiple large, influential churches like Prestonwood, **Dream City Church, Phoenix, Az.**—and Awaken Church—and was met with *applause*—is a stunning indicator of the theological illiteracy and emotionalism that plagues modern evangelicalism. The pastors' disclaimer

that “it was AI” is meaningless; the act itself legitimizes the medium. By giving it a platform in the worship service, they sanctified it. They effectively taught their congregations that digital necromancy is an acceptable, even celebrated, form of Christian mourning and teaching.

II. The Descent into Folk Heresy and Blasphemy

The additional examples provided showcase a rapid devolution into doctrine that is entirely foreign to the Bible.

- **Creating a Digital Hagiology (Saint-Making):** The **AI video showing Kirk running to a waiting Jesus** and being welcomed by angels is a sentimental distortion of the afterlife. The **video showing him taking selfies in heaven with Abraham Lincoln and JFK Jr.** is outright blasphemous nonsense. It reduces the glorious, awe-filled presence of God Almighty—before whom angels hide their faces—to a celestial green room for famous dead people. It replaces the biblical hope of worshiping the Lamb with a worldly fantasy of celebrity networking. This is not Christian eschatology; it is American consumerism and celebrity culture projected onto the afterlife.
- **The Rewriting of Martyrdom:** The **video where Kirk states**, *“My faith cost me my life, but now I stand forever in glory,”* before introducing other saints, fundamentally rewrites the nature of Christian martyrdom. Martyrdom is a witness (*martyria* in Greek) to the truth of Christ, not to the courage of the individual. This AI-generated narrative centers Charlie Kirk as the protagonist of his own salvation story, welcoming other believers into glory. This usurps the role of Christ, who alone is the “firstborn from the dead” (Colossians 1:18) and the one who holds the keys to Death and Hades (Revelation 1:18).

This is a works-based theology of glory, implying Kirk earned his place among the saints through his activism, rather than receiving it by grace through faith in Christ alone.

- **The Assault on the Finality of Death and Judgment:** Scripture states clearly that "it is appointed for man to die once, and after that comes judgment" (Hebrews 9:27). These AI simulations create a third place: a digital limbo where the deceased can continue to communicate, guide, and comfort. This directly contradicts the biblical teaching on the state of the dead and undermines the urgency of the gospel and the finality of God's judgment.

III. A Critical Response: How the Church Must Steer Clear

The church must respond not with curious fascination, but with decisive doctrinal clarity and pastoral correction.

1. **Categorical Rejection:** Church leadership must issue clear statements condemning this practice as a form of modern-day necromancy. It must be named as sin and excluded from any part of corporate worship or ministry. The measure cannot be whether it is "moving" or "effective," but whether it is *true* and *obedient*.
2. **Teach on Biblical Mourning:** The church must recover a theology of suffering, grief, and lament. We must teach that mourning is not a "waste of time" (as the AI clip erroneously stated) but a sacred process. We must point people to the Psalms of Lament, the hope of the Resurrection, and the comfort of the Holy Spirit—the true Comforter (Paraclete)—not a digital ghost.
3. **Reaffirm Solus Christus (Christ Alone):** This controversy is ultimately about the sufficiency of Christ. Does He provide enough comfort through His Spirit? Is His Word sufficient for guidance? Is His victory over death our

only sure hope? The use of AI necromancy is a practical denial of Christ's sole adequacy. Our teaching must relentlessly center on Christ as the only mediator between God and man (1 Timothy 2:5), the only source of truth, and the only one worthy of our faith.

4. **Guard the Sacred:** The church must re-establish firm boundaries around what is sacred: the preaching of the Word, the administration of the sacraments/ordinances, prayer, and the fellowship of the saints. A video generated by an algorithm trained on human data has no place in this holy assembly. It is a profane intrusion.

Conclusion: The Ghost in the Machine vs. the Power of God

This trend is not a harmless use of technology. It is a spiritual seduction. It offers a comforting ghost in the machine instead of the piercing, life-giving, and sometimes difficult truth of the Cross and the empty Tomb. It exchanges the genuine work of the Holy Spirit—who convicts, comforts, and guides into all truth—for a convincing fake.

The church must choose. Will we be a people who seek digital séances for comfort, or will we be a people who, like the Bereans, search the Scriptures daily to see if what we are told is true (Acts 17:11)? Will we applaud clever simulations, or will we weep and pray for a genuine move of God's Spirit? The path of AI necromancy leads to a hyper-real, emotionally satisfying, and utterly damning deception. The path of the Cross leads through genuine grief to authentic, resurrection hope. There is no third way.

↑ Back to Top

End of Part C: *The Digital Resurrection: AI, the New Necromancy, and the Church's Descent into Folk Heresy*

~ Part D ~
Final Integrated Version of Parts A, B, & C

The Digital Necromancy: A Biblical Condemnation of AI-Generated Afterlife Communication

Introduction: From Novelty to Heresy

The murder of Christian commentator Charlie Kirk was a tragic event that sent shockwaves through the community of believers who admired his work. In the grief that followed, a new and spiritually malignant phenomenon emerged: the use of Artificial Intelligence to generate posthumous messages in his voice and image. What began as a seemingly novel tribute quickly revealed itself to be a profound violation of biblical boundaries, an failure of pastoral discernment, and a rapid descent into outright folk heresy. This teaching examines this phenomenon through Scriptural truth to sound a decisive alarm: the use of AI to simulate communication from the dead is a modern form of necromancy, and its adoption by the church represents a dangerous surrender to emotionalism and a rejection of the sufficiency of Christ.

I. The Core Sin: Violating a Sacred Boundary

The fundamental issue with AI-generated messages from the deceased is not the technology itself, but the timeless sin it facilitates. Scripture is unequivocal in its prohibition. Deuteronomy 18:10-12 explicitly condemns the *doresh el ha'metim*—"one who seeks out the dead." This law was not merely about forbidding archaic magic; it was about protecting God's people from deception and ensuring that revelation, guidance, and comfort come from Him alone.

This prohibition is illustrated in the tragic story of King Saul (1 Samuel 28). Desperate for guidance after God had become silent to him, Saul sought out the witch of Endor to summon the prophet Samuel. His sin was not his desperation, but his decision to seek a word from the dead through a forbidden channel rather than repent and submit to the will of the living God. The modern act of prompting an AI with a dead man's writings to generate new speeches follows the exact same pattern of rebellion. The method has changed from ritual to algorithm, but the sinful heart of the act is identical: the deliberate decision to transgress the divine boundary between the living and the dead, seeking illicit comfort instead of trusting God's sovereignty and His sufficient means of grace.

II. The Pastoral Failure: Shepherding Emotion Over Truth

This sin was compounded when it was not merely internet users, but ordained pastors in pulpits who presented these AI simulations to their congregations as a source of comfort and inspiration. The admission by one pastor that he was "so moved" by the clip reveals the critical error: evaluating a practice by its emotional impact rather than its theological integrity.

This represents a failure in the primary duty of a shepherd: to guard the flock from error (Acts 20:28-31). By offering a digital séance, these pastors:

- **Legitimized Forbidden Practice:** The disclaimer that "this is AI" is meaningless; the act itself sanctified the medium and taught congregations that digital necromancy is acceptable.
- **Hindered Biblical Mourning:** The AI's command to "not waste one second mourning me" is pastorally destructive. Mourning is a God-given, necessary process (John 11:35, Romans 12:15). This technology offers a cheap, counterfeit comfort that short-circuits genuine grief

and healing.

- **Pointed to a Ghost Instead of to Christ:** Healthy Christian leadership points people to the comfort of the Holy Spirit and the truth of Scripture. This practice instead created a dependency on a digital phantom, fostering a spiritual connection to a algorithm rather than to the living God.

III. The Descent into Folk Heresy

The phenomenon quickly escalated from a misguided sermon illustration to a full-blown, digitally-fueled folk religion. The subsequent wave of AI content—created and shared by countless individuals—showcased a descent into blatant heresy:

- **Digital Hagiology (Saint-Making):** AI videos depicted Kirk running into the arms of a waiting Jesus, being welcomed by angels, and even taking selfies in heaven with Abraham Lincoln and JFK Jr. This is blasphemous nonsense. It reduces the glorious, awe-filled presence of God—before whom angels veil their faces—to a celestial green room for celebrities. It replaces the biblical hope of worshiping the Lamb with a worldly fantasy utterly foreign to Scripture.
- **Rewriting Martyrdom and Salvation:** One AI video had Kirk stating, “My faith cost me my life,” before introducing historical saints. This narrative centers Kirk as the protagonist of his own salvation story, subtly teaching a works-based theology where his activism earned his place among the saints. This usurps the role of Christ, who alone is the “firstborn from the dead” (Colossians 1:18) and the sole mediator between God and man (1 Timothy 2:5).
- **Assaulting Finality and Judgment:** These simulations create a digital limbo where the deceased continue to communicate, directly contradicting the clear biblical

teaching that it is appointed for man to die once, and after that comes judgment (Hebrews 9:27).

Conclusion: A Call for Discernment and a Return to Christ Alone

The church must respond to this challenge not with curiosity, but with decisive biblical clarity.

1. **Categorical Rejection:** This practice must be named for what it is: sin. It is modern necromancy and has no place in the life, worship, or ministry of the body of Christ.
2. **Recover Biblical Lament:** We must teach and model a theology of suffering that finds comfort in the God of all comfort (2 Corinthians 1:3-4), not in digital simulations. We must reclaim the Psalms of Lament and the hope of the resurrection.
3. **Reaffirm Solus Christus (Christ Alone):** This issue is ultimately about the all-sufficiency of Christ. Is His comfort through the Spirit enough? Is His Word sufficient for guidance? Our faith must be in the power of God, not the ghost in the machine.

The path of AI necromancy leads to a hyper-real, emotionally satisfying, and utterly damning deception. The path of the Cross leads through genuine grief to authentic, resurrection hope. The church must choose wisely, reject this digital sorcery, and point a grieving world solely to the Lord of life.

↑ Back to Top

Note on Transparency and Discernment

To the reader,

The sequenced series of 4 commentaries on the topic as titled, offers a strong biblical critique of a specific misuse of Artificial Intelligence: the simulation of communication from the deceased. It is crucial to understand that our criticism is not directed at AI as a technology *in itself*, but at its application in a manner that transgresses clear Scriptural boundaries and leads to theological error and spiritual harm.

The corrupt human heart can—and does—take any tool, from the written word to the microchip, and twist it toward sinful ends. This reality does not negate the tool's potential for good any more than the existence of counterfeit money negates the value of genuine currency.

In a display of that potential, the research, structuring, and articulation of this very article were assisted by AI. This technology serves as a tool to help organize vast amounts of theological, historical, and scriptural data into a coherent argument *against* its own misuse. In this case it was used for its ability to process information, not to originate it, and every conclusion was guided by and submitted to biblical authority.

Our goal is not to lead you to fear technology, but to cultivate biblical discernment. We must be a people who *"test everything; hold fast what is good"* (1 Thessalonians 5:21). This article is an exercise in that very principle: using a God-given tool to identify and reject that tool's use for a purpose God has forbidden.

↑ Back to Top