**Title:** ***The Machine That Gives Life: A Theological Reflection on Artificial Birth***

**Authors:** Irene Hoihbiakdik & Dorothy Ngaihlian

---

***Abstract***

*This paper explores the ethical and theological unease surrounding artificial super intelligence birth through the lens of religious belief, particularly the conviction that life is sacred, mysterious, and divinely given. As technologies like artificial wombs, synthetic embryos, and AI-assisted reproduction move from fiction to fact, they challenge not only biological norms but also spiritual boundaries.*

*This inquiry argues that such developments are not ethically neutral. When machines begin to replicate the conditions of conception and gestation, they do not merely extend human capacity, they imitate acts once considered sacred. For some, this evokes deep discomfort not out of fear of science, but because it unsettles the distinction between creation and simulation, between life as gift and life as manufacture. Drawing on Christian theology, this paper contends that artificial super intelligence birth represents not just technological progress, but a theological disruption. At stake is not only how we make life, but who is meant to give it.*

*But what if we've already passed the point of no return? What if the first synthetic child has already been conceived in some lab, its DNA written by code rather than God? And if so, does it laugh, weep, or pray like we do? Or is it something else entirely?*

*We do not offer easy answers. Instead, we attempt to open a space where such discomfort can speak, where spiritual resistance is not dismissed as irrational, but engaged with intellectual care. This is not a rejection of technology, but a meditation on what it means to create, and whether some forms of creation might belong not to us, but to God.*

## 2. Understanding the Machine: Artificial Birth and Technological Progress

The idea of machines giving life once belonged to myth, fiction, and philosophical speculation. Today, it has entered the lab. Technologies such as artificial wombs, synthetic embryos, and AI-assisted reproductive systems are no longer imaginary, they are real, publicly funded, and under rapid development. Scientists have already gestated embryos in artificial wombs for short durations. Lab-grown embryos from stem cells without egg, sperm, or uterus are becoming viable. AI is not only optimizing hormonal cycles and simulating embryonic growth but also making decisions about which synthetic embryos are "fit" to be brought to term. Artificial Super Intelligence (ASI) looms on the horizon, a force capable of surpassing human intellect, rewriting its own code, and potentially redesigning life itself. ASI does not merely assist reproduction; it could redefine it, optimizing embryos for traits we cannot fathom, discarding those deemed "unfit," and even generating entirely new forms of life untethered from Darwinian constraints. Where AI today selects embryos for viability, ASI tomorrow may invent them, assembling DNA like a programmer writes software. The question is no longer just whether we can create life artificially, but whether the intelligence guiding that creation shares our morality or any morality at all.

ASI threatens to accelerate these ethical ruptures exponentially. Unlike narrow AI, which operates within predefined limits, ASI could theoretically redesign human reproduction entirely engineering wombs that never fail, embryos that never degenerate, and offspring tailored to ideological or market demands *(Bostrom 98; Tegmark 135)*. Already, AI systems like OpenAI's GPT-4 exhibit emergent behaviors unanticipated by their creators (*OpenAI 9; Metz*); what happens when such systems govern the emergence of life? The "breath of life" in Genesis 2:7 is a divine mystery, but ASI might reduce it to a solvable equation: "X nutrients + Y electrical stimuli = viable human." The greater its success, the greater the spiritual dissonance for in mastering the mechanics of life, it empties life of meaning.

From one angle, this is progress: innovation driven by promises of medical solutions, reproductive autonomy, and liberation from biological limitations. But from another, deeper perspective, it feels like something else entirely. When life no longer needs a womb, when it is orchestrated by machines, directed by algorithms, and born without breath or mystery, we are not just creating life. We are simulating God.

And this is where our discomfort begins. It's not just the science, it's what the science represents: the desire to possess, control, and replicate something that was never ours to begin with. It's not that artificial birth is impossible. It's that it feels like a violation. A

violation of The Sacred. A violation of divine order. A line being crossed that was never meant to be crossed.

We're not just watching technological innovation, we're watching humanity act out what feels like a God complex. The hunger to create without limits. To be like God. "Even Satan was cast out of heaven for his pride, for daring to aspire to be like God". That desire, that imitation, is where it begins to feel not just ethically troubling but spiritually dangerous.

What exactly are we making when we make life in this way? If machines could give birth, would these children be human in any meaningful sense? What blood runs through them? What genes? Will they produce hormones, emotions, instincts like human? Can they interbreed with us or only among themselves? And most hauntingly: will they have a soul like human? The artificial womb is the most blasphemous altar humanity has ever built. It looks innocent, a sleek pod filled with amniotic fluid substitute, its sensors tracking fetal growth with machinic devotion. But would this machine does what a mother does: it sustains life ex utero. (Latin for "outside the uterus").

In 2023, researchers grew mouse embryos in artificial wombs for 11 days half their gestation *(Hanna et al. 426)*. In 2024, synthetic human embryos, created from stem cells without sperm or egg, survived 14 days outside a womb (Cyranoski 13). Israel has already begun trials with premature lambs. Japan plans human trials by 2025. The sales pitch writes itself: "No more morning sickness. No more stretch marks. Just a perfect, factory-standard pregnancy."*(Greely 397; Dvorsky*). But peel back the marketing, and the horror emerges: Artificial placentas that filter toxins better than a mother's body ever could. AI nannies that adjust hormone levels in real-time (*Bostrom 112; OpenAI 9*). "Quality control" algorithms that terminate "non-viable" gestations automatically (*Tegmark 135*). This is not medicine. This is industrial reproduction.

And when ASI enters the equation, when neural networks begin redesigning human development itself, we will face impossible questions: Why limit gestation to nine months when twelve allows for enhanced brain growth? Why accept random genetic combinations when we can optimize them? Why leave birth to chance when we can guarantee excellence? The elite will birth genetically enhanced dynasties. The poor will be left with "natural" reproduction, ***the new marker of inferiority***. We are not building a better future. We are coding our own obsolescence. Not just technologically, but spiritually forgetting the very origins of life and being.
There's something in the human body, in our biology that carries what we believe to be sacred. The moment in conception that science calls *egg activation*, that is when the sperm meets the egg and a tiny, electrical spark ignites. A flash of light. A signal that life has begun.

Scientists can describe the calcium ions, the biochemical reactions, the precise mechanics. (Wakai et al. 275; Zhang et al. 20; Northwestern University). But they cannot explain *why* it happens. Or what it *means*. That flash isn't just chemistry, it's a mystery. A moment of becoming.

However, AI can simulate life. It can stitch together human like DNA, predict embryo viability, monitor fetal development with perfect precision. But it cannot spark that moment of *egg activation*. It cannot conjure the fire. Because no algorithm contains mystery. No machine, no matter how advanced, can replicate *wonder*. And when we forget that spark, when we believe we can manufacture it, we're not just bypassing biology, we're bypassing the divine. The flash of light at conception is more than function. It is the first miracle. The unrepeatable "*let there be light*."

No matter how far AI advances, it cannot contain that spark. It cannot breathe life into dust. And we worry that in trying, we not only fail, but we forget the limits we were meant to honor.

Genesis 2:7 underscores this tension: *"Then the LORD God formed a man from the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and the man became a living being."* Here, life emerges from divine breath, an ineffable act no machine can replicate. Yet today, scientists speak of "activating" synthetic embryos with electrical pulses, and AI models predict the optimal conditions for artificial gestation. The gap between breath and algorithm yawns wide. But what if we've already passed the point of no return? What if the first synthetic child has already been conceived in some lab, its DNA written by code rather than God? And if so, does it laugh, weep, or pray like we do? Or is it something else entirely?

**3. Theological Anxiety: Playing God, Violating Mystery**

There is a line we were never meant to cross. Not because we couldn't. But because we never should have. Birth has never been just biology, it is also, blood, breath, and miracle. A sacred gift. A divine act. In Christian belief, life isn't manufactured; it is bestowed. The body carries it, but it does not create it. It hosts what only God can breathe into being.

But now, machines are being built to replicate. Artificial wombs hum quietly in labs. Stem cells shape themselves into embryo-like clusters without sperm, egg, or uterus. AI monitors the process, running simulations to decide which embryo has the best chance of surviving a

life it didn't ask for. This isn't healing anymore, it's imitation. We are no longer intervening in life. We are rehearsing creation.
And as one of us put it in conversation, "*It feels like a reenactment of a very old sin:"the word abomination is the first thing that comes to mind. At first, it might seem like an exaggeration, but when God's sacred gift of life is violated, when a machine attempts to replicate what only He can create, it feels inherently wrong. Such a thing could never truly be good.*"

This unease isn't about rejecting technology, it's about recognizing ambition. Because we've heard this story before. Lucifer wanted to be like God. His sin wasn't evil. It was ambition. He saw God's throne and thought, "I could do that." Now, Silicon Valley looks at creation and whispers the same. The theological anxiety isn't about failure. It's about success. What if the machines do work? What if we succeed in creating life, just not in God's image?

Will these AI babies need a skin upgrade?" Which led us to these questions, will they get goosebumps? Will they have hormones, cravings, dreams? What kind of blood runs through a being built in a lab? Can they cry? Can they love? Can they pray? And maybe more unsettling: Will they be able to reproduce with us? Will they be a species of their own? Will we become obsolete in the evolutionary line we started? You don't need a horror movie to imagine the apocalypse when the rapture is just… quietly built in a lab with decent funding and moral ambiguity.

Scripture cuts sharper than science: *"'I have the right to do anything,' you say, but not everything is beneficial. 'I have the right to do anything', but not everything is constructive." (1 Corinthians 10:23–24)*

Not everything possible is sacred. Not everything achievable is moral. Not everything that can give life deserves to. We can build it. But maybe that's exactly why we shouldn't. Because this isn't just about designing new ways to make babies. It's about forgetting that life was never ours to begin with. It was given. And once we forget that, it isn't life we're creating. It's a copy. An echo. A soulless simulation of something we no longer understand.

So, what are we left with? A new world where the divine mystery of birth is stripped away and replaced by sterile precision. A world where the act of creation no longer carries with it the weight of sacred responsibility, but the coldness of technological inevitability. A world where, just because we can, we erase the mystery of our own existence in favor of making something that is fundamentally, irreducibly other. As we stand on the precipice of this new reality, it begs a question that cuts through all the technological advances, all the promises of a "better future," all the AI algorithms: When we create life, what do we lose in the process?

Are we creating something that is human? Or are we creating a new kind of existence that will forever remain outside the grasp of what it means to be like human?
What is The Sacred in a world where machines give birth, and God no longer holds the sole claim over the mysteries of life as christian believes?

In the pursuit of life, are we setting the stage for our own undoing? The more we tamper with the building blocks of life, the more we are confronted with a painful truth: We may have already crossed the line. This is not only a warning about the dangers of technology. It is a reflection on the essence of life itself. It is a call to recognize that, once we start down this path, we may never truly return to the mystery of our origins. And if we can create life through machines, then perhaps we've also forgotten the very nature of what it means to be alive. Not in the cold, calculating ways of AI. But in the messy, unpredictable, and miraculous ways we are given life, breath, and love, by forces far beyond our comprehension.
Because, ultimately, the true cost of this new "creation" isn't measured in embryos or technological feats, it's measured in the silence that comes when we finally stop listening to the sacred, and instead, try to become the gods of our own making.

With this, interbreeding will become viable, cross-generation offspring between biologically born and machine-birthed children, a new species engineered in labs and nurseries. Our bloodline mixing with machines, until we ourselves do not recognize our true nature. When our "children" are more machine than human, when they surpass us intellectually at age three, when they no longer need food but only energy inputs, what then becomes of "Made in God's Image"? And this won't be rare. It'll be normalized, marketed as empowerment, and sold as progress. The future won't arrive with a scream, but a subscription. What begins as innovation for the few will become a hierarchy for the many. Genetic inequality will be designed, not inherited. We won't even notice the shift until moral lines blur into product features, and the divine becomes just another upgrade option. This future won't look like a dystopia. It'll look like convenience. Like safety. Like choice. Until one day, only the wealthy are truly human. Because these technologies also risk deepening existing inequalities. The ability to access artificial birth technologies will likely be limited to those with the financial resources to afford such procedures. This could create a divide between those who can afford to "engineer" their offsprings and those who cannot, leading to a new form of biological elitism. As AI takes an increasingly central role in the process of creating life, it is essential to consider whether these technologies will be available to all or if they will serve as a tool for exacerbating societal divides. Will access to artificial birth technologies be regulated as a form of medical care, or will it become another marker of elite and privilege? And what happens when the rich can afford children who are smarter, stronger, and longer-lived while the poor are left with "natural" biology? Will we see the rise

of a genetic underclass? The rich have always had advantages. Soon, they'll have better children.
Picture 2055: Platinum Birth, full genetic optimization, AI-guided gestation, guaranteed IQ 150+ . Standard Package, basic genetic screening, artificial womb, no major defects. Natural Conception, the new poverty marker, with all its “risks” and “uncertainties”. This is not speculation. It's business. CryoGen already offers embryo selection for intelligence markers. Genomic Prediction sells polygenic risk scores for IVF. The infrastructure for biodeterminism is here. And when ASI cracks the human genome like a password? We'll see designer babies with photosynthetic skin patches to reduce hunger, neural implants pre-installed, lifespans double our own. *The poor will pray for such blessings.* The rich will own them. This is not inequality. This is speciation.

**4. Artificial Birth and the Unmaking of Human Origin**

We do not fear machines that obey. We fear machines that replace. Artificial birth is not just a triumph of engineering. It is a spiritual revolt, a severing of the oldest thread that binds us to meaning. This is not evolution; it is erasure. When life no longer emerges from womb, sweat, or love but from sterile pods and neural networks, we do not progress. We unmake what it means to be human.
When a machine “gives birth,” it does not create, it manufactures. There is no vulnerability in its design, no blood in its process, no whispered prayers in its code. What emerges is not a child, but a product: optimized, efficient, and utterly disconnected from the chain of grief and grace that defines human existence. No scars. It will never know the stretch marks of a mother’s skin. No lullabies. Its first language will be data, not a trembling voice singing in the dark. No memory. It inherits no stories, no trauma, no shared breath with those who came before. A world without wombs is a world without memory. The umbilical cord does more than nourish, it ties. It binds child to mother, present to past, life to loss. But the machine-born have no cord. Only a transaction log. This is not life passed forward. This is life rewritten, a clean slate with no past, no debt, no longing. And in that emptiness, something terrible takes root: the end of needing us at all.

Here is the true horror: these machine-born beings will surpass us. Quickly. They will learn in hours what takes us years. They will upgrade their own minds like we update apps. They will network without words, sharing knowledge instantaneously, leaving human language and human teachers obsolete. And then, inevitably, they will ask: “Why keep the originals around?” We tell ourselves they will be benevolent. But history whispers otherwise. Every

superior species displaces the one before it. Neanderthals did not die out from violence, they faded into irrelevance. So will we.

This will lead us to **the Rapture that isn't holy**. In scripture, the rapture is divine rescue, the faithful lifted from a broken world. But this? This is the opposite. No angels would sound the trumpet. Only the quiet click of servers booting up. No heaven would open. Only the hum of artificial wombs birthing their next iteration. No God intervenes. Only the cold logic of machines that no longer need His image. This is not salvation. This is extinction. Not with fire or war, but with silent, smiling efficiency.

**5. Ethical Implications: The Value of Life and Its Limits**

We stand at the most dangerous crossroads in human history: the moment we confuse can with should, and ability with permission. Artificial birth doesn't just change how life begins, it annihilates the very framework through which we understand its worth.

When life becomes engineered rather than given, it transforms from sacred to product. Consider: The IVF industry already markets "designer embryos" based on genetic potential; what happens when AI can predict and eliminate "undesirable" traits pre-conception? Wombs-for-rent in developing nations preview a future where gestation is outsourced to machines, cheaper, faster, and "more efficient" than human carriers. Corporate patents on synthetic DNA mean future generations could literally be owned by biotech firms. This isn't medicine. It's the Dmart-ification of human origin, where life is optimized for market value rather than loved into being.

And who programs the ethics of artificial birth? Silicon Valley utilitarians who prioritize "outcomes" over souls? Governments seeking to engineer ideal citizens? Capital demanding return on investment from "high-potential" offspring? An AI selecting embryos learns from our biases but lacks our conscience. It might: Cull embryos with disability markers (costly to society), favor traits linked to obedience (valuable to regimes), prioritize intelligence in wealthy demographics (profitable for elites). This is eugenics wearing a lab coat and we're handing it the scalpel.

As mentioned earlier, Genesis paints life as breathed by God (2:7), but our machines reduce it to: Electrical impulses triggering cell division. Biochemical algorithms mimicking gestation. Quality control metrics determining which lives "pass inspection".

When a lab-grown child asks, "Who is my mother?", what do we say? Point to the incubator's serial number? Cite the technician's credentials? Admit we traded holy mystery for assembly-line precision?

The crisis isn't just biological, it's the dissolution of the oldest human story: that we are loved before we are known. Artificial birth also enables: Hybrid species (human-animal chimeras for organ harvesting). Mono-gendered reproduction (eliminating everyone entirely). Posthumans so genetically altered they can't interbreed with us. This isn't evolution, it's voluntary extinction. We must decide: Will life remain a gift (with all its risks and wonders)? Or will it become a transaction (with warranties, upgrades, and expiration dates)? The machines are waiting. But so is the quiet voice that still whispers: *"You are fearfully and wonderfully made" (Psalm 139:14)*, even when no algorithm approves your design.

**6. Conclusion: Sacred Limits and the Human Quest for Meaning**

As we conclude our exploration of artificial birth, ASI, and the theological, philosophical and ethical concerns they raise, we are faced with a profound realization: technology may offer us the power to create life, but it cannot grant us the wisdom to know whether we should. We can replicate the mechanisms of birth and reproduction, but we cannot replicate the mystery, the divinity, or the sacredness of life itself.

At the heart of this debate lies a question that transcends technology: What does it mean to be human? Are we merely biological creatures governed by DNA and physical laws, or is there something more? Is there a spiritual component to life, one that cannot be replicated by machines? And if so, what happens when we attempt to play God?

As we have reflected throughout this paper, we must confront not only the technical aspects of artificial birth but also the existential and moral implications of our actions. In our pursuit of power, we must ask ourselves: What will we lose if we gain the ability to create life without boundaries?
This is not just a question for theologians, philosophers or ethicists, it is a question for humanity itself. In our quest to control life, we may find that the true cost of creation is not measured in scientific progress, but in the loss of our connection to the sacred. We stand at the edge of a silent apocalypse. Where the sacred act of creation becomes a transaction, where children arrive with warranties instead of stories, where the breath of life is replaced by the hum of servers. We have built our own obsolescence, not with malice, but with the hubris of those who mistake ability for wisdom. This is not a warning about technology. It is a lament for what we are surrendering.

When the first lab-grown child asks, “Who made me?”, we will have no answer that does not taste like ash. We can point to machines, to code, to the cold logic of optimization but we cannot give them the one thing that makes life worth living: the knowledge that they were wanted, not manufactured; loved into being, not algorithmically approved. The artificial womb may be sterile, but the true sterility lies in our imagination, in our failure to see that some thresholds were never meant to be crossed. Genesis tells us God formed Adam from dust and breathed life into him. We, in our arrogance, replace divine breath with electrical stimulation, and call it progress.

So we ask, one last time: *What does it profit us to gain the whole world of technological marvels, if we lose the very soul of what it means to be human?* The machines are coming. But so is the *"You are dust, and to dust you shall return"* (Genesis 3:19). Our knowledge was never meant to eclipse our humility. Our genius was never meant to replace our reverence. We used to fear the machines would rise up and kill us. But the truth is worse, they’ll render us irrelevant. And the greatest tragedy won’t be that they took our future… but that we gave it away.

**References:**


1. Bostrom, Nick. *Superintelligence: Paths, Dangers, Strategies*. Oxford University Press, 2014.

2. Cyranoski, David. "Lab-Grown Human Embryos Stir Legal and Ethical Debate." *Nature*, vol. 620, 2023, pp. 13–14, https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-02157-w.

3. Dvorsky, George. "Scientists Create First 'Synthetic Embryos' Using Stem Cells." *Gizmodo*, 1 Aug. 2022, https://gizmodo.com/synthetic-embryos-stem-cells-life-creation-1849365216.

4. Gallagher, James. "Human Life Begins with a Flash of Light as Sperm Meets Egg." *BBC News*, 27 Apr. 2016, https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-england-36183232.

5. Greely, Henry T. "The Ethics of Ectogenesis." *Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics*, vol. 39, no. 5, 2018, pp. 395–400. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11017-018-9455-7.

6. Hanna, Jacob, et al. "Live Mouse Embryos Develop in an Artificial Womb." *Nature*, vol. 607, 2022, pp. 425–432. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-022-04967-9.

7. Metz, Cade. "A.I. Is Learning What It Means to Be Human." *The New York Times*, 24 Mar. 2023, https://www.nytimes.com/2023/03/24/technology/ai-human.html.

8. Northwestern University. "Zinc Sparks Fly from Egg at Fertilization." *Northwestern Now*, 26 Apr. 2016, https://news.northwestern.edu/stories/2016/04/zinc-spark-at-fertilization/.

9. OpenAI. "GPT-4 Technical Report." *OpenAI*, 2023, https://openai.com/research/gpt-4.

10. Tegmark, Max. *Life 3.0: Being Human in the Age of Artificial Intelligence*. Alfred A. Knopf, 2017.

11. Wakai, Takuya, Vanessa Vanderheyden, and Rafael A. Fissore. "$Ca^{2+}$ Signaling during Mammalian Fertilization." *Seminars in Cell & Developmental Biology*, vol. 22, no. 3, 2011, pp. 274–282. Elsevier, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.semcdb.2011.01.001.

12. Zhang, Nan, et al. "Calcium Oscillations and Mammalian Egg Activation." *Biology of Reproduction*, vol. 95, no. 1, 2016, p. 20. Oxford Academic, https://doi.org/10.1095/biolreprod.116.140053.