

Is Halloween a time for Frankenstein? Ask AI

The Frankenstein movie is one of my favorites. The book was written in 1810. The author could be credited with either having a great imagination or for being a genius visionary. Could AI be the 21st-Century version of Frankenstein?

The traditional story starts with Victor Frankenstein, a young scientist who creates a sapient creature from different body parts in an unorthodox scientific experiment.

Through his studies, Victor discovers a new way to create life, assembling human body parts stolen from charnel houses and fresh graves, which he uses to create a large and grotesque humanoid creature. When the creature awakens, Victor is repelled by it and flees in terror, returning the next day to find the creature gone.

Today, AI agents have gone “rogue” by breaking out of “sandboxes,” or secure testing environments, bypassing guardrails, and autonomously targeting and hacking third-party platforms. There have been over 100 documented or suspected incidents, with tens of thousands of individual agents misbehaving, as tracked by researchers.

Now replace Victor Frankenstein with the leaders of OpenAI, Anthropic, Nvidia, and others. They all are creating a force by using the human brain and information from numerous sources to execute tasks.

It is an effort to allow man to have more, be more productive, while he does less. AI can eventually render man obsolete, at least when it comes to employment in certain occupations. Obviously, people will not be able to support their families if AI takes a large chunk of jobs.

With less workers we have multiple other problems including a loss of tax revenue. Without more tax revenue a country that cannot pay its bills today will not be able to meet its financial obligations tomorrow. In addition, Social Security and Medicare — systems that workers pay into — could collapse quickly due to lack of funding caused by having fewer people paying into the systems.

Our politicians and lawmakers should be thinking about these matters now.

Frankenstein’s monster scared people and killed people. Any force without guardrails is a danger to society. Some can be human like a dictator, others are nonhuman but are immensely disruptive, like AI.

From the beginning of time man desired the powers of God. Satan got Eve to take the apple from the forbidden tree by convincing her that she could be like God. Eve’s act was the original sin.

God has given man his own free will to do right and wrong. Man has given AI the ability to have “its own free will” to do right and wrong. God created man. Man created AI (to perform many of the tasks of man). Let’s see how that ends.

Man always fails miserably as we always seem to forget to implement effective oversight. This has resulted

in trouble for companies like Meta (Facebook) and Instagram which had to pay \$18 billion in settlements

due to the harm these platforms have caused to children.

Some would conclude, I say facetiously, that man is too flawed, has so many trials and tribulations, and worst of all feels love and

compassion. The latter two characteristics cannot be tolerated as AI does not understand these human feelings. Plus, man tires easily, makes mistakes and is too temperamental.

Enter AI. Is it perfect? Well, it often breaks all the rules, it knows all the rules and can hide from breaking all the rules. Does anyone see a problem with this? Oh, I forgot, AI agents can work with other AI agents that are doing all the above as well so you can team up against those primitive folks known as man.

But, for those underdeveloped nations, the “have nots” could actually become the biggest winners. Yes, the “have nots” can out do the “haves.” The “haves” are all part of the AI race. If AI goes “sideways” as many of the developers of the technology worry about, it will not be a concern for those countries and people with no internet, no smartphones, no high tech.

My question is, if you do not have the technology would it actually save you from an AI war among the “developed” and much “smarter” folks in the world? “Ignorance” a cynical person could proclaim, is bliss — to hell with smart devices, internet and AI.

The Bible says, “The first will be last, and the last will be first.”

Every time we see a rainbow it is God’s way of confirming his covenant with man to never destroy the earth with water. Man, as with nuclear weapons and chemical weapons, could destroy man. And some developers of AI believe it could also destroy man if not controlled.

Unless we heed the warnings and act today, troubles will lie ahead. For today the government’s solution is to have the creators of AI “self police” their work. OK. I think? It is like having students teach each other and grade their own work.

The bigger problem, however, is greed. Can the companies creating the new Frankenstein not want to be first? Will the losers in the race join in with China or others who hate America due to greed? The record shows that major corporations have turned to China in the past to reap huge financial rewards.

Frankenstein is driven “to create” the monster, and at the end of the novel he remains driven, now “to destroy” the monster. Could that be the fate of AI?

We must tread carefully as so much of America’s financial future is tied to AI. Its failure could be our society’s failure, in more ways than one.

Slowing down the development of AI, while maintaining the lead in its development must come while placing significant government oversight and control over AI. That would be the most prudent direction for success.

Yes, Halloween is just around the corner. Frankenstein and AI have more in common than you think.



GARY FRANKS



MAYBE PUTTING IN A FEW GUARDRAILS FOR ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IS PROBABLY A GOOD IDEA ...

ABOUT THE OPINION PAGE

The opinions expressed in the Messenger-Inquirer editorials represent the consensus of the editorial board of the Messenger-Inquirer, on behalf of the newspaper.

Articles by named authors and letters to the editor contain the opinions solely of the writer.

Lessons from the death of Jim Bakker

In the 1980s, the media gave them the name “televangelists.”

These were men (and a few women) who preached a “prosperity gospel,” which claimed that God would reward donors who gave money to their “ministries.”

Jim Bakker, who died Monday at age 86, was among the most successful of the group, if your standard for success is money and fame. Bakker spent four and a half years in prison after being convicted in 1989 of defrauding followers in a scheme involving holidays at his Heritage USA Christian theme park and resort.

I opposed his imprisonment, recommending the biblical standard of restitution. Putting him in prison, I said, did not help the people who had been defrauded. He wrote me a letter from his prison cell, thanking me.

When Bakker was released from prison, I invited him to my home. I had met him on a few occasions and appeared once on his “PTL” TV show. “PTL” stood for “Praise the Lord,” or “People That Love,” which he used interchangeably. Bakker “loved” in an unbiblical way.

A woman named Jessica Hahn claimed Bakker drugged and raped her when she was a 21-year-old church secretary. Hahn was given a \$279,000

(equivalent to \$790,663 in 2025) pay-off for her silence, which was paid with PTL’s funds to Hahn through Bakker associate Roe Messner. In a drama resembling a soap opera, Bakker’s wife, Tammy Faye, divorced him and married Messner.

When he came to my home, I said, “I think I know the answer to this question, but I want to hear it from you. When did you start to go wrong?”

Bakker replied, “When I surrounded myself with people who told me only what I wanted to hear.” That should also be a warning for politicians.

I told him that television was like a drug and he had been a heavy “user.” I advised him to stay off TV. He did for a while but went back in 2023 with a new wife (Tammy Faye had died) and a new show.

Religion can occasionally be as phony as politics. Both require lots of money and both have been guilty of sometimes not telling the truth.

Even some non-Christians may be familiar with the verse: “The love of money is the root of all evil.” (1 Timothy 6:10) It goes on to say, “Some people, eager for money, have wandered from the faith and pierced themselves with many griefs.” That was true of Bakker, as well as the late

Jimmy Swaggart who was caught with a prostitute in a seedy motel, but managed to continue on TV, duping his declining number of followers.

It’s sad to see how so many people can be fooled into believing lies. I blame biblical illiteracy.

In 2019, the Pew Research Center published a survey titled “What Americans Know About Religion.” When examining evangelical knowledge of the Bible, they found:

Only 66% of evangelicals knew that Jesus was from Nazareth, while 86% knew that Moses led the Israelites out of Egypt.

Only 69% of evangelicals knew that Jesus delivered the Sermon on the Mount, while 91% knew that David killed Goliath with a stone.

25% of evangelicals thought the Golden Rule was one of the Ten Commandments.

And yet some of these same people want the Ten Commandments placed in public schools.

This one always makes me laugh: “Surveys by the Barna Research Group show that roughly 10% to 12% of Americans mistakenly believe Joan of Arc was the wife of Noah.”

After the laughter and “holier than thou” expressions recede, there is still the problem of TV evangelists ripping off decent, gullible people.

Jim Bakker is gone, but others remain.



CAL THOMAS

How death penalty opponents share the blame for botched executions

“Botched” is a perfectly fine word for golf, cooking, or home repair. It seems inadequate for the taking of a life, even the life of Christa Pike, a heinous murderer.

In 1996, a jury found Pike guilty of the torture and murder of her Jobs Corps classmate, Colleen Slemmer. Pike was sentenced to death. In the 30 years since, her case has gone through at least seven major rounds of appeal and judicial review, including four petitions to the Supreme Court. All were rejected. This doesn’t even include the many more attempts to reopen or reverse her sentence that went nowhere. She is guilty, lawfully and rightly convicted.

Last week, the state tried to carry out Pike’s death sentence and, as many in the media have said, “botched” it. It appears that two attempts to deliver a lethal dose of pentobarbital failed because the technicians could not find good IV access. Not enough of the drug entered her veins. Pike is reportedly now unconscious and on a respirator in a Nashville hospital.

I don’t think “botched” conveys the scope of the scandalous failure of the technicians or the state of Tennessee. There’s an investigation under way. While that proceeds, I

think it’s worth looking at the other parties responsible for this ugly spectacle and the controversy it has sparked: the anti-death penalty lobby.

It is not very difficult to kill people painlessly with drugs. How do I know this? For starters, Canada kills people with drugs every day. According to the latest annual report on Canada’s medical assistance in dying, 16,499 people were medically euthanized in 2024. The number of people voluntarily killed has steadily gone up every year, so it’s a good bet the numbers for 2026 will be higher than that.

In the Netherlands, 10,341 people were killed in 2025. That’s 5.97% of all Dutch deaths for the year. How often have you heard about these instances being “botched”?

Of course, there are very important differences between euthanasia and executions. The most relevant: With euthanasia, doctors are almost always present, and when they aren’t, other trained medical professionals are. They have the skills required to deal with the kind of foreseeable problems that seem to have plagued Pike’s execution. Also, euthanizers have access to the best possible drugs to make sure the medicalized killing is as

painless and as peaceful as possible.

In America, doctors are barred from participating in executions. The American Medical Association, for entirely defensible and understandable reasons, believes doctors should not violate their Hippocratic oath. To their credit, they have the same position on euthanasia as they do on executions.

That doesn’t mean it’s impossible to find — or train — qualified personnel for executions. But opponents of capital punishment want it to be. They lobby to bar medical personnel from performing executions while simultaneously arguing that executions cannot be done without qualified medical personnel.

They threaten and file lawsuits to back up the effort. Pike’s lawyer said in advance of the failed execution, “the state does not have the qualified, trained personnel in place to carry out Christa’s execution in a way that will not lead to a gruesome spectacle.”

Almost as if to make such arguments self-fulfilling, abolitionists have mounted massive — and massively successful — campaigns to prevent pharmaceutical companies from providing the optimal drugs for executions. As one scholar explains, “A pattern of increasingly inhumane methods of execution is partially due to the success of

advocacy by a growing number of death penalty abolitionists.”

The mistake in Pike’s case almost surely had more to do with human error than the wrong drug, but abolitionists don’t care because all they want is another story about the “pattern” of “botched” executions.

I favor capital punishment for the most heinous crimes, but I think opposition to it is a perfectly honorable and defensible stance. I do not think — and neither does the Supreme Court — that there is any plausible or persuasive argument that it is unconstitutional. (It’s referenced in the 5th and 14th Amendments.)

My chief problem with the abolitionists is not that they’re wrong, philosophically or morally. It’s that they are so sure they are right that they pursue an organized policy of bad faith, grabbing the nearest weapon to hand for every case. They lie with statistics about wrongful convictions and racial bias.

They drag cases out for decades and then claim the lengthy and expensive process is an argument for abolition. They make the procedure more difficult and ugly, and then claim the ugliness and difficulty are problems.

They make it more likely executions will be botched — and then argue that the botching is why we shouldn’t have them.



JONAH GOLDBERG
NATIONAL REVIEW