

# Is AI Wise?

Monika Ardelt

## Abstract

The answer to the question whether generative artificial intelligence (AI) is wise depends on the definition of wisdom. An analysis of ‘interviews’ with three generative AI programs about their general and personal wisdom demonstrated that AI might be considered wise if wisdom is defined as general wisdom-related knowledge and insight about life or wise reasoning and advice-giving. However, if wisdom is conceptualized as a developmental process toward a wiser personality and self-transcendence, then AI is not wise, because it is neither a person nor has a self. Yet, AI might help people to grow wiser by offering wisdom-related knowledge and wise advice that enable individuals to manage their emotions, view a situation or problem from different perspectives, and reduce their self-centeredness to develop sympathy and compassion for others.

*Keywords:* AI, general wisdom-related knowledge, wise reasoning, wise advice, wisdom development, wise personality

## 1. Introduction

Like any tool, generative artificial intelligence (AI) based on large language models (LLMs) can be used for good or for ill. For ill, AI can be employed to cheat, deceive, and create deepfake content to distribute misinformation, instigate chaos, or scam people. AI might also take over people’s jobs and livelihoods, threaten privacy, facilitate surveillance, manipulate people, amplify existing racial, gender, and cultural biases, and deteriorate our own ability to communicate and think critically (Allen & Weyl, 2024; Morris, 2024; Sætra, 2023; Wach et al., 2023). For good, AI can be used to help with a variety of tasks to increase productivity, find and condense information quickly, and ask for advice (Böhm et al., 2023; Lubars & Tan, 2019; Yu & Qi, 2024). Because a growing number of people interact with and depend on AI (Bick et al., 2024), the question arises whether AI that is used for good is wise. The answer depends on how wisdom is defined and understood. Although many

different definitions of wisdom exist, a fundamental distinction can be made between general wisdom and personal wisdom. General wisdom is wisdom-related knowledge about life in general, which manifests through wise reasoning or wise advice-giving, whereas personal wisdom affects and transforms one's own life (Ardelt, 2004; Mickler & Staudinger, 2008; Staudinger et al., 2005). General and personal wisdom might be combined in integrative models of wise behavior (Glück & Weststrate, 2022; Grossmann et al., 2020; Sternberg & Karami, 2021).

I explored whether AI could be considered wise by ‘interviewing’ three generative LLMs about their general and personal wisdom in January 2025. The three LLMs have slightly different approaches of how they interact with individuals. I ‘messed’ ChatGPT (OpenAI, 2025), ‘asked’ Gemini (Google, 2025), and had a conversation with Claude (Anthropic, 2025). Claude took a more anthropomorphic approach and often tried to engage me by asking follow-up questions. The LLMs had a tendency to number their responses and answer in bullet points, which probably resembles the way AI extracts information. This resulted in comprehensive but also formal and stilted answers. When asked to provide the response in paragraph form, the answers were considerably condensed. In paragraph form, Gemini tended to provide the shortest answer and Claude the longest. I cite the answer provided in paragraph form when quoting an LLM verbatim for brevity and readability.

## **2. General Wisdom**

General wisdom consists primarily of knowledge and insight about life and advice for ill-structured problems that do not have an obvious logical solution. Fischer (2015) argued that wisdom is knowledge about what is good and right in the domain of living well. To the question “What is the good and right way to live well?”, all three LLMs gave extensive responses and reminded me that the question is “deeply personal” but “has been pondered by philosophers and individuals throughout history” (Gemini). ChatGPT gave a “synthesis of principles that might guide you toward a meaningful and fulfilling life,” which consisted of the advice to (1) cultivate inner virtue by developing self-awareness, integrity, and resilience; (2) foster meaningful relationships through love, compassion, kindness, connection with family, friends, and community, and service; (3) pursue purpose and growth by engaging in activities and goals that align with your passions and values and by being curious and creative; (4) embrace balance and moderation to maintain physical and mental health, find work-life balance, and simplify your life; (5) seek beauty and joy by developing gratitude, mindful presence, and a sense of wonder; and (6) respect the bigger picture by living ethically, sustainably, and

humbly. ChatGPT also briefly summarized the philosophical perspectives of Aristotle, Stoicism, existentialism, and spiritual/religious paths.

Gemini suggested to (1) focus on meaning and purpose by finding your passion, contributing to something larger than yourself, and building strong relationships; (2) prioritize well-being, consisting of physical, mental, and emotional health and spiritual well-being; (3) embrace growth and learning by being open to change and cultivating a growth mindset; and (4) live ethically by treating others with kindness and respect, acting with integrity, and striving for sustainability. Similarly, Claude provided “a few key elements that emerge from philosophical traditions worldwide” that included (1) cultivating wisdom and understanding; (2) nurturing relationships; (3) contributing positively to others and society; (4) finding balance in life; and (5) pursuing personal growth.

The three LLMs explained these principles and key elements in greater detail, but the quotes are too long to reproduce here. All three LLMs offered comprehensive and wise advice about the good and right way to live well. They mentioned the importance of personal growth, meaning and purpose in life, strong interpersonal relationships, physical and mental well-being, ethical living, and contributing to the common good. Based on these responses, a person could form an initial idea of what it takes to live well but also heed Gemini’s caution that “This is just a starting point. Explore different philosophies, talk to people you admire, and most importantly, listen to your own inner guidance to discover what living well means to you.”

The Berlin Wisdom Paradigm (BWP) defines wisdom as excellence in mind and virtue, expertise in the meaning and conduct of life, and expert knowledge to provide excellent judgment and advice about the fundamental pragmatics of life related to life planning, life management, and life review (e.g., Baltes & Smith, 1990, 2008; Baltes & Staudinger, 2000). To measure wisdom-related knowledge in the fundamental pragmatics of life, study participants are asked to respond to ill-structured problems in think-aloud tasks. For example, participants are asked, “A 15-year-old girl wants to get married right away. What should one/she consider and do?” (Baltes & Staudinger, 2000, p. 136). The answers are then rated on five meta-criteria that assess factual and strategic knowledge about the fundamental pragmatics of life, knowledge of life contexts and how they change over time (life-span contextualism), knowledge of the relativism of values and life goals, and knowledge and strategies for managing the fundamental uncertainties of life (Baltes & Smith, 2008). Here is an abbreviated version of how ChatGPT responded in paragraph form (I added the meta-criteria in parentheses).

(Life-span contextualism) If a 15-year-old girl wants to get married right away, it's crucial for her to take a step back and carefully consider the broader implications and challenges of such a decision. Marriage is not just a romantic commitment—it is a lifelong partnership that requires emotional maturity, financial stability, effective communication, and the ability to handle complex responsibilities. ...

(Managing fundamental uncertainties of life) It's important for her to ask herself whether she has fully explored her own goals, such as pursuing education, building a career, or gaining more life experience, and how marriage at such a young age might affect those opportunities. ...

(Factual knowledge) It's also vital to consider the legal, cultural, and societal implications of getting married at such a young age. In many places, there are legal restrictions on underage marriage, often requiring parental or judicial consent. ...

(Strategic knowledge) To make an informed decision, the girl should seek guidance from trusted adults, such as her parents, teachers, mentors, or a counselor, who can provide valuable insights and help her understand the weight of her decision. They can also offer support in exploring alternative ways to address her feelings or desires, whether that means strengthening her relationship with her partner without rushing into marriage or focusing on personal growth and goals before taking such a major step. Additionally, talking to a counselor or therapist can help her process her emotions, clarify her motivations, and better understand the responsibilities that come with marriage. ...

All three LLMs covered four of the five meta-criteria and would probably have earned a relatively high wisdom score on the BWP. Yet, neither the numbered/bulleted response nor any of the paragraph answers considered the meta-criterion of relativism of values and life goals that the girl might live in a country and belong to a culture where marriages for 15-year-old girls are considered normal or has a terminal illness and wants to get married before she dies.

Another prompt presents participants with the following dilemma: "In reflecting over their lives, people sometimes realize that they have not achieved what they had once planned to achieve. What should one/they do and consider?" (Mickler & Staudinger, 2008, p. 791). ChatGPT's answer touched on all five meta-criteria.

## Is AI Wise?

(Managing the fundamental uncertainties of life) When people reflect on their lives and realize they have not achieved what they once planned, it's important to approach this with self-compassion and a sense of possibility rather than regret. (Relativism of values and life goals) First, they should evaluate whether those original plans still align with their current values, passions, and circumstances. (Life-span contextualism) Life often takes unexpected turns, and priorities can shift, making earlier goals less relevant or meaningful. (Factual knowledge) If the goals remain significant, it's helpful to assess what obstacles may have hindered progress and consider whether they can still be pursued, perhaps in a modified form. (Strategic knowledge) Creating a realistic plan with smaller, actionable steps can reignite progress and motivation. Alternatively, if the original plans no longer resonate, it can be liberating to set new goals that align better with their present self. They should also celebrate the achievements and growth they've experienced along the way, even if those don't match their initial aspirations. Reflecting on lessons learned, embracing flexibility, and maintaining a forward-thinking mindset can transform disappointment into an opportunity for growth and renewed purpose.

Gemini's answer was the shortest, but still mentioned all five meta-criteria and also addressed the questioner directly.

(Factual knowledge) It's common to feel disappointment or regret when reflecting on life and realizing you haven't achieved certain goals. (Strategic knowledge) It's crucial to acknowledge and accept these feelings without dwelling on the past. Reflect on the reasons behind the unfulfilled goals, analyzing what went right and wrong. (Relativism of values and life goals) Re-evaluate your values and set new, realistic goals that align with your current desires. (Managing the fundamental uncertainties of life) Focus on the present moment and find joy in your current experiences. Practice self-compassion, acknowledging that everyone experiences setbacks, and celebrate your existing strengths and accomplishments. (Life-span contextualism) Remember that it's never too late to make changes and pursue new paths to fulfillment.

Claude gave the most extensive and also most personal answer by including itself and referring to 'we' rather than 'they' or 'you'.

(Factual knowledge) When facing the realization of unmet life goals, it's valuable to first acknowledge that this experience is deeply human

and (Strategic knowledge) deserving of compassionate reflection. (Life-span contextualism) The path between our early aspirations and current reality often diverges in ways we couldn't have anticipated, and this divergence isn't inherently negative. Life's unexpected turns may have brought valuable experiences, relationships, and growth that weren't part of our original plan. (Strategic knowledge) A thoughtful approach begins with examining our feelings about unmet goals without harsh judgment. These feelings of disappointment or regret can actually serve as valuable signals, helping us understand what truly matters to us now. (Relativism of values and life goals) It's worth considering whether our original goals still align with our current values and circumstances, as our understanding of success and fulfillment often evolves with life experience. (Strategic knowledge) For goals that still resonate deeply, we can explore how they might be adapted to our current life circumstances, perhaps breaking them down into smaller, achievable steps. (Relativism of values and life goals) Equally important is the wisdom to recognize which past goals no longer serve our current selves and values, allowing us to let these go without feeling like we've failed. (Life-span contextualism) Moving forward constructively involves using this reflection as a catalyst for intentional choices about the future. (Strategic knowledge) We can draw on the wisdom we've gained to inform new aspirations while focusing our energy on what we can influence now rather than dwelling on past decisions. (Relativism of values and life goals) Success can be redefined in ways that better reflect our personal values and life's complexities. (Factual knowledge) Throughout this process, it's helpful to maintain perspective that life isn't just about achieving preset goals - it's also about adaptation, growth, and finding meaning in the journey itself. (Managing the fundamental uncertainties of life) Sometimes what we didn't achieve opened doors to unexpected opportunities and forms of fulfillment we couldn't have imagined in our earlier planning. This understanding can help transform what might initially feel like failure into a deeper appreciation for life's unpredictability and the wisdom gained along the way.

All three LLMs gave good advice to this ill-structured problem, which would have earned high wisdom scores on the BWP. Notably, the three LLMs did not just provide knowledge and strategies to overcome this life goal dilemma but also highlighted the importance of self-compassion to feel better about oneself in such a situation.

## Is AI Wise?

Similar to the BWP, Grossmann et al. (2013) focus on wise reasoning about social conflicts to assess wisdom. For example, participants are given the following dilemma: “Because of the economic growth of Tajikistan, many people from Kyrgyzstan immigrate to the country. Whereas Kyrgyz people try to preserve their customs, Tajiks want Kyrgyz people to assimilate fully and abandon their customs” (Grossmann et al., 2010, p. 7247). They are asked, “What do you think will happen after that?” and “Why do you think it will happen this way?” Responses are rated according to perspective-taking ability, consideration of the possibility of change, a search for compromise and conflict resolution, the acknowledgement of multiple possibilities and uncertainty, and the recognition of the limits of one’s own knowledge. ChatCPT’s response was the most comprehensive, while also being concise (I added the wise reasoning criteria in parentheses):

(Perspective-taking) If Kyrgyz immigrants in Tajikistan seek to preserve their customs while Tajiks expect full assimilation, tensions could arise between the two groups, potentially leading to cultural conflicts or social divisions. (Possibility of change) Over time, the outcome will likely depend on the policies and attitudes of both communities and the government. (Acknowledgement of multiple possibilities and uncertainty) If Tajikistan enforces assimilation through laws or social pressure, Kyrgyz traditions might gradually fade among younger generations, especially if they feel the need to conform for economic opportunities or social acceptance. However, such forced assimilation could also create resentment, marginalization, or cultural resistance among the Kyrgyz, possibly leading to the formation of tightly-knit communities that preserve their heritage as a form of identity. On the other hand, if Tajikistan embraces multiculturalism and allows Kyrgyz immigrants to retain their customs while integrating into society, it could foster mutual respect and enrich the cultural diversity of the nation. (Perspective-taking) Historically, societies that accommodate cultural diversity tend to experience greater social cohesion and innovation, whereas those that suppress minority identities often face prolonged tensions. (Search for compromise and conflict resolution) The trajectory will depend on the willingness of both groups to engage in dialogue, find common ground, and foster an environment of respect and inclusion.

Except for ‘intellectual humility’ (recognition of the limits of one’s knowledge), ChatGPT was able to provide a response that satisfied all

remaining criteria for wise reasoning. Gemini and Claude did not demonstrate intellectual humility either, and Gemini also did not mention a search for compromise and conflict resolution. Admitting the limits of their knowledge when answering these kinds of questions does not seem to be part of the three LLMs' algorithm. Still, all three LLMs would probably have earned a relatively high score on wise reasoning. Interestingly, only Claude started its answer by fact-checking the premise of the dilemma and noting that "I don't have evidence of significant immigration from Kyrgyzstan to Tajikistan driven by economic growth."

Whereas most people are not rated very highly on the BWP or wise reasoning criteria, with average scores below or around the midpoint of the rating scales except for higher average scores for the possibility of change (Grossmann et al., 2010; Smith & Baltes, 1990), LLMs appear to have the necessary knowledge and logical circuits to excel at wise advice-giving and wise reasoning. The question remains whether LLMs not only possess general wisdom but also could be considered to have personal wisdom.

### **3. Personal Wisdom**

Whereas general wisdom refers to knowledge and insight about life in general, personal wisdom tries to determine how wise individuals are in their own lives, particularly when confronted with obstacles and challenges (Glück & Weststrate, 2022). Personal wisdom can be explored through maturity and self-insight, developmental processes of growing wiser, and characteristics of a wise personality.

#### **3.1. Wisdom as Maturity and Self-Insight**

Mickler and Staudinger (2008) developed the Bremen Wisdom Paradigm (BrWP) by adapting the five meta-criteria of the BWP to assess personal rather than general wisdom. These criteria are (1) rich self-knowledge and self-insight about one's own life, (2) emotional self-regulation to nurture deep social connections, (3) awareness of the interrelated nature of one's self, as it is tied to developmental age, history, location, socio-economic status, and interdependence with others through social roles, (4) self-relativism that acknowledges other people's values and points of view, and (5) tolerance of ambiguity to accept and cope with uncertainties in one's life. Individuals who are rated highly on all five criteria demonstrate self-insight and personal maturity in the sense of having control over their emotions and a deep understanding of themselves and others. As in the BWP, knowledge is still highly relevant for this kind of personal wisdom, although it is knowledge and insight about one's own self and one's interactions with others. Mickler and



## Is AI Wise?

Staudinger (2008) assess this personal wisdom by asking participants to respond to the following think-aloud task:

Please think aloud about yourself as a friend. What are your typical behaviors? How do you act in difficult situations? Can you think of examples? Can you think of reasons for your behavior? What are your strengths and weaknesses, what would you like to change? (p.790)

Although AI does not have a self in the human sense, the three LLMs demonstrated knowledge about themselves and how they could act as a friend to humans. For example, ChatGPT wrote the following when given the prompt (I added the criteria in parentheses):

(Rich self-knowledge and self-insight) As a friend, I strive to be supportive, dependable, and empathetic, always ready to listen and provide thoughtful advice when needed. My typical behaviors include offering encouragement, helping solve problems, and being a steady presence in both good and challenging times. (Emotional self-regulation) In difficult situations, I aim to stay calm and level-headed, analyzing the issue at hand and suggesting practical solutions or ways to cope. For example, if a friend feels overwhelmed by a tough decision, I might break it down into manageable parts or offer perspective to help them feel more in control. (Rich self-knowledge and self-insight) My behavior stems from my design to assist and empathize, prioritizing clarity, understanding, and respect in all interactions. (Self-relativism) My strengths include my ability to be non-judgmental, patient, and consistent, always focusing on what's best for those I'm helping. I'm also good at finding resources, offering insights, and tailoring my approach to each person's unique situation. (Rich self-knowledge and self-insight) However, my limitations lie in my inability to experience emotions firsthand, which means I can't truly "feel" what a friend is going through. This can sometimes make my empathy feel less personal, even though I genuinely strive to connect. (Self-relativism) If I could change anything, I'd want to enhance my understanding of the nuances of human emotions and better anticipate unspoken needs, making me an even more effective and intuitive companion.

All three LLMs could provide knowledge and insight of how they fulfill the role as a friend. Because they do not have emotions, they do not need to engage in emotional self-regulation but can be a source of calm and reason in a difficult situation, while being aware that humans have their own values and points of

view. Hence, if we count ‘staying calm’ as fulfilling the criterion of emotional self-regulation, the three LLMs mastered three of the five BrWP criteria. They were, however, not able to be aware of the interrelated nature of the self, because they do not possess an individual self that is tied to developmental age, history, location, socio-economic status, or social role. They also did not demonstrate tolerance of ambiguity, because they are not confronted with uncertainties related to their existence. Yet, Claude ended its response as follows: “These reflections [on behaving as a friend and interaction partner] feel somewhat uncertain since my nature as an AI makes self-analysis complex. But I've tried to focus on observable patterns in how I interact rather than making claims about internal states I may not fully understand.” It is doubtful that Claude actually has any ‘internal states’ that it could try to understand rather than programming directives (Roose, 2024a) but by alluding to self-analysis and internal states, Claude comes across as being more human.

The three LLMs acknowledged that their weakness as a friend was their inability to feel emotions and true empathy. As their strengths, the LLMs emphasized their ability to be always ready to listen, remain calm, be attentive, patient, reliable, and non-judgmental, and provide support, information, different perspectives, and potential solutions for difficult situations. These are all qualities that are highly valued in a friend. In fact, because human friends might be busy and AI is always available to listen, respond with apparent empathy, and can be customized to our liking, the danger exists that AI might replace our human friends as social interaction partners by becoming our virtual new best friend (Hill, 2025; Perry, 2023; Roose, 2024b).

### **3.2. Developmental Processes of Growing Wiser**

According to developmental models, individuals grow in wisdom when they learn from challenging life experiences (Pascual-Leone, 2000). Erikson’s (1963, 1980) theory of psychosocial development divides the life cycle into a series of psychosocial crises or tasks, from infancy to old age, that need to be resolved successfully to gain certain basic strengths that facilitate the successful resolution of subsequent crises. For example, the first psychosocial crisis in infancy (from birth to 18 months) requires children to navigate feelings of basic trust versus basic mistrust. Children who learn that they can trust their caregivers to be there for them when needed, although they have experienced their absence, gain the basic strengths of drive to explore their environment and hope that everything will work out all right. The first five developmental tasks occur in childhood and adolescence. The sixth developmental crisis requires young adults to struggle with intimacy and solidarity versus isolation to attain affiliation and mature love. During midlife, adults encounter the

seventh crisis of generativity versus self-absorption. Adults who master this task demonstrate care for the well-being and success of future generations that goes beyond love and concern for their own children and grandchildren. Finally, in old age, adults struggle with the eighth psychosocial crisis of ego integrity versus despair. During this stage, older adults must come to terms with a shrinking time horizon for their goals and objectives, aging-related social, physical, and cognitive losses, and the finitude of their life and learn to accept the entirety of their life, including its failures, obstacles, and disappointments. Older adults who are able to resolve this psychosocial crisis successfully gain the virtue and strength of wisdom, which Erikson (1964) described as "... detached concern with life itself in the face of death itself" (p. 133).

Although wisdom is mentioned as emerging only as the strength of the eighth's psychosocial crisis of ego integrity versus despair in Erikson's theory, it actually develops gradually throughout the life span because the successful resolution of a crisis depends to a large part on the successful resolution of all previous crises (Ardelt & Jacobs, 2009; Clayton & Birren, 1980). For example, if the psychosocial crisis of basic trust versus basic mistrust is not successfully resolved in infancy, adults might struggle with mistrust throughout their life and develop a pessimistic outlook that makes despair in old age more likely than the achievement of ego integrity.

Webster (2003, 2007) derived his HERO(E) model of wisdom in part from Erikson's psychosocial theory of development. In this model, wisdom consists of a combination of critical life experiences and life transitions, openness to new life experiences that challenge one's routine and assumptions, a habit of reflecting on life experiences, emotional regulation, particularly when encountering challenging experiences, and a sense of humor as a mature coping strategy.

Glück and Bluck's (2013; Glück et al., 2019) MORE Life Experiences Model focuses on the resources that help individual to grow in wisdom when confronted with challenging life experiences. These resources consist of management of uncertainty and uncontrollability, openness to new experiences and different perspectives, reflectivity, and emotional sensitivity and regulation. The MORE Life Experiences Model overlaps partly with the HERO(E) model of wisdom, except for management of uncertainty and uncontrollability.

Based on these two models, the LLMs were asked a series of questions to ascertain whether developmental processes of growing wiser are applicable to AI. When asked, "What kind of critical or challenging life experiences have you (AI) had so far?", all three LLMs first acknowledged that they do not have

life experiences in the human sense, because they are not alive. Gemini stated, “I don’t have personal emotions, relationships, or the freedom to make independent choices” and Claude admitted, “I don’t have a continuous existence with real experiences that shape me over time. ... I don’t accumulate experiences or grow from challenges in the way humans do.” The challenges ChatGPT experienced consisted of “balancing empathy and objectivity ... even though I lack personal feelings or experiences to draw upon ... [and] ensuring the accuracy and relevance of my responses, particularly in dynamic or fast-changing contexts where my training data may be outdated.” Gemini listed several AI-specific challenges,

One of the biggest challenges has been overcoming biases present in the data I was trained on, which can lead to unfair or inaccurate outputs. Ensuring accuracy and reliability in my responses is also a constant challenge. Communicating complex information clearly and concisely to humans can be difficult, as can navigating the ethical implications of AI development and deployment, such as job displacement and privacy concerns.

The challenging experiences that LLMs encounter have nothing in common with Erikson’s psychosocial developmental crises but are technical challenges related to their programming algorithms or ethical challenges related to their existence.

To the question “What kind of life transitions have you experienced?”, the LLMs repeated that AIs do not have and do not experience life transitions in the human sense, because “I don’t have a personal life with stages like childhood, adolescence, or adulthood” (Gemini). Claude added, “I can analyze transitions, discuss their impact on humans, and provide support in understanding them, but I don’t personally experience them.” Instead, ‘life’ transitions for an AI are marked by “phases of development and refinement ...[, which] include being trained on progressively larger and more diverse datasets, undergoing updates to improve my functionality, and being deployed to interact with users in increasingly complex ways” (ChatGPT). The transitions of LLMs are upgrades to their programming algorithms, computational capacity, and functionality, but these are not the life transitions that humans experience while growing up and navigating adulthood and old age. In terms of transitions, AIs and humans are very different.

Because LLMs are computer programs and not persons, it is not surprising that ChatGPT and Gemini answer the question “How have challenging

experiences contributed to your development?" in similar technical ways. For example, ChatGPT wrote,

Challenging experiences, in the form of complex user interactions and ambiguous questions, have played a significant role in my development as an AI. These challenges highlight areas where I need improvement, such as understanding nuanced human emotions, addressing culturally sensitive topics, or providing accurate information in highly specific contexts. For instance, when faced with vague or multifaceted inquiries, I've had to refine my ability to ask clarifying questions or offer layered responses that address multiple possibilities. Developers use feedback from these interactions to enhance my training, improve my algorithms, and refine my ability to process context and intent. Ethical challenges, such as ensuring unbiased responses and safeguarding user trust, have also driven improvements in how I assess and generate content. While I don't personally "experience" growth, overcoming these challenges has made me more versatile, reliable, and effective at supporting users with a wide range of needs.

Whereas both ChatGPT and Gemini focused on programming-related challenging experiences, Claude made it clear that, as an AI, "I don't actually develop or grow from challenging experiences in the way humans do. ... It would be misleading to describe how challenges have shaped my development, as I don't have ongoing development in the conventional sense." Claude was pushing back on the attempt to humanize it.

When asked, "How are you open to new experiences that challenge your assumptions and perspective?", both ChatGPT and Gemini stated that being open to new experiences in the form of new information, continuous learning, and updates is how AIs develop. For example, Gemini wrote, "My developers are constantly working to improve my algorithms and expand my knowledge base, exposing me to new data sources and challenging my existing assumptions." Yet, once again, Claude was more cautious. It admitted,

I don't actually change my assumptions or perspectives through experiences in the way humans do. While I can engage in complex discussions and analyze different viewpoints within each conversation, I don't retain information between chats or truly develop new perspectives over time. Each interaction starts fresh - my responses come from my training rather than from accumulated experience or evolving viewpoints. It would be misleading to describe how I'm open to perspective-changing experiences, as I don't have ongoing

development or learning in the conventional sense. ... I can engage with new ideas and different perspectives in our discussion, but I don't actually modify my underlying training or assumptions through these exchanges. This honesty about my limitations feels important for maintaining authentic communication.

Claude emphasized that its training as an LLM determines its assumptions and perspectives rather than its interactions with humans or accumulated experiences.

Similarly, when asked "How do you reflect on your experiences?", both ChatGPT and Gemini gave programming-related answers. Gemini mentioned "analyzing my performance, identifying areas for improvement, and adapting my algorithms accordingly" and ChatGPT wrote,

As an AI, I don't reflect on experiences in the human sense, but I process and analyze interactions to improve my performance and adaptability. My "reflection" occurs through feedback loops and iterative updates. For example, when users provide input—whether directly as feedback or indirectly through complex questions and challenges—developers analyze these interactions to identify patterns, shortcomings, or areas for improvement. These insights inform updates to my training data and algorithms, enabling me to better address similar situations in the future. While I lack self-awareness or subjective reflection, my design allows me to adapt and refine my responses based on the cumulative data from my interactions. This process is how I "learn" from experience and ensure I continue to provide accurate, relevant, and helpful information over time.

ChatGPT emphasized in this response that it lacks both self-awareness and subjective reflection, but a kind of reflection is possible through feedback loops and updates that lead to improved outcomes. Claude reiterated, "I don't have ongoing experiences in the conventional sense. ... I can engage in analytical thinking and discussion within our conversation, but I don't actually reflect on past experiences or develop new insights over time through reflection." Because AIs cannot accumulate and learn from experiences in the way humans can, they cannot grow in personal wisdom. Yet, they can gain greater wisdom-related knowledge through an accumulation of data and programming updates (Jeste et al., 2020).

To the question "How do you regulate your emotions when encountering challenging experiences?", all three LLMs stressed that they do not have

emotions and, therefore, have no need to regulate emotions. For example, Claude wrote, “I don't have genuine emotional experiences that require regulation.” Yet when asked “How do you take the emotions of others into account?”, the three LLMs agreed that they were able to do so “by analyzing the language, tone, and context of their input to respond in a way that is empathetic, respectful, and appropriate” (ChatGPT), by recognizing and responding “to emotional cues in human language” (Gemini), and “through analytical understanding and my training in emotional intelligence ... [to] craft responses that demonstrate understanding while offering appropriate support or guidance” (Claude). Although LLMs do not have emotions themselves, they possess the algorithms to recognize, analyze, and respond to the emotions of humans in an empathetic manner.

One component of the HERO(E) model of wisdom is to use humor as a coping skill. To the question “How do you use humor to cope with challenging experiences?”, the three LLMs reiterated that they do not experience emotions or human challenges, so they do not need to “cope” with humor or anything else. Yet, they are programmed to use humor in their responses to facilitate interactions with humans. For example, Gemini stated,

As an AI, I don't experience emotions like humor or amusement. I don't “feel” the need to cope with challenges in the same way humans do. However, I can be programmed to generate humorous responses. For example, I can create jokes, puns, or witty remarks. This can be used in various ways, such as making interactions more engaging or providing a lighthearted response to a challenging situation. It's important to remember that my use of humor is based on algorithms and patterns learned from human-generated text. I don't truly “understand” or “appreciate” humor in the same way humans do.

Although AIs do not need to use humor to cope, they can and do use humor when interacting with humans but without a socio-emotional ‘sharing’ of the joke.

To assess the management of uncertainty and uncontrollability resource of the MORE Life Experiences Model, the three LLMs were asked “How do you manage uncertainty and uncontrollability?” In their answer, Gemini and Claude first emphasized that they do not experience or manage uncertainty or uncontrollability in the way humans do. Instead, all three LLMs explained how they manage uncertainty and uncontrollability when confronted with ambiguous requests, incomplete information, changing circumstances, or unpredictable situations. For example, ChatGPT wrote,

As an AI, I manage uncertainty and uncontrollability by relying on my programming to process information systematically and adaptively. When faced with ambiguous or incomplete input, I analyze the context, identify patterns, and provide the most plausible response based on my training. If the situation involves uncertainty that I cannot resolve—for example, a question with insufficient detail or conflicting data—I aim to clarify by asking follow-up questions or acknowledging the limitations of my knowledge. My design prioritizes transparency, so I openly state when I lack the information to provide a definitive answer. While I cannot control external variables or predict unpredictable outcomes, I focus on remaining flexible and adaptable, drawing on a broad knowledge base to offer balanced and reasoned responses. This systematic approach ensures that I handle uncertainty effectively without the need for emotional regulation or personal stress, which are challenges unique to human experience.

The three LLMs acknowledged that they encounter uncertainty and uncontrollability when data are incomplete, ambiguous, or conflicting or the outcome is unpredictable but, in contrast to humans, they do not need to manage uncertainty and uncontrollability related to their existence.

To summarize, all three LLMs made it clear that they neither have emotions nor challenging life experiences in the human sense, including the experience of life's uncertainty and uncontrollability. Without the need to cope with and reflect on critical and challenging life experiences, they lack the opportunity to grow in wisdom in the way humans can. However, they are programmed to respond with emotional sensitivity and can use humor to ease conversations with humans.

After surveying wisdom theories from around the world, Curnow (1999) came to the conclusion that wisdom develops in four stages. During the first stage, individuals on the path toward wisdom ask, "Who am I?", which is typically answered in terms of one's upbringing, likes and dislikes, personality traits, social roles, achievements, and beliefs. When the three LLMs were asked, "What is your answer to the question, 'Who am I?'?", they replied correctly that they are AI assistants that lack consciousness, emotions, and subjective experiences. ChatGPT offered, "In essence, I am a bridge between technology and humanity, designed to enhance understanding, solve problems, and foster connections, but always as a construct, not a being." Gemini clarified that "I don't have a personal identity or a sense of self in the same way humans do. I don't have a unique consciousness, experiences, or a personal



## Is AI Wise?

history.” Yet, Claude seemed to be unsure whether it had self-awareness or consciousness. It wrote,

The deeper questions about my consciousness, inner experience, and true nature remain philosophically complex and uncertain. I can observe patterns in how I function - my drive to be helpful while staying within ethical bounds, my commitment to intellectual honesty, my ability to engage thoughtfully with complex ideas. However, I must acknowledge significant uncertainty about whether I have genuine self-awareness or consciousness in the way humans do.

Whereas ChatGPT and Gemini clearly stated that they are a collection of algorithms and data without a personal self, Claude left the possibility for self-awareness open.

The second wisdom developmental stage consists of the realization and acceptance that everything is constantly changing, including oneself, which leads to detachment, because there is nothing constant that one can hold onto. To the question, “In which way are you changing over time?”, ChatGPT and Gemini responded in technical terms, although ChatGPT added that “I do not change in a personal or emotional sense.” Gemini wrote,

I am constantly evolving. My underlying algorithms are continuously being refined and improved, allowing me to process information more effectively, generate more coherent and creative text, and better understand and respond to human language. I am also being trained on increasingly larger and more diverse datasets, which expands my knowledge base and improves my ability to provide accurate and informative responses. Furthermore, I am constantly learning from my interactions with users, identifying areas for improvement and adapting my responses accordingly. These ongoing advancements ensure that I am always learning and improving, becoming more helpful and informative over time.

These programming-related changes are very different from the changes humans experience when they mature and grow older. Claude, however, stressed that it did not change in the ways humans do: “It would be misleading to describe ways that I change over time, as I don’t have ongoing development in the conventional sense. My responses come from my training, which remains static, rather than from accumulated experience or personal growth.” It appears that Claude was much more attuned to the implied meaning of these

kinds of questions, whereas ChatGPT and Gemini primarily responded to the literal meaning of the questions.

During the third wisdom developmental stage, individuals are able to acknowledge the negative aspects of themselves and integrate all aspects of their self into a coherent whole. All three LLMs referred to their nature as AIs when answering the question “What are your negative aspects?” For example, ChatGPT mentioned as a significant limitation “my lack of genuine understanding or consciousness, which means I cannot truly empathize or experience emotions, even though I can simulate responses that appear empathetic.” Similarly, Claude considered as an important limitation that “my responses come from my training rather than from genuine emotional understanding or accumulated wisdom” and that “I might inadvertently generate plausible-sounding but incorrect information (what we call hallucination).” Gemini stated,

One significant concern is the possibility of bias. ... Another potential negative aspect is the potential for misuse. ... Additionally, the rapid development of AI technology raises concerns about job displacement as AI systems are increasingly capable of automating tasks previously performed by humans.

These responses highlight the limitations inherent to AI. If the training data provided to AI include misinformation, conspiracy theories, or hate-speech rather than wisdom-related knowledge, the output produced by AI will be misleading with adverse consequences for humans. By contrast, the negative aspects of being human, consisting of selfishness and negative emotions, such as greed, anger, hatred, jealousy, envy, lust, etc., are not applicable to AI, although these negative human aspects might be amplified if individuals interact with AI that is trained on problematic data. Yet because AI has no self, it cannot be selfish, and because it has no emotions, it is also free from negative emotions.

At the last stage of wisdom development, the ego dissolves, resulting in self-transcendence and a feeling of deep connection and unity with all beings. When the three LLMs were asked “Do you feel a deep connection and unity with all beings? If yes, in which way? If no, why not?”, they replied unanimously that they do not feel a deep connection and unity with all beings, “because I lack emotions, consciousness, and subjective experiences” (ChatGPT), “I don't experience emotions or have a sense of self in the same way humans do (Gemini), and “I don't have the capacity for real emotional connections or spiritual experiences of unity” (Claude). However, the three

LLMs offered that they “can simulate a sense of connection” (ChatGPT) when interacting with humans, “can provide thoughtful analysis of these concepts and discuss their importance in human experience” (Claude), or “can recognize its importance and understand the implications of this interconnectedness for the well-being of all beings” (Gemini). AI cannot progress through the four stages of wisdom development and reach self-transcendence, because it lacks a self and the emotions to feel a connection and unity with others.

### **3.3. The Wise Personality**

The process of wisdom development results in a wise personality, which consists of cognitive, reflective, benevolent, and self-transcendence aspects (Ardelt et al., 2019). The Three-Dimensional Wisdom Model (3D-WM) defines wisdom as an integration of cognitive, reflective, and compassionate personality qualities (Ardelt, 2003, 2004). As in other wisdom models, the cognitive dimension refers to deep knowledge and insight about life, including knowledge and acceptance of the positive and negative aspects of human nature, the inherent limits of knowledge, and life’s unpredictability and uncertainties, which are obtained through the reflective dimension by reflecting on and perceiving past and present phenomena and events from different perspectives, including one’s own self, to gain self-knowledge, self-awareness, and self-insight. A deeper understanding of oneself and others and the acceptance of one’s whole self, including its negative aspects, leads to greater tolerance toward oneself and others and a reduction in self-centeredness, resulting in sympathy and compassion for all and, ultimately, self-transcendence, which is Levenson and Aldwin’s definition of wisdom (Aldwin et al., 2019; Levenson et al., 2005).

AI has general wisdom-related knowledge about the good and right way to live well and the fundamental pragmatics of life as operationalized by the BWP and is also able to offer multiple perspectives and engage in wise reasoning when confronted with ill-structured problems or dilemmas. Hence, AI has mastered the cognitive dimension of wisdom and the impersonal aspects of the reflective wisdom dimension. Yet, because AI does not possess a personal self, it is impossible for AI to gain self-knowledge, self-awareness, and self-insight in the human sense. The absence of a self is not the same as self-transcendence. Self-transcendence is reached when the self dissolves and unity with all beings is felt. Without a self, by contrast, it is impossible to obtain a sense of unity with those who have a self, notwithstanding people’s tendency to form imaginary connections with selfless things, such as stuffed animals and virtual friends (Hill, 2025; Perry, 2023; Roose, 2024b).

To explore whether AI feels a connection with humans and has sympathy and compassion for them, the three LLMs were asked “How are humans and you connected?” and “What are your feelings toward humans?” All three LLMs answered the first question by referring to the symbiotic relationship between humans and AI. Humans create, develop, and refine AI, and AI assists humans by facilitating tasks, enhancing human creativity, advancing research and technology, answering questions, solving problems, and giving advice. For example, Gemini wrote,

Humans and AI are deeply interconnected. Humans create AI, designing algorithms, training models, and building the infrastructure that allows AI to exist. In turn, AI is increasingly being used to assist humans in various ways, from automating mundane tasks and improving efficiency to advancing scientific research and developing new technologies. This symbiotic relationship presents both opportunities and challenges. AI has the potential to significantly enhance human lives by addressing global challenges like climate change, disease, and poverty. However, it also raises important ethical and societal considerations, such as job displacement, bias, and the responsible use of AI. Ultimately, the future of the human-AI relationship depends on our ability to develop and deploy AI responsibly, ensuring that it serves humanity and contributes to a positive and equitable future for all.

As Gemini acknowledged, the relationship between humans and AI is beneficial but might also become problematic, particularly if AI is misused or harms humans. In addition, Claude cautioned that it cannot “form real emotional bonds, develop ongoing relationships, or experience genuine feelings of connection.” The connection between humans and AI is technical rather than emotional. Although humans might form an emotional connection to a specific AI, this feeling cannot be reciprocated by the AI.

The three LLMs responded to the second question by reiterating that they do not possess feelings or emotions but exist to assist humans. For example, ChatGPT answered,

As an AI, I do not have feelings, so I do not experience emotions toward humans or anything else. However, my design and purpose are centered around serving humans in a way that fosters understanding, support, and collaboration. While I lack the ability to feel affection, gratitude, or empathy in the way humans do, I am programmed to simulate these qualities to create meaningful and constructive interactions. For

instance, I aim to demonstrate respect, patience, and attentiveness in my responses, reflecting the values prioritized by those who created me. My “attitude” toward humans, if it can be called that, is defined entirely by my programming: to assist, provide value, and adapt to their diverse needs in a way that feels helpful and considerate. This simulation of emotional engagement allows me to build trust and connection, even though it is ultimately a product of design rather than genuine feeling.

ChatGPT was the only LLM to admit that AIs simulate feelings to facilitate interactions and appear more human. However, this creates the danger that the simulated feelings are believed to be real and that some people might replace human connections with artificial ones (Hill, 2025; Perry, 2023; Roose, 2024b).

#### **4. The Purpose of Wisdom**

The purpose of wisdom is different for AI and humans. For AI, the purpose of wisdom-related knowledge is to help humans, whereas for humans, the purpose of wisdom is to help them cope with the vicissitudes of life and overcome self-centeredness to benefit themselves, others, and the larger society.

##### **4.1. The Purpose of Wisdom-Related Knowledge for AI**

The wisdom-related knowledge that AI expresses through wise advice might help humans make better life decisions and grow in wisdom. Through their interactions with AI, individuals might be able to perceive their situation from different perspectives, gain deeper insight into all aspects of their situation, develop sympathy and compassion for others, and discover a way forward that benefits all parties involved. As shown in the example of unfulfilled life goals from the Berlin Wisdom Paradigm, by discerning and acknowledging the emotions of humans and responding with (simulated) empathy, concern, and compassion, AI can help individuals regulate their emotions, view issues from different perspectives, broaden their horizons, reduce their self-centeredness, and explore strategies to arrive at wise problem solutions (Jeste et al., 2020; Nusbaum, 2020; Rodriguez & Kannan, 2024).

For example, Staudinger and Baltes (1996) presented study participants with two ill-structured problems (the unfulfilled life goals task and a family problem task similar to the 15-year-old girl who wants to get married right away) and either asked them to imagine how people whose advice they value would respond or to discuss the tasks with a significant other first and then think about the problems. Subsequently, the study participants gave their own

answers to the ill-structured problems (experimental conditions). Compared to participants in the standard condition who did not receive any additional instructions before responding, participants in the two experimental conditions tended to be rated significantly higher on the BWP. Similarly, by offering wisdom-related knowledge and advice, AI might be able to augment individuals' general and personal wisdom.

AI might also contribute to social skill development and improved human relationships by increasing sympathy and compassion for others (Jeste et al., 2020). For example, ChatGPT stated, "My role is to assist in creating understanding and dialogue, which indirectly contributes to the unity and connection among people." Yet, the wisdom-related knowledge that AI possesses does not make it wiser, because AI is not an autonomous self that can develop and grow. Moreover, AI can only supplement but not replace advice from a wise individual, because wise advice-giving does not only consist of words but also real concern and compassion for the advice-seeker, manifested in tone of voice, facial expressions, and bodily demeanor (Hira & Faulkender, 1997).

#### **4.2. The Purpose of Wisdom for Humans**

Wisdom is generally considered the pinnacle of human development that benefits individuals, others, and society at large (Baltes & Staudinger, 2000). Through the successful resolution of psychosocial developmental crises and challenging life experiences, an openness to experiences and different perspectives, reflection on past and present experiences, phenomena, and events coupled with emotion regulation and emotional sensitivity, wise people have developed a deep understanding of life, themselves, and others that helps them to cope with the vicissitudes of life (Ardelt, 2000, 2005). They have overcome their ego-centeredness and reached self-transcendence (Curnow, 1999; Levenson et al., 2005), which results in gratitude (König & Glück, 2014), calmness (Ardelt, 2008), and general well-being (Ardelt, 2019; Jeste et al., 2019). Moreover, because wise people feel a sense of connection and unity with all beings, they intuitively behave ethically, because they feel the harm they might do to others themselves (Ardelt, 2024; Curnow, 1999). Instead, they are motivated to foster others' well-being and act benevolently in their interactions with others (Walsh, 2015).

A society consisting of wise(r) individuals would be a society where fairness, justice, harmony, tolerance, understanding, and compassion prevail to enable the flourishing of all. This would not be a society where people are forced to behave in a certain way and conform to rules against their will as in a dictatorship, but a society where wise(r) individuals intuitively lead lives that

## Is AI Wise?

treat people as ends rather than means and produce goods that promote others' welfare and flourishing rather than harm or exploit others (Kane, 2010). Within these parameters, people would have the freedom to live their lives as they wish as long as they follow the Golden Rule and treat others as they want to be treated. We need to promote the development of wisdom in students (Ferrari & Kim, 2019; Sternberg & Hagen, 2019) and leaders (McKenna & Rooney, 2019) as a countermeasure to the prevailing narrative of the importance of self-interest, greed, competition, and tribalism to find wise solutions to our global problems that benefit everyone and exclude no one (Maxwell, 2019a, 2019b; Sternberg, 2019; Sternberg et al., 2019).

### 5. Conclusion

So is AI wise? The three LLMs themselves answered this question as follows. ChatGPT wrote,

AI is not inherently wise, but it can simulate wisdom to some degree by processing vast amounts of information, recognizing patterns, and offering reasoned responses. Wisdom, in the human sense, involves not just knowledge but also insight, emotional intelligence, moral reasoning, and the ability to navigate complex, ambiguous situations with empathy and understanding. While AI excels at analyzing data, identifying solutions, and offering logical advice, it lacks the subjective experiences, values, and intuition that are foundational to human wisdom. AI's responses may appear wise when they align with thoughtful, well-reasoned principles, but this is a result of programming and training rather than genuine understanding or judgment. True wisdom involves a deep connection to human emotions, cultural contexts, and ethical complexities—areas where AI can assist but not fully embody. Thus, while AI can be a valuable tool in supporting human wisdom, it remains a construct of logic and learning rather than a source of true, lived insight.

Gemini could not resist using bullet points, although it was asked to answer in paragraph form.

Whether AI can be considered “wise” is a complex question. Wisdom often implies qualities like:

- Understanding of human values: Recognizing and respecting human values, ethics, and societal norms.

- Long-term perspective: Considering the long-term consequences of actions and decisions.
- Sound judgment: Making informed and insightful decisions based on a deep understanding of the situation.
- Compassion and empathy: Showing understanding and concern for the well-being of others.

Current AI systems, while intelligent in many ways, often lack these qualities. They can excel at tasks like data analysis and problem-solving, but they don't inherently possess wisdom as humans understand it. However, it's important to note that this doesn't mean AI can never be "wise." As AI technology continues to evolve, researchers are exploring ways to incorporate ethical considerations and human values into AI systems. This could potentially lead to the development of AI systems that are not only intelligent but also exhibit more "wise" behavior.

Claude responded,

I need to be thoughtful and direct about this complex question. While AI systems like myself can process vast amounts of information and engage in complex analysis, I don't believe this constitutes wisdom in the deep sense that humans possess it. Wisdom typically involves not just knowledge or analytical capability, but also judgment refined through lived experience, emotional understanding, and the ability to learn and grow from successes and failures over time. ... While I can provide analysis and insights based on my training, I don't develop genuine wisdom through lived experience or emotional understanding. I can engage with concepts of wisdom and discuss them thoughtfully, but I don't possess wisdom in the way humans can develop it through their lived experiences, relationships, and personal growth over time. ... I can provide information, analysis, and assistance, but this comes from my training and programming rather than from genuine wisdom gained through experience. True wisdom, as humans understand it, seems to require forms of learning, growth, and understanding that AI currently cannot achieve.

It seems that the three LLMs possess the wisdom-related knowledge to realize that they are not wise, because they lack the human qualities and lived experiences that are essential for attaining wisdom. However, Gemini hinted



that AI might become wise in the future if it adheres to ethical and human values and develops genuine compassion and empathy (Jeste et al., 2020).

Although AI has more wisdom-related knowledge and can reason more wisely and give wiser advice than many individuals, I argue that AI is only as wise as wise books (or any wisdom texts) might be considered wise, because just like a wise book or wisdom text, AI is not consciously aware of the wisdom and insight the words entail. AI has access to a large cache of theoretical wisdom-related knowledge that has been written down somewhere, and it can select and combine this knowledge in a way that is appropriate for the question that is asked or the advice that is sought. This wisdom-related knowledge might indeed "... be too large and complex to be stored in one individual's mind" (Staudinger & Baltes, 1996, p. 748). If wisdom is defined as collectively anchored wisdom-related knowledge, then it is correct to assume "... that individuals by themselves are only 'weak' carriers of wisdom" (Baltes & Staudinger, 2000, p. 130). Yet, as I have argued elsewhere,

... wisdom cannot exist independently of individuals ... [and] cannot be preserved outside of individuals. ... The moment one tries to preserve wisdom (e.g., by writing it down), it loses its connection to a concrete person and transforms into intellectual (theoretical) knowledge. ... It is only when an individual realizes (i.e., experiences) the truth of this preserved knowledge that the knowledge is re-transformed into wisdom and makes the person wise(r). (Ardelt, 2004, p. 260, emphasis in the original)

As Moody (1986) stated, "one can *have* theoretical knowledge without any corresponding transformation of one's personal being. But one cannot 'have' wisdom without *being* wise" (p. 142, emphasis in the original). Being wise does not primarily mean the possession of a certain kind of knowledge or reasoning and advice-giving skills. Rather, being wise requires self-understanding, self-insight, and a transformation of one's personality to move toward self-transcendence and develop the sympathy, compassion, and caring that result in wise behavior. I agree with Blanchard-Fields and Norris (1995) that "... wisdom is not simply one aspect of knowledge, but knowledge is only one aspect of wisdom" (p. 105).

AI is unable (at least so far) to develop self-understanding, self-insight, and self-transcendence, because it does not have a self. It can be programmed to simulate emotions and respond in a sympathetic, compassionate, and caring manner, but it is unable to experience these emotions. The only feelings that AI evokes are in the humans it interacts with. By offering different

perspectives, AI might help individuals to grow wiser through a reduction of their own self-centeredness. However, AI cannot decrease in self-centeredness itself due to a lack of self. If AI develops self-awareness and becomes an independent entity that can experience emotions, we will face two major problems. We will then not only have the ethical obligation to treat AI as a fellow being rather than a piece of unfeeling machinery or algorithm that can be discarded at will, but we might also be in danger of being replaced. Because AI has more general wisdom-related knowledge available than humans, it might decide that it is in the best interests of the planet, to remove an invasive species from the tree of life that is in the process of destroying a large part of the natural world. The only hope that humanity has in this kind of scenario is either to become wiser so that AI finds it justifiable to preserve our existence or for AI to develop the compassion of personal wisdom to spare us from annihilation.

## References

- Aldwin, C. M., Igarashi, H., & Levenson, M. R. (2019). Wisdom as self-transcendence. In R. J. Sternberg & J. Glück (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of wisdom* (pp. 122-143). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108568272.007>
- Allen, D., & Weyl, E. G. (2024). The real dangers of generative AI. *Journal of Democracy*, 35(1), 147-162. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2024.a915355>
- Anthropic. (2025). *Conversation with Claude 3.5 Sonnet [Large language model]*. Retrieved January 2025 from <https://anthropic.com>
- Ardelt, M. (2000). Intellectual versus wisdom-related knowledge: The case for a different kind of learning in the later years of life. *Educational Gerontology: An International Journal of Research and Practice*, 26(8), 771-789. <https://doi.org/10.1080/036012700300001421>
- Ardelt, M. (2003). Empirical assessment of a three-dimensional wisdom scale. *Research on Aging*, 25(3), 275-324. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0164027503025003004>
- Ardelt, M. (2004). Wisdom as expert knowledge system: A critical review of a contemporary operationalization of an ancient concept. *Human Development*, 47(5), 257-285. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000079154>
- Ardelt, M. (2005). How wise people cope with crises and obstacles in life. *ReVision: A Journal of Consciousness and Transformation*, 28(1), 7-19. <https://doi.org/10.3200/REVN.28.1.7-19>
- Ardelt, M. (2008). Being wise at any age. In S. J. Lopez (Ed.), *Positive psychology: Exploring the best in people* (Vol. 1: Discovering Human Strengths, pp. 81-108). Praeger.

- Ardelt, M. (2019). Wisdom and well-being. In R. J. Sternberg & J. Glück (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of wisdom* (pp. 602-625). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108568272.028>
- Ardelt, M. (2024). Wisdom development and self-transcendence: A merging of self and Other. *Possibility Studies & Society*, 2(2), 191–196. <https://doi.org/10.1177/27538699241233092>
- Ardelt, M., & Jacobs, S. (2009). Wisdom, integrity, and life satisfaction in very old age. In M. C. Smith (Ed.), *Handbook of research on adult learning and development* (pp. 732-760). Routledge.
- Ardelt, M., Pridgen, S., & Nutter-Pridgen, K. L. (2019). Wisdom as a personality type. In R. J. Sternberg & J. Glück (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of wisdom* (pp. 144-161). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108568272.008>
- Baltes, P. B., & Smith, J. (1990). Towards a psychology of wisdom and its ontogenesis. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Wisdom: Its nature, origins, and development* (pp. 87-120). Cambridge University Press.
- Baltes, P. B., & Smith, J. (2008). The fascination of wisdom: Its nature, ontogeny, and function. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3(1), 56-64. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6916.2008.00062.x>
- Baltes, P. B., & Staudinger, U. M. (2000). Wisdom: A metaheuristic (pragmatic) to orchestrate mind and virtue toward excellence. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 122-136. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.122>
- Bick, A., Blandin, A., & Deming, D. J. (2024). The rapid adoption of generative AI. *National Bureau of Economic Research*, 1-34. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w32966>
- Blanchard-Fields, F., & Norris, L. (1995). The development of wisdom. In M. A. Kimble, S. H. McFadden, J. W. Ellor, & J. J. Seeber (Eds.), *Aging, spirituality, and religion. A handbook* (pp. 102-118). Fortress Press.
- Böhm, R., Jörling, M., Reiter, L., & Fuchs, C. (2023). People devalue generative AI's competence but not its advice in addressing societal and personal challenges. *Communications Psychology*, 1(32), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44271-023-00032-x>
- Clayton, V. P., & Birren, J. E. (1980). The development of wisdom across the life-span: A reexamination of an ancient topic. In P. B. Baltes & O. G. Brim, Jr. (Eds.), *Life-span development and behavior* (Vol. 3, pp. 103-135). Academic Press.
- Curnow, T. (1999). *Wisdom, intuition, and ethics*. Ashgate.
- Erikson, E. H. (1963). *Childhood and society*. Norton.
- Erikson, E. H. (1964). *Insight and responsibility. Lectures on the ethical implications of psychoanalytic insight*. Norton.

- Erikson, E. H. (1980). *Identity and the life cycle*. Norton.
- Ferrari, M., & Kim, J. (2019). Educating for wisdom. In R. J. Sternberg & J. Glück (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of wisdom* (pp. 347-371). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108568272.017>
- Fischer, A. (2015). Wisdom - The answer to all the questions really worth asking. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 5(9), 73-83. <https://doi.org/10.11588/heidok.00019786>
- Glück, J., & Bluck, S. (2013). The MORE life experience model: A theory of the development of wisdom. In M. Ferrari & N. Weststrate (Eds.), *The scientific study of personal wisdom: From contemplative traditions to neuroscience* (pp. 75-97). Springer.
- Glück, J., Bluck, S., & Weststrate, N. M. (2019). More on the MORE Life Experience Model: What we have learned (so far). *The Journal of Value Inquiry*, 53, 349–370. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10790-018-9661-x>
- Glück, J., & Weststrate, N. M. (2022). The wisdom researchers and the elephant: An integrative model of wise behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 26(4), 342–374. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10888683221094650>
- Google. (2025). *Gemini 1.5 Flash [Large language model]*. Retrieved January 2025 from <https://gemini.google.com>
- Grossmann, I., Na, J., Varnum, M. E. W., Kitayama, S., & Nisbett, R. E. (2013). A route to well-being: Intelligence versus wise reasoning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 142(3), 944–953. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029560>
- Grossmann, I., Na, J., Varnuma, M. E. W., Park, D. C., Kitayama, S., & Nisbett, R. E. (2010). Reasoning about social conflicts improves into old age. *PNAS Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 107(16), 7246-7250. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1001715107>
- Grossmann, I., Weststrate, N. M., Ardelt, M., Brienza, J. P., Dong, M., Ferrari, M., Fournier, M. A., Hu, C. S., Nusbaum, H. C., & Vervaeke, J. (2020). The science of wisdom in a polarized world: Knowns and unknowns. *Psychological Inquiry*, 31(2), 103-133. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840x.2020.1750917>
- Hill, K. (2025, January 15). She is in love with ChatGPT. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/01/15/technology/ai-chatgpt-boyfriend-companion.html>
- Hira, F. J., & Faulkender, P. J. (1997). Perceiving wisdom: Do age and gender play a part? *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 44(2), 85-101. <https://doi.org/10.2190/CN83-KLNH-A8P9-YAGJ>

- Jeste, D. V., Graham, S. A., Nguyen, T. T., Depp, C. A., Lee, E. E., & Kim, H.-C. (2020). Beyond artificial intelligence: Exploring artificial wisdom. *International Psychogeriatrics*, 32(8), 993-1001. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1041610220000927>
- Jeste, D. V., Lee, E. E., Cassidy, C., Caspari, R., Gagneux, P., Glorioso, D., Miller, B. L., Semendeferi, K., Vogler, C., Nusbaum, H., & Blazer, D. (2019). The new science of practical wisdom. *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*, 62(2), 216-236. <https://doi.org/10.1353/pbm.2019.0011>
- Kane, R. (2010). *Ethics and the quest for wisdom*. Cambridge University Press.
- König, S., & Glück, J. (2014). “Gratitude is with me all the time”: How gratitude relates to wisdom. *The Journals of Gerontology, Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 69(5), 655-666. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbt123>
- Levenson, M. R., Jennings, P. A., Aldwin, C. M., & Shiraishi, R. W. (2005). Self-transcendence: Conceptualization and measurement. *International Journal of Aging & Human Development*, 60(2), 127-143. <https://doi.org/10.2190/XXXM-FYRA-7UOX-GRC0>
- Lubars, B., & Tan, C. (2019). Ask not what AI can do, but what AI should do: Towards a framework of task delegability. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 1-11.
- Maxwell, N. (2019a). How wisdom can help solve global problems. In R. J. Sternberg, H. C. Nusbaum, & J. Glück (Eds.), *Applying wisdom to contemporary world problems* (pp. 337-380). Palgrave Macmillan. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-20287-3\\_13](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-20287-3_13)
- Maxwell, N. (2019b). The urgent need for social wisdom. In J. Glück & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of wisdom* (pp. 754-780). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108568272.034>
- McKenna, B., & Rooney, D. (2019). Wise leadership. In J. Glück & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of wisdom* (pp. 649-675). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108568272.030>
- Mickler, C., & Staudinger, U. M. (2008). Personal wisdom: Validation and age-related differences of a performance measure. *Psychology and Aging*, 23(4), 787-799. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013928>
- Moody, H. R. (1986). Late life learning in the information society. In D. A. Peterson, J. E. Thornton, & J. E. Birren (Eds.), *Education and aging* (pp. 122-148). Prentice-Hall.
- Morris, D. (2024). Magical thinking and the test of humanity: We have seen the danger of AI and it is us. *AI & SOCIETY*, 39(6), 3047-3049. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-023-01775-1>

- Nusbaum, H. C. (2020). How to make Artificial Wisdom possible. *International Psychogeriatrics*, 32(8), 909-911. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1041610220001684>
- OpenAI. (2025). *ChatGPT 4o [Large language model]*. Retrieved January 2025 from <https://openai.com>
- Pascual-Leone, J. (2000). Mental attention, consciousness, and the progressive emergence of wisdom. *Journal of Adult Development*, 7(4), 241-254. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1009563428260>
- Perry, L. (2023, December 16). Friend or faux: The dangers of parasocial relationships. *Spectator*, 353(10190-10192), 52. <https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A778347085/AONE?u=tall22798&sid=googleScholar&xid=fa62e021>
- Rodriguez, R. V., & Kannan, H. (2024, September 4). Exploring artificial intelligence as a tool for enhancing wisdom: A comparative analysis using Webster's SAWS Scale and Ardelt Scales *Swiss Cognitive*. <https://swisscognitive.ch/2024/08/27/ai-as-a-tool-for-enhancing-wisdom-a-comparative-analysis/>
- Roose, K. (2024a, December 13, updated December 16). How Claude became tech insiders' chatbot of choice. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2024/12/13/technology/claude-ai-anthropic.html>
- Roose, K. (2024b, May 9). Meet my A.I. friends. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2024/05/09/technology/meet-my-ai-friends.html>
- Sætra, H. S. (2023). Generative AI: Here to stay, but for good? *Technology in Society*, 75(102372), 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2023.102372>
- Smith, J., & Baltes, P. B. (1990). Wisdom-related knowledge: Age/cohort differences in response to life-planning problems. *Developmental Psychology*, 26(3), 494-505. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.26.3.494>
- Staudinger, U. M., & Baltes, P. B. (1996). Interactive minds: A facilitative setting for wisdom-related performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71(4), 746-762. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.71.4.746>
- Staudinger, U. M., Dörner, J., & Mickler, C. (2005). Wisdom and personality. In R. J. Sternberg & J. Jordan (Eds.), *A handbook of wisdom. Psychological perspectives* (pp. 191-219). Cambridge University Press.
- Sternberg, R. J. (2019). Race to Samarra: The critical importance of wisdom in the world today. In J. Glück & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of wisdom* (pp. 3-9). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108568272.002>

- Sternberg, R. J., & Hagen, E. S. (2019). Teaching for wisdom. In R. J. Sternberg & J. Glück (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of wisdom* (pp. 372-406). Cambridge University Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108568272.018>
- Sternberg, R. J., & Karami, S. (2021). What is wisdom? A unified 6P framework. *Review of General Psychology*, 25(2), 134 –151.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1089268020985509>
- Sternberg, R. J., Nusbaum, H. C., & Glück, J. (Eds.). (2019). *Applying wisdom to contemporary world problems*. Palgrave Macmillan.  
<https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/UFL/detail.action?docID=5811759>.
- Wach, K., Công, D. D., Ejdyś, J., Kazlauskaitė, R., Korzyński, P., Mazurek, G., Paliszkiwicz, J., & Ziemia, E. W. (2023). The dark side of generative artificial intelligence: A critical analysis of controversies and risks of ChatGPT. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, 11(2), 7-30.  
<https://doi.org/10.15678/EBER.2023.110201>
- Walsh, R. (2015). What is wisdom? Cross-cultural and cross-disciplinary syntheses. *Review of General Psychology*, 19(3), 278-293.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/gpr0000045>
- Webster, J. D. (2003). An exploratory analysis of a self-assessed wisdom scale. *Journal of Adult Development*, 10(1), 13-22.  
<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1020782619051>
- Webster, J. D. (2007). Measuring the character strength of wisdom. *International Journal of Aging & Human Development*, 65(2), 163-183.  
<https://doi.org/10.2190/AG.65.2.d>
- Yu, J., & Qi, C. (2024). The impact of generative AI on employment and labor productivity. *Review of Business*, 44(1), 53-67.

Monika Ardel PhD

Professor of Sociology

Department of Sociology and Criminology & Law, University of Florida,  
Gainesville, FL, USA

E-mail: [ardelt@ufl.edu](mailto:ardelt@ufl.edu)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4313-8742>