Available on: https://jsshrs.ep-journals.org/ E-ISSN: 3051-3561, P-ISSN: 3051-3553

Journal of Social Science and Human Research Studies

Volume : 02 Issue : 06 June-2026

Artificial Intelligence and Adventism: Opportunities, Ethical Tensions, And Theological Examination

Touza Isaac, PhD

Assistant Professor in Artificial Intelligence and Knowledge Engineering Department of Mathematics – Computer Science, Faculty of Science, The University of Maroua, Cameroon

Jacob Aguimesheo, PhD Candidate

PhD Candidate in Systematic Theology Adventist International Institute of Advanced Studies, Philippines

Published Date: June 30, 2026 **Article DOI: 10.65150/EP-jsshrs/V2E6/2026-30**

ABSTRACT: The rapid expansion of artificial intelligence (AI) raises profound theological ethical, anthropological, and missiological questions for faith-based communities, particularly concerning human dignity, moral responsibility, and the future orientation of their mission. While the intersection of AI and religion has received increasing scholarly attention, the perspectives of particular faith traditions such as the Seventh-day Adventist Church remain comparatively underrepresented within the current academic discourse. This article addresses that gap by offering a conceptual and theological analysis of AI within Adventist framework. Drawing on a narrative review of the literature on AI and religion, an examination of official publications of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, and a normative theological approach grounded in its core values, this article analyzes both the opportunities and the ethical tensions generated by AI across the domains of education, healthcare, mission, and administration. It proposes an original eight-criterion discernment framework adapted to the Adventist core beliefs, and formulates strategic recommendations for Adventist institutions. The study argues that the governance of AI must remain anchored in the character of God and the canonical affirmation of humanity as bearers of the divine image, ensuring that all technological practices uphold truth, justice, and compassion. Moreover, within the cosmic conflict framework, AI may be understood as a new arena in which the tensions between truth and deception, freedom and coercion, and human moral responsibility and technological automation are increasingly played out, thereby calling users to engage its use with wisdom, faithfulness, and a Christ-centered perspective.

KEYWORDS: artificial intelligence; Seventh-day Adventism; AI ethics; theological discernment; faith-based institutions; technology and religion; digital transformation; religious education

1. INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence has ceased to be a speculative technology confined to research laboratories. In less than a decade, AI systems have penetrated virtually every sector of modern life: education, healthcare, communication, industry, and governance, reshaping the way institutions operate and individuals relate to knowledge, work, and one another [1, 12]. Large language models, predictive analytics, automated decision systems, and intelligent tutoring platforms have moved from academic prototypes to widely deployed tools, generating enormous debate about their societal implications [13, 14].

Religious institutions are not immune to this transformation. Churches, seminaries, hospitals, and faith-based schools are increasingly confronted with practical questions: Should AI tutoring systems be integrated into Christian education? Can a pastoral assistant powered by AI supplement spiritual counseling? How should a religiously affiliated hospital govern AI-assisted diagnostics while preserving the primacy of human dignity? These are no longer abstract questions; they demand theologically grounded, institutionally responsible answers [5].

Despite the growing body of scholarship at the intersection of AI and ethics [3, 15], remarkably little has been written about the specific responses of identifiable Christian denominations. The Seventh-day Adventist Church is a particularly significant omission in this literature. With over 21 million baptized members worldwide, the Church manages one of the largest Protestant networks of educational institutions (more than 8,000 schools and universities), the largest Protestant hospital network globally, and a prolific multilingual media and publishing system. The Adventist institutional footprint makes it a major actor in precisely the sectors where AI is most rapidly being deployed [4, 16].

Furthermore, the Seventh-day Adventist theological tradition is deeply shaped by convictions directly relevant to the ethical evaluation of AI: a high view of human dignity grounded in the biblical doctrine of the *imago Dei*; a sustained emphasis on education as holistic formation [6]; a healthcare philosophy centered on the unity of body, mind, and spirit; a historical defense of religious liberty and freedom of conscience; and an eschatological worldview that encourages moral vigilance in the face of technological and social change [16].

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

The central research question of this article is therefore: **How can the Seventh-day Adventist theology understand, evaluate, and guide the integration of artificial intelligence across its institutions and mission?**

To address this question, the article adopts a conceptual and analytical approach. It proceeds through five main stages: (1) a methodological clarification; (2) a contextual presentation of Adventism as an analytical framework; (3) a systematic mapping of the opportunities AI offers within Adventist contexts; (4) a rigorous identification of ethical and theological tensions; and (5) the proposal of an original discernment framework and accompanying strategic recommendations.

2. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

This article is situated within the tradition of conceptual and theological scholarship. It does not employ empirical fieldwork, questionnaires, or quantitative data collection. Its methodology consists of three complementary approaches that are well-established in religious ethics and practical theology.

The first component is a narrative critical review of the scholarly literature on artificial intelligence and religion [1, 2, 3, 5, 12, 14, 15]. This review covers contributions from technology ethics, philosophy of religion, practical theology, and the emerging interdisciplinary field of AI and human values. The aim is to identify the conceptual landscape within which any faith-based engagement with AI must be situated, and to locate the specific lacuna that Adventist scholarship can fill.

The second component is a documentary analysis of official Adventist publications and institutional guidelines [4, 16]. This includes General Conference resolutions and pastoral letters, publications from Adventist educational and health networks, relevant contributions from Adventist theological journals, and publicly available institutional policies on technology use. The goal is to reconstruct the implicit values and normative commitments that already animate the Adventist institutional tradition.

The third component is a normative theological approach. Drawing on the doctrinal and ethical foundations of Adventism [6, 16], the article evaluates AI opportunities and risks against Adventist core principles. This normative dimension generates original analytical categories (above all the eight-criterion discernment framework proposed in Section 6) that have practical applicability for institutional governance.

The study acknowledges the limitations inherent in a conceptual approach. The absence of empirical data means that findings cannot be generalized to the actual beliefs or practices of Adventist communities with statistical confidence. The article compensates for this limitation through analytical rigor, theoretical depth, and systematic grounding in primary Adventist sources [4, 6]. It is positioned as a foundational contribution that can and should be complemented by future empirical research.

3. ADVENTISM AS A RELEVANT ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

The Seventh-day Adventist Church was formally organized in 1863, emerging from the broader evangelical Protestant milieu of nineteenth-century North America [16]. From its earliest decades, Adventism distinguished itself not only by its theological particularity: the observance of the biblical Sabbath, a conditional view of immortality, and the imminent return of Christ, but also by an unusually vigorous investment in institutional development. Ellen G. White, one of the founding figures of the movement, articulated a vision of Christian education, health reform, and global mission [16] that translated rapidly into schools, sanatoriums, publishing houses, and a worldwide network of mission stations.

Today, the Seventh-day Adventist Church operates one of the most extensive Protestant institutional networks in the world [4]. Its educational system enrolls millions of students from primary school through doctoral programs. Its health system includes nearly 200 hospitals and hundreds of clinics in the United States alone, with a comparable global footprint [4]. Its communication and publishing infrastructure produces materials in hundreds of languages, including through digital and broadcast media. This institutional scale makes Adventism a major actor in the sectors where AI raises the most urgent ethical questions.

Several specific Adventist theological emphases are directly relevant to the evaluation of AI:

- **Education as holistic formation**: Adventist education has historically resisted reduction of learning to information transfer. The cultivation of moral character, critical thinking, and relational wisdom is considered inseparable from intellectual development [6] a commitment directly challenged by AI systems optimizing information delivery.
- **Healthcare and the unity of the person**: The Adventist health philosophy, grounded in the biblical understanding of the human person as an indivisible unity of body, mind, and spirit [16], has direct implications for AI-assisted diagnostics that reduce patients to datasets.
- **Religious liberty and freedom of conscience**: The Adventist tradition has a long and distinctive history of advocacy for the freedom of individual conscience against institutional coercion [4], with direct implications for AI-enabled surveillance and data governance.
- **Eschatological responsibility**: Adventist theology cultivates heightened awareness of the moral significance of historical choices [16], encouraging neither passive resignation nor uncritical adoption of technological novelty. Moreover, Adventist eschatology places strong emphasis on individual moral responsibility, particularly in end-time decisions concerning allegiance, obedience, and worship; however, the rise of AI complicates this framework by increasingly mediating human decisions through algorithmic systems such as recommendations, predictive analytics, and behavioral nudging. As a result, moral agency risks being subtly shaped or even outsourced, diminishing the role of conscious, reflective discernment that is central to Adventist ethical and eschatological thought. AI does not directly contradict prophetic expectations, but it reshapes the conditions under which those expectations unfold particularly in relation to truth, freedom, identity, and moral responsibility.
- **Mission and communication**: Adventism has always been attentive to emerging communication technologies for gospel proclamation [4]. AI offers new instruments for this mission, alongside new risks of superficiality and manipulation.

These commitments do not constitute a ready-made AI policy. But they supply a distinctive normative vocabulary that can generate principled evaluative criteria which is precisely the purpose of the discernment framework proposed in Section 6.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

4. OPPORTUNITIES OFFERED BY ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN THE ADVENTIST CONTEXT

A responsible theological engagement with AI begins not with condemnation but with discernment [5]. Before identifying risks, it is necessary to map the genuine opportunities that AI presents within the specific institutional landscape of Adventism.

4.1 Education

Adventist schools and universities serve a globally diverse student population, including many in low-resource contexts across Africa, Asia, and Latin America. AI offers specific opportunities in this setting [12, 15] that deserve serious attention:

- Intelligent tutoring systems [12] capable of adapting to individual learning paces and styles can support students who lack access to qualified teachers in specialized subjects. In the context of Adventist schools in rural or underserved communities, such systems can meaningfully complement human instructors without replacing them.
- Automated translation and multilingual content generation [15] can extend the reach of Adventist educational materials to language communities that have historically been underserved.
- Accessibility tools [15] powered by AI: text-to-speech, real-time captioning, language simplification, can improve educational participation for students with disabilities or limited proficiency in instructional languages.
- Administrative automation of assessment, scheduling, and institutional reporting [13] can free educators to devote more time to the relational and formative dimensions of teaching that are central to the Adventist educational philosophy [6].

The key Adventist caveat in all these applications is that AI must remain an instrument of holistic formation, not a substitute for the teacher-student relationship that carries moral and spiritual significance in Adventist pedagogy [6, 16].

4.2 Healthcare

The Adventist Health System is one of the most significant fields for AI deployment, given the sector-wide transformation that AI is already driving in clinical medicine [3, 11]:

- AI-assisted diagnostic imaging, pattern recognition in laboratory data, and predictive analytics for disease prevention [12] can enhance the quality and speed of clinical decision-making, particularly in contexts where specialized physicians are scarce.
- AI-driven population health management tools [3] can support Adventist health institutions in identifying at-risk patients, designing preventive interventions, and allocating scarce resources more equitably.
- Administrative automation: billing, scheduling, clinical documentation [13], can reduce the administrative burden on healthcare professionals, restoring time for the relational dimensions of care.

The critical Adventist concern is that quantification of patient data should never reduce the person to a statistical profile [11]. Adventist healthcare has historically been committed to the dignity of the whole person [16]; AI implementation must be governed by this commitment.

4.3 Mission and Communication

The missionary vocation of Adventism has always driven attention to emerging communication technologies [4]. AI offers new instruments for this mission:

- Natural language processing [12, 15] enables the automated translation and adaptation of evangelistic, devotional, and educational materials across hundreds of languages, including low-resource languages previously inaccessible to large-scale content production.
- AI-powered content recommendation systems [14] can personalize spiritual formation pathways for digital audiences, matching individuals with resources suited to their specific questions and contexts.
- Conversational AI assistants can provide first-level spiritual information, answer frequently asked questions about Adventist beliefs, and direct individuals to human pastoral accompaniment for deeper engagement [5, 12].

Here, the theological caution is substantial: pastoral accompaniment is inherently relational and irreducibly human [5, 16]. AI can extend the reach of the mission but cannot substitute for the incarnational witness at the heart of Christian ministry.

4.4 Administration and Institutional Governance

The integration of artificial intelligence into institutional operations presents significant opportunities for enhancing efficiency, accountability, and strategic decision-making within the Seventh-day Adventist Church:

- Workflow automation and document management **[**13] can improve institutional efficiency across Adventist organizations operating in complex multi-country environments.
- AI-assisted financial management and audit tools [3] can enhance transparency and accountability in institutions that depend on donor trust and community confidence.
- Data analytics platforms can support evidence-based planning and evaluation [13], helping Adventist institutions make better-informed decisions about resource allocation.

5. ETHICAL AND THEOLOGICAL TENSIONS

The opportunities catalogued in the previous section are real, but they exist alongside serious ethical and theological tensions [2, 3, 9, 10] that an Adventist institutional framework must not minimize.

5.1 Human Dignity and the Imago Dei

The foundational Christian conviction that every human being is created in the image of God (*imago Dei*) carries profound implications for the design and governance of AI systems [5, 11]. AI systems, particularly machine learning models trained on population-level data, operate by identifying patterns and generating probabilistic outputs. Applied to human persons, this logic reduces individuals to statistical profiles aggregates of behavioral data, demographic variables, and predicted responses. The irreducible uniqueness, moral agency, and spiritual significance of each person is, at a structural level, invisible to AI [2].

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

In Adventist education and healthcare, where the formation of the whole person is explicitly central to institutional mission [6, 16], the risk of reducing students to performance metrics or patients to diagnostic codes is a concrete governance challenge that demands deliberate countermeasures.

5.2 Truth, Cosmic Conflict, Misinformation, and AI-Generated Religious Content

Seventh-day Adventism is a church that places exceptional emphasis on the study of Scripture and the discernment of truth [16]. The emergence of generative AI creates unprecedented risks of religious misinformation: theologically inaccurate content generated at scale; deepfake videos presenting fabricated statements by religious leaders; AI-generated texts mimicking canonical Adventist or biblical sources [2, 14]. Within the cosmic conflict framework, these developments intensify the ongoing struggle between truth and deception, as well as between freedom and coercion, as technological systems increasingly shape perception, knowledge, and belief.

The institutional and individual capacity to verify the authenticity and accuracy of religious content requiring both critical thinking skills and community accountability structures [3, 6] is therefore more important than ever. Adventist educational institutions have a particular responsibility to develop these discernment capacities.

5.3 Dependence and Spiritual Superficiality

Adventist theology has consistently warned against the externalization of spiritual authority the temptation to substitute human or institutional mediation for direct engagement with Scripture and the Holy Spirit [16]. AI systems designed to provide spiritual content, devotional guidance, or pastoral counsel risk cultivating a form of spiritual passivity that is theologically problematic [5].

If AI makes spiritual formation more convenient, it may also make it more superficial [7]. The deep reading of Scripture, the sustained practice of prayer, the accountability of communal worship these are disciplines that resist automation. An AI that answers every spiritual question on demand may inoculate users against the productive discomfort of genuine spiritual seeking.

5.4 Algorithmic Bias and Justice

AI systems are trained on historical data that inevitably reflects existing inequalities racial, linguistic, cultural, and economic [9, 10]. Deployed in Adventist institutions that serve some of the most marginalized communities on earth, biased AI systems risk amplifying, rather than alleviating, existing disadvantages [2].

The dominance of English in large language model training data [9] means that AI tools designed to support multilingual Adventist communities may perform significantly better for English-speaking users than for speakers of Swahili, French, Fulfulde, or Portuguese. Adventist institutions committed to global equity [4, 15] must take this disparity seriously in their AI procurement and governance decisions.

5.5 Surveillance and Freedom of Conscience

The Adventist tradition's defense of religious liberty is grounded in a principled commitment to the inviolability of personal conscience before God [4]. The large-scale data collection and behavioral profiling enabled by AI-powered systems in educational and religious contexts raises fundamental questions about the right to private spiritual development [17].

Church membership data, digital devotional habits, search histories, and engagement patterns with religious content constitute a form of spiritual surveillance that has no precedent in the history of the Church [17]. Adventist institutions must confront the question of whether the efficiencies gained by data-intensive AI systems are worth the corresponding erosion of the space for free, unobserved spiritual formation [3, 17].

6. TOWARD AN ADVENTIST FRAMEWORK FOR AI DISCERNMENT

The opportunities and tensions identified in the preceding sections suggest that Adventist institutions need not choose between technological engagement and theological integrity [3, 5]. What they need is a principled evaluative framework that enables consistent, accountable discernment across diverse institutional contexts.

Drawing on the Adventist theology [4, 6, 16], the following eight criteria are proposed as the pillars of an **Adventist Framework for AI Discernment (AFAD)**. Each criterion corresponds to a core dimension of Adventist theology and practice, and each is formulated as a diagnostic question to guide institutional decision-making [3, 11]:

1. **Truth** [16]: Does this AI system enhance the institution's capacity to identify, communicate, and preserve truth? Does it create unacceptable risks of misinformation, deception, or manipulation of religiously sensitive content?
2. **Human Dignity** [5, 11]: Does this AI system respect the irreducible dignity of each person as an image-bearer of God? Does it reduce persons to data, profiles, or instruments?
3. **Justice** [9, 10]: Does this AI system serve the marginalized as well as the privileged? Are its benefits distributed equitably across the diverse, global communities that Adventist institutions serve?
4. **Compassion** [5, 16]: Does this AI system strengthen the relational, empathetic, and pastoral dimensions of Adventist ministry? Or does it replace human encounter with algorithmic efficiency?
5. **Freedom of Conscience** [4, 17]: Does this AI system respect the right of individuals to private, unobserved spiritual formation? Does it collect, analyze, or commercialize personal spiritual data in ways that violate this freedom?
6. **Responsibility** [3, 11]: Are there clear lines of human accountability for the decisions and impacts of this AI system? Can affected persons seek redress when the system causes harm?
7. **Service of the Common Good** [15]: Does this AI system contribute to the flourishing of communities beyond the immediate institution? Is its deployment consistent with Adventism's commitment to global citizenship and social responsibility?
8. **Primacy of the Spiritual** [16]: Does this AI system support or undermine the primacy of spiritual formation, human relationship, and divine encounter in Adventist institutional life? Does it position technology as servant or master?

These eight criteria do not function as a checklist that produces binary pass/fail judgments. They are diagnostic lenses that can illuminate the ethical dimensions of any proposed AI deployment, generate structured deliberation among institutional stakeholders, and produce documented

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

accountability trails for governance purposes [3]. Institutions may wish to formalize these criteria in an AI Ethics Charter adapted to their specific context.

7. STRATEGIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADVENTIST INSTITUTIONS

The discernment framework proposed in Section 6 implies a set of practical governance measures that Adventist institutions at every level should consider adopting [3, 11, 15].

7.1 Institutional AI Charters

Each Adventist institution deploying AI-enabled systems should develop a written AI Ethics Charter [3, 11] that articulates Adventist values, the criteria by which AI tools are evaluated, the governance structures through which AI decisions are made, and the processes by which affected persons can raise concerns. Such charters should be developed through a participatory process including administrators, theologians, educators, healthcare professionals, students, patients, and community representatives.

7.2 Theological and Ethical Formation

AI literacy understood not only as technical competence but as critical theological and ethical reflection [6, 15] should be integrated into the curricula of Adventist schools, seminaries, and professional training programs. Administrators, educators, pastors, and healthcare workers need conceptual tools to evaluate AI systems in their specific professional contexts, informed by the Adventist theological core beliefs.

7.3 Data Governance

Adventist institutions must adopt robust data governance frameworks [17] specifying what personal data may be collected by AI systems, how it is stored, who has access to it, how long it is retained, and under what circumstances it may be shared with third parties. Given the sensitivity of spiritual and health data, the default posture should be one of data minimization and user sovereignty. Such frameworks should also be grounded in ethical accountability and transparency, ensuring that data practices align with the church's commitment to human dignity, trust, and responsible stewardship.

7.4 AI as Assistant, Not Substitute

Adventist institutional policy should explicitly affirm that AI functions as an assistant to human professionals, never as a substitute for human judgment in decisions affecting persons [5, 11]. This principle is especially critical in healthcare (clinical decisions), education (formative assessment), and pastoral ministry (spiritual accompaniment) [16]. Accordingly, human oversight must remain central, ensuring that empathy, moral discernment, and relational responsibility are not displaced by automated systems.

7.5 Regular Audit and Accountability

Adventist institutions should establish regular auditing processes for deployed AI systems [3], assessing their actual impacts against the AFAD framework criteria. These audits should be conducted by interdisciplinary teams including both technical and theological competencies, and their findings should be shared transparently with institutional communities. Such accountability mechanisms ensure that AI use remains aligned with Adventist ethical standards, theological commitments, and the church's mission.

7.6 Theological-Technical Collaboration

The governance of AI in Adventist institutions requires sustained collaboration between theologians and technologists [5, 13]. Neither group possesses sufficient competence alone: technologists need theological grounding to ask the right ethical questions; theologians need technical literacy to understand what AI systems actually do [12]. Adventist universities, which train both populations, are uniquely positioned to model and develop this collaborative competence. This collaboration therefore fosters the development of contextually responsible AI policies that reflect both Adventist doctrinal commitments and practical realities.

8. CONCLUSION

Artificial intelligence is neither a salvific technology that will resolve the deepest challenges of human education, health, and community, nor an intrinsically malevolent force that faithful institutions must resist. It is a powerful ensemble of tools whose moral valence is determined by the purposes they serve, the values that govern their design, and the wisdom with which they are deployed. For religious institutions, this means that AI demands not primarily technical expertise but theological discernment. The Seventh-day Adventist Church, with its distinctive theological commitments and its unusually large institutional footprint in education and healthcare, is both particularly exposed to the challenges of AI and particularly well-equipped to navigate them. Its traditions of holistic education, patient-centered care, religious liberty advocacy, and eschatological moral seriousness constitute genuine intellectual and spiritual resources for the task of AI governance resources that the broader field of AI ethics would benefit from taking seriously. The eight-criterion Adventist Framework for AI Discernment (AFAD) proposed in this article is offered as a provisional but principled contribution to that task. It is provisional because the technologies are evolving rapidly, and because the empirical research needed to test its applicability across diverse Adventist institutional contexts has yet to be conducted. It is principled because it is grounded in the normative commitments of the tradition, not merely in the pragmatic demands of technological adoption. Future research should subject this framework to empirical testing through surveys of Adventist educators, healthcare professionals, and pastoral workers; case studies of specific AI deployments in Adventist institutions; and comparative analysis of AI governance approaches across different faith traditions. This article aspires to open that conversation, convinced that faith communities that have for generations defended the dignity of persons in the face of impersonal systems have something essential to contribute to one of the defining challenges of our time. All in all, the governance of AI must remain anchored in the character of God and the biblical affirmation of humanity as bearers of the divine image, ensuring that all technological practices uphold truth, justice, and compassion. Moreover, within the cosmic conflict framework, AI represents another domain in which questions of truth, freedom, and moral responsibility are contested, calling the users to wisdom, faithful, and Christ mission-oriented engagement.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

REFERENCES

1) Bostrom, N. (2014). *Superintelligence: Paths, dangers, strategies*. Oxford University Press.
2) Crawford, K. (2021). *Atlas of AI: Power, politics, and the planetary costs of artificial Intelligence*. Yale University Press.
3) Floridi, L., et al. (2018). AI4People — An ethical framework for a good AI society. *Minds and Machines*, 28(4), 689–707; White, E. G. (1911). *The great controversy*. Pacific Press Publishing Association;
4) General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. (2015). *Adventist education: a statement of consensus*. Silver Spring, MD: General Conference; Knight, G. R. (2000). *A search for identity: The development of Seventh-day Adventist beliefs*. Review and Herald; Knight, G. R. (2012). *A brief history of Seventh-day Adventists* (3rd ed.). Review and Herald.
5) Herzfeld, N. (2009). *Technology and religion: remaining human in a co-created world*. Templeton Press. White, E. G. (1905). *The ministry of healing*. Pacific Press Publishing Association ; White, E. G. (1911). *The great controversy*. Pacific Press Publishing Association; Landless, P. N., & Charles-Marcel, Z. L. (2021). Adventist health message: Ridiculous or serious? *Adventist Review*.
6) Knight, G. R. (2001). *Philosophy and education: an introduction in christian perspective*. Andrews University Press; Numberger, K., & Bowers, P. (Eds.). (1998). *The silent church: Human rights and Adventist social ethics*. Palgrave Macmillan; Du Preez, R. (2016). *Interpreting and applying biblical ethics*. In G. W. Reid (Ed.), *Understanding Scripture: An Adventist approach* (pp. 285–310). Review and Herald; Norman R. Gulley. (2012). *Systematic theology: Creation, Christ, salvation*. Andrews University Press.
7) Kurzweil, R. (2005). *The singularity is near: When humans transcend biology*. Viking.
8) Minsky, M. (1986). *The society of mind.* Simon & Schuster.
9) Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of oppression: how search engines reinforce racism*. New York University Press.
10) O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Crown Publishers.
11) Pontifical Academy for Life. (2020). *Rome calls for ai ethics*. Vatican City.
12) Russell, S., & Norvig, P. (2021*). Artificial intelligence*: *A modern approach* (4th ed.). Pearson.
13) Schwab, K. (2016). *The fourth industrial revolution*. World Economic Forum.
14) Tegmark, M. (2017). *Life 3.0: Being human in the age of artificial intelligence*. Knopf.
15) UNESCO. (2021). *Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence*. Paris: UNESCO.
16) White, E. G. (1903). *Education*. Pacific Press Publishing Association; Gulley, N. R. (2003). *Systematic theology: Prolegomena*. Andrews University Press; Peckham, J. C. (2016). *Canonical theology: The biblical canon, sola Scriptura, and theological method*. Eerdmans; Reid, G. W. (Ed.). (2016). *Understanding Scripture: An Adventist approach*. Review and Herald.
17) Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism*. Public Affairs.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/