

# Artificial Intelligence Sexual Innovation and the Marriage Covenant: An Ethical and Theological Assessment

Brian Kapembwa Sinyangwe

Adventist University of Africa, Kenya

## Abstract

Artificial intelligence (AI) is a fundamental breakthrough in contemporary science. At its innovative core is the quest to simulate human intelligence processes using machines and computer systems. A topical moral discussion lies in the development of sexual robots that can perform conjugal functions. However, the Bible presents the concept of sexuality as a privilege exercised within the precincts of the same species in heterosexual relationships. Hence, according to the Scriptures, human beings can only have a sexual relationship with fellow human beings of the opposite biological gender. However, the rise in robotic technology that includes sexuality raises fundamental questions. What are the ethical implications of AI sexual innovation for marriage covenants? Towards what cause should contemporary theology and ethics relate to this innovation within AI? What is the place of sexuality in humans? Can sexuality with a human-like robot be understood as a biblical and legitimate alternative in the face of rising sexually transmitted diseases? This theoretical paper seeks to interrogate this line of AI innovation from an ethical and theological assessment.

Keywords: Sexuality, creation, procreation, AI girlfriend, *digisexuality*, ethics, marriage

## Introduction

The influence of artificial intelligence (AI) is growing rapidly globally (Yampolskiy, 2016). AI and its innovations primarily aim to understand mechanical systems to develop intelligent articles that can safely process mechanisms and produce effective reactions in varying situations (Cardon, 2018; Ertel, 2017; Russell & Norvig, 2022). At the core of these innovations is the quest to simulate human intelligence processes using machines and computer systems. Intrinsically, the engineering and programming of these digital devices are such that they perform intelligent processes akin to those of human beings. In the early years of AI and robotic technological development, machines could only perform human-like tasks analogous to human cognition. These included, but were not limited to, speech interpretation, arithmetic calculations, analysis, reading, and writing. However, contemporary innovations have extended beyond human cognitive functions.

This study primarily discusses contemporary AI sexual innovations with implications for biblical marriage covenants. This paper highlights the global reach of AI innovation, influence, and application in various spheres of human life. It also explores AI's sexual innovations and highlights the biblical principles of human sexuality and the divine intention for marriage. Finally, the paper draws fundamental conclusions and raises implications for marriage covenants. To clearly define the problem at hand, there is a need to begin by exploring the influence of AI on a global scale and the projections for its influence internationally and then turn to the focus questions of sexuality and the marriage covenant.

## The Global Influence of AI

Projections regarding the influence of AI on international development reveal rising and impactful trends. In recent research, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) published

a report titled “Gen-AI: Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Work,” which highlights three economic areas that AI will directly affect. These areas include labor displacement, complementarity, and productivity gain (Gazzaniga et al., 2024). The IMF team concluded that the global roll-out implementation of AI would potentially dislodge labor-based responsibilities. This synopsis accentuates non-AI-dependent jobs for the market and “may lead to broad-based productivity gains, boosting investment, and increasing overall labor demand, which may offset some of the decline in labor income caused by AI-induced labor displacement” (Gazzaniga et al., p. 15).

Consequently, this scenario leaves inequality levels measurable and relative to the potency of economic activities on AI productivity, which will counterbalance labor income losses caused by potential displacements. To this end, as Georgieva (2024), in the article *AI will transform the global economy – Let’s make sure it benefits humanity*, highlights that AI will affect approximately 40% of global employment, with advanced economies being affected by up to 60%. In contrast, emerging economies and low-income countries face up to 40% and 26% displacements, respectively.

With a global shortage of teachers, organizations like the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), as evidenced in the article, *The teachers we need for the education we want: The global imperative to reverse the teacher shortage*, are moving in to advocate toward implementing AI technology to bridge this gap (UNESCO, 2023). Therefore, the growing use of AI is a helpful alternative (Elhussein et al., 2024). AI applications also register presence in healthcare provision, transport systems, hotels and tourism, manufacturing, agriculture, service delivery, transport and logistics, and social interactions (Akinrinmade et al., 2023; Alowais et al., 2023; Bohr & Memarzadeh, 2020; Dac-Nhuong et al., 2018; Panesar, 2019; Pushkar, 2024). It is appropriate to observe that we are heading towards an AI-driven world. However,

this development in AI raises safety and ethical concerns (Russell & Norvig, 2022). This requires a reverberating appeal for the responsible use of AI. Therefore, this paper investigates AI’s sexual innovation and its implications for marriage covenants in contemporary society.

### AI Sexual Innovations

In recent AI developments, humanoid robotics, robot fetishism, *technosexuality*, *robophilia*, Kissinger, AI girlfriend, and *robosexuality* are becoming increasingly familiar with the day-to-day vocabulary of AI innovations and marketing. In the development of AI-powered humanoids, engineers are developing biomechanical and high-tech programmed mannequins identical to human beings (Harada, 2019). Researchers in robotics and robotic technology concede that “one of the problems tackled in humanoid robotics is the understanding of human-like information processing and the underlying mechanisms of the human brain in dealing with the real world” (Asfour et al., 2019, p. 338; Kaplan, 2016). However, there is a determination against all odds to develop humanoid robots of “high-performance 24/7 humanoids able to predict, act in open-ended environments, and learn from humans and own experience” (Asfour et al., p. 363).

David Levy, one of the foremost advocates for human-robot intimate relationships, argues that “every one of the main factors that psychologists have found to cause humans to fall in love with humans can almost equally apply to cause humans to fall in love with robots...the concept that humans will fall in love with robots is a perfectly reasonable one to entertain” (Levy, 2007, p. 150). Levy’s view raises fundamental concerns. By implication, Levy seems to suggest that contemporary developments in robotics are militating towards human-like psychophysiological makeup. However, this judgment falls short and is an oversight for comparison. There is no way humans can mimic robots. Humans are not system programmed to behave in a sequential cause-and-effect manner

that the robotic operating system may use. Human relationships are stronger than those of computational systems.

Levy sets two foundational grounds that seem to agree with the idea conveyed by Jesse Fox and Andrew Gambino's article "Relationship development with human social robots: Applying interpersonal theories to human-robot interaction" (Fox & Gambino, 2021) on which human-human relationships develop strong feelings of affection and relate each of the principles to the context of human-robot relationships. The first is proximity and repeated exposure; for the human-robot relationship, this is subject to the cost of the robot; and the second is self-disclosure of intimate details; in this case, robot developers design these robots in a way that robots "form friendships and stronger relationships with their users, therefore [being] programmed to disclose virtual personal and intimate facts about virtual selves and to elicit similar self-disclosure from humans" (Levy, pp. 143-144).

From the two foundational principles discussed above, Levy relates ten other, more specific human-robot relationship factors: First is similarity. Levy acknowledges that psychological dissimilarity will exist because of the human consciousness of knowing that the robot may not be of the same family, yet he contends that this will be dealt with at the level of personalities. As such, "attitudes, religious beliefs, personality traits, and social habits – information on all of these can be the subject of a questionnaire to be filled out when [a] human orders a robot, or it could be acquired by the robot during conversation" (Levy, p. 144). Second is the 'desirable characteristics of the other'. Two factors are considered: a). personality; b). appearance. He argued that the primary element is desirability. Specifically, on appearance when purchasing a robot, "the purchase form will ask questions about dimensions and basic physical features, such as height, weight, the color of eyes and hair, whether muscular or not, whether circumcised (if appropriate), size of feet, length

of legs (and length of penis, in the case of malebots)" (Levy, p. 145).

The third is reciprocal liking; according to the programming design, "the robot will exhibit enthusiasm for being in its owner's presence and for its owner's appearance and personality" (Levy, p. 147). The fourth is social influence. The primary argument is that while contemporary social factors may not fully accept this innovation, the passing of time will bring many dynamic changes that will facilitate accepting human-robot relationships as socially acceptable (Levy, pp. 147-148). The fifth is fulfilling needs: Levy contends that robots are designed in a way that adapts behavior to satisfy human needs. He argues "that a robot will be better equipped than a human partner to satisfy the needs of its human, simply because a robot will be better at recognizing [human] needs, more knowledgeable about how to deal with them, and lacking any selfishness or inhibitions that might, in another human being, militate against a caring, loving approach to whatever gives rise to those needs" (Levy, p. 148).

Arousal/ Unusualness, as identified by Levy, is the sixth factor in the human-robot relationship. Arousal stimulation by robots is being developed in a way that the user may not determine the difference between the presence of the human partner and the robot; in any case, Levy contends, it will be to "the extent that it might make the human feel more attracted to the robot than to another human under the same circumstances" (Levy, p. 149). Specific cues are the seventh factor. The robotic invention will be fitted with sense to identify "physical characteristics that could act as cues to engender love for your robot at first sight" (Levy, p. 149). Number 8 is readiness for entering a relationship. Because people may be disappointed by their human partners in a relationship, the robot is an assured promise of an ever-present and available replacement for dating at the owner's will (Levy, p. 149).

Isolation from others is the ninth factor identified by Levy. In this case, the robot will be

available at all times because it will be designed to satisfy the gap of human loneliness, hence having more personal time with the robot (Levy, p. 149). The last is mystery. “By having different levels of performance that can be set or self-adapt to suit those with whom the robot interacts, the behavior and performance of the robot can be endowed with human-like imperfections, giving the user a sense of superiority when that is needed to benefit the relationship” (Levy, pp. 149-150). As such, Levy sees this component of the mystery as having the potential to “be the spice of life in human-robot relationships” (p. 150).

In the contemporary context, AI sexual innovation and the sex technology industry are growing rapidly. Cox-George and Bewley (2018) estimate that this industry is worth more than US \$ 30 billion. Regarding AI sexual innovations, Robosexualogist and AI researcher Kate Devlin (2018) stated that the philosophy of these innovations, which is the basis of her book, is “about intimacy and technology, computers, and psychology. [It is] about....loneliness and companionship, law and ethics, privacy and community. Most of all, it’s about being human in a world of machines” (p. 10). The idea is to develop a mechanism by which humans can mate with machines, while simultaneously creating business opportunities around human sexual appetites.

Rosemary Dolls, a leading promoter of AI sexual innovation, conducted research in 240 countries and territories on the legal framework within those territories regarding how permissible sexual robots are from a legal perspective. The results revealed that the legal framework of 209 countries considers sexual robots to be legal. Four of the 209 countries affirmed legality with explicit restrictions on certain specifications, especially on issues such as height, face, and child-like mannequins. It is only in 31 countries that robotic sexual dolls are strictly illegal. Moreover, most are Islamic nations in the Middle East and North Africa (Dolls, 2024).

Focusing on Sub-Saharan Africa, although the legal framework survey above suggests a legal permissiveness of sexual robotic inventions and with apparent quiescence on usage, the human family culture is inviolable (Sinyangwe, 2022). One primary loci of family values is the idea that individuals belong to ethnic groups. Toyin Falola (2003) highlights that “an ethnic group doubles as a source of identity affirmation and an agency of power. What sustains the group is its history and tradition? Established cultural habits in food, attire, literature, and music are put to good use to socialize members into the group, encourage marriage among group members, and generate feeling of respect” (p. 9). In many sub-Saharan African countries, an individual is answerable by the values of his or her ethnic group. As is the case in Democratic Republic of Congo, many African countries have “ad hoc interlineal committees of elders who co-operate to regulate marriage” (Westerlund, 2006, p. 37) within social contexts. The linchpin to these ideas around the high regard for a marital institution is that “... marriage unite a large number of families who trace descent to one ancestor...” (Falola, p. 254).

Concomitantly, the influence of Christianity, on the one hand, and the general tradition and culture, on the other, in Africa form the dominant structure of people’s views on marriage and sexuality. Alkebulan (2009), reflecting on the Akan people group, argues that “it is no exaggeration to state that religion is present in all things. Religion dictates the value Akan people place on the collective over the individual. It further informs the Akan of their morals and values as they relate to human interaction with each other...[Even] kinship ties and marriage are predicated on the religious values of the Akan as well” (p. 71). We contend that although the legal framework seems inadequate and African countries and their respective legislative bodies have not paid significant attention to the moral and ethical issues this line of innovation poses to society, it is difficult to hold that sexual robotics will be generally acceptable among African communities as alternatives to marital relations between humans.



The AI industry is a fast-growing commercial occupation, dominating research and development in almost every sphere of contemporary society. In the last decade, the fronts of AI innovations have become more topical, as these innovations demand prominence and visibility in the public space. With the surge in public publicity, AI's sexual innovations have raised fundamental theological and ethical concerns. For example, AI's sexual innovations have raised fundamental questions. How can society embrace AI sexual innovation and remain faithful to social ethics and morality? What are the implications of such innovations in marriage and human sexuality? To what extent are these sexual innovations tolerable, if any? We first assess the biblical principles of human sexuality in the context of marriage and then discuss how these principles interact with AI's sexual innovations.

### **Society and AI Sexual Innovation**

Although the receptibility of AI's sexual innovation is on the rise globally, as noted above, some issues confront this line of innovation. The challenges presented by AI sexual innovation are complex and require a comprehensive approach to address these issues fully. However, a few highlights are essential for our discussion. Guillén et al. (2024, p. 579), contend for a critical sexual challenge especially among women – that is, objectification. One significant challenge of AI robotic sexual innovation is its potential to encourage objectification of humans, which could perpetuate harmful sexual and gender stereotypes that undermine the value of human worth and relationships. Forthwith, robotic sexual innovation may cascade into sexualization, especially of women, a matter that Guillén et al., highlight as “viewing a person sexually” (p. 577). The idea of sexualization dehumanizes humanity. Such dehumanization may lead to emotional and psychological trauma.

Secondly, legal concerns regarding the use of robotics and AI girlfriends are also rising (Lin et al., 2012). Even though there seems to be laxity in the legal framework regulating the use

of AI sexual robotics and AI girlfriends in some countries, there is a renaissance in the advocacy of legal frameworks to regulate the use of these innovations. The key question is how society and governments with legislative organs can regulate AI sexual robots.

While arguments for human-robotic augmentation are the reason for advancing this line of innovation, the critical challenge that AI sexual innovation has the potential to create an unrealistic human expectation about sexuality and human relationships are real (Megginson, 2022, August 29). This imposing challenge can alter the divine view of human relationships and the “oneness” that human sexuality brings among humans, as will detailed below.

Moreover, AI sexual innovation may seem to be gaining ground for its use across the globe (Gupta et al., 2017). However, there are more concerns than significance (Lin et al., 2012). There is no degree to which sexual innovation can be acceptable while remaining faithful to social, ethical, and moral concerns. Rather, such a balance may lead to syncretical behaviors that stand against human conscience and the provisions of scripture regarding human creativity. Furthermore, this line of innovation may have both direct and indirect adverse reactions. Key elements that have adverse implications for this innovation include perspectives on humanity and the image of God, humanity as the likeness of God, and the relationship expressed in the marriage covenant.

### **Biblical Principles on Human Sexuality**

The discussion on human sexuality begins with a scriptural affirmation to “glorify God in your body” (1 Cor 6:20). This comes against the backdrop that God is the initiator of human existence (cf., Gen 1:26). Scripture records: “Then God said, “Let us make man in our image, according to our likeness”” (Gen 1:26a). The biblical account of creation offers evidence of the origins of life. It places the discussion within the purview of the divine creative framework. Integrally, an analysis of the origins of humanity

is possible through the Creator's purposeful, intentional, and governing plan. Therefore, it seems reasonable to conclude that human life derives value and sanctity from being a gift from God. Life is a solemn and precious gift that God accords to humanity. Häring (1981) observes, "The human person is called in this bodily life to realize himself as an image and likeness of God... not only is human life the most marvelous creation of the Word of God; its dignity appears, above all, in the Word of God becoming flesh" (p. 4). Therefore, what do the image and likeness of God mean, and how do they fit into the discussion of human sexuality in the marriage covenant vis-à-vis contemporary AI sexual innovations?

### Humanity as the Image of God

The Genesis creation account attributes God to bequeathing some necessary aspects of His being to no other creature than humanity. Scripture affirms, "Then God said, 'Let Us make man in Our image' ..." (Gen 1:26a). The fundamental question is, what is the image of God? Why would God desire to share His image with humanity? What qualifies humanity to share in God's image?

The starting point is that, in no way, does the concept of the image of God imply that humanity serves as a substitute for God in the created order. Secondly, creation in the image of God (Gen 1:26) does not imply multiplication of divinity in humanity. God is not a component of a human being. God transcends creation in both His reality and nature. Third, the phrase "image of God" does not mean that humanity is an extension of God (Cairus, 2000). Instead, it points to two primary facets. First, humanity is God's representative of creation in the context of exercising the divinely bequeathed dominion. Second, humanity bears the image of God in his resemblance to God in the physical, intellectual, and spiritual facets of his being (Cairus, 2000).

The biblical phrase "Our image" is translated from the Hebrew *b'e'sal menu*, which is derived from *Selem*, meaning "resemblance; hence a representative figure" (Strong, 2009, p.

99). In this regard, the "image of God" clearly depicts the representative aspect of humanity's role in and over creation. When God created humanity, male and female, He placed them in the world with the responsibility of naming what He had made (cf. Gen 2:4–15). Man and woman were manifestations of a representative model of God among the creatures, bearing the imprint of the qualities of their Maker. Erickson, M. (1983) aptly asserts that the Bible "makes [it] clear that the image of God is what distinguishes humans from the rest of the creatures" (p. 196). Therefore, what differentiates humanity as the image of God is the significant way they are created (cf. Ps 139:14) on the one hand and the role God assigned to them on the other hand. Allberry (2022) underlines that "the human body is not just a human body. It is an extraordinary work of art by the God of all creation. It's a unique work of art. However, we might be tempted to see ourselves; God sees us in a very different kind of way." The human body is a fundamental expression of God's intricate creative design. To bear the image of God implies that humans in "their rational powers, their freedom of choice, their original moral purity (now damaged by the Fall), their physical appearance, and their emotional life [carry a semblance of their Maker]. To be created in the image of God means to have received a comprehensive likeness of the Creator" (Shea, 2000, p. 24). Shea rightly crafts his argument to include the various dimensions of the "image of God" debate, covering the physical, emotional, and spiritual facets of what the image of God implies.

Humans are a product of divine creative power and reflect "an image of God...as a portrait achieved by His creative design" (Cairus, p. 207). The image of God is a unique distinction of humanity from the rest of the created order. In all creation, it is humanity that mirrors God in the way they are made. Their worth stands out among all created things. It was intentional for God to make humankind in His image. He purposefully reasoned it. However, marred by the influence of sin, human beings must be seen as, to a greater extent, reflecting the image of

God. A materialistic view of humanity must not crowd, in any sense, the view of the worthiness of an individual. All human life is valuable. Its value comes from it being the image of God. This concept of humanity underpins his horizontal relations with each other.

### Humanity as the Likeness of God

The creation account presents a second aspect of human nature in relation to God at creation. This aspect is the quality of humanity—that they are made after the “likeness of God.” As in the earlier discussion, it is challenging to determine the accuracy of God’s intention to assign this likeness to humanity. Questions arise, such as: What is the likeness of God? To what extent is this likeness veracious in the context of sin? How reliable is “likeness” in conveying the worth of humanity? How does the likeness motif relate to human-human relationships?

Contemporary scholarship seems to contend that there is no need to distinguish between “image of God” and “likeness of God.” For Enns (2023, February 6), “both terms mean the same thing.” Similarly, Turner (1996) contends that “it is doubtful that distinctions between the meanings of these two words are to be pressed. Rather, the pair of words conveys one idea through a literary device known as hendiadys.” However, from its textual usage, there seems to be something significant about separating the two terms.

The word *dēmuth* conveys a connotation of “likeness” or “similitude.” The Driver-Briggs lexicon states that *dēmuth* means “likeness, similitude, of external appearance, [as] chiefly in Ezek 1:5 (likeness, i.e., something that appeared like), i.e., one like the sons of man; similitude, resemblance Ezek 1:5, 10, 16, 22, 26; 10:10, 21, 22; of son in likeness of father Gen 5:3 (P); so also, of man in likeness of God Gen 1:26...” (Brown et al., 1977, p 198). From this view, it seems probable that likeness conveys the implications of humanity’s outward resemblance to God. This may imply that there are features of outward human appearance that are like God’s. This, however, should not be construed as saying

that “human beings are a precise copy of God; [rather] human beings are representational of the invisible God” (Hamilton, V. P., 1982, pp. 27-28; cf. John 1:18; 14:8-10). We infer, therefore, that likeness is not exactitude; rather, it implies similitude.

The biblical portrayal of God seems to resemble humanity in how God manifests Himself. God manifests Himself with human-like physical features such as head, hair, and eyes (Rev 1:14; 19:12); Scripture depicts God as producing voice or speaking, with arms and feet (Dan 10:12; Rev 1:15). The Bible demonstrates that God breathes (Gen 2:7), stands (Rev 5:6; cf. Dan 12:1), and speaks (Gen 1—the recurring pattern “and God said”; cf. Rev 1:15). Significantly, there are also specific divine attributes uniquely ascribable to humanity, including the ability to judge and express gratitude. Nevertheless, there is a need to acknowledge the limitations of human likeness to God; first, it is from the creature-Creator perspective, and second, it is from the sin corruption perspective.

From the experiences of Christ on Earth, there are parallel similarities with the divine-human similitude. This seems to be the question Christ may have been addressing when He affirmed to His disciples, in response to Philip’s question, “Have I been so long with you, and yet you have not come to know Me, Philip? He who has seen Me has seen the Father; how can you say, ‘show us the Father’?” (John 14:9; cf. Matt 11:27). Further, in John’s testimony “no one has seen God at any time; the only begotten God who is in the bosom of the Father, He has explained Him” (John 1:18 NASB). A look at divine manifestations in scripture suggests that God purposefully appears in human form. In the conversation with Moses, God told him that “you cannot see My face” (Exod 33:20), signifying that, like human beings, God has a face; instead, God opted to pass before Moses, and he [Moses] saw the back of God (Exod 33:23).

Therefore, we infer that humanity possesses some physical aspects that follow God’s likeness. Whereas God is presented in Scripture

as a spirit (John 4:24), we cannot restrict God in every sense of His omnipotence. Therefore, the physical appearance of humanity represents what God intended humanity to view or idealize about Him, and much more importantly, it represents the human-God relationship and how God treasures this association. Looking at the physiology and anatomy of humans, one marvels at the intellectual thoughtfulness of God (cf. Psalm 139:14). Thus, we infer that humanity represents God's likeness in a physical sense.

There is a complementary motif between God and humanity in their likeness. This complementarity is asserted in human-human relationships. Noteworthy is Davison (2007) affirmation that in a marriage context, sexual wholeness entails "the complementarity of sexes as in the creation narrative... the complementarity of the sexes is particularly pertinent in the marriage relationship... God intends for such complementarity and mutuality in the wider arena of social relationships between the sexes. Christians understand that part of what it means for humanity to be made in the image of God is the capacity for an I-Thou relationship at the human level, as God experiences an I-Thou relationship among the members of the Godhead. It takes both male and female together to..." (pp. 297-300) represent God most adequately.

### Constituting the First Marriage

When God instituted marriage, Scripture affirms God as introspecting: "It is not good that man should be alone; I will make him a helper comparable to him" (Gen 2:18). There are fundamentals that we derive from this text. First is the idea that God is the first designer, establisher, and officiant of the first marriage. Second, that God made for Adam a "suitable" or "comparable" companion, a translation from the Hebrew *keneḡdōw* bearing the connotation of "opposite part" of the same, "counterpart," "mate," yet of the same substance. God made Adam and Eve of the same material substance, "and the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living being" (Gen

2:7). Scripture highlights that humanity, male and female, is composed of two foundational elements, the body – derived from the dust of the earth – and the breath of life – which God breathed into the nostrils, and humanity became a "living soul" (Gen 2:7). The Genesis account suggests that humanity is not a duality of soul and body; rather, he "is a soul" (Cairus, p. 213).

God established the marriage covenant between two human individuals, biologically differentiated as male and female, yet of the same species (cf. Gen 1:27; 5:2). Scripture is categorical that God created them *zācār ūnēqēbāh*. In them, God had invested His image and likeness. To this couple, God charged, "Be fruitful and multiply" (Gen 1:28). In this charge lies the foundational premise on which sexuality is expressed and experienced in marriage.

In the Edenic model, there was a perpetual standard by which subsequent marriages or sexual relations were to be conducted. First, both bore the image of God; second, they were of the same species; and third, they had different biological makeup (heterosexuality). We affirm, therefore, that in no way can the concept of sexuality be removed from the biblical concept of divine image and likeness. While marriage is not a prerequisite for identity as a human being, male or female, "human sexuality modifies and helps to define our personhood" (Cairus, p. 211). Further, Cairus highlights that God "literally made the first husband and wife from the same flesh and bones, as counterparts of the same body, and brought them together for a sturdy lifelong union" (p. 211).

Precisely, as in the words of Häring (1979), humanity is "simply male and female. Whatever else, they may be, it is only in this differentiation and relationship. This is the particular dignity ascribed to sex relationship" (p. 497). Consequently, the dignity of human sexuality and intimacy, practiced in the context of the marriage covenant, should be understood from the perspective of humanity bearing the image and likeness of his Maker. Consequently, viewing through the Edenic lens, "sexuality



is wholistic, involving the whole being” (Davidson, p. 297). One cannot talk about sexual wholeness without referring to human wholeness, which encompasses the totality of “the whole being—physical, mental, social, and spiritual” (Davidson, p. 302). Humanity cannot be fragmented into parts nor a duality of body and soul; humanity is a complete whole (cf. Gen 2:7 KJV).

In establishing the covenant of marriage, God specifically demonstrated the relational and compatible nature of sexuality. From a biblical worldview, sexual relations involve the preservation of married individuals in heterosexual relationships. To preserve the integrity of the marriage institution, God instructs, “You shall not commit adultery” (Exod 20:14). Gane (2017) attributes this proscription to “the imperative of sexual purity” (p. 268). Sexual purity is, to a greater extent, enshrined in the solemnity of the divine declaration: “Let us make man in Our image, according to Our likeness... so God created man in His own image; in the image of God, He created him; male and female, He created them” (Gen 1:26a, 27). Marriage, with the privilege of sexual intimacy, should be the domain of consenting adults of the opposite sex. Scripture warns, do not “act corruptly and make for yourselves a carved image in the form of any figure: the likeness of male or female” (Deut 4:16; cf. Ezek 16:17) (Botterweck & Ringgren 1980). The linguistic expressions in Ezekiel’s (16:17 NIV) narrative suggest prohibition against connotative thoughts of sexual relations with anything carved or fashioned in the similitude of human likeness.

### **Human-Robot Sexuality: A Perspective**

Having dealt with the parameters of humanity as the image and likeness of God and sexuality as the primal experience from the context of human-to-human, in a heterosexual relationship, among adult consenting marriage partners. The fundamental question is whether sexuality with human-like robots can be viewed as a biblical and legitimate alternative in light

of the rising incidence of sexually transmitted diseases.

We cannot underestimate the global impact of sexually transmitted diseases. Elendu et al. (2024), in the article “Global perspectives on the burden of sexually transmitted diseases: A narrative review” highlight that “sexually transmitted diseases (STDs) represent a significant global health challenge with profound social, economic, and public health implications. These infections, caused by various bacterial, viral, and parasitic agents, are primarily transmitted through sexual contact.... The global prevalence of STDs is alarmingly high, with millions of new cases reported yearly.” Further, with alarming statistics published by the World Health Organization (WHO) in May 2024 that “more than 1 million curable STIs are acquired every day.” Additionally, WHO published that “in 2020, [they] estimated 374 million new infections with 1 of STIs: chlamydia (129 million), gonorrhoea (82 million), syphilis (7.1 million), and trichomoniasis (156 million). More than 490 million people were estimated to be living with genital herpes in 2016, and an estimated 300 million women have an HPV infection...” Further, Cox-George & Bewley (2018) report that some places where sexual robots have been embraced is argued in favour based on high STIs prevalence which has been observed that sexual robots reduce human-human STI transmission, secondly, in places where sexual robots have been used, there is evidence of reduced gender-based violence, especially against women. Therefore, could the above statistics be the foundation for validating the use of AI sexual robots?

First, we contend that the challenge with prevailing reality is a sin problem. Therefore, an appropriate understanding of society could be better placed in the context of cosmic conflict. Secondly, a practical interpretation, from a religious perspective, of the above statistics suggests a high prevalence of extramarital sexuality. It seems incorrigible to adduce that the challenge can be remedied by substituting sexual robotic innovation. At the core of the

problem, human behavior must be adequately dealt with to gravitate towards a remedy for STIs. In this regard, it is important to concede that human behaviour plays a significant role in the proliferation of transmission of STIs.

### Conclusion

Notwithstanding, AI is not only here to stay but will play a significant role in social, economic, religious, political, and scientific transformation. Therefore, responsible legislative authorities must create deliberate global legal frameworks for the responsible and ethical use of AI technology.

To create a sexual innovation for human convenience is firstly the abrogation of the second covenant promise: “You shall not make for yourself a carved image – any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is under the earth; you shall not bow down to them nor serve them...” (Exod 20:4-5). We contend that AI’s sexual innovations have no biblical, ethical, or moral tolerability as an alternative to human sexual relations. Human sexuality is a preserve for the married, male and female, of the same species, made of the same substance, in the image and likeness of God, bound together in a heterosexual covenant of matrimony.

AI sexual innovation stands against the order of nature because it militates against the concept of similitude presented by the likeness motif observed above. Robots are not part of the same family as humans and will never be. This defeats the purpose of uniting humans and robots through the bond of a sexual union. The psychological awareness of humans that they are not comparable to the robot makes the task of uniting the two against the law of natural affection (cf. Rom 1:26-32; 2 Tim 3:3a).

To validate AI’s sexual innovation mars the image of God and misrepresents the divine purpose and function of creating human coitus. To view human sexuality from a mere physical perspective undervalues its divine purpose and function in human relationships. Sexuality is

more than the physical expression of one’s feelings. It conveys spiritual connotations that bond husband and wife as one flesh. On the condition that humanity is the representative of God in creation, there is a need for humanity to live according to divine expectations to fully represent the image of God to the rest of creation, especially in the cosmic conflict context. Consequently, to validate sexual relations between humans and robots is not only to suggest an implied oneness with robots, but also to deny the higher divine ideal and purpose of human-to-human heterosexual relationships.

To interrogate the basic philosophy of AI sexual innovation, one finds the following challenges. First, there is a failure by humans to relate to each other well in marriages or any social system. The social struggle for broken relationships necessitates a gap that needs to be fulfilled. Thus, AI sexual innovation seems to seek to bridge this gap. However, creating an order outside of divine creation mutilates God’s image and likeness. Humans are social beings with an inner desire to live and interact with other people. It is noteworthy that in this social system, in the context of sin, human-to-human misunderstandings may be inevitable; yet, these relationships are foundational in creating an environment of self and others’ understanding.

The second challenge deals with the idea of a discussion of sexual health and wellbeing. The World Health Organization (WHO) identifies sexual health as not merely the absence of disease, dysfunction, or infirmity. Sexual health requires a positive and respectful approach to sexuality and sexual relationships, as well as the possibility of having pleasurable and safe sexual experiences free of coercion, discrimination, and violence. For sexual health to be attained and maintained, the sexual rights of all persons must be respected, protected, and fulfilled” (*Sexual Health & Well-being*, 2024). Unfortunately, robotic sexuality or the AI girlfriends do not satisfy the parameters of sexual health. Forthwith, robotic sexuality and AI girlfriends raise fundamental issues regarding sexuality as a public health concern. As such, with robotic sexuality, we

cannot conclude without considering the issues of hygiene post-intercourse. Other concerns include the possibility of malfunctioning and other technological failures.

Therefore, there is a need to view human sexuality with a higher divine premium from the perspective of humans as representatives of the image and likeness of God. Sexuality is sacred. Engaging in sexuality must be solemnly thought and carefully undertaken.

**Funding Statement:** The author did not receive financial support for this research.

**Conflicts of interest:** None.

### References

- Akinrinmade, A. O. et al. (2023, September 20). *Artificial intelligence in healthcare: Perception and reality*. Cureus 15 (9). <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.45594>.
- Alkebulan, A. A. (2009). Asante. In M. K. Asante & A. Mazama (Eds.), *The encyclopedia of African religion* (pp. 69-71). Sage.
- Allberry, S. (2022). *What does it mean to be fearfully and wonderfully made?*. Crossway. <https://www.crossway.org/articles/what-does-it-mean-to-be-fearfully-and-wonderfully-made/#:~:text=In%20Psalm%20139%2C%20David%27s%20praying,out%20in%20a%20mechanistic%20way>.
- Alowais, S. A., Alghamdi, S. S., Alsuhbany, N. et al. (2023). Revolutionizing healthcare: the role of artificial intelligence in clinical practice. *BMC Med Educ* 23, 689. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-023-04698-z>.
- Asfour, T. et al. (2019). The Karlsruhe ARMAR Humanoid Robot Family. In: Goswami, A., Vadakkepat, P. (eds) *Humanoid Robotics: A Reference*. Springer, Dordrecht. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-6046-2\\_23](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-6046-2_23).
- Bohr, A. & Memarzadeh, (Eds.). (2020). *Artificial intelligence in healthcare*. Elsevier Academics.
- Botterweck, J. G. & Ringgren, H. (Eds.). (1980). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*. (Vol. IV). Eerdmans.
- Brown, F., Driver, Samuel R., & Briggs, Charles A. (1977). *Enhanced brown-driver-briggs hebrew and english lexicon*. Clarendon Press.
- Cairus, A. E. (2000). The Doctrine of man. In R. Dederen (Ed.), *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist theology* (pp. 205-232). Review and Herald.
- Cardon, A. (2018). *Beyond artificial intelligence: From human consciousness to artificial consciousness*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Cox-George, C., & Bewley, S. (2018). I, sex robot: The health implications of the sex robot industry. In *Bmj sexual and reproductive health*. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/325558553\\_I\\_Sex\\_Robot\\_The\\_health\\_implications\\_of\\_the\\_sex\\_robot\\_industry](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/325558553_I_Sex_Robot_The_health_implications_of_the_sex_robot_industry).
- Dac-Nhuong, L. et al., (Eds.). (2018). *Emerging technologies in health and medicine: virtual reality, augmented reality, artificial intelligence, internet of things, robotics, industry 4.0*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Davidson, R. M. (2007). *Flame of yahweh: Sexuality in the Old Testament*. Hendrickson.
- Devlin, K. (2018). *Turned on: Science, sex, and robots*. Bloomsbury Sigma.
- Dolls, R. (2024). *Understanding the legality of sex dolls: What you need to know*. <https://www.rosemarydoll.com/are-sex-dolls-legal/>.

- Elendu C, et al (2024). Global perspectives on the burden of sexually transmitted diseases: A narrative review. *Medicine* 2024; 103:20 (e38199). <https://doi.org/10.1097/MD.00000000000038199>
- Elhoussein, G. et al. (2024). Shaping the future of learning: The role of AI in education 4.0. *World Economic Forum, Insight Report, April 2024*. World Economic Forum.
- Enns, P. *What does "Image of God" mean?* BioLogos. <https://biologos.org/articles/what-does-image-of-god-mean>.
- Erickson, M. J. (1983). *Christian theology*. Baker Academics.
- Ertel, W. (2017). *Introduction to artificial intelligence: Understanding topics in computer science*. (N. Black, Trans.). (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). Springer International.
- Falola, T. (2003). *The power of African cultures*. University of Rochester Press.
- Fox, J. & Gambino, A. (2021, May 17). *Relationship development with humanoid social robots: Applying interpersonal theories to human-robot interaction*. Cyberpsychology, Behavior, & Social network. <https://www.liebertpub.com/doi/10.1089/cyber.2020.0181>.
- Gane, R. E. (2017). *Old Testament law for Christians: Original context and enduring application*. Baker Academics.
- Gazzaniga, M. et al., (2024). Gen-AI: Artificial intelligence and the future of work. *IMF staff discussion note SDN2024/001*. International Monetary Fund.
- Georgieva, K. (2024). *AI will transform the global economy – Let's make sure it benefits humanity*. IMF Blog. <https://www.imf.org/en/Blogs/Articles/2024/01/14/ai-will-transform-the-global-economy-lets-make-sure-it-benefits-humanity#:~:text=The%20IMF%20analysis%20captures%20both,to%20impact%20high%2Dskilled%20jobs>.
- Guillén, L., Kakarika, M., & Heflick, N. (2024). "Sexualize one, objectify all? The sexualization spillover effect on female job candidates. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 45(4), 576-594. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2758>.
- Gulley, N. (2012). *Systematic theology: creation, Christ, salvation*. Andrews University Press.
- Gupta, A. K. (2017). *Industrial automation and robotics*. Mercury learning & information.
- Hamilton, V. P. (1982). *Handbook on the Pentateuch: Genesis, exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy*. Baker Academic.
- Harada, K. (2019). Introduction: Humanoid mechanism and design. In A. Goswami & P. Vadakkepat (Eds.), *Humanoid robotics: A reference* (pp. 371-376). Springer Nature.
- Häring, B. (1979). *Free and faithful in Christ: Moral theology for priests and laity vol.2 – The truth will set you free*. St. Paul Publications.
- Häring, B. (1981). *Free and faithful in Christ: Moral theology for priests and laity vol.3 – Light to the world, salt for the earth*. St. Paul Publications.
- Kaplan, J. (2016). *Artificial intelligence: What everyone needs to know*. Oxford University Press.
- Levy, D. (2007). *Love and sex with robots: The evolution of human-robot relationships*. HarperCollins.



- Lin, P. et al. (2012). *Robot ethics: The ethical and social implications of robotics*. MIT Press.
- Megginson, M. (2022, August 29). *Are unrealistic sexual expectations preventing you from enjoying sex?* The center for couples & sex therapy. <https://www.thecenterportland.com/are-unrealistic-sexual-expectations-preventing-you-from-enjoying-sex/>.
- Panesar, A. (2019). *Machine learning and AI for healthcare: Big data for improved health outcomes*. Springer Science.
- Pushkar, A. (2024, April 18). *The benefits of AI in healthcare*. Intellipaat. <https://intellipaat.com/blog/artificial-intelligence-in-healthcare/>.
- Russell, S. J. & Norvig, P. (2022). *Artificial intelligence: A modern approach*. Pearson Education.
- Russell, S. (2016). Rationality and intelligence: A brief update. In V. C. Müller (Ed.), *Fundamental issues of artificial intelligence* (pp. 337-368). Springer International.
- Sexual health and Well-being*. (2024, December 11). [https://www.who.int/health-topics/sexual-health#tab=tab\\_1](https://www.who.int/health-topics/sexual-health#tab=tab_1).
- Sexually transmitted infections (STIs)*. (2024, 21 May). [https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/sexually-transmitted-infections-\(stis\)](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/sexually-transmitted-infections-(stis)).
- Shea, W. H. (2000). Creation. In R. Dederen (Ed.), *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist theology*. Review and Herald.
- Sinyangwe, B. (2022). "Marriage and family: Biblical foundations." In E. Chibende (Ed.), *Adventist wedding handbook* (pp. 1-21). Adventist Family Ministries - Southern Zambia Union Conference of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.
- Strong, J. (2009). *A concise dictionary of the words in the Greek Testament and the Hebrew Bible*. Logos Bible Software.
- Turner, D. L. (1996). Image of God. In W. A. Elwell (Ed.), *Baker's evangelical dictionary of biblical theology*. <https://www.biblestudytools.com/dictionary/image-of-god/>.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2023). *The teachers we need for the education we want: The global imperative to reverse the teacher shortage*. UNESCO. <https://doi.org/10.1787/53f23881-en>.
- Westerlund, D. (2006). *African indigenous religions and disease causation: From spiritual beings to living humans*. Brill Academic.
- Yampolskiy, R. V. (2016). *Artificial superintelligence: A futuristic approach*. CRC Press.