

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI) IN SCIENCE: IS THE SCIENTIST OR AI LIABLE WHEN A BELIEVER'S HUMAN RIGHTS ARE VIOLATED?

Judith Massia*

Abstract: Artificial Intelligence (AI) may appear to be one of the newest and most talked about areas of science amidst the current 4th Industrial Revolution (4IR), but it has, in fact, been under development since the beginning of time, from Arabic Alchemy to (Jewish) Talmudic scholar Rabbi Judah Loew ben Bezalel's 16th century interpretation of Golem. More recently discussed only in the realm of science fiction movies, AI has now comfortably and securely entered the highest circles of academia, industry, and government. However, experts have only just begun to look at the impact of AI on human rights violations and God. As AI and technology become integral parts of our working lives, this essay aims to answer the question of whether the scientist or AI will be held liable when a Believer's human rights are violated (physical and psychological violations) and whether the European Union's Directive 85/374/EEC legislation is adequate in tackling this currently very niche issue.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence (AI); Religion; Shintoism

* BPP University, United Kingdom.

Table of Contents

Introduction	46
I. Is the Scientist or AI Liable?	47
II. Alternative Solutions	48
III. AI, God, and a Believer’s Human Rights Violations	49
IV. When a Scientist Is Liable	51
V. Can God Be Sued?	51
Conclusion	52

INTRODUCTION

Although the concept of Artificial Intelligence (AI) seems central to the zeitgeist of the 4th Industrial Revolution (4IR), it has, in fact, been in development since the beginning of human recorded time. From religious traditions of Shintoism¹ (an ancient indigenous Japanese religion) to Arabic alchemy² to Talmudic scholar Rabbi Judah Loew ben Bezalel's 16th century interpretation of Golem (a creature made of clay who later gains life),³ AI has been pondered through ages. Yet, no generally accepted definition exists.⁴ In its most basic sense, AI refers to “the ability of a machine to perform cognitive functions we associate with human minds, such as perceiving, reasoning, learning, interacting with the environment, problem solving, and even exercising creativity.”⁵ By giving life to non-living things, people and religions have long explored the role of non-living entities in relation to human beings. (Even Mary Shelley's infamous 1818 novel, *Frankenstein* explored the dangers of giving non-living things human life forms through galvanism⁶ and alchemy – the AI of their day). The phrase “4IR” was coined by Professor Klaus Schwab to describe the fourth stage of technological progress, of which we are now in the middle.⁷ The 4IR consists of automation, robotics, big data, machine learning and AI. And it's in the field of science where AI is making the most prominent and noticeable technological advances. AI technology now makes life for the visual impaired easier with tools for image recognition helping people better navigate both the Internet and the real world.⁸ AI plays varied functions in these applications. AI systems can be *descriptive* as they tell you what happened; *diagnostic* as they tell you why something happened; *predictive* as they forecast what will (statistically) happen; and *prescriptive* in being capable of performing actual decision-making and implementation.⁹

It has become trite to consistently discuss whether AI is “good” for society or not.¹⁰ Good or bad, AI is here to stay, and we must now find legal solutions (not just have legal discussions) on how to solve the very real legal and ethical problems AI brings with. Thankfully, AI's legal liability conversation has now entered the highest circles of academia, industry and government. AI legal cases are currently thin on the ground (non-existent in most countries)¹¹ so for the moment, we must rely on international and domestic law, treaties, think tanks and government-backed research to find solutions. Experts are now also beginning to

¹ THE CAMBRIDGE COMPANION TO MODERN JAPANESE CULTURE, 5 (Yoshio Sugimoto ed., 1 ed. 2009).

² In the ninth century, Arabic alchemists became interested in producing not only metals and minerals, but also artificially creating plants, animals, and even people. These practices, known as *Takwin*, influenced European alchemy and science. See ABŪ AL-QĀSIM AL-IRĀQĪ (D. C. 1280), THE SOURCES OF TRUTHS AND THE EXPLICATION OF PATHS (‘UYŪN AL-ḤAQĀ’IQ WA IDĀH AL-ṬARĀ’IQ).

³ Edan Dekel & David Gantt Gurley, *How the Golem Came to Prague*, 103 THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW 241 (2013).

⁴ Iria Guiffrida, *Liability for AI Decision-Making: Some Legal and Ethical Considerations*, 88 FORDHAM LAW REVIEW 439, 441 (2019).

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ Generation of electric current by chemical action

⁷ <https://www.weforum.org/about/the-fourth-industrial-revolution-by-klaus-schwab> (last visited Feb. 22, 2023)

⁸ *Id.* at 14.

⁹ Guiffrida, *supra* note 4.

¹⁰ Tamas Cser, *Is AI Good for Society?—The Good, The Bad & The Ugly* (Dec 4, 2018)

<https://www.functionize.com/blog/ai-in-society-the-good-bad-and-ugly/> (last visited Nov. 24, 2022); Forbes Technology Council, *14 Ways AI Will Benefit Or Harm Society* (Mar 1, 2018)

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbestechcouncil/2018/03/01/14-ways-ai-will-benefit-or-harm-society/?sh=1c5ad2784ef0> (last visited Nov. 24, 2022); Samuel Fosso Wamba et al., *Are we preparing for a good AI society? A bibliometric review and research agenda*, 164 TECHNOLOGICAL FORECASTING AND SOCIAL CHANGE 120482 (2021).

¹¹ Numbers countries including all 54 African countries, India, Russia etc.

look at the impact of AI on human rights (but not yet its relationship with God and a Believer). International human rights treaties, such as the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) (1953) (which is interpreted into domestic law, such as England and Wales' Human Rights Act (1998)) lay down obligations which their signatories are bound to respect and fulfil; accordingly, member states must refrain from interfering with rights and take positive actions to fulfil their enjoyment. Whilst none of the conventions currently explicitly apply or mention "AI or machine learning", their broad and general scope would cover most of the issues and challenges identified.¹² Human rights is a broad term which encompasses family life, private life, religion, sexual orientation, etc.; nonetheless, this essay will steer towards physical and psychological human rights violations. As AI and technology become integral parts of our working lives, this essay aims to answer the question of whether the scientist or AI form will be held liable when a Believer's¹³ human rights are violated.

I. IS THE SCIENTIST OR AI LIABLE?

With the aforementioned technological advances, AI raises unprecedented ethical challenges for both the legal and scientific worlds (and at their intersection.) The current answer is that there is typically a "shared" or "distributed" responsibility between robot designers, engineers, programmers, manufacturers, investors, sellers, and users;¹⁴ none of these agents can be indicated as the ultimate source of action.¹⁵ Liability issues around the use of AI could be addressed under the purview of civil or criminal liability. Author J.K.C Kingston¹⁶ discusses AI and legal liability—both whether criminal liability could ever apply, to whom it might apply, and, under (tort) law, whether an AI program is a product that is subject to product design legislation (product liability, e.g., in cases of design or manufacturing failures) or a service to which the tort of negligence applies.¹⁷

This is an interesting separation because under current laws, an AI robot cannot commit a crime, first and foremost because it's not a legal person,¹⁸ and secondly because for a crime to be committed, there needs to be two factors present: *actus reas* and *mens rea*.¹⁹ When an AI robot kills someone, the *actus reas* (the action) can be easily proved, but the *mens rea* (the thought/intention) of the AI robot is harder to prove. Additionally, even if all these hurdles were overcome and the AI robot was arrested (as an AI robot was recently in Switzerland)²⁰ and subsequently charged and imprisoned, what would the judicial and rehabilitation objectives

¹² Rowena Rodrigues, *Legal and human rights issues of AI: Gaps, Challenges and Vulnerabilities*, 4 JOURNAL OF RESPONSIBLE TECHNOLOGY 100005, 4 (2020).

¹³ A 'Believer' in this essay is refers to an individual that follows any religious denomination

¹⁴ [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2020/634452/EPRS_STU\(2020\)634452_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2020/634452/EPRS_STU(2020)634452_EN.pdf) (last visited Feb. 22, 2023).

¹⁵ *Id.* at 6.

¹⁶ J. K. C. Kingston, *Artificial Intelligence and Legal Liability*, in RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN INTELLIGENT SYSTEMS XXXIII 269 (Max Bramer & Miltos Petridis eds., 2016), http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-319-47175-4_20 (last visited Feb. 22, 2023).

¹⁷ Rodrigues, *supra* note 13, at 6.

¹⁸ Ugo Pagallo, *Vital, Sophia, and Co.—The Quest for the Legal Personhood of Robots*, 9 INFORMATION 230, 1 (2018).

¹⁹ *Actus Reas*—a guilty act, and *Mens Rea*—a guilty mind. See LOUISE TAYLOR, ELLIOT & QUINN'S CRIMINAL LAW 13 (12th ed. 2018).

²⁰ Swiss Police Release Robot That Bought Ecstasy Online, THE GUARDIAN, Apr. 22, 2015, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/apr/22/swiss-police-release-robot-random-darknet-shopper-ecstasy-deep-web> (last visited Dec. 3, 2021).

be of imprisoning an autonomous machine that does not age, feel remorse or miss its loved ones?²¹

Shortcomings associated with shared responsibility are compounded by the lack of algorithmic transparency, a significant issue at the forefront of legal discussions on AI. Author Cath states that given the proliferation of AI in high-risk areas, “pressure is mounting to design and govern AI to be accountable, fair and transparent.”²² The lack of algorithmic transparency is problematic in many areas; for example, people who were denied jobs, refused loans, put on no-fly lists, or denied benefits without knowing “why that happened other than the decision was processed through some software.”²³ Accessibility to information about the functionality of algorithms is often intentionally poor due to commercial competition and intellectual property protection and this barrier only exacerbates the problem.²⁴

However, the idealistic answer of a “shared” or “distributed” responsibility (which falls under Directive 85/374/EEC) is insufficient. That is to say that Directive 85/374/EEC *legislation is inadequate in terms of resolving this issue*. One reason is that the legislation creates its own problem: it dilutes the notion of responsibility altogether. If everybody has a part in the total responsibility, no one is fully responsible;²⁵ therefore, avoiding the potential paralyzing difficulties in attributing responsibility is a major challenge where the ethics and legal liability of AI are concerned.²⁶

II. ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS

To avoid the current potential lack of responsibility that scientist face when it comes to scientific innovations in regards (and before any cases reach the courts), lawmakers and government advisers have come up with various solutions. One solution is to develop techniques to anticipate the impacts of robotic development as much as possible²⁷ and subsequently implement legislation to deal with issues when they arise. Another solution put forward is to deal carefully with the inevitable occurrence of unexpected implications by considering the societal introduction of AI technologies as a ‘social experiment’ that needs to be conducted with great care,²⁸ and thus implement legislation to protect society given the aforementioned social experiment basis. The European Parliament released a draft report in 2016²⁹ highlighting civil rules on AI. The report confirmed that under current rules, AI cannot be held liable – any issues that arise have to be traced back to a human.³⁰ The report did mention Directive 85/374/EEC as the only EU legal legislation that in any way references ‘damage’ done by AI, but the report highlighted that this directive is inadequate as it deals with the robot as a product (such as a TV or kettle) and does not deal with the advanced human

²¹ We Could Soon Face a Robot Crimewave ... The Law Needs to Be Ready, THE CONVERSATION, Apr. 11, 2017, <https://theconversation.com/we-could-soon-face-a-robot-crimewave-the-law-needs-to-be-ready-75276> (last visited Dec. 3, 2021).

²² Corinne Cath, *Governing Artificial Intelligence: Ethical, Legal and Technical Opportunities and Challenges*, 376 PHIL. TRANS. R. SOC. A. 20180080 (2018).

²³ *Id.* at 4.

²⁴ Rodrigues, *supra* note 13, at 6.

²⁵ *Id.* at 6.

²⁶ *Id.* at 6.

²⁷ *Id.* at 6.

²⁸ *Id.* at 6.

²⁹ COMMITTEE ON LEGAL AFFAIRS, EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, *DRAFT REPORT with recommendations to the Commission on Civil Law Rules on Robotics (2015/2103(INL))*, https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/JURI-PR-582443_EN.pdf?redirect (last visited Feb. 22, 2023).

³⁰ *Id.*

rights infringements and other legal liabilities that a more sophisticated robot can introduce. However, Section 29 of the report advised the parliament that any liability attributed to AI should not be restricted and should not restrict its liability in any shape or form. The report also introduced the potential idea of setting up an insurance type scheme; the obligatory insurance would mirror other insurance schemes:

as is already the case, for instance, with cars, nevertheless, that unlike the insurance system for road traffic, where the insurance covers human acts and failures, an insurance system for robotics could be based on the obligation of the producer to take out an insurance for the autonomous robots it produces such an insurance system could be supplemented by a fund in order to ensure that reparation can be made for damage in cases where no insurance cover exists; calls on the insurance industry to develop new products that are in line with the advances in robotics.³¹

Whether these measures alone will be sufficient to protect AI and scientists against human rights lawsuits remains to be seen as there are still many unanswered issues. For example, the EU conclusion that AI is not a legal person is too dismissive an answer and is a very anthropocentric stance.³² It lacks self-realization that legal systems have long since granted commercial businesses legal status even though they are essentially artificial entities³³ made up mostly of logos, trademarks, patents and copyrights. Additionally, others arguing for granting robots legal personality state it would prevent “the debates over slavery” that “remind us of uncomfortable parallels with the past.”³⁴ Moreover, the European Parliament’s insurance proposal scheme addresses the financial compensation for human rights abuses but doesn’t define how possible psychological or other harder to measure consequences will be addressed.

III. AI, GOD, AND A BELIEVER’S HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS

The topic of psychological or other more difficult to measure damages (such as emotional and spiritual) is important to explore and forms the focal point of this essay. As mentioned in the introduction, AI has been in development since the earliest days of human society, from the religious traditions of Japanese Shintoism (Shinto believes in the kami, a divine power that can be found in all things) to Arabic alchemy to Jewish Talmudic. Simultaneously, the 2nd century theory of Gnosticism explored the concept of ‘knowing God’ through religious experiences³⁵—experiences which at times are hard to rationalize and acutely explain. When the two ancient paths of Gnosticism and AI collide in the 4IR, the lesser discussed topic of AI and God emerges. (It’s important to note the irony here: religion is where AI began, but it is within religion that modern AI is least discussed). Nevertheless, today scientists are developing AI robots to mimic the place that God has in people’s lives.³⁶ But knowing God is (again) ironically also one of the most complex areas of AI because it involves more than just entering algorithms into a computer. “Religious AI”, this essay predicts, will be at the forefront of pushing AI boundaries as it needs to go beyond just what has been entered

³¹ *Id.*

³² Pagallo, *supra* note 19, at 2.

³³ Pagallo, *supra* note 19, at 1.

³⁴ Pagallo, *supra* note 19, at 2.

³⁵ Stephan A. Hoeller, *The Gnostic World View: A Brief Summary of Gnosticism*, <http://gnosis.org/gnintro.htm> (last visited Sept. 26, 2021).

³⁶ Jason Alan Snyder, *God in the Machine—Artificial Intelligence, Coronavirus, Racism and Religion* (June 27, 2020) <https://medium.com/swlh/god-in-the-machine-5aa80c54f0ef> (last visited Dec. 13, 2021).

by its computer scientist. "Religious AI" must be able to understand, think and interpret for themselves, free of unconscious bias.³⁷

The world of AI has developed rapidly in the last twenty years with the production of AI machines that are able to think and interpret for themselves. The dangers of AI's ability to think freely coincide with this essay's discussion of human rights violations and violations to human bodies (specifically, the mind and spirit). Emotional and spiritual developments in AI over the last twenty years have including: Cupid³⁸ (where scientists have developed neural networks modeled to mimic the way human brain works to develop emotions, subsequently training AI to recognize images, patterns, or numbers and then apply what it has learned. This evolutionary technology is being closely followed by dating websites to better match their clients in the elusive search for love), the Waterfall³⁹ Model (AI can easily read pages of text, but understanding subtext is more complex. Waterfall allows for this subtext to be understood), and lastly and most importantly: Move37. Until recently, AI lacked original thought – until a breakthrough was achieved by Move37 in 2016: AI company DeepMind's machine (named AlphaGo) played chess champion Lee Sodel in a game of Go. The ancient board game of Go is one of the most complex games ever devised and was considered a challenge for AI. AlphaGo played professional Go player Sodel in a high-profile game watched by millions. During the match, AlphaGo played a series of original and creative moves⁴⁰ (especially on its 37th move, later coined "Move37") that led to its 4-1 win and transformed thinking about the game. This breakthrough in AI original thought is now being developed further by DeepMind and other companies. The above innovations (subtext, emotion and original thought) are now being developed to mimic the human relationship to God. The legal question, then, must be asked: what will happen when AI violates these innovations in its emotional and spiritual relationship with a human, resulting in human rights infringements? Recall that this is a violation protected by Article 5 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) ("No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or *degrading treatment* or punishment"). The idea of religious exploitation by AI is not far-fetched; after all, money hungry and morally bankrupt pastors and televangelists have reigned supreme for the last twenty-five years and are ever growing in the YouTube/social media era.⁴¹ So; if, as concluded above, Directive 85/374/EEC falls far short when it comes to regulating physical AI, suffice to say it is also inadequate with regard to policing emotional and spiritual well-being.

Despite the shortcomings of the aforementioned solutions (such as social experiment status), remedies are still worth exploring (especially in the absence of more concrete alternatives). This is particularly true if we, as a society, value the advancement of scientific knowledge and scientific breakthroughs; that is to say, the benefits of AI in the scientific and medical world should be valued more than the negative legal ramifications when it fails. Furthermore, an insurance scheme is the most feasible means of addressing AI's shortcomings (with the added element of therapeutic support for mental and spiritual damages). But make no mistake about it: in order for these solutions to gain momentum and eventually make their way into legislation there will be a need for stronger cooperation between state actors, including governments, parliaments, the judiciary, law enforcement agencies, private companies,

³⁷ Such as race and gender biasness. Joy Buolamwini, *AI, Ain't I A Woman*, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QxuyfWoVV98> (last visited Sept. 26, 2021).

³⁸ The Barbican, *AI: More Than Human Exhibition* (London England Attended Aug. 16, 2019)

³⁹ *Id.*

⁴⁰ To achieve this original thinking AlphaGo used amongst other things; The Monte Carlo tree search (MCTS) is a heuristic search algorithm for some kinds of decision processes, most notably those employed in game play.

⁴¹ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PL26wc3YNcU> Catch Her If You Can (last visited Feb. 22, 2023).

academia, NGOs, international organizations, and finally, the public at large. The task is daunting, but not impossible.⁴²

IV. WHEN A SCIENTIST IS LIABLE

Regarding duty of care of a scientist and his scientific consumer product, we can get an indication as to where the courts will decide a scientist's negligence by looking at a few preceding cases. Starting with the landmark English civil case of *Donoghue v. Stevenson* (1932)⁴³ (famously called *Snail in the Bottle* case) the House of Lords ruled that the manufacturer of a ginger beer owed a duty of care to Ms Donoghue because it was reasonably foreseeable that failure to ensure the product's safety would lead to harm to consumers. Prior to *Donoghue v. Stevenson*, liability for personal injury in tort usually dependent upon showing physical damage inflicted directly (trespass to the person) or indirectly (trespass on the case).⁴⁴ More fitting concerning scientists, however, is the case of *North Glamorgan NHS Trust v. Walters* (2003).⁴⁵ This case expanded the English court's parameters of liability and duty of care. In this case the mother of a deceased boy was seeking damages against the North Glamorgan NHS Hospital for the psychological damages incurred in the mishandling and failures leading up to the death of her son. Ward LJ (majority) noted that the mother felt 'that life is empty and meaningless' (words that can be easily used to describe a Believer's parasocial⁴⁶ relationship with God). In his ratio Ward LJ extensively referenced *Alcock* (1991).⁴⁷ In the *Alcock* case ten relatives of the victim's family sued the South Yorkshire police for psychiatric harm and liability of the police for nervous shock suffered as a consequence of the infamous Hillsborough disaster in Liverpool, England – a national tragedy where 96 spectators were killed and 450 injured in a human crush at a football match. The ten relatives were unsuccessful, but many believed this decision was harsh as the courts were trying to avoid a 'floodgate' of similar lawsuits. Keith of Kinkel LJ and the majority judges ruled that seeing replays of incident on TV was not enough to induce psychological harm (a worthy note for Televangelists if this case was still standing). However, the justices instead reversed this and referenced back to the case of *McLoughlin v O'Brian* (1983).⁴⁸ In this case a friend came to the claimant's house to tell her of a serious accident involving her husband and three children, two hours after it had occurred. At the hospital she was told one child was dead and saw her husband and two other children seriously injured. She suffered serious nervous shock and as a result sued the respondent O'Brian who was responsible for the accident. This case was unique at the time because the claimant suffered injuries away from the scene of the accident and hours after the accident occurred. The House of Lords ruled in favour of *McLoughlin*. The above cases show that English law is continuing to expand the legal parameters of liability, breach and duty of care beyond clinical negligence cases.

V. CAN GOD BE SUED?

In the context of religious violations, it may be worth exploring whether it is possible to sue God. There have been cases where plaintiffs have indeed sought to sue God. The most

⁴² Dunja Mijatović, *Safeguarding Human Rights in the Era of Artificial Intelligence* (July 3, 2018), <https://www.coe.int/en/web/commissioner/-/safeguarding-human-rights-in-the-era-of-artificial-intelligence>.

⁴³ *Donoghue v. Stevenson*, [1932] UKHL 100.

⁴⁴ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Donoghue_v_Stevenson (last visited Feb. 25, 2023).

⁴⁵ *Walters v. North Glamorgan NHS Trust*, [2002] EWCA Civ 1792.

⁴⁶ Parasocial relationships are one-sided relationships, where one person extends emotional energy, interest and time, and the other party, the persona, is completely unaware of the other's existence.

⁴⁷ *Alcock v. Chief Constable of South Yorkshire Police*, [1991] UKHL 5, [1992] 1 AC 310.

⁴⁸ *McLoughlin v O'Brian*, [1983] 1 AC 410.

famous of which is the case of Betty Penrose. In 1970 Arizonian lawyer Russell T. Tansie filed a lawsuit on behalf of his secretary Penrose against God for his “negligence” in allowing a lightning bolt to strike her house.⁴⁹ They were seeking \$100,000 in damages for this distress. When God failed to turn up to court Penrose won by default.⁵⁰ It was doubtful however whether they actually received the \$100,000 in damages.

The most recent case of a civil suit against God was in 2008 when atheist civil rights activist Ernie Chambers filed a lawsuit in Nebraska's Fourth Judicial District Court.⁵¹ The Plaintiff sought ‘a permanent injunction ordering the Defendant to cease certain harmful activities and the making of terroristic threats.’⁵² In response to Chambers' case, two responses were filed. The first was from a Corpus Christi lawyer, Eric Perkins, who wanted to answer the question “what would God say”. The source of the second response, claiming to be from God, is unclear as no contact information was given.⁵³ Chambers then appealed the first decision. But the suit was eventually dismissed because God could not be properly notified and served as he had no known fixed address.⁵⁴

The no doubt humorous reaction these lawsuits receive from observers is indicative of the frivolous nature of even attempting to sue God under tort law. They also show why the court often (sensibly) pursue scientists or organizations behind the scientific invention rather than God himself.

CONCLUSION

This essay set out to answer the question of whether the scientist or the robot will be held liable when a Believer's human rights are violated. The current answer in our judicial system is that it is a shared responsibility; however, this solution was proven to be inadequate, especially in light of potential physical and psychological bodily harm. At present, the European Parliament's proposal of an obligatory insurance scheme seems to be the only feasible idea to help safeguard human rights, but whether it will be sufficient to prevent infringements has yet to be seen. As AI and the 4IR continues their growth and evolution, becoming ever more integrated into our lives, the legal and scientific worlds need to find robust answers to the legal liabilities surrounding AI robots and human rights and God.

⁴⁹ Never Forsaken, <https://www.backtothebible.org/post/never-forsaken> (last visited Nov. 26, 2022).

⁵⁰ *Id.*

⁵¹ https://www.wired.com/images_blogs/threatlevel/files/chambersversusgod.pdf (last visited Nov. 24, 2022).

⁵² *Id.* p. 1.

⁵³ Lawsuits against God, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lawsuits_against_God#cite_note-AP15Oct2008-3 (last visited Nov. 24, 2022).

⁵⁴ *Id.*