

# The dignity of work and the challenge of artificial intelligence

Melchor Labao Cuizon<sup>1\*</sup>, Jose Epimaco Reyes. Arcega<sup>1</sup>,  
Randolf Warren Gregorio Talavera Mayo II<sup>1</sup>, Jay Balmes Villafria<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Central Luzon State University, Philippines

\*Corresponding author: cuizonmel@clsu.edu.ph

## ARTICLE INFO

DOI:10.46223/HCMCOUJS.  
soci.en.14.3.3060.2024

Received: November 08<sup>th</sup>, 2023

Revised: December 27<sup>th</sup>, 2023

Accepted: January 04<sup>th</sup>, 2024

### Keywords:

artificial intelligence; challenge;  
dignity at work

## ABSTRACT

The Social Teachings of the Church define work as a “human act” (*opus humanum*), an “arduous good” (*bonum arduum*), and an expression of the intrinsic value and dignity of the human person. The right to work is not only granted by the State but rather a disposition of the value possessed by a person in fulfilling his/her “destiny and vocation” as a rational and autonomous being. However, the breakthroughs of modernity dichotomized the established value of humanity and his work. Artificial Intelligence (AI) is on the way to altering this essential relationship, giving priority to Machine Intelligence (MI). This admiration of humanity for the proliferation of technical advances lurks a certain danger, “a danger as such” if I may use Heidegger’s term. The danger is not only the possible displacements of humanity in his/her work but rather an alienated individual stripped of his/her worth and dignity as a person who is the sole object of work. This paper argues that (1) the human person remains the indispensable subject of work and (2) artificial intelligence is problematic. To facilitate the said discourse, the work of John Paul II “*Laborem Exercens*” (John Paul II, 1981), shall be the guide in exploring the issue.

## 1. Introduction

The capacity to work is a God-given gift to humanity, and through it, the human person can unfold the mystery of creation and develop a sense of responsibility in their chosen profession which according to Paul VI in *Populorum Progression* (Paul VI, 1967) “a life worthy of the material, social, cultural, and spiritual level” (p. 07). However, the discovery of creation also generates a materialistic principle that conditions humanity and society to prioritize economic activities and competition, as Pope Pius XI argues, “a system of the international imperialism of money” (Paul VI, 1967, p. 05). This emerging condition of the generation where Artificial Intelligence (AI) intervenes affects the value system of humanity including their personal life and choices. Everything is determined by technology; it becomes the tool driver of values and influences all aspects of human life. Proponents of AI, such as social engineers, determine the decision-making on all aspects of economic activities such as transport, communication, and industrial systems. Machine technologies are empowered to do complex work in factories and industries that set aside the human capacity to do manual work. The underlying principle behind this technical innovation is merely instrumental and geared towards efficiency and profitability, disregarding its ethical and moral implications for human beings (Maboloc & Pastrana, 2022). These new conditions and demands, as argued by John Paul II

(1981), will require re-structuring and adjustment of humanity, especially in the distribution of work in the workplace. For millions of workers, this could mean massive unemployment an issue that needs attention and constant reflection. This reflection will unearth the indissoluble link of the human person to their work, a relationship that cannot be eliminated nor debased amidst technical prowess.

The discourse on articles about human work and the challenge of Artificial Intelligence (AI) is primarily grounded on the objective dimension of work understood as a means to human subsistence. This understanding sees work as merely instrumental to human survival and flourishing. However, one must understand that the right to work is not only granted by the State but rather a disposition of the value possessed by a person in fulfilling their “destiny and vocation” as a rational and free-conscious subject. This is the gap that this paper is trying to explore, the pre-eminence of the subjective work over the objective one is what defines the dignity of a person, and the true purpose of work is “for man and not man for work” (John Paul II, 1981, p. 09).

This fundamental duty of a person to work is challenged by AI. The obsession of humanity with the spectacular skills and enormous capacity of AI technology to carry tasks beyond imagination redirected the disposition of the person toward created things. This disposition towards the grandeur of AI might bring the person in a dangerous position, a “danger a such” if I may use Heidegger’s term. A threat grounded by a possible displacement of humanity in the workplace, an alienated individual stripped and reduced to its objectlessness. Thus, this paper argues that: (1) the human person remains the indispensable subject of work and (2) artificial intelligence is problematic. To facilitate the said discourse, the work of John Paul II “*Laborem Exercens*” (John Paul II, 1981), shall be the guide in exploring the issue.

## **2. Theoretical framework**

Pope John Paul II, in *Laborem Exercens* (John Paul II, 1981), defines work as any human activity, either manual or intellectual. This capacity to work is distinct for the human person as having been created as *imago Dei* (image of God). Thus, human beings are placed at the apex of creation and thereby called to preserve and sustain this God-given dignity in communion with others in the community. However, human work has been challenged by modernity with its development and discoveries of advanced technology whose speed runs contrary to biological and natural evolution (Francis, 2015). This “eve of new developments in technological, economic and political conditions” and technical prowess, as argued by John Paul II (1981) may cause detrimental effects to humanity (p. 02). In response, the Pope addresses humanity through his encyclical *Laborem Exercens* (John Paul II, 1981) to renew their commitment towards work, a human activity that emanates from free and conscious subjects.

This vocation to work transcends every generation, culture, and civilization of humanity. It is a universal gift of God to humanity that should be respected and nurtured amidst the challenges of technology and artificial intelligence. This conviction is expressed in the Book of Genesis which reveals the truths of human existence and the demand implied by it. The Scriptures says “Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it” (John Paul II, 1981, p. 05). This passage may not quote directly to work; nonetheless, “to subdue” as argued by John Paul II indicates a human activity that they need to fulfill, a mandate demanded by their humanity. This human work begins and ends with the human person which should be realized and fulfilled over and above material satisfaction (John Paul II, 1981). A reversal of this fundamental value is not only discriminating but also a violation of the intrinsic value that the

person possesses. Humanity has to work, as John Paul II (1981) remarks, because “work is a good thing for man, a good thing for his humanity” (p. 13). Through work, human beings do not only transform nature, adapting it to their own needs, but rather an experience of satisfaction and fulfillment that is appropriate to being human.

Human dignity, on the other hand, refers to the intrinsic worth or value that a human person possesses, or a distinctive character that differentiates them from the rest of creation. This is associated with the capacity to think and discern as an autonomous being. Sison, Ferrero, and Guitain (2016) succinctly refer to human dignity as an exalted social rank, which has come to be attributed universally to all human beings. Thus the human person is the ultimate end of all economic activities and social institutions (Sison et al., 2016). Perhaps the most exalted understanding of human dignity is grounded in Scriptures on the belief that human beings are *imago Dei*. Although this is a faith claim it does not exclude people who do not believe in the existence of the Divine. The notion of human dignity is universally valid and binding to all humanity like the United Nations Universal Declaration on Human Rights. Both notions share a common theoretical consensus, which is respect for persons (Sison et al., 2016), and condemned situations in which human dignity is violated and discriminated (John Paul II, 1981).

Karl Marx, on the other hand, offers the same line of argument who regarded work as human creative activity as active beings (Sayers, 2005). The satisfaction that the human person gets from work is not merely motivated by their passion and desires like that of the hedonist; rather, a satisfaction that is a product of actively exercising one’s power and capacity in performing and fulfilling their work (Sayers, 2005). However, this dignity of work is objectified by a capitalist society. This objectification happens when the workers are manipulated merely as tools in the process of production. Thus workers are treated as inferior to capital, a means to an end (Maboloc, 2021).

**Artificial Intelligence (AI)** is widely known; however, the term is ambiguously used to stand for a variety of machine technologies, automation, and simulations (Preston, 2022). The complexity of intelligence resulted in no definite understanding of the term that bears universal acceptance (Wang, 2019). Thus, as Preston (2022) added, it remains an over-burdened and contested concept.

The possibility of creating AI machine technology inspired scholars of the field to produce machines that exhibit human intelligence like the computer named Hal in Stanley Kubrick’s film 2001: A Space Odyssey (Dreyfus & Dreyfus, 1984). John Searle believes that the human brain functions like a digital computer and the mind is just a built-in computer program (Kenaw, 2008). This idea of Searle reiterated that of Herbert Simon, a leading figure in AI development in the 1950s (Kenaw, 2008). This newfound technology has been expected since then and given the task of performing a wider range of industrial activities in exchange for human labor (Bruun & Duka, 2018). For the capitalist, this is practical and efficient because this technology will carry tasks beyond human imagination. The double bind effect of AI is undeniable. The advances in technology, according to Francis (2015), are wonderful products of God-given human creativity. The progress brought about by medicine, engineering, and communications owe the human person a sense of gratitude and appreciation. Technology improves the quality of life that distinguishes this generation from the past as it expresses the inner tension that impels man gradually to overcome material limitations (Francis, 2015). However, as Pope Francis sees humanity has taken up technology and its development according to an undifferentiated and one-dimensional paradigm (Francis, 2015). This paradigm exalts the spectacular skills of technology over and above the intrinsic value of the human person. The

work cultivated by the person becomes less significant, forgotten, or neglected, and has the tendency of being reduced to an object. This cannot be the case, since human work bears a personal character about the truth of the person. More than an external expression of their personality, human work reveals an inner disposition of freedom and intelligence. As Sison et al. (2016) argue dignity is a gift that needs to be developed, and work is the means to fulfilling this.

### **3. Methodology**

The study focuses on a discourse on the dignity of work and the challenge of artificial intelligence of which the encyclical of John Paul II, "*Laborem Exercens*" (John Paul II, 1981), was used as the primary reference for justifying the dignity of work, which was challenged, by modernity specifically humanity's adherence to artificial intelligence that offers a convenient and efficient lifestyle. The encyclical was examined by highlighting important themes needed to support the claim of the study. In addition, related online academic articles from reputable journal publications like Google Scholar were also used, as references in exploring the topic. The search for articles in the search engine is guided by the keywords used in the study that revolve around the discourse on dignity at work, the dignity of the person, and artificial intelligence. The authors synthesized, compared, contrasted, and commented on the reviewed articles to generate an overview to support the claim.

### **4. Discussion**

The Book of Genesis commanded humanity to "be fruitful, multiply, fill the earth, and subdue it" (Revised Standard Version Catholic Edition, 1952, pp. 1-28). This inscription may not directly pertain to the nature of work; nonetheless, it explicitly expresses human activity as a demand for one's existence (John Paul II, 1981). Attached to the command is the hierarchy that places humanity at the apex of creation which entails commitment and responsibility to use all its resources at the service of humanity as the end itself. This call, on the other hand, reflects the understanding of the human person as a transcendent being whose source emanates from the Divine.

There are two ways of looking at work as argued by John Paul II. First, in an objective sense human work finds expression in culture and civilization where human existence emerges (John Paul II, 1981). Thus, the command of "subduing the earth" means cultivating the land and all its natural resources as a means of human subsistence. To put it simply, as Sison et al. (2016) suggest, work in the objective sense means "the sum of activities, resources, instruments, and technologies used by human beings to produce things" (p. 515). This dimension of work is a "contingent aspect" present alongside the technological and social conditions of a society. Furthermore, this human work in the objective sense can either be physical or intellectual (John Paul II, 1981). Physical or manual work includes work in agriculture such as farming and domesticating animals. Other workers, such as in factories and industries who earn their living by the "sweat of their face" belong to this dimension (John Paul II, 1981). On the other hand, intellectual work finds expression in the field of research, experiment, and theory such as the work of science and technology. These two types of works are inseparable and complement each other. For instance, in engineering works, the engineers make the plan, the design, and the blueprint of the building, which is an intellectual work, while the one who performs the construction works such as the concrete mixers, hammers, diggers, the roofers, etc. are examples of manual work. The engineers and the construction workers are important factors for a building or house to be built. The two classes of workers work together in different degrees to achieve a common result. Thus, in the absence of one class of workers, it is impossible to procure the result of production. Here both persons are involved in the production process even though of

varying degrees. This leads to the second dimension of work that is subjective about a person, the involvement of a free and conscious subject. This dimension of work is a “stable aspect,” grounded exclusively on human dignity (Sison et al., 2016), and reflects the person as *imago Dei*, a being capable of making rational and moral choices. In this dimension work is a privileged means of developing one’s dignity that precedes the act of the human person (*actus personae*). However, work is not an isolated entity; it is done in the presence of others, hence, communal. It relates oneself to the presence of others in the workplace giving opportunities for exchange relationships and a meaningful encounter (Sison et al., 2016). The pre-eminence of the subjective work over the objective one is what defines the dignity of a person and the true purpose of work that is for man and not man for work (John Paul II, 1981). This reveals also the value of work grounded solely on the human person and not the type and kind of work a person has in a society or community. Gaburro and Cressotti (1998) expounded this dimension of work as intransitive human action as opposed to the objectification of the transitive. Human action in the intransitive sense is inclusive, that is action performed towards the improvement and flourishing of oneself as well as of others in the community. Thus, when a person works, he/she is not a detached subject or isolated individual rather he/she is consciously involved and commits himself/herself throughout the whole human activity. Work is designed primarily as a response to human dignity which should be realized and fulfilled over and above material satisfaction (John Paul II, 1981). A reversal of this fundamental value is not only a violation of the intrinsic dignity that he/she possesses but a compromise of the Divine calling.

In working, the person does not only consider the remuneration he/she gets from it. Instead, the person also wishes for the fruit of this work, which he/she shares with others. However, the excessive bureaucratic centralization, which perceives the workers merely as instruments rather than an involved subject in the whole process of production, becomes a threat to the human person. Here the workers are reduced to a “cog in a huge machine” moved and dictated by a defective system of bureaucracy. This mechanism drastically transforms the essence of work into various forms of automation guided by the principle of practicality and convenience. In trying to advance profit and the means of production at the minimum expense, the nature of work has been devalued. This commodification of the worker runs contrary to the destiny and vocation of the person started in Genesis, where God exalts humanity to be the master and architect of the universe. The commodification of the workers exists whenever the person is reduced to a mere agent of production, instead of being stewards and masters of the work he/she is supposed to fulfill.

However, AI tends to reduce the person to a technical aspect, and the market economy, which is supposed to be a place of communion where humanity develops a profound human character and cultural values become commoditized and profit-driven. AI is driven by this technical aspect giving priority to the production process and capital over and above the human person. Through industrialization driven by a capitalist mentality, work becomes a purely mechanistic activity designed to increase production and accumulate desirable profit. The powered machines are tasked to work at the maximum while the person is displaced and reduced to a servant of the means of production. One factor that affects these changes is the hedonistic culture of the time. Work has been reduced to convenience and profit-driven which creates a gap between a person and his/her masterpiece. This gap bears a negative connotation that does not only hinder the worker's creativity and skills but rather a sense of nostalgia for being alienated and exploited from his/her work, the source of fulfillment and satisfaction. The dignity of work is grounded on the primacy of the subjective dimension (person) over and above the objective

dimension (product, craft, and things). Thus, the human person or the worker who performs the work either manually or intellectually is of greater importance than the products or the kind of work one is engaged in. For this reason, Sison et al. (2016) comment that, whatever reason, human beings should not be reducible to mere economic or mechanical resources. The human person is "*homo laborem exercens*" (a human being at work), the subject of work, and, through work, realizes his/her humanity (Schotte, 1982). This principle is succinctly expressed by John Paul II in a passage below:

"Just as human activity proceeds from man, so it is ordered towards man. When a man works, he not only alters things and society, but he develops himself as well. He learns much, he cultivates his resources, and he goes outside of himself and beyond himself. Rightly understood, this kind of growth is of greater value than any external riches that can be garnered ... Hence, the norm of human activity is this: in accord with the divine plan and will, it should harmonize with the genuine good of the human race, and allow people as individuals and as members of society to pursue their total vocation and fulfill it" (John Paul II, 1981, p. 37).

On the other hand, the existence of AI technology in all aspects of human life is evident from weather updates, news forecasting on social media platforms, medical care, finance, and employment. In the employment system, for instance, employers relied on AI from recruitment to employment. However, trusting AI to make decisions in the workplace can be discriminating for the workers because it can never be objective in dealing with the person's protected characteristics (race, gender, disability) (Kim & Bodie, 2021). Furthermore, giving AI absolute control in the workplace not only reduces the person into a state of powerlessness over their work but also disrupts the meaningful interaction between workers and employers (Kim & Bodie, 2021). It is true that AI-based technology can perform better and faster than any human being in the universe. However, this principle is motivated only by the value system of functional capacities like speed, accuracy, and scale of its processing capabilities (Acemoglu & Restrepo, 2019; Brynjolfsson & Mitchell, 2017; Walsh et al., 2019). Furthermore, experts see that humanity in the coming decade is better off because of the wide-ranging possibilities offered by AI. They even predicted that this technology might even exceed human intelligence and capabilities offering opportunities and a more customized future (Pew Research Center, 2018). But there are also concerns about the effects of this AI on humanity. The study conducted by Pew Research Center (2018) to 979 respondents, including technology pioneers, innovators, developers, business and policy leaders, researchers, and activists shows that AI technology is a threat to human agency, data abuse, and manipulation because it is primarily designed for profit and the exercise of power. Other concerns such as job loss that will widen economic divides leading to social upheaval, dependence lock-in as a result of machine-driven dependence that reduces the person's cognitive, social, and survival skills, and worse the destabilization of humanity leading to a possible annihilation brought about by a digital and automated weapons of war (Pew Research Center, 2018). This existential threat of AI technology is somehow depicted in the fictional movie "The Terminator." The mission of military AI in the movie is to eliminate humanity by war. Upon destruction, humanity retreats into barbarism, fighting a guerrilla war with the machines. Thus, AI envisions a transhumanist future where the human person is completely removed, giving way to cyborg colonization of capitalism and the future of proletarianization (Preston, 2022). This future social stratification placed the human person at the level of the working class with AI as the ruling class. The goal and objective is the maximization of utility which, according to Bostrom (2014), is "wire headed" towards the maximization of reward signal, programmed to transform the universe into a computronium "... physical resources arranged in a way that is optimized for computation" (pp. 148-149).

However, the human person is called to a higher and noble purpose from which the dignity of work precedes. In contrast to the AI principle, human work promotes personal values needed to sustain and strengthen the capacity to work. Without such values and concern together, the workplace will eventually collapse and disintegrate. Through working the person does not only fulfill his/her duty to the family, but also commits his/her moral obligation to the stability of the future generations. Work is accompanied by a values system that shines whenever it is performed. One such habit that is developed is virtue. For instance, values such as industriousness, punctuality, creativity, responsibility, and even leadership are developed through work. These moral values are important in developing the personality of the human person towards work (John Paul II, 1981). This motivation to work, on the other hand, is family-oriented as the source and means of subsistence. The values developed from the family are instrumental in the person's disposition to work. As commented by John Paul II, the family is simultaneously a community made possible by work and the first school of work within the home for every person. From the cultivation of moral values, nourished and strengthened by family life, emerges the human person's social responsibility as a citizen and member of the community of the nation. This commitment to work must be sustained until the end of time as a response to the Divine command.

## 5. Conclusion

The challenge of AI technology can scarcely be reconciled with the dignity of work grounded within the framework of subjectivity. Work is a means towards the fulfillment and actualization of the human person, the ultimate aim and the real subject of work over and above economic value. Work reveals two things: the objective dimension and the subjective dimension. Work in the objective sense points to its instrumental value of how a craft or product is produced, while the subjective sense is directed to the value and dignity of the person. These two dimensions of work complement each other towards the development and fulfillment of the person. However, AI technology dichotomized the nature of work in the objective sense bringing with it ambivalent effects like the fragmentation of production to promote greater efficiency and profits, increased labor flexibility to cope with market liberalization and stiff competition, the shift from an industrial to a service economy, with new professions taking the place of old ones due to technological changes (Sison et al., 2016). However, the concern of AI is only at the objective dimension that favors a kind of technological progress and productive activity that disregards the predominant subjective dimension that determines and defines the value and meaning of work as John Paul II argues "Work serves man, but man must not serve work..., the purpose of work, of any work done by man... is always man himself" (John Paul II, 1981, p. 07).

## Declaration of conflicting interest

The authors declare that there are no potential conflicts of interest in this research article.

---

## References

- Acemoglu, D., & Restrepo, P. (2019). *Artificial intelligence, automation, and work in the economics of artificial intelligence: An agenda edited by Ajay Agrawal, Joshua Gans, and Avi Goldfarb*. Chicago, IL and London, UK: University of Chicago Press.
- Bostrom, N. (2014). *Superintelligence: Paths, dangers, strategies*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

- Bruun, E., & Duka, A. (2018). Artificial intelligence, jobs and the future of work: Racing with the machines. *Basic Income Studies*, 13(2), 1-15. doi:10.1515/bis-2018-0018
- Brynjolfsson, E., & Mitchell, T. (2017). What can machine learning do? Workforce implications. *Science*, 358(6370), 1530-1534. doi:10.1126/science.aap8062
- Dreyfus, H., & Dreyfus, S. (1984). Mindless machines. Computers don't think like experts, and never will. *The Sciences*, 24(6), 18-21. doi:10.1002/j.2326-1951.1984.tb02749.x
- Francis. (2015). *Laudato Si. On care for our common home*. Retrieved October 10, 2023, from [https://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/encyclicals/documents/papa-francesco\\_20150524\\_enciclica-laudato-si.html](https://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/encyclicals/documents/papa-francesco_20150524_enciclica-laudato-si.html)
- Gaburro, G., & Cressotti, G. (1998). Work as such - the social teaching of the church on human work. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 25(11/12), 1618-1639. doi:10.1108/03068299810233259
- John Paul II. (1981). *Laborem exercens*. Retrieved October 10, 2023, from [https://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_jp-ii\\_enc\\_14091981\\_laborem-exercens.html](https://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_14091981_laborem-exercens.html)
- Kenaw, S. (2008). Hubert L. Dreyfus's critique of classical AI and its rationalist assumptions. *Minds & Machines*, 18, 27-238. doi:10.1007/s11023-008-9093-7
- Kim, P. T., & Bodie, M. T. (2021). Artificial intelligence and the challenges of workplace discrimination and privacy. *ABA Journal of Labor and Employment Law*, 21(26).
- Maboloc, R. (2021). Herbert Marcuse's theory of domination. *SABTON: Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 1, 1-14
- Maboloc, R., & Pastrana, K. (2022). The question of ethics in modern technology. *The URSP Research Journal*, 8(1), 1-7.
- Paul VI. (1967). *Populorum progression*. Retrieved October 10, 2023, from [https://www.vatican.va/content/paul-vi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_p-vi\\_enc\\_26031967\\_populorum.html](https://www.vatican.va/content/paul-vi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_26031967_populorum.html)
- Paul VI. (1971). *Octogesima adveniens*. Retrieved October 10, 2023, from [https://www.vatican.va/content/paulvi/en/apost\\_letters/documents/hf\\_p-vi\\_apl\\_19710514\\_octogesima-adveniens.html](https://www.vatican.va/content/paulvi/en/apost_letters/documents/hf_p-vi_apl_19710514_octogesima-adveniens.html)
- Pew Research Center. (2018). *Artificial intelligence and the future of humans*. Retrieved October 10, 2023, from <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2018/12/10/artificial-intelligence-and-the-future-of-humans/>
- Preston, J. (2022). *Artificial intelligence in the capitalist university academic labor, commodification, and value*. New York, NY and London, UK: Routledge, Taylor & Francis.
- Revised Standard Version Catholic Edition. (1952). *BibleGateway*. Retrieved October 10, 2023, from <https://www.biblegateway.com/versions/Revised-Standard-Version-Catholic-Edition-RSVCE-Bible/#vinfo>
- Sayers, S. (2005). Why work? Marx and human nature. *Science & Society*, 69(4), 606-616.



- Schotte, G. E. (1982). The social teaching of the church: Laborem exercises, a new challenge. *Review of Social Economy*, 40(3), 340-359. doi:10.1080/00346768200000036
- Sison, A. J., Ferrero, I., & Guitián, G. (2016). Human dignity and the dignity of work: Insights from catholic social teaching. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 26(4), 503-528. doi:10.1017/beq.2016.18
- Walsh, T., Levy, N., Bell, G., Elliott, A., Maclaurin, J., Mareels, I., & Wood, F. (2019). *The effective and ethical development of artificial intelligence: An opportunity to improve our wellbeing*. Melbourne, Australia: Australian Council of Learned Academia (ACOLA).
- Wang, P. (2019). On defining artificial intelligence. *Journal of artificial genera Intelligence. Sciendo*, 10(2), 1-37. doi:10.2478/jagi-2019-0002

