

# **Sacred Resistance in the Age of Intelligent Systems: A Framework for Institutional Flourishing in Theology, Technology, and Public Leadership**

**William Triplett**

PhD, Hampton University School of Religion, Hampton, VA, USA  
william.triplett@my.hampton.edu

---

**ABSTRACT:** The public has become less confident in contemporary institutions, communities are more racially polarized, there is a fast digital acceleration, and intelligent systems are more influential in the institutional world. Political, corporate, university, and religious institutions are increasingly facing crises over legitimacy, ethical governance, and technological adaptation. This paper first argues that the Black Church offers a historically and interdisciplinary framework for the flourishing of institutions in the era of artificial intelligence and algorithmic governance. This theological research, drawing on the traditions of sacred resistance, current scholarship on digital religion, and new research in AI ethics and cyber science education, proposes the Triplett Framework of Institutional Flourishing. The five dimensions of the framework include: moral imagination, Ubuntu communal ethics, narrative epistemology, digital adaptability, and ethical technological governance. The paper examines the historical role of Black Churches as social, political, healing, and adaptive innovating hubs in response to structural oppression. It also examines emerging new forms of distributed authority and institutional agility as consequences of digital ministry practice, during and after the COVID-19 period. It concludes that, beyond technological efficiency, these institutions will need to have an ethical imagination, contextually informed leadership, community-based governance methods, and transparent approaches to intelligent systems if they are to maintain credibility in technologically mediated regions. Theological reflection, therefore, is not only one strategy for sacred resistance but also institutional to maintain legitimacy, justice, and public trust in an intelligent age.

**KEYWORDS:** Sacred Resistance, Artificial Intelligence, Institutional Flourishing, Black Church, Ethical Governance, Digital Religion, Ubuntu Ethics, Intelligent Systems

---

## **Introduction**

Dividing society, technological change, and the normalization of a crisis of faith in government pose more serious risks in the twenty-first century than at any time in history. Governments, educational systems, workplaces, and religious organizations are all situated in algorithmic worlds, under increased surveillance, with a rise in disinformation campaigns and an increase in social inequality (Asimakopoulos et al. 2025). Conversely, it is by now well known that AI-driven technologies are transforming decision-making in the healthcare, financial policing, and cybersecurity sectors, with consequential impacts on the workplace and education systems (Rashid & Kausik, 2024).

While the promise of AI to bring about efficiency and innovation is great, so too are the ethical questions surrounding bias, explainability, transparency, and historical inequalities. But institutional crises have worsened with the rise of intelligent systems. Distrust persists, and leadership structures and institutions find it more difficult to prove their legitimacy, moral obligations, and social responsiveness (Bannor & Baysah, 2025). In

this environment, structures are required that allow for technological and value changes, to build trust and respect among the people of the community.

This paper proposes that the Black Church offers a historically informed mechanism for building resilience and flourishing during systemic disruption. The Black Church historically functioned not only as a religious institution but also as a social, political, educational, and psychological institution within the black community over multiple generations (Neal-Stanley et al., 2024). It has historically functioned as a haven, a platform for leadership development, a vehicle for civic mobilization, a collective refuge, and an opposition to racial mistreatment. These institutions maintained their hope, dignity, and collective action amid structural injustice through the theological culture of sacred resistance (Conway, 2024). Through the theological culture of sacred resistance, these institutions remained hopeful, maintained their dignity, and continued to act collectively despite structural injustice.

This research builds on theological and AI ethics, public leadership, digital religion, and cyber science scholarship to suggest the Triplett Framework of Institutional Flourishing. The framework identifies five interconnections that are key to ethical institutional sustainability in technologically mediated societies, including moral imagination, Ubuntu communal ethics, narrative epistemology, digital adaptability, and ethical technological governance.

The paper suggests that in the future, ethical imagination will have to play an increasingly important role in integrating with technological systems to gain institutional legitimacy. Researchers and institutions embarking on an innovation journey without a moral framework are likely to perpetuate inequality, exclusion, and distrust. In contrast, institutions shaped by a tradition of sacred resistance might provide sustainable means for technological governance oriented to justice and the flourishing of the community.

### **The Institutional Moment We Inhabit**

At present, there is a legitimacy crisis within modern institutions, as mentioned by many scholars, including Ignácz (2024) and Svenbro & Wester (2022). The corruption of governmental institutions, newspapers, schools, and companies has greatly diminished people's trust in these institutions in recent decades (Gebrihet, 2024). Institutions are increasingly challenged by citizens over whether they serve the public interest or reinforce a system of concentrated power (Virtanen & Jalonon, 2023). Three major forces cause this institutional instability: racial trauma, digital transformation, and intelligent systems.

### ***Racial Trauma and Historical Memory***

Institutional inequalities are entrenched in many societies and continue to fuel racial inequality (Banaji et al., 2021). Social outcomes and perception of legitimacy remain a legacy of past discriminatory practices in housing, healthcare, policing, education, and employment (Drydakis, 2024). Often, institutional responses to racial injustice are seen as reactive and not transformative.

Historically marginalized communities have an institutional distrust not only in their emotions, but also in their history. Collective memories exist across many communities that have experienced exclusion, surveillance, discrimination, and political abandonment (Olumba, 2023). Consequently, the institutions vying for legitimacy need to demonstrate ethical responsibility and historical awareness, not just procedural authority.

### ***Digital Transformation***

Digital technologies have changed the way institutions communicate, govern, and exercise authority. The traditional gatekeepers are decentralized through social media platforms,

livestreaming, remote collaboration systems, and digital economies (Yadima & Iliya, 2025). More is being localized across networks, particularly in comparison to hierarchical institutions. In addition, digital transformation brings its own challenges, including misinformation, digital fatigue, cybersecurity, and the lack of cohesion among people (Husain et al. 2026). Organizations are so compelled to function in environments where they remain permanent threats, where trust is limited in scope, and where they are held accountable by the people at all times.

### ***Intelligent Systems and Algorithmic Governance***

Human job selection, policing, credit rating, admissions, healthcare choices, and cybersecurity surveillance are increasingly driven by artificial intelligence systems. These systems are often claimed to be objective and efficient, but they reflect historical inequities in the data used for training and in the structures and beliefs of the institutions that created the systems (Radanliev, 2025).

The use of algorithmic systems can inadvertently perpetuate discrimination if historical data contain structural bias. The use of predictive policing, facial recognition, automated hiring, and financial risk assessment tools has shown a tendency to discriminate against racial and socioeconomic groups (Ferrara, 2023). Therefore, there are new ethical challenges for institutions beyond their functional aspects. They need to identify areas of justice, transparency, accountability, community well-being, and how the intelligent systems fit in.

### **Sacred Resistance as Moral Infrastructure**

Sacred resistance is the merging of spiritual conviction, communal resilience, ethical imagination, and public action in response to oppressive systems. Historically, sacred resistance was used to articulate a theology and a means of survival for institutions within black traditions (Goodman, 2025).

The Black Church encompassed many aspects of black community life; therefore, it became one of the most important institutional settings to emerge in the black community (Goodman, 2025). Churches were not only used for worship but also for teaching classes, providing economic assistance, organizing political activities, and offering psychological sanctuary.

### ***Moral Imagination***

Moral imagination is a prerequisite of sacred resistance, since it involves images of alternatives in intrinsically unjust conditions. Moral imagination gives institutions the possibility of moving beyond survival toward transformation.

Black Churches drew on preaching, music, storytelling, activism, and community ritual to shape their moral imagination. These images and body practices provided ways for communities to imagine freedom, dignity, and justice within institutional realities.

Technology-mediated societies also need to cultivate moral imagination because intelligent systems may surpass human efficiency (Ghosh, 2025). Optimization deteriorates communities, fairness, and compassion. Moral imagination supplies a remedy to this technocratic reductionism.

### ***Institutional Resilience through Communal Ethics***

Relational accountability further plays an important role in sacred resistance, as co-responsibility, interdependence, and community survival have been critical in defining leadership in the Black Church rather than personal empowerment (Toendepi & Cele, 2024). This is consistent with Ubuntu ethics, which can be summarized as 'Humanness is

not an individual matter but embedded in relationships with others' (Ubuntu principle) (Mugumbate et al., 2023).

The Ubuntu approaches provide a critique of hyper-individualist institutional cultures, in which dignity and responsibility are shared among individuals. Institutions grounded in a communal ethic might be more likely to remain legitimate because they rest on relational trust rather than on mere proceduralism.

### **Digital Pulpits And Distributed Authority**

The transition to digital forms in churches and religious organizations was transformational, particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic (Grigore & Cobzeanu, 2025). Churches swiftly converted from their traditional methods of worship to accepting the use of social media to livestream services, online prayer groups, online donation-giving tools, virtual and online counseling, and hybrid models of outreach. This shift revealed the institutional flexibility of many Black Churches, which could innovate while maintaining core theology.

#### ***The Rise of Digital Ministry***

The digital ministry was expanded beyond the physical space. Worship was offered to congregation members and others from across the globe, while the younger generation had become more familiar with worship through digital spaces (Waruwu et al. 2025).

The 'digital pulpit' is more than an adaptation of the technology. It is the very embodiment of the change in organization of authority, participation, and communities within institutional settings. Authorities are becoming more interactive, networked, and platform-based.

#### ***Distributed Leadership Models***

Traditional institutional settings may have hierarchies of power and control, but digital ecologies, through distributed computing, enable more participatory and influential systems. Congregants, students, employees, and citizens expect dialogue, openness, participatory engagement, and interactivity, not one-way communication.

Distributed leadership does not automatically do away with institutional leadership; instead, it re-centers leadership as a relational process. The ability to include structure and participation may be more obvious in institutions that can do so in digitally mediated environments.

#### ***Digital Adaptability without Moral Compromise***

Adapting technology does not guarantee institutional winning. More sophisticated digital infrastructure may be adopted while community identity and/or moral responsibility are simultaneously eroded. So, digital flexibility must be tied to institutional mission and moral intention. The Black Church exhibits adaptive continuity. Most congregations adapted to using digital technologies without sacrificing congregational care, spiritual formation, and social justice. The learned capacity for being innovative and ethical is an important institutional learning for the intelligent age.

### **Intelligent Systems And Ethical Governance**

AI systems are increasingly becoming institutional partners in decision-making. From security operations to government use to algorithmic admissions at universities to automated hiring at corporations to AI-powered diagnostics in healthcare, predictive analytics has a wide range of applications (Alrawahna et al., 2025). Nevertheless, while intelligence has made great strides, there are ethical dangers to be anticipated from intelligent systems.

### ***Historical Bias in Algorithmic Systems***

AI systems use past information to gain knowledge. Historical systems that have been based on racial discrimination and/or social inequality may perpetuate them at scale with the power of intelligent systems.

These include systems within automated credit scoring, predictive policing, or facial recognition systems that are less accurate for people of color. The results show that technological systems are socially constructed.

Therefore, in the case of ethical governance, assessment of the historical implications and social consequences is needed, in addition to the technical performance of institutions.

### ***Transparency and Accountability***

Trust in institutions is growing, particularly regarding decision-making processes. Algorithms that cannot be meaningfully explained by the black-box approach can lead to a lack of trust and ethical responsibility.

Clear governance needs to be explainable, audited, subjected to bias-checking measures, and involve public reporting. Institutions also need to provide opportunities for communities impacted by the intelligent systems to participate and be involved.

### ***Human-Centered Technological Design***

Human-centered governance frameworks highlight the need for technology to advance human dignity rather than institutional efficiency. This strategy confronts only market-based technological models, which focus on optimization rather than justice.

Sacred resistance traditions offer important ethical lessons through their emphasis on humaneness, memory, community healing, and ethical responsibility. Some of these principles could help institutions withstand the depersonalization of people and the reduction of communities to data points under technological governance.

## **The Triplett Framework of Institutional Flourishing**

This paper presents the Triplett Framework of Institutional Flourishing as a model for ethical institutional sustainability in technologically mediated societies, grounded in an interdisciplinary approach. The five dimensions form a connected framework.

### ***Moral Imagination***

Institutions need to develop the ability to think in terms of a justice alternative in an unequal system. Moral imagination promotes a spirit of leadership for change, not for compliance.

### ***Ubuntu Communal Ethics***

The three pillars for institutional legitimacy are relational trust, communal responsibility, and collective flourishing. Ubuntu ethics foster non-extractive leadership grounded in mutual dignity.

### ***Narrative Epistemology***

Stories are the basis of institutional legitimacy and community knowledge. All institutions must treat individual experiences and history as valid sources of data, rather than as indicators of institutional success.

### ***Digital Adaptability***

The challenge for institutions will be to balance technological flexibility with their ethical integrity and mission focus. Innovation would have to strengthen rather than dilute community values and trust.

### ***Ethical Technological Governance***

Intelligent systems should also be clear and traceable, rules should be fair, and systems should take history into account; every bit of ethical governance must have systems of accountability able to evaluate the impact of technology on the relatively powerless.

### **Implications for Public Leadership and Higher Education**

The influence of the Triplett Structure is quite significant for public leadership (in general), theological education, cyber science education, and the creation of institutional policies. As AI is developing, colleges and universities are expanding the use of technology across domains such as academic administration, learning analytics, cybersecurity education, and student involvement. Building ethical leaders in 'Intelligent societies' is not merely achieved by technology. Therefore, education in cyber and technical sciences should be complemented by cognitive training in ethical thinking and historical knowledge, combined with an interdisciplinary approach. Students should learn what intelligent systems are and their impact on social facts, institutional trust, and democracy. Similarly, in public leadership programs, moral vision and social responsibility must play a crucial role in the governance of technology. New leaders will have to navigate both the digital world and the moral gray area.

Theological colleges have a role to play in fostering meaningful and fruitful dialogues on questions concerning the ethics of AI and injustice, as well as the responsibilities of theological institutions. There are enduring ethical codes from the religious traditions relevant in digitally mediated societies that have not been erased.

### **Conclusion**

For institutions, the issues are profound ethical, technological, and social issues that they must face in the age of intelligent systems. The institutional architectures to be developed must combine innovation and responsibility in this age of algorithmic governance, digital acceleration, and public institutions' loss of trust.

This paper suggests that the Black Church has some traditions that can be termed 'sacred resistance' and offers an important interdisciplinary model for institutional flourishing. Traditionally, the Black Church's moral imagination, adaptive leadership, relational ethics, and public engagement for justice have been sources of community resilience. These customs continue to influence the governance of institutions in the era of AI, as they grapple with the ethical implications and potential of these new technologies.

The Triplett Framework of Institutional Flourishing comprises five key elements of sustainable institutions: moral imagination, Ubuntu communal ethics, narrative epistemology, digital adaptability, and ethical technological governance.

Technological efficiency will not be the only factor keeping the institution legitimate. Ethical imagination within governance systems, leadership processes, and technological systems will be necessary for institutions to thrive in intelligent societies. Sacred resistance is thus more than a theological reflection. It symbolizes a strategic institutional context to sustain justice, trust, and human dignity in the intelligent age.

### **References**

- Alrawahna, A. S., Alzghoul, A., & Awad, H. (2025). The impact of artificial intelligence on public sector decision-making: Benefits, challenges, and policy implications. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 15(5), 125–138. <https://doi.org/10.32479/irmm.19419>
- Asimakopoulou, G., Antonopoulou, H., Giotopoulos, K., & Halkiopoulos, C. (2025). Impact of information and communication technologies on democratic processes and citizen participation. *Societies*, 15(2), 40. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc15020040>

- Banaji, M. R., Fiske, S. T., & Massey, D. S. (2021). Systemic racism: Individuals and interactions, institutions and Society. *Cognitive Research: Principles and Implications*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41235-021-00349-3>
- Bannor, F. O., & Baysah, J. O. (2025). Ethical leadership challenges in the age of artificial intelligence: An in-depth analysis. *Pan-African Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, 6(2), 76–88. <https://doi.org/10.56893/pajes2025v06i02.06>
- Conway, J. (2024). Collective and substantial: Human dignity beyond individualism. *Religions*, 15(6), 639. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel15060639>
- Drydakakis, N. (2024). Discrimination and Health Outcomes in England's black communities amid the cost-of-living crisis: Evaluating the role of inflation and bank rates. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2024.2410900>
- Ferrara, E. (2023). Fairness and bias in Artificial Intelligence: A brief survey of sources, impacts, and mitigation strategies. *Sci*, 6(1), 3. <https://doi.org/10.3390/sci6010003>
- Gebrihet, H. G. (2024). The effects of the perception of corruption on public trust in government in Africa: A comparative analysis. *Politikon*, 51(1–2), 18–39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02589346.2024.2344276>
- Ghosh, M. (2025). Artificial Intelligence (AI) and ethical concerns: A review and research agenda. *Cogent Business & Management*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2025.2551809>
- Goodman, C. E. (2025). Resilient Ecclesiology: The adaptive identity of the Black Church in diaspora contexts. *Religions*, 16(9), 1128. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel16091128>
- Grigore, C., & Cobzeanu, A. (2025). The impact of digitalization on religious practices and community dynamics following the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review. *Revista Romaneasca Pentru Educatie Multidimensionala*, 17(2), 302–343. <https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/17.2/984>
- Husain, M. S., Alqahtani, S. A., Saeed, S., Gull, H., Iqbal, S. Z., & Saqib, M. (2026). Cybersecurity challenges of digital transformation in the entertainment industry. *Information*, 17(3), 219. <https://doi.org/10.3390/info17030219>
- Ignácz, Z. S. (2024). The relationship between political legitimacy and economic legitimacy: Empirical explorations of a novel research approach on legitimacy. *Frontiers in Political Science*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2024.1198295>
- Mugumbate, J. R., Mupedziswa, R., Twikirize, J. M., Mthethwa, E., Desta, A. A., & Oyinlola, O. (2023). Understanding ubuntu and its contribution to social work education in Africa and other regions of the world. *Social Work Education*, 43(4), 1123–1139. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2023.2168638>
- Neal-Stanley, A. M., Morgan, J. C., & Allen, D. J. (2024). The religio-spiritual capital of the Black Church: A conceptual model for combatting antiblackness in the early years. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 69. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2024.03.003>
- Olumba, E. (2023). *Preserving the Future through the Past: Unveiling the Role of Collective Memory in Conflict-Affected Communities*. <https://doi.org/10.33774/apsa-2023-gxbnh>
- Radanliev, P. (2025). AI ethics: Integrating transparency, fairness, and privacy in AI development. *Applied Artificial Intelligence*, 39(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/08839514.2025.2463722>
- Rashid, A. B., & Kausik, M. A. (2024). AI Revolutionizing Industries Worldwide: A comprehensive overview of its diverse applications. *Hybrid Advances*, 7, 100277. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hybadv.2024.100277>
- Svenbro, M., & Wester, M. (2022). Examining legitimacy in government agencies' crisis communication. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, 17(1), 54–73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1553118x.2022.2127358>
- Toendepi, J., & Cele, K. (2024). Responsible leadership, an Afrocentric viewpoint: Leadership as a collective effort. *South African Journal of Business Management*, 55(1). <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajbm.v55i1.4337>
- Virtanen, P., & Jalonen, H. (2023). Public value creation mechanisms in the context of public service logic: An integrated conceptual framework. *Public Management Review*, 26(8), 2331–2354. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2023.2268111>
- Waruwu, E., Pasaribu, A. G., Sitopu, E., & Tobing, L. L. (2025). Digital Churches and faith education in the virtual age: A theological study on the validity of online worship and Communities. *Formosa Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 4(11), 5305–5314. <https://doi.org/10.55927/fjmr.v4i11.571>
- Yadima, G. J., & Iliya, S. (2025). Assessing the influence of the media technologies on communication practices and Social Change. *ALSYSTECH Journal of Education Technology*, 3(2), 256–269. <https://doi.org/10.58578/alsystech.v3i2.5468>