**QiST: Journal of Quran and Tafseer Studies**
ISSN (Online): 2828-2779
Received: 01-11-2025, Revised: 30-12-2025
Accepted: 26-01-2026, Published: 02-02-2026
DOI: https://doi.org/10.23917/qist.v5i1.15994

# AI systems at the test of Revelation: From the Promise of Augmented Intelligence to the Perils of Human Dehumanization

**Abderrazak Said Belabes**[1]

## Abstract

*This research offers a reflection on AI systems in light of the Quranic verse, ﴿He Is The One Who Created for You Allah that is on the Earth﴾ (Qur'ān, 2: 29). It challenges the traditional view that reduces technology to a mere neutral instrument, revealing instead that it is a profoundly existential, ontological, and ethical human endeavor, demanding responsibility, discernment, and regulation. The study emphasizes that mastering AI systems does not grant humanity absolute sovereignty, but rather places it in the position of mustakhlaf (steward of the earth) and amīn (trustworthy), charged with preserving the balance between creatures and guaranteeing their rights. It warns against the temptation to make AI an end in itself, which could alienate humanity and sever its transcendent connection with the world order through a vertical causality. From this perspective, AI presents itself as a true mirror of human commitment, revealing the depth of our responsibility towards the designs of creation and the realization of the common good, liberated from all pursuit of material domination and any descent into nihilism.*

**Keywords**: *Quranic Studies; Revelation; Humanity, Ethics, AI Systems.*

[1] Islamic Economics Institute, King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, Email: abelabes@kau.edu.sa, Orcid: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6805-6623

## Introduction

The digital age is distinguished by the continuous expansion of human capacity to transform the world. This dynamic often rests on an implicit assumption: the neutrality of technology, viewed as a mere instrument whose value depends exclusively on human use. Such an epistemological stance obscures fundamental questions about the purpose, meaning, and limits of technological action. By adopting a critical philosophical perspective, it becomes possible to juxtapose modern horizons of rationality with those imposed by the deployment of technology, to re-embed human action within a framework of informed responsibility, and to foster a critical dialogue that questions normative and conceptual assumptions, thus paving the way for a more thoughtful and comprehensive understanding of the effects and challenges of artificial intelligence systems.

The Quranic verse, ﴿*He Is The One Who Created for You Allah that is on the Earth*﴾ (Qur'ān, 2: 29), opens a radically different perspective on humanity's relationship to creation and technology. It does not simply affirm divine creation, but specifies its human-centered purpose, placing human responsibility at the heart of our actions in the world. Within this framework, technology cannot be considered a neutral instrument: it must be examined in light of Revelation, which illuminates its legitimacy and reveals its limitations.

This perspective allows us to juxtapose the horizons of modern rationality with those of Revelation, to re-inscribe human action within a framework of responsibility and critical judgment, and to conceive of technology as a space for critical dialogue where efficiency and use are no longer sufficient to establish the legitimacy of human choices. Thus, humankind ceases to be merely a master of technology and becomes a responsible steward (an amīn), capable of directing its capacities in accordance with an order of meaning [1] that transcends purely instrumental rationality, which has come to reproduce the very oppression it aspired to eliminate [2].

## Method

This article adopts a philological, hermeneutical and reflexive approach, articulating the textual analysis of the aforementioned Quranic verse with a conceptual inquiry into AI systems.

The philological approach, conceived as the art of reading well [3], refers to an attentive and meticulous approach to the text, which seeks to grasp its meaning through the precision of the language, the subtlety of the words, and the context in which it is situated.

The hermeneutic approach refers to a method of interpretation [4]. Reading a text does not consist of mechanically extracting data from the words used, but of listening to its meaning, following the movement of its language and grasping its inscription in a broader horizon of meaning.

The reflective approach consists of taking a step back from one's own categories of analysis through the search for the inner nature of thought and the reason for this nature [5]. Instead of considering AI systems, progress, or technical neutrality as self-evident, they are questioned as intellectual constructs.

AI systems, in their various forms, are now being deployed on a massive scale, profoundly reshaping social and human activities. Such deployment calls for critical reflection, allowing us to reconstruct judgment in light of the technological, cultural, social, and geostrategic upheavals it generates. It is a matter of examining the tension between modern horizons of rationality and the transformations brought about by these systems, in order to consider not only their uses and effects, but also the conceptual frameworks from which we understand the world in the age of AI systems [6].

The issue is not the jurisprudential and teleological justification of AI systems in terms of *Ta'sīl Shar'ī* (*Shari'ah*-Based Foundation) in reference to the *fiqh* discourse or *Maqasid al-Shari'ah* (*Shari'ah*-Based Proposes) in reference to *usūl al-fiqh* discourse, but their testing, based on a revealed text conceived not as an argumentative support, but as a principle of unveiling the meaning of the technical action of AI systems through an interdisciplinary approach that does not fall within the scope of the so-called Islamic sciences.

Nor is it a question of adopting a prescriptive normative approach or a technical-instrumental analysis of digital technological devices, but rather an interpretative reading aimed at identifying the ontological, axiological and epistemological implications of the Quranic verse ﴿*He Is The One Who Created for You Allah that is on the Earth*﴾ (Qur'ān, 2: 29).

The ontological implications revolve around the fundamental question of being: what exists, and what does it mean to exist? As such, it interrogates the nature of intelligence, the status of humans in relation to machines, and the possibility of considering artificial intelligence systems as subjects, agents, or mere artifacts. In other words, it questions how AI redefines who we are?

The axiological implications are rooted in the fundamental question of value: what has value, and according to what criteria? This leads us to question the values mobilized by the development of AI—such as efficiency, performance, and profitability—as well as the place given to human dignity,

moral responsibility, and meaning. It thus highlights the tensions between technological values and ethical or spiritual values. In other words, it reveals what AI systems encourage us to value, or conversely, to sacrifice.

The epistemological implications revolve around the question of knowledge: how do we know what we think we know? It examines the role of algorithms in the production and legitimation of knowledge, the distinction between data, information, knowledge, and wisdom, as well as the respective places of revelation, reason, and experience in relation to automated systems. In other words, it explores how AI systems are transforming our ways of knowing and understanding reality.

The approach adopted consists of subjecting contemporary discourse on AI systems to a critical examination of its implicit presuppositions—whether ontological, normative, or anthropological—by confronting them with the horizon of meaning opened up by Revelation. This is not about applying pre-established analytical categories to the revealed text, but rather about shifting the perspective from which these discourses are questioned. This confrontation is achieved through a cross-cutting reading that articulates the notions of purpose, responsibility, and limit: purpose, to question the ultimate direction assigned to technology beyond efficiency; responsibility, to reintegrate algorithmic action into a moral and legal framework that is not reducible to functional accountability; and limit, finally, to challenge the implicit horizon of unlimitedness and total control that structures many contemporary narratives on AI [7].

This approach acknowledges the incommensurability of horizons of rationality without confining them within a hermetic enclosure [8]. Modern categories of knowledge are understood as historically situated constructs, endowed with their own internal coherence, but incapable of exhausting the meaning of the revealed text. This text cannot be dissolved into pre-established methodological frameworks, nor can it be presented as a pure outside modern knowledge; rather, it establishes a space for critical dialogue where contemporary frameworks are both understood from their own logic and challenged by a different horizon of rationality. The ensuing dialogue is therefore neither a complete translation nor a reductive synthesis, but a fruitful confrontation, capable of reciprocally shifting the conditions of meaning and reason.

## Result and Discussion

### 1. Understanding technology as an anthropological fact rather than a neutral given

Technology is often thought of as the set of means by which humans dominate and appropriate nature [9]. This conceptualization masks an essential dimension: all technology rests on a certain vision of the world we live in, of humankind, and of the world we live from. In other words, technology is never purely instrumental; it is always already inscribed in an implicit ontology [10].

Thinking of technology as an anthropological fact means recognizing that it is not simply a tool, a set of machines, or AI systems, but that it is deeply linked to human existence [11]. It reveals how humankind lives, thinks, and transforms the world, and participates in what defines him as a being capable of creating, adapting, and shaping his living milieu (*umwelt*, *fūdo* 風土). To consider technology from this perspective is to situate it within the history, culture, and social life of humankind, rather than reducing it to a neutral instrument [12].

To consider technology from this perspective is to situate it within the history, culture, and social life of humankind, rather than reducing it to a neutral instrument [13]. However, the history of technology shows that it reconfigures social relationships, redefines human priorities, and even alters the perception of reality [14]. The question is therefore not only what can be done?, but what does technology do to our way of inhabiting the world by dissociating the world from which we live from the world we live in? [15].

Technology can make us live in a separate, artificial, virtualized, or controlled world while making us forget the physical and natural world in which we actually exist. It creates a distance between concrete human experience and the technical devices we use, sometimes to the point of transforming our relationship to reality. Big data flows and generative AI systems are shaping artificial environments that can gradually distance us from direct contact with real life.

By placing technology at the heart of human experience, this perspective invites us to question AI systems not as mere neutral tools, but in terms of their legitimacy, their purposes, and their place within the ethical framework that stems from Revelation through the SMELT theoretical model [16]. This involves going beyond the justifications based on *Ta'sīl Shar'ī* and *Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah*, as well as the approach that sees technology as a dangerous form of human domination [17], and the one that denounces the alienation of man by new technologies [18].

Pessimistic narratives about AI ethics deserve to be nuanced and reformulated, as they often reflect implicit assumptions about rationality, power, and technological mastery [19]. A critical reading requires challenging these narratives with other horizons of rationality, examining the normative and social frameworks that underpin them, and simultaneously recognizing the real risks and the conditions of responsibility, purpose, and limits that structure the deployment of AI systems [20].

It is not only a matter of integrating explicit human values into the design of AI systems [21], but also of mobilizing transcendent values to regulate power imbalances and social impacts, while ensuring concordance between the rights of Allah and the rights of creatures, and questioning the normative and methodological assumptions that underlie our understanding of technology and rationality.

## 2. AI systems in the light of divine creation

The Quranic verse ﴿*He Is The One Who Created for You Allah that is on the Earth*﴾ (Quran, 2: 29) indicates that everything that exists on earth was created by Allah for man, for use, enjoyment, or responsibility to fulfill the rights of God and the rights of creatures.

Fulfilling God's rights means recognizing Allah's sovereignty and His role as Creator, living according to His commandments—that is, respecting *Shari'ah*, adopting an attitude of gratitude and responsibility, and using creation in accordance with God's will [22].

Fulfilling the rights of creatures means respecting the life and well-being of living beings, including animals and plants, using natural resources responsibly, without causing unnecessary destruction, maintaining the balance of living ecosystems, because man is the steward (*khalīfah*) on earth [23].

While divine creation includes *rizq*—that is, everything that serves the good of humankind, such as animals, plants, and natural resources—human inventions are not strictly part of it; they result from the ingenuity of man, who implements and transforms what Allah has created, by mobilizing the reason, imagination, and intuition that have been given to him [24].

AI systems are not created directly by Allah; they are designed and built by humankind, which utilizes the intellectual capacities Allah has bestowed upon it—through programming, mathematics, and statistics—as well as natural resources, to invent and assemble electronic chips, powerful computers, machines, and algorithms, thus transforming divine creation into technological instruments to fulfill the rights of Allah and the rights of His creation.

In this sense, AI systems are indirectly made possible by divine creation, as they rely on human faculties created by Allah, materials created by Allah, and *sunan kawniyah*—those universal laws established by Allah that govern earthly life, the order of the quantum microcosm, and that of the gravitational macrocosm.

Even though AI systems are not part of Allah's original creation, they remain a manifestation of human creativity, operating within the limits of the divine capacity granted to humankind to shape and manage creation. The crucial question is whether these systems will contribute to respecting divine rights and the rights of creatures or whether they will prioritize the interests of tech giants, which socialize capital while privatizing social value [25] and employ manipulative tactics to create addiction among users [26].

### 3. AI systems and ethical responsibility: between the rights of Allah and creatures and the interests of digital giants

This question goes far beyond considerations of efficiency or resilience: it touches the very heart of humanity's mission on Earth as a divine creation. In other words, the central question is not simply what AI systems can do, but how this fits into humanity's mission to serve the good and respect the principles of creation.

Man, as steward (*khalifah*) on earth, is entrusted with the mission of managing creation according to divine principles and protecting all creatures. However, when AI systems are designed or operated solely to maximize profit or reinforce economic dominance, they stray from this purpose and risk transforming tools designed for good into instruments of power and exploitation.

It therefore appears crucial to evaluate these technologies as a social construction [27] not only from a technical standpoint, taking into account their social and environmental impact as well as moral responsibility, in order to ensure that they serve the common good rather than private or monopolistic interests, but also through the lens of divine and human rights.

The value of a conception of ethics that goes beyond individual rights, social and ecological impact, and the simple common good—which often remain rooted in a Eurocentric perspective—lies in its ability to introduce a more universal and transcendental vision of human responsibility.

Traditional approaches to ethics, centered on individual rights, the common good, or social and ecological impact, are often based on values and frameworks stemming from the historical trajectories of European societies (freedom, utility, social justice, environmental sustainability). They remain

limited to earthly and human contexts, without always questioning the spiritual or universal foundations of human action.

By including the rights of Allah and the rights of His creatures, ethics becomes transcendent, in that it is part of a broader universal order, where humankind is not only responsible to society or the environment, but also to the Creator and all of creation.

The value of this approach lies in linking individual, social, and ecological ethics to a cosmic and spiritual purpose, offering a holistic vision of human responsibility. Human beings are no longer merely economic or social agents; they become servants of the divine order and protectors of all creatures, which considerably broadens the scope of ethics.

In the context of AI systems, this approach allows us to question the purposes of technology beyond profit, efficiency, or societal impact: it compels us to ask whether technology respects creation, serves justice, and contributes to a harmonious universal order. This establishes a universal perspective, valid beyond cultural boundaries and particular economic interests.

**4. The major hermeneutical significance of the Quranic verse ﴿*for you*﴾**

The Quranic phrase ﴿*for you*﴾ does not signify unlimited permission for appropriation. It indicates a purpose, not absolute ownership. Creation is directed towards humankind, but it does not belong to humanity in the sense of unconditional sovereignty.

This means that everything in the universe—animals, plants, natural resources—was created by God for the use and benefit of humankind, as emphasized in the verse, ﴿*He Is The One Who Created for You Allah that is on the Earth*﴾ (Qur'ān, 2: 29). Humankind is thus both the beneficiary and the steward of creation, able to use it to meet its needs, nourish itself, develop, and live on Earth.

Although creation serves humankind, it is not its absolute property. Humans do not have the right to do whatever they want with it without limits. Humans are stewards or administrators, not absolute rulers. They must respect divine principles, the balance of ecosystems, and the rights of all creatures.

Human beings cannot act solely according to their desires or private interests. Their sovereignty is conditioned by moral, ethical, and spiritual responsibility. The management of creation must therefore reconcile use and protection, taking into account the rights of God and the rights of other creatures.

Such an orientation of creation towards humankind implies three fundamental dimensions that structure humanity's responsibility and guide its interaction with the surrounding worlds:

- The purpose: What is created for man is created for his fulfillment, not for his destruction or alienation.
- Responsibility: Benefiting from a purposeful creation implies a moral obligation in its use.
- The limit: Quranic phrase ﴿*for you*﴾ excludes arbitrariness; it presupposes a responsible and transcendent framework.

Understood in this way, AI systems become a testing ground: they reveal whether humanity respects or betrays the purpose inscribed in creation. This relates to how we view AI not simply as a technical system, but as a phenomenon situated within the framework of divine creation and human responsibility.

AI systems reveal how humanity mobilizes its abilities and knowledge, giving rise to choices that transcend mere technical mastery to engage ethical and moral responsibility. They thus illuminate humanity's relationship with creation, which is oriented towards a specific purpose: respecting the rights of God and creatures, preserving the balance of the world, and exercising responsible governance of what has been entrusted to us as stewards on Earth.

The use of AI systems can be aligned with this purpose when humanity uses technology for the common good, in accordance with divine principles, or it can be betrayed when AI is misused for personal gain, domination, or exploitation, disregarding the inherent limits and responsibilities of creation in the name of greed and appropriation, manifested by the mass collection, appropriation, and concentration of data for the benefit of a few dominant digital players. It then becomes essential to re-examine AI systems in light of Revelation.

## 5. Revelation as a framework for discerning the scope of AI systems

While AI systems benefit from being re-examined in light of Revelation to question their purposes, limits, and implications, this does not offer a catalog of legitimate or illicit artificial intelligence systems. Rather, it tests technology as a meaningful human practice, not as a mere material object devoid of significance.

This challenge manifests itself through fundamental questions, particularly those that follow:

- Do AI systems truly serve life, or do they reconfigure it according to a logic beyond their control?
- Do they respect the balance of creation, or do they contribute to its reduction to a mere exploitable stock?
- Do they maintain man in his role as a trustworthy (*amīn*), or do they tempt him to imagine himself as an absolute master?

Revelation acts here as a revealer, highlighting dimensions that technocratic discourse and contemporary ethics centered solely on individual rights struggle to grasp, including the question of the ultimate purposes of technological action, man's responsibility before Allah, and the structural and collective effects of technologies on the order of creation and the balance of the world.

In terms of structural and collective effects, AI systems extend beyond the impact limited to the individual user to influence social, economic, and environmental structures as a whole. The word structural refers to effects that modify the foundations and organization of societies and institutions, such as the concentration of power among a few digital actors, the transformation of markets, or the reorganization of work patterns. As for the word collective, it refers to repercussions that affect not only the direct user or inventor, but also the society that designs, deploys, and uses the technology, as well as, more broadly, all humans and communities. It thus designates a diffuse and structural level of impact, where the effects of technical systems unfold through institutions, social norms, and shared ways of life, far beyond individual interactions.

Furthermore, the order of creation refers to how divine creation was designed to function harmoniously to ensure the balance of ecosystems, the natural regulation of resources, and the interdependence of living beings. Human use of AI systems can respect this order, for example, by preserving the environment and social equilibrium, or disrupt it, for example, through the overexploitation of resources or ecological degradation.

Lastly, the notion of global balance broadens the perspective to a global and systemic dimension, as technologies are not limited to their local uses and influence the entire ecological, social, economic, and political equilibrium. Thus, poorly regulated AI systems can exacerbate inequalities, concentrate wealth, and cause social imbalances, affecting both societies and human relationships, which runs counter to the original purpose intended by Allah [28].

Thus, when the use of AI systems disrupts the harmonious balance intended by creation, what was meant to be a tool serving humanity and the

common good can gradually transform into an instrument of domination and the concentration of power [29]. It is this shift, often silent but profound, that paves the way for a reversal of power relations, leading from domination to dispossession.

**6. From domination to dispossession: a silent reversal**

Paradoxically, the more AI systems promise humanity increased control, the more they risk leading to a form of dispossession [30]. The hyper-technologically driven individual can thus lose their sense of proportion, of gratuitousness, and of the ontological dependence that connects them to creation.

A person whose existence, choices, and activities are increasingly shaped by artificial intelligence systems may gradually become dependent on machines and automation, to the point that their direct link with life, with creation, and with the divine erodes, giving way to a silent form of dispossession of self and of their place in the world order.

Furthermore, the loss of moderation reflects the erosion of humanity's capacity to judge and act with discernment, restraint, and harmony. When technology dominates decisions and actions, it can generate obsessive hyper-efficiency and an endless pursuit of performance or control, gradually detaching humanity from its natural limits and essential balances [31]. In this silent process, humanity risks becoming alienated from life itself, from its relationship to creation, and from the ontological dependence that connects it to the divine, allowing a subtle yet profound existential dispossession to take root.

Freeness evokes what is offered without calculation, beyond self-interest, profit, or domination, stemming from giving, generosity, and philanthropy. Under the sway of hyper-technologization, every gesture, every exchange, or every use tends to conform to the logic of efficiency and exploitation, gradually erasing the dimension of service and sharing that echoes the very spirit of creation, as the verse testifies: ﴿*and from what We have provided them, they spend*﴾ (Qur'an., 8: 4).

When technology loses sight of its dimension of giving and service, it ceases to function as a simple tool at humanity's service and begins to structure and condition its life, choices, and relationships. In this context, Revelation does not oppose technology as such, nor its reasoned use, but its absolutization—that is, the idea that it could become an end in itself, autonomous and independent of any ethical, human, or divine purpose [32].

Technological society, while accumulating unprecedented power, paradoxically reveals its profound fragility. Technology itself has risen to the

status of a new sacred object, and humankind, instead of mastering it as a tool, finds itself at its service, venerating what it thought it had mastered [33]. In this idolatrous world of machines, algorithms, and AI, Gabor and Larsen's laws illustrate the fundamental tensions of technological society, where the obsession with performance and control clashes with the inherent limitations of all human creation.

Gabor's law states that everything technically possible will inevitably be achieved, while Larsen's law shows that problems generated by technology are always solved by new technical solutions, which themselves create new problems. In this virtuous yet perilous cycle of technology-driven innovation, humanity finds itself trapped in a dynamic where creativity and technological power unfold endlessly, but at the risk of alienating it and detaching it from its capacity for measurement, its ethical purpose, and its ontological dependence on creation [34].

Because technology is fundamentally ambivalent, the blind pursuit of technological growth, according to Gabor's Law, and the systematic search for technical solutions to the problems it generates, in accordance with Larsen's Law, simultaneously produce progress and disorder: improved comfort and speed for humankind, but also chains of unforeseen catastrophes. It is not technology itself that enslaves, but the sacredness attributed to it, which elevates it above all human measure, purpose, or responsibility [35]. In this context, AI systems reveal our relationship to creation: what we thought we controlled can gradually dominate us, and what was meant to serve humanity is transformed into a silent instrument of dispossession, inaugurating a subtle but profound reversal of human and social balances.

Thus, AI systems frequently contribute to the reproduction and amplification of existing inequalities, while simultaneously altering consumption patterns [36]. Rather than redistributing power or broadening access to resources and opportunities, these technologies tend to concentrate control in the hands of a few private actors [37]. Algorithms, by sorting, classifying, and prioritizing information and social interactions, reinforce selection and prediction logics that accentuate socio-economic and cultural biases [38]. Furthermore, the mass collection of personal data and the optimization of behavior by automated systems increase surveillance and dependence on private platforms, limiting individual freedom and autonomy [39]. Consequently, AI systems contribute less to social emancipation than to the centralization of power and the reproduction of pre-existing hierarchies, transforming social life into a space largely controlled and regulated by private economic interests [40].

## Conclusion

Reading AI systems in light of the verse ﴿*He Is The One Who Created for You Allah that is on the Earth*﴾ (Qur'ān, 2: 29) brings about a profound shift in perspective. It is no longer simply a matter of evaluating performance or efficiency, but of reflecting on the meaning and purpose of human action. Revelation does not deny humanity's capacity to transform and shape the world, but it situates this endeavor within a framework of giving, responsibility, and respect for limits, reminding us that all innovation, including artificial intelligence systems, must remain at the service of humanity and creation, without replacing divine purpose or engendering a silent dispossession of our relationship with the world.

Thus, AI systems are neither condemned nor sacralized; they are neither inherently good nor inherently bad. They become a testing ground, revealing how humanity exercises its capabilities and assumes its responsibilities. It is in this confrontation, more than in the innovation itself, that the future of humankind is at stake: the use we make of artificial intelligence systems, the way we respect or betray the limits imposed by creation, and our capacity to preserve meaning, the gift, and the ontological dependence that connects us to the divine determine whether these tools will serve life and the common good, or whether they will engender a silent dispossession of our humanity.

This is not a material dispossession, like the loss of possessions or property, but an erosion of the essential qualities of humankind, of what constitutes our nature and our humanity. The intensive and unreflective use of artificial intelligence systems can subtly transform the way we think, act, and perceive the world, without our consciousness immediately registering it. Isn't our humanity manifested above all in our capacity to act with moderation and discernment, in our aptitude for giving, for selflessness and generosity, in the awareness of our ontological dependence and the bond that unites us to creation and the divine, as well as in the exercise of our responsibility towards ourselves, others, and the divine creation?

## Author Contributions

**Abderrazak Said Belabes**: Conceptualization of the theoretical and epistemological framework; development of the research methodology; conducting the investigation and critically analyzing the materials; drafting the initial version of the manuscript; thorough proofreading, critical revision, and final correction of the text.

## Acknowledgement

I wish to express my deep gratitude to an anonymous reviewer, whose discreet but incisive questions acted like flashes of light on this work, refining its main lines and deepening its meaning.

## Conflict of Interest

The author attests that no conflict of interest exists in connection with this work, specifying that no financial, professional, or personal relationship influenced the conception, development, analysis, or writing of the article.

## Funding

This research was conducted entirely independently and did not receive any external financial support.

## Bibliography


[1] A. Al-Jurjānī. *Dalā'il al-I'jāz* [The evidence of the inimitability of the Qur'ān meanings], Sharikat al-Quds, Cairo, 2022.

[2] M. Horkheimer and T. W. Adorno, *Dialectic of enlightenment*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, 2002.

[3] U. Ibn Jinnī, *Al-Khasāis* [The characteristics], Dar al-Kutub al-Misriyya, Cairo, 1952, vol 1, p. 150.

[4] A. Al-Jurjānī. *Asrār al-Balāghah* [The secrets of eloquence], Sharikat al-Quds, Cairo, 2022.

[5] J. Lagneau, *Écrits*, Sandre, Paris, 1996, p. 205.

[6]. T. Ménissier, *Vocabulaire critique de l'intelligence artificielle*, Hermann, Paris, 2025.

[7] A. Belabes, Conceptualizing the limits of the use of Generative AI in economic analysis via a deep meaning of ḥabs, *Journal of King Abdulaziz University*: *Islamic Economics*, vol. 38 no. 2, pp. 23-38, 31 July 2025, https://doi.org/10.64064/1658-4244.1001

[8] H. Sankey. *The The Incommensurability Thesis*, Taylor and Francis, Abingdon, 1994.

[9] R. Descartes, *Discours sur la méthode*, Flammation, Paris, 2020.

[10] A. A. Gómez, La non-neutralité de la technologie. Une ontologie sociohistorique du phénomène technique. *F Écologie & Politique*, vol. 61, no. 2, pp. 27–43, Sep. 2020. https://doi.org/10.3917/ecopo1.061.0027

[11] L. Koycheva, A. K. VandenBroek, M. Artz, *Anthropology and AI*, Routledge, London, 2026.

[12] V. Blok, The Ontology of Technology Beyond Anthropocentrism and Determinism: The Role of Technologies in the Constitution of the (post)Anthropocene World. *Foundations of Sc*ience, vol. 28, pp. 987–1005, Sep. 2023. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10699-022-09829-1

[13] S. Heyndels, *T*echnology and Neutrality. *Philosophy adn Technology,* vol. 36, no. 75, Nov. 2023, https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-023-00672-1

[14] F. Jarrige, *Technocritiques. Du refus des machines à la contestation des technosciences*, La Découverte, Paris, 2016.

[15] A. Belabes, *Economic Life Beyond Economists*, Routldge, London, 2025, https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003287063

[16] A. Abulaban and A. Belabes, A analytical framework for an ethics of AI in Saudi Arabia beyond individual rights, *Journal of King Abdulaziz University*: *Journal of Law College*, 1(1), vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 35–60, Dec. 2025.

[17] M. Heidegger, *Question Concerning Technology, and Other Essays*, HarperCollins, New York, 2013.

[18] J. Ellul, *La technique ou l'Enjeu du siècle*, Economica, Paris, 2008.

[19]. P. Königs, The negativity crisis of AI ethics, Synthese, vol. 206, no. 277 28 November 2025, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-025-05378-9

[20] K. Crawford, *Atlas of AI*: *Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 20222.

[21] F. Coleman, *A Human Algorithm*: *How Artificial Intelligence Is Redefining Who We Are*, Counterpoint, Berkeley, 2019.

[22]. A. Belabes, Iʿjāz of the Qurʿān for Using the Words Gold, Silver and Not Money, *Journal of Quran and Tafseer Studies*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 327-339, Dec. 2024, https://doi.org/10.23917/qist.v3i3.5131

[23] A. Belabes, Iʿjaz in the Qurʿān through the Use of the Word Bayt to Designate the Kaʿaba Before its Rebuilt by Quraysh: Lessons for the Revivification of the Awqāf Knowledge, *Journal of Quran and Tafseer Studies*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 327-340, 2025, https://doi.org/10.23917/qist.v4i2.8430

[24] A. Belabes, The quadriptych of rizq, ḥabs, maʿāsh, and ʿumrān: insights from Hājar's statement on water rights, *Invest Journal of Sharia & Economic Law*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 90-108, June 2025, https://doi.org/10.21154/invest.v5i1.10404

[25] C. Pitelis, Big tech and platform-enabled multinational corporate capital(ism): the socialisation of capital, and the private appropriation of social value, C*ambridge Journal of Economics*, Vol. 46, no. 6, November 2022, pp. 1243–1268, https://doi.org/10.1093/cje/beac042

[26] M. Nie, Algorithmic Addiction by Design: Big Tech's Leverage of Dark Patterns to Maintain Market Dominance and its Challenge for Content Moderation, *arXiv*, 15 Dec. 2025, https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2505.00054

[27] A. Belabes, Islamic finance, Artificial Intelligence, and the debt embedded in the ex nihilo monetary creation system, *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 485-491, February 2025, https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v8-i02-08

[28] V. Nizov, The Artificial Intelligence Influence on Structure of Power: Long-Term Transformation, *Legal Issues in the Digital Age*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 183-212, July 2025, https://doi.org/10.17323/2713-2749.2025.2.183.212

[29] W. E. Bijker, T. P. Hughes and T. Pinch, *The Social Construction of Technological Systems. New Directions in the Sociology and History of Technology*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, 2012.

[30] S. Zuboff, *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*: *The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*, PublicAffairs, New York, 2019.

[31] I. Marszałek-Kotzur, Cognitive Technologies – Are We in Danger of Humanizing Machines and Dehumanizing Humans? Management Systems in Production Engineering, vol. 30, no. 3, Sep. 2022, https://doi.org/10.2478/mspe-2022-0034

[32] J. Ellul, *The Technological Society*, Vintage, New York, 1964.

[33] Z. B. Turkkan and M. Altin, The impact of artificial intelligence on workplace dehumanization: a critical review". *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Horizons*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 128–149, July 2025, doi: https://doi.org/10.1108/JHTH-01-2025-0014

[34] F. Rognon, Les véritables enjeux de la technique d'après Jacques Ellul. *Promesses*, no. 231, Jan-Mar 2025. https://promesses.org/les-veritables-enjeux-de-la-technique-dapres-jacques-ellul/

[35] N. Postman, *Technopoly*: *The Surrender of Culture to Technology*, Knopf, New York, 1992.

[36] D. Bailey, D. Coffey, C. Thornley, P. R. Tomlinson, Advertising and the consumer in the age of Big Tech: a new moment in the evolution of monopoly capitalism?, *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, vol. 46, no. 6, pp. 1387–1406, Nov. 2022, https://doi.org/10.1093/cje/beac050

[37] R. Srinivasan, *Beyond the Valley: How Innovators around the World are Overcoming Inequality and Creating the Technologies of Tomorrow*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, 2019.

[38] E. Sadin, *La Vie algorithmique*: *Critique de la raison numérique*, Echapée, Paris, 2015.

[39] C. Prunkl, Human Autonomy at Risk? An Analysis of the Challenges from AI. *Minds & Machines*, vol. 34, no. 26, June 2024, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-024-09665-1

[40] S.O. Carter and J.G. Dale, Social Bias in AI: Re-coding Innovation through Algorithmic Political Capitalism. *AI & Society*, August 2025.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-025-02540-2

## Copyright