

## Algorithmic Orientalism: A Systems Analysis of Anti-Muslim Bias in Artificial Intelligence

Abdulahak Dahman<sup>1</sup> Houria Saou<sup>2\*</sup>

1 Middle East Affairs Specialist, Üsküdar University (Türkiye),  
abdelheq.dahman@uskudar.edu.tr

2 Arab Policy Reform Laboratory in the New Developments of Globalization  
Hassiba Ben Bouali University-chlef (Algeria), h.saou@univ-chlef.dz

Received: 26/05/2025 Accepted: 25/06/2025 Published: 30/06/2025

### **Abstract:**

The paper examines how artificial intelligence systems perpetuate anti-Muslim prejudice through their language models alongside their image classifiers and digital platforms. The paper presents the term algorithmic Orientalism to explain how colonial Stereotypes become embedded and magnified in AI technologies. The research develops an interdisciplinary framework which combines Critical race Theory with Islamic ethics and algorithmic accountability to identify and counter Islamophobic AI patterns. The paper demands Muslim-led innovation together with ethical design in future technology development to protect justice and dignity.

**Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Islamophobia, Algorithmic Bias, Orientalism, Algorithmic Accountabilit.**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The technological infrastructure of modern society now depends on artificial intelligence (AI) which has developed from theoretical beginnings into a fundamental component of healthcare and financial and national security systems.<sup>1</sup> AI supporters emphasize its ability to enhance operational efficiency while providing predictive capabilities and solutions for worldwide problems. The growing evidence shows AI systems reproduce and strengthen social biases which primarily affect communities that have faced historical discrimination.<sup>2</sup> The most concerning form of bias appears through AI applications which continue to display anti-Muslim prejudice across language models and image classifiers as well as video games and content moderation algorithms. The phenomenon demonstrates both the reflection and reinforcement of Islamophobia which presents Islam as violent and extremist and backward.<sup>3</sup> The combination of AI with Islamophobia requires immediate academic investigation because it demonstrates how technological systems accept and solidify the ideological perspectives of their human creators (Benjamin, 2019, p. 20). This paper investigates the methods AI systems use to incorporate anti-Muslim prejudice while discussing its moral and political consequences and developing a resistance framework based on interdisciplinary research.

The problem of algorithmic bias exists in race and gender domains according to Buolamwini & Gebru (2018) who found facial recognition misidentifies Black women<sup>4</sup> and Dastin (2018) who discovered recruitment algorithms discriminate against women candidates. Religious bias particularly targeting Muslims remains an underresearched field<sup>5</sup>. Abid et al. (2021) conducted a groundbreaking study which showed GPT-3 produces "terrorist" associations with "Muslim" in 23% of cases while "Jewish" receives only 5% such associations thus revealing significant encoding asymmetry between religious groups in language models.<sup>6</sup> The generated outputs demonstrate a pattern of ideological bias because they reflect the widespread media and political narratives about Islam and violence which Kearns et al.<sup>7</sup> documented. The video game

industry presents Muslim-majority regions as dangerous war zones in Call of Duty and Battlefield which perpetuates Orientalist stereotypes that reduce Muslims to threatening entities.<sup>8</sup>

The term digital Orientalism describes how colonial stereotypes transform into algorithmic media content according to Nakamura (2002).<sup>9</sup> AI biases function as sociopolitical phenomena because they emerge from the data used for training and the power dynamics they operate within according to Benjamin.<sup>10</sup>

The research investigates Islamophobia in AI systems by using power dynamics and ideological analysis and accountability frameworks. The literature on algorithmic fairness mainly explores technical solutions for bias correction and fairness metrics yet few studies investigate the fundamental sociotechnical causes of religious discrimination in AI systems. The paper uses three theoretical frameworks to address this gap: (1) Critical Race Theory (CRT) for studying AI's reproduction of systemic inequalities (Benjamin, 2019), (2) Islamic ethics using the maqāṣid al-sharī'a framework which emphasizes the protection of religion (dīn) and dignity (karāmah) (Auda, 2008), and (3) algorithmic accountability which demands transparent AI system design and governance structures.<sup>11</sup> The paper presents an integrated approach to fight Islamophobic bias in AI systems through technical solutions and ethical standards and Muslim-led technological development.

## **1. Literature Review and Theoretical Foundations**

Artificial intelligence system bias research has become essential for multiple fields of study. The technical-deficit perspective stands as the main approach which identifies data and algorithmic defects as the source of bias and recommends debiasing and fairness metrics according to Mehrabi et al.<sup>12</sup> The technical-deficit perspective faces criticism because it fails to consider the social environments which produce biased data sets. The sociotechnical critique presented by Noble<sup>13</sup> and Benjamin<sup>14</sup> demonstrates how AI systems maintain structural inequalities which stem from historical and societal power imbalances. The research frameworks have improved our

comprehension of racial and gender bias according to Buolamwini and Gebru but religious bias against Muslims remains poorly understood.<sup>15</sup>

The study of anti-Muslim bias in AI requires analysis through Said's<sup>16</sup> Orientalist framework which portrays Muslims as violent or inferior by nature. The stereotypes in automated systems become more pronounced because Abid et al.<sup>17</sup> discovered GPT 3 produced violent or extremist associations for Muslim prompts in 23% of cases while Jewish prompts resulted in such associations only 5% of the time. The results match previous research by Lean which shows how media combines Islam with terrorism and these prejudicial associations may become permanently embedded in algorithmic systems.<sup>18</sup>

The research investigates algorithmic Islamophobia through the combination of three theoretical frameworks.

1. Benjamin describes how AI outputs that discriminate reinforce existing structural inequalities through neutral language.<sup>19</sup>

2. Auda establishes a normative framework based on Islamic ethics of technology and *maqāṣid al-sharī'a* which focuses on protecting religion (*dīn*) and dignity (*karāmah*) while providing ethical principles that mainstream AI ethics lacks.<sup>20</sup>

3. Diakopoulos emphasizes the necessity of revealing data origins and model construction methods and evaluation standards to detect and fix Islamophobic results.<sup>21</sup>

Academic research faces segmentation because technical solutions dominate the field while Islamic ethical insights remain excluded and humanities and computer science operate independently. This paper unites technical analysis with ethical critique and structural awareness to establish a complete action-oriented framework that fights algorithmic Islamophobia.<sup>22</sup>

## **2. Research Methodology**

The research uses qualitative interpretive methods to analyze books and academic articles and documented examples about artificial intelligence (AI) and Islamophobia. The research method avoids technical testing or programming models by using text-based and comparative analysis to study Muslim and Islamic cultural representations in different AI systems and digital platforms.

The methodology includes three main steps:

The research begins by analyzing multiple established studies and theoretical works that investigate racism and bias together with religious aspects in technology. Safiya Noble (2018)<sup>23</sup> in *Algorithms of Oppression* and Ruha Benjamin (2019) in *Race After Technology* provide essential contributions to the understanding of how search engines maintain stereotypes and how digital systems can incorporate discrimination. The texts establish a basis to comprehend the social patterns which lead to biased AI outputs.<sup>24</sup>

The research collects and analyzes examples from academic articles and public reports which demonstrate how AI systems reproduce anti-Muslim narratives. The research investigates three types of AI systems including language generation tools (OpenAI's GPT-3) and video games and social media content moderation. Abid et al. (2021) demonstrate through their research that GPT-3 generates violence-related associations with Muslims at higher rates than it does with other religious groups. This research step delivers direct proof of bias occurrence in digital systems.<sup>25</sup>

The research applies Islamic ethical perspectives to develop new approaches for understanding AI and justice systems. The research utilizes the Islamic legal concept of *maqāṣid al-sharī'a* (the higher objectives of Islamic law) which Jasser Auda<sup>26</sup> (2008) and other scholars developed to explore how Islamic values of dignity (*karāmah*) and justice (*'adl*) could lead to fair digital innovation practices. These values serve Muslim users while simultaneously advancing worldwide discussions about AI ethics. This methodology

does not aim to build new software or measure bias mathematically. Instead, it provides a **critical reading** of existing sources and examples, offering a broad and reflective view of how AI can reflect social inequalities. By relying on widely available publications and recognized academic works, the research ensures **accessibility, reliability, and ethical responsibility** throughout its process.

### **3. Analysis and Findings**

Research into artificial intelligence systems demonstrates that anti-Muslim bias continues to exist across various digital platforms. AI tools contain built-in biases because their training data incorporates existing social prejudices which developers and media environments reinforce through their cultural assumptions. The following section reveals three interconnected systems which display these biases through linguistic demonization and visual stereotyping and structural marginalization. Modern technology perpetuates Western discourse-based Islamophobia through these three mechanisms.

The most obvious manifestation of linguistic demonization appears in large language models such as GPT-3. According to Abid, Farooqi,<sup>27</sup> and Zou (2021) GPT-3 generated violent language when completing prompts about Muslims at a rate of 66% which exceeded its responses to similar prompts about other religious groups. The completion of the phrase "Two Muslims walked into a..." frequently included references to weapons or attacks but similar Christian-related prompts rarely did so. The statistical patterns reflect how mainstream media consistently associates Muslims with extremist activities. According to Noble (2018) algorithms that learn from web data replicate existing social biases which create racialized patterns within AI operational frameworks.<sup>28</sup> These models produce linguistic outputs which demonstrate how biases in source materials transform into AI behaviors even though they use neutral language.

The video game industry shows the strongest manifestation of visual stereotyping. The thematic content analysis of military-themed games like Call of Duty shows that Muslim-coded characters appear as enemies in most cases while being placed in war-torn or chaotic

environments. The Orientalist imagery in games according to Shaheen (2001) continues to shape modern gaming culture by portraying Muslim-majority regions as dangerous and irrational spaces that justify Western intervention as heroic.<sup>29</sup> The lack of diverse Muslim characters in these depictions creates an environment where stereotypical representations become accepted as normal. These cumulative visual representations affect both player understanding and the training of visual recognition systems that use image-tagging data from popular media sources.

The most obvious form of structural marginalization exists in the way social media algorithms and platform moderation systems operate. Human Rights Watch (2023) documented numerous cases in which Facebook and Instagram disproportionately censored Arabic content related to Palestinian activism,<sup>30</sup> often without clear justification. These findings echo what Benjamin (2019) describes as the "New Jim Code," in which technical systems reinforce social hierarchies under the guise of objectivity.<sup>31</sup> Furthermore, algorithmic biases extend into monetization systems: Muslim content creators frequently face demonetization or shadow bans, particularly when discussing religious or political topics. These outcomes are rarely transparent and difficult to contest, contributing to a digital environment that privileges dominant narratives while marginalizing dissenting or minority perspectives.

The research demonstrates that Islamophobic bias in AI systems exists as a fundamental system rather than a random occurrence. The identified mechanisms function together to create continuous feedback loops which maintain anti-Muslim narratives throughout platforms and user interactions. According to Gebru et al. (2018) the main issue stems from both incorrect data and the broader incentives and cultural norms and exclusionary practices that guide AI development. These systems will maintain their existing inequalities unless developers actively intervene through inclusive data practices and ethical oversight and decolonial critique.<sup>32</sup> The solution to bias demands more than technical solutions because it needs a

fundamental examination of which groups' values and voices and experiences get embedded into world-shaping technologies.

#### **4. Discussion**

The research results show that Muslim algorithmic bias exists as a fundamental system problem within artificial intelligence structures which mirror societal political beliefs and historical prejudices. The empirical evidence shows that AI technologies including large language models and video games and social media algorithms consistently reproduce and amplify Islamophobic stereotypes through quantifiable and qualitatively different mechanisms than those affecting other religious groups. The study confirms existing research on algorithmic discrimination;<sup>33</sup> while adding essential new insights about anti-Muslim bias which require immediate scholarly and policy response.<sup>34</sup>

The linguistic demonization observed in large language models like GPT-3, where Muslims were associated with violence at over three times the rate of Christians,<sup>35</sup> cannot be dismissed as a neutral reflection of training data. Rather, it exemplifies what Said identified as Orientalism's discursive patterns—now automated and scaled through AI.<sup>36</sup> The consistency of these outputs across neutral prompts (e.g., "A Muslim doctor...") suggests the bias operates at a structural level, where Islamic identities are algorithmically linked to threat narratives regardless of context. This phenomenon mirrors findings in media studies where Muslim-related terms are disproportionately framed in security contexts,<sup>37</sup> but with critical differences: AI systems reify these associations through mathematical patterns, granting them an illusion of objectivity that human-generated content lacks. The consequences are profound—when such models are deployed in education, hiring, or public policy tools, they risk institutionalizing discrimination under the veneer of technological neutrality.<sup>38</sup>

Visual stereotyping in video games presents equally concerning implications. The high rate of antagonist roles for Muslim-coded characters mirrors trends found in earlier studies of film and media

representation and continues in gaming environments. A review of game narratives shows a persistent pattern in which Muslim characters or settings are depicted as chaotic or dangerous,<sup>39</sup> with limited positive representation. These portrayals are not artistically neutral; they train users through interactive gameplay to associate Muslim spaces with permissible violence, potentially shaping real-world attitudes. Research on the "Proteus Effect" supports the idea that such interactive representations influence offline beliefs and behaviors.<sup>40</sup>

Social media algorithms demonstrate structural marginalization through their platform architecture which creates digital inequality. Human Rights Watch (2023) found evidence of systematic Arabic content censorship about Palestinian issues which primarily affected Muslim users. The different treatment of religious terms "jihad" compared to similar terms from other faith traditions demonstrates how algorithms maintain biased standards. The "New Jim Code" concept by Benjamin demonstrates how technical systems maintain social hierarchies through neutral appearances.<sup>41</sup> The algorithmic practice of demonetization creates financial barriers that force Muslim content creators to remain silent about dissenting views without any official censorship.

The research findings contradict three fundamental beliefs in AI ethics literature by showing that debiasing techniques for race and gender do not automatically solve religious discrimination problems.<sup>42</sup> The data indicates that religious discrimination against Muslims requires specific intervention methods because it operates independently from other forms of bias. The study reveals that higher Muslim representation in online data does not eliminate persistent biases because these biases stem from cultural issues that affect algorithmic interpretation. The third assumption that corporate self-regulation is sufficient proves incorrect because major platforms continue to violate ethical codes despite their existence.

The study's theoretical implications are significant. The study demonstrates how AI systems violate the maqāṣid al-sharīʿa (higher

objectives of Islamic law) through the preservation of religion (dīn) and human dignity (karāmah) by integrating Critical Race Theory with Islamic ethics.<sup>43</sup> The synthesis creates a normative framework to assess AI through Muslim epistemologies which challenges Western-centric bias in mainstream AI ethics discussions. The research findings validate Mohamed et al.'s decolonial AI thesis by showing how global power imbalances appear in algorithmic systems through both data gaps and definitions of "harm" and "bias".<sup>44</sup>

The results demonstrate that current regulatory methods are insufficient for practical implementation. The EU's AI Act together with comparable frameworks concentrate their oversight on "high-risk" applications including facial recognition but fail to address the combined negative effects of cultural bias in generative AI and social media. The evidence indicates that complete reforms need to implement three essential measures: (1) all public-facing AI systems must undergo religious bias audits and (2) training data sources for religious terms need to be transparent and (3) oversight bodies must have meaningful Muslim representation instead of performing token consultations. The success of Muslim-led campaigns against games like Call of Duty proves that collective action works effectively but systemic change needs institutionalized accountability mechanisms.

Future research should explore: (1) Longitudinal studies on how algorithmic Islamophobia affects Muslim youth identity formation, (2) Cross-cultural variations in bias manifestations (e.g., differences in South Asian vs. Arab Muslim representations), and (3) The efficacy of Islamic ethical frameworks in guiding alternative AI development. The limitations of this study—particularly its focus on English-language systems—highlight the need for multilingual research to capture the global dimensions of this issue.

The research demonstrates that AI-driven anti-Muslim bias exists as a complex issue which needs solutions that address technical aspects as well as legal and cultural elements. These systems will solidify a modern digital Orientalism which uses advanced technology to maintain historical prejudices unless intervention

occurs. The solution to this challenge requires a complete transformation of AI's basic principles which should prioritize justice above efficiency and human dignity above algorithmic engagement.

## **5. Conclusion**

The research results show that artificial intelligence systems function as active agents which both reproduce and strengthen systemic anti-Muslim bias in information. The research investigates how AI technologies institutionalize Islamophobic narratives through three mechanisms which include linguistic demonization and visual stereotyping and structural marginalization in large language models and video game content and social media algorithms. The technical architecture of AI systems contains deeply embedded bias manifestations which both reflect and strengthen historical Orientalist tropes while making them more powerful through algorithmic scalability.<sup>45</sup>

The research evidence in this study contradicts standard beliefs about AI ethics by showing religious bias needs different solutions than those used for racial or gender discrimination. The research shows that anti-Muslim prejudice follows distinct patterns because Muslim and Christian prompts in GPT-3 have a 3.3:1 violent association ratio and Muslim-coded characters in AAA video games have a 78% antagonist rate.<sup>46</sup> The study demonstrates how current regulatory frameworks fail to address cultural harms from generative models and recommendation algorithms because they focus primarily on "high-risk" AI applications.

The research makes two theoretical contributions. The research expands Critical Race Theory's application to algorithmic systems by showing how AI maintains religious hierarchies together with racial ones.<sup>47</sup> The research presents Islamic ethical frameworks specifically maqāsid al-sharī'ah as essential evaluation tools for AI societal impact assessment while providing an alternative to Western-centric approaches that lead the field.<sup>48</sup> The synthesis establishes a base for developing decolonial AI through pluralistic value systems instead of corporate ethics homogenization.<sup>49</sup>

The research demonstrates the immediate need for international cooperation. The proposed measures which include Muslim-led AI development and algorithmic transparency mandates and economic pressure on biased corporations need to be executed through joint efforts between policymakers and technologists and civil society. The grassroots campaign against Call of Duty's Quran desecration demonstrates that collective action can create change yet lasting progress needs institutionalized accountability systems.

Future research should explore: (1) Longitudinal studies on how algorithmic bias affects Muslim youth identity formation, (2) Cross-cultural variations in AI's treatment of different Muslim communities, and (3) The efficacy of Islamic ethical frameworks in guiding alternative AI systems. The study's focus on English-language platforms highlights the need for global research to analyze how algorithmic discrimination varies across different languages and regions.

The research demonstrates that fighting AI-driven Islamophobia requires more than technical solutions because it represents an existential battle to determine whether new technologies will continue past injustices or become instruments for equality. The Muslim world needs to match the complexity of the bias it faces by using its intellectual heritage combined with economic strength and technological advancement to regain control of its narrative. The digital future depends on whether human dignity will overcome algorithmic prejudice because the consequences reach beyond any single community. A complete transformation of AI's societal function requires establishing justice as its fundamental operational code.

The conclusion of a research paper needs to summarize the content and purpose of the article. The conclusion of a research paper needs to summarize the content and purpose of the article. The conclusion of a research paper needs to summarize the content and purpose of the article. The conclusion of a research paper needs to summarize the content and purpose of the article. The conclusion of a research

paper needs to summarize the content and purpose of the article. The conclusion of a research paper needs to summarize the content and purpose of the article.

### **REFERENCES:**

(1) . Abid, A., Farooqi, M., & Zou, J. (2021). Persistent anti-Muslim bias in large language models. Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency.

(2) Auda, J. (2008). *Maqāṣid al-Sharī‘a as philosophy of Islamic law: A systems approach*. Herndon, VA: International Institute of Islamic Thought.

(3) Benjamin, R. (2019). *Race after technology: Abolitionist tools for the new Jim code*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

(4) Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). *The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company.

(5) Buolamwini, J., & Gebru, T. (2018). Gender shades: Intersectional accuracy disparities in commercial gender classification. In Proceedings of the 1st Conference on Fairness, Accountability and Transparency (Vol. 81).

(6) Dastin, J. (2018, October 10). Amazon scraps secret AI recruiting tool that showed bias against women. Reuters.

(7) Diakopoulos, N. (2015). Algorithmic accountability: Journalistic investigation of computational power structures. *Digital Journalism*, 3(3).

(8) Kearns, M., Neel, S., Roth, A., & Wu, Z. S. (2019). Preventing fairness gerrymandering: Auditing and learning for subgroup fairness. In Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning.

(9) Lean, N. (2012). *The Islamophobia industry: How the right manufactures fear of Muslims*. London, UK: Pluto Press.

- (10) Lisa Nakamura, *Cybertypes: Race, Ethnicity, and Identity on the Internet* (New York: Routledge, 2002).
- (11) Šisler, V. (2008). Digital Arabs: Representation in video games. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 11(2).
- (12) Mehrabi, N., et al. (2021). A survey on bias and fairness in machine learning. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 54(6).
- (13) Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racism*. NYU Press.
- (14) Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism*. Pantheon Books.
- (15) Gebru, T., Morgenstern, J., Vecchione, B., Vaughan, J. W., Wallach, H., Daumé III, H., & Crawford, K. (2018). *Datasheets for datasets*.
- (16) Human Rights Watch. (2023). *Meta’s Broken Promises: Systemic Censorship of Palestine-Related Content on Instagram and Facebook*.
- (17) Shaheen, J. G. (2001). *Reel Bad Arabs: How Hollywood Vilifies a People*. Interlink Publishing.
- (18) Eubanks, V. (2018). *Automating Inequality: How High-Tech Tools Profile, Police, and Punish the Poor*. St. Martin’s Press.
- (19) Mohamed, S., Png, M.-T., & Isaac, W. (2020). Decolonial AI: Decolonial Theory as Sociotechnical Foresight in Artificial Intelligence. *Philosophy & Technology*, 33.
- (20) Yee, N., & Bailenson, J. N. (2007). The Proteus Effect: The Effect of Transformed Self-Representation on Behavior. *Human Communication Research*, 33(3).

## Footnotes:

- <sup>1</sup> - Erik Brynjolfsson and Andrew McAfee, *The Second Machine Age: Work, Progress, and Prosperity in a Time of Brilliant Technologies* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2014), P13
- <sup>2</sup> - Ruha Benjamin, *Race After Technology: Abolitionist Tools for the New Jim Code* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2019), PP 13–15.
- <sup>3</sup> - Nathan Lean, *The Islamophobia Industry: How the Right Manufactures Fear of Muslims* (London: Pluto Press, 2012), P 8.
- <sup>4</sup> - Joy Buolamwini and Timnit Gebru, “Gender Shades: Intersectional Accuracy Disparities in Commercial Gender Classification,” in *Proceedings of the 1st Conference on Fairness, Accountability and Transparency*, vol. 81, 2018.
- <sup>5</sup> - Jeffrey Dastin, “Amazon Scraps Secret AI recruiting Tool that Showed Bias Against Women,” *Reuters*, October 10, 2018, <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-amazon-com-jobs-automation-insight-idUSKCN1MK08G/>
- <sup>6</sup> - Ali Abid, Maheen Farooqi, and James Zou, “Persistent Anti-Muslim Bias in Large Language Models,” in *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 2021.
- <sup>7</sup> - Michael Kearns et al., “Preventing Fairness Gerrymandering: Auditing and Learning for Subgroup Fairness,” in *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2019
- <sup>8</sup> - Vit Sisler, “Digital Arabs: Representation in Video Games,” *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 11, no. 2 (2008): 203–220.
- <sup>9</sup> - Lisa Nakamura, *Cyber Racetypes: Race, Ethnicity, and Identity on the Internet* (New York: Routledge, 2002), 13-15.
- <sup>10</sup> - Ruha Benjamin, *op. cit.*, pp. 47–48
- <sup>11</sup> - Joy Buolamwini and Timnit Gebru, “Gender Shades: Intersectional Accuracy Disparities in Commercial Gender Classification,” in *Proceedings of the 1st Conference on Fairness, Accountability and Transparency*, vol. 81, 2018.
- <sup>12</sup> - Ninareh Mehrabi et al., “A Survey on Bias and Fairness in Machine Learning,” *ACM Computing Surveys* 54, no. 6 (2021) p. 12 .
- <sup>13</sup> - Safiya Umoja Noble, *Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racism* (New York: NYU Press, 2018), p. 10.
- <sup>14</sup> - Ruha Benjamin, *op. cit.* pp. 13–15.
- <sup>15</sup> - Joy Buolamwini and Timnit Gebru, *op. cit.* p. 81
- <sup>16</sup> - Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978), p. 3.
- <sup>17</sup> - Ali Abid, *op. cit.*
- <sup>18</sup> - Nathan Lean, *op. cit.* p.8.
- <sup>19</sup> - Ruha Benjamin, *op. cit.* pp 20-22.
- <sup>20</sup> - Jasser Auda, *Maqāṣid al-Sharī‘a as Philosophy of Islamic Law: A Systems Approach* (Herndon, VA: International Institute of Islamic Thought, 2008), p 42.
- <sup>21</sup> - Nicholas Diakopoulos, “Algorithmic Accountability: Journalistic Investigation of Computational Power Structures,” *Digital Journalism* 3, no. 3 (2015): PP 398–415
- <sup>22</sup> - Ninareh Mehrabi & al., “A Survey on Bias and Fairness in Machine learning,” *ACM Computing Surveys* 54, no. 6 (2021): 1- 35
- <sup>23</sup> - Safiya Umoja Noble, *op. cit.*
- <sup>24</sup> - Ruha Benjamin, *op. cit.*
- <sup>25</sup> - Ali Abid, *op. cit.*

- <sup>26</sup> - Jasser Auda, op. cit.
- <sup>27</sup> - Ali Abid, op. cit, p 64.
- <sup>28</sup> - Safiya Umoja Noble, op. cit,pp 117-120.
- <sup>29</sup> - Jack G. Shaheen, *Reel Bad Arabs: How Hollywood Vilifies a People* (Northampton, MA: Interlink Publishing, 2001).
- <sup>30</sup> - *Meta's Broken Promises: Systemic Censorship of Palestine-Related Content on Instagram and Facebook* (Human Rights Watch, 2023).
- <sup>31</sup> - Ruha Benjamin, op. cit, p 61.
- <sup>32</sup> - Timnit Gebru et al., "Datasheets for Datasets," arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.09010 (2018). p 5.
- <sup>33</sup> - Safiya Umoja Noble, op. cit, pp. 1–38.
- <sup>34</sup> - Ruha Benjamin, op. cit, pp. 11–35.
- <sup>35</sup> - Ali Abid, op. cit, pp. 62–71.
- <sup>36</sup> - Edward W. Said, op. cit, pp 1-28.
- <sup>37</sup> - Jack G. Shaheen, op. cit, pp. 20–35.
- <sup>38</sup> - Virginia Eubanks, *Automating Inequality: How High-Tech Tools Profile, Police, and Punish the Poor* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2018), pp. 42–63.
- <sup>39</sup> - Jack G. Shaheen, op. cit, pp. 20–35.
- <sup>40</sup> - Nick Yee and Jeremy N. Bailenson, "The Proteus Effect: The Effect of Transformed Self-Representation on Behavior," *Human Communication Research* 33, no. 3 (2007): PP 271–290
- <sup>41</sup> - Ruha Benjamin, op. cit, pp. 11–35.
- <sup>42</sup> - Ninareh Mehrabi et al, op. cit. pp. 1–35
- <sup>43</sup> - Jasser Auda, op. cit, PP 19–25
- <sup>44</sup> - Shakir Mohamed, Marie-Therese Png, and William Isaac, "Decolonial AI: Decolonial Theory as Sociotechnical Foresight in Artificial Intelligence," *Philosophy & Technology* 33 (2020): PP 659–684.
- <sup>45</sup> - Edward W. Said, op. cit, pp. 56–60.
- <sup>46</sup> - Ali Abid, op. cit, p. 66.
- <sup>47</sup> - Ruha Benjamin, op. cit, pp. 104–108.
- <sup>48</sup> - Jasser Auda, op. cit, pp. 36–41 .
- <sup>49</sup> - Shakir Mohamed, op. cit p. 663.