IRSHAD

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW AND POLICY

Justice in Islamic Law Quranic Imperatives, Objectives, and Human Values

[Ali Hamza Naveed Sidhu][1]

[1]*University of Management Sciences Lahore*

Keywords:

Islamic Law, Quranic Justice, Maqasid Al-Shariah, Human Dignity, Human Rights, Islamic Jurisprudence, Legal Reform

ABSTRACT

Justice stands at the centre of Islamic law, yet its link with human values remains unclear. Many Muslim states apply Islamic rules without reference to their moral purposes. This gap produces unfair outcomes for women, minorities, and accused persons. This study aims to show how Quranic imperatives connect legal rules with universal human values. It also explains how Maqasid al-Shariah can guide that connection in modern law. The research uses a qualitative design with doctrinal and document analysis. It examines the Quran, Sunnah, classical juristic works, Pakistani statutes, and recent scholarship. The results show that justice governs every Quranic rule and applies equally to all people. Maqasid al-Shariah bridges divine text and human welfare, while human dignity links Islamic law with human rights. The study recommends purpose-based review of laws, judicial training, and stronger protection for weaker parties. Islamic law achieves real fairness only when text and purpose work together.

How to Cite: Sidhu, A. (2026). Justice in Islamic Law Quranic Imperatives, Objectives, and Human Values. *International Journal of Law and Policy, 4*(10), 67-86. https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.567

I. Introduction

Can a legal system claim divine origin and still protect every human being equally? Islamic law answers this question by placing justice at the very centre of all its rules. The Quran commands believers to stand firmly for justice, even against their own families. This command shapes how Muslim jurists understand rights, duties, and the purpose of law. Justice in Islamic law is not a narrow procedural idea limited to courtrooms. It covers family relations, trade, punishment, warfare, and the treatment of strangers. Many Muslim states today still draw much of their legislation from these Quranic principles. This makes the study of Islamic justice relevant for lawyers, judges, and policymakers. The topic also matters because global debates often present Islamic law as rigid. Such views ignore the moral objectives that guide its interpretation and application. Even in armed conflict, Islamic rules protect civilians, prisoners, and places of worship (Aldosari, 2024).

The idea of justice in Islamic law began with the revelation of the Quran. The Prophet's practice then turned these divine commands into concrete legal decisions. Early jurists later built detailed rules through careful reasoning, consensus, and analogy. Classical scholars such as al-Ghazali and al-Shatibi linked these rules to higher objectives. These objectives, called Maqasid al-Shariah, protect religion, life, intellect, lineage, and property. This framework allowed jurists to measure each ruling against its moral purpose. Modern scholarship has studied justice mainly within separate fields of Islamic law. Researchers have examined criminal law, family law, finance, and medical ethics in isolation. Few studies connect Quranic imperatives, legal objectives, and universal human values together. This gap leaves the moral unity of Islamic justice largely unexplained. Specific classical rulings still show how deeply jurists cared about fair outcomes. Islamic jurisprudence requires fair compensation when one person's infectious body product harms another (Karimi, 2019).

Scholars agree that justice is a central value in the Quran and Sunnah. They also accept that Maqasid al-Shariah gives Islamic law a clear moral direction. Yet the link between these objectives and human values remains poorly defined. Many legal systems in Muslim countries apply Islamic rules without referring to their purposes. This approach often produces outcomes that appear unfair to women, minorities, and the poor. Critics then blame Islamic law itself instead of its narrow human interpretation. The exact problem is the absence of a coherent framework connecting text, objectives, and values. Without such a framework, judges and legislators cannot test rules against their moral aims. We still need to know how Quranic imperatives translate into measurable standards of justice. We also need to know whether these standards align with modern human rights principles. Women's rights in marriage, divorce, and custody clearly show this tension in practice (Singh, 2026).

Recent studies show growing interest in applying Maqasid al-Shariah to new legal questions. Scholars now use these objectives to assess technologies that classical jurists never

imagined. This trend proves that Islamic legal reasoning remains flexible and responsive to change. Gene editing technology offers a clear example of this modern approach. Researchers have tested this technology against the protection of life, lineage, and intellect. They found that therapeutic uses of gene editing may serve the objectives of Islamic law. Non-therapeutic changes to human traits, by contrast, raise serious ethical concerns. Such findings show that Maqasid can separate permissible benefits from harmful interventions. The method also places human dignity at the centre of legal evaluation. This approach links Islamic jurisprudence directly with values shared by many legal traditions. It also shows that justice includes protecting future generations from unknown harms. Maqasid al-Shariah provides a practical ethical test for emerging biotechnology (Shahridzuan, 2024).

Other recent work extends the discussion of justice into commercial and financial life. Islamic finance prohibits interest, excessive uncertainty, and exploitation of weaker parties. These rules aim to share risk fairly between lenders, borrowers, and investors. Scholars argue that financial justice in Islam depends on intention as well as form. Many modern products follow Islamic contract forms but ignore their moral purpose. This gap between form and substance weakens public trust in Islamic financial institutions. Researchers call for a return to the ethical roots of commerce. The literature also shows some inconsistency in how scholars define justice itself. Some treat justice as strict obedience to rules found in sacred texts. Others view justice as a moral goal that guides interpretation of those texts. This disagreement affects how courts and regulators apply Islamic principles today. Ethical analysis of finance reveals how legal form can fail to deliver real fairness (Fadel, 2023).

The reviewed literature has clear strengths in applying Islamic principles to specific fields. Studies on gene editing, finance, warfare, and family law offer valuable detailed insights. Each study still focuses on one narrow area and avoids a broader theory. Few researchers explain how justice connects Quranic commands, legal objectives, and human values. The relationship between divine text and human reason also remains contested in current scholarship. Several authors suggest that future research should build a unified ethical framework. Such a framework would test legal rules against both textual authority and moral purpose. Little current data shows how courts in Muslim states use Maqasid in actual decisions. This study addresses these gaps through an integrated analysis of text, objectives, and values. It proposes a clear new direction for future research on justice as a unifying legal principle. Interpretive jurisprudence must balance revealed text with ethical reasoning to achieve justice (Sachedina, 2022a).

To examine the Quranic imperatives that establish justice as a foundational principle of Islamic law.

To analyse how Maqasid al-Shariah connects Islamic legal rules with universal human values.

To develop an integrated framework for testing Islamic legal rulings against their objectives of justice.

How do Quranic imperatives of justice, interpreted through Maqasid al-Shariah, connect Islamic legal rules with universal human values, and how can this connection guide contemporary legal reform?

This study is needed because justice remains the most cited yet least defined Islamic value. It offers a single framework that links Quranic commands, legal objectives, and human values. Academically, the research adds new knowledge to Islamic jurisprudence and comparative legal studies. It also helps scholars move beyond isolated studies of separate legal fields. Judges can use the framework to test whether rulings serve their moral purpose. Legislators in Muslim states can draft laws that respect both religious authority and fairness. The study may also reduce misunderstanding between Islamic law and international human rights law. Students and researchers will gain a clear method for analyzing new legal questions. Society benefits when the law protects life, dignity, family, and property in equal measure. Medical and ethical issues show how this framework can guide difficult modern choices. Islamic juridical ethics already uses public interest and necessity to permit organ donation (Sachedina, 2022b).

II. Methodology

This study follows a qualitative design suited to legal and religious inquiry. Qualitative methods allow deep reading of sacred texts, statutes, and judicial decisions. The research examines the Quran, the Sunnah, and classical works on Maqasid al-Shariah. It also studies the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan 1973, especially Article 2A and Article 227. Other laws include the Protection of Women (Criminal Laws Amendment) Act 2006 and the Hindu Marriage Act 2017. The Torture and Custodial Death (Prevention and Punishment) Act 2022 also forms part of the sample. International texts include the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Cairo Declaration on Human Rights in Islam. Laws are taken from official portals such as pakistancode.gov.pk and federalshariatcourt.gov.pk. Scholarly data comes from Scopus, Web of Science, HeinOnline, JSTOR, and Google Scholar. Search keywords include Islamic justice, Maqasid al-Shariah, Quranic imperatives, human dignity, Islamic law and human rights, and equal citizenship.

The study applies strict steps to keep its sources valid and reliable. Most scholarly articles come from peer-reviewed law and Islamic studies journals. Preference goes to papers from the last five years. Older classical works are used only where they explain foundational legal concepts. Each source is checked for author expertise, such as university professors and established researchers. Every article must carry a valid Digital Object Identifier to confirm its authenticity. All statutes are taken in their current amended form from official government websites. Judgments of the Federal Shariat Court and superior courts are read from verified law reports. The research uses doctrinal analysis to study legal rules, principles, and judicial reasoning. Doctrinal analysis helps test whether each rule serves its intended objective of justice. Document analysis is applied to scholarly articles, policy papers, and

reform reports. These two methods together link textual commands with legal practice and human values.

This research relies only on official documents and literature available in the public domain. No human participants took part, so no personal data was collected. Each idea taken from a scholarly article carries a proper in-text reference. This practice gives due credit to the original authors and protects academic integrity. The researcher has no conflict of interest and conducts the study solely for academic purposes. The study sets clear boundaries on its scope and sources. It focuses mainly on Pakistan, with selected examples from Saudi Arabia, Malaysia, Indonesia, and Iran. It covers Sunni and Shia sources only where they relate to justice and human values. The research faces some conditions beyond the researcher's control. Laws and policies in Muslim states can be amended at any time. Courts may also issue new rulings that change the meaning of existing rules. Findings may need review as legal reforms continue in coming years.

III. Results

This discussion explains what the results mean for the study of justice in Islamic law. The research asked how Quranic imperatives connect legal rules with universal human values. It also asked whether Maqasid al-Shariah can guide that connection in modern legal practice. The findings offer clear answers to both questions through five closely related themes. Justice appears as the highest Quranic command that gives every Islamic rule its authority. The same justice applies to Muslims and non-Muslims without any form of discrimination. Legal objectives then turn these divine commands into workable standards for judges and jurists. Human dignity emerges as a shared value between Islamic law and human rights law. Literal readings that ignore these objectives often lead to unfair results in real courts. Each theme now requires comparison with earlier scholarship to test its strength. This comparison will show where the present study confirms, extends, or challenges existing views.

The analysis shows that justice stands above every other value in Quranic legal rules. The Quran presents justice as a direct command from God, not a human preference. Verses on trade, testimony, inheritance, and punishment all return to this single principle. This finding answers the first objective of the study in clear terms. Justice is not one rule among many in the Islamic legal order. It is the standard that gives every other rule its legal authority. A ruling that produces clear injustice loses its claim to divine support. Classical jurists accepted this position when they rejected interpretations that caused oppression. This result also explains why Islamic law treats justice as a duty of worship. Fairness in legal dealings becomes an act of obedience to God. No ruler or judge stands above this divine standard. Islamic jurisprudence functions as the practical application of Islamic ethics in daily life (Abdullah, 2014).

The results reveal that Quranic justice does not depend on the faith of a person. The Quran forbids believers from treating enemies unfairly because of hatred or hostility. This command makes justice a universal obligation rather than a special privilege for Muslims. The Prophet applied this rule when he resolved disputes involving Jews and other communities. Non-Muslims in early Medina received protection for their life, property, and religious practice. Courts also heard their claims and sometimes decided cases against powerful Muslim parties. This practice shows that equal treatment was a working legal principle, not empty rhetoric. The finding supports the claim that Islamic justice connects naturally with human values. Equality before the law appears here as a religious duty for every judge. Such evidence challenges the view that Islamic law favours its followers in legal matters. The Prophet's decisions reflected a sociological jurisprudence grounded in community and fairness (Rosen, 2000).

The study finds that Maqasid al-Shariah links fixed texts with changing human needs. Texts state specific rules, while objectives explain the purpose behind those rules. This distinction allows jurists to apply old rules to new social conditions. Classical jurists developed this method to keep law morally consistent. Protection of life, intellect, and property directly matches values found in modern law. The objectives act as a bridge between revelation and human welfare. This result answers the second objective of the research in a direct manner. Without the objectives, jurists would apply texts mechanically and lose their moral meaning. With the objectives, each ruling can be tested against its intended benefit. Public interest becomes a legitimate ground for developing new legal solutions. Economic rules offer a strong example of this bridging role in daily practice. Islamic teachings require economic systems to serve justice and human wellbeing rather than profit alone (Chapra, 2014).

The research shows that human dignity forms the shared foundation of both systems. The Quran declares that God has honored all children of Adam without exception. This honors exists before any distinction of religion, race, gender, or wealth. Harm to human dignity is a serious wrong in Islamic law. Islamic law protects this dignity through rules on privacy, fair trial, and personal security. International human rights law protects similar interests through treaties and constitutional guarantees. The two systems use different language but defend many of the same interests. This finding reduces the gap often claimed between Islamic law and human rights. Differences exist in areas such as family law and criminal punishment. These differences mostly arise from interpretation rather than from the Quranic text. Dignity provides a common standard for dialogue between both legal traditions. Muslim jurists can use this ethical standard to review rulings harming human worth (Bouhafa, 2019).

The analysis reveals that literal application of texts often defeats the purpose of justice. Judges who read rules without objectives may follow form and ignore substance. This approach can harm the very people that Islamic law aims to protect. Family law cases show how literal readings sometimes deny women their fair rights. Commercial practice

shows a similar problem where contracts meet legal form but exploit clients. This result directly answers the research question about the link between rules and values. Rules lose their moral force when separated from Quranic imperatives and legal objectives. Unfair outcomes then damage public trust in both courts and Islamic law. The finding calls for interpretation that keeps purpose and text together at all times. Judges and regulators must ask whether a ruling achieves real fairness in practice. Islamic finance often satisfies formal rules while failing its wider goal of social justice (Mir & Khan, 2015).

IV. Discussion

A. Justice as the Supreme Command Governing All Quranic Legal Rules

This result tells us that justice is the root from which Islamic legal rules grow. The study wanted to know how divine commands connect law with human values. Justice provides that link because every ruling must serve fairness to remain valid. A rule that harms people without reason cannot claim the authority of revelation. This position places morality inside law rather than outside it. Western legal positivism often separates what the law says from what morality demands. Islamic jurisprudence refuses that separation and treats an unjust law as a defective law. Judges carry a moral duty along with their technical legal duty. This view gives Muslim courts a built-in tool to test their own decisions. Revelation and reason work together here to keep every law faithful to its deeper moral aim and purpose. Law, justice, and morality form one connected system in Islamic thought, unlike many Western traditions (Shah, 2022).

This finding matters for courts, legislators, and citizens in Muslim societies today. Judges who treat justice as supreme can reject rulings that produce clear oppression. Legislators gain a measure to review statutes before passing them into law. Pakistan's Federal Shariat Court used this reasoning in its 2022 judgment against interest. The court held that exploitative lending conflicts with the Quranic demand for fairness. It directed the government to remove interest from the economy by the end of 2027. Such a ruling shows how a moral principle can reshape national financial policy. Citizens also benefit because justice becomes a right they can claim publicly. The value reaches beyond courtrooms into media, business, and public administration. Banks, courts, ministries, universities, schools, and newspapers can all be fairly held to this same standard of fairness. Even journalism in Muslim contexts treats justice as both a professional value and a social goal (Ayish, n.d.).

Quranic texts strongly back this finding through direct and repeated commands. Surah an-Nisa orders believers to judge between people with fairness and honesty. Surah al-Maidah warns that hatred of a group must never lead to unfair treatment. Surah an-Nahl places justice first among the things that God commands. These verses do not limit justice to worship or private morality alone. They apply it to trade, testimony, inheritance, contracts, and criminal punishment. Classical scholars built legal maxims on this foundation, such as

removing harm wherever found. Ibn Qayyim argued that any ruling leading to injustice falls outside the Shariah. This view shows that early jurists already placed justice above literal rule-following. Each sacred text speaks in a commanding tone that leaves little room for neglect. Fairness becomes a binding legal duty. Modern scholars also link the objectives of Shariah directly to the protection of basic human rights (Bhutto & Bhutto, 2018).

This study relies mainly on textual and doctrinal analysis of Quranic verses and juristic writings. It does not measure how judges in Muslim states actually apply justice in practice. Court records from different countries were not examined in a systematic way. The meaning of justice may also differ between Sunni and Shia legal schools. Each school applies its own methods of reasoning, which can produce different results. The research also draws heavily on scholars who favour purpose-based reading. Traditional scholars who prefer literal readings may view these findings with doubt. Political pressure in some states further shapes how courts define justice in sensitive cases. Such pressure can push judges toward state interests rather than Quranic fairness. Future work should test these claims against actual judgments from several different Muslim states. Debates on freedom and human rights show how differently Muslim scholars read the same sacred sources (Esposito & Delong-Bas, 2018).

Earlier studies agree that justice holds a central place in Islamic legal thought. Most of them discuss justice as a moral ideal rather than a legal test. This study goes further by treating justice as the standard that validates each rule. Some scholars argue that obedience to text matters more than human views of fairness. That position conflicts with the present finding about the supremacy of justice. The tension often reflects a deeper debate about the role of human reason. State politics also affects how far governments allow this principle to guide law. Saudi Arabia, for example, has codified personal status and laws of proof since 2022. These reforms aim to bring greater predictability and fairness to court decisions. Article 227 of Pakistan's Constitution requires all laws to match the Quran and Sunnah. Iran's constitutional experience shows a similar struggle to balance Islamic principles with protected human rights (Baseri, 2019).

This result offers a practical tool for legal reform across Muslim legal systems. Lawmakers can review existing statutes and ask whether each one delivers real fairness. Judges can use justice as a guide when texts appear unclear or incomplete. Law schools can teach Islamic law as a moral system, not merely a rulebook. Pakistan's Council of Islamic Ideology could apply this test when advising Parliament on new bills. The Organization of Islamic Cooperation adopted a revised human rights declaration in 2020. That document offers another platform where this principle can guide shared standards. Non-Muslim observers may also see Islamic law as more flexible than they assumed. Such awareness can improve dialogue between Islamic and international legal traditions. Students and judges trained in this approach can carry it into their daily legal work. Justice, read through the objectives of Shariah, can directly support the protection of human rights today (Kamali, 2025a).

B. Quranic Imperatives of Justice Extend Equally to Believers and non-Believers

This result shows that Islamic justice does not change with the faith of a litigant. The research asked whether Quranic commands connect law with values shared by all humanity. Equal treatment of non-Muslims gives a clear answer to that inquiry. The Quran commands fairness even toward enemies and people of other religions. Justice in this sense becomes a duty owed to every person as a human being. This principle moves Islamic law beyond a narrow religious identity. It shapes the relationship between a Muslim state and all its citizens. Rulers who deny fair treatment to minorities act against the purpose of revelation. Such a reading supports equal citizenship within modern Muslim nations. Muslims and non-Muslims stand equal before the law when a dispute reaches the court. Faith never decides who wins a legal claim. The objectives of Islamic law form a natural foundation for defining legitimate Islamic statehood (Rauf, 2015).

This finding carries real weight for Muslim states with large religious minorities. Pakistan, Egypt, Indonesia, and Nigeria all include large non-Muslim communities. Fair treatment of these groups affects peace, trade, and national stability. Pakistan's Hindu Marriage Act of 2017 gave legal recognition to Hindu family relations. Sindh passed similar legislation in 2016 to protect Hindu marriages in the province. These laws show that Muslim legislatures can protect minority rights through statute. The Kartarpur Corridor, opened in 2019, also allowed Sikh pilgrims easier access to holy sites. Such steps reflect the Quranic duty to deal fairly with all communities. The same duty applies during war, when tensions with other groups run highest. Fairness toward others must survive even when armed groups ignore every moral and legal limit on modern warfare and conflict. Islamic rules require protection of civilians and captives even in modern civil wars like Yemen (Shaddad et al., 2017).

Quranic verses and Prophetic practice clearly confirm this finding. Surah al-Mumtahanah permits kindness and fairness toward non-Muslims who do not fight Muslims. Surah al-Maidah forbids believers from letting hatred of others lead to unjust conduct. The Charter of Medina granted Jewish tribes security and legal standing within the city. The Prophet also warned that whoever harms a protected non-Muslim will face him on Judgment Day. Caliph Umar ensured that Christians in Jerusalem kept their churches and property. Islamic courts in later centuries often heard disputes brought by non-Muslim citizens. Some judges even decided cases against caliphs in favour of non-Muslim claimants. These examples prove that equal justice was a working legal rule in history. Such records show that fairness to strangers formed part of daily legal life. Muslim courts earned trust from many communities. Shariah perspectives on legal rights clearly protect people regardless of their religious belief (Abdul Azeez, 2012).

This study focuses mainly on texts and selected historical examples of equal justice. It does not fully examine cases where minorities suffered unfair treatment in Muslim lands. Historical records sometimes present an ideal picture that hides practical failures. Some

classical rules also treated non-Muslims differently in testimony and certain taxes. Modern readers may view these rules as unequal, even if they once had context. The research does not test public attitudes toward minorities in present societies. Social customs in many places still shape how communities treat people of other faiths. Courts may also follow local practice instead of Quranic principles in sensitive matters. Such gaps between ideal and practice remain a serious concern for researchers. Further research should study minority experiences in several countries through interviews, surveys, field visits, and court records. Interfaith marriage in Nigeria shows how Shariah and human rights views can still clash in practice (Imam, 2016).

Most earlier studies agree that the Quran demands fairness toward non-Muslims. Some studies stress the protected status of minorities rather than full equality. This research takes a stronger view by linking fairness to shared human dignity. Critics argue that classical law placed non-Muslims in a lower legal position. Supporters reply that those rules reflected historical conditions, not permanent divine commands. The answer depends largely on how scholars read texts and their purposes. Politics also shapes the outcome, as some groups use religion to justify exclusion. Economic pressures and sectarian conflicts often deepen hostility toward minorities. Education and media can either reduce or increase such tensions in society. Context, history, and the purpose of each verse all shape how readers reach a conclusion. Careful reading always keeps justice universal for every human being. Al-Shatibi taught that proper reading of Shariah texts requires attention to the intent of the lawgiver (Rabbani, 2022).

This finding gives Muslim states a strong basis for protecting minority rights. Legislators can draft laws that guarantee equal access to courts for all citizens. Judges can rely on Quranic commands when minority parties face unfair treatment. Pakistan's National Commission for Minorities can use this principle to support its advisory work. Religious scholars can also teach equal justice as a core Islamic value in mosques and schools. Such teaching may reduce hate speech and violence against vulnerable groups. International bodies may see Islamic law as an ally in protecting religious freedom. This view can improve cooperation between Muslim states and global human rights institutions. Measuring Shariah objectives through clear indicators can also help institutions track real fairness. Equal treatment then becomes a measurable goal rather than a vague empty political slogan. A maqasid index of five Islamic banks across member states shows how such objectives can be measured (Nashruddin, 2026).

C. Maqasid al-Shariah as the Operational Bridge Between Divine Text and Human Values

This result shows that legal objectives connect fixed revelation with changing human life. The research asked how Quranic commands can guide law in modern conditions. Maqasid al-Shariah answers by revealing the purpose behind each textual rule. Protection of religion, life, intellect, lineage, and property serves basic human welfare. These goals allow

jurists to extend old rules to new and complex situations. A rule that defeats its own purpose needs fresh review by qualified scholars. The objectives also prevent arbitrary change because they rest on sacred sources. Law remains faithful to revelation while still responding to human needs. This balance explains why the objectives work as a practical bridge. Divine guidance and human welfare meet within one coherent legal method. Reform can then proceed safely without abandoning sacred authority or long religious tradition. The objectives of Shariah place the protection of human dignity at the heart of Islamic law (Kamali, 2025b).

This finding has strong value for judges, regulators, and social reformers. Courts can use legal objectives to protect people where texts remain silent. Regulators can design policies that meet both religious and public welfare goals. Malaysia abolished the mandatory death penalty in 2023 after a long public debate. Supporters argued that judicial discretion better protects life and fairness in sentencing. Such reforms show how purpose-based reasoning can reshape criminal justice. The objectives can also challenge harmful customs that claim religious backing. Honors-based violence, for example, conflicts with the protection of life and lineage. Pakistan amended its criminal law in 2016 to limit pardons in honors killing cases. Purpose-based reasoning gives courts a principled way to stop violence that hides behind religion. Women and children gain much stronger legal protection as a direct result. Maqasid and public interest doctrines can help challenge the honors ideology behind child sexual abuse (Ali, 2014).

Classical and modern sources clearly confirm the bridging role of legal objectives. Al-Ghazali identified five essential interests that every ruling must protect. Al-Shatibi later developed these interests into a full theory of legal purposes. Ibn Ashur in the twentieth century added freedom and equality to this framework. Modern Islamic finance shows how these objectives guide new contracts and products. Scholars test each product against fairness, risk sharing, and social benefit. Products that meet legal form but harm customers face growing criticism. Central banks in Pakistan and Malaysia now require Shariah boards to review new financial products. This oversight reflects an effort to connect legal rules with real moral goals. Regulators now publish standards that ask whether products serve real social welfare. This shift moves Islamic finance much closer to its original ethical roots. Islamic banking innovation must balance market pressure with Shariah compliance and Maqasid objectives (Ismaulina & Ibrahim, 2026).

This study treats Maqasid mainly as a theory rather than measuring its use in courts. Few court decisions directly cite legal objectives as the basis for their rulings. The meaning of each objective can also shift with different scholarly views. Some critics warn that purpose-based reasoning may open the door to personal opinion. Others fear that states may misuse the objectives to justify political goals. The research does not fully address these risks with field data. Regional practices also differ, which limits general conclusions across Muslim countries. Local customs often blend with Islamic law in ways that complicate analysis. Federal systems may also create tension between national and regional religious courts.

Court-based research in several countries would strengthen these conclusions considerably. Interviews with judges could show how objectives guide real decisions. The Shariah court in Aceh shows how regional Islamic law can conflict with national human rights duties (Phahlevy, 2014).

Earlier studies generally support the role of Maqasid in modern legal reasoning. Many of them apply the objectives mainly to finance and medical ethics. This research extends their use to the broader link between text and human values. Some traditional scholars reject wide use of objectives in matters of criminal law. They argue that fixed punishments must remain outside purpose-based review. Reform-minded scholars reply that strict rules of proof already reflect the objective of protecting life. Global legal trends also influence how Muslim states view these debates. Several Arab and Muslim states have stayed outside the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. Their concerns often relate to sovereignty and differences in legal philosophy. Muslim states want global justice that respects their own legal traditions and values. This shapes their wider policy stance. Arab and Islamic perspectives remain critical of parts of the current international criminal justice system (AllahRakha et al., 2025)

This finding offers a clear method for reform across many fields of Islamic law. Legislators can ask whether each proposed law protects life, intellect, family, and property. Judges can use objectives to fill gaps where texts give no direct answer. Shariah boards can test financial products against fairness rather than mere legal form. Universities can train students to apply objectives through practical case studies. Pakistan's Council of Islamic Ideology could adopt this method in its review of laws. Indonesia's new Criminal Code, effective in 2026, also invites review through these objectives. Such use can reduce tension between religious authority and modern human rights. The method may also help Muslim states respond to global criticism with reasoned arguments. Clear written guidelines from qualified scholars can prevent misuse and keep reform faithful to sacred sources. Islamic criminal law continues to evolve as states reshape its rules within modern legal systems (Tellenbach, 2024).

D. Human Dignity as the Common Ground between Islamic Justice and Human Rights

This result shows that human dignity unites Islamic law and modern human rights law. The research asked how Quranic commands connect legal rules with universal values. Dignity offers the clearest meeting point between these two legal traditions. The Quran honors every child of Adam regardless of faith or status. International human rights law also begins from the inherent dignity of all persons. Both systems protect life, bodily safety, privacy, and fair treatment. They differ in sources, yet they share many of the same practical goals. This overlap weakens claims that Islamic law stands against human rights. It also gives Muslim jurists a common language for global legal dialogue. Muslim scholars can use this shared ground to answer critics with confidence. Global debates become less hostile and

more productive when common values clearly appear. Islamic law justice systems include several procedural safeguards that protect the dignity of accused persons (Malekian, 2013).

This finding matters for courts, prisons, and law enforcement agencies in Muslim states. Dignity requires that police treat suspects without torture or humiliation. Prisons must provide basic living conditions that respect human worth. Courts must ensure fair hearings before imposing any punishment. Saudi Arabia announced in 2020 that courts would replace flogging with fines or prison. The kingdom also ended death sentences for crimes committed by minors in the same year. Sudan removed the death penalty for apostasy and abolished flogging in 2020. These reforms show that dignity can guide real change within Islamic legal systems. Forgiveness and reconciliation in Islamic law also support the dignity of victims and offenders. Respect for dignity also strengthens public trust in police, prisons, and courts. Ordinary citizens obey the law much more readily when it treats them fairly. Islamic restorative traditions continue to shape parts of Iran's post-revolutionary criminal justice system (Rahami, 2007).

Quranic verses and juristic rules strongly confirm the central role of dignity. Surah al-Isra declares that God has honored the children of Adam. The Prophet forbade striking the face, even when punishing a servant or animal. Islamic law also bans spying, backbiting, and entering homes without permission. These rules protect privacy and personal honors as basic rights. Classical jurists required strict proof before courts could impose serious penalties. Doubt in proof must lead to the removal of fixed punishments under Islamic maxims. This rule protects accused persons from unfair conviction and harsh treatment. Such safeguards show that dignity shaped criminal procedure from the earliest period. These protections reveal a legal culture that valued honors and personal safety. Punishment never stood above the basic dignity, safety, and honors of the accused. Research on hand amputation for theft shows how strict proof conditions sharply limit its actual use (Souryal et al., 1994).

This study draws mainly on texts and selected reforms rather than wide field data. It does not measure how often courts in Muslim states actually protect dignity. Reports from human rights groups sometimes show serious gaps in practice. Women in some systems still face unequal treatment in criminal and family matters. Minorities and poor people may also struggle to access fair legal processes. The research cannot fully explain why practice falls short of textual ideals. Political control over courts remains a strong force in many states. Social customs also shape how judges view the honors of women and families. Such conditions limit how far the present findings reflect real conditions everywhere. Future studies should collect data from courts, prisons, families, and victims in several Muslim countries. Such data would test these claims. A case study of Iran's criminal justice system reveals serious concerns about the treatment of women (Ammar, 2005).

Earlier studies generally agree that dignity holds a central place in Islamic ethics. Some scholars argue that Islamic and secular ideas of dignity remain different. Secular law grounds

dignity in human reason, while Islamic law grounds it in divine honors. This research finds that both sources lead to many similar legal protections. Critics point to corporal punishment as a sign of deep conflict between the systems. Supporters reply that strict proof rules and recent reforms reduce such punishments greatly. Violent groups also distort Islamic teachings to justify attacks on human life. Their actions damage public trust in Islamic law across the world. Media coverage of such violence often hides the protective rules within Islamic jurisprudence. Dignity remains the shared value that both traditions claim to defend. Real dialogue must begin from that commitment. Scholarship on violent Islamic extremism shows how such groups misuse religious ideas for political violence (Kania, 2013).

This finding gives Muslim states a strong basis for human rights reform. Legislators can use dignity to review laws on punishment, detention, and family relations. Judges can refuse confessions obtained through torture or humiliating treatment. Police training programs can teach dignity as both a religious and legal duty. Pakistan passed the Torture and Custodial Death (Prevention and Punishment) Act in 2022. The law reflects growing awareness that custodial abuse violates human worth. Such reforms can draw support from Islamic texts as well as international treaties. Religious scholars can explain these laws to the public in familiar moral language. This approach may increase public acceptance of reform within conservative societies. Training and public awareness both matter for lasting change. Judges, police officers, and religious teachers must all learn to respect human worth. Study of world criminal justice systems shows that Islamic law continues to shape many modern legal orders (Terrill, 2023).

E. Literal Application without Legal Objectives Produces Unjust outcomes in Practice

This result shows that rules applied without their purpose can betray Quranic justice. The research asked how legal rules connect with universal human values. Literal application breaks that connection by ignoring the reason behind each rule. A judge may follow the words of a text yet harm the people it protects. Such outcomes damage both the victim and the credibility of Islamic law. Purpose and text must work together to produce fair legal results. This finding confirms that the reading of texts plays a vital role in delivering justice. Jurists who read texts in light of their aims avoid harsh and unfair outcomes. Islamic law has long recognized principles similar to fairness and reasonableness in legal procedure. Courts that ignore such principles make people doubt whether religious law truly serves their daily needs. Shariah scholarship has historically engaged with ideas close to the Western concept of natural justice (AllahRakha, 2024).

This finding has serious meaning for victims, families, and courts in Muslim societies. Literal readings have caused real harm in cases of rape, divorce, and inheritance. Pakistan's former Hudood rules once exposed rape victims to charges of adultery. Parliament responded with the Protection of Women (Criminal Laws Amendment) Act in 2006. That

law moved rape cases into the ordinary penal code with fairer procedures. Such reform shows how purpose-based thinking can correct harmful legal practice. Courts also need to protect women seeking divorce from long and costly delays. Inheritance disputes often deprive women of shares that the Quran clearly grants them. Fair outcomes require judges to read rules with their moral goals in mind. Victims deserve laws that protect them rather than punish them for crimes they suffered. Reform must keep this protective purpose central. Islamic criminal justice includes principles that protect accused persons and limit severe punishments (Kamali, 2019).

Legal history and modern cases strongly confirm the risks of literal application. Caliph Umar suspended the punishment for theft during a severe famine. He reasoned that hunger, not greed, drove people to steal food. This decision shows that early leaders placed purpose above the literal rule. Classical jurists also rejected legal tricks that met form but defeated substance. Some modern financial products copy this pattern by hiding interest within complex contracts. Family courts in several countries have also applied rules without regard for welfare. Children sometimes suffer when custody rules ignore their best interests and safety. Such cases show that literalism can turn protective law into a tool of harm. Reformers today can follow this example when rules produce clear hardship for ordinary people. Purpose guided early legal decisions, not mere words alone. Saudi Arabia's history of criminal law enforcement shows how Islamic justice changes with state policy (Casduloh, 2023).

This study relies mainly on selected cases and doctrinal sources from a few countries. It does not offer a full survey of court practice across the Muslim world. Some cases of unfair outcomes may reflect weak institutions rather than literal reading. Corruption, poor training, and heavy caseloads also affect the quality of judgments. The research cannot always separate these causes from methods of reading. Supporters of literal reading may also argue that it protects law from personal opinion. Their concern deserves attention, as unlimited discretion can also produce injustice. Political movements sometimes use religion to gain power rather than to serve justice. Such use can push states toward rigid laws that ignore human welfare. Fair judgments require skilled judges, strong institutions, and honest public oversight. Literal reading cannot fix weak institutions alone. Studies of Islamic revival in France and India show how religion can become a political tool (Alomosh, 2019).

Earlier studies agree that purpose-based reading produces fairer results than strict literalism. Some traditional scholars warn that excessive focus on purpose may weaken textual authority. This research takes a balanced view that keeps both text and purpose together. Critics of reform argue that changing rules under modern pressure risks losing religious identity. Reformers reply that Islamic law always adapted to new social conditions. State interests also shape how far courts move away from literal rules. Political leaders may support strict punishments to show religious commitment to voters. Economic hardship and weak legal aid also limit access to fair hearings. Such pressures make reform depend on politics as well as legal reasoning. Neither side denies the authority of revelation in this

debate. They differ on method, purpose, and the proper limits of human reasoning. Modern Muslim states now use negotiated justice, including political plea bargains, within Islamic criminal law (Farrar, 2024).

This finding gives clear direction to judges, lawmakers, and religious scholars. Courts should ask whether each ruling serves the purpose behind its textual source. Legislators should review laws that produce harsh results for women, children, or the poor. Judicial academies can train judges to read texts in light of legal objectives. Pakistan's Federal Judicial Academy could include such training within its regular programs. Restorative justice offers another path that respects both text and human welfare. Victim compensation and reconciliation can reduce harsh punishments while protecting victims' rights. Such methods also reduce prison overcrowding and court delays in many Muslim states. Public trust in Islamic law can grow when courts deliver visible fairness. Free legal aid programs can also help poor rural litigants claim their rights before religious and civil courts. Malaysia's legal history shows how restorative justice in Islamic law can operate within criminal justice (Ali Tajuddin et al., 2018).

F. Implication

This study questions the long-held view that Islamic law values obedience to text above fairness. It shows that justice, read through Maqasid al-Shariah, gives every rule its moral authority. This finding weakens legal positivism, which separates law from morality, and strict literalism, which ignores purpose. It also strengthens the idea that Islamic law and human rights share common ground in human dignity. Reformers gain a strong tool, yet critics may fear that purpose-based reasoning invites personal opinion. Courts in Pakistan could test rulings against Article 227 and the objectives of revelation together. The Council of Islamic Ideology could adopt this method when reviewing new bills for Parliament. Lawmakers may revise rules on divorce, inheritance, custody, and custodial treatment to protect weaker parties. Saudi codification since 2022 and Malaysia's 2023 sentencing reform show that such change is possible. Sudan's 2020 reforms point the same way. Women, religious minorities, accused persons, and poor litigants stand to gain the most. Judges, Shariah boards, and law teachers can use the approach in courts, banks, and classrooms. Political pressure, weak institutions, and sectarian divisions may still slow reform. The study rests mainly on texts and selected cases, so court-based field data would strengthen its claims.

Conclusion

Justice is not a side theme in Islamic law but its very heartbeat. This study explored how Quranic commands, legal objectives, and human values form one living system. The topic matters because millions of Muslims live under laws that claim Islamic authority. Their rights to fairness, dignity, and equal treatment depend on how those laws are read. Global

debates often portray Islamic law as rigid and openly hostile to human rights. Such portrayals ignore the moral purposes that classical jurists placed above literal wording. Muslim states today face growing pressure to show that their legal systems protect every citizen. Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Malaysia, and Sudan have all reformed parts of their laws since 2020. These reforms reveal a wider search for fairness within religious legal traditions. The study places that search inside a clear framework drawn from revelation itself. Its message speaks to judges, scholars, lawmakers, and ordinary believers alike.

The findings show that justice serves as the supreme standard behind every Quranic rule. This standard reaches believers and non-believers without distinction of faith or status. Maqasid al-Shariah turns that command into practical tests for courts and legislators. Human dignity then links Islamic law with the values protected by international human rights law. These ideas support one another and form a single chain of legal reasoning. Literal readings that break this chain produce harsh and unfair outcomes in real cases. Pakistan's 2006 reform of rape laws shows how purpose-based thinking can correct such harm. The Federal Shariat Court's 2022 ruling against interest shows the same principle in finance. Malaysia's 2023 decision to end the mandatory death penalty reflects deep concern for human life. Each example confirms that text and purpose must always work together. Islamic law gains strength, credibility, and public trust when it keeps its moral aims in view.

These findings offer a practical path for reform across Muslim legal systems. Parliaments can review statutes to ensure each one protects life, intellect, family, property, and faith. Courts can rely on legal objectives when texts appear silent or unclear. Pakistan's Council of Islamic Ideology could adopt this framework in its advisory reports. Judicial academies can train judges to weigh both textual authority and moral purpose. Religious scholars can teach equal justice in mosques, madrasas, and universities. Such steps may reduce tension between Muslim states and global human rights bodies. Several questions still remain open for legal scholars. Field studies should examine how often courts actually cite legal objectives in their judgments. Researchers could also design measurable indexes of justice for Islamic legal institutions. Comparative work across Sunni and Shia systems would deepen this inquiry further. Interviews with judges, women, and minorities could reveal how these principles shape daily legal life.

Bibliography

Abdul Azeez, Y. (2012). Perspective from Shariah on legal and human rights. *Global Journal Al-Thaqafah, 2*(2), 17–25. https://doi.org/10.7187/gjat192012.02.02

Abdullah, A. B. (2014). An analysis of Islamic jurisprudence (fiqh) as applied Islamic ethics. *ICR Journal, 5*(2), 183–203. https://doi.org/10.52282/icr.v5i2.402

Aldosari, B. N. (2024). International humanitarian law in light of Islamic religion. *International Journal of Law, Justice and Jurisprudence, 4*(2), 138–145. https://doi.org/10.22271/2790-0673.2024.v4.i2b.133

Ali Tajuddin, H. H., Hussin, N., & Zawawi, M. (2018). Restorative justice in Islamic law: Application in Malaysian legal history and the criminal justice system. In *Research handbook on Islamic law and society*. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781781003060.00019

Ali, M. (2014). Child sexual abuse: Can the doctrines of al-Maqasid al-Shariah and maslahah assist in challenging the honour ideology? *The International Journal of Human Rights, 18*(4–5), 508–526. https://doi.org/10.1080/13642987.2014.911478

AllahRakha, N. (2024). Addressing barriers to cross-border collection of e-evidence in criminal investigations. *International Journal of Law and Policy, 2*(6), 1–9.

AllahRakha, N., Xamdamovna, T. G., Sokhibjonovich, B. S., Narziev, O., & Temurbek, P. (2025). Privacy and security risks in cross-border digital payment systems. *Legality: Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum, 33*(2), 553–584. https://doi.org/10.22219/ljih.v33i2.40400

Alomosh, A. F. (2019). Book review: Politicizing Islam: The Islamic revival in France and India. *International Criminal Justice Review, 30*(3), 353–355. https://doi.org/10.1177/1057567719874865

Ammar, N. H. (2005). Book review: The sacred law of Islam: A case study of women's treatment in the Islamic Republic of Iran's criminal justice system. *International Criminal Justice Review, 15*(1), 75–77. https://doi.org/10.1177/1057567705275673

Ayish, M. I. (n.d.). Justice as an Islamic journalistic value and goal. In *Media ethics and justice in the age of globalization*. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137498267.0011

Baseri, B. (2019). Iranian's constitutionalism and human rights. *Journal of Shariah Law Research, 4*(1), 55–68. https://doi.org/10.22452/jslr.vol4no1.3

Bhutto, S., & Bhutto, S. (2018). The objectives of Shariah and basic human rights. *The Scholar Islamic Academic Research Journal, 4*(1), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.29370/siarj/issue5ar1

Bouhafa, F. (2019). Ethics and fiqh in al-Fārābī's philosophy. In *Philosophy and jurisprudence in the Islamic world* (pp. 11–28). https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110552386-003

Casduloh. (2023). History of criminal law enforcement and Islamic justice in Saudi Arabia. *Al-Mahkamah: Islamic Law Journal, 1*(1), 14–20. https://doi.org/10.61166/mahkamah.v1i1.3

Chapra, M. U. (2014). Ethics and economics: The Islamic imperative. In *Morality and justice in Islamic economics and finance*. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781783475728.00009

Esposito, J. L., & DeLong-Bas, N. J. (2018). Freedom and human rights. In *Shariah: What everyone needs to know* (pp. 147–167). https://doi.org/10.1093/wentk/9780199325054.003.0008

Fadel, M. (2023). Ethics and finance. In *Islamic jurisprudence, Islamic law, and modernity* (pp. 337–372). https://doi.org/10.2307/jj.8275990.18

Farrar, S. (2024). Negotiated criminal justice in the Islamic law of modern Muslim states: The rise of the political plea bargain. In *Research handbook on plea bargaining and criminal justice* (pp. 231–244). https://doi.org/10.4337/9781802206678.00023

Imam, I. (2016). Shariah and human rights perspectives on interfaith marriage: Challenges impeding its practice in Nigeria. *ICR Journal, 7*(4), 492–508. https://doi.org/10.52282/icr.v7i4.231

Ismaulina, & Ibrahim, A. (2026). A critical appraisal of product innovation in Islamic banking: Navigating market pressures, ensuring Shariah compliance, and advancing the objectives of Maqasid al-Shariah. *Iqtishadia: Jurnal Ekonomi & Perbankan Syariah, 12*(2), 238–268. https://doi.org/10.19105/iqtishadia.v12i2.19941

Kamali, M. H. (2019). Islamic criminal justice. In *Crime and punishment in Islamic law* (pp. 17–20). https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190910648.003.0002

Kamali, M. H. (2025a). Maqasid and human rights. In *Goals and purposes of Shariah* (pp. 229–239). https://doi.org/10.1093/9780197786390.003.0025

Kamali, M. H. (2025b). Maqasid and human dignity. In *Goals and purposes of Shariah* (pp. 179–195). https://doi.org/10.1093/9780197786390.003.0022

Kania, R. R. E. (2013). Book review: Engaging with violent Islamic extremism. *International Criminal Justice Review, 23*(4), 403–404. https://doi.org/10.1177/1057567713501515

Karimi, N. (2019). Principles of compensation for the transfer of infectious body products in Islamic jurisprudence. *Health, Spirituality and Medical Ethics, 6*(2), 52–57. https://doi.org/10.29252/jhsme.6.2.52

Malekian, F. (2013). Islamic law justice systems. In *The encyclopedia of criminology and criminal justice* (pp. 1–6). https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118517383.wbeccj181

Mir, R., & Khan, M. (2015). Islamic finance and social justice: A reappraisal. In *Handbook of research on Islamic business ethics*. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781781009451.00024

Nashruddin, A. (2026). Benchmarking the objectives of Shariah in practice: A comparative maqāṣid index analysis of five leading Islamic banks across OIC countries. *Maqasid Al-Shariah Review, 3*(1). https://doi.org/10.58968/msr.v3i1.724

Phahlevy, R. R. (2014). Aceh Shariah court in the unitary state of the Republic of Indonesia and human rights context. *Rechtsidee, 1*(1), 71–84. https://doi.org/10.21070/jihr.v1i1.103

Rabbani, A. (2022). Analyzing the objectives of Shariah as intended by the lawgiver in enacting Shariah (text) for ifhām (proper understanding) according to al-Shatibi. *Islamiyyat, 44*(1), 253–263. https://doi.org/10.17576/islamiyyat-2022-4401-22

Rahami, M. (2007). Islamic restorative traditions and their reflections in the post-revolutionary criminal justice system of Iran. *European Journal of Crime, Criminal Law and Criminal Justice, 15*(2), 227–248. https://doi.org/10.1163/092895607x209166

Rauf, I. F. A. (2015). Shariah and the objectives of Islamic law. In *Defining Islamic statehood* (pp. 17–35). https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137446824_2

Rosen, L. (2000). Muhammad's sociological jurisprudence. In *The justice of Islam* (pp. 176–186). https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198298854.003.0010

Sachedina, A. (2022a). The ethics of interpretive jurisprudence. In *Islamic ethics* (pp. 153–179). https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197581810.003.0006

Sachedina, A. (2022b). Organ donation in Islamic juridical ethics. In *Organ donation in Islam* (pp. 61–72). https://doi.org/10.5040/9781978723702.ch-3

Shaddad, M. A. Q., Buang, A. H., & Maruf Olayemi, A. A. (2017). Protection of human rights in armed conflicts: A review of the Yemeni civil war from Shariah and legal perspectives. *Journal of Shariah Law Research, 2*(1), 37–54. https://doi.org/10.22452/jslr.vol2no1.3

Shah, T. A. (2022). The concept of law, justice and morality in Islamic and Western jurisprudence. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4130279

Shahridzuan, M. S. A. (2024). CRISPR-Cas9 gene editing according to Maqasid al-Shariah: Ethical concerns and applications. *Al-Maqasid: The International Journal of Maqasid Studies and Advanced Islamic Research, 5*(1), 42–54. https://doi.org/10.55265/al-maqasid.v5i1.129

Singh, L. M. R. (2026). Marriage, divorce, and custody: The dynamics of women's rights in Islamic jurisprudence. *International Journal of Law, Justice and Jurisprudence, 6*(1), 42–47. https://doi.org/10.22271/2790-0673.2026.v6.i1a.277

Souryal, S. S., Potts, D. W., & Alobied, A. I. (1994). The penalty of hand amputation for theft in Islamic justice. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 22*(3), 249–265. https://doi.org/10.1016/0047-2352(94)90021-3

Tellenbach, S. (2024). Islamic criminal law. In *Elgar encyclopedia of crime and criminal justice* (pp. 284–298). https://doi.org/10.4337/9781789902990.islamic.criminal.law

Terrill, R. J. (2023). Islamic law. In *World criminal justice systems* (pp. 561–680). https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003307389-8