



Islamic Ethical Perspectives on Artificial Intelligence and Digital Surveillance: Principles, Challenges, and Policy Recommendations

Dr. Imran Hayat

Lecturer, Department of Islamic Studies, Division of Islamic and Oriental Learning, University of Education, Lower Mall Campus, Lahore, Pakistan, imran.hayat@ue.edu.pk
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0647-0989>

Dr. Salman Arif

Former Research Scholar Yale University, USA, Current research scholar at Indiana Wesleyan University, USA, salman.arif@myemail.indwes.edu

Abstract

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) and digital surveillance systems into the social structures has generated serious ethical, legal, and social anxieties. Although the existing AI ethics paradigms are mostly based on Western philosophical and regulatory models, there is a strong necessity to examine these trends through the prism of the Islamic ethic. The paper explores the Islamic perspective of AI and digital surveillance in terms of its principles, challenges, and implications on policy. The paper, based on the classical books of Islam, the Quran, Hadith and classical jurisprudence, reveals that such beliefs as the preservation of human dignity (كرامة الإنسان), justice (العدل), privacy (السير), and accountability (المسؤولية) are considered to be the main principles to govern AI practices. This analyzes the academic discussion of AI ethics, bias, fairness, and algorithmic responsibility to place these concepts in the context of the modern technological environment. The article also examines policy proposals of normative character with a focus on how AI governance can be adjusted to conform to the standards of Objectives of Shariah (مقاصد الشريعة) and universal human rights. It highlights the dangers of discrimination, privacy, and socio-economic disparities arising out of AI and surveillance systems and suggests ethically-based mechanisms to counter or reduce it. The analysis of how Islamic ethics can be applied to the global AI ethics discussion places an emphasis on

the possibility of culturally sensitive and spiritually sensitised paradigms that can supplement the existing governance paradigms. Finally, the study contributes to theoretical and practical knowledge on AI ethics, proposing the creation of policy and technological solutions to support human dignity and justice and social welfare in the digital era.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Digital Surveillance, Islamic Ethics, Privacy, Justice, Accountability, Algorithmic Bias

Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has revolutionised rapidly in several fields of human activity, such as healthcare, finances, governance, and online communication. The adoption of the AI systems is associated with both game-changing benefits and deep ethical issues, especially in the context of fairness, accountability, privacy, and surveillance (Radanliev et al., 2025). Transparency, privacy, accountability, and fairness are also widely recognised (Khan et al., 2025; Radanliev et al., 2025) as the most prominent principles in the world of AI ethics, and systematic reviews of the literature on AI ethics continuously demonstrate this trend. The ethical aspect of AI is traced to the algorithmic infrastructures that are complex, which help in processing large amounts of data, and in many cases, the results obtained can be defined as opaque or not easily explained (Jobin, Ienca, & Vayena, 2019; cited in the modern AI ethics research). This difficulty is often referred to as the black box problem where neither developers nor end users can easily describe the decision-making process of an artificial intelligence system (Wikipedia, 2025). This kind of opaqueness contributes to the worries regarding justice and credibility especially in situations where decisions made by AI affect human rights, right to fairness, or even personal welfare.

According to a global view, researchers have already reported the fact that AI ethics is a dynamic interdisciplinary area of research, and the available frames are quite different in their range, meaning, and applications (Khan et al., 2025). The AI ethics frameworks adopted by international organisations have focused on privacy protection, fairness, accountability, transparency, and human oversight (UNESCO, 2021). As an example, the Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence created by UNESCO includes the respect of privacy and data protection, responsibility and accountability, transparency and explainability, human oversight, and fairness and non-discrimination (UNESCO, 2021). These motifs are echoed in the scientific and governance literature regarding AI ethical governance, and meta-analyses of hundreds of AI governance policies (Correa et al., 2022). Although the discourse of global guidelines has been growing, scholarly mainstream AI ethics have been accused of its overwhelming Western and secular focus, which might fail to represent ethical concerns based on the non-Western civilizational traditions (Hagerty & Rubinov, 2019; as reviewed in AI ethics surveys). This observation corresponds with the suggestion of ethical pluralism in the governance of AI that acknowledges the various intellectual and cultural traditions, such as the ones informed by religion, philosophy, and local moral vocabularies, as useful in the enrichment of ethical systems (Muchtasor, 2025).

The normative repertoire of evaluating the concept of justice, dignity, accountability, and the well-being of the population on the issue of technological change is unique to Islamic ethical thought, based upon the Quran, Sunnah, classical jurisprudence, and *maqasid al-Shariah* (goals of Islamic law) (Mohadi, 2023). In the Islamic tradition, justice (*adl*) is not just a concept of procedural fairness, but a holistic moral concept, which aims at preserving the welfare of the community and guarding human dignity. The teleological system of ethics is known as the *Maqasid* theory that focuses on safeguarding key human values such as life, intelligence, offspring, wealth, and religion amid long-term ethical obligations (Mohadi & Tarshany, 2023). Empirical evidence shows that Islamic sources of ethical reasoning can be used in the modern technological dilemma issues of algorithmic bias, invasive surveillance, and loss of privacy. Notably, the Islamic views on AI do not necessarily oppose the development of technology. Instead, researchers state that AI has the potential to serve the common good (*مصلحة*), but it is also dangerous when uncontrolled and unregulated. Classical literature on *maqāṣid al-Sharī‘ah* emphasizes the avoidance of harm (*لا ضرر ولا ضرار*) and the upholding of human dignity (*كرامة الإنسان*), which puts ethical restrictions on intrusion surveillance and privacy intrusion (Radanliev et al., 2025). The foundation of Islamic ethical analyses thus rests on the idea that technological innovations are to be considered in the light of technical efficiency and economic advantage but based on the moral principles according to which the rights of human beings and social justice are preserved.

The paper covers two gaps in the standing literature which are interrelated. To begin with, although the study of AI ethics has been conducted in secular circles, relatively little has been done in terms of systematising the synthesis of applying the Islamic ethics to AI and digital surveillance behaviours. Second, AI governance policies discourses often do not include contextually specific normative frameworks which best apply to Muslim majority societies. The present research is aimed at closing those gaps by performing a study, which explains an Islamic moral framework regarding the interpretation of AI and digital surveillance, defines the main ethical issues involved in the modern application of AI, and outlines normative policy proposals based on the Islamic moral philosophy.

The paper shows that Islamic ethics can expand current AI regulation systems and create cross-cultural ethical pluralism on global responsible AI debate by grounding ethical judgement in Islamic normative resources and the international literature of AI ethics. The following sections describe the methodological basis of this research followed by a systematic review of the most important ethical issues caused by AI and digital surveillance and continue on to an Islamic ethical examination including policy guided normative suggestions.

Methodology

This study is based on normative ethical inquiry, it involves the process of gathering, synthesising, and processing existing academic sources and authoritative references and not the production of new empirical information (Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill, 2019). Since the research problem is conceptual (the questioning of ethical principles based on the sources of

Islamic normativity, when applied to artificial intelligence (AI) and online surveillance) such a research is a good fit to the desk research paradigm, which allows conducting an integrative study of the disciplinary literatures, legal-theoretical traditions, and policy documents.

The paper uses an analytical-conceptual framework that is in between the ethical theory and technology research. The conceptual research concept indicates that information system and ethics research should be done by building adaptive theory whereby the existing constructs are incorporated and interpreted to create new theoretical understandings (Walsham, 1995). The purpose of the investigation in the present study is to generalise the ideas of ethics based on classical Islamic texts and the latest AI governance literature to come up with an integrated normative framework. This method corresponds to the priorities in ethical theory studies where the desk analysis assesses the moral systems in opposition to new technologies (Floridi et al., 2018). Instead of quantifying empirical phenomena or stakeholder attitudes, desk research is chosen over empirical approaches since the research questions are normatively oriented, they seek to investigate which ethical principles ought to guide AI and digital surveillance as an Islamic viewpoint. According to Avgerinou and Eric (1997), desk research is particularly appropriate in research studies that attempt to build theoretical constructs through the synthesis of authoritative texts and other scholarly publications.

The information used in this research is all secondary data such as peer-reviewed journal articles, books, governmental reports, international policies, and classical texts on Islam. The core religious texts (the Quran and the officially recognised sets of Hadith) are to be interpreted along with developed jurisprudence versions that are recorded in modern literature (Kamali, 2008; Rahman, 2019).

In case of secular AI ethics literature, the selection criteria include:

- Articles in peer-reviewed journals/ institutional reports (e.g. UNESCO, OECD, EU schemes)
- Literature that discusses main ethical principles of AI and digital surveillance systematically.
- Publications within the past ten years, as a representation of the current ethical arguments (2015-2025).

As far as Islamic ethical sources are concerned, the criteria have been:

- Expositions of classical maqasid al-shariiah by distinguished scholars
- Recent peer-reviewed studies which implement Islamic ethics to the context of modern technologies (e.g., Mohadi and Tarshany, 2023)

Analytical Procedure

They consist of normative interpretation and thematic synthesis as the analytical strategy. Adhering to qualitative desk research standards, the literature is coded according to the

recurrent ethical themes (ex: justice, dignity, accountability, public welfare) through a reflexive process of reading (Braun and Clarke, 2006). These themes are then overlaid with ethical issues that have been found in modern literature on AI and surveillance (Jobin, Ienca, and Vayena, 2019; Correa et al., 2022), which results in a comprehensive normative framework, both ethically sound and contextually oriented. Normative interpretation follows the norms of research in ethics, according to which the meaning of texts, both religious and secular, is followed in terms of the conceptual context and assessed with regard to the logical consistency with the wider ethical commitments. As an example, the basic Islamic juridical notions, like al-Maslahah (public welfare) and al-Adl (justice) are discussed in the context of fairness and human dignity issues that also occupy a central place in the AI governance literature.

Scope and Limitations

It is rather normative evaluation of ethics than the empirical one or legal interpretation. In this regard, the research does not perform original surveys, field research, and calculus of AI systems, and does not suggest certain legislative steps in relation to any jurisdiction. Rather, it is intended to offer evidence-based normative orientations, which can be used in future empirical, legal, or policy studies. This desk analysis can be limited by the access to English-language sources on some of the Islamic jurisprudential interpretations; however, at least the seminal Arabic works are included through the authority of secondary scholarship.

The Ethical Threats of Artificial Intelligence and Online Surveillance

Ethical issues surrounding artificial intelligence (AI) and digital surveillance are widely written in the interdisciplinary literature in the field of computer science, law, philosophy, and the social sciences. These issues are not caused by the unique malfunctions of the technical equipment but by the nature of AI systems, especially the need to operate on mass data, probabilistic inference, and decision-making automation in socially relevant situations (Floridi et al., 2018; Jobin, Ienca, and Vayena, 2019). The current section summarises the literature to find four connected areas of ethical problems algorithmic bias and discrimination, the loss of privacy, the lack of transparency and accountability, and the centralization of surveillance power.

Another ethical risk of AI systems that has been studied most is that of algorithmic bias, in which automated systems can reproduce or exaggerate existing social inequalities. The factual data indicate that even models of AI trained on historical or unrepresentative data might produce unequal effects on the marginalised populations, without any direct discriminatory will (Barocas and Selbst, 2016). This has been evidenced in different fields which include hiring, credit score, predictive policing, and facial recognition. The related empirical analysis, the largest-ever study by Buolamwini and Gebru (2018), found that the commercial facial recognition systems were significantly more prone to errors in women and people with darker complexion, which exposed deep-rooted bias in training datasets. The presence of such biases is confirmed as not an exception by later studies which have structurally correlated these biases with the data selection, labelling, and design of models (Mehrabi et al., 2021). Therefore,

algorithmic systems can be used to internalise biased results in the name of being objective thus posing serious moral issues of justice and equality.

Ethically, researchers argue that algorithmic bias may jeopardise the principles of fairness and non-discrimination especially when artificial intelligence systems are used in high-stakes scenarios like criminal justice or even social welfare distribution (O'Neil, 2016). The reasons have driven the demand of bias auditing, impact and regulatory oversight as part of AI governance systems (EU High-Level Expert Group on AI, 2019).

Datafication and Dilution of Privacy

The other ethical dilemma that is at the core is the question of individual privacy being eroded by extensive data gathering and electronic surveillance. The AI systems often rely on the consistent retrieval of information on the online and offline behaviours of the individuals, including biometric identifiers, geolocation information and personal communications. This is what scholars call datafication whereby things in human life are converted into measurable data to be analysed and manipulated (van'Dijck, 2014). AI-driven surveillance technologies, including facial recognition, predictive analytics, and behavioural monitoring, make it possible to observe people like never before, and these actions are usually performed without any significant consent or disclosure (Lyon, 2018). According to Zuboff (2019), those practises make this a part of a more extensive system of surveillance capitalism where personal information is commodified and used for economic or political profits. Ethical discussions highlight that privacy breaches do not only imply victimisation on an individual level but also group impacts, such as chilling the freedom of expression and association (Solove, 2021). Such issues are explicitly recognised as the part of international governmental regulations, which consider privacy as a key human right that should be enhanced in the context of AI-driven systems (UNESCO, 2021).

Lack of Opacity, Explainability, and Accountability

One of the distinguishing features of most AI systems, especially machine-learning-based ones, is that they can hardly be interpreted. Researchers call this the black box problem in which the internal reasoning of algorithmic decision-making is not easily comprehended or explained, even by the system creators (Burrell, 2016). This obscurity sparks a lot of ethical issues of accountability, particularly in cases where AI systems are used to make decisions that may impact on the legal rights, jobs, or even access to government services. Wachter, Mittelstadt, and Floridi (2017) declare that to have meaningful accountability, it is important that the affected individuals can make sense of and challenge automated decisions. Without transparency, responsibility of harm is distributed among developers, deployers, and institutions hence the so called accountability gap in AI governance (Floridi et al., 2018).

As these dangers have been identified, clarifying their concerns things such as explainability, human control, and traceability become foundational ethical mandates in AI systems (OECD, 2019; UNESCO, 2021). However, researchers warn that technical explainability in isolation

might not be enough given that it must come with institutional redress and governmental controls (Yeung, 2018). 4.4 Surveillance, Power, and Governance. The overlap of AI and digital surveillance creates even greater issues related to the concentration of power and management. Surveillance AI systems provide states and companies with augmented abilities to observe, anticipate, and affect human behaviour on a large scale. According to critical scholarship, this capability can be used to encourage authoritarianism, social control, and unlevelled power especially where there is no established strong legal framework (Browne, 2015; Lyon, 2018).

Empirical literature shows that predictive policing and risk-scoring systems have the ability to strengthen the loop of surveillance among communities that are already marginalised, consequently making structural inequalities self-perpetuating (Eubanks, 2018). Ethically, the phenomenon creates concerns on proportionality, legitimacy, and ethical limits of the surveillance technologies in democratic and non-democratic societies. Surveillance by AI, without restraint, has become a threat to human dignity and civil liberties, and this fact has drawn growing attention of international organisations, which have called on high standards of necessity and proportionality (UN Human Rights Council, 2021). These issues of governance form an essential context of normative ethical judgement, especially in measuring the AI technologies in different cultural and legal theories. The moral issues that AI and digital surveillance raised are algorithmic prejudice, undermining privacy, privacy, and secrecy, and power concentration, which are all well-reported in modern research. These are not individual technical issues, but massive systemic ethical dangers that data-driven automation presents. These risks demand a complete picture, without which any normative framework wishing to rate AI responsibly can do so. The next part of the paper expands on this body of literature by discussing the way Islamic ethical principles address these issues and offer normative regulation of ethically based AI governance.

Islamic Ethics and Artificial Intelligence and Digital Surveillance

The Islamic ethics is based on normative moral universe which is influenced by the Quran, Sunnah of Prophet Muhammad ﷺ and the interpretive tradition of Islamic jurisprudence (فقه) and legal theory (اصول الفقه). In this tradition, ethical assessment is not attached to technological novelty but rather on lasting values that are interested in matters of justice, dignity, responsibility and the common good. Modern researchers assume that these principles provide a valid and orderly foundation of the evaluation of contemporary technologies, such as artificial intelligence (AI) or digital surveillance, despite the fact that these technologies were not available to ancient jurists (Kamali, 2008; Mohadi and Tarshany, 2023). Thereupon, it follows this tradition by stating four linked Islamic ethical principles: justice (العدل), human dignity (الكرامة), accountability (المسؤولية), and public welfare (المصلحة), and analyses their applicability to AI and digital surveillance practices.

Justice (العدل) and Algorithmic Fairness

Justice takes the key place in the Islamic moral and legal thought. The Quran calls numerous times upon believers to practise justice as a duty, which does not depend on personal interest, loyalty, or power relations. One of the verses commonly quoted is the following:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا كُونُوا قَوَّامِينَ بِالْقِسْطِ شُهَدَاءَ لِلَّهِ وَلَوْ عَلَىٰ أَنفُسِكُمْ أَوِ الْوَالِدِينَ وَالْأَقْرَبِينَ

“O you who believe! Be constantly firm in righteousness, bear witness to Allah, even against yourselves or your parents and relatives. Surah An-Nisa (4:135)

Classical exegetes understand this verse to mean that justice is a general moral imperative, to which individuals and institutions are responsible (Al-Tabari, Tafsir). Injustice (zulm) is in Islamic jurisprudence a topic that is categorically forbidden whether through intent or negligence (Kamali, 2008). This Islamic commitment to justice is directly involved in matters related to algorithmic bias and discriminatory outcomes in the modern rhetoric on ethics. Although AI systems are typically framed as neutral, empirical studies have shown that such systems can be used to reinforce unfair results when trained on biased data or implemented without any kind of safeguard (Barocas and Selbst, 2016). According to the Islamic ethical views, the consequences of disadvantaging certain groups in a systematic manner would also be considered ظلم despite the fact that no single actor of the system means to harm people.

This knowledge is supported by a legal maxim which is thoroughly set:

الضَّرْرُ يُزَالُ (Harm must be removed) (Al-Suyuti, Al-Ashbah wa al-Nazair).

This maxim has traditionally been used by Islamic jurists to practise in the society which produce predictable damage. Put in normative terms as applied to AI, this means that technologies that have unjust or discriminating outcomes cannot be considered ethically warranted just due to their efficiency or innovation. The justice therefore needs to be subject to ethical scrutiny, which involves preventive measures as opposed to correction.

Human Dignity (كرامة الإنسان) and the Sanctity of privacy

The Quran clearly stipulates the human dignity as the intrinsic feature of all human beings:

وَلَقَدْ كَرَّمْنَا بَنِي آدَمَ

And We have, indeed, given honour to the offspring of Adam. (Qur'an 17: 70)

The concept of كرامة (honor or dignity) according to Islamic scholars is comprised of bodily integrity, moral agency, privacy, and humiliations or intrusion (Kamali, 2010). In contrast to contemporary concept of legal responsibility which tends to base dignity on autonomy, Islamic ethics places dignity in the context of the theological anthropology, in which humans are valued creations of God and moral agents who bear responsibility towards what they do. This conception of dignity leads to the protection of privacy. Quran outright forbids intrusive surveillance:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اجْتَنِبُوا كَثِيرًا مِّنَ الظَّنِّ إِنَّ بَعْضَ الظَّنِّ إِثْمٌ وَلَا تَجَسَّسُوا وَلَا يَغْتَبَ بَعْضُكُم بَعْضًا

O ye that believe, Avoid much suspicion; indeed, some suspicion is sin. And do not spy on one another, nor backbite each other..

This ban is strengthened in the Prophetic traditions. The Prophet, Muhammad ﷺ said:

قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ " يَا مَعْشَرَ مَنْ آمَنَ بَلِسَانِهِ وَلَمْ يَدْخُلِ الْإِيمَانُ قَلْبَهُ لَا تَغْتَابُوا الْمُسْلِمِينَ وَلَا تَتَّبِعُوا عَوْرَاتِهِمْ فَإِنَّهُ مَنِ اتَّبَعَ عَوْرَاتِهِمْ يَتَّبِعِ اللَّهُ عَوْرَتَهُ وَمَنْ يَتَّبِعِ اللَّهُ عَوْرَتَهُ يُفْضَحْهُ فِي بَيْتِهِ "

The Prophet (ﷺ) said: O community of people, who believed by their tongue, and belief did not enter their hearts, do not back-bite Muslims, and do not search for their faults, for if anyone searches for their faults, Allah will search for his fault, and if Allah searches for the fault of anyone, He disgraces him in his house. Sunan Abi Dawud » General Behavior (Kitab Al-Adab) - كتاب الأدب » Hadith 4880

Classical jurists saw such writings as creating a powerful presumption of not unwarranted intrusion, even by authorities, unless based on a clear necessity and a general interest of people (Al-Ghazali, Ihya completion of the al-Ulum al-Din). Islamic ethics is a significant concern on the normative substantive front, in terms of AI-driven surveillance, including facial recognition, biometric databases and behavioural tracking. Ceaseless and unselective data gathering is likely to dehumanise people to subjects of surveillance, which is degrading and lacks moral jurisdiction. According to the Islamic perspective, technological competency does not lead to the creation of moral authorization; dignity serves as a restrictive measure to surveillance activities.

Accountability (المسؤولية) and Moral Responsibility

In the Islamic ethics, accountability is a guiding principle based on the belief that every action is liable to moral judgement in the presence of God. The Qur'an states:

كُلُّ نَفْسٍ بِمَا كَسَبَتْ رَهِينَةٌ

All the souls will be kept in pledge of what they deserved. (Qur'an 74: 38)

This principle creates the view that responsibility cannot be alienated or lost. It means that authority is accompanied by moral liabilities at all time. This was stressed upon by the Prophet ﷺ in a famous hadith:

أَلَا كُلُّكُمْ رَاعٍ وَكُلُّكُمْ مَسْئُولٌ عَنْ رَعِيَّتِهِ

Each of you is a shepherd and each of you is responsible for his flock.

Sunan Abi Dawud » Tribute, Spoils, and Rulership (Kitab Al-Kharaj, Wal-Fai' Wal-Imarah) - كتاب الخراج والإمارة والفيء » Hadith 2928

The Islamic legal theory opposes the idea of diffused or anonymous responsibility, which is of great significance in modern AI systems. Recent literature on AI ethics raises the issue of accountability gaps due to the presence of complicated socio-technical systems in which the responsibility is shared between developers, deployers, and institutions (Floridi et al., 2018). Islamic ethics reacts normatively by stating that moral responsibility can still be traced, no matter how technological it has become.

The other applicable legal maxim is:

“الأمر بمقاصدها” (Actions are judged by their purposes). This is a well-known Islamic legal maxim (قاعدة فقهية) in *uṣūl al-fiqh*. Application of this maxim to artificial intelligence requires that the results and intentions should all be subject to an ethical evaluation. The problem is that artificial systems that provide harmful effects cannot be viewed as morally neutral due to being automated. Accountability has to be ensured, therefore, by human oversight, by explainability, and by contestation-allowing mechanisms, hence meeting modern calls of responsible AI governance (OECD, 2019).

Public Welfare (المصلحة العامة) and *Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah* (مقاصد الشريعة)

Taking a key role in the Islamic legal reasoning is the principle of *al-Maslahah*, or the common good, especially when it comes to novel problems. Al-Shatibi describes *maslahah* as safeguarding the essential goals (*maqasid*) of the *Shari'ah*, which are safeguarding religion, life, intellect, lineage and property (*Al-Muwafaqat*). The current research is generally agreed that the *maqasid* approach provides a pragmatic but principled approach toward assessing modern technologies (Auda, 2008; Mohadi and Tarshany, 2023). Technologies of artificial intelligence that aid in the provision of healthcare, disaster management, or educational opportunities may therefore be used to promote *maslahah* by protecting life and intelligence, but this is not an absolute rule. Islamic jurists underline that the common good should not be obtained in a perverse way. A widely cited maxim states:

“درء المفسد مقدم على جلب المصالح” (Prevention of harm is more eminent than obtaining benefit.)

This is especially the case with online surveillance. Although surveillance may be efficient or secure, it may be unethical to conduct it in a systematic violation of dignity, privacy or justice. However, Islamic will support a logic of proportionality, which is well-consonant with modern human-rights based AI governance paradigms (UNESCO, 2021), but based on a unique theological ethics.

Collectively, justice, dignity, accountability, and public welfare constitute a consistent Islamic code of ethics in terms of assessing AI and digital surveillance. These principles are not technical rules but normative restrictions which are used in making ethical judgement. They resonate with a lot of the issues discussed in the world literature on AI ethics but provide a more profound moral framework based on the theological responsibility and human dignity.

The next section expands these principles to get normative policy orientations, thus showing how Islamic ethics can help to guide responsible AI governance without invoking empirical or jurisdiction-specific assertions.

Islamic Ethical Policy: Recommendation of normative policies

Ethical research has normative policy recommendations which are not rules to be followed but value-based orientations that are used to make decisions, institutional responsibility, and governance design (Floridi et al., 2018). Within the context of artificial intelligence (AI) and digital surveillance, the Islamic ethics also offers these orientations by providing moral conditions in the context of which the technological usage can be considered ethically justified. Based on the Islamic ethical principles presented above, namely, Justice (العدل), Human Dignity (الكرامة), Accountability (المسؤولية), and the Public Good (المصلحة العامة), this section provides normative policy recommendations that resonate not only with the principles of the Islamic ethical reasoning but also with the internationally recognised principles of AI ethics. In this section, Davenport and Cox explain that the problem of algorithmic unfairness can be prevented by establishing a justice-focused orientation, which involves the growing involvement of society within the algorithmic system. Assuming the Islamic approach to ethical considerations, AI system policies ought to strive to avoid injustice instead of simply address it after the damage has been done. The Islamic jurisprudence is categorical impermissible to ظلم (injustice), with or without intention (Kamali, 2008). This corresponds with the modern literature of AI ethics, which stresses the active consideration of the fairness and impact evaluation to reduce the tendency to biases in algorithms (Barocas and Selbst, 2016; Mehrabi et al., 2021). The policy orientations that Islamic ethics encourages include:

- Severe discriminating results should be regarded as morally inadmissible, even when they are not intentional;
- Oblige the ethical examination of AI systems used in high-stakes settings like policing, provision of welfare, and hiring;
- Preference of harm prevention according to the legal maxim الضرر يزال (harm must be removed).

The latter orientations align with the international AI governance principles that anticipate fairness and non-discrimination as the key principles (OECD, 2019; UNESCO, 2021).

Dignity-Affirming Orientation: Moral Boundaries to Surveillance

Islamic ethics sets up non-compromising moral boundaries to surveillance procedures based on the importance of human dignity and privacy. A firm ethic of prohibition of intrusive monitoring is founded on the Quranic taboos against espionage (Qur'an 49:12) and the prophetic threats concerning the disclosure of personal affairs (Kamali, 2010). Normatively, it means that the policy strategies toward AI-enabled surveillance should:

- consider privacy as a right that is based on human dignity, and not just a procedural or contractual issue;
- Impose the necessity and proportionality as moral conditions of surveillance;

Rejects the continuous or indiscriminate data collection which is not clearly justified by the publics

The human-rights-based AI governance frameworks are similar to these orientations as they recognize privacy and dignity as among the key values that are threatened by AI-driven surveillance systems (UN Human Rights Council, 2021; UNESCO, 2021).

Governance Accountability-Based: Maintaining Moral Responsibility

Islamic ethics think disallows the spread of moral responsibility. Accountability (masuliyah) can be followed as the province of human agents and human institutions no matter how it is mediated by the technologies. The normative rejection of moral opacities is determined by the Quranic statement that each soul will be answerable to what it receives (Quran 74:38). Under policy, the Islamic ethics advocates orientation that:

- Confirms the role of humans in the decisions made with AI mediation;
- disapproves that automated systems exonerate institutions;
- Makes the accountability of explanations and human control ethically imperative and not technical choices.

These roles are similar to the scholarship of AI ethics that points to a lack of accountability and the necessity to establish governance systems that would maintain responsibility in socio-technical systems (Floridi et al., 2018; Wachter et al., 2017). The ethical permissibility of a certain act is contingent on the condition of its validity to the common good and its relative health benefits. The al-Maslahah principle offers a conditional ethical justification to the adoption of technology. The Islamic jurisprudence allows the use of innovative tools as long as they prove to be beneficial to the populace without harming the aims of the higher morality (maqasid al-shari'ah) (Auda, 2008). Nevertheless, the benefits do not suffice, the prevention of harm should be mentioned as a priority on gaining benefits, as it is stated in the maxim dar al - mafasid muqaddam al jalb al - masalih.

Normatively, it means that AI and surveillance technologies:

- Can be morally right in case they safeguard life, intelligence, or civic security;
- Must be made ethically problematic when benefits are speculative, or when their disadvantages to dignity and justice are greater than their advantages;
- Biannual moral review as social consequences change

This proportionality-focused argument is similar to the modern demands of risk-based AI regulation but bases them on a unique Islamic moral reasoning (UNESCO, 2021).

The normative policy orientations in this paper do not take the form of prescriptions of particular legal tools or institutional designs. Instead, they define ethical limits and priorities based on the Islamic moral philosophy and supported by the modern world literature on the ethics of AI. The provision of justice, dignity, accountability, and public welfare as ethical requirements and not technical contingencies are Islamic ethics offer a principled moral view that can be used to discuss AI governance in both Muslim-majority and pluralistic societies.

The next paragraph places these normative insights in the context of the larger discussion of global AI ethics with a focus on convergent areas and different contributions.

Conversation: Islamic Ethics in Global AI Ethics Discourse

The controversies around artificial intelligence and digital surveillance have produced a growing body of ethical theories put forward by international organisations, governments, and academia. Among the values that these frameworks usually anticipate are fairness, accountability, transparency, privacy, and human oversight (OECD, 2019; UNESCO, 2021; Floridi et al., 2018). Although the principles represent a generalised moral agreement, scholars are starting to note that AI-ethical governance further demands that cultural-based normative traditions can be mobilised that can potentially drive moral responsibility beyond procedural compliance (Jobin et al., 2019; Greene et al., 2019). In this terrain, the Islamic morality provides a divergent-convergent ethical approach. Instead of bringing new ethical issues to the table, Islamic moral argument reinforces and enriches the already existing global assumptions through embedding them in a theologically informed understanding of human dignity, justice, and responsibility. This part makes the Islamic ethical views relevant to the major global AI ethics discourse, pointing at the points of convergence, original contributions, and normative added value.

Areas of Convergence

There is an obvious overlapping of Islamic ethical values and global AI ethics standards that are widely accepted. Justice (العدل) is similar to the emphases of fairness and non-discrimination when using algorithms at the international level (OECD, 2019). Likewise, the Islamic belief of safeguarding dignity (الكرامة) and privacy is consistent with human-rights-based models, which have revealed a lack of privacy as a key ethical threat of AI -regulated surveillance (UN Human Rights Council, 2021). In Islamic ethics, accountability (المسئولية) is the reflection of the modern issues of explainability, human control, and irresponsibility in automated decision-making (Floridi et al., 2018; Wachter et al., 2017). Similarly, the principle of the common good (المصلحة) is echoed by the risk-based and proportionality-based models of governance that continue to gain more and more popularity in the international AI policy discourse (UNESCO, 2021). According to these convergences, it is possible to conclude that Islamic ethics does not oppose global AI ethics but serves as a normatively compatible tradition, and it can affirm common ethical priorities.

The unique normative contributions:

Although such a convergence exists, Islamic ethics adds a number of unique normative dimensions that are not typically well developed in secular AI ethics systems. To start with, Islamic ethics bases moral commitments on transcendent accountability as opposed to institutional enforcement. Ethical responsibility eventually goes beyond compliance to regulatory regulations to moral responsibility to God enhancing ethical motivation, especially in a scenario where regulatory control is loose or unbalanced (Kamali, 2008). Second, Islamic

moral reasoning focuses on the prevention of harm over benefit maximisation in the form of the legal maxim of the maxims of maximising, i.e. *دَرْءُ الْمَفَاسِدِ مُقَدَّمٌ عَلَى جَلْبِ الْمَصَالِحِ*. Though risks and advantages are frequently aligned in global AI ethics frameworks, Islamic ethics provides a more serious ethical standard, particularly concerning intrusive surveillance technologies, the long-term negative impacts of which are hard to revert (Zuboff, 2019). Third, the framework of the maqasid al-shariah will provide a methodical ethical framework to analyze the new technologies. Technological testing through Islamic ethics offers a methodical evaluative perspective upon which the preservation of life, intellect, dignity and property is analysed to prevent ad hoc moral reasoning (Auda, 2008).

Response to Critiques and Limitations

One common criticism of religious ethical systems is that they are said to be inapplicable to technologically complicated systems. Nevertheless, the tradition of Islamic jurisprudence is rich in the practise of solving issues that have not been tackled before by using analogical reasoning, the consideration of the interests of the people, and normative maxims (اصول الفقه). Modern theorists suggest that this methodological pliability allows the Islamic ethics to address contemporary technological issues in an active manner and do not use literalism as a pretext (Kamali, 2011; Mohadi and Tarshany, 2023). However, the Islamic ethics cannot replace technical skills, empirical studies, and law enforcement. Its major input is normative orientation and not operational design. The AI ethical governance thus necessitates the interdisciplinary approach in which the principles of Islamic ethics can guide policy values with technical and legal implementation systems taking care of the actual implementation.

Recommendations on AI Governance as Pluralistic

The Islamic ethics could be used as a supplementary moral voice in pluralistic societies, instead of a normative system. Islamic ethics allows the cross-cultural ethical dialogue to take place by expressing the ethical principles in a universal moral language, such as justice, dignity, accountability, etc., and not losing its theological substance. This makes Islamic ethics a positive force in the global AI governance discussions, especially in the Muslim-majority settings where the notion of ethical legitimacy is strongly interconnected with religious ideals.

Conclusion

The speed at which the fields of artificial intelligence and digital surveillance are growing posits fundamental ethical issues that cannot be addressed using technical efficiency or adherence to laws and regulations. This paper has suggested that the Islamic ethics can be used to provide a consistent and solid normative framework to assess such technologies with reference to the principles of Justice (العدل), Human Dignity (الكرامة), Responsibility (المسؤولية), and the Common Good (المصلحة العامة). As part of a desk-based examination of the Quranic injunctions, Prophetic traditions, classical and contemporary Islamic legal theory, the study has showed that Islamic ethics has much in common with world AI ethics frameworks, although it adds its own unique ethical observations. Specifically, its focus on harm prevention, moral

responsibility outside of an institutional arrangement, and reasoning based on maqasid can give a more profoundly ethical basis to arguments on algorithmic bias, erosion of privacy, and management of surveillance.

Instead of offering legal prescriptions and technical solutions, this article further normative policy orientations, which have the capacity to inform responsible AI governing in various cultural and institutional settings? The rigour and critical Islamic ethics do not oppose technological innovation but place their validity on moral limitations that safeguard the dignity of human beings as well as social justice. Around the application of these principles in practise to particular policy settings, future researchers need to investigate the implementation of these principles in practise, and how Islamic reasoning is able to engage with legal and technical systems in practise. With AI technologies ever transforming the social life, the need to incorporate the ethics based on the cultural background in the global governance discourse will stay crucial in making sure that the technological advancement benefits humanity and not its demise.

No Conflict of Interest

The author(s) confirm that the research, analysis, and conclusions presented in this article were conducted independently, without any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Acknowledgement:

Parts of the manuscript were prepared with the assistance of OpenAI's ChatGPT, an AI language model, for editing, phrasing, and ensuring clarity. ChatGPT (OpenAI, 2023)

Correspondence should be addressed to: Dr. Imran Hayat, Lecturer, Department of Islamic Studies, Division of Islamic and Oriental Learning, University of Education, Lower Mall Campus, Lahore, Pakistan. Email: imran.hayat@ue.edu.pk

References

Al-Bukhārī, M. ibn Ismā'īl. (c. 810–870). *Al-Jāmi' al-Ṣaḥīḥ al-Musnad al-Mukhtaṣar min Ḥadīth Rasūl Allāh* [Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī]. Muṣṭafā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī wa-Awladahu. Retrieved from <https://sunnah.com/bukhari>

Al-Ghazālī, A. H. (d. 1111). *Iḥyā' 'Ulūm al-Dīn*. Lajnat Nashr al-Thaqāfa al-Islāmiyya. Retrieved from <https://www.ghazali.org/ihyainprint>

Al-Shāṭibī, I. (d. 1388 CE). *Al-Muwāfaqāt fī Uṣūl al-Sharī'ah*. Dār al-Ma'ārif.

Al-Suyūṭī, J. (d. 1505 CE). *Al-Ashbāh wa al-Nazā'ir*. Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya.

- Auda, J. (2008). *Maqasid al-Shari'ah as philosophy of Islamic law*. International Institute of Islamic Thought.
- Avgerinou, M. D., & March, M. E. (1997). The basis of qualitative research in information systems. *Information Systems Journal*, 7(1), 13–25.
- Barocas, S., & Selbst, A. D. (2016). Big data's disparate impact. *California Law Review*, 104(3), 671–732.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Browne, S. (2015). *Dark matters: On the surveillance of blackness*. Duke University Press.
- Buolamwini, J., & Gebru, T. (2018). Gender shades: Intersectional accuracy disparities in commercial gender classification. *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 81, 1–15.
- Burrell, J. (2016). How the machine “thinks”: Understanding opacity in machine learning algorithms. *Big Data & Society*, 3(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951715622512>
- Corrêa, N. K., Galvão, C., Santos, J. W., et al. (2022). Worldwide AI ethics: A review of 200 guidelines and recommendations for AI governance. *arXiv*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.11922>
- Eubanks, V. (2018). *Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor*. St. Martin's Press.
- Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., et al. (2018). AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations. *Minds and Machines*, 28(4), 689–707. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5>
- Greene, D., Hoffmann, A. L., & Stark, L. (2019). Better, nicer, clearer, fairer: A critical assessment of the movement for ethical artificial intelligence and machine learning. *Proceedings of the 52nd Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS)*.
- Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1(9), 389–399. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-019-0088-2>
- Kamali, M. H. (2008). *Shari'ah law: An introduction*. Oneworld Publications.
- Kamali, M. H. (2010). *Human dignity in Islam*. The Islamic Texts Society.
- Kamali, M. H. (2011). *Principles of Islamic jurisprudence* (2nd ed.). The Islamic Texts Society.
- Khan, A. A., Badshah, S., Liang, P., et al. (2025). Ethics of AI: A systematic literature review of principles and challenges. *arXiv*. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/354651489>

Mehrabi, N., Morstatter, F., Saxena, N., Lerman, K., & Galstyan, A. (2021). A survey on bias and fairness in machine learning. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 54(6), Article 115. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3457607>

Mohadi, M., & Tarshany, Y. (2023). Maqasid al-Shari'ah and the ethics of artificial intelligence. *Journal of Contemporary Maqasid Studies*.

Muchtasor, N. S. (2025). Ethical pluralism in AI policy: A framework for Islamic integration into global AI governance. *Sinergi International Journal of Islamic Studies*.

O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Crown Publishing.

OECD. (2019). *OECD Principles on Artificial Intelligence*. OECD Publishing. <https://www.oecd.org/going-digital/ai/principles/>

OpenAI. (2023). ChatGPT (GPT-5) [Large language model]. <https://openai.com/chatgpt>

Radanliev, P., De Roure, D., Nicolescu, R., et al. (2025). AI ethics and the ethics of artificial intelligence. *Frontiers in Digital Health*. <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/digital-health>

Rahman, F. (2019). *Islam and modernity: Transformation of an intellectual tradition*. University of Chicago Press.

Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2019). *Research methods for business students* (8th ed.). Pearson Education.

Solove, D. J. (2021). *Understanding privacy* (2nd ed.). Harvard University Press.

UN Human Rights Council. (2021). *The right to privacy in the digital age* (A/HRC/48/31). United Nations.

UNESCO. (2021). *Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. <https://www.unesco.org/en/artificial-intelligence>

van Dijck, J. (2014). Datafication, dataism and dataveillance: Big data between scientific paradigm and ideology. *Surveillance & Society*, 12(2), 197–208.

Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., & Floridi, L. (2017). Why a right to explanation of automated decision-making does not exist in the GDPR. *International Data Privacy Law*, 7(2), 76–99. <https://doi.org/10.1093/idpl/ipw022>

Wikipedia contributors. (2025, December). *Ethics of artificial intelligence*. Wikipedia. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ethics_of_artificial_intelligence

Yeung, K. (2018). Algorithmic regulation: A critical interrogation. *Regulation & Governance*, 12(4), 505–523. <https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.12132>

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.