FRAMEWORK FOR ADDRESSING LEGAL DIMENSIONS OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND ROBOTICS APPLICATIONS: A FIQH PERSPECTIVE

AKBAR, M. A.

Department of Economics, International Islamic University Malaysia, Selangor, Malaysia.
e-mail: aslamakbar[at]iium.edu.my

(Received 08th December 2024; revised 05th February 2025; accepted 12th February 2025)

Abstract. The rapid evolution of artificial intelligence (AI) and robotics has brought forth profound implications, particularly within the realm of ethics and jurisprudence. This paper seeks to initiate a humble yet significant exploration into the intersection of AI applications and Islamic jurisprudence. By focusing on foundational principles, the study highlights how Islamic legal frameworks can provide ethical guidance for human-AI interactions that ensure justice, social welfare, and moderation. A key focus of this work is the five indicators identified in Islamic jurisprudence that are particularly relevant for addressing AI abuses: (i) intent to harm, (ii) intention for an unlawful purpose, (iii) causing greater harm than good, (iv) unethical use resulting in damage to others, and (v) negligence or error in usage. These principles underscore the critical need for precaution and accountability in developing and deploying AI technologies. This paper also emphasizes the importance of preventing harmful applications of AI through the lens of Islamic technoethics. By offering this integrative perspective, the study hopes to contribute to ongoing discussions about AI governance and ethics, encouraging further research and dialogue. The intention is to provide a starting point for more inclusive and culturally informed frameworks that address the challenges and opportunities of technological advancements while upholding ethical integrity.
Keywords: *Islamic jurisprudence, AI governance, ethical integrity, precaution*

Introduction

In Islam, acts of worship can be both ritualistic and intertwined with everyday life choices and activities. As a result, actions performed with the right intentions—such as honesty in the workplace or acts of kindness-aim to promote individual and societal well-being while simultaneously nurturing spiritual growth. Ethics, therefore, play a central role in the ideal Muslim life, where every action holds moral weight in striving for justice, social harmony, and order (Maududi, 1966). Islamic scholars have identified specific principles and guidelines that should govern the development and use of modern technologies, ensuring these align with the broader moral framework of society (Qadir and Suleman, 2018). These principles include core values such as moderation in consumption, responsible resource management, avoiding harm or misuse, respecting others with dignity, acting with good intentions, upholding responsibility, and maintaining integrity (Ramadan, 2018; Moosa, 2016). The emphasis on ethics in Islam provides a foundational perspective that extends into the realm of technoethics. This perspective insists that the moral considerations applied to daily life must also guide the development and use of technology. Principles such as moderation, efficient resource utilization, and respect for others underscore the holistic approach Islam advocates across all areas of life, including technological advancements. Islamic moral philosophy offers a distinct viewpoint on the implications of technology, emphasizing the importance of balancing innovation with moral integrity (Akbar et al., 2025; Akbar, 2022; Arzroomchilar and Olamaiekopaie, 2022).

Artificial Intelligence and robotics have transformative potential across various sectors. In healthcare, AI-driven diagnostic tools can significantly enhance precision, enabling earlier and more accurate disease detection (Topol, 2019). Robotic surgeries, guided by AI algorithms, are increasingly reducing surgical errors and improving patient outcomes. Similarly, in education, AI-powered platforms can provide personalized learning experiences, tailoring content to individual student needs and facilitating access to quality education globally (Holmes et al., 2019). In agriculture, robotics and AI assist in precision farming, optimizing water usage, and maximizing crop yields while minimizing environmental impacts (Wolfert et al., 2017). From a governance perspective, AI can improve decision-making by analyzing vast datasets to identify trends and predict future challenges (Müller and Bostrom, 2016). Law enforcement agencies use AI to detect and prevent cybercrimes, while robotics play a critical role in disaster management by assisting in search and rescue operations. These applications showcase AI's ability to enhance human welfare and address global challenges efficiently, emphasizing its transformative impact on society.

However, alongside these benefits, the potential misuse of AI and robotics poses existential threats. AI applications are vulnerable to abuse, ranging from the dissemination of misinformation to the development of autonomous weapons systems (Brundage et al., 2018). Such threats are exacerbated by the lack of universal standards and regulatory frameworks. For instance, malevolent actors may exploit AI to manipulate elections, spread propaganda, or undermine societal trust (Nemitz, 2018). Additionally, the integration of AI into surveillance technologies raises concerns about privacy violations and authoritarian control (Zuboff, 2023). The misuse of AI and robotics represents a profound societal challenge. The potential for these technologies to be employed for harmful purposes, including the propagation of disinformation, cyberattacks, and violations of human rights, underscores the urgency of robust governance. From an Islamic perspective, the malicious use of AI contravenes principles of justice, social welfare, and harm prevention. For example, exploiting AI for unethical surveillance or misinformation directly violates Islamic injunctions against harming others. Moreover, the unregulated development of autonomous systems risks exacerbating inequalities and enabling harmful applications, challenging both secular and religious standards (Floridi et al., 2018).

This paper focuses on the potential applications of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and robotics, particularly from the perspective of Islamic jurisprudence. Existing research has largely emphasized Western viewpoints on the misuse and abuse of AI (Puzio, 2023; Lin et al., 2014; Robertson, 2014), often overlooking perspectives from other cultural and religious frameworks, including Islamic jurisprudence. The importance of examining AI applications through an Islamic lens stems from the growing integration of AI into numerous facets of society. As AI technologies evolve and play increasingly significant roles, it becomes essential to understand how diverse cultural and religious values shape the guidelines that govern their use (Elmahjub, 2023). Incorporating Islamic jurisprudence into discussions on AI allows for a more holistic and inclusive exploration of the challenges posed by these technologies, contributing to the development of globally relevant standards. Additionally, this inclusion can stimulate further research into underrepresented areas, enriching the dialogue between different traditions (Shinkafi et al., 2020). Such efforts help bridge existing gaps and foster a broader, more inclusive conversation in the field of AI ethics. Hence the objective of this paper is to propose an integrative framework that addresses the classification of AI

within the context of Islamic jurisprudence, examines the dimensions of AI-human interactions, and explores mechanisms for preventing AI misuse through the principles of Islamic technoethics. The subsequent sections delve into this framework, combining principles from Islamic jurisprudence with AI governance and classification, thus offering a meaningful contribution to the fields of Islamic ethics and technoethics.

Artificial intelligence application and associated legal dimensions from Islamic jurisprudence perspective

Conventionally speaking, the nature and form of the entity for which rights are being determined are taken into consideration while determining and assigning legal privileges and obligations. As stated by Bennett and Daly (2020), there are three primary categories of privileges: those that belong to a person, those that belong to animals, and those that belong to things. A preliminary examination of the extant literature in Islam suggests that artificial intelligence and robotic applications should be regarded as things, assets, or property according to Islamic law. According to the standard definition of capital in economics, capital is a man-made method that facilitates the creation of a good or the provision of a service to the owner of the capital it possesses. Therefore, at its most fundamental level, an artificial intelligence (AI) is an automated and mechanized device that helps its owner achieve their goals. Taking this into consideration, the initial point of departure for analyzing the applications of artificial intelligence from the perspective of Islamic jurisprudence ought to be from the standpoint of property ownership, as well as its utilization and restrictions in Islam.

In Islam, the development of computers that can imitate human behavior and personality is not a groundbreaking or contemporary occurrence. On the contrary, there are documented instances of Muslims participating in the design of robots even in the past (Hill, 1991). It is generally agreed that Ismail al-Jazari was the first person to create a machine specifically for the purpose of service in the home. His book, which was composed in 1206, was titled ‘The Book of Knowledge of Ingenious Mechanical Devices’ (Kitab fi ma'rifat al-hiyal al-handasiya). It detailed fifty different mechanical devices and included directions on how to build them. According to Pacey (1993), al-Jazari is credited with the invention of the elephant clock. He has also been hailed as the "father of robotics" and modern-day engineering. When he was doing ablution, one of the monarchs of his time asked him to develop a machine that would take the place of all the attendants that he required to attend to him. According to a researcher, this was a machine that performed the duties of at least two slaves simultaneously. It was responsible for providing him with towels, pouring water for his ablution, and alerting him to the moment when it was time for prayer.

In recent times, Dr. Magdi Ashour, the academic advisor to the Grand Mufti of the Republic of Egypt (a highly qualified Islamic jurist), has highlighted that robots have the potential to take the form and appearance of human beings (Ashrafian, 2015). This is in reference to the robot Sophia. To put it another way, similar to the work that al-Jazari has done in the past, artificial intelligence applications and robotics might be modeled after the general form of a human being, and they could even be given a personality. This is granted that the AI serves a purpose that is clearly stated, and that a particular aim of benefit is reached. The applications of artificial intelligence cannot be elevated to the status of Allah or sanctified in any way. In accordance with the broad ethics that were discussed before, it is also forbidden to employ applications of artificial intelligence for activities that encourage unethical behavior and cause harm.

As a result, Shari'ah allows for the development of artificial intelligence (AI) or robotic applications that mimic human behavior and appearance if the parameters that have been outlined above are satisfied. Within the context of creating applications for artificial intelligence as people, a significant clarification is required. Even while the human body and personality can be used to construct an artificial intelligence, the AI should not be a clone of a real person who is currently alive or who has ever lived. According to previous studies, this is the same as seeking to imitate Allah, the Creator, which is considered to be an unacceptable form of behavior. Therefore, it is acceptable for an artificial intelligence to be able to perform the tasks and possess the capabilities of a particular individual; however, if the AI was intended to become that individual in such a way that it is capable of replacing that individual in every way, then this is where Islam draws the line.

The perception of AI and robotics applications ownership

Bennett and Daly (2020) illustrate the difficulties that are connected with giving ownership privileges over something that is complicated and is generated by several parties. The contentious nature of who should have legal power over artificial intelligence highlights the issues that are associated with this paper. On the other hand, as was mentioned previously, artificial intelligence and robots are only regarded as things or items that have liability issues that may essentially be controlled within the frameworks of existing contractual and tort liability (Bertolini, 2013).

In Islam, the majority of the discussion on property privileges can be applicable to the treatment of applications of artificial intelligence. According to Zuhayli et al. (2003), in order to properly use one's privileges, one must do so in accordance with the teachings and guidance provided by the fundamental sources associated with Islam. When exercising a right, one should never do so in a way that could potentially cause injury to other people, regardless of whether or not the harm was intended. When seen from the Islamic point of view, ownership of any assets is not taken very seriously. Allah is the source of the limited resources that are used in the production of commodities and services, including uses of artificial intelligence and robots. The possession of intelligence and abilities is also regarded as a favor from Allah. The ultimate owner of the item is therefore Allah, but the legal owner is responsible for managing the asset in a manner that is helpful or else they risk having it forfeited. The owner of any property or application that is geared toward artificial intelligence does not have the right to abuse it, nor does he or she have the right to misuse any other assets that are possessed. The term ta'assuf refers to the misuse of a person's privileges in any way that causes harm to either the individual or to other people. According to Zuhayli et al. (2003), when a person acts in a manner that goes beyond the scope of his privileges, it is not deemed to be arbitrary but rather a violation of the privileges of other people.

In addition, Zuhayli et al. (2003) contends that there are two reasons why it is necessary to impose restrictions on the misuse of privileges (ta'ssuf). The first thing to note is that the person who holds privileges does not have complete freedom to exercise them. This is because the legal texts of Shari'ah prohibit monopoly and the forcible sale of the money of the monopolist when it is necessary. Additionally, these texts prevent aggression against blood, money, and honor, regardless of whether the harm is caused by the use of a legitimate right or not. Second, according to Islam, the interest that is derived from the financial private right is not restricted to the owner alone; rather, it is

also accrued to the society as a whole. This is because of the trend of collective privileges. The wealth of an individual is a component of the wealth of a nation, which must continue to be robust in order to respond appropriately to unexpected events. According to Ikram and Kepli (2018), when society has a right to the money of individuals, then individuals are not allowed to dispose of or abuse their property in a detrimental manner. This is because doing so constitutes an attack on the right of society as well as an attack on the individual themselves.

In the same vein, applications of artificial intelligence (AI) and robots are categorically positioned within this paradigm as objects or property that must be controlled by human agents or existing non-human legal organizations such as companies for the purpose of serving the interests of society. Within the framework of autonomous vehicles, a number of these liability-related concerns are already being contemplated. The introduction of autonomous vehicles onto public roads would necessitate the establishment of clear guidelines on accountability and insurance. Concerns regarding artificial intelligence and robotics will also develop, and the manner in which these issues are addressed may be contingent on the degree to which the AIs are capable of operating independently (Richardson, 2016).

AI abuse and preventions from Fiqh perspective

Applications of artificial intelligence (AI) and robotics are advancing rapidly, impacting nearly every aspect of society. However, the incorporation of AI into illegal and dangerous activities has grown, increasing risks and exposing new vulnerabilities. Interactions between humans and AI can at times be harsh or problematic (Bartneck and Keijsers, 2020). Identifying the weaknesses in AI models and understanding how malicious actors might exploit them is essential to mitigating these risks. Blauth et al. (2022) provided examples of malevolent uses of AI, including social engineering, hacking, autonomous weapon systems, and the spread of misinformation or fake news. Addressing these threats requires a proactive approach to prevent the misuse of AI technologies. In Islamic jurisprudence, principles related to property rights are often discussed to prevent the abuse of privileges. Zuhayli et al. (2003) outlined five foundational principles that can serve as valuable guidelines for developing strategies to address the misuse of AI and robotics. These principles offer a framework for fostering preparedness and resilience against the harmful and unethical application of these technologies. The following diagrams illustrate these indicators, demonstrating their relevance as tools for guiding moral AI practices and safeguarding against exploitation.

Intent to harm

In Islam, individual rights are granted based on the personal and social benefits they provide. However, if an individual exercises their rights with the intent to cause harm, such use is prohibited due to its arbitrary nature and must be prevented. Examples include filing a lawsuit against an innocent person to tarnish his reputation or a terminally ill individual divorcing their spouse to deprive them of inheritance. Such actions are considered unlawful as they exploit legitimate rights for selfish gain at the expense of others. The prohibition stems from the principle that rights must not be used to inflict harm or injustice. Similarly, in the realm of technology and artificial intelligence (AI), the responsibility for preventing harm lies with those who own and control these tools. This includes refraining from actions like creating and spreading

false information or hacking into individuals' personal data. The terms ‘harmful AI’ and ‘malevolent AI’ have been introduced by scholars to describe situations where AI systems or applications directly cause harm to individuals (Hibbard, 2014). Furthermore, the intentional misuse of AI by individuals or organizations to harm others also falls under this category. This includes both the deliberate intentions of the actors and the unintended consequences of their actions, whether direct or indirect (Chaudhary, 2020; Blauth et al., 2012; Masum et al., 2012). Such scenarios underscore the moral obligation to use technology responsibly and ensure that its applications align with principles of fairness and harm prevention (*Table 1*).

***Table 1**. Indicators of abuses.*

Category			Description
Indicator of Abuses (i)	Intent to harm	Abuse of Property	inflicting harm to others in contrast to the advantage that is expected from the property
		Abuse of Artificial Intelligence	the production and dissemination of misleading information, as well as the violation of the personal information of individuals
Indicator of Abuses (ii)	Intention for an unlawful purpose	Abuse of Property	achieving an aim that is not in accordance with the intended interest of the property and is therefore illegal
		Abuse of Artificial Intelligence	the models that are used to teach artificial intelligence programs to produce results that are different from what the creator had intended.
Indicator of Abuses (iii)	Greater harm than good	Abuse of Property	that causes harm to other people that is more than or equivalent to the benefit that was meant to be gained from the property
		Abuse of Artificial Intelligence	as a result of algorithmic trading, which makes decisions that are difficult for humans to comprehend, the amount of volatility in the market has increased, which has led to the development of the risk of high-speed crashes.
Indicator of Abuses (iv)	Unethical use and damage to others	Abuse of Property	making use of the property in a manner that is not common knowledge among the people, and subsequently causing injury to other individuals.
		Abuse of Artificial Intelligence	AI-powered social robots are the target of verbal and physical abuse since they are in a position of clear inferiority, they are not expected to reply in kind, and they are unable to feel pain.
Indicator of Abuses (v)	Using the right with negligence or error	Abuse of Property	injuring other people while using his property in a manner that is not precautionary, prudent, or proven, and causing harm to other people
		Abuse of Artificial Intelligence	the risks and hazards that are associated with artificial intelligence applications and robots in the event that they are operated with carelessness and error.

Source: Scopino (2020); Carlini et al. (2019); Brščić et al. (2015); Hibbard (2014); Zuhayli et al. (2003).

Intention for an unlawful purpose

When an individual uses their rights to achieve an unlawful purpose, exploiting the guise of legitimacy to conceal their true intent, they are guilty of an impermissible act. Examples include entering into a marriage contract solely to facilitate a divorce so the woman can remarry her first husband, using a sales contract to disguise usurious practices, converting a non-Muslim spouse with the intention of inheriting their wealth, or gifting money to a relative within a year to avoid paying the obligatory zakat. In such cases, the person’s intent deviates from the legitimate purposes of the right, rendering their actions unlawful. This principle relies on evidence and presumptions to establish intent, with the foundation of this rule being the deliberate aim to cause harm, which aligns with the broader moral principle prohibiting intentional misuse. Similarly, unintended consequences can arise in artificial intelligence (AI) systems, particularly when their models produce results beyond the inventor's expectations. Neural network-based models, for example, may unintentionally memorize and release sensitive or

confidential data used during training. As Carlini et al. (2019) point out; this poses significant risks, especially when the information in question involves private or proprietary details. During the learning process, AI systems might retain data unrelated to their primary function, which could lead to unintended disclosures. To mitigate these risks, Taddeo and Floridi (2018) as well as Moosa (2016) emphasize the critical importance of implementing robust measures to safeguard data confidentiality. Ensuring that algorithms do not inadvertently memorize or disclose sensitive information is essential to prevent adverse outcomes and uphold standards in AI development and deployment. This highlights the need for careful oversight and the incorporation of moral practices into the design and training of AI systems to align their outputs with intended purposes and avoid harmful misuse (*Table 1*).

Greater harm than good

When harm, whether widespread or directed at specific individuals, results from someone exercising their privileges with the intention of achieving a legitimate benefit, but the harm caused outweighs or equals the intended benefit, the individual should be restrained from further use of those privileges. This principle aligns with the legal maxim rooted in the Prophetic tradition: 'Do not inflict injury nor repay one injury with another.' This maxim serves as the foundation for the prohibition against actions that lead to harm disproportionate to their benefits. The exercise of a right is deemed arbitrary if it results in greater general harm compared to the specific harm or benefit it intends to address. Examples include monopolistic practices, where essential goods are purchased and withheld until prices rise, exploiting people's needs. Similarly, the practice of talaqqi involves merchants intercepting farmers bringing crops to the city, purchasing them at below-market prices, and reselling them to urban dwellers at inflated rates. Both cases represent arbitrary and exploitative behavior, as outlined by Alserhan (2017) as well as Hassan and Lewis (2007), because the damage caused outweighs any legitimate benefit to the right-holder. Comparable issues arise in the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in financial markets, particularly in high-speed algorithmic trading. While these systems accelerate trading, they also introduce significant risks, such as high-speed market crashes. The 2010 flash crash, which wiped out nearly one trillion dollars in value, highlighted the dangers of automated decision-making in volatile markets (Scopino, 2020). For instance, high-frequency trader Navinder Singh Sarao was accused of using automated software to create large sell orders, artificially depressing market prices. Afterward, he canceled his orders and capitalized on the lower prices as the market recovered (Martin, 2020). This manipulation exemplifies how algorithmic systems, if unchecked, can disrupt market stability and harm participants. The aftermath of the 2010 market collapse served as a wake-up call for regulators and market participants, shedding light on the complexities and risks of high-frequency algorithmic trading. To mitigate such risks, regulators have prohibited manipulation tactics like spoofing and layering, which exploit high-speed trading to deceive other market participants (Wibowo and Mansah, 2020; Salah et al., 2018). These measures underscore the necessity of moal and regulatory safeguards to prevent the abuse of technological advancements in financial markets and other sectors (*Table 1*).

Unethical use and damage to others

When an individual uses their privileges in a manner that deviates from customary norms and causes harm to others, this behavior is deemed arbitrary. Examples include damaging gadgets or personal belongings, disturbing neighbors and causing them harm, overloading a rented vehicle, or mistreating animals, such as excessively beating livestock or overburdening them. Such actions are considered arbitrary because they go against established norms of behavior. In such cases, the individual responsible is restrained from further abuse of privileges, and compensation is provided to those who have suffered harm. The standard for determining whether the conduct is habitual or exceptional is based on customary practices. Carlson et al. (2019) as well as Lin et al. (2014) emphasize that the unusual or unorthodox use of property forms the basis of this principle. Similarly, studies have revealed that artificial intelligence (AI)-powered social robots have frequently been subjected to verbal and physical abuse in the past (Brščić et al., 2015). AI and robots are often perceived as "ideal" victims of abuse due to their apparent inferiority, inability to retaliate, and lack of sentience or capacity to feel pain, which absolves abusers of moral guilt. However, this does not imply that abuse of AI and robots should be condoned. Practically speaking, mistreatment of AI and robots can result in significant damage to these systems, create hazardous situations for users and abusers, and disrupt their intended functionality. The belief that any behavior is permissible as long as no one is physically harmed is not widely accepted, even in most libertarian societies (Danaher, 2020; Richardson, 2016). This notion often underpins unethical conduct toward AI-powered social robots. What is even more concerning is the persistence of abusive behavior toward robots, as research indicates that finding effective robot responses to deter such actions has proven challenging. From an ethical perspective, certain actions may still be considered immoral even when performed on objects incapable of experiencing pain, such as AI and robots (Sparrow, 2017). Because humans tend to perceive AI-driven robots as social agents, the abuse of such systems could have broader societal consequences. Malle (2016) and Whitby (2008) caution that normalizing abusive behavior toward AI and robots might eventually influence how people treat one another, potentially eroding social norms of respect and moral behavior. Consequently, addressing the misuse and abuse of AI systems is critical, not only to protect the integrity of these technologies but also to safeguard societal values and human relationships (*Table 1*).

Using the right with negligence or error

An individual is considered abusive or negligent when they misuse their privileges in a manner that lacks precaution, care, or responsibility, causing harm to others. This negligence, commonly referred to as a mistake, can arise from errors in actions. For instance, a hunter might mistakenly aim at prey but hit a human being instead, or in cases where a mistake during pursuit leads to unintended harm or death. Similarly, road accidents, whether resulting in fatalities or damage to property, or instances of exceeding the boundaries of legal defense, reflect varying degrees of negligence. Examples also include mistakenly spending someone else's money under the belief it is one's own. Such actions highlight the need for intent and careful execution to avoid harm. If harm occurs, whether intentional or not, the individual is held accountable to ensure the preservation of others' lives and property. This principle of compensating for harm, as emphasized by Chaudhary (2020) as well as Masum et al. (2012), is rooted in the occurrence of damage, regardless of its severity. In a similar vein, the growing integration of artificial intelligence (AI) and robotics in various sectors, particularly

businesses, raises comparable moral concerns. While these technologies have undoubtedly enhanced health, safety, and efficiency, their misuse or errors can significantly disrupt workplace environments. Negligence or ignorance in operating AI systems can lead to substantial risks. As AI-driven robots and algorithms increasingly handle routine tasks, there is a pressing need for legal professionals, legislators, and developers to address the legal implications of these advancements. A study highlights that AI and automation introduce new perspectives on human agency and responsibility, uncovering potential forms of negligence not previously encountered. For example, developers could face accountability if their technology causes harm, such as financial losses for a law firm. This scenario raises questions about whether legal professionals have adequately supervised AI systems and the extent of a programmer's responsibility for unforeseen outcomes in their code. Brownsword (2017) points out that the ethereal nature of software and code complicates accountability. However, workable legal frameworks must be developed to address situations where lawyers may be accused of professional negligence-whether by over-relying on machine learning or under-utilizing available AI technologies. As these issues remain unresolved, the intersection of AI, negligence, and legal responsibility calls for urgent attention from all stakeholders to ensure responsible use of emerging technologies (*Table 1*).

Conclusion

This study seeks to humbly initiate a thoughtful discourse on the ethical governance of AI and robotics, underscoring the critical importance of integrating Islamic jurisprudence into global conversations on AI ethics. By grounding the discussion in Islamic technoethics, the paper highlights how foundational principles such as justice, social welfare, and harm prevention can guide the development and use of AI technologies to ensure they align with ethical and lawful standards. The focus on the five indicators of AI abuses within Islamic jurisprudence-intent to harm, intention for an unlawful purpose, causing greater harm than good, unethical use resulting in damage to others, and negligence or error-further underscores the relevance of this perspective. Future research should build upon these initial efforts, expanding the exploration of Islamic ethical principles in AI governance through empirical studies that assess their practical applications in diverse contexts. Comparative analyses between Islamic technoethics and other ethical frameworks can foster richer, more inclusive global discussions, bridging cultural and philosophical divides. Additionally, interdisciplinary collaborations between theologians, technologists, policymakers, and ethicists are essential to tackle emerging challenges and craft frameworks that ensure the responsible and equitable advancement of AI and robotics applications. This paper aspires to be a starting point, encouraging more significant and impactful work that safeguards humanity while leveraging the transformative potential of these technologies responsibly.

Acknowledgement

This research is self-funded.

Conflict of interest

The authors confirm that there is no conflict of interest involve with any parties in this research study.

REFERENCES

[1] Akbar, M.A. (2022): Towards an Interpretation of Cryptocurrency as a Commodity from Maqasid al-Shari'ah Perspective. – International Journal of Islamic Economics and Finance Research 5(2): 99-112.
[2] Akbar, M.A., Ramlan, A.N.M., Pitchay, A.A., Annuar, H.A. (2025): Blockchain and Cryptocurrency Ecosystem: Balancing Innovation and Islamic Ethics for Sustainable Finance. – In Islamic Finance and Sustainability, Routledge 18p.
[3] Alserhan, B.A. (2017): The principles of Islamic marketing. – Routledge 258p.
[4] Arzroomchilar, E., Olamaiekopaie, M. (2022): Where technology meets Islam: towards an Islamic perspective on technology. – Journal of Islamic Thought and Civilization 12(2): 14-27.
[5] Ashrafian, H. (2015): Intelligent robots must uphold human rights. – Nature 519(7544): 391-391.
[6] Bartneck, C., Keijsers, M. (2020): The morality of abusing a robot. – Paladyn, Journal of Behavioral Robotics 11(1): 271-283.
[7] Bennett, B., Daly, A. (2020): Recognising rights for robots: Can we? Will we? Should we? – Law, Innovation and Technology 12(1): 60-80.
[8] Bertolini, A. (2013): Robots as products: the case for a realistic analysis of robotic applications and liability rules. – Law, Innovation and Technology 5(2): 214-247.
[9] Blauth, T.F., Gstrein, O.J., Zwitter, A. (2022): Artificial intelligence crime: An overview of malicious use and abuse of AI. – IEEE Access 10: 77110-77122.
[10] Brownsword, R. (2017): Law, liberty and technology, – The Oxford Handbook of Law, Regulation and Technology 17p.
[11] Brščić, D., Kidokoro, H., Suehiro, Y., Kanda, T. (2015): Escaping from children's abuse of social robots. – In Proceedings of the Tenth Annual ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction 8p.
[12] Brundage, M., Avin, S., Clark, J., Toner, H., Eckersley, P., Garfinkel, B., Dafoe, A., Scharre, P., Zeitzoff, T., Filar, B., Anderson, H. (2018): The malicious use of artificial intelligence: Forecasting, prevention, and mitigation. – ArXiv Preprint 101p.
[13] Carlini, N., Liu, C., Erlingsson, Ú., Kos, J., Song, D. (2019): The secret sharer: Evaluating and testing unintended memorization in neural networks. – In 28th USENIX security symposium (USENIX security 19) 17p.
[14] Carlson, Z., Lemmon, L., Higgins, M., Frank, D., Salek Shahrezaie, R., Feil-Seifer, D. (2019): Perceived mistreatment and emotional capability following aggressive treatment of robots and computers. – International Journal of Social Robotics 11: 727-739.
[15] Chaudhary, M.Y. (2020): Initial considerations for islamic digital ethics. – Philosophy & Technology 33(4): 639-657.
[16] Danaher, J. (2020): Welcoming robots into the moral circle: a defence of ethical behaviourism. – Science and Engineering Ethics 26(4): 2023-2049.
[17] Elmahjub, E. (2023): Artificial intelligence (AI) in Islamic ethics: Towards pluralist ethical benchmarking for AI. – Philosophy & Technology 36(4): 24p.
[18] Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., Luetge, C., Madelin, R., Pagallo, U., Rossi, F., Schafer, B. (2018): AI4People-an ethical framework for a good AI society: opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations. – Minds and Machines 28: 689-707.

[19] Hassan, M.K., Lewis, M.K. (Eds.) (2007): Islamic finance. – Cheltenham, Glos, UK: Edward Elgar 460p.
[20] Hibbard, B. (2014): Ethical artificial intelligence. – ArXiv Preprint 177p.
[21] Hill, D.R. (1991): Mechanical engineering in the medieval near east. – Scientific American 264(5): 100-105.
[22] Holmes, W., Bialik, M., Fadel, C. (2019): Artificial intelligence in education promises and implications for teaching and learning. – Center for Curriculum Redesign 242p.
[23] Ikram, N.A.H.B.S., Kepli, M.Y.B.Z. (2018): Establishing legal rights and liabilities for artificial intelligence. – IIUMLJ 26(1): 161-181.
[24] Lin, P., Abney, K., Bekey, G.A. (Eds.) (2014): Robot ethics: the ethical and social implications of robotics. – MIT Press 27p.
[25] Malle, B.F. (2016): Integrating robot ethics and machine morality: the study and design of moral competence in robots. – Ethics and Information Technology 18: 243-256.
[26] Martin, K. (2020): Flash crash-the trading savant who crashed the us stock market. – Financial Times 5p.
[27] Masum, A.K.M., Ullah, M.C., Azad, M.A.K. (2012): Information technology (IT) ethics in the light of Islam. – IIUC Studies 9: 243-260.
[28] Maududi, A. (1996): Ethical viewpoint of Islam. – Lahore: Islamic Publication 55p.
[29] Moosa, E. (2016): Technology in Muslim moral philosophy. – Journal of Religion and Health 55(2): 369-383.
[30] Müller, V.C., Bostrom, N. (2016): Future progress in artificial intelligence: A survey of expert opinion. – Fundamental Issues of Artificial Intelligence 17p.
[31] Nemitz, P. (2018): Constitutional democracy and technology in the age of artificial intelligence. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences 376(2133): 14p.
[32] Pacey, A. (1993): Technology in world civilization: a thousand-year history. – Philosophy East and West 43(1): 250p.
[33] Puzio, A. (2023): Robot, let us pray! Can and should robots have religious functions? An ethical exploration of religious robots. – AI & Society 17p.
[34] Qadir, J., Suleman, M. (2018): Teaching ethics, (Islamic) values and technology: musings on course design and experience. – In 2018 7th International Conference on Computer and Communication Engineering (ICCCE), IEEE 5p.
[35] Ramadan, T. (2018): Islamic ethics: Sources, methodology and application. – Islamic Bioethics: Current Issues & Challenges 21p.
[36] Richardson, K. (2016): The asymmetrical'relationship' parallels between prostitution and the development of sex robots. – Acm Sigcas Computers and Society 45(3): 290-293.
[37] Robertson, J. (2014): Human rights vs. robot rights: Forecasts from Japan. – Critical Asian Studies 46(4): 571-598.
[38] Salah, K., Rehman, M.H.U., Nizamuddin, N., Al-Fuqaha, A. (2018): Blockchain for AI: Review and open research challenges. – IEEE Access 4: 23p.
[39] Scopino, G. (2020): Algo bots and the law: technology, automation, and the regulation of futures and other derivatives. – Cambridge University Press 250p.
[40] Shinkafi, A.A., Yahaya, S., Sani, T.A. (2020): Realising financial inclusion in Islamic finance. – Journal of Islamic Marketing 11(1): 143-160.
[41] Sparrow, R. (2017): Robots, rape, and representation. – International Journal of Social Robotics 9(4): 465-477.
[42] Taddeo, M., Floridi, L. (2018): How AI can be a force for good. – Science 361(6404): 751-752.
[43] Topol, E. (2019): Deep medicine: how artificial intelligence can make healthcare human again. – Hachette UK 400p.
[44] Whitby, B. (2008): Sometimes it's hard to be a robot: A call for action on the ethics of abusing artificial agents. – Interacting with Computers 20(3): 326-333.

[45] Wibowo, A., Mansah, A. (2020): Analysis of SMEs in the ciputat traditional market in Islamic business ethics perspective. – In 6th Annual International Conference on Management Research (AICMaR 2019), Atlantis Press 5p.
[46] Wolfert, S., Ge, L., Verdouw, C., Bogaardt, M.J. (2017): Big data in smart farming-a review. – Agricultural Systems 153: 69-80.
[47] Zuboff, S. (2023): The age of surveillance capitalism. – In Social Theory Re-Wired, Routledge 10p.
[48] Zuhayli, W., Gamal, M.A., Eissa, M.S. (2003): Financial transactions in Islamic jurisprudence. – Dar al-Fikr 352p.