

THE ROLE OF INDONESIAN FATWA INSTITUTIONS IN RESPONDING TO ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TECHNOLOGY

Pratama Agus Widodo¹  

¹ Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Kalijaga Yogyakarta, Indonesia

 Corresponding Email: pratama@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Artificial intelligence (AI) technology is transforming social, economic, and legal interactions across contemporary societies, raising complex ethical and normative questions that require religious as well as legal responses. This study examines the role of Indonesian fatwa institutions in addressing the opportunities and challenges associated with artificial intelligence technology. Using a normative approach informed by Islamic legal modernism, the research analyzes the interpretive methods and institutional responses employed by fatwa bodies when evaluating emerging technological developments. The findings indicate that fatwa institutions play an important role in providing ethical guidance and normative frameworks for Muslim communities navigating technological change. Through principles such as *ijtihad*, *maṣlaḥah*, and *Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah*, Islamic scholars seek to evaluate AI-related issues including data privacy, algorithmic decision-making, automation, and ethical accountability. The study further reveals that contemporary technological developments challenge traditional legal categories and require interdisciplinary engagement between religious scholars, legal experts, and technology specialists. Fatwa institutions increasingly adopt adaptive interpretive approaches to ensure that Islamic legal guidance remains relevant in rapidly evolving technological contexts. The research argues that Islamic legal modernism provides a flexible framework for addressing novel issues while preserving the foundational objectives of Islamic law. The study concludes that the effective engagement of fatwa institutions with artificial intelligence can contribute to the development of ethical technology governance that balances innovation, social welfare, and religious values. These findings enrich scholarly discussions concerning Islamic jurisprudence, technological transformation, and legal adaptation in the digital era.

KEYWORDS *Artificial Intelligence, Fatwa Institutions, Islamic Jurisprudence, Ijtihad, Islamic Legal Modernism*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	76
II. INDONESIAN FATWA INSTITUTIONS AND THE LOGIC OF CONTEMPORARY IJTIHĀD	79
III. MAQĀSID AL-SHARĪ'AH AS A FRAMEWORK FOR EVALUATING ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE	80
IV. FROM AI-ASSISTED IJTIHĀD TO AI-GENERATED FATWA: WHERE SHOULD THE BOUNDARY BE?	82
V. FATWA INSTITUTIONS AND THE GOVERNANCE OF AI IN INDONESIA	83
VI. TOWARD AN INDONESIAN MODEL OF ISLAMIC AI GOVERNANCE	84
VII. CONCLUSION	85

I. INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence (AI) has rapidly developed from a specialized computational technology into a general-purpose infrastructure affecting education, healthcare, finance, communication, employment, government, law, and religious practice. Generative AI systems can now produce text, images, audio, video, and computer code, while algorithmic systems increasingly participate in decisions that affect individuals and communities. These developments have generated significant questions concerning privacy, misinformation, discrimination, intellectual property, accountability, human autonomy, employment, and the moral status of technologically mediated decisions (Russell 2019; Crawford 2021; Coeckelbergh 2020).

The emergence of AI presents a distinctive challenge to Islamic jurisprudence. Unlike conventional legal questions, AI-related problems are often technologically complex, rapidly changing, and distributed across multiple legal and ethical domains. A single AI application may simultaneously involve questions of *mu'āmalāt*, privacy, intellectual property, employment, medical ethics, information ethics, human dignity, and public welfare. Consequently, determining its Islamic legal status cannot always be accomplished through a simple analogy with a single classical legal category.

This problem becomes particularly important for institutions responsible for issuing Islamic legal guidance. In Indonesia, several institutions contribute to the production and dissemination of contemporary Islamic legal reasoning, including the Indonesian Ulema Council (*Majelis Ulama Indonesia*, MUI), the *Lajnah Bahtsul Masail* of Nahdlatul Ulama (NU), and the *Majelis Tarjih dan Tajdid* of Muhammadiyah. These institutions differ in institutional structure and methodological orientation, but they share a common function: responding to emerging social questions through Islamic normative reasoning.

The Indonesian context is particularly significant because Islamic legal authority operates within a plural legal and institutional environment. Fatwas do not generally possess the same coercive status as legislation, but they can have substantial normative and social influence. Their significance becomes particularly

visible when religious institutions address issues involving science and technology, financial innovation, public health, digital communication, and emerging forms of social interaction (Ansori, Labib, and Marwadi 2021; Wahyudi and Fajar 2018).

The methodological question is therefore not simply whether Islamic law permits or prohibits AI. A more important question is how Indonesian fatwa institutions can construct legitimate Islamic legal responses to technologies whose characteristics were not contemplated in classical jurisprudence.

The concept of *ijtihād* is central to this question. Islamic jurisprudence has historically developed mechanisms for addressing novel circumstances through *qiyās*, *istihsān*, *maṣlaḥah*, *sadd al-dharāʿiʿ*, custom (*ʿurf*), and other interpretive methods. Contemporary scholars have further emphasized *maqāṣid al-sharīʿah* as a methodology for evaluating new circumstances according to the higher objectives of Islamic law (Ibn Ashur 2006; Kamali 2008; Auda 2008).

AI demonstrates the continuing relevance of this methodological tradition. The legal status of AI should not be determined merely by its technological novelty. Instead, Islamic legal analysis must identify the purposes, uses, consequences, risks, and social contexts associated with particular AI applications.

For example, the use of AI to assist medical diagnosis may promote the preservation of life (*ḥifẓ al-nafs*) when appropriately supervised. AI-assisted educational technologies may promote the preservation and development of intellect (*ḥifẓ al-ʿaql*). AI applications that improve financial inclusion may promote economic welfare and the preservation of property (*ḥifẓ al-māl*). Conversely, AI systems used for mass surveillance, fraud, deepfakes, discriminatory profiling, or unauthorized exploitation of personal data may undermine these objectives.

Consequently, the Islamic legal status of AI cannot be reduced to a binary judgment concerning the technology itself. It must be determined according to purpose, use, consequence, proportionality, and harm.

Recent Islamic scholarship increasingly recognizes this complexity. Ahmed (2024), for example, argues that AI may improve the accessibility and efficiency of *fatwā* services but simultaneously raises concerns about contextual understanding, empathy, accountability, and the reliability of machine-generated answers. Similarly, recent research on Islamic ethics and AI has identified *maṣlaḥah*, *maqāṣid al-sharīʿah*, human dignity, privacy, and non-harm as important normative principles for evaluating AI.

The question becomes particularly concrete in Indonesia. In August 2025, MUI publicly addressed whether AI could serve as a source of religious legal answers. MUI's position was that AI cannot become a *mufti* or *mujtahid* because it lacks human consciousness and the contextual competence required for issuing a fatwa. At the same time, MUI recognized that AI can function as a research and analytical tool assisting scholars in legal inquiry. This position is important because it reveals an emerging distinction between AI as a legal instrument and AI as a legal authority. AI may assist human jurists in searching texts, comparing opinions, organizing evidence, translating materials, and identifying patterns. However, the final normative judgment remains a human institutional responsibility.

This article therefore argues that Indonesian fatwa institutions should approach AI not as an autonomous source of Islamic legal authority but as an object of contemporary *ijtihād* and, under appropriate safeguards, as an instrument that

can assist human *ijtihad*. This approach reflects Islamic legal modernism because it preserves the normative authority of Islamic jurisprudence while adapting its methodology to technological transformation.

Previous scholarship relevant to this research can be divided into four major strands. The first concerns the methodology of Indonesian fatwa institutions. Research by Wahyudi and Fajar (2018) demonstrates that MUI's Fatwa Commission employs *ijtihad* to respond to new social problems for which explicit textual rulings may not exist. Rahmat (2016) similarly identifies collective *ijtihad* as an important methodological feature of MUI's contemporary legal reasoning, incorporating *bayānī*, *ta'līlī*, and *istiṣlāḥī* approaches. More recent research comparing MUI, NU, and Muhammadiyah emphasizes that contemporary Indonesian fatwa institutions increasingly recognize the need for contextual and dynamic *istinbāt* methodologies.

The second strand concerns *maqāṣid al-sharī'ah* and legal modernization. Contemporary scholars such as Ibn Ashur (2006), Kamali (2008), and Auda (2008) have demonstrated that *maqāṣid* can provide a methodology for addressing circumstances that cannot be adequately resolved through literalist approaches. Indonesian research has similarly shown that MUI's fatwas frequently employ considerations of *maṣlaḥah* and harm prevention in contextualizing Islamic law (Hasanudin 2019).

The third strand concerns Islamic ethics and AI. Recent studies have examined AI through *maqāṣid*, Islamic ethical theory, legal maxims, human dignity, and public welfare. Al-Zuraib (2025) discusses responsibility, privacy, automation, and governance from an Islamic legal perspective. Habib (2025) similarly examines algorithmic bias, privacy, accountability, and social justice through *maqāṣid al-sharī'ah*. A particularly important contribution is the 2025 study of Islamic ethics and AI using the concept of trusteeship, which argues that *maqāṣid* can guide AI ethics while also recognizing limitations arising from the distinction between jurisprudence and broader Islamic ethics.

The fourth strand concerns AI and *fatwā* itself. Ahmed (2024) directly examines the implications of AI chatbots for the role of the *muftī*. His analysis recognizes the accessibility and efficiency benefits of AI while emphasizing the limitations of automated systems in understanding contextual and human dimensions of legal questions. More broadly, the 2025 systematic literature review by Sudirman, Sutiah, and Supriyono identifies AI-assisted *fatwa* issuance and *ijtihad* as an emerging area of research but also notes the absence of coherent policy frameworks in many Muslim jurisdictions.

Despite these contributions, an important research gap remains. Existing literature tends to focus either on AI ethics from an Islamic perspective or on the methodological operation of Indonesian fatwa institutions. Less attention has been given to the institutional question of how Indonesian fatwa bodies can respond to AI while preserving the authority of human *ijtihad*. This study addresses that gap by connecting Indonesian fatwa methodology with contemporary AI governance. This article addresses three questions:

1. How do Indonesian fatwa institutions conceptualize their authority when responding to emerging technologies such as AI?
2. What *ijtihad* and *maqāṣid*-based principles can be employed to evaluate AI-related problems?

3. What institutional model can enable Indonesian fatwa institutions to contribute to responsible AI governance without transforming AI into an autonomous source of religious authority?

This study employs a normative-doctrinal and conceptual methodology. The normative component examines Islamic legal principles, contemporary fatwa methodologies, institutional statements, and relevant Indonesian regulatory developments concerning AI. The conceptual component analyzes *ijtihad*, *maqāṣid al-sharī'ah*, *maṣlaḥah*, *ḍarar*, *sadd al-dharā'i'*, *'urf*, and human accountability as methodological tools for AI-related legal reasoning. The analysis focuses primarily on MUI, while also considering NU and Muhammadiyah as important components of Indonesia's plural Islamic legal landscape. Particular attention is given to MUI's 2025 position concerning AI and religious legal authority and Muhammadiyah's contemporary discussion of *fiqh teknologi informasi*. The study also examines AI governance developments in Indonesia. By 2025, the Indonesian government had been developing a national AI roadmap and ethical guidelines, building upon existing regulations including the Electronic Information and Transactions Law, Personal Data Protection Law, and Ministerial Circular No. 9 of 2023 on AI ethics.

This article makes three contributions. First, it conceptualizes AI as a new object of *ijtihad* rather than merely a technological phenomenon. Second, it distinguishes AI-assisted *ijtihad* from AI-generated *fatwā*, arguing that the former may be methodologically useful while the latter cannot replace qualified human *muftīs*. Third, it proposes a model of institutionalized human-AI collaboration in Islamic legal research that connects fatwa institutions with technology experts, legal scholars, and AI governance institutions.

II. INDONESIAN FATWA INSTITUTIONS AND THE LOGIC OF CONTEMPORARY *IJTIHĀD*

Fatwa institutions occupy an important position within Indonesia's Islamic legal ecosystem. Their authority does not derive from the coercive power of the state in the same manner as legislation. Rather, their authority derives from religious scholarship, institutional legitimacy, collective reasoning, and the recognition of Muslim communities. This distinction is essential when discussing AI. A fatwa is fundamentally a normative response to a question posed within a particular context. The *muftī* is therefore not simply a database of legal rules. The *muftī* must understand the question, identify relevant facts, evaluate applicable evidence, understand consequences, and determine the most appropriate ruling. The Indonesian tradition of collective *ijtihad* is particularly relevant. MUI's methodology recognizes the need to address issues that do not have straightforward precedents in classical jurisprudence. Research on MUI's Fatwa Commission demonstrates that its methodology involves textual analysis as well as analogy, legal reasoning, and consideration of public interest (Rahmat 2016; Wahyudi and Fajar 2018).

The same tendency can be observed in comparative research on Indonesian fatwa institutions. MUI, NU, and Muhammadiyah have developed different methodological traditions, but each has mechanisms for dealing with contemporary issues that require contextualization beyond simple reproduction of classical legal texts. This methodological flexibility is important because AI is not a single legal

object. “AI” encompasses machine-learning systems, recommender systems, generative AI, facial recognition, autonomous systems, medical AI, financial algorithms, large language models, and many other technologies. Their legal implications differ substantially.

Therefore, the question “What is the Islamic ruling on AI?” is methodologically inadequate. A more appropriate set of questions would be:

1. What purpose does the AI system serve?
2. What data does it use?
3. Who owns or controls the data?
4. What decisions does it make?
5. Who is affected?
6. What harms can result?
7. How reversible are those harms?
8. Who remains accountable?
9. Does the system enhance or undermine human dignity?
10. Does its use promote or undermine *maṣlaḥah*?

This represents a shift from technology-centered jurisprudence toward use-and-consequence-centered jurisprudence. The legal maxim concerning the permissibility of things in principle can provide an initial presumption of permissibility, but that presumption is not absolute. If an AI application produces significant harm, facilitates fraud, violates privacy, or causes unjust discrimination, its particular use may become prohibited even if the underlying technology is neutral. This is consistent with the distinction between technology as a *wasīlah* (means) and its purpose (*maqṣad*). A technologically sophisticated tool is not inherently good or bad. Its legal status may change according to its function and consequences.

The contemporary *ijtihād* required by AI therefore resembles what has historically occurred whenever Islamic law encounters new technologies. The jurisprudential task is to identify the relevant legal cause (*‘illah*), evaluate the consequences, and determine whether the technology advances or undermines recognized objectives.

The role of fatwa institutions is consequently not to compete with technological expertise but to provide normative interpretation based on Islamic legal principles. This requires interdisciplinary engagement. AI experts can explain how algorithms work. Data scientists can identify technical risks. Lawyers can interpret statutory obligations. Sociologists can examine social consequences. Islamic jurists can evaluate normative implications within Islamic law. Collective *ijtihād* can therefore become genuinely interdisciplinary.

III. *MAQĀṢID AL-SHARĪ’AH* AS A FRAMEWORK FOR EVALUATING ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Maqāṣid al-sharī’ah provides a particularly useful framework because AI affects virtually every major dimension of human welfare. The five classical necessities—religion, life, intellect, lineage, and property—can each be affected by AI.

1. *Ḥifẓ al-Dīn*: Protection of Religious Integrity
AI can provide significant benefits for religious education. It can facilitate translation, access to classical texts, educational content, and personalized

learning. It may help Muslims access religious materials in languages previously underserved. However, AI-generated religious information creates a new problem: epistemic authority. An AI model can produce an apparently authoritative religious answer without possessing the qualifications of a *muftī*. It may generate fabricated references, confuse different schools of law, or present minority opinions without adequate contextualization. This explains the importance of MUI's 2025 position. MUI explicitly stated that AI cannot become a *mufti* or *mujtahid*, although it can assist researchers and scholars in analyzing jurisprudential questions. The position reflects an important principle: religious knowledge is not merely information retrieval. A *fatwā* requires understanding the questioner's circumstances and determining how general legal principles apply to particular realities. AI may assist with the first stages of information processing but cannot simply assume the normative authority of a qualified human scholar.

2. **Ḥifẓ al-Nafs: Protection of Life**
AI has significant potential in medicine, disaster prediction, medical diagnosis, and public health. These applications can contribute to the protection of life. However, high-risk AI applications also create serious ethical problems. Errors in medical algorithms can result in misdiagnosis. Autonomous systems can make decisions with consequences for physical safety. Algorithmic systems may also reproduce biases contained in training data. The *maqāṣid* approach therefore requires balancing benefit and harm. An AI system should not be accepted merely because it is technologically sophisticated. Its reliability, accuracy, transparency, human oversight, and consequences must be considered. This is consistent with Islamic legal reasoning based on *maṣlaḥah* and *ḍarar*.
3. **Ḥifẓ al-ʿAql: Protection of Intellect**
AI creates both opportunities and threats to human intellectual development. It can increase access to education, accelerate research, and assist students and researchers. Yet generative AI can also encourage intellectual dependency, academic dishonesty, misinformation, and the erosion of independent reasoning. A *maqāṣid*-based approach therefore does not simply ask whether AI increases efficiency. It asks whether AI contributes to meaningful human intellectual development. This is particularly important for educational institutions. If students use AI to replace rather than support intellectual effort, the technology may undermine the very objective it appears to promote.
4. **Ḥifẓ al-Māl: Protection of Property**
AI affects property through automated financial systems, intellectual property, employment, e-commerce, and digital assets. AI-generated content creates difficult questions concerning copyright and ownership. Algorithmic trading can generate economic benefits but may also produce market manipulation. Automation can increase productivity while simultaneously displacing workers. Islamic legal reasoning must therefore consider not only individual ownership but also distributive consequences.
5. **Ḥifẓ al-Nasl and Human Dignity**
AI's implications for family and social relationships are increasingly important. Deepfakes, synthetic identities, sexualized AI-generated imagery,

and automated manipulation can threaten dignity, privacy, and family relationships. These problems demonstrate why contemporary *maqāṣid* analysis cannot remain confined to the traditional five objectives in a narrow sense. Human dignity (*karāmah*), justice, freedom, and social trust are increasingly important dimensions of contemporary Islamic legal reasoning (Auda 2008; Kamali 2008). Recent Islamic AI scholarship similarly emphasizes privacy, bias, dignity, and accountability as central issues. The *maqāṣid* framework therefore provides a multi-dimensional evaluation mechanism rather than a simple permissibility test.

IV. FROM AI-ASSISTED *IJTIHĀD* TO AI-GENERATED FATWA: WHERE SHOULD THE BOUNDARY BE?

The most distinctive issue facing Indonesian fatwa institutions is whether AI can eventually replace human *mufītīs*. The answer should currently be no. But this does not mean that AI has no legitimate role in Islamic legal reasoning. The distinction between AI-assisted *ijtihād* and AI-generated *fatwā* is therefore crucial. AI may assist scholars by:

1. searching large collections of classical texts;
2. comparing different juristic opinions;
3. identifying relevant Qur'anic and hadith references;
4. translating Arabic, Indonesian, English, and other languages;
5. organizing fatwa archives;
6. mapping previous legal opinions;
7. summarizing scientific literature;
8. identifying potentially relevant statutes;
9. analyzing large datasets; and
10. assisting preliminary comparative research.

Such functions can increase the efficiency of collective *ijtihād*.

AI-generated *fatwā*, by contrast, involves treating machine-generated output as an authoritative Islamic legal judgment. This creates several methodological problems. First, AI systems do not possess *taklīf* in the traditional sense. They are not human moral agents. Second, AI does not possess the contextual experience of a *mufītī*. A machine can process information but does not necessarily understand the lived circumstances underlying the question. Third, generative AI systems can produce fabricated citations or internally inconsistent reasoning. Fourth, responsibility becomes unclear. If an AI-generated *fatwā* causes harm, who bears responsibility? Fifth, AI systems can reflect biases contained in their training data.

Ahmed's analysis of AI and *fatwā* highlights precisely this tension. While AI offers accessibility, consistency, and scalability, its lack of empathy and contextual understanding raises serious questions concerning its ability to replace the human *mufītī*. MUI's 2025 position is therefore methodologically significant. It does not reject AI as such. Instead, it draws a distinction between using AI as a tool and recognizing AI as a religious authority.

This is an example of technological adaptation without institutional displacement. The principle can be expressed as follows: AI may expand the epistemic capacity of the *mufītī*, but it should not replace the normative responsibility of the *mufītī*. This distinction is consistent with Islamic legal

modernism. Modernism does not require rejecting technology; rather, it requires adapting legal institutions to new technologies while maintaining the foundational principles of Islamic jurisprudence.

A similar tendency is visible in Muhammadiyah's 2025 discussion of *fiqh teknologi informasi*. Muhammadiyah has emphasized that AI should be assessed through Islamic ethics, *maqāṣid al-sharī'ah*, and public welfare, while also invoking classical legal principles such as the presumption of permissibility and the prohibition of harm. This suggests that Indonesian Islamic institutions are beginning to develop a human-centered model of Islamic AI governance.

V. FATWA INSTITUTIONS AND THE GOVERNANCE OF AI IN INDONESIA

The final issue concerns the relationship between Islamic fatwa institutions and state AI governance. Indonesia entered the AI governance debate with a combination of existing legal instruments and emerging AI-specific policies. The government has recognized the relevance of the Electronic Information and Transactions Law, Personal Data Protection Law, and other regulations while developing dedicated AI ethical guidance. In August 2025, the Ministry of Communication and Digital Affairs announced public consultation concerning a national AI roadmap and a draft AI ethics guideline.

This creates an important opportunity for Indonesian fatwa institutions. Fatwa institutions should not attempt to replace the state regulator. Their comparative advantage lies elsewhere: ethical legitimacy, religious education, normative interpretation, and community mobilization. A cooperative governance model could therefore involve four actors, as shown on Table 1.

Table 1. AI Actor implementation

Institution	Principal contribution
Government	Regulation, enforcement, public policy
Technology experts	Technical standards, risk assessment, system evaluation
Legal scholars	Legal interpretation and regulatory harmonization
Fatwa institutions	Islamic ethical guidance, <i>maqāṣid</i> , public education, religious legitimacy

Source: Various sources, edited by the Author

Such cooperation would be consistent with the historical logic of collective *ijtihād*. The complexity of AI makes isolated jurisprudential reasoning increasingly inadequate. A contemporary *muftī* may understand *uṣūl al-fiqh* deeply but cannot reasonably be expected to possess expert knowledge concerning machine learning, neural networks, data governance, cybersecurity, and algorithmic auditing.

Therefore, the qualification of contemporary *ijtihād* should not be understood exclusively in individualistic terms. The future may require institutional collective expertise. A fatwa institution addressing AI should ideally establish a multidisciplinary committee involving:

1. *fuqahā'* and *uṣūl al-fiqh* scholars;

2. AI and computer-science experts;
3. legal scholars;
4. data-protection specialists;
5. ethicists;
6. representatives of affected communities.

This structure would allow the institution to identify both the technological *'illah* and the normative consequences. Such an approach is consistent with the evolution of Indonesian fatwa methodology. Contemporary studies show that MUI, NU, and Muhammadiyah increasingly recognize the need for contextual *istinbāt* when responding to technological and social change.

The institutional transformation can therefore be represented as: *Classical jurisprudence* → *collective ijtihād* → *interdisciplinary ijtihād* → *AI-assisted legal research* → *human-centered AI governance*. The ultimate objective is not to make Islamic law “automated.” It is to make Islamic legal reasoning more informed, responsive, accountable, and capable of addressing technological change without surrendering normative responsibility to machines.

VI. TOWARD AN INDONESIAN MODEL OF ISLAMIC AI GOVERNANCE

Based on the preceding analysis, Indonesian fatwa institutions should develop an institutional model consisting of five principles.

1. First, technological neutrality
AI should not automatically be categorized as *ḥalāl* or *ḥarām* as a technology. The ruling should depend on its purpose, design, implementation, and consequences.
2. Second, maqāṣid-based assessment
Every significant AI application should be evaluated according to its effects on life, intellect, property, dignity, family, religion, justice, and public welfare.
3. Third, harm prevention
The principles of *lā ḍarar wa lā ḍirār* and *sadd al-dharā'ī* should inform the assessment of foreseeable harms, including privacy violations, fraud, manipulation, discrimination, and reputational damage.
4. Fourth, human accountability
AI should remain a tool rather than an autonomous source of Islamic legal authority. The person or institution issuing the final fatwa must remain identifiable and accountable.
5. Fifth, interdisciplinary collective ijtihād
AI-related fatwas should increasingly be developed through cooperation between jurists, technology experts, lawyers, ethicists, and relevant stakeholders.

This framework is consistent with recent developments in Islamic AI scholarship. Research published in 2025 argues that *maqāṣid* can provide a comprehensive framework for evaluating AI across the five essential objectives of Islamic law, while other work emphasizes the importance of trusteeship, human dignity, public welfare, and responsible technological use.

At the same time, the framework avoids an important conceptual error: assuming that *maqāṣid* alone can resolve every ethical question posed by AI. Recent scholarship has correctly pointed out that *maqāṣid* originated primarily as a methodology for Islamic jurisprudence rather than as a complete theory of contemporary technology ethics. Therefore, *maqāṣid* should operate in dialogue with broader ethical concepts, empirical evidence, technological expertise, and public regulation.

This produces a more sophisticated model of Islamic legal modernism. Islamic legal modernism does not mean replacing Islamic law with secular technology ethics. Nor does it mean applying classical rules mechanically to modern technologies. Rather, it involves preserving the normative purposes of Islamic law while developing institutions and interpretive methodologies capable of understanding new realities. AI provides an especially powerful test of this approach. If Indonesian fatwa institutions succeed in developing such a methodology, they could contribute not only to Muslim religious guidance but also to the wider debate about ethical technology governance.

VII. CONCLUSION

Artificial intelligence presents Indonesian Islamic legal institutions with a fundamentally new form of jurisprudential challenge. The problem is not simply whether AI is permissible but how Islamic law should evaluate diverse technological applications whose consequences extend across privacy, human dignity, employment, education, healthcare, finance, religious authority, and public welfare. This study has demonstrated that *ijtihād* and *maqāṣid al-sharī'ah* provide an appropriate methodological foundation for responding to these challenges. Through principles of *maṣlahah*, harm prevention, human dignity, accountability, and contextual interpretation, Indonesian fatwa institutions can evaluate AI according to its purposes, uses, risks, and social consequences rather than treating AI as a monolithic legal object.

The analysis also demonstrates that the future role of Indonesian fatwa institutions should be understood as human-centered and institutionally collaborative. MUI's 2025 position that AI cannot replace the *muftī*, while remaining useful as a research tool, provides an important starting point for distinguishing AI-assisted *ijtihād* from AI-generated *fatwā*. Indonesian Islamic institutions should therefore develop interdisciplinary mechanisms involving jurists, technology experts, lawyers, ethicists, and affected communities. Such a model would allow Islamic legal reasoning to remain responsive to technological transformation without transferring normative responsibility to algorithms. In this sense, the most appropriate contribution of Islamic legal modernism to AI governance is not the automation of *fatwā*, but the development of adaptive, accountable, and *maqāṣid*-oriented human jurisprudence capable of governing technology in the service of social welfare and human dignity.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, Shoayb. 2024. "Fatwā and AI: A Literature-Based Assessment on How AI Impacts the Role of the Muftī." *Journal for Islamic Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.25159/2957-9163/14400>.
- Alamsyah, Mulki Firdaus, Yayuli, and Ahmad Remanda. 2025. "Ethics of the Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in the Paradigm of Islamic Law." *Solo International Collaboration and Publication of Social Sciences and Humanities* 4 (1). <https://doi.org/10.61455/sicopus.v4i01.393>. (
- Albashir Mohamed, Amna Ali. 2024. "The Islamic Foundations of Ethics in the Use of Artificial Intelligence within the Framework of the Objectives of Islamic Law." *Humanities and Educational Sciences Journal* 39: 509–530. <https://doi.org/10.55074/hesj.vi39.1069>.
- Al-Ghazali, Abu Hamid. 1997. *Al-Mustasfa min 'Ilm al-Usul*. Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah.
- Al-Haddad, Umar. 2016. "Ijtihad dan Beberapa Ide Pembaruan dalam Fikih Islam." *AHKAM: Jurnal Ilmu Syariah* 16 (1). <https://doi.org/10.15408/ajis.v16i1.2896>.
- Al-Shatibi, Abu Ishaq. 1997. *Al-Muwafaqat fi Usul al-Shari'ah*. Beirut: Dar Ibn Affan.
- Al-Zuraib, Mohammad Ali G. 2025. "Artificial Intelligence in Islamic Law: A Comparative Jurisprudential and Ethical Study." *International Journal of Environmental Sciences* 11 (2s): 133–135. <https://doi.org/10.64252/tpvscj37>.
- Ansori, Ansori, Mughni Labib, and Marwadi. 2021. "Reformulation of Islamic Law in Indonesia: Study on Indonesian Ulama Council's Fatwa." *Ulul Albab: Jurnal Studi dan Penelitian Hukum Islam* 4 (2).
- Auda, Jasser. 2008. *Maqasid Al-Shariah as Philosophy of Islamic Law: A Systems Approach*. London: International Institute of Islamic Thought.
- Bender, Emily M., Timnit Gebru, Angelina McMillan-Major, and Shmargaret Shmitchell. 2021. "On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots: Can Language Models Be Too Big?" In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 610–623. New York: ACM.
- Coeckelbergh, Mark. 2020. *AI Ethics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Crawford, Kate. 2021. *Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- European Union. 2024. *Regulation (EU) 2024/1689: Artificial Intelligence Act*. Brussels: European Union.
- Floridi, Luciano, and Massimo Chiriatti. 2020. "GPT-3: Its Nature, Scope, Limits, and Consequences." *Minds and Machines* 30: 681–694.
- Floridi, Luciano, Josh Cows, Monica Beltrametti, Raja Chatila, Patrice Chazerand, Virginia Dignum, Christoph Luetge, Robert Madelin, Ugo Pagallo, Francesca Rossi, Burkhard Schafer, Peggy Valcke, and Effy Vayena. 2018. "AI4People—An Ethical Framework for a Good AI Society." *Minds and Machines* 28: 689–707.
- Habib, Zainal. 2025. "Ethics of Artificial Intelligence in Maqāsid Al-Sharī'a's Perspective." *KARSA Journal of Social and Islamic Culture*.

- Hagendorff, Thilo. 2020. "The Ethics of AI Ethics: An Evaluation of Guidelines." *Minds and Machines* 30: 99–120.
- Hakim, Muhammad Kamal Ihkam Mukmin, and Mustafa Mat Jubri Shamsuddin. 2024. "Maqasid Al-Shariah in the Age of AI: A Critical Examination of ChatGPT Usage among International Islamic University Malaysia Students." *Online Journal of Research in Islamic Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.22452/ris.vol11no2.1>.
- Hallaq, Wael B. 2009. *An Introduction to Islamic Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hasanudin, Fuat. 2019. "Ijtihad Maqashidi: Metodologi dan Kontekstualisasi Hukum Islam di Indonesia (Studi Fatwa-fatwa Majelis Ulama Indonesia)." *Al-Mawarid: Jurnal Syariah dan Hukum*. <https://doi.org/10.20885/mawarid.vol1.iss2.art2>.
- Ibn Ashur, Muhammad al-Tahir. 2006. *Treatise on Maqasid al-Shari'ah*. Translated by Mohamed El-Tahir El-Mesawi. London: International Institute of Islamic Thought.
- Ikhana, Lisa, and Eka Imroatun Khasanah. 2020. "The Role of the Indonesian Ulama Council in Establishing Fatwas as a Method of Ijtihad in the Contemporary Era." *Jurnal Scientia Indonesia* 6 (2). <https://doi.org/10.15294/jsi.v6i2.36143>.
- Indonesia. 2022. *Undang-Undang Nomor 27 Tahun 2022 tentang Pelindungan Data Pribadi*. Jakarta: Government of Indonesia.
- Indonesia. 2023. *Surat Edaran Menteri Komunikasi dan Informatika Nomor 9 Tahun 2023 tentang Etika Kecerdasan Artifisial*. Jakarta: Ministry of Communication and Informatics.
- Indonesia. 2024. *Undang-Undang Nomor 1 Tahun 2024 tentang Perubahan Kedua atas Undang-Undang Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik*. Jakarta: Government of Indonesia.
- Jobin, Anna, Marcello Ienca, and Effy Vayena. 2019. "The Global Landscape of AI Ethics Guidelines." *Nature Machine Intelligence* 1: 389–399.
- Kamali, Mohammad Hashim. 2008. *Maqasid Al-Shariah Made Simple*. London: International Institute of Islamic Thought.
- Kamali, Mohammad Hashim. 2008. *Shari'ah Law: An Introduction*. Oxford: Oneworld.
- Kementerian Komunikasi dan Digital Republik Indonesia. 2025. "Atur Tata Kelola Pemanfaatan AI, Pemerintah Siapkan Perpres." July 17, 2025.
- Kementerian Komunikasi dan Digital Republik Indonesia. 2025. "Konsultasi Publik Buku Putih Peta Jalan Kecerdasan Artifisial Nasional dan Konsep Pedoman Etika Kecerdasan Artifisial." August 8, 2025.
- Majelis Ulama Indonesia. 2025. "Mengapa AI Tidak Bisa Dijadikan Rujukan dalam Persoalan Hukum Agama?" August 19, 2025.
- Masud, Muhammad Khalid. 1995. *Shatibi's Philosophy of Islamic Law*. Islamabad: Islamic Research Institute.
- Mathar, Ahmad Rifat. 2025. "Ijtihad Method in Determining of the Fatwa Dewan Syariah Nasional–Majelis Ulama Indonesia (DSN-MUI)." *Maaliyah: Journal of Islamic Economic Law and Islamic Finance* 1 (1). <https://doi.org/10.61159/maaliyah.v1i1.525>.

- Mittelstadt, Brent Daniel, Patrick Allo, Mariarosaria Taddeo, Sandra Wachter, and Luciano Floridi. 2016. "The Ethics of Algorithms: Mapping the Debate." *Big Data & Society* 3 (2).
- Muhamad Shadiq, Gusti, Jalaluddin, Fathurrahman Azhari, and Fahmi Hamdi. 2024. "Telaah Metodologi Istibath dan Corak Hukum Islam Lembaga-Lembaga Fatwa di Indonesia." *Indonesian Journal of Islamic Jurisprudence, Economic and Legal Theory* 2 (2): 684–699. <https://doi.org/10.62976/ijjel.v2i2.546>.
- Muhammadiyah. 2025. "AI Tidak Bisa Dihindari, Muhammadiyah Dorong Literasi dan Etika Digital." August 2025.
- Mustapha, Ramlan. 2025. "Maqasid al-Shariah in the AI Era: Balancing Innovation and Islamic Ethical Principles." *Zenodo*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15381828>.
- Nasrudin, Muhamad, Ali Sodiqin, Abdul Mujib, Budhi Santoso, and Muhammadun. 2025. "From Nonbinding to Binding: Legal Authority Transformation of DSN–MUI Fatwas within the National Legal System." *Jurnal Hukum Islam* 23 (2). <https://doi.org/10.28918/jhi.v23i2.03>.
- National Institute of Standards and Technology. 2023. *Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework (AI RMF 1.0)*. Gaithersburg, MD: U.S. Department of Commerce.
- OECD. 2019. *Recommendation of the Council on Artificial Intelligence*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- Rahman, Fazlur. 1982. *Islam and Modernity: Transformation of an Intellectual Tradition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rahmat, Rahmat. 2016. "Metode Ijtihad Komisi Fatwa Majelis Ulama Indonesia." *Nukhbatul 'Ulum* 2 (1): 159–166. <https://doi.org/10.36701/nukhbah.v2i1.11>.
- Russell, Stuart. 2019. *Human Compatible: Artificial Intelligence and the Problem of Control*. New York: Viking.
- Saeed, Abdullah. 2006. *Interpreting the Qur'an: Towards a Contemporary Approach*. London: Routledge.
- Selbst, Andrew D., Danah Boyd, Sorelle A. Friedler, Suresh Venkatasubramanian, and Janet Vertesi. 2019. "Fairness and Abstraction in Sociotechnical Systems." In *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 59–68. New York: ACM.
- Sudirman, Sutiah, and Supriyono. 2025. "Islamic Law in the Era of Artificial Intelligence: A Systematic Literature Review." *International Journal of Engineering, Science and Information Technology* 5 (4): 321–328.
- UNESCO. 2021. *Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Wahidah, Z. 2025. "Maqasid al-Syariah dalam Fikih Kontemporer di Era Kecerdasan Buatan: Menuju Etika Algoritmik Global." *Journal of Contemporary Fiqh* 1 (1). <https://doi.org/10.70742/jcf.v1i1.1027>.
- Wahyudi, Heri Fadli, and Fajar. 2018. "Metode Ijtihad Komisi Fatwa Majelis Ulama Indonesia dan Aplikasinya dalam Fatwa." *Cakrawala: Jurnal Studi Islam* 13 (2). <https://doi.org/10.31603/cakrawala.v13i2.2402>.
- Wahyunisa, Hasmia, and Aminullah. 2025. "Constructing an Artificial Intelligence Ethics Framework Based on Maqasid Shariah for Sustainable Digital

Transformation Governance.” *Khazanah: Journal of Islamic Education and Science* 1 (2). <https://doi.org/10.61815/khazanah.v1i2.875>.

Zakirman, Al Fakhri. 2018. “Metodologi Fatwa Majelis Ulama Indonesia.” *Jurnal Al-Hikmah: Jurnal Dakwah*.

Acknowledgment

None

Funding Information

None

Conflicting Interest Statement

The authors state that there is no conflict of interest in the publication of this article.

Publishing Ethical and Originality Statement

All authors declared that this work is original and has never been published in any form and in any media, nor is it under consideration for publication in any journal, and all sources cited in this work refer to the basic standards of scientific citation.

Generative AI Statement

The authors declare that generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools were used solely to assist in improving the clarity of language, grammar, and the organization of the manuscript during the writing process. The AI tools also supported preliminary drafting and language refinement under the direct supervision of the authors. All substantive intellectual contributions, including the conceptualization of the research, legal analysis, interpretation of data, critical evaluation of the literature, and formulation of arguments and conclusions, were undertaken exclusively by the authors. Every AI-assisted output was carefully reviewed, verified, and substantially revised to ensure its accuracy, originality, and compliance with academic and ethical standards. The authors accept full responsibility for the content of this manuscript, including the accuracy of all citations, interpretations, and conclusions presented.