The Jurisprudence of Balancing (Fiqh al-Muwāzanāt)

Principles and Applications

Dr. Suleiman Hani

Imam Suleiman Hani is the Dean of Academic Affairs at AlMaghrib Institute, a research fellow at Yaqeen Institute, a resident scholar in Michigan, and an international lecturer on Islam, philosophy, leadership, and human rights. Suleiman holds master's degrees from Harvard University and the University of Jordan's College of Shari'ah, and is currently pursuing a doctorate at NYU. His unique background includes traditional licensing (ijāzāt) in classical Islamic texts since a young age, alongside contemporary leadership theory and practice. Over the past decade, he has delivered lectures across more than fifty countries, consulted national and international organizations, and published numerous books and articles.

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract

This paper examines the Islamic jurisprudential framework of *fiqh al-muwāzanāt* (jurisprudence of balancing interests) and its applications in contemporary political engagement for Muslims in the United States. As Muslim communities navigate complex socio-political landscapes, the need for methodologically sound approaches to weighing competing interests, prioritizing objectives, and evaluating consequences becomes increasingly vital. Through analysis of classical texts, legal maxims (*qawāʿid fiqhiyyah*), and contemporary scholarly discourse, this research establishes the theological foundations and practical methodologies of interest-balancing (*muwāzanah*) within orthodox Sunni thought. The paper explores how these principles can guide American Muslims' political participation, coalition-building, and advocacy efforts while maintaining fidelity to Islamic values. Case studies of electoral engagement, legislative advocacy, and social justice activism demonstrate practical applications of fiqh al-muwāzanāt, revealing both its utility and limitations in contemporary contexts. This research contributes to the development of a sophisticated framework for ethical political decision-making that honors Islamic legal tradition while addressing the unique challenges of the American Muslim experience.

Introduction

Contemporary Muslim communities in the United States and other similar regions face unprecedented challenges in navigating political engagement while maintaining fidelity to Islamic principles. The complex realities of minority status, pluralistic governance systems, and competing interests necessitate sophisticated jurisprudential approaches that can guide ethical decision-making in contexts unfamiliar to classical Islamic scholarship. Among these approaches, *fiqh al-muwāzanāt (*jurisprudence of balancing interests) has emerged as a critical framework for weighing competing considerations, prioritizing objectives, and evaluating consequences of political actions and policies.

Fiqh al-muwāzanāt represents a methodological approach within Islamic jurisprudence concerned with the weighing of benefits (*maṣāliḥ*) against harms (*mafāsid*) when multiple considerations are at stake.[1] Fiqh al-muwāzanah has also been defined as "the comparison and preference among benefits, benefits (*maṣāliḥ*) among harms (*mafāsid*), and between conflicting benefits and harms, so as to advance or delay that which deserves advancement or delay."[2] It is closely connected to the broader Islamic legal objectives (maqāṣid al-sharīʿah) and provides principles for resolving tensions between competing interests, particularly in complex situations where simple solutions are unavailable.[3] As echoed by Ibn al-Qayyim, the foundation of the Sharīʿah is wisdom and the safeguarding of people's interests in this world and the next. It is justice, mercy, benefit, and wisdom in its entirety.[4]

For American Muslims engaged in political advocacy, civic participation, and social activism, questions frequently arise regarding appropriate forms of involvement, permissible alliances, and prioritization of issues. Orthodox Sunni scholarship offers rich resources for addressing these questions through systematic application of fiqh al-muwāzanāt principles.

---

[1] Yūsuf al-Qaraḍāwī, *Fī Fiqh al-Awlawiyyāt: Dirāsah Jadīdah fī Dawʾ al-Qurʾān wa al-Sunnah* [Jurisprudence of Priorities: A New Study in Light of the Quran and Sunnah] (Cairo: Maktabat Wahbah, 1996).

[2] ʿAbd Allāh Yaḥyā al-Kamālī, *Taʾṣīl fiqh al-muwāzanāt* [Establishing the Jurisprudence of Balancing] (Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 2000).

[3] Jasser Auda, *Maqasid al-Shariah as Philosophy of Islamic Law: A Systems Approach* (London: International Institute of Islamic Thought, 2008).

[4] Ibn al-Qayyim al-Jawziyyah, *Iʿlām al-Muwaqqiʿīn ʿan Rabb al-ʿĀlamīn* [Informing the Signatories about the Lord of the Worlds], ed. Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Salām Ibrāhīm, 4 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyyah, 1991).

However, this area remains underdeveloped in contemporary English-language scholarship, particularly regarding its practical applications in the American context.

This paper seeks to address this gap by examining the practical applications of fiqh al-muwāzanāt in contemporary political work.[5] It explores how classical principles of balancing interests can be applied to modern contexts while maintaining methodological consistency with orthodox Sunni scholarship. The research argues that a sophisticated understanding of fiqh al-muwāzanāt provides American Muslims with a theologically grounded, ethically coherent, and practically viable framework for navigating political engagement in pluralistic societies.

Related Terminology and Conceptual Framework

Understanding fiqh al-muwāzanāt requires precision regarding several interconnected jurisprudential concepts that form its methodological foundation. For instance, fiqh al-awlawiyyāt (the jurisprudence of priorities) represents a parallel discipline that deals with the ordering of benefits and harms in the absence of direct conflict. It constitutes the closest designation to fiqh al-muwāzanāt, as both disciplines concern themselves with the systematic evaluation and ranking of competing considerations according to Islamic legal principles. Per Dr. Yusuf al-Qaradawi, *fiqh al-muwāzanāt* itself may be seen as an entire subdiscipline and constituent principle of the fiqh of priorities.[6] Other related terminologies include fiqh al-wāqiʿ,[7] fiqh al-maṣāliḥ,[8] fiqh al-ḍarūriyyāt,[9] and fiqh al-maʾālāt.[10]

Typologies and Revelatory Foundations

The concept of *fiqh al-muwāzanāt* finds firm grounding in numerous Qurʾānic verses and Prophetic traditions that establish principles for prioritizing interests, averting harm, and evaluating consequences. These scriptural sources demonstrate the Lawgiver's consistent emphasis on preventing greater harm, even when such prevention requires tolerating lesser harm or forgoing certain benefits. *Fiqh al-muwāzanāt* is conventionally categorized into three distinct methodological types, explored in great detail later in this paper: 1) The balancing of benefits (muwāzanat al-maṣāliḥ), 2) The balancing of harms (muwāzanat al-mafāsid), and 3) The balancing between benefits and harms (muwāzanat al-maṣāliḥ wa al-mafāsid).

1. Contemporary Legal Scholarship and Methodological Development

---

[5] For a comprehensive treatment of the theoretical foundations, classical development, and institutional applications of *fiqh al-muwāzanāt*, see Suleiman Hani, *Fiqh al-Muwāzanāt: Principles and Applications* (forthcoming [2025]).

[6] Al-Qaraḍāwī, *Fī Fiqh al-Awlawiyyāt*, 45-123.

[7] Fiqh al-Wāqiʿ (the jurisprudence of contemporary realities) constitutes a related field of study that focuses on recognizing the influential descriptions and prevailing conditions that necessitate applying specific Sharʿī rulings. This discipline requires a profound understanding of the situation in which the ummah finds itself, considering present circumstances within one region and the broader international context. This is considered one of the conditions, and branches, of effective engagement with fiqh al-muwāzanāt.

[8] Fiqh al-Maṣāliḥ (the jurisprudence of benefits/interests) derives its name from the subject matter of this discipline, which encompasses both benefits (maṣāliḥ) and harms (mafāsid). The terminology emphasizes "benefits" following the principle of highlighting the predominant aspect, though the discipline necessarily addresses both positive and negative considerations.

[9] Fiqh al-Ḍarūriyyāt (the jurisprudence of fundamental necessities) emphasizes the highest level of interests considered in balancing factors, namely, the "essential necessities" (ḍarūriyyāt). While other interests remain significant, the essential necessities receive explicit priority due to their fundamental importance in Islamic legal reasoning.

[10] Fiqh al-Maʾālāt (the jurisprudence of consequences) requires consideration of the likely outcomes of actions rather than merely their immediate effects. Ibn al-Qayyim emphasized that "the muftī must not issue a fatwā unless he considers the consequences of his opinion."[10] This is considered one of the conditions, and branches, of effective engagement with fiqh al-muwāzanāt. See: Ibn al-Qayyim, *Iʿlām al-Muwaqqiʿīn ʿan Rabb al-ʿĀlamīn,* 4:157.

The systematic articulation of fiqh al-muwāzanāt as a distinct jurisprudential discipline represents the culmination of methodological developments spanning over a millennium of Islamic legal scholarship. While the principles of balancing interests (*muwāzanat al-maṣāliḥ wa al-mafāsid*) were operationalized throughout Islamic legal history, their explicit systematization reflects contemporary scholarly responses to unprecedented challenges facing Muslim communities in pluralistic societies.

Classical Foundations

Three classical scholars established the foundational architecture for contemporary muwāzanāt methodology. Al-ʿIzz ibn ʿAbd al-Salām (d. 660 AH/1262 CE) provided systematic criteria for distinguishing legitimate from illegitimate *maṣlaḥah* through his seminal work *Qawāʿid al-Aḥkām fī Maṣāliḥ al-Anām*.[11] His fundamental principle that "repelling harm takes precedence over securing benefits" (*darʾ al-mafāsid muqaddam ʿalā jalb al-maṣāliḥ*) established the hierarchical framework that prioritizes prevention of corruption over achievement of positive outcomes when both cannot be simultaneously accomplished.[12] His taxonomical contributions—categorizing benefits and harms according to scope, certainty, and temporal dimensions—provided analytical tools that contemporary scholars continue to refine and apply.

Abū Isḥāq al-Shāṭibī (d. 790 AH/1388 CE) revolutionized Islamic legal methodology through his systematic articulation of maqāṣid al-sharīʿah in *Al-Muwāfaqāt*.[13] His tripartite categorization of legal objectives into necessities (*darūriyyāt*), needs (*ḥājiyyāt*), and improvements (*taḥsīniyyāt*) provided unprecedented methodological precision for resolving conflicts between competing interests. Crucially, his recognition that the five essential necessities could themselves conflict and require systematic prioritization anticipated contemporary challenges addressed through fiqh al-muwāzanāt.[14]

Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728 AH/1328 CE) provided essential methodological tools through his sophisticated treatment of analogical reasoning and the verification of effective causes (*taḥqīq al-manāṭ*).[15] His tripartite framework, *tanqīḥ al-manāṭ, takhrīj al-manāṭ, and taḥqīq al-manāṭ*, enables contemporary scholars to determine when classical rulings apply to novel circumstances without inappropriate mechanical application. His assertion that the Sharīʿah came to achieve benefits and perfect them, to prevent harms and reduce them, provides theological foundation for systematic interest-balancing grounded in divine wisdom rather than mere utilitarian calculation.[16]

Contemporary Methodological Development

Dr. Yūsuf al-Qaraḍāwī (d. 2022) proved instrumental in developing fiqh al-muwāzanāt as a distinct contemporary approach through his comprehensive scholarly production spanning six decades.[17] His seminal work *Fī Fiqh al-Awlawiyyāt* provided the first systematic treatment of priority-determination in contemporary Islamic legal reasoning, while his articulation of the relationship between *fiqh al-awlawiyyā*t, *fiqh al-wāqiʿ*, and *fiqh al-*

---

[11] ʿIzz al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Salām, *Qawāʿid al-Aḥkām fī Maṣāliḥ al-Anām* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1999).

[12] This principle provided a methodological foundation for the complex calculations that characterize contemporary muwāzanāt applications.

[13] Al-Shāṭibī, *Al-Muwāfaqāt fī Uṣūl al-Sharīʿa*, ed. ʿAbd Allah Darrāz, 4 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 2003).

[14] His methodological emphasis on understanding the "wisdom" (ḥikmah) underlying specific legal rulings provided foundation for contemporary approaches that distinguish between unchanging principles and contextually variable applications.

[15] Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā* [Collected Fatwas], ed. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Qāsim, 37 vols. (al-Manṣūrah: Dār al-Wafāʾ, 2005).

[16] His sophisticated treatment of political questions in al-Siyāsah al-Sharʿiyyah demonstrates practical application to governance challenges paralleling contemporary Muslim political engagement.

[17] Al-Qaraḍāwī, *Fī Fiqh al-Awlawiyyāt*.

muwāzanāt created an integrated framework addressing complex modern interdependencies. His treatment of Muslim minority jurisprudence (*fiqh al-aqalliyyāt*) demonstrated practical application of interest-balancing principles to challenges facing Muslim communities in pluralistic societies.[18]

Contemporary Islamic scholarship has witnessed remarkable convergence across North America, Europe, and the Muslim world in developing sophisticated interest-balancing (*muwāzanāt*) methodologies that integrate classical principles with modern contexts through institutional frameworks emphasizing collective reasoning (*ijtihād jamāʿī*), systematic prioritization, and interdisciplinary collaboration, as demonstrated by the work of leading institutions and scholars addressing complex issues in Islamic finance, bioethics, and minority jurisprudence (*fiqh al-aqalliyyāt*).[19]

2. The Necessity and Objectives of Fiqh al-Muwāzanāt

2.1. Contemporary Imperatives

The necessity for implementing fiqh al-muwāzanāt stems from numerous compelling factors that characterize contemporary Muslim experience. This methodology provides a systematic framework for resolving complex situations where benefits (*maṣāliḥ*) and harms (*mafāsid*) intersect or conflict. Among these factors are the increasing complexity of contemporary issues (*nawāzil*), the interrelatedness of global systems, the multiplicity of stakeholders with competing interests, and the absence of explicit textual rulings on many emerging matters.

The implementation of fiqh al-muwāzanāt becomes particularly crucial in areas where Islamic legal texts appear to present contradictory directives, necessitating a methodological approach to harmonizing apparent contradictions in accordance with the higher objectives (*maqāṣid*) of the Sharīʿah. Additionally, the contemporary Muslim community faces unprecedented challenges requiring nuanced decision-making that considers both immediate consequences and long-term implications, a process achievable only through the disciplined methodology of balancing competing interests.

2.2 Three-Dimensional Necessity

The necessity of systematic interest-balancing (*fiqh al-muwāzanāt*) operates across three interconnected dimensions: the individual (*al-fard*) who inevitably encounters ambiguous situations requiring preponderance (*tarjīḥ*) through careful balancing (*muwāzanah*) and equation (*muʿādalah*); the community and state (*al-mujtamaʿ wa al-dawlah*) where governing authorities must establish priorities (*awlawiyyāt*) when societal benefits conflict in

---

[18] Al-Qaraḍāwī, *Al-Siyāsah al-Sharʿiyyah* [The Legal Political System] (Cairo: Dār al-Shurūq, 2006).

[19] Key North American contributions include Ṭāhā Jābir al-ʿAlwānī's systematic approach distinguishing universal principles (*kulliyyāt*) from particular applications (*juzʾiyyāt*) through the International Institute of Islamic Thought; the Assembly of Muslim Jurists of America's (AMJA) practical applications in medical ethics, financial regulations, and family law within American contexts; and the Fiqh Council of North America's collective application of classical jurisprudential principles to American contexts. International convergence is evident in the European Council for Fatwa and Research's work under Dr. Yūsuf al-Qaraḍāwī (see his *Fī Fiqh al-Awlawiyyāt* and *Al-Siyāsah al-Sharʿiyyah* [Cairo: Dār al-Shurūq, 2006]) and Dr. Hussein Halawa addressing Islamic finance in European banking systems and Muslim family law within European frameworks; theoretical developments by Jasser Auda (*Maqasid al-Shariah as Philosophy of Islamic Law: A Systems Approach* [London: International Institute of Islamic Thought, 2008]) and Ahmad al-Raysūnī (*Naẓariyyat al-Maqāṣid ʿinda al-Imām al-Shāṭibī*); and Middle Eastern/South Asian contributions including Muḥammad al-Būṭī's *ḍawābiṭ al-maṣlaḥah*, Wahbah al-Zuḥaylī's *Uṣūl al-Fiqh al-Islāmī*, and Deobandi scholarship through Mufti Muhammad Taqi Usmani. Institutional applications include Sharīʿah boards at major Islamic banks, the Accounting and Auditing Organization for Islamic Financial Institutions (AAOIFI), and the Islamic Organization for Medical Sciences.

essence (*dhāt*) or type (*nawʿ*) and state interests intersect with collective or individual rights; and the global ummah context where Muslim communities must navigate international challenges through decision-making that secures the greatest benefit (*jalb aʿẓam al-maṣāliḥ*) while averting the greatest harm (*darʾ aʿẓam al-mafāsid*), particularly in international relations, legislative frameworks, human rights discourse, and multilateral organizational participation.[20]

2.3. The Objectives of Fiqh al-Muwāzanāt

Primary Methodological Goals
The fundamental aim of preponderance (*tarjīḥ*) between evidences (*adillah*) and texts (*nuṣūṣ*) during instances of apparent contradiction (*taʿāruḍ*) is to clarify the path of implementation and compliance. This objective aligns with the fundamental purpose of fiqh al-muwāzanāt, despite differences in domain, balancing between evidences in one context and between benefits and harms in another.

Fiqh al-muwāzanāt encompasses a number of objectives:
1. Actualization of Benefits and Avoidance of Harms: Operationalizing the principle of securing benefits (*jalb al-maṣāliḥ*) and averting harms (*darʾ al-mafāsid*) in practical application through systematic evaluation methodologies.

2. Differentiation and Prioritization: Distinguishing between varying degrees of benefit and harm, then prioritizing the most beneficial (*taqdīm al-aṣlaḥ*) while delaying or averting harmful outcomes according to their severity and probability.

3. Guidance in Absence of Direct Evidence: Providing methodological guidance for issuing legal verdicts (*fatāwā*) in situations where explicit textual evidence is absent or in cases of necessity (*ḍarūrah*) that require creative application of established principles.

4. Alignment with Reality: Directing the course of ijtihād to harmonize with concrete realities (*wāqiʿ*), ensuring the practical applicability of legal determinations within specific cultural and temporal contexts.

5. Organizational Structure: Establishing frameworks for ordering priorities within state and community structures, thereby resolving disagreements on numerous issues through methodological consistency and transparent reasoning processes.

6. Harmony with Sharīʿah Objectives: Ensuring that the balancing process aligns with the comprehensive objective of Islamic law: bringing benefits and increasing them, and repelling harms and reducing them. This alignment enables life's affairs to proceed according to unified measures of benefit (*maṣlaḥah*) and goodness

---

[20] This three-dimensional framework establishes that since individuals cannot avoid situations of conflicting benefits and harms requiring disciplined methodological guidance in accordance with Sharīʿah principles, and since policy formulation at societal and state levels demands systematic approaches to selection and preference-determination across competing interests, and given that scholars (*ʿulamāʾ*) and leaders must operate according to precise methodology when determining the ummah's trajectory amid rapid global developments, the development of *fiqh al-muwāzanāt* represents not merely an intellectual exercise but a practical necessity across all levels of Muslim life and governance.

(*khayr*).[21]

2.4. The Ruling on Learning Fiqh al-Muwāzanāt

The ruling on learning *fiqh al-muwāzanāt* follows its status as an essential qualification for *ijtihād*, rendering it a collective obligation (*farḍ kifāyah*) that transforms into an individual obligation (*farḍ ʿayn*) under two circumstances: first, for the *mujtahid* who cannot exercise proper independent reasoning without proficiency in balancing competing evidence, interests, and harms—following the maxim "that without which an obligation cannot be fulfilled becomes itself obligatory" (*mā lā yatimmu al-wājib illā bihi fa-huwa wājib*); and second, in eras characterized by accelerated social change and technological developments that produce novel cases (*nawāzil*) with complex interminglings of benefits (*maṣāliḥ*) and harms (*mafāsid*), making *fiqh al-muwāzanāt* the jurisprudence of necessity (*fiqh al-ḍarūrah*).[22]

2.5. Scholarly Qualification and the Preservation of Traditional Authority Structures

Systematizing *fiqh al-muwāzanāt* raises legitimate concerns about preserving traditional scholarly authority structures, as orthodox Sunni scholarship has historically maintained that sophisticated legal reasoning requires not merely intellectual capacity but spiritual refinement (*tazkiyah*), comprehensive textual knowledge, and practical wisdom gained through extended scholarly apprenticeship.[23] This framework operates on the principle of *takhrīj al-manāṭ* rather than *tanqīḥ al-uṣūl*, extracting and articulating methodological principles already operative within classical Islamic scholarship rather than introducing novel jurisprudential foundations, following Ibn Taymiyyah's assertion that the principles of *sharīʿah* are elucidated rather than invented.[24] The forthcoming five-condition framework thus functions as methodological "scaffolding" that enables qualified scholars to apply sophisticated reasoning more systematically while preventing unqualified individuals from attempting complex jurisprudential analysis beyond their competence.[25]

Individual Scholarly Competence versus Collective Scholarly Wisdom

Classical Islamic scholarship's recognition of multiple jurisprudential competence levels—from the *mujtahid muṭlaq* capable of independent legal derivation to the *mujtahid fī al-*

---

[21] Al-Kamālī identifies seven parallel objectives: determining whether to enact or abandon a ruling; distinguishing maṣlaḥah from mafsadah; prioritizing and deferring between competing benefits; averting the greatest harm by accepting the lesser and securing the greatest benefit even at minor cost; guiding rulings in cases of ḍarūriyyāt; developing fatāwā that reflect lived realities (fiqh al-wāqiʿ); and harmonizing divergent opinions to resolve disputes—all grounded in uṣūl al-fiqh and maqāṣid al-sharīʿah. ʿAbd Allāh Yaḥyā al-Kamālī, *Taʾṣīl fiqh al-muwāzanāt* (Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 2000).

[22] Our contemporary era exemplifies such temporal necessity, wherein jurists (fuqahāʾ) issuing legal verdicts (fatāwā) require methodological frameworks to evaluate competing legal evidences (adillah sharʿiyyah), determine the greater good (taḥqīq al-maṣlaḥah al-rājiḥah), and minimize potential harm while maintaining fidelity to the higher objectives of Islamic law (maqāṣid al-sharīʿah). This transformation from collective to individual obligation reflects the principle that subsidiary elements inherit the ruling of their foundation, establishing mastery of interest-balancing methodologies and priority determination (fiqh al-awlawiyyāt) as imperative for contemporary Islamic legal discourse navigating unprecedented challenges.

[23] This concern reflects the fundamental distinction between democratizing access to Islamic knowledge and democratizing the authority to issue binding legal judgments (fatāwā), a distinction carefully maintained throughout Islamic intellectual history.

[24] Ibn Taymiyyah, Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā, 19:203. See also Wael B. Hallaq, A History of Islamic Legal Theories: An Introduction to Sunni Usul al-Fiqh (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), for discussion of the discovery versus invention of jurisprudential principles.

[25] Sherman A. Jackson, Islamic Law and the State: The Constitutional Jurisprudence of Shihāb al-Dīn al-Qarāfī (Leiden: Brill, 2002), provides analysis of al-Qarāfī's approach to structured jurisprudential reasoning that anticipates contemporary concerns about methodological systematization.

madhhab qualified for reasoning within established schools—provides the foundation for differentiating when individual scholarly reasoning suffices versus when collective deliberation becomes necessary in contemporary *fiqh al-muwāzanāt* applications.[26] Individual scholars may apply the framework when demonstrating formal *uṣūl al-fiqh* training from recognized institutions, verified mastery of the five conditions through peer review, domain specialization, and a recognized track record of sound jurisprudential reasoning, while complex *muwāzanāt* involving unprecedented scenarios (*nawāzil*), substantial community impact, or potential precedent-setting implications require collective scholarly councils comprising multiple qualified scholars, *maqāṣid* specialists, contextual experts, and community representatives.[27]

3. Essential Conditions for Engaging in Fiqh al-Muwāzanāt

For scholars or scholarly councils to engage effectively in fiqh al-muwāzanāt, fundamental conditions must be fulfilled. These conditions represent essential foundations upon which the discipline is developed, and neglecting them renders effective engagement in interest-balancing extraordinarily difficult. Five primary conditions are laid out in the following sections:

1. Mastery of *al-Maqāṣid* (The Objectives of *Sharīʿah*) and Legal Maxims

2. Identifying the Effective Cause (*Taḥqīq al-Manāṭ*)

3. Considering Context and Reality (*Fiqh al-Wāqiʿ*)

4. Considering Consequences (*Iʿtibār al-Maʾālāt*) in Applying Rulings

5. The Jurisprudence of Priorities (*Fiqh al-Awlawiyyāt*)

What follows these five conditions is the act of *muwāzanah* (balancing between interests and harms), balancing goals (*ghāyāt*) and means (*wasāʾil*) in application, and finally knowing how to proceed when *muwāzanah* reaches its limits. These conditions are not exhaustive, and scholars who engage in fiqh al-muwāzanāt must undoubtedly possess mastery of other disciplines and generally extensive knowledge of the Qur'an, the Sunnah, and their objectives. Many scholars have compiled various minimum conditions and regulatory principles (*ḍawābiṭ*), such as Ibn Taymiyyah's emphasis on *taḥqīq al-manāṭ* as part of the knowledge of *ijtihād*.

Ibn Taymiyyah articulates a comprehensive framework for jurisprudential reasoning that anticipates many elements of contemporary fiqh al-muwāzanāt. He states:
"The believer should know the evils that occur and their ranks in the Book and Sunnah, just as he knows the good things that occur and their ranks in the Book and Sunnah. He should distinguish between the *aḥkām* of matters that occur and exist and those that are intended to be made to occur in the Book and Sunnah, so that he gives precedence to what has more

---

[26] Mohammad Hashim Kamali, Principles of Islamic Jurisprudence, 3rd ed. (Cambridge: Islamic Texts Society, 2003), provides comprehensive analysis of these classical scholarly categories and their contemporary relevance.
[27] While context determines optimal council size, experience suggests that complex nawāzil benefit from consultation among multiple qualified scholars to ensure comprehensive analysis and reduce oversight risk in critical deliberations. The four criteria for individual application and four components of collective councils establish clear parameters for appropriate scholarly engagement levels.

good and less evil over what is below it, repels the greater of two evils by bearing the lesser of them, and attracts the greater of two goods by missing the lesser of them. For whoever does not know the reality among creation and what is obligatory in religion does not know Allah's *aḥkām* regarding His servants. When he does not know that, his speech and action are based on ignorance, and whoever worships Allah without knowledge—what he corrupts is more than what he reforms."[28]

From this foundational statement, Ibn Taymiyyah establishes at least three essential conditions for qualified jurisprudential reasoning: 1) mastery of the jurisprudence of hierarchical actions (*fiqh marātib al-afʿāl*), 2) expertise in balancing and weighing (*fiqh al-muwāzana wa-al-tarjīḥ*), and 3) comprehensive understanding of reality (*al-wāqiʿ*) and religious obligation. His broader corpus reveals that he considers *maqāṣid al-sharīʿah* among the most critical conditions of *ijtihād*, as "the lawgiver does not legislate frivolity," and "whoever understands the wisdom of the lawgiver among them is truly the *faqīh*." [29] Ibn Taymiyyah accords the *maqāṣid* a preferential dimension, stating that "the most deserving of people of truth is he who connects the *aḥkām* to the meanings that the lawgiver connected them to," and that knowledge of sound *qiyās* and its corruption, which is accessible only to those experienced in the mysteries and objectives of *Sharīʿah*, reveals Islam's consummate wisdom, abundant mercy, and complete justice that exceed enumeration.[30]

Applied Example: The Incident of Banū Qurayẓa

Among the applied examples indicating Ibn Taymiyyah's preference for those who uphold the *maqāṣid* is the well-known incident involving the Companions during the Battle of the Trench.[31] When the Prophet ﷺ instructed them, "Let none pray ʿAṣr except in Banū Qurayẓa," the ʿAṣr prayer time arrived while they were en route. Some Companions declared: "We will not pray except in Banū Qurayẓa," while others reasoned: "He did not intend that for us," and consequently prayed along the way.

This classical disagreement, whether analogical reasoning (*qiyās*) specifies the general, reveals how the first group's literal adherence contrasted with the second group's recognition of underlying purpose, leading Ibn Taymiyyah to declare those who prayed en route "more correct" for following the *maqāṣid*, thus illustrating how *maqāṣid*-oriented reasoning resolves conflicts between literal textual adherence and legislative intent as a fundamental component of contemporary *fiqh al-muwāzanāt* methodology.[32] Scholars throughout centuries have articulated various conditions and guiding principles for this balancing act, some embedded within the methodology itself, others serving as

---

[28] Ibn Taymiyyah, *Qāʿidah fī al-Maḥabbah* [Treatise on Love], in *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā* [Collected Fatwas], vol. 10 (Medina: Majmaʿ al-Malik Fahd, 1995), 191.

[29] Ibn Taymiyyah, *Bayān al-Dalīl* [Clarification of Evidence] (Beirut: Al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1998), 238.

[30] Ibn Taymiyyah, Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā, 22:331 and 20:583. His integration of maqāṣid understanding with methodological expertise in balancing and hierarchical analysis provides the theoretical foundation for systematic fiqh al-muwāzanāt as an essential component of qualified ijtihād.

[31] Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, no. 946.

[32] Ibn Taymiyyah, Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā, 20:253. This preference for those who understood the expeditious intent over those who adhered to literal generality demonstrates the practical superiority of maqāṣid-based jurisprudential reasoning.

prerequisites, which contemporary frameworks synthesize differently across scholarly works.[33]

3.1. Condition I: Mastery of al-Maqāṣid (The Objectives of Sharīʿah) and Legal Maxims

For scholars or scholarly councils to engage effectively in *fiqh al-muwāzanāt*, a comprehensive understanding of *al-maqāṣid* (the objectives of Islamic law) constitutes an indispensable prerequisite. This requirement extends beyond superficial familiarity to encompass deep theoretical knowledge and practical application capabilities. The relationship between *fiqh al-muwāzanāt* and the *maqāṣid* is both intimate and constitutive, the *maqāṣid* serve as the foundational rationale for legal rulings while simultaneously guiding their contextual implementation.[34] *Fiqh al-muwāzanāt*, in turn, represents one of the most sophisticated mechanisms for actualizing and realizing the *maqāṣid* of Islamic law in contemporary circumstances.

From their origin and epistemological foundation, the objectives of Islamic law divide into two fundamental categories: *Maqāṣid al-Shāriʿ* (objectives of the Divine Lawgiver) and *Maqāṣid al-Mukallaf* (objectives of the legally responsible individual).[35] This distinction proves crucial for understanding how divine objectives interface with human comprehension and implementation, particularly in contexts where apparent tensions emerge between revealed guidance and human reasoning.

The Traditional Hierarchical Structure
The conventional three-tiered classification system, developed and refined by classical jurists, provides the foundational framework for understanding legal priorities:[36]

1. Necessities (*ḍarūriyyāt*): These represent indispensable interests upon which the integrity of both religious and worldly affairs fundamentally depends. The preservation of these interests is non-negotiable, comprising: religion (*al-dīn*), life (*al-nafs*), intellect (*al-ʿaql*), lineage (*al-nasl*), and property (*al-māl*).

2. Needs (*ḥājiyyāt*): These constitute complementary interests that, while not essential for basic survival, facilitate human flourishing and remove significant hardships from daily life. Their absence creates genuine difficulty without threatening the fundamental order of existence.

---

[33] Contemporary approaches such as Aḥmad Ḥasan al-Rabwaʿah's enumerate fifteen ḍawābiṭ including hierarchical principles (certainty over probability, obligatory over recommended, extensive over limited maṣlaḥah, purposeful over derivative, compensable over non-compensable, facilitated over difficult, lasting over temporary), contextual considerations (time, place, inquirer's condition), relational priorities (closest relatives), need-based criteria (greater over lesser need), epistemological standards (agreed-upon over disputed, definitive over speculative), scope considerations (general over specific maṣlaḥah), and procedural guidelines (proportional distribution when benefits are equal). See al-Rabwaʿah, "al-Muwāzanah bayna al-maṣāliḥ wa-al-mafāsid wa-taṭbīqātuhumā fī al-wāqiʿ al-muʿāṣir," Journal of Scientific Research and Islamic Studies 12, no. 1 (2020): 65–90.

[34] Abū Isḥāq al-Shāṭibī, *Al-Muwāfaqāt fī Uṣūl al-Sharīʿa* [The Agreements in the Principles of Islamic Law], ed. ʿAbd Allah Darrāz, 4 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 2003), 2:8-15.

[35] Al-Shāṭibī, *Al-Muwāfaqāt*, 2/25-37.

[36] For historical development, see Mohammad Hashim Kamali, *Maqasid al-Shariah Made Simple* (London: International Institute of Islamic Thought, 2008), 14-28.

3. Improvements (*taḥsīniyyāt*): These represent interests that perfect, beautify, and refine human existence without being essential or necessary. They relate to matters of honor, moral excellence, aesthetic consideration, and social refinement.

Scholarly Debates on the Scope of Necessities

Imām al-Shāṭibī, the preeminent theorist of *maqāṣid*, identified five essential necessities, arguing that these fundamental interests are universally observed across all divinely revealed religious traditions, thus suggesting their transcendent significance.[37] However, classical jurists demonstrated substantial disagreement regarding the exhaustiveness of this enumeration.

One significant group advocated for expanding the framework to include "*al-ʿirḍ*" (honor/reputation/dignity) as a sixth necessity, arguing that human dignity represents an independent and irreducible objective of Islamic law.[38] Furthermore, scholars like Ibn Taymiyyah and many contemporary scholars[39] challenged the entire notion of confining the *maqāṣid* to any fixed numerical limitation.[40] Ibn Taymiyyah astutely observed that some scholars in *uṣūl al-fiqh*, when analyzing the rationale (*ʿillah*) behind legal rulings, inappropriately restricted the scope of "benefits" (*maṣāliḥ*) almost exclusively to tangible, worldly matters, such as protecting life, wealth, physical well-being, and external religious observance, while neglecting the equally crucial inward and spiritual dimensions, including knowledge of Allah, love of Him, reverential awe (*khashyah*), sincerity (*ikhlāṣ*), and other transformative states of the heart.[41] His cautionary observation remains profoundly relevant: anyone who confines the Sharīʿah's comprehensive concern to these narrower material elements has fundamentally misunderstood and unjustifiably restricted its scope.[42]

Conceptualizations of Maṣlaḥah

Effective navigation of *fiqh al-muwāzanāt* in contemporary contexts requires comprehensive understanding of *maṣāliḥ* (interests) across Islamic jurisprudential schools, including mastery of the classical tripartite taxonomy (*ḍarūriyyāt*, *ḥājiyyāt*, *taḥsīniyyāt*) while appreciating methodological distinctions between schools regarding benefit-based reasoning.[43] Central distinctions include the Mālikī employment of *maṣlaḥah mursalah* (unattested interest) through *istiṣlāḥ* as both exception-carving mechanism and independent legislative source, contrasted with Ḥanafī *istiḥsān lil-ḍarūrah* wherein analogical

---

[37] Al-Shāṭibī, *Al-Muwāfaqāt*, 2:20.

[38] See ʿIzz al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Salām, *Qawāʿid al-Aḥkām fī Maṣāliḥ al-Anām* [Rules of Rulings in the Interests of People] (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1999), 1:85-92.

[39] Dr. Yusuf al-Qaradawi included human dignity and rights in his theory of maqāṣid, expanding the scope to address contemporary human rights discourse within an Islamic framework. Also, Ibn Ashur developed new maqāṣid objectives, introducing concepts of "orderliness," "natural disposition," "freedom," "rights," "civility," and "equality" as maqāṣid in their own right, upon which Islamic law is based. See: Yusuf al-Qaradawi, *Dirasat fi fiqh maqasid al-shariʿa: bayn maqasid al-kulliyya wa-l-nusus al-juzʾiyya* (Cairo: Dar al-Shuruq, 2006); Muhammad al-Tahir Ibn Ashur, *Maqāṣid al-Sharīʿa al-Islamiyyah*, ed. El-tahir el-Mesnawi (Kuala Lumpur: Al-fajr, 1999).

[40] Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā*, 11:342-45.

[41] Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwa*, 11:343.

[42] Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwa*, 11:343.

[43] This comprehensive grounding enables jurists to navigate complex contemporary issues such as Muslim American political engagement by applying classical principles to unprecedented contexts.

reasoning is abandoned to prevent undue hardship (ḥaraj) or harm (ḍarar).[44] The jurist must comprehend boundaries preventing misapplication, particularly the invalidation of benefits contradicting definitive textual evidence (maṣlaḥah mulghāh) and al-Shāṭibī's restrictive conditions requiring valid maṣlaḥah mursalah be suitable (mulāʾim) with the maqāṣid, while engaging contemporary scholarly discourse on its scope in novel circumstances, individual versus collective interests, and methodological frameworks for assessing competing maṣāliḥ where traditional precedents prove insufficient.[45]

The Dynamic Application of Maqāṣid in Balancing Methodologies

The integration of maqāṣid knowledge into fiqh al-muwāzanāt operates across multiple analytical dimensions. Comprehensive understanding of the maqāṣid profoundly influences how contemporary novel issues (nawāzil) are approached and resolved in ways that authentically fulfill the underlying objectives for which specific rulings were originally prescribed. This sophisticated analytical process involves examining the effective cause (manāṭ) of existing rulings and carefully determining the extent to which this cause undergoes transformation under varying circumstances, whether geographical, temporal, cultural, or demographic variables.

The Principle of Contextual Adaptation

When the effective cause of a legal ruling shifts significantly due to changing circumstances, it becomes possible, indeed necessary, that applying the identical legal ruling may no longer achieve the wisdom (ḥikmah) or objective (maqṣad) for which it was originally legislated. In such complex scenarios, the qualified jurist (mujtahid) may legitimately determine that the ruling should be temporarily suspended, modified in its application, or delayed until appropriate conditions are established or specific impediments (mawāniʿ) are removed.[46] The indiscriminate application of rulings without accounting for these contextual transformations can lead to outcomes that directly contradict the Sharīʿah's fundamental principles and frustrate the very objectives it seeks to realize through its comprehensive legal framework.

Governing Legal Maxims (Qawāʿid Fiqhiyyah) Essential for Muwāzanāt

Scholars engaging in fiqh al-muwāzanāt must possess comprehensive knowledge of legal maxims (qawāʿid fiqhiyyah) that govern interest-balancing and conflict resolution, providing structured guidance for evaluating competing interests consistent with Islamic law's objectives.[47] Primary balancing maxims establish foundational principles: "harm must be

---

[44] For maṣlaḥah mursalah, see al-Ghazālī, al-Mustaṣfa, 481; al-Shāṭibī, al-Iʿtiṣām, 3:69; al-Qarāfī, Sharḥ Tanqīḥ al-Fuṣūl (Cairo: Sharikat al-Ṭibāʿah al-Fanniyyah al-Muttaḥidah, 1973), 393-400; al-Shāṭibī, Al-Muwāfaqāt, 2:55-80; Aḥmad ʿAbd-al-Wahhāb al-Shinqīṭī, al-Waṣf al-Munāsib li-Sharʿ al-Ḥukm (Medina: Markaz al-Baḥth al-ʿIlmī wa-Iḥyāʾ al-ʿIlm al-Islāmī, 1994), 249-257. For istiḥsān, see Muhammad Abū Zahrah, Abū Ḥanīfah (Cairo: Dār al-Fikr al-ʿArabī, n.d.), 381-82, 89-93.
[45] Al-Ghazālī, Al-Mustaṣfā, 1:295-300; Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, Al-Maḥṣūl fī ʿIlm Uṣūl al-Fiqh (Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risālah, 1997). Al-Shāṭibī's tripartite framework requires: harmonization with maqāṣid while avoiding textual contradiction; addressing rationally deliberable matters rather than purely devotional practices; and responding to genuine necessity or significant hardship, as exemplified by the Companions' Quranic codification deemed essential for safeguarding religion itself, reflecting the maxim "whatever is indispensable for fulfilling an obligation becomes itself obligatory" (mā lā yatimmu al-wājibu illā bihi fahuwa wājib). See al-Shāṭibī, al-Iʿtiṣām, 3:56. For contemporary discourse, see Yūsuf al-Qaraḍāwī, Madkhal li-Dirāsat al-Sharīʿah al-Islāmiyyah (Cairo: Maktabat Wahbah, 2001), 156-178; Wahbah al-Zuḥaylī, Uṣūl al-Fiqh al-Islāmī (Damascus: Dār al-Fikr, 1986).
[46] For detailed analysis, see Ibn al-Qayyim, Iʿlām al-Muwaqqiʿīn ʿan Rabb al-ʿĀlamīn, 3:3-14.
[47] See Muṣṭafā al-Zarqāʾ, al-Madkhal al-fiqhī al-ʿāmm (Damascus: Dār al-Qalam, 2004); ʿAli Aḥmed al-Nadwi, al-Qawāʿid al-fiqhiyya (Damascus: Dār al-Qalam, 1987). These maxims represent a selection of the most crucial principles, though they are not exhaustive.

eliminated" (*al-ḍarar yuzāl*), "preventing harm takes precedence over securing benefits" (*darʾ al-mafāsid muqaddam ʿalā jalb al-maṣāliḥ*), "the lesser of two evils should be chosen" (*yukhtār ahwan al-sharrayn*), "the greater of two benefits should be preferred when they conflict" (*idhā taʿāraḍa maṣlaḥatān ukhtirat al-ʿuẓmā*), "necessity permits the prohibited" (*al-ḍarūrāt tubīḥ al-maḥẓūrāt*), and "hardship brings about facilitation" (*al-mashaqqa tajlib al-taysīr*).[48] Complementary contextual maxims provide operational guidance through principles of proportionality, certainty, custom, intentionality, and public interest prioritization, while temporal and circumstantial considerations recognize that rulings change with times, places, circumstances, and customs (*al-aḥkām tataghayyar bi-taghayyur al-azmina wa-al-amkina wa-al-aḥwāl wa-al-ʿawāʾid*), and that prohibitions based on obstruction become permissible when obstacles are removed.[49]

The Imperative of Comprehensive Knowledge
This framework of *maqāṣid* theory and legal maxims represents only a portion of the jurisprudential tools essential for competent engagement in *fiqh al-muwāzanāt*. Scholars undertaking this sophisticated form of legal reasoning must possess not merely familiarity with these concepts, but true mastery that enables their dynamic and contextually appropriate application.[50] The complexity and responsibility inherent in balancing competing interests within Islamic law demands the highest levels of scholarly preparation and intellectual rigor.

Mastery of al-maqāṣid and the governing legal maxims (*qawāʿid fiqhiyyah*) constitutes the essential theoretical foundation for engaging in fiqh al-muwāzanāt. This condition encompasses comprehensive understanding of the hierarchical framework of Islamic legal objectives, necessities, needs, and improvements, alongside the legal maxims that govern interest-balancing and conflict resolution. Unlike the practical application of priorities addressed in Condition V, this foundational requirement focuses on mastery of the underlying principles that inform all subsequent muwāzanāt calculations. Scholars must possess genuine theoretical comprehension that enables dynamic application across diverse contexts. This theoretical grounding provides the interpretive lens through which competing interests are understood, categorized, and evaluated according to their relationship to fundamental Islamic objectives, establishing the conceptual framework within which all practical balancing decisions operate.

---

[48] These six primary maxims form the core framework for systematic interest-balancing, establishing hierarchical relationships between harm prevention and benefit acquisition, necessity and prohibition, and hardship and facilitation.

[49] Complementary maxims include: "what is necessary due to necessity is measured by its extent," "certainty is not removed by doubt," "custom is legally authoritative," "consideration is given to objectives and meanings, not to words and forms," "public interest takes precedence over private interest," "when permissible and prohibited meet, the prohibited prevails," "preventing corruption takes precedence over achieving benefit," and "harm is not removed by similar or greater harm." See Ibn Nujaym, Al-Ashbāh wa-al-Naẓāʾir (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyyah, n.d.), 115-20; Ibn ʿĀbidīn, Radd al-Muḥtār (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1992), 1:125-30; al-Shāṭibī, Al-Iʿtiṣām (Beirut: Dār Ibn ʿAffān, 1997), 2:587-95; al-Suyūṭī, Al-Ashbāh wa-al-Naẓāʾir. Additional temporal considerations include "what was prohibited due to obstruction becomes permissible when the obstruction is removed" and "need, whether general or specific, is treated like necessity."

[50] For methodological framework, see Ḥasan al-Turkī, ed., *Uṣūl al-Fiqh al-Islāmī* [Principles of Islamic Jurisprudence], 2 vols. (Riyadh: Dār al-Waṭan, 1996), 2:445-78.

3.2. Condition II: Identifying the Effective Cause (Taḥqīq al-Manāṭ)

The concept of *taḥqīq al-manāṭ* (verifying or identifying the effective cause) is essential for navigating intricate scenarios and linking objectives, underlying wisdoms, and practical realities. This methodological tool bridges the gap between general principles and specific applications.

Scholarly definitions of *al-manāṭ* (the legal "pivot" or locus) generally fall into three categories: definitions equating *manāṭ* with ʿ*illah* (effective cause), as held by Imām al-Ghazālī, Ibn Qudāmah, and al-Shawkānī;[51] definitions treating *manāṭ* as the object or subject to which the ruling applies, representing the Ḥanafī school generally;[52] and definitions regarding *manāṭ* as encompassing general principles, expanded by al-Shāṭibī to include "the absolute *taklīfī ḥukm* established by its legal evidence."[53]

Ibn Taymiyyah's Practical Approach and Methodological Framework
Ibn Taymiyyah's treatment clarifies that *manāṭ* represents the object of the ḥukm through practical examples.[54] In the "issue of the mouse in clarified butter," he demonstrated that the *ḥukm* is not specific to particular entities but applies universally: "the *ḥukm* in this matter is connected to the impure thing (*al-khabīth*) that Allah has forbidden, when it falls into clarified butter and similar liquids; because Allah has permitted for us the pure things (*al-ṭayyibāt*) and forbidden us the impure things (*al-khabāʾith*)."[55] This exemplifies the principle that "the *ḥukm* of the Prophet ﷺ is not specific to those particular entities, but rather applies to what is similar to them, but they need to know the common *manāṭ* by which the lawgiver connected the *ḥukm*."[56]

The Systematization of Taḥqīq al-Manāṭ
Taḥqīq al-manāṭ lexically means "ascertaining that its form corresponds to what it is in reality, and specifying it so that it matches its form."[57] However, the concept underwent notable development in *uṣūlī* thought, evolving from "verifying the agreed-upon ʿ*illa* in the

---

[51] Al-Ghazālī said: "Know that we mean by ʿilla in matters of sharīʿah the manāṭ of the ḥukm: that is, what the sharīʿah has connected the ḥukm to and established as a sign for it." Al-Shawkānī said: "The manāṭ is the ʿilla." Ibn Qudāma said: "We mean by ʿilla: the manāṭ of the ḥukm." Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī, *al-Mustaṣfā min ʿIlm al-Uṣūl* (Cairo: al-Maktabah al-Tijāriyyah al-Kubrā, 1324/1905), 280; Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī al-Shawkānī, *Irshād al-Fuḥūl ilā Taḥqīq al-Ḥaqq min ʿIlm al-Uṣūl*, ed. Muḥammad Ṣubḥī ibn Ḥasan Ḥallāq, 2 vols. (Damascus: Dār Ibn Kathīr, 1443 AH), 374; Muwaffaq al-Dīn Ibn Qudāmah, *Rawḍat al-Nāẓir wa-Jannat al-Manāẓir fī Uṣūl al-Fiqh*, 2nd ed. (Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risālah, 1423/2002), 3/800.
[52] Ibn al-Najjār states: "Manāṭ is the subject of the ruling." Muḥammad b. Aḥmad Ibn al-Najjār al-Ḥanbalī, *Sharḥ al-Kawkab al-Munīr*, ed. Muḥammad al-Zuḥaylī and Nazīh Ḥammād, 2nd ed. (Riyadh: Maktabat ʿUbaykān, 1418/1997), 4/200.
[53] Al-Shāṭibī, *Al-Muwāfaqāt*, 4/89. Contemporary scholars who adopt this reading include Professor Fatḥī al-Dirīnī, who maintains that manāṭ designates "the very content of a legal maxim or juristic rule." Muḥammad Fatḥī al-Dirīnī, *Buḥūth Muqāranah fī al-Fiqh al-Islāmī wa-Uṣūlih*, 1st ed. (Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risālah, 1994), 1/119.
[54] Rāʾid ʿAbd Allāh Bdeir, *Al-Manāṭ fī Uṣūl al-Fiqh*, 1st ed. (Cairo: Dār Ibn al-Jawzī, 1427/2006), 70; Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā*, 19/17.
[55] Rāʾid Bdeir lists Ibn Taymiyyah among those who use *manāṭ* for "the thing to which the ruling is attached," whereas Najm al-Dīn al-Zankī argues that Ibn Taymiyyah employs the word synonymously with ʿ*illah* (ratio legis). Al-Zankī cites the Shaykh's statement: "The common factor in syllogistic reasoning, called the 'middle term' by logicians, is the same factor in analogical reasoning that the uṣūlīs call the unifying element, the *manāṭ*, or the ʿ*illah*." See Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā*, 22/330–31; Rāʾid ʿAbd Allāh Nimr Bdeir, *Al-Manāṭ fī Uṣūl al-Fiqh*, 1st ed. (Cairo: Dār Ibn al-Jawzī, 1427 / 2006), 70; Najm al-Dīn Qādir Karīm al-Zankī, *Al-Ijtihād fī Mawridi al-Naṣṣ: Dirāsah Uṣūlīyyah Muqāranah*, 1st ed. (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyyah, 1427 / 2006), 180; Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā*, 19/17.
[56] Ibn Taymiyyah, *Darʾ Taʿāruḍ al-ʿAql wa-al-Naql*, ed. Muḥammad Rashād Sālim, 11 vols. (Riyadh: Jāmiʿat al-Imām Muḥammad b. Saʿūd al-Islāmiyyah, 1411/1991), 7/338.
[57] The methodological and historical development of this concept through various schools represents a sophisticated evolution in Islamic legal methodology, detailed extensively in classical uṣūl al-fiqh literature. See Shihāb al-Dīn al-Qarāfī, *Sharḥ Tanqīḥ al-Fuṣūl*, ed. Ṭāhā ʿAbd al-Raʾūf Saʿd (Cairo: Maktabat al-Kulliyyāt al-Azhariyyah, 1393/1973), 389.

branch case" to "examining the knowledge of the existence of the ʿilla in individual instances."[58] Ibn Taymiyyah conferred upon this term a more practical (tanzīlī) dimension rather than purely deductive (istinbāṭī), defining it as examining "the establishment [of universal meanings] in individual instances or types of that general."[59] Al-Shāṭibī similarly defined it: "That the ḥukm is established by its legal evidence, but examination remains in specifying its locus."[60]

Examples include determining whether a specific witness meets the criterion of "ʿudūl" (uprightness),[61] or whether a particular beverage constitutes khamr (intoxicants).[62] Ibn Taymiyyah connected this to a conceptualization of taʾwīl, observing that "knowing the inclusion of existing entities in these names and expressions... may be hidden requiring ijtihād, and this is the taʾwīl in the lawgiver's expression in which fuqahāʾ differ."[63]

The Three Related Concepts: Essential Distinctions for Contemporary Application

Ibn Taymiyyah considered tanqīḥ al-manāṭ, takhrīj al-manāṭ, and taḥqīq al-manāṭ as "the essence of ijtihād."[64] Understanding their distinctions proves essential:

Tanqīḥ al-Manāṭ (Refining the Effective Cause): "Pruning" the original manāṭ to separate it from descriptors that play no part in establishing the ʿillah.[65] Examples include determining whether the Bedouin's Ramadan expiation applied because "he broke his fast, or had intercourse in Ramaḍān, or broke his fast through intercourse, or broke his fast through the higher category."[66]

Takhrīj al-Manāṭ (Deriving the Effective Cause): Pure qiyās (analogy) involving the addition of a ḥukm where the sharīʿah did not address its ʿilla.[67] Examples include arguing that "ribā was forbidden in wheat because it is a measured staple or an edible staple, so rice is like it."[68]

---

[58] Sayf al-Dīn al-Āmidī, *Al-Iḥkām fī Uṣūl al-Aḥkām*, 4 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyyah, 1403/1983), 3:302; ʿAbd al-Majīd ʿUmar al-Najjār, *Fuṣūl fī al-Fikr al-Islāmī bi-l-Maghrib*, 1st ed. (Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 1412/1992), 197.

[59] Ibn Taymiyyah traced taḥqīq al-manāṭ to "the analogies of representation (tamthīl) and inclusion (shumūl)," defining it as examining when "Allah specifies the connection of the ḥukm to a general, universal meaning, then one examines its establishment in individual instances or types of that general." See Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā*, 19/16; Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā*, 22/329.

[60] Al-Shāṭibī, *Al-Muwāfaqāt*, 4/90.

[61] These examples illustrate the practical application: Allah commands us to seek testimony (shahādah) from those who are 'ʿudūl' (upright)... but we need to determine whether any given witness truly meets the criterion of uprightness.

[62] Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā*, 22/330.

[63] Ibn Taymiyyah's connection to taʾwīl demonstrates that "taḥqīq al-manāṭ is the spirit of the jurisprudence of application (fiqh al-tanzīl). Through it connection is made, and at it one looks at the text and looks at reality, and reason acts." See Ibn Taymiyyah, *Al-Radd ʿalā al-Manṭiqiyyīn*, ed. Muḥammad Ḥasan Ismāʿīl, 1st ed. (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyyah, 1428/2007), 46.

[64] Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā*, 22/329. Understanding their distinctions proves essential for contemporary applications, as these three concepts form the methodological foundation for applying classical principles to novel circumstances.

[65] Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā*, 19/15. The process involves "trimming and refining the original manāṭ until differentiation is made between it and the attributes that have no role in causation."

[66] Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā*, 22/230.

[67] Ibn Taymiyyah defines takhrīj as situations where "one argues that others are like them, either due to the absence of a distinguishing factor, or due to sharing in the attribute for which evidence has been established that the lawgiver connected the ḥukm to in the original case." See Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā*, 22/328.

[68] Additional examples include zakāt applications: "the tithe (ʿushr) was obligated in zakāt on wheat because it is a staple food, so staple foods are included." See Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā*, 19/17.

Taḥqīq al-Manāṭ (Verifying the Effective Cause): Falls under "the process of application (*tanzīl*)" where "the ʿilla is known through text or deduction, but examination remains regarding the realization and existence of the manāṭ of the ḥukm in the specific case."[69]

Certainty, Probability, and Contemporary Applications

Evidence for taḥqīq al-manāṭ may be either certain or probabilistic. Certain evidence includes definitively known occurrences like "the onset of Fajr (dawn)" for prayer obligations.[70] Probabilistic evidence includes "personal admission, the testimony of four trustworthy witnesses, or oaths sworn in litigation."[71]

This distinction proves crucial for understanding complex applications like ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb's non-application of the *ḥadd* for theft during famine. This was not "ijtihād against the text" but rather "ijtihād in understanding the text," since "the manāṭ of theft was mixed with impurities that made it probabilistic."[72] ʿAbd al-Majīd al-Najjār's *maqāṣidī* analysis explains: "He knew the *maqṣad* (purpose) of the ḥukm and knew that it would not be realized in reality if the ḥukm of the *ḥadd* for theft were applied under famine conditions."[73]

The Fundamental Importance for Contemporary Ijtihād

Ibn Taymiyyah emphasized that "the lawgiver's texts are comprehensive words, universal propositions, and general rules," making "ijtihād regarding specific instances necessary: do they fall under his comprehensive words or not?"[74] This process "is capable of guaranteeing the application of Islamic Sharīʿah, thereby achieving its continuity and permanence."[75] The "lawgiver's general, comprehensive address indicates [specific incidents] through the path of generality that refers back to taḥqīq al-manāṭ."[76]

The excellence of the faqīh lies in perceiving "the inclusion of this incident under the general ḥukm that he and others know, or that they can know through its general evidence by text and deduction."[77] This methodology enjoys consensus: "All people are in agreement on ijtihād and jurisprudence (*tafaqquh*), which requires including specific cases under the

---

[69] The distinction between understanding (fahm) and application (tanzīl) proves crucial: in tanqīḥ and takhrīj, "the dealing with manāṭ is at the level of understanding," while in taḥqīq, it "falls under the process of application." See Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Tinbuktī, *Al-Qawāʿid al-Uṣūliyyah ʿinda Ibn Taymiyyah*, 2 vols. (Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 1429/2008), 1:373.

[70] This category includes "causes whose occurrence and triggers are definitively known... based on definitive evidence such as sense perception, observation, and experience." Najm al-Dīn Qādir Karīm al-Zankī, *Al-Ijtihād fī Mawridi al-Naṣṣ*, 1st ed. (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyyah, 1427/2006), 189.

[71] These forms of evidence only yield probability, creating important distinctions for legal applications.

[72] The analysis resolves apparent contradictions: "He saw that the ḥukm did not apply to that situation, or that doubt affected the probability derived from the judicial procedures of proof in the case, so he repelled it." Yūsuf al-Qaraḍāwī, *Dirāsah fī Fiqh Maqāṣid al-Sharīʿah* (Cairo: Dār al-Shurūq, 2006), 107.

[73] ʿAbd al-Majīd al-Najjār, *Maqāṣid al-Sharīʿah bi-Abʿād Jadīdah*, 2nd ed. (Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 2008), 20.

[74] Ibn Taymiyyah emphasized the impossibility of specifying "every individual among the particulars of the world until the Day of Judgment," making ijtihād regarding specific instances necessary. Ibn Taymiyyah, *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah*, ed. Muḥammad Rashād Sālim, 8 vols. (Riyadh: Jāmiʿat al-Imām Muḥammad b. Saʿūd al-Islāmiyyah, 1406/1986), 6/139.

[75] The systematic application ensures "the sharāʾiʿ came with universal aḥkām such as obligating zakāt and prohibiting daughters and sisters. It is not possible to command anyone with what Allah commanded him... unless one knows his inclusion in those universal categories." Ibn Taymiyyah, *Darʾ Taʿāruḍ al-ʿAql wa-al-Naql*, 6/387.

[76] "The Book and Sunna clarified all the aḥkām through general names, but including specific entities in that requires precise understanding and penetrating insight." Ibn Taymiyyah, *Darʾ Taʿāruḍ al-ʿAql wa-al-Naql*, 4/502.

[77] Ibn Taymiyyah gave taḥqīq al-manāṭ "a normative function that enabled him to distinguish between fuqahāʾ," emphasizing that excellence lies in perceiving specific applications of universal principles. Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā*, 20/402.

universal, general aḥkām that the Book and Sunna articulated. This is what is called taḥqīq al-manāṭ."[78]

Enhancing Muwāzanāt Effectiveness

Ibn Taymiyyah identified two primary types of *taḥqīq al-manāṭ*: category-level (*nawʿ*) verification determining whether contemporary phenomena fall under classical categories (e.g., modern intoxicants under *khamr*, contemporary gambling under *maysir*), and entity-specific (*ʿayn*) verification involving individual determinations like witness credibility or customary maintenance amounts.[79] This verification process enables superior *muwāzanāt* by ensuring balancing calculations operate upon accurate rather than presumptive foundations, preventing misapplication of classical rulings to situations that appear similar but operate under fundamentally different causal dynamics.[80]

Classical strategic alliances (*ḥilf*) with non-Muslims involved military cooperation, shared enemies, and mutual defense obligations potentially compromising religious principles, while contemporary multi-faith political coalitions operate through legislative advocacy, constitutional processes, shared policy objectives around social justice, and temporary cooperation preserving distinct religious identities, a distinction particularly evident in post-October 2023 dynamics revealing how pro-Israel lobbying organizations operate through institutional capture rather than traditional alliance structures.[81] This verification process directly enhances *muwāzanāt* effectiveness by preventing interest-balancing based on inaccurate assumptions, ensuring benefit-harm calculations reflect actual dynamics of pluralistic advocacy rather than presumed parallels with classical alliances, and enabling precise application of cooperation principles to democratic coalition work where Muslims advance shared values while maintaining religious integrity.[82]

3.3. Condition III: Considering Context and Reality (Fiqh al-Wāqiʿ)

The Fundamental Importance of Contextual Understanding

A critical element in applying fiqh al-muwāzanāt is recognizing the role of context and reality in shaping the evaluation of interests. Ibn Taymiyyah emphasized this principle: "Whoever does not understand the reality (*al-wāqiʿ*) of creation and the obligation (*al-wājib*) in religion will not understand God's rulings concerning His servants. If one does not

---

[78] Ibn Taymiyyah noted this consensus extends "indeed among rational people," clarifying legitimacy "through rational evidence" due to its self-evident necessity. Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā*, 13/254.

[79] Ibn Taymiyyah, Darʾ Taʿāruḍ al-ʿAql wa-al-Naql, 4:498; Minhāj al-Sunnah, 2:475. Category examples include "the inclusion of intoxicating drinks from other than grapes and dates under the designation of 'wine' (khamr), the inclusion of 'chess' and 'backgammon' and their like under the designation of 'gambling' (maysir)."

[80] Without proper manāṭ verification, scholars risk applying classical rulings to contemporary situations based on superficial similarities while missing fundamental differences in underlying causal mechanisms.

[81] Specific examples include "ijtihād in determining the qibla when confused, ijtihād regarding the justice of a specific person, maintenance according to custom for a specific woman... the inclusion of types of intoxicants under the name of wine, and types of transactions under the name of ribā and gambling." Ibn Taymiyyah, Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā, 32:231; 22:308. For analysis of contemporary political dynamics, see Stephen Walt and John J. Mearsheimer, "The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy," KSG Faculty Research Working Paper Series RWP06-011, March 2006.

[82] This contemporary application demonstrates how verification of effective legal causes ensures that Muslim organizations can navigate complex coalition politics with accurate understanding of partner constraints and genuine independence, rather than operating on assumptions derived from classical precedents involving fundamentally different power dynamics and alliance structures.

know these, then his words and deeds will be based on ignorance. And whoever worships God without knowledge does more harm than good."[83]

In this context, *wāqiʿ* refers to how a thing actually exists in its own context, irrespective of how it might be perceived or expressed by others.[84] This understanding requires deep engagement with empirical realities rather than theoretical abstractions. Another definition is that it is the fiqh of "descending to the field and observing the reality that people are in, and knowing their problems and their sufferings and their circumstances and what presents itself to them, and what are the texts that apply to their reality, in a particular stage, and what is deferred from the obligations to provide capability, this is indeed the jurisprudence of reality (fiqh al-wāqiʿ)."[85]

The Scholarly Imperative for Contextual Mastery

Among the established principles in Islamic scholarship is that passing judgment on a matter depends on proper understanding of it. Accurate legal rulings generally arise after thorough study of the issues presented to a muftī. A great *faqīh's* intimate familiarity with his society becomes clear to other scholars and students of knowledge who understand fiqh and its *uṣūl*, exemplified in every fatwā he issues. He speaks of people's affairs as if living continually among them, and he addresses their interests as though he were personally involved in their everyday interactions.

Some scholars were so committed to fiqh al-wāqiʿ that they made it a condition for being a jurist (*faqīh*). Al-Qarāfī said: "Applying rulings whose basis is customs when those customs have changed is contrary to consensus (*ijmāʿ*) and is ignorance in religion. Rather, everything in the Sharīʿah that follows customs: the ruling changes when the custom changes to what the new custom requires."[86] This emphasis reflects the recognition that legal reasoning disconnected from lived reality risks producing irrelevant or harmful guidance.

Ibn al-Qayyim said in the chapter on "The Change of Fatwās and Their Variation According to Changes in Times, Places, Conditions, Intentions, and Customs:"

> "This is a chapter of tremendous benefit. Ignorance of it has caused great error regarding the Sharīʿah, resulting in hardship, difficulty, and imposing what is impossible - things that one knows the brilliant Sharīʿah, which is at the highest levels of benefits, did not bring. The Sharīʿah is built and based on wisdom and the benefits of servants in this world and the next. It is all justice, all benefits, and all wisdom. Every issue that departs

---

[83] Ibn Taymiyyah, *Qāʿidah fī al-Maḥabbah*, In *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā*, vol. 10. Medina: Majmaʿ al-Malik Fahd li-Ṭibāʿat al-Muṣḥaf al-Sharīf, 1995.
[84] It is mentioned in Lisān al-'Arab: "*waqaʾa ʿalā al-shay'* (it fell upon something), and from it *yaqaʾu waqaʾan wa-wuqūʾan*: it fell, and likewise, *awqaʾahu ghayruh* (someone else made it fall), and *waqaʾa al-maṭaru bi-al-arḍ (*the rain fell upon the earth)... and *mawāqiʾ al-ghayth* (places where rain falls): *masāqiṭuh* (its falling places), it is said *waqaʾa al-shay' mawqiʾah* (the thing fell in its place)." See: *Kitāb al-'Ayn al-Muhmalah*, 8/402.
[85] *Fiqh al-Wāqiʾ Uṣūl wa-Ḍawābiṭ* (The Jurisprudence of Reality: Principles and Controls), Silsilat Kitāb al-Ummah, Issue No. 75 (Ministry of Awqāf and Islamic Affairs, Qatar, 2000), 44-45.
[86] Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad b. Idrīs al-Qarāfī, *Al-Iḥkām fī Tamyīz al-Fatāwā ʿan al-Aḥkām wa-Taṣarrufāt al-Qāḍī wa-l-Imām*, ed. ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghuddah, 2nd ed. (Beirut: Dār al-Bashāʾir al-Islāmiyyah, 1995), 112.

from justice to oppression, from mercy to its opposite, from benefit to harm, and from wisdom to futility is not from the Sharīʿah, even if it entered it through interpretation."[87]

The unprecedented consolidation of pro-Israel influence across American political institutions since October 2023, documented through congressional voting patterns showing near-unanimous support for military aid despite widespread public opposition, exemplifies how *fiqh al-wāqiʿ* must account for structural constraints that differ qualitatively from normal democratic pluralism. When both major political parties demonstrate systematic alignment with foreign state interests over domestic constituencies, traditional muwāzanāt calculations assuming meaningful electoral choice require fundamental recalibration.

3.4. Condition IV: Considering Consequences (Iʿtibār al-Maʾālāt) in Applying Rulings

The consideration of consequences (*iʿtibār al-maʾāl*) fundamentally belongs to implementational reasoning (*ijtihād tanzīlī*), where the legal scholar (*mujtahid*) must not merely examine present circumstances but anticipate probable outcomes, recognizing that addressing immediate benefits might generate greater long-term harm.[88] *Iʿtibār al-maʾāl* is precisely defined as comprehensive examination of an action's potential trajectories during legal application, encompassing intended and unintended consequences, with ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Sanūsī offering a nuanced definition: "the verification of a ruling's foundational context (*taḥqīq manāṭ al-ḥukm*) by meticulously examining consequential requirements emerging upon application, assessing its capacity to achieve its fundamental objective (*maqṣad*), and systematically building upon those inherent necessities."[89]

This sophisticated form of applicational *ijtihād* necessitates critical examination of potential outcomes before rendering definitive rulings, preventing mechanical application of textual injunctions that might contradict the lawgiver's fundamental intentions through a nuanced decision-making process: legitimating actions when benefits can be confidently anticipated, prohibiting when intended benefits fail or generate greater harm, and instituting prohibitions to prevent harm only if prevention doesn't create equivalent or escalated negative consequences.[90]

Methodological Foundations
The methodology reflects a profound understanding of contextual complexity. As Ibn Taymiyyah eloquently articulates, the Sharīʿah fundamentally aims to:

1. Achieve and perfect beneficial outcomes

---

[87] Ibn al-Qayyim, *Iʿlām al-Muwaqqiʿīn ʿan Rabb al-ʿĀlamīn*, 3/3.

[88] ʿUmar Jadīyah, *Aṣl Iʿtibār al-Maʾāl bayna al-Nazariyyah wa-al-Taṭbīq* (Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 2009), 36. This principle represents the key challenge distinguishing skilled jurisprudential reasoning from superficial textual application.

[89] ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Maʿmar al-Sanūsī, *Iʿtibār al-Maʾālāt wa-Murāʿāt Natāʾij al-Taṣarrufāt: Dirāsah Muqāranah fī Uṣūl al-Fiqh wa-Maqāṣid al-Sharīʿah* (Dammām: Dār Ibn al-Jawzī, 1424 AH / 2003 CE), 19. This definition emphasizes the dynamic nature of consequential analysis in legal application.

[90] Jadīyah, *Aṣl Iʿtibār al-Maʾāl*, 55; Farīd Shukrī, *Fiqh al-Tanzīl*, 161. The foundational premise recognizes that every legislative ruling is predicated on generating practical benefits, just as prohibitions prevent potential harms. As Ibn Taymiyyah illustrates: "forbade prohibitions because they lead to corruption outside of them. Marrying two sisters is forbidden because it leads to severing kinship ties, and severing ties is a matter outside of marriage. Wine and gambling are forbidden and made abomination of Satan's work because that leads to turning away from prayer and causing enmity and hatred, which is a matter outside of wine and gambling. Ribā is forbidden because that leads to consuming wealth unjustly." Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā, 29:2287.

2. Nullify and minimize potential harms

3. Prioritize the superior option between two positive alternatives

4. Select the lesser harm when confronting conflicting negative potentialities[91]

He further notes a critical insight: "Many a principle, if its proponent knew what it leads to, he would not say it."[92] This approach demands that legal practitioners transcend immediate textual interpretations. A ruling's applicability is suspended until its comprehensive consequences are thoroughly verified. Even when an action satisfies all traditional causative conditions, potential negative implications might necessitate reconsideration.

Practical Implementation

The verification of consequences provides the legal scholar with a critical mechanism for: 1) Confirming the ruling's ultimate objective, 2) Ensuring the action genuinely serves its intended purpose, and 3) Tracing potential ripple effects across diverse contextual domains.[93]

Consider, for instance, the principle of forbidding wrongdoing: the intervention must be carefully calibrated to ensure it does not precipitate a more extensive or severe form of wrong.[94] Al-Shāṭibī's profound insight captures this methodological essence: "Considering the consequences of actions is an established and intended principle in the Sharīʿah, applicable whether actions align with or deviate from established norms. The scholar does not adjudicate any accountable person's action, whether proceeding or refraining, without meticulously examining its potential consequences."[95]

Theological and Legal Rationale

The consideration of consequences is not merely a procedural technicality but reflects the Lawgiver's profound wisdom. As evidenced through rigorous inductive reasoning, the sharīʿah was established exclusively to serve human welfare in both temporal and spiritual dimensions. Allah's legislative framework systematically considers causative mechanisms and clarifies the intended purposes behind specific rulings.[96]

Ibn Taymiyyah illustrates this through contractual examples: "Allah legislated causes to be performed to achieve purposes, just as He legislated acts of worship from words and actions to seek His favor and pleasure, and just as He legislated the contract of sale to transfer ownership for compensation, the contract of loan to benefit the borrower, the contract of marriage for coupling and affection between spouses, *khulʿ* to achieve separation that includes the woman's ransom from her husband's authority, and other things," representing a dynamic, contextually sensitive methodology that transcends rigid literalism while emphasizing Islamic jurisprudence's adaptive and compassionate nature.[97]

---

[91] Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwa*, 20/48.
[92] Ibn Taymiyyah, *Bayān al-Dalīl*, 147.
[93] Farīd Shukrī, *Fiqh al-Tanzīl,* 159-160.
[94] Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwa*, 22/191.
[95] al-Shāṭibī, *al-Muwāfaqāt,* 4/194-195.
[96] This theological foundation establishes that consequential analysis is intrinsic to divine legislation rather than a human addition to the interpretive process.
[97] Ibn Taymiyyah, Bayān al-Dalīl, 31. The enumeration of various contracts demonstrates how each legal institution serves specific purposive outcomes, reinforcing that Islamic law operates through goal-oriented rather than merely formal mechanisms.

Revelatory Evidence for Considering Consequences

The Qurʾān often justifies rulings by the outcomes to which they lead, making the consequence and recompense explicit:

1. Capital retribution: "There is life for you in qiṣāṣ, O people of discernment, so that you may be God-fearing."[98] Qiṣāṣ averts turmoil that would otherwise destroy society. Executing the murderer is in itself a harm (i.e., taking his life), yet it was permitted because it serves to preserve the lives of people at large.

2. Forbidding lawful acts when they lead to wrongdoing: "Do not revile those whom they invoke besides Allah, lest they revile Allah in enmity without knowledge"[99] Reviling idols is a form of worship, yet Allah forbade it because it would become a means to a worse evil, reviling Allah Himself.

3. Moderation in worship: "Do not raise your voice in prayer nor speak too softly, but seek a way between."[100] While in Mecca, the Prophet ﷺ was restrained from loud recitation lest the idolaters hear and blaspheme the Qurʾān, its Reveler, its recipient, and its bearer.

Likewise, the Prophet ﷺ consistently applied consequential reasoning, prohibiting what leads to prohibited outcomes ("A woman may not be married together with her paternal aunt or her maternal aunt") because such unions foster rivalry and eventual severing of kinship ties even if both women agree, and commanding "None of you should urinate in stagnant water and then wash in it" to "block the means," as urine causes impurity and successive urination further corrupts the water.[101]

The Foundations of Considering al-Maʾālāt: Sadd al-Dharāʾiʿ

Technical Definition: Dharīʿah as "whatever serves as a means or path leading to something."[102] The composite definition of *sadd al-dharāʾiʿ* becomes: preventing whatever leads to a forbidden act. The purpose of *sadd al-dharāʾiʿ* is to prevent avenues of corruption and block paths leading to it, preempting it before it occurs. The Sharīʿah is built on caution and vigilance, preserving the aims (*maqāṣid*) of legislation. Therefore, *sadd al-dharāʾiʿ* is among the uṣūl (foundational principles) most closely connected to consequences (*maʾālāt*).

The relationship between *sadd al-dharāʾiʿ* and *maʾālāt* is causative. If a given means leads to harm or evil, it is blocked, while if it leads to benefit or good, it is opened (*fatḥ al-dharāʾiʿ*). The outcome (*maʾāl*) is the effect, and the *dharīʿah* is the cause. *Sadd al-dharāʾiʿ* is the most connected uṣūlī principle to consequences, and due to its strong connection to consequences, mention of consequences became associated with it.[103] To summarize, "when pure otherworldly benefits gather, if it is possible to achieve them all, we achieve them. If

---

[98] Qur'an 2:179.

[99] Qu'ran 6:108.

[100] Qur'an 17:110.

[101] Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, no. 5109; Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, no. 282. See Ibn Taymiyyah, Bayān al-Dalīl, 260; Majmūʿ al-Fatāwa, 21:34. These prophetic examples illustrate practical application of blocking means (sadd al-dharāʾiʿ) to prevent harmful consequences, even when initial actions might appear permissible in isolation.

[102] Ibn Taymiyyah, *Bayān al-Dalīl*, 254.

[103] Walīd b. ʿAlī al-Ḥusayn, *Iʿtibār Maʾālāt al-Afʿāl wa-Atharuhā al-Fiqhī*, 2 vols. (Riyāḍ: Dār al-Tadmuriyyah, 2009), 1:339.

achieving them all becomes impossible, we achieve the most beneficial, then the more beneficial, then the most preferable, then the more preferable."[104]

3.5. Condition V: The Jurisprudence of Priorities (Fiqh al-Awlawiyyāt)

Before engaging in *fiqh al-muwāzanāt*, contemporary Muslim scholars and legal councils must grasp the foundational discipline of *fiqh al-awlawiyyāt* (jurisprudence of priorities), which represents not merely academic nicety but essential methodological foundation without which legal balancing risks fundamental distortion of Islamic values and objectives.[105] The absence of this understanding has led to widespread confusion among contemporary religious movements, scholarly institutions, and Muslim communities, with well-intentioned practitioners expending enormous energy on secondary matters while neglecting fundamental obligations or elevating peripheral concerns above core principles.[106]

Dr. Yūsuf al-Qaraḍāwī and other scholars identified this pervasive crisis of systematic priority inversion manifesting in troubling patterns: communities mobilizing extensive resources for mosque beautification while neglecting educational infrastructure; scholarly debates consuming vast intellectual energy on peripheral ritual details while fundamental questions of necessities remain unaddressed; and movements prioritizing symbolic piety over substantive engagement with poverty, ignorance, and structural violence.[107] This misallocation stems from fundamental misunderstanding of Islamic obligations' hierarchical nature, as the Qur'ān establishes: "Do you consider providing the pilgrims with water and maintaining the Sacred Mosque as equal to believing in Allah and the Last Day and struggling in the cause of Allah? They are not equal in Allah's sight."[108]

Theoretical Foundations: Quality over Quantity
The Islamic tradition consistently emphasizes qualitative over quantitative measures of religious achievement. The Prophet's declaration that "actions are but by intentions"[109] establishes intention and purpose as the primary criterion for evaluating religious acts, superseding mere volume or frequency of practice. This principle extends beyond individual worship to encompass communal religious life. A small number of deeply committed believers working with clear priorities and strategic thinking contributes more to Islamic civilization than masses engaged in unfocused activity. The Qur'ānic praise for "those who remember Allah standing, sitting, and lying on their sides and give thought to the creation of the heavens and earth"[110] emphasizes reflective quality over mechanical repetition.

Examples of Prioritization Principles
Although beyond this paper's scope, the following *awlawiyyāt* principles exemplify the field requiring mastery for effective interest-balancing, similar to Condition I (*maqāṣid*):[1]

---

[104] Ibn ʿAbd al-Salām, *Qawāʿid al-Aḥkām.*
[105] This prerequisite knowledge ensures that subsequent balancing exercises operate within properly understood value hierarchies rather than arbitrary preference systems.
[106] Contemporary inversions include Muslim organizations expending resources on interfaith dialogue events with groups actively supporting Palestinian erasure while neglecting urgent community needs like legal defense funds for students facing disciplinary actions for Palestine advocacy, illustrating misplaced priorities that favor symbolic acceptance over substantive justice.
[107] Yūsuf al-Qaraḍāwī, Fī Fiqh al-Awlawiyyāt. These patterns reflect not individual failings but systematic educational and institutional deficiencies in teaching priority frameworks.
[108] Qur'an 9:19. This verse explicitly rejects equivalence between acts of different religious significance, establishing divine precedent for hierarchical evaluation of religious actions.
[109] Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, no. 54, Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, no. 1907.
[110] Qu'ran 3:191.

A. Theological and Creedal Priorities
1. Fundamentals over Secondary Issues[111]
2. Certainty over Probability[112]

B. Practical and Ritual Priorities
3. Obligations over Voluntary Acts[113]
4. Individual vs. Communal Obligations[114]

C. Social and Ethical Priorities
5. Human Rights in Relation to Divine Rights[115]
6. Community over Individual Interests[116]

D. Methodological and Epistemological Priorities
7. Knowledge before Action[117]
8. Understanding over Memorization[118]
9. Purposive Interpretation over Literalism[119]
10. Independent Reasoning over Blind Following[120]

E. Temporal and Contextual Priorities
11. Permanent over Temporary Benefits[121]
12. Widespread over Limited Benefit[122]

---

[111] Islamic theology establishes an unambiguous hierarchy wherein matters of ʿaqīdah (creed) and īmān (faith) take absolute precedence over practical jurisprudential details. The Qurʾānic sequence consistently places belief before action: "Those who believe and do righteous deeds." This ordering reflects not mere literary convention but fundamental theological priority. Contemporary application requires that educational curricula, community programs, and scholarly research prioritize developing sound Islamic worldview and character formation before advancing to complex legal opinions on secondary matters.

[112] Definitive (qaṭʿī) textual evidence takes precedence over probable (ẓannī) interpretations. This principle prevents the elevation of disputed scholarly opinions to the level of fundamental religious requirements, maintaining essential flexibility in areas where the divine guidance allows for interpretive diversity.

[113] The foundational principle that required duties (farāʾiḍ) supersede recommended practices (sunan and nawāfil) appears throughout Islamic literature. The Prophet emphasized: "My servant does not draw near to Me with anything more loved by Me than the religious duties I have imposed upon him" (Bukhārī). This principle revolutionizes contemporary religious practice by redirecting energy from accumulating voluntary acts toward perfecting obligatory duties, both ritual and social.

[114] Personal obligatory duties (farḍ ʿayn) take precedence over collective responsibilities (farḍ kifāyah), though this hierarchy operates within careful parameters. An individual must fulfill personal obligations before contributing to communal needs, yet when communal obligations remain completely unmet, they may supersede individual voluntary acts.

[115] Islamic jurisprudence establishes a nuanced relationship between divine rights (ḥuqūq Allah) and human rights (ḥuqūq al-ʿibād). While divine rights hold ultimate priority, the tradition demonstrates remarkable flexibility in cases where human welfare demands immediate attention. The Prophet's permission to break voluntary fasts when guests arrive exemplifies this principle. The general rule holds that human rights often take practical precedence because: (a) God is ghanī (self-sufficient) and does not benefit from worship, while humans suffer real harm from neglect; (b) human rights typically cannot be forgiven except by their holders, while divine forgiveness is always accessible; and (c) fulfilling human rights often constitutes worship of the highest order.

[116] The welfare of the Muslim community (ummah) supersedes individual interests when genuine conflict arises. This principle, rooted in the Qurʾānic vision of Muslims as a "middle nation" (ummatan wasaṭan), provides the foundation for legitimate governmental authority and social legislation. However, this principle requires careful application to prevent authoritarian abuse. Individual rights retain strong protection, and communal interests must represent genuine benefit rather than elite manipulation.

[117] The Qurʾānic command "So know that there is no deity except Allah, then seek forgiveness" (Muḥammad 47:19) establishes knowledge as the prerequisite for all righteous action. This principle applies to both religious and worldly affairs, demanding that individuals and communities invest in understanding before implementing.

[118] While memorization of Islamic texts holds great value, comprehension and internalization take priority over mere textual retention. The Qurʾānic criticism of those who "carry the Torah but do not act upon it, like a donkey carrying books" (Al-Jumuʿah 62:5) warns against emphasizing form over substance.

[119] Understanding the objectives (maqāṣid) of Islamic legislation takes precedence over rigid adherence to apparent textual meanings when these conflict. This principle, developed systematically by scholars like al-Shāṭibī, prevents the manipulation of Islamic texts to achieve outcomes contrary to their underlying purposes.

[120] While respecting scholarly tradition, contemporary Muslim scholarly councils must prioritize independent reasoning (ijtihād) over blind following (taqlīd) when facing novel, challenging circumstances. The Prophet's declaration that "scholars are the inheritors of the prophets" implies the continuation of interpretive responsibility, not its termination.

[121] Actions whose benefits continue beyond their immediate timeframe take precedence over those with temporary impact. The concept of ṣadaqah jāriyah (continuing charity) exemplifies this principle, as does investment in education over immediate consumption.

[122] Actions benefiting broader populations supersede those with restricted impact. This principle elevates public service, education, and social reform above purely personal spiritual practices.

13. Actions in Times of Crisis[123]
14. Heart over Limbs[124]

Implications for Contemporary Islamic Discourse

The systematic application of *fiqh al-awlawiyyāt* would revolutionize contemporary Islamic practice and scholarship: religious institutions prioritizing character development over ritual compliance monitoring, Islamic education emphasizing critical thinking over textual memorization, and Muslim communities focusing on fundamental social problems rather than symbolic religious displays.[125]

For legal councils and scholarly bodies, mastery of these priorities becomes essential before attempting complex balancing between competing interests, as without this foundation, *fiqh al-muwāzanāt* risks becoming mere preference-based decision-making rather than principled Islamic jurisprudence.[126] The revival of authentic *fiqh al-awlawiyyāt* represents not academic luxury but existential necessity for contemporary Islamic civilization, as Muslim communities worldwide grappling with complex social, political, and economic challenges require the ability to distinguish between essential and peripheral concerns for effective religious, social, and political leadership.[127]

While Dr. al-Qaraḍāwī's foundational work provides the essential starting point for this revival, contemporary scholars must extend and apply these principles to emerging twenty-first century challenges, enabling the Islamic legal tradition to contribute meaningfully to contemporary debates through sophisticated *fiqh al-muwāzanāt* methodology, ultimately realizing Islam's comprehensive vision: societies embodying divine guidance through human institutions where individual spiritual development and communal welfare achieve harmonious integration under revealed priorities' clear hierarchy.[128]

4. The Balancing Act: Al-Muwāzanah wal-Tarjīḥ (Balancing and Prioritizing)

"As for prioritizing the ranks of recognized good (maʿrūf) and evil (munkar) and the degrees of evidence (dalīl), so that, in case of conflict, you give precedence to the most pressing good and call to it, oppose the most severe evil and forbid it, and likewise give preference to the stronger of two evidences—that is the hallmark of those most learned in this religion."
– Ibn Taymiyyah[129]

---

[123] Righteous action during periods of tribulation, oppression, or social decline carries enhanced merit and priority due to its increased difficulty and greater social necessity. The principle finds its apex in numerous reports, such as: "The best jihād is a truthful word before an unjust ruler" (Abū Dāwūd, al-Tirmidhī). The Prophet further declared: "The master of martyrs is Ḥamzah ibn ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib, and a man who stood before an unjust imam, commanded him to good and forbade him from evil, and was killed for it." The Prophet also provided quantitative perspective on this principle: "Worship during tribulation (harj) is like emigration to me" (Muslim)

[124] Internal spiritual states and intentions (ʿamal al-qalb) take precedence over external ritual actions (ʿamal al-jawāriḥ), since the latter derive their validity from the former. The Prophet's emphasis on the heart as *"the piece of flesh that, if it is sound, the whole body is sound"* establishes this hierarchy.

[125] This transformation would redirect religious energy from performative demonstrations toward substantive engagement with community needs and societal challenges.

[126] The prerequisite nature of priority understanding ensures that subsequent balancing exercises operate within divinely established value hierarchies rather than subjective preferences or cultural biases.

[127] Contemporary examples include determining whether resources should address immediate humanitarian crises or long-term educational infrastructure, whether political engagement should prioritize symbolic victories or substantive policy changes, and whether interfaith activities should focus on theological dialogue or collaborative justice work.

[128] This vision transcends both secular materialism and otherworldly escapism, offering a balanced approach that honors both spiritual and temporal dimensions of human existence within properly understood priority frameworks.

[129] Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā*, ed. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Qāsim, 37 vols. (al-Manṣūrah: Dār al-Wafāʾ, 2005).

Al-muwāzanah (weighing and balancing considerations) is one of the most intricate and challenging tasks a jurist undertakes. It guides him when interests (*maṣāliḥ*) clash with one another, or harms (*mafāsid*) collide, or when interests and harms oppose each other. He must place everything in its proper rank justly, whether rulings, values, or actions, then prioritize them correctly based on proper Sharʿī standards, informed by both revelation and reason. Rather, he gives precedence to whatever truly merits precedence, and postpones what belongs later, avoiding magnifying what is minor or downplaying what is significant. Instead, everything is put in its rightful place with the perfect "balance" (*al-qisṭās al-mustaqīm*), free of either excess or neglect, as God says: "And He raised the heaven and established the balance, so that you may not transgress within the balance. And establish weight with justice and do not decrease the balance."[130]

This section presents the actual balancing act (*muwāzanah*), covering three types and their applications to Muslim American political engagement:

1. The balancing of benefits (muwāzanat al-maṣāliḥ)

2. The balancing of harms (muwāzanat al-mafāsid)

3. The balancing between benefits and harms (muwāzanat al-maṣāliḥ wa al-mafāsid)

Typologies of Fiqh al-Muwāzanāt
Before diving into the three typologies, it is crucial to emphasize what should be apparent to every sincere and wise believer. When engaging in muwāzanah (the balancing of maṣāliḥ and mafāsid), the first step is to actually verify that each interest presented is genuine. The scholar must, with honesty and objectivity, distinguish between legitimate maṣlaḥah and anything that is imagined, fabricated, or already nullified by sharīʿah. Any interest found to be illusory or contradicted by established rulings must be set aside and not weighed against real considerations.

Once authenticity is confirmed, the scholar should attempt to reconcile all valid interests rather than neglect one in favor of another. Combining maṣāliḥ is preferred whenever possible; for example, by comparing their temporal scope, availability of substitutes, and the legislator's implicit ordering, so long as they do not truly conflict. Muwāzanāt remains an exception to the general rule of fulfilling all obligations, employed only when interests cannot coexist.

4.1. The Balancing of Benefits (Muwāzanat al-Maṣāliḥ)

When two interests (*maṣāliḥ*) conflict, the jurist gives precedence to the more important over the less important, the obligatory over the recommended, the essential (*ḍarūrī*) over the complementary (*ḥājī*) and the embellishing (*taḥsīnī*), prioritizing communal interests over individual ones, lasting interests over temporary ones, and the more certain interests over those that are merely probable.[131] Revelatory evidence in Sūrat Ṭāhā demonstrates this principle when Hārūn (AS) explains to Mūsā (AS) why he did not more forcefully

---

[130] Qur'an 55:7-9.
[131] This hierarchical framework provides systematic criteria for resolving conflicts between competing beneficial outcomes, ensuring decisions align with Islamic value structures rather than arbitrary preferences.

restrain the Banū Isrāʾīl from wrongdoing in Mūsā's absence, stating his forbearance was due to preserving the community's unity until Mūsā's return, tolerating a lesser wrong temporarily to avoid the far graver consequence of outright schism among the Israelites, highlighting how prioritizing unity can sometimes necessitate postponing immediate corrective measures when such measures risk inciting more severe divisions.[132]

Likewise, the Prophet ﷺ established this principle through statements like "Ṣalāh in congregation is superior to ṣalāh performed alone by twenty-seven degrees" and "Guarding (ribāṭ) for a day or a night in the cause of Allāh is better than fasting for an entire month and performing its nightly prayers," demonstrating how fulfilling certain religious responsibilities, such as defending the community, can take precedence over other meritorious acts like voluntary fasting and night prayers, thus exemplifying balancing benefits in various forms of worship.[133]

Guidelines for Balancing Benefits

Scholars have offered guidelines (ḍawābiṭ) for balancing between interests, such as ʿIzz al-Dīn's guidelines on seven maxims,[134] including some of the following:

1. Prioritizing by the Rank of the Ruling

The *wājib* (obligatory) would be preferred over the *mandūb* (recommended), as in prioritizing the repayment of a demanded debt over giving voluntary charity.[135] Similarly, a *farḍ ʿayn* (individual obligation) is preferred over a *farḍ kifāyah* (communal obligation). This also includes examples of ranking in terms of value or noble actions, such as obedience to Allah above obedience to creation, and prioritizing necessities before needs and embellishments.

2. Prioritizing by Scope (Individual vs. Collective)

The public interest is preferred over a private one, such as price regulation in times of inflation. Ibn Taymiyyah's example of an imam adjusting congregational prayer practice to preserve unity demonstrates this principle: even if the imam believes one method of *basmalah* superior, he may adopt the community's preference to preserve harmony.[136] This represents *mushārakah* in a less preferred method for the sake of a stronger communal interest.[137]

3. Choosing What Benefits the Individual

Ibn Taymiyyah notes that the best deed is what is most obedient to Allah and brings the greatest benefit to its doer.[138] An apparently "inferior" deed might actually be superior for a given individual if he benefits more from it; for example, studying Qurʾānic meaning over mere memorization when understanding is lacking.[139]

4. Prioritizing by Potential Replacement

---

[132] Qur'an 20:94. This Qurʾānic account provides divine precedent for sophisticated consequential reasoning where immediate action might produce greater harm than temporary forbearance.
[133] Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, no. 649; no. 2892. These prophetic comparisons establish quantitative relationships between different acts of worship, providing practical guidance for prioritizing religious obligations based on their relative merit and communal impact.
[134] See ʿIzz al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Salām, *Qawāʿid al-Aḥkām.* The seven maxims are not listed in order here but repurposed for the three classifications of interests, harms, and interests v. harms.
[135] Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwa*, 20/51.
[136] Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā*, 29/256.
[137] Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā*, 24/195.
[138] Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā*, 22/344.
[139] Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwa*, 23/56.

If you must choose between two benefits and performing one forfeits the other, and if one can be replaced but the other cannot, then prioritize the one whose loss cannot be remedied. This is summarized by the principle: "If one of two gains will be lost irrecoverably, and the other, though lost, can be compensated, then we secure that which has no substitute and let go of the one which can be replaced."[140]

Likewise, if two good deeds conflict, one of which must be done now or not at all, while the other can be performed later, one must engage in the act that cannot be postponed. For instance, one might respond to the *muʾadhdhin* during the *adhān*, or pray the solar eclipse prayer (*kusūf*) over other concurrent but deferrable acts.[141]

Application to Muslim American Political Engagement

These principles directly apply to contemporary political decisions, though post-2023 realities have narrowed viable options. When Muslim voters face candidates who uniformly support policies enabling genocide while differing on domestic issues, the balancing framework must account for this convergence. For instance, prioritizing local and state-level engagement where pro-Israel lobby influence remains less totalizing represents adapting the "scope prioritization" principle to current constraints.

4.2. The Balancing of Harms (al-Mafāsid)

If two evils (*mafāsid*) conflict in a setting where both cannot be avoided, one must ward off the worse by tolerating the lesser, never repelling small evil by causing larger evil nor removing lighter harm by producing greater harm, thus whatever cannot be wholly removed of evil must be diminished as much as possible, with the lesser of two evils not being truly *ḥarām* in this case though described as prohibited in general contexts.[142] Revelatory evidence in Sūrat al-Kahf shows al-Khaḍir damaging a boat to save it from confiscation by a king seizing all usable vessels, choosing lesser harm (partial damage) over greater harm (complete loss to tyranny).[143]

Likewise, the Prophet's ﷺ instruction regarding the Bedouin urinating in the mosque, "Let him be, and do not interrupt him," exemplifies preventing greater harm through accepting lesser harm, as interruption might have caused physical harm, further soiling, or alienation from Islam, with Ibn Ḥajar noting: "The Prophet did not reprimand the companions for their initial reaction but instructed them to cease for the greater benefit, exemplifying the principle of choosing lesser harm to avoid greater harm and securing greater benefit by abandoning a lesser one."[144] The Prophet's statement to ʿUmar regarding spoils distribution, "They have forced me to choose between rude demands and being labeled a miser, and I refuse to be a miser," demonstrates choosing between two disliked outcomes by repelling the more severe through distribution.[145]

---

[140] Nāṣir al-Mīmān, *Al-Qawāʿid wa-al-ḍawābiṭ al-fiqhiyya ʿinda Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyya fī Kitābay "al-Ṭahārah wa-al-Ṣalāh"* (Master's thesis, Umm al-Qurā University, 1993), 1/479.

[141] Nāṣir al-Mīmān, *Al-Qawāʿid,* 1/480. This refers to the maxim:
إذا تزاحمت مصلحتان إحداهما تفوت والأخرى لا تفوت، قدمت التي تفوت على التي لا تفوت

[142] Ibn Taymiyyah, Majmūʿ al-Fatāwa, 23:343; 20:57. This principle establishes that context transforms the legal status of actions, where normally prohibited acts become permissible when preventing greater harm.

[143] Qur'an 18:79. This divine narrative provides Qur'ānic precedent for preemptive action causing minor harm to prevent major loss.

[144] Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, no. 6025; Ibn Ḥajar, Fatḥ al-Bari, 1:324. The Prophet's wisdom in allowing temporary ritual impurity to prevent permanent spiritual alienation demonstrates practical application of harm minimization.

[145] Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, no. 1056; Ibn Taymiyyah, Majmūʿ al-Fatāwa, 28:155. Additional evidence includes Ibn Masʿūd and Ibn ʿAbbās stating: "I would rather swear by Allah while lying than swear by someone else truthfully," prioritizing preservation of tawḥīd over perfect truthfulness because shirk constitutes far graver evil. The sunnah contains dozens of similar examples demonstrating this principle's consistent application.

Guidelines for Balancing Harms
1. Preferring Temporary Harm over Lasting One
The example of a woman migrating without maḥram from persecution demonstrates choosing temporary harm (traveling alone, which might ordinarily be disallowed in some *fiqhi* schools of thought) over perpetual evil (remaining under persecution).[146]

2. Driving Out Greater Harm by Incurring Lesser One
Praying behind an openly deviant imam when no alternative exists exemplifies this principle; missing congregational prayer represents greater harm than the lesser harm of following such an imam.[147]

3. Prioritization vis-à-vis the Necessities (al-Ḍarūriyyāt)
One of the methods for weighing between harms (*al-mafāsid*) is to give precedence (*tarjīḥ*) according to the levels (*marātib*) of the necessities (*al-ḍarūrīyāt*).

3a. Preserving Religion vs. Preserving Life
The application of *fiqh al-muwāzanāt* to conflicts between ḥifẓ al-dīn and ḥifẓ al-nafs represents perhaps the most sophisticated dimension of contemporary Islamic jurisprudential analysis, as the principle of "choosing the lesser of two evils" when both fundamental objectives cannot be simultaneously preserved requires a methodological framework transcending simplistic hierarchical applications.[148] Building on al-Ghazālī's framework and al-Shāṭibī's refinements, classical scholars developed nuanced approaches distinguishing between preserving religion's essence (*aṣl*), which remains inviolable, and its secondary manifestations (*farʿ*), which may be compromised when death is imminent, though determining which constitutes "greater" versus "lesser" evil between religious and vital preservation requires sophisticated jurisprudential analysis considering multiple contextual factors.[149]

Contemporary applications employ multifaceted frameworks: in medical emergencies where treatment preserves life but temporarily compromises religious observance, the immediacy and certainty of physical harm typically outweighs potential spiritual consequences, yet when religious compromise involves fundamental ʿaqīdah affecting eternal salvation, calculations become more complex; scope of impact must be evaluated whether affecting individuals alone or the broader *ummah*; and the reversibility principle assesses whether chosen actions allow future rectification, with death's irreversibility often favoring ḥifẓ al-nafs while many religious compromises permit subsequent *tawbah* and compensation.[150] The COVID-19 pandemic exemplified this framework when health authorities restricted congregational prayers: sophisticated *muwāzanāt* analysis revealed that preventing mass casualties served both *maqāṣid* simultaneously, preserving life directly serves ḥifẓ al-nafs

---

[146] Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwa*, 20/52.

[147] Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwa*, 28/343. If one truly cannot remove or replace him except through an action that causes a worse harm, it is better to endure this lesser harm by praying behind him. Missing the congregational prayer, Friday prayer, or ʿĪd prayer is a greater harm, so such an imam should still be followed so long as there is no viable alternative – and the community should strive for that.

[148] The classical legal maxim "when two harms conflict, the greater harm is averted by committing the lesser harm" establishes the theoretical foundation for these contemporary applications, representing the precise issue at hand in contemporary fiqh al-muwāzanāt frameworks.

[149] This distinction between essential and secondary religious elements provides crucial analytical flexibility while maintaining core theological integrity.

[150] These analytical tools—immediacy assessment, scope evaluation, and reversibility analysis—enable systematic rather than arbitrary decision-making in complex scenarios where fundamental objectives conflict.

while maintaining the Muslim community's capacity for future religious practice ultimately serves *ḥifẓ al-dīn*, demonstrating how apparent conflicts resolve through temporal and consequentialist analysis where temporary suspension preserves long-term collective worship ability.[151]

Preserving One Life vs. Another

The classical consensus (*ijmāʿ*) regarding coercion to commit murder provides perhaps the most unambiguous example of *muwāzanāt* application: if coerced to kill a Muslim or be killed himself, one must refuse by consensus, as preserving one's life cannot justify unjustly killing another, establishing that preservation of innocent life (*ḥifẓ al-nafs*) cannot be achieved through destruction of equally innocent life, reflecting the fundamental Islamic principle that each soul possesses equal intrinsic value before Allah with no individual's right to life superseding another's equivalent right.[152] This precedent establishes crucial methodological principles for contemporary applications: numerical equivalence whereby preservation of life cannot justify taking equal innocent lives; moral agency where coercion mitigates individual culpability but not objective wrongness; and ultimate accountability where the coerced remains responsible to Allah for choosing martyrdom over murder, reflecting divine judgment's supremacy over temporal preservation.[153]

Preserving Intellect vs. Preserving Life

The permissibility of using wine to dislodge life-threatening obstructions demonstrates *muwāzanāt* when preserving life requires temporarily compromising intellect preservation, while Ibn Taymiyyah's complex example regarding the Tatars shows contextual *muwāzanāt* where standard prohibitions were suspended because their sobriety posed greater threats to community survival.[154] In American political engagement, this principle illuminates complex calculations facing Muslim voters, organizations, and activists navigating between ideological purity and pragmatic effectiveness, where temporary compromise of certain intellectual or religious commitments prevents greater societal harm through strategic political alliances supporting candidates or policies not perfectly aligned with Islamic principles but preventing more significant damage to Muslim communities or vulnerable populations.[155]

Contemporary applications include supporting candidates with problematic positions on certain moral issues but offering strong protection for religious freedom and minority rights, exemplifying *muwāzanāt* calculation when American Muslim organizations endorse candidates supporting policies protecting Muslim civil rights and preventing Islamophobic legislation despite conflicting positions on social issues, with the key methodological principle that such compromises must be temporary, aimed at preventing greater harm, evaluated through the proposed *fiqh al-muwāzanāt* framework via scholarly councils, and constantly reevaluated as circumstances change.[156]

---

[151] This case demonstrates how some argued that ḥifẓ al-dīn is much more important than ḥifẓ al-nafs, yet proper analysis revealed both objectives could be served through temporal accommodation, illustrating the sophistication required in contemporary muwāzanāt applications.

[152] This consensus demonstrates Islamic law's unwavering commitment to the sanctity of innocent life, rejecting utilitarian calculations that would sacrifice one innocent for another.

[153] These principles find contemporary relevance in scenarios involving medical triage, resource allocation during humanitarian crises, and policies in countries where preserving one life over another presents ethical challenges, providing clear guidance that equal lives cannot be weighed against each other through human calculation.

[154] These classical precedents establish that preservation of life can justify temporary compromise of other maqāṣid when no alternative exists.

[155] This reasoning reflects sophisticated understanding that absolute adherence to all principles simultaneously may result in greater overall harm to the community and its ability to practice Islam freely.

[156] Current applications also include Muslim mental health professionals weighing whether to accept positions at institutions requiring silence on genocide's psychological impact on Muslim communities, where choosing between preserving professional advancement (thus community mental health resources) versus maintaining moral integrity exemplifies how contemporary authoritarianism forces previously theoretical dilemmas into daily practice. See Appendix A for full framework summary.

Preserving Intellect vs. Preserving Property

ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb's burning of Ruwayshid al-Thaqafī's wine shop exemplifies prioritizing intellectual preservation over property preservation, providing guidance for American Muslim political advocacy that prioritizes community intellectual and spiritual development over purely economic considerations, supporting policies restricting certain economic activities when they fundamentally undermine community well-being, even when such restrictions negatively impact Muslim-owned businesses.[157]

This principle manifests in supporting regulations on predatory lending, gambling establishments, or exploitative media content targeting vulnerable communities, reflecting prioritization of intellectual and spiritual preservation over short-term economic gains, as exemplified in the 2024-2025 political landscape's unprecedented harm-balancing calculations between candidates who actively support genocide with "progressive" domestic policies versus those combining genocide support with authoritarian domestic agendas, leading some Muslim organizations to strategically withhold endorsements, asserting that legitimizing either option causes greater long-term harm.[158]

The precedent justifies Muslim political support for public education funding, mental health services, and community development programs strengthening intellectual capacity despite higher taxation affecting Muslim business owners, and advocating for zoning restrictions preventing casinos, liquor stores, or "adult" clubs near mosques and schools, arguing that community intellectual and spiritual preservation takes precedence over individual property rights, with ʿUmar's action teaching that political decisions should evaluate long-term community intellectual health rather than immediate economic impact.[159]

During political crises, the harm-balancing framework provides systematic guidance: when facing discriminatory legislation, Muslim organizations must evaluate whether legal challenges, political mobilization, or strategic accommodation best minimizes long-term harm, with the principle of preferring temporary over permanent harm suggesting acceptance of short-term political costs to prevent constitutional precedents creating lasting damage to Muslim civil rights.[160]

4.3. Balancing between Interests (maṣāliḥ) and Harms (mafāsid)

The third and most intricate category of *fiqh al-muwāzanāt* emerges when scholars and individuals must navigate situations where beneficial and harmful consequences coexist within the same course of action. This category represents perhaps the broadest and most crucial application of muwāzanāt principles, given how frequently these conflicts arise in complex modern contexts. Unlike scenarios where competing benefits or competing harms must be prioritized, this dimension requires the sophisticated evaluation of qualitatively different moral considerations, weighing positive outcomes against negative consequences to determine the overall ethical valuation of a proposed action.

---

[157] For example, supporting such regulations reflects sophisticated understanding that certain economic activities, while potentially profitable, corrode the intellectual and spiritual fabric of communities.

[158] This contemporary application demonstrates how the classical principle guides navigation of complex political landscapes where all options involve significant moral compromise.

[159] Similarly, this framework includes economic boycotts of businesses or organizations complicit in genocide, occupation (e.g., of Palestine), or oppression, even if potentially harming individual business owners, recognizing that community moral integrity supersedes individual economic interests.

[160] This systematic approach ensures that crisis responses are principled rather than reactive, maintaining long-term strategic vision even under immediate pressure.

As many scholars note, the frequency and complexity of such calculations intensify during periods of social, political, or religious decline. Such issues multiply in times and places where the marks of prophethood are diminished. The more corruption pervades society, the more complicated these trade-offs become, causing fitnah (trial and discord) among the ummah. Some people focus exclusively on the positive aspects while ignoring negative consequences; others obsess over potential harms while dismissing genuine benefits. True moderation requires comprehensive evaluation of both dimensions, careful assessment of their relative magnitudes, and principled decision-making, though even this process may be compromised if personal desires distort objective judgment.

Qurʾānic Foundation

The Qurʾānic treatment of wine and gambling provides the paradigmatic example for balancing mixed consequences. Allah says: "They ask you about wine and gambling. Say, 'In them there is great sin and [some] benefit for people. But their sin is greater than their benefit'").[161] This verse establishes several crucial methodological principles for contemporary muwāzanāt applications. First, the Qurʾān explicitly acknowledges that morally problematic practices may contain genuine benefits, this divine recognition validates the intellectual framework for weighing mixed outcomes rather than demanding absolute categorical thinking. Second, the verse establishes that benefits and harms can be compared and measured against each other, suggesting that moral evaluation requires quantitative as well as qualitative assessment. Third, the Qurʾānic conclusion that "their sin is greater than their benefit" demonstrates that such calculations can yield definitive moral judgments rather than merely theoretical exercises.

The progressive revelation regarding alcohol consumption further illustrates the sophisticated nature of Qurʾānic muwāzanāt. Many scholars note that the verses addressing alcohol were revealed gradually, from initial acknowledgment of both benefits and harms, to prohibition during prayer times, to complete prohibition, suggesting that the balance of benefits and harms may shift depending on community circumstances and spiritual development. This progression provides methodological guidance for contemporary scholars evaluating policies or practices that may serve transitional functions while communities develop toward more ideal arrangements.

Prophetic Precedent

The Prophet's decision regarding rebuilding the Kaʿbah provides perhaps the most instructive example of Prophetic *muwāzanāt* in balancing religious benefits against social harms: he told ʿĀʾishah he would have rebuilt the Kaʿbah upon its original Abrahamic foundation "were it not that your people have recently left disbelief," refraining from restoring the Kaʿbah to its true historical form, though representing a clear *maṣlaḥah*, to avoid the greater *mafsadah* of destabilizing the newly reformed community whose faith remained fragile.[162] This prophetic example demonstrates prioritizing the most important benefit when all benefits cannot be simultaneously achieved.

This Prophetic precedent establishes crucial methodological guidelines: even religiously meritorious actions may be suspended when implementation would cause greater harm to community stability or spiritual development; timing and context significantly affect overall

---

[161] Qur'an 2:219.
[162] Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, no. 1585. This decision demonstrates the Prophet's sophisticated understanding of social psychology and community dynamics in religious leadership.

moral calculation where beneficial actions in one circumstance may prove harmful in another; community readiness and capacity constitute legitimate factors in pursuing otherwise desirable objectives; and leadership requires wisdom to distinguish between ultimate ideals and immediate practical necessities, with effective governance often requiring graduated approaches toward ideal arrangements.[163]

Evidence from Consensus (Ijmāʿ)

The companions' decision-making immediately following the Prophet's death provides compelling evidence for classical consensus on *muwāzanāt* methodology: facing competing religious obligations between the Prophet's immediate burial (a clear religious duty) and establishing caliphal leadership (a crucial political and religious necessity), they determined through collective assessment that selecting a caliph took precedence to preserve community unity and prevent political fragmentation, while burial could be temporarily delayed without fundamental harm, with no Companion objecting to this prioritization, constituting *ijmāʿ* on the legitimacy of weighing competing benefits and choosing the more pressing obligation.[164]

This foundational precedent demonstrates that *muwāzanāt* calculations require collective wisdom rather than individual judgment when possible, with the Companions' consultation process and unanimous agreement suggesting that complex benefit-harm calculations benefit from diverse perspectives and communal discernment, while establishing that religious obligations themselves may be prioritized against each other based on temporal circumstances and community needs rather than operating according to abstract hierarchical arrangements.[165] For contemporary American Muslim political engagement, this precedent supports collective decision-making processes within Muslim organizations and communities when evaluating political candidates, policy positions, or advocacy strategies, suggesting that rather than individual Muslims making isolated calculations about political participation, the Companions' model advocates seeking community consultation and striving for consensus on complex political questions involving weighing religious principles against practical political considerations.[166]

4.4. Contemporary Applications to Political Strategy

Electoral Participation Calculations

Muslim American electoral participation exemplifies complex benefit-harm balancing. Engaging in democratic processes offers benefits of civic representation, policy influence, and community protection, while potentially involving compromises with corrupted systems or candidates. The framework enables systematic evaluation: when democratic participation's benefits (protecting Muslim civil rights, advancing social justice, preventing greater harms through political marginalization) substantially outweigh its costs (association with imperfect political systems), engagement becomes not merely permissible but recommended.

---

[163] These four guidelines—suspension of meritorious actions when harmful, contextual timing considerations, community readiness assessment, and graduated implementation—provide a comprehensive framework for contemporary Muslim leaders navigating between religious ideals and practical constraints.

[164] This historical moment represents perhaps the most significant collective muwāzanāt decision in Islamic history, establishing precedent for prioritizing community preservation even over immediate religious obligations.

[165] The principle that even clear religious duties can be temporarily postponed for greater communal benefit revolutionizes understanding of Islamic legal flexibility in crisis situations.

[166] This collective approach ensures that political decisions reflect community wisdom and shared responsibility rather than individual preferences or isolated interpretations.

Coalition Building Analysis

When Muslim organizations consider joining coalitions for religious freedom, civil rights, or social justice, muwāzanāt methodology provides evaluation criteria. Benefits include amplified political influence, shared resources, and broader social acceptance. Potential harms involve association with groups holding conflicting positions on other significant issues or dilution of distinctly Islamic messaging. The key consideration remains whether coalition participation enhances Muslim capacity to achieve legitimate objectives while maintaining religious integrity.

Post-October 2023 coalition dynamics require sophisticated muwāzanāt applications as Muslim organizations navigate between maintaining necessary alliances while avoiding complicity in genocide normalization. When longtime coalition partners enforce litmus tests requiring silence on Palestinian rights, the framework evaluates whether temporary coalition dissolution better serves long-term justice objectives than compromised participation.

Policy Advocacy Prioritization

Muslim American organizations face constant decisions about resource allocation across competing policy priorities. Systematic muwāzanāt enables strategic evaluation: immigration reform might offer substantial benefits for Muslim communities while requiring cooperation with groups holding problematic positions on other issues. Environmental protection initiatives may align with Islamic stewardship principles while necessitating alliances with secular environmental movements. The methodology provides frameworks for evaluating such mixed scenarios systematically rather than through ad hoc decision-making.

5. Strategic Principles for Implementation

5.1. The Principle of Temporal Urgency

Within American Muslim political engagement, temporal considerations assume critical importance. Legislative windows, electoral cycles, and policy debates operate within compressed timeframes that rarely accommodate extended scholarly deliberation. The principle that preventing harm takes precedence over securing benefits (*dar' al-mafāsid muqaddam ʿalā jalb al-maṣāliḥ*) suggests that providing immediate guidance based on established principles may be preferable to prolonged deliberation allowing preventable harms to multiply.[167] American Muslim communities frequently face political developments where scholarly silence can result in exponentially increasing mafāsid. When immigration policies threaten family unity or educational policies impact Islamic identity formation, the absence of timely scholarly direction leaves community members navigating challenges without proper sharīʿah-based frameworks.[168]

The methodology of strategic gradualism emerges as paramount for navigating complex political transformations, with the Qur'ānic paradigm establishing gradualism as fundamental to divine pedagogy through the twenty-three-year revelation process demonstrating that even perfect divine guidance was transmitted through carefully

---

[167] When Muslim students face discriminatory policies, when mosques encounter zoning restrictions, or when Muslim candidates seek community support, the temporal element becomes crucial to effective muwāzanāt.

[168] Organizations at national or regional levels should consider a time-based framework for responding to urgent situations requiring balancing of interests and harms.

calibrated stages.[169] ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz responded to his son's impatience with reform: "Do not be in such haste. God condemned wine twice in the Qurʾān, and then prohibited it the third time. I am afraid of imposing the truth on the people all at once for they will reject it all at once, and this will lead to trial." This reveals profound jurisprudential insight establishing that divine wisdom employs gradualism, comprehensive rejection results from precipitous implementation, sustainable change requires alignment between external requirements and internal capacity, and prudential leadership involves managing transformation tempo.[170]

Gradualism's primary objectives include systematic alleviation of hardship while preventing social discord (*fitnah*), positioning it as an essential mechanism within comprehensive legal balancing that functions as applied wisdom (*ḥikmah*), harmonizing divine objectives with human capacity while simultaneously opening pathways to benefit (*fatḥ al-dharāʾiʿ*) and blocking routes to harm (*sadd al-dharāʾiʿ*).[171] The Prophet's instructions to Muʿādh regarding Yemen demonstrate systematic gradualism through sequential priority establishment, conditional progression, sensitivity to capacity, and strategic patience, though in the Muslim American political context, accelerating authoritarian drift and systematic targeting of Palestinian advocacy since 2023, including congressional attempts to codify IHRA definitions criminalizing legitimate political speech, may require recalibrating gradualist approaches when institutional capture accelerates faster than community capacity building, necessitating *muwāzanāt* calculations weighing whether continued gradualism risks permanent structural exclusion against dangers of precipitous action.[172]

5.2. Balancing Goals (ghāyāt) and Means (wasāʾil) in Democratic Participation

The classical principle of balancing between ultimate objectives and instrumental mechanisms proves essential for Muslim American political engagement. The *ghāyah* encompasses protection and advancement of ethical values, Muslim community welfare, social justice promotion, and fulfillment of the witnessing role.[173] The *wasāʾil* represents various democratic mechanisms: voting, coalition-building, advocacy, lobbying, and electoral participation.

Contemporary Muslim American political discourse reveals concerning patterns of means-ends confusion, where political parties and policy positions become ends in themselves rather than instruments toward broader Islamic objectives. The notion that the means (*wasīlah*) is nearness requires constant reevaluation of political strategies based on their effectiveness in achieving legitimate ethical objectives.[174]

---

[169] This temporal methodology reflects not limitation but wisdom: recognition that human societies require progressive adaptation to absorb and implement transformative principles effectively.

[170] ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz's son ʿAbd al-Malik had declared willingness to endure any consequence "if in matters of truth the pots begin to boil between you and me," revealing the natural human tendency toward impatience that necessitates deliberate cultivation of measured restraint.

[171] Mohammad Hashim Kamali, Principles of Islamic Jurisprudence (Cambridge: Islamic Texts Society, 2003). This dual function—facilitating beneficial change while preventing destructive disruption—creates optimal conditions for sustainable transformation.

[172] The Prophet's instructions involved beginning with fundamental theological concepts before procedural obligations, advancing only after achieving acceptance of prior stages, recognizing that overwhelming populations with comprehensive obligations simultaneously may result in total rejection, and accepting temporary incomplete implementation to secure long-term comprehensive adoption.

[173] These goals align with the Quranic injunction: "And thus We have made you a justly balanced community that you will be witnesses over the people" (al-Baqarah: 143), establishing Muslim engagement's fundamental purpose as constructive participation and moral leadership. See Muḥammad ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmiʿ al-Bayān fī Taʾwīl al-Qurʾān*, ed. Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākir (Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risālah, 2000), 3:142-156.

[174] Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Qurṭubī, *Al-Jāmiʿ li-Aḥkām al-Qurʾān* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʾIlmiyyah, 1996), 6:159.

The Prophetic model provides instructive precedents. The Treaty of Ḥudaybiyyah exemplifies sophisticated political calculation prioritizing long-term strategic objectives over immediate tactical preferences.[175] ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb's administrative innovations demonstrate institutional adaptation in service of Islamic governance, prioritizing effective administration over rigid adherence to pre-existing political forms.[176] Contemporary manifestations include Muslim organizations developing parallel institutional structures when mainstream political channels prove systematically compromised. The creation of alternative media platforms,[177] independent political action committees refusing pro-Israel lobby funding, and grassroots organizing networks outside traditional party structures exemplifies the principle that when existing structures become irredeemably corrupt, building new foundations becomes not merely permissible but obligatory.[178]

5.3. The Jurisprudence of Lesser Harm in Democratic Participation

Classical frameworks for navigating situations where perfect Islamic solutions are unavailable prove particularly relevant to democratic engagement, where pure options rarely exist and political participation often requires choosing between imperfect alternatives.[179] The application of choosing the lesser of two harms recognizes that supporting candidates aligning with some Islamic values while contradicting others may represent legitimate strategic choice when alternatives present greater harm to Muslim interests.

However, such flexibility requires clear ethical boundaries. The classical concept that necessities permit prohibitions (*ḍarūrāt tubīḥ al-maḥẓūrāt*) applies only within strict limits, requiring that any compromise be proportionate to necessity, temporary in nature, and aimed at preventing greater harm.[180]

5.4. Balancing Strategic Coherence and Community Mobilization

The implementation of *fiqh al-muwāzanāt* requires systematic coordination between scholarly analysis and community mobilization to avoid fragmentation weakening Muslim political effectiveness, addressing the critical gap between theoretical frameworks and practical implementation through organized community action while recognizing that sustainable political engagement depends upon institutional capacity rather than ad hoc responses.[181] Effective application demands institutional infrastructure bridging scholarly deliberation with grassroots mobilization, with al-Shāṭibī's emphasis on qualified interpretation (*ijtihād*) in contemporary applications establishing that complex political balancing requires specialized competency rather than popular consensus.[182] This involves

---

[175] For detailed analysis of the Treaty of Ḥudaybiyyah, see Muḥammad Ḥamīdullāh, *Majmūʿat al-Wathāʾiq al-Siyāsiyyah* (Beirut: Dār al-Nafāʾis, 1987), 56-78.

[176] On ʿUmar's administrative innovations, see ʿAbd al-ʾAzīz al-Dūrī, Al-Nuẓum al-Islāmiyyah (Beirut: Markaz Dirāsāt al-Waḥdah al-ʾArabiyyah, 1993), 89-112.

[177] Zeteo, the platform created by journalist Mehdi Hasan, is an example of an independent media platform that is not reliant on Zionist lobbying, wealthy donors, or western or eastern government influences, while of course it is not intended to be a purely religious media platform for Muslims.

[178] Similar ideas are expressed by Ibn Khaldun about civilizational changes; see Ibn Khaldun, Muqaddimah, trans. Franz Rosenthal (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967).

[179] ʿIzz al-Dīn ibn ʿAbd al-Salām, *Qawāʿid al-Aḥkām*, 1:61-85.

[180] For the principle of necessity in Islamic law, see Wahbah al-Zuḥaylī, *Al-Fiqh al-Islāmī wa-Adillatuh* (Damascus: Dār al-Fikr, 1997), 1:89-123.

[181] On the necessity of institutional frameworks for effective Islamic governance, see ʿAbd al-Wahhāb Khallāf, ʿIlm Uṣūl al-Fiqh (Cairo: Maktabat al-Daʾwah al-Islāmiyyah, 1990).

[182] Abū Isḥāq al-Shāṭibī, Al-Iʿtiṣām (Riyadh: Dār Ibn ʿAffān, 1997), 2:178-201. This principle prevents the dilution of sophisticated jurisprudential reasoning through uninformed popular opinion.

establishing Qualified Council Requirements ensuring bodies applying this methodology include scholars demonstrating mastery of *maqāṣid* methodology and balancing principles, contextual experts in American political systems and constitutional law, and community representatives who can articulate practical implementation challenges and assess real-world consequences.[183]

The principle that rulings follow their underlying reasons in presence and absence requires institutional mechanisms capable of analyzing contemporary political contexts through established Islamic legal reasoning rather than superficial analogies, necessitating ongoing scholarly development in American *fiqh* addressing particular challenges of minority Muslim political participation within secular democratic frameworks.[184]

Documentation and Methodological Consistency

The requirement for systematic documentation emerges from classical emphasis on preserving reasoning processes (*taʿlīl*) underlying legal determinations, with Ibn Taymiyyah's insistence that Islamic governance must demonstrate both divine adherence and practical effectiveness establishing accountability as integral to legitimate authority.[185] This creates institutional responsibility for systematic recording of reasoning processes documenting specific balancing considerations, textual evidence, and contextual analysis; outcome evaluation systems comparing predicted versus actual consequences to refine methodological application; and institutional memory development creating accessible repositories of precedents and lessons learned.[186]

Contemporary scholars like Yūsuf al-Qaraḍāwī emphasize that *fiqh al-wāqiʿ* (jurisprudence of reality) requires continuous engagement with changing circumstances rather than static application of inherited precedents, demanding institutional frameworks capable of systematic learning and methodological refinement based on practical experience in American political contexts.[187]

Community Education and Leadership Development

Long-term success of principled political engagement requires systematic community education developing widespread understanding of balancing methodologies rather than elite dependence, with al-ʿAlwānī emphasizing that contemporary *ijtihād* requires both traditional Islamic scholarship and modern disciplines.[188] This necessitates comprehensive curricula integrating Islamic and American political knowledge, mentorship programs following the Prophet's graduated responsibility model, and communication networks

---

[183] The three-component structure ensures comprehensive analysis combining theoretical expertise, practical knowledge, and community perspectives.

[184] Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī, Al-Ashbāh wa-l-Naẓāʾir (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1990), 1:45. This ongoing development recognizes that American Muslim political engagement presents unique challenges requiring contextualized jurisprudential responses.

[185] This classical foundation establishes that transparency and accountability are not modern impositions but intrinsic to Islamic governance methodology.

[186] These three components—documentation, evaluation, and institutional memory—create a learning system that improves over time rather than repeating errors.

[187] This dynamic approach recognizes that American political contexts present unique challenges requiring continuous methodological adaptation while maintaining principled consistency.

[188] Ṭāhā Jābir al-ʿAlwānī's work on Islamic methodology establishes this dual requirement, challenging traditional educational models that separate Islamic sciences from contemporary disciplines. Educational curricula must teach both Islamic political theory and American constitutional principles, enabling community members to understand reasoning behind scholarly guidance rather than merely accepting conclusions, addressing classical Islamic sciences alongside American political science, constitutional law, and policy analysis.

enabling timely guidance through genuine *shūrā* mechanisms.[189] Post-2023 priorities must include digital security as Islamic knowledge, given how pro-Israel organizations weaponize data against Muslim activists, making encryption and surveillance resistance part of preserving legitimate political expression, updating classical *ḥifẓ al-dīn* for contemporary authoritarianism.[190]

Integration with Broader Islamic Institutional Development

Strategic coherence requires recognizing political engagement within broader Islamic institutional development in America, where effective participation depends upon authentic community identity rooted in Islamic scholarship rather than reactive responses to external pressures.[191] This necessitates coordinating political engagement with educational institutions producing scholars versed in both Islamic tradition and American contexts, community service organizations demonstrating values through practical benefit rather than mere advocacy, and conditional multi-faith relationship building establishing Muslims as constructive contributors rather than special interest groups.[192] The objective remains maximizing Muslim capacity to advance Islamic values and societal welfare through sophisticated understanding honoring both Islamic universality and American political particularity, requiring institutional sophistication matching democratic complexity while maintaining principled foundations.[193]

---

[189] Mentorship and leadership pipeline development must link experienced practitioners with emerging leaders through structured programs combining theoretical learning with practical political experience. The Prophet's method of preparing companions for leadership responsibilities through graduated responsibility and continuous guidance provides the paradigmatic model. Communication networks and rapid response systems must enable timely dissemination of guidance during critical political moments while maintaining methodological rigor, with the classical concept of shūrā (consultation) requiring institutional mechanisms that facilitate genuine deliberation rather than mere ratification of predetermined positions.

[190] Teaching encryption, secure communication, and doxxing prevention becomes part of preserving the community's ability to engage in legitimate political expression. This contemporary addition recognizes that digital surveillance and doxxing campaigns have become primary tools for suppressing Muslim political participation, making digital security a religious obligation for community preservation equivalent to protecting physical safety.

[191] As emphasized by diverse Muslim American scholars for decades, community identity must be perceived in its true diversity, with authentic identity formation preceding effective political engagement to avoid reactive or assimilationist approaches.

[192] These three coordinated areas ensure political engagement emerges from strong community foundations rather than operating in isolation. Educational institution development must produce scholars capable of sophisticated engagement with both traditions; community service must demonstrate Islamic values through tangible social benefit; and civic relationships must be built with clear conditions that preserve Islamic principles while engaging constructively.

[193] This mature understanding of political engagement requires institutional sophistication that matches the complexity of democratic participation while maintaining clear connection to Islamic foundational principles, representing the practical application of fiqh al-muwāzanāt to American Muslim political engagement.

6. When Muwāzanah Reaches Its Limits: Alternative Resolution Mechanisms for Muslim American Political Engagement

Despite sophisticated *fiqh al-muwāzanāt* methodology, scholars may encounter situations where systematic interest-balancing proves insufficient, with exhaustive application of the five conditions, three balancing methodologies, and temporal strategies yielding inconclusive results where benefits and detriments appear genuinely equivalent.[194] Classical Islamic jurisprudence anticipated such limitations, developing three complementary approaches—consultation (*istishārah*), seeking divine guidance (*istikhārah*), and drawing lots (*qurʿah*)—representing not methodological failures but recognition that certain decisions transcend rational analysis alone, offering structured approaches when traditional *muwāzanāt* cannot definitively resolve competing considerations between Islamic principles and American civic participation.[195]

6.1. First Alternative: Consultation (Istishārah)

Consultation constitutes systematic counsel-seeking from qualified individuals when *muwāzanāt* analysis reaches inconclusive results, with Prophetic precedents including military strategy, diplomatic treaties, and community governance, and the Quranic principle emphasizing consultation as characteristic of righteous communities: "whose affair is [determined by] consultation among themselves."[196] Contemporary application requires engagement with individuals possessing relevant expertise (*ahl al-khibrah*) rather than general opinion, necessitating scholars with both Islamic legal expertise and practical understanding of American political systems, noting that while consultation is already part of *muwāzanāt*, a second round becomes necessary after extensive balancing efforts when experts themselves remain uncertain.[197]

6.2. Second Alternative: Seeking Divine Guidance through Prayer (Istikhārah)

Istikhārah represents systematic divine guidance-seeking through prayer when human analytical capacity reaches limits despite proper consultation and methodological application, with scholarly consensus (*ijmāʿ*) confirming its application to matters where individuals cannot determine optimal action through rational analysis alone.[198] Sequential integration involves completing systematic *muwāzanāt* analysis, engaging qualified

---

[194] These situations particularly arise when all major political candidates support fundamental violations of Islamic ethics while differing only in degree, making traditional cost-benefit analysis insufficient and necessitating enhanced reliance on divine guidance and collective wisdom beyond pure rational calculation.

[195] For Muslim Americans navigating complex political engagement decisions, these mechanisms offer structured approaches particularly valuable for electoral participation, coalition-building with non-Muslim organizations, or policy advocacy strategies where Islamic principles provide general guidance but allow flexibility in specific implementation.

[196] The Prophetic precedents include military strategy consultations during the Battle of Badr, diplomatic consultations regarding the Treaty of Ḥudaybiyyah, and administrative consultations concerning community governance. The Quranic verse is from al-Shūrā 42:38.

[197] Al-Nawawī's analysis provides essential guidance: consultation applies to matters lacking explicit textual guidance and should not address questions where divine revelation has already established clear preferences. The Quranic emphasis on asking "the people of knowledge" establishes that consultation effectiveness depends upon consultant qualification and specialized expertise relevant to specific decision contexts.

[198] The Kuwaiti Encyclopedia of Islamic Jurisprudence confirms this consensus across the four schools. The theological foundation recognizes that divine knowledge encompasses consequences and implications transcending human analytical capacity, enabling Allah to guide believers toward optimal decisions when systematic muwāzanāt analysis yields inconclusive results.

consultation, applying *istikhārah* for divine guidance regarding implementation and timing, then implementing decisions with confidence that both human analytical capacity and divine guidance have been utilized.[199]

6.3. Third Alternative: Drawing Lots (Qurʿah)

Drawing lots represents the a specialized mechanism, applied when interests prove genuinely equivalent after comprehensive analysis, consultation, and *istikhārah*, with ʿIzz ibn ʿAbd al-Salām establishing: "When interests are equal, with the impossibility of combining them, then precedence and postponement are left to chance through lot-drawing."[200] Al-Qarāfī clarifies that lot-drawing only applies when competing rights or interests are genuinely equal, providing resolution when analytical methods cannot establish clear precedence, with Quranic precedents including Maryam's guardian selection and Prophet Yūnus, while Prophetic applications include administrative decisions, though this rare practice requires unique circumstances and doesn't replace silence or neutrality when they are better options.[201] While classical jurisprudence recognizes drawing lots (*qurʿah*) as a third alternative for genuinely equivalent choices, its specialized nature and rare application make it less relevant for contemporary American Muslim political contexts.

6.4. Integration and Sequential Application

The alternative mechanisms operate within hierarchical sequence reflecting their relationship to human analytical capacity and divine guidance systems. The methodology begins with comprehensive *muwāzanāt* analysis, progresses to qualified consultation when analysis yields inconclusive results, advances to *istikhārah* when consultation confirms analytical limitations, and concludes with lot-drawing only when all previous approaches demonstrate genuine equivalence between competing alternatives.

For Muslim American political engagement, this sequential approach provides structured decision-making when communities face complex choices about electoral participation, policy advocacy priorities, or coalition strategies. Each mechanism supplements rather than replaces previous analytical work, building upon systematic *muwāzanāt* methodology while preventing misuse as substitutes for rigorous jurisprudential analysis.

Contemporary application requires careful attention to classical limitations while adapting procedural implementation to modern institutional contexts. The sequential integration of consultation, *istikhārah*, and lot-drawing provides comprehensive resolution capacity when systematic *muwāzanāt* analysis reaches its analytical limits through proper methodological application. The framework's sophistication lies in its recognition that optimal decision-making integrates multiple sources of guidance while maintaining methodological integrity and preventing misuse of alternative mechanisms as substitutes for rigorous jurisprudential analysis and community leadership responsibility.

---

[199] Al-Nawawī emphasizes that istikhārah should follow rather than replace consultation: "It is recommended that one seek consultation before istikhārah from those known for their counsel, expertise, and prudence regarding religion and worldly knowledge." Ibn Ḥajar al-Haytamī clarifies that consultation provides external perspective while istikhārah seeks divine guidance transcending human analytical limitations.

[200] This applies particularly to Muslim American communities when multiple equally qualified candidates seek the same leadership position or when determining priority among equivalent community projects with limited resources.

[201] Al-Qarāfī states: "When truth or interest is specifically determined, it is not permissible to deviate from it through lot-drawing, because such deviation abandons known guidance for uncertain alternatives." Quranic precedents are found in Āl ʿImrān 3:44 and al-Ṣāffāt 37:141, with Prophetic applications including selecting companions for travel.

Conclusion

Fiqh al-muwāzanāt provides American Muslims with a sophisticated framework for navigating complex political landscapes while maintaining fidelity to Islamic principles. Rooted in classical jurisprudential traditions yet responsive to contemporary realities, this approach offers a methodological path between rigid textualism and unmoored pragmatism. The principles of evaluating benefits and harms, prioritizing interests according to their importance, considering consequences, and acknowledging contextual factors collectively enable nuanced engagement with political questions facing Muslim communities.

From electoral participation to coalition-building, legislative advocacy to social activism, abortion debates to sexuality and gender-related policies, these principles guide decision-making in ways that honor both religious commitment and practical wisdom. Recent examples include Muslim communities grappling with whether to participate in Democratic primaries to unseat genocide-enablers despite the party's institutional commitment to Israeli apartheid, or evaluating involvement in campus protests knowing they face coordinated suppression through IHRA-based policies and doxxing campaigns funded by pro-Israel organizations.

Nevertheless, significant challenges remain in developing systematic, authoritative, and transparent approaches to applying these principles in the American context. Addressing these challenges requires institutional development, educational initiatives, and interdisciplinary engagement that can strengthen the methodological foundations of fiqh al-muwāzanāt while making it more accessible to community members.

As American Muslim communities continue to navigate their political identity and engagement, *fiqh al-muwāzanāt* offers not only practical guidance for specific questions but also a methodological approach that balances principled commitment with contextual awareness. This balance will remain essential as Muslims seek to contribute positively to American society while maintaining their distinctive identity and values in an increasingly complex political landscape.

The systematic framework presented in this paper represents a significant contribution to English-language Islamic jurisprudence, providing both theoretical foundation and practical methodology for one of the most pressing challenges facing contemporary Muslim communities. Through rigorous application of classical principles to modern contexts, *fiqh al-muwāzanāt* demonstrates the continued relevance and sophistication of Islamic legal reasoning in addressing the complexities of minority Muslim political engagement in pluralistic societies.

Bibliography

AAOIFI (Accounting and Auditing Organization for Islamic Financial Institutions). *Sharīʿah Standards*. Manama, Bahrain: AAOIFI, n.d.

Abū Dāwūd, Sulaymān ibn al-Ashʿath. *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*. Riyadh: Dār al-Salām, 1999.

Abū Zahrah, Muḥammad. *Abū Ḥanīfah*. Cairo: Dār al-Fikr al-ʿArabī, n.d.

Abū Zahrah, Muḥammad. *Uṣūl al-Fiqh* [Principles of Jurisprudence]. Cairo: Dār al-Fikr al-ʿArabī, 1958.

ʿAlwānī, Ṭāhā Jābir al-. *Uṣūl al-Fiqh al-Islāmī: Manāhij al-Baḥth wa-l-Maʿrifah*. Herndon: International Institute of Islamic Thought, 1995.

al-Āmidī, Sayf al-Dīn ʿAlī b. Muḥammad. *Al-Iḥkām fī Uṣūl al-Aḥkām* [The Definitive in the Principles of Rulings]. 4 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyyah, 1983.

AMJA (Assembly of Muslim Jurists of America). *Contemporary Fiqh Issues*. n.p.: n.d.

Auda, Jasser. *Maqasid al-Shariah as Philosophy of Islamic Law: A Systems Approach*. London: International Institute of Islamic Thought, 2008.

Bdeir, Rāʾid ʿAbd Allāh. *Al-Manāṭ fī Uṣūl al-Fiqh*. 1st ed. Cairo: Dār Ibn al-Jawzī, 1427/2006.

al-Bukhārī, Muḥammad ibn Ismāʿīl. *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*. Riyadh: Dār al-Salām, 1999.

al-Būṭī, Muḥammad Saʿīd Ramaḍān. *Ḍawābiṭ al-Maṣlaḥah* [Controls of Public Interest]. Damascus: Dār al-Fikr, n.d.

Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR). *2024 Voter Guide: Principles Over Parties*. Washington, DC: CAIR, 2024.

Dār al-Iftāʾ al-Miṣriyyah. *Al-Manhaj* [The Methodology]. Cairo: Dār al-Iftāʾ, n.d.

al-Dirīnī, Muḥammad Fathī. *Buḥūth Muqāranah fī al-Fiqh al-Islāmī wa-Uṣūlih*. 1st ed. Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risālah, 1994.

al-Dūrī, ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz. *Al-Nuẓum al-Islāmiyyah* [Islamic Systems]. Beirut: Markaz Dirāsāt al-Waḥdah al-ʿArabiyyah, 1993.

ECFR (European Council for Fatwa and Research). *Islamic Legal Verdicts*. n.p.: n.d.

El-Gamal, Mahmoud. *Islamic Finance*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

FCNA (Fiqh Council of North America). *Contemporary Issues*. n.p.: n.d.

Gāwush, Aḥmad. *Al-Ijtihād ʿinda al-Uṣūliyyīn: Min al-Naẓariyyah ilā al-Taṭbīq* [Ijtihad among Methodologists: From Theory to Application]. 1st ed. Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 2009.

al-Ghazālī, Abū Ḥāmid. *Iḥyāʾ ʿUlūm al-Dīn* [Reviving the Religious Sciences]. Beirut: Dār al-Maʿrifah, n.d.

al-Ghazālī, Abū Ḥāmid. *Al-Mustaṣfā min ʿIlm al-Uṣūl* [The Chosen from the Science of Principles]. Edited by Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Salām ʿAbd al-Shāfī. 2 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyyah, 1993.

al-Ghazālī, Muḥammad. *Fiqh al-Sīrah*. Damascus: Dār al-Qalam, 1991.

al-Ghazālī, Muḥammad. *Kayfa Nataʿāmal maʿa al-Qurʾān* [How We Interact with the Quran]. Damascus: Dār al-Shāmiyyah, 1999.

Ḥajar, Ibn. *Fatḥ al-Bārī*. 13 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Maʿrifah, 1379 AH.

Ḥajar al-Haytamī, Ibn. *Tuḥfat al-Muḥtāj fī Sharḥ al-Minhāj* [The Gift of the Needy in Commenting on the Curriculum]. 10 vols. Cairo: al-Maktabah al-Tijāriyyah al-Kubrā, 1983.

Hallaq, Wael B. *A History of Islamic Legal Theories: An Introduction to Sunni Usul al-Fiqh*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Ḥamīdullāh, Muḥammad. *Majmūʿat al-Wathāʾiq al-Siyāsiyyah* [Collection of Political Documents]. Beirut: Dār al-Nafāʾis, 1987.Hishām, Ibn. *Al-Sīrah al-Nabawiyyah* [The Prophetic Biography]. Edited by Muṣṭafā al-Saqqā, Ibrāhīm al-Abyārī, and ʿAbd al-Ḥāfiẓ Shalabī. 4 vols. Cairo: Muṣṭafā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī, 1955.

al-Ḥusayn, Walīd b. ʿAlī. *Iʿtibār Maʾālāt al-Afʿāl wa-Atharuhā al-Fiqhī*. 2 vols. Riyāḍ: Dār al-Tadmuriyyah, 2009.

Ibn ʿĀbidīn. *Radd al-Muḥtār*. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1992.

Ibn ʿAbd al-Salām, ʿIzz al-Dīn. *Qawāʿid al-Aḥkām fī Maṣāliḥ al-Anām* [Rules of Rulings in the Interests of People]. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyyah, 1999.

Ibn Āshūr, Muḥammad al-Ṭāhir. *Maqāṣid al-Sharīʿah al-Islāmiyyah*. Edited by El-tahir el-Mesnawi. Kuala Lumpur: Al-fajr, 1999.

Ibn al-Najjār al-Ḥanbalī, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad. *Sharḥ al-Kawkab al-Munīr*. Edited by Muḥammad al-Zuḥaylī and Nazīḥ Ḥammād. 2nd ed. Riyadh: Maktabat ʿUbaykān, 1418/1997.

Ibn al-Qayyim al-Jawziyyah. *Iʿlām al-Muwaqqiʿīn ʿan Rabb al-ʿĀlamīn* [Informing the Signatories about the Lord of the Worlds]. Edited by Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Salām Ibrāhīm. 4 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyyah, 1991.

Ibn Khaldun. *The Muqaddimah: An Introduction to History*. Translated by Franz Rosenthal. 3
    vols. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967.

Ibn Nujaym. *Al-Ashbāh wa-al-Naẓā'ir* [Similarities and Parallels]. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-
    'Ilmiyyah, 1999.

Ibn Qudāmah, Muwaffaq al-Dīn. *Rawḍat al-Nāẓir wa-Jannat al-Manāẓir fī Uṣūl al-Fiqh*. 2nd
    ed. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risālah, 1423/2002.

Ibn Taymiyyah. *Bayān al-Dalīl* [Clarification of Evidence]. Beirut: Al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1998.

Ibn Taymiyyah. *Dar' Ta'āruḍ al-'Aql wa-al-Naql*. Edited by Muḥammad Rashād Sālim. 11
    vols. Riyadh: Jāmi'at al-Imām Muḥammad b. Sa'ūd al-Islāmiyyah, 1411/1991.

Ibn Taymiyyah. *Majmū' al-Fatāwā* [Collected Fatwas]. Edited by 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Qāsim.
    37 vols. al-Manṣūrah: Dār al-Wafā', 2005.

Ibn Taymiyyah. *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah*. Edited by Muḥammad Rashād Sālim. 8
    vols. Riyadh: Jāmi'at al-Imām Muḥammad b. Sa'ūd al-Islāmiyyah, 1406/1986.

Ibn Taymiyyah. *Qā'idah fī al-Maḥabbah* [Treatise on Love]. In *Majmū' al-Fatāwā* [Collected
    Fatwas], vol. 10. Medina: Majma' al-Malik Fahd, 1995.

Ibn Taymiyyah. *Al-Radd 'alā al-Manṭiqiyyīn*. Edited by Muḥammad Ḥasan Ismā'īl. 1st ed.
    Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1428/2007.

Ibn Taymiyyah. *Al-Siyāsah al-Shar'iyyah*. Riyadh: Wizārat al-Shu'ūn al-Islāmiyyah, 1998.

IFA (Islamic Fiqh Academy). *Majallat Majma' al-Fiqh al-Islāmī* [Journal of the Islamic Fiqh
    Academy]. Jeddah: IFA, n.d.

IOMS (Islamic Organization for Medical Sciences). *Contemporary Bioethical Issues*. Kuwait:
    IOMS, n.d.

IOMS. *Islamic Ethics in Medical Practice*. Kuwait: IOMS, n.d.

Jackson, Sherman A. *Islam and the Blackamerican: Looking Toward the Third Resurrection*.
    New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Jackson, Sherman A. *Islamic Law and the State: The Constitutional Jurisprudence of Shihāb
    al-Dīn al-Qarāfī*. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Jadīyah, 'Umar. *Aṣl I'tibār al-Ma'āl bayna al-Naẓariyyah wa-al-Taṭbīq*. Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm,
    2009.

al-Kamālī, 'Abd Allāh Yaḥyā. *Ta'ṣīl fiqh al-muwāzanāt* [Establishing the Jurisprudence of
    Balancing]. Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 2000.

Kamali, Mohammad Hashim. *Maqasid al-Shariah Made Simple*. London: International
    Institute of Islamic Thought, 2008.

Kamali, Mohammad Hashim. *Principles of Islamic Jurisprudence*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Islamic
    Texts Society, 2003.

Khallāf, 'Abd al-Wahhāb. *'Ilm Uṣūl al-Fiqh*. Cairo: Maktabat al-Da'wah al-Islāmiyyah, 1990.

Kitāb al-'Ayn al-Muhmalah. 8 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, n.d.

al-Mawsū'ah al-Kuwaytiyyah [Kuwaiti Encyclopedia]. 45 vols. Kuwait: Wizārat al-Awqāf wa-
    al-Shu'ūn al-Islāmiyyah, 1983–2006.

Mearsheimer, John J., and Stephen M. Walt. *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy*.
    Updated edition. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2006.

al-Mīmān, Nāṣir. *Al-Qawā'id wa-al-ḍawābiṭ al-fiqhiyya 'inda Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyya fī
    Kitābay "al-Ṭahārah wa-al-Ṣalāh"*. Master's thesis, Umm al-Qurā University, 1993.

Muslim, Abū al-Ḥusayn. *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. Riyadh: Dār al-Salām, 1998.

al-Nadwī, 'Ali Aḥmad. *Al-Qawā'id al-fiqhiyya*. Damascus: Dār al-Qalam, 1987.

al-Najjār, 'Abd al-Majīd. *Khilāfat al-Insān bayna al-Waḥy wa-al-'Aql* [Human Vicegerency
    between Revelation and Reason]. Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 1987.

al-Najjār, 'Abd al-Majīd. *Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah bi-Ab'ād Jadīdah* [Objectives of Islamic Law
    with New Dimensions]. 2nd ed. Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 2008.

al-Najjār, 'Abd al-Majīd 'Umar. *Fuṣūl fī al-Fikr al-Islāmī bi-l-Maghrib*. 1st ed. Beirut: Dār al-
    Gharb al-Islāmī, 1412/1992.

al-Nawawī, Yaḥyā ibn Sharaf. *Al-Majmū' Sharḥ al-Muhadhdhab* [The Collected Commentary
    on the Refined]. 20 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1996.

Palestine Legal and Center for Constitutional Rights. *The Palestine Exception to Free
    Speech*. 2024 Update. New York: Palestine Legal & Center for Constitutional Rights,
    2024.

al-Qaraḍāwī, Yūsuf. *Dirāsah fī Fiqh Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah*. Cairo: Dār al-Shurūq, 2006.

al-Qaraḍāwī, Yūsuf. *Fiqh al-Wāqi': Dirāsāt fī Ishkāliyyāt al-Ḥarakah al-Islāmiyyah al-
    Mu'āṣirah*. Cairo: Maktabat Wahbah, 2007.

al-Qaraḍāwī, Yūsuf. *Fī Fiqh al-Awlawiyyāt: Dirāsah Jadīdah fī Ḍaw' al-Qur'ān wa al-Sunnah*
    [Jurisprudence of Priorities: A New Study in Light of the Quran and Sunnah]. Cairo:
    Maktabat Wahbah, 1996.

al-Qaraḍāwī, Yūsuf. *Madkhal li-Dirāsat al-Sharī'ah al-Islāmiyyah*. Cairo: Maktabat Wahbah, 2001.

al-Qaraḍāwī, Yūsuf. *Al-Ṣaḥwah al-Islāmiyyah bayna al-Juhūd wa al-Taṭarruf*. Cairo: Dār al-Shurūq, 2001.

al-Qaraḍāwī, Yūsuf. *Al-Siyāsah al-Shar'iyyah* [The Islamic Legal Political System]. Cairo: Dār al-Shurūq, 2006.

al-Qarāfī, Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad b. Idrīs. *Al-Furūq* [The Distinguishing Points]. 4 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1998.

al-Qarāfī, Shihāb al-Dīn. *Al-Iḥkām fī Tamyīz al-Fatāwā 'an al-Aḥkām wa-Taṣarrufāt al-Qāḍī wa-l-Imām*. Edited by 'Abd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghuddah. 2nd ed. Beirut: Dār al-Bashā'ir al-Islāmiyyah, 1995.

al-Qarāfī, Shihāb al-Dīn. *Sharḥ Tanqīḥ al-Fuṣūl*. Cairo: Sharikat al-Ṭibā'ah al-Fanniyyah al-Muttaḥidah, 1973.

al-Qurṭubī, Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad. *Al-Jāmi' li-Aḥkām al-Qur'ān* [The Comprehensive Book of Quranic Rulings]. 20 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1996.

al-Rabwa'ah, Aḥmad Ḥasan. "Al-Muwāzanah bayna al-maṣāliḥ wa-al-mafāsid wa-taṭbīqātuhumā fī al-wāqi' al-mu'āṣir" [The Balancing of Interests and Harms and Their Applications in Contemporary Reality]. *Journal of Scientific Research and Islamic Studies* 12, no. 1 (2020): 65–90.

al-Rāzī, Fakhr al-Dīn. *Al-Maḥṣūl fī 'Ilm Uṣūl al-Fiqh*. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risālah, 1997.

al-Raysūnī, Aḥmad. *Naẓariyyat al-Maqāṣid 'inda al-Imām al-Shāṭibī*. Herndon: International Institute of Islamic Thought, 1995.

al-Sa'dī, 'Abd al-Ḥakīm 'Abd al-Raḥmān. *Mabāḥith al-'Illah fī al-Qiyās 'inda al-Uṣūliyyīn* [Discussions on Causality in Analogy among Methodologists]. 1st ed. Beirut: Dār al-Bashā'ir al-Islāmiyyah, 2000.

al-Sanūsī, 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ma'mar. *I'tibār al-Ma'ālāt wa-Murā'āt Natā'ij al-Taṣarrufāt: Dirāsah Muqāranah fī Uṣūl al-Fiqh wa-Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah*. Dammām: Dār Ibn al-Jawzī, 1424 AH / 2003 CE.

al-Shāfi'ī, Muḥammad ibn Idrīs. *Al-Risālah*. Edited by Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākir. Cairo: Dār al-Turāth, 1979.

al-Shāṭibī, Abū Isḥāq. *Al-I'tiṣām* [Holding Fast]. Beirut: Dār Ibn 'Affān, 1997.

al-Shāṭibī, Abū Isḥāq. *Al-Muwāfaqāt fī Uṣūl al-Sharī'ah* [The Agreements in the Principles of Islamic Law]. Edited by 'Abd Allah Darrāz. 4 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 2003.

al-Shawkānī, Muḥammad ibn 'Alī. *Irshād al-Fuḥūl ilā Taḥqīq al-Ḥaqq min 'Ilm al-Uṣūl*. Edited by Muḥammad Ṣubḥī ibn Ḥasan Ḥallāq. 2 vols. Damascus: Dār Ibn Kathīr, 1443 AH.

al-Shinqīṭī, Aḥmad 'Abd al-Wahhāb. *Al-Waṣf al-Munāsib li-Shar' al-Ḥukm*. Medina: Markaz al-Baḥth al-'Ilmī wa-Iḥyā' al-'Ilm al-Islāmī, 1994.

Shukrī, Farīd. *Fiqh al-Tanzīl* [Jurisprudence of Revelation]. Rabat: Maṭba'at al-Najāḥ al-Jadīdah, 2015.

Silsilat Kitāb al-Ummah. *Fiqh al-Wāqi' Uṣūl wa-Ḍawābiṭ* [The Jurisprudence of Reality: Principles and Controls]. Issue No. 75. Ministry of Awqāf and Islamic Affairs, Qatar, 2000.

Soroush, Abdolkarim. *Reason, Freedom, and Democracy in Islam*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

al-Suyūṭī, Jalāl al-Dīn. *Al-Ashbāh wa-al-Naẓā'ir* [Similarities and Parallels]. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1983.

al-Ṭabarī, Muḥammad ibn Jarīr. *Jāmi' al-Bayān fī Ta'wīl al-Qur'ān* [Comprehensive Exposition of the Interpretation of the Quran]. Edited by Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākir. 15 vols. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risālah, 2000.

al-Tinbuktī, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad. *Al-Qawā'id al-Uṣūliyyah 'inda Ibn Taymiyyah*. 2 vols. Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 1429/2008.

al-Tirmidhī, Muḥammad ibn 'Īsā. *Sunan al-Tirmidhī*. Riyadh: Dār al-Salām, 1999.

al-Turkī, Ḥasan, ed. *Uṣūl al-Fiqh al-Islāmī* [Principles of Islamic Jurisprudence]. 2 vols. Riyadh: Dār al-Waṭan, 1996.

Usmani, Muḥammad Taqī 'Uthmānī. *Introduction to Islamic Finance*. Karachi: Maktabah Ma'ārif al-Qur'ān, n.d.

al-Zankī, Najm al-Dīn Qādir Karīm. *Al-Ijtihād fī Mawridi al-Naṣṣ: Dirāsah Uṣūliyyah Muqāranah*. 1st ed. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1427/2006.

al-Zarqā', Muṣṭafā. *Al-Madkhal al-fiqhī al-'āmm*. Damascus: Dār al-Qalam, 2004.

al-Zuḥaylī, Wahbah. *Al-Fiqh al-Islāmī wa-Adillatuh* [Islamic Jurisprudence and Its Evidences]. 8 vols. Damascus: Dār al-Fikr, 1997.

al-Zuḥaylī, Wahbah. *Uṣūl al-Fiqh* [Principles of Jurisprudence]. 2 vols. Damascus: Dār al-
    Fikr, 1986.

Appendix A: High-Level Overview:
The Muwāzanāt Decision Matrix

A systematic six-phase process enabling Islamic scholarly councils to make principled decisions when competing interests, benefits, and harms must be carefully balanced according to Islamic legal principles. What follows is a proposed system that can be modified and adopted to varying councils and their respective needs.

Six-Phase Process

Phase 1: Issue Assessment

Objective: Comprehensive understanding of the decision context

- Clearly define the question requiring resolution

- Gather factual information from qualified experts

- Map all affected stakeholders and their interests

- Classify urgency level (Critical/Urgent/Important) to determine timeline

Phase 2: Islamic Legal Analysis

Objective: Establish the Islamic legal foundation for decision-making

- Research relevant Quranic verses, Prophetic traditions, and scholarly consensus

- Apply maqāṣid al-sharīʿah (Islamic legal objectives) framework

- Identify applicable legal maxims (qawāʿid fiqhiyyah)

- Verify that/if classical precedents address genuinely analogous situations

Phase 3: Interest Evaluation

Objective: Systematic assessment of all potential benefits and harms

- Identify and categorize all positive outcomes (benefits)

- Identify and analyze all negative consequences (harms)

- Assess probability and certainty levels for each outcome

- Evaluate immediate, medium-term, and long-term implications

Phase 4: Systematic Comparison

Objective: Rank options according to Islamic priorities and practical considerations

- Apply maqāṣid hierarchy (necessities > needs > improvements)

- Calculate net benefit for each option (benefits minus weighted harms)

- Test rankings under different scenarios (sensitivity analysis)

- Identify non-negotiable Islamic principles that cannot be compromised

Phase 5: Implementation

Objective: Execute the decision effectively while maintaining community support
- Develop stakeholder engagement and communication strategy

- Create detailed implementation plan with success metrics

- Establish risk mitigation and contingency protocols

- Document comprehensive reasoning for future reference

Phase 6: Review and Learning

Objective: Evaluate outcomes and improve future decision-making
- Assess actual results against predicted outcomes

- Document lessons learned and methodological improvements

- Share insights with other councils and scholarly community

- Conduct long-term impact evaluation

Special Procedures
Emergency Response (24-72 hours)

Abbreviated three-phase process for crisis situations:
1. Rapid assessment of essential facts and Islamic principles

2. Priority triage focusing on preventing irreversible harm

3. Provisional decision with commitment to fuller review

Quality Assurance
- **Documentation**: Comprehensive reasoning records for every decision

- **Appeals**: Internal and external review mechanisms

- **Coordination**: Communication with other councils and established Islamic institutions

- **Continuous Improvement**: Regular methodology refinement based on experience

Appendix B: Implementation Framework and Institutional Requirements for Fiqh al-Muwāzanāt

Effective deployment of the *Muwāzanāt* Decision Matrix requires standardized institutional safeguards ensuring methodological competency and procedural integrity. For Muslim American communities navigating complex political and civic engagement decisions, these implementation frameworks provide structured approaches that maintain scholarly rigor while enabling practical community guidance.

Institutional Standards and Certification

Certification criteria encompass five essential domains: verified mastery of the foundational five conditions through formal examination, institutional transparency commitments including public reasoning documentation, internal governance procedures specifying consensus thresholds and disagreement management, continuous improvement mechanisms incorporating outcome assessment, and accountability structures linking council decisions to demonstrable community welfare rather than institutional self-interest.[202]

Inter-council coordination requires systematic mechanisms balancing consistency with contextual adaptation, including regional communication networks among certified councils, comprehensive case law databases documenting *muwāzanāt* decisions and reasoning processes, structured appeal mechanisms, and periodic scholarly conferences for framework refinement.[203]

Community Engagement and Procedural Adaptations

Systematic community perspective incorporation requires structured mechanisms preserving scholarly autonomy while ensuring practical relevance. Implementation protocols include scheduled community consultation sessions, educational programming developing community understanding of *muwāzanāt* principles, systematic outcome evaluation assessing whether decisions achieve intended *maqāṣid* objectives, and periodic review processes examining practical effects on community welfare.[204]

Framework effectiveness across diverse temporal constraints requires standardized adaptation protocols maintaining analytical integrity while acknowledging practical urgency. Temporal flexibility mechanisms include abbreviated protocols for emergency community needs, explicit criteria distinguishing situations requiring full analysis from those permitting expedited approaches, and timeline templates categorizing issues by complexity and urgency.[205]

Integration with Established Scholarly Institutions

Effective implementation requires harmonious interface with existing Islamic scholarly infrastructure rather than institutional competition. Integration mechanisms encompass structured protocols incorporating guidance from established scholarly bodies into local *muwāzanāt* processes, formal communication channels with international Islamic

---

[202] These certification standards establish quality assurance frameworks while preventing unauthorized appropriation of the methodology's scholarly authority. Transparency commitments ensure community members can understand reasoning processes while maintaining scholarly autonomy through systematic documentation of analytical processes, textual sources, consultation participants, and reasoning justifications.

[203] The case law database system prevents duplication of analytical effort while enabling systematic development of precedents. Documentation includes final decisions, comprehensive reasoning processes, contextual factors, and outcome evaluations, creating institutional memory that enhances future decision-making efficiency while enabling appropriate adaptation to changed circumstances.

[204] Community engagement protocols maintain appropriate boundaries between scholarly expertise and community input, ensuring popular preferences do not override sound jurisprudential analysis while ensuring scholarly reasoning addresses genuine community needs. Educational programming develops community capacity to understand and evaluate scholarly reasoning.

[205] Timeline templates include: emergency response (24-72 hours) for crisis situations; urgent community needs (2-4 weeks) for significant decisions with moderate time constraints; routine policy development (2-6 months) for comprehensive analysis; and strategic planning (6+ months) for long-term institutional development. Each category specifies appropriate analytical procedures while maintaining essential methodological integrity.

organizations, systematic procedures reconciling framework decisions with existing *fatwā* literature, and hierarchical appeal mechanisms connecting local decisions to recognized higher scholarly authorities.[206]

These integration efforts strengthen contemporary Islamic scholarly discourse while preserving methodological diversity and contextual adaptation appropriate to pluralistic societies, enabling Muslim American communities to maintain connection with global Islamic scholarship while developing contextually appropriate guidance for American civic and political engagement.

The implementation framework provides comprehensive infrastructure supporting systematic *muwāzanāt* methodology while maintaining scholarly integrity and community responsiveness. For Muslim American communities, these requirements provide structured approaches for developing institutional capacity to address complex contemporary challenges while maintaining connection to classical Islamic legal methodology and global scholarly discourse.

Appendix C: Addressing Fundamental Methodological Concerns in Fiqh al-Muwāzanāt

The systematization of *fiqh al-muwāzanāt* inevitably encounters objections from various quarters of Islamic scholarship, ranging from concerns about innovation (*bidʿah*) in established methodology to questions about the spiritual dimensions of Islamic legal reasoning. These concerns deserve systematic engagement rather than dismissive treatment, as they reflect legitimate anxieties about preserving the integrity and authenticity of Islamic scholarship in contemporary contexts, particularly as Muslim American communities develop sophisticated approaches to civic engagement and political participation.

The Innovation (Bidʿah) Objection: Distinguishing Articulation from Legal Innovation

Traditional Islamic scholarship has maintained cautious attitudes toward methodological innovation, recognizing that changes in legal methodology can fundamentally alter substantive legal outcomes. However, Islamic intellectual history demonstrates consistent evolution in jurisprudential methodology without compromising fundamental legal principles. The development of *uṣūl al-fiqh* as a systematic discipline during the second and third Islamic centuries represents precisely this kind of methodological systematization of reasoning processes that had previously operated at intuitive levels.

Al-Shāfiʿī's "*Risālah*," widely recognized as the foundational text of Islamic legal methodology, systematized principles of analogical reasoning (*qiyās*), consensus (*ijmāʿ*),

---

[206] Integration recognizes that local *muwāzanāt* councils operate within broader networks of Islamic scholarship and should contribute to rather than fragment scholarly discourse. Formal communication channels enable knowledge exchange with international institutions while hierarchical appeal mechanisms provide recourse when local decisions prove controversial, maintaining both local responsiveness and global scholarly coherence.

and textual interpretation that had previously operated without explicit methodological articulation.[207] Similarly, al-Ghazālī's "*al-Mustaṣfā*" and al-Shāṭibī's "*al-Muwāfaqāt*" represent methodological developments that articulated principles of reasoning implicit within earlier scholarly practice rather than introducing novel legal content.[208]

The distinction between methodological articulation (*bayān al-manhaj*) and substantive innovation (*iḥdāth fī al-aḥkām*) provides crucial framework for addressing innovation concerns. Explicating what was implicit does not constitute innovation, and scholars of diverse backgrounds throughout Islamic history have established a classical foundation for methodological development that clarifies rather than alters established legal reasoning. The five-condition framework proposed in this paper operates according to this principle, with each condition representing systematic articulation of reasoning processes that classical scholars employed without explicit methodological formulation.

The Cultural Specificity and Complexity Objections

Some scholars argue that systematic *muwāzanāt* methodology, emerging from American Muslim experiences, reflects cultural assumptions limiting its applicability to other contexts. The framework addresses this through clear distinction between universal methodological principles and particular contextual applications. The five conditions represent universal requirements for sophisticated jurisprudential reasoning, while specific applications necessarily reflect particular circumstances.

The classical principle of "*al-ʿādah muḥakkamah*" (custom is legally authoritative) establishes that Islamic legal reasoning has always incorporated contextual considerations.[209] The *muwāzanāt* framework systematizes this integration of universal principles with contextual analysis rather than introducing novel cultural relativism. The emphasis on verification of effective cause (*taḥqīq al-manāṭ*) specifically prevents inappropriate transfer of rulings across different contexts.

Regarding complexity concerns, the framework addresses feasibility through graduated application protocols that match analytical complexity to issue significance and available resources. The distinction between emergency response procedures, urgent community needs, and comprehensive policy development ensures appropriate scaling to practical circumstances. The systematic approach actually increases efficiency for complex issues by preventing repeated analysis and creating institutional memory for similar future issues.

Critics might argue that emphasizing post-2023 constraints in this publication reflects temporary political pessimism rather than enduring methodological insight. However, the framework's strength lies precisely in its capacity to recognize when political contexts shift from "normal" democratic competition to systematic exclusion requiring different strategic approaches. Just as classical scholars developed distinct methodologies for Muslim

---

[207] Muḥammad ibn Idrīs al-Shāfiʿī, *al-Risālah*, ed. Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākir (Cairo: Dār al-Turāth, 1979), 234-267. Contemporary scholars universally recognize this systematization as methodological clarification rather than substantive innovation, establishing precedent for systematic articulation of reasoning processes previously operating without explicit methodological formulation.

[208] Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī, *al-Mustaṣfā*, 3:234-267. These works represent sophisticated methodological developments that articulated principles of reasoning implicit within earlier scholarly practice rather than introducing novel legal content, demonstrating the consistent evolution in jurisprudential methodology throughout Islamic intellectual history.

[209] Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī, *al-Ashbāh wa al-Naẓāʾir fī Qawāʿid wa Furūʿ Fiqh al-Shāfiʿiyyah* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyyah, 1983), 123-145. This classical principle establishes that Islamic legal reasoning has always incorporated contextual considerations rather than operating through abstract universal application, providing foundation for the *muwāzanāt* framework's systematic integration of universal principles with contextual analysis while preventing inappropriate cultural relativism.

minorities under hostile rule versus Muslim-majority contexts, contemporary muwāzanāt must acknowledge when democratic participation occurs within fundamentally compromised systems.

The Precedent-Setting Objection: Managing Legal Precedents

Traditional Islamic scholarship has been cautious about creating legal precedents that might be inappropriately applied to future situations. The framework addresses precedent concerns through explicit documentation of reasoning processes, contextual factors, and scope limitations for each decision. Rather than creating rigid precedents, the methodology establishes transparent reasoning patterns that can be appropriately adapted to future situations.

The emphasis on *taḥqīq al-manāṭ* specifically prevents inappropriate precedent application by requiring careful analysis of whether circumstances underlying previous decisions remain applicable to new situations. The framework includes explicit review and revision procedures enabling communities to modify previous decisions when circumstances change or when experience reveals unintended consequences, enhancing rather than constraining future scholarly reasoning.

These methodological concerns reflect legitimate anxieties about preserving Islamic scholarship's integrity while developing capacity to address contemporary challenges. The systematic *muwāzanāt* framework responds to these concerns not through dismissal but through careful integration of traditional scholarship principles with structured contemporary applications. For Muslim American communities, these methodological safeguards are particularly crucial as they develop sophisticated approaches to political engagement, policy advocacy, and civic participation. The framework's emphasis on qualified scholarship, spiritual insight, contextual analysis, and precedent management provides structured approaches that honor traditional Islamic legal methodology while enabling effective engagement with contemporary American political and social contexts. The goal is not to replace traditional scholarship but to provide systematic tools that support traditional scholarly virtues, including careful analysis, spiritual insight, collective wisdom, and practical effectiveness, in addressing the complex challenges facing Muslim communities in contemporary America and beyond.