

STRUCTURAL DISCRIMINATION, MEDIA REPRESENTATION, AND LEGAL REMEDIES IN SECULAR AND ISLAMIC JURISPRUDENTIAL FRAMEWORKS

Dr. HM Azhar Usama^{1*}, Dr. Shams ul Arifeen², Dr. Salman Ahmad Khan³, Mr. Mahmood Akhtar⁴, Mr. Mahmood ul Hasan⁵, Dr. Muhammad Nawaz⁶, Mr. Hafeez ur Rahman⁷

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Islamic Studies, The University of Lahore, Lahore
Email Id:- muhammad.azhar@ais.uol.edu.pk , ORCID#0000-0003-2740-3902

²Associate Professor, Department of Islamic Studies, The University of Lahore, Lahore
shams.arifeen@ais.uol.edu.pk , ORCID#0009-0005-8537-6983

³Assistant Professor, Department of Islamic Studies, The University of Lahore, Lahore
salman.ahmad@ais.uol.edu.pk , ORCID#0009-0003-0622-0397

⁴Lecturer, Department of Islamic Studies, The University of Lahore, Lahore
mahmood.akhtar@ais.uol.edu.pk , ORCID#0009-0002-4849-5201

⁵Lecturer, Department of Islamic Studies, The University of Lahore, Lahore
mahmood.ulhasan@ais.uol.edu.pk , ORCID#0009-0004-9493-8231

⁶Professor, Department of Islamic Studies, The University of Lahore, Lahore
nawazhasani@ais.uol.edu.pk , ORCID#0009-0003-1717-0946

⁷Lecturer, Department of Islamic Studies, The University of Lahore, Lahore
hafeez.urrahman@ais.uol.edu.pk , ORCID#0009-0006-5785-3444

*Corresponding Author

Dr. HM Azhar Usama

Assistant Professor, Department of Islamic Studies, The University of Lahore, Lahore

Email Id:- muhammad.azhar@ais.uol.edu.pk , ORCID#0000-0003-2740-3902

ABSTRACT

This article examines the structural intersection of institutional discrimination, mass media representation, and legal enforcement within both secular legal systems and Islamic jurisprudence (Fiqh). While secular constitutional frameworks promise formal equality (De Jure neutrality), systemic biases frequently persist through structural channels (De Facto inequality). Mass media serves both as an engine of structural discrimination—through symbolic annihilation, framing, and algorithmic bias—and as a primary site for rights enforcement. Analyzing comparative legal approaches alongside Islamic socio-legal mechanisms, this paper evaluates how traditional tort actions and civil rights doctrines fail to remedy group-based harms or algorithmic discrimination. By integrating the objectives of Islamic law (Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah), the principle of epistemic verification (Tabayyun), and systemic accountability (Ḥisbah), this study proposes structural remedies. These include mandatory algorithmic impact assessments, state-supported media pluralism, and representative litigation to secure substantive justice (Al-'Adl al-Ḥaqīqī).

Keywords: Structural Discrimination, Media Representation, Secular Frameworks, Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah, Algorithmic Bias, Tabayyun, Symbolic Annihilation, Substantive Justice.

1. INTRODUCTION: THE TRIAD OF STRUCTURE, DISCOURSE, AND LAW

Modern secular constitutional states rely on the principle of formal state neutrality. Under this doctrine, state institutions must maintain religious, racial, and gender neutrality, guaranteeing equal protection before the law regardless of identity background. However, sociolegal analysis reveals a persistent gap between formal legal equality (De Jure) and substantive equality (De Facto). Structural discrimination persists through socio-economic conditions, institutional policies, cultural norms, and media representation.

In contrast to purely procedural models of neutrality, Islamic jurisprudence roots legal protection in essential human dignity (Karāmah), as declared in the Quran: "And We have certainly honored the children of Adam" (Surah Al-Isra 17:70). This dignity is universal, transcending ethnicity, tribal identity, and socio-economic standing. The Prophet Muhammad ﷺ reinforced this structural equality in his Farewell Sermon (Khutbat Al-Wadā'), establishing that no ethnic or racial group holds inherent superiority over another except through righteousness (Taqwā). Islamic legal philosophy posits that true justice ('Adl) requires active structural equity (Iḥsān) rather than passive institutional indifference (Surah An-Nahl 16:90).

Mass media is central to this dynamic. Far from acting as a neutral conduit for information, media organizations shape social reality. Media representation constructs social identity, determines political agendas, and frames marginalization. When media systems repeatedly rely on stereotypes or exclude marginalized voices, they reinforce structural inequality.

This creates a paradox across legal systems:

Constitutional Rights vs. Harm: Secular doctrine prioritizes absolute press freedom, limiting state intervention in media content even when expression reinforces social hierarchies.

Individual Remedies vs. Group Harm: Individualized legal remedies—such as traditional tort law or anti-discrimination litigation—fail to address group-based media bias, systemic marginalization, and computational discrimination.

Information Integrity: Unregulated digital media markets weaponize sensationalism, creating systemic harm (Dharar) that distorts public discourse.

This paper evaluates these dynamics. Section 2 contrasts secular and Islamic theoretical foundations of structural harm. Section 3 analyzes media as a vector of bias through framing, symbolic annihilation, and algorithmic sorting. Section 4 compares legal frameworks across secular jurisdictions alongside Shariah principles (Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah). Section 5 critiques current legal remedies, while Section 6 proposes structural and policy reforms to advance substantive justice.

2. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF STRUCTURAL DISCRIMINATION

2.1 Conceptualizing Structural and Systemic Harm

Structural discrimination differs from direct discrimination. Direct discrimination requires an explicit act by an identifiable perpetrator targeting an individual based on a protected characteristic. In contrast, structural discrimination refers to rules, institutional habits, and cultural patterns that perpetuate disadvantage across social groups, even without explicit intent.

Structural Discrimination

$$= f(\text{Institutional Rules, Resource Distribution, Historical Advantage, Cultural Hegemony})$$

Legal theorist Iris Marion Young conceptualized structural injustice as a combination of systemic constraints, including exploitation, marginalization, powerlessness, cultural imperialism, and violence. In Islamic jurisprudence, such pervasive imbalance reflects Zulm Structural (systemic oppression), where institutional norms collectively inflict harm (Dharar) on vulnerable segments of society (Al-Mustadh'afin).

Attribute	Direct Discrimination	Structural Harm
Perpetrator	Identifiable actor	Institutional network / Culture
Intent	Required	Irrelevant
Harm Location	Isolated event	Cumulative patterns (Dharar Mutaniqqil)
Primary Fix	Individual damages	Systemic reform (Iṣlāḥ)

2.2 Secular Neutrality vs. Islamic Substantive Justice

Secular legal systems often struggle to address structural harm due to a reliance on procedural neutrality. Formal secularism views the state as a neutral arbiter, assuming that removing explicit bias from legal texts ensures equal opportunity.

This assumption creates two key legal blind spots:

The Disparate Impact Gap: Legal doctrines requiring proof of discriminatory intent fail to address policies that appear neutral but produce unequal outcomes.

Abstract Individualism: By viewing rights claimants primarily as isolated individuals, legal systems overlook group-based subordination shaped by historical and institutional factors.

Islamic jurisprudence (Fiqh) overcomes abstract individualism through the concept of collective obligation (Farḍ Kifāyah). Equity in Islam (Al-Musāwāh al-Ḥaḳīqiyyah) is not merely formal compliance (Al-Musāwāh al-Ṣūriyyah); it demands proactive measures to prevent harm and ensure public welfare (Maṣlaḥah). When state institutions or media markets allow systemic oppression to persist under the guise of neutrality, they fail the fundamental Islamic mandate of establishing balanced justice (Mīzān).

3. MEDIA REPRESENTATION AS A VECTOR OF STRUCTURAL BIAS

3.1 Media Framing, Symbolic Annihilation, and Islamic Epistemic Duty

Media platforms shape public understanding by selecting, framing, and structuring narratives. Cultural theorist Stuart Hall highlighted that media representations encode dominant social values, shaping how audiences decode social reality.

Mechanism	Definition and Socio-Legal Impact	Islamic Jurisprudential Critique
Framing	Highlights specific aspects of reality to promote a biased interpretation.	Distorts truth (Labs al-Ḥaqq bil-Bāṭil; Surah Al-Baqarah 2:42).
Symbolic Annihilation	Underrepresents or omits specific social groups, rendering them invisible.	Erases human dignity (Karāmah) and societal standing.
Stereotyping	Reduces marginalized groups to simplified, sensationalized traits.	Constitutes collective mockery and libel (Lamz and Nabaz; Surah Al-Hujurat 49:11).
Criminalization	Disproportionately links minority identity groups to social threat.	Amounts to systemic false accusation (Buhtān) and character assassination (Tashweeh).

To counteract these dynamics, Islamic law imposes the strict duty of **Tabayyun** (epistemic verification and investigation of reports):

"O you who have believed, if there comes to you a disobedient person with information, investigate, lest you harm a people out of ignorance and become, over what you have done, regretful." (Surah Al-Hujurat 49:6)

This principle places an ethical and legal obligation on information dissemination networks to verify facts, avoid inflammatory speculation, and protect social groups from media-driven vilification.

3.2 Algorithmic Discrimination in Digital Media

The transition from legacy broadcast media to digital, algorithmically driven platforms has altered how structural bias operates. Modern media distribution relies on automated curation algorithms designed to maximize engagement.

Key dimensions of digital media bias include:

Feedback Loops: Machine learning models trained on historical data replicate and amplify existing social inequalities.

Filter Bubbles & Echo Chambers: Content distribution models prioritize sensational material, reinforcing group biases and social polarization.

Commercial Profiling: Targeted advertising systems restrict access to housing, employment, and credit ads along racial, religious, or socio-economic lines.

From an Islamic legal standpoint, algorithmic opacity and dark patterns introduce **Gharar** (uncertainty/ deception) and generate automated harm (Dharar). The legal maxim "There shall be no harm nor reciprocating harm" (Lā dharara wa lā dhirār) mandates that systems causing systemic public distortion must be structurally regulated or prohibited.

4. LEGAL FRAMEWORKS ACROSS JURISDICTIONS AND SHARIAH OBJECTIVES

Different legal frameworks approach media regulation, free expression, and anti-discrimination through distinct constitutional traditions.

Jurisdiction / Framework	Primary Protection	Limits on Expression	Anti-Bias Regulatory Mechanism &
United States	Absolute press freedom (First Amendment)	Strict scrutiny; incitement standard	Market-led; limited government intervention
European Union / ECHR	Qualified freedom (Article 10 ECHR)	Article 10(2) balancing; hate speech rules	Active diversity mandates; Digital Services Act
India	Qualified freedom (Article 19(1)(a))	Reasonable restrictions under Article 19(2)	Program codes; statutory prohibitions
Islamic Jurisprudence (Fiqh)	Freedom of conscience & truth (Ḥaqq)	Prohibition of Buhtān, Gheebah, and harm (Dharar)	Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah oversight; Institutional Ḥisbah

4.1 Comparative Secular Jurisprudence

In the United States, First Amendment jurisprudence establishes a high threshold for state intervention in media content. The Supreme Court's decision in *Miami Herald Publishing Co. v. Tornillo* (1974) affirmed that the government cannot compel news organizations to publish specific viewpoints. Consequently, remedies for structural media bias rely heavily on market forces and voluntary codes.

European human rights law applies a broader approach. Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) guarantees freedom of expression but allows restrictions necessary to protect public order, health, morals, and the rights of others. E.U. directives, such as the Audiovisual Media Services Directive (AVMSD) and the Digital Services Act (DSA), introduce systemic risk assessment obligations for platforms.

4.2 The Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah Framework

Islamic legal theory evaluates media regulation through the essential objectives of Islamic law (Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah). Media systems and legal frameworks must safeguard five fundamental necessities:

Protection of Honor (Ḥifẓ al-'Irḍ): Direct legal shield against character assassination, symbolic annihilation, and group-based media slander.

Protection of Intellect (Ḥifẓ al-'Aql): Requires media to foster truth and public literacy while prohibiting sensationalism, disinformation, and algorithmic manipulation.

Protection of Religion (Ḥifẓ al-Dīn): Prevents systemic Islamophobia, religious vilification, and structural discrimination targeting faith communities.

Protection of Life (Ḥifẓ al-Nafs): Prevents media framing that incites communal violence, hatred, or structural hostility.

Protection of Wealth (Ḥifẓ al-Māl): Prohibits algorithmic ad profiling that restricts access to housing, credit, or commercial opportunities based on identity.

5. EVALUATION OF CURRENT LEGAL REMEDIES AND THEIR LIMITATIONS

Traditional legal systems rely on three primary mechanisms to address discrimination and media harms: tort law, civil rights legislation, and administrative regulation. Each faces structural limitations when addressing media bias.

Legal Mechanism	Primary Function	Limitations in Secular Law	Islamic Jurisprudential Resolution
Defamation Law	Protects individual reputation.	Fails on "group defamation" claims.	Recognizes collective harm to communal dignity (Hifz al-‘Ird).
Hate Speech Rules	Punishes severe, explicit incitement.	Misses normalized, subtle stereotypes.	Enforces duty of Tabayyun and prohibits bad faith assumption (Zann).
Non-Discrimination Laws	Targets employment and public services.	Focuses on direct acts; misses algorithmic bias.	Applies legal maxims (Qawā'id) against systemic harm (Dharar).

5.1 Defamation Law and the Group Harm Barrier

Defamation law protects individual reputations. However, standard secular legal doctrines reject claims for "group defamation". If a media outlet portrays an entire group using harmful stereotypes, individual members lack legal standing to sue. Islamic jurisprudence bridges this gap by recognizing that attacks on a group's collective honor (‘Ird) inflict direct substantive harm on every member of that community, justifying institutional intervention.

5.2 Hate Speech Statutes and the Intent Standard

Hate speech regulations typically require proof of explicit intent to incite violence or hatred. They miss subtle, normalized media biases—such as disproportionate coverage of minority crime—that continuously reinforce social inequality. In Islamic jurisprudence, liability does not depend exclusively on subjective intent (Niyyah) when objective harm (Dharar) is systematically generated across public channels.

5.3 Algorithmic Opacity and Intellectual Property Protection

Machine learning models operate as opaque "black boxes," making it difficult to trace how inputs lead to biased outputs. Proprietary claims over algorithms limit external auditing, making it hard for litigants to satisfy standard evidentiary burdens. Under Islamic commercial and administrative principles, proprietary rights cannot be used to conceal public harm (Gharar and Dharar).

6. PROPOSED REMEDIES AND POLICY FRAMEWORKS

Addressing structural discrimination in media representation requires moving beyond reactive, individual remedies toward proactive, systemic solutions that integrate legal, administrative, and institutional mechanisms.

6.1 Proactive Algorithmic Auditing and Systemic Risk Assessments

Regulatory agencies must mandate regular algorithmic impact assessments for large digital platforms. Modeled on the Islamic legal maxim **"Repelling harm takes precedence over bringing benefits"** (Dar'u al-mafāsidi muqaddamun ‘alā jalbi al-manāfi'), platforms must evaluate how recommendation engines affect protected groups prior to deployment. Independent third parties should conduct annual audits to measure bias in content delivery and ad allocation.

6.2 Structural Remedies and Institutional Injunctions

Courts and regulatory bodies should expand the use of structural remedies. Rather than focusing solely on individual monetary damages, remedies should include institutional adjustments:

Mandating transparent, multi-faith, and diverse editorial oversight boards for media organizations found liable for systemic bias.

Compelling digital platforms to modify recommendation algorithms that drive discriminatory outcomes.

Funding independent media literacy programs that teach critical consumption and epistemic verification (Tabayyun).

6.3 Public Subsidies and Endowments (Awqāf) for Media Pluralism

Market dynamics alone rarely support media pluralism for underrepresented or economically marginalized communities. State frameworks should establish independent public funding mechanisms to support non-profit, diverse media outlets. In an Islamic framework, this can be institutionalized through specialized educational and media endowments (**Awqāf**), ensuring sustained, independent funding to amplify marginalized voices in public discourse.

6.4 Expanding Legal Standing through Hisbah and Representative Actions

To address group-based harms, legal frameworks should allow civil rights organizations, statutory human rights bodies, and community advocacy groups to bring public interest litigation on behalf of marginalized groups. This directly aligns with the Islamic legal institution of **Hisbah**—the legal and administrative duty to act in the public interest to uphold justice, prevent fraud, and eliminate systemic social harm (*Munkar*).

7. CONCLUSION

Secular legal frameworks promise equality under law, but achieving substantive justice (*Al-‘Adl al-Ḥaqīqī*) requires addressing the structural mechanisms that reproduce bias. Mass media functions both as a primary site of structural discrimination and as an essential forum for democratic and moral discourse.

Traditional, individualized legal remedies are insufficient to address systemic bias, particularly in an era of algorithmic media distribution. By integrating the objectives of Shariah (*Maqāṣid al-Sharī‘ah*), the imperative of verification (*Tabayyun*), and public interest accountability (*Hisbah*), legal systems can bridge the gap between formal legal equality and substantive justice. Combining algorithmic accountability, structural injunctions, public media endowments (*Awqāf*), and expanded representative standing will better align modern media environments with fundamental human dignity (*Karāmah*).

REFERENCES

1. Agnivesha, Charaka Samhita, Vimanasthana 5/3–8, Chakrapani Commentary.
2. Agnivesha, Charaka Samhita, Sutrasthana 30.
3. Sushruta Samhita, Sharirasthana.
4. Ashtanga Hridaya, Sutrasthana.
5. Sharma RK, Dash B. Charaka Samhita (English Translation). Chaukhambha Publications.
6. Tripathi Brahmanand. Charaka Samhita, Chaukhambha Surbharati Prakashan.
7. Gupta Atridev. Ashtanga Hridaya, Chaukhambha Prakashan.
8. Lad V. Textbook of Ayurveda: Fundamental Principles.
9. Sharma PV. Ayurveda Ka Vajjnani Itihas.
10. Recent publications on Srotas and systemic disorders from AYUSH and indexed Ayurvedic journals.