



(MUDIMA)



## Justice Over Growth: A Maqasid-Based Reassessment of Neoliberal and Socialist Climate Policies

Agustin Windianingsih<sup>1\*</sup>, Euis Amalia<sup>2</sup>, Desmadi Saharuddin<sup>3</sup>, Mulki Siregar<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup> Sekolah Pascasarjana UIN Syarif Hidayatullah

<sup>4</sup> Universitas Islam Jakarta

**Corresponding Author:** Agustin Windianingsih [agustinwindia@yahoo.com](mailto:agustinwindia@yahoo.com)

### ARTICLE INFO

*Keywords:* Maqasid Al-Sharia, Bibliometric Literature Mapping, PICOS Framework, Neoliberal Economic Models, Socialist Economic Models, Climate Justice, Intergenerational Equity, Ecological Economics

*Received* : 1 April

*Revised* : 23 May

*Accepted* : 24 June

©2026 Windianingsih, Amalia, Saharuddin, Siregar: This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Atribusi 4.0 Internasional](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



### ABSTRACT

**Purpose:** This study examines how Maqasid al-Sharia serves as an ethical lens to evaluate and compare neoliberal and socialist economic models under climate change, aiming to map the scientific landscape, address structural gaps, and challenge growth-centric assumptions. **Design/methodology/approach:** The study conducts a hybrid evaluation combining a bibliometric literature mapping approach with an integrated evidence synthesis leveraging the PICOS framework for study selection. Following comprehensive searches across Scopus and Web of Science, 690 initial records were screened through co-occurrence and citation networks, resulting in the final inclusion of one empirical study matching the rigorous PICOS criteria. Qualitative approaches dominate the mapped landscape (82%), while empirical mixed-methods designs are completely absent. **Practical implications:** The findings reveal a striking empirical scarcity, identifying only one qualitative study—a Maqasid-adjusted scorecard for Indonesia's energy transition. Four major structural gaps are highlighted: a lack of comparative empirical evaluations using a consistent scorecard, missing empirical validation for Maqasid indicators, an underrepresentation of affective and conative justice, and a heavy geographical concentration in a few Muslim-majority countries. Consequently, future research must prioritize mixed-methods designs, comparative case studies, and geographical expansion to Sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia, and Eastern Europe. **Originality/value:** This research offers unique value by presenting a novel classification matrix integrating cognitive, affective, and conative justice components alongside a bibliometrically derived research agenda. It demonstrates that Maqasid al-Sharia provides a holistic, multidimensional, yet severely underutilized framework for assessing intergenerational and ecological justice beyond conventional Western-centric critiques

## INTRODUCTION

The world today is grappling with socio-ecological challenges that are not only complex but also deeply interconnected, demanding systematic approaches to map and synthesize global scientific knowledge. Among these challenges, the persistence of two dominant economic paradigms—neoliberalism and socialism—alongside the escalating threat of accelerating climate change, has increasingly called into question the adequacy of conventional development thinking. Interestingly, while these paradigms have long been positioned as opposing forces in political and economic theory, neither seems empirically equipped to offer a complete or sustainable response to the pressing ecological demands of our time. Neoliberalism, for instance, has been heavily criticized across global literature for deepening socio-economic inequalities and accelerating environmental degradation through unchecked market forces; socialism, on the other hand, has historically struggled with operational inefficiencies, over-centralized state mandates, and a lack of grassroots eco-innovation. What makes the current global moment even more urgent is the intensifying climate crisis, which forces academic communities to rethink the very purpose of development—moving beyond linear, growth-centric paradigms to ask difficult questions about sustainability, biocentric value, and equity across generations.

It is within this theoretical impasse that alternative ethical frameworks, such as Maqasid al-Sharia, have begun to attract serious scholarly attention across international indexes. Notably, this framework does not merely focus on material prosperity or narrow monetary wealth. Instead, it offers a holistic, ontological vision of human well-being rooted in the absolute preservation and promotion of five core pillars: life, intellect, religion, lineage, and property. What is particularly compelling is how recent scholarship has started to utilize Maqasid principles as a critical evaluative lens to examine the socio-ecological performance of neoliberal and socialist structures, especially in critical areas like national energy transitions, climate

adaptation strategies, and cross-sectoral distributive justice. Taken together, these works highlight a growing consensus within ecological economics: that ethical, moral, and spiritual dimensions can no longer be treated as secondary or peripheral inputs in global development discourse. In fact, several theorists have convincingly argued that without integrating such profound ethical dimensions, any pursuit of global sustainability risks remaining superficial, technocratic, and fundamentally incomplete.

Nevertheless, despite these promising individual contributions, the existing body of review literature remains surprisingly fragmented, scattered, and conceptually siloed. Most systematic or scoping reviews conducted to date have focused either exclusively on technical efficiency or on narrow outcomes related to macroeconomic redistribution, without attempting to map or synthesize findings through a coherent ethical framework. For example, while earlier literature mapping efforts have identified general dimensions of sustainable development, they have largely overlooked how Maqasid-based criteria might fundamentally reshape comparative evaluations of neoliberal and socialist systems under intense climate stress. Even more problematic is the persistent geographic, institutional, and thematic bias embedded within Indexed literature: developing countries remain severely underrepresented in baseline datasets, and justice-oriented outcomes—such as authentic intergenerational equity and non-human ecological fairness—are rarely given center stage in systematic inquiries.

This brings us to the central structural gap that motivates the present study. To the best of our knowledge, no study has yet deployed a combined **bibliometric literature mapping approach** and systematic review via the **PICOS framework** to examine Maqasid al-Sharia as an explicit evaluative lens for comparing neoliberal and socialist economic paradigms in the context of climate change. Traditional reviews often suffer from subjectivity in study selection or fail to visualize the broader intellectual networks, co-citation structures, and

thematic evolutions across sub-disciplines. By introducing a hybrid approach—where bibliometric macro-mapping delineates the boundaries of the global discourse and the PICOS framework micro-selects highly specific, eligible studies—this paper provides a rigorous, transparent, and replicable audit of the field. Addressing this gap, we believe, is not merely an isolated academic exercise; it is a necessary, transformative step toward advancing both international theoretical conversations and practical, cross-cultural policy-making in the pursuit of just and sustainable socio-ecological transitions.

### **Justification of Novelty and Scientific Contributions**

What makes this review distinct from conventional systematic literature reviews? We propose that the novelty and scientific rigor of this study rest on three interrelated dimensions:

1. **Theoretical and Methodological Integration:** This is the first study to systematically apply Maqasid al-Sharia as a holistic ethical framework for concurrently assessing neoliberal and socialist economic models under climate change, while uniquely operationalizing a dual-engine methodology. By combining a macro-level **bibliometric literature mapping approach** (to trace co-word clusters, institutional linkages, and publication trajectories) with a micro-level **PICOS framework** (to enforce exact boundaries on Population, Intervention, Comparison, Outcomes, and Study designs), this paper sets a new standard for transparency and methodological pluralism in Islamic ecological economics.
2. **Contextual and Institutional Focus:** Unlike earlier mainstream reviews that have been heavily Western-centric and restricted to secular paradigms, our study explicitly searches for and incorporates comparative insights from developing countries—especially Southeast Asia. This allows us to map structural, infrastructural, and cultural specificities that are often completely

ignored or flattened by broader global synthesis tools.

3. **Outcome Redefinition via Bibliometric Clusters:** We deliberately shift the evaluative focus away from conventional growth metrics (e.g., GDP growth, carbon accounting efficiency) toward multi-layered, justice-oriented outcomes such as biocentric ecological justice and intergenerational equity. The use of bibliometric mapping allows us to visually demonstrate how current economics literature is clustered around growth assumptions, thereby providing an empirical rationale for challenging these linear trajectories.

What contributions do we expect to make to the broader scientific community? Our review aims to offer at least four distinct scientific and practical contributions:

- **First**, we propose a new conceptual classification matrix that integrates cognitive, affective, and conative dimensions of justice into economic model assessment, born out of the conceptual gaps highlighted by our bibliometric keyword mapping.
- **Second**, we attempt a systematic synthesis of fragmented knowledge across disparate fields—including Islamic economics, climate policy, and radical development studies—constructing a unified, visual research agenda.
- **Third**, we derive highly policy-relevant implications in the form of an evidence-based matrix for contextual interventions, particularly tailored for developing nations facing severe climate impacts.
- **Fourth**, we provide absolute methodological transparency and replicability by establishing open SLR and PICOS protocols that can be seamlessly adapted for future cross-cultural ethical evaluations and meta-analyses.

## Research Questions

To guide our comprehensive investigation, we have formulated two distinct sets of research questions that align directly with the combined bibliometric and thematic novelty of our study:

### A. Methodological and Research Profiling Questions (Bibliometric Mapping)

1. How have the annual publication patterns, citation trajectories, and core source titles evolved for studies evaluating neoliberal and socialist models through ethical frameworks in climate-related contexts?
2. Which geographical regions, institutional affiliations, and country networks are most heavily represented or marginalized in the existing literature on Maqasid-based economic assessments?
3. What methodological approaches (qualitative, quantitative, or mixed-methods) dominate the structural clusters of comparative economic studies under climate stress?
4. What grand theories—such as ecological economics, Islamic political economy, dependency theory, or eco-socialism—underpin current bibliographic clusters?

### B. Thematic Analysis Questions (PICOS Framework)

5. **Population/Context**, within literature capturing climate-induced vulnerabilities in specific populations, in what ways have neoliberal and socialist economic models been assessed against Maqasid al-Sharia's core principles (protection of life, intellect, religion, lineage, property)?
6. **Intervention/Comparison/Outcomes**, what explicit justice-oriented outcomes—ranging from biocentric ecological justice and intergenerational equity to distributional fairness—are either achieved or obstructed by neoliberal interventions when compared directly to socialist models through a Maqasid lens?
7. **Study Design**, what are the most critical structural gaps, biases, and empirical

limitations in studies that survived the PICOS selection criteria regarding the operationalization of socio-ecological justice amid the global climate crisis?

These research profiling and thematic questions are not arbitrary; they directly reflect the structural dimensions of our analytical framework and ensure that our findings will meaningfully fill the identified gaps in global knowledge systems.

### Research Objectives

Consistent with the research questions detailed above, the objectives of this systematic review are threefold:

- **To systematically map and visualize** the historical evolution, contextual settings, institutional collaborations, methodological choices, and theoretical underpinnings of research comparing neoliberal and socialist models through Maqasid al-Sharia in climate change contexts, utilizing advanced bibliometric software.
- **To identify, filter, and classify** the essential gaps, empirical shortcomings, and biases in existing Maqasid-based evaluations of socio-ecological justice by applying rigorous PICOS study selection criteria.
- **To formulate a forward-looking, unified research agenda** that provides specific methodological and theoretical pathways to support a transformative socio-economic transition “from growth to justice” using the Maqasid lens in the face of the global climate crisis.

## METHODS

### Bibliometric Mapping and PICOS Framework

#### The Bibliometric Literature Mapping Paradigm

To ensure a macro-level understanding of the academic landscape, this study deploys a bibliometric literature mapping approach using VOSviewer and Bibliometrix. Rather than applying traditional systematic review criteria in isolation, integrating bibliometric macro-mapping provides an empirical, network-driven foundation that directly

strengthens the objectivity, validity, and reliability of our subsequent PICOS (Population, Intervention, Comparison, Outcome, Study design) framework. Historically, literature evaluation has evolved from subjective narrative reviews to contemporary meta-science, leveraging algorithmic mapping to process massive datasets. This approach visualizes the intellectual structure of the field, positioning our review within the broader evolutionary trajectories of global scientific production through three computational axes:

- **Keyword Co-occurrence Networks.** Map conceptual associations and dominant thematic clusters in climate economics, empirically validating our PICOS search syntax and scoping boundaries.
- **Co-citation Analysis.** Uncover the foundational theoretical frameworks and pivotal authors underpinning economic paradigms, ensuring our inclusion criteria capture the core literature defining target interventions and outcomes.
- **Geographical and Institutional Collaboration Maps.** Illuminate the spatial

distribution of research, exposing systemic geopolitical biases to ensure external validity during study selection.

By transitioning from isolated data collection to systematic structural mapping, this architectural foundation ensures our PICOS criteria are not deployed in a vacuum. Instead, it contextualizes micro-level study selection within macro-scientific trends, mitigating arbitrary selection bias and enhancing the overall rigor of the synthesis.

#### Study Selection via the PICOS Framework

While bibliometric mapping provides a comprehensive view of the entire scanned corpus, the micro-level selection of specific studies for deep qualitative synthesis requires an uncompromisingly rigorous, non-biased filtering mechanism. To achieve this, we operationalize the **PICOS framework**, which establishes precise, explicit boundaries across five core dimensions. The specific criteria developed for this review are defined in the following table:

Table 1. Study Selection via the PICOS Framework

PICOS Dimension	Inclusion Criteria (Menerima)	Exclusion Criteria (Menolak)
<b>P – Population / Context</b>	Communities, nations, or ecosystems facing explicit climate-induced vulnerabilities, energy transition processes, or socio-ecological stress.	General economic studies lacking context on climate change, ecological degradation, or environmental policy.
<b>I – Intervention</b>	Neoliberal economic policies, market-led environmental governance, carbon trading, privatization of resources, or growth-centric adaptation models.	Purely technical carbon capture or engineering interventions without clear socio-economic policy applications.
<b>C – Comparison</b>	Socialist economic models, state-directed eco-socialism, centralized climate mandates, or localized hybrid economic paradigms.	Studies evaluating a single neoliberal policy in isolation without any comparative structural paradigm analysis.

PICOS Dimension	Inclusion Criteria (Menerima)	Exclusion Criteria (Menolak)
<b>O – Outcomes</b>	Evaluations mapped against ethical frameworks, specifically justice-oriented outcomes (ecological justice, intergenerational equity, distributive fairness) or explicitly utilizing Maqasid al-Sharia principles.	Studies restricted purely to secular macroeconomic efficiency indicators, GDP growth rates, or narrow technical financial returns.
<b>S – Study Design</b>	Peer-reviewed empirical studies, formal qualitative case studies, systematic literature reviews, quantitative econometric modeling, or mixed-methods designs.	Non-peer-reviewed editorials, opinion pieces, conference abstracts, brief commentaries, or books lacking transparent methodologies.

By cross-referencing all 690 records retrieved from Scopus and Web of Science against this explicit PICOS grid, we minimize selection bias and isolate the exact state of knowledge regarding Maqasid-based comparative climate economics.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Macro-Mapping: The Bibliometric Intellectual Landscape

Before drilling down into the specific study that survived our PICOS filtering, our bibliometric literature mapping approach provides a rigorous, visual diagnosis of the 690 initial records retrieved during the database search.

### Conceptual Mapping via Keyword Co-occurrence

Algorithmic network analysis of author keywords reveals a deeply fragmented intellectual landscape. The keyword co-occurrence map highlights two massive, completely isolated thematic islands:

- **Cluster 1 (The Secular-Climate Justice Island):** Dominated by dense nodes such as “*climate change*”, “*environmental justice*”, “*neoliberalism*”, “*political ecology*”, and “*eco-socialism*”. This cluster is overwhelmingly populated by Western-centric publications, focusing on structural

critiques of capitalism under climate stress but remaining completely devoid of religious, metaphysical, or non-Western spiritual vocabulary.

- **Cluster 2 (The Islamic Economics Island):** Centered around terms like “*Maqasid al-Sharia*”, “*Islamic finance*”, “*welfare*”, and “*ethics*”. This cluster is highly insulated, mapping closely to corporate governance or general banking ethics in Muslim-majority countries, with virtually zero overlapping co-occurrence strings reaching out to global “*climate crisis*” or “*macroeconomic paradigm comparisons*”.

The total lack of conceptual bridges or interconnecting lines between these two clusters visually validates the core thesis of this study: the intersection of Maqasid principles and comparative climate economics is a critically vacant scholarly space.

### Geographical and Institutional Density Maps

Spatial mapping reveals a stark geopolitical division. Citation and authorship density maps show that research critiquing neoliberalism and socialism through an ecological lens is heavily concentrated in Anglo-American and European hubs (USA, UK, Germany, Australia). Conversely, institutional nodes

publishing on Maqasid al-Sharia are heavily concentrated in Southeast Asia (Malaysia and Indonesia) and parts of the Middle East (Turkey and the Gulf states). This geographical polarization means that mainstream economic models are rarely subjected to indigenous ethical critiques, and Maqasid research remains marginalized within regional silos, preventing its entry into global policy debates.

### Micro-Synthesis: PICOS Study Selection Results

After applying the strict exclusion criteria dictated by our **PICOS framework**, a dramatic narrowing of the dataset occurred. Out of the 690 initial bibliographic records, only one single empirical article met all eligibility criteria across Population, Intervention, Comparison, Outcomes, and Study Design.

This extreme outcome—a single surviving study—is a powerful bibliometric finding in its own right. It provides definitive empirical proof that the field is still in its absolute infancy, struggling to move from high-level conceptual proposals to rigorous, comparative field applications. The lone study that satisfied the PICOS criteria, authored by Penulis E (2020), focuses on operationalizing Maqasid principles specifically within a Muslim-majority country’s energy transition policies.

To maximize the analytical value of this review and maintain comprehensive depth, the sections below synthesize the structural data from this included study while using the broader, excluded bibliographic clusters as an essential contrast framework.




Figure 1. Micro-Synthesis: PICOS Study Selection Results

### Organizing the Findings: A Four-Dimensional Classification Matrix

To structure the insights derived from our combined bibliometric and PICOS approach, we classify the reviewed literature across four analytical dimensions, directly corresponding to our initial research profiling and thematic objectives:

#### 1. Theoretical Grounding and Paradigm Core

Our bibliometric co-citation mapping reveals that a clear majority of the scanned corpus—approximately 70%—is strictly anchored either in secular neoclassical environmental economics or in

Marxist political ecology. Only a very small fraction of international publications engage with normative ethical frameworks at all. Among those that do, the vast majority refer to “*sustainable development*” or “*environmental justice*” in a highly generic, rhetorical manner, failing to operationalize any concrete ethico-spiritual paradigm.

In sharp contrast, the single study included via PICOS grounds its entire baseline analysis explicitly in Maqasid al-Sharia. The author draws on the classical taxonomy of *al-daruriyyat al-khams* (the five essential human protections: life, intellect,

religion, lineage, and property) and purposefully extends this framework to incorporate *hifz al-bi'ah* (the protection and preservation of the environment) as an absolute, non-negotiable core requirement. This theoretical advancement, while consistent with pioneering conceptual models in Islamic eco-philosophy remains an isolated anomaly in global economics literature. The total absence of Maqasid-based assessments in the wider bibliometric clusters confirms a critical knowledge gap: dominant economic models are appraised almost exclusively through market-driven or materialist indicators, completely sidelining holistic spiritual well-being and biocentric value systems.

## 2. Methodological Orientation and Triangulation

The methodological profiling of our scanned records indicates severe structural homogeneity. Across the entire corpus, qualitative and conceptual methods completely dominate, accounting for 82% of all publications. These primarily manifest as theoretical essays, static policy document reviews, or speculative comparative case studies. Quantitative approaches—such as advanced econometric modeling of carbon emissions trajectories, resource depletion rates, or Gini inequality coefficients—appear frequently, but they are confined exclusively to studies evaluating neoliberal or socialist policies in isolation, with absolutely no integration of Maqasid principles.

Crucially, our bibliometric audit reveals that not a single study in the current international literature employs an empirical mixed-methods design to triangulate normative Maqasid criteria with real-world, large-scale empirical impact data. The single study included via PICOS relies on a purely qualitative design, using thematic analysis of semi-structured interviews with national policymakers, environmental economists, and Islamic scholars, paired with text-based document analysis. While this choice provides deep context-dependent insights, it severely limits statistical generalizability. This highlights an urgent methodological gap: the field is stuck in an exploratory phase, prioritizing conceptual refinement over empirical validation. As established by mixed-methods methodologists, advancing the

policy relevance of a field requires integrating these deep qualitative insights with robust quantitative validation to measure exactly how ethical choices impact community climate resilience.

## 3. Geographical and Institutional Context

Of the 382 closely screened records within our bibliometric database, only 12 publications explicitly discuss Maqasid al-Sharia in direct relation to climate change or macroeconomic policy. The spatial distribution of these 12 papers is highly concentrated: eight originate from Malaysia or Indonesia, two from Turkey, and two from the Gulf states. The single study that fully survived the PICOS selection process is situated entirely within the institutional and physical context of Indonesia, exploring localized energy transition scorecards.

Conversely, studies that provide radical, systemic critiques of neoliberalism or socialism from a climate justice perspective are overwhelmingly Western-centric, emerging almost entirely from institutions in the USA, UK, Germany, and Australia. This geographical skew exposes a profound double-blind spot in global sustainability research:

- **First**, Maqasid-based climate evaluations remain a highly localized, niche endeavor that fails to cross over into mainstream, global climate economics debates.
- **Second**, global economic frameworks are suffering from a missed theoretical opportunity. Applying a Maqasid-based evaluative scorecard to highly diverse sociopolitical contexts—such as post-socialist transition economies or aggressively neoliberalized Latin American and African developing countries—could yield powerful, unprecedented insights into how different configurations of state, market, and civil society impact holistic justice outcomes.

## 4. Nature of Justice-Focused Outcomes

When “*justice*” is evaluated in the broader, excluded literature clusters, it is almost universally restricted to procedural or distributional justice frameworks situated within the Western liberal

egalitarian tradition. These frameworks focus on ensuring fair market access or state-led compensation for environmental harms, but they rarely challenge the underlying growth-centric, anthropocentric worldview. Very few integrate authentic biocentric ecological justice or intergenerational equity as core, mathematical evaluative metrics.

The single study included via PICOS however, breaks away from this limitation by explicitly operationalizing long-term intergenerational equity. The author structures an evaluative matrix asking whether market-led (neoliberal) or state-led (socialist) energy policies compromise the fundamental rights and biological security of future generations—representing a direct operationalization of the Maqasid principles of protecting *nafs* (life) and *mal* (property) across extended temporal scales. Nevertheless, the absolute absence of similar comparative metrics in the wider literature underscores a persistent deficiency: even when modern climate actions are appraised for “*sustainability*,” the primary baseline metric almost invariably returns to short-term economic efficiency or carbon reduction quotas, completely ignoring deep ethical obligations across generations and species.

## Discussion

### Deconstructing Methodological Evolutions

A critical cross-examination of our bibliometric data and PICOS selection reveals a deeply asymmetric trajectory in sustainable development literature. While mainstream frameworks leverage AI-driven big data and real-time predictive modeling, this technological evolution reinforces an ideological and methodological split between competing economic paradigms:

#### 1. Neoliberalism (Market-Centric).

Dominates bibliometric clusters through hyper-quantitative econometric modeling. Its advantage lies in clear, scalable metrics and market-driven pricing signals (e.g., carbon trading) that easily translate into global policy. Its critical disadvantage is a

reductive, techno-optimist bias that commodifies nature and fails to quantify non-market ecological values.

#### 2. Socialism (State-Centric).

Excels at structural macro-planning, systematically integrating state-led conservation targets over short-term profits. However, it suffers from top-down administrative inefficiencies, computational strains in non-market resource allocation, and historical data gaps that limit real-time policy adjustments.

Consequently, alternative paradigms like Islamic ecological economics remain heavily restricted to qualitative, conceptual analysis. This isolation is not born of a quantitative aversion, but because the normative nature of ethical questions demands frameworks that prioritize holistic human values over narrow financial metrics.

Yet, remaining purely qualitative prevents these critical ethical frameworks from influencing actual global climate policy, which yields to the numeric clarity of positivist economics. The path forward for Maqasid-based climate assessments requires a pluralistic synthesis. Rather than rejecting quantitative tools, future research must adopt innovative mixed-methods designs—combining the rich, value-driven depth of Maqasid principles with the statistical, predictive power of econometric and climate impact data to challenge and enrich the global policy landscape.

### The Proposed Cognitive-Affective-Conative Justice Matrix

To bridge the massive structural gaps exposed by our hybrid review—specifically the lack of empirical indicators and the underrepresentation of multi-layered justice dimensions—we propose a comprehensive **Three-Dimensional Classification Matrix of Socio-Ecological Justice**. This matrix expands the classical Maqasid al-Sharia principles into operational, evaluative components that can be applied to any economic paradigm under climate stress:




Figure 2. The Proposed Cognitive-Affective-Conative Justice Matrix

1. **Cognitive Justice (Dimensi Kognitif).**

Focuses on the intellectual recognition and systemic integration of ecological boundaries and indigenous knowledge systems within economic planning. This directly aligns with *Hifz al-Aql* (protection of intellect), ensuring that climate data and environmental sciences are not distorted by market-driven corporate interests or rigid state propaganda.

2. **Affective Justice (Dimensi Afektif).**

Targets the emotional, psychological, and spiritual well-being of climate-vulnerable communities, ensuring the preservation of cultural heritage, religious freedom, and local attachments to land. This maps directly onto *Hifz al-Din* (protection of religion/morality) and *Hifz al-Nasl* (protection of lineage/future generations), validating emotional resilience and ancestral continuity as core metrics of development.

3. **Conative Justice (Dimensi Konatif).**

Demands concrete, behavioral, and institutional actions toward transforming governance structures, enforcing wealth redistribution, and halting destructive growth practices. This operationalizes *Hifz al-Nafs* (protection of life) and *Hifz al-Mal*

(protection of property), translating ethical philosophy into enforceable, measurable legal constraints on both corporate markets and state monopolies.

**CONCLUSION**

This study successfully executed a comprehensive evaluation of global literature by deploying a unique hybrid methodology, combining a macro-level bibliometric literature mapping approach with a micro-level PICOS framework for study selection.

The systematic audit analyzed data derived from primary and secondary data streams—encompassing comprehensive metadata extractions across Scopus and Web of Science as secondary index sources, alongside qualitative interview and document data within qualified texts as primary source material.

Our core findings reveal a striking absolute scarcity of empirical, comparative research evaluating neoliberal and socialist models through a unified framework like *Maqasid al-Sharia*, evidenced by the survival of only one empirical study. The mapping visually exposed deep geopolitical biases, proving that modern climate economics remains Western-centric and growth-dominated, while ethical-spiritual paradigms are relegated to isolated regional silos. Politically,

governments must shift from growth-centric metrics like GDP toward Maqasid-based scorecards to secure intergenerational and ecological equity.

To move the field forward, we propose a clear four-point research agenda for future research:

1. **Methodological Pluralism.** Deploy robust mixed-methods designs triangulating qualitative insights with quantitative econometric data.
2. **Empirical Validation.** Translate abstract principles into specific, mathematically verifiable socio-ecological indicators tested across active projects.
3. **Comparative Case Studies.** Apply the same Maqasid scorecard concurrently to identical climate policies implemented under divergent neoliberal, socialist, and hybrid governance regimes.
4. **Geographical Expansion.** Conduct climate justice assessments in underrepresented, highly vulnerable regions, especially Sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia, and Eastern Europe.

#### Acknowledgement

I would like to express my gratitude for the opportunity to receive invaluable guidance from the Lectures of the Islamic Economics Concentration, namely Professor Euis Amalia and Professor Desmadi Saharuddin, in the Doctoral Program at the Graduate School of Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University, Jakarta, who have provided tremendous assistance in the writing and completion of this article.

#### REFERENCES

Albaker, Haya Bader, Kelsey N. Ellis, Jennifer First, Dimitris A. Herrera, and Solange Muñoz. “Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices on Climate Change in a Muslim Community in Knoxville, Tennessee.” *Sustainability* 17, no. 15 (July 25, 2025): 6770. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17156770>.

Ayu Setianingrum, Diah, Setiyo, and Agus Dwiyanto. “Environmental Education through Islamic Lens: Values and Practices.” Edited by A. Saregar, R. Umam, and A. Rahmat. *E3S Web of Conferences* 482 (January 29, 2024): 04014. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202448204014>.

Barkdull, John, and Paul G. Harris. “Adapting to Climate Change: From Capitalism to Democratic Eco-Socialism.” *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 35, no. 3 (July 2, 2024): 11–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10455752.2024.2389053>.

Bsoul, Labeeb, Amani Omer, Lejla Kucukalic, and Ricardo H. Archbold. “Islam’s Perspective on Environmental Sustainability: A Conceptual Analysis.” *Social Sciences* 11, no. 6 (May 24, 2022): 228. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci11060228>.

Gupta, Joyeeta, Aarti Gupta, and Courtney Vegelin. “Equity, Justice and the SDGs: Lessons Learnt from Two Decades of INEA Scholarship.” *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics* 22, no. 2 (June 5, 2022): 393–409. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10784-022-09563-w>.

Harnowo, Tri, and Fachry Hasani Habib. “Islamic Law and Environment Issues: Indonesian Ulama Council’s Fatwas on Climate Change.” *AHKAM : Jurnal Ilmu Syariah* 24, no. 1 (June 30, 2024): 101–18. <https://doi.org/10.15408/ajis.v24i1.34161>.

- Islam, Md Saidul. "Rethinking Climate Justice: Insights from Environmental Sociology." *Climate* 12, no. 12 (December 2, 2024): 203. <https://doi.org/10.3390/cli12120203>.
- Islamy, Mohammad Rindu Fajar, Suprima Suprima, Wawan Hermawan, Nurti Budiyantri, Muhamad Parhan, and Dina Siti Logayah. "The Role of Islamic Law in Addressing Global Warming: Perspectives from Indonesia and Global Contexts." *Mazahib* 24, no. 2 (December 16, 2025): 358–86. <https://doi.org/10.21093/mj.v24i2.11314>.
- Ismail, Ahmad Munawar, and Mohd Farhan Firas. "Environmental Degradation and Radical Solution from Islamic Perspective." *International Journal of Islamic Thought* 26 (December 3, 2024): 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.24035/ijit.26.2024.297>.
- Karimullah, Suud Sarim. "Humanitarian Ecology in Islamic Law: Balancing Human Needs and Environmental Preservation in Islamic Law." *Asy-Syari'ah* 26, no. 2 (December 31, 2024): 113–36. <https://doi.org/10.15575/as.v26i2.38177>.
- Narayan, Paresh Kumar, Seema Narayan, Yoga Affandi, and Danny Hermawan. "Climate Change and Economic Growth: Evidence from a Growth at Risk Model of Indonesia." *International Journal of Islamic and Middle Eastern Finance and Management*, February 25, 2026, 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IMEFM-10-2025-0764>.
- Osman, Bashir Mohamed, Mohamud Hussein Mohamud, Abdi Falir Omar, Abdikadir Ali Yabarow, Omar Mohamed Omar, Mohamed sheikh Ali Jirow, Abdinasir Nur Dahir, and Anisa Mohamed Nur. "The Impact of Climate Change on Economic Growth in Somalia: Using Random Forest and Bayesian Approach." *Cogent Economics & Finance* 13, no. 1 (December 31, 2025). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23322039.2025.2496684>.
- Piratti, Marianella, and Valentino Cattelan. "Islamic Green Finance." In *Islamic Social Finance*, 144–72. 1 Edition. | New York : Routledge, 2019. | Series: Islamic business and finance series | Series: Islamicfinance: Routledge, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315272221-9>.
- Rohman, Agus Taufiqur, and Aminullah Ibrahim. "A Discourse of Islamic Law on Environmental Protection and Sustainability: How Are Religious Values Transferred into Indonesian Environmental Law?" *Indonesian Journal of Environmental Law and Sustainable Development* 1, no. 2 (July 31, 2022): 139–64. <https://doi.org/10.15294/ijel.v1i2.58136>.
- Ruggia, A., S. Dogliotti, V. Aguerre, M. M. Albicette, A. Albin, O. Blumetto, G. Cardozo, et al. "The Application of Ecologically Intensive Principles to the Systemic Redesign of Livestock Farms on Native Grasslands: A Case of Co-Innovation in Rocha, Uruguay." *Agricultural Systems* 191, no. November 2020 (2021): 103148. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2021.103148>.

- Rusu, Oana, Filip Alexandrescu, Ioana Bunescu, Ionuț Codreanu, Carmen Gheorghe, and Irina Velicu. "Insidious Whiteness in Eastern Europe: Environmental Injustice and Dehumanisation in a Roma Community." *Antipode* 58, no. 3 (May 20, 2026). <https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.70170>.
- Salman, Abdul Matin Bin, and Eko Asmanto. "Islamic Environmental Stewardship: A Sociological Approach to Hadith and Legal Frameworks for Ecological Responsibility." *Volksgeist: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Dan Konstitusi* 7, no. 2 (December 8, 2024): 361–78. <https://doi.org/10.24090/volksgeist.v7i2.12205>.
- Susana, Lina Marlina, Ramadhani Irma Tripalupi, Suparman Kholil, Nur Efendi, and Gina Sakinah. "Reconstructing Islamic Legal Norms in Environmental Governance: A Maqasid-Based Legal Critique of Indonesia's Resource Policies." *Al-Istinbath: Jurnal Hukum Islam* 10, no. 2 (September 16, 2025): 650–70. <https://doi.org/10.29240/jhi.v10i2.13038>.
- Susanto, Yoghi Arief, and Fatham Mubina Iksir Gholi. "Protecting the Environment: Revisiting Sharia Commands and Objectives, and the Mandate of the Constitution." *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science* 1537, no. 1 (September 1, 2025): 012013. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/1537/1/012013>.
- Syahputra, Hendra, Syafruddin Kamal, Azida Alfarisi, Azharsyah Ibrahim, Muhammad Rusdi, and Lailissa'adah Muhammad. "Climate Resilience and Coffee Farmers' Welfare in Central Aceh, Indonesia: Adaptation Strategies from the Maqāṣid Al-Sharī'ah Perspective." *International Journal of Islamic Finance and Sustainable Development* 17, no. 4 (December 25, 2025): 20–37. <https://doi.org/10.55188/ijifsd.v17i4.1090>.