

 <https://doi.org/10.47353/lawpass.v3i3.120>

Justice, Mercy, and the Spirit of Law: Reconsidering Punishment, Accountability, Protection, and Human Dignity

Ossama S. Qatrani

Third Generation in International Relations (3GIR) Project, United Kingdom

*Corresponding author: jkqatrani@gmail.com

Abstract

This article examines the moral purpose of law through the relationship between justice, mercy, accountability, human dignity, and the spirit of law. It addresses whether law should primarily function as an instrument of punishment, deterrence, correction, guidance, protection, institutional restraint, or revenge. Using an interdisciplinary comparative and reflective approach, the study examines Islamic ethical teachings, ancient legal traditions, constitutional principles, human-rights standards, judicial decisions, restorative justice, executive clemency, procedural safeguards, and contemporary challenges to access to justice. The analysis demonstrates that the legitimacy of law depends not only on the existence of formal rules but also on how those rules are interpreted and applied within particular human circumstances. Mercy does not eliminate accountability, while justice should not be reduced to punishment. A humane legal system must distinguish deliberate wrongdoing from error, coercion, vulnerability, ignorance, and genuine repentance. The article proposes a five-lens model consisting of text, purpose, intention, harm, and proportionality and reform. The model provides an analytical framework for maintaining legal certainty while preventing justice from becoming mechanical cruelty or revenge. Ultimately, the spirit of law represents the moral commitment to protect human dignity, restrain power, repair harm, and preserve the possibility of responsible human reform.

Keywords: justice; mercy; spirit of law; rule of law; human dignity; proportionality; restorative justice; due process; legal inequality; Islamic ethics.

Introduction

Law occupies a fundamental position in the organization of human society. It establishes standards of conduct, determines rights and obligations, regulates institutions, resolves disputes, and provides mechanisms for responding to wrongdoing. In modern societies, law is frequently associated with order, predictability, punishment, and enforcement. Yet the existence of legal rules alone does not necessarily guarantee justice. A legal system may possess detailed statutes, sophisticated courts, professional judges, and elaborate procedures while still producing outcomes that are experienced as unfair, disproportionate, or dehumanizing. The central problem is therefore not merely whether a rule exists, but whether the application of that rule remains connected to the moral purpose for which law exists. The original paper similarly begins from



<https://lawpass.org/>

Received: Juni 23, 2026 | Revised: July 19, 2026 | Accepted: August 25, 2026 | Publication: August 31, 2026

Copyright (c) 2026 Ossama S. Qatrani



Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

the tension between law as punishment, correction, guidance, protection, accountability, and the possibility of revenge disguised as formal legality.

The concept of justice itself contains multiple dimensions. Justice may mean giving each person what they deserve, protecting rights, correcting wrongdoing, compensating victims, maintaining social order, or limiting the exercise of power. Punishment is consequently only one possible instrument of justice. When punishment becomes the dominant language of legal reasoning, the legal system may gradually lose sight of other purposes, including rehabilitation, prevention, reconciliation, restoration, and human dignity. This problem becomes particularly significant when the legal system deals with individuals whose circumstances differ substantially. A deliberate act of violence, an accidental violation, an act committed under coercion, and an offence resulting from profound ignorance may all violate a legal rule, but they do not necessarily possess identical moral meaning.

The distinction between the letter and the spirit of law becomes important in this context. The letter of law refers to the formal wording of a legal provision, while its spirit concerns the purpose, values, and social objectives underlying that provision. This distinction should not be interpreted as permission for judges or officials to ignore written law whenever they personally disagree with its consequences. Such an approach could undermine legal certainty and produce arbitrary decision-making. Rather, the spirit of law requires disciplined interpretation that asks whether the application of a rule remains consistent with its legitimate purpose. The original manuscript emphasizes that the spirit of law does not abolish legal text but requires the text to remember its purpose of protecting dignity, restraining power, repairing harm, and preventing justice from becoming revenge.

The question of mercy is particularly significant within this discussion. Mercy is sometimes regarded as the opposite of justice because justice is associated with accountability while mercy is associated with forgiveness or leniency. Such a binary understanding, however, is too simplistic. Mercy can coexist with accountability when it is exercised according to principled standards. A person may acknowledge wrongdoing, demonstrate remorse, compensate a victim, undertake rehabilitation, and receive a proportionate response without being treated as permanently irredeemable. Conversely, unlimited mercy without responsibility can undermine victims' rights and weaken public trust in law. The relationship between justice and mercy must therefore be understood as a relationship requiring balance rather than mutual exclusion.

Islamic ethical thought provides a particularly important starting point for examining this relationship. The Qur'anic tradition repeatedly connects divine accountability with mercy, repentance, justice, and moral responsibility. The significance of this perspective is not that religious principles should automatically be transformed into state legislation, but that religious moral traditions can contribute to broader philosophical reflection about why human beings judge one another. The original paper explicitly uses Islamic examples as ethical and philosophical reflections rather than as technical legal rules. This distinction is important in pluralistic societies, where religious traditions may contribute to public moral reasoning without necessarily determining the legal framework of the state.



The historical development of law also demonstrates that legal systems have never been concerned solely with punishment. Ancient legal traditions sought to make rules publicly knowable, while later constitutional traditions increasingly emphasized the limitation of governmental power. The Code of Hammurabi, for example, represents an important historical effort to make legal judgments visible and authoritative, while Magna Carta symbolizes the emerging principle that rulers themselves should be subject to law. This historical movement is important because justice cannot be understood solely as the state's authority to punish individuals. It must also include mechanisms for preventing the state from exercising arbitrary power.

The rule of law consequently represents one of the central institutional expressions of the spirit of law. Legality, equality before the law, judicial independence, legal certainty, and access to justice are not merely technical principles. They are safeguards against arbitrary authority. A system in which wealthy individuals can obtain sophisticated legal representation while poor individuals struggle even to understand procedural requirements may formally provide equality while producing substantial inequality in practice. The original paper identifies this unequal access as one of the most significant weaknesses of contemporary justice systems.

Procedural justice illustrates the same tension. Legal procedures are sometimes criticized as "technicalities" that allow guilty individuals to escape punishment. However, procedural safeguards often exist precisely because the state possesses enormous coercive power. Rules governing searches, interrogation, evidence, legal representation, and fair trials protect individuals from unlawful governmental action. Decisions such as *Mapp v. Ohio* and *Miranda v. Arizona* illustrate how procedural protections can function as constitutional barriers against state power. The deeper issue is therefore whether procedure obstructs justice or protects the conditions under which justice can legitimately be achieved.

Another challenge concerns the influence of wealth, politics, media, and public pressure. Legal systems do not operate in social isolation. Judges and institutions may confront intense public expectations, political interests, media narratives, and institutional pressures. When these forces influence judgment, the courtroom risks becoming a stage for public emotion rather than an institution of impartial justice. The problem is not necessarily corruption in the narrow sense. Institutional legitimacy can also be weakened by fear, reputation management, political pressure, ideological polarization, or unequal resources.

Contemporary developments create an additional dimension of the problem. Increasingly, legal and administrative institutions use databases, automated decision-making systems, algorithms, risk assessments, and digital procedures. These technologies may improve efficiency, but they can also make legal processes less sensitive to individual circumstances. An automated system may recognize a missed deadline or procedural inconsistency without understanding disability, trauma, coercion, language barriers, poverty, or lack of meaningful notice. The original manuscript therefore argues that the spirit of law becomes more important, rather than less important, in the algorithmic age.

Against this background, this article asks a central research question: How can a legal system remain faithful to written law while simultaneously incorporating mercy, proportionality,



human context, and the deeper spirit of justice? The objective is not to propose the abolition of punishment or the replacement of law with subjective compassion. Instead, the article seeks to develop an analytical framework for understanding how legal systems can maintain accountability while protecting human dignity.

The article has three specific objectives. First, it examines the philosophical and ethical relationship between justice and mercy. Second, it analyzes institutional and procedural mechanisms through which the spirit of law can protect individuals from arbitrary or disproportionate treatment. Third, it develops a five-lens analytical model that integrates legal text, legal purpose, intention, harm, and proportionality and reform. Through these objectives, the article argues that the highest form of legal judgment is not necessarily the harshest judgment, but the judgment capable of distinguishing carefully between guilt and error, power and vulnerability, deliberate harm and confusion, justice and revenge.

Method

This study employs an interdisciplinary comparative and reflective research approach. The method is consistent with the original manuscript, which identifies itself as a research essay rather than a doctrinal analysis of a particular national legal system. The study does not employ quantitative data collection or statistical testing. Instead, it synthesizes philosophical, religious, historical, constitutional, human-rights, and restorative-justice perspectives to examine the moral purpose of law.

The analysis draws upon several categories of sources. First, Islamic ethical sources, particularly Qur'anic passages and selected Prophetic traditions, are examined to explore the relationship between accountability, repentance, mercy, and human dignity. Second, historical legal traditions, including the Code of Hammurabi and Magna Carta, are considered to identify the transformation of law from an expression of authority toward an instrument for restraining authority. Third, jurisprudential literature concerning the morality of law, legal interpretation, rules, principles, and proportionality is examined.

Fourth, international and constitutional human-rights instruments are analyzed, including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the European Convention on Human Rights, and the Nelson Mandela Rules. Fifth, selected judicial cases and contemporary discussions concerning procedural justice, clemency, legal inequality, and restorative justice are used as illustrative examples.

The analytical process consists of identifying recurring themes, comparing different normative traditions, and synthesizing them into a conceptual framework. The principal analytical categories are legal text, legal purpose, intention, harm, proportionality, and reform. The resulting five-lens model is intended as a moral-analytical framework rather than a substitute for positive law or professional legal doctrine.



Law as Punishment, Guidance, Accountability, and Protection

The first finding of this analysis is that law cannot adequately be understood as an instrument of punishment alone. Although punishment remains an important function of criminal justice, legal systems perform several overlapping functions. They establish behavioral standards, prevent harm, protect vulnerable persons, resolve disputes, constrain governmental authority, provide compensation, and create opportunities for rehabilitation. The meaning of justice consequently depends on the institutional purpose assigned to law.

A punishment-centred conception of law tends to ask a relatively narrow question: What rule was violated and what punishment should follow? A broader conception asks additional questions: Why does the rule exist? What harm occurred? Who was affected? Was the violation intentional? Was the accused acting freely? What response protects society? Can the harm be repaired? Would a particular punishment produce justice or merely reproduce suffering?

This distinction is important because the same formal violation may arise under radically different circumstances. A person who intentionally deceives another for financial gain is morally different from someone who commits an administrative violation because they misunderstood a complex regulation. Similarly, a person who violates a rule under coercion cannot necessarily be assessed in the same manner as someone who acts with calculated malice.

A humane legal system therefore requires differentiated judgment. Such differentiation does not undermine equality. On the contrary, treating materially different situations as identical can itself produce injustice. Equality before the law should mean equal respect and equal protection, not mechanical uniformity.

The original manuscript expresses this principle through the idea that law should distinguish between guilt, error, ignorance, coercion, vulnerability, poverty, illness, and bad faith. This distinction forms the foundation of the broader argument developed in this article.

Mercy Before Judgment: An Islamic Ethical Perspective

Islamic ethical thought provides a valuable framework for examining the relationship between accountability and mercy. The Qur'anic worldview does not present divine judgment as an arbitrary exercise of power. Accountability exists alongside the possibility of repentance, forgiveness, and moral transformation. The ethical significance of repentance is particularly important because it demonstrates that responsibility does not necessarily end with punishment.

Repentance presupposes recognition of wrongdoing. A person who sincerely repents does not simply request that consequences disappear. Genuine repentance involves acknowledging the wrong, regretting it, abandoning the wrongful conduct, and attempting to repair harm where another person's rights have been affected. In this respect, mercy does not eliminate accountability. Instead, mercy can create a path through which accountability becomes morally productive.

This insight has significant implications for legal philosophy. If the purpose of punishment is partly to communicate social condemnation and prevent future harm, then punishment that completely destroys the possibility of moral reform may sometimes fail to achieve its broader



purpose. A legal system should therefore distinguish between accountability and permanent exclusion.

The Islamic ethical tradition also emphasizes divine mercy as a reminder of human limitations. Human beings judge with incomplete information. They may not know every intention, circumstance, pressure, fear, or internal struggle experienced by another person. Divine judgment, in contrast, is traditionally understood as possessing complete knowledge. Human legal systems cannot replicate such knowledge. Consequently, humility should be an essential characteristic of human judgment.

This does not imply that courts should abandon evidence or objective standards. Rather, it suggests that the authority to judge should be accompanied by awareness of institutional limitations. Mercy, therefore, can function as a moral discipline that prevents legal authority from confusing severity with truth.

Religious Narratives and the Moral Purpose of Law

Religious narratives can contribute to legal philosophy by illustrating moral principles through concrete stories. The original manuscript discusses Prophetic traditions concerning a woman punished because of cruelty toward a cat and another woman forgiven after providing water to a thirsty dog. The significance of these narratives lies in their emphasis on conduct, harm, mercy, and moral responsibility rather than social reputation alone.

These narratives challenge the assumption that moral judgment can be reduced to outward status. A person may possess social respectability yet commit serious cruelty. Conversely, a socially marginalized person may perform an act of profound compassion. The moral lesson is that judgment must attend to actual conduct and its consequences.

The discussion of slavery in the original manuscript reinforces this point. Islamic moral history contains an important emphasis on emancipation, the dignity of enslaved persons, and the rejection of human worth being determined by wealth, lineage, or social status. The story of Bilal ibn Rabah is particularly powerful within Islamic moral memory because a person who was socially treated as property became one of the most respected figures in the early Muslim community.

The legal-philosophical significance of such narratives extends beyond the historical question of slavery itself. They demonstrate that law can lose its moral legitimacy when it normalizes domination. A legal order must therefore be evaluated not only according to whether its rules are formally valid but also according to whether those rules preserve the basic dignity of human beings.

The discussion of Adam and Eve in the original manuscript offers another useful lesson. The Qur'anic account does not centre the narrative on the identification of a particular fruit or assign the moral burden exclusively to Eve. Instead, the story emphasizes temptation, human error, responsibility, repentance, and divine mercy. For legal philosophy, this illustrates the danger of allowing secondary formal details to obscure the moral question at the centre of judgment.



From Hammurabi to Constitutional Restraint

Historical legal development demonstrates an important transformation in the understanding of legal authority. The Code of Hammurabi represents an early attempt to make legal judgments visible and authoritative. The Louvre describes the stele as containing 282 legal judgments concerning areas including family, property, trade, and labour, while cautioning against treating it as a modern legal code.

The significance of such historical material is not that ancient law should be directly transferred into modern systems. Rather, it demonstrates the longstanding human desire to make authority predictable and publicly knowable. Written rules can reduce arbitrary decisions by establishing standards that are available for public examination.

Constitutional development added another dimension: the law must also restrain those who exercise power. Magna Carta has become symbolically important because it articulated the principle that the king and government were not above the law.

This principle fundamentally changes the moral direction of law. If law merely controls citizens, it risks becoming an instrument of domination. If law also controls government, it becomes a mechanism of institutional accountability. Police officers, prosecutors, judges, ministers, administrative agencies, and other officials are consequently not external to the legal order. They are themselves subject to legal constraints.

The spirit of law therefore operates vertically as well as horizontally. It protects citizens from one another, but it must also protect citizens from arbitrary governmental power.

The Rule of Law as a Limitation on Power

The rule of law provides the institutional foundation for this conception of justice. Legality, equality before the law, judicial independence, legal certainty, and access to justice are essential because they limit the possibility that personal power will replace legal standards.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights recognizes the right of every person to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal. Similarly, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights establishes equality before courts and tribunals and provides fair-trial guarantees. These principles indicate that procedural fairness is inseparable from human dignity.

The same principle appears in Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights, which protects the right to a fair and public hearing within a reasonable time before an independent and impartial tribunal.

The practical significance of these principles is substantial. A legal system may formally provide identical laws to everyone while producing different experiences based on wealth, social status, education, political connections, or access to legal expertise. The rule of law therefore requires more than formal equality. It requires institutional arrangements that make legal rights meaningfully accessible.



The Letter and the Spirit of Law

The distinction between the letter and the spirit of law is central to this article. The letter provides certainty. The spirit provides purpose. Neither can safely exist without the other.

Pure formalism can generate unjust outcomes because it may treat every violation identically regardless of context. Pure discretion can generate arbitrary outcomes because officials may replace legal standards with personal preferences. The challenge is therefore to establish a disciplined relationship between rule and context.

For example, a procedural deadline may exist to promote efficiency and finality. However, if an individual was genuinely unable to comply because of circumstances beyond their control and without meaningful notice, rigid enforcement may defeat rather than serve the purpose of the rule. Similarly, evidentiary rules exist not simply because technical procedures are valuable in themselves but because reliable evidence contributes to fair decision-making.

The spirit of law should therefore be understood as purpose-oriented legal reasoning. It asks whether the application of a rule advances or undermines the legitimate objective of that rule. The original manuscript explicitly emphasizes that such reasoning must consider purpose, context, intention, harm, proportionality, and fairness rather than personal sympathy.

Procedural Justice: Technicality or Protection?

Procedural safeguards are sometimes portrayed as obstacles to justice, particularly when they prevent the prosecution from using evidence or obtaining a conviction. Such criticism is understandable from the perspective of victims, particularly when a serious offence appears to have been committed.

However, procedure is frequently the most important protection available to individuals confronting state power. The state controls police forces, investigative agencies, prosecutors, prisons, and substantial coercive resources. Without procedural restrictions, these powers could easily become instruments of abuse.

Mapp v. Ohio demonstrates this principle through the exclusion of evidence obtained in violation of constitutional protections. The underlying principle is not that guilty individuals deserve technical escapes. Rather, the state should not obtain legal victory through illegal conduct.

Miranda v. Arizona illustrates a similar principle. The requirement that custodial suspects be informed of their rights protects individuals within the inherently coercive environment of police interrogation.

Procedural justice consequently protects both individuals and institutions. When courts refuse to reward governmental illegality, they communicate that legal enforcement must itself remain lawful. This protects the legitimacy of the entire legal system.



Intention, Harm, Proportionality, and Human Context

The analysis demonstrates that proportionality is essential to humane justice. Not every legal violation carries the same degree of culpability. Intention, knowledge, capacity, coercion, vulnerability, and actual harm must be considered when legally permissible.

A person may violate a rule deliberately, accidentally, through ignorance, under exploitation, or under intense pressure. The external act may appear similar while the moral circumstances differ substantially. A legal system that cannot distinguish these circumstances risks becoming blunt and excessively punitive.

Proportionality also requires consideration of actual harm. The response to wrongdoing should be sufficiently serious to protect victims and society, but it should not exceed what is reasonably necessary for legitimate legal objectives.

Judicial discretion can therefore serve the spirit of law when it is structured by transparent principles. Discretion should not become favoritism. Decisions based on mercy or mitigating circumstances should be explainable, reviewable, and grounded in legally recognized considerations.

Wealth, Legal Representation, and Unequal Access to Justice

One of the strongest findings concerns unequal access to legal assistance. Formal equality before the law does not guarantee substantive equality when individuals possess dramatically different resources.

A wealthy litigant may employ specialist lawyers, obtain expert evidence, conduct extensive research, challenge procedural decisions, negotiate settlements, and endure prolonged litigation. A poor litigant may struggle to understand the legal notice itself. Consequently, the law may be identical while the practical ability to use the law is profoundly unequal.

The original manuscript cites the Legal Services Corporation's 2022 *Justice Gap* report, which found that low-income Americans received inadequate or no legal assistance for 92% of their substantial civil legal problems. This illustrates that access to justice is not merely an abstract moral concern. It is an institutional and measurable problem.

Marc Galanter's distinction between "repeat players" and "one-shotters" further explains how experienced and resource-rich actors can accumulate structural advantages. The wealthy do not necessarily purchase judicial decisions directly; instead, they can purchase time, expertise, strategy, information, and procedural capacity.

The spirit of law therefore requires attention to the conditions under which people enter the legal system. A right that cannot realistically be exercised is weaker than a right supported by meaningful legal assistance.

Courts, Media, Politics, and the Risk of Distorted Judgment

Legal institutions operate within broader political and social environments. Media attention, political pressure, public anger, institutional reputation, and social polarization can influence the atmosphere surrounding a case.



The problem is particularly serious when the public begins to demand punishment before the evidence has been fully examined. A court may then face pressure to satisfy public expectations rather than independently evaluate the case.

Sheppard v. Maxwell illustrates the dangers of prejudicial publicity and inadequate control over the trial environment. The broader lesson is that justice can become theatrical when legal institutions are overwhelmed by public spectacle.

Institutional independence therefore requires more than formal constitutional provisions. It also requires a culture of restraint. Judges, prosecutors, lawyers, governments, and media organizations must recognize the difference between public accountability and public pressure.

Clemency and the Legal Space of Mercy

Executive clemency provides one of the clearest examples of mercy operating within formal legal structures. In the United States, the Constitution grants the President authority to issue reprieves and pardons for federal offences, except in cases of impeachment.

Clemency demonstrates that legal systems recognize circumstances in which finality may not be the highest value. Punishment can sometimes become excessive, circumstances can change, or broader social considerations may justify modification of a sentence.

However, clemency also presents a serious danger: selective mercy. If mercy is primarily accessible to politically connected individuals, celebrities, wealthy petitioners, or institutional allies, it may reinforce rather than correct inequality.

The Nixon pardon illustrates this ambiguity. President Gerald Ford presented the pardon as an effort to help the country move beyond Watergate, while critics argued that it compromised accountability.

The lesson is that mercy must itself be governed by principles. Mercy that is transparent, reasoned, and oriented toward justice can strengthen the legal system. Mercy used selectively to protect powerful individuals can undermine it.

Restorative Justice and the Repair of Harm

Restorative justice offers an alternative way to understand the relationship between accountability and mercy. Rather than focusing exclusively on the question of how much an offender should suffer, restorative justice asks several additional questions: Who was harmed? What does the victim need? What obligations does the offender have? How can the harm be repaired? What role should the community play?

This approach does not deny wrongdoing or eliminate accountability. Instead, it changes the centre of attention from punishment alone toward responsibility and repair.

The original paper draws on UNODC's conception of restorative justice as an inclusive and participatory approach that can complement or, in appropriate circumstances, provide an alternative to conventional criminal justice.

Restorative justice is not appropriate for every case. Serious violence, continuing threats, coercion, and vulnerable victims may require strong protective measures. Nevertheless, the



restorative perspective reminds legal institutions that punishment does not automatically repair harm.

The Nelson Mandela Rules provide an additional ethical foundation by affirming that prisoners must be treated with respect for their inherent dignity and value as human beings. Even after conviction, therefore, a person does not cease to be human.

A Five-Lens Model for Humane Legal Judgment

Based on the preceding analysis, this study develops a Five-Lens Model for Humane Legal Judgment. The model is adapted from the conceptual framework already presented in the original manuscript.

Lens	Central Question	Human Purpose
Text	What does the written rule say?	Preserves legal certainty and limits arbitrary judgment.
Purpose	Why does the rule exist?	Connects the rule to safety, fairness, dignity, accountability, and public order.
Intention	Was the act deliberate, negligent, coerced, confused, or accidental?	Distinguishes culpability from vulnerability and genuine mistake.
Harm	What harm occurred, and who requires repair?	Connects legal violation with actual human consequences.
Proportionality and Reform	What response is necessary, fair, and humane?	Prevents justice from becoming revenge and preserves the possibility of restoration.

The first lens protects against arbitrary interpretation. A legal system cannot function if written law is simply ignored. The second lens prevents formalism from becoming detached from social purpose. The third recognizes that intention and circumstances influence moral culpability. The fourth places victims and actual harm at the centre of analysis. The fifth ensures that the legal response remains proportionate and considers whether rehabilitation or restoration is possible.

Importantly, the model does not instruct decision-makers to disregard legislation. It instead provides a structured way of asking whether a legal decision remains faithful to the reason the law exists.

Human Rights as Minimum Moral Limits

International human-rights standards provide minimum boundaries within which legal systems should operate. Arbitrary detention, torture, discrimination, unfair trials, denial of legal



assistance, and degrading treatment are not simply administrative problems. They affect the fundamental dignity of the person.

Human rights also place limits on mercy. Mercy cannot become a mechanism for eliminating victims' rights or shielding officials from accountability. Similarly, justice cannot justify humiliation or dehumanization.

Human dignity therefore functions as a common normative standard. It limits excessive punishment while also preventing abusive forgiveness. The original manuscript identifies this dual function by arguing that dignity should constrain both excessive punishment and irresponsible mercy.

Law in the Algorithmic Age

The final analytical finding concerns digitalization. Artificial intelligence, automated decision-making, databases, risk assessment systems, and algorithmic governance are increasingly influencing administrative and legal processes.

These systems can improve consistency and efficiency, but efficiency is not equivalent to justice. An algorithm may identify a missed deadline but fail to understand why it occurred. It may identify a risk pattern without understanding disability, trauma, coercion, poverty, language barriers, or lack of meaningful notice.

Consequently, automation should not eliminate human judgment. Human review, explainability, appeal mechanisms, legal assistance, transparency, and proportionality remain essential safeguards.

The algorithmic age therefore intensifies rather than eliminates the need for the spirit of law. A legal system that combines text + data + enforcement without contextual judgment may become extremely efficient at producing decisions while becoming increasingly incapable of understanding the people affected by those decisions.

The future of humane law should therefore not be understood as a choice between technology and human judgment. Technology can support legal institutions, but it should remain embedded within a normative framework that prioritizes dignity, fairness, accountability, and proportionality.

Conclusion

This article has examined the relationship between justice, mercy, accountability, and the spirit of law. The analysis demonstrates that law cannot adequately be understood as a mechanism for punishment alone. Law simultaneously performs functions of guidance, protection, accountability, dispute resolution, institutional restraint, rehabilitation, and social repair. When punishment becomes the dominant purpose of law, the legal system risks reducing justice to the infliction of suffering. When mercy becomes detached from accountability, however, it can produce inequality, impunity, and institutional disorder.

The central argument is therefore that justice and mercy should not be treated as mutually exclusive principles. Mercy does not mean the abandonment of responsibility. Properly



understood, mercy can recognize repentance, vulnerability, changed circumstances, and the possibility of rehabilitation while maintaining accountability for harm. Justice, meanwhile, should protect victims and society without becoming revenge.

The distinction between the letter and the spirit of law is essential to achieving this balance. The letter preserves certainty and prevents arbitrary decision-making, while the spirit reminds legal institutions of the purposes underlying legal rules. The analysis of procedural justice, legal inequality, media pressure, clemency, restorative justice, human rights, and algorithmic governance demonstrates that formal legality alone cannot guarantee humane justice.

To strengthen this relationship, the article proposes a Five-Lens Model consisting of text, purpose, intention, harm, and proportionality and reform. The model does not replace positive law or legal doctrine. Instead, it offers a conceptual framework for ensuring that legal decisions remain connected to their underlying human purposes.

Ultimately, the spirit of law is a form of moral restraint. It asks the legal system not to confuse severity with justice, legality with legitimacy, or punishment with social repair. A truly humane legal system is not the system that punishes most severely, but the system that distinguishes most carefully: between guilt and error, deliberate wrongdoing and vulnerability, power and weakness, accountability and revenge, and punishment and meaningful reform. Human law cannot possess divine knowledge, but it can possess humility. That humility is not a weakness of justice; it may be one of its highest forms.

References

- Amin, M., Murdiono, M., & Sarimov, R. (2023). Evolution of the Islamic judicial system: Justice in the governance of Caliph ‘Umar Ibn Al-Khaṭṭāb. *Al-Ahkam: Jurnal Ilmu Syari’ah dan Hukum*, 8(2), 133–145. <https://doi.org/10.22515/alahkam.v8i2.8061>
- Aristotle. (1999). *Nicomachean ethics* (M. Oswald, Trans.). Book V. Prentice Hall.
- Ashworth, A., & Zedner, L. (2014). Preventive justice. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 34(3), 485–509. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/gqu002>
- Assumpção, A. D. G. (2010). The punishment humanity and the human dignity from a perspective of prisoner’s escape. *Revista do Direito Público*, 5(1), 63–79. <https://doi.org/10.5433/1980-511X.2010v5n1p63>
- Barak, A. (2012). *Proportionality: Constitutional rights and their limitations*. Cambridge University Press.
- Barkow, R. E., & Osler, M. (2024). Clemency. *Annual Review of Criminology*, 7, 311–327. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-criminol-022222-040514>
- Berman, H. J. (1983). *Law and revolution: The formation of the Western legal tradition*. Harvard University Press.
- Braithwaite, J. (1989). *Crime, shame and reintegration*. Cambridge University Press.
- Daly, K. (2016). What is restorative justice? Fresh answers to a vexed question. *Victims & Offenders*, 11(1), 9–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2015.1107797>



- Dehaghani, R., & Newman, D. (2021). Criminal legal aid and access to justice: An empirical account of a reduction in resilience. *International Journal of the Legal Profession*, 29(1), 33–52. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09695958.2020.1868474>
- Deigh, J. (2014). Punishment and proportionality. *Criminal Justice Ethics*, 33(3), 185–199. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0731129X.2014.988429>
- Dworkin, R. (1986). *Law's empire*. Harvard University Press.
- European Convention on Human Rights. (1950). Article 6.
- Fuller, L. L. (1969). *The morality of law* (Rev. ed.). Yale University Press.
- Galanter, M. (1974). Why the 'haves' come out ahead: Speculations on the limits of legal change. *Law & Society Review*, 9(1), 95–160.
- Hansen, T., & Umbreit, M. (2018). State of knowledge: Four decades of victim-offender mediation research and practice: The evidence. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 36(2), 99–113. <https://doi.org/10.1002/crq.21234>
- Hart, H. L. A. (1994). *The concept of law* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Hildebrandt, M. (2018). Algorithmic regulation and the rule of law. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 376(2128), 20170355. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2017.0355>
- Huang, K.-C., Lin, C.-C., & Chen, K.-P. (2024). Do rich and poor behave similarly in seeking legal advice? Lessons from Taiwan in comparative perspective. *Law & Society Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lasr.12055>
- Ibrahim, Z. S., Karimullah, S. S., Assaad, A. I., Septiani, R., & Okur, H. (2025). Integration of Maqasid al-Shari'ah in the criminal law reform to achieve justice and human dignity. *Jurnal Hukum Islam*, 23(1), 105–144. <https://doi.org/10.28918/jhi.v23i1.04>
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. (1966). Article 14.
- Khabirpour, N. (2025). A tale of two cases and a story yet untold: Access to justice and legal advice under the civil limb of Article 6 ECHR. *The Modern Law Review*, 88(3), 527–556. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2230.12937>
- Krygier, M. (2016). The rule of law: Pasts, presents, and two possible futures. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 12, 199–229. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-102612-134103>
- Lacey, N. (2016). The metaphor of proportionality. *Journal of Law and Society*, 43(1), 27–44. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6478.2016.00739.x>
- Latimer, J., Dowden, C., & Muise, D. (2005). The effectiveness of restorative justice practices: A meta-analysis. *The Prison Journal*, 85(2), 127–144. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885505276969>
- Leenes, R., Palmerini, E., Koops, B.-J., Bertolini, A., Salvini, P., & Lucivero, F. (2017). Regulatory challenges of robotics: Some guidelines for addressing legal and ethical issues. *Law, Innovation and Technology*, 9(1), 1–44. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17579961.2017.1304921>
- Legal Services Corporation. (2022). *The justice gap: The unmet civil legal needs of low-income Americans*.



- Lloyd, A., & Borrill, J. (2020). Examining the effectiveness of restorative justice in reducing victims' post-traumatic stress. *Psychological Injury and Law*, 13, 77–89. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12207-019-09363-9>
- Magnus, A. M., & Donohue, F. A. (2022). Reimagining access to justice through the eyes of rural domestic violence survivors. *Theoretical Criminology*, 26(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/13624806211035103>
- Mapp v. Ohio, 367 U.S. 643 (1961).
- Meyerson, D. (2018). Procedural justice and the law. *Philosophy Compass*, 13(8), e12548. <https://doi.org/10.1111/phc3.12548>
- Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436 (1966).
- Nagelsen, S., & Huckelbury, C. (2016). The death penalty and human dignity: An existential fallacy. *Laws*, 5(2), 25. <https://doi.org/10.3390/laws5020025>
- Newman, D. (2025). Access to justice policy: Legal aid in post-war UK general election manifestos. *Journal of Law and Society*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09695958.2024.2446418>
- Ono, Y., & Zilis, M. A. (2022). Ascriptive characteristics and perceptions of impropriety in the rule of law: Race, gender, and public assessments of whether judges can be impartial. *American Journal of Political Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12599>
- Radbruch, G. (2006). Statutory lawlessness and supra-statutory law. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 26(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/gqi041>
- Rich, S. (2026). Cardinal proportionality and justifications of harm in punishment theory. *Legal Theory*, 32, 41–54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09615768.2026.2640631>
- Riley, S. (2015). Human dignity and the rule of law. *Utrecht Law Review*, 11(2), 91–105. <https://doi.org/10.18352/ulr.320>
- Rodrigues, R. (2020). Legal and human rights issues of AI: Gaps, challenges and vulnerabilities. *Journal of Responsible Technology*, 4, 100005. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrt.2020.100005>
- Setyaudin, T., Tan, E., & Teo, R. (2026). The Quranic conception of justice and its application in Islamic legal thought. *Journal of Noesantara Islamic Studies*, 3(2), 136–149. <https://doi.org/10.70177/jnis.v3i2.3568>
- Sheppard v. Maxwell, 384 U.S. 333 (1966).
- Snacken, S. (2021). Human dignity and prisoners' rights in Europe. *Crime and Justice*, 50, 193–236. <https://doi.org/10.1086/715910>
- Suhariyanto, B., & Mustafa, C. (2022). Analysis and evaluation of legal aid in the Indonesian court. *Jurnal Hukum dan Peradilan*, 11(2), 176–194. <https://doi.org/10.25216/jhp.11.2.2022.176-194>
- Suzuki, M., & Jenkins, T. (2024). Redefining forgiveness in restorative justice. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 27(3), 273–289. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1478601X.2024.2349586>
- Tonry, M. (2018). Punishment and human dignity: Sentencing principles for twenty-first-century America. *Crime and Justice*, 47, 119–157. <https://doi.org/10.1086/696948>
- Tyler, T. R. (2003). Procedural justice, legitimacy, and the effective rule of law. *Crime and Justice*, 30, 283–357. <https://doi.org/10.1086/652233>



- United Nations General Assembly. (2015). United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (the Nelson Mandela Rules) (Resolution 70/175).
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2020). Handbook on restorative justice programmes (2nd ed.).
- United Nations. (1948). Universal Declaration of Human Rights.
- United Nations. (1990). Basic Principles on the Role of Lawyers.
- van der Aa, S. (2026). The conceptualisation of ‘procedural justice’ for victims and defendants: Different strokes for similar folks? *International Review of Victimology*.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/02697580261434034>
- van Hall, M., Dirkzwager, A. J. E., van der Laan, P. H., & Nieuwbeerta, P. (2023). Procedural justice, perceived legitimacy, and reoffending behavior: In police and court settings. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 50(12), 1874–1892.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/00938548231206833>
- von Hirsch, A. (1992). Proportionality in the philosophy of punishment. *Crime and Justice*, 16, 55–98. <https://doi.org/10.1086/449204>
- Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., & Floridi, L. (2017). Why a right to explanation of automated decision-making does not exist in the General Data Protection Regulation. *International Data Privacy Law*, 7(2), 76–99. <https://doi.org/10.1093/idpl/ipx005>
- Weitekamp, E. G. M., & Parmentier, S. (2016). Restorative justice as healing justice: Looking back to the future of the concept. *Restorative Justice*, 4(2), 141–147.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/20504721.2016.1197517>
- Wood, W. R., & Suzuki, M. (2024). Getting to accountability in restorative justice. *Victims & Offenders*, 19(7), 1400–1423. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2024.2333304>
- Zinsstag, E., & Chapman, T. (2022). Conferencing in restorative justice: International variation and best practice. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 42(3), 789–815.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/gqac014>

