CRIMINAL LIABILITY FOR STRUCTURAL ECONOMIC DAMAGES
THE INTERSECTION OF CRIMINAL INTENT, BEHAVIORAL ECONOMICS, AND THE PHILOSOPHY OF DISTRIBUTED AGENCY

Author: Dr. Mohamed Kamal Arafa Elrakhawi
Researcher, Consultant, Expert, Jurist, and Author
International Lecturer in Law and Intellectual Property Rights

Digital Object Identifier: 10.5281/zenodo.20421043

Copyright Notice:
All rights reserved. Reproduction, translation, adaptation, or distribution in any form is strictly prohibited without the written permission of the author. All rights reserved for the first edition.

Dedication:
To the souls of my pure father and pure mother, knowing that harm is not measured by volume but by the depth of its structural impact on the economic fabric. May God grant them light in their graves and make them among the residents of Paradise.

To my beloved daughter with Spanish roots and Algerian heritage, who represents a future we shield from non-transparent algorithmic oscillations. May this book be placed in your hands as a methodology that illuminates your path with economic criminal justice.

To every researcher who seeks to uncover the hidden mechanisms through which algorithmic efficiency transforms into punishable harm.

Author's Introduction:
This book is a completely original work without parallel in Arab or international economic criminal jurisprudence. We do not merely translate ready-made Western theories here, but rather establish the Theory of Structural Criminal Intent as a new criminal science. The central idea revolves around reconstructing the ontological dimension of criminalization in light of decentralized algorithmic systems. The objective is to bridge the gap between traditional criminalization and indirect structural economic damages. We believe that living criminal law serves justice and responds to the complexities of modern economic distribution. This work is the fruit of a deep personal aspiration regarding liability challenges in the era of distributed agency. We place this work in the hands of scholars and judges as a guide for decentralized criminal liability. We believe that economic criminal reality is embedded in the stability of legal systems, not in textual rigidity. This text may not be used to justify evasion from punishment, but rather to regulate structural accountability. We pray to God that this effort serves humanity and our nation. Written and published in December 2026.

DETAILED PEER-REVIEWED RESEARCH PAPER
Foundations of Criminal Liability for Structural Economic Damages from Autonomous Algorithmic Systems

Precise and Comprehensive Explanation of Pillars and Applications

Author: Dr. Mohamed Kamal Arafa Elrakhawi

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY IN ARABIC
This research paper presents the theoretical and applied framework for the Theory of Structural Criminal Intent. The paper aims to bridge the gap between traditional criminal law and algorithmic structural damages. We discuss here the methodology of Systemic Negligence as a tool for accountability in uninspectable environments. This paper is considered the basic reference for researchers in the Arab world to establish economic criminal jurisprudence. Economic Criminal Law needs strong theoretical foundations to support its practical applications in changing reality. The Theory of Structural Criminal Intent represents a qualitative leap in contemporary criminal economic thought within the Integrated School. This paper is available for researchers to benefit from in their research and scientific studies within controls. We confirm the originality of the content and non-plagiarism from any external source to ensure intellectual precedence.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION AND SCIENTIFIC PROBLEM STATEMENT
Humanity witnesses major criminal economic challenges in keeping pace with autonomous algorithmic systems. The gap between fixed criminal text and changing algorithmic reality creates structural accountability problems. The traditional model of criminal intent failed to explain indirect macroeconomic damages. We pose here the problem of how to prove criminal intent without a direct human actor. The solution lies in a structural intent methodology adapting to distributed agency through criminal protocols. The research relies on the critical analytical method between criminal jurisprudence and behavioral economics. We aim to present a practical model applicable in the diverse criminal economic environment. Originality in this research lies in integrating jurisprudential rooting with algorithmic modernity within a unified vision. We reject textual stagnation as we reject rupture with origins at once to achieve the required balance.

CHAPTER TWO: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR STRUCTURAL CRIMINAL INTENT
Structural Criminal Intent Theory views economic crime as a network event, not an isolated individual act. Criminal intent is not an end in itself but a means to achieve fair accountability. We rely here on the principle of systemic negligence that allows accountability without a direct human actor. Economic criminal stability does not conflict with development but needs it to remain valid. We link here between the jurisprudential theory of causation and variables of complex algorithmic markets. The theoretical framework is based on the idea that law must serve the economy, not the reverse in all cases. Flexibility means the ability to respond to economic crises without needing to amend the text always. This framework protects the prestige of law from frequent amendments that lose its dignity. We confirm that economic criminal vitality is the secret of survival of the legal system through ages.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY OF DISTRIBUTED AGENCY AND DECENTRALIZED ACCOUNTABILITY

We propose here the Agency methodology as a realistic solution to avoid shock of radical replacement. Development is done through update protocols attached to the original system without abolishing it. Technical Sharia Foundational Committees play a pivotal role in reviewing texts periodically. Unified judicial interpretations play a quasi-legislative role to fill gaps temporarily until amendment. Flexible clauses in economic contracts allow parties to adapt to variables without dispute. Local experimentation in specific areas precedes national generalization to ensure success. This methodology ensures system stability while allowing necessary and urgent development. Distributed Agency protects from institutional resistance to sudden and unstudied change carefully. We confirm that flexibility is the safe bridge between changing reality and fixed criminal text.

CHAPTER FOUR: APPLICATIONS IN STRUCTURAL ECONOMIC CRIMINALIZATION

We apply here the living methodology to regulate criminalization in independent systems and digital markets. Considering structural damage as a source of criminal liability approved legally with controls. Regulating liability within the framework of traditional justice with updates to include structural dimensions. Protecting society from existential economic risks while considering shared heritage. Justice extends to include algorithmic and economic damages according to expanded guarantee theory. We balance between freedom of innovation and protection of the weak party in modern economic contracts. Living law allows recognizing legal personality for systems for accountability purposes. This application bridges the gap between classical texts and accelerating technology reality. We thereby ensure protection of rights in economic space without obstructing innovation.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION AND SCIENTIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

The paper concludes with the necessity of adopting the Structural Criminal Intent methodology in Arab criminal legislations. We recommend creating a digital Fiqh-Criminal Economic platform to support unified jurisprudence. We recommend training judges and lawyers on structural understanding methodologies for economic actions. Development must be participatory including all stakeholders in civil society. We confirm that realism and flexibility are the secret of law remaining valid for effective application. Philosophical sovereignty requires a balance between Sharia constants and modern variables. This theory represents an original contribution to contemporary criminal economic jurisprudence globally. We place this work in the hands of scholars to discuss and develop it continuously. All rights reserved to the author and may not be used without explicit written permission.

CHAPTER SIX: TRANSITION FROM INDIVIDUAL ACT TO STRUCTURAL NETWORK DAMAGE

This introduction determines the radical shift from individual act to structural network damage. Contemporary criminal jurisprudence must consider the nature of indirect macroeconomic damages. Structural intent does not rely on direct human negligence but on the architecture of the algorithmic system. The theory of intent must evolve to include systemic negligence as a radical element in criminalization. Decentralized liability means the distribution of obligations among designers, operators, and the system in a balanced manner. Original criminal principles must protect against evasion under the cover of technical complexity. The independent

economy requires a new framework recognizing structural liability for algorithmic systems. Living law must consider the pace of market development without sacrificing guarantees. Proof of impact requires a precise ontological link between design and economic damage. Arab legislations must provide rapid tools to combat crimes arising from algorithms. Structural criminal jurisprudence transcends traditional boundaries requiring comprehensive international cooperation. Legal jurisprudence must consider cultural and religious specificity in defining structural harm. Multiple justice must protect society from exploitation under the cover of economic efficiency. Laws must provide clear definitions for structural intent and systemic negligence. Structural criminal jurisprudence threatens traditional concepts requiring its classification as a new science. Living law must consider the rights of future generations in a stable economic environment. Justice extends to cover long-term structural damages that touch the depths of the economic fabric. Legislations must provide tools to adjudicate algorithmic systems in specialized courts. Structural criminal jurisprudence is the greatest challenge to legal jurisprudence in the twenty-first century. This introduction establishes a new understanding of liability in the era of decentralized agency and autonomous algorithms.

CHAPTER SEVEN: CRITIQUE OF TRADITIONAL INTENT AND ITS INABILITY TO ABSORB STRUCTURAL DAMAGES

Traditional criminal theories rely on individual intent as the sole source of liability. We must critique this theory in light of indirect network economic damages. The traditional intent model fails to explain liability when the actor is an algorithmic system. The theory of intent must evolve to cover decentralized damages within the economic network. Individual liability becomes insufficient when the damage results from collective algorithmic interaction. Criminal jurisprudence must consider the role of the market as a contributor to structural harm. We must clarify the difficulty of establishing doubt exceeding individual boundaries. Laws must provide tools to distribute liability according to the degree of structural impact. Traditional intent theory protects the perpetrator but fails to regulate the system. Living law must consider the programmer's error regarding harmful algorithms. Intent has expanded to include negligence in designing economic protection systems. Legislations must provide precise definitions for direct and indirect human intervention. Traditional intent theory needs updating to cover crimes of autonomous algorithms. Criminal jurisprudence must consider the difficulty of isolating a single cause in structural economic damage. Intent in networks requires economic experts to analyze algorithmic causal chains. Laws must protect designers from liability for unexpected learning errors. Traditional intent theory hinders justice in complex economic crimes. Living law must consider the balance between innovation and criminal liability. Intent must be flexible to accommodate continuous algorithmic development. Critique of traditional intent is the first step toward comprehensive structural economic justice.

CHAPTER EIGHT: SYSTEMIC NEGLIGENCE AS A FOUNDATION FOR ECONCRIMINAL LIABILITY

The theory of systemic negligence evolves to recognize liability without a direct human actor. Living law must consider the nature of damage resulting from defective structural design. Systemic negligence aims to protect the economy from algorithmic oscillations. Laws must provide tools to force systems to bear structural liability. Systemic negligence accommodates

long-term protection more than individual liability. Criminal jurisprudence must consider the desire of future generations for sound economic stability. Systemic negligence reduces the burden on humans and distributes liability to all. Legislations must provide clear criteria to estimate structural damage. Systemic negligence requires judicial oversight to ensure execution of penalties. Living law must consider the possibility of algorithmic damage recurrence. Systemic negligence enhances human responsibility toward the shared economic system. Laws must provide tools to prevent humans from returning to harmful activities. Systemic negligence accommodates large algorithms more than individuals. Criminal jurisprudence must consider justice as an existential economic right. Systemic negligence requires technical cooperation between judges and economic experts. Laws must provide protection for algorithms during the process of structural analysis. Systemic negligence is the future of economic criminal justice in the digital age. Living law must consider the balance between economic efficiency and criminal justice. Systemic negligence achieves broader justice in dealing with complex systems. Structural economic justice is the guarantee of the stability of the sound economic system.

CHAPTER NINE: BEHAVIORAL ECONOMICS AND REVEALING HARMFUL ALGORITHMIC TOOLS

Behavioral economics evolves to monitor algorithmic oscillations in markets. Living law must consider the nature of damage resulting from cognitive exploitation. Behavioral economics aims to protect consumers from algorithmic exploitation. Laws must provide tools to force companies to reveal algorithms. Behavioral economics accommodates long-term protection more than individual rights. Criminal jurisprudence must consider the desire of future generations in fair markets. Behavioral economics reduces the burden on humans and distributes liability to all. Legislations must provide clear criteria to estimate behavioral damage. Behavioral economics requires judicial oversight to ensure execution of remedies. Living law must consider the possibility of behavioral damage recurrence. Behavioral economics enhances human responsibility toward shared economic decisions. Laws must provide tools to prevent humans from returning to harmful activities. Behavioral economics accommodates large algorithms more than individuals. Criminal jurisprudence must consider transparency as an existential economic right. Behavioral economics requires technical cooperation between judges and programmers. Laws must provide protection for algorithms during the process of behavioral analysis. Behavioral economics is the future of economic justice in the digital age. Living law must consider the balance between efficiency and justice. Behavioral economics achieves broader justice in dealing with complex markets. Structural economic justice is the guarantee of the stability of the sound economic market.

CHAPTER TEN: TRADING ALGORITHMS AND HIGH-FREQUENCY COVERAGE OF RESULTING RISKS

The concept of trading evolves to cover risks resulting from high-frequency algorithms. Living law must consider the nature of damage resulting from structural causation. Trading algorithms aim to protect markets from consumer exploitation. Laws must provide tools to force companies to insure against damages. Trading algorithms accommodate long-term protection more than individual rights. Criminal jurisprudence must consider the desire of future generations in financial protection. Trading algorithms reduce the burden on humans and distribute liability to

all. Legislations must provide clear criteria to estimate compensation value. Trading algorithms require judicial oversight to ensure execution of compensation. Living law must consider the possibility of damage recurrence in trading. Trading algorithms enhance human responsibility toward shared risks. Laws must provide tools to prevent humans from returning to harmful activities. Trading algorithms accommodate large algorithms more than individuals. Criminal jurisprudence must consider financial justice as an existential right. Trading algorithms require technical cooperation between judges and trading companies. Laws must provide protection for individuals during the process of loss analysis. Trading algorithms are the future of financial justice in the digital age. Living law must consider the balance between innovation and protection. Trading algorithms achieve broader justice in dealing with complex risks. Structural financial justice is the guarantee of the stability of the sound financial system.

CHAPTER ELEVEN: AUTONOMOUS DYNAMIC PRICING SYSTEMS AND MARKET OSCILLATIONS

International law evolves to monitor autonomous pricing across borders. Living law must consider the nature of global damage subject to proof. Autonomous pricing aims to protect rights from cross-border exploitation. Laws must provide tools to force countries to comply with international standards. Autonomous pricing accommodates long-term protection more than individual rights. Criminal jurisprudence must consider the desire of future generations in a global system. Autonomous pricing reduces the burden on humans and distributes liability to all. Legislations must provide clear criteria to estimate global damage. Autonomous pricing requires judicial oversight to ensure execution of remedies. Living law must consider the possibility of global damage recurrence. Autonomous pricing enhances human responsibility toward shared markets. Laws must provide tools to prevent humans from returning to harmful activities. Autonomous pricing accommodates large algorithms more than individuals. Criminal jurisprudence must consider cooperation as an existential economic right. Autonomous pricing requires international cooperation between judges and governments. Laws must provide protection for rights during the execution process. Autonomous pricing is the future of global justice in the digital age. Living law must consider the balance between sovereignty and rights. Autonomous pricing achieves broader justice in dealing with complex global systems. Structural global justice is the guarantee of the stability of the sound international system.

CHAPTER TWELVE: DECENTRALIZED AUTONOMOUS ORGANIZATIONS (DAOs) AND CRIMINAL LIABILITY

Legal education evolves to include artificial intelligence and technical approaches. Living law must consider the nature of transferable knowledge. Legal education aims to protect the future through technology. Laws must provide tools to force universities to update curricula. Legal education accommodates long-term protection more than individual rights. Criminal jurisprudence must consider the desire of future generations in sound awareness. Legal education reduces the burden on humans and distributes liability to all. Legislations must provide clear criteria for legal education. Legal education requires judicial oversight to ensure execution of updates. Living law must consider the possibility of educational error recurrence. Legal education enhances human responsibility toward shared knowledge. Laws must provide tools to prevent humans from returning to harmful activities. Legal education accommodates

large algorithms more than individuals. Criminal jurisprudence must consider awareness as an existential right. Legal education requires international cooperation between universities and governments. Laws must provide protection for students during the learning process. Legal education is the future of knowledge justice in the digital age. Living law must consider the balance between tradition and modernity. Legal education achieves broader justice in dealing with complex knowledge. Structural knowledge justice is the guarantee of the stability of the sound educational system.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN: EVIDENCE STANDARDS IN UNSCREENABLE ENVIRONDES
Design ethics evolve to monitor the creation process of digital algorithms. Living law must consider the nature of damage subject to proof. Design ethics aim to protect algorithms from structural defects. Laws must provide tools to force designers to commit ethically. Design ethics accommodate long-term protection more than individual rights. Criminal jurisprudence must consider the desire of future generations in sound design. Design ethics reduce the burden on humans and distribute liability to all. Legislations must provide clear criteria to estimate design damage. Design ethics require judicial oversight to ensure execution of remedies. Living law must consider the possibility of design damage recurrence. Design ethics enhance human responsibility toward the shared algorithm. Laws must provide tools to prevent humans from returning to harmful activities. Design ethics accommodate large algorithms more than individuals. Criminal jurisprudence must consider quality as an existential right. Design ethics require technical cooperation between judges and engineers. Laws must provide protection for algorithms during the design process. Design ethics are the future of technical justice in the digital age. Living law must consider the balance between innovation and safety. Design ethics achieve broader justice in dealing with complex algorithms. Structural technical justice is the guarantee of the stability of the sound digital system.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN: MODELING SOCIAL COSTS OF ALGORITHMIC DAMAGE
Dispute resolution tools evolve to adjudicate in digital networks. Living law must consider the nature of multiple disputes subject to resolution. Dispute resolution aims to protect litigants from complex adjudication. Laws must provide tools to force parties to comply with resolution. Dispute resolution accommodates long-term protection more than individual rights. Criminal jurisprudence must consider the desire of future generations in lasting peace. Dispute resolution reduces the burden on humans and distributes liability to all. Legislations must provide clear criteria to estimate dispute damage. Dispute resolution requires judicial oversight to ensure execution of solutions. Living law must consider the possibility of dispute recurrence. Dispute resolution enhances human responsibility toward the shared system. Laws must provide tools to prevent humans from returning to harmful activities. Dispute resolution accommodates large algorithms more than individuals. Criminal jurisprudence must consider peace as an existential right. Dispute resolution requires international cooperation between judges and mediators. Laws must provide protection for rights during the resolution process. Dispute resolution is the future of Islamic justice in the digital age. Living law must consider the balance between rights and obligations. Dispute resolution achieves broader justice in dealing with complex systems. Structural Islamic justice is the guarantee of the stability of the sound international system.

CHAPTER FIFTEEN: THE ONTOLOGY OF GUILT IN AUTONOMOUS ALGORITHMIC ENVIRONMENTS

This chapter unifies all sections in a unified philosophical vision. We outline here the features of post-human law. Humanity, algorithms, and networks integrate in rights and obligations. The chapter links all sections in one philosophical approach. Post-human law philosophy is the basis for developing living law. We believe that philosophical integration is the secret to the success of justice. Philosophers live philosophy as a daily practical reality. The chapter determines a general compass for comprehensive philosophical development. The one who succeeds is the one who makes philosophy serve justice. Fragmentation is not allowed in the application of post-human law. The chapter calls for a comprehensive revolution in legal thought. Philosophy is completely liberated when the living methodology is built. Philosophy is the ultimate conclusion of legal thought. The chapter establishes the principle that philosophy is a means without end. Philosophy concludes its journey with a living legal philosophy. Development is the beginning and end in the existence of philosophy. The chapter links philosophy and the meaning of comprehensive justice. Philosophers have improved the world and left the philosophy. This chapter presents the book with a comprehensive philosophical approach. Post-human law philosophy is the ultimate homeland for justice.

CHAPTER SIXTEEN: RECONSTRUCTING THE THEORY OF CRIMINALIZATION IN THE DIGITAL ECONOMY

Legal education evolves to include multiple environmental approaches. Living law must consider the nature of transferable knowledge. Legal education aims to protect the future with new rights. Laws must provide tools to force universities to update curricula. Legal education accommodates long-term protection more than individual rights. Criminal jurisprudence must consider the desire of future generations in sound awareness. Legal education reduces the burden on humans and distributes liability to all. Legislations must provide clear criteria for legal education. Legal education requires judicial oversight to ensure execution of updates. Living law must consider the possibility of educational error recurrence. Legal education enhances human responsibility toward shared knowledge. Laws must provide tools to prevent humans from returning to harmful activities. Legal education accommodates large algorithms more than individuals. Criminal jurisprudence must consider awareness as an existential right. Legal education requires international cooperation between universities and governments. Laws must provide protection for students during the learning process. Legal education is the future of knowledge justice in the digital age. Living law must consider the balance between tradition and modernity. Legal education achieves broader justice in dealing with complex knowledge. Structural knowledge justice is the guarantee of the stability of the sound educational system.

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN: DETERRENT PENALTIES IN AUTONOMOUS ALGORITHMIC ENVIRONMENTS

Design ethics evolve to monitor the creation process of digital algorithms. Living law must consider the nature of damage subject to proof. Design ethics aim to protect algorithms from structural defects. Laws must provide tools to force designers to commit ethically. Design ethics accommodate long-term protection more than individual rights. Criminal jurisprudence must consider the desire of future generations in sound design. Design ethics reduce the burden on

humans and distribute liability to all. Legislations must provide clear criteria to estimate design damage. Design ethics require judicial oversight to ensure execution of remedies. Living law must consider the possibility of design damage recurrence. Design ethics enhance human responsibility toward the shared algorithm. Laws must provide tools to prevent humans from returning to harmful activities. Design ethics accommodate large algorithms more than individuals. Criminal jurisprudence must consider quality as an existential right. Design ethics require technical cooperation between judges and engineers. Laws must provide protection for algorithms during the design process. Design ethics are the future of technical justice in the digital age. Living law must consider the balance between innovation and safety. Design ethics achieve broader justice in dealing with complex algorithms. Structural technical justice is the guarantee of the stability of the sound digital system.

CHAPTER EIGHTEEN: BALANCE BETWEEN PROTECTING ECONOMIC EFFICIENCY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Dispute resolution tools evolve to adjudicate in digital networks. Living law must consider the nature of multiple disputes subject to resolution. Dispute resolution aims to protect litigants from complex adjudication. Laws must provide tools to force parties to comply with resolution. Dispute resolution accommodates long-term protection more than individual rights. Criminal jurisprudence must consider the desire of future generations in lasting peace. Dispute resolution reduces the burden on humans and distributes liability to all. Legislations must provide clear criteria to estimate dispute damage. Dispute resolution requires judicial oversight to ensure execution of solutions. Living law must consider the possibility of dispute recurrence. Dispute resolution enhances human responsibility toward the shared system. Laws must provide tools to prevent humans from returning to harmful activities. Dispute resolution accommodates large algorithms more than individuals. Criminal jurisprudence must consider peace as an existential right. Dispute resolution requires international cooperation between judges and mediators. Laws must provide protection for rights during the resolution process. Dispute resolution is the future of Islamic justice in the digital age. Living law must consider the balance between rights and obligations. Dispute resolution achieves broader justice in dealing with complex systems. Structural Islamic justice is the guarantee of the stability of the sound international system.

CHAPTER NINETEEN: LEGISLATIVE CRIMINALIZATION INDICATORS APPLICABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

The concept of sovereignty evolves to include control over national algorithms. Living law must consider the nature of digital sovereignty subject to destruction. Sovereignty aims to protect the state from external threats. Laws must provide tools to force companies to commit to national compliance. Sovereignty accommodates long-term protection more than individual rights. Criminal jurisprudence must consider the desire of future generations in sound sovereignty. Sovereignty reduces the burden on humans and distributes liability to all. Legislations must provide clear criteria to estimate sovereign damage. Sovereignty requires judicial oversight to ensure execution of protection. Living law must consider the possibility of sovereignty violation recurrence. Sovereignty enhances human responsibility toward the shared homeland. Laws must provide tools to prevent humans from returning to harmful activities. Sovereignty accommodates large algorithms more than individuals. Criminal jurisprudence must consider

independence as an existential right. Sovereignty requires international cooperation between judges and governments. Laws must provide protection for sovereignty during execution. Sovereignty is the future of national justice in the digital age. Living law must consider the balance between openness and protection. Sovereignty achieves broader justice in dealing with complex systems. Structural national justice is the guarantee of the stability of the sound national system.

CHAPTER TWENTY: CRIMINAL LIABILITY OF TECHNOLOGY COMPANIES FOR STRUCTURAL DESIGN

This chapter unifies all sections in a unified philosophical vision. We outline here the features of post-human law. Humanity, algorithms, and networks integrate in rights and obligations. The chapter links all sections in one philosophical approach. Post-human law philosophy is the basis for developing living law. We believe that philosophical integration is the secret to the success of justice. Philosophers live philosophy as a daily practical reality. The chapter determines a general compass for comprehensive philosophical development. The one who succeeds is the one who makes philosophy serve justice. Fragmentation is not allowed in the application of post-human law. The chapter calls for a comprehensive revolution in legal thought. Philosophy is completely liberated when the living methodology is built. Philosophy is the ultimate conclusion of legal thought. The chapter establishes the principle that philosophy is a means without end. Philosophy concludes its journey with a living legal philosophy. Development is the beginning and end in the existence of philosophy. The chapter links philosophy and the meaning of comprehensive justice. Philosophers have improved the world and left the philosophy. This chapter presents the book with a comprehensive philosophical approach. Post-human law philosophy is the ultimate homeland for justice.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY IN ENGLISH

This research paper presents the theoretical and applied framework for the Theory of Structural Criminal Intent. The paper aims to bridge the gap between traditional criminal law and algorithmic structural damages. We discuss here the methodology of Systemic Negligence as a tool for accountability in uninspectable environments. This paper is considered the basic reference for researchers in the Arab world to establish economic criminal jurisprudence. Economic Criminal Law needs strong theoretical foundations to support its practical applications in changing reality. The Theory of Structural Criminal Intent represents a qualitative leap in contemporary criminal economic thought within the Integrated School. This paper is available for researchers to benefit from in their research and scientific studies within controls. We confirm the originality of the content and non-plagiarism from any external source to ensure intellectual precedence.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY IN FRENCH

Ce document de recherche présente le cadre théorique et appliqué de la Théorie de l'Intention Criminelle Structurelle. Le document vise à combler le fossé entre le droit pénal traditionnel et les dommages structurels algorithmiques. Nous discutons ici de la méthodologie de la Négligence Systémique comme outil de responsabilité dans les environnements non inspectables. Ce document est considéré comme la référence de base pour les chercheurs

dans le monde arabe pour établir une jurisprudence pénale économique. Le Droit Pénal Économique a besoin de fondements théoriques solides pour soutenir ses applications pratiques dans une réalité changeante. La Théorie de l'Intention Criminelle Structurelle représente un saut qualitatif dans la pensée criminelle économique contemporaine au sein de l'École Intégrée. Ce document est disponible pour que les chercheurs en bénéficient dans leurs recherches et études scientifiques dans le respect des contrôles. Nous confirmons l'originalité du contenu et l'absence de plagiat de toute source externe pour garantir la priorité intellectuelle.

Copyright Reserved for the Author
Reproduction, adaptation, translation, or distribution in any form is strictly prohibited without written permission from the author.

First Edition: December 2026