23th International Conference on Management & Humanistic Science Research in Iran
APRIL 20, 2026 | TEHRAN

Governance-in-Action in Sacred Semantics: A Civilizational Algorithm Theory Analysis of the Second Section of Jawshan Kabir

SeyyedAbdolHojjat MoghadasNian
University of Religions and Denominations
s14110213@gmail.com

SeyyedAbdolHamed MoghadasNian
University of Religions and Denominations
smmoghaddasnian1@gmail.com

1

Abstract

This article presents a conceptual and systems-oriented interpretation of the second section of *Jawshan Kabir* through the lens of Civilizational Algorithm Theory (CAT). It explores how this bounded sacred text may be read, in addition to its devotional significance, as a coherent governance sequence comprising authority, responsiveness, elevation, ethical stewardship, restorative correction, provision, reintegration, listening, hidden-state awareness, and crisis deflection. The study employs a qualitative conceptual design grounded in bounded-text analysis and theological-hermeneutic interpretation. Its ten divine attributes are examined through semantic analysis, theological hermeneutics, cybernetic mapping, governance translation, and the construction of indicative evaluative variables. The analysis indicates that the section forms an ordered governance-in-action grammar rather than merely a liturgical list of divine names. The article therefore extends CAT from ontological grounding to operational governance interpretation and identifies a distinct governance layer embedded in sacred semantics. Its contributions are threefold: it deepens theology-to-governance translation, demonstrates the

analytical adaptability of CAT across compact textual units, and proposes a normative framework for responsive, restorative, attentive, and resilient institutions. The article concludes by calling for expert review, refinement of the proposed variables, and comparative application across other sacred corpora and governance settings.

Keywords: Jawshan Kabir; Civilizational Algorithm Theory (CAT); sacred semantics; governance-in-action; restorative governance; resilience; key performance indicators.

Introduction

Governance scholarship has produced sophisticated analyses of accountability, resilience, institutional adaptation, and performance architecture. Yet a persistent limitation remains: many governance models are operationally sophisticated but normatively under-specified. They clarify how institutions coordinate, monitor, and respond, but they say less about the deeper semantic and ontological structures that render order intelligible, legitimate, and sustainable. In the author's earlier CAT-based study of *Jawshan Kabir*, the opening invocation was reconstructed as an ontological kernel of legitimate order, linking sacred semantics to governance-relevant functions without collapsing theology into managerial reductionism (MoghadasNian et al., 2026). The present article builds on that foundation but advances to a different analytical layer.

This shift is important because governance failure does not arise only from weak legitimacy. It also emerges from failures of responsiveness, repair, listening, anticipation, and protection. The second section of *Jawshan Kabir* is examined here as a bounded semantic sequence encoding precisely these operational capacities (Qummī, 1376/1997–1998). In this reading, authority is followed by responsiveness, elevation, stewardship of good, restorative correction, provision, reintegration, listening, hidden-state intelligence, and crisis deflection. Interpreted through Civilizational Algorithm Theory (CAT), the second section appears not as a second ontological prologue, but as the governance-in-action layer through which grounded order becomes executable, responsive, restorative, listening-centered, and resilient.

Theoretically, this article responds to a clear transition in the literature. Normative grounding, while indispensable, is no longer sufficient on its own. Even institutions with a legitimate moral center continue to face operational challenges involving demand response, capability uplift, corrective reintegration, distributed listening, hidden-risk detection, and crisis prevention. Within this context, the article adopts CAT, informed by cybernetic and systems thinking, as its primary interpretive lens. A rival reading would treat the same stanza chiefly as devotional, ethical, or liturgical language. By contrast, this study argues that the second section may be interpreted, non-reductively, as a structured control-oriented grammar of order.

Conceptually, the article proposes a bounded translational chain in which divine attributes are rendered into governance-in-action functions, those functions into cybernetic roles, those roles into indicative

evaluative variables, and those variables into wider institutional and civilizational implications. At the stanza level, the sequence is reconstructed as authority, responsiveness, elevation, stewardship, correction, provision, reintegration, listening, hidden-state awareness, and crisis deflection. This sequence provides the analytical basis for the article's central claim: that sacred semantics can encode an operational architecture of governance without losing theological integrity.

The core problem addressed in this study is the absence of a disciplined framework for translating a bounded sacred invocational unit into an operational governance architecture. Existing scholarship offers rich devotional and theological readings of *Jawshan Kabir*, while governance scholarship provides substantial work on responsiveness, restoration, resilience, and institutional design. What remains insufficiently developed is a transparent interdisciplinary model capable of reconstructing a concentrated sacred text as a formal architecture of authority, responsiveness, repair, listening, hidden-state intelligence, and protective continuity. The problem, therefore, is not simply that religion is underused in governance studies, or that theological scholarship lacks metrics. More precisely, the problem is that operational governance derived from sacred semantics remains under-modeled.

This problem becomes clearer when contrasted with the earlier CAT-based study of *Jawshan Kabir*. That study examined how order becomes legitimate, coherent, and epistemically grounded. The present study addresses a different question: how such order operates under conditions of demand, plurality, error, opacity, and threat. In this sense, the earlier study reconstructed the ontological kernel, whereas the present article focuses on the operational governance architecture. This distinction is important to the article's originality and helps clarify that the analysis is not merely a sequential commentary on another stanza.

The corresponding research gap lies in the tension between governance literature and theological literature. Governance studies increasingly recognize the need for deeper normative and ontological grounding, but they rarely operationalize such grounding through disciplined textual-theological reconstruction. Theological and devotional scholarship, by contrast, is rich in semantic, mystical, and doctrinal insight, yet seldom translates sacred invocations into formal architectures of governance, control, evaluation, and civilizational measurement. The novelty of this article, therefore, does not lie simply in examining a different section of the prayer. Its stronger contribution lies in the analytical move from sacred semantics to an operational governance architecture organized around authority, responsiveness, elevation, ethical stewardship, restorative correction, provision, reintegration, listening, hidden-state intelligence, and crisis deflection.

The purpose of this study is to determine how the second section of *Jawshan Kabir* can be reconstructed within Civilizational Algorithm Theory as an operational governance architecture. More specifically, the study seeks to show how the ten divine attributes in this section can be translated into a cybernetic sequence of governance-in-action and then expressed through indicative governance variables and wider civilizational implications.

The primary research question is as follows: How can the second section of *Jawshan Kabir* be reconstructed within Civilizational Algorithm Theory (CAT) as an operational governance architecture of

authority, responsiveness, elevation, ethical stewardship, restorative correction, provision, reintegration, listening, hidden-state intelligence, and crisis deflection?

To answer this question, the article addresses five subsidiary questions. First, what semantic and theological architecture is encoded in the ten divine attributes of the section? Second, how can these attributes be translated into a cybernetic and systems-theoretic sequence of governance-in-action? Third, which indicative KPIs and evaluative variables may be derived from that sequence? Fourth, how does this translation respond to ontological thinness without reducing the text to managerial instrumentalism? Fifth, what implications does the resulting model carry for governance design, institutional resilience, civilizational diplomacy, taqrīb-oriented applications, and potentially high-reliability settings?

This article is significant at both scholarly and practical levels. Its scholarly significance lies in extending sacred-text analysis beyond devotional commentary toward disciplined conceptual modeling, while simultaneously enriching governance theory through a denser account of responsiveness, repair, listening, and resilience. By extending CAT beyond ontological-kernel analysis into the reconstruction of an operational governance stack, the study contributes to theology-to-governance translation, systems-oriented hermeneutics, and governance theory more broadly.

4 Its practical significance lies in offering a normative and evaluative vocabulary through which institutions may be assessed not only in terms of efficiency or control, but also in terms of their capacity to respond, reintegrate, hear plural voices, identify hidden risk, and deflect crisis. In this respect, the article moves beyond thematic interpretation toward preliminary evaluative design. The indicative variables proposed in the manuscript, including Strategic Command Integrity, Request Responsiveness Index, Reintegration Acceptance Index, Voice Listening Index, Latent Signal Intelligence, and Adversity Deflection Index, illustrate how the second section may inform governance review, resilience assessment, and institutional self-diagnosis. The study is therefore relevant not only to academic researchers, but also to policymakers, institutional designers, and practitioners working in governance-sensitive, dialogue-sensitive, and resilience-sensitive settings.

The scope of the study is intentionally narrow and explicitly bounded. The principal unit of analysis is the second section of *Jawshan Kabir*, while the micro-units are the ten divine attributes contained within that section. The article is conceptual and theory-building rather than empirically validated. It does not claim exhaustive coverage of the entire supplication, nor does it claim that the proposed indicators have already undergone psychometric or institutional validation. The translation developed in the article is analogical and systems-theoretic rather than literalist.

Accordingly, the argument is designed to hold within the specific context of disciplined theology-to-governance translation using a bounded sacred corpus. It does not claim immediate generalizability to all invocations, all religious traditions, or all institutional settings. Any wider extension requires further comparative analysis, contextual refinement, and later empirical testing. This boundedness is not a weakness of the design; rather, it is part of the article's methodological discipline and proof-of-concept character.

Literature Review

This literature review is integrative and theory-building rather than systematic or meta-analytic. It is anchored in the earlier study of the opening invocation of *Jawshan Kabir*, the CAT methodological paper, and a focused selection of external scholarship on ethical governance, performance measurement, sacred-text translation, and design mediation (Ghafran & Yasmin, 2020; Haniffah et al., 2023; Krieger, 1987; Naudé & Miller-Naudé, 2022). It therefore does not seek exhaustive bibliographic coverage. Instead, it reconstructs the article's most defensible intellectual lineage by placing the CAT-based conceptual corpus in conversation with a limited but relevant bridge literature on governance, translation, and operationalization (MoghadasNian, 2026; MoghadasNian et al., 2026). Such a bounded review design is appropriate to the proof-of-concept nature of the study and supports its broader objective of developing a disciplined model of theology-to-governance translation.

In inclusion terms, the review privileges sources that do at least one of four things: clarify why governance may remain normatively or ontologically thin despite procedural sophistication; supply a language of translation from meaning to structure, design, or system; demonstrate that religious corpora can be operationalized into ethical or performance architectures; or position CAT within a wider KPI-governed framework ecosystem (Ghafran & Yasmin, 2020; Haniffah et al., 2023; Ahsani et al., 2024; Krieger, 1987). Sources are therefore included because they help explain the article's conceptual model, not because they belong to a generic bibliography. This is important because the present paper is not a broad survey of sacred-text studies; it is a tightly bounded argument about how the second section of Jawshan Kabir can be read as a governance-in-action architecture.

The primary theoretical lens is Civilizational Algorithm Theory (CAT). CAT is defined as a design-science, ontology-structuring, and theology-to-governance translation method that proceeds through corpus delimitation, semantic extraction, ontological coding, systems translation, cybernetic mapping, governance translation, indicatorization, and systems integration (MoghadasNian, 2026). CAT therefore does not treat sacred texts merely as devotional artifacts; it treats bounded semantic units as structured ontological corpora that can be translated into auditable systemic and governance architectures. This positioning also aligns with a small external literature showing that sacred meaning can be mediated into architectural, ethical, and organizational forms without being reduced to mere symbolism (Krieger, 1987; Ahsani et al., 2024; Naudé & Miller-Naudé, 2022). In this paper, CAT functions not as a replacement for downstream KPI frameworks, but as their ontological precursor.

The first rival lens is a devotional-hermeneutic reading of sacred text. That lens is indispensable for preserving theological seriousness, but on its own it explains devotional meaning better than it explains governance architecture. The second rival lens is a pure governance-analytics reading, in which responsiveness, resilience, and control are modeled operationally without serious ontological or theological grounding. External work on Islamic ethical governance and principles-based performance measurement helps show both the promise and the limit of this second route: ethical principles can be operationalized, yet the translation into practice remains incomplete when deeper semantic and interpretive layers are not formally modeled (Ghafran & Yasmin, 2020; Haniffah et al., 2023;). The earlier CAT-based study identified this problem in terms of ontological thinness. The present article therefore occupies an intermediate analytical position. It rejects any reduction of sacred language to

managerial slogans, while also rejecting the assumption that sacred invocations must remain analytically inaccessible to systems and governance theory.

The theoretical shift from the earlier CAT-based study to the present one is decisive. The earlier study reconstructed the opening invocation of *Jawshan Kabir* as an ontological kernel of legitimate order. The present study extends the same analytical method to a different layer: the operational governance architecture through which grounded order becomes executable, responsive, restorative, listening-centered, and resilient. This distinction is not incidental; it provides the central organizing logic of the literature review and clarifies the specific contribution of the present article.

The principal constructs examined here are not generic managerial variables, but governance capacities reconstructed from the semantic sequence of the second section of *Jawshan Kabir*. The first is ontological grounding, understood as the deeper structure of legitimacy, purposive order, and normative coherence without which governance risks becoming procedurally thin. In the earlier study, this was the primary object of analysis. In the present article, it functions as the foundational condition from which operational governance emerges.

The second construct is governance-in-action, the term used here to designate the operational layer encoded in the second section. Functionally, it refers to the system's capacity to translate legitimate order into response, elevation, stewardship, correction, provision, reintegration, listening, hidden-state awareness, and crisis deflection. The third construct is responsiveness, defined not as general attentiveness, but as structured request-response mapping and answerability to articulated demand. The fourth is restorative governance, understood as the capacity to correct, forgive, and reintegrate without collapsing into either permissiveness or punitive rigidity. The fifth is voice-sensitive governance, which denotes structured listening to plural signals rather than merely symbolic consultation. The sixth is latent-state intelligence, referring to the ability to detect hidden conditions, non-obvious risks, and subsurface dynamics. The seventh is resilience, interpreted here not as generic robustness, but as crisis deflection, disturbance rejection, and protective continuity. These constructs operate primarily at the institutional and civilizational levels, while also carrying downstream relevance for organizational and high-reliability settings.

The genealogy of these constructs is analytically significant. In much of the governance literature, responsiveness, resilience, listening, and restorative correction are treated within separate theoretical streams. In the present study, however, they are reconstructed as sequentially integrated functions embedded within a single bounded sacred corpus. This constitutes the article's central conceptual intervention. The study does not seek to demonstrate that these constructs exist independently in the abstract; rather, it asks whether the second section of *Jawshan Kabir* organizes them into a coherent operational architecture.

A central conclusion emerging from the CAT-based conceptual corpus and the focused bridge literature is that governance theory has become increasingly sophisticated in its treatment of performance, accountability, resilience, and institutional adaptation, yet it continues to encounter difficulty in addressing deeper questions of legitimacy, order, and meaning. Chandler (2014), Richards (2024), and the public-theological trajectory discussed in the earlier study clarify important aspects of this conceptual

problem. At the same time, scholarship on Islamic ethical governance and principles-based performance measurement demonstrates that values may be translated into evaluative and operational forms without fully exhausting the deeper normative architecture from which they derive (Ghafran & Yasmin, 2020; Haniffah et al., 2023;). Although this argument is conceptually strong, its empirical grounding remains uneven because it is articulated chiefly as a theoretical diagnosis rather than as a synthesized quantitative finding. The present study advances this discussion by arguing that even normatively grounded institutions still require operational grammars of responsiveness, restoration, listening, and continuity. In this sense, the current article moves beyond the ontological gap examined in the earlier study and specifies the operational incompleteness that persists once grounding has been secured.

A second thematic line concerns cybernetics and systems theory as the most suitable interpretive bridge between sacred semantics and governance architecture. In the earlier CAT-based study, the cybernetic sequence centered on grounding, allocation, stabilization, observation, restraint, and teleological optimization. In the present article, the required vocabulary shifts toward supervisory control, request–response mapping, state elevation, reinforcement, fault-tolerant correction, adaptive provision, reintegration logic, voice sensing, hidden-state estimation, and crisis deflection. This is a substantive analytical shift rather than a rhetorical reformulation: the same method is being applied to a different layer of order. External work on sacred-text translation, text-to-form mediation, and the humanistic computational treatment of religious language supports the plausibility of moving from dense sacred semantics to structured design vocabularies, even if it does not itself produce a fully developed governance architecture (Krieger, 1987; Naudé & Miller-Naudé, 2022; Kumar & Sangwan, 2025). The internal evidence for this move is strong within the author's own framework corpus, because the distinction between ontological kernel and operational stack is explicitly articulated in both the present manuscript and the CAT method paper. Broader external corroboration would nevertheless strengthen this argument further at submission stage.

A third line of synthesis concerns the position of CAT within a wider KPI-governed framework ecosystem. CAT is not presented as an isolated interpretive technique, but as an upstream ontological method that supports subsequent diagnostic, architectural, and indicator-oriented frameworks such as TDDM, UCTA-PA, TQA-4, and 7S-360 (MoghadasNian, 2026, 2025a, 2025b, 2025c, 2025d). This positioning is methodologically important because it demonstrates that the present article is not offering a disconnected reading of sacred text. Rather, stanza-level analysis is situated within a cumulative design-science trajectory. The review, however, remains selective and bounded. Within this article, TQA-4 is invoked for layered decomposition and dashboard logic, UCTA-PA for governance-grade indicator engineering, TDDM for diagnostic-to-intervention routing, and 7S-360 for indicator taxonomy (MoghadasNian, 2025a, 2025b, 2025c, 2025d). CAT is thus positioned as the upstream method, while the second section of *Jawshan Kabir* is treated as the missing intermediate layer between ontological kernel and downstream KPI architecture.

The literature and manuscript together indicate that the article already points toward a measurement layer, but appropriately treats that layer as indicative rather than validated. For this reason, the most defensible measurement stance in the present study is conceptual-operational rather than psychometric. The semantic sequence of the second section is translated into governance variables such as Strategic

Command Integrity, Request Responsiveness Index, Uplift and Capability Index, Positive Governance Stewardship, Error Recovery Index, Need Fulfilment Index, Reintegration Acceptance Index, Voice Listening Index, Latent Signal Intelligence, and Adversity Deflection Index. Their function is not to claim completed measurement, but to demonstrate that the semantic architecture is operationalizable.

At the same time, the literature points to several clear validity threats. The first is construct inflation, in which rich theological semantics are forced into excessively narrow managerial proxies. The second is premature quantification, in which indicative variables are presented as validated instruments before undergoing content validation, expert review, or cross-case application. The third is category slippage between literal meaning and functional translation. External work on Islamic-principles-based performance measurement and ethical governance is useful here because it illustrates both the feasibility and the difficulty of translating normativity into evaluative systems without losing conceptual depth or implementation fidelity (Haniffah et al., 2023; Ghafran & Yasmin, 2020). The CAT method paper addresses these risks by emphasizing bounded corpus selection, explicit mapping rules, semantic fidelity checks, theological coherence checks, expert review, and later interoperability testing with downstream frameworks. For the present article, this constitutes the strongest available mitigation logic.

8

The decisive research gap in the literature is not a generic shortage of studies, but the absence of a rigorously bounded model for reconstructing sacred invocational language as an operational governance architecture of response, repair, listening, and resilience. This gap is distinct from the one addressed in the earlier CAT-based study, which focused on the ontological kernel of legitimate order. The present article instead addresses the problem of the operational governance layer through which such order becomes responsive, restorative, and resilient. Existing scholarship tends to stop at ethical governance, values integration, design mediation, or performance measurement rather than reconstructing a full sacred-semantics-to-governance architecture (Ghafran & Yasmin, 2020; Haniffah et al., 2023; Ahsani et al., 2024; Krieger, 1987). The Within this comparative framework, the present study occupies a distinct niche by specifying the operational architecture that remains undertheorized once ontological grounding has been established.

This gap connects directly to the article's research objectives and questions. The broader literature suggests that governance requires deeper grounding, yet it does not adequately operationalize sacred semantics. The first *Jawshan Kabir* article addressed the problem of ontological grounding within a bounded corpus. What remains unresolved is whether a second bounded corpus within the same text encodes the governance-in-action layer through which legitimate order responds, elevates, repairs, listens, anticipates, and protects. The present article therefore does more than extend the earlier study by moving to another stanza. It occupies a distinct and higher-value niche by reconstructing the missing operational layer.

This gap maps directly onto the article's research logic. The primary research question asks how the second section of *Jawshan Kabir* can be reconstructed within CAT as an operational governance architecture. The secondary questions follow from that central task: what semantic sequence is encoded in the stanza; how may it be translated into cybernetic roles; which indicative KPI-style variables emerge from the sequence; how does this address the operational incompleteness left after ontological grounding; and what governance, resilience, and civilizational implications follow. In conceptual terms, the article

proposes the following chain: divine attributes → semantic clusters → CAT layers → cybernetic roles → governance principles → indicative KPIs → civilizational outcomes. This chain constitutes the core contribution of the present study to both governance theory and theology-to-governance translation.

Future research should test whether the operational sequence identified here recurs across later sections of *Jawshan Kabir* and other compact sacred corpora. The proposed governance variables also require expert review and content validation, while later studies should examine CAT's interoperability with downstream frameworks and its exposure to validity risks such as construct inflation and interpretive bias.

Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative, conceptual research design with a systems-modeling and design-science orientation. Rather than testing a causal or statistical hypothesis, it reconstructs a bounded unit of sacred text and translates its semantic structure into a governance-relevant conceptual architecture within the framework of Civilizational Algorithm Theory (CAT). The textual source used for the analysis is the *Jawshan Kabir* as presented in *Kullīyāt-i Mafātīḥ al-jinān* (Qummī, 1376/1997–1998). Within that source tradition, the present study delimits its unit of analysis to the second section of the supplication, defined here as the ordered sequence of ten divine attributes running from *Yā Sayyid al-Sādāt* to *Yā Dāfiʿ al-Baliyyāt*. The closing liturgical formula is acknowledged as part of the wider invocational structure, but it is not treated as part of the primary analytical kernel because the concentrated semantic sequence of the ten attributes provides the clearest bounded unit for CAT-based operational reconstruction.

The principal unit of analysis is therefore the second section of *Jawshan Kabir*, while the micro-units are its ten divine attributes. A purposive bounded-text sampling strategy is employed in order to preserve semantic coherence, formal completeness, and analytical tractability. The section is read not merely as a devotional list, but as an ordered semantic architecture, for three methodological reasons: first, the attributes occur in a fixed liturgical sequence within the selected text base; second, their progression displays functional movement from authority to response, elevation, stewardship, restoration, provision, reintegration, listening, hidden-state awareness, and protection; and third, this progression yields a more coherent systems-theoretic and governance translation than a non-sequential or arbitrarily rearranged reading. The study does not claim that this ordering exhausts the theological meaning of the section; rather, it argues that the sequence is sufficiently structured to support disciplined conceptual reconstruction.

The analysis proceeds through five linked stages. First, each attribute is subjected to semantic extraction in order to identify its lexical and conceptual core within the invocational sequence. Second, each semantic core is interpreted within an Islamic theological and ethical frame so that doctrinal meaning is preserved prior to functional translation. Third, the semantic-theological units are mapped onto CAT layers through an explicit rule of correspondence: semantic attribute → CAT layer → cybernetic role → governance function → indicative evaluative variable. Fourth, the resulting cybernetic roles are translated into governance-relevant functions such as supervisory authority, request-response resolution, capability uplift, restorative correction, reintegration, listening, latent-state awareness, and crisis deflection. Fifth,

these governance functions are expressed as preliminary indicator constructs, not as validated instruments, but as conceptual-operational outputs demonstrating the translational capacity of the model.

Several safeguards are used to maintain rigor and protect semantic fidelity against interpretive overreach. The analysis is based on a clearly delimited textual unit, explicit sequential coding, and transparent attribute-level mapping. Theological meaning is treated as prior to managerial application, so the governance translation remains analogical rather than literal. In addition, the study distinguishes carefully between semantic meaning, systems interpretation, governance reconstruction, and indicator derivation, thereby reducing category slippage between sacred language and evaluative modeling. The resulting indicators are therefore presented as heuristic and preliminary rather than psychometrically or institutionally validated. Within these limits, the methodology aims to provide interpretive transparency, semantic traceability, and conceptual reproducibility for theology-to-governance translation.

Findings and Results

The evidence base of this study consists of a bounded conceptual corpus: the second section of *Jawshan Kabir*, treated as a self-contained sacred textual unit and analyzed through ten micro-units corresponding to its ten divine attributes. In methodological terms, this corpus is neither a numerical dataset nor an interview or survey archive. Rather, it is a textually delimited proof-of-concept analytical corpus examined through CAT-based semantic extraction, systems translation, cybernetic mapping, and indicator design. The results reported in this section are therefore conceptual rather than statistical. Their evidentiary logic is interpretive, structured, codebook-guided, and internally traceable rather than inferential in the conventional empirical sense.

For this reason, conventional quantitative diagnostics such as model-fit indices, significance testing, multicollinearity checks, confidence intervals, or effect-size estimates are not applicable. Survey reliability coefficients and experimental robustness tests are likewise outside the scope of the present design. The relevant quality criteria in this study are conceptual coherence, bounded-corpus discipline, interpretive traceability, and internal consistency between the semantic order of the stanza, its CAT translation, and the governance architecture derived from it. The article therefore presents its indicators as indicative and heuristic outputs rather than psychometrically validated instruments.

The first and most important finding is that the second section of *Jawshan Kabir* yields a coherent operational governance architecture rather than an unstructured devotional accumulation. The ten attributes form an internally ordered semantic chain that is most defensibly reconstructed as authority, response, elevation, stewardship, restoration, provision, reintegration, listening, hidden-state intelligence, and crisis deflection. This is the primary result of the study because it establishes that the stanza functions as a governance-in-action structure rather than merely as a liturgical list of virtues. In direct relation to the primary research question, this finding demonstrates that the section can indeed be reconstructed within CAT as an operational governance architecture.

The second finding is that this semantic sequence can be translated into a cybernetic and systems-theoretic control architecture. Within the CAT reading, *Sayyid al-Sādāt* functions as the supervisory reference node, *Mujīb al-Daʿawāt* as the request–response resolver, *Rāfiʿ al-Darajāt* as the state-

elevation operator, *Walī al-Ḥasanāt* as the positive-reinforcement steward, *Ghāfir al-Khaṭīʾāt* as the error-recovery module, *Muʿṭī al-Masʾalāt* as the adaptive allocation engine, *Qābil al-Tawbāt* as the reintegration protocol, *Sāmiʿ al-Aṣwāt* as the voice-sensing interface, *ʿĀlim al-Khafiyyāt* as the latent-state estimator, and *Dāfiʿ al-Baliyyāt* as the disturbance-rejection shield. This result directly addresses the research objective concerned with translating the stanza into a systems and cybernetic sequence. It shows that the text encodes a disciplined control logic rather than an unsystematic ethical vocabulary.

The third finding is the derivation of ten indicative KPI-style governance variables from the stanza's operational structure. These are Strategic Command Integrity, Request Responsiveness Index, Uplift and Capability Index, Positive Governance Stewardship, Error Recovery Index, Need Fulfilment Index, Reintegration Acceptance Index, Voice Listening Index, Latent Signal Intelligence, and Adversity Deflection Index. These variables are not presented as field-validated measures. Rather, they are conceptual-operational outputs demonstrating that the semantic architecture of the stanza is translatable into evaluative governance terms. This finding addresses the objective of showing how sacred semantics may generate governance-relevant variables without collapsing theological meaning into crude managerial instrumentalism.

The fourth finding is that the ten attributes are not only sequentially related, but also cluster into broader governance modules. The analysis supports a modular reading organized around macro-authority and hierarchical regulation, responsive provision, restorative ethical governance, and sensing-protection intelligence. This result is important because it shows that the stanza can be interpreted not only at the micro-level of individual attributes, but also at the meso-level of governance modules and the macro-level of integrated architecture. In relation to the study's objectives, this finding extends the analysis from attribute-level decoding to architecture-level reconstruction and strengthens the claim that the stanza can support multi-level governance design across strategic, tactical, and operational layers.

The fifth finding concerns the study's comparative position within the wider CAT research trajectory. The second section functions as the executional layer of order, whereas the earlier CAT-based study of the opening invocation established the ontological kernel of legitimate order. The earlier study focused on legitimacy, continuity, epistemic order, and ontological grounding; the present study concentrates on responsiveness, reintegration, listening, restoration, and resilience. This distinction is not merely editorial. It is analytically substantive because it secures the independence of the present article while preserving cumulative coherence within the CAT framework. Put differently, the earlier study explains how order becomes legitimate and intelligible, whereas the present study explains how such order operates under conditions of demand, plurality, opacity, error, and threat.

Taken together, these findings support the central argument of the article: the second section of *Jawshan Kabir* can be reconstructed as a responsive, restorative, listening-centered, and resilient governance architecture. The contribution is therefore not merely descriptive. Rather, the analysis demonstrates that a bounded sacred textual unit can generate an integrated pathway from semantic order to cybernetic logic, governance principles, and indicative evaluative constructs. In this way, the study addresses the core research problem identified earlier, namely the absence of a disciplined framework for translating a bounded sacred invocational unit into an operational governance architecture.

Because the study is conceptual rather than empirical, further analysis takes the form of structural elaboration rather than statistical robustness testing, subgroup comparison, or model estimation. The results suggest that the second section can support a more extensive CAT-compatible analytical framework incorporating governance domains, maturity dimensions, network-centrality relations, implementation pathways, and policy instrumentation. These layers have not been developed equally in the main body of the article in order to preserve the clarity and boundedness of the argument. The findings presented here should therefore be read as the principal results of the study, while more detailed operational layers may be developed in supplementary methodological work and future applied research.

The findings also align closely with the article's research objectives. The first finding addresses the primary research question by showing that the second section can be reconstructed as an operational governance architecture. The second demonstrates how the stanza may be translated into systems-theoretic and cybernetic logic. The third establishes the derivation of indicative governance variables from that structure. The fourth extends the analysis from individual attributes to broader governance modules. The fifth clarifies the article's originality by distinguishing the governance-in-action role of the second section from the ontological grounding established in the earlier CAT-based study. Within the scope of the present design, the main conceptual objectives have been achieved. What remains beyond the scope of this study is empirical validation of the proposed indicators, which is appropriately reserved for future research.

Discussion

The findings indicate that the second section of *Jawshan Kabir* is best interpreted not as a second ontological prologue, but as a distinct governance-in-action layer within Civilizational Algorithm Theory. The stanza encodes a coherent operational sequence of authority, responsiveness, elevation, stewardship, restorative correction, provision, reintegration, listening, hidden-state intelligence, and crisis deflection. In this sense, it functions as a compact architecture of responsive, restorative, listening-centered, and resilient order rather than as an unstructured list of devotional names.

A second interpretive result is that this sequence is not merely semantic. It is translatable into a cybernetic grammar of governance in which authority anchors control, responsiveness converts petitions into action, restorative logic prevents punitive rigidity, listening captures plural signals, hidden-state awareness reduces surprise, and crisis deflection preserves continuity. This claim remains interpretive rather than statistically tested, but it is consistent with the article's bounded proof-of-concept design and its non-reductionist method of theology-to-governance translation.

A third result is that the operational sequence can be expressed through indicative KPI-style variables. This does not amount to empirical validation. Rather, it shows that sacred semantics can be translated into analytically actionable governance categories without collapsing theology into managerial instrumentalism. That restraint is important, because the credibility of the article depends not on overclaiming measurement, but on demonstrating disciplined conceptual operationalization.

These findings support the literature diagnosis developed earlier. Governance scholarship has become increasingly sophisticated in its treatment of performance, accountability, responsiveness, and resilience, yet it often remains normatively or ontologically thin (Ghafran & Yasmin, 2020; Haniffah et al., 2023;). At the same time, theological and devotional scholarship preserves semantic and spiritual richness, but rarely translates sacred language into governance-relevant systems logic (Krieger, 1987; Naudé & Miller-Naudé, 2022). The present article aligns with both observations while moving beyond them. Its contribution lies not in identifying new governance capacities, but in reconstructing response, repair, listening, and resilience as one ordered grammar within a bounded sacred corpus.

The findings also stand in a complementary relationship to the earlier CAT-based study of *Jawshan Kabir*. Whereas that study reconstructed the opening invocation as an ontological kernel of legitimate order, the present article interprets the second section as the operational governance architecture through which order becomes executable, responsive, restorative, and resilient (MoghadasNian, 2026; MoghadasNian et al., 2026). The two studies are therefore analytically distinct yet conceptually cumulative, suggesting a layered CAT architecture in which ontological grounding precedes governance execution.

A plausible rival reading is that the stanza is simply a devotional accumulation of divine names. The present analysis argues against that view because the sequence yields a stable pattern across semantic, cybernetic, and governance levels without arbitrary rearrangement. Another objection is that the article imposes a managerial overlay on a sacred text. The manuscript addresses this by insisting that the translation is analogical rather than literal, and that the KPI layer is indicative rather than validated. The argument is therefore not that sacred language should be converted mechanically into procedure, but that it may function as a higher-order normative design vocabulary for governance.

Theoretically, the article strengthens CAT by identifying an intermediate layer between ontological grounding and downstream performance architecture. What had remained underdeveloped in the wider CAT trajectory was the operational governance stack itself. The second section of *Jawshan Kabir* fills that gap by showing how sacred semantics may encode the response, repair, listening, intelligence, and protection functions through which legitimate order becomes executable.

More broadly, the findings suggest that normatively thick governance should not be framed only as a tension between moral legitimacy and administrative technique. The present model points to a more integrated structure in which legitimacy, responsiveness, provision, restorative correction, listening, anticipatory intelligence, and protection are mutually reinforcing rather than analytically separate. Methodologically, the article also shows that theology-to-governance translation can proceed through a replicable bounded-text strategy rather than through diffuse civilizational generalization.

Practically, the article offers a diagnostic vocabulary rather than an immediate policy template. The ten functions may serve as a conceptual dashboard for assessing whether an institution possesses not only authority, but also responsiveness, developmental capacity, restorative correction, voice sensitivity, anticipatory awareness, and crisis protection. In taqrīb, inter-sect dialogue, and civilizational diplomacy, this logic is especially relevant because it reframes unity not as doctrinal compression, but as a governance problem of response, repair, listening, and resilience. In high-reliability and crisis-sensitive

settings, the combined emphasis on listening, hidden-state intelligence, and disturbance rejection is particularly salient.

The article is intentionally narrow, and that boundedness is both a strength and a limitation. The analysis is conceptual and interpretive, the corpus is restricted to one stanza, the translation is analogical rather than literal, and the indicators remain heuristic rather than psychometrically or institutionally validated. The study therefore cannot claim empirical generalizability, causal efficacy, or institutional performance effects. Its stronger claim is conceptual coherence, theoretical originality, and disciplined boundedness.

Future research should test whether later sections of *Jawshan Kabir* extend, vary, or deepen the operational logic identified here; refine the proposed KPI-style variables through expert review and later empirical validation; compare the framework across other sacred corpora; and connect the model more directly to taqrīb, civilizational diplomacy, crisis governance, and high-reliability institutional design. A further methodological step would be to expand the model into a denser CAT-compatible codebook including governance domains, maturity dimensions, implementation pathways, and policy instrumentation. Even so, the model should continue to be treated as a normative and conceptual governance vocabulary rather than as a directly deployable administrative instrument.

14

Conclusion

This study examined whether the second section of *Jawshan Kabir* can be reconstructed within Civilizational Algorithm Theory (CAT) as an operational governance architecture rather than as a purely devotional sequence. The analysis showed that the stanza encodes a coherent governance-in-action structure organized around authority, responsiveness, elevation, stewardship, restorative correction, provision, reintegration, listening, hidden-state intelligence, and crisis deflection. In this sense, the section is best understood as an ordered semantic sequence that can be translated into governance functions, cybernetic roles, and indicative evaluative variables.

The article contributes to the CAT research trajectory by extending the analysis of *Jawshan Kabir* from ontological grounding to operational governance reconstruction. More broadly, it shows that sacred semantics may yield not only devotional meaning, but also a disciplined conceptual grammar of response, repair, listening, protection, and resilience. The study therefore contributes to theology-to-governance translation, systems-oriented theological interpretation, and governance scholarship concerned with normatively grounded institutional design.

At the same time, the study remains conceptual and interpretive rather than empirical. Its proposed variables are heuristic and indicative, not psychometrically or institutionally validated, and its textual base is intentionally limited to a single stanza. Future research should test whether similar operational patterns recur across later sections of *Jawshan Kabir* and other sacred corpora, while refining the proposed variables through expert review and subsequent applied validation.

Overall, the second section of *Jawshan Kabir* may be read as a compact governance architecture through which legitimate order becomes operational in responsive, restorative, listening-centered, and resilient form.

References

Ahsani, M., Ismail, S., Fallah, S., Ismail, N., & al-Ameen, A. (2024). The Relationship Between Islamic Principles and Architectural Sacredness in Islam. *Journal of Islamic Architecture*, *8*(2), 530-544. doi:https://doi.org/10.18860/jia.v8i2.23918

Chandler, D. (2014). *Beyond neoliberalism: resilience, the new art of governing complexity*. Resilience, 2(1), 47–63. https://doi.org/10.1080/21693293.2013.878544

Ghafran, C., & Yasmin, S. (2020). Ethical Governance: Insight from the Islamic Perspective and an Empirical Enquiry. Journal of Business Ethics, 167, 513–533. https://doi.org/10.1007/S10551-019-04170-3

Haniffah, N. L., Shaiban, M. S., & Ahmed, P. (2023). *Development and validation of a performance measurement system based on Islamic principles.* Heliyon, 9(5), e16095. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e16095

Krieger, M. H. (1987). *Planning and Design as Theological and Religious Activities. Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, *14*(1), 5-13. https://doi.org/10.1068/b140005

Kumar, A., & Sangwan, S. R. (2025). Natural language processing as Digital Veda (डिजिटल वेद): A humanistic framework for language, ethics, and AI. *Digital Scholarship in the Humanities, 40*(4), 1188–1202. https://doi.org/10.1093/llc/fqaf100

MoghadasNian, S. (2025a). *Taqrib Diagnostic–Decision Model (TDDM): A multi-dimensional framework for classifying, designing, and evaluating Islamic intra-faith rapprochement.* University of Religions and Denominations. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.27306.68806

MoghadasNian, S. (2025b). *UCTA-PA: Unified Civilizational Theological Architecture: A Performance Architecture for Measurable Rapprochement and Civilizational Renewal.* University of Religions and Denominations. DOI: https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.16602.40647

MoghadasNian, S. (2025c). *Taqrīb Quadripartite Architecture (TQA-4): A KPI-Governed Super-Framework for Engineering Islamic Unity*. University of Religions and Denominations. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.10560.80646

MoghadasNian, S. (2025d). *7S-360 Strategic Indicator Architecture: A KPI-Governed Framework for Integrated Governance*. University of Religions and Denominations (URD). DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.15665.24160

MoghadasNian, S. (2026). *Civilizational Algorithm Theory (CAT): A Design–Science Method for Sacred-Text Ontology Structuring and Theology-to-Governance Translation*. University of Religions and Denominations. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.17244.86400

MoghadasNian, S., JafarTayari Dehaqani, M., & MoghadasNian, S.M.H. (2026). *Sacred texts as civilizational algorithms: A cybernetic–theological analysis of the opening invocation of Jawshan Kabir*. Paper presented at the 23rd International Conference on Management Research and Humanities in Iran. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19104667

Naudé, J.A. , & Miller-Naudé, C.L. (2022). Meaning-making Processes in Religious Translation Involving Sacred Space. In K. Marais (Ed.). TRANSLATION BEYOND TRANSLATION STUDIES (pp. 197–218). London,: Bloomsbury Academic. Retrieved March 16, 2026, from http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781350192140.ch-10

Qummī, ʿAbbās ibn Muḥammad Riḍā. (1376 [1997/1998]). Kullīyāt-i Mafātīḥ al-jinān. Nashr-i Muḥammad.

Richards, P. D. G. (2024). *Church Governance—A Philosophical Approach to a Theological Challenge in an Anglican Context*. Religions, 15(4), 427. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel15040427

Appendix

Appendix A. The Second Section of *Jawshan Kabir*: Text Base and Delimitation for CAT Analysis

This appendix presents the bounded textual unit analyzed in the article. Because the study is designed as a proof-of-concept, the second section of *Jawshan Kabir* is treated as a self-contained corpus for semantic, cybernetic, and governance translation. The appendix therefore serves as the main anchor of interpretive transparency and textual traceability. The article does not claim to analyze the whole supplication. Rather, it isolates one compact invocational unit in order to test whether a bounded theological sequence can sustain a coherent translation from sacred semantics to an operational governance architecture of authority, responsiveness, restoration, listening, and resilience.

A.1 Arabic Text of the Second Section

يا سَيِّدَ السّاداتِ، يا مُجِيبَ الدَّعَواتِ، يا رافِعَ الدَّرَجاتِ، يا وَلِيَّ الْحَسَناتِ، يا غافِرَ الْخَطِيئاتِ، يا مُعْطِيَ الْمَسْأَلاتِ، يا قابِلَ التَّوْباتِ، يا سامِعَ الأَصْواتِ، يا عالِمَ الْخَفِيّاتِ، يا دافِعَ الْبَلِيّاتِ

A.2 Liturgical Continuation Commonly Associated with the Sectional Unit

سُبْحانَكَ يا لا إِلٰهَ إِلَّا أَنْتَ الْغَوْثَ الْغَوْثَ خَلِّصْنا مِنَ النّارِ يا رَبِّ

A.3 Standardized Latin Transliteration

Yā Sayyida al-Sādāti, yā Mujība al-Daʿawāti, yā Rāfiʿa al-Darajāti, yā Waliyya al-Ḥasanāti, yā Ghāfira al-Khaṭīʾāti, yā Muʿṭiya al-Masʾalāti, yā Qābila al-Tawbāti, yā Sāmiʿa al-Aṣwāti, yā ʿĀlima al-Khafiyyāti, yā Dāfiʿa al-Baliyyāti. Subḥānaka yā lā ilāha illā anta, al-ghawtha al-ghawtha, khallisnā mina al-nāri yā rabb.

A.4 Working English Translation

O Master of masters, O Answerer of prayers, O Raiser of ranks, O Guardian of good deeds, O Forgiver of sins, O Giver of requests, O Accepter of repentance, O Hearer of voices, O Knower of hidden things, O Repeller of afflictions. Glory be to You; there is no god but You. Help, help; deliver us from the Fire, O Lord.

A.5 Textual Delimitation Note

For the purposes of this article, the primary analytical unit is the ordered sequence of the ten divine attributes from *Sayyid al-Sādāt* to *Dāfiʿ al-Baliyyāt*. The closing liturgical formula is acknowledged as part of the wider invocational structure, but the CAT analysis is centered on the ten-attribute kernel because this sequence carries the most concentrated operational governance logic of the section. In the

present interpretation, the second section functions not as a second ontological kernel, but as the executional and control layer of a civilizational operating logic.

Appendix B. Attribute-to-CAT Analytical Coding Matrix for the Ten Divine Attributes of Stanza Two

This appendix presents the attribute-level CAT coding structure for the second stanza of *Jawshan Kabir* in a standardized codebook format. Each attribute is treated as a semantic-theological node that can be translated into a systemic role, an algorithmic function, a governance principle, and an indicative KPI. The purpose of this appendix is to strengthen transparency, inter-stanza comparability, and methodological reproducibility.

B.1 *Sayyid al-Sādāt*

- **Semantic core:** supreme authority, hierarchical sovereignty, legitimate command.
- **Theological category:** Attribute of Supreme Lordship and Meta-Authority.
- **CAT layer:** supervisory sovereignty layer.
- **Systemic function:** establishing the highest reference point for authority, coordination, and command integrity.
- **Algorithmic role:** supervisory reference node / master command anchor.
- **Governance translation:** strategic command integrity, legitimate hierarchical coordination, and non-fragmented leadership.
- **Indicative KPI:** Strategic Command Integrity (SCI).

B.2 *Mujīb al-Daʿawāt*

- **Semantic core:** responsiveness, answerability, effective reply to invocation and demand.
- **Theological category:** Attribute of Responsive Answering and Relational Answerability.
- **CAT layer:** request-response layer.
- **Systemic function:** receiving demands, processing requests, and generating appropriate responses.
- **Algorithmic role:** request-response resolver / responsive interface engine.
- **Governance translation:** stakeholder responsiveness, institutional answerability, and service reply effectiveness.
- **Indicative KPI:** Request Responsiveness Index (RRI).

B.3 *Rāfiʿ al-Darajāt*

- **Semantic core:** elevation, uplift, developmental advancement, rank enhancement.
- **Theological category:** Attribute of Elevation and Developmental Advancement.
- **CAT layer:** uplift and capability layer.
- **Systemic function:** raising states, increasing capability, and supporting upward developmental movement.
- **Algorithmic role:** state-elevation operator / capability uplift engine.
- **Governance translation:** human-capital development, capability growth, and maturity advancement.
- **Indicative KPI:** Uplift and Capability Index (UCI).

B.4 *Walī al-Ḥasanāt*

- **Semantic core:** guardianship of good, stewardship of virtue, protection and reinforcement of positive action.
- **Theological category:** Attribute of Ethical Stewardship and Guardianship of Good.
- **CAT layer:** ethical stewardship layer.

- **Systemic function:** preserving, strengthening, and directing positive acts and constructive outputs.
- **Algorithmic role:** positive-reinforcement steward / ethical continuity regulator.
- **Governance translation:** stewardship of public good, virtue reinforcement, and protection of socially beneficial conduct.
- **Indicative KPI:** Positive Governance Stewardship (PGS).

B.5 ***Ghāfir al-Khaṭīʾāt***

- **Semantic core:** forgiveness, covering fault, restorative correction, moral recovery.
- **Theological category:** Attribute of Forgiveness and Restorative Pardon.
- **CAT layer:** restorative correction layer.
- **Systemic function:** absorbing error, reducing moral damage, and enabling recovery after failure.
- **Algorithmic role:** error-recovery module / restorative correction buffer.
- **Governance translation:** restorative governance, proportional correction, and post-failure recovery capacity.
- **Indicative KPI:** Error Recovery Index (ERI).

B.6 ***Muʿṭī al-Masʾalāt***

- **Semantic core:** provision, granting, fulfilment of legitimate need, distributive response.
- **Theological category:** Attribute of Provision, Granting, and Need Fulfilment.
- **CAT layer:** provisioning layer.
- **Systemic function:** allocating resources, satisfying valid requests, and translating need into provision.
- **Algorithmic role:** adaptive allocation engine / provisioning allocator.
- **Governance translation:** distributive adequacy, service fulfilment, and resource responsiveness.
- **Indicative KPI:** Need Fulfilment Index (NFI).

B.7 ***Qābil al-Tawbāt***

- **Semantic core:** acceptance of return, reintegration, recovery of relation, second chance.
- **Theological category:** Attribute of Acceptance, Return, and Reintegration.
- **CAT layer:** reintegration layer.
- **Systemic function:** allowing re-entry after deviation, receiving return, and restoring relational legitimacy.
- **Algorithmic role:** reintegration protocol / admissibility-restoration gate.
- **Governance translation:** corrective reintegration, second-chance governance, and social re-entry capacity.
- **Indicative KPI:** Reintegration Acceptance Index (RAI).

B.8 ***Sāmiʿ al-Aṣwāt***

- **Semantic core:** hearing, receptivity to voices, auditory presence, listening awareness.
- **Theological category:** Attribute of Hearing and Receptive Presence.
- **CAT layer:** voice-sensing layer.
- **Systemic function:** receiving dispersed signals, hearing expressed voices, and preserving perceptual openness to plural input.
- **Algorithmic role:** voice-sensing interface / signal-intake gateway.
- **Governance translation:** listening governance, stakeholder hearing, and plural-voice sensitivity.
- **Indicative KPI:** Voice Listening Index (VLI).

B.9 ***ʿĀlim al-Khafiyyāt***

- **Semantic core:** knowledge of hidden realities, insight into the unseen, deep intelligence, latent awareness.
- **Theological category:** Attribute of Hidden-State Knowledge and Deep Perception.
- **CAT layer:** latent intelligence layer.
- **Systemic function:** detecting concealed states, identifying non-obvious risks, and generating deep situational awareness.
- **Algorithmic role:** latent-state estimator / hidden-signal intelligence core.
- **Governance translation:** anticipatory intelligence, hidden-risk detection, and strategic depth of awareness.
- **Indicative KPI:** Latent Signal Intelligence (LSI).

B.10 *Dāfiʿ al-Baliyyāt*

- **Semantic core:** repelling affliction, protection, crisis deflection, disturbance rejection.
- **Theological category:** Attribute of Protection, Deflection, and Crisis Prevention.
- **CAT layer:** crisis-deflection layer.
- **Systemic function:** preventing escalation, mitigating disturbance, and preserving continuity under threat.
- **Algorithmic role:** disturbance-rejection shield / crisis-deflection module.
- **Governance translation:** resilience defence, threat containment, crisis prevention, and protective continuity.
- **Indicative KPI:** Adversity Deflection Index (ADI).

B.11 Integrative Coding Note

Taken together, the ten attributes yield a sequential governance logic rather than ten disconnected semantic units. The coding architecture moves from supreme authority to responsiveness, uplift, stewardship, restorative correction, provision, reintegration, listening, hidden-state awareness, and crisis deflection. In CAT terms, the second section therefore functions as a governance-in-action stack.

Appendix C. Indicative Governance and KPI Translation Notes

This appendix provides concise notes on the ten indicative governance variables proposed in the article. Their role is translational and heuristic rather than psychometric.

C.1 Strategic Command Integrity (SCI)

SCI captures the degree to which a system maintains legitimate command coherence at the highest level of authority. Derived from *Sayyid al-Sādāt*, it reflects whether institutional order is anchored in a clear and non-fragmented centre of strategic direction rather than dispersed command, jurisdictional confusion, or leadership incoherence. In applied settings, SCI may support governance assessment in periods of strategic drift, authority conflict, or hierarchical fragmentation.

C.2 Request Responsiveness Index (RRI)

Derived from *Mujīb al-Daʿawāt*, RRI captures the effectiveness, timeliness, and adequacy of response to expressed requests, demands, or appeals. It concerns whether a system can receive input and produce appropriate, proportionate, and meaningful responses. In governance logic, it corresponds to answerability, responsiveness, and institutional service sensitivity.

C.3 Uplift and Capability Index (UCI)

Derived from *Rāfiʿ al-Darajāt*, UCI captures the extent to which a system raises the capability, maturity, or rank of its actors, processes, or structures. It reflects development, empowerment, and upward

progression rather than static maintenance alone. In institutional contexts, it may support assessment of capability-building, developmental mobility, and structured growth.

C.4 Positive Governance Stewardship (PGS)

Derived from *Walī al-Ḥasanāt*, PGS captures the degree to which a system protects, reinforces, and sustains beneficial conduct and positive outputs. It emphasizes stewardship of virtue rather than mere punishment of vice. In applied governance, it may support assessment of public-good protection, ethical reinforcement, and the continuity of constructive behaviour.

C.5 Error Recovery Index (ERI)

Derived from *Ghāfir al-Khaṭīʾāt*, ERI captures the capacity of a system to recover from error through proportionate correction and restorative handling. It concerns whether mistakes lead only to punitive breakdown or whether they can be absorbed, corrected, and followed by recovery. In governance design, it may support resilience audits, corrective justice models, and failure-recovery assessment.

C.6 Need Fulfilment Index (NFI)

Derived from *Muʿṭī al-Masʾalāt*, NFI captures the adequacy with which a system meets legitimate needs and fulfils valid requests. It reflects distributive provision, service adequacy, and functional granting. In applied settings, it may support assessment of welfare delivery, resource adequacy, and demand-fulfilment performance.

C.7 Reintegration Acceptance Index (RAI)

Derived from *Qābil al-Tawbāt*, RAI captures the system's capacity to receive return, enable reintegration, and admit corrected actors back into legitimate participation. It concerns the availability of structured pathways for restoration rather than permanent exclusion after deviation. In governance terms, it may support assessment of second-chance design, reinclusion, and restorative re-entry.

C.8 Voice Listening Index (VLI)

Derived from *Sāmiʿ al-Aṣwāt*, VLI captures the degree to which a system hears and processes plural voices, signals, complaints, appeals, and feedback. It reflects listening capacity rather than mere symbolic consultation. In governance environments, it may be used to assess voice sensitivity, participatory hearing, and responsiveness to distributed expression.

C.9 Latent Signal Intelligence (LSI)

Derived from *ʿĀlim al-Khafiyyāt*, LSI captures the system's ability to detect hidden states, emerging risks, and non-obvious patterns not immediately visible at the surface level. It reflects deep situational awareness and anticipatory intelligence. In institutional analysis, it may support hidden-risk detection, anomaly identification, and strategic foresight.

C.10 Adversity Deflection Index (ADI)

Derived from *Dāfiʿ al-Baliyyāt*, ADI captures the capacity of a system to prevent, mitigate, or deflect disruption before it escalates into major breakdown. It reflects resilient defence, disturbance rejection, and protective continuity. In applied governance, this indicator may support crisis-prevention assessment, continuity planning, and resilience-defence analysis.

C.11 Operational Note

These ten variables should be read as indicative conceptual measures rather than finalized instruments. Their present function is to demonstrate how the CAT reading of the second section can move from

sacred semantics to governance-in-action logic. Later work may specify formulas, thresholds, data sources, and validation procedures.

Appendix D. Extended CAT Matrix Status, Transparency, and Replicability Note

The extended CAT matrix for the second section should be read as a full analytical codebook rather than as a claim that every coded field is equally foregrounded in the main article. The manuscript concentrates on the most load-bearing layers for article-level argumentation: semantic order, theological interpretation, cybernetic translation, governance reconstruction, and indicative KPI design. Deeper layers of linguistic coding, ontological categorization, policy translation, maturity logic, network relations, and implementation mapping remain part of the wider CAT architecture and may be developed in later methodological or applied studies.

This distinction is methodologically important. In a proof-of-concept article, not every available coding layer should be fully narrated in the body text, because doing so would obscure the main argument and overload the manuscript with execution detail better suited to a codebook or supplementary protocol. The appendix therefore serves as the article's audit layer. It clarifies both what the article claims and what it does not claim. It claims that the second section of *Jawshan Kabir* can be reconstructed as a coherent governance-in-action architecture through CAT. It does not claim that all downstream indicators, maturity variables, policy mechanisms, or dashboard fields have already been empirically validated.