



From Karbala to Arbaeen: AALMA-360+ as a Living Memory Architecture of Moral Choice, Loyalty and Service Governance

SeyyedAbdolHojjat MoghadasNian*

University of Religions and Denominations (URD), s14110213@gmail.com

Abstract

This article develops AALMA-360+, the Ashura-Arbaeen Living Memory and Moral Activation Architecture, as a source-aware and non-reductionist framework for explaining how Karbala remains active as a living architecture of moral choice, loyalty, embodied service and service governance. The study addresses an integrative gap in which Ashura and Arbaeen are often explained through separate lenses: grief, political memory, identity, pilgrimage experience, crowd logistics, hospitality, or KPI-based service management. Using qualitative, source-sensitive and design-science-informed conceptual modelling, the article integrates five foundation studies, four core Ziyarat functions, three supporting devotional-textual modules, Kamil al-Ziyarat as archival corpus, and Arbaeen as an embodied service-governance layer. The design output shows that the model is defensible only when Ziyarat Ashura, Ziyarat Warith, Ziyarat Nahiya and Ziyarat Arbaeen are treated as distinct source functions; when supporting texts are not inflated into core pillars; and when Ziyarat Arbaeen is separated from contemporary Arbaeen governance while remaining architecturally connected to it. The article identifies the Mawkib as a service-governance cell and proposes a KPI boundary that permits monitoring of service duties such as WASH, safety, medical readiness, access, lost-person support and service learning, while excluding sanctity, faith, sincerity, divine acceptance, reward, spiritual rank and Wilayah truth from empirical measurement. The article contributes a bounded architecture for sacred memory, ritual embodiment and responsible service governance.

Keywords: Ashura; Arbaeen; AALMA-360+; living memory; Ziyarat; design science; service governance.

1. Introduction

1.1 Background and Context



Karbala remains active in Imami Shi'i memory not merely because it is remembered as a past tragedy, but because it is repeatedly reactivated through ziyarat, mourning, narrative, covenantal loyalty, prophetic inheritance, witness-memory, ritual return, embodied presence, service, and communal responsibility. This article is positioned as a capstone study within a wider Ashura–Arbaeen research sequence. The preceding layers examine Ziyarat Ashura as a covenantal-moral loop, Ziyarat Warith as a Prophetic Inheritance–Legitimacy Cycle, Ziyarat Nahiya as Witness-Memory and Anti-Forgetting Architecture, Ziyarat al-Arba'in as a Purpose-and-Return Cycle, and Arbaeen as embodied ritual presence, mawkib service, and dignity-based governance [1–5]. The task of the present article is to integrate these layers without collapsing their distinct textual, ritual, embodied, and governance functions.

The article proposes AALMA-360+, the Ashura–Arbaeen Living Memory and Moral Activation Architecture, as a source-aware and non-reductionist framework for explaining how Karbala becomes a living architecture of moral choice, loyalty, service, and civilizational self-questioning. The corrected textual foundation of the model is not five ziyārāt. It consists of four core Ziyarat functions, three supporting devotional-textual modules, and one institutional archive. Ziyarat Ashura, Ziyarat Warith, Ziyarat Nahiya, and Ziyarat al-Arba'in form the core quadrangle; Du'ā' 'Alqama/Şafwān, Ziyarat al-Shuhadā', and al-Ziyarat al-Rajabiyyah function as supporting modules; and Kāmil al-Ziyārāt functions as an archival corpus of Ziyarat transmission and reception rather than as a fifth Ziyarat [1–6].

The theoretical point of departure is that sacred memory survives through structured carriers, not through abstract recollection alone. Collective and cultural memory theory clarifies how communities preserve meaning through social frames, repeated practices, texts, symbols, and institutions [7–9]. Ritual theory and embodiment theory explain how memory becomes performative through recitation, mourning, bodily discipline, movement, route, fatigue, sensory participation, and repeated ritual presence [10,11]. Design science research provides the methodological discipline for treating AALMA-360+ as an artifact composed of constructs, relationships, boundaries, evaluation logic, and communication pathways rather than as a loose metaphor [12,13]. The author's earlier Civilizational Algorithm Theory also supports the controlled translation of sacred-text structures into auditable conceptual and governance architectures, while preserving the distinction between sacred reality and social translation [14].

The immediate “why now” of this study lies in the increasing visibility of Arbaeen as a large recurring religious gathering and as a service field involving hospitality, health, safety, transport, public care, and multi-level coordination. International recognition of Arbaeen hospitality and institutional attention to public-health learning show that Arbaeen is no longer only a devotional or local phenomenon; it is also a field of service, risk, governance, and public responsibility [15,16]. Yet scale is not explanation. Arbaeen cannot be adequately understood if it is reduced to religious tourism, crowd logistics, event management, political mobilization, or operational performance. Gift, recognition, and hospitality theories help explain why service in Arbaeen differs from ordinary transaction: the pilgrim is not merely a



customer, tourist, or crowd unit, but is received as an honoured guest within a moral economy of care [17–19]. Arbaeen-focused pilgrimage studies further show the importance of embodied walking, attachment, ritual experience, and spiritual authenticity in the contemporary field [20,21].

This article therefore adopts a bounded integrative lens. It does not deny the relevance of operational indicators in Arbaeen service systems; prior KPI-oriented Arbaeen work has already shown the value of monitoring service quality, safety, satisfaction, logistics, and continuous improvement [22,23]. Rather, the article assigns those indicators to the correct analytical layer. Service responsibilities may be governed and improved, but sanctity, sincerity, divine acceptance, thawāb, wilāyah truth, spiritual rank, and the metaphysical value of Ziyarat are not empirical variables.

1.2 Statement of Problem

The central problem is analytical and methodological: existing approaches tend to explain one layer of the Ashura-Arbaeen phenomenon while leaving the full transformation architecture underdeveloped. A grief-only reading explains mourning but not covenantal responsibility; a politics-only reading explains resistance but not prophetic inheritance and ritual return; a tourism or crowd-logistics reading explains mobility and risk but not the source grammar through which Ashura memory becomes embodied service; and a KPI-reductive reading supports operational improvement but becomes invalid when it attempts to measure sacred realities [1–5,20–23].

The problem is clearest in three areas. First, Ziyarat Arbaeen and Arbaeen governance must remain separate but connected: the former is a textual purpose-return function, while the latter is an embodied service-governance field involving walking, Mawkib, hospitality, health, safety, transport, dignity safeguards and coordination [4,5,15,16]. Second, Kamil al-Ziyarat must remain an archival corpus, while supporting texts must not be inflated into core pillars [1–6]. Third, service indicators may monitor WASH, food safety, medical response, route access, lost-person support, transport, emergency readiness, volunteer coordination, accessibility and service learning, but they cannot measure faith, sincerity, sanctity, divine acceptance, intercession, Thawab, Wilayah truth or spiritual rank [5,15,16,22,23].

1.3 Research Gap: Critical Synthesis

The relevant literatures explain important parts of the field: Shii Ziyarat studies and the author's prior article sequence clarify source functions; cultural memory theory explains social and institutional transmission; ritual and embodiment theory explains bodily enactment; Arbaeen studies explain walking, hospitality and pilgrimage experience; and service/KPI works explain operational monitoring and improvement [1–23]. The unresolved gap is not the absence of studies, but insufficient integration. Sacred-text analysis often protects theological meaning but does not fully model service governance. Pilgrimage and hospitality studies explain embodied experience but may not preserve the internal source-function sequence of the Ziyarat corpus. KPI and governance studies support operational responsibility but may



become reductive if they lack a sacred boundary. AALMA-360+ addresses this gap by modelling a bounded transformation: Karbala → narrative → Ziyarat → living memory → covenant/inheritance/witness/return → embodied presence → Mawkib service → governance responsibility → memory renewal.

1.4 Research Purpose and Research Questions/Objectives

The purpose of this article is to develop AALMA-360+ as a source-aware, non-reductionist, and design-science-informed architecture explaining how Karbala becomes a living memory system that is repeatedly activated through Ashura–Arbaeen texts, rituals, embodied presence, mawkib service, and governance responsibility. The article aims to integrate sacred-text functions and service-governance responsibilities while preserving a strict boundary between what may be academically analyzed and what must not be empirically measured.

The primary research question is:

How does Ashura move from a sacred-historical event into a living memory architecture that, through Arbaeen, reproduces moral choice, loyalty, embodied service, and civilizational continuity without reducing sacred meaning to politics, tourism, crowd logistics, or managerial metrics?

The subsidiary research questions are:

SRQ1: How do the four core Ziyarat functions—Ziyarat Ashura, Ziyarat Warith, Ziyarat Nahiya, and Ziyarat al-Arba'in—activate covenant, inheritance, witness-memory, and purpose-return within AALMA-360+?

SRQ2: How do the supporting modules—Du'ā' 'Alqama/Şafwān, Ziyarat al-Shuhadā', and al-Ziyarat al-Rajabiyyah—extend post-covenantal supplication, named martyr memory, and seasonal companion memory without becoming independent core pillars?

SRQ3: How does Kāmil al-Ziyārāt function as an archival and transmission corpus rather than as a fifth Ziyarat?

SRQ4: How does Arbaeen translate textual and ritual memory into embodied walking, meaningful fatigue, mawkib hospitality, dignity-based guesthood, health and safety responsibility, transport coordination, and multi-level service governance?

SRQ5: Which aspects of Arbaeen service governance may be ethically monitored through indicators, and which sacred realities must remain outside empirical measurement?

SRQ6: How can AALMA-360+ be evaluated as a design-science artifact through source audit, evidence-chain traceability, expert validation, and bounded service-governance demonstration?

The objectives are to define the core constructs of AALMA-360+, distinguish textual, embodied, and operational layers, construct the 360-degree transformation cycle, identify



permitted and prohibited forms of measurement, and provide a defensible capstone model for future textual, ritual, memory, and governance research.

1.5 Significance and Contributions

The significance of this article lies in its capacity to explain the persistence of Karbala without reducing it to one disciplinary frame. For Shi'i studies, it provides a source-sensitive architecture for understanding how different Ziyarat texts perform different functions in Ashura remembrance. For cultural memory studies, it offers a case in which memory is not only recalled but ritually re-entered, ethically activated, socially translated, and institutionally sustained. For ritual and pilgrimage studies, it explains Arbaeen as embodied ritual presence rather than only mass movement. For service and governance studies, it interprets mawkib service as dignity-based hospitality and semi-distributed care. For KPI and data-governance scholarship, it clarifies how service responsibilities can be improved without turning sacred realities into performance variables [1–23].

The article makes five specific contributions. First, it defines AALMA-360+ as a bounded architecture of Ashura–Arbaeen living memory rather than as a broad metaphor. Second, it corrects the source-function foundation by distinguishing four core Ziyarat functions, three supporting devotional-textual modules, and one archival corpus. Third, it theorizes the transformation from Karbala to Arbaeen as a 360-degree cycle linking narrative, Ziyarat, memory, covenant, inheritance, witness, return, embodiment, service, governance, and renewal. Fourth, it introduces a KPI boundary doctrine that protects sacred realities from measurement while enabling responsible service governance. Fifth, it specifies an evaluation pathway through source audit, evidence-chain traceability, expert review, and bounded Arbaeen service-governance demonstration.

The theory–practice bridge is central. Decision-makers responsible for Arbaeen service systems can use the framework to distinguish legitimate operational monitoring from illegitimate spiritual scoring. WASH readiness, medical response, lost-person support, food safety, accessibility, route flow, volunteer coordination, and after-action learning may be monitored because they belong to service responsibility. Faith, sincerity, divine acceptance, sanctity, spiritual rank, thawāb, intercession, and wilāyah truth may not be monitored because they belong to sacred reality. The practical value of the model therefore lies not in measuring devotion, but in protecting dignity, safety, care, and learning while preserving the non-measurable status of the sacred.

1.6 Scope and Boundary Conditions

This study is conceptual, source-sensitive and design-science-informed. Its unit of analysis is not an individual pilgrim, a single Mawkib, a national policy system or a statistical population, but the AALMA-360+ architecture: the source-function relationship among Ashura-Arbaeen texts, memory mechanisms, embodied ritual presence, service governance and non-reductionist measurement boundaries. The argument applies where Ashura-Arbaeen memory is mediated through the named Ziyarat corpus, ritual reception, embodied return,



Mawkib service and service-governance responsibility. It does not claim causal effects, measure inward faith or spiritual rank, or generalize automatically beyond this ritual-textual and service-governance ecology.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Review Logic and Source-Selection Boundary

This literature review is an integrative, theory-building narrative review. It is not presented as a systematic review, scoping review, or meta-analysis because the article does not seek to estimate effect size, prevalence, causal impact, or statistical association. Its purpose is to synthesize the theoretical and source-based literatures required to justify AALMA-360+ as a bounded architecture of Ashura–Arbaeen living memory, moral choice, loyalty, embodied service, and service governance.

The review draws on six interlocking streams. The first is the author’s Ashura–Arbaeen article sequence, which supplies the internal source-function logic of the model: Ziyarat Ashura as covenantal-moral positioning, Ziyarat Warith as prophetic inheritance and legitimacy, Ziyarat Nahiya as witness-memory and anti-forgetting, Ziyarat al-Arba’in as purpose-return, and Arbaeen as embodied ritual service governance [1–5]. The second is the classical source field of Ziyarat transmission, represented here by Kāmil al-Ziyārāt as archival corpus rather than as a fifth Ziyarat [6]. The third is cultural and collective memory theory, which explains how memory is socially framed, ritually repeated, institutionally preserved, and transmitted across generations [7–9]. The fourth is ritual and embodiment theory, which explains how memory is enacted through repeated practice, bodily discipline, movement, sacred route, sensory experience, and social participation [10,11,24–26]. The fifth is design-science research and the author’s prior sacred-text governance work, which support AALMA-360+ as a construct system and evaluable artifact rather than as a loose conceptual metaphor [12–14,31]. The sixth is pilgrimage, hospitality, service governance, and KPI literature, including the author’s prior KPI-focused Arbaeen and civilizational-governance works [15–23,32–35].

The review applies three exclusion rules. First, devotional websites and general online summaries are not treated as final scholarly evidence unless later replaced by Arabic source editions, peer-reviewed scholarship, or official institutional records. Second, claims about Arbaeen scale, health, transport, WASH, crowd risk, or service performance are not treated as validated unless supported by official or institutional datasets [15,16]. Third, claims about faith, sincerity, divine acceptance, thawāb, wilāyah truth, intercession, spiritual rank, and sanctity are excluded from empirical measurement. They may be discussed as theological or devotional meanings, but they are not operational variables.

The evidence base is therefore graded by claim type. Source-function claims require primary Arabic source verification and reception-status control. Theoretical claims require recognized memory, ritual, pilgrimage, governance, or design-science literature. Arbaeen service-governance claims require official or institutional data where operational performance is



discussed. Conceptual claims about AALMA-360+ require construct clarity, source traceability, rival-explanation control, and expert validation.

2.2 Theoretical Background: Primary and Rival Lenses

The primary theoretical foundation of this article combines cultural memory theory, ritual embodiment, and design-science reasoning. Cultural memory theory is essential because Ashura persists not as isolated recollection but as socially framed, textually mediated, ritually repeated, and institutionally sustained memory. Halbwachs explains memory through social frames; Connerton emphasizes embodied and commemorative practices; Assmann clarifies the role of cultural forms, writing, ritual, and institutional carriers in preserving meaning across generations [7–9]. These theories support the article’s central claim that Karbala becomes living memory through repeated carriers: narrative, Ziyarat, mourning, ritual time, ritual place, embodied return, and service.

Ritual theory adds a second layer. Bell’s theory of ritual practice shows that ritual is not merely expressive but organizes bodies, hierarchies, meanings, and forms of disciplined action [10]. Turner’s account of liminality and *communitas* clarifies how pilgrimage and ritual movement can temporarily reshape social relations and shared identity [11]. Durkheim’s sociology of religious life explains how collective ritual can intensify social attachment and moral order [24]. Rappaport’s ritual theory shows how repeated ritual forms authorize meaning beyond individual intention [25]. Seligman and colleagues further show that ritual creates a structured “as if” world capable of sustaining forms of order, sincerity, and social trust without reducing religious life to individual belief alone [26]. Together, these works support the AALMA-360+ claim that Arbäeen walking, fatigue, service, and mawkib hospitality are not external additions to memory; they are embodied mechanisms through which Ashura memory becomes socially enacted.

Moral-emotional and ethical-action literature clarifies the transition from remembrance to moral positioning. Jasper’s work on moral protest helps explain how emotion can become public moral action rather than remaining private affect [27]. Nussbaum’s account of emotions as forms of evaluative judgment helps explain why mourning may carry ethical cognition rather than mere sentiment [28]. This is important for Ziyarat Ashura, where grief moves toward *salām*, *wilāyah*, *barā’ah*, covenant, supplication, and present responsibility [1]. In this paper, however, these theories remain auxiliary. They explain moral activation but do not replace the internal Shi‘i source grammar of Ziyarat.

A further memory lens comes from religious memory and *lieux de mémoire*. Hervieu-Léger’s concept of religion as a chain of memory clarifies how religious identity is transmitted through continuity, authorized memory, and repeated belonging [29]. Nora’s work on sites of memory helps explain why places, texts, rituals, and commemorative practices can become concentrated carriers of collective meaning [30]. Karbala and Arbäeen operate in this sense as memory-sites, but the article does not reduce them to secular mnemonic devices. Their sacred meaning is interpreted through the Ziyarat corpus and Shi‘i devotional grammar.



Design science provides the model-building discipline. Hevner et al. define design-science research as the creation and evaluation of artifacts intended to solve relevant problem classes [12]. Peffers et al. offer a process model of problem identification, objective definition, design and development, demonstration, evaluation, and communication [13]. AALMA-360+ uses this logic to avoid becoming a decorative framework. It must define a problem class, construct the artifact, demonstrate its use, and specify evaluation. The author's Civilizational Algorithm Theory and related work on sacred texts as civilizational algorithms further support a controlled method for translating sacred-text structures into conceptual, ethical, and governance architectures without collapsing sacred truth into management logic [14,31].

The rival lenses are useful but insufficient. A grief-only lens explains mourning, but it does not explain why mourning becomes covenantal responsibility [1]. A political lens explains resistance but not prophetic inheritance, sacred legitimacy, and ritual return [2]. A sectarian lens explains boundary-making but risks misreading *barā'ah* as hostility instead of ethical dissociation from injustice [1]. A pilgrimage-management lens explains mobility, service, health, transport, and crowd coordination, but it cannot explain why the Arbāeen field is rooted in Ashura memory and Ziyarat grammar [4,5,20,21]. A KPI lens explains service improvement, but it becomes invalid if it measures sacred realities rather than service responsibilities [22,23,32–35]. AALMA-360+ therefore does not reject these lenses; it disciplines them through source hierarchy, layer separation, and a non-reductionist KPI boundary.

2.3 Conceptual Domain Map: Constructs, Genealogy, and Boundaries

The first construct is living memory. In collective-memory theory, memory is socially framed; in cultural-memory theory, it is carried by texts, rituals, symbols, and institutions; in religious-memory theory, it is transmitted through chains of continuity and belonging [7–9,29,30]. AALMA-360+ adopts a more specific definition: living memory is sacred-historical memory that is textually anchored, ritually repeated, ethically activated, socially transmitted, and capable of returning each generation to moral choice. Operationally, it is identified through the chain: Karbala → narrative → Ziyarat → ritual reception → covenant/inheritance/witness/return → embodied service → renewal. Its boundary condition is that memory activation may be studied, but sacred truth itself is not measured.

The second construct is Ziyarat function. Ziyarat may be treated devotionally as visitation, salutation, sacred address, love, supplication, or loyalty. In AALMA-360+, Ziyarat function means the analytical role a received Ziyarat text performs within the Ashura–Arbāeen architecture. Ziyarat Ashura activates covenantal positioning; Ziyarat Warith activates prophetic inheritance and legitimacy; Ziyarat Nahiya activates witness-memory and anti-forgetting; Ziyarat al-Arba'in activates purpose and return [1–4]. Kāmil al-Ziyārāt supports the archive of reception and transmission, but it is not an equivalent fifth Ziyarat [6]. The boundary condition is source-critical: devotional reception may be analyzed, but attribution certainty must not be overclaimed.



The third construct is moral choice. In social-movement theory, moral choice may appear as protest; in emotion theory, it may appear as evaluative judgment; in virtue ethics, it may appear as moral formation [27,28]. In this article, moral choice refers to the recurring ethical positioning generated by Ashura remembrance: standing with truth, dignity, loyalty, and justice rather than neutrality before injustice. Operationally, it is traced through the movement from grief to salām, wilāyah, barā'ah, covenant, supplication, and present accountability [1]. The boundary condition is that outward textual and ritual structures can be analyzed, but inward sincerity cannot be scored.

The fourth construct is prophetic inheritance. Genealogical readings may reduce inheritance to lineage, while political readings may reduce legitimacy to power. Ziyarat Warith requires a broader definition: prophetic inheritance means the transmission of guidance, ethical mission, spiritual authority, sacred legitimacy, and Imami continuity through the prophetic and Imami line [2]. Operationally, it is identified through the repeated inheritance formula linking Imam al-Husayn to Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus, Muhammad, Imam 'Ali, Lady Fāṭimah, and Imam al-Ḥasan [2]. The boundary condition is that interreligious resonance may be discussed cautiously, but empirical interfaith reception requires separate evidence.

The fifth construct is witness-memory. General memory theory may preserve events as shared meaning, but witness-memory preserves morally charged detail against abstraction. Ziyarat Nahiya functions in this layer by returning memory to body, wound, thirst, battlefield, tent, captivity, and named persons [3]. Operationally, witness-memory is identified where the text resists symbolic flattening and converts remembered suffering into anti-forgetting responsibility. Its boundary condition is attribution caution, especially where Ziyarat Nahiya, Ziyarat al-Shuhadā', and al-Ziyarat al-Rajabiyyah are used as received devotional materials with differing source statuses [3].

The sixth construct is purpose-return. Pilgrimage literature may treat return as movement to sacred space; ritual-calendar theory may treat it as annual recurrence. Ziyarat al-Arba'in requires a more precise definition: purpose-return is the movement by which Ashura memory returns to the telos of Imam al-Husayn's sacrifice—guidance, awakening, covenantal continuity, and renewed alignment [4]. Operationally, it is identified through the Ziyarat's language of martyrdom, guidance, walāyah, barā'ah, ritual identity, and renewed return [4]. Its boundary condition is analytical separation: Ziyarat al-Arba'in is textually related to Arbaeen, but it is not identical with contemporary pilgrimage governance.

The seventh construct is embodied ritual presence. Ritual theory defines embodiment as bodily participation, patterned practice, and sensory enactment [10,11,24–26]. The Arbaeen article defines embodied ritual presence as the translation of Ashura memory from text, narration, mourning, and covenant into walking, fatigue, vulnerability, shared route, tears, guesthood, and service [5]. Operationally, it is identified through the route, body, fatigue, mawkib encounter, hospitality, and service relation. The boundary condition is that bodily



participation may be described, but inward spiritual transformation cannot be presumed without independent evidence.

The eighth construct is service governance. Service governance refers to the organization of care, hospitality, safety, health readiness, WASH, food safety, transport, route access, volunteer coordination, lost-person support, emergency response, accessibility, and annual learning [5,15,16,22,23]. The author's Arbāeen KPI works are relevant because they show how pilgrimage service may be analyzed through operational indicators [22,23]. The author's broader KPI-governed Taqrīb and civilizational-governance works are also relevant because they develop governance-grade measurement architectures for religious, dialogical, and civilizational contexts [32–35]. The boundary condition is decisive: service duties may be monitored; sacred realities may not.

2.4 Critical Synthesis by Themes and Mechanisms

2.4.1 Event, narrative, and the production of living memory

The first mechanism is the movement from sacred-historical event to living memory. Memory theory shows that collective meaning is not preserved by cognition alone; it requires social frames, repeated practices, carriers, and institutions [7–9]. Religious memory theory adds that continuity is sustained through chains of memory, authority, and repeated belonging [29]. In the Ashura–Arbāeen field, these carriers include maq̄tal narration, mourning assemblies, Ziyarat texts, sacred time, sacred place, pulpit, route, mawkib, and intergenerational ritual repetition [1–6].

The contested issue is whether general memory theory can adequately explain sacred memory. It can explain transmission, repetition, and social durability, but it cannot replace the internal grammar of Shi'i sources: wilāyah, barā'ah, imamate, Ziyarat, martyrdom, supplication, and return. The conflict exists because secular memory theories often abstract memory from theological claims, while Shi'i devotional memory embeds remembrance inside sacred address and covenantal alignment. Evidence strength is strong for the general memory mechanism, but mixed for its direct transfer to sacred-text analysis unless source hierarchy is preserved.

The implication for AALMA-360+ is clear: memory theory is necessary but not sufficient. The model must begin with Karbala as sacred-historical event and proceed through source-governed carriers of remembrance. This supports the primary research question by explaining why Ashura persists as living memory rather than as historical recollection alone.

2.4.2 Ziyarat as source-function architecture

The second mechanism is the movement from living memory into distinct Ziyarat functions. The author's preceding article sequence is central here. Ziyarat Ashura converts mourning into covenantal stance and ethical dissociation from injustice [1]. Ziyarat Warith relocates Karbala within prophetic inheritance, imamate, sacred legitimacy, and human dignity [2].



Ziyarat Nahiya protects Ashura from abstraction by preserving witness-memory, bodily detail, named suffering, and anti-forgetting responsibility [3]. Ziyarat al-Arba'in clarifies the purpose of martyrdom and frames return as renewed alignment with guidance [4].

The literature tension concerns source status and function. A devotional text can be ritually central even where attribution, recension, or transmission layers require scholarly caution. This is especially important for Ziyarat Nahiya, Ziyarat al-Shuhadā', and al-Ziyarat al-Rajabiyyah [3]. The conflict exists because devotional reception and source-critical certainty are related but not identical. A Q1-level article must not dismiss reception, but it must also avoid unrestricted attribution claims.

The implication for AALMA-360+ is that the model must distinguish function from source certainty. The four core Ziyarat functions form the main architecture; supporting texts extend specific mechanisms; Kāmil al-Ziyārāt remains archive and transmission corpus [6]. This directly supports SRQ1, SRQ2, and SRQ3.

2.4.3 Moral choice, loyalty, and non-sectarian boundary-making

The third mechanism is the transformation of grief into moral choice. Ziyarat Ashura is decisive because it does not stop at mourning. It moves through salām, wilāyah, barā'ah, covenant, supplication, and self-assessment [1]. Moral-emotional theory supports the claim that grief can carry judgment, value, and moral orientation rather than merely private sadness [27,28]. Social-movement theory also clarifies how moral emotion can become public alignment and responsibility [27].

The contested issue is barā'ah. A reductive reading may interpret it as sectarian hostility. The author's Ziyarat Ashura article instead frames barā'ah as ethical dissociation from injustice, humiliation, distortion, and complicity [1]. This distinction is essential for Q1 defensibility because it prevents the article from being read as polemical sectarianism. The conflict exists because the same textual language can be read through polemical, devotional, ethical, or political frames. Evidence strength is strong within the author's textual argument, but final submission still requires exact source citations and careful translation.

The implication for AALMA-360+ is that moral choice must be framed as ethical positioning, not sectarian escalation. This supports the model's claim that Ashura memory reproduces responsibility, dignity, and loyalty without collapsing into hostility.

2.4.4 Prophetic inheritance and sacred legitimacy

The fourth mechanism is the movement from local tragedy to sacred-historical continuity. Ziyarat Warith interprets Imam al-Husayn through inheritance from Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus, Muhammad, Imam 'Ali, Lady Fāṭimah, and Imam al-Ḥasan [2]. This structure prevents Karbala from being reduced to a local conflict or political defeat. It also prevents universalization from becoming theological neutralization because Karbala becomes universalizable from within Shi'i imamate, not by bypassing it [2].



The contested issue is the meaning of inheritance. A genealogical reading is too narrow because it treats inheritance as lineage only. A symbolic reading is also incomplete if it weakens the Imami and theological structure of the text. A political reading misses the sacred legitimacy dimension. Evidence strength is moderate to strong for the internal textual function, but further Arabic source verification strengthens the claim.

The implication for AALMA-360+ is that loyalty is not merely affective attachment. It is structured through sacred history, guidance, and inherited legitimacy. This supports SRQ1 and strengthens the model's civilizational but non-triumphalist claim.

2.4.5 Witness-memory, anti-forgetting, and embodied detail

The fifth mechanism is the transformation of generalized suffering into witness-memory. Ziyarat Nahiya resists symbolic flattening by returning memory to the body, wound, thirst, battlefield, tents, captivity, and named persons [3]. This aligns with broader memory theory insofar as memory requires concrete carriers, but it goes further by making detail morally necessary. The point is not only to remember that suffering occurred, but to remember how suffering was witnessed, embodied, named, and transmitted.

The contested issue is whether such detail is historical report, devotional amplification, trauma memory, or ritual witness. The most defensible reading is bounded: the article analyzes Ziyarat Nahiya as received Shi'i liturgical witness-memory without making unrestricted claims about every layer of attribution or direct historical reporting [3]. This distinction protects the article from overclaiming.

The implication for AALMA-360+ is that living memory requires anti-forgetting architecture. Without witness-memory, Karbala risks becoming abstract moral symbolism. With witness-memory, memory remains accountable to bodies, names, wounds, and justice expectation.

2.4.6 Purpose-return and the separation of Ziyarat al-Arba'in from Arbaeen governance

The sixth mechanism is purpose-return. Ziyarat al-Arba'in explains why the memory of Karbala returns. Its internal logic connects martyrdom, guidance, rescue from ignorance and misguidance, walāyah, barā'ah, ritual identity, and renewed alignment [4]. This provides the textual bridge from Ashura memory to return.

The contested issue is the frequent collapse between Ziyarat al-Arba'in and the contemporary Arbaeen walk. Pilgrimage-management literature and KPI-governance studies are relevant to the contemporary Arbaeen service field, but they cannot explain the textual telos of Ziyarat al-Arba'in [4,5,22,23]. Conversely, textual study of the Ziyarat cannot replace analysis of contemporary health, safety, transport, WASH, and service systems [5,15,16].

The implication for AALMA-360+ is that Ziyarat al-Arba'in and Arbaeen governance must remain analytically separate but architecturally connected. Ziyarat al-Arba'in provides the purpose-return grammar; Arbaeen governance is the embodied-service field through which



return becomes walking, care, hospitality, coordination, and learning. This directly supports SRQ4.

2.4.7 Embodied ritual presence, mawkib hospitality, and service governance

The seventh mechanism is the movement from return to embodied ritual presence. Arbaeen walking converts memory into body, route, fatigue, vulnerability, and collective presence [5,20,21]. Pilgrimage studies show that sacred walking involves attachment, experience, authenticity, and transformation beyond ordinary travel [20,21,36]. Hospitality theory further clarifies why the mawkib cannot be reduced to a logistics point. Mauss's gift theory explains non-market giving; Honneth's theory of recognition explains dignity and honour; Siddiqui's work on Islamic hospitality frames welcoming as a religiously meaningful act [17–19]. Together, these perspectives support the article's interpretation of the mawkib as a service-governance cell.

The contested issue is whether mawkib service should be interpreted as gift economy, identity performance, public welfare, informal governance, sacred devotion, or civil society. The conflict exists because the mawkib operates across several levels at once: family, tribe, volunteer, shrine, municipal, health, security, transport, and pilgrim networks [5,15,16]. The strongest reading is therefore multi-level: mawkib service is devotional hospitality with governance consequences.

The implication for AALMA-360+ is that service is not external to memory. Service is the social translation of loyalty when it protects dignity, safety, care, and hospitality. This supports the model's movement from embodied presence to service governance.

2.4.8 KPI boundary and non-reductionist governance

The eighth mechanism is the movement from service to governance and learning. Operational indicators are necessary for Arbaeen because large-scale service fields require monitoring of WASH, food safety, medical readiness, route access, lost-person response, transport coordination, volunteer readiness, emergency response, accessibility, privacy, inclusion, and after-action learning [5,15,16,22,23]. The author's prior Arbaeen KPI works are directly relevant because they establish pilgrimage service as a field in which performance indicators can support planning, coordination, and improvement [22,23]. The author's wider KPI-governed religious and civilizational frameworks further show how governance tools can support religious dialogue, unity, and institutional performance when properly bounded [32–35].

The contested issue is whether KPI logic strengthens or distorts sacred service. The answer depends on boundary discipline. KPI governance is legitimate when it measures service duties and social translations; it is invalid when it attempts to measure sacred truth, faith, sincerity, divine acceptance, thawāb, intercession, wilāyah truth, or spiritual rank. This distinction is not a minor ethics note. It is the core condition that allows the article to speak to governance without reducing the sacred.



The implication for AALMA-360+ is that the KPI boundary must be built into the model, not added later. Green-zone indicators may govern service responsibilities; amber-zone materials may describe ritual meaning qualitatively; red-zone sacred realities must remain outside measurement.

2.4.9 Design-science synthesis and artifact evaluation

The final mechanism is design-science integration. AALMA-360+ is not only a theme or metaphor; it is an artifact composed of constructs, relationships, transformation logic, boundary conditions, and evaluation criteria. Design-science research requires more than model naming. It requires problem relevance, artifact construction, demonstration, evaluation, and communication [12,13]. The author's Civilizational Algorithm Theory and related sacred-text algorithm work provide an internal methodological bridge by showing how sacred-text structures can be translated into governance-aware conceptual architectures while preserving sacred boundaries [14,31].

The contested issue is whether design science can be used in a sacred-text and ritual-memory article without managerial reduction. It can, but only if design science is applied to the scholarly artifact, not to the sacred reality itself. The artifact is the model; the sacred truth is not redesigned, measured, or optimized. Evidence strength is strong for design-science requirements, but AALMA-360+ still requires external evaluation through source audit, expert panel, construct-clarity review, evidence-chain traceability, and bounded Arbæen service-governance demonstration.

The implication for AALMA-360+ is that the model's Q1 credibility depends on validation. The article must show how claims are traceable, how constructs are bounded, how rival explanations are handled, and how the model can be reviewed by experts in Islamic studies, memory/ritual theory, pilgrimage studies, public health, and KPI governance.

Operationalization in this article is conceptual rather than statistical: source-function mapping, phrase-function coding, construct coding and KPI boundary classification replace survey scales or causal estimation.

2.5 Measurement, KPI, and Operationalization Review

Operationalization in this article is conceptual rather than statistical. Living memory is not measured through individual belief scores, but traced through source-function mapping: Karbala, narrative, Ziyarat, ritual reception, covenant, inheritance, witness, return, embodied service and renewal [1–9,29,30]. Moral choice is operationalized through the movement from mourning to ethical positioning, covenantal loyalty, Baraah from injustice and present accountability, while inward sincerity remains outside measurement [1,27,28]. Embodied ritual presence is traced through walking, fatigue, vulnerability, route, guesthood, Mawkib encounter and service relation, not through claims about measurable spiritual transformation [5,10,11,20,21,24–26,36]. Service governance is the only layer where KPIs are appropriate: WASH readiness, medical response, food safety, route access, lost-person support,



accessibility, transport reliability, volunteer coordination, emergency readiness and annual service learning may be monitored through aggregate, purpose-limited and privacy-preserving service data [5,15,16,22,23]. The KPI boundary is therefore central to AALMA-360+: green-zone service responsibilities may be improved; amber-zone ritual meanings may be described qualitatively; red-zone sacred realities—faith, sincerity, sanctity, divine acceptance, Thawab, intercession, spiritual rank and Wilayah truth—must not be treated as empirical variables [22,23,32–35].

2.6 Research Gaps to Research Questions Bridge

The reviewed literature leaves five linked gaps: fragmentation across textual, memory, embodiment and governance streams; source-function ambiguity; confusion between Ziyarat Arbaeen and Arbaeen governance; measurement reduction; and insufficient design-science validation. These gaps justify the PRQ and six SRQs by requiring a model that connects sacred text, living memory, embodied service, Mawkib governance and KPI boundary without reducing any layer to another.

3. Methodology

This study uses a qualitative, source-sensitive and design-science-informed methodology. The primary method is design-science conceptual modelling: AALMA-360+ is constructed as an analytical artifact that defines a problem class, clarifies objectives, organizes source functions, maps transformation mechanisms, specifies boundary conditions and prepares an evaluation pathway [12,13]. The auxiliary methods are source-sensitive textual analysis, cultural-memory interpretation, ritual and embodiment interpretation, and bounded Arbaeen service-governance reading. The evidence base consists of the five foundation studies, the four core Ziyarat functions, three supporting devotional-textual modules, Kamil al-Ziyarat as archival corpus, and the Arbaeen service-governance layer [1–6].

Analysis proceeded through five linked procedures: source-boundary mapping, phrase–function coding, construct coding, evidence-chain control and claim-boundary testing. Each textual or conceptual unit was examined according to its function in the architecture: covenant, inheritance, witness-memory, purpose-return, embodied presence, service governance or KPI boundary. The model is therefore an interpretive and design-science artifact, not a statistical estimate, causal model or behavioural prediction.

Trustworthiness is supported through a non-statistical audit trail consisting of the source hierarchy, construct definitions, coding categories, evidence chains and claim-boundary decisions. No interviews, surveys, private records, medical records, participant observation or individual pilgrim datasets are used. Ethical discipline is maintained by separating analysable social and service translations from non-measurable sacred realities. Health, safety, WASH, access, food safety, emergency response, lost-person support, volunteer readiness and service learning may be evaluated; sanctity, faith, sincerity, divine acceptance, spiritual rank, intercession, reward and Wilayah truth are not treated as empirical variables.



4. Findings and Results

4.1 Data Overview and Evidence Base

The findings are conceptual and documentary rather than statistical. The evidence base consists of the five foundation studies, the corrected source-function map, Kamil al-Ziyarat as archival corpus, the Arbaeen service-governance layer, and the design-science logic used to construct AALMA-360+ [1–6,12,13]. No interviews, surveys, private records, medical files, participant observation, route-level operational datasets, or statistical models were used. Accordingly, reliability coefficients, model-fit indices, p-values, effect sizes, confidence intervals, and causal claims are not applicable. Trustworthiness rests on source-boundary mapping, phrase-function coding, construct coding, evidence-chain control, and claim-boundary testing.

The first finding is that AALMA-360+ is defensible only when its source foundation is corrected. The model is not built on five Ziyarat texts. It is built on four core Ziyarat functions, three supporting devotional-textual modules, and one archival corpus. Ziyarat Ashura functions as covenantal alignment and ethical positioning; Ziyarat Warith functions as prophetic inheritance and sacred legitimacy; Ziyarat Nahiya functions as witness-memory and anti-forgetting; and Ziyarat Arbaeen functions as purpose and return [1–4]. Dua Alqama/Safwan, Ziyarat al-Shuhada, and Ziyarah Rajabiyyah support post-covenantal supplication, named martyr memory, and seasonal companion memory, while Kamil al-Ziyarat functions as archive and transmission corpus, not as a fifth Ziyarat [1–6]. This finding answers SRQ1, SRQ2, and SRQ3.

The second finding is that the Ashura-Arbaeen movement operates as a layered transformation architecture rather than as a linear theme. The model sequence is: Karbala becomes narrative; narrative becomes Ziyarat; Ziyarat becomes living memory; living memory becomes covenant, inheritance, witness, and return; return becomes embodied ritual presence; embodied presence becomes Mawkib-based service; service becomes governance responsibility; and governance returns into memory through learning, correction, and next-generation reproduction. This finding answers the PRQ by showing how Karbala remains active as moral choice, loyalty, service, and civilizational continuity rather than as historical recollection alone.

The third finding is that Ziyarat Arbaeen and Arbaeen service governance must remain analytically separate but architecturally connected. Ziyarat Arbaeen is the textual purpose-and-return function. It explains why Ashura memory returns to guidance, loyalty, and covenantal continuity [4]. Contemporary Arbaeen is the embodied service-governance field in which return becomes walking, fatigue, hospitality, health, safety, transport, Mawkib service, dignity safeguards, and multi-level coordination [5,15,16]. This separation prevents two errors: reducing the Ziyarat to an operations preface and reducing Arbaeen governance to logistics without sacred root. This finding answers SRQ4.



The fourth finding is that the Mawkib is the core service-governance mechanism of the Arbaeen layer. The Mawkib is not merely a food station, hospitality tent, or logistical node. It is a service-governance cell where loyalty is translated into water, food, rest, shelter, guidance, care, protection, and recognition. The pilgrim is therefore framed as an honoured guest rather than a tourist, customer, consumer, or crowd unit [5,17–19]. This finding explains how embodied ritual presence becomes dignity-based service and how service becomes a public expression of Ashura memory.

The fifth finding is that Arbaeen governance is semi-distributed and multi-level. It is neither purely state-run nor ungoverned. It emerges across shrine institutions, state bodies, families, volunteers, Mawakib, health services, security actors, transport providers, local communities, and pilgrims [5,15,16]. This finding matters because it shows that governance in Arbaeen is not external to devotion; it is part of protecting bodies, dignity, access, safety, and service continuity at scale.

The sixth finding is that AALMA-360+ requires a non-reductionist KPI boundary. Green-zone service responsibilities may be governed and improved: WASH, food safety, medical readiness, route access, lost-person support, volunteer coordination, transport reliability, accessibility, emergency response, privacy, inclusion, and annual service learning [5,15,16,22,23]. Amber-zone materials may be described qualitatively: ritual meaning, participant experience, narrative memory, and devotional grammar. Red-zone sacred realities are not measured: sanctity, faith, sincerity, divine acceptance, intercession, reward, spiritual rank, and Wilayah truth. This finding answers SRQ5 and is central to the article's ethical discipline.

The seventh finding is a negative finding. Grief-only, politics-only, sectarian-only, tourism-only, crowd-logistics-only, and KPI-reductive readings each explain part of the Ashura-Arbaeen field but fail to explain the complete transformation from sacred event to living memory, from living memory to embodied service, and from service to bounded governance. AALMA-360+ is therefore not an additional label for the same phenomenon; it is a corrective architecture that organizes source, memory, body, service, governance, and boundary conditions.

The results answer all stated objectives within the article's conceptual scope. The study defines the model architecture, corrects the source foundation, maps the transformation chain, separates textual return from service governance, identifies the Mawkib as service-governance cell, defines the KPI boundary, and specifies why further validation is required. What remains outside the present results is empirical testing through interviews, surveys, field observation, route-level operational datasets, official medical records, service logs, Delphi panels, or statistical construct validation. No private human-subject data were used; therefore, anonymization, participant consent, and data-code release are not applicable in this section. Future empirical use of service data should remain aggregate, purpose-limited, privacy-preserving, and strictly separated from spiritual profiling.



5. Discussion

5.1 Summary of Principal Findings

This article shows that AALMA-360+ is best understood as a bounded living-memory and service-governance architecture, not as a broad symbolic label. The principal finding is that Karbala remains active through a layered transformation: event, narrative, Ziyarat, living memory, covenant, inheritance, witness, return, embodied presence, Mawkib service, governance responsibility, and renewed memory. The model is defensible only when its source foundation is corrected: four core Ziyarat functions, three supporting devotional-textual modules, and Kamil al-Ziyarat as archival corpus rather than a fifth Ziyarat [1–6].

A second finding is that Ziyarat Arbaeen and Arbaeen service governance must remain analytically separate but architecturally connected. Ziyarat Arbaeen provides the textual purpose-and-return grammar; contemporary Arbaeen provides the embodied service-governance field of walking, hospitality, health, safety, transport, dignity, coordination, and learning [4,5,15,16]. A third finding is that the Mawkib is not merely a service point but a service-governance cell where loyalty is translated into care, guesthood, protection, and recognition [5,17–19]. A fourth finding is that KPI governance is legitimate only for service responsibilities, not for sacred realities [22,23]. The key negative finding is that grief-only, politics-only, tourism-only, crowd-logistics-only, and KPI-reductive readings each explain part of the field but fail to explain the full transformation cycle.

5.2 Interpretation and Mechanisms

Evidence-supported interpretation: AALMA-360+ explains persistence through structured carriers. Karbala does not remain active as information alone; it is transmitted through narrative, Ziyarat, mourning, covenantal alignment, prophetic inheritance, witness-memory, purpose-return, embodied route, Mawkib service, and governance learning [1–6]. The mechanism is sequential but cyclical: memory becomes action, action becomes service, service requires governance, and governance returns to memory through correction and annual learning.

Evidence-supported interpretation: the separation between Ziyarat Arbaeen and Arbaeen governance strengthens the model. It prevents textual analysis from being overloaded with operations research, and it prevents governance analysis from losing its sacred textual root [4,5]. This is a key contribution because it allows the article to speak to both sacred-text scholarship and service-governance scholarship without reducing either field.

Interpretive but requiring further testing: the model suggests that stronger dignity safeguards may improve trust, service legitimacy, and route experience. It also suggests that Mawkib service may function as a practical translation of covenantal loyalty. These claims are theoretically consistent with the findings, but they require fieldwork, official service data, interviews, observation, or expert validation before they can be treated as empirical conclusions.



5.3 Comparison with Prior Literature

The findings align with cultural memory theory by showing that Ashura is preserved through repeated carriers, institutional forms, and ritual transmission rather than individual recollection alone [7–9]. They also align with ritual and embodiment theory because Arbaeen demonstrates how memory becomes bodily enacted through walking, fatigue, route, vulnerability, service, and shared presence [10,11,24–26]. The article extends these theories by showing that Ashura memory is not only collective or embodied; it is also source-governed through distinct Ziyarat functions.

The findings also align with pilgrimage and hospitality literature, especially where Arbaeen is understood through walking, attachment, spiritual authenticity, guesthood, and non-market service [17–21,36]. The difference is that AALMA-360+ does not treat pilgrimage experience as the primary explanatory layer. Pilgrimage is one layer inside a wider architecture that begins with Karbala, moves through Ziyarat and memory, and becomes service governance only after textual purpose and embodied return are established.

The findings qualify KPI and service-management approaches. Prior Arbaeen KPI work is relevant for safety, service quality, logistics, satisfaction, and continuous improvement [22,23]. However, the present article adds a stronger boundary: KPIs support service responsibility only when they do not become proxies for faith, sincerity, divine acceptance, spiritual rank, reward, or Wilayah truth. This resolves the central debate between governance utility and sacred reduction.

5.4 Alternative Explanations and Rival Mechanisms

Several rival explanations remain plausible and must be treated seriously. Arbaeen's contemporary scale may also reflect post-2003 Iraqi political change, shrine-institution expansion, state capacity, security conditions, media visibility, diaspora networks, infrastructure growth, and transnational identity formation [NEED SOURCE if discussed empirically]. These factors may explain growth, visibility, and mobility, but they do not by themselves explain the source-function chain from Karbala to Ziyarat, living memory, purpose-return, embodied service, and KPI boundary.

A grief-only explanation explains affect but not covenantal responsibility. A politics-only explanation explains resistance but not prophetic inheritance and sacred legitimacy. A tourism-only explanation explains movement and experience but not Ziyarat grammar. A logistics-only explanation explains coordination but not dignity-based guesthood. A KPI-only explanation explains improvement but not the ethical limit of measurement. AALMA-360+ therefore does not deny rival mechanisms; it locates them as partial explanations within a wider non-reductionist architecture.

5.5 Theoretical Implications

The first theoretical contribution is to cultural memory studies. The article specifies a source-governed form of living memory in which memory is not only socially transmitted but structured through distinct textual functions: covenant, inheritance, witness, and return [1–



4,7–9]. This contribution resolves the literature gap concerning how sacred memory moves from text to embodied and institutional translation.

The second contribution is to ritual and pilgrimage studies. The model shows that embodied walking becomes analytically meaningful only when connected to the purpose-return structure of Ziyarat Arbaeen and the service-governance field of contemporary Arbaeen [4,5,20,21]. This contribution responds to the gap between textual studies and pilgrimage studies.

The third contribution is to design-science research. AALMA-360+ is framed as an artifact with problem definition, construct system, transformation chain, KPI boundary, and evaluation pathway [12,13]. This contribution addresses the gap between conceptual theology and evaluable scholarly architecture.

The fourth contribution is to KPI and governance theory. The KPI boundary doctrine distinguishes green-zone service duties, amber-zone qualitative meanings, and red-zone sacred realities. This contribution directly responds to the measurement-reduction gap identified in the Literature Review and Findings [5,22,23].

5.6 Practical and Policy Implications

For shrine institutions and Arbaeen coordinators, the implication is actor → action → data → KPI → horizon → risk. Shrine and route authorities should preserve dignity-based guesthood through service standards for water, sanitation, shelter, guidance, accessibility, lost-person support, emergency readiness, and medical response. Required data include aggregate service capacity, incident logs, route-flow observations, health-response records, volunteer readiness, and after-action reports. KPIs may track WASH readiness, medical response time, lost-person resolution, accessibility coverage, food-safety incidents, and service-learning closure. The likely time horizon is annual, because Arbaeen governance learns through yearly preparation and review. The main risks are fragmented data ownership, inconsistent definitions, privacy weakness, political reporting bias, and resource constraints [15,16,22,23].

For Mawkib networks and volunteers, the implication is to treat hospitality as dignity protection, not only service volume. The practical action is to define minimum dignity safeguards: respectful reception, vulnerable-pilgrim support, safe food handling, gender-sensitive access where needed, clear route guidance, and protection from humiliation or exclusion. The enabling data should be aggregate and non-intrusive. The KPI is not “spiritual quality” but service reliability, safety, accessibility, and complaint-resolution learning. The key risk is that measurement may turn free service into competition or ranking; the mitigation is aggregate reporting and explicit exclusion of devotion scoring.

For researchers and policymakers, the implication is to build a service-data dictionary and evidence matrix before claiming operational impact. Each allowed KPI should have an owner, definition, data source, collection method, privacy rule, bias risk, decision trigger, corrective



action, and escalation path. Without this governance layer, indicators become dashboards without accountability.

6. Conclusion

6.1 Summary of Key Findings

This article set out to answer how Ashura moves from a sacred-historical event into a living memory architecture that, through Arbreen, reproduces moral choice, loyalty, embodied service and civilizational continuity without reducing sacred meaning to politics, tourism, crowd logistics or managerial metrics. The findings show that AALMA-360+ is defensible as a bounded architecture only when its source foundation is corrected: four core Ziyarat functions, three supporting devotional-textual modules and Kamil al-Ziyarat as archival corpus rather than a fifth Ziyarat.

The article further shows that the Ashura-Arbreen movement operates as a layered transformation cycle: Karbala becomes narrative; narrative becomes Ziyarat; Ziyarat becomes living memory; living memory becomes covenant, inheritance, witness and return; return becomes embodied ritual presence; embodied presence becomes Mawkib-based service; service becomes governance responsibility; and governance returns to memory through learning and renewal. Ziyarat Arbreen and Arbreen service governance must therefore remain analytically separate but architecturally connected. Ziyarat Arbreen provides the textual purpose-and-return grammar, while contemporary Arbreen provides the embodied service-governance field of walking, hospitality, health, safety, transport, dignity and multi-level coordination.

The findings also show that the Mawkib is best understood as a service-governance cell, not merely as a food station or logistical point. It translates loyalty into care, guesthood, protection and recognition. At the same time, the article establishes a non-reductionist KPI boundary: WASH, food safety, medical readiness, route access, lost-person support, volunteer coordination, accessibility, emergency response and service learning may be governed and improved, but sanctity, faith, sincerity, divine acceptance, reward, intercession, spiritual rank and Wilayah truth are not empirical variables.

6.2 Scholarly Contributions

This paper contributes first by refining the literature on Ashura memory through a source-function architecture. It shows that living memory is not only socially transmitted or ritually repeated; it is also organized through distinct textual functions: covenant, inheritance, witness and return. This changes the literature by moving the analysis from general remembrance to a traceable architecture of sacred memory activation.

Second, the paper contributes to ritual and pilgrimage studies by separating textual return from embodied service governance. This separation clarifies why Ziyarat Arbreen cannot be reduced to pilgrimage logistics and why Arbreen service governance cannot be detached from its sacred textual root. Third, the paper contributes to design-science and governance scholarship by defining AALMA-360+ as an evaluable conceptual artifact with source



hierarchy, construct boundaries, transformation logic and claim-boundary discipline. Fourth, it contributes to KPI and service-governance theory by defining a measurement boundary that permits responsible service improvement while preventing spiritual scoring.

6.3 Recommendations for Practitioners and Policymakers

Shrine institutions and Arbaeen coordinators should develop a green-zone service governance framework for WASH, medical response, food safety, route access, transport coordination, lost-person support, accessibility, volunteer readiness and after-action learning. The key KPIs should include WASH readiness, medical response time, food-safety incident rate, lost-person resolution time, accessibility coverage, transport reliability and closure rate of after-action improvements. The appropriate horizon is annual, because Arbaeen governance is prepared, executed and reviewed in yearly cycles. The main constraints are fragmented data ownership, inconsistent definitions, resource pressure and privacy risk.

Mawkib networks and volunteer coordinators should treat hospitality as dignity protection rather than service volume. Practical action should focus on respectful reception, vulnerable-pilgrim support, safe food handling, accessible guidance and protection from humiliation or exclusion. The relevant KPIs should remain service-based: service reliability, food-safety compliance, guidance availability, vulnerable-pilgrim support coverage and complaint-learning closure. The key risk is that measurement may turn free service into competition or spiritual ranking; this risk is mitigated by aggregate reporting and explicit exclusion of devotion scoring.

Researchers and policymakers should build an evidence matrix and service-data dictionary before making operational claims. Each permitted KPI should have a definition, data owner, source, collection method, privacy rule, bias risk, decision trigger and corrective action. The time horizon is short to mid-term for data-dictionary design and long-term for cross-year learning. The main failure mode is dashboard production without accountability; the mitigation is to connect every indicator to a responsible actor and a service-improvement decision.

6.4 Limitations

The study is conceptual and design-science-informed; it does not establish causal effects. It cannot claim that recitation, mourning, walking, fatigue, Mawkib service or Arbaeen participation produces measurable faith, moral transformation, political behavior or spiritual rank. The model explains a source-function architecture and its governance implications, not individual spiritual change.

The study is also limited by the need for further source-critical verification. The core and supporting texts require continued Arabic source audit, reception-status clarification and page-level evidence chains. This limitation does not invalidate the architecture, but it limits the strength of claims about textual attribution and historical transmission.



A further limitation is the absence of empirical Arbäeen service datasets in this article. No interviews, surveys, participant observation, route-level records, medical logs, service dashboards or Delphi panels are used. Therefore, operational claims remain conceptual and governance-oriented rather than statistically tested. Generalization is also bounded: the argument applies where Ashura-Arbäeen memory is mediated through the named Ziyarat corpus, ritual reception, embodied return, Mawkib service and service-governance responsibility.

6.5 Directions for Future Research

Future research should complete an Arabic source-critical dossier using primary editions of the core and supporting texts, with source status, textual variants, page-level evidence and claim-boundary notes. Its expected contribution is stronger source validity for the AALMA-360+ architecture.

A second study should conduct expert validation through a Delphi or structured review panel involving Islamic studies, source criticism, cultural memory, ritual studies, pilgrimage studies, public health, governance and KPI experts. Its expected contribution is construct validation and layer-order testing.

A third study should use qualitative fieldwork with Mawkib servants, pilgrims, shrine actors, health teams, transport providers and volunteers to examine how dignity-based hospitality is understood in practice. Its expected contribution is mechanism validation for the Mawkib as service-governance cell.

A fourth study should develop an aggregate Arbäeen service dataset covering WASH, medical response, food safety, route access, lost-person support, accessibility, transport coordination and after-action learning. Its expected contribution is operational testing of the green-zone KPI boundary.

A fifth study should conduct longitudinal analysis across multiple Arbäeen cycles to examine whether after-action learning improves service readiness without producing spiritual ranking. Its expected contribution is evidence on annual governance learning.

A sixth study should compare AALMA-360+ with other pilgrimage and memory systems, while preserving theological and contextual boundaries. Its expected contribution is cross-context testing of where the model holds and where it does not.

6.6 Closing Synthesis

The problem addressed in this article matters because Karbala and Arbäeen are often reduced to one explanatory layer: grief, politics, identity, tourism, logistics or performance management. AALMA-360+ offers a bounded alternative. It explains how sacred memory moves through source, ritual, body, service and governance while preserving the boundary between social responsibility and non-measurable sacred reality. This paper changes Ashura-Arbäeen scholarship from fragmented layer analysis to source-governed living-memory



architecture and enables practitioners to improve Arbaeen service governance without measuring the sacred.

References

- [1] MoghadasNian SAH. Ziyarat Ashura as a holistic covenantal loop: Responsible mourning, ethical dissociation from injustice, and present moral accountability. 2026.
- [2] MoghadasNian SAH. Ziyarat Warith as a Prophetic Inheritance–Legitimacy Cycle: From Karbala to the history of guidance, imamate, and human dignity. 2026.
- [3] MoghadasNian SAH. Ziyarat Nahiya as witness-memory and anti-forgetting architecture in Ashura remembrance. 2026.
- [4] MoghadasNian SAH. Ziyarat al-Arba'in as a Purpose-and-Return Cycle: Martyrdom, guidance, ritual identity and the renewal of Ashura memory. 2026.
- [5] MoghadasNian SAH. Arbaeen as the embodied ritual presence of Ashura's memory: Mawkib, service and dignity-based governance. 2026.
- [6] Ibn Qulawayh J. Kamil al-Ziyarat. al-Amini A, editor. Najaf: Dar al-Murtadawiyyah; 1977/1978. [Arabic edition details and page references to be finalized against the source dossier.]
- [7] Halbwachs M. On collective memory. Coser LA, editor and translator. Chicago (IL): University of Chicago Press; 1992.
- [8] Connerton P. How societies remember. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1989.
- [9] Assmann J. Cultural memory and early civilization: Writing, remembrance, and political imagination. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2011.
- [10] Bell C. Ritual theory, ritual practice. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1992.
- [11] Turner V. The ritual process: Structure and anti-structure. Chicago (IL): Aldine Publishing; 1969.
- [12] Hevner AR, March ST, Park J, Ram S. Design science in information systems research. MIS Quarterly; 28(1):75-105, 2004.
- [13] Peffers K, Tuunanen T, Rothenberger MA, Chatterjee S. A design science research methodology for information systems research. Journal of Management Information Systems; 24(3):45-77, 2007.
- [14] MoghadasNian SAH. Civilizational Algorithm Theory (CAT): A design-science method for sacred-text ontology structuring and theology-to-governance translation. University of Religions and Denominations. ResearchGate; 2026. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.17244.86400>
- [15] UNESCO. Provision of services and hospitality during the Arba'in visitation. UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage; 2019. <https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/provision-of-services-and-hospitality-during-the-arba-in-visitation-01474>
- [16] World Health Organization Regional Office for the Eastern Mediterranean. Iraq conducts its first after-action review for Arbaeen. Cairo: WHO Regional Office for the Eastern Mediterranean; 2025.
- [17] Mauss M. The gift: The form and reason for exchange in archaic societies. Halls WD, translator. London: Routledge; 1990.
- [18] Honneth A. The struggle for recognition: The moral grammar of social conflicts. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press; 1995.
- [19] Siddiqui M. Hospitality and Islam: Welcoming in God's name. New Haven (CT): Yale University Press; 2015.



- [20] Husein USM. A phenomenological study of Arbæen foot pilgrimage in Iraq. *Tourism Management Perspectives*; 26:9-19, 2018.
- [21] Moufahim M, Lichrou M. Pilgrimage, consumption and rituals: Spiritual authenticity in a Shia Muslim pilgrimage. *Tourism Management*; 70:322-332, 2019.
- [22] MoghadasNian SAH, MoghadasNian AS. Measuring Arba'een pilgrimage tourism success: A comprehensive analysis of the top 100 KPIs. 14th International Conference on Tourism, Culture and Art. Zenodo; 2024. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18729081>
- [23] MoghadasNian SAH, Moslehi Z. Optimizing pilgrimage tourism management: A KPI-driven strategy for Arba'een pilgrimage experience. 8th International Congress of Developing Agriculture, Natural Resources, Environment and Tourism of Iran. Zenodo; 2024. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18711160>
- [24] Durkheim E. The elementary forms of religious life. Fields KE, translator. New York (NY): Free Press; 1995. Original work published 1912.
- [25] Rappaport RA. Ritual and religion in the making of humanity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1999.
- [26] Seligman AB, Weller RP, Puett MJ, Simon B. Ritual and its consequences: An essay on the limits of sincerity. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2008.
- [27] Jasper JM. The art of moral protest: Culture, biography, and creativity in social movements. Chicago (IL): University of Chicago Press; 1997.
- [28] Nussbaum MC. Upheavals of thought: The intelligence of emotions. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2001.
- [29] Hervieu-Leger D. Religion as a chain of memory. Lee S, translator. New Brunswick (NJ): Rutgers University Press; 2000.
- [30] Nora P. Between memory and history: Les lieux de mémoire. *Representations*; 26:7-24, 1989.
- [31] MoghadasNian SAH, JafarTayari Dehaqani M, MoghadasNian SMH. Sacred texts as civilizational algorithms: A cybernetic-theological analysis of the opening invocation of Jawshan Kabir. Zenodo; 2026. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19104667>
- [32] MoghadasNian SAH, Karami F, MoghadasNian AS. Applying key performance indicators (KPIs) in Quranic sciences: An interdisciplinary approach to enhance understanding and interpretation. 2024.
- [33] MoghadasNian SAH, AlizadehMousavi SM, HosseinPoor SMM, Bagheri A. Islamic Hiwār Framework (IHF): A KPI-based strategic architecture for intra-faith dialogue, institutional governance, and civilizational unity. 2025.
- [34] MoghadasNian SAH, Farmanian M, AlizadehMousavi SM, HosseinPoor SMM, Bagheri A. Measuring unity: A KPI-governed performance architecture (UCTA-PA) for civilizational rapprochement and governance-grade benchmarking. 2025.
- [35] MoghadasNian SAH, AlizadehMousavi SM, HosseinPoor SMM, Bagheri A, MoghadasNian SAH, Qasemi E. A KPI-governed Taqrīb architecture: A data-driven roadmap to the New Islamic Civilization (DDRNIC). 2025.
- [36] Nikjoo A, Sharifi-Tehrani M, Karoubi M, Siyamiyan A. From attachment to a sacred figure to loyalty to a sacred route: The walking pilgrimage of Arbæen. *Religions*; 11(3):145, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel11030145>