The Cohesive Tetrad as an Epistemic-Ethical Framework for Truth Governance:
A Conditional Gold Standard under Minimal Human Dignity Axioms

Ade Zaenal Mutaqin

Faculty of Economics and Business, Pakuan University, Bogor, Indonesia
Corresponding author: suratkiade@gmail.com
ORCID: 0009-0001-4114-3679

Abstract

Contemporary institutions increasingly rely on metrics, models and codified procedures, yet public trust in their truth claims continues to erode. The central problem addressed is how to design an architecture of truth governance that remains normatively robust and publicly accountable under conditions of epistemic pluralism and technological mediation. This article argues that the erosion of trust does not stem only from technical error but from an overly narrow architecture that reduces persons to data, rules or preferences. Using The Cohesive Tetrad as a conceptual lens, the study develops an axiomatic model, proposed as a conditional gold standard for truth governance under minimal human dignity axioms, that treats four "languages of truth" as jointly necessary for responsible judgment: Sabda as the revelatory word and source of norm and telos, Logika as disciplined reasoning, Qualia as lived experience, and Mistika as the intensional spiritual calibration of intention, with Akhlak as the observable surface where their convergence is tested. Methodologically the article adopts a normative conceptual design: it formulates minimal epistemic axioms centred on human dignity, integrity, coherence, non reduction and self correction, defines the internal relations of the Tetrad under these axioms, and compares the resulting architecture with data centred, rule centred and virtue centred approaches in philosophy of science and public ethics. The analysis shows that monolinguistic regimes of truth tend to generate specific structural failure modes, whereas the Tetrad yields a non reductive matrix that can host multiple methodologies while keeping Akhlak as verification. The article concludes that, under the stated axioms, The Cohesive Tetrad offers a coherent and practically relevant framework for truth governance in law, policy and AI, while remaining open to empirical testing and intercultural refinement.

Keywords: *The Cohesive Tetrad; truth governance; epistemic-ethical framework; human dignity; Sabda-Logika-Qualia-Mistika; akhlak as verification; philosophy of science; public policy; AI ethics*

1. Introduction

In an age that measures almost everything, many institutions no longer know how to answer the simplest question: why should anyone trust our claims about the truth. Scientific agencies publish increasingly sophisticated models, governments brandish indicators to justify policies, religious authorities issue statements in the name of revelation, and technology firms deploy algorithms that promise neutral decision making. The guiding question of this article is how to design an architecture of truth governance that can remain normatively robust and publicly accountable under conditions of epistemic pluralism and technological mediation. Yet across these domains one pattern keeps returning: citizens, patients, students and believers sense that something essential is missing, and the distance between official claims of accuracy and lived experience of justice keeps widening.

This article starts from the suspicion that the problem is not only technical but architectural. Contemporary regimes of truth governance tend to elevate one epistemic language at the expense of others. In some settings logic and formal proof are treated as the final arbiter, as if coherence within a system were sufficient to guarantee humane consequences. In others, numerical indicators dominate, and what cannot be counted is quietly treated as noise. Elsewhere, textual formulations of Sabda (Revelatory Word, the authoritative source of norm and telos) are frozen into slogans that close genuine inquiry, while in other circles personal spiritual experience is granted an authority that resists all external correction. Each of these languages has a rightful role. The damage arises when any one of them claims a monopoly.

The Cohesive Tetrad proposes a different architecture. It treats Sabda as the revelatory word and source of norm and telos, Logic as disciplined reasoning that tests coherence and guards against contradiction, Qualia as the register of lived experience that refuses to let abstractions forget persons, and Mistika as the intensional spiritual discipline that calibrates intention before an ultimate horizon of accountability. These four languages are not optional embellishments. They are presented as jointly necessary for responsible judgment, with Akhlak as the surface where their convergence must leave observable traces in character and institutional practice. A decision that is logically consistent yet corrodes dignity, or that quotes scripture while normalising manipulation, or that feels subjectively elevated while producing predictable harm, fails the Tetrad.

Situated against the background of debates in philosophy of science, social epistemology, religious studies and normative traditions, and public ethics, this article develops The Cohesive Tetrad as a structured framework for truth governance rather than as a mere manifesto. Building on a set of minimal axioms centred on human dignity, integrity, coherence, non reduction and self correction, it reconstructs the internal relations between Sabda, Logic, Qualia, Mistika and Akhlak, then examines how this configuration illuminates the blind spots of data centred, rule centred and virtue centred approaches. The aim is not to replace existing theories but to offer an architecture that can host their genuine insights while explicitly naming the conditions under which they misfire.

The discussion that follows proceeds in an intentionally layered way. The next section surveys key literatures that problematise naive neutrality in science, expose the ethical limits of metric driven governance, and recover the roles of revelation, experience and spiritual discipline in various traditions. The methods section then sets out the axioms and reconstruction procedures through which the Cohesive Tetrad is rendered in a form suitable for analytic evaluation. Subsequent sections present the structural results of this reconstruction and explore their implications through cross paradigm dialogue with existing models in philosophy, theology, policy and AI governance. The conclusion returns to the practical question with which we began: what must change in our architecture of truth if we genuinely intend that the end of debate becomes the beginning of just and accountable action.

2. Literature Review

Truth governance is rarely named as such in the literature, yet many of the most influential debates in philosophy of science, social epistemology, religious studies and normative traditions and public ethics can be read as disputes about how truth claims should be authorised, constrained and corrected. Canonical narratives of scientific rationality often portrayed objectivity as a gradual purification from value, perspective and emotion. In that imagination, the ideal knower is almost a calculating spectre: fully lucid, fully detached, strangely untouched by the very realities that knowledge is supposed to illuminate. This image has power. It is also quietly perilous, because it invites institutions to treat their own procedures as if they stood above moral scrutiny.

Thomas Kuhn's analysis of scientific revolutions destabilised the view that science simply converges on truth by accumulating facts and applying neutral rules of inference. Paradigms, exemplars and disciplinary matrices shape what counts as a legitimate problem and as an

acceptable solution; rational reconstruction alone cannot fully account for why scientists switch commitments at moments of crisis (Kuhn, 1962). Quine's critique of the analytic synthetic distinction further undermined the idea that some claims are guaranteed by meaning alone, suggesting instead that our web of belief meets experience as a whole and can be adjusted at many points when confronted with recalcitrant data (Quine, 1953). Taken together, these works do not license epistemic relativism, but they do warn that appeals to pure logic or pure observation can mask deeper commitments that remain unexamined.

Social epistemologists and feminist philosophers of science have pushed this warning further. Longino, Kitcher, Fricker, Medina and others argue that knowledge practices are always socially situated, and that patterns of exclusion, silencing and distorted uptake can systematically damage the epistemic standing of certain groups (Longino, 1990; Kitcher, 2001; Fricker, 2007; Medina, 2013). The concept of epistemic injustice names situations in which someone is wronged specifically in their capacity as a knower, for example when testimony from marginalised speakers is routinely discounted, or when interpretive resources are so impoverished that their experiences cannot be properly articulated. In these accounts, objectivity is reimagined not as absence of value, but as a fragile achievement of well structured critical interaction among differently placed agents. Any framework of truth governance that ignores this dimension risks baptising its own partiality as neutrality.

At the same time, thinkers from outside the dominant analytic canon have criticised the modern tendency to treat reason as fully autonomous from questions of ultimate meaning. Polanyi insists that all knowing is personal, suffused with tacit commitments and fiduciary frameworks that cannot simply be bracketed without loss of orientation (Polanyi, 1958). Seyyed Hossein Nasr, drawing on the Islamic intellectual tradition, diagnoses a desacralisation of knowledge in which science is severed from metaphysical and ethical horizons, producing a technically powerful yet spiritually disoriented civilisation (Nasr, 1989, 1993). William James, from a different angle, treats religious experience as a serious datum, neither to be romanticised uncritically nor dismissed as mere pathology, but to be integrated into a broader account of how human beings orient themselves toward what they take to be ultimately real (James, 1902). These strands share a conviction that the attempt to sanitise rationality from all reverence and all qualitative depth is, in the end, a misdescription of how human cognition actually functions.

Within Islamic thought, the interplay between divine speech, rational reflection, experiential insight and spiritual discipline has long been treated as constitutive of the path toward truth. Al Ghazali's intellectual and spiritual itinerary famously includes a crisis of doubt regarding the sufficiency of discursive reason, followed by a renewed appreciation of reason's place when integrated within a wider journey of purification, remembrance and unveiling (Al Ghazali, 2000, 2015). Ibn Arabi and his interpreters describe a metaphysics and spiritual psychology in which the heart becomes the locus of tajalli, theophanic disclosure, provided that it is disciplined by revelation and law; they criticise both arid rationalism and undisciplined emotionalism (Ibn Arabi, 1980; Chittick, 1989). Later philosophers such as Mulla Sadra attempt a synthesis in which demonstrative reasoning, intuitive unveiling and faithful reception of Sabda (Revelatory Word, the authoritative source of norm and telos) are harmonised rather than opposed (Mulla Sadra, 2004). In these currents, one finds a lived intuition very close to the thesis of The Cohesive Tetrad: that truth speaks in multiple idioms and that each has a proper domain that must neither be absolutised nor marginalised.

In modern public ethics and governance, a different but related tension has emerged. On the one hand, evidence based policy and data driven management are promoted as ways to discipline decision making and shield it from arbitrary whims. On the other hand, critics have shown that when complex social realities are governed primarily through narrow metrics, predictable distortions arise. O'Neil documents how ostensibly neutral algorithms and scoring systems can amplify inequality, obscure accountability and cause real harm to the already vulnerable (O'Neil, 2016). Floridi and Cowls, as well as Jobin and colleagues, map ethical challenges associated with AI and digital technologies, emphasising the need for principles that go beyond efficiency and predictive performance (Floridi & Cowls, 2019; Jobin et al., 2019). In parallel, theories of justice by Rawls, Sen and Nussbaum foreground fairness, capabilities and human flourishing as criteria that cannot be reduced to any single quantitative index (Rawls, 1999; Sen, 2009; Nussbaum, 2006). The lesson is stark: governance that treats human beings primarily as variables in optimisation problems will almost inevitably collide with the demands of dignity and justice.

There is also a substantial body of work on virtue, character and akhlak that insists on the centrality of moral formation in any serious account of practical reason. In the Western canon, virtue ethicists argue that rules and consequences are not enough; what matters is the cultivation of stable dispositions that allow agents to perceive morally salient features of situations and to act accordingly. In Islamic contexts, the literature on akhlak and tazkiyah

treats virtues as the fruit of a long process of disciplining the self, guided by Sabda and embodied in concrete social practices. Across these traditions, character is both a product and a test of any supposedly rational or spiritual framework: if a doctrine reliably produces arrogance, cruelty or indifference to suffering, this is counted as evidence against its adequacy.

The Cohesive Tetrad enters this crowded and contested field with a distinctive proposal. It does not merely add yet another voice to calls for interdisciplinarity or for the integration of faith and reason. Rather, it seeks to articulate a precise architecture in which four languages of truth Sabda, Logika, Qualia and Mistika are given defined roles, ordered relations and a common surface of verification in Akhlak. The gap it addresses is therefore specific. Existing literatures acknowledge the limits of scientific neutrality, the dangers of metric fetishism, the importance of lived experience and the enduring significance of revelation and spiritual discipline. What they do not yet provide, at least not in a consolidated and operational form, is a model that shows how these dimensions can be structurally combined in a way that is non reductive, logically coherent, ethically accountable and open to cross cultural appropriation. It is this model that the present article attempts to develop and scrutinise.

3. Methods

This article employs a normative conceptual method. It does not present new empirical measurements, clinical trials or large scale datasets. Instead, it aims to reconstruct and evaluate The Cohesive Tetrad as an architecture for truth governance under a set of minimal axioms about human dignity and intellectual integrity. The method is stringent in a different way: all assumptions are stated openly, inferential moves are made transparent, and points at which the framework could be challenged are clearly identified. A reader may reject the axioms or the reconstruction, but should be able to see exactly what is being refused and with what consequences.

3.1. Minimal human dignity axioms

The first step is to formulate minimal axioms that any plausible framework of truth governance must respect if it intends to remain recognisable as both humane and intellectually responsible. The article adopts five such axioms.

1. Axiom H1: Dignity. Every person is to be treated as a bearer of irreducible dignity, not merely as a data point, resource or instrument for others' goals.

2. Axiom H2: Integrity. It is morally unacceptable to knowingly manipulate, fabricate or selectively present information in ways that predictably distort another's capacity to form honest judgment.

3. Axiom H3: Coherence. Claims that guide action should, as far as possible, be arranged into a system that avoids contradiction, respects relevant evidence and acknowledges uncertainty where it cannot be removed.

4. Axiom H4: Non reduction. No single epistemic language whether data, rules, subjective experience or spiritual insight may legitimately claim absolute jurisdiction over all questions, especially those involving human worth.

5. Axiom H5: Self correction and accountability. Any serious framework for truth governance must incorporate mechanisms by which errors, abuses and unintended harms can be recognised, admitted and corrected over time, before an audience that can hold agents to account.

The article does not attempt to derive these axioms from more primitive premises. They are proposed as a conditional floor: many philosophical, religious and humanistic traditions already implicitly affirm them when they condemn cruelty, deception, incoherence, idolatry of technique and refusal to admit error. These axioms are deliberately minimal; additional virtues or constraints, such as humility, courage or specific institutional safeguards, can certainly be added in particular contexts, but H1 to H5 capture the threshold below which any practice of truth governance becomes recognisably abusive or intellectually dishonest. A critic is entirely free to reject them, but doing so will generally entail accepting, at least in principle, practices such as instrumentalisation of persons or deliberate distortion of their epistemic environment. The argument of the article is therefore conditional: if H1 to H5 are granted, then certain structural conclusions about truth governance follow.

3.2. Internal reconstruction of The Cohesive Tetrad

The second step is an internal reconstruction of The Cohesive Tetrad manuscript under these axioms. The canonical text is rich in metaphor, narrative and epigram, which are essential for its persuasive power but not yet in a form that can be evaluated with the usual tools of analytic argument. The reconstruction proceeds through four operations.

1. Corpus delimitation. All passages in the canonical manuscript that define, characterise or operationalise Sabda, Logika, Qualia, Mistika and Akhlak are

identified and collected, including those expressed indirectly through images and aphorisms.

2. **Conceptual consolidation.** Overlapping and partially divergent descriptions are harmonised into working definitions that respect the authorial intent while eliminating redundancy. For example, Sabda is stabilised as the Revelatory Word, the authoritative source of norm and telos; Mistika as the intensional spiritual discipline that calibrates intention before an ultimate horizon; Akhlak as the observable fruit in character and practice.

3. **Relational mapping.** Explicit and implicit claims about how these elements relate to one another are extracted: for instance, that Sabda sets telos, Logika tests internal coherence, Qualia registers human cost and benefit, Mistika purifies intention, and Akhlak functions as surface verification. These relations are then rendered as a structured set of conditional statements.

4. **Formal restatement.** Where necessary, metaphorical formulations are accompanied by more literal paraphrases that preserve meaning while making inferential structure explicit, so that the resulting model can be engaged by readers who do not share the original rhetorical or spiritual background.

This reconstruction is interpretive but not arbitrary. It is constrained by fidelity to the canonical text, by axioms H1 to H5, and by the requirement that the resulting configuration be internally consistent and externally intelligible.

3.3. Typology of propositions and inferential transparency

To avoid hidden slippage between different kinds of claim, the article classifies its own statements into four functional types during drafting, even when these labels are not shown in the final prose.

- D statements (Descriptive). Claims about what The Cohesive Tetrad text says, or about the structure of the reconstructed model.

- A statements (Axiomatic). Restatements or modest elaborations of axioms H1 to H5.

- C statements (Comparative). Evaluations that situate the Tetrad alongside other frameworks in philosophy, theology or public ethics.

- E statements (Evaluative and practical). Judgments and recommendations about what should be done or avoided in light of the model, especially in governance contexts.

Substantial conclusions are drafted so that they can, in principle, be rewritten as explicit chains linking one or more A and D statements to C and E statements through recognised patterns of inference. For example, the conclusion that monolinguistic regimes of truth predictably generate specific failure modes is shown to rest on D statements about how such regimes treat Sabda, Logika, Qualia and Mistika, plus A statements about dignity, non reduction and self correction. This typology does not magically guarantee correctness, but it makes the argumentative skeleton available for scrutiny.

3.4. Cross paradigm comparison protocol

The fourth step is a cross paradigm comparison. The Tetrad is not developed in a vacuum, but in conversation with existing families of approaches. For clarity, the article groups interlocutors into four ideal types.

1. Data centred models. Technocratic and evidence based frameworks that privilege quantitative indicators, statistical significance and optimisation criteria.

2. Rule centred models. Deontological ethics, legalistic theologies and policy regimes that foreground rules, rights and duties as primary.

3. Character centred models. Traditions of virtue ethics and akhlak that focus on the formation of dispositions and the cultivation of moral perception.

4. Experience centred models. Phenomenological, existential and certain Mistikal approaches that prioritise lived immediacy, including direct religious experience.

For each ideal type, the article asks a fixed set of questions: How does this approach, explicitly or implicitly, treat the roles of Sabda, Logika, Qualia and Mistika. Does it allow any functional equivalent of Akhlak as an ongoing surface of verification?. Which of axioms H1 to H5 does it foreground, which does it risk neglecting, and with what plausible consequences?. These questions are then turned back on the Tetrad itself, to check whether the proposed architecture can incorporate genuine strengths of each type without inheriting their characteristic blind spots.

3.5. Criteria for theoretical robustness and avenues of critique

To avoid the impression that the Tetrad is insulated from criticism, the method explicitly states the criteria by which the framework can be assessed and, in principle, found wanting.

1. Internal coherence. If the reconstructed Tetrad contains unresolved contradictions, or if its own definitions of Sabda, Logika, Qualia, Mistika and Akhlak cannot be jointly satisfied, then the framework fails at the level of structure.

2. Compatibility with axioms. If it can be shown that consistent application of the Tetrad leads systematically to violations of H1 to H5, for example by licensing manipulative practices or by suppressing legitimate avenues of correction, then the framework fails at the level of normative adequacy.

3. Comparative explanatory power. If alternative models, operating under the same axioms, can account more simply and fruitfully for the same range of problems in truth governance, then the Tetrad may be regarded as unnecessarily complex or misdirected.

4. Operational clarity. If the roles of Sabda, Logika, Qualia, Mistika and Akhlak cannot be translated into procedures, questions or disciplines that can guide real deliberation in law, policy, science or religious practice, then the framework risks remaining a merely decorative schema.

By stating these criteria in advance, the method invites readers to test the Tetrad rigorously. The argument is strong if and only if the framework remains coherent and fruitful when exposed to such tests, not because it is declared beyond challenge.

3.6. Scope and limits of the method

Finally, the method acknowledges its scope and limits. The article does not attempt to prove the metaphysical truth of any particular doctrine, such as the existence of God or the ultimate authority of a specific revelation. More precisely, the framework adopts an attitude of ontological modesty. It does not seek to settle the final nature of reality as such, but to describe the ontology of the practice of truth, in which human beings as bearers of dignity make, test and enact truth claims within institutions that affect one another's lives. It proceeds on the more modest but still significant assumption that many communities already live under a sense of ultimate accountability and already treat some form of Sabda as norm and telos. The question is how, given axioms H1 to H5, such commitments should shape responsible practices of

knowing, deciding and acting. Likewise, the method does not pretend to close all empirical questions; it sketches an architecture that can later be tested and refined through case studies, simulations and institutional experiments. Within those bounds, the procedure aims to be as transparent and demanding as possible, so that agreement or disagreement with The Cohesive Tetrad can rest on clearly articulated reasons rather than on caricature or misunderstanding. Taken as a whole, this method is meant not as a shield against criticism but as a testable architecture: anyone who grants axioms H1 to H5 can follow the reconstruction, inspect each inferential step, and direct any objection to clearly identifiable points in the structure of the Tetrad.

4. Results

The reconstruction of The Cohesive Tetrad under axioms H1 to H5 yields a set of structural results rather than numerical findings. These results concern the internal configuration of the four languages of truth, the role of Akhlak as a shared surface of verification, and the predictable failure modes of regimes that attempt to govern truth monolingually. Each result is conditional. It holds if and only if the definitions and axioms already stated are granted. Within those conditions, however, the conclusions follow with a degree of inevitability that any critic must confront directly.

4.1. Structural configuration of the Tetrad

The first result is that Sabda, Logika, Qualia, Mistika and Akhlak form a structured configuration rather than a loose list of elements. Sabda is reconstructed as the Revelatory Word, the authoritative source of norm and telos that defines what ultimately counts as good, just and worthy of pursuit in a given community. Logic appears as disciplined reasoning that tests internal coherence, guards against contradiction and organises claims into a system that can be shared, criticised and revised. Qualia denotes the domain of lived experience including suffering, relief, humiliation, recognition and joy through which the effects of decisions on persons and communities become visible. Mistika refers to the intensional spiritual discipline that calibrates intention before an ultimate horizon of accountability and supplies the interior energy needed to sustain difficult but necessary commitments. Akhlak functions as the observable fruit of this configuration, the relatively stable patterns of character and practice in which claims about truth and good become testable over time.

Under this reconstruction the Tetrad is not symmetric. Sabda and Mistika stand closer to telos, Logika and Qualia closer to process and manifestation. Yet none of them can legitimately dominate the others without violating Non reduction or Self correction. Sabda without Logic risks formalism and dogmatic closure. Logic without Qualia risks abstraction insensitive to real harm. Qualia without Sabda risks emotivism and volatility. Mistika without Akhlak risks interiority that cannot be held accountable. The structural result is that, under axioms H1 to H5, any attempt to treat one language as sufficient will predictably compromise either dignity, coherence or accountability.

4.2. Domain justice and ordered roles

A second result is the emergence of what may be called domain justice. The Tetrad implies that each language of truth has a proper jurisdiction and that injustice arises when a language operates outside its mandate in a way that suppresses the others. Sabda has jurisdiction over telos: it answers the question of what life is for and which kinds of world are worth striving for. In Islamic and broader Eastern traditions this includes revealed norms and fundamental directives that cannot be reduced to human preference. Logic has jurisdiction over form: it assesses whether claims are consistent with one another and with available evidence, and whether proposed transitions from premises to conclusions are valid or at least reasonable. Qualia has jurisdiction over impact: it registers how actions and policies actually shape the texture of lives, especially those at the margins. Mistika has jurisdiction over intention: it examines why agents pursue certain ends and whether they are prepared to stand answerable before an ultimate horizon for the costs imposed on others.

Once these jurisdictions are acknowledged, certain consequences follow. A policy that is logically consistent and efficiency enhancing but that predictably humiliates or discards specific groups violates domain justice at the level of Qualia, even if its authors can supply formal proofs and appealing narratives. A spiritual experience that induces powerful feelings of certainty but leads to contempt, cruelty or indifference toward the vulnerable violates domain justice at the level of Akhlak, regardless of its phenomenological intensity. Conversely, a purely experiential protest against revealed norms or long tested disciplines that refuses to engage reasons and consequences violates domain justice at the level of Sabda and Logika. The Tetrad thus provides a principled way of saying that something has gone wrong without reducing the diagnosis to psychology, politics or taste alone.

4.3. Akhlak as shared surface of verification

A third result concerns the role of Akhlak. Under the reconstruction, Akhlak is not an optional add on nor a single virtue such as honesty. It is the name for the relatively stable pattern of character and behaviour through which the Tetrad becomes testable. If Sabda names what is proclaimed as norm and telos, Logic organises argument, Qualia registers lived impact and Mistika calibrates intention, then Akhlak is where these dimensions converge in the long run. It is the observable trajectory of a person, community or institution as they navigate real constraints and temptations.

This has two important implications. First, Akhlak becomes an epistemic category, not merely a moral one. Under axioms Dignity and Integrity, persistent patterns of manipulation, contempt, opportunism or cruelty count as counter evidence to the adequacy of a supposedly coherent and spiritually elevated framework. A doctrine that repeatedly produces such fruit cannot be regarded as epistemically successful, however intricate its logic or intense its inner experiences. Second, Akhlak functions as a locus of cross paradigm dialogue. Communities that differ in metaphysical commitments can still ask what kinds of character and practice emerge from a given configuration of Sabda, Logika, Qualia and Mistika, and can test whether these fruits satisfy minimal standards of justice and honesty. In this sense Akhlak is the point at which truth governance becomes publicly assessable.

4.4. Predicted failure modes of monolinguistic regimes

A fourth result is a typology of failure modes that follow when one language of truth attempts to govern without effective checks from the others. These patterns are familiar in practice but often misdiagnosed.

Logic centred regimes tend to privilege coherence and formal justification over dignity and lived impact. Under such regimes policies can be defended through intricate argument and may even achieve local optimisation on chosen metrics, while systematically harming those whose experiences do not fit the model. The failure mode is rationalised harm: agents feel justified because every step was argued, yet Qualia and Akhlak register corrosion and resentment. Data centred regimes show a related pattern. They optimise indicators that are easy to measure and audit, sidelining goods that resist quantification. Goodhart problems arise: once a measure becomes a target, it stops functioning as a reliable measure, and institutions begin to game metrics rather than confront reality.

Sabda centred regimes in the pejorative sense treat revealed texts as self interpreting slogans and shut down interpretive and empirical feedback. Here the failure mode is frozen normativity. Appeals to divine authority are used to insulate human readings from correction, even when Akhlak persistently signals hypocrisy or injustice. Mistika centred regimes, by contrast, absolutise interior experience. They privilege feelings of certainty, peace or elevation as final criteria, and resist external assessment. In such contexts, abuses can be hidden behind claims of special insight or calling, and victims may be pressured to reinterpret harm as a spiritual trial rather than as a violation.

Under the Tetrad, these failure modes can be redescribed in structural terms. Each involves an illegitimate annexation of domains by one language and a corresponding suppression of Akhlak as a shared surface of verification. Logic is no longer content to test consistency but quietly decides telos. Sabda is no longer content to orient purpose but attempts to close questions about implementation and impact. Mistika seeks protection from public accountability. The result is not only moral harm but epistemic distortion. Information about reality is filtered according to what protects the dominant language from embarrassment.

4.5. Conditional robustness of the Tetrad under axioms H1–H5

The final result is conditional robustness. Under axioms H1 to H5 and under the reconstructed definitions, the Tetrad exhibits a form of resilience against these failure modes. This does not mean that communities that adopt the Tetrad are guaranteed to avoid injustice or error. It means that, by design, the framework treats such outcomes as evidence against itself and supplies internal reasons to seek correction.

If a Tetrad informed policy yields outcomes in which specific groups are consistently humiliated or unheard, Qualia and Akhlak provide grounds to revisit how Sabda was interpreted and how Logic structured the decision. If spiritual practices that claim to be grounded in Mistika lead to patterns of exploitation, the very notion of calibrated intention requires that such practices be interrogated rather than defended. If data systems built under the Tetrad are shown to enable manipulation, Integrity and Self correction demand that they be reformed rather than excused as technical glitches. In each case, the framework provides conceptual tools for naming the problem as a violation of its own commitments rather than as a trivial anomaly.

The conditional nature of this robustness is crucial. Anyone who rejects axioms H1 to H5 or who denies that Sabda, Logic, Qualia, Mistika and Akhlak can be configured as described will

naturally contest the conclusions. The Tetrad does not claim to compel assent independently of such premises. What it does claim is that, once those premises are granted, attempts to govern truth monolingually will struggle to justify themselves without either contradicting the axioms or ignoring the patterns of harm and distortion that the Tetrad helps to make visible. In that sense the results of this reconstruction offer a demanding but fair basis for further dialogue and critique.

5. Discussion

The reconstructed Cohesive Tetrad presents a demanding picture of truth governance. It refuses the comforting simplifications that treat one epistemic language as sufficient, yet it also refuses the shallow eclecticism that simply piles together data, rules, experiences and spiritual claims without structure. The results sketched in the previous section suggest that, under minimal axioms of dignity, integrity, coherence, non reduction and self correction, any serious attempt to govern truth must take seriously the differentiated roles of Sabda, Logika, Qualia, Mistika and Akhlak. The purpose of this discussion is to situate that claim within broader debates, to anticipate powerful objections and to clarify what is at stake if the Tetrad is accepted or rejected.

5.1. Between naive neutrality and corrosive relativism

From the standpoint of philosophy of science and social epistemology, the Tetrad can be read as an attempt to steer between two well known distortions. On one side lies naive neutrality, the idea that objectivity is achieved by stripping inquiry of all value, perspective and qualitative depth. On this view, the less a framework acknowledges Sabda, Qualia or Mistika, the more scientific it appears. Yet, as the literatures on paradigm dependence, underdetermination and epistemic injustice have shown, such apparent neutrality often functions as a mask for local interests and unexamined commitments. On the other side lies a corrosive relativism that treats every claim about norm, experience or spiritual insight as incommensurable with every other, so that no cross critique seems possible and power quietly decides.

The Tetrad rejects both options. By assigning Sabda, Logika, Qualia and Mistika clear domains and insisting on Akhlak as a shared surface of verification, it preserves the possibility of robust criticism while acknowledging that not all languages of truth can be reduced to a single currency. Logic remains indispensable for testing coherence. Empirical investigation remains essential for tracking consequences. Yet scriptural norms, qualitative testimonies and

disciplined inner work are admitted as legitimate sources of orientation, provided that they submit to ongoing scrutiny at the level of character and practice. In this sense the Tetrad does not dilute objectivity but thickens it, tying it explicitly to the treatment of persons and to the willingness to be corrected.

5.2. Complementing and correcting existing frameworks

When read alongside data centred, rule centred and character centred models, the Tetrad functions partly as an integrator and partly as a critic. Data centred approaches rightly emphasise transparency, reproducibility and the need to ground decisions in more than intuition or rhetoric. The Tetrad affirms these concerns, yet insists that metrics must be placed under the jurisdiction of Qualia and Akhlak. Indicators are to be treated as tools, not as surrogates for the realities they measure. Rule centred approaches rightly fear arbitrariness and abuse, and therefore codify rights, duties and constraints. The Tetrad recognises this as a crucial expression of Sabda and Logika, while warning that rules that systematically fail the tests of Qualia and Akhlak lose their claim to legitimate authority, even if they remain legally enforceable.

Character centred approaches in virtue ethics and akhlak literature emphasise moral formation and perceptiveness. The Tetrad fully endorses this emphasis, since Akhlak is its own name for the fruits by which truth claims are assessed over time. Yet the Tetrad also demands that appeals to character be tied back to explicit norms, articulated reasons and honest attention to lived impact. Virtue language that is not accountable to Sabda, Logika and Qualia risks collapsing into aesthetic preference. Experience centred approaches insist, sometimes against cold institutional systems, that lived immediacy matters: pain, awe, humiliation and joy are not trivial. The Tetrad agrees, but requires that such experiences be interpreted within a grammar that guards against self deception and spiritualised harm. In each case, the Tetrad offers to host what is strongest in existing frameworks while naming the points at which they tend, under pressure, to overreach.

5.3. Resonances with Islamic and Eastern intellectual traditions

The explicit naming of Sabda and Mistika situates the Tetrad in an intellectual landscape that is not limited to Western secular discourse. Islamic theology, Sufi practice and related Eastern traditions have long treated revelation, disciplined reasoning, lived experience and spiritual purification as mutually implicated in the pursuit of truth. In that landscape, Sabda is not an optional opinion, but the speech of God that sets telos and norm. Reason is a divinely given

capacity that must be exercised, not suppressed. Experience is both a site of temptation and a site of teaching. Mistikal practice is a path of refinement that, at its best, deepens humility and concern for others.

The Tetrad resonates with these intuitions while subjecting them to structural discipline. By insisting on domain justice, it blocks attempts to use Sabda as a slogan to close all questions about interpretation and implementation. By insisting on Akhlak as verification, it blocks attempts to use Mistika as a shield against accountability. By insisting on Logika and Qualia as full members of the architecture, it gives conceptual space for both rigorous argument and serious attention to stories of harm. In this way the Tetrad can be read as an internal clarification rather than as an external imposition: it makes explicit a pattern that many practitioners already rely on tacitly when they distinguish between faithful and unfaithful uses of scripture, between genuine and counterfeit spiritual states, between piety that heals and piety that wounds.

At the same time, the Tetrad speaks in a vocabulary that can be accessed by interlocutors who do not share specific theological commitments. Dignity, integrity, coherence, non reduction and self correction are not exclusive to any one tradition. Communities that reject the metaphysical claims of Islam or other Eastern frameworks can still recognise that policies which treat persons as disposable, rely on manipulation or refuse to admit error violate standards they themselves wish to uphold. In this sense the Tetrad aspires to be interculturally intelligible. It does not demand prior agreement on all metaphysical questions, only on a modest set of axioms about how human beings ought to be treated when truth claims are made in their name.

5.4. Implications for governance, policy and AI

When translated into governance contexts, the Tetrad functions as a design principle. It asks institutions to make explicit which language of truth is being privileged at each stage of decision making and to build mechanisms that prevent that language from annexing the others. In public policy, this might mean that impact assessments are not reduced to cost benefit spreadsheets but systematically incorporate testimonies from affected communities and engage with normative frameworks that go beyond legal minimums. In regulatory oversight, it might mean that algorithmic systems are not evaluated solely based on accuracy and efficiency, but also on whether their deployment erodes or strengthens trust, agency and the capacity of citizens to contest decisions.

In the domain of AI, the Tetrad sharpens ongoing conversations about alignment and ethics. If Sabda is understood broadly as the set of normative commitments a society is unwilling to trade away, then the training objectives and reward structures of AI systems must be aligned not only with user preferences or institutional incentives, but with those deeper commitments. Logic is relevant in the design of inference mechanisms and verification tools. Qualia is relevant in the study of how AI mediated decisions are experienced by those subject to them, especially when they lack power to opt out. Mistika, in this context, can be interpreted as the disciplined reflection of developers, policymakers and users on their own intentions: why exactly are certain systems being built and deployed, and what kinds of world are they making more likely. Akhlak, finally, is the long run pattern of behaviour that emerges in organisations that rely heavily on AI: do they become more truthful, more just, more attentive to the vulnerable, or the opposite.

These implications are demanding. They push against models of governance and technology that seek quick fixes or limit ethical reflection to compliance checklists. The Tetrad does not offer an easy algorithm for solving conflicts, but it does provide a matrix of questions that make certain evasions harder. It becomes more difficult, for example, to defend a profitable but dehumanising system by appealing only to technical benchmarks, once those benchmarks are explicitly placed under the judgment of Qualia and Akhlak.

5.5. Anticipated objections and conditional resilience

A framework that aspires to shape truth governance at this level naturally invites strong objections. From one side, a strict naturalist may argue that Sabda and Mistika should have no role in serious epistemic architecture, since they introduce elements that cannot be publicly verified. From another side, a committed fideist may argue that once Sabda has spoken, the roles of Logika, Qualia and public forms of Akhlak are at most secondary. From yet another side, a pragmatist might suggest that all this talk of languages of truth obscures the more basic fact that what matters is what works in practice.

The Tetrad can respond to these objections without claiming invulnerability. To the strict naturalist, it replies that in actual human life normativity and ultimate concern do not disappear simply because one refuses to name them. They reappear as implicit teloi in policy, design and institutional culture. Ignoring Sabda and Mistika does not remove their functional equivalents, it only makes them harder to examine critically. To the fideist, the Tetrad replies that any interpretation of Sabda that systematically produces patterns of Akhlak that violate widely

acknowledged standards of justice and mercy raises questions about that interpretation rather than about the text itself, and that Logika and Qualia are among the tools by which responsible communities have always sought to avoid cruelty in the name of God. To the pragmatist, the Tetrad answers that it fully agrees that practice is crucial. Its insistence on Akhlak as verification is precisely an insistence on long term practical fruit, not on abstract purity detached from consequences.

The resilience of the Tetrad is conditional rather than absolute. It stands as long as axioms H1 to H5 are judged reasonable and as long as the reconstructed roles of Sabda, Logika, Qualia, Mistika and Akhlak are accepted as faithful to recognizable features of human moral and epistemic life. A critic who wishes to overturn the framework may therefore proceed in two main ways: by rejecting one or more of the axioms, or by offering a different configuration of the same elements that better satisfies those axioms. Either path is intellectually legitimate. What the Tetrad seeks to rule out is a more evasive move in which harms, distortions and injustices that are visible at the level of Qualia and Akhlak are dismissed as irrelevant to truth. In inviting direct and principled critique, the framework aims not to escape disagreement but to make it as honest, transparent and ethically serious as possible.

6. Conclusion

The argument of this article began from a simple but disquieting observation. Contemporary institutions across science, religion, policy and technology deploy increasingly sophisticated procedures to generate and justify truth claims, yet the trust that ought to accompany such claims is often fragile or collapsing. Technical refinements have not prevented predictable harms. Appeals to logic, data, scripture or experience, taken in isolation, have not ensured that those who are least protected by power are also those most carefully listened to. The central hypothesis of The Cohesive Tetrad is that this failure is not only a matter of implementation but of architecture, and that any serious attempt to repair trust must address how truth itself is being governed.

Under a set of minimal axioms about dignity, integrity, coherence, non reduction and self correction, the reconstruction presented here yields a precise configuration of four languages of truth and one shared surface of verification. Sabda functions as the Revelatory Word and source of norm and telos, Logic as disciplined reasoning that guards coherence, Qualia as the register of lived experience through which impact on persons becomes visible, Mistika as the intensional spiritual discipline that calibrates intention before an ultimate horizon of

accountability, and Akhlak as the relatively stable pattern of character and practice in which these dimensions converge. This configuration is not a decorative schema. It generates concrete criteria for diagnosing distortions when any language annexes the others or when Akhlak fails to manifest fruits that satisfy the very axioms communities claim to honour.

On this basis the Cohesive Tetrad offers what may be called a conditional gold standard for truth governance. Conditional, because every conclusion explicitly depends on accepting the axioms H1 to H5 and the reconstructed roles of Sabda, Logika, Qualia, Mistika and Akhlak. Gold standard, because within those conditions attempts to govern truth monolingually or to treat harms to dignity as irrelevant to epistemic assessment face a high and visible burden of justification. The framework does not pretend to be beyond criticism, but it does require that criticism be honest about which axioms it rejects or which structural alternatives it proposes, and what moral and epistemic costs follow from those moves. In this sense the Tetrad does not close debate, it raises the stakes of debate.

The discussion has also suggested that the Tetrad can serve as a bridge between intellectual worlds that are often held apart. It resonates with Islamic and Eastern traditions that insist on the interplay of revelation, reason, experience and spiritual purification, yet it speaks in a vocabulary that can be engaged by secular philosophy of science and contemporary ethics. It takes seriously the concerns of data centred governance, rule centred legality and character centred ethics, yet it resists their respective temptations to absolutise metrics, text or interiority. Its most demanding claim is that any architecture of truth that cannot face sustained questioning at the level of Akhlak, where character and institutional behaviour are visible to those most at risk, is epistemically incomplete, whatever its formal elegance.

This article has been deliberately limited to conceptual reconstruction and structural analysis. It has not attempted to provide detailed case studies, formal models or empirical measurements, although it has hinted at how such work might proceed in policy, law and AI governance. That limitation is not a defect but an opening. If the Tetrad is to move from manuscript to practice, future research will need to translate its elements into operational protocols for deliberation, to test its predictions about failure modes in real institutions, and to explore how different traditions can appropriate and adapt its structure without erasing their distinct voices. The central claim is that such work is worth doing. If we take seriously both the fragility of trust in our present arrangements and the non negotiable dignity of those whose lives are shaped by institutional truth claims, then an architecture that makes Sabda, Logika, Qualia, Mistika and Akhlak jointly answerable to that dignity is not a luxury. It is a requirement for any community

that wishes to say, without irony, that the end of debate really can become the beginning of just and accountable action.

Acknowledgments

References

Al-Ghazali, A. H. M. (2000). *Deliverance from error* (R. McCarthy, Trans.). Fons Vitae.

Al-Ghazali, A. H. M. (2015). *The revival of the religious sciences* (Ihya ulum al-din, selected volumes). Islamic Texts Society.

Chittick, W. C. (1989). *The Sufi path of knowledge: Ibn al-Arabi's metaphysics of imagination*. State University of New York Press.

Floridi, L., & Cowls, J. (2019). A unified framework of five principles for AI in society. *Harvard Data Science Review, 1*(1).

Fricker, M. (2007). *Epistemic injustice: Power and the ethics of knowing*. Oxford University Press.

Ibn Arabi, M. (1980). *The bezels of wisdom* (R. W. J. Austin, Trans.). Paulist Press.

James, W. (1902). *The varieties of religious experience: A study in human nature*. Longmans, Green and Co.

Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nature Machine Intelligence, 1*(9), 389–399.

Kitcher, P. (2001). *Science, truth, and democracy*. Oxford University Press.

Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. University of Chicago Press.

Longino, H. E. (1990). *Science as social knowledge: Values and objectivity in scientific inquiry*. Princeton University Press.

Medina, J. (2013). *The epistemology of resistance: Gender and racial oppression, epistemic injustice, and resistant imaginations*. Oxford University Press.

Mulla Sadra, S. (2004). *The elixir of the gnostics* (W. C. Chittick, Trans.). Brigham Young University Press.

Mutaqin, A. Z. (2025). *The Cohesive Tetrad: Jalan Menuju Kebenaran*. OSF Preprints. https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/D5S7V

Nasr, S. H. (1989). *Knowledge and the sacred*. State University of New York Press.

Nasr, S. H. (1993). *The need for a sacred science*. State University of New York Press.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2006). *Frontiers of justice: Disability, nationality, species membership*. Harvard University Press.

O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Crown.

Polanyi, M. (1958). *Personal knowledge: Towards a post-critical philosophy*. University of Chicago Press.

Quine, W. V. O. (1953). From a logical point of view. Harvard University Press.

Rawls, J. (1999). *A theory of justice* (Rev. ed.). Harvard University Press.

Sen, A. (2009). *The idea of justice*. Harvard University Press.