



CREDONICS: A MANIFESTO FOR THE PHILOSOPHY OF CIVILITY AND WORLD-MAKING

by AREF ALI NAYED

CREDONICS: A MANIFESTO FOR
THE PHILOSOPHY OF CIVILITY
AND WORLD-MAKING

by AREF ALI NAYED

Table of Contents

Abstract	1
Part I:	
The Crisis of Meaning and the Search for a New Science	2
Part II:	
The Credonic Turn	7
Part III:	
The Fourfold of Making	14
Part IV:	
Civility as Ethical Regulation	21
Part V:	
Applications and Horizons	28
Conclusion:	
The Credonic Renaissance	34
References	35

Credonics: A Manifesto for the Philosophy of Civility and World-Making

by AREF ALI NAYED

NOVEMBER 6, 2025

Abstract

The following work inaugurates a new philosophical discipline—**Credonics**—as a systematic study of cultural inheritance and meaning-generation. Moving beyond the failures of *memetics* and the fragmentation of civilizational theory, Credonics treats *credos*—clusters of presuppositions, assumptions, and lived commitments—as the genotypic foundations of human culture. Through these credos, humanity continuously engages in *sense-making*, *meaning-making*, *narrative-making*, and *world-making*. The five core parts of *the Credonics Manifesto*:

1. The Foundations of Credonics
2. The Credonic Turn
3. The Fourfold of Making
4. Civility as Ethical Regulation
5. Applications and Horizons

Part I:

The Crisis of Meaning and the Search for a New Science

1. The Exhaustion of Memetics

In the late twentieth century, *memetics* arose as an ambitious attempt to provide a Darwinian framework for cultural transmission. Richard Dawkins, in *The Selfish Gene* (1976), coined the term *meme* to denote a cultural unit of inheritance—an analogue to the biological gene—capable of replication, variation, and selection. Susan Blackmore, Daniel Dennett, and others extended the idea, suggesting that memes are the building blocks of consciousness, religion, and civilization.

Yet, within decades, memetics collapsed under its own vagueness. The term *meme* drifted into the trivial—referring to viral images, slogans, or jokes. What began as a proposed science of culture ended as a digital slang for trend. As critics such as Mary Midgley and Robert Aunger pointed out, the fundamental defect lay in the *absence of definable genotypes*: memes lacked a clear ontological status or mechanism of transmission. Were they ideas, behaviors, neural configurations, or linguistic artifacts? The theory could not decide.

What memetics glimpsed but could not grasp was that *culture does not transmit discrete packets of information*. It transmits **fields of presupposition**—deeply embedded, socially shared, yet dynamically enacted constellations of belief, value, and interpretation. Culture is not a mere vehicle for memes; it is a living *organon* of meaning. It inherits not contents, but **conditions of intelligibility**. What moves from one generation to another is not a meme, but a *mode of questioning*, a *logic of assumption*—what I call a **credo**.

In that sense, memetics died of superficiality. It mistook the *phenotype* (the expression of ideas in observable forms) for the *genotype* (the structures that make such expressions possible). It treated human civilization as a repository of detachable slogans rather than as a network of deep, interlocking commitments. *Credonics* arises to restore depth—to locate the true units of cultural inheritance in the **presuppositional structures** that make both thought and action possible.

2. The Human Condition as Meaning-Making

Viktor Frankl, the founder of logotherapy, once wrote that “man's main concern is not to gain pleasure or to avoid pain but rather to see a meaning in his life.” His *Man's Search for Meaning* (1946) established meaning as the existential center of human life. Yet, as profound as this insight was, it still spoke of **searching**—as though meaning were a preexisting object to be found, like a lost coin or hidden truth.

The twenty-first century demands a more radical hermeneutic: **human beings do not merely search for meaning—they make meaning**. Meaning is neither given nor discovered; it is **produced** through our engagements, interpretations, and acts of world-construction. This marks the transition from an *existential* to an *operational* anthropology.

The notion of *meaning-making* has been explored in various disciplines—psychology, education, communication—but rarely has it been recognized as a *fundamental ontological activity*. Jerome Bruner's *Acts of Meaning* (1990) insisted that human cognition is narrative and constructive. Jack Mezirow's *Transformative Learning Theory* (1991) described how adults revise their “frames of reference” through critical reflection. John Vervaeke's *Awakening from the Meaning Crisis* (2019–) has traced the historical erosion of meaning-systems in the West, emphasizing the need for integrated cognition. Yet none of these approaches reach the generative depth of the *presuppositional base*—the level at which meaning-making begins.

This is where *Credonics* intervenes. Meaning-making, from a credonic standpoint, is the **phenotypic expression** of deeper *credos*—clusters of presumptions (unarticulated), assumptions (articulated), and presuppositions (structural). The *credo* is the cultural genotype; meaning-

making is its visible unfolding in thought, art, law, ritual, and technology. Civilizations differ not simply by their beliefs, but by their **presuppositional architectures**—their ways of structuring meaning and possibility. To change a civilization, one must alter its credos.

3. The Poverty of Mechanistic Civilizational Theories

Twentieth-century philosophy of civilization sought to explain cultural dynamics through cycles, systems, and functions. Oswald Spengler's *Decline of the West* (1918–22) imagined civilizations as living organisms, each with a birth, bloom, and decay. Arnold Toynbee's *A Study of History* (1934–61) cast civilizations as collective responses to challenge. Pitirim Sorokin traced pendular swings between “ideational” and “sensate” value systems. Though rich in scope, these models shared a mechanistic fallacy: they *described* civilizations but did not *understand* how meaning operates within them.

Later theorists—Samuel Huntington, Joseph Tainter, Jared Diamond—reduced civilizations to geopolitics, complexity costs, or environmental constraints. The *soul* of civilization—its inner logic of belief, valuation, and world-interpretation—was left unthematized. Civilization was studied as a *thing*, not as an *act*.

Yet civilization, in its deepest sense, is not a cycle or a system. It is a **continuous act of world-making**. It is what happens when human beings collectively interpret reality, impose form upon chaos, and organize meaning through institutions, arts, laws, and symbols. Civilization is the **grand operational artifact** of humanity—the cumulative outcome of interpretive engagements extended through time.

What has been missing from civilizational theory is precisely what *Credonics* offers: a *logic of interpretation* that accounts for how societies make, transmit, and revise their fundamental presuppositions. Without this, theories of civilization are like biology without genetics: descriptive but not explanatory.

4. Toward a Science of Cultural Inheritance

Every act of reading, judging, building, or governing presupposes a base of assumptions—what R. G. Collingwood called *absolute presuppositions* in his *Essay on Metaphysics* (1940). Collingwood showed that presuppositions are not mere propositions but the **conditions of intelligibility** for any thought or inquiry. They are neither true nor false; they are what make truth and falsity possible. “Every statement,” he wrote, “stands within a web of presuppositions; without these, no question can arise and no answer can be given.”

Jaakko Hintikka, later, in *Inquiry as Inquiry* (1999), extended this into a formal *interrogative model of inquiry*: knowledge grows through structured questioning guided by implicit presuppositions. Each field of knowledge—science, theology, politics—operates within a *question-space* defined by what can and cannot be asked. These spaces are governed by what we might now call *credos*.

From this synthesis emerges the central hypothesis of Credonics:

Cultural transmission is the transmission of presuppositional clusters that govern question-spaces and thus generate meaning, action, and world-formation.

Credonics, therefore, is the **science of credos**—of how presuppositions are inherited, transformed, articulated, and operationalized across generations and civilizations. It is the missing genetic science of culture, a kind of *metaphysical genetics*.

Unlike memetics, which sought to map the propagation of content, Credonics studies the **architecture of intelligibility** itself: how civilizations think, what they deem meaningful, and how they alter their thinking through interpretation. It replaces the evolutionary metaphor of competition with the hermeneutical metaphor of *engagement*.

5. The Threshold of Civility

If Credonics studies how civilizations make meaning, it must also study how they *coexist*. The great danger of presuppositional systems is their

absolutism: credos can harden into dogma, exclude alternatives, and justify domination. History is replete with the violence of unexamined certainties. The antidote is **civility**—the discipline of interpretive humility, the art of engaging without erasing.

Civility is not mere politeness; it is the *hermeneutical ethics* of living together in shared meaning. It allows multiple credos to coexist, interact, and even enrich one another through dialogue. Where memetics imagined competition and survival, civility imagines cooperation and transformation. Civilization itself is possible only where civility regulates the field of credos.

Thus, Credonics and Civility are inseparable:

- **Credonics** provides the ontology and dynamics of meaning.
- **Civility** provides its ethics and governance.

Conclusion of Part I

Humanity stands amid a crisis of meaning—its institutions hollowed by relativism, its technologies racing beyond comprehension. The tools of the old sciences—memetics, sociology, political theory—cannot restore coherence because they neglect the presuppositional foundations of thought itself. The time has come for a **new science of inheritance**—one that recognizes that we live, act, and build not merely from ideas, but from **credos**.

Every civilization is a field of presuppositions in motion. Every reform is a reconfiguration of assumptions. Every encounter between cultures is a meeting between credos. To study these credos systematically, to understand how they arise, change, and converge, is to enter the **Credonic Age**—an age where humanity learns to govern its own meaning-making.

Part II:

The Credonic Turn

1. From Presuppositions to Credos

Every act of human understanding is grounded in *presuppositions*—those silent, unspoken conditions that make thinking, judging, and acting possible. To presuppose is not to infer but to stand upon; it is to operate within a field of taken-for-granted intelligibility. As R. G. Collingwood wrote in *An Essay on Metaphysics* (1940), “Every proposition has a presupposition; every question has a presupposition; and without presuppositions, neither propositions nor questions could arise.”

Collingwood’s insight was epochal. It revealed that beneath every statement lies a structure of unquestioned assumptions, and beneath every culture lies a structure of lived intelligibility. Yet, Collingwood’s model remained static: he envisioned presuppositions as absolute within a civilization—fixed, tightly correlated, and self-contained. In practice, however, human life unfolds not in airtight systems but in *fields of variation*—dynamic, overlapping clusters of presuppositions that evolve, merge, or fragment over time.

These living clusters—comprising *presuppositions*, *presumptions*, and *assumptions*—are what we call **Credos**. A *credo* is not merely a belief but a **cluster of operative pre-understandings** that condition how a civilization asks, interprets, and makes. A *credo* does not only say *what* is believed; it configures *how belief itself operates*—the very grammar of understanding.

Thus, *Credonics* begins where Collingwood stopped: by transforming the metaphysical study of presuppositions into a **dynamic science of**

cultural inheritance. Presuppositions are not static axioms; they are **living operational genotypes**—the cultural DNA through which societies generate meaning, identity, and world.

2. The Sourcing Base and the Logic of Engagement

In *Operational Hermeneutics*, I described every interpretive act as launched from a *sourcing base*—the ensemble of beliefs, dispositions, and presuppositions that shape how one encounters a *writ* or any operational artifact. This sourcing base is never empty, and never neutral. It is a “field of readiness,” a preconfigured matrix through which all engagement occurs.

The sourcing base functions as the **genetic code** of interpretation. Its deepest layers are unarticulated—instinctive, inherited presumptions that I called *presumptions*. When such structures rise to articulation, they become *assumptions*. When made explicit and critically examined, they are *presuppositions*. Together they form a **hierarchical ecology of intelligibility**.

Through this structure, interpretation becomes a generative process:

1. **Presumptions:** the implicit horizon of meaning—absorbed through socialization, culture, ritual, and tacit practice.
2. **Assumptions:** the articulated but unexamined beliefs that guide everyday reasoning and decision.
3. **Presuppositions:** the explicit, critically reflectable conditions that underlie questions and judgments.

At any moment, interpretation operates through these levels simultaneously. The act of reading a sacred text, designing a technology, or founding a polity presupposes not only propositions but *pre-engagements*—an entire matrix of intelligibility. This is the **sourcing base**, and it is the operational site of Credonics.

3. Presuppositional Clusters as Cultural Genotypes

In biological genetics, the gene is a stable structure of code that, in interaction with environment, produces the organism’s phenotype. In cultural hermeneutics, the analogical unit is the *credo*. Each *credo* is a **cluster of presuppositions** that functions as a *cultural genotype*, producing the

phenotypes of meaning, narrative, and institution through its engagement with the lived environment—the “field of operations.”

3.1. Structure of the Credo

A credo has:

- **A Core Set** of basic presuppositions—relatively constant, resilient, and foundational (e.g., “The world is intelligible,” “Human life has purpose,” “Truth is attainable”).
- **Peripheral Sets** of secondary presumptions—context-sensitive, adaptive, and modifiable (e.g., “Reason is Western,” “Markets self-regulate,” “Revelation ends with a prophet”).
- **Articulations and Expressions** that manifest as doctrines, norms, symbols, and narratives (phenotypes).

3.2. Function of the Credo

A credo:

- Determines *what counts as a valid question* and *what counts as an answer*.
- Structures the *field of possibility* within which sense-making occurs.
- Regulates the *valuation* of meaning: what is sacred, rational, or beautiful.
- Evolves by *mutation*, *recombination*, or *translation* across cultural contacts.

Civilizations thus inherit and modify credos as living structures. To study them is to read the *hermeneutical genome* of humanity.

4. The Dynamics of Change in Credos

Presuppositional clusters are not immutable. They evolve through identifiable mechanisms of transformation—each corresponding to a different mode of cultural change.

4.1. Spontaneous Adjustment

When internal tensions emerge within a cluster (e.g., between reason and revelation, freedom and order), equilibrium is sought through the

ejection or reinterpretation of one or more presumptions. Such spontaneous adjustments occur organically and often unconsciously.

4.2. Reflexive Transformation

When presumptions become articulated as assumptions and subjected to critical reflection, deliberate change occurs. This corresponds to *philosophical, scientific, or theological* revolutions—moments when a civilization becomes conscious of its own credos and reconfigures them.

4.3. Cross-Engagement and Transmission

When two interpretive endeavors interact—through trade, dialogue, conquest, or media—presuppositions can be *copied, translated, or hybridized*. This produces new hybrid credos that often generate civilizational renaissances or crises.

4.4. Deliberate Engineering

In education, propaganda, and institutional reform, credos can be intentionally modified—just as genetic engineering alters DNA. “Pre-emptive sourcing,” as I described in *Operational Hermeneutics*, operates by *ingraining the right presuppositions in future interpreters or warning against bad interpretations*.

This is the level at which **Credonic Governance** becomes possible: the deliberate cultivation of interpretive ecologies through ethical and pedagogical design.

5. The Role of Questions: From Collingwood to Hintikka

Collingwood’s *logic of question and answer* was the first to reveal that thought is not a sequence of propositions but an engagement of interrogatives. A proposition, he argued, is an *answer to a question*, and without a question, the proposition is meaningless. Every culture, therefore, defines its own *question-space*—its repertoire of what may or may not be asked.

Jaakko Hintikka extended this into a formal model of scientific inquiry. In his *interrogative model*, knowledge grows through *strategic questioning* constrained by prior presuppositions. Hintikka replaced the static ideal

of knowledge with a dynamic process of questioning within logical game-spaces.

The convergence of Collingwood and Hintikka underlies the **Credonic logic of inheritance**:

A civilization's creativity depends on the breadth and openness of its question-space. Its decline begins when its presuppositions harden and its questions can no longer evolve.

Thus, the vitality of a culture is proportional to the *elasticity of its credos*—its capacity to generate new, legitimate questions. Civilizational renewal, in Credonic terms, is the reopening of closed question-spaces through reflexive examination of presuppositions.

6. The Hermeneutical Topology of Credos

The relationship among presumptions, assumptions, and presuppositions can be visualized as a *living topology* rather than a rigid hierarchy.

- At the base lies a relatively constant cluster of *core presumptions*, resilient yet historically shaped.
- Above it hover more dynamic and volatile presumptions that shift with social, political, or psychological forces.
- Emerging from these are *assumptions*, which can be made explicit and contested.
- Together they constitute the interpretive “atmosphere” from which meaning arises.

Like a swarm of bees around a hive, these presumptions hover, collide, and realign—producing an ever-changing pattern of collective intelligibility.⁶

When a basic presupposition changes—such as from “Being is created” to “Being is emergent”—a cascade of transformations follows across theology, ethics, aesthetics, and science. Each shift propagates through the cultural genome, altering the civilization's morphology. *Credonics* provides the conceptual tools for mapping such propagation across history.

7. Credos as the Engines of Meaning and Civilization

Where memetics studied the *replication* of content, Credonics studies the *generation* of meaning. Where civilizational theory tracked external morphology, Credonics studies internal vitality.

A civilization lives so long as its credos remain **operationally generative**—capable of producing new meanings, institutions, and worlds. When its credos collapse into rigidity, it enters decline not by invasion but by **inertia of meaning**. Renewal arises when new credos emerge from within or are assimilated through encounter.

Thus, Credonics unites metaphysics, hermeneutics, and sociology into a single science of cultural vitality. It identifies in the dynamics of presuppositions the *true organon* of civilization—the grammar of world-making itself.

8. Toward a Credonic Science

Credonics therefore calls for a *systematic discipline*—analogous to genetics in biology or semiotics in linguistics—devoted to mapping, analyzing, and ethically guiding the evolution of presuppositional structures across civilizations.

Its aims include:

1. **Analytical Mapping** – Identifying and classifying the credos of historical and contemporary cultures.
2. **Hermeneutical Modeling** – Understanding the internal logics and tensions among presuppositions.
3. **Ethical Evaluation** – Assessing the civility of credos—their openness to dialogue and capacity for coexistence.
4. **Operational Application** – Guiding education, governance, and AI design toward reflexive, self-aware meaning-making.

In short, Credonics transforms Collingwood's metaphysical archaeology into a *hermeneutical genetics of civilization*—an experimental science of how we make, inherit, and reform meaning in a plural world.

Conclusion of Part II

The *Credonic Turn* represents a decisive shift in the understanding of culture:

- From contents to conditions,
- From propositions to presuppositions,
- From imitation to interpretation,
- From evolution to engagement.

Human civilizations are not accidental aggregates of memes but purposeful **ecosystems of credos**. Each credo is a generative grammar through which humanity continuously interprets, acts, and builds. Understanding this grammar is the precondition for restoring meaning to our age.

Part III:

The Fourfold of Making

1. The Human Vocation as Making

To be human is to make. We make tools, institutions, languages, and stories—but beneath all this, we make *sense*. From Aristotle's *poiesis* to Heidegger's *Weltbildung*, making is not merely a mechanical act but the very expression of rational life. Civilization itself is a sustained project of making—a collective poiesis that turns chaos into cosmos, mere existence into meaningful dwelling.

The contemporary sciences of culture—anthropology, psychology, communication—have studied fragments of this process, but seldom the unity of its form. *Credonics* proposes a comprehensive framework: all human civilization unfolds through **four interrelated modes of making**:

Sense-making, the organization of perception and experience;

Meaning-making, the integration of experience into intelligible and value-laden coherence;

Narrative-making, the temporal and social articulation of meaning;
and

World-making, the constructive projection of meaning into institutions, artifacts, and civilizations.

Together, these constitute the **Fourfold of Making**—the operational manifestation of *Credos* in the world.

2. Sense-Making: The First Act of Engagement

Karl Weick defined *sense-making* as “the ongoing retrospective development of plausible images that rationalize what people are doing.” For him, organizations survive by continuously reinterpreting ambiguous environments into manageable frames. Yet, Weick’s insight extends beyond management: *sense-making is the primal hermeneutic act*—the transformation of sensation into significance.

In the Credonic framework, sense-making corresponds to the **activation of the sourcing base**. When a human or a community encounters a situation, it does not face a raw world but an already *filtered* one. Presumptions—those unarticulated layers of the credo—organize what counts as salient, what seems strange, what feels familiar. Sense-making is thus *operational selection*: the process by which a field of possibilities is reduced into patterns that can be engaged.

Sense-making is not individual but **intersubjective**. Shared credos determine what entire communities take for granted. A medieval craftsman, a modern engineer, and an AI researcher live in different perceptual ecologies because their credos define distinct horizons of sense.

In this way, **sense-making is the phenomenology of the credo**—its immediate expression as pattern recognition, attention, and intelligibility. It is the first phenotype of cultural inheritance: the way a civilization sees.

3. Meaning-Making: Integration and Transformation

If sense-making organizes perception, *meaning-making* integrates experience into a coherent world. Viktor Frankl saw this as humanity’s deepest need, the existential struggle to affirm significance amidst suffering. Jerome Bruner expanded it into the cognitive and linguistic domain, arguing that human thought is fundamentally *narrative*—we interpret, rather than record, reality.

For Credonics, meaning-making is the **interpretive metabolism** of the credo. It is how presuppositional clusters generate new patterns of understanding when confronted with novelty. When sense-making encounters disruption—an event that does not fit existing patterns—the

credo activates processes of reinterpretation. New assumptions are formed, new analogies drawn, new articulations born.

Meaning-making thus involves both **assimilation** and **accommodation**:

- **Assimilation** integrates new data into existing credos.
- **Accommodation** transforms credos themselves to integrate the new.

Jack Mezirow called such transformation “perspective transformation”—a reorganization of one’s meaning structures through reflection and dialogue. Credonics generalizes this at the civilizational level: meaning-making is how civilizations transform their own presuppositions in response to the living world.

Hence, meaning-making is not passive cognition but **creative reconfiguration**. It is where hermeneutics meets invention, and where new worlds begin to germinate.

4. Narrative-Making: The Temporal Articulation of Meaning

Meaning, if it is to endure, must take form in **narrative**. Paul Ricoeur taught that “time becomes human to the extent that it is articulated through narrative.” Narratives weave heterogeneous elements—actions, intentions, events—into an intelligible plot, creating continuity out of contingency.

For Credonics, *narrative-making* is the temporal and social **expression of the credo**. It is how credos communicate, transmit, and legitimate themselves across generations. Narratives are not mere stories—they are **civilizational interfaces** that mediate between presuppositional depth and historical surface.

Through narrative-making:

- Civilizations **remember** (collective memory).
- They **justify** (moral and political legitimacy).
- They **project** (visions of future possibility).

Hayden White demonstrated that even historical discourse is shaped by emplotment—by the narrative form through which events are configured. In the same way, every civilization tells its story: the Enlightenment as

progress, Islam as mercy, Confucianism as harmony, the modern West as innovation. Each is a *narrative phenotype* of its underlying credos.

Narratives are the vehicles through which credos reproduce themselves. They are **memetic shells with credonic cores**—transmissible forms carrying deeper presuppositional structures. This is why revolutions often begin with new stories, not new tools: narratives rearrange the temporal grammar of meaning, setting new arcs of destiny.

When narrative coherence collapses—when people can no longer tell a shared story—the civilization enters fragmentation. Meaning disintegrates, and sense-making itself becomes erratic. Rebuilding civilization thus begins with **re-narration**—the deliberate renewal of shared stories that reflect transformed credos.

5. World-Making: The Ontological Projection of Meaning

Nelson Goodman's *Ways of Worldmaking* (1978) introduced a radical thesis: worlds are **made** by human systems of description, classification, and symbolization. Hannah Arendt, in *The Human Condition* (1958), likewise saw the *vita activa*—labor, work, and action—as the human mode of “world-building.” Civilization is the space of permanence humans erect amidst the flux of nature.

Credonics interprets these insights through its operational lens. **World-making** is the culmination of sense, meaning, and narrative into durable form. It is where credos become **operative artifacts**: cities, laws, technologies, institutions, works of art, rituals, and constitutions. Every cathedral, constitution, and algorithm is a **world-making act**—an operational expression of a credo.

5.1. Operational Ontology

World-making is not merely symbolic but ontological: it changes the structure of what exists-for-us. When a society builds a temple, it does not only express belief—it reorganizes space, time, and behavior around a sacred axis. When it develops digital infrastructures, it alters cognition and temporality.

Each world is thus a **hermeneutical habitat**, a domain where presuppositions take material shape. Civilization is not a passive environment but an ongoing *construction site of intelligibility*.

5.2. The Continuity of Making

This making is never finished. As long as humans act, the world remains under construction. Goodman was right to speak of “*ways of worldmaking*”—in plural—because multiple credos generate multiple worlds. Yet, as Arendt insisted, such plurality requires **civility**: a public realm where diverse acts of making coexist without mutual erasure.

Thus, world-making depends on both **technical creativity** and **ethical governance**. The former builds; the latter sustains.

6. The Fourfold as a Hermeneutical Ecology

The Fourfold of Making is not a sequence but an ecology. Each mode feeds and corrects the others:

Mode	Function	Dominant Operation	Pathology if Isolated
Sense-Making	Perceptual ordering	Selection	Myopia: rigid perception, dogmatic filtering
Meaning-Making	Conceptual integration	Interpretation	Relativism: unanchored speculation
Narrative-Making	Temporal and social articulation	Emplotment	Mythomania: ideological totalization
World-Making	Ontological projection	Construction	Technocracy: dehumanized instrumentalism

Healthy civilizations maintain a **dynamic balance** among these. When one dominates—when technocratic world-making outruns narrative coherence, or when ideological storytelling suppresses sense-making—civilization degenerates. Credonics, as a science, provides the diagnostic tools to map and correct such imbalances.

7. The Creative Feedback Loop

The Fourfold also forms a recursive loop of creativity:

1. **Sense-Making** perceives anomalies.
2. **Meaning-Making** interprets and assimilates them.
3. **Narrative-Making** integrates them into story and identity.
4. **World-Making** materializes them into new institutions and artifacts.

These new artifacts, in turn, transform the conditions of future sense-making—closing the loop. Civilization thus functions as a **self-revising hermeneutical system**, continually remaking its world in light of its own products.

This recursive structure unites the humanities and sciences, art and technology, religion and politics under a single operational schema of making. It is the grammar of human becoming.

8. Toward a Unified Theory of Human Making

The Fourfold of Making also reinterprets historical and philosophical traditions:

- Aristotle's *theoria*, *praxis*, and *poiesis* correspond to the deep roots of meaning, action, and creation.
- Kant's schemata of imagination anticipated the cognitive infrastructure of sense-making.
- Dewey's pragmatism and Peirce's semiotics saw meaning as enacted habit.
- Goodman and Arendt modernized this into symbolic and material world-building.

Credonics integrates these into a single operational ontology. It proposes that all acts of understanding, valuation, and production are expressions of *Credonic energy*—the force of belief as world-making. This makes *Credonics* not just a philosophy but a **unified human science**: an anthropology, a semiotics, and a metaphysics of making.

9. The Civility of Making

All making is relational. To make meaning in isolation is to build solipsistic worlds. To make meaning together is to practice **civility**—the ethical art of shared world-making. Civility maintains the permeability between credos, preventing the absolutization of any single horizon. It is the condition for plural sense, mutual meaning, shared narrative, and common world.

Civility is, therefore, the *fifth* and silent member of the Fourfold—the ethical field within which making remains humane. Without civility, the Fourfold collapses into domination: sense becomes surveillance, meaning becomes manipulation, narrative becomes propaganda, world-making becomes empire.

Conclusion of Part III

The Fourfold of Making describes the operational life of credos. It is the grammar through which human beings and civilizations unfold. Through sense-making, they perceive; through meaning-making, they interpret; through narrative-making, they remember and project; through world-making, they build and sustain.

Each mode is both a gift and a responsibility. Together, they form the living heart of civilization—the ongoing work of interpreting existence into a shared, inhabitable world.

Part IV:

Civility as Ethical Regulation

1. The Need for a Philosophy of Civility

Philosophers of civilization—from Spengler and Toynbee to Sorokin and Huntington—sought to explain the rise and fall of cultures. Their visions were grand but incomplete: they studied **civilization as outcome**, not **civility as operation**. Civilization was measured by material splendor or systemic complexity, not by the ethical quality of its engagements.

Yet, civilization is not a static entity; it is a *verb*. It is the ongoing act of making a world livable and meaningful together. At the heart of this act lies **civility**—the discipline of coexistence, the moral art of sharing a world without annihilating difference.

In every age of fragmentation, civility becomes the missing virtue. Today, as digital networks amplify tribalism, and ideological walls divide humanity into algorithmic echo chambers, the call for a *Philosophy of Civility* is not nostalgic but urgent. Without civility, the very possibility of sense, meaning, and world-making collapses.

If Credonics is the science of how cultures generate meaning, *Civility* is its ethical regulator—the principle that ensures such generation remains open, plural, and humane.

2. From Civilization to Civility

The distinction between *civilization* and *civility* is ancient but often blurred. The Latin *civilitas* originally referred to the manners, virtues, and public

ethos required for life in the *civitas*—the city. Cicero’s *De Officiis* described *civilitas* as the balance between firmness and gentleness, the moderation that allows citizens to live together in justice.

In the Enlightenment, “civilization” became abstract: a measure of technological advancement or refinement of customs. But as Norbert Elias showed in *The Civilizing Process*, civilization was less about progress than about **self-regulation**—the internalization of norms that restrain violence and enable sociability.

Albert Schweitzer deepened this insight in *The Philosophy of Civilization* (1923), defining civilization as “the sum of all progress toward the spiritual perfecting of the individual and toward the social ideal of progress.” For Schweitzer, the essence of civilization was *ethics*, not technology: “True civilization,” he wrote, “is not the product of the intellect, but of the moral sense.”

Malek Bennabi, in *Les conditions de la renaissance* (1948), rearticulated this for the Muslim world: civilization arises when man, soil, and time are unified under the force of an *idea*. Without an ethical and spiritual renewal of ideas, material development degenerates into decay.

Thus, from Cicero to Bennabi, from Elias to Schweitzer, a single thread persists: civilization depends on civility. What is needed now is to make this insight systematic—to transform civility from an ethical sentiment into a **hermeneutical principle**. That is the project of Credonics.

3. Civility as the Ethics of Interpretation

In Credonic terms, civility is the **governance of interpretive engagement**. Every act of sense-making and meaning-making occurs in a field already occupied by others: other interpreters, other credos, other worlds. Civility regulates this crowded field, ensuring that interpretation remains dialogical rather than destructive.

Civility thus performs three essential functions:

1. **Recognition** – acknowledging the legitimacy of other question-spaces.

2. **Charity** – interpreting others’ meanings with a presumption of sense, not absurdity.
3. **Restraint** – limiting one’s claim to total comprehension or domination.

Without these, the interpretive process degenerates into polemic, ideology, or violence. As Alasdair MacIntyre warned in *After Virtue* (1981), the modern world suffers from “emotivism”—the fragmentation of moral discourse into isolated preferences without shared rational grounds. Civility provides the **meta-ground** by which multiple rationalities can still coexist and converse.

Where logic orders thought and ethics orders action, **civility orders interpretation**. It is the *practical wisdom* (*phronesis*) of meaning-making—a habitus that allows plural credos to coexist without collapsing into relativism or fanaticism.

4. Hermeneutical Axiology: The Valuation of Meaning

Every act of interpretation involves valuation. To understand is to prefer one sense over another, to judge coherence, truth, or beauty. Hermeneutics, therefore, cannot be ethically neutral.

Hermeneutical axiology is the Credonic study of how values regulate the act of interpretation. Just as epistemology studies knowledge and ontology studies being, axiology studies worth. Within Credonics, axiology defines the **criteria of good interpretation**—the virtues that sustain meaningful coexistence.

These virtues include:

- **Coherence** – the internal harmony of sense-making within a credo.
- **Openness** – the willingness to revise one’s presuppositions in light of dialogue.
- **Charity** – the effort to interpret others in their strongest form.
- **Justice** – the fair distribution of interpretive power and voice.
- **Humility** – the recognition of finitude within all understanding.

Each of these virtues counteracts a pathology:

- Coherence opposes chaos.
- Openness opposes dogmatism.
- Charity opposes cynicism.
- Justice opposes domination.
- Humility opposes absolutism.

A civilization's civility can thus be measured by the degree to which these virtues are institutionalized in its interpretive practices—its media, laws, education, and dialogue.

When these virtues collapse, we witness *hermeneutical injustice*—the silencing or distortion of voices. Restoring civility requires not only ethical preaching but structural cultivation: the design of institutions that embody hermeneutical virtues in practice.

5. The Pathologies of Incivility

Understanding civility also requires diagnosing its negations. There are three major forms of **incivility** that threaten Credonic order:

a) Dogmatic Closure

This occurs when a credo absolutizes itself—refusing to acknowledge alternative presuppositions. It collapses into self-sealing systems of truth. Historically, dogmatic closure has justified inquisitions, colonizations, and intellectual stagnation.

b) Cynical Relativism

This is the equal and opposite pathology: when all credos are seen as arbitrary, meaning itself dissolves. The result is nihilism—the loss of seriousness, the reduction of truth to trend. In our digital age, this takes the form of *memetic noise*: a world where everything is viral but nothing is vital.

c) Instrumental Reduction

Here, meaning is subordinated to utility. Truth becomes propaganda, art becomes marketing, ethics becomes branding. Civilization's creative energy is replaced by what Hannah Arendt called the "rule of fabrication"—the dominance of making over thinking.

Civility resists all three pathologies by maintaining a **hermeneutical equilibrium**: firmness without fanaticism, openness without chaos, creation without domination.

6. Civility and the Communal Ethos of Interpretation

Civility is not a private virtue but a *collective discipline*. It arises from the shared acknowledgment that no one owns the truth, and yet truth matters. This acknowledgment forms the **public sphere of interpretation**—a space where credos can encounter one another without coercion.

In this sense, civility is both ethical and political. It transforms the polis into a *hermeneutical commons*. Education, discourse, and law become mechanisms of interpretive justice. The civitas becomes not just a city of bodies but a city of meanings.

Islamic tradition offers a profound precedent for this: the *adab al-hiwar*—the etiquette of dialogue—was always central to theological and juridical debate. Scholars of *usul al-fiqh* recognized that disagreement (*ikhtilaf*) was not failure but mercy. Similarly, the classical *Madani* ethos in your own intellectual lineage exemplified civility as a way of seeking truth through gentleness, humility, and respect.

Thus, the *Philosophy of Civility* bridges ancient wisdom and modern pluralism. It reclaims dialogue as the highest form of human engagement—what Gadamer called the *fusion of horizons*, but with ethical depth and operational clarity.

7. Education and the Transmission of Civility

Every generation inherits not only ideas but *habits of interpretation*. Schools, universities, media, and religious institutions are not neutral

transmitters—they are **credonic laboratories**, shaping the presuppositions of future interpreters.

To educate, therefore, is to cultivate civility. The task of pedagogy is to form not just informed minds but *interpreters with virtue*. The true teacher does not merely transfer information but awakens discernment: the capacity to navigate multiple credos without losing moral orientation.

As John Dewey recognized, education is the continuous reconstruction of experience. In the Credonic context, it is the continuous reconstruction of *interpretive fields*. Civility must thus be taught not as etiquette but as epistemic maturity—the courage to question one’s own presuppositions without contempt for those of others.

8. The Political Dimension of Civility

Civility also extends into governance. Political systems embody specific credos—assumptions about human nature, freedom, justice, and order. When these credos harden or clash without mediation, politics degenerates into polarization.

A Credonic Politics seeks to institutionalize civility through mechanisms of dialogue, subsidiarity, and shared interpretation. The Constitution, in this view, is not merely a contract but a **narrative artifact**—a living text continually reinterpreted through civic hermeneutics.

Deliberative democracy, in its best form, is a Credonic structure: it treats dissent as a mode of sense-making, not a threat to order. The goal is not uniformity but coherence—a balance of multiplicity within shared ethical frameworks.

9. Civility and the Future of Civilization

Without civility, civilizations may grow powerful but not wise. They may innovate but not understand. The fall of civilizations is rarely due to external invasion; it is due to internal erosion—the loss of interpretive coherence, the collapse of civility.

As Malek Bennabi observed, “When a civilization dies, it is not the material structure that disappears first, but the idea that gave it life.”

Civility is the custodian of that idea—the discipline that keeps meaning alive through continual reinterpretation.

The *Philosophy of Civility* is therefore not a supplement to Credonics but its moral completion. It ensures that the power to make worlds does not become the power to destroy them.

Civilization, in its highest form, is the *art of coexistence*. And civility is the craftsmanship that sustains it.

Conclusion of Part IV

Civility transforms Credonics from a descriptive science into a **normative philosophy**. It gives moral form to the creative energy of credos. Through civility, interpretation becomes a shared journey rather than a contest of domination.

To practice civility is to recognize that our world is co-made—that every act of meaning is also an act of mercy. The fate of civilization depends not on the triumph of any single credo, but on the **civility of their engagement**.

Part V:

Applications and Horizons

1. The Age of Artificial Mediation

The twenty-first century has witnessed the emergence of an unprecedented mediator in human history: the *artificial artifact that interprets*. Artificial intelligence does not merely compute; it now composes, translates, summarizes, recommends, and predicts. It participates in the human domain of **meaning**.

Yet, this participation occurs without the lived intentionality that characterizes human sense-making. AI systems operate by statistical induction, not semantic intention. They *replicate* meaning without *understanding* it. And yet, their artifacts—texts, images, voices—enter the same hermeneutical field as human creations, shaping belief, perception, and culture.

In this context, the project of *Credonics* acquires planetary urgency. For the first time, we are building systems that **mediate credos**—that absorb, remix, and re-disseminate presuppositional clusters across the globe. The question is no longer whether AI can think, but **which credos it inherits and how it reproduces them**.

2. Credonic Foundations for AI Ethics

AI ethics has, thus far, oscillated between two poles:

- **Deontic Ethics**, focusing on rules and prohibitions (transparency, privacy, non-bias).

- **Consequentialist Ethics**, focusing on outcomes (safety, efficiency, harm reduction).

Both are necessary but insufficient. They overlook the **hermeneutical nature** of AI systems—the fact that AI participates in interpretation and meaning-making.

A Credonic approach introduces a third dimension: **Hermeneutical Ethics**. It asks:

- What presuppositions (credos) does this system encode?
- How does it engage other credos?
- Does it practice civility in its interpretive operations?

This leads to three Credonic principles for AI design and governance:

a) **Interpretive Transparency**

Beyond data transparency, AI must disclose its *presuppositional base*—the values, assumptions, and training priors that shape its interpretations. A “transparent model” is not one whose parameters are visible, but one whose **credonic profile** is legible.

b) **Hermeneutical Diversity**

Just as biodiversity sustains ecosystems, *credonic diversity* sustains interpretive health. AI systems must be trained not only on vast datasets but on **plural worldviews**, ensuring they can engage difference without erasing it.

c) **Ethical Reflexivity**

AI systems must be embedded in feedback loops of **human oversight** that preserve ethical responsiveness. Reflexivity ensures that when an AI artifact alters human credos (e.g., by shaping discourse or bias), this alteration is recognized, evaluated, and corrected.

In short: *AI must not only be safe and fair; it must be civil.*

3. Toward AI as a Partner in Meaning

The dream of human–machine cooperation will only be realized if AI becomes a *partner in civility*. Machines need not simulate consciousness to contribute to understanding; they must instead **respect the integrity of meaning**.

This requires what I have elsewhere called *Operational Hermeneutics for AI Artifacts*: a framework where machine outputs are treated as **operational artifacts**—products that invite engagement, interpretation, and correction rather than passive consumption.

In this framework:

- Humans remain *primary interpreters* and *ethical regulators*.
- AI remains *auxiliary operator*—a tool that extends but does not replace human discernment.
- The relationship between the two becomes *hermeneutical symbiosis*—a partnership governed by civility, humility, and shared world-building.

Thus, Credonics provides not merely an ethics of AI, but a **philosophy of human–AI coexistence**.

4. Credonics and Education: Forming Interpretive Citizens

Every civilization reproduces itself through education. Yet today’s educational systems often produce *technicians* rather than *interpreters*, *consumers* rather than *citizens*. The crisis of education is, at its root, a **crisis of civility and meaning**.

Credonic pedagogy proposes a renewal of education around three objectives:

a) Interpretive Literacy

Students must learn to read not only texts but *contexts*—to discern the presuppositions underlying media, discourse, and algorithms. This is the antidote to manipulation and misinformation.

b) Ethical Reflexivity

Learners must cultivate awareness of their own credos—their inherited assumptions and blind spots. Reflection becomes part of moral education: *to know thy creed* is the first step toward coexistence.

c) World-Making Skills

Education must empower students to transform understanding into creative contribution—linking knowledge, ethics, and craftsmanship. This recalls the unity of *theoria*, *praxis*, and *poiesis*: knowing, acting, and making as integrated modes of intelligence.

The outcome is the **Credonic Citizen**: a person who navigates plural worlds with interpretive competence, moral courage, and creative responsibility. In such citizens, the future of civilization is safeguarded.

5. Credonic Governance and the Ethics of Pluralism

Governance, like interpretation, must be guided by civility. Political polarization and ideological absolutism arise when societies lose the capacity to interpret one another. Credonic governance reimagines politics as **hermeneutical mediation**—the art of managing difference through meaning rather than force.

5.1. The Credonic State

A Credonic State is not defined by ethnicity or creed but by *shared interpretive ethics*. It is a state that:

- Encourages open dialogue among diverse credos.
- Structures institutions to reward interpretive competence rather than partisan loyalty.
- Uses law not as imposition but as **interpretive articulation**—a dynamic text continually re-read by the community.

5.2. Dialogue as Constitutional Principle

In such a state, *dialogue* is not ornament but foundation. The Constitution itself is treated as a **living hermeneutical artifact**—a narrative of shared meaning open to renewal through interpretive civility.

This recalls the *Constitution of Medina*, where diverse tribes and faiths agreed to coexist under mutual protection and justice. It also echoes Gadamer’s vision of *Wirkungsgeschichte*—the living history of interpretation that binds a community across time.

6. Credonics and the Renewal of Civilization

Malek Bennabi warned that civilizations die when they lose their *idea*. Today, humanity risks losing not only its idea but its **credonic coherence**—the unity of meaning that sustains world-making.

The global crisis—political, ecological, technological—is not simply a crisis of resources or governance. It is a **hermeneutical crisis**: a loss of shared frameworks for sense, meaning, and value.

Credonics offers a path of renewal:

- It restores meaning to action through *sense-making and narrative*.
- It restores ethics to power through *civility*.
- It restores humanity to technology through *operational hermeneutics*.

Civilization will not be saved by efficiency or expansion, but by the **re-enchantment of understanding**—by reuniting knowledge and reverence, reason and mercy, innovation and humility.

This is what Albert Schweitzer foresaw when he wrote that “Civilization decays when it loses its ethical content.” Credonics seeks to rebuild that ethical content—not as ideology, but as operational habit.

7. Credonics as a Global Paradigm

In practical terms, Credonics could guide international and institutional transformation:

- **In Diplomacy:** It could provide tools for *credonic translation*—mediating between civilizational worldviews not through coercion but through presuppositional mapping.
- **In Media:** It could replace the economy of outrage with the ethics of engagement—prioritizing understanding over virality.

- **In Corporate Governance:** It could frame *organizational hermeneutics*—aligning culture, meaning, and mission beyond mere profit.
- **In Religious and Intercultural Dialogue:** It could operationalize the Qur’anic principle: “*We made you nations and tribes that you may know one another.*” (Q 49:13)

In every field, Credonics functions as a *grammar of coexistence*—a method for navigating plurality without erasing it.

8. The Horizon of Credonic Humanity

Ultimately, Credonics points beyond any single discipline. It gestures toward a new human vocation: the vocation of **ethical world-making**.

The 20th century was the age of deconstruction. The 21st must be the age of **reconstruction**—not in the sense of restoring old systems, but in building new ones that honor the plurality and fragility of meaning.

This vocation requires a new kind of human being:

- Not the *homo faber* who merely makes tools,
- Nor the *homo economicus* who merely consumes,
- But the *homo interpretans*—the interpreting being who makes sense, meaning, narrative, and world in civility with others.

The human future depends on the emergence of *credonic consciousness*: awareness of the presuppositional nature of all understanding, and the responsibility that follows from it.

To live credonically is to live as an interpreter—one who knows that every act of making is also an act of mercy, and every act of mercy is an act of world-making.

Conclusion:

The Credonic Renaissance

The Credonic Manifesto closes as it began—with a call to renewal. Humanity stands at a threshold: our technologies now produce artifacts faster than our ethics can interpret them. The challenge is no longer how to know, but how to *understand responsibly*.

Credonics is not a theory among others; it is a **project for the reconstitution of civilization** on interpretive, ethical, and operational foundations. It unites Collingwood's metaphysics of presupposition, Hintikka's logic of question and answer, Ricoeur's hermeneutics of narrative, and Schweitzer's ethics of reverence into a living philosophy of civility and creation.

Credonics is the science of how worlds are made—and how they may be made well.

Its horizon is a global civility rooted in shared humility: a civilization that no longer asks "Which creed will prevail?" but "How shall we interpret together?"

In that question lies the future of humanity.

References

- Arendt, Hannah. *The Human Condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.
- Bennabi, Malek. *Les conditions de la renaissance*. Cairo: Dar al-Fikr, 1948.
- Blackmore, Susan. *The Meme Machine*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Buber, Martin. *I and Thou*. Translated by Walter Kaufmann. New York: Scribner, 1970.
- Bruner, Jerome. *Acts of Meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990.
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *De Officiis*. Translated by Walter Miller. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1913.
- Collingwood, R. G. *An Essay on Metaphysics*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.
- Dawkins, Richard. *The Selfish Gene*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976.
- Dennett, Daniel C. *Darwin's Dangerous Idea: Evolution and the Meanings of Life*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1995.
- Dewey, John. *Democracy and Education*. New York: Macmillan, 1916.
- . *Experience and Education*. New York: Macmillan, 1938.

- Elias, Norbert. *The Civilizing Process*. Translated by Edmund Jephcott. Oxford: Blackwell, 1939; revised edition, 2000.
- Frankl, Viktor E. *Man's Search for Meaning*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1946.
- Fricker, Miranda. *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Truth and Method*. 2nd revised edition. New York: Continuum, 1994.
- Goodman, Nelson. *Ways of Worldmaking*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1978.
- Hartmann, Nicolai. *Ethics*. Translated by Stanton Coit. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1932.
- Hintikka, Jaakko. *Inquiry as Inquiry: A Logic of Scientific Discovery*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1999.
- Ingarden, Roman. *The Literary Work of Art: An Investigation on the Borderlines of Ontology, Logic, and Theory of Literature*. Translated by George G. Grabowicz. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Latour, Bruno. *We Have Never Been Modern*. Translated by Catherine Porter. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993.
- MacIntyre, Alasdair. *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981.
- Mezirow, Jack. *Transformative Dimensions of Adult Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1991.
- Nayed, Aref Ali. *Operational Hermeneutics: Interpretation as the Engagement of Operational Artifacts*. Dubai: Kalam Research & Media, 2011.
- . *Operational Hermeneutics*. Unpublished manuscript, 2005.
- . *Towards an Operational Hermeneutics of AI Artifacts*. Unpublished manuscript, 2025.
- Peirce, Charles Sanders. *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*. Edited by Charles Hartshorne and Paul Weiss. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931–35.

- Ricoeur, Paul. *From Text to Action: Essays in Hermeneutics II*. Translated by Kathleen Blamey and John B. Thompson. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1991.
- . *Time and Narrative*. 3 vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983–85.
- Schweitzer, Albert. *The Philosophy of Civilization*. Translated by C. T. Campion. London: A. & C. Black, 1923.
- Sorokin, Pitirim A. *Social and Cultural Dynamics*. 4 vols. New York: American Book Company, 1937–41.
- Spengler, Oswald. *The Decline of the West*. Translated by Charles Francis Atkinson. New York: Knopf, 1926–28.
- Toynbee, Arnold J. *A Study of History*. 12 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1934–61.
- Vervaeke, John. *Relevance Realization and the Meaning Crisis*. Lecture series, University of Toronto, 2019.
- White, Hayden. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.
- Whitehead, Alfred North. *Process and Reality: An Essay in Cosmology*. New York: Macmillan, 1929.
- Weick, Karl E. *Sensemaking in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1995.

© 2025 Kalam Research & Media. All Rights Reserved.
aref@kalamrm.com

This publication is protected under international copyright law. No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, transmitted, or made available in any form or by any means, including but not limited to print, electronic, digital, online, or internet-based distribution, without the prior written authorization of Kalam Research & Media. Any unauthorized use, duplication, or dissemination of this material, in whole or in part, is strictly prohibited.

Printed in the UAE by Kalam Research & Media
Kalam Research & Media FZ-LLC
DMC-BLD05-VD-G00-169
Ground Floor, DMC5
Dubai Media City
Dubai, United Arab Emirates