MESANATAN / INDEPENDENT RESEARCH

Is There a Common Architecture Across Sanatana Pathways?

The research journey toward the Sanatana Awareness Equation: a systems and mathematical inquiry

WORKING RESEARCH COMPANION | OCTOBER 2026

Author: Som Chakraborty

This is an evolving inquiry, not a peer-reviewed publication. It does not measure Atman, grace, spiritual worth or liberation. All regression findings are synthetic. No endorsement by any scholar is implied.

Reading guide

Abstract
Research authorship, AI assistance and limits
1. Origins: experience before mathematics
2. Advaita and the inner instrument
3. Bhakti: the challenge to optimization
4. Different paths, different conditions?
5. Narrative studies from the epics
6. Historical equation SAE-1.4
7. Worked model questions
8. Synthetic experiments and corrections
9. What remains open
10. Questions for independent review
Research paths and provenance

Abstract

This research asks whether the diverse pathways of Sanatana Dharma engage distinguishable conditions of the practitioner, whether their intended outcomes share any common structure, and whether such relationships can responsibly be represented mathematically. The Awareness Equation emerged from a longer inquiry into suffering, devotion, the witness, and the changing mind; it is one candidate model rather than a discovered law.

The research first compares the teachings, aims and possible mechanisms of distinct Sanatana pathways without assuming they all lead to an identical outcome. It then asks whether some changing conditions of experience can be represented transparently while respecting the Advaita distinction between unchanging consciousness and mind. It considers the Ramayana and Mahabharata and tests algebraic behavior in constructed data.

If a defensible common structure exists, it may inform everyday reflection and context-sensitive technologies such as Spirit AI, but those applications are speculative and require separate validation. No human study has validated the model; synthetic results include failures. The requested scholarly contribution is correction of philosophical categories, textual interpretations and assumptions, not endorsement.

Research authorship, AI assistance and limits

I am an engineer and a devotee, not a Sanskritist or scholar of all the traditions compared here. I have not read or mastered every primary text or lineage in depth. The central question, engineering framing and proposed equation are my own. I have used AI extensively to search for leads, organize and compare interpretations, draft explanations, simulate examples and examine the mathematical model.

AI output can contain mistakes. Many passage-level citations and tradition mappings have not been independently verified. The research is a personal, AI-assisted inquiry open to scholarly correction, not a traditional teaching, guru instruction or peer-reviewed demonstration.

1. Origins: experience before mathematics

The initial concern was why outward achievement does not necessarily end inward unease. The author approached the problem as both a systems engineer and a devotee. The witness, thought, identification, longing and the possibility of surrender appeared as lived questions before they became model terms.

The earliest MeSanatan work explores the difference between what is noticed and the fact of noticing. The engineering impulse was to describe relationships and possible feedback loops. Yet the philosophical question remained prior: what, if anything, is changing when one reports more clarity or steadiness?

This historical sequence matters. A formal equation is a later attempt to organize a subset of the questions. It does not derive consciousness from mathematics.

2. Advaita and the inner instrument

In Advaita Vedanta, Atman is not a quantity that increases or decreases. The witness is not identical to metacognitive self-monitoring. Manas, buddhi, ahamkara and citta name aspects of the changing inner instrument in commonly used traditional accounts, but their definitions and uses require source-specific care.

The model's historical constant C=1 is a mathematical convention, not a measurement of Brahman. Its output, Awareness_raw, is at most a proposed proxy for changing self-reported conditions. Whether the term awareness-access itself creates a category mistake is an open question.

Gradual preparation, purification, concentration, knowledge and liberation cannot be collapsed into a single scale. This distinction is central to the request for scholarly correction.

3. Bhakti: the challenge to optimization

Devotion to Ma, remembrance, longing and surrender are not simply instruments for producing a higher numerical score. The research encountered a paradox: greater self-monitoring may coexist with agitation or with a diminished felt ease of surrender.

The provisional gate B(t) includes orientation and trust/surrender, but this is an engineering analogy rather than a teaching about bhakti. Divine grace cannot be entered as a known measurable variable. The very act of trying to optimize surrender may undermine the relationship the model seeks to understand.

The question is whether a narrower psychological construct can be modeled while leaving devotion, grace and realization outside the equation.

4. Different paths, different conditions?

The earlier eight-path comparison and later thirteen-tradition atlas explore whether different pathways emphasize distinguishable conditions of the practitioner. The mappings are provisional and not always consistent across versions.

Advaita raises discrimination and mistaken identification; Bhakti raises remembrance, relationship and surrender; Karma Yoga raises attachment to outcomes; Patanjala Yoga raises mental fluctuation and kleshas; Samkhya raises discrimination between purusha and prakriti.

Shakta and Shaiva Tantra, Trika, Nama Japa, Nath/Hatha, Kriya and Aghora require separate ontological and lineage contexts. Numerical Shakti_effective is not metaphysical Shakti. Aghora is a source-sensitive comparative topic, not a practice recommendation.

No tradition is being ranked. The variable map asks whether an analogy helps formulate questions, and where that analogy breaks.

A simple algebraic illustration demonstrates why a shared output cannot establish a shared spiritual outcome: with C=1 and residual=0, B=0.8, K=0.3, P=0.5, S=0.2 gives A=1.12; B=0.7, K=0.2, P=0.6, S=0.2 also gives A=1.12. These are invented parameter combinations, not estimates of any tradition. Their equality shows non-uniqueness, not equivalence of experience or liberation.

5. Narrative studies from the epics

The Ramayana and Mahabharata are treated as narratives that can expose tensions among duty, loyalty, desire, capacity and discrimination. The engineering lens is an interpretation of episodes, not the canonical meaning of the characters.

Arjuna's crisis and instruction raise questions about grief and discrimination. Hanuman's service raises questions about devotion, courage and steadiness. Karna's commitments raise the possibility that a virtue can become rigid. Ravana illustrates why capability does not imply freedom from pride or desire. Bhishma and Vibhishana raise conflicts between loyalty and dharma.

The correct unit of analysis is a passage or episode with competing interpretations, not a permanent spiritual score assigned to a character.

6. Historical equation SAE-1.4

A_raw(t) = B(t) x [C - K(t) + P(t) + S(t)] + epsilon(t). The historical gate is B(t)=min(B1(t),B2(t)). K denotes proposed active blockers, P a cultivated-disposition composite, S an effective-capacity proxy, and epsilon an unobserved residual.

The minimum gate, additive terms, weighting and scaling are assumptions. The residual was historically called grace, but cannot represent or measure divine grace. C=1 is not a consciousness measurement. The equation has no demonstrated link to liberation or spiritual worth.

An instantaneous state, its time integral, its time average and its net change are different quantities. Integrating a state over a longer duration is not proof of increasing awareness.

7. Worked model questions

If B1=0.8, B2=0.6, blockers=0.3, purity=0.6, effective capacity=0.4 and residual=0, the historical formula yields B=0.6 and A_raw=1.02. That output is dimensionless; it does not mean 102 percent consciousness.

If the second gate input falls to 0.1, the same bracket yields A_raw=0.17. The difference is a consequence of the assumed minimum function, not an observed spiritual fact.

Two hypothetical personas can have equal model outputs for different reasons. A steady trajectory can have a large time integral and zero net improvement. These examples test the formula's behavior rather than proving the metaphysics.

8. Synthetic experiments and corrections

The corrected research suite uses 200 constructed subjects over 120 days, with temporal and held-out-subject splits. It compares the fixed SAE formula, fitted variants and simple baselines. All outcomes are synthetic.

In the temporal holdout, purity-only R-squared was 0.158, persistence 0.153, calibrated SAE composite 0.259 and fitted components 0.308. The fixed uncalibrated SAE formula had R-squared -3.283. These figures depend on the constructed outcome and are not evidence about people.

Earlier R-squared values of 0.896 and 0.584 were superseded because the analysis used a generator-only grace_mag predictor unavailable in actual forecasting. The corrected study excludes it. Negative findings and scale problems remain central to the record.

Independent human validation would require operationally defensible outcomes, pre-registered predictions, appropriate ethics, independent comparison models and scholarly scrutiny.

9. What remains open

The strongest philosophical objection is that the construct may reify the witness. The strongest modeling objections concern overlapping inputs, arbitrary gates and incompatible scales. The strongest comparative objection is that different traditions cannot be compressed into one theory of liberation.

The body of work includes self-corrections, disputed textual locators and analogies that were weakened or withdrawn. Those records should remain visible. A result that invalidates the model would be useful scholarship, not a failure to defend it.

10. Questions for independent review

What, if anything, can responsibly be modeled if awareness itself is unchanging? Does speaking of access to the witness already mislead? Do the traditions describe shared intermediate conditions or irreducibly different ends?

Where does phenomenological discrimination of seer and seen stop, and where does scriptural authority begin? Does parameterizing surrender instrumentalize bhakti? What distinctions between intelligence, experience and consciousness are needed when discussing AI?

The request is for correction of category mistakes, unsupported textual readings and misleading language. No endorsement, affiliation or assessment of the synthetic statistics is implied.

Research paths and provenance

Central map: https://mesanatan.com/awareness-equation

Origins and full journey: https://mesanatan.com/research-journey

Body of work and chapter archive: https://mesanatan.com/body-of-work

Formal specification: https://mesanatan.com/model/equation

Tradition comparison: https://mesanatan.com/model/comparison

Synthetic evidence and corrections: https://mesanatan.com/model/evidence

Sources and textual inquiry: https://mesanatan.com/shastra

Five questions for correction: https://mesanatan.com/scholarly-questions

Primary-text citations and some tradition mappings remain under review. Consult the live site for corrections and the current research status.