

The Coexistence Template

A formal definition of units, relationships, values, assembly, and transmission

Author: AnalyticMadhyasthDarshan.org — a group of people studying Madhyasth Darshan philosophy. Source repository: [raghavamohan/AnalyticMadhyasthDarshan](https://github.com/raghavamohan/AnalyticMadhyasthDarshan).

The thesis: Madhyasth Darshan (Shri A. Nagraj's Co-existentialism) contains, beneath its human-centred exposition, a single recurring structural template: *bounded units, immersed in an indivisible medium, recognise and fulfil definite relationships with one another; the content exchanged in those relationships is value; complementary units compose into larger units; an assembly persists exactly as long as its relationships are fulfilled; and each assembly transmits its method of composition across generations of its members*. This paper states that template formally, grounds every clause in the primary texts, shows that Shri Nagraj himself asserts it for **all four orders of nature** (not only for humans), and identifies the one place where the template genuinely changes character — the knowledge order, where participation must be achieved through understanding rather than delivered by constitution. Beyond exposition, the paper has an applied aim: to make the template precise enough to be **carried to systems Shri Nagraj did not himself treat** — used forward, to design organisations, economies, and other assemblies that are stable by construction, and in reverse, to diagnose a failing system by the exact clause of the template it violates (see §1.1).

1. Why a template, and why it is legitimate to generalise

A natural reading of Madhyasth Darshan focuses on its human programme: justice in relationships, family-based order, humane education. On that reading, the recurring pattern — units forming larger wholes through valued relationships — looks like a human story that one might *extrapolate* to atoms and cells.

The texts support a stronger position: the general template is asserted first, and the human case is derived as its hardest instance. The opening analysis of *Samadhanatmak Bhautikvad* states the template in fully general terms, as a direct rebuttal of struggle-based materialism:

“Each unit is a whole along with its environment.” – *SB p. 13–14*

“Each unit is orderliness with its ness and participates in overall orderliness.” – *SB p. 13–14* (*ness = self-ness in the bilingual edition; PDF extraction drops the prefix*)

“Each unit moves towards development in its natural state and decline in its excited state.” – *SB p. 13–14*

and gives the general law of development:

“Each unit in its natural state achieves further development or attains its next level of being, as the natural state provides all conducive naturalness, environment, tradition, etc. If a unit – whether an atom, molecule, plant, animal, or human – finds a suitable environment, naturalness and mutuality, it exhibits changes that lead to its greater qualitative and quantitative abundance.” – *SB p. 14*

The same universality appears in *Manav Vyavahar Darshan*:

“All units saturated in the Omnipresence (permeative and transparent) have form, properties, essential nature & dharma, and have inherent orderliness & participate in overall orderliness.” – *MVD p. 11*

So the task of this paper is not extrapolation but **articulation**: making explicit, in one formal structure, what the texts assert piecewise about atoms (*MVD p. 8; JV p. 67*), cells (*JV p. 82*), organisms (*SB p. 16*), and human collectives (*MVD p. 55, p. 161*).

A note on honesty, stated once and meant throughout: the formalism below is a **lens for clarity**, not a proof machine. It makes the structure of the claims visible and checkable against the texts. It does not prove the metaphysics, and several of its axioms (notably the reality of the medium and of *jeevan*) are exactly the points where Madhyasth Darshan differs from mainstream science.

1.1 Why precision: a template meant to travel

Stating the template formally is not an end in itself. Shri Nagraj elaborated it in depth for a single tier – the human – and asserted, but did not work out, its operation at the others. The point of a precise, tier-neutral statement is to let the same structure be **carried to systems he did not himself analyse**, and used there in two directions.

- **Design (forward use)**. Given a system one wishes to build or reform – an organisation, an economy, an ecological arrangement, an institutional or software

architecture — the template supplies a constructive checklist of what a *stable* assembly requires: identifiable units; a medium that energises and regulates them; definite relationships with explicit expectation profiles $E(r)$; value that actually *flows* in each relationship rather than mere incentive; composition by complementary need rather than competition (L3); persistence made conditional on fulfilment (L4); and an explicit carrier of transmission across member turnover (L5). The system can then be designed so that each clause is satisfied by construction, instead of discovering the missing clause after the system has decayed.

- **Diagnosis (reverse use).** Given a system that is failing or fragile, the template becomes an instrument of fault localisation: walk its clauses and find the one that is unmet. Is a relationship unrecognised (ρ), its value unfulfilled (φ), mis-evaluated (μ — the three failure modes of D6), extracted beyond regeneration (P5), or never transmitted to the next generation of members (τ , L5)? Each unmet clause names a specific, addressable failure rather than a vague malaise, and the knowledge-order discontinuity (P3) predicts that human-tier systems will fail at exactly these understanding-dependent steps first.

This forward/reverse use is what motivates the tier-neutral formalisation of Sections 2–3: it must be stated independently of its original human framing before it can be applied elsewhere. The applications in Section 8 are first instances; the broader claim is that **any** system describable as units-in-relationship is a candidate for both uses. Two cautions travel with this ambition. First, the template’s metaphysical axioms (the medium *O*, *jeevan*, A1–A2, D6) are not established by the formalism, so any analysis that leans on them inherits their status as commitments, not results. Second, importing the template into a domain Shri Nagraj did not treat is itself an interpretive act: the mapping from that domain’s parts onto units, relationships, and values must be argued, not assumed.

2. The template, informally

Ten clauses. Everything in Section 3 is a formalisation of these.

1. There is one indivisible, omnipresent medium (Space / Omnipotence). It is not a unit.
2. Everything else is a countable **unit**: a bounded cluster of activity.
3. Every unit is **immersed** in the medium — soaked, surrounded, energised, and regulated by it. No unit exists, or can be separated out, independently.
4. Existence as a whole is **stable**: nothing is created or destroyed; units only compose, decompose, and develop.
5. Every unit stands in definite **relationships** with other units. A relationship carries pre-determined mutual **expectations**.
6. Every unit **recognises** its relationships and **fulfils** them, with the capacity of its order. The content delivered in fulfilment is **value** — the unit’s usefulness-complementarity to

the other, its participation.

7. Units whose needs and surpluses are complementary **compose** into a larger unit. The larger unit is itself a unit (clause 2 applies to it), so composition iterates: particles → atoms → molecules → structures; cells → organs → organisms; individuals → families → communities → universal order.
8. An assembly **persists** while its internal and external relationships are fulfilled (natural state) and **declines or decomposes** when they are not (excited state).
9. Every persisting assembly **transmits its method of composition** across generations of its members — by constitution in the material order, by seed in the biological order, by lineage/species in the animal order, and by education-*sanskar* in the knowledge order.
10. In the first three orders, clauses 5–9 operate **definitely** (automatically, without choice). In the knowledge order they must pass through **understanding, evaluation, and choice** — which is why human assembly above the individual is the only level of the template that can fail, and the only one that is still incomplete.

3. The formal template

3.1 Primitives

| Symbol | Name | Textual source |
|--------------------------------|--|--|
| O | The omnipresent medium (Space, <i>vyapak</i> , Omnipotence) | “Space is uniform in all dimensions... this reality is omnipresent” (JV p. 31) |
| U | The set of units (<i>ikai</i>), countable | “Nature is in the form of entities that can be counted” (JV p. 45) |
| R ⊆ U × U | Relationships (<i>sambandh</i>) | MVD p. 61 |
| V | Values (<i>mulya</i>) — the content exchanged in relationships | SB p. 50 |
| κ | The composition (assembly) operator | JV p. 67 |
| τ | The transmission (tradition) operator | JV p. 48, 51 |

O is not a member of U. This matters: the medium is “state-complete” while units are “state-dynamic” (MVD p. 12). Statements that quantify over units never apply to O.

3.2 Definitions

D1 (Unit). A unit is a bounded cluster of activity. Insentient units are “active within the bounds of their length, width and height”; sentient units are “active in [the medium] beyond the bounds of their length, width and height” (MVD p. 33). Each unit $u \in U$ possesses an intrinsic four-tuple – form, properties, essential nature, dharma – written $\mathbf{sig}(u) = \langle \mathbf{roop}, \mathbf{gun}, \mathbf{svabhav}, \mathbf{dharma} \rangle$ (MVD p. 11).

D2 (Order). U is partitioned into four orders (*avastha*): material, biological, animal, knowledge (JV p. 47; MVD p. 9). The order of a unit fixes its **capability set**:

| Order | Capabilities | Regulation regime |
|------------|--|--|
| Material | recognising, fulfilling | constitution-conformance (<i>rachna/gathan</i>) |
| Biological | + selection (of nutrients, season) | seed-conformance (<i>beej</i>) |
| Animal | + sensation, hope (living instinct) | species/lineage-conformance (<i>vansh</i>) |
| Knowledge | + knowing, believing, evaluation, choice | <i>sanskar</i> -conformance (achieved, not given) |

Grounding: “The material order is regulated by structural conformity, while the biological order is regulated by seed conformity. The animal order is regulated by species conformity... Humans also require definite conduct, which they achieve through *sanskar*-conformity” (JV p. 48); “the differentiating feature in biological order is the activity of selection” (MVD p. 49); “Humans have two additional activities – knowing and believing” (JV p. 70).

D3 (Relationship and association). A **relationship** is “the mutuality where expectations are predetermined in the sense of completeness”; an **association** is “the mutuality where expectations are voluntary” (MVD p. 61–62). Formally, each $r = (u_1, u_2) \in R$ carries an expectation profile $\mathbf{E}(r)$; r is a relationship if $\mathbf{E}(r)$ is fixed by the orders and signatures of u_1, u_2 , and an association if $\mathbf{E}(r)$ is adopted.

D4 (Value). The value of a unit *in* a relationship is its essentiality to the other – its usefulness and complementarity, i.e. its participation. This is general, not human-specific:

“Entire beingness implies the essentiality of units in every plane and order. Essentiality refers to value... It is values that are reciprocated and mutually recognised, as complementarity, mutual recognition, and impression occur only in mutuality.” – SB p. 50

Formally, a valuation $\mathbf{v}: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$ assigns to every relationship the value flowing in it. The value set \mathbf{V} is **not flat**: the texts give it a definite taxonomy by class (MVD p. 306; JV p. 43, p. 138–139), and the classes available to a unit ascend with its order.

| Class of value | Members | Available to | Character |
|-----------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---|
| Object value | usefulness value + aesthetic value | all orders | <i>definite and constant</i> — “The usefulness value of one kilogram of wheat today is the same as what it was one hundred years ago” (JV p. 123) |
| Jeevan values | happiness, peace, contentment, bliss | knowledge order only | internal harmonies <i>within</i> jeevan — of mun–vritti, vritti–chitta, chitta–buddhi, buddhi–atma respectively (JV p. 138) |
| Established (human) values | trust, respect, affection, gratitude, glory, reverence, care/affinity, love | knowledge order only | the relationship values — the content that flows in mutuality once a relationship is recognised (JV p. 108) |
| Civic values | right-use of body, mind, wealth in the social order | knowledge order, assembly tiers | values of participation in the overall orderliness (MVD p. 306) |

The established values are not produced deliberately; they *flow* from jeevan the moment a relationship is recognised: “when a mother has recognised her child then motherly care starts surging by itself from her. No five-year plan is needed for that!” (JV p. 138). They also have an internal generative order — “With gratitude, other values start to manifest. Following gratitude, the values of affection, love, and trust naturally develop” (JV p. 108) — so V carries a partial ordering, not just a membership list. In the formalism below, V denotes this whole graded set; the operations ρ , ϕ , μ act on the value flowing in a given relationship, whatever its class.

D5 (Recognition and fulfilment). Recognition ρ is a unit’s identification of a relationship and its expectation profile; fulfilment ϕ is conduct that delivers $v(r)$ in accordance with $E(r)$. “Fulfilling is to evidence use, right-use and purposeful-use” (MVD p. 27).

D6 (Evaluation). Evaluation μ is a second-order operation: assessing the value delivered in a relationship against the value inherent in it. μ is defined **only for knowledge-order units**, and it is performed by *jeevan*, not by any bodily mechanism: “Jeevan evaluates the values that emanate from itself... No external instrument is needed for this evaluation” (JV p. 139); “Values and evaluation are processes of understanding; they are not bodily or mechanical processes” (JV p. 39). Evaluation has exactly three failure modes — over-evaluation, under-evaluation, mis-evaluation (MVD p. 38).

D7 (Justice). Justice (*nyaya*) is **not a member of V** — it is the *name the texts give to the complete operation* on a relationship at the knowledge order: the composite $\rho \rightarrow \phi \rightarrow \mu \rightarrow$

mutual satisfaction. This is a definition, not a gloss:

“Recognising relationships, fulfilling values, evaluating, and achieving mutual satisfaction is justice.” – *MVD p. 311 (repeated MVD p. 336); cf. “justice – manifested through relationships, values, evaluation, and mutual satisfaction” (JV p. 55)*

So justice is the knowledge-order instantiation of the template’s core cycle (L1) with evaluation (D6) added. It is the **operator over V**, not an element of it. The established values (D4) are the *content* it operates on; justice is the *act* of fulfilling and evaluating them. Equivalently, “Humane behaviour in mutuality itself is justice” (MVD p. 35).

D7a (Trust as the φ -linked value). Trust (*vishwas*) occupies two roles at once, which is why it stands closest to the template of all the established values. Its own definition coincides almost verbatim with fulfilment φ (D5):

“Trust is the act of fulfilling the inherent expectation of values in mutuality.” – *MVD p. 73 (and p. 336: “Fulfilment of values inherent in mutuality”)*

Thus trust is **(i)** a member of V (an established value) and **(ii)** the value-level name of the φ step itself – what is established when the fulfilment part of justice succeeds. The texts give the resulting causal order explicitly: “happiness and peace lead to affection, affection leads to trust, trust leads to enlightenment of coexistence” (MVD p. 72). In template terms: successful φ over the established values → mutual satisfaction → affection → **trust** → enlightenment of coexistence. Justice is the operation; trust is the value that operation deposits.

D8 (Composition, two modes). κ takes a finite set of units with compatible signatures to a new unit. The texts distinguish two modes (MVD p. 42):

- **Mixture** (*mishran*): components “all maintain their respective conducts” – aggregation without a new joint conduct.
- **Compound** (*yaugik*): components combine “in definite proportion”, “discard their own conducts, and present another kind of conduct” – a genuinely new unit with its own sig(\cdot).

Only compound-mode composition creates a new tier of the hierarchy.

D9 (Natural and excited state). A unit (or assembly) is in its **natural state** when its relationships are being fulfilled within conducive conditions, and in an **excited state** otherwise. “Each unit moves towards development in its natural state and decline in its excited state” (SB p. 14).

D10 (Transmission). τ re-instantiates an assembly's method of composition (*rachna vidhi*) in new member-units, so the assembly persists across member turnover. The carrier of τ differs by order (see L5).

3.3 Axioms

A1 (Saturation). Every unit is immersed in O: “all of nature is submerged, soaked, and surrounded by Omnipotence” (JV p. 3; MVD p. 32). Moreover this immersion is constitutive and non-detachable: “**There is no provision in existence to separate units of nature from Omnipresence**” (JV p. 18).

A2 (Energisation and regulation). Immersion in O is what energises and regulates every unit: “At the fundamental level, every entity is protected, regulated, and energised by Omnipotence” (JV p. 82); “Omnipotence is mediative, therefore the nature saturated in it is regulated and conserved. The nucleus within every atom is the mediative activity, whereby the atom's generative-degenerative activities and relative powers are regulated and conserved” (MVD p. 26).

A3 (Conservation / stability of existence). “Existence neither increases nor decreases” (JV p. 127); “existence is stable, the development and awakening are definite, and all the laws are natural and inherent to being and abiding” (MVD p. 5). Units are never created from nothing or annihilated; all change is composition, decomposition, or development.

A4 (No isolation). “Nothing is isolated – that is the principle” (JV p. 43). Every $u \in U$ participates in at least one relationship; the relation R is total on U.

A5 (Inherent orderliness). Every unit is orderliness in itself and a participant in the overall orderliness (MVD p. 11; SB p. 13). There is no “loose matter” outside the template.

3.4 Laws

L1 (Universal recognition-fulfilment). Every unit recognises and fulfils its relationships, at the capability level of its order:

“Every entity of nature recognises another; that is why it fulfils. An atomic particle too recognises another, and as a result, these particles abide in orderliness. They cohabit and function with one another, thus manifesting coexistence. Similarly, starting from molecules to planets, the entities of nature recognise one another and fulfil accordingly.” — JV p. 69

For the first three orders this is automatic and inerrant — their conduct is *definite* (“A peepal tree maintains its definite conduct with all its fruits, seeds and leaves exhibiting peepal's properties, intrinsic nature and dharma”, JV p. 113). For the knowledge order, recognition and fulfilment pass through knowing and believing, and can therefore fail (JV p. 70).

L2 (Complementarity, not struggle). The engine of inter-unit dynamics is mutual offering and acceptance, not conflict:

“I have seen that there is no conflict in existence. Each unit has inherent strength. Even a subatomic particle has inherent strength, as do atoms, molecules, and bodies composed of molecules... They are capable of achieving complementarity through mutual offering and acceptance, leading to progress.” – *JV p. 157*

L3 (Assembly by complementary need). Composition is driven by complementarity of deficiency and surplus. The canonical instance is atomic: development-progression operates “in the atom in the form of hungry and overfull atoms” (MVD p. 8) – an atom deficient in particles bonds with one bearing excess. Generally:

“Everywhere, there exists a natural inclination towards coexistence. This inclination is what leads atomic particles to assemble into atoms, atoms to combine into molecules, and molecules to combine into molecular forms.” – *JV p. 67*

Even gravitation is read as this law: “weight is evident in the mutuality of two atoms due to their tendency to form molecules... In reality, it indicates participation in the develo[pment progression]” (*JV p. 150*).

L4 (Persistence ⇔ fulfilment). An assembly persists in its natural state – relationships fulfilled, conditions conducive – and declines or decomposes in the excited state (*SB p. 14*). Conducive conditions are order-relative: for vegetation, climatic balance; for humans, a tradition of understanding (*SB p. 15–16*). Notably, in the material order even the excited state can be complementary (an excited atom’s expelled particles feed a hungry atom, *SB p. 15*) – only in the deluded knowledge order does excitation damage both self and others (*SB p. 16*).

L5 (Transmission by order). Every persisting assembly transmits its composition method. The carrier ascends with the orders:

| Order | Carrier of τ | Grounding |
|------------|--|---------------------|
| Material | the constitution itself (<i>gathan</i>) | JV p. 48 |
| Biological | the seed: cells “carry the composition method of the entire tree, allowing them to recreate the same kind of tree” — the <i>beej-vriksha</i> principle | MVD p. 92 |
| Animal | lineage/heredity (<i>vansh</i>), with the body produced by lineage tradition | JV p. 59; MVD p. 79 |
| Knowledge | education- <i>sanskar</i> : “understanding flows in tradition... with each successive generation, it becomes more robust and refined” | JV p. 49 |

The texts explicitly mark this as one principle with order-specific realisations: “The process of seed coordination, or heredity tradition, has its own uniqueness in the biological order, animal order, and knowledge order. While the principle of seed coordination remains the same across these orders, there are fundamental differences in their state and behaviour” (MVD p. 93). At the cellular level the carrier is named outright: “The method of formation is inherent in the pran sutra (genetic material) situated in the cell. This is called *rachna vidhi* (genetic code)” (JV p. 82).

L6 (Closure / iteration). The output of κ is a unit, so the template applies to it in turn. This is what generates the tiered hierarchy: “The coexistence of one cell (pran kosha) with another cell leads to multicellular forms, resulting in the formation of definite organisms” (JV p. 82); “this Earth and every other planet are compositions of atoms and molecules” (MVD p. 8); “More than one human coming together or becoming organised is referred to as a family, community, or undivided society” (MVD p. 55).

3.5 Propositions (consequences the texts also assert)

P1 (Tiered hierarchy). Iterating κ under L3–L6 yields the observed ladder: particles → atoms → molecules → molecular structures → planets (insentient line); cells → organisms (biological line); individual → family → community → undivided society → universal orderliness (knowledge line, MVD p. 161: the “ten-tier family-based orderliness, wherein family is the first tier”). Each tier is a unit *and* a participant in the next (A5).

P2 (Stability is at the top and bottom, dynamism in between). Existence as a whole is stable (A3) and the medium is state-complete; *within* that stability, units undergo definite development-progression. Stability of the whole and restlessness of the parts are not in tension; the second occurs inside the first (MVD p. 5, p. 12).

P3 (The knowledge-order discontinuity). In the first three orders, every clause of the template executes definitely; therefore those orders are *already* in orderliness. In the knowledge order, ρ , ϕ , μ and κ all route through understanding, so they can fail (delusion: over/under/mis-evaluation), and so human assembly is the unique unfinished tier:

“Knowledge Order: This comprises only humans, who are yet to achieve orderliness” (JV p. 47). The corollary is sharp: the universal template predicts that human-tier assemblies (families, societies) are **built and sustained only by an unbroken transmission of understanding**, since sanskar is the only τ -carrier available at this tier (JV p. 48–54).

P4 (Sustainment requires shared cause, goal, and programme). For deliberate (knowledge-order) assemblies: “For an organisation, commonness of cause and goal is necessary. For its sustainment, commonness of the program is also necessary” (MVD p. 55). This is φ and τ restated for voluntary composition.

P5 (Boundedness of extraction). A unit’s relationships with lower-order units are also governed by E(r): right-use and purposeful-use, bounded by regeneration — “expenditure of natural abundance like minerals and forests in proportion to their regeneration” (MVD p. 264). Extraction beyond regeneration is an unfulfilled relationship and, by L4, destabilises the containing assembly (the Earth-tier): “we overlooked the purpose of our relationship with the Earth... This lack of understanding led to the catastrophic collapse of our planet[‘s environment]” (JV p. 77).

4. The template instantiated, tier by tier

| Template element | Material order | Biological order | Animal order | Knowledge order |
|-----------------------------|--|---|---------------------------|---|
| Unit | particle, atom, molecule | cell, plant | animal (body + jeevan) | human (body + jeevan) |
| Immersion (A1) | in O; energised, nucleus-regulated | same | same | same |
| Relationship (D3) | bonding mutuality | nutrient/season relations | herd, lineage relations | the definite human relations (mother, father, teacher...) with purposes: nurturing, protection, usefulness-complementarity, right-use, purposeful-use (JV p. 109) |
| Value (D4) | usefulness-complementarity (constant) | usefulness in food-chains ("food for food", JV p. 77) | usefulness + sensitivity | established values: trust, respect, affection... evaluated by jeevan |
| Recognition-fulfilment (L1) | definite | definite | definite | must be achieved (justice) |
| Assembly (L3) | hungry/overfull bonding → molecules → structures | cells → multicellular organisms | bodies via lineage; herds | family → ten-tier self-governance → world-family order |
| Persistence (L4) | natural state | climatic balance | species conditions | fulfilment of values; mutual satisfaction |
| Transmission (L5) | constitution | seed (<i>rachna vidhi</i>) | lineage/species | education- <i>sanskar</i> |

| Template element | Material order | Biological order | Animal order | Knowledge order |
|------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|---|
| Failure mode | (excitation still complementary) | death/decomposition | species stress | delusion → exploitation, war, ecological overdraw |

Two structural observations the table makes visible:

1. **The same column-shape repeats four times.** That is the precise sense in which the template is universal — it is not a metaphor carried from human life down to atoms; the texts assert each row for each order.
2. **Each row’s content is richer in the knowledge order but never absent below it.** Value, for instance, does not first appear with humans; it is “the essentiality of units in every plane and order” (SB p. 50). What first appears with humans is *evaluation of value* — and with it the possibility of error.

5. What the template is *not*

These contrasts matter because the most natural modern glosses of the template quietly replace it with something else.

Not optimisation. It is tempting to summarise the template as “units organise so as to maximise value.” The texts never use a maximisation principle, and their machinery actively excludes it. Conduct in the first three orders is *definite* — an oak does not do more or less oak-ness (JV p. 113); the usefulness value of objects is *constant* (JV p. 123); development is a *definite progression* toward completeness — constitutional completeness (the jeevan atom), then activity completeness, then conduct completeness (MVD p. 13–14, p. 27) — i.e. a **terminal state**, not an unbounded objective. Even in the human case the goal-language is saturation language: resolution, satisfaction, completeness. Maximisation (“more”) is, in fact, the diagnosed pathology: “Commerce... has become profit-driven, perpetually pursuing ‘more’” (JV p. 41). The correct abstract gloss is: **units move definitely toward fulfilment/completeness of their relationships**, not toward a maximum of any quantity.

Not struggle or selection. The assembly engine is complementarity of need and surplus (L2, L3), explicitly opposed to dialectical conflict and survival-of-the-fittest readings (JV p. 157; SB p. 13). Where Darwinian narratives explain structure by differential destruction, this template explains structure by mutual offering-acceptance; destruction (decomposition) is the *loss* of structure when relations go unfulfilled, not the designer of it.

Not bottom-up emergence alone. In the template, capacities are *provisioned* in existence and manifest when composition reaches the right tier (the human body “has the

provision to evidence understanding”, JV p. 59); the medium energises and regulates from below every tier at once (A2). A purely emergentist reading drops O and turns A2 into magic; the texts treat O as doing real explanatory work.

Not value-as-epiphenomenon. Value in the template is the *content of fulfilment* — what flows in a relationship — present at every tier (SB p. 50). The human innovation is a second-order operation on it (evaluation, D6), located in *jeevan*, “not bodily or mechanical” (JV p. 39). Any restatement that makes value a human projection onto a value-free substrate inverts the doctrine.

6. Critical review of the informal reading

This paper began from a compact informal reading of the darshan — stability of the whole, units inseparable from environment, a fundamental set of relationships, value assessed on a non-material plane, units organising into ever larger assemblies, knowledge succeeding across generations. Checked against the texts, that reading is substantially faithful; four points need correction or sharpening.

1. “A unit cannot exist independent of its environment” conflates two distinct dependencies. The texts distinguish (a) the constitutive immersion of every unit in the *medium* (A1 — “no provision in existence to separate units of nature from Omnipresence”, JV p. 18), and (b) the relational complementarity of every unit with *other units* (A4, L2). The first is absolute and non-contingent; the second is the domain of relationships and value. SB p. 13 holds them together — “Each unit is a whole along with its environment” — but the template needs both levels kept apart, because regulation and energisation come from (a), while value flows in (b).

2. “Independent value assessment of relationships by the units” is true only of the knowledge order. All units *recognise and fulfil* (L1), and value is real at every tier (D4) — but **evaluation** is an activity of *jeevan* alone (D6). An atom does not assess its bond; it fulfils it definitely. The graded statement — universal recognition-fulfilment, knowledge-order-only evaluation — is both what the texts say and what makes the human tier’s fragility intelligible.

3. “Units organise so that value is maximised” should be “units move definitely toward fulfilment/completeness.” See Section 5. The difference is not cosmetic: a maximisation reading reintroduces precisely the unbounded “more” that the darshan identifies as delusion, and it predicts competition for a scarce maximum where the texts predict complementarity of need and surplus.

4. “Shri Nagraj described this in the human context” undersells the texts. The general template is asserted in fully general language in SB Chapter 1 and MVD’s opening chapters, with the atomic, cellular, and planetary instances worked out (Section 1). What is true is that the *elaboration* is densest for the human case — because that is the one tier

where the template's execution is not guaranteed and therefore needs teaching. The correct framing: **the universal template is textual; the human chapters are its boundary-case analysis.**

One further sharpening on transmission: in the knowledge order, τ carries *understanding* — and only understanding. “Ignorance cannot flow in tradition” (JV p. 49) because wrongs are never accepted as sanskar (JV p. 50); yet “tradition is the source of understanding or delusion” (JV p. 54), since an unawakened tradition transmits delusion by default until understanding enters it. So human-tier transmission is not a neutral copying channel like the seed or the lineage: it is *asymmetric*, favouring whatever is genuinely acceptable to jeevan. This asymmetry is the textual basis for the darshan's optimism that an awakened tradition, once established, is self-strengthening (“with each successive generation, it becomes more robust and refined”, JV p. 49).

7. Relation to other formal frameworks

Stated at this level of generality, the template invites comparison with several modern frameworks. The comparisons are useful chiefly for locating what is *distinctive* here.

| Framework | Shared structure | Where it differs |
|--|---|--|
| Holarchy (Koestler's holons; part-wholes all the way up) | Every unit is simultaneously a whole and a part (A5, L6) | Holarchy has no medium O, no value content in relations, and no transmission operator |
| Autopoiesis (Maturana & Varela) | Persistence through continuous re-production of organisation (τ at the organism tier) | Autopoiesis is defined for living systems only; the template runs from atoms to societies, and grounds persistence in relationship-fulfilment, not self-production alone |
| Multilevel / group selection | Nested units whose higher tiers persist or fail as wholes | Selectionist engines are competitive and stochastic; the template's engine is complementarity and is definite (L2, L3) |
| Thermodynamic self-organisation (dissipative structures) | Larger structures arising from flows between non-equilibrium units | Dissipative structures require throughput of free energy and are maintenance-costly; the template's units are energised constitutively by immersion (A2), a claim with no thermodynamic analogue |
| Category-theoretic composition (see the companion paper in this collection) | Relationships as morphisms; assemblies as colimits; tiers as a partial order | Category theory is the natural notation for κ and L6, but is silent on which compositions occur; L3 (complementary need) is the selection rule the notation lacks |

The two genuinely distinctive commitments, visible only when the template is laid out formally, are: **(i)** the medium O as a constitutive, energising, regulating presence at every tier simultaneously (A1–A2) — not an aether *within* physics but a precondition *of* it; and **(ii)** value as the universal content of relations, with evaluation appearing only at the top tier (D4/D6). Frameworks that drop (i) must find energy and regulation inside the units; frameworks that drop (ii) must reconstruct value as preference or fitness. The darshan does neither.

8. Implications and uses of the template

For human organisations. P3 and P4 jointly say: a deliberate human assembly persists only if (a) its relationships are recognised and their values actually fulfilled — not merely incentivised (fear/temptation are explicitly rejected as bases of order, JV p. 39) — and (b) it institutionalises transmission of its understanding to incoming members. An organisation that fulfils values but does not transmit understanding decays on member turnover; one that

transmits rules without value-fulfilment holds together only as long as enforcement does. This is the theoretical core of the practical programme developed in *How To Form Self-Sustaining Organizations* in this collection.

For ecology and economics. P5 turns sustainability from an ethical add-on into a stability condition of the template: extraction beyond regeneration is an unfulfilled relationship at the planetary tier, and L4 then predicts decomposition pressure on the containing assembly. Likewise the darshan's cyclical economy ("producing more than the needs of family by way of circularity", MVD p. 265) is the ϕ -condition applied to production-exchange relations.

For the study of the darshan itself. The template provides a checklist for reading any passage: identify the unit, the tier, the relationships, the expectation profile, the value, the conformance regime, and the transmission carrier. Much apparent repetition across the four texts resolves into the same template instantiated at different tiers.

As a falsifiable-in-parts structure. The metaphysical clauses (O; jeevan) are not empirically testable, but several template-level claims are confronted by evidence and argument: that assembly is everywhere complementarity-driven rather than selection-driven; that human collectives sustained by understanding-transmission outlast those sustained by incentive; that definite, non-maximising development better describes lower-order dynamics than optimisation models. Holding the template explicit makes it possible to say exactly which clause any given criticism touches.

9. Limitations

1. **Formalisation is interpretive.** The symbols above (κ , τ , μ) do not appear in the texts; they are this paper's compression of textual claims, and the page citations are the warrant for each. Where compression involved judgment (notably, treating "seed coordination" as one operator τ with four carriers), the judgment is flagged in place.
 2. **The medium and jeevan are axioms, not results.** A1–A2 and D6 carry the darshan's full metaphysical weight. The template's *structure* survives bracketing them, but its explanation of energisation, regulation, and evaluation does not.
 3. **The texts are realisation-reports, not arguments from premises.** Shri Nagraj presents these claims as seen in samadhi-samyama (MVD p. 7). The template organises the claims; it cannot supply independent evidence for them.
 4. **Translation risk.** Quotations follow the published English translations of Hindi originals; several key terms (*vyavastha* as "orderliness", *nirvah* as "fulfilment", *samprikt* as "saturated") carry interpretive choices made by the translators.
-

10. Conclusion

The reading that Madhyasth Darshan is “centered on the stability of the whole structure of existence”, with inseparable units, valued relationships, ever-larger assemblies, and inter-generational transmission, is confirmed by the texts — and is *more* than an interpretation: it is a structure the texts themselves assert at every order of nature. Stated formally, it is one template: **immersed units, definite relationships, value as the content of fulfilment, composition by complementarity, persistence by fulfilment, transmission by order-specific carriers, iterated into a tiered hierarchy** — with a single discontinuity at the knowledge order, where every clause must pass through understanding, making the human tier at once the most capable and the only unfinished level of the structure. The corrections required to the informal reading are few but consequential: separate the medium from the environment, restrict evaluation (not value) to jeevan, and replace maximisation with definite movement toward completeness. With those corrections, the template stands as a precise, general, and textually grounded statement of what Shri Nagraj called coexistence.

References

All sources cited in this document, grouped by type. Each entry begins with the bold tag used in the text.

Madhyasth Darshan (primary sources)

- **JV** — Nagraj, A. *Jeevan Vidya: An Introduction* (*ju-parichaya*). English translation, version 3.0. Page numbers refer to this edition.
- **MVD** — Nagraj, A. *Madhyasth Darshan (Manav Vyavahar Darshan)*. English version 4.0. Page numbers refer to this edition; chapter numbers given where the edition marks them.
- **SB** — Nagraj, A. *Samadhanatmak Bhautikvad (Resolution Centred Materialism)*. Bilingual edition. Page numbers refer to this edition.

Companion papers in this collection

- [*Category Theory Explained*](#)
- [*How To Form Self-Sustaining Organizations*](#)
- [*Why Humans Are Not Just Material*](#)
- [*Human Behavior and Society*](#)