

Conscion Field Theory Resolves the Mind-Matter Divide through Unified Dual-Aspect Reality

Richard Gauthier

Abstract

The ancient subjective-objective divide remains the central bottleneck across contemporary physics, neurobiology, and the philosophy of mind. Mainstream physicalism relies on a bottom-up reductionism that treats consciousness as an accidental epiphenomenon, while alternative dualisms frequently succumb to the combination problem. This paper introduces Conscion Field Theory (CFT), a mathematically constrained, predictive dual-aspect field theory that expands the state-space of standard Quantum Field Theory (QFT). By coupling physical fields to a five-dimensional Tanmatric State Vector $\Phi_{\text{Tanmatric}}$, CFT formalizes P.R. Sarkar's cosmological laws from his *Ananda Sutram*—specifically the Law of Attributional Capacity—into a constant scalar invariant conservation law.

Grounded in the invariant physical property of frequency, the principle of Physical Phase-Locking establishes how subjective qualities are deterministically bound to physical wave dynamics, identifying biological sensory gateways as the vital physical infrastructure for this field-coupling. By replacing bottom-up fragmentation with a top-down cosmic field interaction, CFT provides systemic, definitive resolutions to nine foundational paradoxes and modern challenges that have long stymied Western thought: René Descartes' original Mind-Body interaction problem, David Chalmers' "hard problem" of consciousness, John Locke's Inverted Spectrum, John Searle's Chinese Room, Frank Jackson's Mary's Room, Thomas Nagel's Bat perception anomaly, the epistemological deadlock of Direct vs. Indirect Realism, the neurophysiological Binding Problem, and the dilemma about AI Consciousness. Finally, the paper demonstrates the practical utility of CFT by outlining a blueprint for Eco-Phenomenological Virtual Reality (VR) frameworks, positioning the theory as a functional "empathy engine" that validates the universal, ethical tenets of Sarkar's Neohumanism. —Saint Louis, USA, June 9, 2026

Keywords: Conscion Field Theory, Consciousness Studies, Mind-Matter Relation, Theory of Consciousness, Unified Field Theory, Philosophy of Mind, Hard Problem of Consciousness, Dual-Aspect Monism, Physicalism, Panpsychism, Foundations of Quantum Mechanics, History of Philosophy, Subjective-Objective Dichotomy, Philosophy of Science.

“Wherever there is any semblance or sign of existence there is bound to be a corresponding vibration or wave, and that vibration must be associated with some inferential expression (tanmātra) or the other. Do you understand? A vibration is always dependent on an inferential expression (tanmātra). Different tanmātras are associated with different vibrations. That is how from these vibrations, inferences such as sound, touch, form, taste and smell continue to saturate the universe. Since they are associated with the tanmātras, sound, touch, form, taste and smell emanate from their respective vibrations and permeate the universe. So, wherever there are

vibrations, there must be sound, touch, smell, form, taste, and they all come within the scope of perception. Varña (mental color) is also a kind of tanmātra. Different colors have been created due to the creative excellence of Prakṛti (the Supreme Entity's creative power) and the dexterity of Māya (that same creative power). But He who is the Creator of all these, the Primordial Cause, that Supreme Entity (Parama Puruṣa) remains colorless, beyond the bondage of tanmātras, be it positive, negative or any other form of tánmātric influence." – Prabhat Ranjan Sarkar

–Source: "Parama Puruṣa – the Primordial Cause", 12 April 1979, Calcutta

1. The Historical Fracture: How Subjectivity Was Exiled from Nature

The separation of mind and matter is not a modern development; its foundations were laid at the very beginning of Western scientific thought. To construct a predictable, mechanical view of the universe, early thinkers found it necessary to strip physical matter of its felt, experiential qualities.

Democritus: The Exile of Quality (5th Century BCE)

The divide began with ancient Greek atomism. Democritus of Abdera asserted that the universe consists entirely of indivisible particles (atoms) moving through empty space (the void). To maintain a purely mechanical physics, Democritus declared that sensory experiences are merely human constructs rather than fundamental properties of nature:

"By convention sweet is sweet, bitter is bitter, hot is hot, cold is cold, color is color; but in reality there are only atoms and the void." [Fragment 9]

By declaring that taste, temperature, and color are not in the atoms themselves, but are subjective illusions generated when external atoms collide with our sense organs, Democritus established a lasting precedent: real physics deals only with quantities; qualities belong strictly to the observer.

Galileo and Descartes: The Mathematical Split (17th Century)

During the scientific revolution, Galileo Galilei codified Democritus' intuition into the methodology of modern science. Galileo stated that the "Book of Nature" is written in the language of mathematics. For physics to be mathematically precise, it had to exclude subjective sensations. He posited that properties like shape, number, and motion remain even if you remove the observer; however, smells, tastes, and colors are entirely localized within the sensing consciousness.

Shortly after, René Descartes formalized this split into a rigorous metaphysical dualism:

Res Extensa (Extended Substance): The physical world, which has mass, extension, and spatial dimension, governed entirely by mechanical laws.

Res Cogitans (Thinking Substance): The unextended mind, where all qualitative experiences (qualia) reside.

While this division allowed the physical sciences to flourish by ignoring the mind, it created a massive explanatory vacuum: if matter is completely devoid of subjective qualities, how can a physical brain ever generate conscious experience?

Locke and Berkeley: The Subjective Backlash (17th–18th Century)

As empiricism gained prominence, philosophers wrestled with how we can ever truly know the physical world if we only directly encounter our own sensations.

John Locke attempted to standardize the Galilean split by dividing properties into Primary and Secondary Qualities. Primary qualities (like size, shape, and motion) are objective and exist within the object itself. Secondary qualities (like color, sound, and taste) are just powers within the object to produce sensations in us.

George Berkeley recognized a fatal flaw in Locke's logic. Berkeley argued that you cannot perceive an object's shape or motion without also perceiving its color, texture, or boundary. Therefore, primary and secondary qualities are completely inseparable. Because everything we experience is fundamentally mental, Berkeley collapsed the physical world entirely, asserting that to be is to be perceived (*esse est percipi*).

2. The Modern Impasse: Physicalism vs. Panpsychism

For the last century, mainstream science has leaned into absolute Physicalism, attempting to explain consciousness as an "emergent property" of complex, non-conscious biological wiring. This framework still stumbles on David Chalmers' famous "Hard Problem" of consciousness: no amount of quantitative rearranging of purely objective matter (neurons, electrical charges, synapses) can logically explain why or how it *feels* like something from the inside. There is an unbridged explanatory gap between objective neural data and subjective qualia.

To fix this, contemporary panpsychism suggests that consciousness is fundamental and ubiquitous, meaning even elementary particles possess basic mental attributes. However, panpsychism suffers from a fatal flaw known as the combination problem: how do billions of isolated, independent micro-consciousnesses (like those of individual quarks or electrons) cleanly merge into a single, unified, coherent human self?

3. Contemporary Quantum Biology: The Limits of Orch-OR

The most prominent contemporary scientific attempt to locate consciousness at the quantum level is the Orchestrated Objective Reduction (Orch-OR) theory, proposed by physicist Roger Penrose and anesthesiologist Stuart Hameroff (2014). Orch-OR posits that consciousness does not emerge from complex neural networks, but rather from quantum computations within microtubules—structural proteins inside biological neurons. According to this model, quantum superpositions of tubulin proteins collapse via a specific gravitational threshold ($E=G/t$) creating discrete bursts of proto-conscious experience.

While Orch-OR correctly looks beyond classical neuroscience, it suffers from two major limitations:

1. **Biological Isolation:** It confines the mechanism of consciousness to highly specific biological structures (microtubules), treating the rest of the physical universe as essentially dead or non-conscious.
2. **The Combination Problem:** It fails to explain how millions of isolated, micro-gravitational quantum collapses throughout a brain cleanly unify into a single, seamless, macroscopic human ego.

4. The Mirror Image: The "Hard Problem" of Advaita Monism

While Western physicalism faces the problem of explaining how mindless matter generates mind, classical Eastern **Advaita Monism** flips the paradigm but runs directly into its own mirror-image dilemma. Advaita posits that *Brahman* (Pure, undifferentiated Consciousness) is the sole fundamental reality. The physical world is merely *Maya*—an illusion or superimposition.

This framework gives rise to **Advaita's Hard Problem:** If fundamental reality is entirely non-dual, changeless, and formless, how and why does it split into the concrete, objective laws of physics, mathematical constants, and distinct individual minds? If matter is dismissed purely as an illusion, Advaita struggles to provide a rigorous, scientific account of physical causality. It leaves an explanatory gap between pure awareness and the highly precise, mathematical calculations observed in quantum mechanics.

5. The Solution: Conscion Field Theory (CFT)

In a previous article, Gauthier (2026) introduced Conscion Field Theory, based the philosophy of Prabhat Ranjan Sarkar¹ in his treatise *Ananda Sutram* (1960). CFT resolves the above 2,500-year-old debate by shifting the paradigm from purely qualitative philosophy to a dual-aspect quantitative field theory. Instead of treating subjectivity as an unmeasurable illusion (Democritus/Galileo) or abandoning the physical world altogether (Berkeley), CFT posits that fundamental particles possess two distinct, inseparable sets of quantitative measurements:

1. **Quantitative Physical Properties:** Mass, charge, spin, and spatial coordinates.
2. **Quantitative Subjective Tanmatric Properties:** Intensities of raw sensory data and proto-experiential fields.

The fundamental unit of this framework is the **conscion** (meaning “particle composed of consciousness”). The conscion acts as a dual-aspect information quantum. When objects or materials emanate physical vibrational entities carrying subtle tanmatras (such as the red sensory

¹ For a comprehensive overview of Sarkar's multidisciplinary contributions across linguistics, history, economics, cognitive philosophy and much more, establishing his reputation as an intellectual polymath and all-knowing entity, distinct from purely devotional traditions, see Gauthier, R., "Who Was Prabhat Ranjan Sarkar or Shrii Shrii Anandamurti?" Available in the Bibliography.

inference of a photon), the tanmatras can traverse our sensory organs and physical nervous system to certain “appropriative points” where they strike the individual’s mental plate, translating directly into unified, coherent qualia (like the mind’s conscious experience of redness). This bypasses the combination problem entirely because subjectivity is built directly into the foundational field structure of the universe.

6. CFT vs. Panpsychism: Distinguishing Fields from Particles

Because CFT embeds subjectivity at the foundational layer of reality, it is critical to address why it is not a variation of contemporary Panpsychism. The distinction is foundational, resting on a shift from particle-centric philosophy to field-theoretic physics:

- **Metaphysical Nature:** Panpsychism is *Atomistic / Pluralistic* (matter is primary; particles possess independent micro-minds). CFT is *Field-Theoretic / Non-Dual* (unified fields are primary; particles are merely localized excitations of these fields).
- **Status of Consciousness:** In panpsychism, consciousness is an intrinsic interior property belonging exclusively inside an isolated particle. In CFT, consciousness is a macro-cosmic, dual-aspect field (the conscion field) flowing through particles.
- **Combination Problem:** Panpsychism is *highly vulnerable* (must explain how isolated minds glue together). CFT is *immune* (individual minds are localized expressions of an already unified field).

Why CFT is Immune to the Combination Problem

Panpsychism fails because it attempts a bottom-up construction of consciousness. CFT completely bypasses this issue via a top-down approach. In quantum field theory, particles do not exist as independent, self-contained little balls; they are simply localized fluctuations of an all-pervading, universal field. CFT applies this exact logic to consciousness.

The conscion field is fundamentally non-local and continuous. A fundamental particle does not possess its own private, isolated little consciousness. Rather, a particle’s quantitative subjective tanmatric properties are localized metrics of the global, universal mind-field interacting with that particle’s physical manifestation. Because consciousness is already a single, continuous, unified cosmic field at the foundational level, there are no fragmented “mind-atoms” to combine.

7. The Mathematical Structure of Tanmatric Intensities

To satisfy the modern physicist and the analytical philosopher, CFT does not treat subjective properties as fuzzy, unquantifiable feelings. Instead, it defines them as quantitative tanmatric intensities. In physics, a field assigns a value to every point in space and time (such as the strength of an electric field). CFT expands the standard Lagrangian framework of quantum field theory by adding a parallel subjective field component. Every fundamental particle is modeled as a dual-

aspect wave packet where standard physical parameters—mass (m), charge (q), and spin (s) — exist in complete synchronization with a vector of subjective intensities (I_n).

These tanmatric intensities represent the raw mathematical values of proto-sensory fields (such as proto-luminosity, proto-resonance, or proto-impact). They interact deterministically with physical fields. Just as a particle's physical mass and charge dictate how it warps spacetime or reacts to electromagnetic fields, its tanmatric vector dictates its intrinsic subjective output. When particles interact, their physical properties undergo energy transformations, while their parallel subjective properties scale proportionally. Subjective intensities are deeply tied to physical energy states, ensuring that mind and matter remain perfectly synchronized without violating the laws of thermodynamics.

8. Quantum Entanglement and the Non-Local Mental Field

One of the greatest mysteries in modern physics is quantum entanglement, which Einstein famously dismissed as "spooky action at a distance." When two particles become entangled, measuring the state of one instantaneously determines the state of the other, no matter how far apart they are. Traditional physicalism struggles to interpret this phenomenon, resulting in fractured models like the Copenhagen interpretation or the many-worlds hypothesis.

CFT offers a cleaner, more intuitive solution by looking at entanglement through a dual-aspect lens. Because every particle is governed by a conscion—which has both a physical manifest layer and an underlying subjective root—entangled particles are not actually separate entities operating across empty space. Instead, they are local, physical projections of a single, non-local underlying field.

CFT proposes that the subjective aspect of the conscion field operates independently of 4D Einsteinian spacetime constraints. When two particles are entangled, their inner tanmatric vectors are bound at a foundational level. The instantaneous coordination observed in physics experiments is not a signal traveling through space faster than light; rather, it is a localized expression of a deeply unified, non-local mental field. This mechanism neatly resolves the paradoxes of quantum mechanics by showing that non-locality is an inherent feature of a conscious universe.

9. Metaphysical Foundation: Sarkar's Cosmic Architecture

To ground this dual-aspect physics, CFT draws upon the macro-conceptual framework of philosopher Prabhat Ranjan Sarkar, who formulated a dynamic monism within his *Ananda Sutram*. Sarkar does not dismiss the physical universe as a non-existent illusion; instead, he defines it as a rational, objective manifestation of the Supreme Consciousness through the Cosmic Cycle (*Brahma Chakra*). This systemic resolution is codified in the opening sutras of the *Ananda Sutram*:

Sutra 1-1: *Shivashaktyātmakaṁ Brahma*

Meaning: Brahma (Supreme Consciousness) is the inseparable composite of Shiva (Cognitive Principle) and Shakti (Operative Principle).

Application: Consciousness is never a passive, featureless void. It inherently possesses a creative, mathematical force (Shakti). The potential for physical manifestation, geometry, and natural law is built directly into the absolute source from the very beginning.

Sutra 1-2: *Shaktih Śā Shivasya Shaktih*

Meaning: Shakti is the immanent power of Shiva.

Application: Force and consciousness are not a Cartesian dualism. Just as fire cannot be separated from its heat, physical energy, fields, and laws are simply the functional expressions of the Cosmic Mind.

The Cosmic Cycle: From Mind to Matter

Sarkar's *Brahma Chakra* outlines an explicit process of cosmic condensation, tracking how pure consciousness transforms into the physical universe:

1. **Saincara (The Extroversive Phase):** Pure consciousness (Shiva), under the step-by-step modification of its own Operative Force (Shakti), condenses into the Cosmic Mind (*Chitta*).
2. **Emanation of Tanmatras:** As the Cosmic Mind continues to contract, it projects its own thoughts outward as fine micro-waves or *tanmatras* (rudimentary sensory currents).
3. **Solidification into Matter:** These tanmatras group together and condense into the fundamental particles of physics—quarks, leptons, and bosons.

This cosmic architecture shows that matter is not the opposite of mind; it is the final, most condensed stage of the Cosmic Mind. Conscion Field Theory provides the exact scientific framework for this step, mapping the exact point where these cosmic tanmatras register as measurable physical attributes in our laboratories.

10. The Quantitative Development of CFT: Methodological Foundations

A legitimate question arising from a dual-aspect framework is: Where is the quantitative theory of Conscion Field Theory? Critics may argue that while the physical parameters are clear, the subjective aspect risks remaining a set of unquantifiable concepts.

To the contrary, CFT is being actively developed as a mathematically constrained, predictive field theory. It does not replace or rewrite standard Quantum Field Theory (QFT); rather, it expands the state-space of existing QFT by coupling physical fields to a highly constrained, five-dimensional Tanmatric State Vector $\Phi_{Tanmatric}$.

$$\Phi_{Tanmatric} = (I_{sound}, I_{touch}, I_{form}, I_{taste}, I_{smell})$$

The values within this vector are strictly bound and prevented from being arbitrary free parameters by three pillars of constraints:

1. Theoretical Invariants: Sarkar's Law of Attributional Capacity

CFT formalizes P.R. Sarkar's cosmological progression as outlined in *Ananda Sutram*, specifically leveraging Sutras 1-8 and 1-10 to derive a strict conservation law governing the five fundamental factors (*bhutas*: ethereal, aerial, luminous, liquid, solid) as they map onto states of physical matter.

Sarkar defines the mechanism of crude physical manifestation through the increasing bondage of the cosmic operative principle (*Prakrti*):

Sutra 1-8: *Guṇabandhanena guṇābhivyaktih.*

(As the guṇas increase their bondage, they express themselves fully in the emergence of the fundamental factors.)

Sarkar's purport: "Guṇa means "binding principle". The stronger the bondage upon anything, the cruder the thing becomes. When in Her freedom acquired from Puruṣa, Prakrti binds Puruṣa, the conscious Puruṣa gets metamorphosed into Mahattattva, Ahaṁtattva, citta, etc., under the ever-increasing binding factors, and then as the result of the gradually greater and still greater bondage of tamoguṇa there come into being as per degrees of crudification, the ethereal, the aerial, the luminous, the liquid and (ultimately) the solid factors. Even in the latter there are degrees of bondage. On account of the firmness of bondage, the inter-atomic and inter-molecular distances go on decreasing, as the result of which the internal frictions in the material body go on increasing. The external pressure of attributional bondage and the internal frictions compel greater and greater attributional expressions in the bodies of objects."

"Here one should bear in mind that "attributional expression" does not mean the excess of attributional capabilities, but that of the attributional manifestations as well as the attributional diversities. The ākāśhatattva [ethereal factor] has the sound-carrying attribute. If, suppose, we fix its measure at one hundred, in that case, when the ākāśhatattva gets metamorphosed into the vāyutattva [aerial factor] on account of greater static bondage, the attribute of touch is also expressed therein along with the sound-carrying attribute, but the attributional capacity remains what it is – unenhanced. The sound-carrying attribute wanes in the vāyutattva as compared to the ākāśhatattva, but, all the same, the combined measure of the sonic and the tactual attributes still remains at one hundred."

Sutra 1-10: *Guṇaprabhāvena bhūtaśaungharśādbalam.*

(Due to the increasing influence of the guṇas, clash occurs among the fundamental factors and bala [energy] is produced.)

Sarkar's purport: "The firmer the binding factor on the object body, the greater the internal friction in it. This clash or play of forces is called bala or prāṇa [power or energy]. This prāṇa exists more or less in all objects or elements, although its expression has not taken place or does not take place in them in equal proportion."

In the framework of CFT, these two sutras provide the vital metaphysical foundation for the **Law of Attributional Capacity**. Sutra 1-8 establishes that the progressive bondage of the *gunas* (*tamoguna*) forces the latent, subjective properties of consciousness to differentiate into explicit, objective attributes (*tanmatras*). However, Sutra 1-10 establishes that this differentiation is driven by an internal "clash" or friction, meaning that the emergence of physical energy (*bala*) and diverse material properties is a structural reallocation of a singular underlying potential.

Consequently, while the diversity of manifested attributes increases as consciousness condenses into cruder states of matter, the total attributional capacity remains an unenhanced, constant scalar invariant (C_{Total}). Mathematically, this means the sum of the tanmatric intensities is normalized to a fixed maximum value (e.g., $C_{Total} = 100$):

$$\sum_{n=1}^5 I_n = I_{\text{sound}} + I_{\text{touch}} + I_{\text{form}} + I_{\text{taste}} + I_{\text{smell}} = C_{Total}$$

Because of this invariant, a specific *bhuta* is mathematically identified by which intensities are permitted to populate the vector, and which are strictly forced to zero:

- **Ethereal Factor (Space):** Devoid of internal friction, it can only express a sonic vibration:

$$\Phi_{\text{Ether}} = (C_{Total}, 0, 0, 0, 0)^T.$$

- **Aerial Factor:** Expresses touch, but must siphon its magnitude away from sound, keeping the net sum constant:

$$\Phi_{\text{Air}} = (I_{\text{sound}}, I_{\text{touch}}, 0, 0, 0)^T, \text{ where } I_{\text{sound}} + I_{\text{touch}} = C_{\text{Tot}}$$

- **Luminous Factor:** Expresses form (light/visibility), siphoning energy from the preceding dimensions:

$$\Phi_{\text{Luminous}} = (I_{\text{sound}}, I_{\text{touch}}, I_{\text{form}}, 0, 0)^T, \text{ where } I_{\text{sound}} + I_{\text{touch}} + I_{\text{form}} = C_{\text{Tot}}$$

- **Liquid Factor:** Expresses taste, further distributing the constant available capacity:

$$\Phi_{\text{Liquid}} = (I_{\text{sound}}, I_{\text{touch}}, I_{\text{form}}, I_{\text{taste}}, 0)^T, \text{ where } I_{\text{sound}} + I_{\text{touch}} + I_{\text{form}} + I_{\text{taste}} = C_{\text{Tot}}$$

- **Solid Factor:** Expresses all five attributes, meaning the individual magnitudes are at their most distributed, yet their collective sum remains strictly bounded:

$$\Phi_{\text{Solid}} = (I_{\text{sound}}, I_{\text{touch}}, I_{\text{form}}, I_{\text{taste}}, I_{\text{smell}})^T, \text{ where } \sum_{n=1}^5 I_n = C_{\text{Tot}}$$

2. Physical Phase-Locking: Frequency and Quality

In CFT, the qualitative type of a subjective experience (the specific shade of redness or pitch of a sound) is deterministically specified by physical frequencies. For example, a specific range of photon frequencies phase-locks onto a specific range of the proto-luminosity (form) *tanmatra*. In acoustics, it is likewise the frequency rather than the wavelength (though they are related by the wave's speed) that determines the perceived pitch. This reliance on frequency is a strict physical necessity: when light or sound travels through different media (such as light passing through water or glass), the wavelength compresses or expands, but the frequency remains absolutely constant. Because our conscious perception of color or pitch remains invariant across these media, the subjective quality cannot be tied to shifting wavelengths; it must be structurally and universally bound to physical frequency through cosmic phase-locking.

This rigid structural coupling allows CFT to decisively resolve nine long-standing philosophical dilemmas and neurophysiological anomalies that have stymied mainstream Western physicalism for centuries:

- **René Descartes' Mind-Body Interaction Problem (1641):** Descartes famously segregated reality into two incompatible substances: immaterial mind (*res cogitans*) and spatial, mechanical matter (*res extensa*). However, the fatal flaw of this interactionist dualism was exposed in 1643 by Princess Elisabeth of Bohemia during their extensive intellectual correspondence. As documented in the Descartes-Elisabeth Correspondence Record, Elisabeth famously challenged Descartes to explain how a completely immaterial soul could physically touch or exert a force to move the material body. Because Descartes' framework lacked a shared medium for causal interaction, Western thought fractured into centuries of reductionism. CFT completely resolves the historic Cartesian interaction problem. By establishing that fundamental particles are not inert, "dead" matter, but dual-aspect entities that inherently carry both physical fields and subjective *tanmatric* field intensities, CFT eliminates the need for an impossible bridge between two independent substances. Mind and matter do not directly collide as separate, incompatible entities. Rather, through Physical Phase-Locking, physical frequencies and subjective qualities are revealed as legally coupled, top-down expressions of a single, unified cosmic field. The Cartesian rift caused by Elisabeth is healed because the physical body and the perceiving mind are fundamentally rooted in the same dual-aspect reality.
- **David Chalmers' "Hard Problem" of Consciousness (1995):** Chalmers argued that even after cognitive science explains all the neurological functions and behaviors of the brain (the "easy problems"), the truly "Hard Problem" remains: why and how do physical processes give rise to rich, subjective internal experience (qualia)? CFT elegantly dissolves the Hard Problem. It stops forcing mindless physical brain cells to manufacture internal sensory experiences. Instead, CFT treats consciousness as a foundational cosmic property. The physical brain is not a creator of qualia, but a localized biological transducer. Subjective experience occurs when the physical frequencies processed by the nervous system phase-lock onto the corresponding cosmic *tanmatric* field vectors, bridging objective biophysics with subjective realization at the root of reality.

- **The Epistemological Deadlock: Indirect vs. Direct Realism:** Traditional philosophy of perception is split between Direct Realism (the assumption that we perceive the external world exactly as it is) and Indirect Realism (the belief that we only perceive internal, mental proxies created by the brain). CFT resolves this impasse through Dual-Aspect Field Theory. Because physical fields are fundamentally coupled to the five-dimensional Tanmatric State Vector ($\Phi_{\text{Tanmatric}}$), human perception is not an isolated brain manufacturing an internal illusion. Through physical phase-locking, the human mind directly interacts with the objective cosmic field. We do not perceive a representation of the universe; we directly experience the universe's own fundamental, dual-aspect reality.
- **John Locke's "Inverted Spectrum Hypothesis" (1689):** Locke proposed that two individuals could share identical physical brain states while experiencing inverted subjective qualia—such as one person experiencing "greenness" where another experiences "redness" when exposed to an identical frequency of light. Physicalism cannot disprove this because it views consciousness as an accidental byproduct generated internally by the brain. CFT completely rules out the inverted spectrum. Because the relationship between physical frequency and subjective quality is fixed at the foundation of the universe through cosmic phase-locking, identical physical frequencies must couple with identical *tanmatric* qualities. The spectrum cannot be inverted because color is a fundamental property of the cosmic field interaction, not an isolated neurochemical fluke.
- **John Searle's "Chinese Room" Argument (1980):** Searle argued that pure symbol manipulation (syntax) can never produce genuine understanding or meaning (semantics). A classical computer processes structural data without any inner realization of what that data represents. CFT solves this by redefining what "information" actually is. Within a dual-aspect field theory, a physical frequency (syntax) does not exist in isolation; it is legally phase-locked to a corresponding *tanmatric* intensity (semantics). True semantic understanding requires the dual-aspect *conscion* to bridge the physical mechanism with cosmic consciousness.
- **Frank Jackson's "Mary's Room" Thought Experiment (1982):** This paradox asks whether a brilliant neuroscientist confined to a strictly black-and-white environment—yet possessing complete physical knowledge of color vision—learns something new when she is released and sees a red object for the first time. Physicalists struggle to explain this "new" knowledge. CFT resolves it cleanly: Mary possessed the mathematical data of the QFT equations, but lacked the experiential activation of the coupled *Tanmatric State Vector*. Therefore, Mary absolutely learns something new upon her release: she experiences the transition from mere physical calculation to active dual-aspect field coupling, proving that a purely physicalist description of reality is fundamentally incomplete without the activation of the subjective *tanmatric* field intensities.
- **Thomas Nagel's "What Is It Like to Be a Bat?" (1974):** Nagel famously argued that because a bat's sensory apparatus is fundamentally different from our own, humans can never truly understand its subjective phenomenological reality [INDEX]. CFT provides the mathematical and structural grammar to dismantle this barrier. A bat's brain processes

high-frequency acoustic wave dynamics that phase-lock onto the *aerial factor* (I_{touch}) and *ethereal factor* (I_{sound}) in a configuration foreign to human neurobiology. By mapping the bat's frequency inputs to the constrained values of the $\Phi_{\text{Tanmatric}}$ vector, we can mathematically model the exact structural contours of its subjective state. Far from remaining a purely theoretical solution, this mathematical mapping provides the functional blueprint for advanced Eco-Phenomenological Virtual Reality (VR) systems. By integrating the CFT coupling constants into software architecture, an advanced VR program could ingest real-time sonar or echolocation frequencies and systematically translate them into human-compatible tanmatric intensities. Rather than merely viewing a visual simulation of a bat's environment on a screen, a user equipped with this interface would experience a radical, calibrated redistribution of their own $\Phi_{\text{Tanmatric}}$ vector. They would literally experience the 3D geometry of a pitch-black environment mapping directly onto their consciousness as a tactile-sonic landscape—rendering Nagel's famously "unanswerable" mystery a concrete human reality. Beyond its technological and commercial value, this application would serve as a powerful practical vehicle for Sarkar's philosophy of Neohumanism. By creating a platform where humans can directly experience foreign, non-human sensory realities, these "What is it like to be a..." programs would act as profound empathy engines. They would dismantle the anthropocentric biases of mindless reductionism by allowing us to intimately realize that other living beings possess a sacred inner existence, validating Sarkar's reminder that other living beings "love their own lives just as much as we love our own lives."

- **The Neurophysiological "Binding Problem":** Modern neuroscience is at a complete loss to explain how the brain unifies disparate sensory inputs—such as the simultaneous color, sound, and texture of an object—into a single, coherent conscious experience, given that these inputs are processed in completely isolated regions of the cerebral cortex. CFT reveals that this binding problem is an artifact of physicalist reductionism. The binding does not occur within the physical architecture of the brain. Instead, because the *Tanmatric State Vector* ($\Phi_{\text{Tanmatric}}$) natively unifies all five fundamental attributes within a single, five-dimensional cosmic field framework, the data is already bound at the root of reality. The biophysical brain merely acts as a localized transducer, allowing the *citta* (mind-stuff) to adopt the shape of the entire vector simultaneously, while the *aham* (the ego-sense) experiences it as a single, unified perceptual object.
- **The Dilemma of Artificial AI Consciousness:** Many modern computer scientists believe that if a silicon-based neural network achieves enough complexity, conscious awareness will "emerge" out of the code. CFT firmly rejects the idea that classical electronic or silicon-based computers can ever achieve genuine consciousness, regardless of their processing power. Building on the Chinese Room logic, CFT demonstrates that digital AI operates entirely via abstract symbol shuffling across uncoupled electro-magnetic pathways. It completely lacks the biological sensory gateways required to phase-lock with the subjective aspect of the cosmic field. An electronic AI can mimic intelligent behavior, but it remains a completely unilluminated mechanism—an elaborate phonograph processing physical syntax without ever experiencing the semantic presence of the inner witness.

3. Empirical Inputs: Psychophysics and Brain Response

While physical frequencies dictate the quality of a tanmatra, the magnitudes of intensity (I_n) are mapped using the empirical laws of classical psychophysics (such as the Weber-Fechner law and Stevens' Power Law), updated by modern neuroscience's data on brain-stimulus and conscious-response thresholds. By using subjective ratings of experienced qualia intensities as real data metrics, CFT establishes a bridge where internal phenomenological data directly calibrates the coupling constants of the coupled QFT equations.

4. The Metaphysical Mechanism of Conscious Awareness: The Cosmic Searchlight

The operational climax of CFT lies in explaining the exact mechanism by which the aggregated sensory waves within the $\Phi_{\text{Tanmatric}}$ vector are elevated into conscious experience. Within Sarkar's framework, the structural anatomy of the individual mind—comprising the mind-stuff (*citta*), the functional ego (*aham* or the "doer-I"), and the existential feeling of "I exist" (*mahat*)—is composed entirely of qualified consciousness. While the mind operates as a highly sophisticated, simulative gateway interface, its inherent awareness is initially obscured by its imposed qualities. For an objective physical excitation to be perceived, it must first impact the bodily sense organs, prompting the *citta* to reshape its mental substance to mirror the exact quantized wave-frequency of the incoming conscion field.

However, the mind-stuff and the ego remain fundamentally insentient objects of perception until they receive a top-down illumination. The individual mind becomes luminous and aware solely because of its separate individual consciousness or self (*Atman*), which is a localized reflection of the singular, infinite Cosmic Consciousness (*Purusha*). Just as the moon has no light of its own but appears brilliant by reflecting the sun, the individual mind experiences subjective awareness because it is continuously illuminated by this reflected Cosmic searchlight. As the *aham* acts as an algorithmic command structure, witnessing quantized qualia on the screen of its *citta*, the entire matrix is dynamically illuminated by this reflected individual consciousness.

This architectural blueprint successfully closes the explanatory gap of the physicalist "hard problem" because we are no longer forcing mindless physical brain matter to manufacture subjective sensory experiences. Instead, it establishes a clear bifurcation of memory storage within the *citta*. At most, cerebral memories stored physically in brain cells—acting like a hologram, videotape, or phonograph—can regenerate stored sensory *tanmatras* for the *aham* to re-experience via the *citta* when the *aham* issues a *tanmatric* memory search command. These physical cerebral records stand in sharp contrast to extracerebral memories, which are stored as deeper reactive potentials (*samskaras*) within the subtler layers of the mind itself. Ultimately, through this final illumination, matter, *tanmatras*, mind, and individual consciousness are revealed as a single, cohesive, top-down lineage of differentially qualified Supreme Consciousness.

Conclusion: The Universe Restored to Wholeness

By linking the mathematical precision of quantum mechanics with the sweeping metaphysics of Sarkar's *Brahma Chakra*, Conscion Field Theory offers a comprehensive, mathematically testable

resolution to the ancient subjective-objective divide. The conscion serves as the vital point of contact where Eastern metaphysics meets modern physics. By demonstrating that fundamental fields carry both physical attributes and subjective tanmatric intensities, CFT proves that the universe is not an accidental fragmentation of dead matter, but a coherent, unified whole.

By trading the bottom-up fragmentation of panpsychism for a top-down field theory, CFT completely avoids the combination problem that compromises modern dualist alternatives to physicalism. Furthermore, CFT rescues physicalism from its mindless reductionism and anchors the core insights of Advaita's idealism within testable mathematical physics. In doing so, CFT presents a complete universe where science and consciousness are fully reconciled, offering a rigorous new paradigm for the future of physics and philosophy alike.

Appendix: Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)

Q1: If CFT is a quantitative theory, where are the explicit, finalized field equations? Why describe its conceptual architecture first?

A: Conscion Field Theory is an active, open-ended research program, not a static dogma. Its physical infrastructure builds directly upon the existing, mathematically verified foundations of Quantum Field Theory (QFT). The ongoing mathematical development of its subjective aspect is strictly constrained by physical conservation laws, the theoretical invariance of Sarkar's Law of Attributional Capacity (*Ananda Sutram* 1-8 and 1-10), and the empirical equations of classical psychophysics.

Outlining the conceptual and boundary framework first is a deliberate, strategic necessity. It establishes the rigorous boundary conditions, filters out research dead ends, and invites interdisciplinary physicists, neuroscientists, and philosophers to collaborate on populating and testing the coupled dual-aspect equations that link physical frequencies to the mind via the sensory gateways.

Q2: Does CFT imply that inanimate matter, like a rock, possesses a rich inner life or human-like consciousness?

A: No. This is a common misunderstanding of field-based consciousness models, and it is where CFT radically differs from naive panpsychism. While a fundamental particle within a rock carries a highly constrained, five-dimensional Tanmatric State Vector $\Phi_{Tanmatric}$, its subjective intensity values (I_n) are entirely bound by the crushing static bondage of *tamoguna* (as described in *Ananda Sutram* 1-8). In crude matter, the vector states are mathematically locked, meaning there is no complex biophysical infrastructure to process, amplify, or reflect those states into an active "inner narrative." A rock contains the foundational ingredients of the subjective field, but lacks the complex, dynamic physical feedback loops required to experience active perception.

Q3: How can internal phenomenological states truly serve as "real data metrics" to calibrate physics equations? Isn't subjectivity too unreliable?

A: Subjectivity is highly structured. Classical psychophysics has proven for over a century via the Weber-Fechner Law and Stevens' Power Law that human subjective responses to physical stimuli scale according to strict mathematical logarithmic and power functions. Modern functional neuroimaging (fMRI and EEG) further maps these thresholds with precise neural correlates.

CFT does not rely on vague introspection; it utilizes these highly predictable, mathematically regularized psychophysical data points as empirical inputs. By treating quantified qualia intensities as legitimate values, we can systematically calibrate the coupling constants that bridge the physical QFT equations to the subjective field vector.

Q4: If the non-local Conscion Field influences human choices or biological evolution, doesn't that violate the "Causal Closure of the Physical" by introducing a non-physical force into brain mechanics?

A: No. Causal closure is only violated if one assumes a Cartesian dualism where a non-physical mind must physically "push" a neuron to cause an action. CFT operates on a dual-aspect framework where physical parameters (mass, charge, spin) and subjective parameters (tanmatriic intensities) are two inseparable, covariant metrics of the same foundational field structure. When an act of subjective intent occurs, it does not inject new energy into the system from the outside; rather, the mental change and the physical neural update occur simultaneously and proportionally as a singular, covariant transformation. The laws of physics remain closed and intact because mind and matter are structurally bound as two sides of the same geometric equation.

Q5: Modern neuroscientists argue that "qualia" are just structural information codes or predictive constructs used by the brain to control behavior. Why do we need an external field if neuroscience can explain the functional utility of sight and sound?

A: This objection confuses the *mechanisms of perception* with the *fact of experience*. Standard neuroscience can successfully chart how the brain maps wavelengths of light or acoustic frequencies into electrical data. However, data processing is entirely distinct from subjective awareness. A digital camera processes light frequencies and translates them into a matrix of numbers, but the camera has no internal observer experiencing the color blue. The brain's neural networks serve as the physical transceiver—the structural syntax. The conscion field provides the vital semantic component: it is the universal subjective medium that decodes that objective neural syntax into direct, felt qualitative experiences (qualia).

Q6: If Conscion Field Theory uses a top-down approach where consciousness is a single, continuous, non-local cosmic field, how do you solve the "Decombination Problem"? Why are our individual minds private and distinct, rather than blended into a single cosmic awareness?

A: The separation of individual minds is an illusion generated by the structural limitations of our physical bodies. While the conscion field itself is universal, continuous, and non-local, the

individual human brain operates as a highly localized, evolutionary biological transceiver. The brain acts as a necessary sensory filter and firewall. It restricts our immediate external awareness to a minute bandwidth of local *tanmatric* intensities (sensory inputs) necessary for physical survival. We do not experience the thoughts of other minds or the macrocosm because our physical transceivers are not tuned to those frequencies. Individual ego-boundaries are defined entirely by the local tuning capacity and filtering mechanisms of the physical transceiver, not by a fragmentation of the underlying cosmic field.

Q7: Rationalist and secular humanist frameworks explicitly reject supernatural or theological causes in the philosophy of science. Can Conscion Field Theory operate without relying on concepts like "Supreme Consciousness" or "Cosmic Consciousness"?

A: The concern regarding theological overreach in science is historically justified and entirely shared by CFT. However, this objection arises from conflating the *supernatural anthropomorphic deities* of dogmatic religions with the *non-local foundational fields* of post-physicalist metaphysics. CFT does not introduce a supernatural entity that intervenes from "outside" to violate physical laws. Rather, it models Cosmic Consciousness as the foundational, non-dual, and all-pervading field from which both physical fields (QFT) and subjective vectors $\Phi_{\text{Tanmatric}}$ emerge as top-down, differentially qualified expressions.

To eliminate Cosmic Consciousness from the theory would be mathematically and structurally impossible, as it would re-introduce the very fragmentation that causes the "hard problem" and the combination problem in the first place. Without a singular, underlying field to serve as the ultimate, unmanifested ground state, there is no logical basis for the constant scalar invariant of the Law of Attributional Capacity ($C_{\text{Total}} = 100$), nor is there a mechanism to explain the localized "illumination" of the *citta*, *aham* and *mahat* in conscious experience.

Just as the introduction of Einstein's spacetime metric or quantum probability fields initially unsettled classical mechanistic physicists but ultimately expanded the boundaries of the "natural", CFT expands naturalism to include consciousness as a fundamental cosmic property. Far from giving dogmatic theology a "foot in the door", CFT provides a rigorous, mathematically constrained, and non-dogmatic alternative that rescues the study of mind from both mindless reductionism and supernatural superstition.

Q8: Even if Cosmic Consciousness is accepted as a logical necessity for CFT, Sarkar's *Ananda Sutram* extensively discusses concepts like reincarnation, kundalini, samadhi, and liberation (mukti/moksha). Does adopting CFT require accepting these seemingly irrational or untestable aspects of yoga philosophy?

A: No. Conscion Field Theory is an epistemologically isolated, localized application of Sarkar's broader cosmological framework. In the philosophy of science, it is entirely standard to extract a rigorous mathematical or structural principle from a larger philosophical system without adopting its entire metaphysics. Just as one can utilize calculus or Leibniz's binary system without adopting his theological theory of monads, or utilize Newton's laws of motion without subscribing to his esoteric alchemical writings, a physicist or philosopher can utilize CFT's mathematically constrained *Tanmatric State Vector* without any commitment to yogic soteriology.

Furthermore, within Sarkar's comprehensive system, concepts like *samadhi*, *kundalini*, and *mukti* are not treated as irrational or supernatural magic. Instead, they are defined as highly structured, systemic reconfigurations of the individual mind-stuff (*citta*) and ego (*aham*). In Sarkar's model, *samadhi* is the mathematical limit where individual vector fluctuations stabilize to zero and merge back into the unmanifested ground state of the cosmic field. While these experiential, advanced meditative states fall outside the immediate scope of an empirical paper on sensory perception, they represent a rationalized, psychological science of consciousness rather than dogmatic superstition. CFT stands on its own merits as a testable, predictive framework for physical phase-locking and sensory perception.

Bibliography

1. Chalmers, David. (1995). "Facing Up to the Problem of Consciousness." *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 2(3), 200–219.
2. Gauthier, R. (2025). "Who was Prabhat Ranjan Sarkar or Shrii Shrii Anandamurti?" Manuscript essay available at <http://richardgauthier.academia.edu/research>, and https://www.academia.edu/attachments/121837905/download_file?s=portfolio.
3. Gauthier, R. (2026). "Conscion field theory resolves the hard problem of consciousness in physicalism and Advaita monism", <http://richardgauthier.academia.edu/research> and https://www.academia.edu/attachments/132992220/download_file?s=portfolio.
4. Hameroff, Stuart, and Penrose, Roger. (2014). "Consciousness in the universe: A review of the 'Orch OR' theory." *Physics of Life Reviews*, 11(1), 39–78.
5. Jackson, Frank. (1982). "Epiphenomenal Qualia." *Philosophical Quarterly*, 32(127), 127–136.
6. Locke, John. (1689). *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. London: Thomas Bassett.
7. Nagel, Thomas. (1974). "What Is It Like to Be a Bat?" *The Philosophical Review*, 83(4), 435–450.
8. Sarkar, Prabhat Ranjan [Shrii Shrii Anandamurti]. (1962). *Ananda Sutram*. Calcutta: Ananda Marga Publications. https://www.academia.edu/attachments/66573981/download_file?s=portfolio.
9. Sarkar, Prabhat Ranjan. (1982). *The Liberation of Intellect: Neohumanism*. Calcutta: Ananda Marga Publications, https://www.academia.edu/attachments/121640081/download_file?s=portfolio.
10. Shapiro, Lisa, ed. (2007). *The Correspondence Between Princess Elisabeth of Bohemia and René Descartes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
11. Searle, John R. (1980). "Minds, Brains, and Programs", *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 3(3), 417–424.

Website: <https://richardgauthier.academia.edu/research>

Email: richgauthier@gmail.com

The author was assisted by an AI LLM. The foundational ideas in this article are those of P. R. Sarkar and the author.