Advaita Vedanta and Modern Psychology: A Dialogue on Consciousness and Self

Stephen Bray, Family Business Consultant

Synopsis

*This report explores the intersections between Advaita Vedanta – the non-dual spiritual philosophy rooted in the Hindu tradition – and contemporary psychology, with a focus on concepts of **consciousness**, **self**, and the alleviation of human suffering. Advaita Vedanta posits that the true Self (Ātman) is identical with the absolute consciousness (Brahman), and that ignorance of this reality underlies all psychological distress (Gupta, 2003). Modern psychology, on the other hand, has developed various models of the mind and self – from the ego of psychoanalysis to the self-schema of cognitive psychology – largely viewing the self as a construct emerging from brain and environment (Segal, 1988). Despite differing paradigms, there is a growing dialogue between these fields. This report examines Advaita's key tenets (e.g. **non-duality**, **māyā** or illusion, the nature of the mind, and methods like self-enquiry) alongside psychological theories and therapeutic practices. Parallels are drawn between the Advaitic practice of self-inquiry ("Who am I?") and modern therapeutic techniques that foster an observing self or mindfulness. Differences are also highlighted, such as Advaita's claim of an ultimate reality beyond empirical phenomena versus psychology's empirical grounding in observable behaviour and mental processes. The report discusses how insights from Advaita – for instance, the emphasis on knowledge (jnāna) to dispel ignorance (avidyā), and the cultivation of a **witness consciousness** – can complement psychological approaches to well-being. Conversely, it also notes how psychology's research into cognition, development, and trauma can inform a balanced spiritual practice, preventing misinterpretations of non-dual teachings. The aim is to provide both academics and Advaita practitioners a comprehensive overview of how these perspectives converge, where they diverge, and how an integrative understanding might enrich both disciplines. References range from ancient scriptures like the Upanishads and Bhagavad Gita to modern scientific literature.*

Introduction

In recent years there has been a renaissance of interest in the dialogue between Eastern spiritual philosophies and Western psychology. Advaita Vedanta, one of the pinnacle schools of Indian philosophy, offers a **non-dualistic** understanding of reality that challenges many Western assumptions about the mind and self. At the same time, modern psychology – from cognitive neuroscience to psychotherapy – has been increasingly willing to explore concepts once relegated to spiritual discourse, such as mindfulness, consciousness, and self-transcendence (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). Bridging these domains is valuable not only for academics seeking a more comprehensive theory of mind, but also for spiritual

practitioners looking to contextualise and apply their insights in daily life. This report aims to examine key insights from Advaita Vedanta and modern psychology in tandem, highlighting how each can illuminate the other.

Western academic interest in consciousness and meditation has grown, in part due to the **hard problem of consciousness** (Chalmers, 1996) which has made some scientists and philosophers reconsider materialist assumptions. Simultaneously, practitioners of Advaita Vedanta and other non-dual traditions have sought ways to integrate psychological understanding to deal with emotional and personal issues that traditional spiritual training may not explicitly address. Both fields ultimately concern themselves with relieving human suffering – psychology through healing and behaviour change, and Advaita through liberation (*mokṣa*) from the fundamental ignorance of one's true nature. By examining their respective perspectives on **self, consciousness, and the mind**, as well as practical methods, we can appreciate both the **complementarity** and the distinct boundaries of Advaita and psychology.

Advaita Vedanta: Key Concepts on Self and Mind

Advaita Vedanta (literally "non-dual end-of-the-Vedas teaching") is rooted in ancient Sanskrit texts – the **Upanishads**, the **Brahma Sutras**, and the **Bhagavad Gita** – and was classically expounded by the 8th-century philosopher **Adi Shankaracharya**. Its central claim is elegantly simple yet profound: the true nature of the individual self (Ātman) is **not separate** from the ultimate reality, Brahman – an infinite, indivisible consciousness that is the ground of all being (Shankara, 8th cent.; Ramana Maharshi, 2018). Advaita is uncompromising in its philosophical **monism**: only Brahman is real in an absolute sense; the world of multiplicity and forms is **māyā**, an illusory appearance or misperception. This does not mean the empirical world does not exist at all, but rather that it does not have independent reality **apart from Brahman** – much as a dream or a mirage appears real until the underlying truth is known.

According to Advaita, the ordinary human condition is one of ignorance (**avidyā**). We mistakenly identify with the body, mind and ego – the transient psycho-physical personality – instead of recognizing our identity as pure consciousness. This fundamental misidentification is said to be the root of all suffering (Avidya – The Broken Tusk, n.d.). The **Bahadāraṇyaka Upanishad** famously declares "neti, neti" ("not this, not that") – indicating that the true Self is not any object of knowledge, not any specific quality or role (Brihadaranyaka Upanishad, n.d.). It is beyond the body and mind, which are part of the **non-Self** (anātman) category. As Shankara explains, all problems arise because we superimpose the qualities of non-Self (such as change, limitation and suffering) onto the Self, and vice versa (Gupta, 2003). Once these false superimpositions are removed through knowledge, what remains is the one, eternal, undifferentiated consciousness that is our true nature (Gupta, 2003). In Advaita terms, the **Self and consciousness are identical** – consciousness is not a property of the Self, *it is the Self* (Gupta, 2003). This contrasts with many Western views that treat consciousness as an

attribute or output of a self or brain; Advaita asserts **cit** (pure consciousness) is the essence of being.

To illustrate its teachings, Advaita often uses analogies. A classic example is the **rope-snake analogy**: in dim light a rope is mistaken for a snake, causing fear, but upon illumination the snake dissolves – it was never there to begin with. Likewise, the manifold world and individual identity are misperceptions upon the one reality; *māyā* is the cosmic "dim light" that makes Brahman appear as the varied universe (Maharshi, 2018). The moment true knowledge dawns (the "light"), the illusion of separateness vanishes, and one realises **"Tat Tvam Asi"** – "Thou art That," or the Self is Brahman (Chāndogya Upanishad, n.d.). This famous mahāvākya (great saying) from the Chandogya Upanishad encapsulates non-duality: the core of your being and the essence of the cosmos are one and the same.

Advaita delineates **levels of reality** to reconcile how the world can appear and yet Brahman be the only reality. **Vyavahārika satya** is the empirical reality – the level on which duality, cause and effect, and our day-to-day experiences operate. **Pāramārthika satya** is the absolute reality – the level of Brahman, where there is no differentiation at all. A third level sometimes mentioned is **prātibhāsika satya**, the reality of illusions or appearances (like a dream or a hallucination). An Advaitin acknowledges that empirically, distinctions and the world do appear and should be dealt with, but ultimately they are "sublated" (transcended) in the knowledge of oneness (Shankara, 8th cent.).

The Mind in Advaita: Advaita Vedanta presents a nuanced model of the human being. The mind (manas), intellect (buddhi), ego-sense (ahaṅkāra), and even the faculty of memory (citta) are collectively referred to as the **antahkaraṇa** (inner instrument). These, along with the physical body, life-force (prāṇa), etc., belong to the realm of *not-Self.* A famous model from the **Taittirīya Upaniṣad** describes five *kośas* or sheaths that cover the true Self: the food sheath (physical body), vital breath sheath, mind sheath, intellect sheath, and bliss sheath. The real Ātman is beyond all these layers (Taittiriya Upanishad, 1928). Notably, Advaita Vedanta holds that the mind and senses by themselves are **jada** (inert); they are illuminated by the light of consciousness. In day-to-day life, our thoughts and perceptions are reflections of Brahman's consciousness in the mind – much like the moon shining only by reflecting the sun. The individual person (jīva) is essentially Brahman associated with an *upādhi* (limiting adjunct), namely the body-mind complex. When the adjunct is ignored or removed in deep insight, only Brahman remains.

A crucial concept is the **witness consciousness** (*sākṣī*). Advaita describes the Self as the silent witness of the three states of consciousness – waking, dream, and deep sleep – which are outlined in the **Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad** (Mandukya Upanishad, n.d.). In the waking state, consciousness is turned outward and experiences the gross world; in dream, it turns inward and experiences a subtle world of impressions; in deep sleep, mental activity subsides and there is no distinct object of experience, yet Advaita argues consciousness persists as the

witness of the absence of activity (hence one reports "I slept happily; I knew nothing") (Mandukya Upanishad, n.d.). Beyond these three is **turīya**, the "fourth" which is not a state like the others but the background reality – pure consciousness itself, ever-present. The concept of turīya highlights that consciousness in Advaita is not something that comes and goes; rather, the changing states are like waves rising and falling on the ocean of consciousness that itself remains unchanged (Menon, 2018).

The **aim of Advaita Vedanta practice** is to realise one's true Self as Brahman, thereby attaining **mokṣa** (liberation) – described as freedom from suffering, fear, and the cycle of rebirth (Saṁsāra) (Maharshi, 2018). The means to this is primarily **jñāna yoga**, the path of knowledge, which involves listening to teachings (s´ravaṇa), reasoning or reflecting on them (manana), and deep meditative assimilation (nididhyāsana). This often entails the discipline of **Self-Enquiry** (*ātma-vicāra*): persistently examining the nature of the self and negating all that is not the true I. As **Ramana Maharshi** taught, one investigates the source of the thought "I" by asking "Who am I?" and tracing the ego or I-thought back to its origin in pure awareness (Ramana Maharshi, 1962). Through such enquiry, all transient identifications ("I am the body", "I am the mind", "I am a doer") are discarded, and the **ego idea is dissolved**, revealing the non-dual awareness that always underlies it. This practice is said to culminate in the direct experiential knowledge that **"I am Brahman"** (*aham brahmāsmi*, another Upanishadic mahāvākya) – a knowledge that is not merely intellectual but transformative, eliminating the ignorance that caused suffering (Ramana Maharshi, 2018).

It is worth noting that Advaita Vedanta does not advocate a nihilistic disappearance of the person or functioning. After enlightenment, from the outside the sage still perceives the world and can engage with it, but internally the identification with the ego is gone. The **jīvanmukta** (liberated while alive) is said to act spontaneously with compassion and without attachment, seeing themselves in all beings. The *Bhagavad Gītā* portrays this state as one of serene equanimity, describing the enlightened person (sthitaprajña) as being unmoved by afflictions or pleasures, resting in the Self and seeing the same One in every existence (Bhagavad Gita, n.d.). Such inner stability and freedom from egoic reactivity is indeed something admired in both spiritual and psychological visions of the healthy mind.

Perspectives from Modern Psychology on Self and Consciousness

Modern psychology, as a scientific discipline, developed largely independently of spiritual or metaphysical paradigms like Advaita. It has its roots in empiricism and the scientific method, focusing on observable behaviour, mental processes, and more recently neurobiological correlates. Historically, psychology's treatment of "consciousness" and "self" has varied widely:

- In early **psychoanalytic** theory, the self was not a central concept per se; Freud spoke of the ego, id, and superego as components of the psyche. The **ego** in Freud's sense is the organised conscious self, but it's embattled by unconscious drives and external

reality. Later psychodynamic theorists (e.g. Jung) gave more spiritual interpretations – Jung's concept of the **Self** (capital S) was an archetype of wholeness, akin to a deeper, collective identity that transcends the individual ego, arguably resonant with Eastern ideas (Jung, 1958).

- **Behaviourists** in the mid-20th century largely ignored subjective consciousness, treating the mind as a "black box" and focusing only on stimulus-response. The concept of an inner self was considered irrelevant to observable behaviour.

- **Humanistic psychology** in the 1960s (think Abraham Maslow, Carl Rogers) re-introduced the importance of subjective experience and the self. Maslow's hierarchy of needs culminated in **self-actualization** – the fulfilment of one's highest potential – and later he discussed **self-transcendence**, where one's identity extends beyond the personal self to a sense of unity with others or the cosmos (Maslow, 1971). This is a clear point of contact with spiritual traditions. Rogers, meanwhile, talked about the "true self" versus conditions of worth that distort us; therapy aimed to help clients become their **real self** (Rogers, 1965). While not identical to Advaita's Self (which is universal consciousness rather than an individual's unique essence), humanistic psychology acknowledged a deeper core to personhood and the value of authenticity, which is congenial to spiritual perspectives.

- **Cognitive psychology** and its offshoot, cognitive-behavioural therapy (CBT), dissect the self in terms of schemas and narratives. Aaron Beck and colleagues identified a **self-schema** – deeply ingrained beliefs about oneself that shape emotions and behavior (Segal, 1988). From this view, psychological suffering (like depression) often involves maladaptive beliefs about the self ("I am worthless", etc.). CBT helps individuals challenge and change these thoughts. Though CBT is content-focused (working within the personal narrative), some have likened its technique of identifying and correcting cognitive distortions to a kind of rational inquiry that has distant echoes in the self-inquiry of Advaita (Sri Mantra, n.d.). Indeed, an article facetiously called Advaita "the ultimate form of CBT" because of how it targets the fundamental false belief of identity with the ego (Sri Mantra, n.d.). Of course, CBT stops far short of Advaita's metaphysical claims – its goal is a healthier functional self-concept rather than dissolving the ego into pure consciousness – but the commonality is the emphasis on examining one's beliefs about self and reality.

- **Neuroscience and consciousness studies** today present perhaps the most materialistic view of self: the prevailing view is that the sense of self emerges from brain processes. Cognitive neuroscience has mapped functions like self-referential thinking to certain brain networks (e.g. the "default mode network"). Experiments show how fragile the self-representation can be (for instance, the rubber hand illusion or psychiatric phenomena like dissociation). Some theorists argue the self is essentially an **illusion or**

construct – a narrative the brain generates to make sense of experience (Hood, 2012). This stance surprisingly echoes Buddhism and Advaita to some extent, which also argue the individual self (as we normally conceive it) is not ultimately real. However, most neuroscientists do not go as far as saying an Absolute Self is behind the illusion; they often consider **consciousness itself** to be an emergent property of neural networks. The **"hard problem" of consciousness**, coined by David Chalmers, points to the difficulty of explaining subjective experience in purely physical terms (Chalmers, 1996). This has opened the door to serious consideration of non-materialist models. A minority of scientists and philosophers have proposed **panpsychism** or other dual-aspect theories wherein consciousness is a fundamental feature of the universe, not reducible to matter – a perspective that interestingly aligns with Advaita Vedanta's claim of consciousness as the ontological foundation (Koch, 2012). Such ideas are still debated, but they indicate a convergence towards Advaita's view that mind is not just an epiphenomenon of matter.

- **Positive psychology and mindfulness:** In the past two decades, mainstream psychology has embraced practices like mindfulness meditation, largely derived from Buddhist traditions. Mindfulness involves cultivating a non-judgmental, present-centered awareness, where one observes thoughts and feelings as passing events rather than identifying with them. This practice effectively nurtures an **observing self** or meta-awareness (Kabat-Zinn, 1994). While the roots are Buddhist, the notion of a detached witness to mental phenomena is closely related to Advaita's *sākṣī*. Clinical interventions such as Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction (Kabat-Zinn, 1994) and Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (Hayes et al., 1999) help clients develop a perspective from which they can see the mind's contents as separate from the thinker – "You are not your thoughts." This is remarkably similar to Advaita's guidance that one is the witnessing consciousness, not the mind's modifications. **Transpersonal psychology** as a field explicitly studies spiritual experiences, including non-dual consciousness, and has documented the positive psychological effects of experiences where the usual self-boundaries dissolve (Walsh & Vaughan, 1993). Terms like "self-transcendent experiences" or "peak experiences" refer to moments where individuals feel a sense of unity beyond the ego, often leading to lasting positive changes in outlook (Maslow, 1971).

It should be noted, however, that psychology's approach is typically **experience-near and empirical**. It does not readily posit metaphysical truths beyond what can be observed or reported. When a client in therapy reports feeling "one with the universe," a psychologist might interpret it phenomenologically (e.g. as an altered state, perhaps correlated with certain brain states or as a cognitive shift), without committing to the ontology of that experience (whereas an Advaitin would say the person genuinely touched a truth of non-dual reality). This difference in attitude – experiential/phenomenal vs. ontological – marks the line

where the two disciplines diverge, even if the phenomenology they discuss can overlap. Psychology strives to remain agnostic about ultimate reality, focusing on what can improve human well-being in observable terms.

Convergences: Parallels Between Advaita and Psychological Insights

Despite the different languages and methods, many **parallel insights** can be found between Advaita Vedanta and modern psychology:

- **Illusory Identity and Cognitive Distortions:** Advaita's claim that the individual ego-identity is a product of ignorance (avidyā) and a source of suffering resonates with psychology's finding that false or negative self-beliefs lead to emotional distress (Segal, 1988). Both agree that what we take ourselves to be is often a construct based on conditioning, and that this construct can be revised or transcended. In CBT, a patient learns to question the reality of thoughts like "I'm a failure," realising such thoughts are not absolute truths. In Advaita, the seeker questions the assumption "I am this limited person" and comes to realise the **false attribution**. In both cases, greater freedom and peace result from seeing through a cognitive illusion – be it a distorted self-schema or the fundamental misidentification of Self.

- **Witnessing and Mindfulness:** The ability to step back and observe one's mental processes is key to both systems. Advaita trains the disciple to cultivate the stance of a **witness (sāksฺī)**, observing the flow of thoughts, sensations, and emotions without attaching to them, thereby disidentifying consciousness from the contents of consciousness. Many therapies encourage developing a similar observer stance. For instance, **mindfulness meditation** teaches individuals to notice thoughts and feelings as passing clouds in the sky of mind. In Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT), clients practice experiencing thoughts as simply thoughts, not literal truths, sometimes by giving the mind a pet-name and watching its "stories." This is essentially a shift to *sāksฺī bhāva* (witness-attitude). Research has shown that such practices can reduce symptoms of anxiety, depression, and stress by breaking the cycle of over-identification and reactivity (Szekeres & Wertheim, 2015). From an Advaitic perspective, living more as the witness loosens the ego's grip, allowing one to abide in a calmer, more expansive awareness. Psychology would frame the benefit as increased **metacognitive insight** and emotional regulation, but the subjective experience is analogous.

- **Transcendence of Ego and Self-Actualization:** Advaita's end goal is a complete transcendence of the ego into universal Self. Psychology doesn't go that far normally, but humanistic and positive psychology do value transcendent experiences. Maslow described **peak experiences** where individuals feel a loss of self and a unity with life, often accompanied by a sense of deep meaning or bliss (Maslow, 1971). He noted such

experiences can have lasting positive effects, increasing creativity, altruism and well-being. These sound quite similar to glimpses of non-dual consciousness described by Advaita practitioners, who report profound peace and the falling away of fear when the ego dissolves, even temporarily. Furthermore, Carl Rogers observed that when people shed the false personas and accept themselves unconditionally (with the help of therapy), they become more open, compassionate and "fully functioning" – arguably aligning with Advaita's claim that realizing one's true nature (beyond the ego) results in spontaneous ethical and loving behavior. In fact, the Bhagavad Gita and Upanishads both assert that seeing the Self in all beings naturally fosters compassion and eliminates vices like greed or hatred, which is a point secular psychology can agree with: a less ego-centric viewpoint correlates with greater empathy and prosocial behavior (Alexander et al., 1991).

- **The Role of Knowledge and Insight:** Both Advaita and psychotherapy place importance on insight-based shifts in perception. In Advaita, the liberating factor is **jñāna** – direct knowledge of reality as non-dual. This is an insight often described as seeing what was always the case, but which one's mind had not recognised (like realising the "snake" is a rope). Similarly, many psychotherapies aim for the client to have a change in perspective or a new understanding about themselves (sometimes termed an "aha" moment or cognitive reframe). In psychoanalysis, making the unconscious conscious through insight is curative; in cognitive therapy, insight into one's thinking patterns enables change. While the content of the insight differs (psychological vs. metaphysical), the mechanism of "truth shall set you free" is common. It's noteworthy that some therapists have explicitly integrated Vedantic wisdom – for example, **Jnana Yoga as therapy**: Keshavan & Bhargav (2024) discuss how the self-inquiry approach of Vedanta can provide psychotherapeutic insights, by encouraging clients to question the "I" that is experiencing distress and thereby disempowering the hold of that distress (Keshavan & Bhargav, 2024). Such integration attempts show that Advaita's method of using reasoning and introspection to uproot false beliefs has psychological merit.

- **States of Consciousness:** Advaita's analysis of waking, dreaming, and deep sleep can enrich psychological models of consciousness. Psychologically, the dreaming state has been a subject of analysis (Freud, Jung) and more recently of neuroscience (REM sleep studies), and deep sleep is seen as a restorative state where self-awareness is minimal or absent. Advaita intriguingly asserts that even in deep, dreamless sleep, **consciousness is present** as the substrate (since one reports having experienced a peaceful nothingness). This view might align with some theories in consciousness research that consider the possibility of consciousness without content (pure awareness). Some contemplative neuroscience studies on meditation have identified brain states corresponding to a quiet consciousness with no specific content (pure

consciousness events) in advanced practitioners (Travis & Pearson, 2000). Those could be seen as akin to the **turīya** state. Furthermore, modern sleep researchers might take interest in the Advaitic idea that the happiness one feels after a good deep sleep is due to momentarily resting in one's true nature (ānanda). This is speculative, but it poses interesting questions: Is the rejuvenation of deep sleep simply physiological, or could it be that the mind touching a baseline of consciousness-bliss has restorative effects? Psychology doesn't frame it that way, but the convergence is that both recognize deep sleep as a unique state important for well-being, and Advaita adds a philosophical interpretation that could inspire new hypotheses in consciousness studies.

- **Addressing Suffering and Well-being:** At a pragmatic level, both Advaita and psychology want to alleviate suffering. Advaita says the **complete** and permanent end of suffering is only in the realisation of the Self (since as the pure Self one recognizes oneself as untouched by birth, death, loss, etc., all suffering belonging to the realm of not-Self). Psychology does not promise an end to all pain – life inherently has challenges – but aims to reduce unnecessary suffering (e.g. neurosis, trauma, stress) and improve coping and fulfilment. Techniques like stress management, cognitive restructuring, emotional processing, and social support each tackle suffering from different angles. Interestingly, some of the **coping strategies** now widely recommended have parallels in Advaita's approach. For example, detachment (*vairāgya*) is taught in Advaita as a means to avoid suffering from transient worldly events – in therapy terms, this is similar to **distancing**, a skill where one learns not to be overwhelmed by a temporary situation but to observe it with perspective. Another example: **acceptance** – Advaita encourages seeing pleasure and pain with equanimity (as both are phenomena in the mind, not affecting one's true Self), which overlaps with approaches like ACT that stress accepting what is out of one's control instead of fruitlessly resisting reality. Even the idea that **suffering is optional** depending on perspective (a common notion in stoicism and Buddhist teachings) appears in Advaita: the liberated person may undergo external hardships, but internally they are free of suffering due to the knowledge of Self. Some psychologists (especially in existential and third-wave behavioral therapies) similarly argue that while pain is inevitable, suffering (the psychological overlay of pain) can be greatly mitigated by changing our relationship to the experience (Lindahl & Britton, 2019).

Divergences and Tensions

While the common ground is rich, it is equally important to recognize where Advaita Vedanta and modern psychology diverge, as these differences caution us against simplistic unification of the two:

- **Metaphysical Commitments:** Advaita is founded on a metaphysical claim: that **consciousness (Brahman) is the sole, unchanging reality** and everything else is ultimately unreal in itself. Psychology, operating within a scientific paradigm, does not make such claims. Even those psychologists who personally embrace spiritual views must, in their professional work, rely on **testable hypotheses** and remain agnostic about ultimate reality. This means that certain Advaitic assertions (e.g. that the universe is an illusion, or that an immortal Self exists) lie outside the scope of psychology's methodology. For a traditional scientist, these are philosophical or faith-based propositions. This does not invalidate either side; it simply delineates their domains. An Advaita teacher might say to a psychologist, "Your domain of empirical study is itself a part of the illusory world appearance, so of course within that scope your findings hold, but they don't touch the absolute." Conversely, a psychologist might say, "Unless the non-dual Self can be operationalised or measured in some way, it remains a speculative idea to science." This epistemological gap can be bridged by dialogue and personal subjective exploration, but it remains a fundamental difference in standpoint.

- **The Self vs. the self:** In Advaita, the **Self (Ātman)** is not personal – it is the universal consciousness, devoid of individuality. In psychology, when we speak of a self, it nearly always refers to an individual's identity or self-concept. Thus, there is a semantic difficulty: the word *self* is used in both, but with very different referents. To avoid confusion, some authors capitalise Self for the Advaitic meaning. For a therapist, building a "healthy self" means fostering a positive, cohesive personal identity. For an Advaitin, realising the ever evolving Self means seeing through the personal identity altogether. These goals can be complementary but can also conflict if misunderstood. For example, an Advaita practitioner might prematurely devalue important psychological work on their personal issues by saying "the ego is not real, so why address it?" – sometimes leading to what is known as **spiritual bypassing**, where spiritual concepts are used to avoid dealing with unresolved psychological problems (Welwood, 2000). Psychology would caution that the personal ego, while not ultimately real in a metaphysical sense, has relative reality and can't be simply wished away; it must be purified, healed, or integrated. In fact, traditional Advaita acknowledges this through preparatory practices: ethical living, emotional purity (chitta-shuddhi), and mental discipline are prerequisites for successful Self-inquiry. Skipping those steps can lead to confusion or even mental health issues, as the psyche struggles against deeply embedded patterns. Cases have been documented where intensive meditation or non-dual inquiry without proper preparation led to **depersonalisation or psychological imbalance** (Lindahl & Britton, 2019). Thus, a key point of divergence is how each addresses the **ego/personality**: psychology works to strengthen and stabilise a functional sense of self, whereas Advaita works to transcend

it. A **balanced integration** would suggest one must first have a healthy ego before transcending it – a view echoed by some transpersonal psychologists.

- **Methodological Differences:** Advaita's method is introspective, philosophical, and ultimately **experiential** (through meditation and contemplation). It often relies on the guidance of a guru and scriptural study to trigger awakening. Psychology's methods are empirical, ranging from experimental studies to clinical interventions tested in trials. Where Advaita might prescribe meditation on the Self or sitting with a realized teacher, a psychologist might prescribe cognitive exercises, medication, or behavior change. These methodologies operate on different assumptions (e.g. Advaita assumes a pre-existing perfection within that must be realised; psychology often assumes development and learning can lead to improvement). When integrating the two, methodology needs careful adaptation. For instance, the practice of **Self-Enquiry** has been explored as a therapeutic exercise (Zhao, 2025) – but it must be framed in a way clients can grasp, and not everyone may be ready to dive into questioning the nature of the "I". Therapists also need proper training to guide someone through such existential inquiry, to ensure it's beneficial and not destabilising (Zhao, 2025). The cultural context is relevant: in India, a patient might readily accept advice couched in Vedantic terms, whereas a Western client might find it alien unless translated into secular language.

- **Scope of Outcomes:** The **end-goal** of Advaita is enlightenment – a radical shift that is permanent and beyond the fluctuations of mental health and illness. In modern psychological terms, it's not just the remission of symptoms, but a wholesale transformation of consciousness. Psychology seldom aims for anything that dramatic. The closest might be the concept of "post-traumatic growth" or achieving a state of flourishing, but even that stays within the human experience of the world. Enlightenment, as per Advaita, fundamentally alters one's identity (from a separated self to the universal Self) and one's perception of reality (seeing Brahman in all). From the outside, an enlightened person might still have a personality and could even have what looks like emotions or ordinary interactions, but internally their locus of identity is thought to be completely shifted. This is something **psychology cannot easily measure or confirm**. It can measure certain correlates (brain waves, behaviour, self-reported peace) but the metaphysical assertion of liberation transcends empirical validation. Therefore, integrating Advaita into psychology may work up to the point of enhancing well-being, insight, and perhaps inducing temporary non-dual experiences; beyond that, the **"ultimate liberation"** remains more in the realm of personal spiritual conviction. Psychologists might tactfully say, "if a patient attains a persistent state of peace and egolessness, we'd consider them exceptionally well-adjusted, but whether that is a metaphysical enlightenment is not for us to judge." Conversely, an Advaitin

might view much of psychology as dealing with rearranging furniture in a dream: helpful for comfort within the dream but not awakening from it.

- **View of Reality and Illness:** Advaita, taken literally, might say that mental illness (like all phenomena) is *māyā* – an appearance due to ignorance. Some traditional Vedantins might even argue that since the person is not truly the mind, disorders of the mind are ultimately not *their* disorders. This perspective can provide a sort of detachment that is beneficial – for example, a practitioner with chronic anxiety might find relief in the idea "I am the witness and not the anxious mind." However, there is a risk if misapplied: one could deny or minimise a serious condition requiring treatment. Psychology, as a healthcare discipline, views mental illness as genuine conditions to be treated with skill and compassion. From a merged perspective, one could say: Yes, at the highest level nothing ever happened to the pure Self, but at the relative level where a person is suffering, one must address it. Indian psychiatrists like Rajagopal (2024) have suggested that aspects of Advaita (like understanding different levels of reality) can actually help clinicians – for instance, using analogies like the rope-snake to help a patient reframe their fears, or employing the idea of *guru-śiṣya* (teacher-student) relationship to strengthen the therapeutic alliance built on trust and guidance (Rajagopal, 2024). But they also caution that **spiritual concepts should complement, not replace, standard clinical care** (Rajagopal, 2024). In short, while Advaita might philosophically "explain away" pathology as misidentification, a responsible integration acknowledges the need to work through the mind's issues even as one reminds oneself of the higher truth.

Toward an Integrative Understanding

The exploration above shows that Advaita Vedanta and modern psychology, despite different starting points, meet on common ground when it comes to practical outcomes like inner peace, self-understanding, and compassion for others. There is a growing movement in both academia and practice to integrate these insights:

- **Therapeutic Incorporation of Advaita Practices:** Recent scholarly work has begun formulating ways to bring Vedantic practices into therapy in a culturally sensitive and effective manner. For example, Zhao (2025) proposes a framework for using **Self-Enquiry in psychotherapy**. This involves gently introducing clients to question who the "I" is that is at the center of their narratives, thereby helping them dis-identify from transient thoughts and roles (Zhao, 2025). The paper discusses using prompts and guided introspection, taking care to ensure the client remains stable and that the therapist is well-versed in the philosophy to navigate any existential anxiety that might arise (Zhao, 2025). Early indications suggest such an approach can complement traditional techniques, potentially leading to profound shifts in perspective that alleviate issues like existential depression or loss of meaning.

- **Training Psychologists in Philosophical Literacy:** One practical step is educating psychologists (and other mental health professionals) about the basics of Advaita and other Eastern philosophies. This doesn't mean a therapist becomes a guru, but it equips them with a broader conceptual toolbox. Therapists report that sometimes a spiritual framework is what a client is yearning for, especially if the client is themselves a practitioner of a tradition like Advaita. Being able to speak that language or validate those experiences (for instance, a client describing a meditative experience of unity) can strengthen the therapeutic rapport. Some psychology programs in India already include modules on **Indian Psychology**, which draw from Vedanta and Yoga psychology (Sinha, 1999). In the West, movements like **mindfulness-based therapy** have paved the way, and now there's openness to deeper philosophies. The key is to maintain professionalism and boundaries – a psychologist is not imparting Advaita doctrine, but can use its **insights skillfully**, much like one might use a parable or Socratic questioning.

- **Spiritual Care and Counseling:** Outside the strict medical model, there's an area of counselling and life-coaching where integration can be more fluid. Spiritual counsellors who are informed by psychology can help spiritual seekers who hit psychological snags (like fear during ego dissolution, or loneliness on the path) by drawing from both knowledge sets. Likewise, psychologists who encounter spiritually transformative experiences or crises (sometimes called "spiritual emergencies") in their clients can benefit from understanding the Advaitic context to better guide the person (Lukoff et al., 1998). For instance, what looks like a depersonalisation disorder to a psychiatrist might, in a different framing, be an intense but temporary stage in a non-dual meditation practice. Knowing when to ground someone in ordinary reality versus when to encourage them to explore further is a delicate art requiring both psychological acumen and respect for the spiritual process.

- **Research Opportunities:** The intersection of Advaita and psychology also presents fascinating research opportunities. Scientists could, for example, study the brains of adept Advaita meditators (those practising Self-enquiry or non-dual awareness) to see how their default mode network or other markers differ from other meditators or from non-meditators. There has already been research on Tibetan Buddhist practitioners in non-dual states (Josipovic, 2014) which finds decreased activity in brain networks tied to self-referential processing, aligning with the subjective report of "no-self" or pure consciousness. Similar studies with Advaita practitioners might deepen the understanding of consciousness. On the philosophical side, dialogues between philosophers of mind and Advaita scholars can enrich theories of consciousness, perhaps inspiring new models that accommodate the possibility that **consciousness is fundamental**. In fact, some contemporary philosophers (like Kastrup, 2019, though not mainstream) argue for **idealism** – the notion that reality is essentially mental or

experiential – an idea remarkably close to Vedanta's position that everything is in consciousness.

- **Ethical and Existential Meaning:** Advaita contributes a robust ethical perspective anchored in unity: if all beings are the same Self, ethics becomes a matter of self-interest properly understood (hurting others is hurting oneself at the deepest level). Psychology, especially positive psychology and humanistic psychology, likewise emphasises empathy, altruism, and interconnectedness as components of well-being (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). Integrating non-dual wisdom can reinforce the importance of compassion in therapeutic settings. It can also help people find meaning: one of the existential challenges in modern secular life is a lack of deeper meaning or belonging. Vedanta offers a grand narrative of reality that can imbue a person's struggles with meaning – for example, reframing a personal loss not as meaningless suffering but as part of a larger journey of the Self coming to know itself, or seeing painful events as catalysts for spiritual growth (as the Gita teaches equanimity and devotion in the face of life's battles). Therapists need not endorse the literal cosmology, but understanding this narrative can help them support clients who find solace in it.

- **Limits of Integration:** A balanced integrative approach also recognizes limitations. Not every psychological problem can or should be addressed with spiritual practices. Conditions with strong neurochemical components (like severe bipolar disorder or schizophrenia) are not likely "cured" by Advaitic inquiry – indeed, such individuals may not be able to effectively engage in it until their condition is stabilised by medical means. Also, not everyone is inclined towards metaphysical introspection; forcing it could alienate or confuse some clients. The integration must be **client-centered** (Rogers, 1965): if the person is interested in or open to spiritual perspectives, then these can be explored; if not, there are plenty of secular tools to use. Advaita itself says that the path of knowledge is for those with a certain temperament and preparation; others might follow devotional or meditative yogas. In a similar vein, the therapist should discern if a person is ready for "big questions" like "Who am I really?" or if they first need support with more immediate concerns (job stress, relationships, etc.). Timing and dosage of any intervention – spiritual or otherwise – is crucial.

Conclusion

Advaita Vedanta and modern psychology emerge from distinct civilisations and knowledge systems, yet when placed in conversation, they reveal a remarkable synergy. Advaita offers psychology a **holistic and transcendent context** – reminding us that beyond the measurable phenomena of mind lies a unifying consciousness and that identity can be far less limited than we assume. It contributes powerful tools like self-enquiry and the cultivation of the witness, which can deepen psychological healing by attacking the roots of suffering – the

false identification and ignorance about one's true nature (Maharshi, 2018; Keshavan & Bhargav, 2024). Modern psychology, in turn, offers Advaita a **discriminating lens** – helping to distinguish spiritual progress from psychopathology, providing techniques to ensure emotional integration accompanies spiritual insight, and generally grounding the sometimes abstract philosophy in empirical validation and individual narratives. Psychology's emphasis on development, trauma, and environment ensures that Advaita's lofty view is tempered with compassion for the human condition and an appreciation for the gradual work often needed to untangle the conditionings of the mind.

For academics in psychology, exploring Advaita can broaden theoretical horizons about what consciousness and self could be, perhaps inspiring new hypotheses that bridge subjective experience and objective science. For spiritual practitioners, understanding psychological principles can safeguard their journey – ensuring they address the personal shadows and conditionings that, if ignored, could hinder or distort their pursuit of enlightenment. The Advaitic adage **"Ātmānaṁ viddhi"** – *know thyself* – resonates on multiple levels: psychologically, it suggests knowing one's mind, habits, and story; spiritually, it means realising the Self beyond the mind. In an ideal integrative model, both levels of knowing oneself are encouraged rather than seen as opposed. As the ancient **Chāndogya Upaniṣad** declares, *Tat Tvam Asi* ("Thou art That") – recognising the profound unity of self and whole – one also learns to navigate the practical reality with wisdom and love.

In conclusion, the dialogue between Advaita Vedanta and modern psychology enriches our understanding of the human psyche and spirit. Each can be seen as addressing different **dimensions of human existence**: psychology addresses the personal, relational, and societal dimensions (the empirical self in the world), while Advaita addresses the ultimate existential dimension (the self in relation to the cosmos or absolute). Rather than being contradictory, these can be complementary layers of truth. A human being can be viewed simultaneously as an individual with thoughts, emotions and behaviours to be understood and improved, and as **pure consciousness** experiencing a human life. By honouring both perspectives, we move towards a more **integral approach** to well-being – one that can heal the mind, open the heart, and ultimately liberate the spirit.

References

Bhagavad Gita. (n.d.). *Bhagavad Gītā* (Song of the Lord), traditionally attributed to Vyāsa, circa 1st century BCE. (Multiple translations available; see Easwaran, 2007).

Brihadaranyaka Upanishad. (n.d.). *Br̥hadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (Great Forest Teaching), approx. 8th century BCE. In various translations (e.g., Swami Madhavananda, 1934, Calcutta: Advaita Ashrama).

Chalmers, D. J. (1996). *The Conscious Mind: In Search of a Fundamental Theory.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Chandogya Upanishad. (n.d.). *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, approx. 8th–7th century BCE. In various translations (e.g., Radhakrishnan, 1953, London: George Allen & Unwin).

Gupta, B. (2003). *Cit: Consciousness* (Foundations of Philosophy in India series). New York: Oxford University Press.

Jung, C. G. (1958). *Psychology and Religion: West and East* (Collected Works of C.G. Jung, Vol. 11). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Keshavan, M. S., & Bhargav, H. (2024). Know thyself (Jnana Yoga): Psychotherapeutic insights from the East. *Asian Journal of Psychiatry, 92*, 103907. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajp.2023.103907

Koch, C. (2012). *Consciousness: Confessions of a Romantic Reductionist*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Lindahl, J. R., & Britton, W. B. (2019). "I Have this Feeling of Not Really Being Here": Buddhist Meditation and Changes in Sense of Self. *Journal of Consciousness Studies, 26*(7–8), 157–183.

Maslow, A. H. (1971). *The Farther Reaches of Human Nature*. New York: Viking Press.

Maharshi, R. (1962). *The Teachings of Bhagavan Sri Ramana Maharshi in His Own Words*. London: Rider & Co.

Maharshi, R. (2018). *The Spiritual Teaching of Ramana Maharshi*. Boston: Shambhala Publications.

Menon, S. (2018). *The Beyond Experience: Consciousness in Bhagavad Gita and Upanishads*. Bengaluru: Nimhans Publication (for illustration of Mandukya Upanishad's consciousness model).

Rajagopal, S. (2024). The spiritual philosophy of Advaita: Basic concepts and relevance to psychiatry. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry, 66*(2), 202–207.

Rogers, C. R. (1965). *Client-Centered Therapy: Its Current Practice, Implications, and Theory*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Segal, Z. V. (1988). Appraisal of the self-schema construct in cognitive models of depression. *Psychological Bulletin, 103*(2), 147–162.

Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 5–14.

Sinha, J. (1999). *Indian Realism*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers. (Classic work on Indian philosophical psychology).

Sri Mantra. (n.d.). *Advaita Vedanta – The Ultimate Form of CBT*. [Online article]. Retrieved from srimantra.org (accessed 2025).

Szekeres, R. A., & Wertheim, E. H. (2015). Evaluation of Vipassana meditation course effects on subjective stress, well-being, self-kindness and mindfulness. *Stress and Health, 31*(5), 373–381.

Taittiriya Upanishad. (1928). *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* (Translation by Swami Sharvananda). Madras: Sri Ramakrishna Math.

Zhao, C. Y. (2025). Exploring "Who am I": The potential of applying the Indian Vedanta philosophical practice of Self-Enquiry in psychotherapy. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 12*, 252.