

The Filter and the Field: New Thought, Behavioural Science, Non-Dual Awareness and the Limits of Evidence

An epistemological and pragmatic comparison of the New Thought movement, non-dual philosophy and behavioural science, with particular attention to consciousness, perception, causation, evidence, generalisation and practical relevance.

Stephen Bray: Family Business Consultant

Synopsis

This paper examines the relationship between the New Thought movement and behavioural science. It focuses particularly upon Florence Scovel Shinn, James Allen and Wallace D. Wattles, alongside Robert Cialdini, Daniel Kahneman, Gerd Gigerenzer, Rory Sutherland, Richard Shotton and other contemporary interpreters of human behaviour. It also places both traditions within a broader philosophical discussion involving William James, Advaita Vedānta, Ramana Maharshi, Rupert Spira, phenomenology, pragmatism, Qabalah and the magical philosophy of Aleister Crowley.

The paper argues that New Thought and behavioural science differ at a level deeper than method. They begin with different assumptions about reality, the individual, causation and knowledge. New Thought commonly treats thought, belief and imagination as formative powers within a spiritually unified reality. Behavioural science usually treats thoughts, choices, environments and outcomes as distinguishable variables within an observable causal system. Non-dual philosophy questions the apparent separation between observer and observed upon which conventional scientific language depends.

Neither approach provides a complete account of human experience. New Thought can possess considerable experiential and practical value while remaining metaphysically unprovable. Behavioural science can produce publicly testable findings while remaining vulnerable to artificial settings, narrow samples, publication bias, cultural assumptions and overgeneralisation. A result obtained from American university students choosing inexpensive products may have little predictive power when applied to an older Turkish boat owner negotiating a family asset under conditions of inflation, marital strain and mistrust.

The paper proposes that filters do more than obstruct total awareness. They make practical life possible by selecting what matters from an otherwise unmanageable field of experience. The same filter may reveal one aspect of reality while concealing another. A telescope, a scientific theory, a religious teaching, a marketing principle and anxiety about the price of coffee each organise awareness around different purposes and scales.

New Thought and behavioural science meet most convincingly around attention, expectation, interpretation, language, action and feedback. They separate when New

Thought attributes external events directly to thought, or when behavioural science treats a local statistical regularity as a universal law of human nature. A more mature synthesis combines first-person experience, second-person understanding and third-person investigation. This approach preserves spiritual and experiential meaning while requiring practical claims to remain open to evidence, revision and failure.

Introduction

The relationship between the New Thought movement and behavioural science initially appears straightforward. Both traditions concern themselves with the influence of thought upon human life. Both examine expectation, language, habits, identity, persuasion, emotion and action. Both promise, in different ways, to help people change their circumstances.

The resemblance becomes less secure upon closer examination.

Florence Scovel Shinn presents thought, imagination, faith and the spoken word as instruments operating within a spiritually ordered universe. James Allen connects the cultivation of thought with character, conduct and circumstance. Wallace D. Wattles proposes that a person may create wealth by thinking and acting in a "Certain Way". Their writings belong to a diverse religious and metaphysical tradition which emerged in the United States during the nineteenth century and became established during the early twentieth century. New Thought generally combines an optimistic theology with an emphasis upon healing, personal transformation and material well-being (Albanese, 2007; Braden, 1963).

Behavioural science approaches many of the same subjects through experiments, observations, models and statistical comparisons. Robert Cialdini describes recurring principles of influence such as reciprocity, consistency, authority, liking, social proof, scarcity and unity (Cialdini, 2021). Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky demonstrated that judgement under uncertainty often depends upon heuristics, framing and reference points rather than fully rational calculation (Tversky and Kahneman, 1974; Kahneman, 2011). Gerd Gigerenzer argues that heuristics may prove intelligent when they fit the environments in which people use them (Gigerenzer, 2007). Rory Sutherland and Richard Shotton translate behavioural findings into advertising and commercial practice (Sutherland, 2019; Shotton, 2018).

The difference between these traditions cannot, however, be reduced to a contrast between religion and science, imagination and measurement, or anecdote and experiment. They possess different epistemologies. They differ over what constitutes knowledge, what counts as evidence, what sort of entity possesses a thought and what relationship holds between an observer and the world observed.

New Thought frequently begins with some version of the proposition that consciousness precedes or shapes experienced reality. Behavioural science usually begins by separating a participant from a stimulus, an internal state from an external environment, and an

intervention from its result. Non-dual philosophies such as Advaita Vedānta question whether these divisions possess ultimate reality at all.

This paper therefore asks several related questions.

What kind of truth does New Thought claim?

What kind of truth can behavioural science establish?

Can an experience possess validity without furnishing a publicly demonstrable metaphysical explanation?

Can an experimental finding remain scientifically valid while carrying little relevance beyond its original conditions?

Do cognitive and linguistic filters merely distort reality, or do they make experience and action possible?

Finally, where might New Thought, non-dual awareness and behavioural science meet without collapsing their genuine differences?

New Thought as a Religious and Experiential Tradition

The New Thought movement never possessed a single founder, creed or institution. It developed through a loose network of teachers, healers, ministers, writers and organisations. Its historical influences included American transcendentalism, Christian metaphysics, mesmerism, mental healing and various interpretations of Asian philosophy. Phineas Parkhurst Quimby often receives attention as an early influence, although later New Thought writers developed his ideas in many different directions (Braden, 1963; Albanese, 2007).

New Thought generally proposes that mind, belief or consciousness participates in the formation of health, happiness and circumstance. Its more restrained forms argue that constructive thinking changes behaviour and experience. Its stronger forms claim that thought acts directly upon physical events.

This distinction matters because the first proposition remains psychologically plausible while the second requires a much more demanding account of causation.

Florence Scovel Shinn

Florence Scovel Shinn published *The Game of Life and How to Play It* herself in 1925 after failing to secure a conventional publisher. Her work draws heavily upon biblical stories and Christian language. She presents life as a lawful spiritual process governed by faith, expectation, love, forgiveness, non-resistance and the spoken word (Shinn, 1925).

Shinn does not write as a systematic theologian or experimental psychologist. She teaches through stories. A person fears a disease and eventually develops it. Another person speaks words of faith and receives money. Someone releases resentment and finds that an external

problem resolves itself. These narratives provide moral and emotional instruction rather than controlled evidence.

Shinn's work contains an important psychological observation: expectations influence what people notice, how they speak, what they attempt and how long they persist. Her metaphysical interpretation extends beyond this observation. She often treats the correspondence between a changed inner state and a favourable event as evidence of spiritual law.

The stories rarely reveal how many people applied similar principles without receiving the desired result. They therefore conceal the denominator. They also leave open several competing explanations, including coincidence, changed behaviour, altered social responses, selective memory, regression towards the mean and the natural resolution of difficulties.

The Christian structure of Shinn's writing gives it emotional power. Her readers encounter a universe organised by providence rather than indifference. Forgiveness, faith and right speech become practical means of restoring harmony. For people who share her theology, these ideas may carry greater motivational force than a technical discussion of cognitive appraisal.

The same theological structure limits her evidential reach. Biblical interpretation supports her spiritual laws, while apparently successful examples then support the biblical interpretation. This circularity can remain spiritually persuasive while resisting scientific examination.

James Allen

James Allen's *As a Man Thinketh* places greater emphasis upon thought, character and moral discipline. He portrays the mind as a garden in which cultivated thoughts gradually produce conduct, character and circumstances (Allen, 1903/2006).

Allen's strongest proposition may be expressed as a sequence:

thought influences interpretation;

interpretation influences conduct;

conduct repeated over time becomes habit;

habit contributes to character;

character affects relationships, reputation and opportunity.

Behavioural and social psychology can support much of this sequence.

Allen sometimes moves further, however, and presents outer circumstances as a precise reflection of inner thought. Such claims risk overlooking chance, inheritance, social class, power, illness, political violence and the actions of other people.

A person may influence future circumstances without having created every condition from which they begin. Agency and total causation do not amount to the same thing.

Allen's value lies largely in his insistence that people possess some influence over the mental habits through which they meet the world. His error arises when moral responsibility expands into an explanation for all fortune and suffering.

Wallace D. Wattles

Wallace D. Wattles published *The Science of Getting Rich* in 1910 through the Elizabeth Towne Company. He presents wealth as the result of thought and action conducted in a "Certain Way" (Wattles, 1910). His philosophy combines metaphysical abundance with disciplined action, gratitude, visualisation and service.

Wattles does not merely recommend fantasy. He repeatedly connects thought with purposeful action. This makes his work psychologically more substantial than later interpretations which present manifestation as a substitute for effort.

Nevertheless, the word "science" in his title carries a meaning quite different from modern experimental science. Wattles offers a purported universal law without controlled tests, operational definitions or a procedure through which the law could fail.

If a follower becomes wealthy, the success confirms the method. If the follower remains poor, the failure can be attributed to incomplete faith, incorrect action or an imperfect mental image. A theory protected from every possible failure becomes difficult to distinguish from an unfalsifiable belief system.

New Thought, Advaita and the Problem of the Individual Agent

New Thought shares a family resemblance with non-dual philosophy, but the resemblance should not hide a deep tension.

Advaita Vedānta teaches that ātman, the deepest Self, does not stand apart from Brahman, ultimate reality. Śaṅkara's philosophical tradition treats pure consciousness as non-dual and denies ultimate independence to the ordinary subject-object division (Deutsch, 1969).

Ramana Maharshi's method of self-enquiry asks the practitioner to investigate the source of the thought "I". In *Who Am I?*, the ordinary mind consists of thoughts, with the "I"-thought appearing as the primary assumption from which distinctions between self and world arise. Persistent enquiry turns attention towards the supposed owner of experience until the separate ego loses its apparent independence (Ramana Maharshi, 1982).

New Thought usually retains a strong individual agent:

I choose the thought.

I speak the word.

I form the image.

I attract the result.

I improve my circumstances.

Advaita asks whether this separate "I" exists in the way it imagines.

New Thought often seeks to make the personal self more effective. Advaita seeks to expose the personal self as a limited appearance within awareness.

The contrast can be stated simply:

New Thought says, "Your thought creates your world."

Advaita asks, "Who possesses the thought, and where does the boundary between your world and the rest of reality arise?"

Rupert Spira presents a contemporary version of non-dual teaching in which awareness constitutes that with which experience becomes known, that in which experience appears and, ultimately, that from which experience receives its apparent substance (Spira, 2017). His position resembles Advaita more closely than conventional New Thought, although his language sometimes intersects with contemporary discussions of abundance and limitation.

The phrase "nothing is really happening" belongs to the absolute rather than the conventional level of enquiry. At the conventional level, people marry, separate, sign contracts, lose money, experience illness and suffer bereavement. At the non-dual level, the apparently separate entities involved in these events possess no independent existence outside the indivisible field of awareness.

Confusion arises when statements from one level become instructions at another.

A person who says "nothing is happening" while ignoring a legal deadline has confused metaphysical insight with practical incompetence. The fact that a wave lacks independence from the sea does not mean that a sailor may ignore it.

Qabalah, Crowley and Metaphysical Mechanics

Qabalah and the magical philosophy of Aleister Crowley enter this discussion because they provide elaborate accounts of correspondences between mind, symbol, will and manifestation.

Crowley defines magick as the art or science of causing change in conformity with will. His system uses ritual, attention, symbolism and disciplined intention to align the practitioner with what he terms True Will (Crowley, 1929/1976).

Crowley's system differs from Shinn's Christian optimism. It also differs from Advaita. It retains elaborate symbolic distinctions, hierarchies and operations even when these ultimately participate in a unified metaphysical order.

Qabalistic and magical systems may function psychologically by organising attention, emotion, identity and commitment through symbol and ritual. A ritual can create a transition,

strengthen resolve, focus perception and change subsequent behaviour. The metaphysical claim that the ritual also operates through invisible correspondences remains a separate proposition.

The same distinction applied to New Thought applies here:

A practice may change the practitioner.

The practitioner's changed behaviour may change events.

Neither fact, by itself, demonstrates the proposed metaphysical mechanism.

The Epistemology of Behavioural Science

Behavioural science seeks publicly examinable knowledge. It attempts to define variables, compare conditions, measure outcomes and estimate uncertainty.

Suppose researchers want to test whether scarcity increases demand. They might show one group a product described as readily available and another group the same product described as nearly sold out. They could then compare purchase intentions or actual purchases.

This structure depends upon distinctions:

participant and stimulus;

treatment and control;

before and after;

inner judgement and observable behaviour;

independent variable and dependent variable;

cause and result.

These distinctions reflect the grammar of subject and object. They do not necessarily prove that reality consists ultimately of separate subjects and objects. They function as methodological boundaries.

A navigational chart divides an undivided sea into coordinates. The lines help the navigator without becoming physical features of the water.

Similarly, a behavioural experiment draws provisional lines so that researchers can ask a limited question. The experiment does not establish that its categories reveal the final structure of consciousness.

Cialdini and Social Influence

Robert Cialdini's principles of persuasion organise a large body of research and observation into memorable categories. Reciprocity concerns the pressure to return benefits. Consistency

concerns the tendency to align present action with prior commitments. Social proof concerns the use of other people's behaviour as information. Authority, liking, scarcity and unity identify additional routes through which influence may occur (Cialdini, 2021).

These principles should not be treated as universal switches. Scarcity may increase desire when it signals popularity or exclusivity. It may decrease desire when it signals manipulation, supply failure or danger.

Social proof may encourage a useful action when it suggests that trusted peers approve. It may normalise harmful conduct when a message emphasises how many people already behave badly.

The category identifies a possible mechanism. The setting determines its meaning.

Kahneman, Tversky and Cognitive Bias

Kahneman and Tversky demonstrated that people often rely upon simplifying heuristics when making decisions under uncertainty. Framing, anchoring, availability, representativeness and loss aversion can produce systematic departures from traditional models of rational choice (Tversky and Kahneman, 1974; Kahneman, 2011).

Kahneman's distinction between fast and slow thinking offers a useful explanatory metaphor. Fast thought operates quickly, associatively and with little conscious effort. Slow thought requires attention and deliberation.

The distinction does not imply two literal organs inside the mind. It provides a model. Like all models, it reveals some features while suppressing others.

Kahneman also warns that the mind constructs coherent explanations from limited information. What someone sees can become "all there is" for the purposes of immediate judgement. This brings behavioural science close to the question of filters.

Gigerenzer and Ecological Rationality

Gerd Gigerenzer criticises the tendency to treat every departure from formal logic as a defect. A simple heuristic may perform well when it fits the structure of the environment in which it evolved or was learned (Gigerenzer, 2007).

A sailor may make a sound judgement from wind, cloud and the feel of the vessel without calculating a formal probability. An experienced doctor may recognise a dangerous pattern before articulating every cue. An older businessman may distrust an artificial deadline because previous experience has taught him that urgency often conceals manipulation.

The quality of a judgement therefore depends partly upon the match between the cognitive strategy and the environment.

This principle becomes crucial when behavioural findings move from the laboratory into the world.

Sutherland and Shotton as Translators

Rory Sutherland and Richard Shotton make behavioural science accessible to commercial audiences. Sutherland emphasises that human value depends upon perception and context rather than physical utility alone. Shotton organises behavioural effects into practical lessons for advertising and marketing (Sutherland, 2019; Shotton, 2018).

Their work has considerable value, but it occupies a different evidential position from a preregistered experiment, systematic review or meta-analysis. They select, interpret and illustrate findings. Commercial examples often demonstrate possibility rather than general law.

A successful campaign can resemble a New Thought anecdote when the failed campaigns, competing explanations and contextual differences remain invisible.

Behavioural popularisation therefore risks becoming a technical form of storytelling. It exchanges providence for bias, but it may still favour memorable successes over representative evidence.

Where New Thought and Behavioural Science Converge

The strongest meeting point does not lie in the claim that thoughts magically command external events. It lies in the sequence through which thought influences attention, interpretation, action and feedback.

Expectation

Expectations shape perception and conduct.

A person expecting rejection may avoid contact, speak defensively, misread uncertainty as hostility and withdraw at the first obstacle. A person expecting some possibility of success may make more approaches, ask better questions and recover more quickly from refusal.

The expectation does not guarantee acceptance. It changes the actions through which acceptance may become more likely.

Bandura's theory of self-efficacy provides a behavioural account of this process. A person's belief in their capacity to perform a task affects goal selection, effort, persistence and recovery after setbacks (Bandura, 1977).

Effective self-efficacy usually develops through experience, practice, observation and credible encouragement. It differs from an unlimited declaration detached from competence.

New Thought intuitively understands the importance of expectancy. Behavioural science attempts to identify the mechanisms and conditions through which expectancy matters.

Language and the Spoken Word

Shinn gives extraordinary power to the spoken word. Her metaphysical explanation remains unverified, but words clearly influence behaviour.

Language can direct attention, frame a situation, create a commitment, organise memory, communicate confidence and invite a response from other people.

The sentence "Nobody wants to buy from me" prepares attention to notice rejection.

The sentence "I shall contact three former clients before midday" specifies an action.

The first statement operates as a global identity claim. The second functions as a behavioural instruction.

Gollwitzer's research on implementation intentions shows that "if-then" planning can help translate goals into action. A person connects a defined situation with a defined response: "If it reaches ten o'clock, I shall make the first call" (Gollwitzer and Sheeran, 2006).

This turns an affirmation into an executable instruction.

New Thought says that words impress the subconscious mind.

Behavioural science says that clear plans make relevant cues easier to recognise and responses easier to initiate.

The vocabularies differ, but a practical overlap appears.

Optimism and Resilience

Optimism has been associated with better health outcomes, although the mechanisms probably include coping, persistence, stress regulation and health behaviour rather than direct metaphysical control of the body. A meta-analysis by Rasmussen, Scheier and Greenhouse found a modest positive relationship between optimism and physical health (Rasmussen, Scheier and Greenhouse, 2009).

Optimism may help a person continue treatment, seek support, exercise or interpret setbacks as temporary.

It may also become harmful when it denies danger, discourages treatment or attributes illness to moral failure.

The behavioural evidence supports constructive expectancy rather than omnipotent thought.

Placebo, Nocebo and Meaning

Placebo and nocebo effects demonstrate that expectation, conditioning, relationship and context can alter symptoms and some physiological responses. Pain provides a particularly clear example because expectation can influence both reported experience and measurable processes involved in pain regulation (Price, Finniss and Benedetti, 2008).

This evidence confirms that meaning enters the body.

It does not establish that belief can cure every disease or replace appropriate treatment.

The boundary matters. New Thought often moves from a valid mind–body interaction to a universal mental causation theory. Behavioural medicine supports the former without endorsing the latter.

Self-Affirmation and Positive Statements

Popular affirmations and psychological self-affirmation refer to different practices.

A popular affirmation often declares a desired condition as an established fact: “I am wealthy,” “I am completely confident,” or “Everything always works for me.”

Psychological self-affirmation usually asks people to reflect upon genuine values, relationships or qualities that support a broader sense of personal integrity.

Meta-analytic evidence suggests that self-affirmation exercises can produce small improvements in receptivity to health messages, intentions and behaviour (Epton et al., 2015).

Highly positive self-statements may, however, make some people with low self-esteem feel worse because the statement activates the gap between the desired identity and the person’s existing self-conception (Wood, Perunovic and Lee, 2009).

The lesson does not require abandoning affirmations. It requires grounding them.

“I am a universally successful businessman” may provoke disbelief.

“I value steadiness and service; today I shall complete the difficult call” joins identity with action.

Positive Fantasy and Mental Contrasting

New Thought often encourages visualisation of the desired future. Visualisation may clarify motivation, but pleasant fantasy can also provide emotional reward without producing effort.

Kappes and Oettingen found that idealised positive fantasies could reduce energy and predict poorer achievement (Kappes and Oettingen, 2011).

Oettingen’s method of mental contrasting combines the desired future with an honest examination of present obstacles. Implementation intentions then connect obstacles with responses (Oettingen, 2014).

This creates a productive synthesis:

imagine the aim;

identify the obstacle;

specify the next action;

observe the result.

New Thought contributes the emotionally compelling future.

Behavioural science contributes friction, planning and measurement.

Where the Traditions Separate

The meeting point remains substantial but limited.

Metaphysical Causation

Behavioural science can support the proposition that thought alters attention, feeling, communication and action. It cannot infer from this that thought independently controls external reality.

The following sequence remains plausible:

belief changes conduct;

conduct changes relationships;

relationships change opportunities;

opportunities change outcomes.

The following claim requires separate evidence:

belief directly causes an otherwise unrelated external event.

New Thought often moves between these propositions without distinguishing them.

Falsifiability

A theory becomes scientifically vulnerable when it specifies what evidence would count against it.

If every success confirms a spiritual law and every failure indicates inadequate faith, no possible result can disprove the law.

This may suit a religious teaching whose purpose involves meaning and spiritual discipline. It does not satisfy the requirements of causal science.

The unprovable nature of a claim does not automatically make it meaningless. It changes the kind of claim being made.

Victim-Blaming

New Thought can restore agency by encouraging people to examine their beliefs and actions. It can also transform suffering into an accusation.

A person may hear:

"You attracted the abusive relationship."

"You created your illness."

"You remain poor because you think poorly."

These statements ignore structural inequality, violence, biology, chance and other people's choices.

Responsibility for one's next action differs from blame for every preceding event.

Any synthesis between New Thought and behavioural science must preserve that distinction.

The Limits of Behavioural Science

Behavioural science possesses stronger methods for causal inference, but it does not escape filters, assumptions or error.

Artificial Environments

An experiment gains control by simplifying reality. The same simplification may remove features that give real decisions their meaning.

A participant selecting between two inexpensive products on a computer screen does not face the same situation as someone deciding whether to sell a family asset during a divorce.

The laboratory isolates variables. Life recombines them.

Narrow Samples

Psychological research has relied disproportionately upon Western, educated, industrialised, wealthy and democratic populations. Henrich, Heine and Norenzayan argued that such participants may prove unusually unrepresentative when researchers attempt to generalise about humanity (Henrich, Heine and Norenzayan, 2010).

Even a culturally diverse sample cannot guarantee generalisation when the experimental context remains artificial. Different populations may interpret the same task differently.

The participant does not respond merely to the stimulus designed by the researcher. The participant responds to what they believe the situation means.

Ethics and Realism

Ethical review constrains the kinds of experiences researchers may create. Scientists cannot normally impose severe financial ruin, prolonged humiliation, domestic abuse or major family conflict merely to observe behaviour.

These restrictions protect participants and strengthen the moral legitimacy of research.

They may also reduce ecological realism.

Ethical review does not itself make science less objective. It restricts the permissible methods. Problems with objectivity arise more directly from measurement choices, sampling, analytical flexibility, financial incentives and selective reporting.

Research must approach some parts of life through natural experiments, observational data, field studies, qualitative enquiry and carefully governed interventions.

Replication and Publication Bias

The Open Science Collaboration attempted to replicate 100 psychology studies and found that replication effects were generally smaller than the original effects. The interpretation of the precise replication rate remains debated, but the project demonstrated the need for larger samples, preregistration, transparent analysis and repeated testing (Open Science Collaboration, 2015).

Publication systems favour novel and positive results. A surprising effect may receive publication while an unsuccessful replication remains unseen.

New Thought hides the denominator by preserving successful testimonies.

Academic science can hide it by publishing significant findings more readily than null results.

The methods differ, but selection can distort both traditions.

Average Effects and Individual People

An average effect does not predict every individual.

An intervention may help one person, produce no effect in another and provoke resistance in a third. Age, culture, experience, trust, wealth, stress and personal meaning can alter the response.

A statistically significant group difference does not amount to a personal destiny.

Behavioural science becomes misleading when a conditional average turns into a universal claim about "how people behave".

The Turkish Boat Owner and the Transportability Problem

Consider a scarcity message tested upon American university students choosing inexpensive consumer goods.

Researchers tell one group that a product remains plentiful. They tell another group that only two items remain. The second group expresses greater purchase interest.

The result may possess internal validity. Under those conditions, the scarcity message changed the measured response.

Now apply the same message to a 70-year-old Turkish boat owner negotiating a family asset during inflation and marital stress.

"You must decide today. Another buyer is waiting."

For the students, scarcity may mean popularity, opportunity or exclusivity.

For the boat owner, scarcity may mean manipulation, loss of control, family danger, financial uncertainty or an attempt to prevent legal consultation.

His history supplies the meaning of the cue.

The same message may increase desire in one population and produce withdrawal in another.

This does not disprove the student experiment. It defines its domain.

A responsible application requires questions such as:

Does the target population interpret scarcity in the same way?

Do the financial stakes resemble those in the original research?

Does the relationship contain trust?

Does the recipient possess prior experience of manipulation?

What other pressures operate at the same time?

Behavioural science must transport a finding rather than merely repeat its wording.

The boat owner also reveals the value of anecdotal knowledge. Someone who knows him may predict his response better than a researcher armed with a general average.

The anecdote should not replace research. It supplies local information that the general study lacks.

George Kelly's Personal Construct Theory provides a more precise account of this individual difference. The boat owner does not respond to "scarcity" as an abstract behavioural variable. He construes the message through distinctions developed from experience: honest or deceptive, opportunity or coercion, safety or danger, control or loss. These constructs generate anticipations about the seller's intentions and the consequences of acting quickly. The effectiveness of the scarcity message therefore depends upon its position within his wider construct system rather than upon the words alone (Kelly, 1955).

Subject–Object Language and the Scientific Filter

Behavioural science describes experience by separating observer and observed.

The participant sees the message.

The researcher measures the response.

The mind contains a belief.

The environment contains a cue.

The behaviour produces an outcome.

This language helps researchers organise evidence. It also carries philosophical assumptions.

Advaita challenges the ultimate separation of seer and seen. Phenomenology studies experience as it appears from the first-person point of view rather than beginning with an observer-independent object (Smith, 2003).

Neither perspective automatically invalidates behavioural research.

A scientist may use subject–object distinctions methodologically without claiming that they describe ultimate reality. The distinction functions like a map grid.

The problem arises when a useful method becomes an unconscious metaphysics.

Science may begin to assume that only third-person measurements count as real. First-person meaning then becomes a secondary report rather than part of the phenomenon itself.

New Thought makes the opposite mistake when it grants first-person conviction automatic authority over external causation.

An adequate epistemology requires both private experience and public correction.

Experiential Validity and Metaphysical Validity

A person may experience a dissolution of the boundary between self and world.

The experience itself may possess first-person certainty:

“For a period, no separate self appeared.”

Several explanations remain possible.

An Advaitin may describe recognition of non-dual awareness.

A Christian mystic may describe union with God.

A Buddhist may speak of emptiness or non-self.

A psychologist may discuss altered self-processing.

A neuroscientist may examine changes in brain networks associated with self-reference.

The person possesses privileged access to the character of the experience. They do not automatically possess privileged access to the one correct cosmological interpretation.

Three kinds of validity should therefore remain distinct.

Experiential validity asks whether the experience occurred and what it felt like.

Pragmatic validity asks what difference the experience made to the person’s life.

Metaphysical validity asks what the experience proves about ultimate reality.

A spiritual experience may transform fear, behaviour and relationships while leaving its metaphysical interpretation unresolved.

New Thought may therefore prove experientially valid for a person without becoming scientifically established as a universal causal theory.

Filters and Total Awareness

The idea of total awareness raises a fundamental question. Do filters stand between awareness and reality like dirty glass, or do they participate in the construction of experienced reality?

Human beings cannot ordinarily attend to everything at once. Attention selects some information and suppresses the rest. This selection makes coherent action possible.

A person crossing a road must prioritise the approaching vehicle over the colour of a distant roof. A lawyer reading a contract must notice the operative clause rather than the texture of the paper. A person buying coffee may attend to the price rather than the cosmological age of the carbon in the cup.

A filter conceals.

A filter also enables.

The absence of selection would not necessarily produce wisdom. It might produce incapacity.

Non-dual awareness may refer to an open field in which all distinctions arise. Practical action still requires distinctions within that field.

Donald D. Hoffman's Interface Theory of Perception develops this argument further by proposing that perceptual systems evolved primarily to support adaptive action rather than to disclose objective reality faithfully. From this perspective, the filter does not merely remove information from an otherwise complete representation. It supplies the practical interface through which a world of relevant objects, risks and opportunities becomes available at all (Hoffman, Singh and Prakash, 2015).

The question therefore becomes less:

"How can I eliminate every filter?"

and more:

"Which filter operates now, what does it reveal, what does it conceal, and does it suit the present purpose?"

The James Webb Space Telescope and Competing Scales of Relevance

The James Webb Space Telescope provides a useful illustration.

Webb did not directly observe the Big Bang. It observes light from early stars and galaxies. Some initial observations revealed galaxies that appeared unexpectedly bright, numerous or mature. Popular commentary sometimes converted these findings into claims that Webb had disproved the Big Bang.

The scientific position remained narrower. Some early estimates made galaxies appear more massive than later analysis supported because light from active black holes contributed to their brightness. These revisions reduced the appearance of a crisis while leaving significant questions about rapid early galaxy formation. In January 2026 NASA reported confirmation of MoM-z14 as it appeared approximately 280 million years after the beginning of cosmic expansion, extending observations further into the early universe without amounting to a simple rejection of Big Bang cosmology.

Several filters operate in this example.

The telescope filters electromagnetic radiation through its instruments.

Scientists filter observations through models.

Statistical procedures filter signal from noise.

Scientific institutions filter findings through review.

Journalists filter technical qualifications into accessible stories.

Internet users filter those stories through prior beliefs and desires for drama.

The ordinary person filters the whole matter through immediate relevance.

For a cosmologist, an unexpectedly mature early galaxy may alter years of work.

For someone worrying about the price of morning coffee, it changes no immediate decision.

The cosmological finding does not become unimportant. Its importance operates at a different scale.

Relevance always belongs to a relationship between information, purpose and circumstance.

A person who treats coffee prices as the only reality suffers from a narrow filter.

A cosmologist who dismisses the person's financial anxiety as trivial mistakes disciplinary importance for human importance.

Total awareness, as an ideal, would include both without confusing their scales.

Different Traditions for Different Temperaments

New Thought and behavioural science attract different audiences partly because they answer different emotional and intellectual needs.

New Thought offers:

meaning;

hope;

agency;

spiritual order;

moral orientation;

a language for transformation;

a sense that life possesses coherence.

Behavioural science offers:

measurement;

prediction;

public evidence;

repeatable procedure;

protection against self-deception;

tools for policy and commercial application.

The New Thought reader may ask:

"How should I understand what is happening to me?"

The behavioural scientist may ask:

"What intervention changes the probability of this response?"

William James recognised a related division between tender-minded and tough-minded philosophical temperaments. The tender-minded orientation favours idealism, optimism, religion and freedom. The tough-minded orientation favours facts, empiricism, scepticism and material explanation (James, 1907).

James did not simply choose one side. His pragmatism asked what practical difference a belief makes and how it survives contact with experience. Pragmatic truth concerns verification, consequences and the reliability of an idea in lived enquiry (James, 1907).

This gives James a central position between New Thought and behavioural science.

A belief such as "life supports me" may remain metaphysically unresolved. Its practical consequences can still receive investigation.

Does the belief reduce defensiveness?

Does it increase constructive action?

Does it make the believer more generous?

Does it encourage persistence?

Does it also make the believer ignore danger?

The metaphysical proposition and its behavioural consequences become separate subjects of enquiry.

Phenomenology as a Bridge

Phenomenology also provides a meeting point.

Behavioural science often begins from an externally defined variable. Phenomenology begins from the way an experience appears to the person living it.

The scarcity message cannot be understood fully by its wording alone. It must also be understood as experienced.

To one person, "only two remain" appears exciting.

To another, it appears coercive.

To another, it appears irrelevant.

The physical stimulus remains similar while the experienced object differs.

Phenomenology does not prove New Thought's metaphysics. It does prevent behavioural science from treating meaning as an accidental decoration placed upon an otherwise complete stimulus-response chain.

Human beings respond to interpreted worlds.

First-Person, Second-Person and Third-Person Knowledge

A more complete inquiry uses three perspectives.

First-person knowledge

First-person enquiry asks:

What do I experience?

What thoughts, sensations and meanings appear?

Where does the sense of separation arise?

What happens when I cease identifying every thought as a fact?

This perspective honours contemplative practice, phenomenology and self-enquiry.

Its danger lies in mistaking conviction for universal proof.

Second-person knowledge

Second-person enquiry asks:

What does this situation mean to this particular person?

How do history, culture, trust and relationship shape the response?

What can emerge through dialogue that neither detached measurement nor private introspection reveals?

This perspective belongs to psychotherapy, mentoring, ethnography and humane conversation.

Its danger lies in overidentification and uncontrolled interpretation.

Third-person knowledge

Third-person enquiry asks:

What happens repeatedly?

Can conditions receive comparison?

Does the effect replicate?

How large is it?

Under which conditions does it disappear or reverse?

This perspective belongs to experimental and observational science.

Its danger lies in treating what can be measured as the whole of reality.

No single perspective can safely replace the others.

A Layered Account of Truth

The conflict between New Thought and behavioural science becomes more manageable when truth receives several levels.

Incubation: Working Upon an Idea While Attending Elsewhere

The writing of this paper offered a small example of the processes it attempts to describe. At several points, I left the computer to unload shopping, carry food into the kitchen and arrange it in the refrigerator. Consciously, I had disengaged from New Thought, behavioural science and the philosophical status of perception. My immediate task involved finding space for vegetables, deciding what required refrigeration and placing each item where I might later find it.

Yet some of the paper's more useful connections appeared during, or shortly after, these intervals. References and relationships which had resisted deliberate effort seemed to present

themselves once I had turned my conscious attention elsewhere. I began to wonder whether I had stopped working upon the article at all, or whether I had merely changed the form in which the work continued.

Psychological research describes a related phenomenon as **incubation**. After becoming engaged with a problem, a person temporarily turns towards another activity and later returns with a new idea, interpretation or solution. A meta-analysis found an overall positive incubation effect, particularly for tasks requiring divergent thought, although the benefit varied according to the kind of problem, the preparation given and the activity undertaken during the interval (Sio and Ormerod, 2009). In one experimental study, participants who performed a simple, undemanding task which allowed greater mind-wandering subsequently produced more creative uses for familiar objects than participants who rested, performed a demanding task or received no break (Baird et al., 2012).

The shopping itself probably contributed no relevant information about Advaita, Personal Construct Theory or the epistemology of behavioural science. It may, however, have reduced the pressure of deliberate control. The familiar physical sequence of carrying, sorting and stacking occupied enough attention to interrupt repetitive thought while leaving sufficient mental freedom for less obvious associations to form. This interpretation remains more cautious than saying that an unconscious intelligence independently completed the argument. The evidence supports a conditional incubation effect rather than a universal claim that every distraction produces insight.

The incident can nevertheless receive several interpretations from within the traditions examined here.

Behavioural science may describe a shift from concentrated effort towards mind-wandering and associative recombination.

Personal Construct Theory may suggest that temporary disengagement loosened the existing organisation of the problem. Once the dominant construction stopped governing every association, an alternative construction became available.

New Thought may describe the experience as releasing strain, ceasing to force the answer and allowing an appropriate idea to arrive.

A non-dual interpretation may question the assumption that a separate author manufactured the thought. The idea appeared within awareness when the effort to claim and control the creative process had diminished.

Each description selects a different part of the same event. None can establish, by itself, the final mechanism through which the idea emerged. The behavioural explanation offers testable regularities. Personal Construct Theory describes a possible reconstruction of

meaning. New Thought preserves the lived sense of receptivity. Non-dual enquiry turns attention towards the uncertain ownership of thought itself.

The experience also complicates any simple division between working and resting, conscious and unconscious, or relevant and irrelevant activity. I appeared to have left the paper in order to stack food in the refrigerator. From another perspective, changing activity formed part of the writing process. The apparent interruption supplied a different cognitive environment in which the unfinished argument could reorganise itself.

This suggests that intellectual work may depend upon a rhythm between concentration and release. Deliberate attention gathers the material, defines the problem and tests the resulting claims. Periods of partial disengagement may allow ideas to meet beyond the arrangement imposed by conscious effort. The insight then requires a return to deliberate thought, where it can receive criticism, evidence and written form.

Incubation therefore provides a modest example of the meeting point developed throughout this paper. Thought does not simply proceed through continuous conscious command. Attention selects and organises, then sometimes benefits from relaxing its grip. A useful idea may arise when the writer has apparently turned towards something more ordinary: a shopping bag, an open refrigerator and the practical question of where to put the milk.

Ontological truth

What ultimately exists?

Advaita proposes non-dual consciousness.

Materialism proposes a fundamentally physical reality.

New Thought usually proposes a divine mental or spiritual order.

Behavioural science need not decide among these positions before conducting limited research.

Epistemological truth

How can knowledge be justified?

New Thought relies heavily upon revelation, intuition, testimony and interpreted experience.

Behavioural science relies upon measurement, comparison, replication and public criticism.

Both methods contain strengths and characteristic errors.

Phenomenological truth

How does the world appear in lived experience?

A fearful world and a hopeful world may contain the same objects while presenting different possibilities.

Causal truth

What produces what under specified conditions?

This requires more than sequence and testimony. It requires comparison and the exclusion of plausible alternatives.

Ecological truth

Does a finding remain valid in the setting where it will be used?

A laboratory effect may possess causal validity and little practical transportability.

Pragmatic truth

What difference does the belief or method make?

Does it help someone act more wisely, effectively or compassionately?

Ethical truth

What happens to responsibility, dignity and power when the idea receives application?

A method that increases compliance may work behaviourally while remaining manipulative.

A spiritual teaching that increases hope may help one person while blaming another for their suffering.

These levels prevent one kind of success from claiming authority over every other question.

Comparative Strengths

New Thought possesses several genuine strengths.

It treats people as participants in their lives rather than passive mechanisms.

It gives emotional and narrative form to abstract ideas about expectancy, attention and conduct.

It offers accessible daily practices.

It takes meaning seriously.

It can support courage during uncertainty.

It recognises that language and imagination shape lived experience.

It may identify possibilities that formal research has not yet examined.

Behavioural science also possesses distinctive strengths.

It compares outcomes rather than relying solely upon memorable stories.

It can estimate how often an effect occurs.

It requires clearer definitions.

It exposes interventions to failure.

It allows other researchers to inspect and challenge a claim.

It develops procedures for correcting error.

It can reveal when intuition produces predictable mistakes.

Anecdote can discover a possibility.

Experiment can test whether the possibility survives comparison.

Comparative Weaknesses

New Thought's weaknesses arise from metaphysical inflation, selective testimony and moral overreach.

It may turn a valid observation about attention into a universal law of manifestation.

It may interpret coincidence as causation.

It rarely records failures systematically.

It can protect itself from disproof.

It may blame people for conditions they did not create.

It can encourage fantasy without action.

Behavioural science's weaknesses arise from abstraction, narrowness and statistical inflation.

It may mistake an operational category for a natural division.

It may overgeneralise from students and artificial tasks.

It may neglect culture, history and meaning.

It may publish novelty more readily than failure.

It can reduce persons to variables.

It may allow a small average effect to become a popular universal rule.

It can serve manipulation as easily as human welfare.

Each tradition needs the corrective strengths of the other without adopting the other's excesses.

A Practical Synthesis

A disciplined synthesis can move through six stages.

Begin with awareness

Notice the thought, expectation or emotional pattern without immediately treating it as a fact.

This step draws upon self-enquiry, contemplative practice and phenomenology.

Clarify meaning

Ask what the situation means to the individual.

A scarcity message may mean opportunity, coercion or danger.

This step requires second-person understanding.

Form a modest hypothesis

Translate the spiritual or intuitive claim into a possible mechanism.

"Faith brings opportunity" might become:

"Reduced fear may increase attention to opportunities and improve social approach behaviour."

Specify action

Convert the belief into behaviour.

"When I encounter a potentially useful contact, I shall ask one clear question and arrange one next step."

Observe repeated results

Record actions, contexts and outcomes.

A single dramatic success may inspire. Repeated observation supplies stronger local knowledge.

Preserve metaphysical humility

The person may interpret the result through providence, non-duality, psychology or coincidence.

The practical result need not settle the ultimate ontology of the universe.

The Point at Which the Traditions Meet

Hoffman and Perception as an Adaptive Interface

Donald D. Hoffman provides an important contemporary bridge between the traditions considered here. His Interface Theory of Perception proposes that evolution need not reward organisms for perceiving the world as it exists independently of them. Natural selection

rewards perceptual systems that guide adaptive behaviour. Perception may therefore function less like a transparent window upon reality and more like a practical user interface which conceals underlying complexity while presenting the organism with manageable opportunities and dangers (Hoffman, Singh and Prakash, 2015).

Hoffman uses the analogy of a computer desktop. The coloured icon representing a document does not resemble the electronic circuits, machine instructions or magnetic states through which the document exists within the computer. The icon nevertheless allows the user to open, move or delete the file. Its value lies in effective interaction rather than literal resemblance. In the same way, the objects, colours, shapes and divisions appearing within human perception may enable useful conduct without reproducing the ultimate structure of reality.

This proposal strengthens the argument that filters do more than stand between awareness and an otherwise plainly available world. A perceptual filter may constitute the usable world through which an organism acts. The coffee cup, the approaching vehicle, the threatening expression and the scarce product appear not merely as neutral objects to which meaning is subsequently added. They appear within a species-specific and personally conditioned interface which has already selected certain distinctions as relevant.

Hoffman therefore approaches the meeting point between New Thought, non-dual philosophy and behavioural science from an unusual direction. Like New Thought, his theory questions the assumption that ordinary perception gives direct access to reality. Like Advaita, it leaves open the possibility that the familiar world of separate objects does not reveal the ultimate nature of existence. Unlike either tradition, however, Hoffman attempts to support his argument through evolutionary game theory and mathematical modelling rather than scriptural authority, introspective realisation or anecdotal testimony.

The comparison requires care. The Interface Theory of Perception does not demonstrate that personal thought creates external events, nor does it prove the metaphysical claims of New Thought or Advaita. It establishes, at most, a theoretical case for doubting that perceptual usefulness requires perceptual truth. Hoffman's further theory of "conscious realism", in which conscious agents rather than physical objects constitute fundamental reality, represents a more speculative ontological development and should remain distinct from the narrower evolutionary argument concerning perception (Hoffman, 2008; Hoffman, 2019).

Hoffman's contribution nevertheless clarifies the point at which the traditions meet. Behavioural science ordinarily studies how people respond to the world presented through their perceptual and conceptual interfaces. New Thought proposes that changing expectation and interpretation changes the experienced world. Hoffman suggests that no uninterpreted perceptual world stands plainly before us in the first place. Perception has already converted whatever reality may ultimately contain into a field of actionable symbols.

George Kelly: Personal Constructs and Constructive Alternativism

Donald D. Hoffman offers an evolutionary account of why human perception may present an adaptive interface rather than a literal representation of reality. George A. Kelly's Personal Construct Theory adds the individual level to this argument. It asks why different people, sharing broadly similar perceptual capacities, nevertheless organise and experience apparently similar events in markedly different ways.

Kelly proposes that people do not passively receive an already interpreted world. They organise experience through personal constructs: dimensions of meaning through which they distinguish, anticipate and respond to events. A person may construe another individual as trustworthy rather than untrustworthy, generous rather than exploitative, safe rather than dangerous, or competent rather than incompetent. These distinctions do more than classify experience after it has occurred. They help the person anticipate what may happen and select a course of action (Kelly, 1955).

Kelly's central philosophical position, which he termed *constructive alternativism*, holds that events remain open to alternative constructions. No present interpretation possesses final authority merely because it appears self-evident. A person may reconsider an event, construct it differently and thereby discover possibilities that the previous construction concealed (Kelly, 1955).

Constructive alternativism does not imply that every interpretation carries equal value. Kelly gives events an important corrective role. A construction produces anticipations, and experience may confirm or disconfirm them. People resemble scientists in this limited respect: they form working hypotheses about their worlds, act upon them and observe what follows. A useful construction anticipates events sufficiently well to support effective action. An unsuccessful construction may require revision or replacement.

Personal Construct Theory therefore provides a psychological account of the filter discussed throughout this paper. The filter does not merely stand between a person and a fully formed objective world. It organises experience into meaningful distinctions and anticipated possibilities. Yet it does not necessarily manufacture external events. The world may answer the person's construction in unexpected ways.

This places Kelly between New Thought and behavioural science. New Thought commonly argues that changing thought or belief changes experienced reality and, in its stronger forms, changes external circumstances directly. Kelly makes a more restrained claim. Changing a construction changes what a person anticipates, notices and attempts. Those changes may alter conduct and consequently affect what happens next. Events nevertheless retain the capacity to challenge the construction.

Kelly also corrects an excessively generalised behavioural science. A behavioural experiment may identify an average response to a scarcity message, but the category of scarcity does not

possess an identical personal meaning for every participant. One person may construe scarcity as evidence of desirability. Another may construe it as evidence of manipulation. A third may see it as a warning of poor supply or financial danger. The behavioural cue reaches the individual through a pre-existing system of personal constructs.

Personal Construct Theory also adds precision to the discussion of first-person and third-person knowledge. The individual's construction deserves attention because it supplies the meaning through which action becomes intelligible. Yet the construction remains open to examination because it makes anticipations that events can challenge. Kelly therefore preserves personal meaning without granting it complete immunity from evidence.

Hoffman and Kelly may consequently be regarded as addressing successive levels of the same problem. Hoffman asks whether ordinary human perception constitutes a species-specific interface shaped for adaptive action. Kelly asks how a particular person develops a distinctive system for construing what appears within that interface. Behavioural science then searches for regularities across many such persons, while New Thought considers how deliberate changes in belief, language and expectation may transform the person's experience.

Neither Hoffman nor Kelly proves the metaphysical doctrines of New Thought or Advaita. Kelly remains concerned principally with the relationship between personal anticipation and experienced events. His theory nevertheless supports the broader conclusion that human beings do not simply encounter a self-explanatory world. They participate in organising the meanings through which that world becomes actionable.

New Thought concentrates upon belief, interpretation and the possibility of transforming the interface from within. Behavioural science examines relations among cues, choices, actions and measurable consequences. Hoffman asks whether the apparent objects and divisions upon which both traditions operate should themselves be understood as adaptive representations rather than literal disclosures of reality.

This does not make every interpretation equally sound. A computer icon may conceal the machinery beneath it, but some actions performed through the icon still succeed while others fail. Similarly, perception may not reveal reality as it ultimately exists, yet the practical consequences of action continue to provide feedback. The interface permits navigation without granting omniscience.

- **an adaptive interface presents;**
- **awareness selects;**
- **selection creates salience;**
- **salience receives interpretation;**
- **interpretation influences action;**

- **action changes the environment;**
- **environmental feedback changes subsequent belief.**

New Thought emphasises awareness, belief and meaning.

Behavioural science emphasises cues, behaviour and measurable feedback.

Non-dual enquiry asks what contains the entire sequence and whether a separate controller can be found within it.

Pragmatism asks what practical difference each interpretation makes.

The traditions therefore meet operationally even when they remain divided metaphysically.

A person releases resentment through prayer.

The New Thought interpretation says that forgiveness restores spiritual harmony.

The behavioural interpretation says that reduced hostility changes communication and makes cooperation more likely.

The non-dual interpretation says that the boundary between self and other has softened.

The pragmatic interpretation asks whether the person now lives with greater freedom and responds more wisely.

These accounts can coexist until one of them makes an exclusive causal claim that contradicts the others or exceeds its evidence.

Final Discussion

The deepest disagreement between New Thought and behavioural science concerns the status of the world they describe.

Behavioural science usually studies an apparent world of individuals, choices, messages and consequences. It draws boundaries so that limited questions can receive public answers.

New Thought often treats this visible world as responsive to a deeper order of consciousness, belief or spirit.

Advaita questions whether either the individual actor or the external world possesses independent existence.

These perspectives do not operate upon a single flat plane.

Behavioural science asks what happens within experience.

New Thought asks how consciousness and meaning participate in experience.

Advaita asks what experience ultimately consists of and who claims to possess it.

Difficulty arises when an answer from one level attempts to govern the others.

A non-dual insight cannot determine whether a scarcity message will increase sales.

A laboratory experiment cannot determine whether consciousness constitutes ultimate reality.

A New Thought testimony cannot establish a universal causal law.

Yet each may reveal something the others conceal.

The person worrying about coffee and the cosmologist studying early galaxies inhabit the same universe while living through radically different fields of relevance.

The coffee price matters locally and immediately.

The galaxy matters intellectually and historically.

Neither cancels the other.

Wisdom may involve changing filters without forgetting that each remains a filter.

Conclusion

New Thought and behavioural science should neither be merged carelessly nor kept in complete isolation.

New Thought offers an emotionally powerful language of expectancy, meaning, personal participation and transformation. Its greatest value appears when it helps people alter attention, conduct and relationship. Its greatest danger appears when it turns symbolic or experiential truth into universal physical causation.

Behavioural science offers methods for comparison, prediction and correction. Its greatest value lies in its willingness to expose claims to failure. Its greatest danger appears when narrow experiments become universal accounts of human nature or when measurable behaviour receives priority over lived meaning.

Non-dual philosophy deepens the discussion by questioning the separate self who supposedly controls thought and the separate world upon which thought supposedly acts. It reminds science that its distinctions belong partly to its method and language. It reminds New Thought that the personal ego may not possess the metaphysical importance attributed to it.

Phenomenology restores the first-person structure of experience.

Pragmatism asks what difference a belief makes.

Ecological rationality asks whether a method fits its environment.

Behavioural science asks whether an effect survives comparison.

Together, these approaches suggest a layered critical pragmatism.

Such a position permits spiritual and experiential claims to retain their human meaning. It also requires external causal claims to accept evidence, limitation and possible failure.

The final synthesis can be stated simply:

New Thought reminds us that changing the filter can change the experienced world.

Behavioural science asks what the changed filter causes us to notice and do.

Phenomenology asks how that world appears from within.

Advaita asks what awareness remains before, during and after every filter.

Pragmatism asks whether the resulting way of living proves dependable, humane and wise.

George Kelly's constructive alternativism gives this position a psychological form. Human beings cannot readily conduct practical life without construing events, making distinctions and anticipating consequences. Wisdom therefore requires more than replacing a supposedly negative construction with a positive one. It requires treating every construction as provisional, observing what it leads us to anticipate and allowing experience to challenge it. The useful lens supports navigation while remaining open to replacement (Kelly, 1955).

A telescope, a scientific model, an affirmation, a ritual and a cup of coffee each reveal a particular world. None contains the whole.

Personal Construct Theory asks how each person constructs the particular world within which attention, expectation and action acquire meaning.

Incubation asks whether creative thought sometimes advances when conscious effort temporarily turns elsewhere, allowing established constructions to loosen and less obvious relationships to emerge.

The task does not require choosing one lens forever. It requires learning what each lens reveals, what it hides, and when the time has come to put it down.

References

Albanese, C. L. (2007) *A Republic of Mind and Spirit: A Cultural History of American Metaphysical Religion*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Allen, J. (1903/2006) *As a Man Thinketh*. New York: Tarcher/Penguin.

Baird, B., Smallwood, J., Mrazek, M. D., Kam, J. W. Y., Franklin, M. S. and Schooler, J. W. (2012) *Inspired by Distraction: Mind Wandering Facilitates Creative Incubation*, *Psychological Science*, 23(10), pp. 1117–1122. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Bandura, A. (1977) 'Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change', *Psychological Review*, 84(2), pp. 191–215. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

- Braden, C. S. (1963) *Spirits in Rebellion: The Rise and Development of New Thought*. Dallas, TX: Southern Methodist University Press.
- Brunswik, E. (1956) *Perception and the Representative Design of Psychological Experiments*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Cialdini, R. B. (2021) *Influence, New and Expanded: The Psychology of Persuasion*. New York: Harper Business.
- Crowley, A. (1929/1976) *Magick in Theory and Practice*. New York: Dover Publications.
- Deutsch, E. (1969) *Advaita Vedānta: A Philosophical Reconstruction*. Honolulu, HI: East-West Center Press.
- Epton, T., Harris, P. R., Kane, R., van Koningsbruggen, G. M. and Sheeran, P. (2015) 'The impact of self-affirmation on health-behavior change: A meta-analysis', *Health Psychology*, 34(3), pp. 187–196. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Gigerenzer, G. (2007) *Gut Feelings: The Intelligence of the Unconscious*. New York: Viking.
- Gollwitzer, P. M. and Sheeran, P. (2006) 'Implementation intentions and goal achievement: A meta-analysis of effects and processes', *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 38, pp. 69–119. San Diego, CA: Elsevier Academic Press.
- Hoffman, D. D. (2008) 'Conscious Realism and the Mind–Body Problem', *Mind & Matter*, 6(1), pp. 87–121. Exeter: Imprint Academic.
- Hoffman, D. D. (2019) *The Case Against Reality: Why Evolution Hid the Truth from Our Eyes*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Hoffman, D. D., Singh, M. and Prakash, C. (2015) 'The Interface Theory of Perception', *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 22, pp. 1480–1506. New York: Springer.
- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J. and Norenzayan, A. (2010) 'The weirdest people in the world?', *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33(2–3), pp. 61–83. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- James, W. (1902) *The Varieties of Religious Experience: A Study in Human Nature*. New York: Longmans, Green and Company.
- James, W. (1907) *Pragmatism: A New Name for Some Old Ways of Thinking*. New York: Longmans, Green and Company.
- Kahneman, D. (2011) *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Kappes, H. B. and Oettingen, G. (2011) 'Positive fantasies about idealized futures sap energy', *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 47(4), pp. 719–729. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Kelly, G. A. (1991) *The Psychology of Personal Constructs*. Volumes I and II. London: Routledge. Originally published 1955.

Levitt, S. D. and List, J. A. (2007) 'What do laboratory experiments measuring social preferences reveal about the real world?', *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 21(2), pp. 153–174. Nashville, TN: American Economic Association.

Mertens, S., Herberz, M., Hahnel, U. J. J. and Brosch, T. (2022) 'The effectiveness of nudging: A meta-analysis of choice architecture interventions across behavioral domains', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 119(1). Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences.

Oettingen, G. (2014) *Rethinking Positive Thinking: Inside the New Science of Motivation*. New York: Current/Penguin.

Open Science Collaboration (2015) 'Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science', *Science*, 349(6251), aac4716. Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Price, D. D., Finniss, D. G. and Benedetti, F. (2008) 'A comprehensive review of the placebo effect: Recent advances and current thought', *Annual Review of Psychology*, 59, pp. 565–590. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.

Ramana Maharshi (1982) *Who Am I? The Teachings of Bhagavan Sri Ramana Maharshi*. Translated by T. M. P. Mahadevan. Tiruvannamalai: Sri Ramanasramam.

Rasmussen, H. N., Scheier, M. F. and Greenhouse, J. B. (2009) 'Optimism and physical health: A meta-analytic review', *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 37(3), pp. 239–256. New York: Springer.

Shinn, F. S. (1925) *The Game of Life and How to Play It*. New York: Privately published by the author.

Shotton, R. (2018) *The Choice Factory: 25 Behavioural Biases That Influence What We Buy*. Petersfield, Hampshire: Harriman House.

Sio, U. N. and Ormerod, T. C. (2009) 'Does Incubation Enhance Problem Solving? A Meta-Analytic Review', *Psychological Bulletin*, 135(1), pp. 94–120. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Spira, R. (2017) *The Nature of Consciousness: Essays on the Unity of Mind and Matter*. Oxford: Sahaja Publications.

Sutherland, R. (2019) *Alchemy: The Surprising Power of Ideas That Don't Make Sense*. London: WH Allen.

Thaler, R. H. and Sunstein, C. R. (2008) *Nudge: Improving Decisions About Health, Wealth, and Happiness*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Tversky, A. and Kahneman, D. (1974) 'Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases', *Science*, 185(4157), pp. 1124–1131. Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Wattles, W. D. (1910) *The Science of Getting Rich*. New York: Elizabeth Towne Company.

Wood, J. V., Perunovic, W. Q. E. and Lee, J. W. (2009) 'Positive self-statements: Power for some, peril for others', *Psychological Science*, 20(7), pp. 860–866. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.