

Thought Control: Mental Influences.

Robert A. Herrmann Ph.D.
30 OCT 2007. Last Revision 29 AUG 2018

Abstract

Via application of nonstandard analysis, this article first presents a detailed nontechnical discussion of the rationally predicted processes that can influence human perception. It is shown how these results satisfy the immaterial aspects of human thought as presented by Eccles and Robinson and also satisfy various Biblical statements. The second part presents a more technical explanation.

Introduction

When I explicitly think and when I read, I do so in words or images. I "hear" a mental voice. It does not have the same characteristics as the sounds I hear via my audio senses, sounds that emanate from sources physically external to my brain. It has a quality that does not change. The qualities it has seem to match my own voice. The mental images are considerable different from those that I perceive via my visual sense. I mentally "talk" to myself. I make the assumption that normally all individuals have these same experiences.

"Self;" (1). the identity, character, or essential quantities or any person (or thing). (2). the identity, personality, individuality, etc. of a given person; one's own person as distinct from all others.

Human beings are "aware" of themselves. They study the differences between members of their own species as well as how the members relate to other species. Human beings are "self-aware."

It is established that the self is certainly not identical with memory. (Eccles and Robinson, (1984, p. 41))

It is readily agreed that our behavior and memories, and in fact the whole content of our inner conscious life, are dependent upon the accumulated experiences of our lives, but no matter how extreme the change at some particular decision point produced by the exigencies of circumstances, one would still be the same self able to

trace back one's continuity in memory to the earliest remembrances at the age one year or so, the same self in a quite other guise.

[M]atteristic solutions fail to account for our experienced uniqueness. (Eccles and Robinson, (1984, p. 43))

The above quotations come from John Eccles, a Nobel Laureate world authority in the electro-chemical behavior of our brain. He won this prize for identifying such electro-chemical activity. Of course, there are many that attempt to discount his views based only upon a non-scientific philosophic stance and nothing else. Such attempts should be rejected.

You are studying for a test. You have never taken a test in this new material before. Suddenly your mental voice states, "I can't learn this stuff. I'm going to fail. Why should I continue wasting my time." You stop preparing and have a snack. Then suddenly your mental voice states, "Well, maybe I can pass it if I just worked a little harder." So, you go back to studying. On the other hand, the second thought may not occur. You do not continue in your preparation and, as you predicted, you fail the test.

I have no doubt that this very simple example, but under different circumstances, has been repeated trillions and trillions of times over thousands and thousands of years. The words you mentally perceive are not random nonsense. They have clear meanings. But, what initiates them, how are they chosen with a specific intention, a mental intention that is not stated or imaged. Notice there are two but opposing "intentions" involved. What initiates prior electro-chemical actions so that these mental statements are formed in a comprehensible way and the intention is satisfied? Although they have not as yet been discovered, many will simply claim that how all of this occurs is via physical processes. Notice, however, that they occur suddenly.

What is it that suddenly chooses the words you mentally state? Even if you have had prior experiences that correspond to the statements, what is it, what is the "something" that electro-chemically initiates these thoughts? If you describe the something, one might ask, "Mustn't there be another something that initiates this something?" Such an "explanation" will yield a "logical regress." This is the continued application of the "something that initiates the something" that does not yield a "final" something. It appears that the "mental intention" aspect revealed by the statements may be the most difficult to "explain" physically.

Is there mental activity that indicates that the choice of such mental words or images is neither initiated by prior knowledge nor by prior memories of words that have the appropriate meanings to express your ideas?

In 1979, I get an "idea." But, there appears to be no words, in any dictionary, that adequately describes the idea. I try one, then another and nothing I try suffices. They do not suffice since, some how or other, I know they do not match the idea. There are no images or diagrams that completely suffice. It appears to be a totally new idea never presented to the scientific world. So, I need to event new words for the idea. But, they remain inadequate to express the idea in a completely satisfactory manner. Others who believe they clearly understand this new notion, when questioned, show that this is not the case. After much thought, I tried to used motion picture film and the VHS tape descriptions as examples for these new ideas, but they did not convey the more detailed requirements. Then, in 1995, a electronic device, the DVD, is invented and it allows for others to have a more complete understanding of my idea. It does not completely demonstrate all the features, however, but it helps. I am sure others have had the same experience.

Since originally there were no words, no images, no diagrams that adequately presented the idea, how was it mentally formed? Where in my brain is this "thing," this idea located? Of what is it composed? I got an "idea" that is not completely expressible in any form physical or mental. How is the "idea" expressed within my brain? Where is it? What electro-chemical combinations form an "idea" that is not so related to prior knowledge, words, images, etc? Am I the only scientist who experiences such difficulties?

One feature of linguistic expression is rarely considered in depth. We can all recognize that when we are attempting to express subtle thoughts, particularly those that are novel and as yet unclear, we may tentatively try now this, now that verbal expression. In fact this is precisely what is done in writing this section. In attempting to convey some experience it is difficult to give satisfactory verbal expression to one's thoughts. One searches for the right words and syntactic arrangement so that one can have hope that one's thoughts may achieve a clear expression to listeners or readers. (Eccles and Robinson, (1984, p. 117))

Have you ever said, "I don't want to think about that anymore." Does your brain, your mind, follow your orders? Do you start thinking about it again? Yes. So, why doesn't your brain obey your orders?

We often mentally argue back-and-forth. "I guess it's okay if I do it. It won't really hurt anyone else. Then maybe it will. I'm not sure how it'll affect the kids. But, I guess they'll get all of my life insurance. After that I'm sure their mother will take care of them. How can I do this so that there is no way it can't be classified as an accident?" After another White Russian, "Oh! sure that's easy. No one will even guess it wasn't an accident. I'll be done with this miscible life." Are these thoughts self-generated somehow or other? Or is

it even slightly possible that there is another source? By-the-way, these thoughts were once my thoughts. This is a true rendering of the facts.

You might ask, "Who or what answered my question?" I had never contemplated such actions before. I had no such experiences. Am I arguing merely within myself, or could there be other entities that influence the selection of the words I mentally "hear" or the images I might mentally "see"?

Your brain is charged with continually preserving your life. It will take from one place, your skin for example, to preserve life sustaining processes. It fights diseases. It repairs injury and does a lot more. But, does this contradict some thoughts? As a continued example, people mentally argue about suicide. "I just can't take it any more. Can't they leave me alone. I see no future for me. I'm so upset. - Well, there's one way I can have peace and quiet and I know there are peaceful ways to do it." Although there are many aspects to suicide such as it being a type of compulsion or a direct result of faulty brain chemistry, I, at present, only consider the concept when it is associated with such mental arguments. The arguments for murdering oneself often rely upon the notion that the future will be the same as the past, which is not the case. Yet, the mental arguments are strong enough that individuals reject their exceptionally strong impulse for self preservation.

Have you ever thought about your thinking? Why do we think so much about occurrences that upset us, occurrences over which we have totally no control? I am fortunate. Since I was a child, I have been forced to think before I speak, to form the words mentally slightly before I speak them. It is then that I repeat what my mind first states. From this requirement, I have spent considerable time in examining how I think.

Although there have been attempts to explain physically how such (Eccles type) mental impressions occur, none that I have investigated is satisfactory from a physical-science viewpoint. This does not invalidate the view that somehow or other, such "thoughts" are self-generated. On the other hand, there might be causes that are classified as non-physical that can help produce such mental results. In Herrmann (2006), I discuss application of the mathematical results in Herrmann (2004) to the Eccles and Robinson (1984) and Popper notion that there are immaterial aspects to human thought, aspects that indirectly relate to such mentally obtained results. Eccles and Robinson claim that there is no reasonable explanation for how our thoughts behave, under certain specific circumstances, except to assume that they are being influenced by an immaterial medium.

Evidence indicates that this Eccles and Robinson conclusion should be somewhat generalized to other mental thought patterns, such as described above. That is, that a much larger

category of thoughts can be influenced by immaterial exterior sources.

As presented in this article, there is an analogue model that yields a process that produces the mental results described above in this introduced. This shows that such a generalization is a scientific rational one. In this case, an "analogue model" is a mathematically based theory that rationally represents behavior and properties, where the actual objects used may be different from those presented in the model.

In general, the term "model" means a "representation" or "to represent" via various devices. Any evidence that supports this new model, at present, is only indirect. What I present may be controversial for it definitely contradicts many world-views that are driven by unverified assumptions. Scientifically, eliminating any of the speculative aspects requires a preponderance of evidence, which, if unbiased observation is used, does exist for this viable scientific alternative. Since the evidence is indirect in character, then individuals can choose other alternative explanations.

Additional Evidence that Human Thoughts are Influenced by Immaterial Processes and Brief Answers to Some Theological Questions

(Relative to the answered questions, after question 10, I give a description of a collection of historical facts, and a most recent one, that establishes the subtle nature of the Adversary's influences as discussed in question 3 and 4.)

In all that follows, I do not contend that we never argue within ourself. Indeed, this may be how many individuals argue most of the time. The evidence, previously presented and that which follows, satisfies the hypothesis that immaterial influences are also present. But, the evidence is an indirect verification since the influences would be caused by immaterial entities.

All notions used to answer the following questions, such as specific definitions for the concepts "immaterial," "ultranatural-processes," the "ultranatural-rules (UN-rules)" and the like are discussed later in this article. This research mathematically models a set of empirical data and predicts behavior based upon the data. When the predicted results are obtained and interpreted, there is a vast amount of indirect evidence for the existence of the predicted processes and causal entities.

For almost 2000 years, detailed observations and personal testimonies imply that "immaterial" processes that influence aspects of human thought and corresponding behavior may, indeed, exist in objective reality. Today, as based upon scientific disclosures, my observations indicate, that it is, at least, probable that some human behavior is being so influenced. It is rather

remarkable that Paul, relative to Christian notions, should present descriptions as to how mental influences can govern our thoughts. In what follows, I utilize Paul's remarks as well as my own personal experiences. I do not contend that the presented testimony of two individuals is ample evidence. However, I am confident that many other individuals can confirm these observations.

Paul states a "law" that "evil is present within" (Rom. 7:21) even when he tries to "do good" and that the "god of this world," in some manner, tries to control human behavior. He writes (underlines added) "the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not" (2 Cor. 4:4). He also states, "the carnal mind is enmity against God" (Rom. 8:7). Paul sees that this "law" is warring against the law of his mind and "bringing me into captivity to the law of sin" (Rom. 7:23). Further, an individual can be "vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind" (Col. 2:18). As to what is the "law of his mind," he states, "So that with the mind, I serve the law of God" (Rom. 7:25). Paul also states that indwelt Christians have the "mind of Christ" (1 Cor. 2:16). "And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God" (Rom 8:27). "And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind" (Rom. 12:2).

In Hebrews, quoting from the Old Testament, we find that for God's laws "in their minds I will write them" (Heb. 10:16). Paul makes it very clear what type of influence he considers paramount, "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus" (Php. 2:5). Experience and Paul's observations clearly imply that the war between "good and evil" is within the mind of each individual. When one has knowledge of what constitutes these two categories, then mostly mental arguments lead an individual to choice one behavior over another.

In answering the following questions, the methods used are descriptive and the questions do not have some deep theological meaning that can be known only to a chosen few. The answers are rather obvious. But, they now have a more rational and "scientific" basis. The logic used is the same as that used within physical science and corresponds to classical logic, the "common sense" logic used by humankind. There are hundreds of other questions one could ask and my simple answers to these questions may tend to generate many other questions that might be of interest.

Please note that this is a preliminary report. Due to a collection of rules termed the "ultranatural-rules" (UN-rules), many questions relative to such mental influences may have no answers describable in a manner comprehensible to humankind, although one can rationally assume that answers exist. Remember that the string of symbols "ultranatural" is a technical term. The model predicates from observable evidence that

ultranatural rules exist. They are action rules that do things, but the mathematical model states that we may not be able to comprehend what some of these rules are stating.

Theologians must justify their existence. Consequently, some will not appreciate the simple and common sense answers I give. There will be claims, I suppose, that the notions are "more complex" and my answers are naïve. I reject the notion that ordinary individuals using their common sense can not comprehend all necessary Scriptural concepts. That is, individuals do not need special knowledge that is comprehensible only by a chosen few. What I have added to these common sense solutions is a method that verifies that the answers have a scientifically rational basis.

In what follows, entities are employed in an active sense in that "immaterial" entities activate processes represented by mathematical symbols. This uses a behavioral notion parallel to human behavior in that humans can apply many physical processes in order to achieve specified goals.

(1) Operationally, how does God "speak" to the prophets and others in most, if not all, Scripturally mentioned cases?

Application of the rationally modeled "influencing processes" predicted to exist by Theorems 1 and 2 in Herrmann (2004), explains this. The Holy Spirit controls such an influencing process. This allows the influencing process to strongly affect the selection of actual words written in the Scriptures. Of course, the words selected would be relative to the knowledge of the individual being used to transmit the information. Notice that the Scriptures specifically state at various points that statements come directly from God and, in other places, they do not come directly from God such as mentioned in some of Paul's writings.

(2) Why are the Scriptures so remarkably consistent although they were written over many years by many different individuals?

From 2 Timothy 3:16, the Bible is given by "inspiration of God." Literally, this is the Greek "theo" combined with "pneuma." This is "God-blown" and in some translations "God-breathed." This combination appears only once in the New Testament. Various Bible statements come from the direct application of the Spirit via the modeled influencing processes where, using answer (1), the words selected are all from the same source, God's Spirit. Except for improvements in comprehension related to additional language nuances, this source maintains consistency. However, the phrase "inspiration of God" seems to be used to compare the Bible with other writings composed solely by individuals not attuned to Spiritual ideas. Unless specifically stated, I do not accept that all verses in the Bible are supernaturally influenced. But, the scribes were attuned to the basic concepts that are directly presented from

God. Hence, these concepts are not contradicted and, necessarily, historical data and presented quotations are fact.

(3) The Scriptures state that the Adversary (Satan)) lies and deceives humankind. How does he do this?

He and his associates are allowed to influence human thought through the rational application of the influencing processes. This is Biblically established by Paul's above statements and by Ephesians 2:2, where he states that it is "the spirit now operating (working) in those who are disobedient." Vine states that the Greek here means that "the spirit of the Evil one" is operative (p. 232). Further, the NIV states in 2:3, that individuals are ". . . following its desires and thoughts." It is significant that all we can know about reality is the reality that we encounter via our sensory systems and corresponding internal brain activities.

In Herrmann (2004) are Definitions 2.1 and 2.2. These show how the influencing processes can have different strengths. Under a very strong influencing process, one might even conclude that the Adversary or his associates can alter an individual's total perception of reality. On the other hand, the Adversary's influence is usually exceptionally subtle. The mental influences need not be restricted to linguistics or perceived images but can include all forms of human sensory impressions. This is because of how the "language" L is constructed. The language includes a coding feature that allows these results to apply to all forms of human sensory information. I note again that at the conclusion of this article I give a description of a collection of historical facts, and a most recent one, that, from my viewpoint, establishes the subtle nature of the Adversary's influences.

I do not propose that, in general, all such choices are so influenced. Indeed, throughout all of human time there is, most likely, a vast number of mental choices that are not influenced in this manner.

(4) In your answer to (3), you mention there are different strengths for the influencing processes. Hence, it is rational to assume that these "immaterial" entities can influence our choices to various degrees. But, is it possible to present a measure for the "strengths" of such influencing processes?

Yes. Strengths for the influencing processes are defined in my 2004 article. These strengths are specifically determined by numerical measures. How these are emphasized mentally would be part of the ultranatural-rules mentioned previously.

(5) Is it rational to assume that human choices and specific desires are used as a means to strengthen the immaterial influences that are guiding some of our choices?

This is certainly possible via the ultranatural-rules. God forbids certain activities and encourages others. Rational analysis of the ultranatural-rules indicate that it may be impossible to understand or to explain in a comprehensible language why He forbids what many today consider as rather innocuous practices. My experiences with the occult indicates why this is the case when He forbids such practices as outlined in say Deut 18:10-12. Apparently, under the ultranatural-rules, if you simply seek forbidden behavior, then you have opened your mind to an influence by the Adversary or his associates via a stronger influencing process as defined in Herrmann (2004). The Bible indicates and it can be rationally assumed that God allows, in some cases, the Adversary and his associates to exert strong influences (Rom. 1:21-28 "God give them over to ..."). Of course, your behavior can be attenuated or encouraged by the society in which you dwell.

The occultist Alice Bailey, the founder of what she termed "The New Age Movement," specifically states that all of her writings are dictated telepathically by her control. Her contention is that the Masters will exert mental influences over selected individuals in a three-step overshadowing process. She contends that Jesus was so overshadowed and acquired the status of "Master Jesus." Since no such control or Masters exist in the observable physical world, then if her writings are not self-generated, then their contents indicate that she and others that follow her written teachings are being strongly influenced by the Adversary's associates.

I point out that relative to Paul's struggle with the war between good and evil, he apparently believes that all of humankind has the capacity to be mentally influenced by such processes. Experience indicates that, due to the Fall of Adam and Eve, God does allow humankind to be influenced by His Spirit or associates, and the Adversary or associates. One can assume that there are ultranatural-rules for this that, when restricted to our physical world, can be somewhat experientially deduced.

(6) As to human choices of behavior, how does the indwelled Holy Spirit influence a Christian?

One must first properly seek the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. The notion of deeply seeking or desiring information can trigger the influencing process. In Acts, there are two Scriptural ways that lead to an individuals being indwelled with the Holy Spirit. But, these are not "if and only if" conditions. Indeed, as Jesus states in John 14, when one finally realizes who Jesus truly is, then He will come to them. Relative to such mental influences, my experience indicates that for the indwelled individual the Holy Spirit is the immaterial entity that can directly influence a mental choice. In such a case, there is a special connection between an individual's immaterial spirit and the Holy Spirit. Relative to the relevant ultranatural-rules, the Holy Spirit's influences are often stronger than any others and they *do not contradict the*

Scriptures. Indeed, in my case and in certain circumstances, the influences have lead to various physical manifestations of a rather special type.

As Paul indicates and experience dictates, indwelled individuals are not immune to the Adversary's often very clever influences via the influencing processes. In particular, how the Adversary or his associates influence an individual's immediate associates. But, indwelled individuals are more prone to follow the leadings of the Holy Spirit via a stronger influencing process than they would be if not so indwelled. Apparently, under ultranatural-rules and experientially, it appears possible to suppress the Holy Spirit's influence.

(7) Paul seems to indicate that the Holy Spirit and Adversary influences can be applied to a Spirit filled Christian. How is this possible and does it not present a contradiction?

In my 2004 paper, the actual object that triggers the Holy Spirit and Adversary influencing processes is a collection of objects take from a predicted language denoted by *L. The objects are not members of any language of which we can have any comprehension. Although these competing influences may cause types of erratic behavior, the entities used do not yield an inconsistent theory. [You can skip this. One needs to simply consider two disjoint finite collections of the representative "λs" and apply Theorems 2.1, 2.2 and Definitions 2.1 and 2.2 to these disjoint collections.]

(8) If certain choices in behavior are influenced by "immaterial" means, how does this correspond to the notion of free will as Scripturally defined?

I do not have complete free choices relative to how I can actually behave within this physical world. That is, behavioral choices that can be actuated. Such choices are all influenced or completely restricted by physical laws, by the environment, by ones associates, by general social practices, etc. Indeed, I have purposely restricted my behavior by choosing a specific life-style and world-view.

There are, today, an immense number of influences attempting to direct our choices. It is often rather difficult not to succumb to some of them unless one retreats to a reclusive environment devoid of any diverse social interactions. These influences, in general, may be either material or immaterial influences. Only complete knowledge of the ultranatural-rules would allow one to differentiate exactly between these two types of mental behavior, an apparent free choice and an influenced one. No human being has this complete knowledge.

As Scripturally described, free will is not absolute but applies to specifically defined behavior. Since most ultranatural-rules cannot be known in detail, for this application, the influencing processes are only relative to these

behavior patterns. As mentioned, by seeking certain behavior, individuals appear to be giving up, for a season at least, their free will in the sense that they seek to behave in certain ways distinct from other behaviors. They also tend to retain knowledge of the behavior they have sought to exclude. It is interesting that God loves all of His created, but hates certain behavior. It is the behavior and not the individual that God detests. Except as Scripturally stated, His influences are not eliminated.

An individual can be associated with detestable behavior and still, through circumstances, exhibit highly acceptable behavior. However, seeking and participating in detestable behavior probably allows the Adversary or his associate stronger and stronger influence over ones selected actions, except under very special circumstances. These situations may be indicated by the incomprehensible ultranatural-rules. In contrast, seeking and participating in Biblically described acceptable behavior, which now includes being fully indwelled by the Holy Spirit, greatly enhances God's influence over an individual's selected actions. Other free will choices that can be performed that are not related to Scripturally described behavior, if there are any, may simply be choices related to self-generated arguments.

(9) Is it possible to know when human minds have been influenced by such immaterial entities so that observed behavior can provide evidence that verifies indirectly this articles hypotheses?

This is a difficult question to answer, even if there is a comprehensible answer. As mentioned, in certain cases, some individuals know that what they are contemplating or writing is being influenced by the Holy Spirit due to special physical manifestations. At present, I can determine only general possibilities that cannot be explicitly demonstrated. With respect to the defined immaterial entities, behavior can be forbidden or encouraged by God. Mental impressions related to such behavior can be self-generation through remembrance or produced by immaterial influences. But does an individual's behavior change so that it becomes more Christ-like or Adversary-like?

If individuals would truthfully state that thoughts expressed in the manner described above influence their behavior and it could be determined that there is no apparent physical cause for such thoughts, then I would conclude that such immaterial influences should be considered. This yields **indirect** evidence for the existence of the influencing entities and the influencing processes. Of course, as Jesus indicates, you might also verify the existence of these influences by observing the fruits produce by ones behavior.

(10) Can questions be asked and have answers, but the answers cannot be communicated in any manner to any intelligent biological entity within our universe?

The mathematical model specifically predicts that this can be the case.

An historical example of subtle Adversary influences.

Starting in 1979, I began to construct the GGU-model and the General Intelligent Design (GID) Model interpretation. Relative to creationary science, in 1982, I published my preliminary results in an article in the Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation. In 1983, I established the scientific rationality of the creationary notion that a universe can suddenly appear in a mature and functional form via the notion of in-transit photon and particle information. This was the prevailing model for the Institute for Creation Research that a few still accept. In 1984, I began publishing a series of articles in the Creation Research Society Quarterly detailing the than used GGU-model processes and, in particular, their higher-intelligence interpretation. That is, that it is rational to state that the processes all display signatures that our universe is designed and produced by an infinitely powerful higher-intelligence, and that everything that exists is indirect evidence for this rational prediction.

Then in 1998, William Dembski, as an application of statistical decision theory, published his ideas on Restricted Intelligent Design (RID), a mode of intelligent design that neither corresponds to that of a higher-intelligence nor is relative to all physical-systems and physical entities. Indeed, it applies to but a miniscule number of these. His theory allows for considerable discussion both pro-and-con. Indeed, as Dembski mentions, his intelligent design can correspond to that produced by an highly "evolved" race of aliens. RID does not satisfy significant Biblical statements that would point to the Biblical God as the RID intelligence. When ID (intelligent design) is mentioned in the popular media and presented to the world by the Discovery Institute, it is RID that is presented and GID is never mentioned or considered.

GID is mostly painted with the same brush as RID although GID methods are not related to the RID methods. GID findings are almost total unknown throughout the world since they are confused with RID. Is the development of RID and its continual applications a product of subtle Adversary influences, influences that will bring not only radical upon the entire subject of ID but will also eliminate GID as a viable alternative? My original in-transit information model is an example of application of the Rapid-Formation Model (RFM) that can reproduce any known cosmology over a miniscule physical time period and not alter the original Genesis 1 Earth and its local environment. Hence, the creationary science movement can accept such cosmologies as the standard "Big Bang" and alterations and these do not contradict a strict Genesis 1 interpretation. Indeed, my Eden model is the primary example of a strict Biblical centered approach that yields all that we observe today.

In 1994, Humphreys published his, less than physically accurate, "white-hole cosmology." This and others yet to come use the presently known physical laws and allow Earth-time to essentially stop during the formation of an exterior universe. To do this, less than strict meanings for Biblical terms are necessary and these creationary cosmologies neither satisfy the pre-Fall and Eden requirements for eternal life nor Rom 1:20, where we are told that indirectly the invisible attributes of God's power and divinity are "clearly seen" "from what has been made." A Complete GGU-model application does satisfy such requirements.

Various aspects of these weak creationary cosmologies are continually discussed and aspects of the standard atheistic cosmologies that do not fit these models are continually criticized by the vast majority of the creationary science community. These facts have allowed many to receive publication credits for their efforts while such articles that describe the detailed workings of the RFM have not been allowed to appear in any creationary science journal, except for a short letter at the end of one issue of the CRS Quarterly. Due to the efforts of some members of the creationary science movement, the revised version of the GGU-model and the GID interpretation have been successfully suppressed. Are any of these events a product of the Adversary's influences? Remember that no individual is completely immune to such influences.

Those that do not know how the Adversary actual works would probably dismiss these historical facts as not related in any manner to the Adversary's influences. However, an event occurred on 21 MAR 2014 that appears to strongly testify to the actuality of these influences.

In Chapter 7 of the 2014 book *Transformed by the Evidence* and as originally written, I give a very brief account of my conversion and then my acceptance of a strict Genesis account as historical fact. It includes an important description for some of the GGU and GID conclusions that led to my acceptance of the Genesis account. It is this inclusion that I was hoping would help publicize GID. However, after my contribution was accepted, various editors altered what I had written. I had no knowledge as to what alterations were made until I received my copies of the first printing.

First, the title they gave to my chapter has no relation to the material presented. Then they removed all of my academic background. They made 8 substitutions that do not substantially alter the original ideas I present. There are 5 deletions, where one alters a historical fact not of great significant. But, there is one addition that has a vast affect upon the major portion of this chapter.

On page 68, while discussing that portion of my 1978 model that establishes the rationality of the Biblically described attributes of God, I wrote in the

original version "For example, it is scientifically rational to state that God's intelligence, wisdom, and love are greater than any that can be displayed by any life form." Then I attribute this to an "higher intelligence." But, an editor added one word, just one word, that completely destroys the facts that I have written. The phrase "by any life form" is altered to read "by any other life form." The word "other" has been inserted. This immediately invalidates the entire GGU and GID Biblical interpretation and makes it no better than RID. It implies that the higher-intelligence to which I am referring is equivalent to the intelligence of a life form. This is certainly a most subtle change. One can ask, how is it possible that an editor found the one word to insert that would, for the reader, completely invalidate my research findings?

For the second printing, the chapter authors were asked to check the articles for errors. I forwarded but two such and the major one was to have the word "other" removed. On 21 MAR 2014, I was informed that there will be the second printing and all errors need to be corrected by the 23rd. I was told that all authors had received a PDF copy of the second version and they should check it. However, I had not been sent such a file. I immediately mentioned this to the individual in charge. "Oh! I'm sorry. Don't know how we made such a mistake." I got my copy early the next day. I checked it and found that my corrections had not been made. The "other" was still there. The publisher was immediately informed of this and was asked to remove this insertion prior to the next printing. The correction was made for the next printing.

The evidence seems to be mounting that there are, indeed, mental influences that have and are still attempting to eliminate, in the minds of the majority of humanity, the GGU and GID models as viable scientifically based Biblical alternatives that eliminate atheistic criticisms. Remember, that the atheist is a major source of the Adversary's control over humankind, since such a control is at its most powerful when one does not accept that it exists.

It is interesting to note that these destructive results have occurred by the addition of only one word to my chapter and how, relative to Scriptures we are warned "Do not add to His words, or He will rebuke you and prove you a liar" (Prov. 30:5-6).

As this article progresses, it will slowly become more technical in nature. This is necessary if I wish to present the entire solution within one article. However, if you have gotten the idea that it appears that "immaterial entities influence our thinking" and accept that this phrase has been shown to be rational, then nothing in the remainder of this article will affect this acceptance and you need not continue.

Beginning Technical Aspects

In physical science, basic physical processes are often not, in general, observed (i.e. separately sensed by humans or equivalent sensory-mimicking machines). What is considered is a collection of observer constituents **A** that are contained in a physical-system, or comprise an observed and named physical-system **B**. Then physical processes yield an observed alteration **A'** of the constituents or an observed alteration **B'** in the physical system **B**. Such alterations are termed as an "alteration in behavior" (i.e. in this case, a response to the applied physical processes as compared to a previous response.) This yields two single "physical process relations" (i.e. $\{(A,A')\}$ and $\{(B,B')\}$). Often various secondary unobserved physical-systems are introduced as additional hypotheses. [Note: Physical-systems are also called natural-systems throughout my writings.] Although the behavior could be static, in this case, what the physical scientist states is that "physical laws" or accepted "scientific theories" somehow or other "force" **A** to be altered and **A'** results, or they "force" **B** to be altered and this yields physical-system **B'**.

The physical laws or scientific theories themselves act like "black-boxes" in that somehow or other they require physical objects to behave in specific ways. Nothing in our solar system is marked with numerical values. There are no mathematical expressions or geometric figures floating in the regions between the planets. Yet, humans construct machines and can measure numerical qualities, place these measures into mathematical expressions or geometric constructions that represent physical laws and, with great accuracy, predict when the next complete solar eclipse will occur.

In general, what is observed is that physical objects are inserted into a black-box where the stated rules for physical behavior are represented by the interior of the box. The observed result is the predicated physical alterations. However, only the physical alterations are observed. The mathematics, the numerical measures and like are not observed. This is why, from a purely physical stance, what "forces" objects to follow certain physical laws or theories acts like a black-box. Unless they affect the observer as well, they are not physically sensed, only the inserted objects are physically affected. Physical process relations model what is actually observed.

The two illustrated physical process relations are equivalent to generated mathematical relations called "behavior-signatures." Such behavior-signatures are generated by the stated physical laws or accepted scientific theories. Physical processes applied to more than one **A** or **B** also yield

physical process relations and an equivalent collection of behavior-signatures that form a logical unification equivalent to the collection of physical process relations.

In Mathematical Logic, aspects of mental behavior are modeled. This is done not by considering any physical features of brain chemistry, but rather by using the black-box notion. Linguistic expressions or images of all sorts are inserted. The brain works and linguistic expressions or images are the results that exit the black-box. One then investigates relations between what is inserted and the expressions or images that exit the black-box. This is first done by modeling what has been inserted and the results obtained by means of a described algorithm that one learns to apply. No consideration is given as to how the brain, the black-box, applies this algorithm. This algorithm represents the black-box brain activity.

Some individuals who attempt to read what I write and who have not suppressed their biases cannot comprehend the material offered for it (linguistically) contradicts their tightly held world-views. Often they claim that I have accepted hidden propositions, which I have not, or that my offerings are in gross error, which they are not. Their "mind" tells them that I am one of those "ignorant creationists" who accepts what physical science has "shown" are false notions.

It has not been shown that what I contend is false and, indeed, it cannot be so characterized. Painting my work with such a broad-brush is the standard approach that often prevents further investigation. The political tactic employed is that if so-called authorities repeat a lie often enough, then many individuals accept the lie as a truth. If critics would actually consider my stated "personal" beliefs and how I have arrived at them, they might discover that they are considerably different from all other individuals who adhere to an interpretation of Genesis 1. More importantly, whenever possible, I have always separated my scientific work from any theological interpretation and, especially, from my own personal belief-system.

In this article, rational explanations are presented for some significant and observed mentally produced results. This is done by applying the results in Herrmann (Original 2004, 2006) and "interpreting" them theologically. Additional mathematical definitions are introduced in Herrmann (2004) that model the strength of certain mental impressions. Applications of mathematically obtained deductions yield scientifically rational answers to many questions that deal with certain modes of human behavior and such behaviors yield indirect evidence for the acceptance of the conclusions.

I have considerable experience analyzing my own mental behavior and how it is influenced by "immaterial" factors. I have no doubt that many who have not made such an in-depth analysis will disallow my findings. A medical

practitioner's license might even depend upon the philosophy that all forms of human behavior must have a physical basis. The materialist must reject my conclusions as mere ravings. Further, exceptionally prideful individuals will find these explanations rather difficult to accept. As a mathematician, I am not controlled by any of the materialistic rules forced upon certain individuals. When I produce mathematics, I need only conform to the specific methods allowed by my colleagues.

Motives for rejecting the findings presented here are understandable since, prior to 1977, I would have denounced the following as complete inane "nonsense." But, I stress that this was before the momentous events that occurred to me on 7 April 1977. Since these conclusions are so intimately associated with the human brain and the notion of the "mind," for some, they represent an unwarranted intrusion into what they believe is a closely guarded and "closed" personal and, yet, physical realm. This article's conclusions relate to behavior of individuals, behavior where a purpose is openly stated as well as behavior that has concealed intentions.

Theologically, what follows seems to be a universal law in the sense that human beings have a basic potential that is partially modeled by the following theory. The presented applications for "mixed logic-systems" require individuals to possess specific semantic skills. In this article, these mathematical conclusions are interpreted in a direct and simple manner. Further, as applied, the necessary semantic skills are self-evident.

Specific Types of Mental Impressions

Major portions of sensory information are obtained via "sight and sound." I use this aspect to model all other forms of sensory information since encoding allows all forms of sensory information to be modeled by a symbolic language. As mentioned, part of my thinking apparatus, so to speak, involves the fact that I mentally "talk to myself." When I read, slowly, I usually mentally "hear" the words. I do not hear them as one would via an audio channel or impression. I can also mentally recall "images" as well. I seem to hear something that is equivalent to my own voice. I argue within my own, shall we call it, mind. Of course, materialists require that the brain must be doing all of this in a rather remarkable, yet physical, manner. I will not repeat the examples of Eccles and Robinson (1984) and others that appear to indicate that there is most likely an immaterial mental aspect involved. I know, as explained in Herrmann (2006), that this appears to be the case for me. But, this is a "personal" experience that may not be shared by others.

I often mentally argue about a personal choice I need to make prior, it is hoped, to initiating the actual behavior. At other times, the mental expression that activates my behavior simply occurs suddenly. (Of course, there are those actions that seem to occur without any apparent and prior

mental description as discussed in Eccles and Robinson (1984).) I suppose that most human beings go through the same mental exercises. Without introducing biases such as absolute materialism, my life's experiences indicate that the actual "words" and even "images" that mentally occur may not be self-generated.

Can non-physical factors influence the "appearance" of those mental words or images, influences that can even select them for me? One of the more perplexing problems with this question is whether a positive answer can be "rationally" established. If it can be so established for non-physical factors, then what type of rational argument would do this? Does one need a philosophic type dialectic argument or can a more significant and absolute scientific argument prevail? Moreover, what hypotheses would the existence of such mental activities indirectly verify?

Then what would constitute the "non-physical" notion, which, for this article, I denote by the word "immaterial"? In Herrmann (2006), what constitutes the "immaterial" is not defined with the exception that it is not a member of an accepted present-day list of named physical objects or processes. For this article, a scientific model is presented that is rational in construction and application, and answers the above emphasized question positively. Consequently, the type of "immaterial" being considered requires, at the least, a working definition. [I point out, that a collection of mathematical results such as those in Herrmann (2004) can have many distinct applications.]

This article's definition for the term "immaterial," with one exception, is applied to all non-physical features of this model. [As I define this notion of the immaterial, I am confident that many will simply go no further for it will contradict their deeply held presuppositions. Indeed, if they do not suppress such assumptions, they have no hope of having any further comprehension. I wonder how they will mentally argue that they should not continue? As I discuss the mental influences that can potentially occur, I mention that, in my experience, some individuals are easily influenced by immaterial entities if they strongly believe that they cannot be so influenced.]

Some might wonder, especially an atheist who just may venture into the follow territory, how an individual can accept the following seeming fantastic notions. Maybe its insanity or, then again, maybe they solve many problems that have plagued mankind, especially today. More likely they come from circumstantial evidence.

The Unobserved Physical World

Within physical science there are hypothesized items termed as "virtual" objects. This means they are not perceived in any manner prior to or after

an observable physical event occurs. Indeed, as stated by Feynman (1985, p. 95), any such object "never really appears in the initial or final conditions of the experiment." The entire widely accepted theory called Quantum Electrodynamics is based upon the use of such "assumed" objects. They are extensively accepted as real physical objects.

Then there are many other widely accepted objects that cannot be detected directly. This means no sensor, human or machine, can detect their individual presence. Their presence is logically inferred only in that an accepted scientific theory predicts that gross matter, which can be sensed, interacts with the hypothesized objects in a specific manner. Although there is no direct evidence for their existence, such objects are classified as "real" physical or material objects by most who investigate fundamental physical behavior. Of course, if an alternate theory uses other entities and processes to predict the exact same observed results, then what is real in this invisible world is rather problematic. I mention that such a theory does exist. The theory of "propertons."

In Quantum Field Theory, there are hypothesized objects called "quantum fields." This theory postulates mathematically characterized physical processes that "create" elementary physical and, hence, material particles. Henley and Thirring in their book, "Elementary Quantum Field Theory" (McGraw Hill, NY, 1962) state:

The most fascinating application of our rules are, however, not to any material substance but to immaterial fields, the excitations of which appear to us as elementary particles (p. 154).

Elementary particles are considered, by many, as primitive physical objects in that one accepts that they cannot be decomposed into more fundamental objects. This assumption is the bases of a philosophy of science called "reductionism." In order to differentiate a quantum field from the object it "creates," such quantum fields were termed, in 1962, as "immaterial" in character. Indeed, it is the "probabilistic" excitation of quantum fields, whatever they are, which is claimed to produce elementary particle manifestations. In later descriptions, the term "immaterial" is missing.

Of course, no quantum field can be detected directly. The only thing that can be detected is the behavior of the "produced" elementary particles as they impinge upon gross matter. Technically, such fields would be primitives and, although termed as immaterial, they are, usually, accepted as physical. But, there are advocates that claim that such fields are but a convenient fiction for local interactions. [As mention, for the GGU-model (i.e. the General Grand Unification Model) there are predicted ultimate primitive object (ultra-propertons), where combinations yield the primitive particle

behavior. In this case, particle-physics theories are but analogue models for behavior.]

Various particle-physics objects encompass the "hypothesized" yet undetectable "things" that comprise some of the vast and lucrative areas of today's scientific investigations. Obviously, there is a problem in terminology. In one theory, the term "immaterial" is employed for assumed real objects. Yet, everything that is assumed to exist physically within our universe is termed by most secularists as "material." What one actually has are two lists of terms, where one list names physical objects that are often not directly detectable. The physical objects list is entitled "material objects" and the other nonempty list is termed "immaterial objects," which a materialist might reject as "nonsense."

****Using observable objects and processes, which are characterized by mathematical notions, additional observable behavior is mathematically predicted. **The method used to predict includes a combination of the mathematics, with an interpretation, and human logical discourse using the same mode of logic as used within the mathematics itself.** In this context, "interpretation" means that the abstract mathematical terms or characteristics are replaced with corresponding terms taken from a list of physical or other discipline terms. **** [These are the same general methods used in quantum physics and physical cosmology.]

It is rather obvious that what one accepts as virtual or other undetectable physical objects is a matter of choice relative to training and their use by members of the particle-physics community. However, such objects need not correspond to reality for there are other theories, which few know about, that do not employ many of them and that predict the same results using the same **** philosophy of science. More importantly for what follows is that the **** philosophy can also be applied to theological notions and to what is defined in theology as not directly detectable "immaterial" stuff. This makes the following scientific in character, and it cannot be rejected by claiming otherwise.

This Article's Immaterial

The Scriptural term "spirit" has diverse meanings. "Immaterial" as used in the remaining portions of this article refers only to one aspect of the term "spirit." Immaterial or spirit means "stuff" distinct from any object within any "secular" list of physical objects. [Note: It is necessary that I use a few of the technical terms related to the Complete GGU-model. Their use should not significantly affect your comprehension.] The notion of the immaterial as used here is distinct from the defined objects used throughout the GGU-model ultranatural world. The ultranatural world is comprised of any

mathematical representation for physical world entities as well as others that form a not directly detectable background universe or substratum. The operators used represent "physical-like" processes. Due to how the mathematics is employed, technically, as operators, physical processes are members of the set of all ultranatural processes. Operators within the ultranatural world represent physical-like processes in the same manner that physical process relations are represented in the physical world except that the physical-like processes are not members of the set of all physical processes.

A purely immaterial Spirit entity related to the GGU-model is denoted by **H**. It is not part of the physical-like processes that generate universes. It is not a member of the substratum. It can be conceived of as the Designer of all of the physical-like processes, processes that leave a higher-intelligence signature when they are applied. [If the context so indicates, the term physical-like is often omitted.] The GGU-model can be "truncated," by choice, leaving only the unified physical laws and accepted physical theories. The behavior of **H** is predicted and uses the empirically observable behavior of the designer of the Complete GGU-model.

In more detail, throughout the GGU-model, many physical-like objects are used to create and sustain the development of a universe. Truncating the model slightly [say by not considering any slightly detailed ultranatural laws] allows for the GGU-model objects to perform their activities automatically, as they would under the notion of pure chance and probabilistic behavior. On the other hand, on a "higher level" than this truncated ultranatural world [not part of the physical or background universes], one can conceive of another type of object, composed of unknowable constituents, that created and controls all such ultranatural processes and, hence, all physical behavior by a method that can best be comprehended or modeled as a continual "mental" control. Biblically, this entity **H** is a Spirit object, God, and **H** has many other Biblical characteristics.

Associated with this one Spirit are other created spirit beings, His angles, and the Adversary and his fallen angles, that are not, in general, part of the ultranatural world although, obviously, they can influence the physical world in various ways. Hence, they are not part of the physical world as well. [Physical manifestations for these immaterial entities are discussed elsewhere and are not being considered in this article.] Although the GGU-model's universe generating entities can not be members of the list of physical entities, they are not classified as "immaterial" for the this article. The named spirit objects and one yet to be discussed comprise this present article's definition of the immaterial.

According to Genesis, the originally created human beings "heard" very directly from God and communed with Him. But, there is also an allowed

communication with another spirit being, the Adversary [dia'bolos from the Greek] (the fallen angle, Old Testament Satan). A choice was made to "hear" more about human behavior within the physical world, behavior that God had to later forbid specifically. In this interpretation and as Scripturally implied, God has given humankind its desires and He allows the Adversary and his associates to influence human mental activity. That is, God has allowed other spirits to influence the choices we make. Thus, the existence of these immaterial spirit objects is part of the hypotheses. However, the GGU-model predicates the existence of what has been termed as "invisible universes" that can be composed of "immaterial" entities (Herrmann, (2014)).

An immaterial medium similar to the Eccles and Robinson (1984) immaterial medium is the immaterial medium termed the human "spirit." The existence of the human spirit is also hypothesized. **It is further hypothesized that these immaterial objects behave, at the least, in the manner described throughout the remainder of this article.** Shortly, mathematical notions are introduced, but not in detail, that utilize empirically demonstrated behavior that predicts human behavior associated with these hypothesized objects.

The Basic Model

The mathematical results established in Theorems 1 and 2 of Herrmann (2004) and the definitions in that paper yield the elementary answers to the above questions, among others. Previously, these results were theologically interpreted (i.e. they yield a model) and they indicate that immaterial entities can influence how human thoughts are expressed. Individuals apply physical processes based upon a collection of "standard rules." The standard rules state that a physical process applies under specific circumstances. These standard rules contain various parameters that must be specified or other requirements that must be met prior to physical-process application. When these standard rules are embedded into the mathematical structure used for the GGU-model, another set of rules is predicted to exist, the "ultranatural-rules" (UN-rules) that include all of the standard rules.

Members of the set of predicted UN-rules that do not correspond to a standard rule differ from the original rules in that they cannot be completely decoded and, hence, cannot be completely presented using humanly comprehensible sensory information. Most of these UN-rules cannot even be partially presented. For this reason, it can be rationally assumed that there are, at the least, actual UN-rules that govern application of the processes here discussed as they are modeled by the pure "[ultralogics](#)" generated by "mixed logic-systems."

Under the basic assumption that what is mentally heard is produced by physical brain functions, then, for each individual, what is mentally heard is based upon the semantic knowledge stored. For this application of Theorems

1 and 2, in Herrmann (2004), it is assumed that the words and images, as mentally expressed, have meaning for an individual. All such words, sentences, paragraphs, etc. as well as images are represented by objects in a language L . Indeed, as mentioned, **members of L can model all human sensory information.**

When L is encoded and embedded into a special mathematical structure, an additional representative "nonstandard language" $*L$ is predicted to exist mathematically. The actual members of the embedded L form a set L of abstract mathematical objects. Abstract mathematical objects can usually be interpreted in many different ways. These objects are interpreted as the embedded members of L and each member of L can be decoded to obtain its corresponding member in L . This is not the case with members in $*L$ that are not members of L (Notation: members in $*L - L$.) Under extensive analysis, portions of these objects might be decoded, but not an entire object in $*L - L$. There is a vast array of members from $*L - L$ that cannot even be partial decoded. We do know, however, that the set $*L$ behaves in many ways exactly like a representative informative language. The set of all UN-rules is a "subset" of $*L$, that is each member of UN-rule is a member of $*L$.

Relations between members of L can represent the black-box generated physical processes that yield the mental words one hears or images mentally perceived. You insert a statement like "How can I do that?" Then the mental voice states "Move the chair next to the small table and put the dictionary on the table." I need not consider how this answer is physically obtained, only that it is the result. This creates a process relation just like those that occur for known physical laws. (Of course, you might just do this without perceiving the mental voice.)

From the mathematical model point of view, the v = "How can I do that?" and the w = "Move the chair next to the small table and put the dictionary on the table." are single objects called (mathematical) "words". All such processes, where a mental statement or image leads directly to a related expression or image, can be expressed in this manner. Of course, w and v are assumed to be some sort of actual physical entities within the brain that are perceived in this manner.

The empirical material processes and entities being modeled are as follows: (1) The enthymeme notion. (2) How humans try to strength their spoken or written influences by repetition.

(1) In almost all informal arguments, all of the hypotheses being used are not stated. They are supposed to be "understood" by the audience to which the statements are addressed. The enthymeme notion is just that, deduction based upon unstated hypotheses. But, to the unformed, they are hidden and, often due to this, a logical argument may be difficult to follow. The

"hidden" hypotheses, logical procedures and other hidden statements are missing. These hidden statements contain meaningful information relative to other nearby statements.

(2) To emphasize what has been written or more likely stated, we often repeat over and over again the same idea, but maybe in different terms. This is a major method within political science.

For (1), using the mathematical theory, the following interpretation is predicted. For a certain w , an immaterial source determines its mental occurrence. For this to occur for this model and for a particular v , an addition "immaterial" object is inserted into the black-box. Such an object is predicted to exist. This immaterial object is the "hidden" statement. Such a hidden statement is represented in whole or in part by members of $*L - L$. For this article, I denote some members of $*L - L$ by $|$, $||$, $|||$, $||||$, $|||||$, etc. These are used to "represent" various "immaterial" mental influences that, along with a v , yield a specific mentally perceived w .

Thus, if you mentally have a v , then to obtain a particular w one of the immaterial entities uses an "interface" type of process requiring, at the least, one $|||$ input. This produces physical brain reactions. The physical products, the w type expressions, of this process are determined by nonstandard elements such as $|||$. The actual modeling process shows that the mental "appearance" of such a w is caused, in part, by the presence of $|||$, where the $|||$ is required in order for the v to yield w . This process is modeled by an "ultra-logic-system" and corresponds to a specific "ultralogic." It is called an **influencing process**.

[The ultra-logic-systems presented in Herrmann (2004) are informally presented. They can easily be predicted by simply formally considering ternary or binary relations for nonempty finite relations of either type.]

Of course, there may be other z , which correspond to the v from which one can select, that are self-generated and no $|||$ is used. Although the $|||$ has no semantic meaning for us, it does have "meaning" for an immaterial intelligence. Consequently, in this immaterial case, the w is not self-generated. Generally, mankind cannot have direct knowledge that the influencing process is being applied, although under certain circumstances, there are individuals that do have physical manifestations that such an influencing process has occurred. Of course, there are other w that one might perceive and that are generated by other influencing processes initiated by other immaterial sources. It is rather significant that Theorem 2 in Herrmann (2004) shows that the influencing process can occur without there being a v type of "triggering" statement. This is where influenced statements seem to simply "pop" into your thoughts.

Although I am following the **** philosophy of science, many will conclude that what I wrote in the last few paragraphs is without merit. It is, however, a fact that this construction does have some significance since Theorems 1 and 2 (Herrmann, 2004) establish that certain collections of objects that include various ||| are equivalent to a corresponding pure ultralogic operator, one of the operators used within the GGU-model. Such influencing processes resemble logically predicted mathematical operators that are interpreted in a physical-like sense as is done in quantum physics via the mathematical "operator" notion. That is, the addition of various ||| yields mathematical objects that behave like processes - the influencing processes - where the influences may be "rationally" attributed to one or more of the defined immaterial sources.

For (2), it is shown in Herrmann (2004), how other ultra-logic-systems model the emphasis process and the strength of such processes can be measured.

Notice that it is rational to assume that there are UN-rules that determine when and to whom such influencing processes are applied. Assuming that every individual has the potential to be so mentally influenced, those that are influenced would need to satisfy certain UN-rule requirements. Although, in general, most members of the UN-rules cannot be expressed in complete detail, observation can lead to experientially deduced restrictions of these rules to our physical world. That is, a standard collection of "rules" that describe and predict human behavior.

The mechanism used to influence our thoughts is via the predicted, not hypothesized, nonstandard language and the application of either of the predicted ultra-logic-systems, as well as the predicted pure ultralogic operators discussed in Theorem 1 and 2 in Herrmann (2004). The model is very general in character and further research may yield other useful predictions.

The mathematically predicted processes that influence our thoughts are not just fantastic ramblings for there is a vast amount of evidence that indirectly verifies that procedures like these "rationally obtained" influencing processes actually exist.

References

Eccles, J. and D. A. Robinson, The Wonder of Being Human, Our Brain and Our Mind, The Free Press, New York, 1984.

Feynman, R., QED, The Strange Theory of Light and Matter, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1985.

Herrmann, R. A. Analysis of the Refined Details of the GGU-model and an Application to Human Corporeal and Incorporeal Experiences, <http://vixra.org/abs/1403.0036>

Herrmann, R. A. The rationality of hypothesized immaterial mental processes, *C. R. S. Quarterly*, 43(2006):127-129

Herrmann, R. A. Nonstandard consequence operators generated by mixed logic-systems, (2004) <http://arxiv.org/pdf/math/0412562>

Vine, W. E., Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words, Fleming H. Revell, Old Tappan, NJ, 1966.

Click back button, or if you retrieved this file directly from the Internet, then return to [top of home page](#). If you retrieved this file while on my website, then return to [top of home page](#).