

A view on our mental processes versus our physical brain

Darryl Raymond Sletten

Dr Wilder Penfield is an American-born Canadian whose research spanned the first half of the twentieth century. At the Montreal Neurological Institute, from 1934 forward, Penfield conducted research that has changed neuroscience. He used his active-brain surgical procedure to quiz epileptic patients during surgery, while applying a stimulating probe to the brain cortex. Penfield's research has changed neuroscience in profound ways. He developed a better understanding of brain function and established a hypothesis on how the immaterial mind and organic brain interact. Penfield opened the Montreal Neurological Institute and Hospital through funding from David Rockefeller.

This article consists of more discoveries into mind/brain mental processes. It also discusses whether there is a connection between the mind and the soul, plus our spirit, with respect to a physical brain interaction. Dualism and materialism are discussed throughout this article. Dualism encompasses both non-material mind and material brain action, whereas materialism only involves material brain action!

The question of brain and mind

Does the physical brain account for the human mind? The answer to that question has huge implications. Atheistic evolutionists must believe that it does—that there is nothing spiritual about our thought processes. But if the physical brain cannot account for the mind—the thinking and creative part of our being—then it gives credence to the idea that we are created in the image of God, separate from the animals. So, everything hinges on this vital question!

There is no specific Bible verse that explains our mental abilities in much depth. Portions of two verses in Daniel 2:28–29 state, “Your dream, and the visions of your head as you lay in bed are these: To you, O king, as you lay in bed came thoughts” And in Romans 12:2, “Do not be conformed to this world, but be transformed by the renewal of your mind.” According to Matthew 22:37: “You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind.”

In *The Bible Knowledge Commentary* we read, “The key to this change is the mind, the control center of our attitudes, thoughts, feelings, and actions. As one’s mind keeps on being made new by spiritual input, his lifestyle keeps on being renewed.”¹

Introducing Dr Wilder Penfield

Dr Wilder Penfield (figure 1), was made a Companion of the Order of Canada and was inducted into the Canadian Medical Hall of Fame in 1994. In his book *The Mystery of the Mind*, Penfield developed a hypothesis about how the mind and organic brain may work in collusion with each other. He saw the mind/brain interaction system as having three

separate functions. There is a mind itself, then the highest brain mechanism, and, lastly, the automaton (the autonomic nervous system, which follows a predetermined sequence of operations or responds to predetermined instructions). The mind can give direction only through the mind’s brain mechanism. Purpose comes to it from outside its own mechanism.² The author says:

“This suggests the mind must have a supply of energy available to it for independent action. We may assume then, that if a mind can give directions minutes in advance, it must also give directions split seconds in advance. I assume that the mind directs, and the mind-mechanism executes. It carries a message. As Hippocrates expressed it so long ago, ‘the brain is messenger’ to consciousness. Or, as one might express it now, the brain’s highest mechanism is *messenger* between mind and the other mechanisms of the brain [emphasis in original].”³

Penfield wrote:

“It is the mind (not the brain) that watches and at the same time directs. Has the mind, then, a memory of its own? No. There is no evidence to suggest it. If it has, there exists a memory mechanism of an entirely different and unsuspected order. The mind has no practical need for other memory sense, to the highest brain-mechanism. It can open the files of remembrance in a flash.”⁴

Penfield states:

“... one can understand the complexity and efficiency of the reflex coordinating an integrative action of the brain. In it, the automatic computer and the highest brain mechanism play interactive roles, selectively inhibitory and purposeful.”⁵



Figure 1. Dr Wilder Graves Penfield OM CC CMG FRS (1891–1976) was an American-Canadian neurosurgeon.

“Does this explain the action of the mind? Can reflex action in the end, account for it? After years of studying emerging mechanisms within the human brain, my own answer is *No!* [emphasis in original].”⁵

Penfield’s first experiment

Brain surgical procedures were used by Penfield in his study of the brain. His writings are the result of actual experiences, not purely philosophical exercises. Below are the details of a brain operation he performed on an epileptic patient:

“We have found that a gentle electrical current interferes with the function of the speech mechanism. One touches the cortex with a stimulating electrode and, since the brain is not sensitive, the patient does not realize that this has made him aphasic until he tries to speak, or to understand speech, and is unable to do so.”⁶

“One of my associates began to show the patient a series of pictures on the other side of a sterile screen. C.H. named each picture accurately at first. Then, before the picture of a butterfly was shown to him, I applied the electrode where I supposed the speech cortex to be. He remained silent for a time. Then he snapped his finger as though in exasperation. I withdrew the electrode and he spoke at once: ‘Now I can talk’, he said. ‘Butterfly’, ‘I could not get that word butterfly, so I tried to get the word moth.’ It is clear that while the speech mechanism was temporarily blocked, the patient could perceive the meaning of the picture of the butterfly. He made a conscious effort to get the corresponding word. Then, not understanding why he could not do so, he tuned back for a second time to the interpretive mechanism, which was well away from the interfering of the electric current, and found a second concept that he considered the closest thing to a butterfly. He must have presented that to the speech mechanism, only to draw another blank.”⁶

“The patient’s simple statement startled me. He was calling on two brain-mechanisms alternately and at will. He had focused his attention on the cards and set himself the purpose of recognizing and naming each picture as it came along. At first each picture was inspected in the stream of consciousness. It was identified, named, and recorded. He was using areas of cerebral cortex that, at birth, had been uncommitted as to function. Evidently, the highest brain-mechanism, impelled by mind-decision, can carry out these transactions, calling upon previously established, conditioned reflexes one by one. When I paralyzed his speech mechanisms he was puzzled. Then he decided what to do. He reconsidered the concept ‘butterfly’ and summoned the nearest thing to butterfly, that was stored away in his concept mechanism. When the concept ‘moth’ was selected and presented in the stream of consciousness, the mind approved and the highest mechanism flashed this non-verbal concept of moth to the speech mechanism. But the word for ‘moth’ did not present itself in the stream of consciousness as he expected. He remained silent, then expressed his exasperation by snapping the fingers and thumb of his right hand. That he could do without making use of the special speech mechanism. Finally, when I removed my interfering electrode from the cortex, he explained the whole experience with a feeling of relief, using words that were appropriate to his thought. *He* got the words from the speech mechanism when *he* presented concepts to it. For the word ‘he’ in this introspection, one may substitute the word *mind*. Its action is not automatic.”⁷

“As I visualize it, a reasonable, explanatory hypothesis can be constructed as follows: because I had asked the patient to do so, he turned his attention to the naming of cards [pictures], programming the brain to that end through the highest brain mechanism. I can say only that the decision came from his mind. Neuronal action began in the highest brain-mechanism. Here is the meeting of the mind and the brain. The psychophysical frontier is here. The frontier is being crossed from mind to brain. The frontier is also being crossed from brain to mind since the mind is conscious of the meaning of the neuronal succession that determines the content of the stream of consciousness. The neuronal action is automatic as it is in any computer.”⁸

“In conformity with the mind’s decision, the highest mechanism sends neuronal messages to the other mechanisms in the brain. The messages go, I suppose, in the form of neuronal potentials arranged in a meaningful pattern and they are sent, in each case, to the appropriate target gray matter. They cause the individual to turn his gaze and focus his eyes on the matter in question. They cause him to interpret what he sees, to select words that will express a meaning.”⁸

“This is hypothetical thinking, of course. It is clear

that much is accomplished by automatic and reflex mechanisms. But what the mind does is different. It is not to be accounted for by any neuronal mechanism that I can discover.”⁸

Additional experiments

From another surgical experience, Penfield says:

“The patient’s mind, which is considering the situation in such an aloof and critical manner, can only be something quite apart from neuronal reflex action. ... The fact that there should be no confusion in the conscious state suggests that, although the content of consciousness depends in large measure on neuronal activity, awareness itself does not.”⁹

The information following simplifies this neurosurgeon’s intricate, detailed report on his brain surgical procedure.

First, even the memory of a physical event must result from it being observed by a non-physical intelligence or there would be no memory imprinted upon the physical brain. Memory involves thoughts, and thoughts are clearly not physical because they include non-physical ideas, such as truth, justice, perfection, etc. Amazingly, because of the mysterious connection of the mind to the brain, what the mind thinks is recorded within the brain.¹⁰

Obviously, no event of itself creates memories. Nor is the mechanism (whatever it may be, such as a video camera) by which a memory is recorded the *source* of either the event or a memory thereof. The brain is no more the *source* of the memories physically stored on it than a video or DVD or audiocassette or computer is the *source* of sights and sounds physically stored on it.¹⁰

Again, Penfield described the brain as a computer programmed by something independent of itself, the mind. The brain can have memories of ideas or events implanted upon its physical structure, but this does not mean the computer (or brain) *originated* such ideas or events. Just as an intelligence that exists outside, and is independent of, the computer must put into it whatever memory it has. So, it is the mind (the independent intelligence) that imprints memories on the brain.¹⁰

Lines of reasoning

Dr Wilder Penfield performed hundreds of stimulations of the brain surface. He had three lines of reasoning as evidence for dualism: his inability to stimulate intellectual thought, the inability of seizures to cause intellectual thought, and his inability to stimulate the will: so he concluded that the intellect and the will are not from the brain, which is precisely what Aristotle said.¹¹

An interesting podcast note reads as follows:

“Dr Egnor goes on to explain that the brain does not experience pain so a neurosurgery patient can comfortably remain conscious with only local anesthetic.



Image: Wellcome Images, Wikimedia / CC-BY-4.0 (colourized)

Figure 2. Sir John Carew Eccles AC FRS FRACP FRSNZ FAA (1903–1997) was an Australian neurophysiologist and philosopher who won the 1963 Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine for his work on the synapse.

The surgeon can then communicate with the patient to be sure that the treatment is not damaging speech or movement.”¹¹

Additional Investigations

Sir John Eccles (fig. 2), Ph.D., neurophysiology and Nobel Prize winner, and a Dr Robinson, Ph.D., psychology, discussed the research of three groups of scientists: Robert Porter and Cobie Brinkman, Nils Lassen and Per Roland, plus Hans Kornhuber and Luder Deeke—all of whom produced startling and undeniable evidence that a mental intention preceded an actual neuronal firing (in the brain)—thereby establishing that the mind is not the same thing as the brain, but a separate entity altogether.¹²

The experiments of Benjamin Libet (figure 3), a mid-to-late 20th-century neuroscientist, studied the precise timing of electrical activity in the brain and conscious decisions to do simple tasks such as pushing a button. He found that we have preconscious impulses, characterized by spikes in brain waves that precede conscious decisions by about a half second. The results seem to indicate that what may seem to be a freely made decision is actually a decision that is made unconsciously, *before* one is consciously aware of having made it. If this is correct, then there seems to be no room to say that we are consciously in *control* of our decisions.¹³

“But Libet was an excellent scientist so he tested the hypothesis that free will wasn’t real by asking the volunteers to occasionally veto their decision after making it—to decide to push the button but to then immediately decide not to. He found that there was no brain wave associated with the veto—i.e. *the veto was not from the brain*. Thus, the veto was immaterial and independent of brain processes, and it corresponded to free will. Libet concluded that our decisions consisted of two parts: a preconscious ‘temptation’ and a conscious acceptance or veto. The temptation was associated with brain activity

and might in that sense be considered involuntary (even that is problematic). But the acceptance or veto of the temptation was *not* determined by brain activity and appeared to be immaterial (i.e. spiritual) in origin. Libet quipped that he ‘hadn’t proven free will, per se, but he had proved “free won’t”’ [emphasis in original].”¹³

Michael Egnor (figure 4), a neurosurgeon, writes that “Materialists sometimes misrepresent the evidence for free will, especially concerning Benjamin Libet’s work!”¹⁴ and “we most certainly have free will. We can see this from three perspectives: scientific, philosophical and logical.”¹⁴ Note that Libet later did believe in free will; it was the popular science media that didn’t believe.¹⁴

The four neuroscience expressions used by Benjamin Libet are: ‘readiness potential’, ‘free won’t’, ‘contra-casual free will’, and ‘both wrist flexing and flicking’. Readiness potential (RP) is the state prior to the conscious decision to move one’s hand in an apparent act of free will, and is unconscious brain activity detectable by EEG recording.¹⁴

Alfred Mele, in his book *Effective Intentions: The power of conscious will*, criticized the interpretation of the Libet results on two grounds. First, the mere appearance of RP a half second or more before the action in no way makes RP the cause of the action. It may simply mark the beginning of forming an intention to act!¹⁵ (Note: Other neuroscience expressions will not be covered due to content restraint, but are also critiqued by Mele. Interestingly, Libet has come around to Mele’s way of thinking and now believes that his experiments leave some room for free will, or at least free ‘won’t’.)

Concerning additional thoughts about free will, Keaton Halley responded involving experiments about physical processes involving free will:

“I will argue that there is no reason to challenge the research *per se*, only the interpretations placed on it. ... Here are seven reasons why these experimental results do not undermine human freedom:

1. It is possible that there is a lag time between making a decision and becoming aware of it. ...
2. Making a decision may not take place in an instant, but involve a process. ...
3. Brain activity is not the same as brain causation. ...
4. The predictive success based on brain scans was not 100%. ...
5. In a 2007 study by Brass and Haggard, it was found that even after a self-reported decision people still had the power to change their minds before they performed the act. ...
6. Lack of freedom in one area wouldn’t prove a total lack of freedom. ...
7. The argument against free will is self-refuting. ...”¹⁶

Egnor notes that “‘the brain can be cut in half, but the intellect and the will cannot.’ That in itself implies that mind and brain are not the same thing.”¹⁷

Egnor argues that the emergence of the mind from the brain is not possible because

“... no properties of the mind have any overlap with the properties of the brain. Thought and matter are not similar in any way. Matter has extension in space and mass.”¹⁸

“I think the best explanation of the relationship of the mind to the brain is Aristotelian hylo-morphism which is the viewpoint that the soul is the form of the body and that certain powers of the soul, particularly the intellect and will, are not generated by matter but are immaterial things—what Thomas Aquinas would call the ‘spirit’. But other properties of the mind, like perception and memory and imagination are physical. They are directly related to brain matter and they are generated by brain matter. I think that is the best explanation philosophically for what we find in neuroscience.”¹⁹

In a discussion with Bruce Gordon, Egnor states:

“‘You also never have morality seizures. You never have seizures where you compulsively recite the 10 commandments,’ and Dr Penfield says, ‘Why not? Why aren’t there intellectual seizures, if the brain is a source of the intellect?’ Of course, Aristotle and St. Thomas, thousands of years ago said the intellect is not material. It doesn’t come from the body.”²⁰

Commenting on physicist Sabine Hossenfelder and biologist Jerry Coyne, both of whom deny free will, Egnor asserts:

“*Rational* appetite is inclination to act based on reason, not on perceptions or imagination. ... My decision about whether to eat a piece of cake because of its appearance and how I imagine it will taste is fundamentally different from my decision about whether I will break my diet in order to do so. One inclination—my sensitive appetite—is based on concrete perception. The other inclination—to follow my diet—is based on abstract reason [emphasis in original].”²¹

“Only abstract reason / rational appetite is the *will* part of free will. Sensitive appetite is not part of the will—it is a passion based wholly on material factors—my brain chemistry, etc. Sensitive appetite is not free—this kind of appetite is indeed dictated by my molecules and neurotransmitters. I can condition and override it but in itself, it is wholly material and subject to the laws of nature [emphases in original].”²¹

Michael Egnor also states:

“Researchers either assume or find it easy to conclude that spiritual experience is *caused* by brain states. This is, of course, not true: spiritual experience is abstract and mediated by the immaterial intellect and will [emphasis in original].”²²

The Discovery Institute’s David Kitzhoffer writes:

“There is an immaterial aspect a spiritual aspect to the human soul that can be demonstrated by science, and it leaves its signature, sadly, in this peculiar aspect

of epilepsy. [Egnor said that] ‘patients (epileptic) never think abstractly as a part of the seizure. There has never been a report in the medical literature of an intellectual seizure’ Penfield concluded, quite reasonably, that this was because intellectual thought didn’t come from the brain. Intellectual thought (Penfield called it the ‘Mind’) is an immaterial human power. Dr. Penfield began his career as a ‘Materialist’. He ended it as a convinced ‘Dualist.’”²³

Spiritual connections

The Bible Dictionary explains ‘mind’, in the Old Testament, as the intellect with all its capacities. ‘Soul’ is referred to as psyche. Mind and psyche are used interchangeably. (The individual self, or each person *is* unique.)

The Berean Call Staff wrote:

“Hebrews 4:12 tells us that the Word of God is living and active and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the ‘dividing asunder of soul and spirit’. There is a distinction between the soul and spirit and it takes an extremely sharp (i.e. supernatural) instrument to discern it. Consequently, any attempt at human definition must fall short. The soul is said to include the mind, the will, and the emotions. Jesus, in His humanity, said that His soul was ‘exceedingly sorrowful, even unto death . . .’ (Matthew 26:38).”²⁴

Other important thoughts

Egnor states:

“‘I believe ‘consciousness’ is the same kind of empty narrative gloss applied to the mind. Man has a soul, and the mind is several powers of the soul—sensation, perception, sensus communis, imagination, memory, rational appetite, reason and will. [Note: Again, some of the above properties are generated by brain matter, as previously mentioned.] By ‘consciousness’ we just mean the exercise of those powers. . . . Mechanical philosophy is the assertion that nature and man are *machines* of a sort. . . . It is an egregious philosophical and scientific mistake but that is beyond our scope here [emphasis added].”²⁵

Egnor also says:

“I believe that ‘consciousness’ became a concept in the early modern era because of this machine analogy. Machines, after all, can be *turned on and off*. If the body is a machine, life is the *on* position of the switch, and death is the *off* position. . . . There are strong scientific reasons to reject this notion that the soul, including the powers of the mind, can be extinguished in the sense of being ‘switched off’ [emphases in original].”²⁵

Egnor goes on to list a number of reasons to dispute the mechanical philosophy:



Image: Author unknown / Wikimedia (coloured)

Figure 3. Dr Benjamin Libet (1916–2007) was an American neuroscientist who was a pioneer in the field of human consciousness, and in 2003, the first recipient of the Virtual Nobel Prize in Psychology from the University of Klagenfurt.

“When we sleep, although we would commonly be called ‘unconscious’, we remain aware to a significant extent of our surroundings. We wake up to noise or pain or cold. . . . During sleep, we are aware of dreams. . . . Our minds [a part of our soul] are never off; we just have states in which one or more powers of the mind—sensation or perception or memory, etc.—are temporarily inactive. . . . We are never switched off—we are never unconscious—not in sleep, not under anesthesia, not in a coma and not even after death.”²⁵

Is consciousness in the cerebral cortex or elsewhere in the brain? Neuroscientist Mark Solms and neurosurgeon Michael Egnor had a debate/discussion on this subject. Mark Solms explains that “the source of consciousness in the brain is in fact in the brain stem” not the cerebral cortex, as is almost universally assumed. He explains his reasoning with evidence.²⁶ Egnor responds that his own clinical experience supports that view, and the view that the mind is not simply ‘what the brain does’, as some popular neuroscientists claim.²⁶

According to philosophy of mind researcher Dr Gualtiero Piccinni:

“Contrary to what many doctors apparently assume, there is overwhelming evidence that hydranencephalic children, who lack a cerebral cortex, are creature conscious in a robust sense. That is, they have a sleep-wake cycle, they respond appropriately to some features of stimuli, and they express emotions and preferences. But are they phenomenally conscious? Since they can’t give linguistic reports, it’s hard to tell.”²⁷

Michael Egnor notes:

“So, the mind cannot arise wholly from matter because intentionality is not a property of matter. The existence of the mind refutes materialism because the mind is characterized by a power that matter does not have. Intentionality, like design, is a shoal on which materialism wrecks.”²⁸

Egnor also cites Oxford philosopher Ferdinand Schiller, who in 1891 proposed:

“... matter is not what produces consciousness but what limited and confines its intensity within certain limits. ... This explanation admits the connection of matter and consciousness, but contends that the course of interpretation must proceed in the contrary direction. ... It is an explanation the possibility of which no evidence in favor of materialism can possibly affect.”²⁹

Egnor goes on to say:

“Schiller argued that brain injuries are better understood as preventing the manifestation of consciousness than as extinguishing it. He suggested that, with regard to memory, it is *forgetfulness* and not memory that needs to be explained by neuroscience. For example, he noted the remarkable clarity of total recall that many people have under hypnosis ... The recent research at Cornell supports that perspective. It is evidence for a dualist and even an idealist view of the mind and brain.”²⁹

An article entitled “The Mind vs Brain Debate (What is Consciousness?)”, by Christina Sarich, poses some interesting questions and answers concerning consciousness and the mind. Now concerning phantom limb pain, “is it the mind feeling the limb [pain] or the erroneous assumption of the brain? Why would the brain feel something that wasn’t there? Is this true consciousness?”³⁰

Further in the article it is stated that:

“... the wave/particle theory [by physicists] also describes the presence of greater intelligence at least insofar as understanding the power of the mind. Not only is intelligence not relegated to the workings of the brain, but it is also not even relegated to the atoms and quarks we observe. When looking at waves and particles and their behavior physicists find that they act differently once observed. Consciousness, in fact, may create them. ... Consciousness or mind is not matter. But even quantum mechanics is having a hard time describing consciousness.”³⁰

Now concerning awareness,

“Although it is theorized that memories in the brain are just stored chemical structures such as in a neural network, some doctors are pointing to evidence of awareness once the physical structure of the brain is considered dead. ... Perhaps we will yoke our mind with the body (or brain) by the contemplation of consciousness itself.”³⁰ (A question arises: what is the exact connection between the mind and consciousness or even awareness?)

Kelsey Ichikawa—a recent Harvard neuroscientist graduate who discussed the snares into which misinterpretation can lead us—has recently published a brilliant piece on the pitfalls of functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) of the brain.³¹ Egnor states:

“A major thrust of neuroscience research in the last couple of decades has been the use of fMRI to correlate brain activity with thinking and to draw conclusions about the physical basis of the mind. A few points about



Image: Biography photo at Discovery Institute

Figure 4. Dr Michael Egnor is Professor of Neurosurgery and Pediatrics at State University of New York, Stony Brook.

fMRI imaging are important to note:

1. fMRI imaging doesn’t see brain activity directly. fMRI imaging detects changes in regional blood flow in the brain, and we know from research over a century ago that activity in a part of the brain correlates more or less with changes in blood flow to that part of the brain. When neurons in a region of the brain become active, blood flow in that region increases.
2. The changes in blood flow do not occur simultaneously with the brain activity. There is a lag of anywhere from a few seconds to upwards of a minute from the neuronal activity to the uptick in blood flow. *The time resolution of fMRI imaging for brain activity is not particularly good [emphasis added].*
3. MRI imaging produces rather fuzzy pictures of the brain. ...

Ichikawa gives an example of the imprecision and potential for bias in fMRI imaging.”³¹

(Space constraints preclude discussion of many additional examples.)

As discussed by Egnor, Ichikawa also refers to a famous fMRI study in which a researcher discovered brain activity in a dead salmon using standard statistical methods:

“Craig Bennett, a postdoctoral researcher at the Univ. of California, Santa Barbara did the MRI scanning of the dead salmon. To his surprise, ‘the dead fish’s brain exhibited increased activity for emotional images—implying a sensitive, if not alive, salmon.’ Even in a dead salmon’s brain, the MRI scanner detected enough noise that some voxels exhibited statistically significant correlations. By failing to correct for multiple comparisons, Bennett and his colleagues ‘discovered’ illusory brain activity. Ichikawa does a great job of pointing out the myriad pitfalls of fMRI research, which is a very active line of neuroscience research in the 21st century.”³¹

The Mind and the Brain: Neuroplasticity and the power of mental force, by Dr Jeffrey M. Schwartz and

Sharon Begley, contains interesting mind/brain information. These two authors demonstrated that the human mind is an independent entity that can shape and control the functioning of the physical brain.³²

Conclusion and personal reflections

Experimental evidence from Dr Penfield plus the credible information from others included in this article lead me to conclude that our minds, our inner being, cannot be accounted for by our physical brain. Some further thoughts to ponder that involve our spirit, soul, and body are: it appears that man's spirit itself communicates with God. I suggest that man's soul (mind) communicates with the spiritual realm through the spirit of man. Also, the soul communicates with the physical realm through the body. 'Soul', which is *psyche* in Greek, is the part of mankind that lives on after death. Luke 1:46–47 states, "My soul magnifies the Lord, and my spirit has exalted in God my Savior."

Concerning when and where believers go after death, when Jesus hung on the Cross where He was executed, there were two criminals along with Jesus. One criminal said, "Jesus, remember me when you come into your kingdom." And Jesus replied, "Truly, I say to you, today you will be with me in paradise" (Luke 23:42–43).

I believe there is a mind or soul connection, plus our spirit, with respect to a physical brain interaction system. This shows a distinction between the physical brain and a non-physical mind or soul. Our mental faculties and our physical brain are a vital part of the creation of mankind. Where would we be without our mental abilities, especially concerning our salvation in Jesus Christ? This truly is a non-physical mental process. This conscious decision is the most important mental one we can ever make. It will both divinely transform our here-and-now and determine our eternal destiny.

"Do not be conformed to this world, but be transformed by the renewal of your mind, that by testing you may discern what is the will of God, what is good and acceptable and perfect" (Romans 12:2).

"... because, if you confess with your mouth that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved. For with the heart one believes and is justified, and with the mouth one confesses and is saved" (Romans 10:9–10).

References

- Walvoord, J.F. and Zuck, R.B. (Eds.), *The Bible Knowledge Commentary: An exposition of the Scriptures*, The Dallas Seminary New Testament edition, Victor Books, 1st edn, 1983.
- Penfield, W., *The Mystery of the Mind: A critical study of consciousness and the human brain*, Princeton University Press, NJ, p. 60, 1975.
- Penfield, ref. 2, p. 46.
- Penfield, ref. 2, pp. 48–50.
- Penfield, ref. 2, p. 48.
- Penfield, ref. 2, p.51–52.
- Penfield, ref. 2, p.52–53.
- Penfield, ref. 2, pp. 53–54.
- Penfield, ref. 2, p. 55.
- Berean Call Staff Q&A: Question: It seems that memory is physical [yet] you say thoughts even about physical things are nonphysical. ... If memory is part of the brain, then I can't see why thoughts, too, can't be part of the brain, thereancall.org, 1 Oct 2003.
- Marks, R.J., Bradley, W., and Egnor, M., *Why pioneer neurosurgeon Wilder Penfield said the mind is more than the brain*, *Mind Matters*, 29 Feb 2020.
- Eccles, J.C. and Robinson, D.N., *The Wonders of Being Human: Our brain and our mind*, Free Press, the University of California, CA, pp. 156–164, 1984.
- Libet, B., Gleason, C.A., Wright, E.W., and Pearl, D.K., Time of conscious intention to act in relation to onset of cerebral activity (readiness-potential). The unconscious initiation of a freely voluntary act, *Brain* **106**(Pt 3):623–642, Sep 1983 | doi.org/10.1093/brain/106.3.623.
- Egnor, M., *A reader asks: does neuroscience disprove free will?*, *Mind Matters*, 7 Feb 2021.
- Mele, A.R., *Effective Intentions: The power of conscious will*, Oxford University Press; 1st edn, 2009.
- Halley, K., *Does your brain make your decisions before you do?* *Creation.com*, 20 Jan 2018.
- Egnor, M., *Some people think and speak with only half a brain*, *Mind Matters*, 21 Nov 2019.
- Egnor, M., *Why the mind cannot just emerge from the brain*, *Mind Matters*, 17 Feb 2020.
- Egnor, M., *The mind's reality is consistent with neuroscience*, *Mind Matters*, 21 Feb 2020.
- Egnor, M., *Bruce Gordon on the meaning of neuroscience (part III)*, *Mind Matters*, 22 April 2021.
- Egnor, M., *Neuroscience can help us understand why free will is real*, *Mind Matters*, 17 Oct 2020.
- Egnor, M., *The brain prosperity gospel: can "neurotheology" be real science?* *Mind Matters*, 16 May 2021.
- Klinghoffer, D., *If materialists are right about the brain, why no "morality seizures"?* *Evolution News*, 29 Oct 2020.
- Berean Call Staff, *Question: Are the soul and spirit the same?* thereancall.org, 1 Aug 2021.
- Egnor, M., *Your soul has no "off switch"*, *Mind Matters*, 31 Jan 2021.
- Egnor, M. and Solms, M., *Consciousness: is it in the cerebral cortex—or the brain stem?* *Mind Matters*, 6 Nov 2021.
- Piccinini, G., *Phenomenal consciousness without cerebral cortex—The Brains Blog*, philosophyofbrains.com, 21 May 2007.
- Egnor, M., *Why consciousness shows that materialism is false*, *Mind Matters*, 7 Dec 2020.
- Carter, C., *Science and the Near-Death Experience: How consciousness survives death*, Inner Traditions, 2010; quoted in Egnor, M., *Can LSD help us understand the mind-brain relationship?* *Mind Matters*, A study by Cornell University, 23 May 2021.
- Sarich, C., *The mind vs brain debate (What is consciousness?)—Ecstatic trance: ritual body postures*, cuyamungueinstitute.com, accessed 29 Nov 2022.
- Egnor, M., *Why a 'budding' neuroscientist is skeptical of brain scans*, *Mind Matters*, 5 Apr 2021.
- Schwartz, J.M. and Begley, S., *The Mind and the Brain: Neuroplasticity and the power of mental force*, Harper Collins, 2003.

Darryl Sletten is an 83-year-old retired U.S. Navy Veteran who served at the U.S. Naval Air Station in Corpus Christi, Texas as a hospital corpsman. Darryl was educated in various laboratory technology and worked in various medical facilities. He became interested in studying the mind/brain in search of the answer of how we pray, which has led to over 20 plus years of reading research in this area.