

# The Easily Comprehended General Intelligent Design Model.

Robert A. Herrmann, Ph.D.\*

7 JUN 2014

*Abstract:* In this article, a basic human “thought” procedure is described. It is employed to demonstrate the simplest and, yet, most significant aspect of the General Intelligent Design Model (GID-model). This aspect is related to descriptions for ordinary human experiences. It is shown how these descriptions are translated rationally into statements that describe the behavior of an higher-intelligence.

## 1. The Infinite.

What does the term “infinite” mean in modern science? Well, without some intuitive idea as to what this means, then modern scientific theories would have little meaning. In Quantum Field Theory is the statement that the quantum field that correspond to “light” can have “infinite range.” One can intuitively think of this concept, relative to content, as stating that it has the property of being “greater in content” than the finite notion. It was claimed for a hundred years, by some, that we cannot completely imagine such a concept. But, else, this is not true. (See [3] if you actually want to “imagine” one type of this concept.) Further, there is an additional technical note on the type of infinite being expressed in this article prior to the “References.” It is a rather special “infinite” concept that is the major predicted characteristic that differentiates human behavior from that of an higher-intelligence.

## 2. Thoughts.

In [2], aspects of human behavior are described, where such behavior is characterized by the term “finite” as this term is understood in its most common sense of counting. The physical foundations of all of science is the notion of language. The General Grand Unification Model is entirely based upon this foundation. This is way its results cannot be rationally rejected. But, they can be ignored and prevented from becoming well known.

Human beings “speak” to themselves when they “think,” do they not? In the beginning, when we learn to read combined strings of symbols, we are often told to “read to yourselves.” If you don’t have a special brain or are not a “speed” reader, then does this form of thinking not “sound like” a mental “voice”? Human beings also make mental “images” as well when they “think.” One can mentally “see” symbols and diagrams and sometimes rather strange images. The written English language and

---

\* Professor of Mathematics (Ret.), The United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, MD, U. S. A. *E-mail* drrahgid@hotmail.com

many others use symbols that represent spoken language-elements. Mathematics uses symbols and often gives them names. The GGU-model uses a representation,  $\mathbf{L}$ , for the general concept of a language. Then it is mathematically modeled, in two different ways. Thus, one can consider  $\mathbf{L}$  as composed of the written symbolic representations for a common written language, as well as collections of diagrams, displayed images and, by the methods of virtual reality, even other human sensory inputs.

The set  $\mathbf{L}$  represents these aspects of the human brain and various portions of  $\mathbf{L}$  correspond to this notion of “thinking.” One does not continually included the word “representation” when the symbol  $\mathbf{L}$  is used.

There is a third aspect of “thinking.” “I can’t find the words, as yet, to express exactly what I mean. But, maybe this will help, although its not quite right.” Such statements as these are very common. If one has a ”thought” they wish to express, but does not, as yet, have the conscious words or images to do so, then in what form are the, as yet, unexpressed “thoughts” that they wish to express? How do we even know that we have such “thoughts”? Whatever our brain is doing in these many, many cases, is not the basic type of thoughts we need to presently consider in order to easily comprehend the GID-model.

Relative to the language  $L$ , facts can be informally stated about how a symbolic language represents such thinking. These facts can relate to such mental processes. For example, most “human beings construct meaningful statements from finitely long words.” These words represent or model sounds we utter or mentally hear. They do not just coorespond to random collections of symbols. It is the “finite” word we hear. It is finite since we “hear” the sound “start and stop.” This is a fact whether the word is auditory or purely mental in character. Hence, most “human beings construct meaningful statements from finitely long thoughts.” Then we can include mental images. Further, I can mentally see an image and then I mentally “talk about it.” Most often images are of finite mental content. But, there are special ways to change this content notion. Thus, the extended language notion can be included in this “thoughts” idea. Next the first list of statements gives facts about human beings stated in terms of the “thoughts” concept relative, at least, to mental “sounds” and “images.”

### **3. The Simple Descriptions.**

In this first list, the term “word” means the mental type. Of course, these statements can all be rephrase in terms of the symbolic notions.

- (1) A human being constructs meaningful thoughts from a finite set of finitely long words.
- (2) These thoughts are members of a language  $\mathbf{L}$ . The language  $\mathbf{L}$  includes diagrams and other humanly comprehensible forms for images.
- (3) Consider a finite counting number. A single rule for deduction, modus ponens, applied to a single hypothesis yields a corresponding finite

set of conclusions, via a human form of rational deduction applied over a miniscule time period. The finite counting number is a measure of the set's content.

(4) A human begin, using a finite collection of thoughts, constructs a meaningful (humanly comprehensible) set of thoughts that details specific portions of our universe.

(5) A human begin constructs a set of thoughts, using members of  $\mathbf{L}$ , that give specific rules for combining elementary building materials so as to yield these designs.

(6) A human being changes thoughts into physical entities and physical-systems. (By definition, physical-systems are composed of physical entities or other physical-systems. For example, entities - bricks, nails, wallboard: physical-systems - fireplaces, walls, rooms.)

The language aspects of these statements are directly related to mathematical symbolism. Then the mathematics PREDICTS other mathematical entities. These predictions can then be interpreted using modifications of the above (1) - (6) statements. This interpretation yields the GID-model. Of course, one need not make such an interpretation and then one gets various GGU-model schemes from which one can choose. These predictions do not come from the standard mathematics used by almost everyone in the world who uses mathematics. So, since it corresponds to nothing to which most have been exposed, individuals may need to trust me and accept the interpreted predictions based upon my expertise in the mathematics. However, they may reject them simply based upon my changed philosophic stance. Of course, this does not prohibit individuals from accepting the secular GGU-model. But, then again, maybe it does since so many scientific theories that are not directly verifiable seem to be created in the hopes of eliminating a GID-model type interpretation. As long as science uses language, this cannot be done.

The types of human thoughts being considered above are assumed by physical science to be the results of physical electro-chemical actions. Physical actions that we perform change such thoughts into physical reality. Further, standard training within the physical sciences has yielded some highly successful but possibly imaginary models that predict physical behavior. It may be difficult to eliminate from ones acquired methods the idea that various questions have any meaningful answers relative to our level of intelligence. It seems necessary that before proceeding that individuals not concern themselves with attempting to answer the following two questions. Of what entities are the higher-intelligence thoughts composed? How does an higher-intelligence change thoughts into various realities? Although within present-day physical science it may be difficult to do so, it appears more appropriate, at least in this case, to rely upon Deut. 29:29 and Prov. 3:5.

In these five statements, one can simply substitute, for certain strings of symbols, other strings of symbols and informally describe the behavior of a predicted “higher-intelligence.” *However, this does not yield any great comprehension as to actual higher-intelligence behavior.* There is an additional fact that does produce better understanding.

It turns out that there are relationships between the “higher-intelligence” concept and the human being. The (1) - (6) physical statements and the higher-intelligence statements (1) - (6) below yield a **comparative understanding** as to the differences between human intelligence and that of an higher-intelligence. The mathematics shows that the higher-intelligence can do everything that is described in the first five statements. **That is, in the first five statements, the phrase “human being” and words “humanly” and “human” can be replaced with the phrase higher-intelligence and the statements are essentially also predicted by the model.** This yields rationally predicted statements such as “An higher-intelligence can construct sets of humanly comprehensible thoughts from a finite set of finitely long words.” (The reason for this being rationally predicted is given prior to the “References” list.) In this case, the finite word is represented as a symbolic member of  $\mathbf{L}$ . In a second case, by a special approach, the word (an ultraword) can still be humanly comprehended although it is a symbolic member of  $^*\mathbf{L}$  and not a member of  $\mathbf{L}$ . The third case, which is the usual case, this finite word is a member of  $^*\mathbf{L}$ , not a member of  $\mathbf{L}$  and is entirely humanly incomprehensible.

#### 4. Rationally Predicted Higher-Intelligent Behavioral Descriptions.

The higher-intelligence can also do a lot that human beings cannot do. The following statements characterize the “higher” part of the term “higher-intelligence.” The following list demonstrates how a simple modification to terms that appear in (1) - (6) leads to predicted higher-intelligence behavioral descriptions. **When not restricted to our physical world, they imply that, relative to characterizing properties, the modified noun is exceptionally "greater than" or "more than," etc. the unmodified "finitely" characterized noun. The word "infinite," as here stated, is intended to carry this intuitive understanding.**

(1) An higher-intelligence constructs meaningful higher-thoughts from an infinite set of infinitely long higher-words (ultrawords).

(2) These higher-thoughts are members of an higher-language  $^*\mathbf{L}$ . The higher-language  $^*\mathbf{L}$  includes higher-diagrams and other higher-intelligence comprehensible forms for higher-images.

(3) Consider an infinite counting number. A single rule for deduction, modus ponens, applied to a single hypothesis yields a corresponding infinite set of conclusions, via an higher-intelligence form of rational deduc-

tion applied over a miniscule time period. The infinite counting number is a measure of the set's content.

(4) An higher-intelligence, using an infinite collection of higher-thoughts, constructs a meaningful (higher-intelligence comprehensible) set of higher-thoughts that details specific portions of a hyper-universe. (A hyper-universe can merely be composed of our physical universe. However, there are predicted hidden universes that can be associated with ours and these need not be empty [5].)

(5) An higher-intelligence constructs a set of higher-thoughts, using members of  $*\mathbf{L}$ , that give specific higher-rules for combining elementary building materials so as to yield these designs. (By application of special techniques, these specific higher-rules are humanly comprehensible.)

(6) An higher-intelligence changes thoughts into higher-physical entities and higher-physical-systems (often termed as physical-like systems). (By restriction, the higher-physical entities include physical entities and higher-physical-systems include physical-systems. And, as in physical case, higher-physical-systems may be composed of higher-physical entities or other higher-physical-systems. The compositions, by restrictions, can contain physical entities or other higher-physical-systems or physical-systems. Examples, entities - x-tons, propertons: higher-physical-systems - human spirit, invisible universes, photons, electrons, physical-systems.)

The model also states that such an higher-intelligence cannot be a member of any of the produced physical universes. Indeed, it cannot be part of any of the GGU-model predicted or employed objects. **From these characteristics, it is obvious that the term “higher-intelligence” can be replaced with the term “infinite-intelligence.”**

Now comes the real problem for the atheists and why they apparently are so intent upon putting extreme barriers between my work, in this area, and the rest of humanity. They cannot scientifically counter these results unless they discard all that they claim is the scientific method. Worst still for them, in [4] is given the following additional theological interpretation for the higher-intelligence produced by substituting into similar types of statements an obvious term for the term “higher-intelligence.”

(1) God designs all universe entities and their behavior patterns as modeled by the thoughts concept.

(2) God produces all of the physical entities and physical behavior patterns as modeled by the concept of changing thoughts into various realities.

Relative to human beings and our universe:

(3) As completely stated in (1), God designs all physical entities and physical behavior patterns as modeled by the thoughts concept.

(4) Human beings make choices.

(5) God activates the choices and produces the pre-designed physical patterns as stated in (2). He is the ultimate agent in all such matters.

(6) God pre-designs all possible human life-paths. But, God does not originate the non-automatic patterns for human physical behavior. Human choice is the original agent that does so. It is when such human mental or physical behavior occurs that the associated ethical consequences are realized. (In the Bible we find that “The LORD said to Moses . . . .” (Lev.) and He then describes what He considers as sinful human behavior. The GID-model employs the allowed Biblical concept of “thinking within oneself” as the Hebrew for “said” can be interpreted or, in this case, “implanted thoughts.” This directly corresponds to the GGU-models pre-design feature. This aspect of the GID-model is not concerned with any type of process that can influence an individual’s specific choice.)

Then the facts are that these and many other so translated statements also satisfy a strict interpretation for statements that appear in the Bible. I suspect the same holds for other “secured texts.” To the atheists, the public, in general, “cannot be allowed to know” that a properly constructed scientific theory could ever have these properties. Thus far, only an extreme minority has this knowledge.

(This is the technical note on the term “infinite” as employed above. It has been shown that the actual GID-model concept of “infinite” can only be partially molded via the mathematics used for this model. An in-depth discussion of this appears in the paper [1] in the References. This concept is a generalization of what can be mathematically measured and is termed as the “generic” notion of the infinite. Intuitively, it is a type of ultimate infinite. The term “infinite” in this case characterizes the concept of “content.” If one states that a “class” of sets is infinite in content, then this ultimate infinite signifies that the entity being so characterized cannot be characterized as represented by a “set” and it has “more” content than the content associated with any member of the class.

Relative to an higher-language, the actual mathematical model states that members of the higher-language  $*\mathbf{L}$  are composed of hyperfinitely long strings of symbols that are also taken from  $*\mathbf{L}$ . The symbols are also members of  $*\mathbf{L}$ . But, the original alphabet symbols and each word from  $\mathbf{L}$  are members of  $*\mathbf{L}$ . The “hyperfinitely long” includes the “finitely long” language-elements. Thus, although the statement is about an higher-intelligence, the presented predicted statements also hold for a restriction to our specific finite world.)

## References

- [1] What the Term *Infinite* Means. And God's Ultimate Attributes are Immeasurable via Set Theory. <http://raherrmann.com/measureintell.htm>
- [2] GGU-model Processes. <http://raherrmann.com/processes.htm>
- [3] How to Imagine the Infinite. <http://raherrmann.com/infinite.htm>
- [4] Herrmann, R. A. Quantum Field Theory, Particles, Thoughts, GGU-model Secretes and Final Theological Conclusions. <http://vixra.org/abs/1405.0295>
- [5] 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>