

# Imagination Is the Technology

*Mental Imagery, Biological Response, and the Question of Where Thoughts Come From*

Alisha Bradley, M.A.  
October 2026 | Version 1.0

*Independent working paper. This paper presents developing hypotheses, research questions, and interdisciplinary inquiry. It has not undergone peer review.*

## Abstract

Human beings can respond emotionally and physiologically to events that are not presently occurring but are vividly represented in the mind. Mental imagery can evoke fear, safety, desire, memory, anticipation, bodily arousal, and behavioral preparation. This working paper asks whether imagination should therefore be studied not merely as fantasy, but as a biologically consequential representational system: an internal capacity through which absent possibilities become experientially present enough to influence the organism. It further asks where imaginative content originates, how deliberate imagery differs from intrusive or spontaneous imagery, and whether intervening at the level of imagination could alter downstream cognitive, emotional, physiological, linguistic, and behavioral processes associated with mental-health symptoms.

## Author's Note

I am developing a broader methodology concerned with the convergence of mind, soul, physical body, and spirit. In my public teaching I use the phrase “imagination is the technology” to describe the extraordinary human capacity to internally represent what is not physically present and nevertheless experience consequences from that representation. This paper does not assume that imagination alone causes mental illness, nor does it treat spiritual causation as scientifically established. It asks whether imagination is an underexamined intervention point and whether current scientific categories fully account for the origin, force, and consequences of all imaginative content.

## The Central Proposition

The proposition under examination is that imagination may function as an interface between information and embodiment. A person can picture danger while physically safe and experience fear. A memory can become vivid enough to alter breathing, muscle tension, attention, and emotion. An anticipated future can influence present behavior. Conversely, imagery involving safety, hope, prayer, successful action, attachment, or recovery may change the way a person feels and behaves in the present.

If an internally represented event can recruit measurable psychological and biological responses, then imagination is not biologically inert. The phrase “imagination is the technology” is therefore offered as a conceptual hypothesis: imagination may be an endogenous representational system capable of converting internally represented information into downstream effects in the organism.

## Where Does an Imagination Come From?

The difficult question is not whether human beings can deliberately imagine. They clearly can. A person can intentionally picture a house, rehearse a conversation, remember a face, envision a goal, or construct a fictional scene. But consciousness also contains material that was not consciously requested: intrusive images, unwanted thoughts, spontaneous associations, traumatic memories, catastrophic simulations, dreams, sudden ideas, and mental content that may conflict with a person’s values or intentions.

This suggests an important distinction between deliberately producing a mental representation and experiencing a mental representation. Not everything appearing within consciousness is deliberately authored.

That observation does not establish an external or supernatural source. Neurocognitive processes, memory, predictive processing, threat detection, associative learning, trauma, environmental suggestion, culture, sensory cues, and other mechanisms can all contribute to spontaneous content. Yet the subjective distinction between intentional and unbidden content remains worthy of careful study.

## A Proposed Imagination Cascade

This paper proposes a provisional sequence for investigation: source or input -> imaginative representation -> cognitive elaboration -> emotional and physiological response -> language -> behavior -> reinforcement.

The sequence is not proposed as universal. Thoughts can occur without imagery, emotion can precede conscious interpretation, and psychiatric conditions are complex and multiply determined. The narrower hypothesis is that, in some symptom episodes, an image or internally simulated possibility may occur early enough in the cascade to become a clinically meaningful intervention point.

If a threatening image is repeatedly attended to, rehearsed, interpreted as true, and emotionally embodied, could it strengthen a maladaptive cycle? Conversely, if the representation is recognized early, evaluated, interrupted, distanced from, rescripted, or replaced, could the downstream response change?

## The Biological Question

Mental imagery research provides a scientific basis for asking this question. Imagined events can overlap with perceptual and emotional systems, and imagery is clinically relevant to conditions including anxiety, trauma-related disorders, depression, obsessive phenomena,

addiction, and psychosis. Imagery-based interventions, including imagery rescripting, already investigate whether changing internally represented scenes can alter distress and meaning.

The larger research question is whether repeated patterns of imagination can influence autonomic activity, stress physiology, learning, expectation, emotional regulation, neural plasticity, and behavior strongly enough to contribute to the maintenance or reduction of psychiatric symptoms.

## **Biblical Attention to the Interior Life**

Biblical literature repeatedly treats internal attention as consequential. Philippians 4:8 directs attention toward what is true, noble, just, pure, lovely, commendable, virtuous, and praiseworthy. Second Corinthians 10:5 speaks of casting down imaginations or arguments and taking thoughts captive. Romans 12:2 describes transformation through the renewing of the mind. Genesis 6:5 refers to the imagination of the thoughts of the heart.

These texts should not simply be translated into modern neuroscience. They arise from theological contexts and make theological claims. But they create an interdisciplinary question worth preserving: could biblical practices involving meditation, attention, thought discipline, prayer, and the rejection or replacement of particular mental content interact with mechanisms that psychology and neuroscience can independently observe?

## **The Question of Source**

At least four explanatory domains should remain distinguishable. A neurocognitive account examines spontaneous brain activity, memory, salience, prediction, and associative processes. A psychological account examines trauma, schemas, conditioning, attachment, expectation, and learned meaning. An environmental account examines media, interpersonal influence, sensory information, culture, and suggestion. A theological account allows for the possibility that some mental content may be understood within Christian anthropology as influenced by God, other persons, or spiritual agents.

A rigorous inquiry should not collapse these categories into one another. Scientific evidence may identify mechanisms without resolving metaphysical origin. Theological interpretation may propose meanings that are not directly testable by laboratory methods. The task is to determine what can be measured, what can be compared, and where explanatory limits remain.

## **Primary Research Questions**

1. What neural and cognitive processes distinguish deliberate imagination from spontaneous or intrusive mental imagery?
2. To what extent does vivid imagination recruit systems also involved in perception, emotion, autonomic regulation, and behavioral preparation?
3. Can repeated mental imagery measurably alter stress responses, affective states, learning, expectation, neural functioning, or behavior?

4. What role does intrusive imagery play in anxiety, depression, PTSD, obsessive-compulsive phenomena, psychosis, addiction, and other psychiatric presentations?
5. During symptom escalation, does mental imagery sometimes precede measurable cognitive, emotional, or physiological changes?
6. Can individuals be trained to recognize maladaptive imagery before extensive cognitive elaboration occurs?
7. Does interrupting, distancing from, rescripting, or replacing maladaptive imagery reduce downstream symptoms?
8. Is imagery-focused intervention more effective when it occurs early in a symptom cascade?
9. Can repeated constructive imagery produce durable changes in emotional regulation, behavior, physiology, or symptom severity?
10. What is currently known about the origin of spontaneous thoughts and images that individuals do not consciously intend to generate?
11. How reliably can people distinguish deliberately generated imagery from spontaneous mental content?
12. How should researchers investigate reports that particular thoughts or images feel “not generated by me” without prematurely classifying those experiences as either supernatural phenomena or psychopathology?
13. Are biblical practices involving meditation, attention, thought discipline, prayer, and replacement of mental content comparable to established psychological mechanisms?
14. Could deliberate regulation of imaginative content serve as an early intervention before a maladaptive representation develops into sustained cognition, physiological arousal, emotional dysregulation, speech, or behavior?

## A Testable Intervention Model

One possible experimental model would identify participants who experience recurrent distressing imagery and measure the sequence of imagery, appraisal, emotion, physiology, and behavior in real time. Participants could then be trained in an imagery-level intervention: noticing the representation, labeling it as mental content, evaluating its meaning, interrupting elaboration, and deliberately generating an alternative representation. Outcomes could include symptom intensity, duration, physiological arousal, recurrence, functional behavior, and longer-term symptom burden.

Such research would not test whether every destructive imagination has a spiritual source. It could test the more immediate proposition that changing imaginative content changes downstream responses. The question of ultimate source would remain a separate philosophical and theological inquiry unless independently measurable evidence allowed stronger conclusions.

## Central Hypothesis

The central hypothesis of this working paper is that imagination may constitute an important interface between internally or externally supplied information and downstream biological, emotional, cognitive, and behavioral responses. If mental representations can recruit physiological and neural systems in the absence of the represented event, then imagination is not merely fantasy. It is biologically consequential information.

The clinical implication is significant: if maladaptive imaginative representations contribute to some psychiatric symptom cascades, learning to recognize, evaluate, interrupt, and deliberately redirect those representations may provide an earlier intervention point than attempting to regulate emotion or behavior after the cascade is already underway.

The theological implication raises a separate question: if Scripture repeatedly instructs human beings to govern what they attend to, meditate upon, imagine, believe, and mentally entertain, might these instructions concern a faculty whose biological significance can also be investigated scientifically?

## Research Boundaries

This paper does not propose that mental illness can universally be reversed through imagination, positive thinking, prayer, or thought control. Psychiatric symptoms can arise from multiple biological, psychological, social, developmental, medical, and environmental factors. Nor should involuntary thoughts or images be treated as evidence of moral failure or spiritual influence merely because they are unwanted. The research question is narrower: whether mental imagery is a biologically consequential process that can contribute to some symptom pathways and whether earlier intervention at that level can improve outcomes.

## Working Proposition

Imagination may be understood as a human representational technology: a capacity through which what is absent can become experientially present enough to affect the body, emotions, cognition, language, and action. The next research task is to determine how far that proposition can be demonstrated, where its limits lie, and whether governing imaginative content can become a measurable component of mental-health intervention.