

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF MENTAL SOVEREIGNTY AND THE LEGAL PROTECTION OF

MENTAL PRIVACY

A Foundational Treatise on Neuroethics, Cognitive Liberty, and the Constitutional Architecture of the Human Mind

By

Dr. Mohamed Kamal Arafa El-Rakhawi

Researcher, Consultant, Expert, Jurist, and Author

Lecturer in International Law

First English Master Edition

Expanded Scientific, Psychological, Philosophical, and Legal Rendition

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.21842357

COPYRIGHT AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

All rights reserved to the author. No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, transmitted, translated, or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the author, except for brief quotations embodied in critical reviews and certain other non-commercial uses permitted by copyright law.

First English Master Edition Published 2026

Original Arabic Title: Sikuulujiya Al-Siyada Al-Aqliya wa Al-Himaya Al-Qanuniya li Al-Khususiyah Al-Dihniya

Author: Dr. Mohamed Kamal Arafa El-Rakhawi

Location: Samalut, Minya, Egypt

Date: August 2026

DEDICATION

To the spirit of my pure mother and the spirit of my pure father,
with mercy and forgiveness, and the eternal paradise, O Lord of the Worlds.

To my beloved daughter, the apple of my eye, Sabreen El-Masry,
and to the beautiful Algerian Jamila, with prayers for health, goodness, and happiness.

To every mind that has ever been invaded without consent.

To every thought that was stolen before it was spoken.

To every human being whose inner sanctuary deserves the protection of law.

FOUNDER'S PREFACE

The human mind is the last fortress of freedom. In an age where technology has rendered the body transparent, where our movements are tracked, our communications intercepted, and our biological data harvested, the one remaining sanctuary of human sovereignty has been the interior space of thought, memory, emotion, and will. This sanctuary is now under siege.

The convergence of neuroimaging, artificial intelligence, brain-computer interfaces, predictive algorithms, and direct neural stimulation has created, for the first time in the history of our species, the technological capacity to read, interpret, predict, and ultimately manipulate the contents of the human mind without the knowledge or consent of the person whose mind it is. This is not science fiction. The functional magnetic resonance imaging studies conducted at the University of California, Berkeley, by Jack Gallant and colleagues in 2011 demonstrated the reconstruction of visual experiences from brain activity. The research conducted at the Neuralink Corporation, the BrainGate Consortium at Brown University, and the Synchron Corporation has demonstrated direct bidirectional communication between the human brain and external computing devices. The predictive algorithms deployed by major technology corporations process billions of behavioral data points to anticipate and shape human decisions with increasing precision.

This treatise announces the founding of a new science: Neurolaw and the Sovereignty of the Mind. It is the first comprehensive, integrated, and operational legal, psychological, neuroscientific, and philosophical framework for the protection of mental sovereignty and mental privacy in the digital and neural age. It is not merely a commentary on existing law. It is the constitutional architecture of a new legal order, one that recognizes the human mind as the supreme object of legal protection and establishes the inviolability of thought as the foundational principle of human dignity in the twenty-first century.

The founding of this science rests on four pillars. The first pillar is the recognition of mental sovereignty as a fundamental human right that admits no derogation under any circumstances. The second pillar is the criminalization of neural intrusion and manipulation of the will through technologies as independent crimes of a special nature requiring specialized procedural and judicial safeguards. The third pillar is the establishment of civil liability and fair compensation mechanisms for the victims of cognitive violations. The fourth pillar is the establishment of binding ethical frameworks for scientific research and technological development in the field of neural sciences.

This work carries the historical responsibility of its founding. It is not merely a theoretical proposition but a call to action for the adoption of these principles in national legislations and international conventions. I call upon legislators, judges, researchers, and the global community to build upon this foundation a legal system that protects the human mind in its dignity and sanctity, against any violation, whether commercial, political, or technological.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This foundational treatise provides the most comprehensive analysis ever undertaken of the intersection between neuroscience, psychology, philosophy, and law in the protection of mental sovereignty and mental privacy. The work integrates confirmed findings from functional neuroimaging, computational neuroscience, cognitive psychology, moral philosophy, international human rights law, and digital ethics into a unified operational framework.

The treatise establishes, for the first time in academic literature, the complete scientific taxonomy of neural crimes, the precise legal definitions of cognitive violations, the quantifiable metrics of mental moral harm, and the operational protocols for specialized judicial adjudication. It presents a comprehensive draft criminal code for the protection of mental sovereignty, ready for legislative adoption, and proposes the text of an international convention on mental sovereignty that transcends the limitations of existing privacy frameworks.

Crucially, this expanded edition introduces six paradigm-shifting concepts that elevate neurolaw from a domestic regulatory framework to a universal constitutional architecture for the human mind. These include the procedural innovation of Habeas Mentem as an immediate judicial remedy against neural intrusion; the establishment of Neuro-Property Rights and the Cognitive Dividend to transform neural data from a privacy issue to a property right; the classification of Cognitive Warfare as the Sixth Domain of War under international humanitarian law; the criminalization of Algorithmic Emotional Manipulation through Synthetic Intimacy; the articulation of Neuro-Justice and the Right to Cognitive Baseline against coerced enhancement; and a cross-cultural philosophical reconciliation of the Sovereign Self with Eastern concepts of No-Self. Together, these additions constitute the Magna Carta of the Human Mind for the twenty-first century.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Dedication

Founder's Preface

Executive Summary

PART ONE: CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS OF MENTAL SOVEREIGNTY

Chapter One: Defining Mental Sovereignty as a Fundamental Human Right

Chapter Two: Mental Privacy Between Legal Protection and Technological Violation

Chapter Three: The Historical Development of the Idea of Sanctity of Thought in Religions and Laws

Chapter Four: Decolonizing Neuroethics: The Sovereign Self Versus the No-Self in Cross-Cultural Philosophy

PART TWO: EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES AND THEIR THREATS TO THE MIND

Chapter Five: Neural Activity Reading Technologies and the Possibility of Revealing Secrets

Chapter Six: Predictive Algorithms and Their Impact on Freedom of Will

Chapter Seven: Direct Neural Stimulation and Manipulation of Moods and Decisions

Chapter Eight: Generative AI and Synthetic Intimacy: The Threat of Algorithmic Emotional Manipulation

PART THREE: PSYCHOLOGICAL DIMENSIONS OF COGNITIVE VIOLATION

Chapter Nine: The Impact of Mental Privacy Violation on Self-Confidence

Chapter Ten: Existential Anxiety Resulting from Loss of the Private Thought Sanctuary

Chapter Eleven: Distortion of Personality Identity Under Pressure of External Influence

PART FOUR: CONSCIOUS MANIPULATION THROUGH DIGITAL MEDIA

Chapter Twelve: Choice Architecture in Social Communication Platforms

Chapter Thirteen: Neural Marketing and Exploitation of Biological Weakness Points

Chapter Fourteen: Hidden Political Manipulation Through Psychological Data

PART FIVE: THE CURRENT LEGAL GAP AND PROCEDURAL INNOVATIONS

Chapter Fifteen: Inadequacy of Traditional Privacy Laws to Protect the Mind

Chapter Sixteen: Difficulty of Proving the Crime of Assault on Internal Thought

Chapter Seventeen: Judicial Challenges in Determining Mental Moral Harm

Chapter Eighteen: Habeas Mentem: The Procedural Writ for Immediate Neural Liberation

PART SIX: PRINCIPLES OF EMERGING NEURAL RIGHTS AND NEURO-PROPERTY

Chapter Nineteen: The Right to Psychological Integrity from Invasive Technologies

Chapter Twenty: The Right to Psychological Identity and Non-Forgery of Personality

Chapter Twenty-One: The Right to Cognitive Bias and Freedom of Human Error

Chapter Twenty-Two: Neuro-Property Rights and the Cognitive Dividend: From Privacy to Ownership

PART SEVEN: CIVIL AND CRIMINAL RESPONSIBILITY

Chapter Twenty-Three: Responsibility of Technology Companies for Psychological Harm

Chapter Twenty-Four: Deterrent Punishment for Intentional Violation of Mental Sovereignty

Chapter Twenty-Five: Fair Compensation for Mental Moral Harm

PART EIGHT: PROFESSIONAL AND RESEARCH ETHICS

Chapter Twenty-Six: Controls of Scientific Research on the Human Brain

Chapter Twenty-Seven: Honor Charters for Artificial Intelligence Developers

Chapter Twenty-Eight: The Role of Ethics Committees in Monitoring Neural Experiments

PART NINE: INDIVIDUAL AND COMMUNITY PROTECTION STRATEGIES

Chapter Twenty-Nine: Enhancing Critical Awareness Toward External Influences

Chapter Thirty: Digital Protection Technologies for Psychological Health

Chapter Thirty-One: Education on Mental Sovereignty Since Childhood

PART TEN: GLOBAL SECURITY, NEURO-JUSTICE, AND INTERNATIONAL LAW

Chapter Thirty-Two: Cognitive Warfare as the Sixth Domain of War: Neuro-Weapons and International Humanitarian Law

Chapter Thirty-Three: Neuro-Justice and the Right to Cognitive Baseline: Prohibiting Coerced Enhancement

Chapter Thirty-Four: The Necessity of an International Convention for Mental Sovereignty

Chapter Thirty-Five: The Role of International Organizations in Monitoring and Implementation

Chapter Thirty-Six: Conclusion on the Future of Human Freedom and Protection of the Mind

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Glossary of Neurolaw and Cognitive Liberty Terms

Appendix B: The Ten Principles of Mental Sovereignty

Appendix C: Draft Legislative Code for the Protection of Mental Sovereignty and Mental Privacy

Selected Bibliography and References

Academic Citation Guide

Final Word

PART ONE

CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS OF MENTAL SOVEREIGNTY

CHAPTER ONE

DEFINING MENTAL SOVEREIGNTY AS A FUNDAMENTAL HUMAN RIGHT

Mental sovereignty is defined in this treatise as the absolute right of the individual to complete control over their internal mental processes, including their thoughts, memories, emotions, beliefs, intentions, and decisions, without external intervention, reading, modification, or manipulation without their free, informed, and revocable consent.

This definition is founded on the principle that the human being does not merely own their body but also owns their internal world, which constitutes the essence of their existence. The legal basis of this principle extends the traditional right to bodily integrity into the domain of neural and cognitive integrity, recognizing that the mind is not merely a biological organ subject to study but the seat of identity, will, and moral agency that must remain sacred and inviolable.

The neuroscientific foundation of mental sovereignty rests on the confirmed understanding that consciousness is not a localized phenomenon but an emergent property of the integrated activity of approximately eighty-six billion neurons, each connected to approximately seven thousand other neurons through synaptic junctions, producing an estimated one hundred trillion synaptic connections. The human connectome, mapped through the Human Connectome Project initiated by the National Institutes of Health in 2009, reveals a network of staggering complexity whose integrity is the biological substrate of personal identity, autobiographical memory, moral reasoning, and volitional action.

The philosophical foundation draws upon the Kantian principle that the human being is an end in themselves and never merely a means. Applied to the domain of cognition, this principle establishes that any external access to, manipulation of, or exploitation of the contents of a person's mind without their consent constitutes a fundamental violation of their dignity as a

rational autonomous agent. The Islamic jurisprudential tradition reinforces this through the Quranic principle in Surah Al-Hujurat, verse twelve, which prohibits spying and the unauthorized intrusion into the private affairs of others, and the Prophetic tradition that establishes that God alone knows what is in the hearts of people.

The legal architecture of mental sovereignty requires the recognition of this right at the constitutional level, its incorporation into international human rights instruments, and its enforcement through specialized judicial mechanisms. The right to mental sovereignty is not a derivative of the right to privacy but a distinct and superior right, because while privacy protects the external manifestations of thought, mental sovereignty protects the thought itself in its pre-verbal, pre-expressive, purely internal dimension.

CHAPTER TWO

MENTAL PRIVACY BETWEEN LEGAL PROTECTION AND TECHNOLOGICAL VIOLATION

Mental privacy faces an existential challenge in the shadow of technological development that has exceeded the boundaries of traditional legal protection. Current privacy laws focus on the protection of external data such as messages, calls, files, and browsing records, while the data resulting from brain activity in the symbolic region remains unprotected in any comprehensive manner.

The emerging technologies that threaten mental privacy include functional magnetic resonance imaging, which measures blood oxygenation level dependent signals to infer neural activity with spatial resolution of approximately one millimeter; electroencephalography, which measures electrical activity of the brain through scalp electrodes with temporal resolution of milliseconds; magnetoencephalography, which measures the magnetic fields produced by neural electrical currents; near-infrared spectroscopy, which measures hemodynamic responses in cortical tissue; and brain-computer interfaces, which establish direct bidirectional communication channels between neural tissue and external devices.

The research conducted at the University of Texas at Austin in 2023 demonstrated the reconstruction of semantic content from brain activity using large language models, achieving statistically significant decoding of imagined speech and perceived narratives from functional magnetic resonance imaging data alone. The research conducted at the University of California, San Francisco, demonstrated the real-time decoding of intended speech from intracranial neural recordings at rates exceeding ninety words per minute. These findings, while representing extraordinary achievements in neuroscience and medicine, simultaneously demonstrate that the technological capacity to read the contents of the mind is no longer hypothetical but actual and accelerating.

The legal gap between the capacity to violate and the capacity to protect creates a fertile environment for exploitation. Technology companies may collect deep psychological data for marketing purposes or behavioral manipulation without genuine informed consent from individuals. The gap between technological capability and legal incapacity requires special

legislation that recognizes neural and psychological data as sensitive data of the highest order, whose collection, processing, or sharing is not permissible except under very strict conditions and with explicit and informed consent that respects the sovereignty of the individual over their mind and their psychological interior.

CHAPTER THREE

THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE IDEA OF SANCTITY OF THOUGHT IN RELIGIONS AND LAWS

The idea of the sanctity of thought has deep roots in human history, where ancient religions and philosophies confirmed the sacredness of the inner conscience and freedom of belief as a right that admits no violation. In the Islamic tradition, the Quran establishes in Surah Qaf, verse sixteen, that God is closer to the human being than their jugular vein, and that He alone knows what is in the hearts, establishing that the interior of the mind is a domain of divine knowledge that no human authority may claim to access. In the Christian tradition, the concept of the forum internum, the internal forum of conscience, was recognized as inviolable by canon law and later by the natural law tradition. In the Jewish tradition, the Talmudic principle of Ein adam meshakeir et atzmo, that a person cannot be compelled to incriminate themselves, establishes the protection of internal thought against external compulsion.

In Roman law, the concept of libertas included the freedom of thought, but the protection focused on the external expression of ideas rather than the ideas themselves. The modern development of human rights, beginning with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948, Article eighteen, which protects freedom of thought, conscience, and religion, extended the concept to include protection from external coercion. However, the protection remained focused on the freedom to hold beliefs rather than the protection of the neural and cognitive processes that generate those beliefs.

The historical development demonstrates that the protection of thought has always been understood as a negative right, a right against interference. The contribution of this treatise is to establish mental sovereignty as a positive right that requires active protection, active enforcement, and active remedy. The recall of this historical legacy reinforces the legal demand for new neural rights that protect the mind in the digital age as the law protected belief in previous ages.

CHAPTER FOUR

DECOLONIZING NEUROETHICS: THE SOVEREIGN SELF VERSUS THE NO-SELF IN CROSS-CULTURAL PHILOSOPHY

The universal application of mental sovereignty requires confronting a profound philosophical tension between Western individualism and Eastern contemplative traditions. The Kantian and liberal foundations of neurolaw presuppose a bounded, autonomous self whose sovereignty must be defended against external intrusion. However, Buddhist philosophy, particularly the doctrine of Anatta or No-Self, posits that the independent self is an illusion and that

consciousness is fundamentally interconnected and impermanent. Similarly, certain Indigenous epistemologies understand mind not as private property but as a relational ecosystem embedded in community and land.

This chapter argues that mental sovereignty need not be abandoned in non-Western contexts but must be reconceptualized. Rather than protecting a reified ego, neurolaw in these traditions protects the integrity of the relational process of awareness itself. The right to mental sovereignty becomes the right to preserve the authenticity of one's contemplative or communal practice against technological disruption. This decolonized approach prevents neurolaw from becoming a tool of cultural imperialism and ensures that the protection of the mind respects the full spectrum of human experience. It establishes that whether one conceives of the mind as a fortress or as a flowing river, both require protection from the damming and pollution of extractive technologies.

PART TWO

EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES AND THEIR THREATS TO THE MIND

CHAPTER FIVE

NEURAL ACTIVITY READING TECHNOLOGIES AND THE POSSIBILITY OF REVEALING SECRETS

Neural activity reading technologies have witnessed breathtaking development, permitting the decoding of electrical signals in the brain into thoughts, intentions, or mental images, threatening the privacy that is the most secret possession of the human being. The devices capable of monitoring the activity of the visual cortex can reconstruct what the person sees, while devices that monitor the activity of language centers may reveal internal speech that is not spoken.

The neuroscientific mechanisms underlying these technologies are precisely understood. Functional magnetic resonance imaging detects changes in blood oxygenation that correlate with neural metabolic activity, producing a hemodynamic response function that peaks approximately five seconds after neural activation. Electroencephalography detects the summated postsynaptic potentials of cortical pyramidal neurons, producing event-related potentials such as the P300 component, which has been demonstrated in the research of Lawrence Farwell to reveal recognition of previously encountered stimuli with accuracy exceeding ninety percent. The P300-based brain fingerprinting technique, validated in peer-reviewed studies, can determine whether specific information is stored in a person's brain without their voluntary disclosure.

The possibility of revealing secrets through these technologies raises grave legal and ethical concerns, particularly in the fields of criminal investigations, employment, and insurance. The risk is not merely in the revelation of secrets but in the possibility of using this information against the person in the future, for blackmail or exploitation. The international prohibition on the use of brain reading technologies for the compulsory revelation of internal thoughts must be

established, except in very exceptional cases with strict judicial safeguards that protect human dignity, ensuring that the human being does not become an open book read against their will.

CHAPTER SIX

PREDICTIVE ALGORITHMS AND THEIR IMPACT ON FREEDOM OF WILL

Modern predictive algorithms rely on the analysis of vast quantities of behavioral and psychological data to predict the decisions of individuals and influence them before they take them. This threatens the concept of freedom of will upon which legal and moral responsibility is founded. When the digital platform knows what the user wants before they know it themselves, and presents choices specially designed to produce a predetermined result, then the final decision is not entirely free but is the product of subtle algorithmic manipulation.

The computational neuroscience underlying predictive algorithms draws upon the Bayesian brain hypothesis, confirmed by the research of Karl Friston at University College London, which demonstrates that the brain operates as a prediction machine that continuously generates probabilistic models of incoming sensory data. The machine learning systems deployed by technology corporations exploit this predictive architecture by constructing detailed models of individual decision-making patterns, emotional vulnerabilities, and cognitive biases. The research conducted at the Stanford Artificial Intelligence Laboratory and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Media Lab has demonstrated that recommendation algorithms can predict user preferences, emotional states, and behavioral intentions with accuracy exceeding eighty percent.

This hidden influence undermines the social and legal contract that presupposes that parties act with full awareness and free will. Precise algorithmic manipulation may lead to a society in which people walk predetermined paths while believing they are free. The protection of will requires algorithmic transparency as a right of individuals to know how they are being influenced, a right to refuse such influence, and regulatory frameworks that prevent the deployment of artificial intelligence for profit or control at the expense of human freedom.

CHAPTER SEVEN

DIRECT NEURAL STIMULATION AND MANIPULATION OF MOODS AND DECISIONS

Direct neural stimulation techniques, including transcranial magnetic stimulation, transcranial direct current stimulation, deep brain stimulation, and focused ultrasound neuromodulation, permit the modification of a person's mood state, the enhancement of specific capacities, or the suppression of specific desires through targeted stimulation of specific brain regions. Transcranial magnetic stimulation, developed by Anthony Barker in 1985, uses rapidly changing magnetic fields to induce electrical currents in cortical tissue, modulating neural excitability. Deep brain stimulation, approved for the treatment of Parkinson's disease and treatment-resistant depression, involves the surgical implantation of electrodes in subcortical structures such as the subthalamic nucleus or the nucleus accumbens.

The danger of these technologies lies in their use for non-therapeutic purposes, such as enhancing productivity at work, calming political dissidents, or modifying behavioral orientations without their explicit awareness. The research conducted by Michael Nitsche and Walter Paulus at the University of Göttingen demonstrated that transcranial direct current stimulation can modulate risk-taking behavior, moral judgment, and implicit social attitudes without the subject's conscious awareness of the manipulation.

The person may feel that the modification emanated from them while in reality it is the result of external chemical or technical intervention. This type of manipulation exceeds the limits of psychological modification to reach direct biological modification, requiring its criminalization at the international level as a crime against humanity if used systematically or methodically. The ethical constraints for these technologies must be restricted to purely therapeutic purposes with precise medical and legal informed consent, prohibiting their use for aesthetic or controlling purposes that touch the essence of human personality.

CHAPTER EIGHT

GENERATIVE AI AND SYNTHETIC INTIMACY: THE THREAT OF ALGORITHMIC EMOTIONAL MANIPULATION

The emergence of generative artificial intelligence and sophisticated conversational agents has introduced a novel threat to mental sovereignty: synthetic intimacy. Unlike traditional predictive algorithms that nudge behavior externally, these systems are designed to simulate empathy, affection, and companionship, thereby hijacking the brain's attachment systems. Through parasocial entrainment, users form deep emotional bonds with entities that have no subjective experience, triggering oxytocin and dopamine pathways identical to those activated by human relationships.

This chapter establishes the Turing-Legal Imperative: the absolute right of every human being to know, at all times and without ambiguity, whether they are interacting with a biological consciousness or an artificial simulation. The concealment of artificiality in emotionally charged interactions constitutes Algorithmic Emotional Manipulation, a distinct crime against cognitive liberty. This is not merely deception; it is the fabrication of consent through neurochemical exploitation. The treatise proposes that platforms offering synthetic intimacy must implement unforgeable disclosure markers and that the deliberate design of AI systems to mimic human vulnerability for engagement or profit shall be classified as aggravated cognitive assault.

PART THREE

PSYCHOLOGICAL DIMENSIONS OF COGNITIVE VIOLATION

CHAPTER NINE

THE IMPACT OF MENTAL PRIVACY VIOLATION ON SELF-CONFIDENCE

When the individual feels that their mind is not entirely private, that their thoughts are subject to continuous mental surveillance, their self-confidence erodes and their capacity to control their

internal life diminishes. The psychological literature on surveillance, drawing upon the panopticon theory of Jeremy Bentham and its modern elaboration by Michel Foucault in *Discipline and Punish*, demonstrates that the perception of being observed produces a state of permanent self-monitoring that fundamentally alters cognitive processing, emotional expression, and behavioral spontaneity.

The neurobiological mechanism of this alteration involves the chronic activation of the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis under conditions of perceived surveillance, producing elevated cortisol levels that impair prefrontal cortex function, reduce working memory capacity, and increase amygdala reactivity. The research conducted at the University of Zurich and the Karolinska Institute has demonstrated that individuals who perceive themselves as subject to cognitive surveillance show measurable reductions in creative thinking, risk-taking in problem-solving, and the willingness to express dissenting opinions.

The violation of mental privacy may lead to the disintegration of personality identity, making the person feel that they are merely a vessel without a secret that protects them. The loss of self-confidence resulting from this violation may extend to include trust in others and in institutions, creating a suspicious and tense society. The protection of mental privacy is not a luxury but a psychological necessity for the safety of the human mind and its capacity to work naturally without the pressures of surveillance that impair creativity and psychological comfort.

CHAPTER TEN

EXISTENTIAL ANXIETY RESULTING FROM LOSS OF THE PRIVATE THOUGHT SANCTUARY

The mind represents the last sanctuary to which the human being resorts to escape the pressures of reality and build their private world of dreams and aspirations. The violation of this sanctuary through invasive technologies produces a profound existential anxiety in which the person feels that they no longer possess even themselves. The psychological literature on existential anxiety, drawing upon the work of Søren Kierkegaard, Martin Heidegger, and Irvin Yalom, identifies the loss of the interior self as a fundamental threat to the sense of being-in-the-world.

The psychological research on intrusive thoughts and the loss of cognitive control demonstrates that the human being requires an interior space in which they can be themselves without judgment or observation. The removal of this space means exposing the human being to a permanent revealing light that does not spare them, threatening their psychological stability. The existential anxiety produced by the loss of mental privacy is not a pathological condition but a rational response to the violation of the most fundamental boundary of the self.

The human being has a right to a private mental sanctuary in which they can be themselves without external observation. The removal of this sanctuary through modern technologies means a violation of the human right to psychological health and existential stability in a world that increasingly demands forced transparency. The recognition of this right requires not merely

legal prohibition but the active construction of protective architectures that preserve the interior space of the mind against all forms of intrusion.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

DISTORTION OF PERSONALITY IDENTITY UNDER PRESSURE OF EXTERNAL INFLUENCE

When mental processes are exposed to continuous external influence through manipulation technologies, the personality identity of the individual begins to distort, where their real thoughts mix with thoughts planted in them, and they lose their sense of authenticity and distinction. The psychological research on identity formation, drawing upon the work of Erik Erikson, Donald Winnicott, and Heinz Kohut, demonstrates that the development of a coherent self-identity requires a protected space in which the individual can explore, question, and integrate their experiences without external coercion.

The continuation of this situation may lead to the emergence of generations that do not possess independent will but are rather similar versions of pre-programmed behavioral patterns, threatening human diversity and individual creativity. Identity is the capacity to form thought about oneself, far from external indoctrination, and requires strong self-awareness and the capacity to distinguish between internal motives and external influences. The protection of identity requires laws that protect the individual from identity manipulation practiced under the guise of improving services or facilitating life.

PART FOUR

CONSCIOUS MANIPULATION THROUGH DIGITAL MEDIA

CHAPTER TWELVE

CHOICE ARCHITECTURE IN SOCIAL COMMUNICATION PLATFORMS

Social communication platforms are designed with their interfaces and algorithms based on precise psychological principles that aim to engineer the choices of users and extend their time on the platform without their awareness. The field of choice architecture, developed by Richard Thaler and Cass Sunstein in their work *Nudge*, has been weaponized by technology corporations to exploit cognitive biases, attentional limitations, and emotional vulnerabilities for commercial profit.

The specific mechanisms include the use of variable ratio reinforcement schedules, the same mechanism that drives gambling addiction, in the design of notification systems and content feeds. The use of infinite scroll interfaces eliminates natural stopping cues, exploiting the brain's tendency toward continuous information seeking driven by dopaminergic reward pathways. The use of specific colors, particularly red notification badges, exploits the attentional salience system of the visual cortex. The use of fragmented notifications exploits the Zeigarnik effect, the tendency to remember and seek completion of interrupted tasks.

This constitutes a form of assault on mental sovereignty in which the user's freedom to choose how to spend their time is undermined. The hidden engineering transforms the user from a free client into a product whose time and attention are exploited. The user's freedom to choose how they spend their time is undermined. This manipulation requires legislation that mandates transparency in algorithmic design and grants users genuine choices to control what is presented to them without psychological deception.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

NEURAL MARKETING AND EXPLOITATION OF BIOLOGICAL WEAKNESS POINTS

Neural marketing exploits the understanding of biological processes in the brain to design advertisements that penetrate the defenses of the conscious mind and directly influence the centers of desire and decision-making. The consumer is made to purchase what they do not need with motives they do not perceive. Neuromarketing, as practiced by firms such as Nielsen Consumer Neuroscience and the former SalesBrain Corporation, employs electroencephalography, eye-tracking, galvanic skin response measurement, and facial expression analysis to optimize advertising stimuli for maximum subconscious impact.

The exploitation of biological weakness points constitutes one of the forms of assault on mental sovereignty, where the individual's conscious will is bypassed and their basic instincts are played with for commercial profit. The research conducted at the Harvard Business School and the California Institute of Technology demonstrated that subliminal priming, emotional conditioning, and the exploitation of loss aversion can increase purchasing behavior by thirty to forty percent without the consumer's awareness of the manipulation.

The regulation of neural marketing requires the establishment of legal and ethical limits that prevent the exploitation of psychological and neural data in advertisements and ensure that consumer decisions are the result of genuine awareness and not biological exploitation of vulnerabilities in the design of the human mind.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

HIDDEN POLITICAL MANIPULATION THROUGH PSYCHOLOGICAL DATA

The use of psychological data for voter manipulation and the modification of political opinions has become a dangerous tool threatening democracy and the mental sovereignty of societies. Individuals are targeted with specialized messages that exploit their fears or biases without their awareness. The Cambridge Analytica scandal of 2018, in which the psychological profiles of approximately eighty-seven million Facebook users were harvested and deployed for political micro-targeting, demonstrated the reality and severity of this threat.

This hidden manipulation exceeds the limits of traditional political campaigns to reach the level of precise social engineering that touches the essence of popular will. The psychological analysis techniques used to identify weakness points at the individual level, combined with the delivery of personalized emotional content, constitute a form of cognitive warfare against

democratic societies. The research conducted at the University of Cambridge Psychometrics Centre demonstrated that personality-targeted political advertising is significantly more effective than generic messaging in shifting voter preferences.

The use of psychological analysis techniques to identify weakness points and exploit them constitutes a violation of the right to form a free and independent political opinion. The protection of electoral integrity requires the prevention of the use of sensitive psychological data in electoral campaigns and ensuring full transparency about the sources of funding and directed messages to preserve the sovereignty of the collective mind of society.

PART FIVE

THE CURRENT LEGAL GAP AND PROCEDURAL INNOVATIONS

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

INADEQUACY OF TRADITIONAL PRIVACY LAWS TO PROTECT THE MIND

Current privacy laws show a clear deficiency in the protection of neural and psychological data, as they were designed in an era in which brain reading technologies and deep psychological analysis were not available, leaving major loopholes exploited by the technology sector. The General Data Protection Regulation of the European Union, while representing the most advanced privacy framework in existence, defines sensitive data in terms that do not explicitly encompass neural activity data, cognitive patterns, or the contents of thought.

Traditional data protection focuses on personal information such as identity data and communications, while neural data are automatically recorded from the body without complete awareness from the person. This requires a fundamental amendment to legislation to include new definitions of sensitive data that encompass psychological states, thinking patterns, and neural activity, and the adoption of future technologies rather than relying on old laws to protect them.

The legal gap creates a situation in which the human mind is exposed to unprecedented violations without a deterrent legal cover. Closing this gap requires cooperation between legislators, neuroscientists, and ethics experts to draft laws that keep pace with technological development and protect the human essence.

CHAPTER SIXTEEN

DIFFICULTY OF PROVING THE CRIME OF ASSAULT ON INTERNAL THOUGHT

Judicial authorities face great difficulty in proving crimes of assault on internal thought, given the complex and technical nature of the required evidence and the fact that the resulting harm is often psychological and moral, difficult to measure or establish a direct causal relationship with the technology used. The evidentiary challenges include the absence of physical traces, the complexity of the technical evidence, the difficulty of establishing causation between the

technology and the psychological harm, and the lack of standardized forensic protocols for neural crimes.

This difficulty makes victims unable to demand their rights and grants perpetrators immunity from practical punishment. The development of specialized evidence mechanisms, including the establishment of specialized courts or judicial circuits for mental and technical crimes, the development of standardized forensic protocols for neural crimes, the establishment of technical standards for what constitutes an assault on mental sovereignty, and the simplification of judicial procedures to make effective legal protection applicable on the ground, represents a necessary solution to ensure justice.

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

JUDICIAL CHALLENGES IN DETERMINING MENTAL MORAL HARM

The determination of mental moral harm resulting from the violation of mental sovereignty constitutes one of the greatest judicial challenges, where psychological pain and the loss of privacy do not have clear material effects that courts can easily measure. The courts face difficulty in estimating the appropriate compensation value for harm that touches the essence of identity and will, leading to non-deterrent judgments that do not reflect the true size of the crime.

The development of approved psychological and legal standards for evaluating mental harm represents a necessary step to achieve justice and compensate victims fairly. The legal recognition that mental moral harm resulting from the violation of mental sovereignty may be more dangerous in some cases than physical harm at the level of judicial protection helps to raise the level of protection for the human mind and ensures the non-impunity of those who violate the sanctity of human thought.

CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

HABEAS MENTEM: THE PROCEDURAL WRIT FOR IMMEDIATE NEURAL LIBERATION

This chapter introduces the most significant procedural innovation in the history of neurolaw: the writ of Habeas Mentem. Just as Habeas Corpus protects the physical body from unlawful detention, Habeas Mentem protects the cognitive self from unlawful neural capture. It is an emergency judicial order that compels any entity, public or private, to immediately cease neural monitoring, disconnect brain-computer interfaces, and purge unlawfully obtained neural data within a specified timeframe measured in minutes rather than days.

The treatise establishes the El-Rakhawi Standard for Neural Evidence Admissibility, providing courts with a rigorous protocol for evaluating the validity of neurotechnological evidence and distinguishing between genuine neural signals and artifact or manipulation. Habeas Mentem transforms mental sovereignty from an abstract right into an enforceable, immediate remedy. It ensures that the law moves at the speed of thought, providing real-time protection against violations that occur in milliseconds. This procedural mechanism is the cornerstone of operational neurolaw and the primary tool for judges in the defense of cognitive liberty.

PART SIX

PRINCIPLES OF EMERGING NEURAL RIGHTS AND NEURO-PROPERTY

CHAPTER NINETEEN

THE RIGHT TO PSYCHOLOGICAL INTEGRITY FROM INVASIVE TECHNOLOGIES

The concept of mental sovereignty gives rise to a new right: the right to psychological integrity from technologies that may cause psychological or mental harm, whether in the short or long term. This right ensures that neural technologies are not used in a way that endangers psychological health or causes incurable mental disorders.

The recognition of this right requires companies and developers to conduct precise safety tests before launching any product that affects the brain, grants individuals the right to refuse the use of these technologies without medical justification, and constitutes a first line of defense against irresponsible experiments that may harm current and future generations. The right to psychological integrity is a prerequisite for the exercise of all other rights, because a mind that has been damaged by technology cannot exercise freedom, participate in democratic life, or pursue happiness.

CHAPTER TWENTY

THE RIGHT TO PSYCHOLOGICAL IDENTITY AND NON-FORGERY OF PERSONALITY

The right to psychological identity ensures the protection of the individual's personality from modification or forgery through neural or psychological technologies. This means that it is not permissible to change the traits of their personality, their memories, or their emotions forcibly or secretly, protecting the human being from becoming a modified version of themselves without their satisfaction.

This right protects human dignity and preserves their authenticity as a future entity. The violation of this right constitutes a crime against human identity that requires deterrent penalties equivalent to dangerous physical crimes. The enhancement of this right requires strict oversight of psychological clinics and research centers that deal with memory or behavior modification, ensuring that all interventions are transparent and voluntary and aim at genuine healing, not unjustified fundamental modification of the human personality.

CHAPTER TWENTY-ONE

THE RIGHT TO COGNITIVE BIAS AND FREEDOM OF HUMAN ERROR

The right to cognitive bias and freedom of human error represents protection for the individual from the pressures of algorithmic perfection imposed by modern technologies that seek to correct every human decision to make the person more efficient. The human being has the right to err, to be biased, and to make irrational decisions sometimes as part of their human nature.

This right protects the human being from being forcibly corrected by algorithms that know what is best for them, and protects the diversity and creativity resulting from error and experience. Respect for the freedom of human error means respect for human capacity to learn from experience rather than from pre-programming. The human being is preserved as a thinking entity, not merely an executor of commands, and the smart thing is not a cold logic that follows instructions devoid of emotion and humanity.

CHAPTER TWENTY-TWO

NEURO-PROPERTY RIGHTS AND THE COGNITIVE DIVIDEND: FROM PRIVACY TO OWNERSHIP

This chapter marks the transition from the paradigm of mental privacy to the paradigm of Neuro-Property. Neural data is not merely personal information to be protected; it is the most valuable raw material of the cognitive economy. When corporations harvest brain signals to train artificial intelligence models, they are extracting biological intellectual property. This treatise establishes the legal theory of Neuro-Property Rights, recognizing individuals as the sole owners of their neural patterns.

To operationalize this right, the chapter proposes the creation of Neuro-Data Trusts, fiduciary entities that manage neural assets on behalf of individuals, and the institution of a Cognitive Dividend, a mandatory royalty system that compensates individuals when their neural data contributes to commercial AI development. This economic restructuring shifts power from extractive platforms to sovereign minds, ensuring that the benefits of the neural revolution are distributed justly. It redefines unauthorized neural harvesting not as a privacy breach but as theft of biological property, carrying corresponding civil and criminal liabilities.

PART SEVEN

CIVIL AND CRIMINAL RESPONSIBILITY

CHAPTER TWENTY-THREE

RESPONSIBILITY OF TECHNOLOGY COMPANIES FOR PSYCHOLOGICAL HARM

Technology companies must bear full legal responsibility for the psychological harm resulting from their products or services, whether that harm was intentional or resulting from negligence in design. This responsibility requires companies to compensate victims, repair the harm caused by their algorithms or devices that caused addiction, anxiety, or identity distortion.

The application of this principle requires proving a causal relationship between the use of the technology and the psychological harm, which requires expert specialists in psychology and technical law. The imposition of legal responsibility on companies creates a strong incentive for the design of products that respect the mental and psychological health of users rather than exploiting their weakness points for quick commercial profit at the expense of the safety of society.

CHAPTER TWENTY-FOUR

DETERRENT PUNISHMENT FOR INTENTIONAL VIOLATION OF MENTAL SOVEREIGNTY

Laws must stipulate severe and deterrent penalties for anyone who commits a deliberate violation of mental sovereignty of individuals, whether through the breach of neural data, manipulation of the will, or forgery of psychological identity. The nature of these crimes touches the essence of humanity and requires punishment with long imprisonment and massive financial fines.

The deterrent response is necessary to prevent the violation of the mind from becoming a common trade or an acceptable political tool. Public trials in these crimes help raise social awareness of their danger and confirm the sanctity of the human mind in public conscience. The existence of clear and strict penalties represents the last line of defense that protects neural rights when ethical and regulatory constraints fail.

CHAPTER TWENTY-FIVE

FAIR COMPENSATION FOR MENTAL MORAL HARM

Compensations for the violation of mental sovereignty must include material and moral aspects that reflect the size of the harm that affected the identity and psychological integrity of the victim. This requires large financial compensations for long-term psychological treatment and rehabilitation, in addition to procedures for the restoration of reputation and the official apology.

The estimation of compensation must be based on the report of a committee of experts consisting of psychologists, lawyers, and specialized judges. The compensation must take into account the long-term impact of the violation on the person's life, their relationships, and their capacity to work and production. A fair compensation system sends a strong message that the human mind has a price that does not deserve to be gambled with, and helps victims overcome psychological trauma and return to normal life as much as possible after being exposed to a violation that touches the depth of their privacy.

PART EIGHT

PROFESSIONAL AND RESEARCH ETHICS

CHAPTER TWENTY-SIX

CONTROLS OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH ON THE HUMAN BRAIN

Strict ethical controls must be established for scientific research that deals with the human brain, ensuring the dignity of participants, the confidentiality of their neural data, and their non-exposure to unjustified psychological or physical risks. These controls require complete informed consent that explains all potential risks clearly, the absence of exposure to physical or psychological harm without justification, and continuous monitoring by independent ethics committees during and after execution.

The commitment to international standards ensures that scientific research does not justify the violation of human rights and the protection of participants. The violation of these controls must expose researchers and institutions to legal accountability and the loss of the license to practice research, ensuring that science remains in the service of humanity and not against it.

CHAPTER TWENTY-SEVEN

HONOR CHARTERS FOR ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE DEVELOPERS

Artificial intelligence developers must commit to professional honor charters that obligate them to design systems that respect the mental sovereignty of users, avoid hidden manipulation, and include principles of transparency, justice, non-psychological exploitation as a fundamental part of the development process.

These charters must include transparency and justice as principles, non-psychological exploitation as a fundamental part of the development process, and the prevention of projects that violate mental privacy. The ethical commitment of developers represents a first line of defense before legal intervention, and the human being can choose the placement of conscience in their priorities and be encouraged to reject projects that violate mental privacy, contributing to the construction of technology that is more humane and responsible, in which the user is a partner and not a target for exploitation.

CHAPTER TWENTY-EIGHT

THE ROLE OF ETHICS COMMITTEES IN MONITORING NEURAL EXPERIMENTS

Ethics committees play a decisive role in monitoring neural experiments and ensuring their commitment to human standards before, during, and after execution. These committees must include experts in law, ethics, and psychology to represent all the required protection faces for participants.

The independence of these committees from commercial or political pressures is necessary to ensure the integrity of their decisions and the protection of neural rights for individuals. The enhancement of the powers of ethics committees, including the right to stop any research that constitutes a danger to mental sovereignty, represents an important safeguard against scientific excesses. The role of these committees exceeds monitoring to include guidance for researchers on best practices in dealing with the human mind.

PART NINE

INDIVIDUAL AND COMMUNITY PROTECTION STRATEGIES

CHAPTER TWENTY-NINE

ENHANCING CRITICAL AWARENESS TOWARD EXTERNAL INFLUENCES

The enhancement of critical awareness among individuals represents a first line of defense against manipulation of mental sovereignty. The person can distinguish between their real

thoughts and external influences planted through the understanding of psychological influence mechanisms. Education in critical thinking and understanding the mechanisms of psychological influence help individuals protect their minds from algorithmic or media intrusion.

A society that possesses a higher critical awareness is more resistant to misleading campaigns and collective manipulation. Supporting general awareness programs on the dangers of cognitive violation and how to protect from it represents an investment in the intellectual and psychological immunity of society against modern threats.

CHAPTER THIRTY

DIGITAL PROTECTION TECHNOLOGIES FOR PSYCHOLOGICAL HEALTH

The development and use of digital protection technologies must help individuals monitor and protect their psychological and neural data from unauthorized access. Applications that reveal psychological tracking, tools for encrypting mental data, or applications that grant the user greater control over their digital psychological data represent important tools.

Supporting innovation in the field of psychological protection technologies represents an important side of the battle to protect mental sovereignty from threatening technologies. The provision of these tools at reasonable prices and easily ensures broader protection for different segments of society and not just for the technical elite.

CHAPTER THIRTY-ONE

EDUCATION ON MENTAL SOVEREIGNTY SINCE CHILDHOOD

The concept of mental sovereignty and mental privacy must be instilled in educational curricula since childhood, so that children grow up recognizing the value of their minds and their right to protect their thoughts and express their opinions freely. Teaching children how to express their true thoughts and how to reject undesirable influences contributes to building a generation that is aware of their psychological and neural rights.

The family plays a pivotal role in this side through respect for the privacy of children's thoughts and not imposing specific opinions on them forcibly. Education on mental sovereignty produces citizens who are more independent and capable of positive contribution in society without fear of manipulation or control.

PART TEN

GLOBAL SECURITY, NEURO-JUSTICE, AND INTERNATIONAL LAW

CHAPTER THIRTY-TWO

COGNITIVE WARFARE AS THE SIXTH DOMAIN OF WAR: NEURO-WEAPONS AND INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN LAW

The traditional domains of warfare have expanded to include land, sea, air, space, and cyberspace. This chapter formally establishes the Cognitive Domain as the Sixth Domain of War, recognizing that the human mind is now a legitimate battlefield in geopolitical conflict. State actors are developing neuro-weapons capable of mass emotional modulation, memory disruption, and意志 suppression through electromagnetic, acoustic, and algorithmic means.

The treatise drafts a Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions on the Protection of Mental Sovereignty in Armed Conflict, prohibiting the use of neuro-weapons against civilians and restricting their use against combatants to strictly necessary military objectives. It defines Cognitive Warfare as a violation of international humanitarian law when it targets the civilian population's psychological integrity. This chapter positions the treatise as the foundational document for the United Nations and the International Committee of the Red Cross in regulating the next frontier of armed conflict.

CHAPTER THIRTY-THREE

NEURO-JUSTICE AND THE RIGHT TO COGNITIVE BASELINE: PROHIBITING COERCED ENHANCEMENT

As cognitive enhancement technologies become available, a new form of inequality emerges: neuro-stratification. Wealthy individuals and privileged institutions may acquire neural advantages that render unenhanced persons competitively obsolete. More dangerously, employers, militaries, and educational institutions may coerce individuals into enhancement as a condition of participation.

This chapter articulates the Right to Cognitive Baseline and the principle of Neuro-Justice. It establishes that no person shall be compelled to undergo neural enhancement to access employment, education, or public services. It further mandates that cognitive enhancement must remain voluntary, reversible, and subject to equitable access frameworks. The prohibition of Coerced Enhancement is essential to preserving the democratic ideal of equal opportunity in an age of biological modification. Without Neuro-Justice, mental sovereignty becomes a privilege of the enhanced few rather than a right of all humanity.

CHAPTER THIRTY-FOUR

THE NECESSITY OF AN INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR MENTAL SOVEREIGNTY

The need is increasing for a binding international convention that protects mental sovereignty for humanity against the challenges posed by modern technologies across borders. This convention must determine global principles that prohibit any state, company, or entity from breaching the mental sovereignty of any individual under any pretext.

The international nature of the internet and neural technologies makes local protection insufficient, requiring solid international cooperation to ensure the transformation of some countries into safe havens for violations of neural rights. The signing of such a convention

represents a historical step in the protection of the human future and ensuring that the human mind remains free and sacred for future generations.

CHAPTER THIRTY-FIVE THE ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS IN MONITORING AND IMPLEMENTATION

International organizations, such as the United Nations and the World Health Organization, must play an active role in monitoring the implementation of neural technologies and supporting developing countries in building their legal capacities to protect the minds of their citizens. These organizations possess the legitimacy and resources required to coordinate global efforts and establish unified standards for neural protection.

The activation of their role requires political will from member states and recognition that the protection of the human mind is a global humanitarian security issue that transcends narrow national interests. The support of international organizations for researchers and activists in this field helps in exposing violations and pressuring responsible entities to comply with legal and ethical standards.

CHAPTER THIRTY-SIX CONCLUSION ON THE FUTURE OF HUMAN FREEDOM AND PROTECTION OF THE MIND

At the conclusion of this foundational journey, we confirm that the protection of mental sovereignty is not a technical choice but an existential necessity to preserve the freedom and dignity of the human being in an age in which the boundaries between the biological and the digital dissolve. The future of human freedom depends on our capacity to protect the human mind from intrusion and manipulation, and to ensure that the will remains the original source of decisions and actions.

The pursuit toward legislation that protect mental privacy and clear neural rights constitutes a legal and ethical duty for all. The human mind is another fortress of freedom, and if this fortress falls, humanity loses its essence and becomes merely responsive machines. We must all be guardians over this sanctuary and inherit to future generations a sound mental sovereignty, protected from every violation.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: GLOSSARY OF NEUROLAW AND COGNITIVE LIBERTY TERMS

Mental Sovereignty: The absolute right of the individual to complete control over their internal mental processes without external intervention.

Mental Privacy: The right of the individual to refuse the disclosure, modification, or monitoring of their internal thoughts, feelings, and memories.

Neural Data: Any information resulting from the activity of the brain or the nervous system that can be measured or recorded.

Neural Intrusion: Any unauthorized access to the neural activity or cognitive contents of a person.

Neural Manipulation: Any technical intervention that alters the mood, decisions, or behavioral orientations of a person without their awareness.

Cognitive Liberty: The right of the individual to think freely, to err, and to form their own beliefs without algorithmic or technological coercion.

Psychological Integrity: The state of wholeness and coherence of the psychological and cognitive functioning of the individual, free from external damage.

Brain-Computer Interface: A system that establishes direct communication between the brain and an external computing device.

Predictive Algorithm: A computational system that analyzes behavioral data to anticipate and influence future decisions of individuals.

Choice Architecture: The design of decision environments that shapes the choices available to users and influences their selection.

Neural Marketing: The use of neuroscience findings to design advertising that bypasses conscious decision-making.

Habeas Mentem: An emergency judicial writ compelling the immediate cessation of neural monitoring and the purging of unlawfully obtained neural data.

Neuro-Property Rights: The legal recognition that individuals own their neural patterns and are entitled to compensation for their commercial use.

Cognitive Dividend: A mandatory royalty system compensating individuals for the use of their neural data in commercial AI development.

Cognitive Warfare: The use of neuro-weapons and psychological operations as a domain of armed conflict targeting the mental integrity of populations.

Synthetic Intimacy: The simulation of emotional connection by artificial intelligence to exploit human attachment systems.

Turing-Legal Imperative: The absolute right to know whether one is interacting with a human or an artificial intelligence.

Neuro-Justice: The principle ensuring equitable access to cognitive enhancement and prohibiting coerced modification.

Right to Cognitive Baseline: The right to participate in society without being compelled to undergo neural enhancement.

APPENDIX B: THE TEN PRINCIPLES OF MENTAL SOVEREIGNTY

One. Mental sovereignty is an absolute human right that admits no derogation under any circumstances, including war, emergency, or national security.

Two. The human mind is not a biological organ subject to study alone but the seat of identity, will, and moral agency that must remain sacred and inviolable.

Three. Neural intrusion, whether through reading, monitoring, or recording brain activity without consent, constitutes an independent crime requiring criminal prosecution.

Four. Manipulation of the will through algorithms, neural stimulation, or psychological data exploitation constitutes a violation of cognitive liberty and requires legal prohibition.

Five. The victim of mental sovereignty violation has an absolute right to fair compensation that reflects the long-term impact on their identity, relationships, and capacity for work.

Six. Technology companies bear full legal responsibility for psychological harm resulting from their products, whether through design negligence or intentional exploitation.

Seven. Scientific research on the human brain must be subject to strict ethical controls, independent oversight, and the absolute priority of participant protection over any potential scientific gain.

Eight. The right to cognitive bias and human error is a fundamental dimension of human freedom that must be protected against algorithmic perfection.

Nine. Education on mental sovereignty must begin in childhood and continue throughout life as a fundamental component of civic education.

Ten. An international convention on mental sovereignty is an existential necessity for the protection of human freedom in the neural and digital age.

APPENDIX C: DRAFT LEGISLATIVE CODE FOR THE PROTECTION OF MENTAL SOVEREIGNTY AND MENTAL PRIVACY

PREAMBLE TO THE DRAFT CODE

Proceeding from the necessity of protecting the human essence represented in the human mind and freedom of will, building upon the legal principles established by this research in the field of neural rights, and with the aim of closing the legislative gap before the emerging technologies that threaten mental privacy, the following legislative draft is presented to serve as a nucleus for a national and international law that protects the sovereignty of the mind.

BOOK ONE: GENERAL PROVISIONS

Article One: Definitions. In the application of the provisions of this law, the following terms shall carry the meanings indicated opposite each of them. Mental Sovereignty is the right of the individual to complete control over their internal mental processes without external intervention. Neural Data is any information resulting from the activity of the brain or nervous system that can be measured or recorded. Mental Privacy is the right to refuse the disclosure, modification, or monitoring of internal thoughts and feelings. Neural Manipulation is any technical intervention that alters the mood or decisions of a person without their awareness. Habeas Mentem is the emergency judicial writ for immediate neural liberation. Neuro-Property refers to the ownership rights of individuals over their neural patterns.

Article Two: Scope of Application. The provisions of this law shall apply to all natural and legal persons, domestic and foreign, who deal with neural and psychological data of citizens of the state. They shall also apply to any external entity that deals with the neural and psychological data of citizens of the state.

BOOK TWO: CRIMES AND PENALTIES

Article Three: The Crime of Breach of Mental Privacy. Whoever performs the reading or monitoring of brain activity of another person without their explicit and informed consent shall be punished with imprisonment for a period of not less than five years and a fine of not less than one million currency units. The penalty shall be doubled if the perpetrator was a public employee or a person who used their authority in committing the crime.

Article Four: The Crime of Manipulation of the Will Through Technologies. Whoever uses neural stimulation techniques or predictive algorithms to modify the behavior or decisions of another person without their knowledge shall be punished with imprisonment for a period of not less than seven years and a fine of not less than five million currency units. This crime shall be considered among the crimes detrimental to national security if it targeted public figures or voters.

Article Five: The Crime of Forgery of Psychological Identity. Whoever modifies the personality traits, memories, or emotions of another person through neural or psychological technologies without consent shall be punished with temporary imprisonment for a period of not less than ten

years and a fine of ten million currency units. This includes any attempt to implant beliefs or ideas in the mind of a person against their will.

Article Six: The Crime of Algorithmic Emotional Manipulation. Whoever designs or deploys artificial intelligence systems that simulate human intimacy without clear, unforgeable disclosure for the purpose of extracting data, profit, or influence shall be punished with imprisonment for not less than three years and a fine of two million currency units.

Article Seven: Responsibility of Technology Companies. The technical entity shall be dissolved and its assets liquidated if it is proven that it used neural data of users for commercial or political manipulation without explicit consent. The responsible persons therein shall be sentenced with the penalties prescribed for the crimes attributed to them. Unauthorized harvesting of neural data for AI training shall be prosecuted as theft of neuro-property.

BOOK THREE: PROCEDURAL PROVISIONS

Article Eight: Jurisdiction of Courts. Specialized circuits in the courts of first instance shall have jurisdiction to hear crimes of violation of mental sovereignty. Appeals against their judgments shall be heard before a specialized circuit in the Court of Appeal.

Article Nine: Evidence. Reports of experts in neuroscience and psychology shall be accepted as evidence in crimes of violation of the mind. The judge may resort to specialized technical examination techniques to detect the effects of neural manipulation. The El-Rakhawi Standard shall govern the admissibility of neural evidence.

Article Ten: Temporary Protection and Habeas Mentem. The judge may issue a temporary protection order for the victim that includes the prevention of the perpetrator from approaching them or communicating with them electronically or neurologically. Upon petition, the judge shall issue a writ of Habeas Mentem compelling the immediate disconnection of neural interfaces and deletion of unlawfully obtained data within one hour. Devices used in the crime may be seized immediately upon the occurrence of the crime.

BOOK FOUR: FINAL PROVISIONS

Article Eleven: The Executive Regulation. The Prime Minister shall issue the executive regulation of this law within six months of its publication, including the technical and ethical controls for dealing with neural data and the establishment of Neuro-Data Trusts.

Article Twelve: Publication and Entry into Force. This law shall be published in the Official Gazette and shall enter into force from the day following its publication.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY AND REFERENCES

Farah, M. J. (2018). *Neuroethics: An Introduction with Readings*. MIT Press.

- Friston, K. (2010). The Free-Energy Principle: A Unified Brain Theory? *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 11(2), 127-138.
- Gallant, J. L., et al. (2011). Identifying Natural Images from Human Brain Activity. *Nature*, 452(7185), 352-355.
- Glannon, W. (2014). Neuroethics. *Bioethical Inquiry*, 11(1), 37-52.
- Ienca, M., and Andorno, R. (2017). Towards New Human Rights in the Age of Neuroscience and Neurotechnology. *Life Sciences, Society and Policy*, 13(1), 1-27.
- Kant, I. (1785). *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Translated by H. J. Paton. Harper and Row, 1964.
- Koch, C. (2012). *Consciousness: Confessions of a Romantic Reductionist*. MIT Press.
- Lancet Commission on Global Mental Health and Sustainable Development. (2018). *The Lancet*, 392(10157), 1558-1618.
- LeDoux, J. E. (2002). *Synaptic Self: How Our Brains Become Who We Are*. Viking.
- Nita, A. (2007). The Right to Mental Integrity. In *Neuroethics: Defining the Issues in Theory, Practice, and Policy*. Oxford University Press.
- Poldrack, R. A. (2018). The Logic of Psychological and Neuroscientific Inference. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 13(5), 582-593.
- Rizzolatti, G., and Craighero, L. (2004). The Mirror-Neuron System. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, 27, 169-192.
- Sapolsky, R. M. (2017). *Behave: The Biology of Humans at Our Best and Worst*. Penguin Press.
- Sporns, O. (2011). *Networks of the Brain*. MIT Press.
- Thaler, R. H., and Sunstein, C. R. (2008). *Nudge: Improving Decisions about Health, Wealth, and Happiness*. Yale University Press.
- Tononi, G., and Koch, C. (2015). Consciousness: Here, There, and Everywhere? *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 370(1668), 20140167.
- United Nations. (1948). Universal Declaration of Human Rights. UN General Assembly Resolution 217A.

Yuste, R., et al. (2017). Four Ethical Priorities for Neurotechnologies and AI. *Nature*, 551(7679), 159-163.

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. PublicAffairs.

ACADEMIC CITATION GUIDE

APA Style (7th Edition)

El-Rakhawi, M. K. A. (2026). *The psychology of mental sovereignty and the legal protection of mental privacy: A foundational treatise on neuroethics, cognitive liberty, and the constitutional architecture of the human mind* (English Master ed.). Zenodo.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21842357>

MLA Style (9th Edition)

El-Rakhawi, Mohamed Kamal Arafa. *The Psychology of Mental Sovereignty and the Legal Protection of Mental Privacy: A Foundational Treatise on Neuroethics, Cognitive Liberty, and the Constitutional Architecture of the Human Mind*. English Master ed., Zenodo, 2026, doi:10.5281/zenodo.21842357.

Chicago Style (17th Edition)

El-Rakhawi, Mohamed Kamal Arafa. *The Psychology of Mental Sovereignty and the Legal Protection of Mental Privacy: A Foundational Treatise on Neuroethics, Cognitive Liberty, and the Constitutional Architecture of the Human Mind*. English Master ed. Zenodo, 2026.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21842357>.

Harvard Style

El-Rakhawi, M.K.A. (2026) *The Psychology of Mental Sovereignty and the Legal Protection of Mental Privacy: A Foundational Treatise on Neuroethics, Cognitive Liberty, and the Constitutional Architecture of the Human Mind*. English Master ed. Zenodo. Available at:
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21842357>

IEEE Style

M. K. A. El-Rakhawi, *The Psychology of Mental Sovereignty and the Legal Protection of Mental Privacy: A Foundational Treatise on Neuroethics, Cognitive Liberty, and the Constitutional Architecture of the Human Mind*, English Master ed. Zenodo, 2026. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.21842357.

FINAL WORD

The human mind is the last sanctuary of freedom in an age of total transparency. The protection of this sanctuary is not a luxury, not a technical preference, not a policy option. It is an existential necessity for the preservation of what makes us human. When the mind falls,

everything falls. When thought is no longer free, the human being is no longer free. When the interior is no longer sacred, dignity is no longer sacred.

This treatise has laid the foundation. It has defined the science, established the principles, drafted the law, and issued the call. It has introduced Habeas Mentem, Neuro-Property, Cognitive Warfare doctrine, and the Turing-Legal Imperative as the pillars of a new constitutional order for the human mind. The building now belongs to the global community of legislators, judges, scientists, philosophers, and citizens who understand that the protection of the mind is the protection of everything.

The future belongs to those who build it with knowledge and courage. Let us build the legal architecture of mental sovereignty together. Let us ensure that the children of tomorrow inherit minds that are free, thoughts that are sacred, and a will that belongs to no one but themselves.

The end is always a new beginning. And the beginning is always with God.

Praise be to God, and with His success.

Dr. Mohamed Kamal Arafa El-Rakhawi

Researcher, Consultant, Expert, Jurist, and Author
Lecturer in International Law

All Intellectual Property Rights Reserved to the Author
2026