BRAIN, SELF, AND SOCIETY (FALL 2015)

PERS 2002 (CRN 88584)
MON & WED 12.00-12.50
PETIT SCIENCE CENTER 169

Nicole A Vincent

25 Park Place, 16th floor, Room 1617 *Brightspace email* or (404) 413-6113 **Office Hours:** Wednesday, 9am-noon

Description Advances in the mind sciences – especially in psychology, neuroscience, and behavioral genetics – as well as related fields like psychopharmacology and branches of medicine concerned with brain health, might have the potential to enhance our lives in two distinct ways.

First, by improving our understanding of our selves. With increasing frequency scientific discoveries in the mind sciences are claimed to correct our earlier, mistaken, pre-scientific views about ourselves. Science allegedly improves our understanding of our minds, of romantic love and affection, of happiness and sadness, and diverse things like sexuality, gender, empathy, memory, morality, responsibility, addiction, and mental illness. This might be valuable not only because it seems intrinsically good to hold true rather than false beliefs – especially when those beliefs are about our selves – but also because this could improve our ability to make better decisions about how to lead our lives, since it is surely better to base our decisions on facts rather than fictions.

Second, advances in the mind sciences and related fields might also enhance our lives by improving our ability to predict human behavior, or by delivering better (e.g. faster, more reliable, more powerful, and less costly) ways of shaping ourselves into better creatures. For instance, new brain modification techniques are claimed to hold out the promise of delivering not only better treatments for mental disorders, but also medical interventions that will help criminal offenders to reform themselves, to improve our ability to learn, remember, concentrate, and think, and allegedly even to make us more moral.

This course will: (1) introduce students to relevant empirical work in the mind sciences, (2) explain why neuro-enthusiasts claim that these scientific and technological advances have the potential to enhance our lives, (3) highlight problems and oversights with the neuro-enthusiasts' views and arguments by broadening the scope of our inquiry from a narrow focus on brains to a broader focus that includes the self of which the brain is only a part, and the societies that selves construct and inhabit, and (4) encourage students to develop their own views on this topic by providing a wide range of accessible audio-visual material (podcasts and videos) as well as short academic and non-academic articles, and through active participation in classroom debate.

Weekly readings are indicated on the *Class Schedule* and will be provided via *Brightspace*. Each week prepare by reading *all* items in GROUP A and read/watch/hear *at least one* item in GROUP B.

Attendance at classes is not compulsory but is highly recommended. Exams will relate to readings and material covered in classes so missing class will lower your grade.

Assessment is via two multiple choice exams, each worth 50%, using the grading scale below: **A+** 100-99% **A** 98-93% **A-** 92-90% **B+** 89-87% **B** 86-83% **B-** 82-80% **C+** 79-77% **C** 76-73% **C-** 72-70% **D** 69-60% **F** 59-0%

CLASS SCHEDULE

Week	Date	Component / Readings
		INTRODUCTION AND COURSE OVERVIEW
1	Aug 24	YOU, YOUR BRAIN, AND SOCIETY
	Aug 24	GROUP A: [1] Clausen J and Levy N (2015) "What Is Neuroethics", Handbook of Neuroethics,
	Aug 26	Springer, v-vii. [2] Nagel T (1987) "The Mind-Body Problem", What does it all mean?, pp 27-37.
	Aug 20	GROUP B: [1] Warburton N (2013) "Mind", Philosophy: The Basics, Routledge, 137-153. [2] VIDEO
		Dennett D (2011) "Consciousness and brains", Mar 28 http://youtu.be/m8cuAE3Os4o
2		HAPPINESS AND THE BRAIN
		GROUP A: [1] Nozick R (1974) "The Experience Machine", Anarchy, State, and Utopia, Basic Books,
		New York, NY. [2] Haybron D (2011) "Happiness", Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy, http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2011/entries/happiness
	Aug 31	GROUP B: [1] AUDIO Warburton N "Aristotle – Nicomachean Ethics" https://itunes.apple.com/us/podcast/
		philosophy-the-classics/id254465298?mt=2&i=84707289 [2] VIDEO Seligman M "The New Era of Positive
	Sep 2	Psychology" http://www.ted.com/talks/martin_seligman_on_the_state_of_psychology [3] ARTICLE Conklin B (2013)
		"The Role of the Brain in Happiness", Psychology Today, Feb 19 https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/in-
		the-face-adversity/201302/the-role-the-brain-in-happiness [4] AUDIO Zuckerman W (2015) "Science vs
		Happiness", ABC Radio, Feb 19 https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/in-the-face-adversity/201302/the-role-the-brain-in-happiness
	Sep 7	отапт-пт-парритезэ
3	NO CLASS	SADNESS AND THE BRAIN
		GROUP A: Kramer PD (1993) "Makeover", in <u>Listening to Prozac</u> , Viking Books, New York, NY, 1-21.
	Sep 9	GROUP B: Lehrer J (2008) "Is There Really an Epidemic of Depression?", Scientific American, Dec 4.
		LOVE AND THE BRAIN
		GROUP A: Aron A et al (2005) "Reward, Motivation, and Emotion Systems Associated With Early-
		Stage Intense Romantic Love", Journal of Neurophysiology, 94:327-337.
	Sep 14	BROUP B: [1] ARTICLE Anderson R (2013) "The Case for Using Drugs to Enhance Our Relationships
4	6 46	(and Our Break-ups)", The Atlantic. [2] VIDEO Helen F, "The brain in love" https://www.youtube.com/
	Sep 16	watch? v=OYfoGTIG7pY [3] AUDIO Jenkins CI (2015) "The romance of love", Philosopher's Zone, ABC
		Radio http://www.abc.net.au/ radionational/programs/philosopherszone/the-romance-of-love/6575658 [4] VIDEO Young LJ (2014) "The Chemistry Between Us: The Science of Love and Bonding", Brain Matters
		conference, Vancouver, Canada. https://youtu.be/9IAbYFRT9jY
		SEXUALITY AND THE BRAIN
		GROUP A: [1] Earp BD et al (2014) "Brave New Love", AJOB Neuroscience, 5(1):4-12. [2] ARTICLE
5		Vierra A (2015) "Born this way: How high-tech conversion therapy could undermine gay rights",
	Sep 21	The Conversation, April 21 https://theconversation.com/born-this-way-how-high-tech-conversion-therapy-could-
		undermine-gay-rights-40121 CROUD P. [1] AVDIO Fine C (2015) "Plinded by says gonder and the brain". Philosopher's Zone, ARC
	Sep 23	GROUP B: [1] AUDIO Fine C (2015) "Blinded by sex: gender and the brain", Philosopher's Zone, ABC Radio National http://www.abc.net.au/radionational/programs/philosopherszone/the-galaxy-of-gender/6563092 [2]
		AUDIO Zuckerman W (2015) "Science vs The Female Brain", ABC Radio https://soundcloud.com/science-
		vs/the-female-brain [3] AUDIO Zuckerman W (2015) "Science vs The Gay Gene", ABC Radio
		https://soundcloud.com/science-vs/the-gay-gene
6	Cor 30	MEMORY AND THE BRAIN
	Sep 28	GROUP A: [1] Glannon W (2006) "Psychopharmacology and memory", Journal of Medical Ethics,
	Cam 20	32:74-78. [2] Lonergan MH (2013) "Propranolol's effects on the consolidation and reconsolidation of long-term emotional memory in healthy participants: a meta-analysis", <i>Journal of Psychiatry and</i>
	Sep 30	Neuroscience, 38(4):222-231.
		ADVERTISING, PERSUASION, AND THE BRAIN
		GROUP A: [1] Stokes P (2015) "Brain Power", Acuity Magazine, Aug 1 http://charteredaccountantsanz.com/
7	Oct 5	en/Site-Content/Business-Trends-Insights/Acuity/August-2015/Brain-power.aspx [2] Waldron J (2014) "It's All for
		Your Own Good", The New York Review of Books, October 9 http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/
	Oct 7	2014/oct/09/cass-sunstein-its-all-your-own-good/
		GROUP B: Singer N (2010) "Neuromarketing: Making Ads That Whisper to Your Brain", New York Times, Nov 3 http://www.nytimes.com/2010/11/14/business/14stream.html
	Oct 12	REVISION CLASS FOR MID-TERM EXAM
8	Oct 12 Oct 14	MID-TERM EXAM (worth 50%)
<u> </u>	JCI 14	IND ILMA EARIN (WOLLI 50/0)

9	Oct 19 Oct 21	MORALITY AND THE BRAIN GROUP A: Roskies A (2006) "A case study of neuroethics: the nature of moral judgment" in J Illes (ed) Neuroethics: defining the issues in theory, practice, and policy, Oxford University Press, UK, 17-32. GROUP B: [1] AUDIO Crockett M (2012) "Brain chemistry and moral decision-making", Philosophy Bites, July 22 http://philosophybites.com/2012/07/molly-crockett-on-brain-chemistry-and-moral-decision-making- originally-on-bioethics-bites.html [2] AUDIO Sinnott-Armstrong W (2009) "Moral Psychology", Philosophy Bites, May 2 http://philosophybites.com/2009/05/walter-sinnottarmstrong-on-moral-psychology.html [3] AUDIO Churchland P (2012) "What neuroscience can teach us about morality", Philosophy Bites, Aug 3 http://philosophybites.com/2012/08/pat-churchland-on-what-neuroscience-can-teach-us-about-morality.html		
10	Oct 26 Oct 28	ADDICTION AND THE BRAIN GROUP A: Volkow N (2014) Drugs, Brains, and Behavior: The Science of Drug Addiction, NIDA https://d14rmgtrwzf5a.cloudfront.net/sites/default/files/soa_2014.pdf READ PAGES 3-28 GROUP B: [1] AUDIO Volkow N (2007) "No, really, this is your brain on drugs", NPR, Jul 10 http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=11847222 [2] ARTICLE Lewis M (2015) "Addiction is not a brain disease, and that's good news", The Huffington Post, Jul 2 http://www.huffingtonpost.com/marc-lewis/post_9729_b_7715792.html [3] VIDEO Hari J (2015) "Everything you know about addiction is WrOng", http://www.ted.com/talks/johann_hari_everything_you_think_you_know_about_addiction_is_wrong		
11	Nov 2 Nov 4	FREE WILL AND THE BRAIN GROUP A: [1] Nahmias E (2011) "Is Neuroscience the Death of Free Will?", New York Times, Nov 13 http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/11/13/is-neuroscience-the-death-of-free-will/ [2] Eagleman D (2011) "The Brain on Trial", The Atlantic http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/ 2011/07/the-brain-on-trial/308520/ GROUP B: [1] VIDEO Caruso G (2014) "The dark side of free will", Dec 9 https://www.youtube.com/ watch?v=rfOMqehl-ZA [2] AUDIO Vincent N (2015) "Taking Responsibility", Sunday Edition, CBC Radio, April 12 http://www.cbc.ca/radio/thesundayedition/valentina-tso-the-myth-of-military-intervention-online-namesake- writing-in-the-margins-being-responsible-1.3027812/taking-responsibility-1.3028030 [3] VIDEO Episode 1 of "Brains on Trial" http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o0eSqlAmKxU		
12	Nov 9 Nov 11	SMART DRUGS AND THE BRAIN GROUP A: [1] Farah MJ et al (2004) "Neurocognitive enhancement: what can we do and what should we do?", Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 5:421-425. [2] Bell SK et al (2012) "Lessons for Enhancement From the History of Cocaine and Amphetamine Use", AJOB Neuroscience, 3(2):24-29. GROUP B: [1] ARTICLE "Narcolepsy medication modafinil is world's first safe 'smart drug'", The Guardian, Aug 19 http://www.theguardian.com/science/2015/aug/20/narcolepsy-medication-modafinil-worlds-first-safe-smart-drug [2] AUDIO Buchanan A (2009) "Enhancement", Philosophy Bites, May 16 http://philosophybites.com/2009/05/allen-buchanan-on-enhancement.html		
13	Nov 16 Nov 18	SMART DRUGS AND SOCIETY GROUP A: [1] Santoni de Sio F et al (2014) "How cognitive enhancement can change our duties", Frontiers in Systems Neuroscience, Vol. 8, Article 131, 4 pages. [2] Santoni de Sio F et al (in press) "Why less praise for enhanced performance?", in F Jotterand and V Dubjlević (eds), Cognitive Enhancement: Ethical and Policy Implications in International Perspectives, Oxford University Press. GROUP B: [1] VIDEO Vincent N (2014) "Enhancement: the new 'normal'?", Apr 26 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0z7OJgUeGqk [2] ARTICLE Vincent NA and Jane EA (2014) "Put down the smart drugs: cognitive enhancement is ethically risky business", The Conversation, June 15. https://theconversation.com/put-down-the-smart-drugs-cognitive-enhancement-is-ethically-risky-business-27463 [3] Collins S (2015) "The New Normal", GSU Magazine, Summer Issue http://magazine.gsu.edu/article/the-new-normal/		
Thanksgiving Break: Nov 23-28				
14	Nov 30 Dec 2	BEYOND THE BRAIN GROUP A: Clark A & Chalmers D (1998) "The extended mind", <i>Analysis</i> , 58(1):7-19. REVISION CLASS FOR FINAL EXAM		
<u> </u>	Dec 8-15	FINAL EXAM (worth 50%)		
	DGC 9-12	FINAL EARIN (WOLUI 50%)		

Department of Philosophy General Syllabus Statement Fall 2015

- This syllabus provides a general plan for the course. Deviations may be necessary.
- The last day to **withdraw** from a course with the possibility of receiving a W is **Tuesday, October 13.**
- Students are responsible for confirming that they are attending the **course section** for which they are registered. Failure to do so may result in an F for the course.
- By University policy and to respect the confidentiality of all students, final grades may not be posted or given out over the phone. To see your grades, use PAWS.
- The customary penalty for a violation of the academic honesty rules is an "F" in the course. See the University Policy on Academic Honesty on the reverse of this sheet. Copying or using material from the internet without citation is a violation of the academic honesty rules.
- A student may be awarded a grade of "W" no more than 6 times in their careers at Georgia State. After 6 Ws, a withdrawal is recorded as a WF on the student's record. A WF counts as an F in a GPA.
- Your constructive assessment of this course plays an indispensable role in shaping education at Georgia State University. Upon completing the course, please take the time to fill out the online course evaluation.
- Students who wish to request accommodation for a disability must do so by registering with the Office of Disability Services in Suite 230 of the Student Center. Students may only be accommodated upon issuance by the Office of Disability Services of a singed Accommodation Plan and are responsible for providing a copy of that plan to instructors of all classes in which an accommodation is sought.

Subscribe to one of our department listservs for current information and events:

Undergraduate Students: www2.gsu.edu/~wwwphi/2131.html
 Graduate Students: www2.gsu.edu/~wwwphi/2109.html

For more information on the philosophy program visit: www.gsu.edu/philosophy

Policy on Academic Honesty, from the GSU Catalog

As members of the academic community, students are expected to recognize and uphold standards of intellectual and academic integrity. The university assumes as a basic and minimum standard of conduct in academic matters that students be honest and that they submit for credit only the products of their own efforts. Both the ideals of scholarship and the need for fairness require that all dishonest work be rejected as a basis for academic credit. They also require that students refrain from any and all forms of dishonor-able or unethical conduct related to their academic work.

The university's policy on academic honesty is published in the *Faculty Handbook* and *On Campus: The Student Handbook* and is available to all members of the university community. The policy represents a core value of the university, and all members of the university community are responsible for abiding by its tenets. Lack of knowledge of this policy is not an acceptable defense to any charge of academic dishonesty. All members of the academic community—students, faculty, and staff—are expected to report violations of these standards of academic conduct to the appropriate authorities. The procedures for such reporting are on file in the offices of the deans of each college, the office of the dean of students, and the office of the provost.

In an effort to foster an environment of academic integrity and to prevent academic dishonesty, students are expected to discuss with faculty the expectations regarding course assignments and standards of conduct. Students are encouraged to discuss freely with faculty, academic advisers, and other members of the university community any questions pertaining to the provisions of this policy. In addition, students are encouraged to avail themselves of programs in establishing personal standards and ethics offered through the university's Counseling Center.

Definitions and Examples

The examples and definitions given below are intended to clarify the standards by which academic honesty and academically honorable conduct are to be judged. The list is merely illustrative of the kinds of infractions that may occur, and it is not intended to be exhaustive. Moreover, the definitions and examples suggest conditions under which unacceptable behavior of the indicated types normally occurs; however, there may be unusual cases that fall outside these conditions that also will be judged unacceptable by the academic community.

Plagiarism: Plagiarism is presenting another person's work as one's own. Plagiarism includes any para-phrasing or summarizing of the works of another person without acknowledgment, including the submitting of another student's work as one's own. Plagiarism frequently involves a failure to acknowledge in the text, notes, or footnotes the quotation of the paragraphs, sentences, or even a few phrases written or spoken by someone else.

The submission of research or completed papers or projects by someone else is plagiarism, as is the unacknow-ledged use of research sources gathered by someone else when that use is specifically forbidden by the faculty member. Failure to indicate the extent and nature of one's reliance on other sources is also a form of plagiarism. Any work, in whole or in part, taken from the Internet or other computer-based resource without properly referencing the source (for example, the URL) is considered plagiarism. A complete reference is required in order that all parties may locate and view the original source. Finally, there may be forms of plagiarism that are unique to an individual discipline or course, examples of which should be provided in advance by the faculty member. The student is responsible for understanding the legitimate use of sources, the appropriate ways of acknowledging academic, scholarly or creative indebtedness, and the consequences of violating this responsibility.

Cheating on Examinations: Cheating on examinations involves giving or receiving unauthorized help before, during, or after an examination. Examples of unauthorized help include the use of notes, computer-based resources, texts, or "crib sheets" during an examination (unless specifically approved by the faculty member), or sharing information with another student during an examination (unless specifically approved by the faculty member). Other examples include intentionally allowing another student to view one's own examination and collaboration before or after an examination if such collaboration is specifically forbidden by the faculty member.

Unauthorized Collaboration: Submission for academic credit of a work product, or a part thereof, represented as its being one's own effort, which has been developed in substantial collaboration with another person or source or with a computer-based resource is a violation of academic honesty. It is also a violation of academic honesty knowingly to provide such assistance. Collaborative work specifically authorized by a faculty member is allowed.

Falsification: It is a violation of academic honesty to misrepresent material or fabricate information in an academic exercise, assignment or proceeding (e.g., false or misleading citation of sources, falsification of the results of experiments or computer data, false or misleading information in an academic context in order to gain an unfair advantage).

Multiple Submissions: It is a violation of academic honesty to submit substantial portions of the same work for credit more than once without the explicit consent of the faculty member(s) to whom the material is submitted for additional credit. In cases in which there is a natural development of research or knowledge in a sequence of courses, use of prior work may be desirable, even required; however the student is responsible for indicating in writing, as a part of such use, that the current work submitted for credit is cumulative in nature.