

NEUROETHICS (FALL 2015)

PHIL 4780 (88255) 4780 HONS (88256) 6780 (88257)
NEUR 4780 (89043) 4780 HONS (89044) **PSYC** 4780 (89528)
MON & WED 3.00-4.15PM ADERHALD 229

Nicole A Vincent

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

Neuroethics has two sub-fields: *neuroscience of ethics* and *ethics of neuroscience*. In ethics of neuroscience moral judgment is a tool used to investigate issues raised by neuroscientific research and its clinical applications, whereas in neuroscience of ethics moral judgment is itself the object of our investigation. So, for instance, while in ethics of neuroscience we might study how to deal with incidental findings from brain scans or the moral and social problems raised by "smart drugs", in neuroscience of ethics we might study how and where moral judgment is implemented and what factors can influence our moral views.

In this course, these two sub-fields of neuroethics shall be used to investigate how advances in the mind sciences – in particular, psychology, neuroscience, behavioural genetics, psychopharmacology, and relevant branches of medicine – bear on important topics such as intimate relationships, happiness, responsibility, competence, the self, personal identity, authenticity, and even liberty, equality, fairness, and justice.

Consider an example. Presuppositions about human nature inform what views we find compelling in moral and political philosophy, and what reasons we offer to support of our views. For instance, what we think love is and about whether and why it is valuable can influence how plausible we find the utilitarian requirement for impartiality – i.e. that everyone's pleasure should count equally in deciding how to act. Our views about how to live our lives are also influenced by human nature itself – not just by what we think our nature is, but by what it actually is. In particular, how our minds operate. For example, if we had been different kinds of creatures – perhaps ones who do not value intimate long-term bonds – then it may never have occurred to us to treat family and friends differently to strangers in the first place.

What human nature is like, and what we think it is like, are two things that have many implications for how we have reason to live our lives. But what if human nature turned out to be different to what we thought? Or what if it turned out to be more malleable than we ever imagined? Advances in the allied mind sciences have the potential to do both of these things. First, to improve our understanding of ourselves. Second, to deliver better tools with which to shape ourselves. This course will introduce students to the rich field of neuroethics, as well as demonstrate how its conceptual machinery can be employed to think about a range of important topics that bear on how to enhance the lives we live.

Assessment is via four components, each worth 25% of the final grade, using the following grading scale:
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%

COMPONENTS	4780 STUDENTS	4780 HONS STUDENTS	6780 STUDENTS	NOTES
10 in-class quizzes	score based on best 5 results	score based on best 6 results	score based on best 8 results	<i>Missed quizzes score -2.5% not 0%</i>
Paper 1	Length: 5 pages (excluding references)	Length: 6 pages (excluding references)	Length: 8 pages (excluding references)	<i>Topics ready: Sep 14 Due by: 9am, Sep 28 Grades ready: Oct 7</i>
Paper 2	Length: 5 pages (excluding references)	Length: 6 pages (excluding references)	Length: 8 pages (excluding references)	<i>Topics ready: Oct 26 Due by: 9am, Nov 9 Grades ready: Nov 27</i>
Final Exam (in-class)	Only short answer questions.	Short answer questions, and one long answer question.	Only long answer questions.	<i>Date, time & place: 3pm on Dec 2 in Aderhald 229. Questions cover topics from the entire course.</i>

In-class quiz answers will be collected in class. Submit Papers 1 and 2 via *Brightspace*. **Late submissions** reduce grades for that piece of assessment by 5% for each day or part thereof. If you submit something by email (which you shouldn't), it is your responsibility to ensure that I receive it by when it is due. Bring a blue book to the final exam. **Make up assessment** may be permitted subject to my approval, but requests must be made in advance, in writing, and substantiated by appropriate documentation (e.g. doctor's certificates). **Attendance** is not compulsory though it is highly recommended especially given the in-class quizzes.

Use ***Brightspace email*** for course-related questions. Please direct questions to my TA, Ms Jumana Morciglio (jmorciglio). If you get no response within 48 hrs, email her again. If you still get no response 48 hrs later, email me (nvincent). If problems persist then contact the secretaries in the Department of Philosophy.

Please contact **Disability Support Services** – details at <http://disability.gsu.edu/> – if you require special accommodations, and also advise me during the first week of class.

Student Evaluations Your constructive assessment of this course is indispensable, so please fill out the online course evaluation once you have completed the course.

Details in this syllabus can change. You are responsible for all changes announced in class.

CLASS SCHEDULE

There is no set textbook for this course. All material is provided on *Brightspace*. Some material may be removed or swapped or new material may be added, so please check *Brightspace* regularly. **GROUP A** contains material for *All Students*, and **GROUP B** contains additional material for *Hons & Grad Students*.

Week	Date	Component / Readings
1	Aug 24 Aug 26	INTRODUCTION AND COURSE OVERVIEW NEUROETHICS AND NEURO-INTERVENTIONS GROUP A: [1] Clausen J and Levy N (2015) "What Is Neuroethics", <i>Handbook of Neuroethics</i> , Springer, v-vii. [2] Roskies A (2002) "Neuroethics for the New Millenium", <i>Neuron</i> , 35:21-23. [3] Farah MJ (2007) "Emerging Ethical Issues in Neuroscience", in W Glannon (ed), <i>Defining Right and Wrong in Brain Science</i> , Dana Press, 19-36.
2	Aug 31 Sep 2	INTERVENING IN THE MIND GROUP A: [1] Levy N (2007) "Changing our Minds", <i>Neuroethics</i> , OUP, 69-87. [2] Clark A & Chalmers D (1998) "The extended mind", <i>Analysis</i> , 58(1):7-19.
3	Sep 7 NO CLASS Sep 9	MOOD ENHANCEMENT GROUP A: [1] Kramer P (1993) "Makeover", <i>Listening to Prozac</i> , Viking Books, 1-21. [2] Ravelingien A et al (2009) "Cosmetic Neurology and the Moral Complicity Argument", <i>Neuroethics</i> , 2(3):151-162.
4	Sep 14 Sep 16	LOVE AND ANTI-LOVE DRUGS GROUP A: [1] Earp BD et al (2013) "If I Could Stop Loving You", <i>The American Journal of Bioethics</i> , 13(11):3-17. [2] Aron A et al (2005) "Reward, Motivation, and Emotion Systems Associated With Early-Stage Intense Romantic Love", <i>Journal of Neurophysiology</i> , 94:327-337. [3] VIDEO Young LJ (2014) "The Chemistry Between Us" https://neuroethicscanada.wordpress.com/2014/07/23/the-chemistry-between-us-the-science-of-love-and-bonding/ [4] VIDEO Helen F, "The brain in love" https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OYfoGTIG7pY GROUP B: [1] Jenkins CSI (2015) "What is Love? An Incomplete Map of the Metaphysics", <i>Journal of the American Philosophical Association</i> , 1(2):349-364. [2] AUDIO Jenkins CI (2015) "The romance of love", <i>Philosopher's Zone</i> http://www.abc.net.au/radionational/programs/philosopherszone/the-romance-of-love/6575658
5	Sep 21 Sep 23	SEXUALITY AND CONVERSION THERAPY GROUP A: [1] Earp BD et al (2014) "Brave New Love", <i>AJOB Neuroscience</i> , 5(1):4-12. [2] Vierra A (2015) "Born this way: How high-tech conversion therapy could undermine gay rights", <i>The Conversation</i> , Apr 21 https://theconversation.com/born-this-way-how-high-tech-conversion-therapy-could-undermine-gay-rights-40121 GROUP B: [1] Greely HR (2012) "Direct Brain Interventions to Treat Disfavored Human Behaviors: Ethical and Social Issues", <i>Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics</i> , 91(2):163-165. [2] AUDIO Fine C (2015) "Blinded by sex: gender and the brain", <i>Philosopher's Zone</i> http://www.abc.net.au/radionational/programs/philosopherszone/the-galaxy-of-gender/6563092
6	Sep 28 Sep 30	MEMORY ALTERATION GROUP A: [1] President's Council on Bioethics (2007) "Better Memories? The Promise and Perils of Pharmacological Interventions", in W Glannon (ed) <i>Defining Right and Wrong in Brain Science</i> , Dana Press, 237-257. [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 Neuroscience</i> , 38(4):222-231. GROUP B: Erler A (2011) "Does Memory Modification Threaten Our Authenticity?", <i>Neuroethics</i> , 4(3):235-249.
7	Oct 5 Oct 7	MORAL ENHANCEMENT GROUP A: [1] Terbeck S et al (2012) "Propranolol Reduces Negative Racial Bias", <i>Psychopharmacology</i> , 222(3):419-424. [2] Douglas T (2008) "Moral Enhancement", <i>Journal of Applied Philosophy</i> , 25(3):228-245. [3] AUDIO Crockett M (2012) "Brain chemistry and moral decision-making", <i>Philosophy Bites</i> , July 22 http://philosophybites.com/2012/07/molly-crockett-on-brain-chemistry-and-moral-decision-making-originally-on-bioethics-bites.html GROUP B: Roskies A (2006) "A case study of neuroethics: the nature of moral judgment" in J Illes (ed) <i>Neuroethics: defining the issues in theory, practice, and policy</i> , OUP, 17-32.

8	Oct 12 Oct 14	<p>MORAL ENHANCEMENT DEBATE</p> <p>GROUP A: [1] Harris J (2011) "Moral Enhancement and Freedom", <i>Bioethics</i>, 25(2):102-111. [2] Douglas T (2013) "Moral Enhancement via Direct Emotion Modulation, a reply to John Harris", <i>Bioethics</i>, 27(3):160-168. [3] AUDIO Sinnott-Armstrong W (2009) "Moral Psychology", <i>Philosophy Bites</i>, May 2 http://philosophybites.com/2009/05/walter-sinnottarmstrong-on-moral-psychology.html</p> <p>GROUP B: AUDIO Savulescu J (2015) "Ethics of Moral Enhancement", Australian Broadcasting Corporation, March 11 http://www.abc.net.au/radionational/programs/bigideas/moral-enhancement/6035314</p>
9	Oct 19 Oct 21	<p>CRIME AND MORAL ENHANCEMENT</p> <p>GROUP A: [1] Lewis CS (1953) "The Humanitarian Theory of Punishment", <i>Res Judicatae</i>, 6:224-230. [2] Focquaert F and Schermer M (2015) "Moral Enhancement: Do Means Matter Morally?", <i>Neuroethics</i>, 8:139-151.</p> <p>GROUP B: Bublitz JC and Merkel R (2014) "Crimes Against Minds: On Mental Manipulations, Harms and a Human Right to Mental Self-Determination", <i>Neuroethics</i>, 8:51-77.</p>
10	Oct 26 Oct 28	<p>CRIMINAL PUNISHMENT</p> <p>GROUP A: [1] Latzer B (2003) "Between Madness and Death: The Medicate-to-Execute Controversy", <i>Criminal Justice Ethics</i>, 22(2):3-14 [2] Vincent N (2014) "Restoring Responsibility: Promoting Justice, Therapy and Reform Through Direct Brain Interventions", <i>Criminal Law and Philosophy</i>, 8(1):21-42.</p> <p>GROUP B: White AJ et al (2012) "The Role of Cognitive Assessment in Determining Fitness to Stand Trial", <i>International Journal of Forensic Mental Health</i>, 11(2):102-109.</p>
11	Nov 2 Nov 4	<p>SUBJECTIVE EXPERIENCE AND JUSTICE</p> <p>GROUP A: [1] Kolber A (2007) "Pain Detection and the Privacy of Subjective Experience", <i>American Journal of Law & Medicine</i>, 33(2-3):433-456. [2] Vincent N and Bingle R (draft) "Enhancing Punishment", in N Vincent (ed) <i>Neuro-Interventions and The Law: Regulating Human Mental Capacity</i>.</p> <p>GROUP B: Rossmanith K (2015) "Affect and the Judicial Assessment of Offenders: Feeling and Judging Remorse", <i>Body & Society</i>, 21(2):167-193.</p>
12	Nov 9 Nov 11	<p>COGNITIVE ENHANCEMENT: PROMISES AND PERILS</p> <p>GROUP A: [1] Farah MJ et al (2004) "Neurocognitive enhancement: what can we do and what should we do?", <i>Nature Reviews Neuroscience</i>, 5:421-425. [2] Bell SK et al (2012) "Lessons for Enhancement From the History of Cocaine and Amphetamine Use", <i>AJOB Neuroscience</i>, 3(2):24-29.</p> <p>GROUP B: [1] ARTICLE "Narcolepsy medication modafinil is world's first safe 'smart drug'", <i>The Guardian</i>, Aug 19 http://www.theguardian.com/science/2015/aug/20/narcolepsy-medication-modafinil-worlds-first-safe-smart-drug [2] AUDIO Buchanan A (2009) "Enhancement", <i>Philosophy Bites</i>, May 16 http://philosophybites.com/2009/05/allen-buchanan-on-enhancement.html</p>
13	Nov 16 Nov 18	<p>COGNITIVE ENHANCEMENT: BROADER ISSUES</p> <p>GROUP A: [1] Santoni de Sio F et al (2014) "How cognitive enhancement can change our duties", <i>Frontiers in Systems Neuroscience</i>, 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 Dubljević (eds), <i>Cognitive Enhancement: Ethical and Policy Implications in International Perspectives</i>, OUP. [3] VIDEO Vincent N (2014) "Enhancement: the new 'normal'?", Apr 26 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0z7QJgUeGqk</p> <p>GROUP B: [1] Grunwald A (2013) "Are We Heading Towards an 'Enhancement Society'?", in E Hildt and AG Franke (eds) <i>Cognitive Enhancement: An Interdisciplinary Perspective</i>, Springer, 201-216. [2] Jane EA and Vincent N (2015) "The rise of cognitive enhancers is a mass social experiment", <i>The Conversation</i>, Jun 15 https://theconversation.com/the-rise-of-cognitive-enhancers-is-a-mass-social-experiment-40072</p>
Thanksgiving Break: Nov 23-28		
14	Nov 30 Dec 2	<p>EXAM REVISION</p> <p>IN-CLASS EXAM</p>

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 signed 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:

1. Undergraduate Students: www2.gsu.edu/~wwwphi/2131.html
 2. 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 unacknowledged 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.