

NEUROETHICS (SPRING 2015)

PHIL 4780 (CRN 17591) PHIL 4780 HONORS (CRN 17592)
NEUR 4780 (CRN 18607) NEUR 4780 HONORS (CRN 18608)
PHIL 6780 (CRN 17593) NEUR 6530 (CRN 18609)
MON & WED 7.15PM-8.30PM ADERHALD 31

Nicole A Vincent

25 Park Place, 16th floor, Room 1617
nvincent@gsu.edu or (404) 413-6113
office hrs Monday 2pm-5pm
twitter @drcolekat

Neuroenhancement is a topic of increasing prominence in the field of neuroethics, and this course offers you an opportunity to develop a more in-depth engagement with this exciting current topic.

Following Adina Roskies, the field of neuroethics has typically been divided into two sub-fields: *neuroscience of ethics* and *ethics of neuroscience*. The *neuroscience of ethics* is usually described as something akin to the empirically-informed study of morality – in this case, a study of morality informed by the mind sciences. For instance, the study of what goes on in the brain when a human decides a moral dilemma, which has often involved the study of individuals with various pathologies, since studying a "broken" moral agent and comparing them to a "well functioning" moral agent, is thought to have the potential to reveal the brain-based mechanisms upon which moral judgment relies. On the other hand, the *ethics of neuroscience* is usually described as a branch of applied ethics or bioethics. In this sense, neuroethics examines the moral quandaries – sometimes problems, other times solutions that spring from new opportunities – brought about through neuroscientific research, discoveries, technologies, and so on. Examples of ethics-of-neuroscience questions might include what should be done about incidental findings from imaging studies, or what kinds of brain treatments is it ok to administer to different kinds of people.

In this course, though, we will endeavour to develop an appreciation for how a study of the myriad ways in which the human brain (and thus, the human mind) can be modified, sheds light on a range of ideas that have typically played weighty roles in ethical and political debates. For instance, the nature and value of inter-personal relationships; what constitutes a good life; the nature of responsibility and competence; the self, personal identity, and authenticity; and notions like liberty, equality, fairness, and justice. That is, we will attempt to bridge the gap between these two branches of neuroethics – i.e. *ethics of neuroscience* and *neuroscience of ethics* – by reflecting on how our views change about key ideas like the ones listed above when we acquire the possibility to modify aspects of our or other people's brains. The *Class Schedule* on the next two pages lists the topics that will be investigated in order to shed light on these ideas.

Given the mix of students enrolled in this course – both graduates and undergraduates from philosophy and neuroscience – classes will take the form of interactive seminars. Students will be expected to engage one another and me in discussion, in order to both understand the content of the set readings, as well as to develop a critical standpoint on those readings. Classes will also play a key role in helping you to prepare your assessment, and so it is critical that you not miss classes.

CLASS SCHEDULE

There is no set textbook for this course. Articles, chapters, videos, podcasts, and other relevant material will be made available on *Brightspace*. Some of the items listed below may be taken off the reading list, others might be swapped for different items, so please check for announcements.

Week	Date	Component / Readings
1	January 12 & 14	<p>Neuroethics, Neuroenhancement, and Syllabus</p> <p>[1] Clausen, Jens and Levy, Neil (2015) "What Is Neuroethics", <i>Handbook of Neuroethics</i>, Springer, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, v-vii.</p> <p>[2] Roskies, Adina (2002) "Neuroethics for the New Millenium", <i>Neuron</i>, 35:21-23.</p> <p>[3] Farah, Martha J. (2007) "Emerging Ethical Issues in Neuroscience", in <i>Defining Right and Wrong in Brain Science</i>, Dana Press, New York, NY, 19-36.</p> <p>[4] Farah, Martha J. and Wolpe, Paul Root (2007) "Monitoring and Manipulating Brain Function: New Neuroscience Technologies and Their Ethical Implications", in <i>Defining Right and Wrong in Brain Science</i>, Dana Press, New York, NY, 37-57.</p>
2	MLK Jr. Day January 21	<p>Direct Brain Interventions</p> <p>[1] Levy, Neil (2007) "Changing our Minds", <i>Neuroethics</i>, Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, 69-87.</p> <p>[2] Klaming, Laura and Haselager, Pim (2013) "Did My Brain Implant Make Me Do It?", <i>Neuroethics</i>, 6(3):527-539.</p>
3	January 26 & 28	<p>Memory Modification</p> <p>[1] Glannon, Walter (2006) "Psychopharmacology and memory", <i>Journal of Medical Ethics</i>, 32:74-78.</p> <p>[2] Lonergan, Michelle H. (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.</p> <p>[3] Meinzer, Marcus et al (2014) "Transcranial direct current stimulation over multiple days improves learning and maintenance of a novel vocabulary", <i>Cortex</i>, 50:137-147.</p> <p>[4] Erler, Alexandre (2011) "Does Memory Modification Threaten Our Authenticity?", <i>Neuroethics</i>, 4(3):235-249.</p>
4	February 2 & 4	<p>Love and Anti-Love Drugs</p> <p>[1] Esch, Tobias and Stefano, George B. (2005) "The Neurobiology of Love", <i>Neuroendocrinology Letters</i>, 26(3):175-192.</p> <p>[2] Earp, Brian D et al (2013) "If I Could Stop Loving You", <i>The American Journal of Bioethics</i>, 13(11):3-17.</p> <p>[3] Anderson, Ross (2013) "The Case for Using Drugs to Enhance Our Relationships (and Our Break-ups)", <i>The Atlantic</i>.</p>
5	February 9 & 11	<p>Conversion Therapy for Sexuality and Gender</p> <p>[1] Earp, Brian D. et al (2014) "Brave New Love", <i>AJOB Neuroscience</i>, 5(1):4-12.</p> <p>[2] Greely, Hank R - "Direct Brain Interventions to Treat Disfavored Human Behaviors: Ethical and Social Issues", <i>Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics</i>, 91(2):163-165.</p> <p>[3] Dreger, Alice (2013) "Why Gender Dysphoria Should No Longer Be Considered a Medical Disorder", <i>Pacific Standard</i>. Published October 18, 2013.</p>
6	February 16 & 18	<p>Mood Enhancement</p> <p>[1] Kramer, Peter D (1993) "Makeover", in <i>Listening to Prozac</i>, Viking Books, New York, NY, 1-21.</p> <p>[2] Ravelingien, A et al - "Cosmetic Neurology and the Moral Complicity Argument", <i>Neuroethics</i>, 2(3):151-162.</p> <p>[3] Lehrer, Jonah (2008) "Is There Really an Epidemic of Depression?", <i>Scientific American</i>. Published December 4, 2008.</p>

7	February 23 & 25	Moral Enhancement [1] Douglas, Thomas (2008) "Moral Enhancement", <i>Journal of Applied Philosophy</i> , 25(3):228-245. [2] Terbeck, Sylvia et al (2012) "Propranolol Reduces Negative Racial Bias", <i>Psychopharmacology</i> , 222(3):419-424. [3] Bartz, Jennifer A et al (2011) "Social effects of oxytocin in humans: context and person matter", <i>Cell</i> , 15(7):301-309.
8	March 2 & 4	Moral Enhancement Debate [1] Harris, John (2011) "Moral Enhancement and Freedom", <i>Bioethics</i> , 25(2):102-111. [2] Douglas, Thomas (2013) "Moral Enhancement via Direct Emotion Modulation, a reply to John Harris", <i>Bioethics</i> , 27(3):160-168.
9 March 9 your abstract	March 9 & 11	Moral Enhancement and Crime [1] Glannon, Walter (2014) "Intervening in the Psychopath's Brain", <i>Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics</i> , 35(1):43-57. [2] Lewis, C S (1953) "The Humanitarian Theory of Punishment", <i>Res Judicatae</i> , 6:224-230.
<i>Spring Break: Mar 16-22</i>		
10	March 23 & 25	Criminal Punishment and Enhancement [1] Latzer, Barry (2003) "Between Madness and Death: The Medicate-to-Execute Controversy", <i>Criminal Justice Ethics</i> , 22(2):3-14 [2] Vincent, Nicole (2014) "Restoring Responsibility: Promoting Justice, Therapy and Reform Through Direct Brain Interventions", <i>Criminal Law and Philosophy</i> , 8(1):21-42. [3] ONE MORE PAPER WILL BE ADDED HERE.
11 March 30 referee reports on other students' abstracts	March 30 & April 1	Cognitive Enhancement, Duty, and Blame [1] Farah, Martha J et al (2004) "Neurocognitive enhancement: what can we do and what should we do?", <i>Nature Reviews Neuroscience</i> , 5:421-425. [2] Coffman, Brian A et al (2014) "Battery powered thought: Enhancement of attention, learning, and memory in healthy adults using transcranial direct current stimulation", <i>NeuroImage</i> , 85(3):895-908. [3] Santoni de Sio, Filippo et al (2014) "How cognitive enhancement can change our duties", <i>Frontiers in Systems Neuroscience</i> , Volume 8, Article 131, 4 pages.
12	April 6 & 8	Cognitive Enhancement, Praise, and Society [1] Santoni de Sio, Filippo et al (forthcoming) "Why less praise for enhanced performance?", in Fabrice Jotterand and Veljko Dubjlevic (eds), <i>Cognitive Enhancement: Ethical and Policy Implications in International Perspectives</i> , Oxford University Press. [2] Vincent, Nicole A and Jane, Emma A. (2014) "Put down the smart drugs: cognitive enhancement is ethically risky business", <i>The Conversation</i> , June 15, 2014. [3] Vincent, Nicole A (2014) "Enhancement: the new 'normal'?", <i>TEDxSydney</i> , Sydney Opera House, Australia. http://tedxsydney.com/site/item.cfm?item=F435D6860698F5605CFDAB108CA3A550 [4] Grunwald, Armin (2013) "Are We Heading Towards an 'Enhancement Society'?", in Elisabeth Hildt and Andreas G. Franke (eds) <i>Cognitive Enhancement: An Interdisciplinary Perspective</i> , Springer, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, 201-216.
13 April 13 submit your talk or poster	April 13 & 15	Conference Talks presented on April 13 & 15 .
14	April 20 & 22	Conference (continued) Talks presented on April 20 , posters displayed on April 22 .

ASSESSMENT

COMPONENTS	4700	4700 HONS	6780 OR 6530	DUE DATE
1. Participation	10%	10%	10%	<i>must miss no more than two classes in weeks 1-12, and no classes in wk 13 & 14</i>
2. Class				
CCR	20% 2 pages	20% 3 pages	10% 3 pages	varies from student to student
Presentation	—	—	10% 15 min (talk 10, questions 5)	
3. Conference				
Abstract	10% 2 pages	10% 3 pages	10% 3 pages	March 9
Referee other students' abstracts	10% for 2 x 4700 level students 1 page per commentary	10% for 2 x 4700 level students 1 page per commentary	10% for 3 x 6780 or 6530 students 1 page per commentary	March 30
Poster (4700/Hons)	—	—	10% 15 min (talk 10, questions 5)	April 22
or				submit poster, slides, or handout: April 13
Talk (6780/6530)	10%	10%	—	April 13, 15, or 20
4. Final Paper	40% 10 pages	40% 13 pages	40% 16 pages	April 27
FINAL GRADE	100%	100%	100%	available May 8th

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%
 Students will be graded according to standards appropriate for the section of the course in which they are enrolled (e.g. expectations are not the same for undergraduate and graduate students). There is no exam, and there may be opportunities for extra credit.

Class Participation (10%) means satisfactory *attendance* (miss no more than 2 classes without good documentable grounds, see "Late assignments" below for examples of what is and is not good), evidence of *preparation* (i.e. that you read the set articles and came to class with questions about them), and active *participation* during class discussion (evidenced by e.g. raising questions about the content of the set articles and engaging in debate with me and your classmates).

CCR & Presentation (20%) In week 1 each student will be assigned one article on which they will write a *Comprehension and Critical Response* (CCR) piece. 6780 and 6530 level students will also give an in-class oral Presentation based on their CCR. CCR's are due on the Monday of the week in which the respective articles are scheduled to be read. Word lengths for CCR's for different level students are indicated in the "Assessment" table above. As the name suggests, your CCR should demonstrate your *comprehension* of the set article's argument – i.e. what was the author trying to tell us (i.e. what is the article's main point), how does the author support their point (i.e. what premises or considerations do they raise), and why is this meant to be significant in the author's view (e.g. what position does the author take themselves to be responding to, or why do they take this to be important) – but also offer your own *critical stance* on the author's argument. Oral Presentations should introduce the class to the article and to your critical thoughts about it, and they should last **15 minutes** (10 min presentation, 5 min question time). The written CCR will be graded on the basis of how well you've understood that article, and on the quality of your insights (i.e. the critical component), as well as the quality of your writing. The oral Presentation will also be graded on the basis of how well you present, field questions, and on your ability to take a lead in subsequent class discussion. Students may trade topics with each other but: (a) consent must first be obtained from me, and (b) presentations must be delivered on the date for which the article was scheduled (e.g. you can't swap articles but retain the date on which you were originally going

to present). Students who miss their presentation will need to submit a CCR for their scheduled presentation, and give an oral Presentation on another topic arranged with me.

Conference (30%) Students will eventually present (give a talk or display a poster) at a course Conference that will be held during class time in weeks 13 and 14. The topic of your presentation (i) cannot be the same as your CCR/in-class oral Presentation, (ii) it must be selected from the list of [red-numbered] articles in the *Class Schedule* above, and (iii) no more than two students can give a presentation on the same topic. Your grade for this component will be made up as follows:

- 10% **abstract** for talk/poster
- 10% **referee comments** on three other students' abstracts
- 10% **presentation**, either poster or talk

First, all students will submit an abstract (due **March 9**) in the same format and length as a CCR.

Next, each student will read other students' abstracts (assigned by me, and anonymized), and provide a grade and referee's comments to their authors (due **March 30**).

I will read and grade each student's *abstract* and the *feedback* they provided to the other students.

Students will then have an opportunity to take their classmates' feedback on-board in preparing their presentations (posters, and slides or handouts) which are due for submission on **April 13** though presented on different days (refer to the *Class Schedule* or *Assessment* sections above for general information). Everyone must submit either a poster or a set of slides, or a handout; and the version of the poster, slides, or handout that you submit will be the version that you will be expected to use in your conference presentation. I will grade the quality of your presentation and how well you field questions. *To receive a grade for your presentation, you must attend and participate in the entire conference.*

Final Paper (due **April 27**; see "Assessment" section above for the word length, which includes notes but not the bibliography) The Final Paper should be written on the same topic as your Conference poster/talk. In essence, it is meant to be a fully-written-up version of your Conference Presentation, and you are welcome to incorporate any insights you gained from comments on your Conference Presentation that you found useful.

Unless otherwise indicated, all **written assessment** must be **submitted electronically by 5pm** on the **indicated dates**.

OTHER INFORMATION

Late assignments: Unexcused late assignments are penalized 5% for each calendar day late. Saturdays and Sundays count as calendar days. The following are examples of valid reasons for an excused late assignment: a death in the family, or a serious illness (your, or a close friend or

relative), documentation must be provided. The following are examples of invalid reasons: lots of other work, or end-of-the-term travel plans.

Email: Email is the best way to contact me. You should check your official GSU email at least once every 24 hours. By University policy, I must use your official GSU student email address. If you send an email from a non-GSU email account, I cannot respond, but if I do then that is not an indication that this policy has changed. If you email me from your GSU account and have not received a reply within 24 hours, you should assume that I did not receive the message. If this happens attempt to email me again, and if problems persist then visit me or the secretaries in the Philosophy Department. If for some reason you turn in a piece of assessment by email, it is your responsibility to confirm that I received it on time. You will know that I got it because I reply to all student emails within 24 hours. If I do not receive it (on time), then you will not get credit for the assignment without time-stamped email proof that you sent it (before it was due). Having trouble with your email, computer, or ISP is not an excused late assignment.

Disability Support Services and Special Needs: All efforts will be made to accommodate students with special needs, so long as sufficient notice is given. If you require special accommodations you must contact me during the first week of class. It is also imperative that you notify Disability Services by calling 404-463-9044 or on the web via <http://disability.gsu.edu/>

Student Evals: Your constructive assessment of this course plays an indispensable role in shaping education at GSU. Upon completing the course, please take time to fill out the online course evaluation.

Academic Honesty & Miscellanea: See the last two pages of this syllabus.

**Everything in this syllabus can change (and something always does).
You are responsible for all changes announced in class.**

Department of Philosophy

General Syllabus Statement Spring 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, March 3**.
- 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.
- If you have a disability that may impair your ability to successfully complete this course, contact your instructor as soon as possible to arrange accommodations. GSU has two programs that provide support services to students with disabilities.
 - Office of Disability Services - <http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwwods/> - 404.413-1560**
 - Accessibility At GSU - <http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwwada/> - 404.464-9044**Students who wish to request accommodations for a disability may do so by registering with the Office of Disability Services (second floor in the Student Center, dismail@gsu.edu). Students may be accommodated only upon issuance by the Office of Disability Services of a signed Accommodation Plan and are responsible for providing a copy of that plan to instructor of all classes in which accommodations are sought. If you have not been issued the Accommodation Plan by Disability Services, I am required by federal law and university policy not to accommodate.

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 dishonorable 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.