

Philosophy 312
Neuroethics

Spring 2016
MW 10:25-11:40, Bausch and Lomb 315

Instructor: Richard Dees, Ph.D.
Office: Lattimore 529
Hours: M 11:45-12:45, W 9:15-10:15
Phone: 275-8110
E-mail: richard.dees@rochester.edu

Advances in neuroscience allow us to understand the brain and its functions more completely now than ever before. From these findings, new medical techniques and technologies are being developed that will allow us to peer into the working of others' minds and to alter our cognitive functions, our memory, and our moods, raising fundamental questions about free will, about the basis for our identity as persons, and about morality itself. For these reasons, neuroscience may pose a deeper set of moral issues than any other science and this course will seek to explore the ethical issues that it raises.

Required Texts:

Patricia Churchland, *Braintrust* (Princeton)
Readings on Blackboard

Course Requirements:

Class participation is worth a significant portion of your grade. The class is based on student discussions, not on lectures. You are expected to come to class, and you are expected to come to class prepared to discuss the readings – if only to ask relevant questions about them. Most of your class participation grade is based on regular, substantive participation in class discussions.

Reflection papers. Almost every week, you will be expected to write a brief one-page reaction paper to the upcoming week's reading, due generally on Sunday nights at 9:00 p.m. Please email them to me. These papers should respond to some specific arguments or position in the readings by explaining why you agree or disagree with it. Reflections are due on the following dates: January 19 (Tuesday), January 24, January 31, February 7, February 21, February 28, March 13, April 3, April 10, and April 17.

Paper assignments. The major assignments in this course will be done using a tutorial system. I will give you a series of questions about particular texts, and I will ask you to respond to them in a paper of 6-8 pages. You and another student will meet with me in my office during the week set aside for that purpose. Together, the three of us will discuss each of your papers. While attending a tutorial is required, you will be graded only on what is in your paper. I will explain the tutorial method in more detail later.

For your final assignment, you will have a choice: you may either write a third tutorial of 7-10 pages on a topic I will give you, or you may write a 7-10 page paper on a topic of your own choosing. This latter option will give you the opportunity to explore an issue of particular

interest to you at greater length. Note that the paper must be a *philosophy* paper: it should explain and evaluate a line of argument that concerns neuroscience or neurological practice. I will be happy, however, to help you develop your topic. In any case, if you choose to write a paper, you *must* consult me.

The course grade is divided into 500 points, apportioned as shown:

First tutorial	Feb 17	100 points
Second paper	Mar 23	100 points
Final assignment	Apr 27	120 points
Reaction papers		80 points
Participation		100 points

Schedule of Readings:

This schedule is tentative (especially for topics later in the course). However, any changes will be announced on Blackboard, and an up-to-date copy of the syllabus can always be found on Blackboard. All readings, except those in the required books for the class, are on Blackboard.

- Jan 13 Introduction
Hilary Putnam, "Brains in a Vat" (handout)
Oliver Sacks, "The Lost Mariner," *New York Review of Books*, February 16, 1984
- Jan 20-25 The Brain and Identity
Bernard Williams, "The Self and the Future," *Philosophical Review* 79 (1970): 161-180
Derek Parfit, "Personal Identity," *Philosophical Review* 80 (1971): 3-27
Martha Farah and Andrea Heberlein, "Personhood and Neuroscience: Naturalizing or Nihilating?," *American Journal of Bioethics* 7 (2007): 37-48
Reflection paper due, January 19, 9 p.m.
- Jan 27-Feb 1 Brain Death
Ad Hoc Harvard Committee on Brain Death, "A Definition of Irreversible Coma," *JAMA* 205 (1968): 337-40
Benedict Carey and Denise Grady, "At Issue in Two Wrenching Cases: What to Do After the Brain Dies," *New York Times*, 9 January 2014
James Bernat, "A Defense of the Whole Brain Concept of Death," *Hastings Center Report* 28.2 (1998): 14-24.
Jeff McMahan, "Brain Death, Cortical Death, and Persistent Vegetative State," in *A Companion to Bioethics*, ed. Helga Kuhse and Peter Singer (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), 250-60.
Don Marquis, "Are DCD Donors Dead?," *Hastings Center Report* 40.3 (2010), 24-31
Reflection paper due, January 26, 9 p.m.

- Feb 3 The Self and Advance Directives
 Ronald Dworkin, "Life Past Reason," in *Life's Dominion* (New York: Random House, 1993), 218-37
 Seana Shiffrin, "Autonomy, Beneficence and the Permanently Demented," in *Dworkin and His Critics*, ed, Justine Burley (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004), 195-217 (typescript version)
- Feb 8-10 Allen Buchanan, "Advance Directives and the Personal Identity Problem," *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 17 (1988), 277-302
 Agnieszka Jaworska, "Respecting the Margins of Agency: Alzheimer's Patients and the Capacity to Value," *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 28 (1999): 105-38
Reflection paper due, February 7, 9 p.m
- Feb 15 John Paul II, "Life-Sustaining Treatments and Vegetative State"
 Paul Menzel and Bonnie Steinbock, "Advance Directives, Dementia, and Physician-Assisted Death," *Journal of Law, Medicine, and Ethics* 41 (2013): 484-500
- Feb 17 *First tutorials (No regular class meeting)*
- Feb 22-24 Ethical Issues in Neuroimaging
 Geoffrey Aguirre, "Functional Neuroimaging: Technical, Legal, and Social Perspectives," *Hastings Center Report* 44.2 (2014): S8-S18.
 Martha Farah, "Brain Images, Babies and Bathwater: Critiquing Critiques of Functional Neuroimaging," *Hastings Center Report* 44.2 (2014): S19-S30
 Jeremy Gray and Paul Thompson, "Neurobiology of Intelligence: Science and Ethics," *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 5 (2004): 471-82
 Turhan Canli and Zenab Amin, "Neuroimaging of Emotion and Personality: Scientific Evidence and Ethical Considerations," *Brain and Cognition* 50 (2002): 414-31. Read only section 3.
Reflection paper due, February 21, 9 p.m
- Feb 29 Neuroscience and Law
 -Mar 2 Joshua Green and Jonathan Cohen, "For the Law, Neuroscience Changes Nothing and Everything," *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London B* 359 (2004): 1775-85.
 David Wasserman and Josephine Johnson, "Seeing Responsibility: Can Neuroimaging Teach Us Anything about Moral and Legal Responsibility?" *Hastings Center Report* 44.2 (2014): S37-S49.
 Richard Boire, "Neurocops: The Politics of Prohibition and the Future of Enforcing Social Policy from *Inside the Body*," *Journal of Law and Health* 19 (2005): 215-57.
Reflection paper due, February 28, 9 p.m
- Mar 7-9 *Spring break (no classes)*

- Mar 14-16 Ethical Issues in Deep Brain Stimulation
 Felicitas Kraemer, “Authenticity or autonomy?: When Deep Brain Stimulation Causes a Dilemma,” *Journal of Medical Ethics* 39 (2013): 757-60
 Matthis Synofzik, Thomas Schlaepfer, and Joseph Fins, “How Happy is Too Happy?: Euphoria, Neuroethics, and Deep Brain Stimulation,” *AJOB Neuroscience* 3.1 (2012): 30-36
 Nir Lipsman and Walter Glannon, “Brain, Mind, and Machine: What are the Implications of Deep Brain Stimulation for Perceptions of Personal Identity, Agency and Free Will,” *Bioethics* 27 (2013): 465-70
 Eran Klein, et al., “Engineering the Brain: Ethical Issues and the Introduction of Neural Devices,” *Hastings Center Report* 45.6 (2015): 26-35
Reflection paper due, March 13, 9 p.m
- Mar 21 Memory and Mood Manipulations
 “Eternal Sunshine of the Spotless Mind,” 10 am – 1 pm in Gleason video room.
- Mar 23 *Second tutorials (No regular class)*
- Mar 28-30 President’s Council on Bioethics, “Happy Souls,” in *Beyond Therapy: Biotechnology and the Pursuit of Happiness* (2003), sections I-II
 Carl Elliott, “Pursued by Happiness and Beaten Senseless: Prozac and the American Dream,” *Hastings Center Report* 30.2 (2000): 7-12
 Peter Kramer, “The Valorization of Sadness: Alienation and the Melancholic Temperament,” *Hastings Center Report* 30.2 (2000): 13-18
Reflection paper due, March 27, 9 p.m
No class Mar 30
- Apr 4-6 Neuroenhancements
 Anjan Chatterjee, “The Promise and Predicament of Cosmetic Neurology,” *Journal of Medical Ethics* 32 (2006): 110-13
 Michael Sandel, “The Case Against Perfection,” *Atlantic* 293.3 (2004): 50-62
 President’s Council on Bioethics, “Happy Souls,” section III
 Ingmar Persson and Julia Savulescu, “The Perils of Cognitive Enhancement and the Urgent Imperative to Enhance the Moral Character of Humanity,” *Journal of Applied Philosophy* 25 (2008): 162-77
 (optional) Richard Dees, “Better Brains, Better Selves?” *Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal* 17 (2007): 375-99
Reflection paper due April 3, 9 p.m,
- Apr 11-13 Transhumanism
 Nick Bostrom, “Why I Want to Be a Posthuman When I Grow Up,” in *Medical Enhancement and Posthumanity*, ed. Bert Gordijn and Ruth Chadwick (New York: Springer, 2008), 107-37 (typescript version)
 Nicholas Agar, “What Is It Possible to Enhance Moral Status and Why is Doing So Wrong?,” *Journal of Medical Ethics* 39 (2013): 67-74

Fred Baumann, "Humanism and Transhumanism," *The New Atlantis* (Fall 2010):
68-84

Reflection paper due April 10, 9 p.m.

Apr 18-20

Neuroscience on ethics

Patricia Churchland, *Braintrust*, chs. 1-5 (pp 1-117)

Reflection paper due April 17, 9 p.m.

Apr 25

Churchland, *Braintrust*, chs. 6-8 (pp. 118-204)

Apr 27

Third tutorial/Final assignment due (No regular class)