

### Session 3—Neuroscience and Moral Decisionmaking, part 2: Criticisms and Responses

*Readings* (indexed to pagination of course readings):

1. Richard Joyce, *What Neuroscience Can (and Cannot) Contribute to Metaethics*, in *The Neuroscience of Morality: Emotion, Brain Disorders, and Development* 371-94 (W. Sinnott-Armstrong ed., 2008) .....107
2. Brian Fiala, *The Secret Emptiness of Greene's Argument* (unpublished manuscript, Nov. 2006) .....127
3. Jon Bardin *Voodoo That Scientists Do*, *Seedmagazine.com* Mar. 25, 2009 .....149
4. Edward Vul, Christine Harris, Piotr Winkielman & Harold Pashler, *Puzzlingly High Correlations in fMRI Studies of Emotion, Personality, and Social Cognition*, 4 *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 274-290 (2009).....153
5. Nikolaus Kriegeskorte et al., *Circular Analysis in Systems Neuroscience: The Dangers of Double Dipping*, 12 *Nature Neurosci.* 535 (2009).....192
6. Matthew D. Lieberman et al., *Correlations in Social Neuroscience Aren't Voodoo: Commentary on Vul et al.*, 4 *Persp. Psych. Sci.* 299 (2009).....188
7. Jonathan McGuire et al., *A Reanalysis of the Personal/Impersonal Distinction in Moral Psychology Research*, 45 *J. Experimental Soc. Psych.* 577 (2009) .....198
8. Joshua D. Greene, *Dual-process morality and the personal/impersonal distinction: A reply to McGuire, Langdon, Coltheart, and Mackenzie*, 45 *J. Social Psychol.* 581 (2009).....202

(Some) *Questions*:

1. Do you find the criticisms that Joyce and Fiala make of the relevance of neuroimaging for moral reasoning persuasive? (If we put you in an fMRI machine, would we be able to tell why you find those arguments persuasive or not? If we could do that, would that cast doubt on the conclusions you reached after reading the articles?)
2. How do you imagine that members of the public, including the media, lawmakers, and judges will react to the arguments about the relevance of neuroimaging for moral or related forms of reasoning? Will they all react in the same way? If they don't—if there is disagreement about the relevance or normative importance of this work—do you have any guesses about the characteristics or identities of those will take one position or another, or when?
3. Do you find the methodological critiques of the emerging work on neuroscience and decisionmaking persuasive? Are you satisfied by the replies? Do you anticipate that this argument will be resolved conclusively in the near future? The medium-term future? The long-term?
4. How do you imagine that members of the public, including the media, lawmakers, and judges will react to the arguments about the methodological validity of the neuroimaging studies? Will they be able to evaluate the validity of the evidence and arguments being presented by both sides? Will they fall into line with the most persuasive position, if one emerges? Will they all form the same assessment? If not, who do you think will take what position and why?