

Seminar IRH-ICUB

Consciousness and Cognition: An Interdisciplinary Approach

<https://irhunibuc.wordpress.com/2016/04/05/new-seminar-consciousness-in-philosophy-and-neuroscience/>

convenor Dr. Diana Stanciu

https://irhunibuc.wordpress.com/visiting_scholars

Date: Tuesday, 22 November 2016, 17h

Place: IRH-ICUB (1 D. Brandza Str.), conference room

Dr. Emilian Mihailov

University of Bucharest, Faculty of Philosophy

Dr. Emilian Mihailov is the Executive Director of the Research Centre in Applied Ethics (CCEA), at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Bucharest, and a teaching assistant at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Bucharest. He was a postdoctoral fellow of the Romanian Academy, Iasi section. Among Dr. Mihailov's research interests are Kantian ethics, analytic moral philosophy, applied ethics, the evolution of morality and neuroethics. Currently he is working on the implications of experimental moral psychology and neuroscience for normative and applied ethics. Recent publications include *Intuitive methods of moral decision making, a philosophical plea*, in Valentin Muresan, Shunzo Majima (eds.), "Applied Ethics: Perspectives from Romania", Center for Applied Ethics and Philosophy, Hokkaido University, 2013; *The Argument from Self-Defeating Beliefs Against Deontology*, Ethical Perspectives, 2015; *Is Deontology a Moral Confabulation?*, Neuroethics, 2016. Dr. Mihailov won several grants from the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF) for the project "Building bioethics capacities in education and doctoral training: a collaborative network between Moldova, Romania and Switzerland", 2015-2017, and from the Society of Applied Philosophy to organize the "Oxford – Bucharest Workshop in Applied Ethics" and the "Animal Ethics Workshop" with Christine Korsgaard, at the University of Oxford, on 1-3 December 2014.

Cognitive Enhancement and Mental Doping

Should the development of "smart" drugs that improve memory, attention, executive function or intelligence raise worries about mental doping? Is there a case for pharmacological cognitive enhancement in chess, for instance? I will argue that using evidence of enhancement to justify a ban on particular substances is a mistake based on a misunderstanding of the data and on loose general connections between cognitive processes.