

What's Wrong with Mandatory Neuroenhancement?

Thomas Douglas (University of Oxford)

The ethical debate on neuroenhancement has focussed mainly on assessing whether and how individuals ought to use neuroenhancements, not on whether and how governments ought to regulate them. Moreover, to the extent that regulations have been considered, the question has normally been: when, if ever, should neuroenhancements be legally *permitted*? In this paper, I consider the further question of whether they ought ever to be legally *mandated*. I first present a case for mandatory neuroenhancement in certain limited contexts, drawing on comparisons with (i) non-biomedical enhancements, and (ii) biomedical therapies. I then consider a range of possible objections to mandatory neuroenhancement. I seek to show that the most persuasive of these invokes a right to mental integrity, but I argue that even this objection is not (yet) conclusive.