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CLUSTER ANALYSIS

NEUROSCIENCES CONTEXT
- INTERVENTION
- PROS
- REQUIREMENTS
- CONTRIBUTION
- RISKS
- CONCEPTS

EMOTIONS
- CONSEQUENCES
- JUSTICE CONTEXT
“To speak about objective diagnosis of disease no longer makes sense. They are not only changes in words, they are overall changes in world views…”

“Science gives information but cannot gives any indication…”
INTERVENTIONS | PROS

“In my opinion neuroscience can contribute at two different levels: there are investigations and science can provide statistics, but science can also help us to understand in a more objective way if the person who committed the offense was unfit to plead.”

“We are talking about a multidisciplinary issue… Surely the new frontier of neuroscience would give more relevance to clinical and medical experts; however, once the problem have been identified and classified, other expert can intervene ....”
REQUIREMENTS | CONTRIBUTIONS

“Neuroscience can help you to make a classification of diseases. You should start with a research aimed at identifying the genetic diseases that cause deviant behavior. Otherwise there may be a risk of improper use of these techniques. The problem is: who draws up the list of these diseases? Who determines that a disease is serious enough to constitute an extenuating circumstance in the process?”

“Science is revealing us information about the brain and behavior that could greatly impact the way of doing the law”
“Cultural and psychological factors that determine behavior will increasingly lose their relevance. Why the weight of biological, genetic or neurological factors should be so crucial now? Why education, culture, ideologies, having been abused or have been indoctrinated in the faith are not equally important in determining the conduct? Are not they equally coercive? I think yes, but unfortunately my perception will not come out.”
EMOTIONS

“The risk of categorizing people on the basis of their genetic makeup scares me a little.”
All the law may be reset on neuroscience rather than on free will, which does not exist …

“Does cruelty has a gene that determines it? Can we find, at genetic level, the factors that enhances the level of cruelty? If we discover that a murderer has this gene that justifies his behavior what will we do? Would a judge have to say “yes, indeed this man has a gene that leads him to be cruel”? …"
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AREAS, DIMENSIONS AND PARTICIPANTS

- Neuroscientists/Philosophers: 67%
- S.C. Officers: 33.5%
- Socio-Educ. workers: 28%
- Neuroscientists: 40%
- Physicians: 30%
- Philosopher: 37%
- Bioethics experts: 29%
- S.C. Officers: 37%
- Neuroscientists: 50%

Areas, dimensions, and participants.
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