March 2014
Volume 10, Issue 2

ASEBL Journal

ASEBL Journal
Copyright©2014
E-ISSN: 1944-401X
publisher@ebibliotekos.com

www.asebl.blogspot.com

Member, *Council of Editors of Learned Journals*

Association for the Study of
(Ethical Behavior)•(Evolutionary Biology) in Literature
St. Francis College, Brooklyn Heights, N.Y.

~■■~

THIS ISSUE FEATURES THE PROGRAM OF THE SECOND ST. FRANCIS COLLEGE MORAL SENSE COLLOQUIUM

—

†

~■~

~■~

This Moral Sense Colloquium is generously sponsored by
Dr. Allen Burdowski, Dean of Academic Program Development,
The Evolutionary Studies Collaborative,
The Psychology Department, and the English Department

—

Moral Sense Colloquium, II. 7 March 2014, Noon to 6pm. St. Francis College.
Presentations and Panels, Founders Hall.
Breaks, and Reception, the Callahan Center.

—

12:00 **Sign-in/coffee, Callahan**

12:30 **Welcome and Opening Remarks by Dr. Allen Burdowski, Dean of Academic Program Development, and Gregory F. Tague. Introductions of Dr. Diana Reiss and Julie Hecht by Dr. Kristy L. Biolsi**

12:45 **Dr. Diana Reiss [30 minutes]**

1:15 **Q/A regarding Dr. Reiss's presentation [15-20 minutes]**

1:35 **Julie Hecht [30 minutes]**

2:05 **Q/A regarding Julie Hecht's presentation [15-20 minutes]**

2:30 **Snack Break**

3:00 **Panel – Moral Sensations. Dr. Tague and Dr. David Lahti. Students Luke Kluisza and Tyler Perkins.**

4:00 **Panel – Evolved Ethics. Dr. Biolsi (Evolved Ethics Introduction). Students Jeannette Raymond (Neural Philosophy of Moral Behavior), Lorianna Colon (The Neural Mechanisms of Morality), and Andrew Salzillo (Innate Morality: The Code of Ethics Concerning the Human Captivity of Other Species). Dr. Kathleen Nolan (Evolved Ethics Conclusion).**

5:00 **Presentation: Dr. Kevin Woo. Cowardly Punks Travel in Packs: Social Responsibility in an Urban Environment. [15 minutes followed by Q&A]**

5:30 **Reception**

C A L L for P A P E R S:
St. Francis College, Second Colloquium on the Moral Sense.

On Friday, 7 March, from noon until about 6pm, we will be holding our second Moral Sense Colloquium. We have two main presenters, Diana Reiss (Hunter College) and Julie Hecht (Columbia University) on comparative animal cognition (and the continuities of such with human beings).

As with the first Colloquium, we are not thinking of a full-scale conference; rather, we envision a small, one-day event that consists of keynote presentations followed consecutively by faculty and student presentations or panels. In line with the aims of the first Moral Sense Colloquium, we'd be especially interested in cross-disciplinary perspectives. (Details of the first Moral Sense Colloquium can be found in the January 2013 issue of the *ASEBL Journal*.)

While the over-arching theme of the colloquium is the notion of moral sense (i.e., not morality *per se* but the approval or disapproval sensation of a behavior), we'd be particularly attentive to talks or presentations that home in on related issues such as emotions and cognition. In line with our keynote presenters, we'd be especially keen on presentations or talks that address the continuities between animal emotions (e.g., sympathy) or cognition and human emotions and cognition. For instance, Citing Frans de Waal (one of many primatologists who has studied the great apes), philosopher Jesse Prinz looks for an equivalency (ape=human) that is not there. Certainly there are continuities, but clearly we have evolved down a different path than the great apes, and therefore we are not going to find among them the sophisticated culture seen in human beings. But the great apes do exhibit tendencies (see, e.g., Christopher Boehm) which in us evolved into moral sensations and emotions.

Some general questions that might prove useful in helping you focus on a topic include:

- **Do we have an inherited (evolutionary, adapted) moral sense?**
- **How are emotions related to morality?**
- **Is there a biological explanation for morality?**

Biologist Richard Alexander speaks of the evolution of the human psyche (encompassing cognition, consciousness, emotions, and personality) as capable of creating "scenarios," mostly social in nature, that involve the past and future in relation to the present, and it is this very complex intellectual ability (evolved in an environment of cooperation and competition) that accounts ultimately for the tangents related to such scenario construction, such as morality. (Richard Alexander, "Evolution of the Human Psyche." *The Human Revolution* Chris Stringer and Paul Mellars, eds. Edinburgh: U Edinburgh P, 1989. 455-513.)

Biographies & Abstracts
of Program Participants

Diana Reiss, Ph.D.

Bio. Dr. Diana Reiss is a cognitive psychologist, marine mammal scientist, and professor in the Department of Psychology at Hunter College, CUNY and the Animal Behavior and Comparative Psychology Doctoral program at The Graduate Center, CUNY. Dr. Reiss's research focuses on dolphin cognition, communication, comparative animal cognition, and the evolution of intelligence.

Abstract. "Mirrors, Minds & Morals." Numerous studies conducted in the field, lab and in aquaria have shown that the large-brained dolphin is socially, behaviorally and cognitively complex. Further evidence for their advanced cognitive prowess is their capacity for mirror self-recognition and their motivation to use a mirror as a tool to view themselves. Despite the extant scientific knowledge that is disseminated globally though the scientific literature, the media, and the internet, there still exists a disparity in how dolphins are treated across different cultures. For example while most modern cultures have strong laws protecting dolphins and other cetaceans, the government of Japan continues to sanction the brutal and inhumane killing of dolphins year after year in the dolphin drive hunts in Taiji. What does this striking disparity in the treatment of dolphins suggest about the relationship that exists or *does not exist* between knowledge, culture and morals?

—

Julie Hecht

Bio. Julie Hecht studies the behavior and cognition of companion dogs. Since 2010, she has managed Alexandra Horowitz's Dog Cognition Lab, investigating olfaction, inter-species play, and anthropomorphisms. She is a Ph.D. student at CUNY being supervised by Diana Reiss. Hecht is a features columnist for The Bark magazine and blogs at Dog Spies for Scientific American and at Do You Believe in Dog? She would really like to meet your dog.

Website: www.dogspies.com Twitter: https://twitter.com/DogSpies

Abstract. "The Moral Dog?" What is it to be a dog? To that, many respond: "Unconditional love," "Man's best friend," and just recently *The New York Times* declared, "Dogs are people, too." Dogs, more so than any species we live with, are effusively afforded special characteristics and competencies. Our propensity to interpret dogs through an anthropocentric lens is unparalleled. But the question remains: are our attributions and assumptions spot on, or does

empirical research into the mind of the dog suggest that we sometimes miss the mark?

This talk investigates the complexity of The Dog, both through a human lens and in the wake of a growing field of canine behavior and cognition research exploring the dog umwelt, or worldview. Research finds that dog success as human social companions is not magic but rather their exceptional social cognitive skills. Our gestures, words and even emotional states are meaningful to them, and their responsiveness to us is extraordinary. Yet research finds that other attributions, such as "guilt," "fairness" and even "protective" could be associated with different underlying cognitive processes that require us to question the utility of these attributions.

Ultimately, dog welfare is at stake, and applied research programs bring us closer to engaging with dogs in a more canid-centered light. Ultimately, if dogs could speak (English that is), they would undoubtedly petition to be judged on their terms and not ours.

—

Gregory F. Tague, Ph.D.

Bio. Dr. Tague is professor of literary studies, founder and senior developer of The Evolutionary Studies Collaborative, and chair, Department of English, St. Francis College. Most recent book (forthcoming), *Making Mind: Moral Sense and Consciousness in Philosophy, Science, and Literature*. He is the founder and editor of the *ASEBL Journal* (where literature, ethics, and evolution converge).

Abstract. Drawing from previous study (*Character and Consciousness* and *Ethos and Behavior*), my current work posits the moral sense and consciousness intersecting, in *Homo ergaster*, about 1.7 million years ago, to initiate narrative. The symbolic self appears in human history at this time, suggesting that our prehistoric ancestors could imaginatively position themselves in relation to others. No one so far has suggested that the adaptive function of narrative arose because of the convergence of moral sense and consciousness. Although we are a cooperative species, we tend to act in terms of self-interest, so the union of the moral sense (a sensation of approval or disapproval) and consciousness (attention, memory, emotions, and cognition) permits the mind to engage in a virtual reality of reading other minds so as to map a self-narrative in space and time related to others. Therefore, what we now call story had its primitive origins in the junction of social emotions and consciousness and hence why narrative still holds a strong moral component and why we still desire to read or hear narratives.

We are inherently sympathetic creatures (to kin and allies) but not necessarily moral (as we understand that term); narrative arose to help the individual place self in a social context and then to help the group (of individuals) understand norms and *mores*. That is, there seems to be a connection between the character-

driven, biological imperative for narrative (via consciousness) and the human need for nurturing cooperation (against a competitive tendency). Our species-inherited moral sense can differ dramatically from one individual to another. While *mores* pertain to a group, narrative comes from and is processed by the individual and reaches its high point in the novel. We see how or not the moral sense works in characters as a monitor, and we feel it operating in us as readers in terms of approval, or not.

Some influences: Richard Alexander; Roy Baumeister; Christopher Boehm; Brian Boyd; Leda Cosmides and John Tooby; Charles Darwin; Antonio Damasio; Michael Gazzaniga; Nicholas Humphrey; Jerome Kagan; Dennis Krebs; Frans de Waal; Lisa Zunshine. CONTACT: gtague@sfc.edu

—

David C. Lahti, Ph.D.

Bio. David C. Lahti received a Ph.D. in philosophy for work on the relationship between natural science and the foundations of morality; and a second Ph.D. in ecology and evolutionary biology for a study of behavioral evolution in birds. He is an Assistant Professor of Biology at Queens College, and is on the doctoral faculties of Psychology and Biology at the CUNY Graduate Center. His laboratory is devoted to the evolution, development, and function of complex behavior, particularly that which involves learning and can accumulate across generations (i.e., culture). He is currently examining long-term changes in learned bird song, and the correlated cultural evolution of human social organization, morality, and religion.

Abstract. "Morality and its relationship to human evolution." Are we humans essentially altruistic beings whose natural state is to care for others? Or are we ogres at heart, our moral codes the only thing holding us back from utter selfishness? A tour through the evolutionary history of morality and its precursors suggests a third alternative – that we are neither angel nor beast, but are by nature moral strugglers and deliberators. We are not programmed for altruism nor selfishness, but rather have influences in both of these directions, along with a refined ability to assess our social environments and make informed decisions. Humans tend to make moral decisions on the basis of two main variables: the anticipated effects of our behavior on our reputation, and the perceived stability of the social groups on which we depend. Moreover, the part of human nature we call morality is actually a conglomerate of tendencies and capacities, some of which are millions of years old and others just thousands. Many of its more recent features, including moral rules that are difficult for us to follow, are cultural surrogates for adaptation in an age when our social environments are changing too fast for us to adapt genetically to them. In the end, although we have inherited the tools of the moral trade and several important biases, the goals of our lives and the significance we place on morality and goodness are up to us.

—

Luke Kluisza

Bio. Luke Kluisza is an Honors scholar majoring in Psychology at St. Francis College. He is graduating in May of 2014 and his beloved cat, Witz, is very proud of this forthcoming accolade. Moreover, he is writing his Honors thesis on the origins of morality, which is one of his many interests, which also include film and literature. Luke hopes one day to be a clinical psychologist but, in the meanwhile, he enjoys working on his fantasy sports teams.

Abstract. While debates concerning the origins of morality continue to persist in fervent fashion, an indisputable facet of ethical behavior remains its flexibility. The present discussion, through briefly documenting a history of our species rich in homicide, genocide, civil discord, and the subjugation of various minorities, attempts to assuage public speculation of a thoroughly brutish world and acknowledge the lengths we have traveled in cultivating peace. Attending to such supposed moral foundations as religion, in-group loyalty, and reciprocal altruism, this analysis ultimately aims to establish Fiske's (2002) relational model of social norms as a convenient and necessary behavioral taxonomy.

Steven Pinker (2011), devoting his most recent work of monumental achievement, *The Better Angels of Our Nature*, towards delineating multiple stages in humanity's ever-increasing pursuit of peace, marks the shift of our horticultural ancestors towards agriculture as man's first act of collective harmony. Capitalism and free enterprise, offshoots of an emerging concept of "civilization," stifled competition/aggression, revolutionarily allowing neighbors to adopt positive-sum relationships, now being more reliant on the growth and success of one another than ever before. Government and judiciary bodies, referred to as "Leviathans," loomed large over the motivations of malcontents, as indiscriminate, self-serving violence finally met its fiercest opponent. Enlightenment appeals of the mid-eighteenth century toward self-control and education, themselves stalwarts of pacification, were further reinforced through technological innovation, particularly the invention of the printing press; through mainstream access to novels, political satire, and historical accounts documenting the travesties of superstitious killings, capital punishments, slavery, torture, etc., human nature prepared itself for revision. Suddenly, we became acutely capable of putting ourselves into the shoes of others, experiencing the atrocities they did; in other words, we developed empathy. Empathy, reason, self-control, and universal moral standards, constituting Pinker's understanding of our "better angels," sowed the seeds for amicability in a postwar (World War II) society, additionally contributing to a variety of 20th century rights revolutions (civil rights, women's rights, children's rights, homosexual rights, animal rights, etc.). Consequently, we are beholden to the most peaceful age in the history of human development.

Naturally, Hobbes did have justification in assuming that we are an innately selfish species; in many ways, we do still conform to that rule, and universal accord will always remain an impossibility. Recognizing our flaws, rather than denying they exist, however, can further nudge our expanding capacity for peace

in a positive direction; and doing so can be accomplished through establishing a grammar for morality. Anthropologist Alan Fiske's (2002) four-pronged relational taxonomy of social development, itself evolved from Shweder and Haidt's conceptions of morality, provides a remarkably holistic interpretation of humanity's moral foundations. Communal sharing, Fiske's first relational model, combines the values of community and religion/ancestry (if one so chooses to embrace those constructs) to foster group-wide bonding and synchronization. Authority ranking, an evolutionary result of paternalistic dominance among primates, commands individuals to respect our superiors, thus allowing "Leviathans" to properly mediate between the conflicts of our neighbors. Equality matching, essentially, satisfies evolutionary psychologists' appraisal of altruism, encouraging members of all societies to partake in clear-cut reciprocity. Contrived from Max Weber's concept of a "rational-legal" method of social interaction, Fiske's final model, market pricing, creates room for social norms to be resolved through much needed rationality, which allows individuals to separate their behavior from enflamed dogmatism.

The current investigation, while commending our species' rapidly increasing penchant for peace, asserts the need for a universal discussion on the moral foundations of human behavior; Fiske's relational model of social norms, merging the oftentimes conflicting views of naturists, empiricists, and theists alike, can hopefully serve as a unifying platform to help us reap the benefits of an even more amicable world than the one we presently enjoy.

—

Tyler Perkins

Bio. Tyler Perkins is majoring in Philosophy and English, is a member of the Honors Program, and is a student athlete on the men's water polo team.

Abstract. How should we talk about morality at its present state in evolutionary studies? Many of the evolutionary theorists predict the demise of speculative moral philosophizing in the future. I, however, feel that is not the case. It is my experience that the studies about moral sensations, and moral judgement are only affirming that we have sensations (or instincts, emotions) that appear at the beginning of any moral judgement. Lawrence Kohlberg posits a theory in which moral development is attributed to "role taking" which will ultimately contribute to the maturation moral reasoning. While this theory is attributed to moral psychology rather than evolutionary studies, it still allows for the presence of an overarching moral system that assists in affirming or denying our moral instincts.

Jonathan Haidt points out in his article "How (and where) does moral judgement work?" Kohlberg's theory neglects moral emotions, as well as the fact that "the origins of human morality" can be pointed to "a set of emotions that make individuals care about the welfare of others, and about cooperation, cheating,

and norm-following."

However, talk about moral sensations as the basis of human morality presents a problem. When we talk about moral sensations, it is important to consider how we go about expressing them; that is, as soon as we become aware of any moral sensation, we begin to appropriate it so that we may talk about it. The appropriation forces us to categorize our moral emotion so that we can talk about it in a way that other people can understand. Haidt appears to have found a way around this problem insofar as brain imaging equipment has made it possible for scientists to examine neuro-processes that accompany moral judgements – thus, granting access to the neural activity linked to moral sensation before person has had a chance to become aware of it.

My question is now: how do/can we develop a moral theory centered on these moral sensations? Moreover, can we even call this a discussion about *morality* if there is no talk about how one *ought* to act? I don't think we should discard moral sensations; rather, attempt to make use of the discoveries about moral sensations in making claims about morality and how people *ought* to act.

—

Kristy Biolsi, Ph.D.

Bio. Dr. Kristy Biolsi is an Assistant Professor of Psychology at St. Francis College, where she also serves as the Director of the BA/MA Program in Applied Psychology and is a co-founder of the Evolutionary Studies Collaborative. She received her B.S. in Psychobiology from Long Island University, Southampton College in 2001 and in 2007 she received her Ph.D. in Cognitive Psychology from the University of California, Santa Cruz (UCSC). Her research focus was on marine mammal cognition and while at Long Marine Lab she worked specifically with the Pinniped Cognition and Sensory Systems Lab (PCSL). Her current research interests are in comparative cognition, focusing on marine mammals, and she has two main lines of scientific inquiry: laboratory work that is conducted at the Long Island Aquarium and Exhibition Center in Riverhead NY investigating category learning with two captive, trained, California sea lions and field work which consists of data collection from surveys and naturalistic observations of the local harbor seal population. She is the founder and Co-Director of the Center for the Study of Pinniped Ecology and Cognition (CSPEC).

Abstract. Evolved Ethics: Panel Introduction. The question of morality is inherently an interdisciplinary field. With this in mind we have compiled a panel consisting of students and professors from the fields of psychology and biology. This panel will discuss the overarching theme of the evolution of the moral brain and the ethical dilemmas that present themselves when we consider that our human morality may have its roots in the neurology of the brain, and as such, is subject to the forces of evolution.

—

Kathy Nolan, Ph.D.

Bio. Dr. Nolan holds a B.S. in Biology and a minor in Geology from Northeastern University in Boston. She received a Master's in Biology from City College and a Ph.D. in Biology from the City University of New York. Dr. Nolan has been teaching biology at St. Francis College for the past 18 years. She especially enjoys teaching about different types of natural selection. She has taught Biological Evolution at St. Francis College. She researches topics as varied as kin selection, the effects of different salinities on horseshoe crab survival, and fish biodiversity. She has been a Visiting Scientist at the American Museum of Natural History.

Abstract. When taking an integrative approach it becomes apparent that the fields of biology and psychology complement each other. Through discussion of the biological mechanisms of a psychological phenomenon, such as morality, one can see a larger picture and we must then contemplate what effect accepting the concept of continuity of a moral brain may mean for our actions as a species – both to our fellow man and to other animals. The importance of an interdisciplinary approach to this topic will be discussed.

—

Jeannette Raymond

Bio. Jeannette Raymond will be graduating in May 2014 from St. Francis College with a Psychology major and French minor. During her tenure at St. Francis College she has been a research assistant at both the Institute for International and Cross-Cultural Psychology and at Center for the Study of Pinniped Ecology and Cognition. Jeannette is also an Honors program scholar, President of the SFC Chapter of the Psi Chi Honor Society, and of the Dun Scotus Honor Society.

Abstract. "The Neural Philosophy of Moral Behavior." The advance of scientific knowledge over the past 20 years has been dramatic, especially in the field of neurobiology. With that being said, many of the ethical quandaries and moral dilemmas that have come along with these advances have not been entirely addressed. There will always be moral and ethical predicaments surrounding issues such as genetically designed babies and euthanasia. However, other developments in modern science and technology can, and will, guide and change the ways in which we look at some of these issues. Not only will science inform our perspective, it will also inform the way we see ourselves as social and intellectual beings, challenging our current conventions.

—

Lorianna Colon

Bio. Lorianna Colon is currently enrolled in the BA/MA Program in Applied Behavioral Psychology at St. Francis College (SFC). Her research focuses on the

neurobiology of emotion systems and she is particularly interested in neural mechanisms mediating empathy. Lorianna is presently working on her Masters thesis titled *Neural Mechanisms Linking Imitation and Empathy* and is also a member of the SFC Honors Program and Psi Chi chapter, the International Honor Society in Psychology.

Abstract. "The Neural Mechanisms of Morality." This report reviews mounting neurological evidence that suggests that morality is innate to the human brain. Recent neuroimaging studies have presented compelling evidence for a moral network through the study of antisocial behavior. Research utilizing fMRI has compared normal subjects and patients with prefrontal cortex brain lesions and has revealed neurobiological evidence suggesting the existence of an intrinsic, automatic "neuromoral" brain network. This moral brain network encompasses intricate connections between several brain regions including the ventromedial prefrontal cortex, orbitofrontal cortex, amygdala and the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex. The presence of a moral network in the brain is consistent with evolutionary based theories that suggest universal moral emotions such as empathy, gratitude, righteousness, and fairness are fundamental and intrinsic emotions that helped advance social cooperation and the survival of our species.

—

Andrew Salzillo

Bio. Andrew is a senior at St. Francis College from Staten Island, majoring in Biology. He is a member of the Duns Scotus Honors Society and a 4 year member of the Honors Program – holding many positions in the program including, Honors Club President, Program Secretary, and Representative of his Senior and Freshman classes. He is the founder of the Zoology Club at St. Francis and currently serves as its president. Andrew attended the Northeast Regional Honors Conferences in 2012 and 2013, and has been accepted for the 2014 NRHC conference where he will present his Honors Thesis on the synthetic molecular biological process of De-Extinction. Research at the college has included, "The Study of Color Pattern and Social Behavior in African Cichlids" and "Auditory Vocal Patterns of Captive Pinnipeds."

Abstract. "Innate Morality: The Code of ethics Concerning the Human (H. Sapiens) Captivity of Other Species." Mankind has a neurological basis for its morals and man believes morality separates their species from every other. However, if we accept Darwin's theory of evolution, which taught our race about the evolution of animal morphology and physiology – then we must accept that our human morality has evolutionary rudiments that can be found in other species as well. In general, humans today have accepted the theory of Darwinian continuity and have no problem believing that humans are the superior mind and in turn that apes are smarter than rats. Humans, however, seem to ignore that their mind is an evolved form of the primates before them – not a separate entity. If the theory of a neurological basis of morality is accepted then morality was not spontaneously conceived in the human genome. It was a progression of

genetic changes which led to the eventual moral sense that humans have today. How much has the brain changed as it evolved into a moral organ? If nonhuman animals have a sense of morality, then what does it mean that humans are holding them in captivity – either for recreational or scientific purposes? An answer to this would be difficult; there are plenty of reasons to have animals in captivity and plenty of reasons against it.

—

Kevin Woo, Ph.D.

Bio. Dr. Kevin Woo is an Assistant Professor and Faculty Chair at the Metropolitan Center of SUNY Empire State College. Dr. Woo earned his Ph.D. in Animal Behavior from Macquarie University, and was post-doc at the Sydney Institute of Marine Science. He was a Visiting Professor of Psychology at Southwestern University and Visiting Lecturer of Biology at the University of Central Florida. His research examines the evolution of signal communication, using pinniped, canid, avian, and invertebrate models.

Abstract. The evolution of morality in a social context is a complex discussion. One explanation from a biological perspective suggests that morality is innate, but also shaped through selection processes. A social science perspective may add that morality is likely influenced as a consequence of one's behavior, and can also be affected as an individual engages others in specific social contexts. There are clearly other likely explanations, such as through eastern and western religion. However, it is also conceivable that a combination of these philosophies have shaped modern perspectives on morality and sociality – both in animal models and particularly human behavior. In contrast, sociality does not necessarily imply an element of responsibility. This point is critical for noting that the behaviors are not mutually exclusive, but are ways in which humans and animals likely engage each other, and often under similar circumstances. Consequently, there is a stark unevenness in the literature on morality and social responsibility. For example, and to identify two disciplines that been investigated heavily, there is a wealth of literature that focuses on the evolution of corporate social responsibility (CSR) and social welfare ethics. However, there is surprisingly little discussion on morality, disengagement, and agency as it pertains to social contexts. Moreover, there is virtually no discussion about the relationship between the evolution of morality, responsibility, and environmental awareness.

The focus of my presentation is aimed at the transition of morality to social responsibility. In particular, my interest is to question the behavior of urbanites, and their social attitudes towards actions of responsibility in relation to environmental sustainability. There are two interesting contexts: 1) that the urban environment presents unique opportunities to engage in socially responsible ways, and 2) that the threat to natural ecosystems by anthropogenic actions is greatest in urban environments. Here, I will highlight examples in which we may assume that people will act in a socially responsible way, but may behave in a manner contrary to our expectations. We will then question why our

ethics may hence differ from the actions that are ultimately produced. Given this framework, the fundamental question that I will pose is: 'As a society, why do we question ourselves?'

Affiliation: Metropolitan Center, SUNY Empire State College, 325 Hudson St., Fifth Floor, New York, NY 10013-1005; Phone: 646.230.1262; e-mail: Kevin.Woo@esc.edu

—

ABOUT THE ASEBL JOURNAL

[www.asebl.blogspot.com]

ASEBL Journal **[pronounced, az-a-bell] issues are housed on the St. Francis College (Brooklyn Heights, NY) website. This is an online journal, so issues appear as PDFs. Currently the journal is published once a year, around January (though supplements appear on the blog as guest-posts and notes, some of which might be published in the journal itself). We can release a special issue if needed.**

The journal is peer-reviewed and indexed in Humanities Source, a major database of EBSCO Host, and the MLA International Bibliography. This means that if your work is accepted, it will be available to a world-wide audience through a major academic (electronic) publisher and included in a prominent language and literature bibliography. ***ASEBL Journal*** **is also a member of the Council of Editors of Learned Journals.**

If you are interested in submitting, please review carefully the information below and contact the editor, Professor Gregory F. Tague: publisher@ebibliotekos.com

The overall scope of the journal can be classified as evolutionary cultural studies, where culture is understood (via Edward Tylor, 1871) as "that complex whole which includes knowledge, beliefs, art, law, morals, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired . . . as a member of society."

So while ASEBL is interested in, primarily:

1. How moral (social) behavior is depicted in literary texts, how readers might respond to such depictions, and whether or not there is an evolutionary or adaptive function to the production of such moral representations.

Nevertheless, ASEBL can include:

2. The other dimensions of culture Tylor notes. There is no reason one cannot cover personal responsibility, moral identity, social emotions, human nature, consciousness, and conscience from an evolutionary perspective in other cultural manifestations. Scholars working in cognitive cultural studies (e.g., neuroaesthetics or the neurobiology of aesthetic experience) are welcome to

query about a submission. The editors are therefore open to analyses (evolutionary or cognitive) of other cultural creations, such as visual arts, dance, music, film, or sculpture.

In great part the evolution of our social emotions is connected to many of our behavioral codes and cultural productions. How can we re-vitalize the humanities by reading literature (or the other arts) with an understanding of evolutionary (or cognitive) studies? To borrow from the title of Robert Wright's book, what makes a human being a moral animal? We are looking for answers, then, to this question: Why does a moral animal make art?
Please query before submitting, and make sure that any correspondence includes ASEBL in the subject line. Submissions are to be in MLA or APA format: brief in-text citations with a works-cited page; minimal endnotes (no footnotes). Important: endnotes need to be set up without using embedded noting programs. If you use some type of automatically-enumerating noting software (such as Endnote), all of the enumerations get lost when we create the master journal: simply type notes (if you have any), numbered consecutively, as text after your paper just before the bibliography. (See recent issues for models, but again, notes should be kept to a minimum.) Documents should not have any headers or footers. If, after a query, the editor asks you to submit a paper for consideration, please send two Word attachments in one email: one that is a cover sheet with your name and contact information; and a second attachment that is the paper itself (though your name should not appear anywhere in the body of your paper). Papers should be approximately 4,000-5,000 words (more or less). Please submit finished, proofread work only.

We want to use this site as a forum for guests to blog about the connections (consilience / congruence) among philosophy, science, and literature. While blog entries need not be scholarly, there should be some commitment to academic discourse. We are also open to book reviews, although for these we would prefer works only in the realm of evolutionary studies. Please query first about a blog post or (blog) book review – do not send any unsolicited material. When querying, please include ASEBL in the subject line.

To provide context and grounding, many of the following have done some writing in the areas of interest (evolutionary cultural studies, emotions, consciousness, evolutionary psychology, and morality – a highly-selective list: Charles Darwin; Richard Alexander; Maxwell Bennett; Paul Bloom; Christopher Boehm; Wayne C. Booth; Brian Boyd; Joseph Carroll; Patricia Churchland; Leda Cosmides; Antonio Damasio; Richard Dawkins; Daniel Dennett; Ellen Dissanayake; Michael Gazzaniga; Joshua Greene; Jonathan Haidt; Peter M.S. Hacker; Marc Hauser; David Hume; Jerome Kagan; Dennis L. Krebs; Joseph Le Doux; Steven J. Mithen; Martha C. Nussbaum; David Parker; Steven Pinker; Adam Smith; John Tooby; Blakey Vermeule; Frans de Waal; E.O. Wilson; Lisa Zunshine. [18 December 2013 update]

ABOUT THE EVOLUTIONARY STUDIES COLLABORATIVE
St. Francis College

M I S S I O N A N D G O A L S

The Mission of the Evolutionary Studies Collaborative is to advance the study and discussion of evolution using an interdisciplinary approach by:

- **including clear and robust elements of evolution in a range of courses across disciplines;**
- **fostering discussions about evolution in the classroom and on campus;**
- **promoting a greater awareness and understanding of evolution in campus-wide (public) forums.**

The Goals of ESC include (but are not limited to):

- **coordinating meetings with students and professors who wish to discuss evolution (and to find ways of incorporating evolutionary studies in courses);**
- **creating on-campus workshops or symposia highlighting the importance of an evolutionary perspective to learning and teaching;**
- **encouraging students to offer periodic *Evolution Everywhere* presentations (in class, on campus, or via a Collaborative-related blog);**
- **holding public events on campus;**
- **inviting speakers to campus;**
- **conducting field trips;**
- **working with the ASEBL Journal and blog (especially in terms of a biennial Moral Sense Colloquium);**
- **initiating a stand-alone blog (with student involvement) devoted entirely to evolutionary studies at SFC;**
- **engaging with other evolutionary studies programs at other colleges.**

Senior Developers to contact for more information:

Gregory F. Tague, Ph.D. (English);
Irina Ellison, Ph.D. (Biology);
Kristy Biolsi, Ph.D. (Psychology)

[update December 2013]

NOTES