Become a Member

Log In ScienceMag.org Q



Log In ScienceMag.org Q

Brain scientists can watch neurons fire and communicate. They can map how brain regions light up during sensation, decision-making, and speech. What they can't explain is how all this activity gives rise to consciousness. Theories abound, but their advocates often talk past each other and interpret the same set of data differently. "Theories are very flexible," says Christof Koch, president of the Allen Institute for Brain Science in Seattle, Washington. "Like vampires, they're very difficult to slay."

Now, the Templeton World Charity Foundation (TWCF), a nonprofit best known for funding research at the intersection of science and religion, hopes to narrow the debate with experiments that directly pit theories of consciousness against each other. The first phase of the \$20 million project, launched this week at the Society for Neuroscience meeting in Chicago, Illinois, will compare two theories of consciousness by scanning the brains of participants during cleverly designed tests. Proponents of each theory have agreed to admit it is flawed if the outcomes go against them.

Head-to-head contests are rare in basic science. "It's a really outlandish project," says principal investigator Lucia Melloni, a neuroscientist at the Max Planck Institute for Empirical Aesthetics in Frankfurt, Germany. But understanding consciousness has become increasingly important for researchers seeking to communicate with locked-in patients, determine whether artificial intelligence systems can become conscious, or explore whether animals experience consciousness the way humans do. To winnow the theories, TWCF took inspiration from a 1919 experiment in which physicist Arthur Eddington pitted Albert Einstein's theory of general relativity against Isaac Newton's gravitational theory. Eddington measured how the Sun's gravity caused light from nearby stars to shift during a solar eclipse—and Einstein won.

SIGN UP FOR OUR DAILY NEWSLETTER

Get more great content like this delivered right to you!

Email Address *

Consciousness, however, is much less easily tested or mathematically defined than gravity. TWCF has identified a half-dozen leading consciousness theories and intends to eventually fund research to test them all. "What we hope for is a process that reduces the number of incorrect theories," says foundation President Andrew Serazin, who is based in Nassau, Bahamas. "We want to reward people who are courageous in their work, and part of having courage is having the humility to change your mind."

from the interconnectedness of brain networks. The more neurons interact with one another, the more a being feels conscious—even without sensory input. IIT proponents suspect this process occurs in the back of the brain, where neurons connect in a gridlike structure.

To test the schemes, six labs will run experiments with a total of more than 500 participants, costing the foundation \$5 million. The labs, in the United States, Germany, the United Kingdom, and China, will use three techniques to record brain activity as volunteers perform consciousness-related tasks: functional magnetic resonance imaging, electroencephalography, and electrocorticography (a form of EEG done during brain surgery, in which electrodes are placed directly on the brain). In one experiment, researchers will measure the brain's response when a person becomes aware of an image. The GWT predicts the front of the brain will suddenly become active, whereas the IIT says the back of the brain will be consistently active.

Tononi and Dehaene have agreed to parameters for the experiments and have registered their predictions. To avoid conflicts of interest, the scientists will neither collect nor interpret the data. If the results appear to disprove one theory, each has agreed to admit he was wrong—at least to some extent.

The project has drawn criticism, mostly because it includes the IIT. Anil Seth, a neuroscientist at the University of Sussex in Brighton, U.K., says the theory is too philosophical—attempting to explain why consciousness exists, rather than how the brain determines whether a stimulus is worthy of conscious attention—to be directly testable. "I don't think [the competition] will do what it says on the tin," he says. Tononi himself doubts the experiments could rule out all aspects of his theory, although he says they could "make our life more difficult."

Koch, who supports the IIT, disagrees with Seth's assessment. "Of course it's testable," he says. He points to clinical trials in which researchers stimulate the brains of people in minimally conscious states such as comas or under anesthesia, triggering brain activity patterns that suggest neurons interconnect in the way the IIT predicts.

Despite his misgivings about the project's prospect for a decisive answer, Seth says it will spark discussion and collaboration among scientific rivals. "That itself is to be applauded," he says.

Become a Member Log In ScienceMag.org Q



More from News

Human speech may have a universal transmission rate: 39 bits per second



Study challenges idea that autism is caused by an overly masculine brain



Cheer up! Optimists live longer



Enjoy reading News from Science? Subscribe today. If you have already subscribed, log into your News account.

Got a tip?

How to contact the news team

ScienceInsider

Statistically speaking, 2019 Nobel Prize lineup of 11 men and one woman was bound to happen By Lila Guterman | Oct. 15, 2019



•



Prestigious journal pulls paper about chemical attack in Syria after backlash

By Kai Kupferschmidt | Oct. 14, 2019

By Elizabeth Pennisi | Oct. 11, 2019



In bid to boost transparency, bioRxiv begins posting peer reviews next to preprints

By Jeffrey Brainard | Oct. 10, 2019



More ScienceInsider

Sifter

Many state birds may flee their home states as planet warms

By Eva Frederick | Oct. 10, 2019



Pigs caught on video using tools for the first time

By Eva Frederick | Oct. 7, 2019



What made *T. rex*'s bite so ferocious?

By Eva Frederick | Sep. 27, 2019



Your tea could contain billions of plastic particles

By Eva Frederick | Sep. 26, 2019



Here's how much a whale is worth to economists

By Eva Frederick | Sep. 25, 2019



Become a Member

Log In ScienceMag.org Q

11 October 2019

Vol 366, Issue 6462



Table of Contents

Seeing fossils in a new light

ECOLOGY

Our future in the fjords

ASTRONOMY

Telescope seeks clues to exoplanet interiors

ANTHROPOLOGY

Bronze Age inequality and family life revealed in powerful study

MEDICINE/DISEASES

Cellular oxygen sensor system earns Nobel for trio

PHYSICS

Nobel honors pioneers in cosmology and exoplanets

Subscribe Today

Receive a year subscription to Science plus access to exclusive AAAS member resources, opportunities, and benefits.

Subscribe Today

Get Our Newsletters

Receive emails from Science. See full list

Become a Member Log In ScienceMag.org Q

Scrience Careers July Seeker	
Country *	*
Email address *	
I agree to receive emails from AAAS/ <i>Science</i> and <i>Science</i> advertisers, including information on products, services, and special offers which may include but are not limited to news, career information, & upcoming events.	
Click to view the Privacy Policy.	
Sign up today	
Required fields are indicated by an asterisk (*)	

About Us

Journals

News from Science

Leadership

Team Members

Work at AAAS

For Advertisers

Advertising Kits

Awards and Prizes

Custom Publishing

Webinars

For Authors

Submit

Information for Authors

Editorial Policies

Become a Member Log In ScienceMag.org Q

Related Sites

AAAS.org

EurekAlert!

Science in the Classroom

Science Magazine Japanese

Help

Access and Subscriptions Order a Single Issue Reprints and Permissions Contact Us Accessibility

Stay Connected



© 2019 American Association for the Advancement of Science. All rights Reserved. AAAS is a partner of HINARI, AGORA, OARE, CHORUS, CLOCKSS, CrossRef and COUNTER.

Terms of Service | Privacy Policy | Contact AAAS