

Neuro-Rights, Human Subject Protections, and Safeguards for Emerging Neurotechnologies

A Policy Framework for Bioethical Governance and Neural Sovereignty

Specification	Institutional Details
Organization	Advocacy for Neuro Rights Inc. (A4NR)
Lead Author	Lewis Scott Rowe, CEO & Ethics Practitioner
Document Standard	Policy Directive & Human Rights Framework
Domain Focus	Bioethics, Cognitive Liberty, Neural Data Governance & Patient Autonomy

Executive Summary

Advocacy for Neuro Rights (A4NR) was established to advocate for individuals reporting complex neurological, physiological, sensory, psychological, toxicological, and legal concerns. Over multiple years of advocacy, case management, and registry development, recurring themes emerged involving informed consent, autonomy, diagnostic reassessment, participant protections, emerging technologies, and gaps in existing governance frameworks.

Through longitudinal case review, multidisciplinary documentation, practitioner coordination, and public-health analysis, A4NR identified a need for expanded discussion surrounding future neurotechnologies, physiological telemetry systems, artificial intelligence, Brain-Computer Interfaces (BCIs), Medical Internet of Things (IoT) systems, Wireless Body Area Networks (WBANs), and emerging nanotechnologies.

The purpose of this paper is not to establish proof of a specific technological mechanism, nor to make claims regarding any particular system. Instead, this framework seeks to identify ethical, scientific, legal, and public-health questions that deserve consideration before future technological capabilities outpace existing human-subject protections.

The New Human Rights Frontier

Human rights frameworks were developed to protect the body, privacy, freedom of movement, freedom of speech, freedom of thought, and personal autonomy.

Emerging neurotechnologies introduce a new category of questions. Technologies are increasingly capable of monitoring biological information, interpreting physiological signals, analyzing behavioral patterns, collecting large-scale health data, and interacting with human cognition through increasingly sophisticated interfaces.

Historically, governments developed protections after harms occurred. Neuro-rights offer an opportunity to establish protections before future technological capabilities create irreversible consequences.

The challenge presented by neurotechnology is not only technical. It is ethical, legal, social, and humanitarian.

Core Bioethical Pillars

Cognitive Liberty

Every individual should retain the right to independent thought and self-determination. Freedom of thought has historically been treated as an assumed human condition. Emerging neurotechnologies may require societies to formally recognize cognitive liberty as a protected right.

No individual should lose authority over their own cognitive processes because of technological systems, data-collection environments, or future forms of neurobiological interaction. The preservation of cognitive liberty should become a central principle guiding future neurotechnology governance.

Mental Privacy

The concept of privacy must evolve alongside technology. Current privacy laws are primarily designed around communications, financial information, digital records, and personal identifiers.

Future neurotechnologies may create entirely new classes of information involving attention, cognition, perception, neurological activity, physiological states, behavioral prediction, and biological data. Mental privacy recognizes that information derived from the human body and mind warrants heightened protections due to its intimate relationship with personal identity and autonomy.

Future governance should ensure that individuals maintain meaningful control over information derived from biological and neurological processes.

Neuro-Autonomy

The right to bodily autonomy has long been recognized in medicine and ethics. Emerging neurotechnologies suggest the need for an expanded concept: neuro-autonomy.

Individuals should retain the ability to make informed decisions concerning participation in technologies capable of collecting, monitoring, storing, transmitting, or analyzing physiological and neurological information. Meaningful informed consent should remain a foundational requirement for any technology interacting with the human nervous system or biological systems.

Emerging Technology Domains

Artificial Intelligence and Human Cognition

Artificial intelligence is increasingly integrated into healthcare, communications, education, public services, and decision-support systems. While these technologies may provide significant benefits, they also introduce questions concerning transparency, accountability, algorithmic influence, and decision-making authority.

Future governance should ensure that AI systems affecting human wellbeing remain subject to oversight, explainability, accountability, and ethical review. Human judgment should remain central to decisions impacting health, autonomy, legal rights, and human dignity.

Brain-Computer Interfaces and Neural Technologies

Brain-Computer Interfaces represent one of the most rapidly developing fields in modern science. Potential applications include rehabilitation, assistive technologies, communication support, neurological treatment, and healthcare innovation.

As these technologies advance, critical questions emerge regarding:

- Long-term safety and neurological stability
- Neural data ownership and biological sovereignty
- Human subject and participant protections
- Modernized informed consent protocols
- Preservation of neuro-autonomy
- Cognitive liberty and thought sanctuary
- Mental privacy standards

Governance frameworks should be established before widespread deployment rather than after preventable harms occur.

Wireless Body Area Networks and Physiological Telemetry

Wireless Body Area Networks (WBANs) and physiological telemetry systems are increasingly utilized in healthcare environments. These technologies may include wearable devices, implantable sensors, remote health monitoring systems, and Medical Internet of Things (IoT) platforms.

While these systems offer substantial benefits, they also expand the scale and scope of physiological information capable of being collected, processed, transmitted, and stored. Additional transparency and participant protections may be necessary to ensure that vulnerable populations are not subjected to intrusive monitoring practices without meaningful awareness and consent.

Safeguarding Vulnerable Populations

Particular attention must be given to vulnerable populations. Historically, individuals experiencing disability, illness, cognitive impairment, social isolation, institutionalization, financial hardship, or diagnostic uncertainty have often faced increased barriers to advocacy and representation.

Future neurotechnology governance should ensure that vulnerable populations receive enhanced protections rather than reduced protections. Respect for Persons, Beneficence, and Justice remain relevant and should continue serving as foundational principles for future governance strategies.

Modernizing the Belmont Framework

The Belmont Report (1979) remains one of the most important ethical documents in American research history. Its core principles—Respect for Persons, Beneficence, and Justice—continue to provide meaningful guidance. However, the technological environment of the twenty-first century differs substantially from the environment in which Belmont was originally developed.

Future ethical and regulatory discussions should explore how these foundational principles apply to:

- Artificial intelligence and predictive behavioral modeling
- Brain-Computer Interfaces and closed-loop systems
- Physiological telemetry systems and biometric data harvesting
- Medical IoT platforms and continuous health tracking
- Wireless Body Area Networks (WBANs)
- Non-clinical neurotechnology research and consumer wearables
- Advanced biomonitoring systems and ambient signal extraction
- Emerging nanotechnologies and nanoscale bio-interfaces

Policy Recommendations

Advocacy for Neuro Rights respectfully recommends the implementation of ten core directives:

1. **Recognition of Cognitive Liberty:** Formally codify cognitive liberty as an inviolable, constitutionally protected human right.
2. **Expansion of Mental Privacy:** Establish legal standards classifying raw neural data and cognitive inferences as sensitive biological Protected Health Information (PHI).
3. **Development of Neuro-Autonomy Standards:** Guarantee individuals complete sovereignty and decision-making authority over technologies interacting with their nervous systems.

4. **Modernization of Informed Consent:** Mandate continuous, transparent, and plain-language consent protocols that fully disclose algorithmic, data-sharing, and long-term neural risks.
5. **Enhanced Protections for Vulnerable Populations:** Create procedural safeguards for individuals facing diagnostic uncertainty, disability, or institutionalization to prevent clinical misclassification or unconsented exposure.
6. **Independent Oversight of Emerging Neurotechnologies:** Extend Institutional Review Board (IRB) and Federalwide Assurance (FWA) mandates to commercial, non-funded, and consumer-grade neurotechnologies.
7. **Transparency Standards for Telemetry Systems:** Enforce mandatory disclosure, signal classification, and cybersecurity encryption for all Wireless Body Area Networks and Medical IoT platforms.
8. **Interdisciplinary Research Directives:** Foster collaborative research initiatives bridging neuroscience, biomedical ethics, public health, computer science, and legal scholarship.
9. **Evaluation of BCI Governance Frameworks:** Establish national and international regulatory standards for brain-computer interfaces prior to commercial or ambient deployment.
10. **Creation of a Federal Neurotechnology Initiative:** Form a dedicated federal agency liaison body to oversee neuro-rights protections, track emerging risks, and enforce compliance.

Conclusion

The purpose of this paper is not to oppose scientific advancement. Rather, it is to encourage responsible innovation grounded in human dignity, informed consent, transparency, autonomy, and public trust.

Neurotechnologies possess extraordinary potential to improve human health and wellbeing. However, technological capability alone should never determine the future of human rights.

As artificial intelligence, Brain-Computer Interfaces, Wireless Body Area Networks, physiological telemetry systems, Medical Internet of Things platforms, and future nanotechnologies continue to evolve, society should ensure that ethical safeguards evolve alongside them.

The future should be shaped not only by what technology can do, but by what humanity decides it ought to do.

References

- HHS. (2026). HHS seeks public input on electromagnetic fields and wireless radiation. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Ienca, M., & Andorno, R. (2017). Towards new human rights in the age of neuroscience and neurotechnology. *Life Sciences, Society and Policy*, 13(5), 1-27.
- IEEE Standards Association. (2012). **IEEE Standard for local and metropolitan area networks: Part 15.6 Wireless body area networks**. IEEE.
- National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research. (1979). **The Belmont report: Ethical principles and guidelines for the protection of human subjects of research**. U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Rainey, S., Erden, Y. J., & Maslen, H. (2020). Brain recording, mind-reading, and neurotechnology: Ethical issues from consumer devices to brain-computer interfaces. *AJOB Neuroscience*, 11(2), 1-12.
- UNESCO. (2023). **Recommendation on the Ethics of Neurotechnology**. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
- Yaghoubi, M., Ahmed, K., & Miao, Y. (2022). Wireless body area networks: Architecture, applications, and security challenges. *Journal of Sensor and Actuator Networks*, 11(4), 67.