GENEVA ACADEMY
of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights
a joint centre of
GENEVA GRADUATE INSTITUTE
UNIVERSITÉ DE GENÈVE

IN BRIEF ...

NEUROTECHNOLOGIES DEVELOPMENTS: THE RIGHT TO PRIVACY

DECEMBER 2025 | JONATHAN ANDREW

INTRODUCTION

The rapid advancement of neurotechnologies represents one of the most significant scientific frontiers of the 21st century, fundamentally challenging our understanding of human cognition, consciousness, and the boundaries of privacy. These emerging technologies, ranging from brain-computer interfaces (BCIs)[1] to neural monitoring devices and cognitive enhancement systems,[2] promise revolutionary applications in medicine, education, and human performance optimization.[3] However, they simultaneously raise unprecedented questions with respect to many facets of mental privacy—a domain largely considered the last bastion of individual autonomy and personal sanctuary.[4]

The concept of privacy has evolved considerably throughout human history, adapting to technological innovations from the printing press to digital surveillance systems.[5] Yet neurotechnologies present a qualitatively different challenge: the potential for direct access to human thoughts, emotions, memories, and intentions.[6] This development necessitates a fundamental re-examination of the right to privacy within legal, ethical, and philosophical frameworks that were not initially designed to address such intimate technological intrusions.

This analysis explores the complex intersection between neurotechnological advancement and privacy rights, examining both the transformative benefits these technologies offer and the profound risks they pose to cognitive liberty and mental autonomy. The stakes of this discussion extend beyond individual privacy concerns to encompass broader questions of human dignity, democratic governance, and the future of human agency in an increasingly connected world.

OVERVIEW OF CONTEMPORARY NEUROTECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENTS

BRAIN-COMPUTER INTERFACES AND NEURAL PROSTHETICS

Modern BCIs have progressed from experimental laboratory devices to commercially viable medical interventions, enabling direct communication between the brain and external devices. Researchers based at enterprises including Neuralink, Synchron, and Blackrock Neurotech have developed sophisticated systems that enable monitoring of neural signals with increasingly remarkable precision.[7] These devices have already for improvements in mobility for allow paralyzed individuals, and to control computers, robotic limbs, and communication devices, representing a paradigm shift in assistive technology.[8]Therapeutic applications extend beyond motor control to include treatment of depression, epilepsy, and Parkinson's disease through deep brain stimulation and closed-loop neurostimulation systems.[9] These interventions demonstrate neurotechnologies' capacities to not only interpret neural signals but also to modify brain activity, raising questions as to the boundaries between an individual's treatment and enhancement.

NEURAL MONITORING AND NEUROIMAGING TECHNOLOGIES

Advanced neuroimaging techniques, including high-resolution fMRI, optogenetics, and emerging technologies such as ultrasonic neural interfaces, provide unprecedented increasingly nuanced perspectives on brain activity.[10] These non-invasive or minimally invasive methods can detect patterns associated with thoughts, emotions, and decision-making processes, potentially enabling applications in areas such as lie detection, assessment of a person's mental state, and monitoring of cognitive load.[11] In addition, consumer-grade neurotechnologies devices already on the market, such as EEG headsets, claim to assist in activities such as meditation, focus enhancement, and to enable 'brain training', supposedly democratizing access to capabilities while simultaneously expanding the data collection footprint of neurotechnology into everyday life.[12]

COGNITIVE ENHANCEMENT AND NEUROPHARMACOLOGY

The convergence of neurotechnology with pharmaceutical interventions and stimulation techniques has created new possibilities for potential cognitive enhancements. These technologies promise to augment memory, attention, learning capacity, and emotional regulation, potentially transforming educational and professional environments.[13]

BENEFITS OF NEUROTECHNOLOGIES FOR SOCIETY AND INDIVIDUALS

MEDICAL AND THERAPEUTIC USES

Neurotechnologies offer transformative potential for treating previously intractable neurological and psychiatric conditions. Patients with spinal cord injuries, ALS, and locked-in syndrome have regained communication abilities and motor control through BCI systems.[14] Deep brain stimulation has provided relief for individuals with treatment-resistant depression, obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD), and movement disorders, offering hope where prior interventions have either failed or provided limited improvement in patients' conditions.[15]

The potential for a precision medicine approach enabled by neurotechnology allows for personalized treatment protocols based on individual neural patterns, potentially improving therapeutic outcomes while reducing side effects.[16] Real-time neural feedback systems can also potentially optimise treatment delivery and adjust interventions based on ongoing monitoring of neural activity.[17] For individuals with disabilities, neurotechnologies potentially offer unprecedented opportunities for treatment to improve mobility, independence and also social participation.[18] Development in neural prosthetics also promise advancements in the treatment and restoration of sensory capabilities, enabling complex motor control, improved vision, and facilitating communication in ways that traditional assistive technologies have heretofore provided only limited improvements.[19]

Neurotechnologies can also provide researchers with powerful tools for understanding brain function, consciousness, and the neural basis of human behaviour. This enhanced understanding could lead to breakthrough treatments in other areas of medicine such as mental health, neurodevelopmental disorders, and age-related cognitive decline, potentially benefiting millions of individuals worldwide.[20]

PRIVACY RISKS AND CONCERNS

MENTAL PRIVACY AND COGNITIVE LIBERTY

The most fundamental privacy concern raised by neurotechnologies involves the potential violation of mental privacy—the right to keep one's thoughts, memories, and mental processes private.

Unlike traditional surveillance technologies that monitor external behaviours or communications, neurotechnologies could potentially in the future access the content of consciousness itself, including involuntary thoughts, emotional states, and subconscious processes.[21]

This capability raises questions about cognitive liberty—the right to mental self-determination and freedom from unwanted mental intrusion. The involuntary nature of many neural signals means that individuals may be unable to control what information is collected, fundamentally challenging traditional notions of prior and informed consent, and voluntary disclosure.[22]

DATA PROTECTION AND DATA SECURITY

Neural data presents unique data security and data protection challenges due to the sensitivity of the information it relates to, creating particular concerns for personal data collection, processing, data transfers and retention.[23] The theft or misuse of neural data could enable unprecedented forms of fraud and other harms, including profound risks such as psychological manipulation by malign actors.

The storage and transmission of neural data across networks and devices create multiple points of vulnerability where malicious actors could intercept or corrupt brain-derived information. The consequences of such breaches extend beyond individual privacy to include potential manipulation of democratic processes, commercial exploitation, and social control.

IMPLICATIONS FOR SURVEILLANCE AND SOCIAL CONTROL

Neurotechnologies could enable new forms of surveillance, both by State and corporate entities, that penetrate deeper into individual autonomy than any previous technology. Governments could leverage neural monitoring to detect dissent, attempt to predict subversive or criminal behaviour, or enforce ideological compliance.[24] Businesses might attempt to exploit neural data for manipulation of consumer behaviour and preferences for goods and services.[25] The potential for coercive deployment of neurotechnologies in institutional settings—such as prisons, schools, or workplaces—raises concerns about involuntary mental monitoring and the erosion of fundamental human rights. The integration of neurotechnology with existing surveillance infrastructure could create comprehensive monitoring systems that track both external behaviour and internal mental states.

LEGAL AND REGULATORY CHALLENGES

CHALLENGES TO CURRENT LEGAL FRAMEWORKS

Existing privacy laws and regulations have evolved primarily to address and regulate traditional forms of data collection, processing and retention, leaving significant gaps in certain legal frameworks with regard to data protection for information derived from monitoring using neurotechnologies. Current frameworks typically require explicit prior and informed consent for data collection, but the involuntary nature of neural signals complicates traditional consent models.[26]

The classification of neural data within existing legal categories remains unclear, with questions about whether brain signals constitute medical information, biometric data, or an entirely new category requiring specialised protection.[27] Variations in privacy law across jurisdictions and regional human rights mechanisms create additional complications for neurotechnology deployment and data transfers between entities.[28]

The unique characteristics of neural data may necessitate development of existing legal frameworks that address mental privacy as a fundamental human right. Legislation must continue to balance the promotion of beneficial neurotechnology developments and the treatment of diseases with the robust

protection of cognitive liberty and mental autonomy required to safeguard all of a person's interconnected and interdependent human rights. Furthermore, regulatory approaches must consider the dual-use nature of many neurotechnologies, which can serve both beneficial and potentially harmful purposes depending on their application. International cooperation and standardisation efforts will continue to prove essential to prevent regulatory arbitrage and ensure consistent protection of human rights across jurisdictions with respect to the use of neurotechnologies.[29]

ETHICAL FRAMEWORKS AND PHILOSOPHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

HUMAN DIGNITY AND PERSONAL AUTONOMY

The deployment of neurotechnologies raises fundamental questions as regards human dignity and the boundaries of individual personhood. The potential for external control or influence over mental processes challenges core concepts of individual autonomy and self-determination that underpin democratic societies and human rights. Debates as to the nature of consciousness, free will, and personal identity become ever more relevant as neurotechnologies gain the ability to monitor and potentially influence these fundamental aspects of human experience.[30] Moreover, medical procedures that alter normal cognitive variation through neurotechnology interventions raises questions about neurodiversity and the social construction of personhood and identity.[31]

The development and deployment of neurotechnologies must also address questions of distributive justice and equitable access to cognitive enhancement capabilities. If neurotechnologies provide significant advantages in cognitive performance, their unequal distribution could exacerbate existing social inequalities and create new forms of cognitive stratification. The potential for neurotechnologies to be used for social control or discrimination against individuals raises concerns as regards acceptance of neurodiversity and the rights of individuals who may choose not to adopt enhancement technologies.

CONCLUSIONS

The emergence of neurotechnologies marks a pivotal moment in human history, comparable to other transformative innovations that have reshaped society and human experience. The development of neurotechnologies represents both an unprecedented opportunity for human advancement and a fundamental challenge to traditional concepts of privacy and cognitive liberty. The benefits of these technologies—from treating intractable medical conditions to enhancing human capabilities—are potentially substantial, as has already been evidenced by early medical applications of neurotechnologies in treatments of disorders such as Parkinson's Disease.[32] However, the risks they pose to mental privacy and individual autonomy are equally significant and require careful consideration and proactive governance and regulation.

The path forward requires a delicate balance between promoting beneficial innovation and protecting fundamental human rights. This balance can only be achieved through interdisciplinary collaboration amongst all concerned stakeholders: governments, technologists and neuroengineers, bioethicists, legal scholars, and civil society. The further development of appropriate frameworks must occur in parallel with technological advancement, rather than as an afterthought to innovation.

FURTHER RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. **How can legal frameworks be further developed to protect privacy while enabling beneficial neurotechnologies research and development?** This question addresses the fundamental challenge of balancing innovation with human rights protection in an emerging technological domain.

2. **What constitutes meaningful informed prior consent for neurotechnologies interventions that may access involuntary mental processes?** Traditional consent models may prove inadequate for neurotechnologies that can extract neural data for development of inferences without conscious awareness or control of the individual.
3. **How should neural data be classified as a form of personal data, and regulated?** The unique characteristics of nervous system-derived personal data may require new regulatory approaches and legal data protection mechanisms.
4. **What are the long-term societal implications of widespread cognitive enhancement through neurotechnologies?** Understanding the potential for social stratification and inequality is crucial for developing appropriate legal and governance frameworks.
5. **How can the dual-use potential of neurotechnologies be managed to prevent misuse while promoting beneficial applications?** Many neurotechnologies can serve both therapeutic and potentially harmful surveillance or social control functions.
6. **What international governance mechanisms are needed to ensure consistent protection of human rights across different jurisdictions with respect to neurotechnologies use?** Multilateral coordination will be essential to prevent regulatory arbitrage and ensure universal protection of cognitive liberty across jurisdictions.
7. **How do neurotechnologies challenge existing human rights-based concepts pertaining to personal identity, consciousness, and free will?** These fundamental concerns have practical implications for the development of legal and ethical frameworks governing neurotechnology use.

END NOTES

1 See: Hramov, A. E., Maksimenko, V. A., & Pisarchik, A. N. (2021). Physical principles of brain–computer interfaces and their applications for rehabilitation, robotics and control of human brain states.*Physics Reports*,*918*, 1-133.

2 See: Marois, A., & Lafond, D. (2022). Augmenting cognitive work: a review of cognitive enhancement methods and applications for operational domains.*Cognition, Technology & Work*,*24*(4), 589-608.

3 See further: Liu, Z., Shore, J., Wang, M., Yuan, F., Buss, A., & Zhao, X. (2021). A systematic review on hybrid EEG/fNIRS in brain-computer interface. *Biomedical Signal Processing and Control*,*68*, 102595.

4 See: Magee, P., Ienca, M., & Farahany, N. (2024). Beyond neural data: Cognitive biometrics and mental privacy.*Neuron*,*112*(18), 3017-3028.

5 See, for example: López-Silva, P., Wajnerman-Paz, A., & Molnar-Gabor, F. (2024). Neurotechnological applications and the protection of mental privacy: an assessment of risks.*Neuroethics*,*17*(2), 31; Yuste, R. (2023). Advocating for neurodata privacy and neurotechnology regulation.*Nature Protocols*,*18*(10), 2869-2875.

6 See: Collins, B., & Klein, E. (2023). Invasive Neurotechnology: A study of the concept of Invasiveness in Neuroethics.*Neuroethics*,*16*(1), 11.

7 See: Drew, L. (2024). Neuralink brain chip: advance sparks safety and secrecy concerns.*Nature*,*627*(8002), 19; Schalk, G., Brunner, P., Allison, B. Z., Soekadar, S. R., Guan, C., Denison, T., ... & Miller, K. J. (2024). Translation of neurotechnologies.*Nature Reviews Bioengineering*,*2*(8), 637-652.

8 See: Hain, D. S., Jurowetzki, R., Squicciarini, M., & Xu, L. (2023). *Unveiling the neurotechnology landscape: scientific advancements, innovations and major trends*. UNESCO Publishing.

9 See further: Stieglitz, T. (2021). Why Neurotechnologies? about the purposes, opportunities and limitations of neurotechnologies in clinical applications.*Neuroethics*,*14*(1), 5-16; Serrano, R. R. M., Troughton, J. G., Mirkhani, N., Martinez, N., Mariello, M., Tsigarides, J., ... & Guemes, A. (2025). From Neural Sensing to Stimulation: An Interdisciplinary Roadmap for Neurotechnology. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.07116*; Nag, S., & Thakor, N. V. (2016). Implantable neurotechnologies: electrical stimulation and applications. *Medical & biological engineering & computing*,*54*(1), 63-76.

10 See: McDowell, K., Lin, C. T., Oie, K. S., Jung, T. P., Gordon, S., Whitaker, K. W., ... & Hairston, W. D. (2013). Real-world neuroimaging technologies.*Ieee Access*,*1*, 131-149; Shoaran, M., Shin, U., & Shaeri, M. (2024, April). Intelligent neural interfaces: An emerging era in neurotechnology. In*2024 IEEE Custom Integrated Circuits Conference (CICC)*(pp. 1-7). IEEE.

11 See further: Cinel, C., Valeriani, D., & Poli, R. (2019). Neurotechnologies for human cognitive augmentation: current state of the art and future prospects. *Frontiers in human neuroscience*,*13*, 13; Midha, S., Wilson, M. L., & Sharples, S. (2022, June). Ethical concerns and perceptions of consumer neurotechnology from lived experiences of mental workload tracking. In*Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*(pp. 564-573);

12 See: Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). Direct-to-consumer neurotechnology: What is it and what is it for?. *AJOB neuroscience*, *10*(4), 149-151; Wexler, A., & Reiner, P. B. (2019). Oversight of direct-to-consumer neurotechnologies. *Science*, *363*(6424), 234-235.

13 See: Yang, J. (2025). Reversibility of neurotechnological interventions: conceptual and ethical issues.*Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy*, 1-18; Berger, T. W., Gerhardt, G., Liker, M. A., & Soussou, W. (2009). The impact of neurotechnology on rehabilitation. *IEEE reviews in biomedical engineering*, *1*, 157-197; Giacobbe, P., Burhan, A. M., Waxman, R., & Ng, E. (2023). Interventional psychiatry and neurotechnologies: education and ethics training.*Canadian Journal of Neurological Sciences*,*50*(s1), s10-s16.

14 See: Klein, E., & Nam, C. S. (2016). Neuroethics and brain-computer interfaces (BCIs). *Brain-computer interfaces*, *3*(3), 123-125.

15 See: Krauss, J. K., Lipsman, N., Aziz, T., Boutet, A., Brown, P., Chang, J. W., ... & Lozano, A. M. (2021). Technology of deep brain stimulation: current status and future directions.*Nature Reviews Neurology*,*17*(2), 75-87.

16 See: Patel, S. R., & Lieber, C. M. (2019). Precision electronic medicine in the brain. *Nature biotechnology*, *37*(9), 1007-1012.

17 See: Shoaran, M., Shin, U., & Shaeri, M. (2024, April). Intelligent neural interfaces: An emerging era in neurotechnology. In *2024 IEEE Custom Integrated Circuits Conference (CICC)*(pp. 1-7). IEEE.

18 See: Wolbring, G. (2024). Neuro-abilities and a good life.*Journal of Neurology Research*,*14*(1), 16-36.

19 See, for example: Glannon, W. (2021). Ethical and social aspects of neural prosthetics. *Progress in Biomedical Engineering*, *4*(1), 012004; Roeder, B. M., She, X., Dakos, A. S., Moore, B., Wicks, R. T., Witcher, M. R., ... & Hampson, R. E. (2024). Developing a hippocampal neural prosthetic to facilitate human memory encoding and recall of stimulus features and categories.*Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience*,*18*, 1263311 ; Andersen, R. A., Hwang, E. J., & Mulliken, G. H. (2010). Cognitive neural prosthetics.*Annual review of psychology*,*61*(1), 169-190.

20 See: Oberman, L. M., & Enticott, P. G. (Eds.). (2018).*Neurotechnology and brain stimulation in pediatric psychiatric and neurodevelopmental disorders*. Academic Press.

21 See, for example: Yuste, R. (2023). Advocating for neurodata privacy and neurotechnology regulation.*Nature Protocols*,*18*(10), 2869-2875; Kablo, E., & Arias-Cabarcos, P. (2023, November). Privacy in the age of neurotechnology: Investigating public attitudes towards brain data collection and use. In*Proceedings of the 2023 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security* (pp. 225-238); Magee, P., Ienca, M., & Farahany, N. (2024). Beyond neural data: Cognitive biometrics and mental privacy.*Neuron*,*112*(18), 3017-3028.

22 See: Farahany, N. A. (2023).*The battle for your brain: defending the right to think freely in the age of neurotechnology*. St. Martin's Press.

23 See: Ienca, M., & Andorno, R. (2017). Towards new human rights in the age of neuroscience and neurotechnology.*Life sciences, society and policy*,*13*(1), 5.

24 See: Rickli, J. M., & Ienca, M. (2021). The security and military implications of neurotechnology and artificial intelligence. In*Clinical neurotechnology meets artificial intelligence: philosophical, ethical, legal and social implications*(pp. 197-214). Cham: Springer International Publishing; Bublitz, C. (2024). Neurotechnologies and human rights: restating and reaffirming the multi-layered protection of the person. *The International Journal of Human Rights*,*28*(5), 782-807.

25 See: Cinel, C., Valeriani, D., & Poli, R. (2019). Neurotechnologies for human cognitive augmentation: current state of the art and future prospects. *Frontiers in human neuroscience*,*13*, 13.

26 See further: Giordano, J. (2015). Conditions for consent to the use of neurotechnology: a preparatory neuroethical approach to risk assessment and reduction.*AJOB Neuroscience*,*6*(4), 12-14.

27 See further: Yuste, R. (2023). Advocating for neurodata privacy and neurotechnology regulation. *Nature Protocols*, *18*(10), 2869-2875; López-Silva, P., Wajnerman-Paz, A., & Molnar-Gabor, F. (2024). Neurotechnological applications and the protection of mental privacy: an assessment of risks.*Neuroethics*,*17*(2), 31.

28 See: Genser, J., Damianos, S., & Yuste, R. (2024). Safeguarding brain data: assessing the privacy practices of consumer neurotechnology companies.*NeuroRights Foundation*.

29 See further: Hain, D. S., Jurowetzki, R., Squicciarini, M., & Xu, L. (2023).*Unveiling the neurotechnology landscape: scientific advancements, innovations and major trends*. UNESCO Publishing; Bublitz, J. C. (2024). What an international declaration on neurotechnologies and human rights could look like: Ideas, suggestions, desiderata.*AJOB neuroscience*,*15*(2), 96-112.

30 See: Bublitz, C. (2024). Neurotechnologies and human rights: restating and reaffirming the multi-layered protection of the person. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, *28*(5), 782-807; Collins, B., & Klein, E. (2023). Invasive Neurotechnology: A study of the concept of Invasiveness in Neuroethics. *Neuroethics*, *16*(1), 11.

31 See: SANDUA, D. (2024). *Neurotechnology: Brain-computer-interface and the Future of Humanity*. David Sandua.

32 See: Möller, J. C., Zutter, D., & Riener, R. (2021). Technology-based neurorehabilitation in Parkinson's disease—A narrative review. *Clinical and Translational Neuroscience*, *5*(3), 23.

THE GENEVA ACADEMY

The Geneva Academy provides post-graduate education, conducts academic legal research and policy studies, and organizes training courses and expert meetings. We concentrate on branches of international law that relate to situations of armed conflict, protracted violence, and protection of human rights.

DISCLAIMER

The Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights is an independent academic centre. Our publications seek to provide insights, analysis and recommendations, based on open and primary sources, to policymakers, researchers, media, the private sector and the interested public. The designations and presentation of materials used, including their respective citations, do not imply the expression of any opinion on the part of the Geneva Academy concerning the legal status of any country, territory, or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its boundaries. The views expressed in this publication represent those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Geneva Academy, its donors, parent institutions, the board or those who have provided input or participated in peer review. The Geneva Academy welcomes the consideration of a wide range of perspectives in pursuing a well-informed debate on critical policies, issues and developments in international human rights and humanitarian law.

GENEVA ACADEMY
of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights

a joint centre of

GENEVA GRADUATE INSTITUTE

UNIVERSITÉ DE GENÈVE

Villa Moynier
Rue de Lausanne 120B
CP 1063 - 1211 Geneva 1 - Switzerland

Phone: +41 (22) 908 44 83
Email: info@geneva-academy.ch
www.geneva-academy.ch