Responsibility for Rationality
Foundations of an Ethics of Mind

Sebastian Schmidt, University of Zurich, Switzerland (Postdoctoral Researcher)
University of Johannesburg, South Africa (Research Associate)
sebastian.schmidt@philos.uzh.ch

_____

Abstract: How can we be responsible for our attitudes if we cannot normally choose what we believe, desire, feel, and intend? This problem has received much attention during the last decades, both in epistemology and in ethics. Yet its connections to discussions about reasons and rationality have been largely overlooked. *Responsibility for Rationality* is the first book that connects recent debates on responsibility and on rationality in a unifying dialectic. It achieves four main goals: first, it reinterprets the problem of responsibility for attitudes as a problem about the normativity of rationality; second, it breaks the stalemate between rationalist and voluntarist accounts of mental responsibility by defending a hybrid view; third, it provides novel support to recent accounts of the normativity of rationality by arguing that epistemic reasons and other 'right-kind' reasons are genuine normative reasons; fourth, it sets the foundations and the research agenda for an 'ethics of mind', including an illustration of how to approach applied issues in epistemology within the presented framework. After spelling out connections between responsibility and rationality (part I), the book engages in debates in normative epistemology (part II) and brings them to bear on the broader field of an ethics of mind (part III).

Keywords: Responsibility, Blame, Rationality, Reasons, Attitudes, Belief, Epistemology

Contents

Main proposal

1. Motivation

We take each other to be responsible for our attitudes in a similar way as we take each other to be responsible for our actions. We think that we *ought* to believe in human-induced climate change, and we even consider it to be appropriate to criticize others if they fail to believe in it. A malicious desire, like the desire for another's suffering, can rightly provoke not only disapproval, but also resentment or indignation. An emotion like anger might turn out to be unjustified, and we might owe an apology to the person who was the target of our hostile emotion. And merely *intending* to become a better person is often already worthy of praise or credit.

Yet our practice of holding each other responsible for our attitudes can become puzzling upon reflection. Attitudes are not themselves exercises of voluntary control – mental states are nothing we, strictly speaking, *do*. They are not actions, but states. It seems that we cannot *choose* what we believe or feel. Yet, according to a widespread assumption, we are only responsible for what is within the scope of our voluntary control. According to Descartes,

> only one thing in us […] could give us good reason for esteeming ourselves, namely the exercise of our free will and the control we have over our volitions. For we can reasonably be praised or blamed only for actions that depend upon this free will (1649, art. 152).

If Descartes is right, then how can we be responsible for our attitudes?

Here is a common response. Intuitively, we are not responsible for just *being* in a state – at most, we are responsible for causing a state or for failing to avoid it. For instance, we are not responsible for just *having* a headache. Nevertheless, we can control our headaches by taking painkillers, and this ability to indirectly control our headaches can explain why we are sometimes responsible for them. Similarly, we can often control our beliefs indirectly by engaging in inquiry, our emotions by going for a walk, and our desires and intentions by actively deliberating about what is good and right. It thus seems that responsibility for attitudes can be derived from the responsibility for actions and omissions which had some foreseeable influence on our attitudes: since attitudes are states, we can only be responsible for them indirectly – that is, we can only be responsible for them *in virtue of* being responsible for actions and omissions. For only the latter are things over which we exercise direct voluntary control.[1]

Recently, this common response has fallen into disrepute.[2] For it presents our attitudes as something *external* to us – as something for which we are only responsible indirectly, in the way we are responsible for the state of our apartment, for the behavior of our dog, or for suffering pain. However, we often hold our attitudes *for reasons*, and sometimes we are criticizable for not complying with our reasons for attitudes – say, for failing to believe what our evidence supports. This suggests that our responsibility for attitudes must be as direct as the responsibility for our actions. Yet how can this be if attitudes are states, and all control over states is indirect? Call this *the problem of mental responsibility*.

---

[1] For elaborated defenses of this kind of *indirect voluntarist* account of responsibility for attitudes, see Meylan (2013; 2017) and Peels (2017) on doxastic responsibility, Oakley (1992) on emotional responsibility, and Jacobs (2001) on responsibility for character. See also Rosen's (2004) view that blameworthiness always originates in *akratic* action, and Fischer and Tognazzini's (2009) view on tracing back all responsibility to voluntary action.

[2] This is mainly due to the *rationalist* accounts of responsibility for attitudes that oppose the views mentioned in the last footnote; see Owens (2000; 2017: intro.), Smith (2005), Hieronymi (2006; 2008; 2014), McHugh (2013; 2014; 2017), McCormick (2015), Roberts (2015), Portmore (2019), White (2019), Schmidt (2020b; 2022a), and Osborne (2021). Adams (1985) and Montmarquet (1993) are earlier opponents of indirect voluntarist accounts.

2. The Project

This section describes the project of *Responsibility for Rationality*, which develops a solution to the philosophical problem just outlined. I first summarize its relevance for current debates. I then sketch my main argument, summarize my main claims, and present the book's structure.

2.1 Relevance

In the last twenty years, research on the rationality of attitudes and on responsibility for attitudes has developed into independent specialized debates. Since both strands of research are concerned with the normative dimensions of *attitudes*, we would expect the debates to be relevant to each other. Yet they are conducted in isolation. *Responsibility for Rationality* is an attempt to change this. It is the first book that brings together both recent debates in a unifying dialectic.

If rationality is more than just 'a pretty pattern of mental states'[3] – that is, if rationality places genuine normative requirements on us to believe, desire, intend, and feel certain things[4] – then we surely must be responsible for complying with rational requirements. Yet if we cannot normally choose our attitudes, then responsibility for rationality is *prima facie* puzzling. The question of how we *control* our attitudes has already received plenty of attention.[5] The present book therefore takes a different approach: it considers how our direct responsibility for (ir)rational attitudes is revealed in our blaming practices. In doing so, the book

- connects the most recent research on responsibility with the most recent research on rationality in a unifying dialectic (see section 2.2 below),
- develops the foundations of an ethics of mind by showing how direct responsibility for attitudes *and* the normativity of rationality are revealed in our blaming practices,
- proposes an original hybrid view of responsibility for attitudes, according to which we are directly responsible for our attitudes in a *robust* sense, while still acknowledging that indirect control over our mind is highly relevant for our blaming practices,
- offers an original defense of the normativity of epistemic reasons for belief and of other 'right-kind' reasons for attitudes[6] – a recently hot topic in epistemology and normative theory on which any recent defense of the normativity of rationality depends, and,
- finally, delivers a rich theoretical background for further research in the ethics of mind, among which are questions in *applied* philosophy: How should we shape our mind and the minds of others, and when should we refrain from such shaping? How should we relate to each other in light of the attitudes we hold, especially in concrete contexts that threaten to undermine our responsibility, such as an epistemically polluted environment (see Levy 2022), ideological indoctrination, or systemic oppression?

By contributing to two contemporary debates at the intersection of epistemology and (meta)ethics, connecting them within one original approach, and finally providing a new framework for (applied) normative theory, the book is guaranteed to be of interest to a wide audience.

---

[3] The phrase is from Wedgwood (2017). It is *prima facie* difficult to see why rationality is normative if, as defended by Broome (2013), rationality consists in holding coherent attitudes (see Kolodny 2005 and Kiesewetter 2017).

[4] As recent proponents in the debate have extensively argued; see Kiesewetter (2017), Lord (2018), and Wedgwood (2017; forthcoming). See also Worsnip's (2021) recent argument that structural rationality is normative.

[5] See, e.g., Hieronymi (2006; 2009; 2014), McCormick (2015), Meylan (2013; 2017), Peels (2017), Smith (2005).

[6] On the distinction between right-kind and wrong-kind reasons, see Gertken and Kiesewetter (2017).

2.2 Main argument

Responsibility for Rationality presents a novel diagnosis of the problem of mental responsibility in part I (chapters 1–3). The problem originates from the intuition that attitudes can be normatively evaluated in ways that seem to presuppose direct responsibility. Evaluations of attitudes as 'irrational' play a key role in driving this intuition. For they seem to imply that the person holding the irrational attitude is directly criticizable, and thus responsible, for the attitude.[7] Note that rationality requires us to *be* in certain mental states. For instance, it might require us to believe in accordance with our evidence and intend in accordance with our reasons for action. If we fail to hold the attitudes that rationality requires, then we seem to be liable to criticism or blame. Importantly, these requirements are not reducible to requirements to perform actions by means of which we could manage our mental states – like inquiry, meditation, or controlling one's attention. Indeed, it might be a sign of irrationality if one must first perform such actions to make oneself rational: the rational agent immediately revises an irrational attitude upon noticing it, and she does so in an effortless manner. So, if the *indirect* control that we can sometimes exercise over our mind cannot explain the *direct* responsibility that we have for complying with rational requirements, then what can?

Indirect voluntarists deny that we are ever responsible just for *being* rational. They must argue that rationality doesn't place any normative requirements on us to *be* in a mental state: we are only required to *ensure* our rationality whenever there are decisive prudential or moral reasons to do so. To support their view, voluntarists can appeal to newly developed arguments to the effect that epistemic reasons and other right-kind reasons for attitudes aren't 'genuinely normative' reasons.[8] This would vindicate their view that we are never directly required to hold the attitudes that are best supported by right-kind reasons. Additionally, if these new arguments were sound, then not even the views according to which rationality *consists* in responding correctly to right-kind reasons could vindicate the normativity of rationality.[9]

Thus, recent doubts about the normativity of epistemic reasons and other right-kind reasons pose new challenges for direct mental responsibility *and* for the normativity of rationality. In the following chapters, I spell out this challenge and offer a comprehensive reply. The aim is to vindicate the idea that we are *directly* and *genuinely* responsible for being (ir)rational: rationality places normative requirements on us to hold certain attitudes and we can be legitimately subject to serious blaming responses if we fail to comply with rational requirements.

The second part (chapters 4–5) concerns the rationality of belief, and specifically the normativity of epistemic reasons. After spelling out the challenge for the normativity of epistemic reasons from the recent literature (see section 5 below, page 15, for details), I reply to this challenge by arguing that epistemic irrationality is a vice that impairs one's relationship to one's epistemic community, thus warranting epistemic blame. Appropriate epistemic blame

---

[7] See Kauppinen (2019: 3), Kiesewetter (2017: ch. 2), Parfit (2011: 123), Way (2009: 1). Worsnip (2021) pushes back on this idea, arguing that rational criticism is often 'merely evaluative'. I critically discuss his arguments.

[8] See the view of Maguire and Woods (2020) that epistemic reasons are not 'authoritatively' normative, and their denial of reasons for affective attitudes (Maguire and Woods 2018). Similar doubts come from epistemic instrumentalism (Cowie 2014; 2019; Steglich-Petersen and Skipper 2019; 2020) and pragmatism (McCormick 2020; Rinard 2017; 2022). For critical discussions, see Kiesewetter (2021), Paakunainen (2018), and Schmidt (2021).

[9] See Kiesewetter (2017) and Lord (2018), who argue that rationality consists in responding correctly to one's possessed or available right-kind reasons yet take it for granted that right-kind reasons are normative. Worsnip (2021) has recently argued convincingly that requirements of structural rationality (or of coherence) provide us with right-kind reasons for structuring deliberation in certain ways. The challenge I discuss in the book is a challenge for any such view of rationality that vindicates rationality's normativity in terms of right-kind reasons.

implies that a genuinely normative requirement has been violated – one that applies directly to belief, rather than merely to belief-managing actions. Epistemic blame thus reveals the normativity of epistemic rationality, and thereby the sense in which we can be said to be directly responsible for holding (ir)rational beliefs without assuming direct control over belief.[10]

The third part (chapters 6–8) generalizes this argument to other attitudes, especially desire, emotion, and intention. First, I show how the challenge for the normativity of epistemic reasons that I carved out in part II is also a challenge for the normativity of the rationality of desire, emotion, and intention. I then meet the generalized version of the challenge by arguing that distinctive blaming responses are appropriate towards all kinds of rational failure. I argue that violating rational requirements makes us vicious and impairs our relationships, which gives rise to legitimate blame, ranging from distinctively epistemic blame to genuine moral blame.[11] Rationality sets standards of evaluation that we normatively expect each other to live up to, even if we cannot always (directly or indirectly) choose being rational.

Finally, by defending a *hybrid view* of responsibility for attitudes, I provide a way out of the dialectical stalemate between rationalist and indirect voluntarist views (see Schmidt 2022a: 1–2). Rationalists argue that we are directly responsible for our attitudes because attitudes are directly responsive to reasons. Voluntarists reply that reasons-responsiveness only gives rise to mere rational evaluability, which isn't genuine responsibility (see Peels 2017: 46–8, 159–60). Rationalists disagree; voluntarists remain unconvinced. I argue that we can get out of this stalemate by considering how we blame each other for irrationality. This provides rationalists with a convincing reply to voluntarists: the dichotomy between 'genuine blame' and 'mere rational evaluation' is false because irrational attitudes can warrant various kinds of genuine blaming responses. In addition, we can still acknowledge that the amount of indirect control we had over an irrational attitude affects the intensity and sometimes even the kind of blaming response that is appropriate, thus capturing the indirect voluntarist's intuitions.

Overall, the book develops *foundations of an ethics of mind* – a field that can be construed as arising from the ethics of belief (see Schmidt 2020a). On an abstract level, the ethics of mind aims at understanding the nature and structure of the norms that govern our attitudes. *Responsibility for Rationality* investigates the responsibility that is presupposed by these norms. It thereby also provides a basis for thinking about the ethics of mind in broader societal and political contexts. I include an *agenda* for research in the ethics of mind in the concluding chapter. Furthermore, I illustrate how the developed framework has advantages over alternative, purely rationalist or purely voluntarist, frameworks when it comes to approaching issues in *applied epistemology*: in an *Appendix*, I discuss how we should relate to one another when our opinions become polarized, thereby illustrating the fruitfulness of my hybrid view.

2.3 Main claims
To summarize, the book defends the following main claims:

(a) Responsibility for attitudes seems puzzling because intuitively we are directly responsible for complying with rational requirements. Therefore, understanding mental responsibility requires us to think about the normative status of rational requirements. (Chapters 1–3)

---

[10] On epistemic blame, see Boult (2020; 2021; forthcoming), Brown (2020), Kauppinen (2018), Piovarchy (2021). I argue in Schmidt (2021) that epistemic blame reveals the normativity of evidential considerations.
[11] I argue in Schmidt (2022a) that we can be morally blameworthy for failing to respond to reasons for attitudes.

(b) The normativity of epistemic rationality faces a serious challenge from recent views that argue that epistemic reasons aren't 'genuinely normative' reasons. (Chapter 4)

(c) The normativity of epistemic reasons, and thus the normativity of epistemic rationality, is revealed in our practice of epistemic blame. (Chapter 5)

(d) The challenge for the normativity of epistemic rationality can be generalized to the rationality of other attitudes (desire, emotion, intention). Yet right-kind reasons for attitudes other than belief turn out to be normative in the same sense as epistemic reasons. (Chapter 6)

(e) Our (ir)rationality matters for our interpersonal relationships and blaming practices: a person's (ir)rationality provides us with reasons to take up attitudes like (dis)trust and intentions (not) to engage in collective activity, such as rational discourse. (Chapters 5–6)

(f) Responsibility for attitudes is not exhausted by indirect responsibility to manage our mind; rather, we are also *directly* responsible for being (ir)rational in virtue of our attitudes' reasons-responsiveness; yet indirect control matters for our blaming practices. (Chapters 5–6)

(g) Violating rational requirements can even give rise to genuine *moral* blameworthiness. Thus, rationality and morality sometimes have a similar normative significance. (Chapter 7)

(h) The presented hybrid account of responsibility for attitudes allows us to address questions in applied epistemology (surrounding responsibility for and rationality of belief) from a richer perspective than pure rationalist or pure indirect voluntarist views. (Appendix)

2.4 Structure

The structure of *Responsibility for Rationality* is intuitive: after introducing the project just sketched and defending an original diagnosis of the underlying philosophical problem (part I), the book has an epistemological part II and an (in the broadest sense) ethical part III. The epistemological part defends responsibility for *epistemic* rationality by tackling recent problems in normative epistemology. The ethical part reinforces the account presented in the epistemological part by generalizing it from responsibility for belief to responsibility for all attitudes, thus spelling out my hybrid account of mental responsibility, and by defending a continuity between epistemic blame and moral blame in chapter 7. I summarize each chapter in section 5.

2.5 Why Routledge Studies in Epistemology?

The book is motivated by debates within normative epistemology. It focuses on these debates especially in the central chapters 4 and 5. Yet it goes beyond these debates by developing the foundations for an ethics of mind. Its contribution to epistemology is therefore comparable to my previous co-edited volume in the Routledge Studies in Epistemology series, *The Ethics of Belief and Beyond* (Schmidt and Ernst 2020). The core idea of each book is that there are parallels between belief and other attitudes (like desire, emotion, and intention), especially when it comes to reasons and responsibility. *Responsibility for Rationality* thus vindicates my project of connecting epistemology with broader normative theory. The present book would be a good follow-up to the previous volume, and it would thus allow a promising collaboration with Routledge to continue. Furthermore, the book fits nicely with recent titles in the series that view epistemic normativity in the broader context of metaethical normative discourse, such as Vahid's *The Dispositional Architecture of Epistemic Reasons* (2022) or Sharadin's *Epistemic Instrumentalism Explained* (2022), as well as with recent edited volumes that share a similarly broad approach to epistemology, like *Epistemic Duties* (2021) and *Epistemic Dilemmas* (2021).

3. Marketability

This section elaborates on the marketability of *Responsibility for Rationality* by commenting on the competing market, the expected readership, the author, and sources for open access funding. The fourth subsection is about the current state of the manuscript, which now exists in a first draft, chapters of which are ready for peer review, but requires revisions over the next year.

3.1 Market

Discussions about mental normativity are scattered throughout various debates.[12] *Responsibility for Rationality* is the first book that brings together the more recent debates on responsibility and on rationality in a unifying dialectic. It thereby makes a unique contribution to the current market of research within normative theory at the intersection of epistemology and ethics.

The book is part of a strong movement in contemporary philosophy that connects issues in epistemology and ethics by thinking about normative properties in both domains. The most notable recent works here include Mark Schroeder's *Reasons First* (OUP, 2021), recent monographs on rationality (Kiesewetter 2017; Wedgwood 2017; forthcoming; Lord 2018; Worsnip 2021), as well as recent monographs on responsibility and blame in epistemology (Boult forthcoming; Chrisman 2022). These contributions help us to extend normative epistemology into broader normative theory. However, the position advanced in *Responsibility for Rationality* goes beyond such works by focusing *specifically* on the relationship between rationality and responsibility, which has been neglected in the recent literature.

There has been earlier work that connects issues surrounding responsibility and blame with issues surrounding reasons and rationality. However, the present book has an original approach that sets it apart from these previous titles. First, David Owens' *Reason without Freedom* (Routledge 2000) is an early attempt to connect the two fields of research by arguing that problems in normative epistemology arise from a puzzle about epistemic responsibility. In contrast, the present book argues that the problem of mental responsibility arises from worries about normativity, and specifically from worries about the normativity of rationality. Second, Miriam Schleifer McCormick's *Believing Against the Evidence* (Routledge 2015) is concerned with responsibility and reasons for belief. Yet it doesn't connect the issues to the recent debate about the normativity of rationality, and it doesn't discuss the normativity of other attitudes than belief. Third, volumes that draw out connections between responsibility and reasons are Owens' *Normativity and Control* (OUP, 2017) and Joseph Raz's *From Normativity to Responsibility* (OUP, 2011). Although presenting a unified perspective, both titles are collections of earlier papers which concern several loosely connected themes. By contrast, the present work is a monograph with one coherent line of argument.

Thus, there is no monograph yet that brings out systematic connections between the more recent debates on responsibility and on rationality. Yet there is a broad interest in connecting strands of normative theory within epistemology and (meta)ethics. The book thus meets an important demand on the current philosophical market.

---

[12] See Schmidt and Ernst (2020) for an attempt to bring some of these debates together. The debates include, but are not limited to, debates about responsibility for belief and, more generally, debates about responsibility and reasons for attitudes (see footnotes 1 and 2); debates about reasons and rationality especially of belief and intention (see footnotes 3 and 4); as well as debates about the normative dimensions of specific attitudes, like emotions (de Sousa 1987; Roberts 2003; Tappolet 2016), blame (Coates and Tognazzini 2013), and hope (McCormick 2017).

3.2 Readership

Responsibility for Rationality addresses scholars who are interested in normative debates within epistemology, ethics, and moral psychology. By connecting debates on responsibility and rationality, it unifies different strings of philosophical discourse under the label of an 'ethics of mind'. This ensures a broad audience among advanced researchers.

However, the book also aims at being accessible to advanced students of philosophy. This is achieved by the book's introduction, which brings out the relevance of the present inquiry for philosophical theory as well as for our lives, and introduces the central concepts and debates that are relevant for the present inquiry. In this way, the book will help students to engage more deeply with debates on responsibility and rationality that are becoming more specialized and technical, which makes them harder to access for students and young researchers who are not yet contributing themselves to these debates.

Each chapter is written in such a way that it can be understood without reading the whole book, so that the main parts of the book are appropriate reading for advanced and graduate seminars on problems in normative epistemology (part II) and theories of responsibility (part III). Central concepts and relevant philosophical debates are explained in the introduction, and detailed accounts of these concepts are cross-referenced within the book. This allows readers who wish to focus on only one part to refer to other parts when clarification is needed.

3.3 Author

I obtained my PhD from the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg (FAU) in November 2020 (*summa cum laude*). My dissertation on the ethics of mind has been awarded a prize by the FAU (Karl Giehrl Prize, 1,500€). After completing my doctorate, I became a Postdoctoral Researcher at the University of Zurich, where I conduct my research in the *Zurich Epistemology Group on Rationality* (https://www.zegra-meylan.com/). Work that originated from my doctoral thesis has been published in major international philosophy journals, such as *Grazer Philosophische Studien*, *Erkenntnis*, *Philosophical Studies*, and *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, and in edited volumes, such as *The Ethics of Belief and Beyond*, which was a co-edited volume in the Routledge Studies in Epistemology series that shares the approach of the present book. I regularly present my research internationally at major congresses (meetings of the American Philosophical Association, the European Epistemology Network, and the Society for Analytic Philosophy) and prestigious conferences with competitive calls for abstracts, such as the 'Ethics of Emotions' workshop in Bern in 2021 (3 accepted abstracts out of 96). Since 2021, I am associated with the African Center for Epistemology and Philosophy of Science (ACEPS) at the University of Johannesburg, where I conduct research on applied issues in epistemology. I also gained international experience through research activities at the University of California, Los Angeles, the City University of New York, and the University of Reading. Finally, I have recently received a grant (61,600 CHF) for research at the University of Southern California and the University of Glasgow (with the COGITO research group) from the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF) for one year (from September 2022 to August 2023). Afterwards, I am planning to return to my position at the University of Zurich.

3.4 Writing and timetable

I have recently finished a first draft of *Responsibility for Rationality*. Most chapters are ready for peer review. However, there is still some work to be done before the book can be published.

First, I am currently working on chapter 3 on rationality. Providing a guide that situates the present book within the discussion on rationality will be essential, since this debate has become more specialized and is thus difficult to access for non-experts. The chapter defends a close connection between rationality and right-kind reasons by further developing ideas that I first presented in a commentary on John Broome's work (Schmidt 2020). The aim of this chapter is to show that the book is not restricted to a specific kind of rationality ('substantive rationality' or 'responding to reasons'), but is instead concerned with rationality *per se*.

Second, in its current version, the introductory chapter includes a long and rich discussion of central concepts, like norms, reasons, rationality, responsibility, and blame (chapter 1.3). I plan to shorten the chapter by incorporating most discussions into later chapters where they become relevant. The table of contents (section 4) reflects how I envisage the final manuscript.

Third, I wish to work on a research agenda for an ethics of mind, as well as on how the present work bears on applied issues in epistemology. The research agenda will be included in chapter 8, and an Appendix will illustrate how my theoretical framework helps us in tackling applied questions. I describe my plan for the Appendix at the end of section 5.

Since I will be free from teaching duties during the next year thanks to funding by the Swiss National Science Foundation (see section 3.3 above), which gives me the opportunity to work with some of the most renowned experts in the relevant fields, and since I have job security afterwards, I will have time to improve the first draft of the manuscript by working on the issues just explained. The following schedule seems realistic to me:

Time/Period	Activity	Milestones
PHASE I 09/2022-02/2023	Situating my approach within the most recent literature on rationality and clarifying my own conception of rationality.	Finishing chapter 3
PHASE II 03/2023-04/2023	Revising the clarificatory chapter 1.3 by incorporating most of the material into later chapters where it first becomes relevant; reviewing the whole manuscript.	Finishing chapters 1-3
PHASE III 05/2023-11/2023	Writing the research agenda for the ethics of mind and the Appendix.	Finishing chapters 4-8 + Appendix
PHASE IV 12/2023	Final proof reading, typesetting, etc.	Finishing the book

This ensures that the book is of the highest scientific quality and takes into account the most recent research. I will gain permissions for including published material (see section 5).

3.5 Potential funding for open access
The University of Zurich as well as the Swiss National Science Foundation offer open access funding options. It is thus likely that open access publication of the book can be funded.

4. Table of Contents and Length of Manuscript

PART I: THE PROBLEM OF MENTAL RESPONSIBILITY (28,500 words)

PART II: THE NORMATIVITY OF EPISTEMIC RATIONALITY (20,000 words)

PART III: FOUNDATIONS OF AN ETHICS OF MIND (26,500 words)

Overall length: 81,000 words (including footnotes, but excluding list of references)

5. Abstracts of Chapters

Part I
The Problem of Mental Responsibility

This part builds up a systematic connection between the debates on responsibility and on rationality by reinterpreting the problem of mental responsibility. Chapter 1 frames the project and provides an overview of the relevant dialectical landscape. Chapter 2 argues that the normative status of right-kind reasons for attitudes, among which are epistemic reasons for belief, gives rise to the problem of mental responsibility. Chapter 3 argues that the normativity of epistemic reasons and other right-kind reasons is essential for any positive account of the normativity of rationality, thus situating the book within the current debate on rationality.

Note: Chapters 1 and 2 contain paragraphs from my contributions in The Ethics of Belief and Beyond *(Schmidt/Ernst 2020). More precisely, chapter 1.2 is based on some material from Schmidt (2020a), and chapters 2.2–2.4 are loosely built on material from Schmidt (2020b). Furthermore, Chapter 3.3 contains material from my peer commentary "Rationality and Responsibility" (*Australasian Philosophical Review *2020, 379–385). All material is substantially revised in light of the project of the book and the most recent literature.*

Chapter 1: Introduction

This chapter provides philosophical motivation for the present investigation into responsibility for attitudes. This motivation stems from a conflict between the apparent involuntariness of attitudes – due to their nature as mental *states* – and our practice of holding each other responsible for our attitudes. While the problem has received much attention during the last decades, both in epistemology and in ethics, its close connection to debates about reasons and rationality has been largely overlooked: the problem arises only *because* attitudes belong to a special category of states, namely those states that are responsive to reasons. The project of the present book is thus to understand responsibility for attitudes by thinking about reasons and rationality. It thereby connects two strands of debate within contemporary normative theorizing. Furthermore, the book delivers the foundations for an ethics of mind, which is concerned with the nature of the norms that govern our attitudes, and it provides a novel framework for approaching questions that are pressing for philosophical theory as well as contemporary society. After introducing this framework, the chapter traces a careful path through the rich dialectical terrain that philosophers have created within recent debates on responsibility, reasons, and rationality: (i) it discusses the relationship between norms and reasons, (ii) it examines the distinction between right-kind and wrong-kind reasons (avoiding controversial commitments), and (iii) it initially characterizes responsibility, blameworthiness, and rationality. The chapter closes with a summary of the other chapters of the book.

Chapter 2: Mental Responsibility

This chapter argues that to understand responsibility for attitudes, we must think about reasons and rationality. It first offers an intuitive characterization of the involuntariness of attitudes by giving vivid examples of how we adopt countless attitudes in an apparently automatic manner while navigating through our environment. Then it is argued that traditional diagnoses of the

problem of mental responsibility that locate its origin in a lack of direct voluntary control over attitudes don't reveal a genuine philosophical puzzle. By taking the intuition that right-kind reasons are normative reasons seriously, we can see that it is this intuition that creates the problem of mental responsibility: if right-kind reasons are normative, then we are directly responsible for our attitudes; but it seems that neither voluntary nor non-voluntary forms of control could explain our direct responsibility for responding to right-kind reasons. The rest of the book then makes the direct responsibility for responding to right-kind reasons intelligible by considering the normativity of right-kind reasons, and thereby our responsibility for rationality.

Chapter 3: Reasons and Rationality
The previous chapter located our problem as a problem about responsibility for responding correctly to right-kind reasons. The present chapter connects right-kind reasons to the concept of rationality while also situating the project within the recent discourse about the normativity of rationality. Some questions that this debate is concerned with, and which the present inquiry won't answer, are carefully set aside (for instance, the dispute between objectivism and subjectivism about normative reasons, whether all irrational incoherences are reducible to failures to respond to reasons, and whether the 'given' is a myth), and support is provided for the intuition that we are responsible for being rational by discussing the kind of criticism or blame that is implied by irrationality ascriptions. After sketching the recent discussion, the chapter follows Worsnip (2021) in distinguishing three kinds of theories about the nature of rationality that are currently on the market: pure reasons-responsiveness views, pure structuralist views, and dualist views. It is argued that the normativity of right-kind reasons is relevant for each main view. Since this is not immediately obvious for pure structuralist views (which might just deny the connection between rationality and reasons), two ways of how right-kind reasons are relevant for structuralist views about rationality are presented. First, at minimum, structuralist views should be interested in whether rationality is normative, which requires them to discuss whether structural rationality provides us with right-kind reasons, and whether such right-kind reasons are genuinely normative reasons. Second, it is argued that, at least if we focus on cases in which we are *responsible* for being (ir)rational (a methodological restriction that can be justified by our interest in rational *requirements*), being irrationally incoherent *implies* a failure to respond correctly to right-kind reasons. This new argument establishes a close link between rationality and reasons while remaining neutral about the nature of rationality.

Part II
The Normativity of Epistemic Rationality

This part defends a view according to which the normativity of epistemic reasons is revealed in our practice of blaming each other for our distinctively epistemic failures. Within epistemology, this constitutes an argument against certain pragmatist and instrumentalist accounts of epistemic reasons (or of right-kind reasons for belief). Responsibility for being *epistemically* rational is characterized, and the view is later generalized to other types of rationality in part III.

*Note: Chapters 4.1–4.3 as well as 5.1–5.3 are based on my "Epistemic Blame and the Normativity of Evidence" (*Erkenntnis *2021, online first). Everything else is original material.*

Chapter 4: A New Challenge for the Normativity of Epistemic Rationality
In contemporary epistemology, the normativity of epistemic rationality can seem puzzling. How can evidence provide us, all by itself, with normative reasons for or against belief? Chapter 4 is devoted to getting clear about this challenge, which comes in two shapes. *The first shape* arises from the problem of clutter avoidance: it seems that, if epistemic rationality is normative, we have reason to clutter our minds with uninteresting implications of our beliefs. Replying to this problem requires the normativist (about evidence and about epistemic rationality) to specify the conditions under which evidence provides us with genuine normative reasons for belief. However, this leads them into a dilemma: either the condition fails to explain the normativity of epistemic rationality, or it eliminates epistemic rationality by rendering it practical. *The second shape* of the challenge comes from cases in which our practical reasons require us to violate norms of epistemic rationality. Epistemologists have recently argued that such epistemic-practical conflicts show that there is no interesting sense in which we always ought to be epistemically rational, or that epistemic rationality is only part of an overall evaluation of what one ought to believe, all things considered. The chapter works out this challenge for the normativist from the recent literature on pragmatism and instrumentalism about reasons for belief and reconstructs the underlying argument. *Finally*, the chapter ends with a diagnosis: both arguments against normativism share a plausible assumption – namely, that there is a close connection between normative reasons and blameworthiness. The arguments are two shapes of the same challenge for the normativity of epistemic rationality. This challenge consists in making the normativity of right-kind reasons intelligible: it is not obvious that we always *ought* to respond correctly to our right-kind reasons. This is the more generalized version of the challenge, that is, it is a challenge that is applicable to all right-kind reasons for attitudes, not just to epistemic reasons for belief. I return to this generalization of the challenge in more detail in chapter 6.

Chapter 5: Blameworthiness for Epistemic Irrationality
This chapter defends the normativity of epistemic rationality against the challenge from the last chapter by appealing to our epistemic blaming practices. I first offer a defense of the connection between reasons and blameworthiness that the challenge rests on: I argue that the challenge is right in assuming that epistemic reasons are normative only if there is such a thing as epistemic blame. Replying to the challenge thus requires me to defend the possibility of epistemic blame, especially in the context of the cases from chapter 4 that gave rise to the challenge: trivial belief (the cases that were central to the clutter avoidance problem) and epistemic-practical conflicts. The chapter then develops such a reply by building on the recent literature on epistemic blame and on insights from recent rationalist accounts of responsibility for attitudes. It is argued, first, that a subject can be epistemically blameworthy for being epistemically irrational even in cases where no practical stakes are involved. That is, there are plausible conditions on the normativity of evidence that do not render the requirements of epistemic rationality practical (such as the condition that one must *possess* sufficient evidence to *attend* to the question on which the evidence bears). Second, it is argued that a person can be epistemically blameworthy even when they were practically required to fail epistemically. This is revealed especially in cases where one had decisive reasons to cultivate an epistemic vice, which makes one blameless for cultivating the vice but doesn't excuse being epistemically vicious. Taken together, both arguments that reply to our challenge from chapter 4 reveal that epistemic rationality has normative significance independently of practical reasons to make oneself epistemically rational, and thus

that we are directly responsible for complying with the requirements of epistemic rationality. Finally, by building on my previous arguments, the chapter presents a conception of epistemic rationality as an evaluative kind of normativity that matters for how we ought to relate to one another within our epistemic community. Overall, the chapter offers a reply to skepticism about the normativity of epistemic reasons and it refutes pure indirect voluntarist accounts.

Part III
Foundations of an Ethics of Mind

In this final part, the book clarifies the direct responsibility that we have for our attitudes. In chapter 6, the argument from the second epistemological part is generalized: our evaluations of attitudes as (ir)rational imply that we can be directly blameworthy, and thus directly responsible, for our reasons-responsive attitudes, rather than merely for the actions and omissions that influence our attitudes. Second, a main worry with my argument – that responsibility for rationality is not 'genuine' responsibility – is addressed. It is argued that there is a continuity between rational criticism and moral blame: violating norms of rationality can sometimes cause moral harm, and if it does, then our practice of apology and forgiveness can sometimes become fully intelligible, thereby revealing moral blameworthiness for irrationality. This gives the idea of responsibility for rationality a more solid basis than the appeal to distinctively epistemic blame in chapter 5.

*Note: Most of chapter 6 is original material, although it includes some paragraphs from Schmidt (2020b) that have been rewritten in light of the chapter's discussion. Chapter 7.1–7.4 is a reprint of "Blameworthiness for Non-Culpable Attitudes" (*Australasian Journal of Philosophy *2021, online first) that is contextualized within the book. Chapter 7.5 will be original material.*

Chapter 6: A Hybrid Account of Mental Responsibility
This chapter develops my hybrid account of mental responsibility from the previous discussion. I first generalize the challenge from chapter 4 by applying it to right-kind reasons for desire, intention, and emotion: since there are plausible cases of trivial and counterproductive rational attitudes, the doubts about the normativity of epistemic rationality can be generalized to the rationality of other attitudes. I then defend the normativity of right-kind reasons for attitudes by defending the view that we are directly blameworthy for irrationality: irrationality can impair our relationships in various ways and warrant distinctive yet genuine blaming responses. Building on this generalized version of my main argument, the chapter then argues that there is a two-fold foundation of the ethics of mind. That is, it argues that we should allow for *two faces* of mental responsibility: direct responsibility for responding to right-kind reasons by directly forming or maintaining attitudes, and indirect responsibility for responding to wrong-kind reasons for attitudes by managing our attitudes. Both kinds of responsibility are essential to our blaming practices: any view that attempts to ground blameworthiness for attitudes either merely in reasons-responsiveness or merely in indirect control faces counterexamples. The chapter also explains why my view can remain neutral about subjectivism and objectivism about reasons.

Chapter 7: Moralizing Rationality

The task of this chapter is to reinforce the idea that being irrational can warrant genuine blaming responses – indeed, that it can sometimes give rise to *moral* blame. It starts out with the observation that many of our attitudes are non-culpable: there was nothing that we should have done to avoid holding them. It argues that we can still be blameworthy for non-culpable attitudes: they can impair our relationships in ways that make our full practice of apology and forgiveness intelligible. The argument has two steps. First, it is argued that we sometimes legitimately blame agents who behave in non-culpable ways, as when someone gets angry at us but couldn't avoid their behavior. Here I describe five different cases involving beliefs, desires, emotions, and intentions as causes of the relevant behavior and argue that our practice of apology and forgiveness is fully intelligible in these cases. In a second step, I argue that the agent's blameworthiness cannot be located in the behavior itself, but must instead be located in the non-culpable attitudes that cause the behavior. I do so by excluding alternative explanations of the agent's blameworthiness. This argument poses a new challenge for voluntarist views that attempt to reduce all responsibility for attitudes to responsibility for prior actions and omissions. Rationalists, who instead explain attitudinal responsibility by appeal to reasons-responsiveness, can make sense of blameworthiness for non-culpable attitudes. In response, voluntarists could propose a revision of our actual practices. This would lead us into a quite different debate. Overall, the chapter aims at breaking the stalemate between rationalist and voluntarist views of attitudinal responsibility by watering down the contrast between 'mere rational criticism' and 'genuine moral blame', thus revealing a hitherto unnoticed normative force of rationality.

Chapter 8: Conclusion
The concluding chapter summarizes the results and the contribution that the book makes to debates about responsibility and about rationality. Finally, it presents further research avenues and clarifies the implications of this inquiry for other issues in normative and applied epistemology and normative theory, thus setting an agenda for future research in the ethics of mind.

APPENDIX

Applying the Ethics of Mind: Overcoming the Polarization of Opinion
The aim of this Appendix is to illustrate how the presented hybrid framework helps us to address questions in applied epistemology, and how it can do so in a more fruitful way than pure rationalist or pure indirect voluntarist accounts. I do so by focusing specifically on the topic of polarized opinions, and the question of how to deal with this specific kind of disagreement.

Sometimes, two persons hold very different opinions on a topic of moral significance that make it difficult for each person to acknowledge the other person as a peer reasoner or inquirer. In some of these cases, we are faced with *polarized opinions*. In these cases, rational discourse tends to come to an end, and societies are at risk of drifting apart. Examples of polarized opinions include vaccine refusal beliefs, beliefs in conspiracy theories, as well as many populist views in politics, and the corresponding strong denial of these views by other citizens. How should we, as individuals and as a society, approach polarized opinions?

I argue that my hybrid view allows us to distinguish two kinds of questions that are overlooked by pure rationalist or pure voluntarist accounts. First, the indirect voluntarist's question about mental control: How should we deal with our own mind and the minds of others when we realize that our opinions are polarized? This question concerns what the right thing is

to *do* in this case. Second, the rationalist's question about what attitudes we should have: How should one relate to another person who has an opinion that is polarized relative to one's own? This second question is about how we should rationally respond with our own attitudes towards the person with the polarized opinion. This especially concerns whether and how we should *blame* each other for opposed opinions with moral significance.

Building on some previous work, I suggest some plausible answers to each question. I argue that we should not normally blame people who hold polarized opinions, because their overall experiences might in fact provide sufficient (subjective) support for their (*prima facie* crazy) beliefs. Their rationality, in turn, provides us with a reason for *ensuring* that we respect the other person's intellectual autonomy and that we are willing to engage with them in rational discourse whenever appropriate and when we have no decisive evidence that they are 'beyond the pale' (that is, completely irrational or even arational). This, in turn, provides *pro tanto* reasons against certain 'nudging' policies, and in favor of continuing the exchange of reasons.

Note: I have already written on similar issues. In a German piece that was accepted in a competitive call for papers on the coronavirus pandemic (issued by the Society for Analytic Philosophy), I have argued that conspiracy theorists are often rational (Schmidt 2021a) – a view that has recently been reinforced by Neil Levy's (2022) work. Furthermore, I am co-authoring a paper with Anne Meylan (Meylan/Schmidt ms) on the doxastic responsibility and epistemic rationality of vaccine refusers (under review with "revise and resubmit" by Philosophical Psychology*), in which we argue that vaccine refusers are often fully responsible and rational agents that make us aware of the problems of epistemic pollution and of justified distrust towards authorities, especially from disadvantaged and marginalized groups, rather than pointing us to intellectual flaws of individuals. I plan to build on this previous work in writing the Appendix, which I intend to discuss at various colloquia and conferences before including it in the final book.*

6. CV

I attach an up-to-date CV, including a list of publications and presentations, and information about academic services, in a separate document that I have sent with this proposal. See also my departmental website (which doesn't mention forthcoming publications):

https://www.philosophie.uzh.ch/en/seminar/people/research/theory_meylan/schmidt.html

References

Adams, Robert M. (1985). Involuntary Sins, *Philosophical Review* 94, 3–31.

Boult, Cameron (2020). There Is a Distinctively Epistemic Kind of Blame, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, doi: 10.1111/phpr.12726.

Boult, Cameron (2021). The Significance of Epistemic Blame, *Erkenntnis*, doi: 10.1007/s10670-021-00382-0.

Boult, Cameron (forthcoming). *The Puzzle of Epistemic Blame. On the Nature and Norms of Epistemic Relationships*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Broome, John (2013). *Rationality Through Reasoning*, Chichester: Blackwell.

Broome, John (2020). Rationality versus Normativity, *Australasian Philosophical Review* 4, 293–311.

Brown, Jessica (2020). What is Epistemic Blame? *Noûs* 54, 389–407.

Chrisman, Matthew (2022). *Belief, Agency, and Knowledge*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Coates, D. Justin and Neal A. Tognazzini (2013). *Blame. Its Nature and Norms*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Cowie, Christopher (2014). In Defence of Instrumentalism about Epistemic Normativity, *Synthese* 191, 4003–4017.

Cowie, Christopher (2019). *Morality and Epistemic Judgment*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Descartes, René (1649). *The Passions of the Soul*, in: *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes: Volume I*, transl. by Cottingham et al., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

De Sousa, Ronald (1987) *The Rationality of Emotion*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Fischer, John M. and Neal A. Tognazzini (2009). The Truth about Tracing, *Noûs* 43, 531–556.

Gertken, Jan, and Benjamin Kiesewetter (2017). The Right and the Wrong Kind of Reasons, *Philosophy Compass* 12.

Hieronymi, Pamela (2006). Controlling Attitudes, *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 87, 45–74.

Hieronymi, Pamela (2008). Responsibility for Believing, *Synthese* 161, 357–373.

Hieronymi, Pamela (2014). Reflection and Responsibility, *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 42, 3–41.

Jacobs, Jonathan (2001). *Choosing Character: Responsibility for Virtue and Vice*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Kauppinen, Antti (2018). Epistemic Norms and Epistemic Accountability, *Philosopher's Imprint* 18, 1–16.

Kauppinen, Antti (2019). Rationality as the Rule of Reason, *Noûs*, doi: 10.1111/nous.12311.

Kiesewetter, Benjamin (2017). *The Normativity of Rationality*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Kiesewetter, Benjamin (2020) Rationality as Reasons-Responsiveness, *Australasian Philosophical Review* 4, 332–342.

Kolodny, Niko (2005). Why Be Rational? *Mind* 114, 509–563.

Levy, Neil (2022). *Bad Beliefs. Why They Happen to Good People*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Lord, Errol (2018). *The Importance of Being Rational*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Maguire, Barry, and Jack Woods (2020). The Game of Belief, *Philosophical Review* 129, 211–249.

Maguire, Barry, and Jack Woods (2019). There Are No Reasons for Affective Attitudes, *Mind* 127, 779–805.

Mantel, Susanne (2019). Do Epistemic Reasons Bear on the Ought Simpliciter?, *Philosophical Issues* 29, 214–227.

McCormick, Miriam S. (2015). *Believing Against the Evidence. Agency and the Ethics of Belief*, London: Routledge.

McCormick, Miriam S. (2017). Rational Hope, *Philosophical Explorations* 20, 127–141.

McCormick, Miriam Schleifer (2020). Believing Badly: Doxastic Duties Are Not Epistemic Duties, in: *Epistemic Duties: New Arguments, New Angles*, ed. by Kevin McKain and Scott Stapleford, New York: Routledge, 29–43.

McHugh, Conor (2013). Epistemic Responsibility and Doxastic Agency, *Philosophical Issues* 23, 132–156.

McHugh, Conor (2014). Exercising Doxastic Freedom, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 88, 1–37.

McHugh, Conor (2017). Attitudinal Control, *Synthese* 194, 2745–2762.

Meylan, Anne (2013). *Foundations of an Ethics of Belief*, Frankfurt: ontos.

Meylan, Anne (2017). The Consequential Conception of Doxastic Responsibility, *Theoria* 83, 4–28.

Meylan, Anne, and Sebastian Schmidt (ms). Refusing the Covid-19 Vaccine: Is There Anything Wrong with This? under review (with Revise&Resubmit) at *Philosophical Psychology*.

Montmarquet, James (1993). *Epistemic Virtue and Doxastic Responsibility*, Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.

Oakley, Justin (1992). *Morality and the Emotions*, London: Routledge.

Osborne, Robert C. (2021). A Social Solution to the Puzzle of Doxastic Responsibility, *Synthese* 198, 9335–9356.

Owens, David J. (2000). *Reason without Freedom. The Problem of Epistemic Normativity*, London: Routledge.

Owens, David J. (2017). *Normativity and Control*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Paakkunainen, Hille (2018). Doubts about 'Genuinely Normative' Epistemic Reasons, in: *Metaepistemology*, ed. by Conor McHugh, Jonathan Way, and David Whiting, New York: Oxford University Press, 122–140.

Parfit, Derek (2011). *On What Matters. Volume I*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Peels, Rik (2017). *Responsible Belief: A Theory in Ethics and Epistemology*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Piovarchy, Adam (2021). What do We Want from a Theory of Epistemic Blame? *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 99, 791–805.

Portmore, Douglas W. (2019). Control, Attitudes, and Accountability, in: *Oxford Studies in Agency and Responsibility Vol. 6*, ed. by David Shoemaker, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 7–32.

Raz, Joseph (2011). *From Normativity to Responsibility*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Rinard, Susanna (2017). No Exception for Belief, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 94, 121–143.

Rinard, Susanna (2022). Eliminating Epistemic Rationality, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, doi: 10.1111/phpr.12862.

Roberts, Robert (2003). *Emotions: An Essay in Aid of Moral Psychology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roberts, Tom (2015). Emotional Regulation and Responsibility, *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 18, 487–500.

Rosen, Gideon (2004). Skepticism about Moral Responsibility, *Philosophical Perspectives* 18, 295–313.

Ryan, Shane (2018). Epistemic Environmentalism, *Journal of Philosophical Research* 43, 97–112.

Schmidt, Sebastian (2016). Können wir uns entscheiden, etwas zu glauben? Zur Möglichkeit und Unmöglichkeit eines doxastischen Willens, *Grazer Philosophische Studien* 93, 571–582.

Schmidt, Sebastian (2017). Why We Should Promote Irrationality, *Grazer Philosophische Studien* 94, 605–615.

Schmidt, Sebastian (2020). Rationality and Responsibility, *Australasian Philosophical Review* 4, 379–385.

Schmidt, Sebastian (2020a). Introduction: Towards an Ethics of Mind, in: *The Ethics of Belief and Beyond. Understanding Mental Normativity*, ed. by Sebastian Schmidt and Gerhard Ernst, New York: Routledge: 1–20.

Schmidt, Sebastian (2020b). Responsibility for Attitudes, Object-Given Reasons, and Blame, in: *The Ethics of Belief and Beyond. Understanding Mental Normativity*, ed. by Sebastian Schmidt and Gerhard Ernst, New York: Routledge: 149–175.

Schmidt, Sebastian (2021). Epistemic Blame and the Normativity of Evidence, *Erkenntnis*, Online First, doi: 10.1007/s10670-021-00430-9.

Schmidt, Sebastian (2021a). Wie vernünftig sind Verschwörungstheoretiker? Corona und intellektuelles Vertrauen, in: Nachdenken über Corona. *Philosophische Essays über die Pandemie und ihre Folgen*, ed. by Romy Jaster und Geert Keil, Stuttgart: Reclam, 98–109.

Schmidt, Sebastian (2022). On Believing Indirectly for Practical Reasons, *Philosophical Studies* 179, 1795–1819.

Schmidt, Sebastian (2022a). Blameworthiness for Non-Culpable Attitudes, *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, Online First, doi: 10.1080/00048402.2022.2055093.

Schmidt, Sebastian, and Gerhard Ernst (eds.) (2020). *The Ethics of Belief and Beyond. Understanding Mental Normativity*, New York: Routledge.

Schroeder, Mark (2021). *Reasons First*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Smith, Angela M. (2005). Responsibility for Attitudes: Activity and Passivity in Mental Life, *Ethics* 115: 236–271.

Steglich-Petersen, Asbjørn, and Mattias Skipper (2019). An Instrumentalist Account of How to Weigh Epistemic and Practical Reasons for Belief, *Mind* 129, 1071–1094.

Steglich-Petersen, Asbjørn, and Mattias Skipper (2020). Instrumental Reasons for Belief: Elliptical Talk and Elusive Properties, in: *The Ethics of Belief and Beyond*, ed. by Sebastian Schmidt and Gerhard Ernst, New York: Routledge, 109–125.

Tappolet, Christine (2016). *Emotions, Values, and Agency*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Way, Jonathan (2009). Two Accounts of the Normativity of Rationality, *Journal of Ethics and Social Philosophy* 4, 1–9.

Wedgwood, Ralph (2017). *The Value of Rationality*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Wedgwood, Ralph (forthcoming). *Rationality and Belief*, New York: Oxford University Press.

White, Stephen J. (2019). Against Voluntarism about Doxastic Responsibility, *Journal of Philosophical Research* 44, 33–51.

Worsnip, Alex (2021). *Fitting Things Together. Coherence and the Demands of Structural Rationality*, New York: Oxford University Press.