University of Groningen

Rationalism and Sentimentalism as a Topic of Empirical Research

Schreuder, Joost

DOI:
[10.33612/diss.181200447](https://doi.org/10.33612/diss.181200447)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2021

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Schreuder, J. (2021). *Rationalism and Sentimentalism as a Topic of Empirical Research*. [Thesis fully internal (DIV), University of Groningen]. University of Groningen. <https://doi.org/10.33612/diss.181200447>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Rationalism and Sentimentalism as a Topic of Empirical Research

Printing: Ridderprint | [Ridderprint.nl](https://www.ridderprint.nl)
Cover design: Karol Lasia | [Khomatech.com](https://www.khomatech.com)
© 2021 Joost Schreuder

university of
 groningen

Rationalism and Sentimentalism as a Topic of Empirical Research

PhD thesis

to obtain the degree of PhD at the
University of Groningen
on the authority of the
Rector Magnificus Prof. C. Wijmenga
and in accordance with
the decision by the College of Deans.

This thesis will be defended in public on

Thursday 7 October 2021 at 11.00 hours

by

Joost Schreuder

born on 2 February 1992
in Zwolle

Supervisor

Prof. J.W. Romeijn

Co-supervisors

Dr. L. Henderson

Dr. H.W.A. Evers

Assessment Committee

Prof. D. Danks

Prof. F.A. Hindriks

Prof. S. Nichols

For Trees

Contents

Acknowledgments	v
1. Introduction	1
1.1. Rationalism, sentimentalism, and empirical evidence	1
1.2. Can empirical evidence contribute to the debate?	6
1.2.1. The problem of methodology: Is the debate between rationalism and sentimentalism about a conceptual or an empirical issue?	6
1.2.2. The problem of logical priority: Can a notion of moral judgment be developed that will allow us to evaluate the empirical support of rationalism and sentimentalism?	9
1.3. How to compare the empirical support of rationalist and sentimentalist positions?	12
1.4. What kinds of empirical evidence are used in the debate between process rationalism and sentimentalism?	15
2. An Empirical Framing of the Debate	19
2.1. Introduction.....	19
2.2. Conceptual analysis and empirical evidence	22
2.3. State and process variants of rationalism and sentimentalism	23
2.3.1. State positions.....	25
2.3.2. Process positions	34

2.4. Defining and measuring moral judgment and the capacity for moral judgment	41
2.4.1. Moral judgment	41
2.4.2. The capacity for moral judgment	49
2.5. Can ordinary process positions be relevant for state and ideal process positions?	54
2.6. Conclusion.....	56
3. Introduction to Causal Graph Theory	59
3.1. Introduction.....	59
3.2. Central concepts from probability theory	60
3.3. Bayesian networks.....	66
3.4. Causal models	71
3.5. Identification and estimation problems.....	78
3.6. Discovery problems.....	84
3.6.1. Constraining the set of possible causal structures with associations and experiments	85
3.6.2. Systematic approaches to solving discovery problems: hypothesis testing and algorithms.....	88
3.6.3. Outstanding issues: statistical inference and multiple datasets ..	93
3.7. Conclusion	97
4. Causal Interpretations and Representations of the Debate	101
4.1. Introduction.....	101

4.2. A causal interpretation of the debate	102
4.3. Rationalist and sentimentalist causal models.....	104
4.4. Representing strong and weak process positions	107
4.5. Distinguishing between process rationalism and sentimentalism	113
4.5.1. Causal impact.....	114
4.5.2. Causal structure.....	117
4.5.3. Ambiguities.....	120
4.6. Special cases: Cycles and diachronic relations	124
4.7. Conclusion	127
5. Evaluating Empirical Support	129
5.1. Introduction.....	129
5.2. Connecting process positions to empirical evidence	130
5.2.1. Measuring capacities.....	131
5.2.2. Establishing causal relations between psychological capacities and the capacity for moral judgment	134
5.2.3. Establishing relative causal importance: causal impact and causal structure	136
5.3. Which kinds of available empirical evidence are relevant for process positions?	139
5.4. Connecting causal models to associational data	144
5.5. Comparing the empirical support of Nichols and Maibom.....	146
5.6. Conclusion.....	154

6. Higher-Level Evaluations of Empirical Support	157
6.1. Introduction.....	157
6.2. Comparing the empirical support of one process position against others.....	158
6.2.1. Comparing one process position against many other existing theories	158
6.2.2. Comparing one process position against all possible ones	164
6.3. Evaluating the empirical support for process rationalism and sentimentalism.....	169
6.4. Conclusion.....	175
7. Conclusion	177
7.1. Introduction.....	177
7.2. Whether and how empirical research can contribute to the debate between rationalism and sentimentalism.....	178
7.3. A proposal for a new research program	184
Samenvatting	187
Bibliography	193

Acknowledgments

I am very thankful for the opportunity I had to research a subject that genuinely interests me. Along the way, I received the support of a great many people. Without them, this thesis would not exist (or, at the very least, be a lot worse).

First and foremost, my heartfelt thanks to my day-to-day supervisor, Leah Henderson. The support and feedback Leah has given me were invaluable. She always made sure that I had a good sense of where the thesis was going and what I should do. She also ensured that I developed myself in many different areas, keeping me up to date on opportunities to present work, organize meetings and take courses, while supporting everything I did. Her considerate, knowledgeable and candid way of supervising made my PhD a lot more pleasant than it could have been.

I am also deeply thankful for my two other supervisors, Jan-Willem Romeijn and Daan Evers, who both were an enormous source of support. Jan-Willem's feedback (and different perspective) was very helpful, and he also kept me in mind for the latest opportunities. Without him, I would not have been chairing PCCP sessions, from which I learned a lot. Daan Evers gave invaluable feedback on the meta-ethical side of things. All three supervisors made sure I left meetings feeling energized and inspired. Moreover, I am grateful to Pauline Kleingeld for her support and feedback in the beginning of my PhD.

Thanks to all who gave feedback and helpful comments on parts of the thesis, including (but not limited to!) Markus Eronen, Simon Friederich, Alexander Gebharter, Frank Hindriks and Lieuwe Zijlstra. I am also indebted to Marijana Vujosevic, who introduced me to the topic of moral agency and

psychopathy. This became the topic of the research proposal that ultimately resulted in this thesis.

I am also grateful to the members of the causal modeling reading group and the meta-ethics reading group. The meetings were genuinely interesting and a nice break from working on my thesis. It was a great way to meet colleagues and to learn new criticisms and perspectives.

More generally, thanks to the whole Faculty of Philosophy and in particular all fellow PhD candidates for providing a supportive, friendly and warm work environment. I am especially grateful for the support the whole faculty has shown during and after the illness and passing of my mother. Thanks for the space and support you all have given me during that time.

I am grateful to the assessment committee, David Danks, Frank Hindriks and Shaun Nichols, for their valuable feedback and for taking the time to seriously read and assess the thesis.

Thanks to my parents, Bert Schreuder en Trees Kappers, for their love, support, genuine interest and wise advice. Also thanks to my brother (and paranymp) Bram Schreuder, for being there for down-to-earth advice and when I needed a break, for being a way more conscientious housemate than I am and for all the (largely unsolicited) advice about the usage of Dutch. Although everything is different without Trees, I am grateful that the three of us who remain have such a close bond.

Thanks to the ‘Eetclub’ for being great and supportive friends, especially during difficult times. It has been a great source of joy during both my student and PhD period, and I hope we can see each other again more regularly in post-corona circumstances. Special thanks to paranymp Eva Enschede; the walks in the Onlanden were a great respite (especially due to the coffee!).

Finally, I am grateful for my high school philosophy teacher, Marianne Gaastra, for fostering my interest in philosophy and for her great support during a tough time.