

In recent philosophy debates, conflicting views persist on the influence of manipulation on moral responsibility of individuals. One side sees manipulation as not different from any other deterministic environmental influence on the agent, others advocate for historicism — the idea of deviant causal route — if manipulation is present in the agent's history. Historicist account of moral responsibility is based on disruption of natural development, but this may not be trivial to detect in cases of covert non-constraining control and social conditioning. In addition, opinions on the resulting responsibility of the agent are influenced by intuitions on her identity, locus of control and nature of motivating reasons. The aim of this thesis is to map the recent debate and identify the factors playing the role while searching for the borderline of responsibility of the manipulated agent.