

Detailed Contents

<i>Preface and Acknowledgments</i>	xvii
------------------------------------	------

1. Introduction	1
-----------------	---

I. CRIMINAL LAW AND THE MORALITY OF ASCRIBING RESPONSIBILITY

2. The General Structure of the Criminal Law in Terms of Ascriptive Moral Principles	19
I. Anglo-American Theorizing about Criminal Law's General Part	20
II. The Variety of Theories in, about, or of Criminal Law	22
III. Descriptive Theories of Areas of Law	24
IV. The General Part as a Descriptive Theory of the Special Part	27
A. Describing the Doctrines of the Special Part in General, "Content-Neutral" Terms	27
B. The Moral Aspect to Any Theory of the Special Part	31
V. Can There Be a Theory of the General Part, and If So, by What Criteria?	35
VI. The Content of the General Part of Anglo-American Criminal Law	41
VII. The Specialness of the General Part	50

II. THE CRIMINAL LAW'S SUPPOSITIONS ABOUT THE PSYCHOLOGY OF PERSONS

3. Human Actions at the Root of Moral Wrongdoing and Criminal Law's Actus Reus	57
I. Introduction	57
II. Rejection of the Causal Theory of Action by the "New Mysterians" of Human Agency	59
III. Are Bodily Movements Essential to Human Actions?	63
IV. Are Mental States Eligible to Be Related in a Causal Relationship with Bodily Movements?	68

V. Must Mental States of Intention or Volition Cause the Bodily Movements that Are Their Immediate Objects, for Those Movements to Be Human Actions?	70
Appendix to Chapter 3: The Moore/Yaffe Correspondence	76
4. Intention and Belief at the Root of Moral Culpability and Legal Mens Rea	87
I. The Roles of Intention in Assessing Responsibility in Law and Morals	87
II. Responsibility, Culpability, and Intentions	89
III. Ordinary and Legal Concepts of Intention	93
IV. Suppositions about the Nature of Intention in Responsibility Assessments	98
V. Suppositions about the Content of Intention in Responsibility Assessments	105
VI. Conclusion	115
5. Further Questions about the Basic Distinction between Intention and Belief	117
I. Intention vs. Belief as to Result	118
II. Intention vs. Belief as to Circumstances	128
6. The Royal Road to the Criminal Law's Concept of the Psychology of Persons: The Insanity Defense	143
I. Introduction	143
II. The Medical Model of Legal Insanity	144
III. The Diverging Purposes of Law and Psychiatry in Defining "Mental Disease"	147
A. Legal Purposes in Defining "Insanity"	147
B. Psychiatric Purposes in Defining "Mental Disease," "Schizophrenia," and Other Particular Mental Diseases, and "Psychosis"	149
1. <i>Psychiatric Purposes in Defining "Schizophrenia" and Other Particular Mental Disorders</i>	150
2. <i>Psychiatric Purposes in Defining "Mental Disorder" Generally</i>	152
3. <i>The Purposes behind Psychiatric Definition of "Psychosis"</i>	155
IV. The Weak Relevance of Medical Definitions to Excuses from Responsibility and Punishment	158
V. The Strong Relevance of Medical Definitions to Excuses from Responsibility and Punishment	166
A. On the Relevance of Having Some Particular Mental Disease	166
B. The Implications of Being Mentally Disordered for Responsibility	167
C. The Implications of Being Psychotic for Responsibility	174
VI. Why Crazy, by Itself, Eliminates or Reduces Responsibility	178

VII. How Do Medically Recognized Mental Disorders Generally, and Psychoses More Specifically, Relate to Madness?	191
VIII. Should Norwegian Law on Insanity Be Changed?	197
A. What Is Not Wrong about Norwegian Law	197
1. <i>Mental Illness Is Morally Relevant to Responsibility without the Addition of Other, Traditionally Excusing Conditions</i>	197
2. <i>Mentally Ill Criminals Are Not Excused because Their Mental Illness Was a Strong or Efficient Cause of Their Criminal Actions</i>	197
3. <i>Being So Mentally Ill as to Be Insane Is a Status Defense, Not a Defense Requiring Lack of Control by an Accused of the Particular Criminal Act with Which He Is Charged</i>	198
4. <i>Only Very Seriously Mentally Ill Offenders Are Eligible for Excuse as Legally Insane</i>	198
5. <i>Being Psychotic Is Related to Being So Seriously Mentally Ill as to Be Morally and Legally Excused</i>	198
B. What Could Be Improved in Norwegian Insanity Law	199
1. <i>It Should Not Be Determinative of Legal Insanity Whether or Not an Accused Is Properly Diagnosed for Medical Purposes as Having a Psychotic Disorder</i>	199
2. <i>The Cognitive Impairments Distinctive of Psychotic Symptoms in Psychiatry Are Only a Rule of Thumb for Legal Insanity</i>	199
3. <i>Psychiatrists Should Neither Make, Nor Have Dominant Influence on Others Who Make, Decisions about Who Is Legally Psychotic</i>	200
4. <i>Common-Sense Judgments of Insanity Do Not Need to Be Disguised as Psychiatric or Other Nonmoral, Factual Judgments</i>	201
IX. Epilogue: Dispositional Ruminations	202
Appendix to Chapter 6: Senses of Practical Rationality	204

III. THE CHALLENGES TO CRIMINAL LAW BY NEUROSCIENCE

7. The Challenging Data of Neuroscience and the Challenges Mounted from That Data	207
I. Introduction	207
II. The Challenging Data of Modern Cognitive Science	211
A. Reductionism	212
B. The Data of the Libet and Libet-Inspired Experiments	217
C. The Data of the Wegner and Wegner-Inspired Experiments	221
III. The Challenges Presented by the Data of Neuroscience	225
A. The Reductionist Challenges	225
B. The Determinist Challenges	228

C. The Challenge of a Merely Epiphenomenal Will	233
D. The Challenge of a Merely Epiphenomenal Consciousness	237
E. The Challenge that Consciousness Is Not Veridical or Privileged in Its Knowledge of Mental States	239
F. The Challenge of Secondary Agency	241
IV. The Eleven Challenges and Two Possible Queries about Them	243
A. Reductionist Challenges	244
B. Determinist Challenges	244
C. Epiphenomenalist Challenges	244
D. Fallibilist Challenges	245
Appendix to Chapter 7: The Moore/Dennett Correspondence	248

IV. THE HARD DETERMINIST CHALLENGE

8. The Libertarian, Fictionalist, and Compatibilist Responses to Hard Determinism	265
I. Taxonomizing the Challenges of the Hard Determinist	265
A. The Argument from Incapacity to Act Otherwise	266
B. The Argument from Lack of Ultimate Self-Determination	266
C. The Argument from Manipulation by Second Agents	267
II. The Libertarian Answers to the Incapacity Challenge of Hard Determinism	268
A. Metaphysical Libertarianism: Human Choice as Such Is Free	268
B. Occasional Libertarianism: Only Some Choices Are Free	270
C. Patchy Libertarianism: All Choices Are "Sort of" Free and "Sort of" Not Free, in Varying Degrees	270
D. Causally Dualist Libertarianism: Human Behavior Is Caused in Only a Secondary, Predisposing, Inclining, or Probabilistic Sense of "Caused"	271
E. Epistemic Libertarianism: Our Present Ignorance of Causation for Some Actions Makes Others Responsible for Those Actions?	272
F. Selective Libertarianism: Only Some Kinds of (Full, Strong) Causes Excuse	272
III. The Fictionalist Answers to the Incapacity Challenge of Hard Determinism	274
A. Making Do with Utilitarian "Responsibility": Deterring Undesirable Behavior by Punishing People and Calling Them "Responsible" Whenever They Are Deterrable	274
B. The Fictional Posits of Each Autonomous Discipline: We Can Blame Some Actors as if They Were Responsible because We Can Regard Their Choices "as if" They Were Free	274
C. Transcendental Fictionalism: Fictional Freedom and Fictional Responsibility that We Cannot but Help Invent	276

D. Linguistic Fictionalism: It Is Senseless to Deny that We Are Free and Responsible	276
E. Social Practice/Psychological Attitude Fictionalism: Our “Reactive” Attitudes and Practices of Resentment Gratitude, and the Like Depend on Our Not Regarding Ourselves as Mere Products of Forces beyond Our Control	278
F. Pragmatic Fictionalism: It Is Useful to Regard Ourselves as Free and Responsible Even if We Really Aren’t	279
IV. Compatibilism(s)	282
A. Isolating the Kinds of Compatibilism by First Isolating the Arguments for Incompatibilism	282
B. Logical Positivist Compatibilism: “Free” Means “Uncompelled”	283
C. Classical Compatibilism	286
1. <i>Conditionalizing “Could”</i>	287
2. <i>Moving from “Could Have . . . if . . .” to “Would Have . . . if . . .”</i>	292
3. <i>Counterfactuals and Possible Worlds</i>	296
D. New Conditionalist Compatibilism	298
1. <i>The Austinian Worry about “Unlucky” Failures</i>	298
2. <i>The Chisholm Worry about Apparent Ability to Do Otherwise when There Is an Inability to Choose to Do Otherwise</i>	298
3. <i>The Chisholm Worry about Infinite Regress of Choosing to Choose To</i>	299
4. <i>The Moorean Worry about “Sticky” vs. “Nonsticky” Choices</i>	299
5. <i>The Worry about Finkish Dispositions</i>	299
6. <i>Pettit’s (and Others’) Worry about the Constitutive Luck in Having the Desires We Do</i>	299
7. <i>The Worry about Aversions and the Impossibility of Certain Desires</i>	300
8. <i>Lehrer’s Finkish Variations of Obsessive Desire/Aversion Counterexamples</i>	301
9. <i>The Worry about Compulsive Desires</i>	303
10. <i>The Worry about Crazy Desires and Crazy Beliefs</i>	303
E. The Supposed Irrelevance of the Freedom to Do or Will Otherwise	307
V. Conclusion	310
Appendix to Chapter 8: My Own Preferred Solution: The Revival of G. E. Moore’s Classical Compatibilism as Amended with Ten Amendments to Avoid Eleven Historic Objections	311
9. Rescuing the Volitional Excuses from Compatibilism (the “Overshoot” Problem for Compatibilism)	313
I. Introduction	313

II. The Dependence of Volitional Excuse on the Can't/Won't Distinction	314
A. The Domain of Excuse	314
B. The Domain of Volitional Excuses	317
C. What Legal Defenses Plausibly Involve Volitional Excuses?	322
D. The Underlying Principle of Volitional Excuse: The Actor Could Not Have Done Otherwise	324
III. The Folk Psychology of Volitional Excuse	327
A. Introduction: The Psychology of Conflicting Desires in the Normal Case Where There Is Responsibility	328
B. Desire, Strongest Desire, and Intention	329
C. Inability to Form the Right Intention	331
D. Inability to Execute the Right Intention	340
E. Summary of the Folk-Psychological Models of Compelled Choice and Action	345
IV. Framing the Appropriate Counterfactual Conditionals that Analyze Incapacity within the Folk-Psychological Models	348
A. The Relevant Conditions for Choosing and Acting Otherwise	348
1. <i>The Counterfactual Analysis of Ability Revisited</i>	348
2. <i>The Relevant Counterfactual for the Ability to Choose Otherwise ("Free Will")</i>	350
3. <i>The Relevant Counterfactual for the Ability to Act Otherwise ("Free Action")</i>	353
B. Disquieting Implications of the Possible Worlds Analysis of the Counterfactuals Involved in Capacities	355
V. How Might Cognitive Psychology/Neuroscience Help?	361
A. Can Experimental Psychology Precisify or Verify the Folk-Psychological Models?	361
B. Can Neuroscience (at Least Potentially) Help?	364
VI. Conclusion	372
Appendix to Chapter 9: MacArthur Foundation Law and Neuroscience Project, Phase II Philadelphia, November 6, 2010—Some General Thoughts about Volitional Incapacity Michael Moore	373

V. THE EPIPHENOMENAL CHALLENGE

10. The Initiation of the Epiphenomenal Challenge in the Work of Benjamin Libet	379
I. The Role of Intention in Assessing Responsibility in Law and Morals	379
II. The Challenging Findings of the Libet Experiments	382

III. Overview and Clarification of the Challenges to the Folk Psychology from the Libet Experiments	383
A. Persons Have No Free Will because Their Willings Are Caused by Unwilled Brain Events	384
B. Persons Have No Causally Efficacious Wills Because Willings Are Always Epiphenomenal to the Actions They Putatively Cause	386
C. Persons Do Not Have Privileged Access to the Processes Producing Actions Early Enough to Be in Control of Those Actions	389
D. Persons Do Not Have Phenomenal Awareness of the Processes Producing Actions Early Enough to Be in Control of Those Actions	390
E. Two Questions about the Three Epiphenomenal Skepticisms	391
IV. The Moral and Legal Relevance of the Three Epiphenomenal Claims	391
A. The Moral Relevance of Willing Being Merely Epiphenomenal with (and Not Causal of) the Bodily Movements Willed	392
B. The Moral Relevance of Privileged Access of Willing Being Merely Epiphenomenal with (and Not Causal of) the Bodily Movements Willed	394
C. The Moral Relevance of Phenomenal Awareness Being Merely Epiphenomenal with (and Not Causal of) the Bodily Movements Willed	397
V. The Truth of These Three Epiphenomenal Claims	398
A. The Alleged Epiphenomenal Status of the Will	398
B. The Alleged Epiphenomenal Status of Consciousness (Nonobservational Knowledge) of Willing	405
C. The Alleged Epiphenomenal Status of Consciousness (as Phenomenal Awareness) of Willing	410
VI. Conclusion	411
11. The Limited Compatibilism of Epiphenomenalism with Responsibility	413
I. Introduction	413
II. Review of the Epiphenomenal Challenge of Contemporary Neuroscience	417
III. Noncausal Control of Epiphenomenal Forks	420
IV. Three Responses to Claims of Non-Cause-Based Control	425
A. Response One: We Can Generally Control the Past?	426
B. Response Two: Denial of There Ever Being Any Control of the Past	428
C. Response Three: Control of the Strongly Necessary and Immediate Past?	429

VI. THE CHALLENGE OF A REDUCTIONIST PHYSICALISM

12. Nothing But a Pack of Neurons	437
I. Introduction	437
II. From What Mind-Brain Metaphysical Views Does the Distinct Reductionist Challenge Arise?	440
A. Classically Reductionist Physicalism	441
B. "Nonreductionist" Physicalism	443
C. Skeptical Physicalisms: Eliminative Materialism	445
D. The Quietist Metaphysics of Componential Mechanism	448
E. The Sui Generis Metaphysics of "Grounding"	449
III. The Salient Data of Neuroscience Making Some Form of Physicalism/Mechanism Plausible	450
A. Actions as Brain-Caused Bodily Movements	451
B. Mental States as Brain States	458
C. The Metaphysical Interpretation of Current and Imagined Neuroscientific Data	461
1. <i>The Data under Four Reductionist Interpretations</i>	461
2. <i>Dualism in Neuroscience?</i>	461
3. <i>Eliminative Materialism</i>	464
IV. The Implications of the Astonishing Hypothesis on Moral Responsibility	465
A. Framing the Question	465
B. Three Possible Answers to the Question	466
1. <i>Moral Responsibility Requires Dualism to Be True, and Physicalism Shows Dualism to Be False</i>	466
2. <i>Reduction as Demotion: Reduced Properties and Entities as Second-Class Citizens in Ontology's Republic</i>	468
3. <i>The Reductions of Mind to Brain, and Actions to Bodily Processes, Are "Skeptical Reductions"</i>	470
V. Conclusion	473

VII. NEUROSCIENCE AS THE HELPER RATHER THAN THE CHALLENGER OF CRIMINAL LAW

13. Addiction, Responsibility, and the Potential Contributions of Neuroscience	477
I. Introduction	477
II. Conceptualizing What Addictions Are	479
III. The Folk-Psychological Explanation(s) of Addiction	490
A. A Schema of Practical Rationality	490
B. Applying the Schema to Explain the Behavior of Addicts: The Rational Choice Model of Addiction	497

C. Indirectly Applying the Schema to Explain the Behavior of Addicts in Terms of Less than Full Practical Rationality	499
1. <i>Failures to Form an Intention—"Automaticity" Models of Addiction</i>	500
a. <i>The Seeming Automaticity of Preconscious Actions</i>	500
b. <i>Too Many Rather than Too Few Intentions</i>	501
c. <i>Addictive Cravings as a Kind of Emotion-Driven Bypassing of Intention</i>	502
d. <i>"Halfway" to Intention Models?</i>	503
2. <i>Failures in the Intention that Is Formed and on which One Acts, to Match What One Most Wants or Most Values</i>	504
a. <i>Cognitive Failure: Not Keeping Degrees of Belief Responsive to the Evidence Available to Support It</i>	504
b. <i>Motivational Failure: Not Integrating One's Desires into What One Most Wants</i>	504
c. <i>Normative Failure: Acting and Wanting against One's Better Judgment</i>	506
3. <i>Failures of One's Actions to Match One's Intentions</i>	507
4. <i>Failures of Experiential Satisfaction to Match What One Wants and Chooses</i>	508
D. Combining These Explanations into One Overall Folk-Psychological Explanation of Why Addicts Use and Acquire Drugs	509
IV. Addiction as a Moral Excuse and Legal Defense	510
A. Three (More) Ways in which Not to Talk about This Issue	511
1. <i>Addiction Excuses because Addicts Do Not Have the Capacity Not to Have the Craving Distinctive of Addiction</i>	511
2. <i>Addiction Excuses because Withdrawal and the Like Make It More Costly for Addicts Not to Use or Steal than It Is for Nonaddicted Persons</i>	512
3. <i>Addicts Are Not Excused for Acts as Addicts because They Are Responsible for Being Addicts in the First Place</i>	514
B. The Main Normative Question: Are Addicts Partially or Wholly Excused by Their Addiction for Acquiring and Using Drugs?	517
1. <i>The Fully Rational Addict</i>	518
2. <i>The Addicts Who Act on "Automatic Pilot"</i>	519
a. <i>Habits and Preconscious Actions</i>	519
b. <i>Emotion-Caused Automaticity</i>	520
c. <i>Dual Intentions Automaticity</i>	522
3. <i>The Addicts Who (Unlike Addicts on Automatic Pilot) Do Choose to Take Drugs But Whose Choices Do Not Match What They Most Want or Most Value</i>	523
a. <i>The Moral Relevance of Cognitive Failures by the Wish-Caused Erosion of Rational Beliefs</i>	523

b. <i>Motivational Failures to Form an Intention that Matches What One Most Wants</i>	525
c. <i>Normative Failure to Form an Intention that Matches What One Most Values</i>	528
4. <i>The Akratic Addicts Who Act against Their Own Intentions Not to Take Drugs</i>	530
5. <i>Addicts Who Most Want or Most Value What They Do Not Like</i>	533
V. <i>The Promise of Neuroscience to Deepen Our Explanatory and Evaluative Understandings of Addictive Behavior</i>	534
A. <i>The Two Potentials for Neuroscience: Changing (Broadening, Deepening, Correcting) Our Folk-Psychological Explanation of Addiction and Changing or Justifying Our Present Doctrines of Moral and Legal Excuse</i>	534
B. <i>The Neuroscientific Explanation of Addiction</i>	536
1. <i>The Explanation for Nonaddicted Drug Use that Risks and Sometimes Causes Addiction</i>	537
2. <i>The Explanation of the Continued Use of Drugs by Addicts</i>	547
C. <i>Basing an Expanded Moral Excuse and Legal Defense on the Neuroscientific Explanation of Addiction</i>	562
VI. <i>Conclusion</i>	568
<i>Index</i>	573