

Contents

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	v
Introduction	1
1 Legal Authority and Normativity: Rediscovering a Hidden Relationship	11
1.1 First thread of the web: grasping the question	11
1.2 Implausibility of performing a complex action: <i>because an authority has said so</i>	14
1.3 Autonomy versus heteronomy: a quick glance at the accounts of autonomy in Wolff and Kant	16
1.4 A first approach towards a harmonising project	21
2 Law as an Actuality	25
2.1 Three questions	25
2.2 Lessons to learn from two conceptions of intentional action: action in terms of the two-component view <i>versus</i> action according to the 'guise of the good' model	25
2.3 Legal rules, reasons and the asymmetrical view	28
2.4 'Following legal rules' as a naive explanation of intentional action	30
2.5 The promulgation puzzle	34
2.6 Legal normativity again	36
2.7 The problem of guidance	38
3 The Guise of the Good Model	41
3.1 The guise of the good model	41
3.2 The why-question methodology	41
3.3 Transparency condition and practical knowledge	47
3.4 A defence of the guise of the good model	52
4 Understanding the Nature and Structure of Practical Reason: Excavating the Classical Tradition	59
4.1 Priority of the first-person perspective or deliberative point of view as manifesting the form or structure of practical reasoning	59
4.2 Understanding <i>Energeia</i> : an interpretation of the why-question methodology	61

4.2.1	Key features of intentional action	61
4.2.2	Aristotle's distinction between actuality and potentiality	65
4.3	Law and <i>Energeia</i> : how citizens comply with legal rules?	69
5	A Defence of the Parasitic Thesis: A Re-examination of Hart's Internal Point of View	75
5.1	Hart's model of intentional action and the parasitic thesis	75
5.2	Hart's non-cognitivist account of intentional action and the internal point of view	78
5.2.1	Some textual analysis	78
5.2.2	Hart's non-cognitivism	80
5.3	Why did I park my vehicle in the park?: a defence of the parasitic conception	86
5.3.1	The practical standpoint: the distinction between the deliberative and the theoretical viewpoints	86
5.3.2	Problems with the 'acceptance thesis'	88
5.3.3	Social version of the acceptance thesis	90
5.3.4	Detached point of view of the 'acceptance thesis*'	92
5.4	Objections to the argument that the detached viewpoint of the 'acceptance thesis*' is merely theoretical and is therefore parasitic on the 'acceptance thesis*'	94
5.4.1	'Detached point of view' is neither deliberative nor theoretical, but rather a 'third point of view'	94
5.4.2	We do not, and cannot, commit ourselves to all the different normative systems that coexist in our practical experience	97
5.5	Conclusions of this chapter	98
6	A Defence of the Parasitic Thesis II: Does Kelsen's Notion of Legal Normativity Rest on a Mistake?	101
6.1	Kelsen's jurisprudential antinomy	101
6.2	Kelsen's notion of the 'subjective meaning' of an intentional action	104
6.2.1	Some textual analysis	106
6.3	A defence of the parasitic thesis	110
6.4	Two possible objections to the parasitic thesis of Kelsen's notion of subjective intention	116
6.4.1	The parasitic thesis is sound, but Kelsen's inversion thesis does not need to be parasitic on Aristotle-Anscombe's explanation of intentional action	116

6.4.2	Kelsen can prescind from the 'subjective' meaning	118
6.5	Conclusions of this chapter	118
7	Authorities' Claims as Expressions of Intentions	123
7.1	Character of authorities' claims	125
7.2	Expressions of intentions about how actions will be performed	131
7.3	Authorities' claims as expressions of intentions	135
8	Authority and Normativity: A Defence of the 'Ethical-Political' Account of Legal Authority	139
8.1	Raz's exclusionary reasons and the guise of the good model	139
8.2	Reasons for actions in Raz's legal and moral philosophies	143
8.2.1	Some key distinctions for understanding exclusionary reasons	143
8.3	A criticism of second-order reasons	144
8.4	The guise of the good model as competing with the exclusionary reasons model	146
8.4.1	Phenomenological Argument	146
8.4.2	Teleological Argument	148
8.4.3	Analogical Argument	149
8.5	Exclusionary reasons and the paradox of intention in action	152
8.6	Presumption of legitimate authority thesis	160
8.6.1	Equivalence thesis: the presumption of the goodness of authority as equivalent to the presumption of legitimate authority	162
8.6.2	The Rule of Law	166
8.6.3	Authorities' claims of moral authority and correctness	168
9	The Epistemology of Modestly Objective Values and Robust Value Realism	171
9.1	A theoretical response to a deliberative question	171
9.2	Conceptual and practical capacities	174
9.3	Two formulas for identifying the objective grounding reasons for actions as good-making characteristics of legal rules	179
9.4	Are there <i>really</i> robust objective values? a defence of normative and value realism	181
9.4.1	The story of a philosophical problem: putting Enoch's robust realism in context	182
9.4.2	Harman's challenge	185
9.4.3	The deliberative indispensability argument: can it stand?	187

10 Possible Objections and Concluding Note	199
10.1 First objection	199
10.2 Second objection	200
10.3 Third objection	201
10.4 Fourth objection	206
10.5 Fifth objection	207
10.6 Sixth objection	210
10.7 Concluding note: law as actuality	213

Bibliography

Index

217
227