

Index

ability to control one's conduct; see control principle abstract concepts, 126, 196, 251 accountability: free will and, 243-7, 251 act(s): defined, 4-5, 253; relationship with mental events, 224-6; see also anticipated acts; basic act(s) act-property(ies), 89, 91, 96 act requirement: separated from voluntariness, 157 act-token(s), 87, 88, 91, 93, 95, 96, 104, 107, 108, 131; and actionplan, 98, 99, 129-30; and automatism defense, 145; basic, 89-90, 91, 93 act-tree, 88-9, 89f, 91-2, 95-6, 96f, 97, 97f, 98-9, 100, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 128-9, 130-1,

act-tree, 88–9, 89f, 91–2, 95–6, 96f, 97, 97f, 98–9, 100, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 128–9, 130–1, 191, 202, 211, 260; and automatism defense, 136, 144, 146, 149, 155; compared with projected act-tree, 93–4; see also projected act-tree

act-type(s), 86–7, 96, 99, 100, 106, 107, 129; basic, 89; offenses as, 94–5

action: in behavior, 121, 145n18; conscious, intentional, 202; and practical reason, 108–28 action-plan(s), 92-3, 95, 96, 99-100, 104, 105, 106, 107–8, 112, 128, 131; act-token and, 98; and automatism defense, 136, 137-8, 140, 143, 144, 146, 149, 151; diagrammed as projected act-tree, 93-4; impaired cognitive processes and, 195-6, 258; generation of, 198; impaired consciousness and, 145; reasoning from standards to, 243; reflection on, 146; relationship with offense elements, 253, 259; selection of, 129, 146-8, 151, 154, 191, 194, 195-6, 251, 252, 261; selection of, and insanity defense, 204, 205, 206-7, 210, 211, 212, 213-14; selection of, with impaired cognitive process, 199, 200, 202, 203; unwarranted conclusions in, 179; and wants, 254

action theory, 26, 86–94, 108–9, 110, 217 261; analysis of offenses in, 94–108, 202–3; and automatism defense, 132–59

action theory analysis, 159; in automatism defense, 136–49; free will in, 251–2; in insanity defense, 160–217



Index

actuation hypothesis, 10-11, 12, 13 - 14actus reus, 1, 9n24 addiction, 248-9 affect, 150-1, 172; see also mood disorders affective aspects of personality: in insanity defense, 32-3, 34-5 affirmative defenses, 155, 157basic act(s), 87, 89-90, 91, 93, 96, 8n38; impaired consciousness and, 156 agent causation, 114 American Bar Association (ABA), 37, 51 American Law Institute, 1, 2 American Law Institute Model Penal Code; see Model Penal Code (MPC) American Psychiatric Association (APA), 37, 51 anticipated acts, 92, 93, 94, 95, 98, 128 assault, 255n34 associations: loosening of, in schizophrenia, 185, 186 associative learning, 123-4, 142-3 associative process, 189, 190, 191, 194-5; deliberation as, 203 attribution of offense to actor as practical reasoner, 155-6, 158, 176, 190-201, 203, 210, 218, 219, 220, 261, free will and, 251-60 automatic reinforcement function, automatism, 3, 22, 70; as failureof-proof defense, 26, 72-3, 74, 75, 84; problematic cases of, 149-58; as problematic defense, 71-85, 108 automatism defense, 27, 191, 195, 216, 217, 218; action theory

analysis of, 136-49; action the-

ory applied to, 132-59; current

approaches to, 132-6; exculpates due to distortion of psychological states and processes, 219; free will and, 253-4; inadequacy of, 24-6, 131, 260; mens rea in, 23-4; status and rationale of, 261

98, 99, 105, 106, 107, 128-9, 131, 136, 144; in action-plans, 92; in automatism defense, 149; decision to perform, 146; epistemic criteria for, 115-16n43, 118; epistemic indicator of, 111-13; inherently intentional, 104-5, 112-13, 118 basic act-token(s), 91, 93 behavior: guided by normative institutions, 226-9; relationship with movement and action, 145n18; theory of, 120-8 belief content, 178-9, 181-2, 188, 194, 214; defenses of, 259-60; false, 199, 201, 256-7, 259 belief-desire sets: acts and, 110-11; causation by, 111-12, 113, 115–16, 119, 120, 125–6, 129 belief process, 179-81 beliefs, 91, 100, 101, 104, 105, 107, 108, 109-10, 114, 119-20, 131, 190; access to, 145, 146-7, 149, 150-1, 154, 191, 193, 195, 254, 258; causing action, 123f, 122-5, 127-8, 136-7, 138, 143, 146, 148, 151-2, 157, 191, 252-4, 261; contradictory/inconsistent, 179-80, 196, 235, 243, 244, 257; epistemically justified, 182-4; in intentional action, 119; occurrent, 143, 144; in practical reasoning, 117-18; reasoning from, 188-9, 193, 195, 216, 251, 257; in repre-



Index

sentational systems, 122-3; as structuring cause, 203, 204; subjective/objective justification of, 183; see also false beliefs blameworthiness, 5-6, 67, 169, 209, 210, 220; culpability level and, 7, 100-2; insanity defense and, 178; moral, 44-6; moral intuitions regarding, 260 bodily movements, 154, 253; relationship with mental processes, 6-7; required by voluntary act requirement, 156, 157 Brakel, S., 53-4 Bratty court, 81 British courts: automatism defense in, 71, 74, 75-84, 132-3, 153n26, 155n29, 158 burden of proof, 157 burden of persuasion: in automatism defense, 155-6

California Penal Code, 38-42, 51 California Supreme Court, 38-40, Canadian courts: automatism defense in, 133 capacity-responsibility, 239 capacity to conform clause, 165 Cardozo, Benjamin, 46 case law, 31, 164, 167 categorical causal theory, 204 causal determination (necessitation), 222, 223, 229n17, 240 causal explanation: and reasons for action, 120-8 causal model: volition and, 201-4 causal process, 115-16, 119, 191, causal subsumption (method),

causal theories of action, 108-9, 110, 111-12, 120, 143 causation: generation and, 88 "characteristic manner" constraint, 111-12, 113, 116, 118, 119, 120, 123, 127, 129, 131, 145n18 children, 54, 192; see also infancy choice, 202, 221, 222, 241, 242 "choice of evils" defense, 17, 177 choosing system, 144 clang associations, 185, 186, 195 clouded consciousness, 145, 152, 216, 254, 258; in automatism defense, 137, 154-5; and deliberation, 146-7; in epilepsy, 149, 150, 151 coercion, 3, 25, 51, 165, 198, 212, 214; reducing voluntariness, 103-4, 247, 248, 251 cognition: as grounds for excuse, 202; in insanity defense, 29-30, 32–3, 35–6, 39, 42, 49; and mood disorders, 205, 206; in self-regulation, 236, 237, 238, 240 cognitive capacities: 261; in associative process, 252; and free will, 244-5, 250-1; and selfregulatory capacity, 239-43 cognitive clauses, 201-2 cognitive competency: in practical reasoning, 189 cognitive disorder (dysfunction)/ impairment, 198, 202-3, 204; in depression, 206; and free will, 243-4, 245, 246, 247-8, 249, 251, 254, 256-7, 258-60; in insanity defense, 178-9, 204–5, 213–14, 215–16; in schizophrenia, 185-8; and self-regulatory capacity, 240 cognitive focus, 185-6, 188, 211, 214; impaired, 195, 199

cognitive process, 183; directing

230, 243



Index

behavior, 226-43; disordered/ distorted, 179-81, 182, 188, 194, 195-201, 203, 209, 211-12, 213, 214, 215–16, 252, 256–7, 258-60 cognitive sophistication, 126, 237 - 8cognitive standard: inadequacy of, 180-1cognitive tests, 37; and insanity defense, 213-17 cognitive transformation, 236 coherence, 190, 195, 199 combinative thinking, 186-7, 196 competence: and criminal liability, 193 comprehension, 195, 251, 252 compulsion (compulsive behavior), 20, 57, 59, 61, 221, 248-9 concept formation, 185, 187, 188, 195, 211, 214, 251; as disability, 216; impaired, 196, 199 concussion, 71, 79 conditioning, 238, 241 conformity to law, 36, 209, 210 consciousness, 137, 145, 252; defects in, and free will, 254; disturbed, 150, 152; in hypnosis, 153-4; wants and beliefs in, 143; see also clouded consciousness; impaired consciousness consequences, 245, 254, 258; justification of, 239-40; and normative institutions, 226-9; and self-regulatory capacity, 234, 235, 236-7, 238 control principle, 165, 166, 167, 172, 173, 204, 239 correspondence thesis, 224-6 convulsion(s), 4, 5, 103n24, 105, 108, 149, 154, 191; in automatism defense, 71, 74 counterexamples, 45, 46, 56; to

causal theories of action, 109; in insanity defense, 172; to interpretations of wrongfulness, 164 counterfactual(s): projected acttrees, 99 criminal homicide, 94, 95, 177 criminal insanity: defined, 64 criminal intent, 51 criminal justice system, 227 criminal law, 219, 261; free will and, 222; influencing rational agent, 144-5 criminal liability, 3, 51-2, 261; free will and, 222-6; limited to actions attributed to actor as practical reasoner, 156-7, 158, 176, 190–201, 203, 210, 218, 256; in MPC offense requirements, 24, 130-1; psychological dysfunction and, 25-6; and psychopathology/practical reasoning, 190-201; voluntariness requirement in, 4-5, 6-7, 8-9 criminal offenses; see offenses criminal penalties, 144-5; deterrent effect of, 35 criminal responsibility: moral basis for, 85; psychological processes/dysfunction and, 25 culpability: and moral blameworthiness, 44; offense modifications and, 16; voluntary act requirement in, 5-6, 8-9; wrongful intent in, 39 culpability element, 152, 194 culpability level, 52-3, 145, 149; and action theory, 95, 96-7, 98, 99-108; and blameworthiness, 100-2 culpability requirement, 1, 2, 3, 7– 14, 24, 25, 40, 55, 68, 84, 106-7, 158, 208, 218, 260; and automatism defense, 72-3, 132,



Index

136; exculpates due to distortion of psychological states/processes, 219; failure-of-proof defense regarding, 22, 191–2; free will and, 252–3, 254–7; lack of clarity in, 26; in manslaughter, 11–12; mens rea as, 23, 24; mistake/ignorance defense and, 148–9; nature and purpose of, 86, 120, 129–30; negligence in, 13–14 psychological processes and, 12–13, 14, 15, 16, 24

Cummins, Robert, 230, 232

decision, 103, 104, 105, 222 decision-maker, 100 decision-making, principled, 83 desires/values distribution, 223-4 defect of reason (DOR), 76-80 defenses, 3, 9, 14-24; categories/ taxonomy of, 4, 14, 17-18, 22-3, 153; implicit notions of personal responsibility in, 175; insanity defense and, 27, 29, 40, 84; role of psychological processes and impairment in, 21-2, 84; structure of, 25, 74, 75, 84, 85, 131; see also problematic defenses; and under individual defense

deliberation, 139–41, 142, 143, 144, 148, 149, 15, 154, 188–9, 191, 194–5, 207, 252; clouded consciousness and, 146–7; decision/choice through, 202; impaired/distorted, 193, 203, 206, 254, 256, 258

delusions, 105, 152, 194n48, 216; false belief content in, 256–7; in insanity defense, 176–8; in *M'Naghten* test, 29, 30; in mood disorders, 205; patho-

in schizophrenia, 185, 198 dependency: in hypnosis, 153, 154 depression, 205-7, 209 desires: and free will/responsibility, 223; unusually strong/ from unusual sources, 249-50; see also belief-desire sets determinism, 114n41, 204, 229; free will and, 221, 222, 242, 243 deviant causal chain, 108, 109-10, 111, 116, 118, 126-8 diminished capacity, 167 disability: in automatism defense, 133; as excusing condition, 18-19, 20, 21, 64, 66; and free will, 253; in insanity defense, 214-15; in structure of excuses, 168 disability clause, 168, 169-70, 171-2, 173, 175 disability requirement, 57, 58, 59, disease: narrow/broad senses of, 77-8, 80 disease of mind, 152, 153n26, 155n29; in automatism defense, 133

logical significance of, 181-5;

disease of mind (DOM) clause (M'Naghten test), 77–81, 83 dispositions, 189–90 dissonance, 244 disturbances of language, thought, judgment, 176 Dretske, Fred, 120–3, 128, 142, 145n18, 231

duress, 157, 208, 248; case law regarding, 167; in insanity defense, 177–8; see also coercion

emotional factors: and free will, 246-7 emotional responses: to standards



Index

for behavior, 236-7; see also affect encoding strategies, 198-9 epilepsy, 71, 72, 76, 108, 154; and automatism defense, 137, 149, 150-1, 152-3, 155n29 epistemic function, 169-70, 171, 172, 173, 174 epistemic justification, 182-4 ethics, 222-4 evidence, 102, 170, 171 exculpating factors, 219-20 exculpation, 130; through excuses, 20; through general defenses, 16, 23; in insanity defense, 28, 29, 30, 33, 37, 42, 43n44, 44, 45-6, 49, 50, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58-9, 66, 69, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169-70, 171, 173, 177, 178, 194; through justification, 17; through lack of selfregulatory capacity, 252-60; mood disorders in, 208, 210; moral principles underlying, 222-3; in MPC defenses, 252; psychological dysfunction in, 25-6; through psychopathology, 190, 212-13; responsibility and, 157; specific excuse, 210; standard of, 3; status offense, 210; volitional clauses as grounds for, 201-2, 203 exculpatory conclusion, 169, 170, 171, 173, 174 exculpatory defenses, 208 excuses, 14, 16, 17-23, 26; causal theories of, 203-4; psychological factors in, 24; structure of, 57-8, 76-7, 78-9, 167-9 excusing clause, 169-70, 171, 173, 175, 181 excusing conditions, 3, 18-19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 51, 64, 65, 66, 68,

130, 153, 165, 198, 210-12, 213; alternative, 201; disability causing, 168; exculpatory force of, 171; in insanity defense, 33-5, 57-61, 62, 67, 173, 214, 215–16; types of, 19 expert testimony: in insanity defense, 29, 36, 37, 200-1 explanation(s): psychological, 230-2; reason-giving, 111-12, 113, 114, 115-16, 119-20; in theory of action, 110-11; triggering cause/structuring cause, 122, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129 explanatory theories, 230-2; types of, 230

failure-of-proof defense, 14-15, 18n46, 20, 40, 84, 98, 165, 198, 212, 214, 220, 261; and attribution of action to actor as practical reasoner, 191-2; automatism as, 25, 26, 72-3, 74, 75, 84, 132, 135, 136, 148-9, 152-3, 155, 156, 158-9, 218; and criminal liability, 191-2, 193; disability in, 202; free will and, 252-60; insanity defense as, 51-7, 66, 68-70, 166; and mens rea, 23, 24; and practical reasoning, 130, 131; psychological disorder in, 194, 208; psychological processes in, 22, 24

false beliefs, 30, 171; in delusions, 182, 184; in insanity defense, 176, 177
fear, 246
Feinberg, Joel, 6, 7, 8, 9, 61, 103–4, 247, 248
Fingarette, Herbert, 62–3, 64–5, 66, 221, 222
Frankfurt, Harry, 222–3, 224, 229,

240, 250



Index

icon, 198

free will, 26, 114n41, 261; and action theory analysis, 251-2; criteria for concept of, 222-4; impaired, 256, 258; moral and legal applications of, 243-51; and MPC defenses, 252-60; and normative institutions, 227; philosophical debate regarding, 219-26; as psychological capacity, 226-43, 246-7, 258-9, 260; as selfregulatory capacity, 239-43 Fulcher v. State, 73-4 functional analysis, 230, 232 functional impairment, 133, 155n29, 213; in epilepsy, 152-3; and insanity defense, 165, 168, 169, 170; in psychopathology, 175-6 general defense(s), 2, 3, 4, 22, 24, 130, 214; automatism as, 25, 132; insanity as, 40, 57-61; lack of voluntariness as, 156, 157, 158; mens rea in, 23, 24; need for, 194 generation: and causation, 88 generational relations, 88-9 Goldman, Alvin, 86, 87, 96, 104, 105, 106, 108, 109–10, 111–14, 115, 116-18, 119-20, 121, 128, 143, 145n18, 253 Goldstein, J., 53 Gross, Hyman, 100-1 hallucinations, 152, 170, 197; in insanity defense, 176, 179; in

hallucinations, 152, 170, 197; in insanity defense, 176, 179; in mood disorders, 205; in schizophrenia, 185
Hare, Richard, 189, 190
Harman, Gilbert, 189–90
Hart, H.L.A., 8–9, 14, 105, 108, 144, 156, 192, 239, 241
Hermann, Donald, 221

Hinckley verdict, 31, 50 homicide; see criminal homicide Husak, Douglas, 62–3, 165, 167, 173 hypnosis, 4, 153–4, 155n29, 249 hypoglycemia, 80–1, 83, 155n29

idiosyncratic interpretations, 187,

196 ignorance, 3, 51, 57, 59-60, 98, 165, 194, 212, 214; in automatism defense, 133; exculpatory force of, 20, 25, 57-8, 59, 76-80; in insanity defense, 33-4, 37-8, 181, 201; regarding physical characteristics of consequences of act, 210-11; and voluntariness, 6, 8, 103-4; of wrongfulness, 171, 172, 211 ignorance clauses, 76-7, 78-9, 80, 166, 172; as excusing conditions, 60-1; in insanity defense, 176-7, 178 ignorance defense, 130, 148-9, 198 ignorance standards/tests, 28, 174; M'Naghten test as, 53-5, 56, 194n45 immaturity, 18-19, 62, 157 impaired consciousness, 133, 145,

fense, 156; in automatism defense, 71, 74, 195 impairment, 6, 103–4, 247 inability to appreciate criminality of act, 28, 30–1 inability to conform conduct to law, 28, 30, 36, 59–60, 64, 69–70, 164 inability to control one's conduct,

211-12; in insanity defense,

165, 166, 167, 173

148, 191; as affirmative de-

269



Index

inconsistency, 190, 193, 195, 196, 199 infancy, 19, 20-1, 22, 62, 193 inference, 115, 116-17, 119, 129; practical, 138-40, 192-3, 198, 199 information: access to, 137, 145; encoding/categorizing, 198-9 information processing model, 198, 199 information storage and retrieval, 141-2, 143, 146 informative function (reinforcement), 228 insane automatism, 75, 79, 81, 83, 133, 153n26, 155n29 insanity (NGRI) defense, 3, 22, 27-70, 134, 152, 157, 193; action theory analysis, 160-217; analysis of, 168-9, 171-4; as application of standard excusing conditions, 57-61; automatism as, 25, 72, 73-4, 132, 133; in British courts, 82-3; changes in, 31-42; classification issues in, 201-13; cognitive process distortion in, 203; exculpates due to distortion of psychological states/processes, 219; as excuse, 17, 18-19, 20-1; as failure-of-proof defense, 51–7, 66, 68–70, 166; free will and, 220-2, 252, 255, 256-8; hard cases, 199-200; lack of clarity in, 24-6, 131, 260; mens rea in, 23-4; mood disorders in, 204-10; and practical reasoning, 194-5; psychopathology and, 176-88, 219; restricting scope of, 32, 50–1; search for satisfactory standard in, 27-51, 68-70, 84, 164, 174-6; specific excuse/status offense, 68-70, 210-13; state-

ment of, 215; as status excuse, 61, 62-8; status of, 51-68, 261; structure of, 167-71; as sui generis specific excuse, 212, 218; tests in, 27-51, 201-2 intent, 1, 10, 39-40, 42; lack of, in automatism defense, 72, 73; role of, 51 intentional acts, 92-3, 94, 95, 96, 99, 104-5, 106, 109, 128-9; belief-desire in, 111-12, 115-16, 119, 125-6, 129; epistemic criteria for, 116n43, 118; generated by basic acts, 118; reasons in, 114-15, 120; weakly intentional, 104, 131, 260 intentionality: in causal theories, 111 intentions (of actor), 91, 100, 101-2 intuitive implication, 193, 195 involuntary acts/behavior, 103n24, 105, 108, 149; in hypnosis, 153, 154 irresistible impulse test, 165, 220-1 irresistible impulses, 28, 37 Jones v. State, 73 judicial process, 83 jury(ies), 36, 37, 44, 174-5, 199-200, 201 jury instructions, 214-15 justification, 57, 58, 194, 208, 219-20, 257; of consequences, 239-43; reasonable mistake regarding, 130 justification defense, 14, 16-17, 177 justificatory function, 169, 170-2, 173, 174, 175 juvenile court, 19, 21, 62 juveniles, 21; see also children; infancy Kadish, Sanford, 23 Katz, J., 53



Index

knowingly [culpability level], 2, 7, 10, 14, 52, 95, 96, 97-8, 100-2, 106; and automatism defense, 134-5 knowledge, 102, 107; and culpability, 52–3 lack of voluntary act (excusing condition), 210-11 LaFave, Wayne, 10, 12, 107 law: purpose of, 241; reasongiving explanations in, 112, 119, 127; unavailability/misrepresentation of, 58; see also criminal law legal accountability, 219 legal agency, 110, 111 legal agent: as practical reasoner, legal applications: of concept of free will, 243-51 legal responsibility, 261 legislative purpose: and automatism defense, 82-3 lesser evils (defense), 16-17 level-generation, 87-8, 91, 96, 128, logic: practical reasoning and, 189major depressive disorder, 205n53, 206 manslaughter, 11-13 mens rea, 1, 72; general/special sense, 23-4, 40, 53-4; insanity defense and, 32, 53-4 mental events: relationship with acts, 224-6 mental fault, 10 mental health professionals, 200-1 mental illness/disease, 152; see also psychopathology mental retardation, 170, 171, 193

mental states, 1, 5, 135-6; causal

role of, 142, 143, 144; and personal agency, 114n41; as structuring cause, 129; see also psychological processes; psychological states mental subnormality: as excuse, 18 - 19mistake, 20, 98, 194; reducing voluntariness, 8, 247, 248, 251 mistake defense, 15, 130, 148-9, 198, 208, 255–7, 259 mistake regarding justification, 208 mitigating circumstances/factors, 16, 208, 209n57, 219-20, 249 mitigation, 208, 210 M'Naghten test, 153n26, 200, 201; analysis of, 168-9, 171-2; in British insanity defense, 75-80, 82; criticisms of, 42-3; deficiencies in, 30, 31, 43-4, 164, 181; disease of mind (DOM) clause, 77-81, 83; disjunctive requirements of, 41n41; as ignorance standard, 53-5, 56, 194n45; interpretation of, 40-2; "nature and quality" disjunct, 136; as standard for insanity defense, 28, 29-31, 32, 34, 35–6, 37, 38–42, 46, 49, 50, 51, 60, 61, 68, 133, 164-5, 166; and free will, 220-1 Model Penal Code (MPC), 102, 153, 191-2, 227; automatism defense in, 74; criminal liability under, 51-2; culpability elements in, 96, 97, 98; ignorance standard in, 53; offense definitions in, 1-2; offense elements system in, 84, 158, 218-19 (see also structure of offense elements); standard for insanity defense in, 28, 29, 30-1, 32, 34, 36, 38, 43, 50,



Index

55-6, 59; volitional clause, 59-60, 61; voluntariness in, 156; see also culpability requirement; voluntary act requirement Model Penal Code (MPC) defenses: and free will, 252-60 Model Penal Code (MPC) standard, 200, 201 mood disorders, 204-10, 246 Moore, Michael, 19-22, 23, 65-6, 68, 109-20, 174, 192, 203-4, 213n59 moral accountability, 219 moral agent, 229, 245, 251; as practical reasoner, 120 moral applications: of concept of free will, 243-51 moral foundations, 218-61 moral intuitions, 45, 49, 218-19, 225, 226, 229, 243, 261; and free will, 259, 260; of jury, 175 moral mistakes, 44, 46-50; avoiding, 36, 37, 38, 42, 43, 49, 50, 51, 164, 167 moral responsibility, 107, 261; free will requisite for, 259 moral standard(s), 43, 44-50, 51 moral theory, 172, 173 morality: reason-giving explanations in, 112, 119, 127 Morse, Steven, 68–9, 174, 213n59 motivational function (reinforcement), 228 movement: behavior as cause of, 120-2; beliefs as cause of, 123f; causes of, 191; inability to control, 166; relationship with behavior and action, 145n18; see also bodily movement MPC: see Model Penal Code (MPC)

nature of act, 176, 178; appreciation of, 40-2, 47, 49, 52, 53, 54, 58–9, 64, 76, 133 necessity (defense), 16-17 negligence, 1, 2, 7, 10, 11, 13-14, 107 negligently [culpability level], 95, 99, 100, 106; and automatism defense, 134 nonexculpatory defenses, 14, 16, 21, 67, 211, 213 nonexculpatory exemptions from punishment, 211 nonculpable mistakes, 177, 194 normative institutions, 239, 242, 246, 247, 251; ability to particpate in, 240; consequences and, 226-9; defined, 226-7 not guilty by reason of insanity (NGRI); see insanity defense (NGRI)

objective justification, 183 offense elements, 1-2, 4-14, 24, 27, 84, 134, 260; action theory analysis of, 94-108; and actor as practical reasoner, 190-1; burden of proving, 56, 68, 155–6; conceptual structure for analysis of, 25, 85, 86-131 (see also structure of offense elements); culpability level, 52; and excuses, 17; fulfilling, 256; implicit notions of personal responsibility in, 175; insanity defense and, 27, 29, 40, 69, 84; psychopathology in prevention of acting with mens rea in, 53; relationship of action plans to, 253, 259; role of psychological processes and impairment in, 7-8, 21-2, 26; satisfaction of, and defen-



Index

ses, 14, 15-16; voluntary act power: expended on basis of decirequirement as, 156, 157 sion or purpose, 103-4 offense modifications (defense), practical reason: action and, 108-14, 15-16 28; role in personal agency, offenses: as act-types, 94-5; defini-109 - 28tion of, 102; intent as essence practical reasoner, 86, 129–31, 210; of, 39-40 actor as, 109-20; and automaordinary human conduct: defined, tism defense, 137, 138-40, 142-4, 145, 149, 152; criminal liability limited to acts attribovergeneralized thinking, 186 uted to actor as, 155-6, 158, paralysis, 253, 258 176, 190-201, 203, 210, 218, paranoia, 181-2 256; mistaken choices by, paranoid schizophrenia, 198 147 - 8Parry, J., 53-4 practical reasoning, 114-18, 151, Parsons v. State, 220-1 188-90, 207, 211, 212, 214, penal codes, 227 220, 259, 261; impaired, 165, People v. Coffman, 39 200, 215-16, 256, 258; and People v. Drew, 38-9, 221 logic, 189-90; logical/causal People v. Higgins, 72 force in, 117-18; psychopa-People v. Kelly, 39 thology and, 188-201; and People v. Newton, 73 psychopathology/criminal lia-People v. Schmidt, 46 bility, 190-201; selecting People v. Skinner, 38, 41-2, 43, 44, action-plans through, 251-2; 51, 68, 82 types of cognitive competency People v. Wolff, 220, 221 in, 189 perception, 252 pressure: and voluntariness, 6 perceptual aberrations, 197 principle of alternative possibilities perjury, 94-5 (PAP), 223 perseveration, 185, 186 probation, 209, 210 personal agency: role of practical problematic defenses, 84, 85; aureasoning in, 109–28 tomatism, 71-85; insanity, 27personal moral standard, 177; see also subjective moral standard product tests, 28 personal responsibility, 25, professional organizations, 31, 38, 114n41, 223; free will and, 26; implicit notions of, 175; intuiprojected act-tree, 92-3, 93f, 95, tively plausible/morally defen-96, 97, 98, 99–100, 128, 129, sible, 217; minimal conditions 130; action-plans diagrammed of, 192; theory of, 170, 173 as, 93-4, 93f; and automatism phobias, 249 defense, 136, 137-8, 140, 143, policy exemptions, 21, 22; see also 144; relationship with acttoken, 107 public policy considerations positive undermining, 190 property analysis, 230-1



Index

Proposition 8 (Calif.), 38–42 provocation, 219-20 psychological capacity(ies): complex organization of, 232-8; free will as, 226-43, 246-7, 258-9, 260 psychological dysfunction/impairment, 211-12; in criminal liability and exculpation, 24-6, 193; in criminal offenses/ defenses, 21-2; exculpatory force of, 28, 31, 33-4, 54-5, 57, 60, 62, 66; and failure-ofproof claim, 40 psychological explanation, 230-2 psychological processes, 3, 4, 217, 258, 260-1; authoring actions through, 114; and defenses, 16-17, 84; disorder of, 194; exculpation due to distortion of, 219; and free will, 239-40; and mistake defense, 255-7; and moral/legal accountability, 218-19; and offense elements, 7–8; relationship between act and, 100, 105, 107; relationship with bodily movements, 6-7; role of, in criminal offenses/defenses, 21-2, 24; and voluntary act/culpability requirements, 12-13, 14, 15, 16, 24 psychological states, 3, 4, 258, 260-1; exculpation due to distortion of, 219; and moral/ legal accountability, 218-19 psychopathology, 3, 152, 212-13; affective, 205-10; cognitive, 202-3; and criminal liability/ practical reasoning, 190-201; culpability and voluntary act requirements in, 8, 107; and excusing clauses in insanity defense, 33-5; and free will,

165, 175-6; and insanity defense, 30, 33-4, 40, 171, 176-88; and practical reasoning, 188-201; in problematic defenses, 85; unrelated to crime, 67-8 psychosis, 170, 171; hallucinations in, 197; insanity defense, 176, 216 psychotic depressives, 205-7 public health model, 158 public policy considerations, 16; in automatism defense, 158; status excuses and, 66-7 punishment, 207, 208-9, 210, 219, 239; moral justification of, 221, 222–3; suspension of, 209 purpose, 102, 103, 104 purposeful action, 2, 7, 12-13, 14 purposely [culpability level], 52, 95, 96, 100-2, 106; and automatism defense, 134, 135-7 quality of act: appreciation of, 40-2, 47, 49, 53, 54-5, 58-9, 64, 76, 133; insanity defense, 176, 178 R. v. Charlson, 76 R. v. Clarke, 77 R. v. Kemp, 76, 77 R. v. Sullivan, 76, 78, 79, 81 rationality, 64-5, 222 rationalization, 110, 111, 113, 115, 125, 126, 127–8, 129, 144; practical reasoning in, 118;

term, 224-5n13; wants/beliefs

211, 214; impaired, 196-7, 199

reality relatedness, 185, 187, 188,

in, 119, 120

Rawls, John, 45

reality sense, 187

reality testing, 187, 196–7

258; functional impairment in,



Index

reasonable standard of care, 99 reasoning, 189, 193, 195, 211, 214, 239, 251, 252; as disability, 216; disturbance of, in schizophrenia, 185, 186-7, 188; fallacious, 105; impaired, 195-6, 199; maladaptive, 199; from standards to action-plans, 243; from wants and beliefs, 188-9, 192-3, 195, 216, 251, 257; see also practical reasoning reasons for acts, 118, 119, 146, 202, 203, 232; causal explanation and, 120-8, 131, 137; wants/beliefs as, 253, 254 recklessly [culpability level], 52, 95, 97-8, 100, 106; and automatism defense, 134 recklessness, 1, 2, 7, 10, 11-13, 107 reconciling project, 222-3 reflective equilibrium, 45-6 reflex(es), 4, 5, 1-3n24, 105, 108, 149, 154; in automatism defense, 71 reinforcement function, 228 reinforcement modalities, 227-9, 231-2, 236; cognitively selfmediated, 227-8, 229, 231-2; direct, 227, 228, 231; vicarious, 227, 228, 229, 231 reliabilism, 183 representational system (RS), 122 - 3responsibility, 24, 110, 192; and automatism defense, 157; control principle and, 167; free will in, 222, 226; limiting to actions attributed to practical reasoner, 158; theory of, 102; see also criminal responsibility; legal responsibility; moral responsibility; personal responsibility

retarded (the), 192, 216; see also mental retardation Robinson, Paul, 14, 15, 16, 17-19, 20, 21-2, 23, 57, 58, 59, 60, 64, 65, 67, 68, 76-7, 78-9, 130, 153, 155-6, 167-8, 169, 210-11, 212 sane automatism, 75, 79-80, 81, 82, 83, 133, 153n26, 155n29 schemata, 198 schizophrenia, 184-8, 202, 204, 206; thought disorder in, 195-9 schizophreniform psychosis, 152 Scott, A. W., Jr., 10, 12, 107 seizures, 253, 258 selective causal theory, 204 self defense, 177 self-evaluation/instruction, 233-5, 237, 237, 242, 244, 246, 254, 258 self-regulatory capacity, 229, 232-8, 243-7, 250-1; components of, 232-6, 238; free will as, 239-43; lack of, 252-60 self-reinforcement, 233-4, 235-6, 237, 238, 242, 244, 246, 254, 258 social moral standard, 43, 44, 47, 48-9, 60-1, 177 somnambulism, 71, 72, 74, 108, 137 specific excuses, 84, 130; in general defenses, 22-3; insanity defense as, 51, 57-8, 62, 63-4, 65, 66, 67-70, 210-13, 214; insanity defense as sui generis, 212, 218, 261 standard excuse: in insanity defense, 57-61 standards: learning of, 236-7, 238; reasoning from, to action

plans, 243



Index

standards comprehension/setting, 232-3, 234-5, 238, 242, 246 standing wants and beliefs, 139-40, 143, 146, 148, 149, 188-9; awareness of, 254 stare decisis (principle), 46n50 state causation, 110-11, 113-14, 115, 119, 125, 127 state transition theories, 230-1 State v. Caddell, 73 status defenses: interpretations of, status excuses, 19-21, 22-3, 73, 84; insanity defense as, 51, 61, 62-70, 174, 210-13 statutory law, 31, 164 stimulus transformation, 236 structure-of-offense elements, 4, 108-9, 120, 128-31, 157-8n38, 175-6, 193-4, 218, 261; action theory interpretation of, 202-3, 217; and automatism defense, 74, 75, 84, 85; insanity defense and, 214; lack of clarity in, 158, 164, 260 structuring causes, 122, 124, 125, 126, 127, 28, 129, 144, 202, 203, 231, 261; wants/beliefs as, 203, 204 subjective justification, 183-4 subjective moral standard, 43, 44, 47-9, 60-1 suspended sentence, 209, 210 symbolic representation, 228, 234, 235, 236-7, 238 symbolism, 187, 196

target acts, 96, 104, 128, 129 temporal lobe epilepsy, 150, 151, 152 thought blocking, 181, 185–6, 195 thought disorder, 189; in schizophrenia, 195–9; see also cognitive disorder (dysfunctional)/ impairment throught process: distortion of, in schizophrenia, 185–6 threat, 248 trauma, 71, 137, 155n29 triggering causes, 122, 127 true excuses, 19–20, 21

unconsciousness, 4, 71, 73 understanding, 239 unintentional acts, 104 U.S. courts: automatism defense in, 71, 72–5, 84, 132, 158 unwarranted conclusions, 179, 180, 195

values, 240, 254 values/desires distinction, 223-4 Vermont, 31n12 volition(s), 202; and causal model, 201-4; defined, 202; and free will/responsibility, 223; secondorder, 223-4, 225, 240 volitional clauses, 59, 60, 61, 69-70; in insanity defense, 55-6; unnecessary/irrelevant, 173–4 volitional impairment, 20, 202, 205, 211-12; in insanity defense, 203; in MPC test, 28, 30 - 1volitional standards, 203, 212; epistemic and justificatory functions of, 173-5; in insanity defense, 164, 165-76, 213-14; and irresistible impulse test,

172, 174, 178, 201, 202 volitional tests, 28, 32, 36, 43; rejection of, 37–8 voluntariness, 18n46, 55–6; conditions defeating, 103–4; and culpability, 8–9, 108; factors reducing, 247–8, 251; and free

220-1; literal/flexible, 166-7,



Index

will, 247-8; hypnosis and, 153; lack of, as general defense, 157, 158 voluntary act: defined, 103 voluntary act requirement, 2, 3, 4-9, 24, 25, 51–2, 55–6, 69–70, 84, 103-7, 156, 157, 158, 218, 260; in action theory, 108; and automatism defense, 73, 74, 75, 84, 132, 135, 136, 145, 148-9, 154-5, 156-7, 158-9; and criminal liability, 193; demands in/purposes of, 156-7; exculpates due to distortion of psychological states/processes, 219; failure-of-proof defense regarding, 22, 191-2; free will and, 252, 253, 256, 258; in insanity defense, 166, 167; lack of clarity, 26; in manslaughter, 11-12; nature and purpose of, 86, 120, 130-1; psychological processes and, 12-13, 14, 15, 24

wants (of actor), 91, 100, 101–2, 104, 105, 107, 108, 109–10, 114, 119–20, 131; access to, 145, 146–7, 149, 150–1, 154,

191, 193, 195, 254, 258; causing action, 90-1, 127-8, 136-7, 138, 141, 143, 144, 146, 148, 151-2, 157, 191; 252-4, 261; inhibitory, 151-2; occurrent, 143, 144; in practical reasoning, 117-18; reasoning from, 188-9, 192-3, 195, 216, 251, 257; satisfaction of, 190, 252; as structuring cause, 203, 204 Watson, Gary, 223-4, 229n17, 250 Wechsler, Herbert, 83 Weiner, B., 53-4 "Wharton's rule," 15-16 will, 105, 223; defined, 202; see also free will Williams, Bernard, 222 witnesses, 200 wrongfulness: ambiguity in term, 164; ignorance of, 28, 33-4, 171, 172, 181; meanings attributed to, 43-5; moral interpretations of, 46-50; nonculpable ignorance of, 130 wrongfulness of act: appreciation of, 29-30, 32, 37, 38, 39, 40-2, 46, 49, 53, 56, 58-9, 64; in insanity defense, 176-7, 178; interpretation of, 30