

Index

Footnotes are indicated by n. after the page number.

- abnormality of mind/mental functioning,
184–185, 191–200, 252
- Aboraya, Ahmed, 211
- abuse, trauma from. *See* trauma
- addiction, 147–149, 179, 195, 199–200, 203
- Alexander, Larry, 18
- Allsopp, Kate, 211
- Anderson, Joel, 74
- Antill, Gregory, 123
- Arenella, Peter, 156–157
- Ashworth, Andrew, 224
- Austin, John L., 259n42
- Australia, partial excuse doctrines, 158–159,
165–166, 265–266
- autonomy and voluntarism. *See also* rational
agency
 - behavioural science questioning, 94
 - circumstances undermining. *See*
circumstances undermining
autonomy/rational agency
 - duress defence, 85n27, 86, 228, 253–254,
 - feminist theory questioning, 57
 - liberal account, 53–54
 - recognitive justice to foster, 74–76, 139–140
 - volitional capacity assessments, 190–191,
243–244
 - voluntary act requirement, 225–230
 - vulnerability theory questioning. *See*
vulnerability theory
- Bargh, John A., 94
- Baron, Marcia, 262
- Barzun, Charles L., 237, 246
- Bazon, David L., 1–2, 219, 222
- Bentham, Jeremy, 114
- Bergelson, Vera, 261,
- Berman, Mitchell N., 81–82, 102
- Berry, Zachariah, 90
- Billis, Emmanouil, 81
- blame assessment. *See* culpability evaluation
- Blom Cooper, Louis, 18
- Bock, Stefanie, 18
- Bottoms, Anthony E., 140
- bounded causal theory of partial excuse
 - critiques addressed by. *See* causal excuse
theories, critiques of
 - diminished responsibility, application to,
218–223
 - inculpation versus exculpation agency,
225–230, 236
 - outlined, 9–10, 222, 244–246, 254
 - summary of main arguments, 5, 216–218,
280
 - UPD based on. *See* Universal Partial
Defence (UPD)
- Braithwaite, John, 103
- Bretschneider, Corey L., 39n156
- Brink, David O.
 - on retributivism, 16–17, 44–45, 83n16, 84,
95, 99, 128, 175–176,
 - on stages of criminal proceedings, 169
 - on verdicts, 175–178
- Brown, Darryl K., 19n50
- Buchhandler-Raphael, Michal, 208
- Canada, diminished responsibility doctrine, 157
- capabilities approach to rational agency,
32–33, 39–40

- capacity assessments
 - defences requiring. *See* diminished responsibility; insanity defence
 - emotional capacity, 58, 193, 253
 - for Universal Partial Defence (UPD), 191–194, 202–203, 205–208
 - volitional capacity, 190–191, 243–244
- Caruso, Gregg D., 101
- Carvalho, Henrique, 119–120, 126–127
- causal excuse theories, critiques of
 - absolutist view of determinism underlying, 88, 149–150, 221–222, 234, 237–238, 280
 - bounded causal theory to address. *See* bounded causal theory of partial excuse
 - compatibilist view, 178–179, 224–225
 - crime response not universal, 217, 238–241
 - evidential problems, 217–218, 241–244
 - universal (full) legal excuse claim, 216–217, 230–238
- Chalmers, James, 153, 266, 273–274
- Chamberlen, Anastasia, 119–120, 126–127
- character-based accounts of criminal responsibility, 21, 25, 124, 228
- Chartrand, Tanya L., 94
- Chiao, Vincent, 14, 32–33, 39–40, 112
- Child, John, 226–228
- childhood trauma. *See* trauma
- Chiswick, Derek, 198
- Christie, Nils, 176
- circumstances undermining autonomy/
 - rational agency
 - addiction, 147–149, 178–179, 195, 199–200, 203
 - cultural contexts, 255–258, 270–271
 - determinism critique. *See* causal excuse theories, critiques of
 - developmental immaturity, 185, 201–203
 - provocation. *See* provocation/loss of control
 - social deprivation. *See* social deprivation trauma. *See* trauma
- civil order objective of criminal law, 14–15, 29–30, 92
- clinical model of criminal justice, 58–59, 101, 104–105, 111–112
- Coca-Vila, Ivó, 34
- Cohen, Stanley, 120
- communicative function of criminal law, 102, 18–19, 103–104,
- consequentialist accounts of criminal law, 15–16, 18–19, 102–103, 114, 118
- contractarianism (social contract theory), 24–25, 35, 39
- control theory, 21
- Coppola, Federica
 - on emotional capacity, 253, 253n19
 - partial excuse proposals, 182, 193, 203n131,
 - on rational agency, 52–53
- Cornford, Andrew, 169n130
- Corrado, Michael, 221–222
- Crewe, Ben, 135
- Crichton, John H. M., 198
- criminal law, objectives of. *See also* public nature of criminal law
 - civil order, 14–15, 29–30, 92
 - consequentialist accounts, 15–16, 18–19, 102–103, 114, 118
 - moral order. *See* moral dimension of criminal law
 - recognitive justice. *See* recognitive justice
 - relational justice, 18n38, 103
 - retributivist account. *See* retributive justice
 - social justice. *See* social justice objective of criminal law
 - victim remediation, 104, 124–125
- criminal responsibility
 - absolute or scalar, 94–95, 105, 145, 178–179
 - assessment of. *See* culpability evaluation
 - autonomy assumption. *See* autonomy and voluntarism
 - causal theories. *See* causal excuse theories, critiques of
 - character-based accounts, 21, 25, 124, 228
 - collective responsibility theories, 30
 - diminished. *See* diminished responsibility
 - moral responsibility and, 20–22, 25–26, 54, 59
 - ‘non-affective’ blame recognition, 58–59
 - rational agency assumption. *See* rational agency
 - therapeutic model (responsibility without blame), 58–59, 101, 104–105, 111–112
 - time and space contingency of, 60–61
- criminalisation, debates on, 15, 27–29, 108–110
- critical feminist criminology, 56–57, 73, 262
- Crocker, Phyllis, 169–170
- culpability evaluation. *See also* criminal responsibility
 - at different stages of criminal proceedings, 169–171

- formalism claim for, 120
- fundamental attribution error of decision-makers, 88–94
- by juries. *See* jury decision-making
- mens rea assessments, 124, 156–157
- multivalent verdicts, 175–178, 271
- parsimony problem. *See* parsimony principle
- proportionality problems. *See* proportionality problems
- real-world approach to, 42–44, 60
- retributivist paradigm, hegemony of, 17–23
- RPA. *See* Real Person Approach (RPA)
- social justice objective, need for. *See* social justice objective of criminal law
- state values underpinning, 250
- UPD. *See* Universal Partial Defence (UPD)
- cultural contexts, 255–258, 270–271
- Dagan, Netanel, 103
- Darjee, Rajan, 198
- Darwall, Stephen L., 61–62
- Delgado, Richard, 219
- Dell, Susanne, 167
- Dershowitz, Alan M., 200
- ‘desert’, conflicting ideas of, 24–25
- determinism critique. *See* causal excuse theories, critiques of
- deterrence theories, 15–16
- developmental immaturity, 185, 201–203
- diminished responsibility
 - abnormality of mind/mental functioning requirement, 184–185, 191–200, 252
 - bounded causal theory account, 218–223
 - causal link requirement, 206–207, 268–269
 - cross-jurisdictional variations, 156–160, 182, 195–198
 - evolution of doctrine, 151–155, 194–195
 - flexible applications by courts, 87, 181–182, 185–186, 195, 212–213, 221
 - normative function of jury, 208–209, 213–215
 - partial defences generally, 53, 145–146, 155–156, 167–168, 179–180
 - provocation defence, proposed merger with, 266, 273
 - psychiatric expert testimony, limitations of, 208–213
 - recognised medical condition requirement, 194–202
 - scalar notion of criminal responsibility acknowledged by, 171–172
 - substantial impairment requirement, 203–205, 251–254
 - Universal Partial Defence (UPD) approach, template for, 5, 182–185, 191–194, 202–203, 205–208, 215, 269–270
 - volitional capacity assessments, 190–191, 243–244
- disproportionality. *See* proportionality problems
- distributive justice, 10, 23–27, 38–39
- domestic abuse cases, 164–167, 257–260, 263–265
- Dressler, Joshua, 88, 160–161, 231, 262–263
- Dripps, Donald A., 91–94
- due process rights, 39–40
- Duff, Anthony
 - on criminal law objectives, 14, 29
 - on parsimony, 114
 - on public nature of criminal law, 33
 - on rational agency, 31, 122n83,
 - on retributivism, 10n2, 102–103
- duress defence, 85n27, 86, 228, 253–254
- Durham* rule (‘product’ test of insanity), 232–234
- Edgely, Michelle, 35–36
- emotional capacity assessments, 58, 193, 253
- emotional disturbance defence. *See* provocation/loss of control
- end state justice theory, 38
- Endicott, Timothy, 186
- ETHOS project, 42
- exculpation versus inculpation agency, 225–230, 236
- excuse doctrine
 - bounded causal theory. *See* bounded causal theory of partial excuse
 - Brink’s account, 44–45
 - critiques of causal theories. *See* causal excuse theories, critiques of
 - full excuses. *See* duress defence; insanity defence
 - partial excuses. *See* diminished responsibility; provocation/loss of control; Universal Partial Defence (UPD)
 - proportionality problem of, 84–88, 91–92, 94–95
 - situational vulnerability and excuse, 71–72
- fair opportunity theory, 21
- fair trial rights, 39–40

- Falk, Patricia J., 217, 235, 241–242
 Farmer, Lindsay, 14, 28–30, 55, 133, 218–219
 Feldman, Guy, 127, 131
 feminist criminology, 56–57, 73, 262
 Ferzan, Kimberly K., 18
 Fineman, Martha A., 63, 66, 68–69, 77
 Fingarette, Herbert, 177
 Fletcher, George P., 27–29, 34–35, 88
 formalism claim for culpability evaluation, 120
 Foucault, Michel, 132
 Fraser, Nancy, 40–44, 134
 Frederickson, Joel, 90
 Fricker, Miranda, 139
 Fulford, K. W. M., 210
 fundamental attribution error, 88–94
- Galoob, Stephen R., 20155
 Garland, David, 132
 gender-based theories of crime, 239–240, 262
 gender-based violence cases, 164–167,
 257–260, 263–265
 Germany, excuse doctrines, 178
 Gibson, Matthew, 213
 Gordon, Gerald H., 174
 Green, Stuart P., 1013
 guilt. *See* criminal responsibility
- Hallett, Nicholas, 189–191, 206–207
 Hanson, Jon, 59
 Harré, Rom, 56
 Hart, H. L. A., 16124, 220, 226134,
 Hart, Henry M., 1218, 20,
 Hasse, Anne Fingarette, 177
 Heffernan, William C., 24–25
 Heider, Fritz, 89
 Herring, Jonathan, 56, 65
 Higgins, Raymond L., 91, 138
 Hill, Rachael, 170
 Hirsch, Andrew von, 81, 113
 Honneth, Axel, 70, 74–75, 77
 Honoré, Tony, 13, 220, 226134, 228,
 honour-based violence, 257–258, 261–262
 Horder, Jeremy, 218–219, 262
 Hoskins, Zachary, 351137
 human dignity studies, 66–67
 Husak, Douglas, 99, 102, 105, 123
- idealised account of rational agency. *See*
 rational agency, liberal account
- Ievins, Alice, 135
 Ikeda, Janice, 131
- immaturity, developmental, 185, 201–203
 inculcation versus exculpation agency,
 225–230, 236
 inherent vulnerability of human beings,
 66–67, 70–71, 96, 147
 insanity defence
 cross-jurisdictional variations, 53, 86,
 232–234
 generally, 22, 239–240
 jury hesitancy to acquit, 149, 213, 267
 M’Naghten Rules, 53, 85–87, 154, 188–189,
 243
 instrumentalist accounts of criminal law,
 15–16, 18–19, 102–103, 114, 118
 intoxication, 199–200
 Irarrázaval, Cristián, 34
 Ireland
 diminished responsibility defence, 154, 187,
 195–196, 2041132, 207–208, 268–269,
 insanity defence, 53, 86
 provocation/loss of control defence,
 161–162, 264173,
 sentencing practice, 272
 ‘irresistible impulse’ assessments, 190–191,
 243–244
- Jackson, Bernard S., 176
 Jaworska, Agnieszka, 141
 Johnston, E. Lea, 252110, 272,
 jury decision-making
 bias affecting, 92–94, 273–274
 insanity defence, hesitancy to acquit, 149,
 213, 267
 normative, 77, 208–209, 213–215, 232–234,
 267–269, 273–275
 just deserts idea, 83–84
 justice, criminal. *See* criminal law, objectives
 of
- Katz, Leora D., 103
 Kaye, Anders
 on causal excuse theories, 234–238
 on partial defences, 151118, 179, 222,
 on situational vulnerability, 60
 Kelly, Erin, 27–28, 31–32, 100–101, 112
 Kenny, Anthony, 224131
 King, Anna, 118
 Knijn, Trudie, 39–41, 43
 Knobe, Joshua, 124
 Knust, Nandor, 81
 Kubota, Jennifer T., 92
 Kymlicka, Will, 36, 1761165,

- Lacey, Nicola
 on criminal law as state power, 18, 55
 on culpability evaluation, 124, 218
 on punishment (with Pickard), 32, 35, 100, 128
 therapeutic model of criminal justice (with Pickard), 58–59, 101, 104–105, 111–112
- Laird, Karl, 214–215
- Lambert, Elisabeth W.
 on partial excuse proposals, 148, 182, 193, 231–232, 250, 270
 poverty/scarcity defence, 207, 254n21, 255,
- Lemke, Thomas, 132–133
- Lepianka, Dorota, 39–40, 43
- Leverick, Fiona, 274
- Levine, Kay L., 257, 270–271
- Lewis, Rachel, 119–120, 126–127
- liberal account of rational agency. *See* rational agency, liberal account
- Liebenberg, Linda, 131
- Lippke, Richard L., 114–116
- Loader, Ian, 111, 113, 115
- Locke, John, 35
- loss of control defence. *See* provocation/loss of control
- Loughnan, Arlie, 54, 57, 60–61, 159
- Mackay, Ronnie
 on diminished responsibility (with Mitchell), 189–190, 195, 206, 266n78, 273,
 on insanity defence, 86
- Mackenzie, Catriona, 68–72, 75, 77, 96
- marginalisation of offenders, 30, 34–35, 72–73, 126–128, 133–134, 136
- Maruna, Shadd, 118
- masculinity, criminogenic, 239–240, 262
- Matravers, Matt, 51–52
- Matthews, Roger, 117
- McEwan, Jenny, 210
- McNeill, Fergus, 135, 140n167,
- McPherson, Rachel, 264n71
- mens rea assessments, 124, 156–157
- mental health disorders
 defences based on. *See* diminished responsibility; insanity defence
 prisoners with, 37, 86–87, 239–240
- mercy killing cases, 208, 212–213, 221, 275
- Miller, David, 23–24
- misrecognition of criminal subjects. *See also* recognitive justice
 doctrinal mechanisms of, 120–125, 135–137
 injustice arising from, 41, 68–69, 116–117, 121–122, 134–135
 pathogenic vulnerability arising from. *See* pathogenic vulnerability
 punitiveness giving rise to, 34, 63, 117–125
- Mitchell, Barry, 189–190, 195, 206, 266n78, 273,
- mitigation at sentencing, 150–151, 167–172, 174
- M’Naghten Rules. *See under* insanity defence
- Moore, Michael S.
 on causal excuse theories, 224, 229–231, 235–236,
 on retributivism, 21, 45
- moral dimension of criminal law
 communicative function, 102, 18–19, 103–104
 Darwall’s respect thesis, 61–62
 emotional capacity framed in moral terms, 193, 253
 moral essentialism risk of culpability evaluation, 120–125
 moral responsibility for wrongdoing, 20–22, 25–26, 54, 59
 normative decision-making by juries, 77, 208–209, 213–215, 232–234, 267–269, 273–275
 political dimension, relationship to, 28–29, 32
 of punishment, 21, 31–32
 retributive justice, morality-based critiques of, 100–102
 social justice accounts of, 31
- Morris, Norval, 113–114, 235
- Morse, Stephen J.
 on causal excuse theories, 231–232, 235–236, 239–240, 242–243
 on culpability evaluation, 94–95, 170–171, 231
 partial excuse proposals, 148, 182, 191–193, 202–203, 260, 269, 272n99,
 on rational agency and volitional capacity, 52n13, 53, 252,
- multivalent verdicts, 175–178, 271
- Munro, Vanessa E., 274
- Naffine, Ngaire, 57, 66, 133
- Nathan, Rajan, 189, 214

- Nelken, Dana K., 128
 neoliberal responsibilisation discourse,
 128–134
 New Zealand, partial excise doctrines,
 159–160, 166–167
 Norman, Wayne, 36, 176n165,
 normative decision-making by juries, 77,
 208–209, 213–215, 232–234, 267–269,
 273–275
 Norrie, Alan
 on diminished responsibility, 153–154, 184
 on rational agency, 26, 55–56, 121
 on retributivism, 19
 not proven verdict (Scotland), 175n153, 178,
 274n110,

 Olusanya, Olaoluwa, 170
 O'Malley, Tom, 20
 Ormerod, David, 214–215
 overcriminalisation, debates on, 15, 27–29,
 108–110

 Parekh, Bhikhu, 256
 parsimony principle. *See also* proportionality
 principle
 definitions and role, 112–116
 for Real Person Approach (RPA), 108–115,
 125
 punitiveness (absence of parsimony). *See*
 under misrecognition of criminal
 subjects
 scholarly discourse trends, 109–112
 summary of main arguments, 63, 107–108,
 141–142
 partial defences. *See* diminished responsibility;
 provocation/loss of control; Universal
 Partial Defence (UPD)
 pathogenic vulnerability. *See also* vulnerability
 theory
 ‘abnormality’ tests contributing to, 184–185,
 191–200, 252
 definition, 72–73
 marginalisation of offenders, 30, 34–35,
 72–73, 126–128, 133–134, 136
 mental health disorders, prisoners with, 37,
 86–87, 239–240
 punitiveness reconceptualised as, 108–117,
 125–126
 therapeutic model of criminal justice,
 58–59, 101, 104–105, 111–112
 penal parsimony. *See* parsimony principle

 Perlin, Michael L., 267
 personhood in criminal law
 autonomy assumption. *See* autonomy and
 voluntarism
 generally, 50–52
 idealised under liberal account, 36–37
 misrecognition injustice. *See* misrecognition
 of criminal subjects
 ‘non-ideal’ theories of, 37–38, 42
 psychiatric expert evidence and, 211–212
 rational agency assumption. *See* rational
 agency
 relational theories of, 54–62
 vulnerability and personhood, 66–67,
 70–71, 96, 147
 Petherbridge, Danielle, 70
 Pettit, Dean, 124
 Pettit, Philip, 103
 Pfeffer, Elizabeth Gordon, 118n57
 Pickard, Hanna
 on punishment (with Lacey), 31–32, 35,
 100, 128
 therapeutic model of criminal justice (with
 Lacey), 58–59, 101, 104–105, 111–112
 Pleasants, Nigel J., 237
 Porro, Costanza, 136
 post-traumatic stress disorder. *See* trauma
 poverty. *See* social deprivation
 ‘product’ test of insanity (*Durham* rule),
 232–234
 proportionality principle. *See also* parsimony
 principle
 just deserts idea and, 83–84
 for Real Person Approach (RPA), 82–83,
 95–100
 significance and meaning, 80–82
 proportionality problems
 degrees of desert, failure to recognise,
 94–95, 105, 145, 178–179
 excuse doctrine, disproportionate blame
 arising from, 84–88, 91–92, 94–95
 summary of main arguments, 4, 62–63,
 79–80, 105–106
 vulnerability, failure to recognise, 97
 provocation/loss of control
 controversies respecting, 164–167, 258–259
 cross-jurisdictional variations, 160–164, 182,
 196–197, 260–261
 diminished responsibility defence, proposed
 merger with, 266, 273
 generally, 152, 183, 240

- loss-of-control test, 191, 259–261, 264n73,
 partial defences generally, 53, 145–146,
 155–156, 167–168, 179–180
 Universal Partial Defence (UPD) of,
 258–266
 volitional capacity assessments, 190–191,
 243–244
 psychiatric expert testimony, limitations of,
 208–213
 PTSD. *See* trauma
 public nature of criminal law
 citizen protections, offenders' entitlement,
 33–36, 39–40, 44–45
 culpability evaluation, state values
 underpinning, 250
 political theory approach generally, 27–33
 public law principles. *See* parsimony
 principle; proportionality principle
 state duties, recognitive justice account. *See*
 recognitive justice
 punishment. *See also* sentencing
 communicative function of, 10n2, 18–19,
 103–104
 consequentialist account of, 15–16, 114
 moral dimension, 21, 31–32
 as retribution. *See* retributive justice
 parsimony principle. *See* parsimony
 principle
 pathogenic vulnerability arising from. *See*
 pathogenic vulnerability
 punitiveness. *See under* misrecognition of
 criminal subjects
 therapeutic model, 58–59, 101, 104–105,
 111–112
 Ramsay, Peter, 70–71, 218–219
 rational agency. *See also* autonomy and
 voluntarism
 capabilities approach, 32–33, 39–40
 circumstances undermining. *See*
 circumstances undermining
 autonomy/rational agency
 cognitive bias errors, 88–95
 emotion theory questioning, 58, 193, 253
 liberal account. *See* rational agency, liberal
 account
 neuroscientific views on, 22
 partial defences, lower threshold permitted,
 53, 189–190
 social psychology studies questioning,
 59–60, 240n110,
 vulnerability theory questioning. *See*
 vulnerability theory
 rational agency, liberal account
 as idealised construct, 36–37
 misrecognition injustice arising from. *See*
 misrecognition of criminal subjects
 neoliberal responsibilisation, link with,
 128–134
 problems arising from. *See* parsimony
 principle; proportionality problems
 reasons-responsiveness thesis, 31, 52–53,
 94–95, 122–125, 192
 retributivist underpinnings, 25–27
 variations of, 31–32
 Rawls, John, 23–37
 Real Person Approach (RPA)
 determinism critique. *See* causal excuse
 theories, critiques of
 feasibility and reconciliation with retributivism,
 76–77, 80, 97–105, 140–141
 objective of, 12–14, 23, 42, 62–63
 parsimony principle aligned with, 108–115,
 125
 personhood issues. *See* personhood in
 criminal law
 proportionality principle aligned with,
 82–83, 95–100
 real-world approach to culpability
 evaluation, 42–44, 60
 recognitive justice promoted by. *See*
 recognitive justice
 summary of main arguments, 3–4, 49–50,
 77–78, 277–279
 UPD proposal. *See* Universal Partial
 Defence (UPD)
 vulnerability recognition for. *See*
 vulnerability theory
 reasons-responsiveness thesis, 31, 52–53,
 94–95, 122–125, 192
 recognitive justice. *See also* social justice
 objective of criminal law
 future-orientated, 74–76, 139–140
 generally, 17, 97, 137
 mechanisms to promote. *See* Real Person
 Approach (RPA); Universal Partial
 Defence (UPD)
 misrecognition injustice. *See* misrecognition
 of criminal subjects
 present-orientated, 138–139
 respect thesis (Darwall), 61–62
 social justice conceived as, 38–42, 76

- Reeves, Craig, 56–57
 relational justice, 18n38, 103,
 relational theories of personhood, 54–62
 remorse, 19, 169, 193, 253
 representative justice, 40
 republican theories of criminal law, 103,
 114–115
 respect thesis (Darwall), 61–62
 responsibilisation discourse, 128–134
 responsibility assessment. *See* culpability
 evaluation
 retributive justice
 at culpability evaluation stage, 17–23,
 76–77, 80, 97–105
 definition and types, 10, 16–17, 98–99,
 102–103
 distributive justice as main competing
 paradigm, 23–27, 38–39
 just deserts idea, 83–84
 morality-based critiques of, 100–102
 parsimony, retributivist accounts of, 110, 118
 punitiveness. *See under* misrecognition of
 criminal subjects
 rational agency assumption. *See* rational
 agency
 resistance to criminal justice reforms, 87–88,
 149–150
 RPA and UPD proposals reconciled with,
 76–77, 80, 97–105, 140–141, 228–229
 Ripstein, Arthur, 22n63
 Ristroph, Alice, 21–22, 21n57, 137,
 Roberts, Julian, 103
 Robinson, Paul
 on causal excuse theories, 239–241, 266
 partial excuse proposals, 177, 183, 207, 250,
 267–268, 274–275
 on provocation/loss-of-control defence, 163,
 273
 ‘vengeful desert’ idea, 124
 Rosen, Michael, 67
 Ross, Lee, 89–90, 92–93
 ‘rotten social background’ defence. *See* social
 deprivation
 RPA. *See* Real Person Approach (RPA)
 Rui, Jon Petter, 81

 scapegoating offenders for social wrongs,
 126–127, 133–134
 Scheffler, Samuel, 25
 Schmitt, Carl, 35
 Schulhofer, Stephen J., 11

 Scots law
 not proven verdict, 175n153, 178, 274n110,
 partial excuse doctrines, 151–153, 164–165,
 186–187, 196–198, 202, 204–205
 selfhood. *See* personhood in criminal law
 Sen, Amartya, 39, 44
 sentencing. *See also* punishment
 mitigation at, 150–151, 167–172, 174
 Universal Partial Defence (UPD) success
 and, 271–273
 Shaver, Kelly G., 89, 93
 Simester, Andrew P., 209n164
 Singh, Sarah, 73
 situational vulnerability, 71–72, 91–92, 96
 situationist psychology, 59–60
 Slovenko, Ralph, 199
 Snyder, C. R., 91, 138
 social contract theory, 24–25, 35, 39
 social deprivation. *See also* causal excuse
 theories, critiques of
 causal theories based on, specific critiques,
 231–232, 237–238
 indices measuring, 242
 Lambert’s poverty/scarcity defence, 207,
 254n121, 255,
 neoliberal responsibilisation discourse on,
 131–134
 situational vulnerability concept, 71–72,
 91–92, 96
 social justice objective of criminal law
 distributive justice, social justice equated
 with, 23–27, 38–39
 political obstacles to acknowledgement, 30
 public law–based rationale. *See* public
 nature of criminal law
 retributive justice hegemony, passivity
 towards, 17–25
 social justice as recognition. *See* recognitive
 justice
 summary of main arguments, 1–3, 9–12,
 45–46
 Sola, Javier C., 68–69, 71–73, 75–76
 South Africa, provocation defence, 163–164
 stigmatisation of offenders, 30, 34–35, 72–73,
 126–128, 133–134, 136
 substantial impairment, 203–205, 251–254

 Tadros, Victor, 22n63, 240n110
 Tetlock, Philip E., 92
 therapeutic model of criminal justice, 58–59,
 101, 104–105, 111–112

- Thorburn, Malcolm, 28, 31
 Tonry, Michael, 81, 114, 116n47,
 transitional justice, 38
 trauma
 clinical diagnosis problems, 199, 211
 emotional capacity assessments taking
 account of, 58, 193, 253
 as partial excuse, current recognition, 170,
 195, 198, 200–201
 as partial excuse, proposed recognition, 203,
 263–265
 trivalent verdicts, 175–178, 271
 Tsee Chee, Kuan, 244

 Ungar, Michael, 131
 United States
 cultural defence, 257–258
 insanity defence, 232–234
 partial excuse doctrines, 156–158, 162–163,
 182, 201, 260–261
 Universal Partial Defence (UPD). *See also*
 Real Person Approach (RPA)
 bounded causal theory for. *See* bounded
 causal theory of partial excuse
 capacity assessment for, 191–194, 202–203,
 205–208
 circumstances considered for. *See*
 circumstances undermining
 autonomy/rational agency
 complexity objection, 273–275
 coordination objection, 172–178
 criminal responsibility, scalar concept
 requirement, 178–179
 current partial defences. *See* diminished
 responsibility; provocation/loss of
 control
 evidential issues, 269–271
 feasibility and reconciliation with
 retributivism, 76–77, 105, 228–229
 full excuse alternative, 149–150
 mitigation at sentencing alternative,
 150–151, 167–172, 174
 objective of, 12–13, 41, 149
 outcomes of successful UPD, 271–273
 recognitive justice promoted by, 76,
 137–138
 summary of main arguments, 2–3, 5–6,
 145–147, 179–180, 215, 249–250,
 275–276, 280–281
 test for, 249–251
 substantial impairment, 251–254
 arising from condition or circumstance,
 254–255, 266–267
 such that reduced responsibility
 recognition is morally appropriate,
 267–269
 universality of, 73, 147–149, 171–172, 202

 Valentini, Laura, 37–38, 66n88,
 verdicts, multivalent, 175–178, 271
 victim-centred criminal justice, 104, 124
 volitional capacity assessments, 190–191,
 243–244
 voluntarism. *See* autonomy and voluntarism
 vulnerability theory
 autonomy questioned by, 55–56, 69, 71–72
 concept of vulnerability, 64–66
 generally, 42, 63
 Mackenzie's typology applied to culpability
 evaluation, 69–73
 non-recognition of vulnerability as
 proportionality problem, 97
 paternalism risk arising from, 77
 pathogenic vulnerability. *See* pathogenic
 vulnerability
 personhood and vulnerability, 66–67,
 70–71, 96, 147
 rational agency questioned by, 67–69
 situational vulnerability, 71–72, 91–92, 96

 Walker, Nigel, 209–210
 Ward, Tony, 214
 Wasik, Martin, 167–168, 172–174
 Watson, Gary, 123n85
 'weak' form retributivism, 98–100
 Williams, Glanville, 213, 244
 Wilson, William, 243
 Wolf, Susan, 123n85
 Wolff, Jonathan, 42
 Woodward, Kitaj, 159–160

 Zehr, Howard, 20