

Contents

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	<i>page</i> ix
Introduction	I
PART I THE PERMISSIBILITY OF BLAME	
1 The Problem of Blame	II
1.1 Reactive Blame	13
1.2 The Varieties of Nonreactive Blame	21
1.3 Quality of Will and Functional Accounts	28
1.4 The Problem of Blame	34
1.5 Conclusion	38
2 The Structure of Basic Desert	40
2.1 Basic versus Nonbasic Desert	44
2.2 Substantive Desert Theses and the Wrong Kind of Reasons	47
2.3 Virtues of the Fittingness Account	51
2.4 Circularity	55
2.5 Conclusion	57
3 Blame and the Reactive Attitudes	58
3.1 Strawsonian Blame	60
3.2 Narrowing the Class of Reactive Attitudes	64
3.3 The Case for Cognitivism	70
3.4 The Right Kind of Reasons to Blame	84
3.5 Conclusion	91
4 Solving the Problem of Blame	92
4.1 The Aims and Value of Blame	93
4.2 The Parity of Reasons Argument	101
4.3 Perceptual Models and the Evidentiary Status of the Negative Reactive Attitudes	114
4.4 Conclusion	122

PART II PRESCRIPTIVE PRESERVATIONISM AND
 ELIMINATIVISM

5	The Methodological Burdens for Eliminativism	127
5.1	Terminological Stage Setting	130
5.2	Eliminativism and the Skeptical Spotlight	132
5.3	The Motivational Challenge	140
5.4	Necessity Arguments	149
5.5	Conclusion	151
6	Free Will, Responsibility, and Reference	152
6.1	Early Reference-Based Arguments against Elimination	154
6.2	An Elimination-Friendly Approach to Reference	162
6.3	Against a Discretionary Case for Eliminativism	171
6.4	A Discretionary Case for Preservationism	180
6.5	The Prospects for Eliminativism	188
6.6	Conclusion	191
7	Facing the Dark Side	192
7.1	Belief in Free Will, Just-World Beliefs, and Right-Wing Authoritarianism	194
7.2	Harming the Innocent?	200
7.3	The Dark Side of Eliminativism and an Argument from Empathy	205
	<i>References</i>	211
	<i>Index</i>	221