

Erratum to: Blocking Blockage

Ken Levy¹

Published online: 10 May 2016
© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2016

Erratum to: *Philosophia* DOI 10.1007/s11406-016-9707-x

The original version of this article unfortunately contained a mistake. The correct details are given below.

In the second full paragraph of the Conclusion, the word (or name) “Frankfurt” should be replaced with “Principle of Alternative Possibilities” or “PAP”. In other words, the entire paragraph should read:

In the section above entitled “The Flicker Strategy,” we saw the difference between the Principle of Alternative Possibilities (PAP) and the Flicker Strategy. While PAP says that moral responsibility requires a “robust” alternative possibility – that is, the possibility of voluntarily performing an alternative, non-resembling action – the Flicker Strategy says that moral responsibility requires only a weak alternative possibility – for example, the possibility of avoiding voluntarily performing the same (resembling) action. The failure of the Blockage Argument supports only the latter (the Flicker Strategy), not the former (PAP).

The online version of the original article can be found at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11406-016-9707-x>.

✉ Ken Levy
Ken.Levy@law.lsu.edu

¹ Holt B. Harrison Associate Professor of Law, Paul M. Hebert Law Center, Louisiana State University, 110 LSU Student Union Building, Baton Rouge, LA 70803-0106, USA