

**Blaming and declaring responsible are separate actions - as shown by your duty to make restitution for what your father did**

Blame can be separated from responsibility.

Take the following case.

Imagine your father was a dictator and stole all the money in the nation out of the banks. He dies. You are not to blame for what he did. But you have a responsibility to return what he took if you can. You have no right to benefit from it or keep it.

But as long as you know he stole it and do not start the process of giving it back you are as bad as him.

It follows that it is no big deal if you are blamed as he is for stealing it if you hold on to it. It might be wrong but it is not like you are blameless.

The argument shows that blame is being accepted as partly legitimate. Blame means condemning a person for doing wrong. The condemnation is punishment in itself and it calls for the person to suffer saying he has earned suffering for causing suffering or breaking the law.

Those who do not blame, usually deny that right and wrong behaviour really exist or, more commonly, they think they don't know enough to be able to work out if the person is blameworthy. The latter have the following position, "If you are guilty then I condemn you and wish punishment on you." Society and religion are both good training schools in fake charm.