Quick summary of the structure of Pereboom's arguments against MR

Either DET is T or it is not. First consider what else is T if DET is T (statements 1 - 7 below). Then consider what else is T if DET is F (statements 8 - 15 below).

1) Tax evader example is example where common moral thinking says the agent is MR, and libertarians agree the agent is MR, but in the example, the agent has no leeway freedom that could be relevant to establishing the MR.

Therefore, 2) NOT (MR requires relevant leeway freedom)
Therefore, 3) Fischer and the compatibilists are right about this point, and the libertarians are wrong to take the opposite view.

Nevertheless, anyone who says DET is compatible with MR is wrong as well, because>>>

4) The 4-case argument shows that if DET is true, then there is no principled way to distinguish between cases in which the agent is sufficiently the SOURCE to be MR and the cases in which the agent is not the SOURCE.
5) MR requires the agent be the SOURCE

Therefore, from 4) and 5): 6) If DET, then no way to tell that an agent is sufficient SOURCE to be MR.
Therefore, from 6) and 5): 7) If DET, no way to tell that an agent is MR
Therefore, from 7): If DET, MR should be given up.

8) If NOT DET, then either agent causation is T (as in O'Connor) or actions occur as a matter of chance or luck (as in Kane's view)
9) But there is no solid evidence that agent causation is T (that is, there is no reason to think we have these powers).
10) If actions occur as a matter of chance or luck, agents are not sufficiently the SOURCE to be MR.

Therefore, from 8) and 10): 11) If NOT DET, then agents can be sufficiently the SOURCE only if agent causation is T.
Therefore, from 9) and 11): 12) If NOT DET, then there is not good reason to think agents are sufficiently the SOURCE of their actions.

But, 13) MR requires that agents be sufficiently the SOURCE.

Therefore, from 13) and 12): 14) If NOT DET, then there is no good reason to think agents are MR.
Therefore, from 14): 15) If NOT DET, MR should be given up.

Now, put it all together:

Therefore, from 7) and 15): MR should be given up.

Actually, the above is not the complete story. These are just the negative arguments against MR. The more positive arguments come at the end of the chapter, where P. argues that society would function well, morality could be maintained, rich interpersonal relations would be possible, and personal development and goal-setting could be maintained – all without MR. P. also argues that the resulting society would be kinder and gentler – a state which he apparently believes is preferable on moral grounds.

These latter claims are part of the argument against MR because they are designed to show that giving up on MR would not have the negative consequences one might imagine, and that it would, on the contrary, have positive consequences.