In the recent debate on explanation, philosophers tend to agree that the sciences do not only provide causal but also non-causal explanations. A challenging aspect of this agreement is that currently dominant causal (and mechanistic) accounts of explanations fail to cover non-causal kinds of explanations. So, how shall we react to this challenge? The goal of my talk is to articulate and to defend the counterfactual theory of explanation (CTE). The CTE is a monist account of explanation. I take monism to be the view that there is one single philosophical account capturing both causal and non-causal explanations. According to the CTE, both causal and non-causal explanations are explanatory by virtue of revealing counterfactual dependencies between the explanandum and the explanans.