

## Second 5-7 page paper

PHIL 13195

Due: Thursday, November 17 (the Thursday before Thanksgiving)

Below are four topics for your second paper. You are welcome to come up with your own topic, though you must get my approval by email first. If you do this, the question that your I approve should be on the first page of your essay. The papers should be at most 5-7 pages in length, double-spaced and with reasonable margins and font. You should turn in the paper to me as an email attachment. A late penalty of 3 points per day, including weekends, will be assessed for any papers which are handed in late. I am happy to read rough drafts, but these must be submitted 7 days or more before the due date by email.

Please use page numbers, and write the number of the topic you are addressing at the top of the first page of the paper.

Plagiarism is a serious and growing problem at Notre Dame and other universities. It is your responsibility to acquaint yourselves with the University's honor code, as well as with the philosophy department's guidelines regarding plagiarism. Both are linked from the course page.

1. Explain Edwards' argument for the incompatibility of free will and divine foreknowledge. Would a similar argument show that *anyone* having foreknowledge of your action would rule out free will? Why or why not? Consider a few different responses to Edwards' argument and say which, if any, you think is convincing.
2. Imagine three people whose lives are alike except that one neither has free will nor believes she does, one lacks free will but thinks she has free will, and one both has free will and believes she does. Would these lives be different in any important way? What of value might be part of one or two of these lives, but not all?
3. The Descartes of Meditation I and Moore argue for different views about our knowledge of the external world. The first argues that we have reason to doubt, and hence cannot know, whether external things exist; the second thinks that he can prove that they do. Which is right?
4. Explain an example, using a situation familiar to you, of the sort of peer disagreement in which Feldman and Kelly are interested. What, in your view, is the rational way to respond to the case you describe? Say why you think this, and be sure to consider the arguments from the readings which oppose the view your advocate.