

## Second 5-7 page paper

PHIL 13195

Due: Thursday, November 21 (the Thursday before Thanksgiving)

Below are five 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 you 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. We considered two different theories of time: the spacetime theory, and the theory that time flows. Say which you think is most plausible, and why. Then consider and respond to a few of what you take to be the most serious objections to your view.
3. Explain and defend the consequentialist moral theory which you think is best suited to respond to Nozick's and Thomson's arguments. Say how, exactly you would respond to those arguments. Be sure to consider the examples from Thomson which you think are most challenging to your view.
4. Say what you take to be the most promising moral theory. You may choose either utilitarianism or the Kantian view, or some view of your own creation — which may be a modification of the utilitarian or Kantian views, or some hybrid of them. Explain the reason for your view, and then consider two or more of what you take to be the most serious objections to your view.
5. Sider concludes that "Christians should either reject the notion of divine judgment altogether, or claim that in the afterlife, as in life, there is no black and white, only shades of grey." Explain his argument for this claim. Is it convincing? If not, say which premise (or premises) of the argument

you reject, and why. If so, consider what you take to be the most promising objections to the argument, and explain why you think they fail.