

Paper #2

Jeff Speaks
PHIL 10100

due: the start of class on Thursday, April 2

We discussed four views about what it takes for you to exist tomorrow: (i) your immaterial soul must exist tomorrow; (ii) the material thing which you are must exist tomorrow; (iii) something must exist tomorrow which stands in the right psychological connections to you now. We also discussed the view (iv) that you won't *really* exist tomorrow – except in the weak sense in which clubs and sports teams continue to exist over time.

In your paper, you should do the following five things. Each of the five tasks should be clearly separated (e.g., with the number of the task) from the others.

A rough draft for this paper is not required. But if you would like your TA to look at a rough draft for you, you must give them the draft a full week before the paper is due: so, by the start of class on Thursday, 3/26.

- (1) Say which of (i)-(iv) you think is true. You may also state a view about what it takes for you to exist tomorrow which is different from any of these, and/or one which combines features of more than one of (i)-(iv). This should take no more than one paragraph, and can (if you pick one of (i)-(iv)) be as short as one sentence.
- (2) State what is in your view the strongest argument for the position stated in part (1). You may, but need not, also give a second argument in favor of your view. If you do, the two arguments should be clearly separated. Most arguments can be explained clearly in 1-3 paragraphs.
- (3) State the two objections to the view stated in part (1) which you think are the most challenging. The two objections should be clearly separated, and each should be stated in at most one paragraph.
- (4) Give what you think is the best response to each of the two objections explained in part (3). The two responses should be clearly separated. Typical responses should be 1-2 paragraphs each. In each case you should focus on clearly explaining and developing what you think is the *best* response, rather than employing the 'scattershot' approach of mentioning but not developing a number of different responses.
- (5) Briefly, in one or two paragraphs, explain why in the end you think that the argument(s) given in part (2) outweighs the objections stated in part (3).