

Daniel Immerman
Intro to Phil

Mini Paper 7

Instructions: this assignment should be **printed out** and turned in **in class** on **October 28**. This paper should be under a page. I like to grade as anonymously as possible, so please **do not put your name on the top of the paper, but instead put it on the opposite side of the page (or on a second page, if you can't print double-sided)**. If you have any questions about how to complete the assignment, please let me know.

Background:

Today, for class, we're reading "The Free Will Defense" by Alvin Plantinga. Pick a case that Dostoevsky mentioned and say whether what Plantinga's free will defense would say about the case is plausible.

There is a rubric for this assignment, which is on the second page of this assignment sheet.

Rubric for MiniPaper 7 - Intro to Phil - Daniel Immerman

Structuring	(3) It is extraordinarily clear what the main goal of your paper is and what you were doing at each point in it. Things followed in a logical order.	(2) It is quite clear what the main goal of your paper was and what you were doing at each point in it. Things for the most part follow in a logical order.	(1) It is somewhat unclear what the main goal of your paper is and what you are doing at each point in it. Things sometimes fail to follow in a logical order.	(0) It is massively unclear what the main goal of your paper is and there are several points in which it is unclear what you are doing in it. Things often fail to follow in a logical order.
Clarity and Precision	(3) Extremely clear and precise. This includes telling me exactly how your arguments go, exactly where you object to arguments you object to, etc.	(2) You are rather clear and precise.	(1) There are a fair number of places in which you fail to be clear and precise.	(0) Your paper is massively unclear and imprecise.
Answering Prompt	(2) Answered all parts of the prompt.	(1) Answered most parts of the prompt.	(0) Ignored the prompt.	Note: you only are eligible for points in rows after the first two if you get one or more points in each of the first two rows.
Interpretation	(2) Maximally accurate and charitable in interpretation, presenting keen insight into other author's ideas.	(1) Fairly accurate and charitable in interpretation.	(0) A number of problems in accuracy or charity of interpretation.	
Depth	(2) Discusses issues in depth, considering objections and responses, rather than talking through a number of points quickly.	(1) Discusses several issues in a moderate amount of depth.	(0) Discusses a large number of issues very quickly.	
Persuasion	(2) The points you make in defense of your main claims are all extremely plausible, or if somewhat implausible, you consider and respond to the most important objections to them.	(1) The points you make in defense of your main claims are, for the most part, fairly plausible.	(0) The points you make in defense of your main claims are rather implausible.	
Concision	(1) No unnecessary sentences or words. Everything regarding what other authors say is necessary to explain the points you'll be making.	(.5) Occasional extra words or sentences. Sometimes adds unnecessary remarks about what other authors say.	(0) Often adds extra words or sentences or talks about irrelevant points.	
Creativity	(2) You make some extremely creative points.	(1) Your points are rather creative.	(0) Your points are not especially creative, but rather fairly standard.	
Ambition	(1) Your conclusions are extremely surprising.	(.5) Your conclusions are rather controversial.	(0) Your conclusions are not particularly controversial, but rather fairly mainstream.	