Total points: 10   Word Limit: 500

Instructions:

(i) Submit in Turnitin. Section: **Assignments**

(ii) Use the format below for identifying your submission. Write it on the top as seen here.

    M20HSS316-ITP/Assignment-[#]/[Roll number]/Program

      e.g. M20HSS316-ITP/Assignment-2/20166737/CSE

(iii) Your submission must be a single PDF, named with your IIITH id. E.g. 20166737.PDF

(iv) Viewing similarity report: **after due date**, Option to resubmit: **Yes**

(v) Similarity index threshold to be considered for evaluation: **15%**

(vi) DO NOT include the question in your submission.

Agents who are *epistemically rational* proportion their beliefs to their evidence. Their confidence goes up and down as new evidence comes in and they make rational, utility-maximizing decisions at every stage. Buchak thinks that there are situations where we are not better off being merely epistemically rational. To undertake risky long-term projects and follow through with them we need to be *practically rational*. When it is foreseeable that at some point along the way the prospects for success will look bleak, an epistemically rational agent will have give up. On the other hand, a practically rational agent acting on faith will be better off in this case since faith justifies behavior that involves risk. However, Buchak's example that we discussed in class involves risk to the agent acting on faith and *not to others*. Anna takes a risk when she places her faith in Bates and decides to marry him, but the risk is only a risk to her. But suppose Anna had children whom she might be placing at risk by marrying Bates. Could it be rational for Anna to have faith that Bates is innocent in such a case? Explain.