

Xavier Ruiz

Professor Hammond

12 February 2019

CAS WR150

### Testing the Argumentative Waters: Devil's Advocate Rough Draft

My initial view on psychological hedonism is that it is false. I believe that humans are motivated by far more than just pleasure. The interlocutor I chose to engage with is also in agreement with me and we brainstormed a list of other things that do not necessarily fall into the pleasure category. For example, we came up with religion as a large source of greater meaning for many. We stumbled across other sources of meaning other than pleasure, but they all could arguably be put in the "pleasure" category.

I believed an example of a greater source of motivation in humans other than pleasure would be religion. Following some reading, however, it became clear to me that the idea of religion itself is in turmoil. According to Marx, religion is the "opium of the people". He believes it is a delusion that mankind created as a means to accept the unhappiness within ourselves. Some could argue that we did not create religion, yet the problem with that is that Divine Command Theory cannot be true. If mankind is motivated by more than simple pleasure, some will argue, then he must also be motivated by religion. If mankind really was motivated by religion, then this is somewhat problematic. Suppose mankind created religion, then we would not really be motivated by religion, rather, the

principles we used when creating the religion. If we argue that mankind did not create religion, then Divine Command Theory must be true. Unfortunately, Divine Command Theory is false, proving that mankind simply cannot be motivated by religion. Mankind can still be motivated by the practices of religion, perhaps it gives them a sense of balance and *pleasure* in their lives, but this is not religion. Mankind must be motivated by pleasure.

However, this argument against religion as a motivator can be qualified; as mentioned earlier, if mankind created religion, then mankind must be motivated by those principles used to create the religion. What could be these principles? Freud would claim that the principle is an 'oceanic' connectedness. It is a feeling that you are part of a greater "plan" and you feel some "sense of purpose". Freud explains, however, that this 'oceanic' feeling is really just a psychological illusion, an effect of having an "ego". He explains that, when we are born, we are not autonomous, we have no sense of self, and develop this feeling of autonomy later in life through the development of one's ego. The feelings and 'senses' you had before developing your ego is this 'oceanic' feeling. Some people, claims Freud, is that they simply do not lose this feeling. Even if this 'oceanic' feeling idea were true, it is doubtful that it is explicitly or even remotely connected to religion. Freud gives two alternate theories as to what we could be motivated by. The first one is our obsession with objects, order and everything around us being in "the right place". It is based on the idea that mankind draws inspiration of organization from nature and seeks to replicate it. However, I would argue that this theory fits more into the pleasure category. Lastly, Freud points out that we may actually be motivated by love and love of all things. He claims that, if mankind is motivated by more than just pleasure, then mankind must also be motivated by

love. This appears plausible, as many things you do out of love, you do not necessarily derive out of pleasure. If mankind is motivated by love, then mankind will do actions out of love. If mankind does actions out of love, then mankind is not be motivated by pleasure to do those actions. However, the problem I have with Freud's theory is that all love, or actions of love, bring pleasure, intentional or not. I am arguing that humans simply pretend that these actions do not bring them pleasure, but they really do. Whether it is short term or long term, these actions of love are undeniably "pleasurable". Therefore, mankind is really motivated by pleasure and mankind is not motivated by love. We are motivated by nothing more than just pleasure.

Some may be led to believe my devil's advocacy objection is not strong because it still leaves many other motivations other than pleasure untouched. There are countless motivations that one could bring up that are not, or at least appear to not be, pleasure. Initially, this appears to be true, maybe there is a motivation out there other than pleasure; but, after reviewing, I have concluded that all actions are connected somehow, someway to pleasure. There may be higher forms of motivations, such love, yet one still derives pleasure from them. The objection of love may seem weak, but it reveals that something that is supposed to be one of the most altruistic motivations is, in actuality, one of pleasure. Put simply, all motivations are connected to pleasure, be it rational or irrational. Love, some naysayers will argue, is irrational, therefore it cannot be motivated by pleasure. What I am arguing is that pleasure, too, can be irrational, it is connected to love. Even still, others will say an avoidance of pain is not connected to pleasure. Still, this is simply another form

of pleasure. In conclusion, pleasure is a binary that cannot be escaped and is what defines all of our motivations.