

ruiz@bu.edu

apozina@bu.edu

Ruiz 1

Xavier Ruiz

12 February 2019

WR150

### Testing the Argumentative Waters

Give a modus tollens argument against hedonism/Utilitarianism using the experience machine with three premises

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

2. I ~~believe~~ <sup>believed an example of</sup> a greater source of motivation in humans ~~other than pleasure~~ would be religion.

<sup>to me</sup> After some reading, however, it became clear that ~~even~~ <sup>he believes</sup> the idea of religion itself could be in ~~the delusion of a religi~~ following turmoil. According to Marx, religion is a delusion. ~~It is a delusion that mankind created as a~~ means to accept the unhappiness within ourselves.

1. If mankind is motivated by more than just pleasure, then mankind must be also motivated by religion.

2. If mankind is motivated by religion, then mankind did not create religion, or else we would just be motivated by the principles used when creating the religion, and thus Divine Command Theory must be true
3. Divine Command Theory is not true
4. Mankind is not motivated by religion
5. Mankind is not motivated by more than just pleasure

argument  
However, this can be qualified, and we can claim that mankind created religion. Therefore, it follows that we are motivated by the principles used to create religion. My original argument still stands, but what are these principles? <sup>Freud would claim</sup> ~~Some claim~~ that the principle <sup>is an</sup> ~~is that~~ 'oceanic' connectedness as described by Freud. <sup>It's</sup> ~~It's~~ 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 <sup>and is</sup> ~~really~~ just a psychological illusion, an effect of having an "ego". He explains that, <sup>this feeling isn't</sup> ~~we are not~~ autonomous but <sup>develops</sup> ~~develop~~ this feeling later in life. The feelings and 'senses' you had before developing your ego is this 'oceanic' feeling. Even if this 'oceanic' feeling idea gained traction, it is doubtful that it is explicitly or even remotely connected to religion. Freud gives two alternate theories as to what we could <sup>be</sup> ~~we are~~ motivated by. The first one is <sup>our</sup> ~~an~~ obsession with objects, order and everything around us being in "the right place". 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~~.

1. If mankind is motivated by more than just pleasure, then mankind must also be motivated by love.

2. If mankind is motivated by love, then mankind will do actions out of love
3. If mankind does actions out of love, then mankind will not be motivated by pleasure.
4. All love brings pleasure
5. Therefore, mankind is really motivated by pleasure
6. Mankind is not motivated by love
7. Mankind is not motivated by more than just pleasure

3. 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. This is true, and after reviewing, I have concluded that all actions are connected somehow, someway to pleasure.

There may be higher forms of motivations, such as love, yet one still derives pleasure from them

4. The objection of love may not seem like a strong one, but it ~~really~~ shows that something that is supposed to be one of the most altruistic motivations is really just one of pleasure.

There simply is nothing that is not connected to pleasure, ~~or even an avoidance of pain.~~ <sup>which</sup> a binary that cannot be escaped ~~and~~ <sup>what</sup> defines all our motivations.

# Peer Review Workshop

Write a 1-2 page response in which you address the following prompts:

## I. Seeing Your Work Through Your Reader's Eyes

Identify and *briefly* summarize (i) the argumentative claim being advanced and the student's line of reasoning in favor this claim and (ii) the devil's advocate objection being raised against that claim or line of reasoning. If you are having a hard time determining (i) and/or (ii), explain why:

The claim the student put forth is, <sup>the</sup> that psychological hedonism is ~~plus~~ ~~false~~. He does this by using the examples of love and religion. Both devil's advocates are clear ~~and~~ - in the case of mankind creating religion/~~from~~ DCT, or in the case of love leading to pleasure.

## II. Assess the strength of the argument and the devil's advocate objection:

Do you find the line of reasoning persuasive? Explain. Do you think you can defeat the objection they raise? If so, explain how. Can you think of ways in which the devil's advocate objection be made stronger?

Yes, I find the line of reasoning persuasive.

In the first case, the objection is strong, ~~it's hard to defeat. I could argue that~~

but is countered effectively by the student already. In the second case for love, there is no devil's advocate objection there.