

# Argument Analysis #3

PHI 370/SPM 370

Due February 5th, 2014

Please write approximately 2 pages stating, in your own words, the argument contained in the following passage and critically analyzing it.

The anorectic is a potential challenge to contemporary moral psychology because she is a person who experiences her psyche in terms of self-control, as if there were something that was *her*, choosing between her desires on the basis of the merits, giving her control over herself, while we have good reasons to believe that unconscious desire or emotion moves her in a manner not characteristic of well exercised practical reason. To the extent that contemporary moral psychology emphasizes the first person perspective, it risks misunderstanding such cases. *Arpaly, pg. 18*

You should first reconstruct the argument in the passage. Make clear what you take the conclusion of the argument to be, and what you take the premises to be, both explicit and suppressed, by setting them off from surrounding text and labeling each premise and the conclusion. Premises and conclusions should not be quotes; they should be stated in your own words. They should not be questions. It is best to do this both in prose and in standard form. Below is an example of an argument in standard form (but you needn't have only two premises).

Premise 1: Every claim with a truth-value is either analytic or empirically verifiable.

Premise 2: No moral claim is either analytic or empirically verifiable.

Conclusion: No moral claim has a truth-value.

Explicit premises are premises the author explicitly states; suppressed premises are premises that he or she is assuming to be true without explicitly stating.

Next, critically analyze the argument. What is the best objection to the argument? Is it to one of the premises? Is the argument valid? Ultimately, can the argument be successfully defended against the objection?