

Reasoning About Social Issues And Addiction

Addiction is not a disease but growing influences in society have led us to believe addiction as a disease, which is harmful and has complex results for the society.

Justification: I think I have the right conclusion because the passage is about addiction as a disease model becoming socially accepted as a norm. The passage has premises supporting the conclusion. The passage explains that addiction should not be considered a disease because it has not yet established. The author mentions addictions to be physically habit forming but does not think addiction as a disease because in his opinion the disease model of addiction has negative outcomes for the society.

C) Addiction is not a disease; however growing influences in society have led us to believe addiction as a disease which is harmful and has complex results for the society.

P1) Accepting addiction as a disease will create a world in which a reason is put forward to justify a fault, a world which will turn into a complete disorder.

P2) People with addictions would be held less “accountable for their actions even when they have harmed others” because they would be thought sick as Governor Dukakis puts addiction as a sickness.

P4) “Often the only penalty for gross, even criminal misconduct” of addicts “is undergoing counselling in a treatment center”.

P5) Psychologists and lawyers consider misbehaviour of addicts as “uncontrollable compulsions” which they think as a form of sickness.

P6) Addiction is thought of as a disease that has affected society.

P7) Wade Boggs third baseman of a professional baseball team “confessed that he was ‘addicted to sex’ to which his mistress responded ‘I guess what I thought was love was just a disease’”.

P3) Science and society agree that “addicts suffer physiologically” and suffering physiologically means abnormal functioning of an organism.

P8) “Drugs like narcotics and alcohol have chemical effects” on body and are associated with addiction.

P9) “Withdrawal from habitual use of those substances” to which an addict is addicted, can draw out a large amount of “irritating physical sensations” and makes a user unaware to his or her surroundings.

P10) Addiction includes “not only chemical dependency but overeating, under eating, shopping” and having sex outside marriage.

Step 3 Premise Analysis

a) Glaring Insufficiencies

Stanley Peele, the author of the passage “Ain’t misbehavin’,” intends to prove that addiction is not a disease but he does not give reasons why addiction should not be considered a disease. Also the author does not define what he means by ‘uncontrollable compulsions’ because of lack of elaboration on the term. The last sentence of the passage in which he says “Creating a world of addictive diseases may mean creating a world in which anything is excusable, one that must inevitably slide into chaos” does not possibly lead to the conclusion and needs more explanation to help us to understand the link to the conclusion. The author needs to mention of whose misbehaviour psychologists and lawyers dismiss forms as “uncontrollable compulsions”. Also psychologists do not dismiss all misbehaviours of addicts to be part of compulsive behaviour. Also the author again needs to mention of whose misconduct is undergoing counselling in a treatment centre, to make more sense of whose misbehaviour and misconduct he is referring to. Fallacy of global insufficiency is committed as it provides insufficient evidence as the basis for a widely general conclusion to prove that addicts undergo treatment rather than punishment when they commit crime.

b) Glaring Irrelevancies

The sentence in the second paragraph of the passage explaining “The more psychologists and attorneys dismiss forms of misbehaviour as uncontrollable compulsions, the less the people are held accountable for their actions” is glaringly irrelevant because it does not answer any question related to conclusion. Also other sentence in the second paragraph of the passage saying “the only penalty for gross, even criminal misconduct is undergoing counselling in a treatment centre” is glaringly irrelevant as it does not answer any question related to the conclusion and it does not answer why a disease model of addiction is harmful for society.

c) Premise Acceptability

P1) Accepting addiction as a disease will create a world in which a reason is put forward to justify a fault, a world which will turn into a complete disorder.

This premise is unacceptable because it is still debated by experts and the psychologists as an issue whether addiction is a disease and whether addiction as a disease is harmful for the society.

P2) People with addictions would be held less “accountable for their actions even when they have harmed others” because they would be thought sick as Governor Dukakis puts addiction as a sickness.

This premise is unacceptable because people with addictions are not held less accountable for their actions unless they show symptoms of some disease. Psychologists are working on whether addiction is a disease or not. If any addiction is considered a disease, it should be justified by symptoms of a disease it is related.

P3) Science and society agree that “addicts suffer physiologically”.

This premise is acceptable because it is public knowledge. Society and also the experts agree that addicts do suffer physiologically because the substance they get addicted to do have chemical effects on the functioning of the body.

P4) “Often the only penalty for gross, even criminal misconduct” of addicts “is undergoing counselling in a treatment center”.

This premise is unacceptable because misconduct of addicts is only forgiven if they show symptoms of a disease. Addicts are not forgiven only because they are addicts and that they were not aware of anything when they committed a crime.

P5) Psychologists and lawyers consider misbehaviour of addicts as “uncontrollable compulsions” which they think as a form of sickness.

This premise is acceptable because in Toronto 2010 psychologists and lawyers think that addicts are unable to control their internal force that leads them to act against their will.

P6) Addiction is thought of as a disease that has affected society.

This premise is acceptable because addiction as a disease idea has spread wildly and addiction to substances causes psychological as well as physical habit forming that effects functioning of the body.

P7) Wade Boggs third baseman of a professional baseball team “confessed that he was ‘addicted to sex’ to which his mistress responded ‘I guess what I thought was love was just a disease’”.

This premise is acceptable because this is public knowledge because Wade Boggs had an extramarital affair with Margo Adams. Boggs was sued for twelve million dollars by Adams while he confessed that he was addicted to sex.

P8) “Drugs and alcohol have chemical effects” on body.

This premise is acceptable because it is a public knowledge of the harmful chemical effects and the side effects of alcohol and drugs like marijuana, heroin and other narcotics on the body.

P9) “Withdrawal from habitual use of those substances” to which an addict is addicted, can draw out a large amount of “irritating physical sensations”.

This premise is acceptable because it is public knowledge that habitual use of certain substances like narcotics and alcohol makes you addicted to them and then not getting those results in withdrawal symptoms like nausea, vomiting and headaches.

P10) Addiction includes “not only chemical dependency but overeating, under eating, shopping” and having sex outside marriage.

This premise is acceptable because it is public knowledge of the harmful effects of addiction to something that is psychologically or physical habit forming and also the chemical dependency of the substance, so that the body develops a need for a certain level of that substance at all times.

Step 4 Fallacies

P1) Accepting addiction as a disease will create a world in which a reason is put forward to justify a fault, a world which will turn into a complete disorder.

This premise commits a fallacy of post hoc ergo propter hoc because it explains what will happen in the world if we accept addiction as a disease. It is fallacy of supposing that because one event follows another, then the second has been caused by the first.

P2) People with addictions would be held less “accountable for their actions even when they have harmed others” because they would be thought sick as Governor Dukakis puts addiction as a sickness.

This premise commits fallacy of false cause. Not all people with addictions are held less accountable for their actions. It is only possible if an addict is diagnosed with some disease. The former event does not cause the latter.

P4) “Often the only penalty for gross, even criminal misconduct” of addicts “is undergoing counselling in a treatment center”.

This premise commits fallacy of global insufficiency as it provides insufficient evidence as the basis for a widely general conclusion to prove that addicts undergo treatment rather than punishment when they commit crime.

P5) Psychologists and lawyers consider misbehaviour of addicts as “uncontrollable compulsions” which they think as a form of sickness.

This premise commits a fallacy of question begging epithets because an epithet “uncontrollable compulsions” has been used to describe the misbehaviour of addicts. The author used this epithet to support his argument that addiction is being accepted as a disease by the psychologist and lawyers.

P8) “Drugs like narcotics and alcohol have chemical effects” on body and are associated with addiction.

This premise commits a fallacy of cum hoc ergo propter hoc because this premise assumes that events which occur together are causally connected. Addiction of the substances has chemical effects on the body.

P9) “Withdrawal from habitual use of those substances” to which an addict is addicted, can draw out a large amount of “irritating physical sensations” and makes a user unaware to his or her surroundings.

This premise commits fallacy of post hoc ergo propter hoc because it explains what will happen to an addict if the substance is reduced or stopped. It is fallacy of supposing that because one event follows another, then the second has been caused by the first.

P10) Addiction includes “not only chemical dependency but overeating, under eating, shopping” and having sex outside marriage.

This premise commits a fallacy of global insufficiency because chemical dependency and other physical activities mentioned are not only what addiction includes. Internet addiction, shopping addiction and gambling addiction do not have chemical dependency or any of the physical activities involved. This premise does not states what kind of addiction is talked about in it.

Step 5 Main Conceptual Question

Is addiction harmful?

Justification: This main conceptual question is related to the passage because the passage is about the disease model of addictions as harmful to society and thus the main conceptual question asks “Is addiction harmful?” proving my question to be ideal because the author thinks addiction to have serious outcomes for the society.

Step 6 Brief Conceptual Analysis

1 a) Model case

Joseph was happily married to Tina. One day Tina was diagnosed with tuberculosis and doctors told she could not live longer. Joseph worried of the approaching death of his wife went under stress and started drinking despite of his awareness of the harmful

effects of alcohol on health. He drank excessively and one day was found unconscious in his room. He was taken to the hospital by his neighbour. Joseph was diagnosed with damage to his central nervous system because of his addiction and dependence of alcohol. Misuse of alcohol for a prolonged use caused damage to his brain function and he lost his eyesight.

2 a) Contrary case

Mark is a 70 year old man. He is addicted to smoking since he was 25. He is happily married with two daughters and four grandchildren. He smokes excessively but gets his check up done every month and is healthy. He goes for his morning walk, goes to buy groceries and do all the gardening. He smokes filtered cigarettes with lower tar content that his doctor suggested because Mark says he cannot give up his habit.

3 a) Borderline case

Hanna lost her only son in an accident and went into a trauma. Psychiatrist told that Hanna needs to indulge into the household activities. Her sister took her to shopping and Hanna bought some clothes for herself and felt good. Often Hanna went to shopping and bought stuff she did not need. For Hanna shopping was a temporary cure for her depression. Shopping became an obsession for her. Her compulsive desire to shop ended when she realized that she was not able to pay the mountain debt. This spending habit helped her get out of the tragic trauma of the death of her child but she was far behind financially.

4 a) RC and RCQ

Related concept: disease

Related conceptual question: Is addiction a disease?

5 a) Invented case

Lolo an alien who lived on planet V formed a habit of eating the morning newspaper after he read it. He was so addicted to the taste of it that he did not let others read that and ate before anyone demanded. One day he had a severe stomach ache and was taken to the Alien care hospital where he was diagnosed with newzomania. Doctors said that his chance of survival was ten percent. The doctors told him of the damage the paper eating addiction had done to his body.

6 a) Social context

Robert was a rich man. One day Robert was very depressed when Bill offered him to go to a casino with him. There Robert and Bill gambled and earned a lot of money and went home in a happy mood. A week later Bill again offered Robert to go with him and

Robert agreed. Robert again won a large amount of money and became richer. This way he developed an addiction to gamble every night at the casino and earn money. But he also lost money and his addiction led him to lose his children to a bet and gambling brought him to financial ruin. One day lying on a bed of the rehabilitation centre he asked himself "Is addiction harmful?"

7 a) Emotional context

I am addicted to shoplifting and this only developed in me because I cannot afford the expensive things which people around me have. One day I went to an expensive shopping mall where my daughter wished to buy her an expensive purse. Without realizing that the cameras were watching I put that purse in my shopping bag. At the exit of the mall a police man stopped me and checked my shopping bag. First I hesitated but then I made him see and when he claimed for the receipt which I do not had he told that they had seen everything in the cameras and thus now me and my daughter are in jail. I do not want my daughter to live in jail but she cannot live elsewhere without me. I ask myself "Is addiction harmful"?

8 a) Is addiction harmful? Yes

Alcohol addiction: People would not drink alcohol in excess. Excess of anything is bad and would lead to getting addicted to alcohol if it is consumed in large quantities.

Caffeine addiction: People would not drink tea in excess so that they won't form a habit.

Gambling addiction: People would not go regularly to casinos for gambling.

Heroin addiction: People would take small quantities of heroin so that they do not get addicted.

Internet addiction: People would not spend hours on internet and would not waste their time.

Marijuana addiction: People would not take marijuana.

Pornography addiction: People would not go for seeing pornography.

Shopping addiction: People would not buy stuff that they do not need and so would not develop an addiction.

Sex addiction: People would not do sex with strangers and prostitutes because they would not get addicted to sex if they refrain from it.

Smoking addiction: People would not smoke excessively and would limit themselves to a minimum quantity.

Video game addiction: People would not indulge in playing video games regularly or they would form an addiction for playing more and more which would be wastage of time and thus harmful.

Doctors: Doctors would instruct their patients to stay away from all addiction.

Health organizations: Health organizations would teach people to stay away from any addictions that are harmful.

Sports: People with addictions would not be allowed to take part in sports.

Religion: Priests and scholars would preach addictions as harmful.

Military: People with any addictions would not be allowed to join military.

Movies: Movies would depict addictions as harmful.

Teaching: Teachers would teach students the harmful effects of addictions to people and thus society.

Internet: Internet information and websites would explain the harmful effects of addictions on the society.

9 b) Labels and Meanings

Labels for addiction

Definitions

Alcohol addiction

To form a habit of drinking alcohol and to be psychologically and physically dependent on it.

Dependence

Being abnormally dependent on something that is psychologically habit forming. An example is forming a habit of drinking alcohol and using narcotics.

Gambling addiction

A strong desire to gamble despite of knowing its harmful consequences to oneself.

Compulsion

Performing certain actions repetitively sometimes against your will and sometimes voluntarily.

Substance abuse

This label is related to the continuous use of substances that are harmful to one. Repetitive use is seen and withdrawal symptoms persist when the substance is not given.

Habituation

Getting physically used to something or psychological dependence on drugs after sometime of usage.

Shopping addiction

To be controlled by a compulsive desire to shop without reason and may be to define oneself socially.

Irresistible impulse

An urge to do something.

Smoking addiction

A strong desire to smoke excessively and many times a day because you are addicted to it and formed a habit. For example seems like something is missing when you don't smoke.

Labels for harmful

Definitions

Damaging

Harmful and resulting in loss of value and usefulness.

Injurious

Something that causes harmful effects. For example smoking is injurious to health because it has harmful effects on our body.

Disadvantageous

Having no advantages or a favourable position.

Catastrophic

Extremely harmful. For example something damaging health or something causes financial ruin.

Destructive

Tending to destroy and ruin. Causing damage.

Detrimental

Causing harm or injury. For example overeating is detrimental to health.

Dangerous

Involving risks and causing damage. Being susceptible to harm or injury.

Ravaging

Causing damage or destruction.

Devastating

To terminate something by causing damage to it that it no longer exists.

Step 7 Key Concept List

Addiction

2) Uncontrollable compulsions

3) Disease

Step 8 Key Concept Analysis

Concept: Addiction

(i) Stanley Peele author of the passage does not define addiction and thus the meaning is not clear. He does not explain of what he means by addiction so I am going to use the principle of charity because there is no indication that he means anything different than what is commonly understood and meant by addiction as a physical habit and a psychological disorder. I reconstructed this meaning of addiction by reading the first sentence of the passage in which the author says "In the minds of most Americans, narcotics and alcohol are linked inextricably with addiction....."

(ii) It is used just right because the author explains addiction to be psychological and in the minds of people and also addiction to substances have withdrawal symptoms that effect the functioning of the body. So linking these concludes us to have a meaning for addiction.

(iii) The key concept addiction is used four times in this passage and there is no evidence that this word changes meanings throughout the passage.

Concept: Uncontrollable compulsions

(i) The author does not define of what he means by uncontrollable compulsions and thus the meaning is not clear. He does not explain of what he means by uncontrollable compulsions so I am going to use the principle of charity because there is no indication that he means anything different than what is commonly understood and meant by uncontrollable compulsions as unable to control one's internal forces that leads one to act against their will. I reconstructed this meaning because the author discusses the withdrawal from certain substances is characterized by symptoms and chemical effects of substances on body.

(ii) The concept "uncontrollable compulsions" is used in a sense too narrow. The author should have given an example or definition of compulsions that could have led us to understand the concept in more detail.

(iii) The concept "uncontrollable compulsions" is used only once and thus it has to be consistent.

Concept: Disease

(i) The author does not define of what he means by disease and thus the meaning is not clear. He does not explain of what he means by disease so I am going to use the principle of charity because there is no indication that he means anything different than what is commonly understood and meant by disease as abnormal functioning of the human body. I reconstructed this meaning because the author discusses addicts suffering physiologically and thus having chemical and physical side effects on their bodies.

(ii) The concept "disease" is used in a sense too narrow. The author should have given an example or definition of disease that could have led us to understand the concept in more detail.

(iii) The concept "disease" is used four times in the passage and there is no evidence that this word changes meanings throughout the passage.

Step 9 Table of Contents:

Step 1 Main Conclusion and Justification

Step 2 Argument Map and Indented Legend

Step 3 Premise Analysis

a) Glaring Insufficiencies

b) Glaring Irrelevancies

c) Premise Acceptability

Step 4 Fallacies

Step 5 Main Conceptual Question and Justification

Step 6 Brief Conceptual Analysis

1 a) Model case

2 a) Contrary case

3 a) Borderline case

4 a) Related concept and Related conceptual question

5 a) Invented case

6 a) Social context

7 a) Emotional context

8 a) Practical results

9 b) Meanings (Labels and definitions)

Step 7 Key Concept List

Step 8 Key Concept Analysis

Reconstructed meaning

Too wide, too narrow or just right analysis

Consistency analysis

Essay

The author of the passage is Stanley Peele and the title of the passage is "Ain't Misbehavin'". The passage is about addiction as becoming socially accepted as a disease. The author of the passage argues that addiction should not be considered a disease because he thinks it to be psychologically connected. The author mentions addictions to be physically habit forming but does not think addiction as a disease because in his opinion the disease model of addiction has negative outcomes for the society. The main problem with the passage is that the author of the passage intends to prove that addiction is not a disease but he does not give any reasons why addiction should not be considered a disease.

My conclusion is that addiction is not a disease; however growing influences in society have led us to believe addiction as a disease which is harmful and has complex results for the society. I think it as the main conclusion because the passage is about addiction as a disease model becoming socially accepted as a norm. The passage has premises supporting the conclusion. The passage explains that addiction should not be considered a disease. The author mentions addictions to be associated with the functioning of the body but does not think addiction as a disease because in his opinion the disease model of addiction has negative outcomes for the society.

Now I am turning to my key concepts and I have three key concepts. My first key concept is addiction. The author does not define addiction and thus the meaning is not clear. He does not explain of what he means by addiction so I am going to use the principle of charity because there is no indication that he means anything different than what is commonly understood and meant by addiction as a psychological and a physical habit forming disorder. I reconstructed this meaning of addiction by reading the first sentence of the passage in which the author says "In the minds of most Americans, narcotics and alcohol are linked inextricably with addiction.....". It is used just right because the author explains addiction to be psychological and in the minds of people and also addiction to substances have withdrawal symptoms that effect the functioning of the body. So linking these concludes us to have a definition for addiction. The key concept addiction is used four times in this passage and there is no evidence that the concept changes meanings.

My second key concept is uncontrollable compulsions. The author does not define of what he means by uncontrollable compulsions and thus the meaning is not clear. He does not explain of what he means by uncontrollable compulsions so I am going to use the principle of charity because there is no indication that he means anything different than what is commonly understood and meant by uncontrollable compulsions as unable to control one's internal forces that leads one to act against their will. I reconstructed this meaning because the author discusses the withdrawal from certain substances is characterized by symptoms and chemical effects of substances on body. The concept "uncontrollable compulsions" is used in a sense too narrow. The author should have given an example or definition of compulsions that could have led us to understand the

concept in more detail. The concept “uncontrollable compulsions” is used only once and thus it has to be consistent.

My third and the last key concept is disease. The author does not define of what he means by disease and thus the meaning is not clear. He does not explain of what he means by disease so I am going to use the principle of charity because there is no indication that he means anything different than what is commonly understood and meant by disease as abnormal functioning of the human body. I reconstructed this meaning because the author discusses addicts suffering physiologically and thus having chemical and physical side effects on their bodies. The concept “disease” is used in a sense too narrow. The author should have given an example or definition of disease that could have led us to understand the concept in more detail. The concept “disease” is used four times in the passage and there is no evidence that the word changes meaning. Now I have finished with the key concepts.

Now I am going to turn to my glaring insufficiencies. Stanley Peele, the author of the passage “Ain’t misbehavin’,” intends to prove that addiction is not a disease but he does not give reasons why addiction should not be considered a disease. Also the author does not define of what he means by ‘uncontrollable compulsions’ because of lack of elaboration on the term. The last sentence of the passage in which he says “creating a world of addictive diseases may mean creating a world in which anything is excusable, one that must inevitably slide into chaos” does not possibly leads to the conclusion and needs more explanation to help us to understand the link to the conclusion. The author needs to mention of whose misbehaviour psychologists and lawyers dismiss forms as “uncontrollable compulsions”. Also psychologists do not dismiss all misbehaviours of addicts to be part of compulsive behaviour. Also the author again needs to mention of whose misconduct is undergoing counselling in a treatment centre, to make more sense of whose misbehaviour and misconduct he is referring to. Fallacy of global insufficiency is committed as it provides insufficient evidence as the basis for a widely general conclusion to prove that addicts undergo treatment rather than punishment when they commit crime. Now I have finished with the glaring insufficiencies.

Now I will turn to my glaring irrelevancies. The most obvious and relevant area of concern is addiction itself. The sentence in the second paragraph of the passage explaining “the more psychologists and attorneys dismiss forms of misbehaviour as uncontrollable compulsions, the less the people are held accountable for their actions” is glaringly irrelevant because it does not answers any question relating the conclusion. Also other sentence in the second paragraph of the passage saying “often the only penalty for gross, even criminal misconduct is undergoing counselling in a treatment centre” is glaringly irrelevant as it does not answers any question relating the conclusion. It does not answers why a disease model of addiction is harmful for society. Now I have finished with the glaring irrelevancies.

Now I am turning to the fallacies in the passage. The premise Accepting addiction as a disease will create a world in which a reason is put forward to justify a fault, a world

which will turn into a complete disorder commits a fallacy of post hoc ergo propter hoc because it explains what will happen in the world if we accept addiction as a disease. It is fallacy of supposing that because one event follows another, then the second has been caused by the first.

The premise People with addictions would be held less “accountable for their actions even when they have harmed others” because they would be thought sick as Governor Dukakis puts addiction as a sickness commits fallacy of false cause. Not all people with addictions are held less accountable for their actions. It is only possible if an addict is diagnosed with some disease. The former does not cause the latter.

The premise “Often the only penalty for gross, even criminal misconduct” of addicts “is undergoing counselling in a treatment center” commits fallacy of global insufficiency as it provides insufficient evidence as the basis for a widely general conclusion to prove that addicts undergo treatment rather than punishment when they commit crime.

The premise Psychologists and lawyers consider misbehaviour of addicts as “uncontrollable compulsions” which they think as a form of sickness commits a fallacy of question begging epithets because an epithet “uncontrollable compulsions” has been used to describe the misbehaviour of addicts. The author used this epithet to support his argument that addiction is being accepted as a disease by the psychologist and lawyers.

The premise “Drugs like narcotics and alcohol have chemical effects” on body and are associated with addiction commits a fallacy of cum hoc ergo propter hoc because this premise assumes that events which occur together are causally connected.

The premise “Withdrawal from habitual use of those substances” to which an addict is addicted can draw out a large amount of “irritating physical sensations” and makes a user unaware to his or her surroundings commits fallacy of post hoc ergo propter hoc because it explains what will happen to an addict if the substance is reduced or stopped. It is fallacy of supposing that because one event follows another, then the second has been caused by the first.

The premise Addiction includes “not only chemical dependency but overeating, under eating, shopping” and having sex outside marriage commits a fallacy of hasty generalization because chemical dependency and other physical activities mentioned are not only what addiction includes. Internet addiction, shopping addiction and gambling addiction do not have chemical dependency or any of the physical activities involved. This premise does not states what kind of addiction is talked about in it. Now I have finished with the fallacies.

Now I am turning to my argument structure. I have ten supporting premises in all. My Premise(1)is accepting addiction as a disease will create a world in which a reason is put forward to justify a fault, a world which will turn into a complete disorder. This

premise (1) has two main supports, one is premise (2) that is People with addictions would be held less “accountable for their actions even when they have harmed others” because they would be thought sick as Governor Dukakis puts addiction as a sickness and second is premise (3) that is Science and society agree that “addicts suffer physiologically”.

Premise (2) that is People with addictions would be held less “accountable for their actions even when they have harmed others” because they would be thought sick as Governor Dukakis puts addiction as a sickness is supported by premise (4). Premise (4) is “Often the only penalty for gross, even criminal misconduct” of addicts “is undergoing counselling in a treatment center” and is supported by premise (5). Premise (5) is psychologists and lawyer considers misbehaviour of addicts as “uncontrollable compulsions” which they think as a form of sickness and is supported by premise (6). Premise (6) is addiction is thought of as a disease that has affected society and is supported by premise (7). Premise (7) is Wade Boggs third baseman of a professional baseball team ‘confessed he was ‘addicted to sex’ to which his mistress responded ‘I guess what I thought was love was just a disease’”. Premise (7) has no supporting premises.

Premise (3) is Science and society agrees that “addicts suffer physiologically”. Premise (3) has one supporting premise that is premise (8). Premise (8) is “Drugs and alcohol have chemical effects” on body and is supported by premise (9). Premise (9) is “Withdrawal from habitual use of those substances” to which an addict is addicted, can draw out a large amount of “irritating physical sensations” and is supported by premise (10). Premise (10) is Addiction includes “not only chemical dependency but overeating, under eating, shopping” and having sex outside marriage. Premise (10) has no supporting premises. Now I have finished with the argument structure.

Now I am turning to my premise acceptability. I have ten premises. My first premise is accepting addiction as a disease will create a world in which a reason is put forward to justify a fault, a world which will turn into a complete disorder. This premise is unacceptable because it is still debated by experts and the psychologists as an issue whether addiction is a disease and whether addiction as a disease is harmful for the society.

My second premise is people with addictions would be held less “accountable for their actions even when they have harmed others” because they would be thought sick as Governor Dukakis puts addiction as a sickness. This premise is unacceptable because people with addictions are not held less accountable for their actions unless they show symptoms of some disease. Psychologists are working on whether addiction is a disease or not. If any addiction is considered a disease, it should be justified by symptoms of a disease it is related.

My third premise is science and society agrees that “addicts suffer physiologically”. This premise is acceptable because it is public knowledge. Society and also the experts

agree that addicts do suffer physiologically because the substance they get addicted to do have chemical effects on the functioning of the body.

My fourth premise is “Often the only penalty for gross, even criminal misconduct” of addicts “is undergoing counselling in a treatment center”. This premise is unacceptable because misconduct of addicts is only forgiven if they show symptoms of a disease. Addicts are not forgiven only because they are addicts and that they were not aware of anything when they committed a crime.

My fifth premise is Psychologists and lawyers consider misbehaviour of addicts as “uncontrollable compulsions” which they think as a form of sickness. This premise is acceptable because in Toronto 2010 psychologists and lawyers think that addicts are unable to control their internal force that leads them to act against their will.

My sixth premise is addiction is thought of as a disease that has affected society. This premise is acceptable because addiction as a disease idea has spread wildly and addiction to substances causes psychological as well as physical habit forming that effects functioning of the body.

My seventh premise is Wade Boggs third baseman of a professional baseball team ‘confessed he was ‘addicted to sex’ to which his mistress responded ‘I guess what I thought was love was just a disease’”. This premise is acceptable because this is public knowledge because Wade Boggs had an extramarital affair with Margo Adams. Boggs was sued for twelve million dollars by Adams while he confessed that he was addicted to sex.

My eighth premise is “Drugs and alcohol have chemical effects” on body. This premise is acceptable because it is a public knowledge of the harmful chemical effects and the side effects of alcohol and drugs like marijuana, heroin and other narcotics on the body.

My ninth premise is “Withdrawal from habitual use of those substances” to which an addict is addicted, can draw out a large amount of “irritating physical sensations”. This premise is acceptable because it is public knowledge that habitual use of certain substances like narcotics and alcohol makes you addicted to them and then not getting those results in withdrawal symptoms like nausea, vomiting and headaches.

My tenth and the last premise is addiction includes “not only chemical dependency but overeating, under eating, shopping” and having sex outside marriage. This premise is acceptable because it is public knowledge of the harmful effects of addiction to something that is psychologically or physical habit forming and also the chemical dependency of the substance, so that the body develops a need for a certain level of that substance at all times. Now I have finished with the premise acceptability.

In conclusion the passage is about addiction as a disease model becoming socially accepted as a norm. The passage argues that addiction should not be considered a

disease because it is psychologically connected. The author mentions addictions to be physically habit forming but does not think of addiction as a disease because in his opinion the disease model of addiction has negative outcomes for the society. The main problem with the passage is that the author of the passage intends to prove that addiction is not a disease but he does not give any reasons why addiction should not be considered a disease.