

Monique Wonderly's paper "Love and Attachment" calls into question the involvement of the self in a romantic relationship. Wonderly refutes the notion that couples are required to eliminate all forms of self-interestedness in order to communicate true and unsullied love. In contrast, Wonderly claims that self-interestedness is not only present in love but is essential for it to occur. She characterizes a healthy form of self-interestedness in a romantic relationship as the adult form of psychological attachment. Wonderly provides sufficient rationale for attachment as a prerequisite to love, yet there remains a lack of elaboration for what circumstances of psychological attachment afford self-interestedness in a healthy romantic relationship.

In this paper, I will review the arguments made in "Love and Attachment" and highlight the extent to which Wonderly's description of attachment communicates the idea of self-interestedness. I will then discuss how Wonderly's explanation of self-interestedness in attachment has shortcomings in three different scenarios. Finally, using the exposed weaknesses, I will offer three additional characterizations of attachment that will further fortify Wonderly's claims: adult attachment must be in the form of a healthy attachment style, adult attachment must not be motivated by fear, and adult attachment in a relationship with love must be in some form, reciprocated.

The value of these three expansions will be justified by revealing how they coincide with Wonderly's argument. To display their utility, a counter argument to Wonderly's paper will be proposed. After examination, reasoning will be provided for why only the additional characterizations address such an argument.

In "Love and Attachment" Wonderly argues that not only does self-interestedness exist in love, but that it is crucial for love to exist. To defend her claim, she presents three scenarios to prove its infallibility. In the first two scenarios, a 'loving' husband confesses that he is sincerely worried for his ill wife not only because she is a great woman whom he values, but because she satisfies some of his personal needs as well. Wonderly declares that these examples illustrate a self-interested worry from the husband that clearly lacks love for his wife. Ultimately, the husband's worries could be satisfied by anyone, and therefore lacked nonsubstitutability.

In the third and final scenario, the husband confesses not only is he sincerely worried for his wife because she is a great woman whom he values, but that without her, his life would be less fulfilled. Wonderly argues that the husband's words provide a convincing example of true, romantic love. The husband is experiencing a nonsubstitutable worry for his wife because only

she can appease that worry. In this instance, the husband possesses a unique *need* for his wife as an individual.

Wonderly argues that the *need* one feels towards their significant other is motivated by a particular form of self-interestedness, namely, adult attachment. Similar to that of psychological attachment in babies, Wonderly defines adult attachment as the desire for engagement with our nonsubstitutable partner, as well as, the increased sense of security derived from interacting with our nonsubstitutable partner. Accordingly, if our partner ever experiences insecurity then we, ourselves, would feel a similar sense of insecurity. In reference to the third scenario presented with the husband and wife, attachment is what allowed the husband to also feel insecure when his wife is in a vulnerable state.

The sense of need or security derived from being attached to your partner is greatly connected to one's sense of self. Since Wonderly defines attachment as fundamental to having a relationship with love, she is able to draw the conclusion that self-interestedness is then a requirement of love. I find the argument for this conclusion agreeable because it supports the formation of the care, compassion, and security required in romantic love. Although I agree that self-interestedness is apparent in love, I find that there is a lack of elaboration for how self-interestedness is drawn from attachment.

Wonderly's argument indicates that self-interestedness is drawn from the feeling of security that attachment offers. However, self-interestedness does not always develop from every instance of attachment. In the following paragraphs I will provide three different scenarios that exemplify this. After analyzing these scenarios, I will provide additional delineations of attachment that strengthen Wonderly's incomplete deduction.

As discussed, Wonderly describes adult attachment similar to that of the attachment a child has to their primary caregiver. The type of relationship a person had with their primary caregiver in their youth would then define how they approached relationships in adulthood. Since there are several different types of relationships one could have with their primary caregiver, there are different adult attachment styles that we may develop as we mature. In the event that a person had an unstable or harmful relationship with their primary caregiver, they could develop an "anxious" or "avoidant" attachment style. In these attachment styles, the idea of a relationship could cause inner turmoil and hesitation and as a result, could motivate some adults to resent and fear the idea of relationships altogether. If an adult with an "anxious" or "avoidant" attachment

style were to find themselves in a romantic relationship, they may still feel insecure while also loving and valuing their significant other nonsubstitutably. This would not result in the immediate sense of security that leads to self-interestedness, more so, the partner would experience a lack of self-interestedness insofar the partner experiences the other as a self-interested *need*. Initial self-interestedness can turn to selflessness, which counters Wonderly's claim that attachment leads to self-interestedness in love. In order to consider such an outcome, I offer that adult attachment in a loving relationship must be such that the attachment style does not result in anxiety or fear towards deep and meaningful relationships with others.

Additionally, I argue that Wonderly's attachment assumes that the attachment a partner feels towards the other is motivated by uncorrupted sources. Wonderly describes attachment as what makes an agent feel drawn to their object of need –their partner– and the sense of security that is felt after having engaged desirably with them. This relationship between need and security is severed when the sense of need is motivated by corrupted sources. For instance, take the fear of never being loved as a source of motivation. This is a corrupted source in that this motivation does not come from the desire to be with the other partner, but rather a source external to the relationship. The fear of never being loved would motivate a compromised partner to develop a sense of dependency and reliance, namely attachment, to a significant other wherein they show potential of fulfilling that deeply rooted insecurity. One could argue that this form of attachment results in self-interestedness, however, the harm one receives from being attached to a person where affection is not present must be considered.

For example, take the fear of one's safety as a motivation for attachment. In an undesirable or abusive relationship, a partner could make the other feel hopelessly dependent on them in exchange for personal security from either the partner themselves or external sources. In this environment, the feeling of security is developed but vastly overruled by the mental, emotional, and potentially physical harm that a corrupted attachment brings to the partner. In this case, attachment does not lend to self-interestedness that can be a positive factor in, or an essential part of love. In order for Wonderly's argument to acknowledge the potential harm that attachment can result in, I offer the following addition: attachment must not be motivated by an antecedent desire to fulfill an insecurity.

Lastly, I argue that Wonderly's attachment must be in some fashion, a mutual affair in order to be a source of self-interestedness in a romantic relationship. This claim is subliminally

acknowledged in her argument when she characterized attachment as mutual in her writing. However, Wonderly's failure to acknowledge the significance of this characterization is a vast oversight. I will use Wonderly's third example of the husband and wife, from which she deemed was an optimal example of love, to demonstrate this pitfall.

Assume that the man expresses his despair that the love of his life is suddenly ill, not only because she is a wonderful woman but that without her, his world will be less fulfilled and meaningful. Now presume that the man and woman are not husband and wife, nor even acquaintances. This man in his right mind loves the other, however if the other does not share these feelings, then this is unnatural behavior that could be quite unsettling to the other and to third-party observers. An example of this behavior could be found in a fan's clinical obsession with a celebrity. Often times, the fan could pronounce their love for the celebrity, confess their utmost fear of losing the celebrity, and even in extreme cases try to possess the celebrity as their own object of desire by various means.

No matter what the celebrity says or does, the obsessive fan will have a withstanding emotional attachment towards the celebrity. Nonetheless, this form of attachment draws a sense security from the idea of an ideal relationship with the celebrity rather than a sense of security the celebrity can actually provide for them. Therefore, the resulting self-interestedness is founded in their existence rather than the relationship, because there is no existing relationship to be self-interested in. The lack of affection in obsession would defeat the argument made by Wonderly that attachment lends to self-interestedness in romantic relationships. Therefore, I claim that in a romantic relationship, if a partner is attached to another, the other must actively offer security in return in order to form a love filled relationship with self-interestedness.

Given the aforementioned conclusions, one may claim that they are unnecessary to the integrity of Wonderly's original argument because none of these scenarios would occur in a relationship filled with love. Ultimately, Wonderly's argument pertains only to self-interestedness in loving relationships, and in loving relationships, attachment would then lend to self-interestedness because of the security it would provide. To address such a notion, I would like to examine how Wonderly describes attachment's relationship with romance.

Wonderly claims that attachment is not only a positive contribution to love, but an essential part of it. If attachment is essential to love, then attachment is antecedent to love because without attachment, there would be no love. The reverse does not apply; attachment

does not require love in order to exist. Therefore, the additions stated are plausible considerations that are imperative if self-interested love were to continue to result from attachment. In order to exemplify the substance of my additions, I will present a counter argument one may have to Wonderly's paper.

Consider a relationship wherein one partner grew attached to the other only for their wealth. The partner could still find a sense of nonsubstitutable security and desire for their partner due to their immense financial and legal dependencies that specify the other. Additionally, they could also feel a resulting insecurity when their partner faces financial hardships and a great desire for their partner to prosper. This form of attachment by Wonderly's definition would then lend to nonsubstitutable, self-interested love even though that the love is founded upon a material need. If one were to apply my clause that attachment should not be motivated by an insecurity, say financial insecurity, then this type of behavior would not result in self-interested love, rather it would be better characterized by ultimate self-detrimental love. Although financial security is not in itself self-detrimental, the corrupted motivation for attachment can be called into question when Wonderly's argument does not address it.

Through the analysis of the arguments proposed in "Love and Attachment", I presented three additional constraints on the characterization of attachment. These constraints provide substance to the original limitations of Wonderly's work and further strengthen her argument that attachment lends self-interestedness in love.