

Psychological hedonism

Business



Psychological hedonism is the speculation that all human preference is motivated by a lust for happiness. It can also be perceived as the way by which each individual is motivated in order to maximize his or her happiness and minimize pain. Psychological hedonism can be viewed in two perspectives. These are motivational hedonism and normative hedonism. Motivational hedonism is a theory that states that every action that we take and the decisions that we make are dependent entirely upon pain or enjoyment.

In this case instances of pain are such as when there is anxiety, itching, stress among others while pleasures include all pleasant feelings such as elation, amusement, delight, etc. among others. (Ahrens-dorf) Normative hedonism on the other hand is the argument that only happiness has worth and only pain is worthless separately of the worth of something they may cause or curb. With this regard, our closeness, events as well as accomplishments, our level of comprehension, imminent along with moral fiber, possess instrumental value, through the happiness they result to or the hurt they reduce. Things could be of both instrumental as well as non-instrumental worth. Where this is true, their overall price is a product of both. They can both lag in reverse directions.

The hurting of being bitten once possesses non-instrumental worthlessness, for instance, but it may also have instrumental worth, during the added pain you avoid. Socrates being a philosopher in his times evaluated the behavior of humans and gave his thesis in his own view. He claimed that no one desires what is awful in that no one wishes to be debilitated bearing in mind that what is injurious is awful. It is true none desires what is dreadful deliberately. Everyone desires the superior regardless of the penalty for the

reason that they desire to lead an honorable existence. Socrates claimed that terrible stuff is detrimental to those who do them.

Individuals do not desire what is dreadful for the reason that it would damage them. People dream of having and doing good things during their lives here on earth. However they fail to realize that sometimes what they consider to be good may be detrimental in life. This is true for the reason that no one wants to secure a stressing life; everyone wants to live a happy life even while seeking bad. Socrates also claims that detrimental things result in miserable lives for the victims. Nevertheless, they are only unhappy to the level in which they have been debilitated.

He went ahead and claimed that no one wants to lead an unhappy life since that means having a life that is not worth. He argued that those people who did not know the evil things desired good things (according to them) but are generally bad. Individuals who might emerge to wish awful things in fact wish the superior that they hope to be the product of it, instead of viewing at the entire scenario and recognizing the general awfulness. (Copleston) A good example to explain this argument is, a person who consumes beer looks at it from the perspective that it tends to relieve stress as well as relax his mind. However, he fails to consider the long run effect of alcohol to his body as well as his entire life.

Psychological hedonism being the scrutiny that individuals are psychologically created in such a manner that they solely want enjoyment comes in, hand in hand. This is because Socrates is talking of how the things humans will do so as to get pleasure whether good and how they do it. This

is also true because he clearly elaborates in his arguments that no one wants what is bad intentionally. Everybody will desire what is good regardless of the consequences; this is the principle of psychological hedonism. Bentham presents his account of what encourages people.

He argues that human beings and their behavior are governed by two powerful things, that is, anguish as well as happiness. Individuals will shift in the direction of activities as well as objects they discover delightful and turn away those they unlearn hurting. There is likelihood for modification.

Nevertheless, if an individual comes across learning to be aching, he will call for reformation of his behavior so that he can have enjoyment in it.

Conceivably the prize of studying fresh items or the satisfaction of passing exceptionally well will make him find education pleasurable. Bentham maintained that all accessible structures of morals could be compromised, that is, one would alter his or her behavior to suit his interests.

Consequently, an ethical sanction to practice or make best use of happiness has compelled separately of the precise welfare of the individual performing.

He also proposes that persons would sensibly search for the universal cheerfulness basically for the reason that the wellbeing of others are in conjunction with their personal, despite the fact that he acknowledged that this is stuff that can be easily ignore by individuals. (Stern) Unlike Socrates

who comes to a conclusion that no one will do a bad thing intentionally

Bentham never makes it clear. Bentham maintains that human beings will only dwell on the things that bring pleasures in their lives while they avoid completely those that they feel will doom their existence. This is an

argument that is far away from Socrates. Socrates made it clear that human

<https://assignbuster.com/psychological-hedonism/>

beings will do things that they feel add value to their lives whether they are good or evil as long as they are not aware.

The key word here is ‘not aware’ according to Socrates while according to Bentham individuals will alter their behaviors in order to suit where they believe pleasure can be attained. However, these two arguments are interrelated in a way.