

# Scientific Support for Psychological Hedonism

Post by “kochiekoch” of April 19, 2024 at 5:54 PM

Hallo!

Lots of good questions here that set me doing some research. 🤔

>>One of the things we want to discuss too is how this applies to people like Plato or Aristotle or Cicero.

Is it fair to also label them "psychological hedonists?"<<

Yes. For one thing, psychological hedonism is part and parcel of human nature. As shown scientifically in the article posted. And these guys were definitely human. 😊

Secondly, they seem to both promote eudemonia. Plato, I understand through self-awareness and moral virtue, Cicero, through his promotion of virtue. Both as ends in themselves, although leading to eudemonia. (The REAL end here). 😊

>>Does this label explain anything helpful to distinguishing between Epicurus and Plato?<<

It does. For Epicurus, it's a more direct path through nature. For Plato it's a more mystical and convoluted path through his imaginary world: creating "self-awareness" and moral virtue, ending in eudemonia.

>>Does the meaning of "hedonism," especially one's definition of "hedonism / pleasure," make any difference to the analysis?<<

It does. Plato is only seeing pleasure in bodily stimulation. And he thinks it's a hindrance to eudemonia. Epicurus see's it as both bodily, and more importantly, mental pleasure.

>>If everyone is in fact a "psychological hedonist," does the label help in some way to answer questions about disputes when the opponent denies that he is acting for pleasure?<<

It does. The science shows everyone IS a psychological hedonist , and the science is what is empirically known. He or she may deny the science, like a creationist denying evolution, but that's what's actually true.