

## **Understanding Happiness: Secrecy and Fantasy as Modes**

Arunima Bhowmick

**Abstract:** *Happiness as a social concern, extending into a field of study, has been a phenomenon of the last three to four decades. This departure was seen with economists finding correlates to patterns in consumption and psychologists locating social indicators of happiness to support mental wellbeing. In fact, the term “wellbeing” became a more precise and acceptable one for providing a holistic understanding of happiness 1970s onwards. My focus in this paper is to travel back from this era of social indicative research and locate the position of classical thinkers of Sociology with regard to happiness. Thereby finding a platform to address the epistemological problematics in handling “happiness” as an object of social research presently. Sociology has seen a long absence of research in subjective wellbeing, though there has been perennial enquiry into the position of the individual in construction of society. The debates brought to focus by economists like Richard Layard on happiness fosters enough challenge to the ideas of subjective wellbeing and the objective social indicators used to explain the same. However, this position has a very strong emphasis on one’s “understanding” and “expectations”, both indicative of a regular journey between objective attributes of happiness and subjective negotiations. This paper tries to find ways into this negotiated world of secrets that lies on the other side of the objective reality, arriving at a social that offers its own methodological tools and ontological position for explaining the disjuncture and convergence in ideas of happiness.*

**Keywords:** Happiness, secrecy, fantasy, wellbeing, negotiated happiness.

### ***Introduction***

Happiness is the prime pursuit of every individual and to fulfill so, the concern of society and its makers remain in defining ways of attaining it. Happiness is a familiar as well as diverse idea in terms of social, cultural and political history, not one especially confined to philosophical deliberations. The concept gains close links with human action, exceeding the realm of ideas, in the works as early as those of Aristotle. In the Nicomachean Ethics (350

BCE), Aristotle stated that happiness is “the human good” - the only thing that humans desire for its own sake and own sake alone. A similar narrative can be derived from a dialogue delivered by Don Draper, the protagonist of an American television series called “Mad Men”<sup>1</sup>. Don says, ‘What is happiness? It’s a moment before you need more happiness’. Both Aristotle and Don seem to be associating happiness with something good, desirable and an achievement in itself. Therefore, an active drive to attain a certain state of being (influenced by changing social conditions) is the constant factor for defining and revisiting happiness, simultaneously negating the “unhappy”. This hints at the prime episteme and the varied directions that can be explored to understand the same.

Much empirical evidences can be found, both from our everyday practices and structural formulations that repeatedly coax for a revisit into ideas of happiness. For me two evidences have worked very strongly. First, advertising taglines such as “Khushiyonki Home Delivery” (Domino’s Pizza), “Khushiyonki Chaabi” (Tata Nano motor vehicles), Khushiyonki Planning (Max Life Insurance Co.)<sup>2</sup> draw our attention to happiness as a superfluous notion that is being used to signify plenty of valuable things, confusing utility with exchange value. Secondly, the World Happiness Report of 2018 as published by the United Nation. The report mentions two interesting indicators of happiness among others; generosity and perceptions of corruption. Both evidences brought to cognizance that the subjective action in pursuit of happiness is guided by needs that are objectively prescribed and collective actions is an imperative.

Under such circumstances there is bound to be plurality of aims as well as conflicts among them, both at the level of individual and collective understanding of happiness. Thus, my attempt in this paper will be at delineating the subjective vs the objective and the individual vs the collective. In doing so I shall travel back and locate the position of classical thinkers with regard to happiness in Sociology, finding a platform to address the epistemological concerns with “happiness” presently. Sociology has seen a long absence of research in subjective wellbeing, though there has been perennial enquiry into the position of the individual in construction of society and the problems encountered in doing so. The historicity of happiness in human civilization has always been substantiated with intellectual endeavors and sought scientific explanations. At times it has been explicit and occasionally implicit. In a similar strain I would make a journey into both the explicit and subtle enquires, building grounds for offering an explanation for “happiness” in secrecy and a parallel world of fantasy. Though my

preoccupation will be with the epistemological position, a suggestive methodological possibility shall be couched in the issues that I highlight for understanding “happiness”.

### *History of the idea of happiness*

Happiness found close links with the moral order of society in ancient times. The divine intervention in human life was seen as the ultimate intellectual source guiding human action. Explanation for happiness was sought in everything that was “morally good”<sup>3</sup>. Utilitarian conception of good was relegated to the margins, if not bracketed out as something bad and hedonistic. The will of God was seen as supreme and unchangeable. Hence “this-worldly” pleasures were often considered as defiance of the supreme and sufferings were destined for ones expelled from heaven. Human conduct was bound by religious principles and so was the understanding of happiness. Human rationality was perceived as too limited to count on and it would do better to rely on traditional wisdom and divine revelation (Ruut Veenhoven 2016). Similarly, the *Advaita Vedanta* offers the theory of non-dualism with a conviction that man is endowed with an innate quality of being (sat), consciousness (chit) and unalloyed happiness (ananda)<sup>4</sup>. He only has to look within to experience the jiva as an embodiment of the macrosmic existence. Refusing to rely merely on conceptual speculation, Advaita resorts to reasoning and scriptural authority to arrive at a conclusion that the “embodied self” is essentially the Supreme Self. It concludes that happiness or bliss is man’s innate quality and that it is not accrued from outside one’s self. Seeking happiness outside is man’s misdirected effort in attaining happiness. Thus, we see divine as the source for determining bliss, though not from similar or a single standpoint. Interpretation of the divine and its reach into the secular life have been diverse, following different school of thought. For instance, the Protestants in the West and Charbak Philosophy of the East.

The 18<sup>th</sup> century European Enlightenment challenged these ideas of divine control of human life and his chances to a more fulfilling/happy life. Some upheld the loving god over the punishing one. Thinkers proposed the idea of rational man and society a product of rational human contracts, which can be revised in view of undesirable consequences. Happiness still remained something to be closely associated with good life with over tones of morality. However, the role of human agency in attaining happiness gained some prominence. The English philosopher and father of modern Utilitarianism, Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) said, ‘it is the greatest

happiness of the greatest number that is the measure of right and wrong' (Burn 2005)<sup>5</sup> Thus good or bad and associated sense of happiness cannot be determined by abstract moral principle, but by the reality of consequences in human life. Here came the hint of pleasure in the articulation of happiness. Another remarkable scientific position raising doubts on the juxtaposed view of morality and happiness can be seen in Emile Durkheim's (1858-1917) concept of "collective effervescence", the group mind of the individual influencing subjective well-being. Nevertheless, the celebration of the group mind and its production of a sense of elation makes us apprehensive about the subjective, pleasure seeking self. It puts to question the role of social sanctions and mores in generating a uniform condition for happiness, its feasibility and thereby, lack of human agency.

However, the ideological framework of happiness for the greatest number drew governments and initiated the use of scientific measures in defining happiness thereafter. Though not without opposition from the then liberals and socialists who had gained strength by the late nineteenth century, policy formulation and state regulation for human good and prosperity continued. However, by the beginning of 20<sup>th</sup> century the heightened spirit of Nationalism and nation building diverted the attention towards the altruistic goals and happiness as an individual endeavor became less important. Happiness found a new indicator for itself in human freedom. Democracy, civil society and organized collective life delegated immense value to individual freedom, equality and rights protecting the individual identity as well as non-subjugated collective life. Happiness found new roadmaps traversing the individual to collective and vice-versa.

### ***Revival of the enquiry***

As we see from the times of enlightenment, the foundations for happiness studies had already been laid. A renewed interest in happiness was seen in the later 20<sup>th</sup> century with the passing of the two world wars and its lingering ills. Democracy and peacemaking became the pressing concern of the power blocs. Individual freedom became an imperative for social and economic progress. Happiness became the new undisputed political agenda with welfarist policy reforms finding a revised mention, holding the hands of the socialists and liberals.

Such changes in the socio-political environment along with technical development accelerated empirical social science research into happiness. The journey that had begun with finding 'good life' had made its way into

“wellbeing” and “life-satisfaction”. Surveys and self-reports gained importance in Social Indicator Research by the 1970s for providing a quantitative value to life satisfaction in economics and positive psychology. The first surveys on happiness were conducted in 1940s in the USA as part of public opinion research (AIPO studies, Easterlin 1973). In the 1950s happiness became a parameter for understanding psychological and social conditions of aging (Kutner et. al. 1956). Mental health research also saw a good inclusion of happiness by the 1960s. Interestingly, since 2012 happiness research is conducted by The Global Happiness Council (GHC)<sup>6</sup> every year. A new global network of leading academic specialists in happiness and key practitioners in areas ranging from psychology, economics, urban planning, civil society has been built to discuss best practices at the national and local levels, and encourage advancement of the causes of happiness and well-being.

Besides, several happiness surveys have been done in market research aimed at identifying client groups. And welfare policy investigations have been studying happiness to find correlation between social deprivation and unhappiness so that they can legitimize policy intervention. In this regard, Richard Layard the proponent of Happiness Economics<sup>7</sup> states that as people keep achieving higher income levels, their idea of sufficient income index keeps moving farther. This keeps them engaged in work and in turn dismissing activities that might provide an experience of wellbeing, showing little correlation between happiness and income position.

On a similar line of thought, Daniel Kahneman has presented the idea of “focusing illusion” to show how affective emphasis on any single factor for happiness distorts the understanding of subjective life satisfaction. Like total utility, objective happiness is a moment-based concept, which is operationalized exclusively by measures of the affective state of individuals at particular moments in time. In this respect, objective happiness differs from standard measures of subjective well-being. The term “objective” is used because the judgment of happiness is made according to objective rules. The ultimate data for the judgment are, of course, subjective experiences (Kahneman and Tversky 2000)<sup>8</sup>.

### ***Sociological distancing***

Preoccupation with subjective well-being or happiness in its pure form has been rare in sociology. Reasons for such a pressing concern lying in the margins of a discipline so integrally associated with understanding society and individuals could be varied. Three categories of reason could be offered

to explain this disciplinary distancing: sociology on pragmatic terms has always remained concerned with social action rather than human feelings. Sociology seeks to explain social behavior and happiness is merely an underlying cause or effect of the same. In fact, happiness bears the risk of engaging in a tautological dilemma of being treated as a cause as well as effect.

Besides, it fosters an enquiry into the individual state of being, which sociology has always tried to abandon in its singularity. Secondly, sociology began its journey as a science for dealing with “social order” and ideologically maintained a position of indifference, if not total negation, in the lack of order or “the unhappy”. Sociologists like to remain the harbinger of social equality and cohesion, and notions driving them to celebrate anything contrary probably sets in some uneasiness. Finally, the difficulty in recording and measuring an idea like happiness, which is based on transitory variables, could put to question the “science” called sociology.

In sociology subjective experiences comes to be closely related to ideas such as *anomie*, *alienation*, *deprivation*, and *relative poverty*. *Anomie* delves into the normlessness as fall out of the change in moral climate, and *alienation* as the collective feeling of being ruled by a system to which they are not a part (Beerling 1978). Hence, we see a search for reason to explain unhappiness and in turn becoming predisposed to the normative structures that ultimately aim at restoring happiness. This specificity in sociological research came with a political aim to locate social problems and address them rather than obsess with happiness.

Thus, an absolute absence of research into happiness in sociology isn't a true story. Thinkers like Auguste Comte (1851–1854), had mentioned about “*bonheur*” (happiness) to show how social progress gave rise to intellectual enlightenment as society moved from one state of consensus and ideological uprising to another (Ple 2000). In studies on deviation and crime too sociology makes an indirect approach towards happiness. Weberian methodological drift to interpretive sociology could be treated as an initiate to accommodate the subjective conditions of life. And one surely cannot discount the contributions of the social exchange theory and behaviorist school in sociology. George Homans proposed that human social interaction is an extension of economic exchange, where both interacting individuals weigh their rewards and risks (costs) and tries to behave in a fashion that maximizes social rewards, in turn escalating gratification. Thus, Exchange theory examines the processes establishing and sustaining reciprocity in social relations, or the mutual gratifications between individuals. The basic

assumption being that the individuals establish and continue social relations keeping in mind the mutual advantage. The initial impetus for social interaction is provided by the exchange of benefits, intrinsic and extrinsic, independently of normative obligations (Blau 1994: 152-6).

### ***Assessing happiness - new directions in Sociology***

In present society people not only seek to be happy but have begun to evaluate the kind of happiness they avail or fail to avail. With scientific research providing more view of conditions of happiness, it is commonly understood as *how much one likes the life one lives*, or more formally, the degree to which one evaluates one's life-as-a-whole positively (Veenhoven 2004). Ruut Veenhoven proposes three types of orientation towards happiness: social constructionist perception of subjective well-being as a mental construct, where one is blind of innate desires and affective exuberance. Subjective well-being arises from "reflective appraisal" of shared notions about life. Second, is the social comparative approach to subjective well-being. "Relative deprivation"<sup>10</sup> has often been considered as an important parameter for determining differences in life chances in any society. Comparison offers discrepancy in outlook of life as it is and life as it should be. The less the difference between the two the higher the level of subjective well-being. However, there could be discrepancies at various level; like discrepancies between what one has and what one thinks one could have, and discrepancies between what one has and what one feels entitled to have (Michalos 1985). Both constructionist and comparative view of happiness, states subjective well-being as a regulated state of being that is arrived at through constant judgement. Besides, happiness cannot be heightened after a point.

It is beyond doubt that shared notions frame much of our appraisals, yet it cannot be said that all kinds of awareness are socially constructed. Thus, Veenhoven offers the third and a vital tenet to understanding subjective well-being in terms of "affect". Happiness depends on unreasoned emotional experience, which reflects gratification of needs. He says that affect and cognition are linked, but they are certainly not the same. While Assessing life one draw on both sources of information. In life people appear to use their mood as the prime source of information (Schwartz & Strack 1991), and consequently overall happiness typically correlates more strongly with hedonic levels of affect than with contentment (Veenhoven 2006)<sup>11</sup>.

**Four life qualities**

According to Veenhoven, when we discuss happiness or subjective well-being, “quality of life” is our prime focus. In understanding quality, we need to consider both the subjective conditions and objective appraisal of life. To make it more explicit, he offers four qualities of life to evaluate happiness.

<i>Outer qualities</i>		<i>Inner qualities</i>
<i>Life-chances</i>	Livability of environment	Life-ability of the person
<i>Life-results</i>	Utility of life	Satisfaction

Source: Veenhoven (2000). *New Directions in the Study of Happiness: United States and International Perspectives*, University of Notre Dame, USA.

The two upper quadrants denote the “livability” of a social setting to which the individual belongs and life-ability is the person’s ability to make situations conducive for a happy life. Ability can be a very strong determinant, as best of livability conditions can fail to offer desired happiness. However, a significant ontological question remains on how far the socio-cultural and political conditions (livability) sustain life’s abilities.

The two lower quadrants tell us about the life goals that are determined by the social needs and motivations. Whereas satisfaction is something innate and subjective appreciation of life. Fulfilling “affective needs”<sup>12</sup> remains the prime focus after all. Thus, none of the life chances and its results work separately or in negation of each other, rather it’s the interplay between the culturally defined demands and life’s needs that get adapted at subjective level through affective appraisal. A variation in this context is proposed by Daniel Kahneman’s (2000) notion of “objective happiness”, which is the “raw” affective experience that underlies the overall evaluation of life.

**Appropriating “pleasure” - exploring Secrets**

Drawing close to Veenhoven’s idea of satisfaction in his enquiry of life-satisfaction/subjective well-being, I encounter a sense of passing happiness as expressed in terms of “pleasure” and in enduring terms, as “bliss”. Though life’s enduring satisfaction (bliss) provides a more holistic sense of happiness, moments of pleasure or enduring satisfaction in life’s part experiences could often become intense and all pervasive to attain life-as-a-whole satisfaction<sup>13</sup>. Here I see a point of departure for a fresh enquiry into the secret or the lie that circumscribes our social life. Trying to

understand happiness, no matter what techniques we employ, we cannot discount human interactions and its determining role in present social condition.

Society has moved far from simple, agrarian communities to modern, industrial ones. A society based on varied and complex network of social interactions, which are based on apprehensive as well as partial information. Simmel's article 'The Sociology of Secrecy and of Secret Societies' (1906) explores the role of information in social interactions in such societies. George Simmel (1858-1918) mentions that knowledge of the other always lies between full knowledge (which is unattainable) and complete ignorance. The lack of information is compensated with imagined inferences. Hence the assumed information (imagined truth) entails a certain amount of trust in the other and the relationship being fostered thereby. Control over information and concealing information from others define modern society. Therefore "knowledge of concealment"<sup>14</sup> is of profound importance in Simmel's understanding of modern societies, which he liked to call "credit-economies" (Simmel 1906: 446). Hence, we see that modern society is based on assumptions of truth about others. Pleasure seeking too can then be based on assumed truth about things.

Thus, human creation of information and concealing the same, is a relational prerequisite to the form secret takes. Simmel argued that modern humans interact in much larger and dispersed social circle and their identities emerge accordingly. Secrets come to exist and function based on these multiple social relations. In such situations cues to happiness or subjective well-being could lie partly in the private (withheld information) and partly in public (projected information) sphere of information. A conscious separation between projected information and withheld information is a necessity because the ultimate choice to reveal and what to reveal as truth is decided by the individual. However, I feel the need to focus on the withheld information for the urgency of locating happiness in the relatively more unreal or assumed truth.

Discovery of secrets entails a certain kind of surveillance. Depending on the context, social roles and culture, secret searching may be permitted or prohibited, both as subjects or agents of surveillance. Freedom to seek information is very closely tied to norms of protecting information. Simmel had approached this dilemma very carefully, and said, 'In general, men credit themselves with the right to know everything which, without application of external illegal means, through purely psychological observation and reflection, it is possible to ascertain' (Simmel 1906: 455). This

undoubtedly hints at the methodological problems that studying of secrets can pose. But there can be no denying that it is a repertoire of information - information indeed worthy of research - if not for its content, definitely for the intentions of withholding them. Such intentions of concealing can act as correlates to pleasure or life satisfaction research.

Secret can be understood from two perspectives: one, the act of concealment and its objective intent in relation to attaining happiness; second, the assumed or imagined truth that arises from keeping secrets and its relation to ideas of pleasure. For the first, one can easily notice the duality of public-private underlying any form of information sharing. For example, between my identity as a public person and a private one can lie several layers of concealment. More importantly, I can control the act of concealment as I move along the continuum of public-private. It also brings to light the sharing intent of any secret, a purpose to enjoy the value of secret by having a good control over its revelation. According to Simmel, sharing secrets is a valuable resource in which individuals are implicitly saying, 'even though there is a risk here, I trust you to treat this sensitive information appropriately and it is only fair that you trust me with secrets as well' (Marx & Muschert 2007). Observation of acts of concealment and revelation, simultaneously, at the individual and collective level can explain the extent to which it generates pleasure or pain.

Communication over social media remains infested with such acts of secret keeping and secret sharing. An application named Sarahah was launched in 2017 for people to share information about each other in anonymity over Facebook. It allowed people to text messages to others and the person reading that could then reply anonymously. Initially, it was meant for workers to compliment their bosses but later it gained enormous popularity among wide audience. This secretly accessing the others led to passing of ideas and beliefs that one is skeptical of in close and direct interaction. Thereby, enabling individuals maintain a secret identity while revealing information that one might not like to hold back. It also throws light upon human desire to seek happiness by camouflaging oneself while sharing information that he or she considers valuable. It acts as a tool to control others' perception of oneself through anonymity and guided revelation.

The second perception holds the promise to unravel the existence of a parallel truth (the imagined reality as produced by keeping secrets). Objective appraisal of 'assumed truth' is an indication of the well-being it provides. Fantasies, if seen as reproduction of such imagined reality, can have lots to speak about pleasures and lack of it.

### ***Fantasy: happiness and the “other” truth***

The world of fantasy has been a parallel to the real for long in history. Even at times, history itself got absorbed and adapted in the fantasies of the present through animism, super naturals and magic. And most often those are pleasurable memories from the past recreated using “unreal”/“imagined” objects. For instance: the opulence of the kings and queens, the ideal love of princesses, magic wands transforming anything displeasing and dispelling all that’s ugly. This historicizing of “happy times”, indeed, gets revealed in the success of fantasies post 9/11% the Lord of the Rings and Harry Potter% that critics link to audience’s desire to escape from frightening and dangerous present into a comforting, simpler vision of past (Grossman 2002).

Two fantasy series, I would like to mention here, are Harry Potter and Generation 14 that have gained immense popularity. According to J. K. Rowling, the author of Harry Potter, a constant theme in the series has been death: ‘My books are largely about death. They open with the death of Harry’s parents. There is Voldemort’s obsession with conquering death and his quest for immortality at any price’<sup>15</sup>. As Harry sails through his adolescence, he is confronted with usual teenage social and emotional problems such as friendships, infatuation, schoolwork and exams, anxiety, depression; all that he overcomes with magic potions. The wizarding world of Harry Potter exists parallel to the real world and contains magical versions of the ordinary elements of everyday life.

The revival of the past or fantasizing about a fantastic future throws light upon the desire for pleasure or lack of it in the present. As, Patrick Curry puts it, ‘that just a there was life before modernity, so there can be life after it’ (Curry 1997: 15). However, fantasies like these and many others trigger an epistemological revisit into happiness and life-satisfaction. What is it that transports us into an imaginary state of bliss? Is “The truth” and its multiplicity opposing the universalizing nature of truth, a good way of treating happiness as a sensual and affective experience at multiple levels? Or is it an escape from the singular, totalizing reality to experience the forbidden; thereby upholding the singularity of truth.

Besides, when happiness becomes a commodity in itself, often separated from its utility, and a medium to sell other objects; one is wrapped in ontological considerations about the “real” and “imagined-to-be-real” happiness. Markets flooded with self-help books for happiness and happiness coaching classes must guide us into a fresh enquiry of happiness having an

“exchange value” in contrast to “use value”. Thus, making a pressing demand on us to understand happiness in the consumer society in terms of its symbolic value. In a society that is defined by consumption and value is appropriated in terms of exchange, images and imagined objects offer greater sense of gratification. ‘The media represents world that is more real than reality that we can experience. People lose the ability to distinguish between reality and fantasy. They also begin to engage with the fantasy without realizing what it really is. They seek happiness and fulfilment through the simulacra of reality, e.g. media and avoid the contact/interaction with the real world.’ (Baudrillard 1988: 166-184)

The 60-year-old man trying to inject the poison called “Botox” into his skin with a desire to appear younger is doing so to attain the happy images that he has in mind of “youth”. Now this youth doesn’t propose a young man of 20 years or in that case even in his 30s. Rather it’s an imaginary ideal of youth associated with 60 years of age. Hence, the ideal world of imagination or fantasy is being recreated as the real world of happiness.

### ***Conclusion***

Happiness studies, be it under the purview of positive psychology, economics or sociology, have their own limitations. Correlations such as income is inversely proportional to happiness cannot be considered true always and therefore should not be mistaken as suggesting a causal relationship. On the contrary, there could be instances where happiness leads to affluence. Besides, there isn’t any singular variable determining happiness, rather there can be multiplicity of factors (like health, illness, aging, geographic location, climate changes etc.). Another most vital consideration is the internal attributes like memory, mood and needs that are remote and unique to each individual and may not always find direct relation to the externality of things. Thus, making objectification of subjective well-being difficult after a point.

There’s no denying that one of the implicit reasons for conducting research into happiness is to find possible ways of increasing it and this shall push research into a prescriptive mode, moving closer to judgements. In fact, my endeavors to further happiness study by slipping into the secret domain also holds the risk of misinterpretation of the hidden, as secrets can be equivocal and invite manipulation of information. Nonetheless, Fantasies are never pure imagination, they invoke much of the reality within themselves. A neat detachment of both (reality and imagined reality) and vouching for a parallel reality in its own right could give way to methodological

misgivings. But there is a possibility too that one becomes more aware of these shortcomings and opens up the field for discovery of new methods and analyses.

The social character of happiness that often gets subsumed by enquires into the subjective actions of pleasure needs to be drawn out and understood from its embeddedness in the collective. Group activities as rudimentary as Picnics to as complex as social movements extend explanation for happiness in collective action. Thus, sociological insight will always have suggestions of happiness in all its enquiries. For what is being propagated as notions of happiness, whether through postulates of the real world or nurtured through fantasies, is determined by the social location and its corresponding cultural edifice.

### *Notes*

1. Mad Men is a drama based on the business of advertising agencies and depicts the transition in the personal lives of the employees.
2. Economic Times Bureau, June 24, 2013. Article. Advertising taglines loaded with happiness gain flavor during slump season. [//  
economictimes.indiatimes.com/articleshow/  
20736314.cms?utm\\_source=contentofinterest&utm\\_medium=text&utm\\_campaign=cppst](http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/articleshow/20736314.cms?utm_source=contentofinterest&utm_medium=text&utm_campaign=cppst)
3. A judgement based on the principalistic morality based on the biblical Ten Commandments. However the Advita School based on Indian Vedic philosophy proposes happiness or bliss as man's innate quality and that it is not accrued from outside one's self.
4. There's a belief that bliss is not capable of being pursuit or sought, as man, as an embodied self, is by nature blissful.
5. Burn raises an enquiry into Bentham's idea of happiness and sees it switching between a "parochial" and "universalist" approach.
6. <http://worldhappiness.report/ed/2018/>
7. Research in economics of happiness began in 1970s by Richard Easterlin at University of Southern California and one of the prime findings was a strong correlation of variables other than income with happiness.
8. Chapter 37 titled 'Experienced Utility and Objective Happiness: A Moment-Based Approach', pp. 673-692.
9. According to Comte happiness is understood as the result of the convergence (consensus) of three components: a scientific conception of the world, the

feelings of love and veneration, and a wisely ordered activity. The essay then demonstrates that the first of these components is of primary importance inasmuch as it is to frame a new horizon within which man is expected to return to a healthy state of mind, to reshape both his hopes and activities, and to discover his own participation in a supreme order acting through the laws of nature as well as through those of the civilization in which he lives.

10. Stouffer's (1949) classic study *The American Soldier*, assessed the satisfaction with promotion chances. Contrary to expectation, the satisfaction with this aspect of Army life appeared to be higher in units where promotion chances were low, such as the military police, than in units where promotion chances were high, such as the Air Force. This phenomenon was explained in terms of social comparison; because promotion was more common in the Air Force, Air Force personnel more often felt *entitled* to promotion. This case of satisfaction with promotion makes many sociologists think that all satisfaction depends on social comparison and thus also life satisfaction.
11. The reference has been drawn from Correlational Findings in the World Database of Happiness.
12. "Needs" are vital requirements for survival, such as eating, bonding and exercise. Nature seems to have safeguarded the gratification of these needs with affective signals such as hunger, love and zest. In this view positive mood signals that all needs are sufficiently met should not be equated with fulfillment of "wants". Needs are inborn and universal while 'wants' are acquired
13. Satisfaction attained after cognitive comparisons for realizing wants and balancing of negative and positive affect
14. Simmel's essay on secrecy is diffuse, covering an array of rather unconnected ideas and topics such as the knowledge individuals have of each other, communication, the lie; the social patterning of concealment as this involves forms such as interest groups, friendship and marriage; the social functions of secrecy and, at a more social psychological level, our "peculiar attraction" to it and its' opposite – betrayal; and finally, the organizational form of the secret society. (*Gary T. Marx & Glenn W. Muschert*)
15. *The Telegraph*. London, 11 March 2007.

### *References*

- Baudrillard, Jean. 1988. *Selected Writings* (ed. Mark Poster). Stanford; Stanford University
- Bellah, Robert N. 1974. Introduction to *Emile Durkheim on Morality and Society*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Bentham, J. 1789. *Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*. London: Payne.
- Bernard Ple. 2000. 'Auguste Comte on Positivism and Happiness', *Journal of Happiness Studies* 1(4):423-445.
- Blau, P. 1964. *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Burns, J. H. 2005. 'Happiness and Utility: Jeremy Bentham's Equation'. *Utilitas*. Volume 17, Issue 1, pp. 46-61. Cambridge University Press.
- Curry, Patrick. 1997. *Defending Middle Earth: Tolkien, Myth and Modernity*. Boston, MA:
- D. Kahneman and A. Tversky (eds). 2000. *Choices, Values and Frames*. New York: Cambridge University Press and the Russell Sage Foundation.
- Grossman, Lev. 2002. 'Feeding on Fantasy', *Time*, 2 December 12. pp. 90-94.
- Layard, Richard. 2003. 'Happiness: Has Social Science a Clue?', Lionel Robbins Memorial Lectures at London School of Economics in March, 2003.
- Michael Eid, Randy J. Larsen (eds.). 2007. *The Science of Subjective Well-Being*. New York: The Guilford Press. pp 166-184.
- Schwartz, N. & F. Strack. 1991. 'Evaluating one's life: a judgmental model of subjective well-being', in F. Strack, M. Argyle & N. Schwartz (eds) *Subjective well-being: An interdisciplinary perspective*. Oxford, UK. Pergamon Press: 27-48.
- Simmel, G. 1906. 'The Sociology of Secrecy and of Secret Societies', *American Journal of Sociology*, 11, 4: 441-498.

Simmel, G. 1950. 'The Secret and the Secret Society', in: Wolff, K. H. (ed) *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe: 307-376.

*Social Indicators and Quality of Life Research*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer Publishers

Stauffer, S.A. 1949. *The American soldier: Adjustment during army life*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Veenhoven, R. 2010. 'How universal is happiness?', in John F. Helliwell & Daniel Kahneman (eds) *International 9 Differences in Well-Being*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Veenhoven. R. 2012. 'Happiness: Also known as "life-satisfaction" and "subjective well-being"', in: Kenneth C. Land, Alex C. Michalos, and M. Joseph Sirgy (Eds) *Handbook of Social Indicators and Quality of Life Research*. 2012 Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer Publishers. pp. 63-77.