

Theory of Happiness from the Perspective of Community

Xue He*

Beijing Foreign Studies University, Beijing, 100089, China

**Corresponding author: hershey@bfsu.edu.cn*

Keywords: Happiness; Community; Individual

Abstract: Historically, the relationship between individuals and communities goes through three stages of development. In the form of a typical community of Greek city-state, Individuals were completely integrated in the community. Since modern times, community faced collapse with the emphasis on individuality. Only in community of free individuals, the individual and the community will achieve real unity. In community of free individuals, people are no longer enslaved by what they create, but for the first time truly complete possession and control of what they create. The personality of people with differences will be improved, and the ability of people will be fully developed. Individuals in this community get real freedom and real happiness.

1. Introduction

Individual freedom and comprehensive development, the ultimate realization of happiness, are achieved in the community. In the place of the old bourgeois society, which its classes and class antagonisms, we shall have an association, in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all. Compared with previous thinkers, the relationship between the individual and the community has changed.

Before exploring the relationship between individual and community, we need to put the development of individual and community into the historical perspective for understanding the development of individual and community, so as to analyze the origin, development and uniqueness of individual and community. The theory of social evolution can provide a clear domain for our understanding. According to the degree of people's possession of nature, the ability of people to control nature and the freedom of people in changing nature and society, the social relations reflected in people's practical activities have been expanded and changed. Productivity advances three social forms in turn, that is natural economy, commodity economy and product economy. The society before modern society was natural economy and belonged to the initial social form. Modern society itself is the second largest social form characterized by commodity economy. Future society is the third social form characterized by product economy.

2. Historical Development of Individual and Community

The social forms of natural economy include primitive society, slave society and feudal society, which are characterized by self-sufficiency. The division of labor in the strict sense has not been formed in social production, so the exchange based on division of labor has not developed, and the

direct purpose of production is consumption. In this initial historical process, the primitive society, the slave society and the feudal society directly corresponded to the Asian, ancient and feudal modes of production, and thus there were three different forms of community, namely, kinship community, city-state military community and feudal political community. The differences between the Eastern and Western feudal society are also embodied in the two forms of the feudal lord's manor community and the feudal patriarchal community. In the west, Greek city states are the most typical ^[1-9]. In the initial social form, the relationship between people was naturally occurring. With the natural dependence of people as the characteristic, human nature could only develop in a narrow range and isolated point. Individual's dependence on nature, his means of production and the need for survival determined that he could not be separated from these means of production. Human life and practical activities were limited by means of production. Individually produced products directly supplied personal consumption and life. Individual production depended on the existing natural conditions, and no need for people's creating. The self connotation of human is obtained in the directness of freedom. Because individual was in a narrow and isolated point at this stage, human had no connection with all kinds of things outside man himself. Self corroboration of human was provided by what he naturally obtained, which distinguishing him from other existence. This natural and direct confirmation stipulated what man was and what he was not, and together with what he was not, it also stipulated man's own self-identity. In this self-identity, we had to endure the limitations of other existence on ourselves. The existence of human at this stage is not for himself, but for something outside himself. The relationship between man and the community is imposed externally. Individuals had no independence and were often swallowed up in the community. The community was a natural and direct unity. The individual and the relationship between them lay in the community. Human labor was for the community, and the objective of individual activities was in the community. The differences within the community were insignificant and not to be concerned. Community showed a stability, and its internal development was relatively static. Individual did not get their own individuality as its essence was to rely on the community. The essence of the individual was obtained from the community. In the community, the relationship between individuals was not the external relationship between individuals, but depended on the relationship in the community, all of which were the relationship with the community and were under the control of the community. The relationship between the individual and the community was a kind of personal attachment master-slave relationship. Man was given an unchanging special function in the community. Individuals played a specific and special function in a stable community. There is no freedom or happiness in the bondage of the community.

With the development of commodity economy, division of labor and exchange was becoming more and more mature in the second social form, and the maturity of division of labor and exchange also further promoted the development of commodity economy. The scope of human activities was beyond the narrow scope of the community which was under natural economic conditions at the former one ^[10]. The dependence between individual and natural conditions had been disintegrated so that the individual and land were separated. As the individual workers with no means of production and no means of life having nothing, so they only been able to sell their labor for a living. Thus, the realization of human nature was reflected in the interpersonal relationship. The development of commodity economy also promoted the development of people themselves. This social form was characterized by the independence of people based on the dependence of people on things. People's various needs were stimulated with a universal large-scale material exchange coming into being. Although individual A needed the commodity of individual B, he did not use violence to occupy the commodity, and vice versa ^[11,12]. On the contrary, they recognized each other as the owner who penetrated their will into the commodity. The expansion of division of labor also provided the possibility for frequent exchange. Capitalist production stimulated not only people's various needs

but also the development of human ability. As for the individual, the development of ability was not comprehensive. Because of the division of labor becoming a necessity, individual development was only one-sided in the case of division of labor. One-sided development of the individual constituted the universality of capitalist mode of production. People's dependence on objects replaced the dependence of previous social forms. The personal independence of individuals was achieved under the premise of dependence on objects. In this stage, the relationship between the individual and the community was realized through the intermediary on account of the individual and the community being interconnected externally ^[13-17]. Therefore, individuals were integrated into the community in the form which different from their true state after being mediated. Individuals became an external existence separated from their own essence. The reality of individual in the community was completely external and alienated from itself. People's understanding of themselves was an externalized objectized self, which was actually an object of external objectification. Thus, the relationship between individuals was a separate, indirect, external one. The self-interested and unrelated individuals constituted a society on the interconnectedness and dependence of meeting needs. In this case, the community did not have the meaning of that organic integration, but merely played a collective significance. Individuals obtained only formal freedom in this society which was outside they themselves, so that there was no happiness in this community.

3. The Realization of Happiness in the Community

The full development of commodity economy will usher in the stage of product economy. The relationship between people will be further expanded and the ability of people will be further developed. Product economy is the sublation of commodity economy, but before entering a higher level of product economy, the stage of commodity economy is insurmountable. In the third social form characterized by product economy, people no longer only care about their own aspects in the process of social production. In the social production, people begin to pay attention to the theory of life of human beings themselves. In this social form, human labor will become a free and conscious general labor, so that people get rid of the dependence on things ^[18]. There will be no longer oppression and exploitation in the relationship between people as people reflecting the true existence of themselves in social interaction. Individuals may achieve free association in production. At the same time, individual activities are not for external needs, but the needs of the people themselves. Society will become an association of free people. People are no longer enslaved by what they create, but for the first time truly and completely possess and control what they create. In the association of free people, the personality of people with differences will be improved, and the ability of people will be fully developed. Individuals in the free association truly become happy people. Man becomes the real master of himself and everything. Individuals will confirm the true self in his objectification of knowledge. Identification between individuals can be mutual realized. The organic unity of individual and community is established by mutual recognition in the association of human freedom. Individual is no longer a separate external object, but as a kind of existence interacting with the community. The relationship between individuals is inherent which is united within the community. The community is no longer composed of mutually exclusive individuals, but of individuals united by man's common type specific property. Man's common type specific property are established between the mutual recognition of individuals, and the essence of individuals is also established in mutual recognition. Thus, human get real freedom and happiness at this stage, as everyone's freedom and happiness will be recognized by others ^[19-22]. In the unity of difference, the characteristics of the community are shown through each individual. Therefore, the community constructed by individuals in the internal relationship not only completely retains the differences between individuals, but also retains the man's common type specific property recognized by all individuals. The realization of community is open

with the basis of its role is to give full play to individual differences.

The three-stage evolution theory of social form embodies the connotation of Hegel's abstract dialectics ^[23]. The social form of natural economy, the social form of commodity economy and the social form of product economy are a positive, negative and combined process, and a process of affirmation, negation and new affirmation. In Hegel's view, dialectics is the evolution of conceptual logic, and here is the development logic of social history. Although the evolution of social form is an objective process that is not transferred by human will, human practical activities play a key role in it. Therefore, the evolution of social form is a process of interaction between subject and object. The individual and community have reached the specific historical unity in the process of historical evolution. Social form is a social organism that evolves on the basis of people's material production mode. The result of people's practical activities leads to the evolution of social form, which is accompanied by social relations and people's own development history. The different development forms of social organisms are embodied in specific social forms. When we interpret historical development from the perspective of human beings, we will find that history is created and selected by human beings. The evolution process of history cannot exclude human beings. Human beings create society and society also creates human beings. The development of man and history is the unity of regularity and purpose. The development of human itself is reflected in the development of society. We can see that the starting points of the three social forms are abstract people, alienated people ^[24-26] and fully free people. Although this understanding of the individual seems to subvert the individualism of ancient Greece. But in fact, this interpretation coincides with Aristotle's logic and gives priority to human beings at the ontological level. The development of social history is based on people's practical activities for social history is constructed by real people's activities. Similarly, the acquisition of personal meaning is inseparable from the relationship between people in the community.

4. The true unity of individual and community

In civil society, the community is composed of atomic individuals ^[27]. Among them, individuals exist in isolation, and the connection between anyone is external. However, in civil society, the social mode of production is the prerequisite for personal development. The human potential of the future society is bred in the existing society. In the existing relations of production, workers develop separately from themselves and other workers. In this development, it contains the potential of an individual's comprehensive and universal future. Human nature is embodied in social relations. History and society are created in the realistic activities of interrelated individuals. We can say that the theory of social development is a philosophy of internal relationship, which is similar to Aristotle's concept of universalism. The concept of relationship here has the same practical significance as the individual and society. The concept of reality comes from the relationship. The idea of the stage of social development is the internal relationship between the existing society and the future society, and the potential development of various relations within the existing society. In the pre-modern society, the absolute authority of national politics makes the citizens' life disappear in the national life. Modern society has realized the separation of political life and civil society, which makes people obtain certain freedom, but it has brought the duality of people's life. Where the political state is really formed, people live a dual life, the life of heaven and the life of the earth, not only in thought, consciousness, but also in reality and life. The dependence on things realized by civil society makes commodity fetishism replace the worship of God, and people repeatedly turn back to the dual life of political life and civil society. Hegel saw the split crisis of individual and community caused by the emphasis on subjectivity since modern times. The separation of modern state from morality is moral for morality is non-state while the state is non-moral.

In other words, the internal life and external life, private life and public life are no longer

coordinated, which makes the whole spiritless, or as Feuerbach once said, inhuman. Therefore, like Hegel, the positive tendency of criticizing existing things is to rebuild a spiritual, that is, personal unity in the whole of real life ^[28]. Therefore, they try to return to an ancient Greek collectivism and community ethics ^[29-31] to achieve the goal of harmonious coexistence between the subject and the community, that is, to realize freedom in the unity of the special interest system and the general interest system. However, their methods are different. Hegel tries to establish an absolute ethical entity on the basis of harmonizing the respective characteristics of the subject and the community, while Feuerbach believes that Hegel inevitably falls into an abstract understanding when he attributes the real state and civil society to the deduction of spirit. And we try to find it in real economic relations. In this regard, Levin once believed that, Hegel abandoned the theory of social contract and the theory of natural rights. Hegel and ancient Greek thinkers sought a political theory that supported collectivism and community. Hegel found this foundation in morality and entity, and we found this foundation in economic life, that is, to make the interdependence in economic life an entity. This political theory is a synthesis of ethics and economics ^[32].

After encountering the problem of material interests in reality, the study of Hegel's philosophy of right should focus more on his civil society theory. Seeing the separation of political society and civil society is Hegel's profound place, Hegel regards the surface as the essence of things. That is to say, Hegel's solution is only superficial, which reverses the relationship between the state and civil society. Just like the form of the state, the relationship between law can not be understood from themselves or from the so-called general development of human spirit. On the contrary, they are rooted in the relationship of material life. The sum of this relationship of material life is summarized by Hegel as "civil society" according to the precedents of the British and French in the 18th century, and the anatomy of civil society should be found in political economics. Starting from the real social relations, we can reveal the realistic basis of ethics with understanding the abstraction of Hegel's ethics. In all historical stages in the past, the form of communication restricted by productivity and productivity is civil society. Civil society includes all material exchanges between individuals at a certain stage of productivity development. This name always marks the social organization developed from production and exchange, which constitutes the foundation of the state and the superstructure of any other concept in all times. All these relationships should return to the real society. From this, we can find that the ethical community is based on public economy and joint labor. The foothold of old materialism is civil society, while the foothold of new materialism is human society or human of society. In this society, through free and conscious activities, that is, labor, people get rid of their dependence on things obtaining their own independence and realizing real happiness.

Is there a contradiction between the consideration of individual rights and interests and the formulation of social goals? What is the relationship between the comprehensive and free development of society and individuals in the future? The tradition of liberalism has always put individuals above society and believes that society is more a restriction on people ^[33,34]. The social development theory opposes the separation and opposition between society and individual with applying Hegel's Speculative Dialectics to the analysis of social reality, which coincides with Aristotle's logic. We can understand that it gives the real individual an ontological priority.

Tracing back to Aristotle, every individual is an individual of a certain kind, so the individual has man's common type specific property, which can make the individual's potential play out in reality and become what he is. We can regard the union of human activities in each specific reality as the entity of the community, so that the contradiction between the free and all-round development of individuals and the realization of the community can be solved. Individuals in the community can recognize the goals of the community, achieving the goals of the community in the union with others, and achieving each other's personal goals. The goal of the community is also based on the free and all-round development of everyone. The goals of the community and the individual are unified with

each other. So far, people's real happiness will be realized.

Acknowledgement

This research was supported by Beijing Social Science Fund Project (Project number: 16KDC028) and Key Project of China National Social Science Fund (Project number: 21AZX001). Research Center for Cooperative Innovation of STCC in Beijing Universities (Beijing Foreign Studies University) stage achievement.

Disclosure statement

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] Aristotle, 2003, *Politics*, [Yi Yan, Dianhua Qin, Trans.], China Renmin University Press, Beijing, 30.
- [2] Carlotta Capuccino, 2013, *Happiness and Aristotle's definition of eudaimonia*, *Philosophical topics*, The University of Arkansas Press, Fayetteville, Arkansas, Vol.41 (1), 1-26.
- [3] Pyeon, Sangbeom, 2015, *Happiness, Desire-satisfaction, and Rationality in Aristotle's Ethics*, CHUL HAK SA SANG: *Journal of Philosophical Ideas*, 58, 95-126.
- [4] Carlotta Capuccino, 2015, *Happiness and Aristotle's Definition of Eudaimonia*, *Philosophical Topics*, 41(1), 1-26.
- [5] Roger Crisp, Michael Slote, 1997, *Virtue Ethics*, Oxford University Press, New York, 215.
- [6] Bryan C Reece, 2020, *Notes and Discussions: Are There Really Two Kinds of Happiness in Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics*, *Classical Philology*, United States, 115(2), 270-280.
- [7] Xinkai HU, 2020, *Complete Virtue and the Definition of Happiness in Aristotle*, *Frontiers of Philosophy in China*, Netherlands, 15(2), 293-314.
- [8] Edward Uzoma Ezedike, 2018, *Happiness as an end: a critique of Aristotle's rational eudaemonism*, *Inkanyiso: Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, South Africa, 10(1), 51-62.
- [9] ByungSeok Son, 2017, *Aristotle's View of the Relation Between Happiness(eudaimonia) and the External Goods*, *Journal of The Society of philosophical studies*, 118, 177-208.
- [10] Amitai Etzioni, 1996, *The Responsive Community: a Communitarian Perspective*, *American Sociological Review*, 61(1), p9-10. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2096403>
- [11] Min-Ah Lee, Ri-Ra Song, 2014, *Money, Materialism and Happiness*, *Korea Journal of Population Studies*, 37(4), 89-114.
- [12] Marco Visentin, 2014, *Happiness and the market: the ontology of the human being in Thomas Aquinas and modern functionalism*, *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 23(4), 430-444.
- [13] Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, 1961, *Philosophy of Right*, [Yang Fan, Qitai Zhang, Trans.], The Commercial Press, Beijing, 199.
- [14] Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, 1975, *Lectures on the Philosophy of World History Introduction: Reason in History*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge Cambridgeshire, 78-79.
- [15] Axel Honneth, 2014, *Die Normativität der Sittlichkeit: Hegels Lehre als Alternative zur Ethik Kants*, *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Philosophie*, 62 (5): 787-800. <https://doi.org/10.1515/dzph-2014-0054>
- [16] Sebastian Stein, Luca Corti, Ermylos Plevrakis, 2020, *Hegel and Aristotle on Ethical Life: Duty-Bound Happiness and Determined Freedom*, *Hegel Bulletin*, United Kingdom, 41(1), 61-82.
- [17] Lumsden, Simon, 2020, *Community in Hegel's Social Philosophy*, *Hegel bulletin*, Cambridge UK, 41(2), 177-201.
- [18] Karl Marx, 2008, *Paris manuscripts*, People's Publishing House, Beijing, 99-102.
- [19] Robson David, 2022, *The Pursuit of Happiness*, *New Scientist*, United States, 3370(253), 38-47.
- [20] Elizabeth M Petty, Karen K Milner, 1998, *Is Happiness Heritable or Hard Won? Reflections on Kevin Sharpe's 'The Sense of Happiness: Biological Explanations and Ultimate Reality and Meaning'*, *Ultimate Reality and Meaning*, Toronto, 21(4), 326-334.
- [21] Bannet Eve Tavor, 2018, *Caroline Winterer. American Enlightenments: Pursuing Happiness in the Age of Reason*, *The American Historical Review*, 123(1), 214-215.
- [22] Gwakhee Han, 2016, *Desires for what one cares about and happiness - A critique of Frankfurt's view of happiness*, *Korean Journal of Philosophy*, 127, 153-178.
- [23] Theoder Wiesengrund Adorno, 1993, *Negative dialectics*, [Feng Zhang, Trans.], Chongqing Press, Chongqing, 319.
- [24] Kišjuhas Aleksej, Marinković Dušan, 2018, *The Production of Happiness or Manufacturing the Alienation. The*

- Philosophy and Economics of Emotions in the Postrational Age*, *Filozofska Istraživanja, Croatia*, 38(3), 493-507.
- [25] Timothy Chappell, 2015, *Eudaimonia, Happiness, and the Redemption of Unhappiness*, *Philosophical Topics*, 41(1), 27-52.
- [26] Yeo, In-sok, 2014, *Man-Machine, Materialism, and Happiness - La Mettrie's Epicurean Philosophy of Happiness*, *Philosophy of Medicine*, 18, 33-51.
- [27] Gerard Delanty, 2003, *Community*, Routledge, London, p1-2.
- [28] Karl Löwith, 2006, *From Hegel to Nietzsche: a revolutionary break in thinking in the 19th century* [Qiuling Li, Trans.], SDX Joint Publishing Company, Beijing, 224.
- [29] Elizabeth Irwin, 2017, *Debating the happiness of Periclean Athens : from Herodotus' Solon to its legacy in Aristotle*, *Acta Classica*, 2017(6), 1-41.
- [30] Jay R. Elliott, 2017, *Aristotle on Virtue, Happiness and External Goods*, *Ancient Philosophy*, 37(2), 347-359.
- [31] Elizondo E Sonny, 2016, *The Virtues of Happiness: A Theory of the Good Life*, *The Philosophical Quarterly*, 66(262), 181-183.
- [32] Norman Levine, 2009, *Divergent Paths* [Fengyu Zang, Trans.], Beijing Normal University Press, 264.
- [33] John Bordley Rawls, 1971, *A Theory of Justice*, Mass, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 192.
- [34] John Bordley Rawls, 2012, *Lectures on the History of Moral Philosophy* [Su Gu, Xuemei Liu, Trans.], China Social Sciences Press, Beijing, 300–305.