

THE AESTHETICS OF HAPPINESS AND THE PHENOMENOLOGIC CARPE DIEM

Assoc. Prof. Maftciu Regis ROMAN, PhD

Aurel Vlaicu University of Arad,

Faculty of Educational Sciences, Psychology and Social Work, Arad, Romania

regis_roman@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT: The Aesthetics of Happiness and the Phenomenologic Carpe Diem.

The article sets out to analyse the fundamentals of the term happiness and to reinterpret them comprehensively: humanity and its general effects discovered in literature and the sciences which do not have a meaning, and do not understand what this present term at the past-present mode represents, yet symbolised either real – perverted in success and materiality, either illusory – not ever discovered. The societal carpe diem which relies on authority and power. However, the meanings of the notion of happiness can be best discovered by their associative framing with the idea of beauty. Yet, since Antiquity an elementary thing has been discovered: beauty is tough! Similarly, the highest feeling is difficult to comprehend and its reduction to primal, prior to the individual physiological sensations is much easier – hereditary, or subsequent: satiety, power, excitement. Eventually, what multiplicatively triggers pleasure in the world population has a heterogeneous nature, and the way in which each of us relates to the novel leads to the discovery of multiple meanings to happiness. If not reduced to heredity or hormones of the central nervous system, it means that it also assumes egological formative, educational developments. And the highest form of education refers to the aesthetic attitude – to purely and simply selfless beauty.

Keywords: *aesthetics of happiness, beauty, creative crises, the illusion of happiness.*

1. The Fundamentals of the Term Happiness Reduced to Unequal Historical Clichés

What is happiness? The abstract term or the individual feeling? An ideal or a real state of mind awoken by the common divergence and personalised through the voice without hereditary thread? Regardless of the undertaken answers, there remains the vagueness and the dissatisfaction of the encounter between one and multiple reinterpreted. *At first sight the notion of happiness is an absurd construct reduced to a sort of vulgar affection.* There arise a few fundamentals which require analysis to gain the understanding of the term: to what extent can happiness be discovered, at least together with satiety/ death? It is not equal to the fulfillment or the end of the individual, yet, they all convey the same meanings which include the lack of semantic notional intelligibility. What do they signify?

Essentially, if we do not know what the subject signifies we content ourselves with the idea that man is a perennial illusion materialised continuously and steers towards the mournful disappearance! Why is that? Because it has very little to say, in reality. Wooden language. Because, once matured to old age it no longer proves useful. The marcerat pragmatism. Faiths become useless when they overstep the risk of insurance in the mercantile market. Thus, there appear the projections of unclear images, visible on the side-walls of the walls where people who cannot step forward from the dull trivia are to be found. And these, caught in triviality, no longer wish to step outside the ritualic thinking, in other words out of the customs reduced to subjective (un)recognisable, (un)controllable, (un)steady dimensions. The myth of the cavern¹ is a perfect symbol of some historically maximised utopia: regional morality, myths and ideologies, regardless of culture and civilisation ensure false hopes. The absent and artificial time would require a brief distancing in order to overcome sadness, or renounce it altogether. What can be stated with certainty? The idea that happiness does not mean obedience, corroborated with the absolute indicated by the fellows interested only in materiality, never.

In the conditions in which we love the shadows of the things projected on walls (post)platonical habitual, we remain so strongly used to the ritual that we consider realities which somehow have material illusory

1 Platon, *Republica*, în *Opere*, vol.V, București, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1986, cartea VII.

correspondence and, if they are abstract ideas, with no connection to nature, we turn them immediately, by means of false explanantions, assimilated by unprovable truths. Reminders². Thus is the fundamental paradigm of humanities described. The immediate realities due to imperfections carried within the inner structure eventually end up being detestable, and those mediated are less tolerable, owing to inherent abstractisation. Why should they all receive criticism? Is it because we fear change, critical thinking, or? Anyhow, we end up adoring the moment, that perpetual sine qua non of the historical space. Does this judgement seem meaningless? Let us analyse one thing, the life of an ephemera (one day), compared to that of a human being (25550 days). The newtonian mechanics, versus the quantic mechanics brought to the same table, etc.

Ever since antiquity beauty, the good and the truth have been thought of as connected fluidly, continuously mytically and mystically. What was beautiful, useful and truthful³! What once proved to be true was beautiful thanks to the fact that it remained a good of the citadel. The good was integrated in truth and beauty, and followed the ensurance of happiness for every citizen, slave⁴! People have never been equal, not ever. But, where did such connections come from? From the categories of citizens which seem to have decreased, but the multitude of slaves has increased. The Hellenic origins, oriental. The last subjects could be reinterpreted due to inherent absurdities. Maintaining and keeping power supposes unconditionally accepting anything! Doctrinary. The truth decreased into a secondary plan, becoming a relatively universal necessity which did not ever depend on human beings. And the good made reference to a common behaviour assumed historically by society, being thus the most volatile subject. However, beauty indicates inner emotions, even externalized, it would be unfair to remain closed, although this often happens. Beauty in real life.

Beauty is what I commonly like, almost directed, becoming an archetype of general necessities induced by the trivial and everlasting fight for power with the purpose of servitude⁵! Religions. A dream, some would

2 Jacqueline Russ, *Istoria filosofiei*, vol.I – Gândirile fondatoare, București, Editura Univers Enciclopedic, 2000, p. 42.

3 Wladyslaw Tatarkiewicz, *Istoria esteticii*, vol.1, București, Editura Meridiane, 1978, pp. 173, 174.

4 Aristotel, *Politica*, București, Editura Semne Artemis, 2009, 1254b16–21

5 Martin Heidegger, *Originea operei de artă*, București, Editura Humanitas, 2001, p. 69.

say, archetypal essence others would say. It rhymes through hilarious, but it ignores with pretentiousness the correspondence of opposites. Though, each argument supposes assumed suggestion and induced in its own, false according to some psychologists, real according to some epistemologists. Do we really have nothing to do, work, contextually think without ideals or materiality? And, if I did not own anything from what I want, why should I feel frustrated, suicidal? For fear and for eternal peace, immortality the absolute is beloved. Yet, which is the most treasured trace left by religions in society? The family. Bi or multipolar? Unisex or indifference to shades, gregarious hopes (re)interpreted decisionally?

People do not get born genetically happy or not, blue-blooded or ordinary, superior or inferior: they are all equal although there are evolutionary potentialities and different socio-familial contexts. Though, if happiness belongs to the educated spirit, then it not only has a genetical impulse but, on the contrary, it remains preponderantly cultural. It does not come down to an evolutionary route and physiologically from the phenomenological, structural and logical point of view and if it does exist, it would be absurd to accept the relating, the implicit correspondence of the superior affect with the primal psychological needs and to consider it different from excitement. Moreover, in the last case it could be assumed that some people are born happy, the rest apprehensive and sad? Improbable. Lately, these are the prejudices that are, filmy and sadly, but absurdly accepted.

The absurd is that the multitude of psychologists⁶, psychiatrists⁷ and neurologists⁸, physiologists ever more loudly support the hereditary character of feelings (happiness, love, empathy, altruism etc.), ignoring phenomena which are formed culturally and civilisationally! 5-4-1. In places where the self is not born with these superior affect, does it mean that it does not exist, that it is empty? And the sociologists, the anthropologists are beside the point, as usual, disinterested in the elementary nature, by

6 Meike Bartels de la Universitatea Vrije din Olanda și alți cercetători au examinat mostre ADN și chestionare care măsurau bunăstarea. Bunăstarea este același lucru cu fericirea?

7 Harold G. Coward, *Perfectibility of Human Nature in Eastern and Western Thought*, The. SUNY Press, 2012.

8 M. Bartels, Genetics of wellbeing and its components satisfaction with life, happiness, and quality of life: A review and meta-analysis of heritability studies. *Behavior Genetics*, 2015, 45(2), 137-156.

relying on residue induced postfactum and tardy. The stated communities reduce, generically, superior emotions to chemical compounds, hormonally secreted, organically: dopamin, serotonin, onyocin, endorphin, etc. Or at archetypal processes! They put the cart before the horse! In vain does the mystery of impossible and improbable trajectory appear! Held guilty are the natural antecedents, not the artificial ones! The greatest sophism by which credit is given to the externalisation of failure of the individual.

Truth, intentionality, happiness, prosperity. One of the four would lose its meaning if we did not compare it with sadness, filmy concluded C.G. Yung. Binary, stereotypical, efficient up to a limit. The opposite of sadness can be joy! They are different, anyhow. At least a few subjects should constitute the desperate approach to philosophy, but studies are complacent in the everlasting old immature seductions transposed to the area of psychological dirigisme. Which is no longer found in anything, little and no different: the same re-analysed, after pre-established criteria. Leaving the disciplines aside we can ask ourselves what associations can be drawn between the four qualities? Reduced to three, by the convoluted simulacrum truth-lie. The truth considered absolute can be an absurd falsity. We do not argue by relativist, epistemic examples, it would be too facile, but by constructive idea.

Consequently, does happiness exist? Is it an illusion? The true post-being question. Is it only hereditarily developed or does it appear so, also in the case of those who are not genealogically able? Discriminatory pseudoproblems necessary to be clarified. Why pseudoproblems? Because it is possible not to have anything to do with any previous conditioning, although it appears thanks to them!

1.1. Cultural Propaedeutics Philologically and Philosophically Contextualised

The most efficient treasoning used in the affective hermeneutics involves clarifying some dilemmas of the term happiness:

Paradigm 1: To be happy means much more than normally, simply, habitually being, processes induced by vibrant music or by reading an excerpt in the relatedly relative quiet. It must rant something in (over)excess. Harmony has almost a tragic death, similar to the state of-. The finite opportunity does not ever convince, except for the papinian man. Or: God's will can only offer us

happiness, once the body is decomposing. A famous contradiction, simultaneously thought. The Absolute, which savours the death of its own children-creations?!? Which feels threatened by the incongruencies of the accomplished deeds by humanities and uses judgement-revenge as weapon?!? Ultimately, it would be unspiritual in a subjective-phenomenologic sense, postfactum-individualistic to become an unintelligent matter to reach the highest feeling. Mediated even by the vocation of the divine representatives who can forgive worldly sins by confession in order to get to the perfect place of greenery, becoming, as follows, the groomed-happy sheep! Meaning that we can do anything? No. Though, it is a correct idea that happiness means to be different, otherwise! But not anyhow, but by willingly/ not knowingly doing, generating thus negative effects in the behavioural plan aware/ unaware. For instance, the essence of lie is inculcate in judgement: man is the being that must lay hold of the Earth and exterminate, explicitly, everything that is non-human, implicitly being able to act upon deeds of civilisatory and cultural canibalism, competitive or egalitarian.

Paradigm 2: Rhetorically: what it means to be happy is to normally, simply habitudinally exist into being. (Re) finding that something to do naturally. The projection of internalized phenomena towards the exterior which is not distorted by subjectivism. The Earth protects itself, even if humanities do not understand this thing and they think that they can sacrifice it in an absolute way. Up to a point, the affects fix themselves normally, the anchoring is correct, but the remaining in possessiveness places the future in an indifferent pathetic posture.

Individually, William Blake concluded that in order "to be happy, it is essential to have something to love, something to do and something to look up to!"⁹ By analysing the prior attributes, we understand the individual of the century, any-one of them. The commoner of society finds, pointwise, something to love, he or she, stuttering love triangle or simple angle directed which reduces itself even to a longing self due to absurd liberties, although one does not know very well what love represents one feels really well, physiologically satisfied with a partner, in conclusion, one loves. A sort of smaller happiness. There arises the societally alphabetised man, namely the one who has jobs, even caprices in which one directs the free time, longs for n-things, often material, financial, sportive, artistic, recre-

9 William Blake, *Cărțile profetice Vala, sau cei patru Zoa*, Iași, Editura Institutul European, 2006.

ational proposed in consumerist kinds, but it cannot overcome personal failure: the one in which one acknowledges that one is nothing, nothing, insignificant as if one wanted to be disguised in a divinity. The arguments of breathing reduce the whole of affectivity to happiness? Not at all! Anyhow, Blake¹⁰ solved the problem of viral dissatisfactions, though he did not explicitly follow this, but mediated-subliminal states in the traditions of other case histories: are you happy? what more do you want? Be satisfied with what you have!? Insignificant, nobody, nothing, more, people never get to be gods! An elementary logic, an authentic prerequisite, false conclusions, but not through timelessness, but by framing. The mere beingness is not happiness, but in an improper, rudimentary, ritualic way.

Paradigm 3: To be happy means to have a vision. The concrete binocular of the sailor with or without a ship. The terrifying water is conjectural, for the time being. As if you said: to be happy means to have a bagel, be it also virtual, even if the bakeries are closed at midnight, we find them on other meridians! Resymbolised: the lust of a leaven dough, baked, full of salty holes involves remembrance! The native idea, complete and obscure. Many refer to rice or other vegetables, not the wheat products.

„Create a visions and never let the environment, other people’s convictions or limitations of the past affect your decisions. Ignore conventional wisdom”¹¹ argued Anthony Robbins in a verve close to interiorised disenchantment, thanks to informational ground based on the (post) modern type. Impossible and improbable. Creative crises. Between parallel universes and twin souls there appear no greater differences. Internalised illusions selfcharacterise through the essence which no human can get past!

The human being is a state in oneself! Plato’s city with the right-side up, not viceversa, as it is thought today. It is necessary to get to that awareness and by which we behave responsibly without potential external coercions. On the other hand, all the principles of the international law must become compulsory, just like those rights of the individual, the rest are mild and whirling words!

Paradigm 4. Man is sociable¹² by primitive nature, the pervert aristotelic idea which was used as an axiom, a tauntologic way specifically

10 *Ibidem.*

11 Anthony Robbins, *Putere nemărginită*, București, Editura Act și Politon, 2017.

12 Aristotel, *Politica*, București, Editura Iri, 2001.

respiritualised to the Middle Ages. *Man is sociably conditioned by one's pre and post-Christian.* Then, the idea was extended in modern times. *Man is sociable by the formative institutional nature.* The imposition of a cliché has been followed, of a metacultural as insinuating exercise of acceptance of masked slavery, respectively of submission compliant with, generalised by several welfare principles of natural right decomposed in the will of some limited lawmakers. Aristotle has an immense merit in imposing the methodological, argumentative, preepistemologic renaissance exercise. Without the philosophical and logical principles assumed by the Anglo-Saxon pragmatism and the European rationalism, it is possible to have lived for a long time between the religious rituals and the poles of degradable, absolutist, dictatorial, demeaning infatuation in their own essences.

The humanist researchers have analysed and analyse particularly the relationship between truth and lie and particularities it casuistically. They belong to the individual in a crowd. Then they discovered the archetype. But I have never seen any analysis of the archetype and nonarchetype, of the uncouth truth considered necessary and valid anytime, anywhere, impossible from the beginnings till now, *ab initio*, or of the universalised lies. They experiment a flagrant impossibility. Maybe only if the whole universe where a static test tube, the same commensurate it might be possible to decipher it unchangeable. At least from the perspective of the binary structuralism maybe the last circumvention would give us food for thought! Are we evolutionary for ever? Do we follow perfection like a primate in heating stimulated by the illusory reward or do we try to build, accomplish the ideal, be it even global?

Razor¹³ and fork¹⁴. Occam. Hume. The elementary simplicity remains continuously true. Why do we always complicate things with a kind of autoimmune despair? Because we do not trust and we wake up late on mornings full of complexes and frustrations, which reduce the world to the unpredictability that we perceive almost as certain. The truth is around us, but we ignore it most of the time since associatively the razor and the fork sting, become figuratively threatening! How do we trust simplicity? In I? The Other. Better in lies, our true God!

13 Roger Ariew, *Ockham's Razor, A Historical and Philosophical Analysis of Ockham's Principle of Parsimony*, 1976.

14 M. A. Box, *Arta Suasivă a lui David Hume*, Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 1990, pp. 39-41.

1.2. The association of happiness with a few processes from the perspective of common sense. *Carpe diem*

Happiness? And *carpe diem*. We know what it means or we pretend that we grow depraved with knowable symbols as usual when it comes to vague terms? The game of marketable art or the interested pleasures? Similarly, we consider the matter of heroic non-erotic love! In the first case we analyse a concrete feeling in which we bring in discussion irrational vanities which, paradoxically hide the absence of the feeling. The simplest is to cast in the process of suitability of the state of well-being, a sort of a game, a chimeras, nothing, any other answers possessively volatilisable. Absurd. There remains a superior affect, the abstract term or an idea caught between relations which once were and no longer are and vice versa, there have been, and still are nothing but paradoxical chimeras. He and she close by relative attributes. Positivised, but affectively tied by the open and paradoxical avidity of the related nostalgia. The case of shared love is the closest to softly decipher *suav fugitive impressionable absences*. It almost belongs to all by the connection of memories, but to few people at present moments. Why? Because there is the generic dissatisfaction like a sort of incurable malady which there is no escape from! As a consequence:

- ✦ we have learnt not to cherish what we have due to opposable jealousies assiduously learnt. When we are little, we want to become adults, if we are strong we seek to control obvious weaknesses, and if we are weak, we give up subjectivities and argument failure caused by external conspiracies!
- ✦ because happiness is identified by the original and unique subjects which are dissatisfied due to alternative aspirations, namely because they do not have enough or once had little, the most absurd feeling is born: the illusion of happiness.
- ✦ a few relative anchors connected to the deciphering the meanings of happiness can continuously be interpreted, which are reduced to material success or relationary.

In conclusion, the processualisation is natural by which the majority, absolute, seek substitutes to superior affective processes, the fact that they do not understand a word in connection with the semantics of the term! Similarly, there is everyday talk on love without indicating communally intelligible proximities, namely it supposes family, nothing more! It

remains in every kind of sacrament, safety, mystery, friendship, etc., necessarily trivial.

1.3. Two who love each other butn never met, maybe accidentally, the dream of false memories.

In the study of happiness as transformation normally falls time and temporality barely defined as if spacial contextualities were knowingly ignored. Similarly do two people who love, survive without ever meeting. They cannot live one without the other, though, they build each other statues, perfect admirations which are built on the wet and attractive multicolor sand, never washed or desertified for the ephemeris that spontaneously live in the nadir. Carpe diem and happiness! The greatest utopia thrown upon humanities, just as artificial dust in the eyes of the gullible, wide open because of this. The moment, the only non-existent element which differentiates from the rest of the terrestrial species. Fundamental. If we were living only the moment, we would not at all be different from the rest of the mammals.

The empty individual always falls in the background, only rarely it matters what one really wants, one always gets what one is able to materially trade. Anyhow, the whole is understood, the sea and the sky, the earth and the universe or other romanticized opposites, the second character, the second accepts or rejects with a characteristic dose of prudence the fundament and the simplicity. What matters is the fact that it resonates, it vibrates in alternative waves the way humanities have been educated. Positively, elegantly. There is no knowing about what is there between them, but it vanished, yet the respectively lost phenomenon only has one dosis of the novel and exciting quest. It is felt as different in comparison to the neutral and trivial feelings from around. The world is thought to be colourful, in reality it remains a distant background, rarely shaded since colours are formed together with the shades practised more or less in the human brains. Yet, at some point reflections meet th basis, the common, the novel, the ritual evolution, the background, its combinations, a.s.o. In the foreground a covenant that carries a sort of hatred or distancing within, is reminded, meaning incapacity/ helplessness. The simplest solution is resorted to in order for the collective survival which carries the name of ignorance to be received.

The nudity of the being, in other words, societies have always tried to clarify through language concerning what they would desire, but do not have: the simple tool of tolerating the frustrations of those who decide for the time being! Culture and civilisations are political pictures which attempt to show how history can be dressed in something tolerable, why not? Even beautiful, states of things are not relevant. Owing to this, the individuals have continuously reached the general conclusion accordingly: the past reflects the sublime, the nostalgic, tending for the perfect sunset! Yet, the two lovers who adore each other and look for each other, do not exist in reality, the whole human universe is reduced to one's own Ego for the individual. Does collectivity exist? Of course. Less for the Ego. Tragic-comic dichotomy.

2. The Word that Actually Breathes

Happiness is the only present-absent word, simultaneous, the real phantom of the unfulfilled life. Of course, it can be stated that many notions can be characterised in this oxymoron meaning. Metaphorically. (De)ontic. But, has no other term captured these contradictory and paradoxical properties which represent the most abstract, but also the language, concrete, initiatic or absurd in form today, here, now? It bends the classical rules of logic regarding the classification of notions. It is not reduced to anything as it contains something, presupposes no mystery or semantic indetermination, anyone can, on most occasions, timely, improperly define it.

Updated cultural potential, but not surprised. The state of- describes a multisemantic unique word, almost unrepeatable, which contains everything abstract and almost nothing concrete, within the same time and space continuously determined. Platonic love dwells in its shadow, although it is associatively closest. It exceeds the traditional logic to show that its intensity is greater than the present virtual ways which are anchored in anachronic forms, due to similarly absurd causes, it relates to the past, not the present, a moment, now. Happiness as a term and feeling becomes, undoubtedly, the tendentious sophism of a seeking life to which humanities tend without relating to modal explicit causes.

2.1. The fundament of errors constitutes the false inner perfection

Sensibly, but also unconsciously happiness is confused for the free will. Human-bird, never defeated or even if mortal, occasionally a flyer although it

does not for one moment think, it floats in whichever direction one wants. One holds the power to do anything. Arguably, there is no synonymy whatsoever between happiness and the freedom to do anything, tangent or cotangent! Maybe out of a mere error the sublime appears as cognitive unpleasantries. If we analyse the state of- by mediating the cultural and the civilisatory nebula, or simply, associatively, through the interiorised judgement, we sadly discover that they rather represent a constant construct of aspirations and "fashionable" advertisements, illusions scattered to humanities with a precise purpose, the normal one, ultimately, resulted from the idea of taming in a sublime and irrefutable way the free will. Individual caprices. The idea is not at all absurd, though controversial.

The illusion that happy is the one who has the freedom to do anything that denotes immaturity, even though the respective gets to even control knowledge, remaining as a still or oscillatory picture, which anchors itself in post-nietzschean emotional poverty, regardless of the wealth associated, by which one pretends to find oneself in the area. These are impressions scattered ahead of sense by daily habit in order to be associated. "*I have got, but I am not!*". The opposite does not assume the lack of conventional free will, the way in which it is not represented by the marking sadness or the religiously or contextually fanatical solitude. Because of these, the simple, the poor in spirit but not ostracized finds oneself rather in the state of-.

2.2. Satiety is translated by instincts, nothing more

In the analyses made on account of this affectivity concealed ideas are stated, like: in the conditions in which it is not found through free will, it can be implied (1) in the affective intentionality, (2) materialisation through rationalisation in the will, or (3) imperative. They all find their buds in genetics. Consequently, what some propose is almost trivial: serotonin, the hormone of instinctual satisfaction, baptized by those who sell dreams "of happiness". Yet, happiness is a cultural construct, we are not born knowing what it means, similar is the feeling of love, we are not born knowing love, we learn them culturally and civilisatory conjunctural. However, psychologists and neurologists contradict us. Instinct. Ineism. Nothing extra. Predestination. Hilarious.

"*Give me happiness!*" represents the universal request of the humanities that are or no longer are ontically. "*Give me a penny!*" The less you

request, the more you are perceived as a detestable and disagreeable beggar, worthy of pity, awakening repulsion. "Give me a salary!" If you make a claim on individual retributed rights, you get to be an employee in the public or private domain, mixed and gradual. And if you are able to occupy the time of those who accept to conjecturally be led you become an entrepreneur, pre or billionaire. The first are confused, the second are ignored, the third oscillate and the last are envied and desperate not to fall from the rank that they hold and do not acknowledge that they continually beg, similarly to the first, but more hysterically and more determined: "Give me a part of your life!" became more significant than "I exist!". Conditionings and relationships become more important than the individual disinterested activities. They describe the whole and keep uncertainties and freedom under control.

Why does the free will represent an apparently fundamental¹⁵ reason which is used when it is associated with the state of- happiness? Is it because humanities want to be semi or full deities? Possibly. Such a hypothesis is not easily accepted. It is obvious. However, this is how maximised happiness at the elementary level is presented, yet these conditioned by different false contexts to renege such a perspective. Freedom transposed in the power to do anything, symbolised by the language of "doing anything you like!".

Humanity cannot be defined in its essence otherwise than an apparently rational and obedient flock, in any other contexts can anarchy and lack of predictability, of social security arise. Maybe these are the causes that often the state of- was portrayed to us, as smoke in the wind which a while ago relied on the past life which can no longer exist as it should be novel, different form the communitary. It is simpler and more concrete to ask for something "give me!", tangible, money, food, than abstract, happiness, love, affective harmony. Ultimately, the "absurd" feeling, almost unreal, the state of- is also perceived as a natural, a "rather" utopic state of mind, not exactly material, but yet pragmatic to which the individual heads and which he/she avidly seeks, though, it would be the case to exist in reality with all the internal intensive specific abstractisations. All things we may think of are paradoxes, contradictions. Finally, in some cases they represent

15 Regis Roman, *Fundamentele limbajului*, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Argonaut, 2009, pp. 17 și urm.

an aspiration barely fulfilled and funded on the past, and in others a quota of the absurd heights, only refers to the uncertain future, potent towards anything. Being too abstract, it awakens negative reactions, sarcasm and the belittling through the variant in which it is thrown from one side to the other in order to get out of uncertainty and simultaneous desertion, namely we encounter it with falsehood in possession and money, although the majority of those who do not have enough financing or properties, deem that it is found exactly there, and the others, the opposed envy the first. The current society.

2.3. Meeting the physiological needs means precedence.

The subsequent states remain secondary

The absurd of materiality generates satisfaction, non-happiness and that is because happiness is a matter of the spirit, not of satiety, regardless of the level pre or post maslowian. Full stop. Sometimes they are confused because it is an intentional process, seeking assumes the obsessive illusion. I want to have "everything!" The thing or the process, the symbiosis which does not exist. After the disappearance of the barter, coins became the most efficient manipulating means by which the individual behaviour was censored, anchored and conducted. Today and yesterday. No money, no fun! Simplified: No money, no honey! Honey. Family. Birdies. Homes. Purses. Etc. Personal plane, rare edition brands or other post-art gadgets.

Ultimately, happiness is reduced to a glass of water half full and empty, simultaneously, denoting positive or pessimistic approaches depending on the pursued intentionality. Insufficient. There is always an urge for more in order to be in the state of-. There follow other days, on top of those that have already ended well or lamely. Therefore, maybe the alternative is not an elementary, simple process, simplistic, but simply selfish. It is possible that happiness does not depend on money, nor on the good state of spiritual being. It is connected to something else. Somehow, altruistically not necessarily also true. Plain and simple or a complex barely intelligible.

2.4. Nostalgia are imaginary losses or obvious overevaluations

At the level of sensations, happiness as a state of- is associated and with an elementary aroma lost in memoirs, memories, remaining obsolete due to this and envious of the trivial present. The expression: "it smells of hap-

piness!" has an initiatic fundament or reported to a distant, primary ego. However, it does not represent an ineist gesture, but rather it allows regret and the nostalgia of something lost to be felt as general contextualisation. Whoever ends up decoding the last negativist characterisation becomes, essentially, capable of understanding the elementary main meanings of the one who states the historical remodelling, they end up relating to oneself with a dosis of falsity. However, it is indeed hard that a third differentiates between Ego and alter-, since the customary and daily directives transpose it in egological idolatry and imputable exterminators: "*I want! To be happy!*" Similar to thirstily asking for a glass of water, but being satiate as a result of other kinds of food there arises the craving as well as the impossibility to swallow anything.

2.5. Happiness, the safest perverse ideologisation among notions: mass-media, ideology and the finances build both

We cannot evolve unless together! The decision-makers and the rest of the population depend on a sort of odd cohabitation: the vampire which gets to feed itself with phantoms. Any leap towards nowhere is a common good and hides what does not explicitly but isolatedly shows, by dictatorial communist imposed forms, which are little represented by collectivites. The liberal are natural, similar with the relation between vampire and phantoms!

Postmystically and neoreligiously polite terms were invented, but efficient at the level of subsistence or of the nuanced control: doctrines, ideologies, political nuances translated through republic, democracy, consistent and coherences sacredness (post)religious which have, as foundation, the disadvantageous exchanges necessary for the counterbalance of phenomenal tolerance absurdly imposed. Listen, believe, do not revolt at all. Do! What it is indicated.

I believe that, one day, we shall deserve not to have governments, states Jorge Luis Borges, elementarily. And the decalogue of an American linguist, N. Chomsky, immediately belittled in (pseudo)academic circles: crazy thinker! We do not comment upon the reactions, but we analyse the mechanisms of social manipulation which show the efficiency of levers implied by the average mass-media for submission with or without the knowledge of humanities, levers which can be discovered simply without having access to hidden information, but which are noticeable by semantic analysis in connection

with the related decisions taken by the factors in power in tandem cause-effect. Governments cannot disappear! What would a world without parasites be like? Insufficient. Immature. Improper?

Allientation seen through the apparent mirror. Rather than the fist punch in your mouth or the bullet in your nape, far more efficient in the purpose of submission of populations was the assumed acceptance of the present-absent forces in the false image of certain representations symbolically framed. And at the end we find the word which was not only present at the beginning of humankind. The case is not for us to wonder too much about the last judgement. If ideologies did not appear, we would have remained in the same premedieval conditions which appealed to the real force gilded by cynical doses full of false denigratory mysteries – some are more superior than others: between absolutist monarchies and dictatorships, the rich and the poor, apparently positively nuanced oligarchies the possibility of choosing a slightest evil, namely the force of representative ideas, even if these are distorted.

Ultimately we are the less free, the more is the critical apparatus reduced to a rudimentary, vegetative state, and the imposition by strict force is deemed to failure or succumbed due to the extermination of at least a part of the mob. The decision-makers cannot be happy, never, many thinkers, writers understood this processuality, as the first remain too preoccupied with the personal image which anchors itself on individual hidden fear. Similarly, cumulated respect is illusory, but the self set in the foreground regardless of the contextual interval in which it is placed: from democrats to dictators it becomes a false self besotted with the idea that the one in power is not loved, adored, venerated, although it legislates for oneself, versatile for others. Therefore, freedom is commensurate with the fear of decision-makers, the greater this is, the greater the conditioning, and viceversa.

3. Conclusions

In this article we have indicated a few cultural-civilisational approaches of the term happiness to show that neither in literature, nor in the approaches of the sciences which did not understand the symbols of the terms of happiness that is not merely reduced to the societal material, financial or relational carpe diem. It does not suppose the idea of hidden free will, the power to do almost anything. The meanings of the notion of happiness can

rather be discovered through the association with the idea of beauty.

Being a superior feeling to be felt, happiness also needs the educational cultural-civilisational valencies to be felt. It is not reduced to mere heredity or hormones of the nervous system unless it is not at all understood what it symbolises and the subsequent deformation of the simple symbols is sought. Due to these, causes represent more than the internal effects, than materiality and external possessions, conditions which can be instantly understood through the fundamental buddhist analyses, hard or almost impossible to follow.

However, the waivering of dissatisfaction and the exterior cannot be complete, there must be something remained there in the connection and what is left must make reference to an aesthetic moment – purely and simply selfless beauty.

Bibliography:

- Ariew, R., *Ockham's Razor, A Historical and Philosophical Analysis of Ockham's Principle of Parsimony*, 1976.
- Aristotel, *Politica*, București, Editura Semne Artemis, 2009, 1254b16–21.
- Bartels, M., „Genetics of wellbeing and its components satisfaction with life, happiness, and quality of life: A review and meta-analysis of heritability studies”, *Behavior Genetics*, 2015, 45(2), 137-156.
- Blake, W., *Cărțile profetice Vala, sau cei patru Zoa*, Iași, Editura Institutul European, 2006.
- Box, M. A., *Arta Suasivă a lui David Hume*, Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 1990.
- Heidegger, M., *Originea operei de artă*, București, Editura Humanitas, 2001.
- Coward, Harold G., *Perfectibility of Human Nature in Eastern and Western Thought*, The. SUNY Press, 2012.
- Robbins, A., *Putere nemărginită*, București, Editura Act și Politon, 2017.
- Platon, *Republica*, în *Opere*, vol.V, București, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1986, cartea VII.
- Roman, R., *Fundamentele limbajului*, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Argonaut, 2009.
- Russ, J., *Istoria filosofiei*, vol.I – Gândirile fondatoare, București, Editura Univers Enciclopedic, 2000.
- Tatarkiewicz, W., *Istoria esteticii*, vol.1, București, Editura Meridiane, 1978.