

Who is the Happy Warrior

When most people are asked about their good experiences, they often talk about happiness. Martha Nussbaum, in her article "Who is the Happy Warrior? Philosophy Poses Questions to Psychology," presents ideas about why happiness is too complex to be defined concretely.

According to the author, pleasure is a feeling experienced while doing specific things. She also offers the notion that happiness is a state of being and not an emotion that people should hope to attain due to self-reflection. In her article, Nussbaum poses different questions to psychologists and counters their beliefs on happiness by integrating her ideas that Wordsworth's poem.

Nussbaum wants to pose conceptual and normative questions to psychology to correct some misunderstandings within the literature of psychology. Certainly, Nussbaum presents a nuanced and good picture of different theories of satisfaction and happiness in philosophy. In her article, the philosopher knows what she is talking about when it comes to philosophy in psychology. She draws a restrictive line between happiness and pleasure, along with an introduction to different perspectives from psychologists who have tried to define happiness. The author poses the questions to indicate why the psychologists are wrong from their perspectives. Her thoughts are majorly aligned with those of Plato, Aristotle, and other ancient Greek philosophers.

Nussbaum thinks that some psychologists might have got wrong while interpreting some philosophical issues. According to the author, most psychologists ask questions concerning



Daniel Villalon

This is not quite true. She just thinks that psychologists have an overly simple view of happiness.



Daniel Villalon

You should not talk about the author's background.

pleasure and the hedonic state of subjects. Furthermore, they rarely some apparent questions that substantially impact research programs that involve the concept. Nussbaum is majorly offended by positive psychology's "conceptual breeziness" and articulates that it is always highly reductive of a subtle and nuanced human concern area. For the author, it is not possible to decrease the idea of happiness to a single one-dimensional metric to suit the quantitative cognitive research calculations, which are the butter and bread of positive psychology.

Martin Seligman argued that people should always minimize bad feelings emotions and promote good feeling emotions. The psychologist's diagnosis of American society is that it is too unhappy and anxious, and his remedy is putting happiness as the main focus in the development of public policy. Nussbaum thinks that Seligman's perceptions and thoughts are not correct. According to the author, the positive and negative emotions from the perspective of ancient Greeks are tightly coupled. If people value things exposed to chance contingencies, it is not possible to experience both fear and hope at the same time. People who value political actions loved ones, and friends are likely to get exposed to painful emotions, especially when they become subjects to bad behavior or bad luck. Painful emotions are critical in people's evaluations of what matters to them, and they can spur them into action to defend what they value.

Nussbaum also counters most perceptions of psychologists concerning happiness. What concerns the author is the broader idea of eudaimonia rather than happiness. She articulates that emotions need to be based on true beliefs to be positive, according to Greek philosophy. For instance, if an individual experiences hope, the emotion will only be useful if it is grounded on practical assessments of true beliefs concerning what may happen and what they wish for. A positive feeling with lower value often demeans the experience. Furthermore, individuals



Daniel Villalon

You should explain why Nussbaum makes this point i.e. what is she trying to show with it?



Daniel Villalon

This part of Nussbaum's paper is separate from her discussion of happiness.

trivialize what has happened by looking on the bright side of tragic circumstances. Most negative emotions are entirely valuable and appropriate. Unlike positive psychology, ancient philosophers develop a highly subtle and nuanced understanding of the term happiness.

Wordsworth's "Happy Warrior" is relevant to this since it offers an alternative concept of happiness. According to Nussbaum, Wordsworth's character shows an Aristotelian view on happiness, which counters the notion of happiness with pleasure. Wordsworth's poem represents a more extended and older tradition concerning happiness derived from the Greek though regarding eudaimonia. This tradition is expressed most fully in Nicomachean ethics, which articulates that happiness is a way of life that is comprehensive and lively of everything that has inherent worth. According to Aristotle, pleasure and happiness are not identical.

In most cases, pleasure accompanies the unimpeded activities performance that constitutes happiness. Wordsworth relied on this conception when he questioned how the demeanor and character of the happy Warrior would be in different areas of life. The most crucial thing concerning the happy Warrior he possesses characteristics that provide him the capabilities of engaging in many activities in his life in the right way. He is also kind, moderate, loving, courageous, and a good friend who is more concerned about the community. He is also honest, a character that was most valued by Aristotle. The Happy Warrior's life is happy since he is rich and full even though he sometimes experiences loss and pain.

Wordsworth is a critical interlocutor to this perspective since it enables people to see the Aristotelian conception of happiness was prevailing until it was dislodged by Bentham's influence. Bentham's oversimplification Wordsworth was powerful to answer a question that Wordsworth perceived as askable altogether. Wordsworth takes five to eight lines trying to answer the question of what happiness is. He relies on the idea that pleasure is not identical to

Daniel Villalon

This is not related (at least directly) to Nussbaum's view of happiness. You should stick with a single issue and explore it in detail.

happiness but often go together with the unhindered presentation of activities constituting to happiness. This is evident when he asks what the demeanor and character of a happy warrior would be. He also agrees with Socratic tradition, which articulates that the law of a happy warrior is reasons. The happy Warrior depends on that law and strives to become more skillful in self-knowledge.

I agree with Nussbaum's critique for several reasons. The ancient Greeks were not wrong when they formulated their beliefs concerning what happiness means. Most of them had logical reasons behind their articulations. Furthermore, I agree with Nussbaum since her perceptions of pleasure, satisfaction, and happiness are similar to what most people agree with. I think that happiness is usually understood in the enlightenment sense as a series of repeated pleasures. It is a feeling one has about life. Pleasure, on the other hand, is activity across a lifetime. It is something that one does. The most fundamental difference is that Aristotle thought purposes and functions were built into nature. There was not a radical break between nature and human beings. The value was not something that people subjectively imposed on the world willy-nilly. Thus, happiness is something experienced throughout life. It was an activity, a skill that centrally involved using people's reason by virtue.

On the other hand, pleasure is not a feeling, but it also was not a stoical rejection of feelings. A virtuous person acquires a disposition to bear the appropriate feeling towards the right kinds of actions. Feelings, emotions, and reasons are aligned. The contrast between modern and Aristotelian conceptions is captured by the idea that Aristotle considered that what happened after a person's death could be relevant to whether that person lived well. "Happiness" is not a momentary snapshot or a subjective state of feel-good; it is successful in the activities one



Daniel Villalon

This is very vague and doesn't help to develop any particular point.



Daniel Villalon

It's not clear how Aristotle's views on purpose are related to his views on happiness. If you are going to draw a connection between them then you need to fully explain it. However, it is also n [...]

engaged in throughout life. Thus, Nussbaum is correct when she argues that happiness and pleasure are not identical.