

Guidebook for

THE LOGIC OF HAPPINESS

A JOURNAL OF ONE FATEFUL SUMMER

SHARON KAYE, Ph.D.

with contributions from Jennifer Ault

Royal Fireworks Press
UNIONVILLE, NEW YORK



Copyright © 2023
Royal Fireworks Online Learning, Inc.
All Rights Reserved.

Royal Fireworks Press
P.O. Box 399
41 First Avenue
Unionville, NY 10988-0399
(845) 726-4444
fax: (845) 726-3824
email: mail@rfwp.com
website: rfwp.com



ISBN: 978-1-63856-129-3

Publisher: Dr. T.M. Kemnitz
Editor: Jennifer Ault
Book and Cover Designer: Kerri Ann Ruhl

Printed and bound in Unionville, New York,
at the Royal Fireworks facility. 29au23

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	3
Glossary of Logic Concepts.....	6
I. Siddhartha Gautama (The Buddha), <i>The Nobel Search</i> , sixth century B.C.E. Happiness is escape from the five senses.....	9
II. Lao Tzu, <i>Tao Te Ching</i> , sixth century B.C.E. Happiness is going with the flow of nature.....	15
III. Plato, <i>Philebus</i> , c. 428-c. 348 B.C.E. Happiness is being good.	25
IV. Aristotle, <i>Nicomachean Ethics</i> , c. 350 B.C.E. Happiness is thinking about noble things.	33
V. Epicurus, <i>Letter to Menoeceus</i> , c. 300 B.C.E. Happiness is simple pleasures.....	42
VI. Marcus Aurelius, <i>Meditations</i> , c. 167 A.D. Happiness is fulfilling our nature.....	50
VII. Thomas Aquinas, <i>Summa Theologica</i> , c. 1270 Happiness is uniting with God.....	59
VIII. David Hume, <i>The Sceptic</i> , 1777 Happiness is relative to each individual.....	68
IX. John Stuart Mill, <i>Utilitarianism</i> , 1863 Happiness is a balance of excitement and tranquility.....	77
X. Charles Darwin, <i>The Descent of Man</i> , 1871 Happiness is the satisfaction of social instincts.....	86

INTRODUCTION

The word *logic* is used loosely in our society. If you ask me why I brought my umbrella, and I say that I brought it because it's raining, you might say, "That's logical."

Having an umbrella for rain is *sensible*. We might even call it *practical* or *agreeable*. But it has little to do with logic, in the classical sense. Classically, logic is the study of *inference*. The logician's job is to determine what we can infer from a given set of facts, opinions, and principles.

For example, suppose I give you this fact:

1. It is raining.

And this opinion:

2. My umbrella is the best way to avoid getting wet in the rain.

And this principle:

3. One should always try to avoid getting wet in the rain.

Then I would be entitled to conclude that:

4. Therefore, I should bring my umbrella.

That is a logical inference.

From this small example, it is evident that there is a lot more to being logical than just being sensible, practical, or agreeable. Being logical means having good reasons for your view. Reasons take the form of facts, opinions, and principles. In the above example, step one is a fact, step two is an opinion, step three is a principle, and step four is a conclusion. When you line up a set of facts, opinions, and/or principles to support your conclusion, you have an argument.

Facts, opinions, and principles are, of course, controversial. For example, someone might claim that it is not actually raining (against step one). Someone else might deny that my umbrella is the best way to avoid getting wet in the rain (against step two). And someone else might disagree that one should always try to avoid getting wet in the rain (against step three).

So even with a logical inference, there is plenty of room for debate. This is to say that logic alone is never going to settle a controversial issue. And yet logic is the crucial first step in approaching any controversial issue.

Suppose I give you the following argument:

1. It is raining.
2. My raincoat is uncomfortable.

3. One should always try to avoid being uncomfortable.
4. Therefore, I should bring my umbrella.

That is not a logical inference. Steps one through three may be perfectly true, yet they are not enough to support the conclusion. There is no point in us discussing the issue any further until I supply a better set of reasons. For instance, I could replace step two with two steps:

2. Getting wet in the rain is uncomfortable.
- 2.5 My umbrella is the best way to avoid getting wet in the rain.

The opinion that my raincoat is uncomfortable may help to explain why I think my umbrella is the best way to avoid getting wet in the rain. But on the other hand, carrying an umbrella might be equally uncomfortable or even more uncomfortable than wearing a raincoat. We have to settle that issue before we can come to a logical conclusion.

Being logical is a matter of solving a problem through a series of steps in order. If you skip steps and try to jump to the end, your solution will be precarious—easily blown over by the slightest challenge. So it's worth taking time to learn how to be logical (or rather, how to be more logical than you already are by nature).

There are plenty of logic textbooks out there, but they typically run into two problems, at opposite ends of the spectrum. Some are too abstract, turning logic into math. For example, the following sequence represents a logical inference:

1. R
2. $R \rightarrow W$
3. $W \rightarrow U$
4. $\neg U$
5. $\neg R$

However, in order to understand this sequence, you would need to learn what the symbols mean. And even then, symbols can't capture all of the content of natural language, such as the *should* in our argument about rain. When you learn logic in the abstract, it becomes difficult to apply it to real life.

Other logic textbooks are too concrete, turning logic into media studies. There are plenty of examples of good and bad logic all over the internet. Politicians and advertisers regularly make arguments to try to influence your choices. For example, a fast-food restaurant might claim: "Either you're eating our hamburgers, or you're settling for second-best." Logicians consider this a "false dilemma" because there are other options, and no reason has been given for eliminating them. However, examples from the internet are generally superficial and uninteresting. Ultimately, who cares about hamburgers?

For centuries, philosophers have been using logic to answer questions about human existence. *Who am I? Why am I here? What should I do with my life?* Logic helps us answer deep and interesting philosophical questions like these.

This guidebook tackles the philosophical question “What is happiness?” Its goal is to show how ten of history’s greatest thinkers answered this question, thereby applying logic to a real-life problem that is neither too abstract nor too concrete.

Each chapter of this book goes with a section of the accompanying novel. While the novel can be instructive and enjoyed on its own, this guidebook presents selections from works written by the ten thinkers discussed in the novel. These selections help to explain each author’s philosophy of what happiness is and how to achieve it. The ten thinkers are presented in ten chapters, each focused on two to six successive chapters of the novel.

Each guidebook chapter begins with a list of the logic concepts that are particularly relevant to the featured selection. Next is the reading itself, followed by a set of questions that highlight some of the logic concepts in the selection using the terms from the list. These start out simply enough, but they get increasingly difficult as you progress through the guidebook. The idea is that, as you become familiar with the logic terms and concepts, you will build your understanding of them and can apply them in more complex ways. The logic questions are followed by discussion questions that explore the author’s concept of happiness and the best way to achieve it. After the discussion questions is a debate topic that relates directly to the author’s argument as it was presented in the novel. Debate is a fun way to bring out the facts, opinions, and principles at stake in an issue. And finally, each chapter ends with a riddle or two; the riddles are also from the novel. If you read ahead in the novel, you will find the answers, but you should allow yourself the opportunity to try to solve them on your own. A riddle typically plays on multiple meanings of words, making them a fun way for logicians to show why it’s so important for us to be clear about what we mean.

There is also a glossary of all of the logic concepts you’ll encounter in this book. Rather than hiding it in the back, as in most books, this one is right up front. That way you can read over the concepts you’ll be learning before you run into them in the guidebook chapters.

Enjoy these selections. Each of them contains many rare and valuable ideas to keep—and much to reject, as well. The best part is deciding for yourself which is which.

A Note about the Selections: The selections in this book are the authors’ original words or widely accepted translations of them. Some of them are challenging to read. You may need to read them more than once to understand what the writers are saying. However, even if you do not fully understand a reading, the logic and discussion questions and the debate topic that follow it provide enough contextual information to allow you to comprehend the important points within it, prompting you to think deeply about ideas you may not otherwise have considered, engage in meaningful discussions and thoughtful debates about them, and take an active part in the process of learning.

GLOSSARY OF LOGIC CONCEPTS

analogy: a comparison to show that one thing is like something else in some way

- **false analogy:** saying that two things are alike in other ways just because they are alike in one way

argument: a set of reasons attempting to prove a conclusion right or wrong

conclusion: the statement that an argument is trying to prove

contradiction: a statement that conflicts either with itself or with another statement

credibility: the quality of an argument that is logically sound and well-supported with evidence and reasoning

deductive validity: when the reasons of an argument logically imply its conclusion

descriptive claim: a claim about how you think something is or is not

fallacy: a mistake in reasoning

- **ad hominem fallacy:** insulting your opponent instead of refuting the opponent's argument
- **ad ignorantium fallacy:** also known as the appeal to ignorance fallacy; claiming that a statement must be true because there is insufficient evidence or no evidence against it
- **ad metum fallacy:** using fear to persuade others to accept a concept
- **ad populum fallacy:** saying that something is good or true because the majority think so
- **ad verecundiam fallacy:** saying that something is true because an authority said so
- **circular reasoning fallacy:** when the end of an argument comes back to the beginning without having proven itself
- **fallacy of composition:** assuming that what is true for each individual part of a whole is true for the whole as well
- **fallacy of division:** assuming that what is true for the whole is true for each of the individual parts as well
- **false dilemma:** also known as the either/or fallacy; misrepresenting an issue by offering only two options when more exist or by presenting the options as mutually exclusive when they are not

- **hasty generalization fallacy:** making a claim based on insufficient evidence
- ***post hoc ergo propter hoc* fallacy:** (Latin for “after this, because of this”) when one event is said to be the cause of a later event simply because it occurred earlier
- **slippery slope fallacy:** claiming that an event or action will trigger a series of other events and lead to an extreme or undesirable outcome
- **straw man fallacy:** attempting to prove an argument by overstating, exaggerating, or over-simplifying the arguments of the opposing side

inference: a logical connection

leading question: a question that is phrased in such a way as to get a specific answer

metaphor: a figure of speech that refers to one thing as something else to imply a likeness

modus ponens: a standard form following this pattern:

1. If P, then Q
2. P
3. Therefore, Q

When a conditional statement (“If P, then Q”) is accepted, and the antecedent (P) is true, then the consequent (Q) must be true.

modus tollens: a standard form following this pattern:

1. If P, then Q
2. Not Q
3. Therefore, not P

When a conditional statement (“If P, then Q”) is accepted, and the consequent (Q) is false, then the antecedent (P) must be false.

non sequitur: a statement or conclusion that has no logical connection to the previous statement or the argument

objection: an argument against the given argument

paradox: an apparent contradiction that can be resolved

premise: a step leading to the conclusion of an argument

- **false premise:** when an argument is based on a premise that is incorrect

prescriptive claim: a claim about how you think something should or should not be

principle: a general rule, maxim, or guide

rhetoric: words used to persuade, regardless of whether or not they are true

- **rhetorical question:** a question asked in order to make a point rather than to get an answer

standard form: the format of a logic argument that is presented in numbered steps

syllogism: a three-step standard form argument about all, some, or none of a group

- **disjunctive syllogism:** a standard form following this pattern:

1. P or Q
2. Not Q
3. Therefore, P

If there are two possibilities, and one is ruled out, then the other must be true.

- **faulty syllogism:** when the statements used to prove a point simply aren't true
- **hypothetical syllogism:** also known as chain reasoning; a standard form following this pattern:

1. If P, then Q
2. If Q, then R
3. Therefore, P = R

When a conditional statement ("If P, then Q") is accepted, and the consequent (Q) is also the antecedent in another conditional statement ("If Q, then R"), then the antecedent of the first statement (P) is equal to the consequent of the second statement (R). This shows the rule of logic that links reasons transitively.

thought experiment: imagining a situation to test an idea

I. THE LOGIC OF HAPPINESS

PROLOGUE-CHAPTER 5

Important logic concepts in this section

argument: a set of reasons attempting to prove a conclusion right or wrong

premise: a step leading to the conclusion of an argument

conclusion: the statement that an argument is trying to prove

analogy: a comparison to show that one thing is like something else in some way

false analogy: saying that two things are alike in other ways just because they are alike in one way

metaphor: a figure of speech that refers to one thing as something else to imply a likeness

credibility: the quality of an argument that is logically sound and well-supported with evidence and reasoning

SIDDHARTHA GAUTAMA (THE BUDDHA),
THE NOBLE SEARCH, SIXTH CENTURY B.C.E.

