

A Quantitative Philosophy of Happiness (QPH) based on some proposed happiness scores, a quantitative version of Pascal's wager and a model of collective approach of Divinity in the Christian definition

DOI: [10.13140/RG.2.2.26517.27367](https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.26517.27367)

Article version: **1.0 (13.10.2019)** (no matter this current paper version, its latest variant can be always downloaded from this [URL](#); version 1.0 first released on 13.10.2019)

Andrei-Lucian Drăgoi^{1,2}

(independent researcher)

For motivation of this Wikipedia-based paper format see [URL](#)

Motto: "[God:] Universe is nothing but a big copying machine, reproducing your thoughts [pure information] in physical form [energy/matter], that will be your experience [in classical linear time]" (Neale Donald Walsch in his „Conversations with God: An Uncommon Dialogue (Book 3)“^[3])

0. Abstract (with main abbreviations used in this paper)

This paper proposes a [quantitative philosophy of happiness \(QPH\)](#) based on some proposed [happiness scores](#) based on the “system of dreams” (SD) (concept) of each human person (HP) in part (based on a personal hierarchy of material and/or spiritual “dreams”/wishes), a quantitative version of [Pascal's wager](#) (PW) and a model of collective approach of [Divinity](#) in the [Christian](#) definition.

1. The 1st statement of this quantitative philosophy of happiness (QPH) and its three proposed happiness scores (HS)

[The philosophy of happiness](#) analyzes the existence, nature and attainment of [happiness](#) (HPN). As suggested by both its title and motto, this paper proposes a couple of statements (including some “HPN scores”) which define author's [quantitative philosophy of happiness](#) (QPH). **Important note.** In QPH, HPN concept is mainly defined as [life satisfaction](#), which is a key-part of [subjective](#)

[well-being](#): more specifically, QPH redefines HPN in its 1st statement (Stat1).

Essentially, QPH is (or can be regarded as) a specific subtype of [philosophy of life](#) (PL).

The redefinition of the [meaning of human life](#) (MHL) concept (proposed by QPH). QPH redefines MHL of a single [human person](#) (HP) as the (multi-hierarchical) system/network of “dreams” (SD) of each HP in part (with “dream” term being redefined as deep/intense and longstanding wish of that HP). Each “dream” in part (from this SD of each HP in part) is defined as a quantized life-target/goal which that specific HP strives to achieve. **Note.** MHL of HP communities/groups may also be the subject of QPH but it is (intentionally) NOT treated in this paper.

The redefinition of HP (proposed by QPH) as based on the previous redefinition of MHL. In the light of MHL redefinition (previously proposed by this QPH), each HP is redefined as a “hourglass”-like (but unitary!) duality/binome composed from a “potentiality” (POT) component (the SD of that HP) and an actuality (ACT) component (the achievements/already-attained-“dreams” of that HP in his/her mind-built classical linear time and region of [objective reality](#)). HP has the capacity to perpetually transform “dreams” (subcomponents of POT) in targeted achieved realities (subcomponents of ACT), but also to build other new “dreams” from the already achieved ones AND so on, cyclically, in a perpetual loop (with MHL being essentially identified with this loop). **Important note.** The terms of “actualization” and “potentialization” were also used by [Lupasco's](#) in his [Included Middle Logic](#) (IML) ^[URL2] [1,2,3], which is also the subject of some author's past papers [4,5,6,7].

1st stament (Stat1) of OPH. Explicitly, the MHL of each HP in part is to transform as many “dreams”/wishes as possible (from his/her SD, part of his/her POT) in reality, BUT also to build other new “dreams” (thus to “refresh” his/her POT) from those pre-achieved/actualized ones and so on (like cyclically turning up and down an hourglass when its upper half runs out of sand). It is also well-known that each dream in part of each HP in part needs a specific focalization of spiritual, mental and physical resources of that HP.

Stat1 proposes three distinct HPN scores which are, from the simplest to the more complex ones:

HPN score 1 (HS₁). HS₁ uses a 1D array of indexed boolean variables “D_k” (dream[s]) (with k>0 being a positive integer index of dreams), each with two possible values: 1 for an accomplished dream and 0 for a dream which hasn't become an objective reality yet. HS₁ takes a rational fractional value from 0 (minimum) to 1 (maximum). HS₁ is the ratio between the number of accomplished dreams over the total number of dreams (see next).

[1] Email: dr.dragoi@yahoo.com

[2] Main pages: www.dragoi.com; www.rg.dragoi.com;

www.academia.dragoi.com; www.vixra.dragoi.com; www.gsj.dragoi.com

[3] Walsch N.D. (2000). „Conversations with God: An Uncommon Dialogue (Book 3)“ (book). Chapter 1. (URL: nytimes.com/books/first/w/walsch-god3.html) (the passages marked between „[]” are my own explanatory and anticipative insertions)

$$HS_1 = \left(\sum_{k=1}^n D_k \right) / n$$

(with finite positive integer $n > 0$ being the total number of “conscious dreams” of each HP in part)

*

HPN score 2 (HS₂). HS₂ uses the same 1D array of indexed boolean variables “D_k” (dream[s]) (with $k > 0$ being a positive integer index of dreams), each with two possible values: 1 for an accomplished dream and 0 for a dream which hasn’t become an objective reality yet. Each dream (D_k) is additionally assigned a k-indexed “importance” (i) factor i_k (with values in the open interval

(0,1) with the property that $\sum_{k=1}^n i_k = 1$ (with finite positive

integer n being the total number of “conscious dreams” of each HP in part). HS₂ also takes a rational fractional value from 0 (minimum) to 1 (maximum) (see next).

$$HS_2 = \sum_{k=1}^n (i_k D_k) \quad \left(\text{with } \sum_{k=1}^n i_k = 1 \text{ and finite positive} \right)$$

integer $n > 0$ being the total number of “conscious dreams” of each HP in part)

*

HPN score 3 (HS₃). HS₃ uses an alternative 1D array of indexed variables “d_k” (the “degree” [d] of accomplishment of each dream in part, taking a variable value between 0% [minimum] and 100% [maximum]) (with $k > 0$ being a positive integer index of dreams). Each dream (D_k) is additionally assigned a k-indexed “importance” (i) factor i_k (with values in the open interval (0,1)

with the property that $\sum_{k=1}^n i_k = 1$ (with finite positive integer n

being the total number of “conscious dreams” of each HP in part). HS₃ also takes a rational fractional value from 0 (minimum) to 1 (maximum) (see next).

$$HS_3 = \sum_{k=1}^n (i_k d_k) \quad \left(\text{with } \sum_{k=1}^n i_k = 1 \text{ and finite positive} \right)$$

integer $n > 0$ being the total number of “conscious dreams” of each HP in part)

**

An important addition to the previous definition of a “dream” of any HP. The “dream” term is not only redefined by QPH as a deep/intense and longstanding wish of any HP but any potential rational and/or emotional states (specific intellectual states/pleasures, self-esteem, joy, inner peace, the feeling of self-safety/optimism, the feeling of being appreciated, loved, adored

etc) that can be “actualized” by that HP in his/her objective/subjective present reality.

*

A OPH-based interpretation of economy based on the “complete” redefinition of the dream term proposed by QPH.

The act of any HP buying any object (by any [economical](#) means and following any [economical rules/laws](#)) is interpreted by QPH in the sense that HP essentially/actually uses that bought object to actualize some potential rational and/or emotional states (also identified/defined as being part of that person’s system of dreams [SD]): specific intellectual states/pleasures, self-esteem, joy, inner peace, the feeling of self-safety/optimism, the feeling of being appreciated, loved, adored etc. All bought objects and the money used to buy them are only means (including pretexts) by which any HP strives for actualization of their “dreams” (in the full redefinition of the term proposed by QPH).

2. A quantification of Pascal’s wager proposed by QPH

[Pascal’s wager](#) (PW) is a philosophical argument (launched by the 17th-century French philosopher, mathematician and physicist, [Blaise Pascal](#)) positing that HPs “bet” with their lives that God (at least “[God](#)” in the [Christian definition of the term/concept](#): the “[Christian God](#)” [CG]) either exists or not: Pascal argues that a rational HP should live as though CG exists and seek to believe in CG BECAUSE:

- (1) If CG does not actually exist, such a person will have only a FINITE LOSS (some pleasures, luxury, etc.);
- (2) If CG actually exists, a HP not “betting” on CG may have an INFINITE LOSS (as represented by eternity in [Heaven](#), as defined by Christianity);

Important note. The original form of PW was set out in section 233 of Pascal’s posthumously published “[Pensées](#)” (“Thoughts”) (these previously unpublished notes were subsequently assembled to form an incomplete treatise on [Christian apologetics](#)): PW is only relatively original, because similar arguments were also previously proposed in [other religious traditions](#).

*

QPH proposes a quantification of the original PW “square box (see next table, with explanations).

Table 1. [Pascal’s wager](#) (PW) as applied, as originally intended, on the [Christian God](#) (CG) definition. The special case of an “arithmetic” scale of [happiness](#) (HPN): „0, 1, 2, 3”.

Definitions. „0” measures the „minimal HPN” (OR the „total unhappiness”, identified in [Christianity](#) with „[Hell](#)”) and „3” measures the „total/eternal HPN” (identified in [Christianity](#) with „[Heaven](#)”). „1” and „2” are stated to measure only „intermediary” HPN-levels between the first two states

„extremes” („0” and „3”). The „progression” from the „minimal HPN” (scored with „0”) to the „maximum HPN” (scored with „3”) is considered to be „arithmetical” in this special case (by adding the constant term „1”). 1=0+1, 2=1+1, 3=2+1)			
	CG exists (G)	CG doesn't exist (non-G)	Total
One “believe*” (B) in CG (B)	3	1 or 2	4(=3+1) OR 5(=3+2)
One doesn't “believe*” (B) in CG (non-B)	0	2 or 1	2(=0+2) OR 1(=0+1)
Total	3	3	
*the “believe” term is used here in its Christian meaning (defined as a high/profound level of correlation between “good” words and good acts in the Christian definition of “good”)			

Interpretation. From the previous table one may easily see that the total HPN score on the “faith” (“believe” [B]) table-line (maximally or almost-maximally valued “5” or “4”) is significantly higher (in obviously supraunitary ratio) THAN the total HPN score on the “unfaith”(“non-believe” [non-B]) table-line (minimally or almost-minimally valued “2” or “1”). Additionally, when applying this (empirical semi-quantitative) PW variant on a more accurate exponential (arbitrary) HPN scale (N^1, N^2, N^3, N^4) (as this is the case in the Christian faith, where “Heaven” is defined exponentially and even infinitely happier than life on Earth, not to consider a “life in the Christian Hell”), the ratio between the B and non-B table-line totals would be significantly larger than 1: $(N^3+N^1)/(N^2+N^0)>>1$ OR $(N^3+N^2)/(N^1+N^0)>>1$.

Checkpoint conclusion. The line of “faith” (“believing” in CG) can be thus regarded as “a highway of happiness” and this “quantized” interpretation of PW (proposed by QPH) may explain why atheists usually represent only a minority in various/all Christian communities (with atheist being usually baptized Christians but becoming “unfaithful” a variable time after their baptize).

3. A quantification of the optimal “speed” for any Christian to get “closer” to his/her Christian God (as proposed by QPH)

This section of QPH is based on a citing from [Abba Dorotheus of Gaza](#) (aka [from Greek] “Dorotheos tes Gazes”; 505 – 565 [or 620, 7th century AD]), a Christian [monk](#) and head ([abbot](#)) of monastery Abba Serid (or Abba Sveridus) (near [Gaza City](#)) who preached and taught under the influence of elders [Barsanuphius of Palestine/Gaza](#) and [John the Prophet](#) (abbot of the monastery of Merosala and teacher of [Abba Dorotheus of Gaza](#)). This citing is a vision of Abba Dorotheus extracted from the so-called [Bodmer papyri](#) ^[URL2], a collection of 22 very old Egyptian papyri containing segments from the [Old](#) and [New Testaments](#), early Christian literature, [Homer](#), and [Menander](#) (papyri now stored for the greatest part in [Bibliotheca Bodmeriana](#) in [Cologne, Switzerland](#) outside [Geneva](#)). This citing was also included in the five-volume collection called “[Philokalia](#)” (aka “The Love of the Good” which contain the writings of the mystics of the [Greek Orthodox Church](#) written between the 4th and 15th centuries). **Citing.** **“Imagine a circle, in the middle, its centre, and radii, or rays, going out of this centre. The further these radii travel from the centre, the more divergent and distant they become from one another; and the other way round, the closer they are to the centre, the nearer they approach one another. Imagine now that this circle is the world, the very middle of it, God, and the straight lines (radii) going out from the centre towards the circumference, or going from the circumference towards the centre are the paths of men's lives. And here also, the further the saints penetrate inside the circle towards the middle of it, desiring to approach God, the closer, according to the depth of this penetration, they come to God and to each other. . . . Understand similarly about going out from the centre. -The more they withdraw from God. . . the more, in the same measure, they withdraw from one another, and as much as they withdraw from one another, so much they withdraw from God.** Such also is the property of love: to the extent that we are withdrawn and do not love God, each of us is also far from his neighbour. But if we love God, then to the extent that we approach to God in our love of Him, we become united in love with our neighbours; and as much as we are united with out neighbours, so much we become united with God also” (Super-consciousness, p. 266; [Philokalia](#), vol. II, page 617 ^[URL1], ^[URL2]). This cite was also included at page 254 in the mystical book called “[Tertium Organum: The Third Canon of Thought a Key to the Enigmas of the World](#)” (1920) ^[URL2] by [Pyotr Demianovich Ouspenskii](#) ^[URL1], ^[URL2], ^[URL3-full pdf]. **Important note.** Ouspenskii made an interesting note at the bottom of the page 254/266, in reference to the above quote (with my bracketed inclusions and URLs): “The author of <<Super-conscious [and the Ways to Achieve It]>>, [M. V. Lodyzhensky](#), told me that in the summer of 1910 he was in [Yasnaya Polyana](#) on a visit to L. N. Tolstoy, and had a talk with him about mystics and the [Philokalia](#). At first Tolstoy took a very skeptical attitude to mysticism, but when M. V. Lodyzhensky read to him the quotation, given here,

from Avva Dorotheus, about the circle, Tolstoy became very enthusiastic, ran into another room and brought out a letter in which a triangle was drawn. It transpired that he had independently almost grasped the thought of Avva Dorotheus and was writing to someone that God was the apex of the triangle and men were points at the angles; coming closer to one another, they come nearer to God, and coming nearer to God they come closer to one another'. (Tertium Organum: The Third Canon of Thought a Key to the Enigmas of the World by P. D. Ouspenskii. (1920). p. 254/266 [URL](#))

A quantization of Dorotheus' circle model (DCM), as proposed by QPH. Based on the previous quotes, QPH proposes an additional quantization of this God-approaching (concomitant to HPs getting closer each other): more specifically, QPH observes that, IF two or more mobile points (MPs) (identified with two distinct HPs, from two or more circle's distinct radii[lives/destinies]) get closer to the center of the circle (identified with God) they get closer to each other ONLY WHEN approaching the center (God) with similar/comparable "speeds": if one chosen MP (identified with a HP approaching God) gets "too quickly" (when compared to the speed of the other MPs) near the center (God), that chosen MP may actually depart (and NOT actually get geometrically closer!) from other "more slow" MPs. That is why Christian priests/monks/saints (who are usually approaching God with "higher speeds") are usually advised by [The Bible](#) NOT to hurry (because they "may fall into the arrogance of being very close to God", much closer than others [others to whom they may alienate/estrangle]) and to constantly teach the others about God and his "profound eternal wisdom"; concomitantly, the Bible teaches the other "more slow God-approaching" HPs that they should constantly and carefully follow the Christian priests/monks/saints. **The strong speed correlation between the two main categories of MPs (the saint and the non-saint HPs) is regarded by QPH as an essential condition of this DCM so that the two main Christian God's "commands" ("Love [get closer and closer to] Me [God]!" AND "Love [get closer and closer to] each other!") to be fulfilled in the same time: in this DCM, it is obvious that HPs focusing on the Christian God only (without correlating the "speeds" of God-approach between them) will NOT necessarily bring those HPs closer to each other.**

4. The main conclusions of this paper

1) In a final conclusion, QPH offers some new (re)definitions and measuring tools which are potentially useful in understanding human persons (HPs), their concept of happiness (HPN) and Christian faith more deeply but also more practically, in an empirical semi-quantized manner.

5. References (partially integrated as Wikipedia URLs in the text)

- [1] [Nicolescu B. \(1999\)](#). "Le tiers inclus. De la physique quantique à l'ontologie", from the key-reference Bădescu Horia and Nicolescu Basarab (eds.) "Stéphane Lupasco. L'homme et l'œuvre" (compendium in French alias "Stéphane Lupasco -The Man and the Work"), Paris: Editions du Rocher ([URL](#))
- [2] [Nicolescu B. \(2001\)](#). "La transdisciplinarité. Manifeste". Paris: Éditions du Rocher, 1996; re-edited as "Manifesto of Transdisciplinarity", Albany: State University of New York Press ([URL1-book](#), [URL2-summary](#), [URL3-ResearchGate](#))
- [3] [Nicolescu B. \(2002\)](#). "Nous, la particule et le monde". Paris: Editions du Rocher ([URL1-book](#), [URL2-extract](#), [URL3-book-new edition](#))
- [4] [Andrei-Lucian Drăgoi \(February 2017\)](#). (BIDUM 3.2 full – Part A – 18 pages – last update on: 23.02.2017) **A Bio-Info-Digital Universe (toy-)Model – towards a transdisciplinary TOE centered on life phenomenon – Part A.** Research Gate preprint. DOI: [10.13140/RG.2.2.23869.26082](https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.23869.26082). [URL](#) (Research Gate source).
- [5] [Andrei-Lucian Drăgoi \(February 2017\)](#). (BIDUM 3.2 full – Part B – 20 pages – last update on: 23.02.2017) **A Bio-Info-Digital Universe (toy-)Model – towards a transdisciplinary TOE centered on life phenomenon – Part B.** Research Gate preprint. DOI: [10.13140/RG.2.2.35013.65760/1](https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.35013.65760/1). [URL](#) (Research Gate source).
- [6] [Andrei-Lucian Drăgoi \(August 2018\)](#). (IP-GP – version 1.0 – 15 pages – 14.08.2018) **On the intrinsic paradox of the geometric point definition (solved using the Included Middle Logic) as the main cause of Euclid's postulate "inaccuracy", allowing the existence not only of non-Euclidean geometries but also of a new "t-metamathematics" used to redefine the basics of General relativity, Quantum field theory, Superstring theories and M-theory.** Research Gate preprint. DOI: [10.13140/RG.2.2.32439.42405](https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.32439.42405). [URL](#) (Research Gate source).
- [7] [Andrei-Lucian Drăgoi \(September 2019\)](#). (mMM - Infinities - version 1.0 - 6 A4 pages - 29.09.2019) **On two proposed distinct types of imaginary (im) infinities ("imfinities") in mathematics and meta-mathematics (including meta-geometry), emphasizing the unlimited "diversity" of zero and infinity.** Research Gate preprint with DOI: [10.13140/RG.2.2.13231.48806](https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.13231.48806), [10.13140/RG.2.2.19149.38885](https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.19149.38885). [URL1a](#) (Research Gate main source), [URL1b](#) (Academia secondary source), [URL1c](#) (Vixra secondary source), [URL1d](#) (GSJ secondary source), [URL1e](#) (dragooi.com latest variant source).