



Available online at <http://jess.esrae.ru/>

“Journal of Economics and Social Sciences”



Philosophical Concepts of Social Well-being.

Tomsk Polytechnic University

Strekovtsova E. A.^a

^a Institute of Humanities, Social Sciences and Technologies, Tomsk Polytechnic University

Abstract

The topic of the prepared work is relevant, as social well-being derives from the existing contradiction between the subjects of social development (society, group, personality) and the objective attitudes of these social groups oriented to the formation of life strategies reflecting different levels of social well-being in the conditions of modern world instability. The article deals with the concepts of well-being and everything that is philosophically useful for a person. The question is revealed, what true well-being, which is of great importance in moral philosophy, is especially in the case of utilitarianism, according to which well-being should be maximized. In modern ethics three standard but different welfare theories are singled out: the hedonism theory, desire theory and objective list theory. However, they still have some issues for studying. According to the opinion known as welfarism, well-being is the only value.

Keywords: Well-being, society, happiness, health, philosophy, morality, life;

1. Introduction.

Basically, the term «well-being» is most commonly used for health conditions description. For example, a surgical clinic can be given the name «Well-Being Clinic». The philosophical use of this term is much broader, although interconnected, but it reduces itself down to the notion of how well a person's life goes. Well-being is what «good for» a human is. Thus, health can be an integral part of human well-being, but this is not all that influences on a person's well-being. One of the notions of this term is «self-interest», that is, personal interests are something that is in the interests of the person himself, and not of other people [3].

2. Discussion.

The philosophical use of the term also covers «negative» aspects. Therefore, we can talk about the well-being of the one who is in the most terrible agony – his/her well-being is negative. The same words can be said about closely interrelated terms such as «welfare», which covers how a person lives as a whole, good or bad, or «happiness», which can be understood, as it was, for example, for a classical utilitarian, Jeremy Bentham, – the balance between good and bad things in a human life [5]. But it is necessary to pay attention that philosophers also use these terms in a more standard «positive» sense, speaking of «bad life», «misfortune» or «bad attitude», in order to capture negative aspects of people's lives.

«Happiness» is often used in everyday life to refer to a short-lived human condition, often a sense of satisfaction: «Today you look happy», «I'm very happy for you». Philosophically, its scope is broader, encompassing all life. Moreover, in philosophy you can talk about the happiness of a person's life or about a happy life, even if this person is often unhappy. The fact is that some good things in his life make him happy, although he does not have enough satisfaction. Such use is unusual and can cause confusion.

Over the past few decades, the so-called «positive psychology» has significantly increased the attention paid by psychologists, philosophers and other scientists to the concept of «happiness». Such happiness is usually understood as satisfaction or «satisfaction of life», and is measured by means such as self-reports or daily surveys. Is positive psychology a *weal*? Up to now, the conceptual differences are not clear enough within the discipline.

But it is fair to say that many of those who participate, both researchers and subjects, believe that a person's life goes well when a person is satisfied with it, that is, a hedonistic record of well-being is true. Some positive psychologists, however, explicitly reject hedonistic theories, preferring Aristotelian or eudemonistic stories about well-being, which are a version of the welfare theory discussed below. For example, Martin Seligman, the leader in this field, suggested that positive psychology, and not only happiness, should refer to positive emotions, involvement, attitudes and achievements.

When discussing the concept of what makes life useful to a person living this life, it is preferable to use the term «well-being» instead of «happiness». Since we want to resolve the conceptual space for the possibility that, for example, plant life can be "safe" for this plant. However, we can not discuss the happiness of the plant. An alternative here may be «prosperity», although this could be taken for shifting the analysis of people's welfare in the direction of some kind of natural teleology [7].

Sometimes it is argued that some ancient ethical theories, for example, Aristotle's, lead to the collapse of the notion of well-being. According to Aristotle, if you are my friend, then my well-being is closely connected to yours. Then it may be tempting to say that «your» well-being is a «part» of mine, and in this case there is no difference between what is good for me and what is good for others. This temptation must be resisted. Your well-being concerns you, and how well your life goes on, and we can allow my well-being to depend on yours, without introducing a vague idea that my well-being consists exclusively of yours. In Aristotle's thoughts there are signs of expanding the term welfare. A friend is an «other self», so that which benefits my friend also benefits me [4].

But this should be taken either as a metaphorical expression of the dependence claim, or as an identity requirement that does not threaten the notion of well-being. If you are really the same person as I am, then, of course, what is good for you will be good for me, as there is no longer a metaphysically significant difference between you and me [2].

Well-being is a kind of value, sometimes called «prudential value», which differs from aesthetic and moral values and is consistent with the notion of «good for» [1]. For example, the serenity of Vermeer's painting is a kind of kindness, but it's not «good» for the picture. It may be useful for us to contemplate such serenity, but contemplation of serenity is not the same as serenity itself. Similarly, my money for the development of charity can have moral value, that is, to be morally good. Moreover, the consequences of my donation can be good for others. The question remains whether charity is good for me.

Ancient ethics in a sense was more concerned with well-being than with ethics; the central question for many ancient philosophers of morality was the question: «What kind of life is better for one person? ». Largely, the rationality of egoism was assumed – the view that my strongest

reason is always to promote my own well-being. This caused a problem. Morality, of course, refers to the interests of other people. After all, if selfishness is correct, then why should I be moral?

One obvious strategy that should be adopted in defense of morality is to argue that a person's well-being consists of his/her virtue. This strategy was adopted in many ways by the greatest ancient philosophers, Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. In his writings, Plato seems to admit the rationality of moral self-sacrifice in the «Cave myth». Analogy with the state – morals are required to refrain from contemplating the sun outside the cave and again to descend into the cave to control their fellow citizens. However, in the writings of Aristotle there are no recommendations to sacrifice. Aristotle believed that he could defend a virtuous choice in the interests of the individual. However, he should not be described as an egoist in a strong sense – as a person who believes that our only reason for action is based on our own well-being. For him, a virtue is someone who promotes the good of others, and promotes his/her own good. Thus, Aristotle could well admit that the well-being of others can induce into action. Only if this never contradicts my own individual well-being.

Aristotle's main argument is his notorious and perfectionist «function argument», according to which the good for a certain being should be identified through attention to his characteristic activity. The characteristic activity of people is to manifest the mind, and the good is to manage the mind well in accordance with virtues. This argument, which is very briefly formulated by Aristotle, is based on assumptions from other sources of his philosophy and, in particular, Plato's, and unites two ideas about what is good for a person, and what is morally good. The mind requires someone to promote one's good, and that good can consist, for example, of pleasure, power, or honor [6]. Nevertheless, most of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* describes the portraits of the life of the virtues that provide independent support for the assertion that well-being consists of virtue. In particular, Aristotle draws attention to the value of «nobility» for a man, a quasi-aesthetic value that people who are sensitive to such qualities cannot but consider as a component of welfare more than any other. In this respect, the good of virtues, in the Kant's sense, is «unconditional». Nevertheless, for Aristotle, virtue or the notion of «good» is not only morally correct but also correct for every person.

Well-being is most commonly used in philosophy to describe what is non-instrumentally or ultimately good for a person. The question what well-being consists of is an independent interest, but it is of great importance in moral philosophy, especially in the case of utilitarianism, according to which well-being should be maximized.

Significant challenges to the very notion have been studied by Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, G.E. Moore and T.M. Scanlon. It has become standard to distinguish theories of well-being as either hedonism theory, objective list theory or desire theory. According to the view known as welfarism, well-being is the only value. Also important in ethics is the question of how a person's moral character and actions relate to their well-being.

3. Conclusion.

Many of the great philosophers have attempted to answer the question: What makes people happy? World religions, such as Christianity and others have attempted to explain what makes people happy and how to live a happy life through faith, the belief in God. The philosophy of Buddhism preaches to its followers how to live a peaceful and blissful life – which ultimately leads to «nirvana».

In recent years, psychology has developed a new field of study called positive psychology, which focuses on the science of happiness. Significant research has been conducted in this area, and many books have been written.

I concluded that the happy person is a young, well-educated, healthy, well-paid, optimistic, worry-free, religious person with high self-esteem, job morale, and modest aspirations, of either sex and of a wide range of intelligence.

References

1. North, H.F. (2008). *Temperance and the Canon of the Cardinal Virtues*. USA: University of Illinois at Chicago
2. Orwell, G. (1940). *Charles Dickens*. Great Britain: Inside the Whale and Other Essays.
3. Scott, B.K. (2015). *Social Daydreams Related to Well-Being?* USA: Scientific American.
4. Singer, P. (1999). *Practical Ethics*. USA: Princeton University, New Jersey.
5. Sumner, W. (2003). *Welfare, Happiness, and Ethics*. Great Britain: Oxford Clarendon Press.
6. Tuomi, J.R. (2014). *The Artist's Dilemma. A Philosophical Analysis of "Selling Out" and Its Impacts on Well-Being In the Music Industry*. USA: Claremont, California, United States Claremont Mckenna college.
7. Van, N., Bryan, W. (2004). *The Virtue of Righteousness in Mencius*. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.