

Blessed Be: *What is Happiness, and How Should We Pursue It?*

Chapter 9 from Jay W. Richards, *Machines Will Not Replace You: How to Thrive in the Future of American Work* (New York: Crown, 2018).

The American Dream has always been about the prospect of a happy life for everyday people. We all want to be happy, yet we know that happiness should not be taken for granted. Thomas Jefferson would not have bothered to write in the Declaration of Independence that man has the right to “the pursuit of happiness” if such a pursuit were guaranteed everywhere. And in fact, at the time, his words were literally revolutionary—and took more than a century for them to be applied to all Americans. Still, to judge by the millions who have left their native homes to come here over the last two and half centuries, Jefferson’s words must resonate.

What is this pursuit of happiness? And is it a good thing? One British writer, Ruth Whippman, moved to California a few years ago when her husband got a job with a software startup. After several months, she concluded that Americans, unlike Britons, are obsessed with happiness—and *it’s making us miserable*.

Yankees, to say nothing of Californians, are always suckers for the next big happiness gimmick—meditation, crystals, yoga, self-help books, mindfulness exercises, empowerment, keeping a “gratitude journal,” attending weekend seminars with names like “Unleash the Power Within.” And yet, to judge by studies, Americans don’t seem, on balance, much happier now than we were in the 1972, when the studies began.

If you spend too much time thinking about your happiness, it can backfire and make you anxious instead. There are even a couple of studies by Cal Berkeley psychologists that suggest as much. “The higher the respondents rated happiness as a distinct personal

ambition,” Whippman explains, describing the studies, “the less happy they were in their lives generally and the more likely they were to experience symptoms of dissatisfaction and even depression.”¹

In 2016, she wrote a book about this American problem of seeking happiness, called *America the Anxious: how Our Pursuit of Happiness Is Creating a Nation of Nervous Wrecks*.² Millions of Americans *are* anxious—about jobs, prosperity, and health. Much of this may be left over from the 2008 financial crisis, rather than a clear assessment of historical norms, but it’s real nonetheless. For the first time in history, most Americans expect their children to be worse off than they are.³

Whippman also has a point about the pursuit of happiness itself. To obsess on one’s happiness doesn’t seem like a good plan. But notice that Thomas Jefferson never commended *that*. The Declaration of Independence doesn’t even mention a right to happiness. It’s a right to the *pursuit* of happiness the American Founders hoped to guarantee. It doesn’t follow that the best way to do that is to focus on happiness itself.

Indeed, that’s never been what the American Dream meant. That Dream has always been wrapped up in the idea that there’s something worthwhile in pursuing, in striving, in earning something you could be proud of. That’s the fruit of hard work and virtue, not weekend seminars on How to Release Your Inner Happy Clown.

So, let’s step back and tie some threads together. If the American Dream is about the pursuit of happiness, and if it takes certain virtues to achieve the Dream, what do those virtues have to do with happiness? Is it just that the virtues get us to the proverbial pot of gold? Surely there’s more to it than that.

These questions take us into deeper waters. We talk about how best to pursue happiness, and we are constantly evaluating whether we're happy with the circumstances of our own lives. But what *is* happiness in the first place? What does it mean to pursue it? And as we've just seen, happiness may not be best achieved by aiming for it, but by aiming for something else, one of whose fruits is happiness.

Economist and happiness expert Arthur Brooks notes that the word *happiness* is used for three distinct ideas: "fleeting feelings of happiness," "happiness on balance," and a "moral quality of life."⁴ We've all experienced the passing sensation of joy or pleasure—maybe when we see a sunrise or win an award or fall in love. But transient surges of joy do not happiness make.

Happiness on balance, Brooks explains, is "the emotional balance sheet we keep that allows us to tell honestly whether we are living, all things considered, a happy life." It is a life with "more joy than sorrow in it."⁵ This is what surveys and studies on happiness try to capture. It's the self-perception people have of whether they are happy overall. When we say we "just want to be happy," or tell our children we want them to be happy, we probably mean something like this.

"What these surveys capture is something like 'contentedness,'" Brooks told me at a recent dinner meeting. Let's call this "psychological happiness."

Our long-term psychological state is part of the story of happiness, but there's more to it. Here is where the third definition of happiness comes in: "a moral quality of life." This refers to the ancient and classical definition of happiness. It's what the ancient Greek philosopher Aristotle called *Eudaimonia*, literally "good spirit." For Aristotle, *Eudaimonia* is

“an activity of the soul expressing virtue.” The happy life, for him and others, is the virtuous life.

This meaning has mostly dropped out of our modern treatment of happiness. That may be because we imagine that one could live a life of both virtue and misery. We might admire a person like St. Teresa of Avila, who was virtuous and holy but suffered pain and illness her entire life. We would not wish such a life for our children.⁶

In any case, virtue-plus-misery is not what Aristotle had in mind. The Stoics, the Buddha, and Socrates commended a life of detachment as a way to endure what might otherwise cause suffering. But *Eudaimonia* for Aristotle is a package deal. It includes virtue (*arête*), health, prosperity, a good reputation, and the other goods we hope for ourselves and our children. As Aristotle says in his *Nicomachean Ethics*, “He is happy who lives in accordance with complete virtue and is sufficiently equipped with external goods, not for some chance period but throughout a complete life.”⁷ Virtue is necessary for a happy life, but it’s not sufficient.

No need to do a deep dive into ancient Greek thought. The main point is that true happiness is more than a state of mind. It’s not just having more pleasant than unpleasant experiences day to day. Many of the characters in Aldous Huxley’s *Brave New World* enjoy life. They are free from want, have lots of sex, and take a pill, Soma, that keeps them all nice and chipper. But for all that, *Brave New World* is known as a dystopian novel every bit as much as George Orwell’s *1984*. Huxley’s book disturbed my older daughter far more than Orwell’s did, perhaps because so many of its prophecies have come true.

But what if we could create our own illusions? Would we be happy? The play *The Nether* by Jennifer Haley depicts a future in which the Internet has evolved into vast virtual

realms. Men and women live and play out their darkest fantasies in an imaginary world of their own making. This includes a region called The Hideaway where pedophiles can enjoy what would get them locked up in the real world. (Sounds more like a prediction than science fiction, right?) Does all that sound like happiness? That queasiness in your stomach is your sense that such a future is not one we should wish for our enemies, let alone our children.

Our gut tells us that true happiness should be rooted in goodness and reality, not evil and illusion. No loving mother would tell her son who likes to torture small animals or spend 15 hours a day playing *World of Warcraft*: “Oh well, whatever makes you happy.” On the contrary, most parents are like me. “It’s better to be a person dissatisfied than a pig satisfied,” I tell my daughters when they try to weasel out of some short-term drudgery. “Better to be Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied.”

What does this have to do with the American Dream? Everything. The same Thomas Jefferson who inscribed “the pursuit of happiness” in the *Declaration* said elsewhere that “happiness is the aim of life, but virtue is the foundation of happiness.” We could quote any number of the Founders to make the same point. Here’s one other representative sample. “There is no truth more thoroughly established,” said George Washington in his First Inaugural Address,

than that there exists in the economy and course of nature, an indissoluble union between virtue and happiness, between duty and advantage, between the genuine maxims of an honest and magnanimous policy, and the solid rewards of public prosperity and felicity: Since we ought to be no less persuaded that the propitious smiles of Heaven, can never be expected on a nation that disregards the eternal rules of order and right, which Heaven itself has ordained.⁸

In other words, don't expect true happiness and divine blessing if you ignore right and wrong. If you want to be happy, pursue virtue that will allow you to create and share value with and for others.

Again, happiness includes the creature comforts we all associate with it. Abraham Maslow's "hierarchy of needs" captures the idea nicely. We must eat, drink, stay warm, sleep, and feel safe—these form the base of Maslow's pyramid. But we're more than cattle or house pets. We're "rational animals" (to quote Aristotle again): We are rational and moral beings. To really flourish, we need friendships, a sense of accomplishment, and fulfillment—the needs that come at the top of the pyramid. And no one gets from the base to the top without virtue.

Can Happiness Be Measured?

Of course, neither Aristotle's philosophy nor Maslow's pyramid was based on scientific research. Can we measure happiness? At first blush, it doesn't seem the sort of thing you could weigh or count. In 1972, Jigme Singye Wangchuck, the young "Dragon King" of the tiny agrarian country of Bhutan in the Himalayas, was told that his kingdom needed to implement political and economic reforms to lift its citizens out of poverty. Rather than take the advice of outside meddlers, though, he instituted a "Gross National Happiness" Index (GNH). "The GNH," the official website explains, "is a much richer objective than GDP or economic growth. In GNH, material well-being is important but it is also important to enjoy sufficient well-being in things like community, culture, governance, knowledge and wisdom, health, spirituality and psychological welfare, a balanced use of time, and harmony with the environment."⁹

King Wangchuck had a point. Isn't it shallow to measure how much money households take in, but ignore their spiritual wellbeing? Isn't it better to be wise than rich? To live at peace with the birds and the trees, than to destroy them to build parking lots and smoke stacks that can be counted in the GDP?

Well, yes. But a skeptic might argue that it was in the king's interest to take the focus off the dismal failure of his kingdom to improve the material well-being of his subjects and aim it on things much harder to measure. In 1972 Bhutan's GNP per capita was an abysmal \$212 (in current dollars).¹⁰ If I were the king of a country whose subjects made less than a dollar a day, I too would want to focus on "wisdom" and "balanced use of time" rather than per capita income.

I would also want to skew the index toward the outcome I favored. A simple, well-defined 1 to 10 scale would be a bit too revealing. Instead, I would use a fuzzy scale with four choices: "deeply happy," "extensively happy," "narrowly happy," and "unhappy." Guess which scale Bhutan uses? Yep, that one. Is it any surprise that most people end up "happy" with this taxonomy? In 2015, 91.2 percent of the population was reported to be deeply, extensively, or narrowly happy.

Alas, the UN liked the Bhutanese approach so much that in 2011 the General Assembly unanimously adopted "happiness" as part of its global agenda. It even aimed to "empower the Kingdom of Bhutan to convene a high-level meeting on happiness" at that year's General Assembly.¹¹ The UN hailed the tiny kingdom as a country that others could emulate. Would you be surprised to learn that, per the UN, "sustainable development" (read: high taxes, population control, and government control of the economy) is now

deemed vital to achieve Bhutanese levels of national elation? Every year since then, the UN has issued an annual World Happiness Report.¹²

Here's the reality. Bhutan remains one of the poorest countries on the planet. In 2014, its GNP per capita was \$2,390.¹³ It ranks 115th on the 2015 Index of Economic Freedom.¹⁴ In the last twenty years or so, 100,000 people in the country of only three-quarters of a million were stripped of their citizenship and consigned to UN refugee camps. (One wonders whether anyone asked them if they were "deeply happy.") Since 2007, many have been relocated to other countries, though thousands remain.¹⁵ In other words, Bhutan is one of the last places that other countries would want to imitate.

Such mischief feeds my skepticism about surveys that try to measure true happiness. "Not everything that can be counted counts," Einstein observed, "and not everything that counts can be counted." Still, if they're not over-hyped, such surveys can tell us something about psychological happiness. After all, the good ones are based on self-reports. Surely people have some sense of how happy they are.

Culture clearly plays a role. Though it ignores the role of heredity in psychological happiness,¹⁶ the UN report found a strong correlation between political culture and happiness—especially at the extremes. Free and prosperous countries with low levels of corruption show up much higher than unfree, poor, and corrupt ones. Is anyone surprised that Denmark, Switzerland, Canada, the US, Luxembourg, and Austria—despite their less sunny northern latitudes—are near the top, while Rwanda, Afghanistan, Syria, and Burundi are at the bottom? The fact that people risk their lives to get into the countries at the top, and to escape from the ones at the bottom, speaks volumes.

When we turn to surveys on (psychological) happiness *within* the US, we can have even more confidence. We now have decades of consistent research on the subject from the General Social Survey conducted by the University of Chicago. Based on this data, Arthur Brooks boils down the predictors of happiness to three: “genes, events, and values.”¹⁷

Just as some people start with more than their fair share of kindness, some people have a higher happiness baseline than others. Studies with identical twins conducted by University of Minnesota psychologists between 1936 and 1955 suggest that we inherit as much as 48 percent of our happiness from our parents.¹⁸ You read that right: Almost half of our psychological happiness could be hard-wired. Depressing.

Then, too, Brooks’ other two predictors of happiness—“events and values”—include some things beyond our control, such as the details of our birth and upbringing. Even among the events over which we have control, some—such as winning a game or buying a new car—are like simple carbs. They give us only short bursts of happiness and then recede into the background.

What remaining factors best predict long-term psychological happiness? Faith, family, friends, and work. Of course, it’s tough to untangle cause and effect. Does faith make us happier, or is it that happy people tend to have faith? Hard to say. As a statistical matter, though, if you’re married and attend worship at least once a week, you’re much more likely to be happy than if you’re single and secular.¹⁹ This fits the over seventy-five-year study of male Harvard graduates—the longest ever—which shows that high quality, long-term social ties are the key predictor of both emotional and physical well-being.²⁰

The final ingredient that Brooks mentions—work—stands out from the rest. We’re not used to thinking of our labor as a *source* of happiness, beyond the fact that it allows us

to make money. Income may not buy happiness, but income and happiness do correlate at lower income levels. At the very bottom of the income ladder, unemployment stinks.

“Abstracted from money,” notes Brooks, “joblessness seems to increase the rates of divorce and suicide, and the severity of disease.”²¹ If you look at a US map of unemployment distributions, you’ll also be looking at a map of disability claims. Some of that is due to on-the-job injuries. Some is due to fraud. But some could be the outcome of a vicious circle: Long term unemployment takes a toll on the body, and then a broken body makes it hard, or unpleasant, to find work.²² Remember that the next time you talk to someone on long-term disability.

Note that this misery is not due to utter destitution: The jobless receive Supplemental Security Income and other government assistance. And yes, some of them prefer this state, choosing the short-term pleasures of sloth to the long-term happiness that a productive job could provide.²³ Still, long-term joblessness in general leads to distress, not joy.

Among the employed, monetary wealth and emotional well-being cluster together up to about \$75,000 in annual income.²⁴ In other words, more money tracks with more happiness. But after a person reaches the upper middle class, growth in income begins to matter less and less.²⁵ In fact, once people reach that threshold, money is more likely to bring happiness if it’s given away. That’s right, charitable giving—government extraction doesn’t count—brings happiness not just to grateful recipients, but to donors.²⁶

So why do so many wealthy Americans work so hard? If more money adds less and less happiness after we hit the upper middle class, why don’t we all start to take longer vacations when we reach that level? Maybe it takes a long time to figure out that money

doesn't buy happiness. But there's a more interesting reason: the value of work itself. Most economists treat work as a cost, a "bad"—as something we do only because we must. They assume that people will trade idleness for work if they can get away with it.

According to the evidence, though, that's way too simple. Happy people don't work mainly for money—even if that's part of the story. They derive satisfaction from meaningful work, from what Brooks calls "earned success." That can be true even for those who work by necessity:

Franklin D. Roosevelt had it right: "Happiness lies not in the mere possession of money; it lies in the joy of achievement, in the thrill of creative effort."

In other words, the secret to happiness through work is earned success.

This is not conjecture; it is driven by the data. Americans who feel they are successful at work are twice as likely to say they are very happy overall as people who don't feel that way. And these differences persist after controlling for income and other demographics.

You can measure your earned success in any currency you choose. You can count it in dollars, sure—or in kids taught to read, habitats protected or souls saved. When I taught graduate students, I noticed that social entrepreneurs who pursued nonprofit careers were some of my happiest graduates. They made less money than many of their classmates, but were no less certain that they were earning their success. They defined that success in nonmonetary terms and delighted in it.

If you can discern your own project and discover the true currency you value, you'll be earning your success. You will have found the secret to happiness through your work.²⁷

This is great news. It means work, done right and in its proper place, need not sap your happiness but can add to it.

The happy life is the "well-lived life." It's a fulfilled life that includes physical, emotional, and spiritual flourishing. It's a life that enjoys and creates value, a life of meaning.

The American Founders, remember, didn't promise happiness. They promised the right to pursue it. Newt Gingrich likes to point out that the *Declaration* contains an active

verb: “Not happiness stamps; not a department of happiness; not therapy for happiness. Pursuit.”²⁸ The government, if it does its job, makes the dream possible. But since happiness is the fruit of a virtuous life, it can’t be guaranteed. Virtue can only be freely pursued through struggle and hard work. In pursuing virtue, we work to overcome our weak will (*akrasia* in Aristotle), the penchant to pursue short-term pleasure such as idleness over real, long-term, happiness.

Done right, the pursuit of happiness sets up a virtuous circle of virtue, so to speak. Here’s how it works. Some of your happiness is beyond your control. It’s rooted in your genes or happenstance. If you’re in the US, however, count yourself lucky. Despite its flaws, our country is still freer and wealthier than most places on earth. On top of that, modern technology offers us countless ways to create and share value. The remainder—the path of virtue—is up to you. You may be tempted to live on the dole or in your parents’ basement. You might think the instant pleasure of marching to your own drummer—like Dustin Hoffman’s character Benjamin Braddock in *The Graduate*—will add up to happiness. But that way lies despair and a loss of meaning—as Braddock found before the summer was over.

If, in contrast, you work to get outside of yourself, if you seek ways to create value with and for others, you are likely to succeed at some point, especially if you treat your failures as lessons rather than excuses to give up. These actions call for short-term effort and sacrifice. But they will contribute to your true, long-term happiness—not only by allowing you to flourish, but to flourish with and for others.

Do you have your basic needs met? If so, good. That’s vital for happiness, not to mention mere survival. But it’s not the whole recipe. For true happiness, we also need to

meet the needs of others. We need to add value. And to do this well our new economy demands that we nurture key virtues. These virtues just happen to be the ones most likely to make us happy. The American Dream, then, is not a fool's errand or a Faustian bargain. As we saw in the stories of people like Brad Morgan and Danielle Tate, we need not sell our souls or our neighbors' silver to get ahead. If we work to create value with and for others, we can not only pursue but compound our happiness—together.

¹ Ruth Whippman, America is obsessed with happiness—and it's making us miserable," *Vox* (Dec. 22, 2016), at: <https://www.vox.com/first-person/2016/10/4/13093380/happiness-america-ruth-whippman>.

² Ruth Whippman, *America the Anxious: How Our Pursuit of Happiness is Creating a Nation of Nervous Wrecks* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2016).

³ In the recent poll of ten nations by the Legatum Institute, "What the World Thinks of Capitalism" (November 3, 2015), at: <https://social.shorthand.com/montie/3C6iES9yjf/what-the-world-thinks-of-capitalism>.

⁴ Arthur C. Brooks, *Gross National Happiness: Why Happiness Matters for America—and How We Can Get More of It* (New York: Basic Books, 2008), p. 4.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁶ Saints often experience a supernatural form of happiness even in suffering that transcends ordinary experience, but here we're just talking about the happiness of ordinary, natural life.

⁷ *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1101a10.

⁸ George Washington, First Inaugural Address, April 30, 1789 (Fitzpatrick 30:294)

⁹ See the official website at: <http://www.grossnationalhappiness.com/>.

¹⁰ See table at: <http://macroeconomics.kushnirs.org/index.php>.

¹¹ Timothy W. Ryback, "The U.N. Happiness Project," *The New York Times* (March 28, 2012), at: <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/29/opinion/the-un-happiness-project.html>.

¹² Some of variables used by the UN have less to do with reported happiness than with the political preferences of UN honchoes. For instance, "GDP per capita," "health life expectancy" and "freedom to make life choices" are among the variables used to explain the scores, but so is something called "social support." Moreover, the fact that the report doesn't even try to take account of the massive hereditary component of psychological happiness is enough justification to sit loosely on it, especially when it is used for political purposes.

¹³ From the World Bank data for Bhutan, at: <http://data.worldbank.org/country/bhutan>. The World Bank uses "GNI" (for Gross National Income) rather than "GNP."

¹⁴ 2015 Index of Economic Freedom, "Bhutan," at: <http://www.heritage.org/index/country/bhutan>.

¹⁵ Deepesh Das Shrestha, "Resettlement of Bhutanese refugees surpasses 100,000 mark," *UNHCR* (Nov. 19, 2015), at: <http://www.unhcr.org/en-us/news/latest/2015/11/564dded46/resettlement-bhutanese-refugees-surpasses-100000-mark.html>.

¹⁶ Heredity seems especially relevant with comparisons between countries with diverse ethnic makeups. A 2014 study looked at the "average genetic makeup of people" in 141 countries, "and compared how similar their genes were to people living in Denmark—a measure called genetic distance." The scientists controlled for factors such as GDP, since rich countries also tend to be happy countries. The result?

They found that the greater a nation's genetic distance from Denmark, the lower the reported well-being of that nation. Countries near Denmark, like the Netherlands and Sweden, ranked among the happiest. Given their close proximity, these countries are some of the most genetically similar to Denmark. Countries that ranked particularly low on the happiness scale, like Ghana and Madagascar, have the least genetic similarity to Denmark.

Kelly Dickerson, "Is There a Happiness Gene?" *LiveScience* (July 18, 2014), at:

<http://www.livescience.com/46877-denmark-happiness-genetics.html>. The paper is Eugenio Proto and Andrew J. Oswald, "National Happiness and Genetic Distance: A Cautious Exploration," *IZA (Institute for the Study of Labor) Discussion Paper No. 8300* (July 2014), at: <http://ftp.iza.org/dp8300.pdf>.

¹⁷ Arthur Brooks, "A Formula for Happiness," *The New York Times* (Dec. 14, 2013), at: <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/12/15/opinion/sunday/a-formula-for-happiness.html>.

¹⁸ Brooks, *Gross National Happiness*, pp. 10-11. He is reporting on David Lykken and Auke Tellegen, "Happiness Is a Stochastic Phenomenon," *Psychological Science* 7, no. 3 (1996).

¹⁹ In brief and on average, women are happier than men, conservatives are happier than liberals, the married are happier than singles, and the actively religious much happier than secularists. "It turns out that conservative women are particularly blissful: about 40 percent say they are very happy. That makes them slightly happier than conservative men and significantly happier than liberal women. The unhappiest are liberal men, only about one-fifth of whom consider themselves very happy." Married, conservative religious women hit the jackpot—again, on average. Arthur Brooks, *The Conservative Heart* (New York: Broadside Books, 2015), p. 27. If they exercise regularly, that's even better. Emily E. Berstin & Richard J. McNally, "Acute aerobic exercise helps overcome emotion regulation deficits," *Cognition and Emotion* (April 4, 2016), at:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/02699931.2016.1168284>. Happiness and health correlates most highly with *social connections*. Severe loneliness kills people. See the TED lecture by Robert Waldinger (Jan. 25, 2016), at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8KkKuTCFvzl>.

²⁰ The current director of the study is Harvard psychiatrist Robert Waldinger. Colby Itkowitch, "Harvard researchers discovered the one thing everyone needs for happier, healthier lives," *The Washington Post* (March 2, 2016), at: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/inspired-life/wp/2016/03/02/harvard-researchers-discovered-the-one-thing-everyone-needs-for-happier-healthier-lives/>.

²¹ Brooks, "A Formula for Happiness."

²² Brendan Greeley, "Mapping the Growth of Disability Claims in America," *BloombergBusinessweek* (Dec. 16, 2016) at: <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/features/2016-12-16/mapping-the-growth-of-disability-claims-in-america>.

²³ This, of course, doesn't go for every unemployed person, and we shouldn't rush to judgment about the long-term unemployed person we happen across. Life happens. Sometimes a person gets dealt a string of strangely bad hands through no fault of his own.

But the opposite impulse is no solution either. If you rush to assume that every person suffering from long-term unemployment is a helpless victim, you have consigned him or her to the status of a child. That isn't a classy move either. The right response is simply to face up to the messy complexity of long-term unemployment and resist pat simplifications. We can do all this and still look for clues in our effort to understand the art of happiness.

²⁴ Daniel Kahneman and Angus Deaton, "High income improves evaluation of life but not emotional well-being," *PNAS* 107, no. 38 (Aug. 4, 2010), at: <http://www.pnas.org/content/107/38/16489>.

²⁵ Brooks, *Gross National Happiness*, p. 114.

²⁶ Ibid., pp. 175-192. If you've followed the details, you might already have guessed that religious conservatives give more money to charity than liberals. Arthur Brooks, *Who Really Cares: The Surprising Truth About Compassionate Conservative Conservatism* (New York Basic Books, 2006).

²⁷ Brooks, "A Formula for Happiness." This commentary is a summary of the findings in his book *Gross National Happiness*.

²⁸ In Pete DuPont, "Pursue Happiness, Vote GOP," *Wall Street Journal* (Nov. 29, 2004); quoted in Brooks, *Gross National Happiness*, p. 32.