



## EURYTHMY OF ETHICS AND HAPPINESS IN ENTREPRENEURSHIP

[10.29073/jer.v1i2.15](https://doi.org/10.29073/jer.v1i2.15)

**RECEIVED:** November 9, 2023.

**ACCEPTED:** November 29, 2023.

**PUBLISHED:** December 26, 2023.

**AUTHOR:** Carlos Costa Gomes , ESSNorteCVP, Portugal, [carlos.gomes@essnortecvp.pt](mailto:carlos.gomes@essnortecvp.pt).

### ABSTRACT

The essential objective of this article is to investigate the considerations about the concept of ethics and happiness. Ethics and Happiness are directly linked to the use of reason, insofar as happiness is the purpose of ethics." The unity of ethics and happiness is established through the concept of eurythmy. It alludes to fundamental values that do not need demonstration for a person to enjoy happiness. As happiness is the fair measure of the use of "reason and emotion," it is concluded that to achieve it ethically we must avoid fragile forms of happiness, since happiness aspires to an "intelligent heart" and not to an "intelligence without heart. The article consists of two parts; In the first, ethics and values are discussed, key elements for happiness, dialoguing with Aristotle, Daniel Serrão and Damásio, in the second, we enter into dialogue, in addition to the authors already mentioned, with Kant, about happiness and the fragile forms of happiness. It is concluded that happiness and ethics in Aristotle and Daniel Serrão converge and morality and happiness in Kant, despite being different from the first, is not necessarily contrary. Different from each other, there is a compatible eurythmy.

**KEYWORDS:** Ethics; Happiness; Morality; Values.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Ethics and happiness are two words that harmonize well with each other. However, what do we understand by ethics, and how do we attain happiness? Ethics allows for the consideration of personal and social values in the decision-making process, and it is this consideration that aims at happiness as the most desired good for human beings. This implies that to be happy, the relationship with others is essential. Therefore, personal ethics alone is not enough; it must be based on social ethics. Happiness requires the capacity for moderation. Deliberation and prudence are necessary in the actions and deeds we undertake. Deliberation in assessing the values present in a particular situation and prudence in choosing the correct action. Happiness is the supreme good that we all seek. In Aristotle, happiness is the sweetest part of life, and to live happily is to love what one loves because one who loves knows to whom and how to give their love. There is a eurythmy between the two terms. Therefore, ethics in Aristotle and in Daniel Serrão requires that we avoid "fragile forms of happiness" to achieve the highest form of freedom. Ethics is the purpose and reason for our happiness. In a brief dialogue with Kant, we perceive a certain ambiguity that distances morality from happiness. Happiness in Kant is not an end in itself, but the author appeals to the moral duty to be worthy of happiness.

### 2. ETHICS AND HAPPINESS IN PERFECT EURYTHMY

Ethics and happiness are two words that articulate in perfect eurythmy<sup>1</sup>. The congruence between them is emphasized by Aristotle: "Ethics and happiness are directly linked to the use of reason, as happiness is the purpose of ethics." We use the term "eurythmy" to affirm that ethics and happiness together form the just proportionality

---

<sup>1</sup> From the Greek *eurythmía*, "harmonious rhythm," through the Latin *eurythmía*-, "harmonia." Grande Dicionário Língua Portuguesa. Porto Editor, 2004.



between the parts of a whole, housing a harmonious rhythm, akin to a grand symphony, with humanity as the conductor. Thus, the human being is the architect of ethics and happiness. As an architect, the human being, as a person, has the ability to learn and grasp the “composition of eurythmy” that connects the melody (happiness) and the score (ethics) in a perfect symbiosis. The melody is in harmony with the score, and the score is related to the intensity of the melody.

In agreement with Aristotle, we assert that ethics and happiness go hand in hand in perfect eurythmy. However, in Kant, his moral doctrine seems to have no connection with the doctrine of happiness precisely because the latter is related to experience. One can only know what the concept of happiness contains through experience<sup>2</sup>.

Thus, for Kant, happiness cannot be the ultimate goal of the rational being, as, in his view, “it is far from being, for our reason, the perfect good. Reason does not approve of it (however much inclination may desire it).”<sup>3</sup> As Kant states in the Doctrine of Virtue, reinforcing his position, “what constitutes my end and, at the same time, my duty is not my happiness but maintaining the integrity of my morality.”<sup>4</sup>

In Kant’s perspective, there seems to be no annulment or rejection of happiness in his thought. It is not clear that this author denies that happiness is the end of every rational being, as Aristotle says, despite affirming, albeit ambiguously, the existence of a distinction between the principle of happiness and the principle of morality. In truth, this “distinction between happiness and morality is not opposition, as pure practical reason does not want one to renounce the claim to happiness but merely not to take it into consideration when talking about duty.”<sup>5</sup> In other words, if we want to speak of moral action, we do not necessarily speak of happiness since “the moral law promises no happiness.”<sup>6</sup>

The question we can pose is this: if, from Kant’s perspective, moral action does not promise happiness, then how do we become happy without the performance of morally good acts? Happiness in Kant plays a different role than in other positions, among which we can highlight the eudemonistic<sup>7</sup>. Morality in Kant is not about how we can be happy but about becoming worthy of happiness.

If, as the author says, morality is the ethical journey through which we can become worthy of happiness, then happiness in Kant also depends on morality. Without moral acts, there is no happiness. Therefore, happiness and morality in Kant enjoy a certain eurythmy, as to be worthy of happiness, we have the moral duty to be morally good.

---

<sup>2</sup> See: Silva, C. (2012). O conceito de felicidade na filosofia moral kantiana. Principais considerações. *Revista da Faculdade de Letras — Série de Filosofia*, 29(20), 119–131.

<sup>3</sup> Kant, E. (2001). *Crítica da razão pura* (M. P. dos Santos & A. F. Morujão). Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, p. 644.

<sup>4</sup> Kant, E. (2004). *Metafísica dos costumes — Parte II — Princípios da doutrina da virtude* (A. Morão, Trans). Edições 70, p. 23.

<sup>5</sup> Kant, E. (2001). *Crítica da razão prática*, op. cit., p. 108. See: Silva, C. (2012). O conceito de felicidade na filosofia moral kantiana. Principais considerações. *Revista da Faculdade de Letras — Série de Filosofia*, 29(20), 119–131. It is worth noting that it is precisely through this passage that John Silber criticizes Hegel’s position on Kant. According to Silber, Kant does not see an inevitable conflict between form and content in ethics. “If interpreted as a critic of Kant, Hegel is fundamentally wrong in insisting on the separation and radical opposition of sensibility and reason in the moral situation,” SILBER, John, “Procedural Formalism in Kant’s Ethics,” John, “Procedural Formalism in Kant’s Ethics,” *Review of Metaphysics*, vol. XXVIII, No. 2, 1974, p. 230. According to Silber, Hegel’s major mistake lies in the confusion between Kantian formalism and logical formalism. “The reason that is the test of the law is not logical reason but practical reason,” SILBER, «Procedural Formalism...», art. cit., p. 232.

<sup>6</sup> Kant, E. (2001). *Crítica da razão prática*, op. cit., p. 147.

<sup>7</sup> See: Silva, C. (2012). O conceito de felicidade na filosofia moral kantiana. Principais considerações. *Revista da Faculdade de Letras — Série de Filosofia*, 29(20), 119–131.



### 3. WHAT IS ETHICS?

According to Aristotle, in a simple definition, ethics seeks the realization of the good and the act as such. The person, endowed with reason, has the capacity to make choices, perceive their actions, and guide them toward the good, with the ultimate good being happiness. Thus, happiness is the purpose of human life.

For Daniel Serrão, ethics should be understood as a capacity or “category” of human reflective intelligence—the human brain from a neurobiological perspective—that allows humans to make decisions after weighing values, so that the actions to be taken aim at the good, i.e., happiness. For this author, happiness is an art, and it is the art of transforming perceptions into values that are affected and shaped by the rational capacity of reflective intelligence.

Damásio believes that ethics began as one of the earliest and most glorious creations of human intelligence, as manifested in simple human behaviors, social conventions, moral rules, the sense of justice, and basic laws<sup>8</sup>. Ethics, therefore, for this author, is a developing project that requires knowledge and rationality, creating wisdom that operates within a culture.

However, not less important, for Damásio, ethics has origins in automatic and genetically inherited phenomena that he calls emotions with their corresponding feelings. There is, therefore, a cultural molding requiring an emotional component of ethics, but he does not reduce ethics to emotions. Ethics, in his view, is a sociocultural modulation that requires the integrity of reflective intelligence and emotional intelligence.

In this archaeobiological perspective<sup>9</sup>, Daniel Serrão says that genetic and epigenetic information, as well as the cultural expressions presented by human beings, do not get lost in time because they do not replace each other but develop and expand. This means that when humans decided based on emotional evaluation, they did not yet know another type of evaluation, as in that distant time, there was only the perception and memorization of events as general episodes in which humans situated themselves and decided on simple behaviors, such as staying still or interacting, fleeing, or attacking.

However, when the evolution of the brain allows the intervention of the neocortex, the emotion “joy or sadness”<sup>10</sup> appears but is subjected to rational evaluation, richer and more complex the broader and more reflected the individual experience of living situations causing the emotion “joy.” The person’s decision is now enriched with evaluations of pleasant or unpleasant, favorable or unfavorable, good or bad. These evaluations, performed by the reflective capacity of rational intelligence, will transform the perception of emotion (emotional intelligence) into value. It is this transformation of perception into value that Daniel Serrão designates as ethics, the capacity of the human brain<sup>11</sup>.

Thus, according to Serrão’s thought, the human being is an ethical person when, in deciding personal behaviors, they weigh the values that have arisen from perceptions of their existence and whose meaning they have archived and memorized<sup>12</sup>.

---

<sup>8</sup> See: Damásio, A. (2007). Neuroscience and ethics: intersections. *The American Journal of Bioethics*, 7(1), 3–7.

<sup>9</sup> Serrão, D. (2014). Archeobiologia e Bioética: um encontro não conflituoso. In *Diálogo e tempo. Homenagem a Miguel Baptista Pereira* (Coord. Anselmo Borges). Fundação Eng. António de Almeida, 235–264.

<sup>10</sup> See: Joseph, D. (2003). *Synaptic Self*. Penguin Books.

<sup>11</sup> Serrão, D. (2014). Responsabilização ética. *Comunicação*. Faculdade de Direito de Lisboa, October 10.

<sup>12</sup> Serrão, D. (2014). Responsabilização ética. *Comunicação*. Faculdade de Direito de Lisboa, October 10.



### **3.1. WHAT ARE VALUES?**

Without resorting to extensive treatises on values, but not disregarding them, we align with Daniel Serrão when he states that value is a personal perception appreciated on the aesthetic, ethical, and rational planes. In other words, value arises from perception, from a life experience—from each individual's personal biography in their way of living and existing as a human being. That is, each human being is in the world, is part of the world, and constantly receives the world within themselves through the cerebral capacity—reflective intelligence. Perceptive, sensory, and perhaps even extrasensory activity is constantly providing us with knowledge of the world, introducing the world into us through the brain and that capacity of reflective intelligence. The treatment of this perception occurs at three levels: the aesthetic level, which tells us if the perception is pleasant or unpleasant; the ethical level, which evaluates if the perception is good or bad for us; the rational level, which decides if the perception has the form or content to be used by the logical quality of human thought.

Perception treated in this way is stored or memorized with a quality that will transform it into a value. Therefore, value is a personal perception appreciated on the aesthetic, ethical, and rational planes. In other words, as Daniel Serrão asserts, value arises from one or more life experiences.

Thus, throughout life, each of us relates to the world, to others, and in this relationship, we construct our personal and social universe of values. This intimate universe of our reflective intelligence is as rich and diversified as the richness of our relational life.

Constructed every day, this universe of values, fundamental for personal and social life, stored—like memories or gifts that are offered to us—allows each of us to use these values, after evaluation and consideration, to make decisions about ourselves, others, and society in general. By acting in this way, we are acting as ethical subjects. We are using the quality of reflective intelligence, as Aristotle described it, ethics, which allows, in the decision-making process, the weighing of personal and social values. This consideration also aims at happiness as the most desired good for human beings.

### **3.2. LIVING IN SOCIETY: NORMS OF SOCIAL BEHAVIOR**

We stated that our life is relational and social. This means that to be happy, the relationship with others is essential. Therefore, personal ethics alone is not enough; it is necessary to have a foundation of social ethics or public morality, understood as a set of norms of behavior for the members of a society in which the goal is not to establish individual ethics, but to establish values generated by social institutions as structuring and guarantors of “social cohesion” as a primary value. Thus, the values inscribed in the social ethics of a particular society or organization apply to all its members.

The generation of values, i.e., the foundation of norms of social behavior, can occur from all its members in a process of direct democracy that accepts the rule of the majority or emanate from powers established within societies, justified by the realization of the best good for all people. In the diversity of societies, from the oldest to the most current, there is a plurality of origins of power that creates an almost insurmountable difficulty in understanding the origin of the values of social ethics or public morality.

The theoretical reflection of a philosophical nature (which we omit) led to the concept of *prima facie* values in developed, stabilized, and peaceful societies. For those who defend this concept, there are values that impose themselves, are accepted, and do not need to be demonstrated or voted upon; these include dignity, autonomy, freedom, justice, and well-being or happiness. These universally accepted values constitute, collectively, ethics or ethicality or public morality. A society of free people practicing justice and aspiring to their well-being and happiness is ethical—and therefore, moral.



The social ethics or social ethicality of societies is accountability. It holds accountable, first and foremost, its members whose behavior must be in line with social values and public morality; it holds institutions and society accountable to respect the values it has established as fundamental.

In summary, ethics is accountability. It holds the individual accountable as an ethical subject in their social and relational life and in the use of reason and reflective intelligence to assess their personal and social decisions. Social ethics holds institutions accountable for ensuring dignity, autonomy, freedom, and happiness as well-being. Together, individuals and institutions are mutually responsible for mutual recognition<sup>13</sup>, to uphold freedom and justice, the supreme values of individual and social ethicality, so that humans can enjoy happiness because happiness is the goal of the individual, and ethics is the purpose, the journey, that leads the individual to happiness.

#### 4. WHAT IS HAPPINESS?

Happiness is the right balance between the use of “reason and emotion.” It is the capacity that aspires to an “intelligent heart” and not to a “heartless intelligence”; it is the just adequacy between material and intellectual goods<sup>14</sup>. In other words, it is a successful life, not a life of success. Success creates happy moments, but the moments that give us pleasure are not sufficient for a happy life.

Happiness requires the capacity for measurement. It means that there is a need for consideration and prudence in the actions and deeds we undertake. Consideration in evaluating the values present in a particular situation in which we find ourselves, and prudence in choosing the correct action. If ethics aims at happiness, then we must ask the question: what is the right action to take in a situation in which I am involved to do good?

Aristotle helps us find this answer through the capacity and self-control of reason, as it is in reason that the fundamental dispositions to be sensible or courageous are found, dispositions that we should allow ourselves to listen to and obey. Therefore, the capacity for reason is, in a sense, a guide that we should listen to in order to achieve the excellence that ethics seeks in our actions.

According to the same author, excellence comes in two forms: theoretical and practical. Wisdom, understanding, and insight, for example, are theoretical dispositions; generosity and temperance (moderation or prudence) are ethical dispositions. Thus, excellence has a dual function: first, as a theoretical disposition—reflective intelligence or comprehensive thinking; second, as an ethical disposition, a permanent character disposition to act well.

However, it is important to note that no ethical excellence (virtue) is born with us by nature; they are learned and acquired through teaching, through a learning process to embrace and perfect them. That is, we become just by practicing justice; we become temperate—moderate and prudent—by practicing temperance; we become courageous by performing acts of courage. But before practicing justice and being just, we must know what justice, temperance, and courage are.

Therefore, by understanding and cultivating these dispositions of excellence (virtues)—both theoretical and ethical—we are capable of acting well in a situation in which we may be involved. Acting with temperance, we are prudent and considerate; acting with courage, we are daring but not cowardly; acting with justice, we are just because the just person acts in a measured way in their specific situation, seeking the most appropriate means for the realization of the good, which is the purpose of ethics—happiness.

In other words, ethics teaches us to understand that happiness, the good we all desire, is not found in extremes but in the mean—the appropriate middle. What we want to affirm is that, according to Aristotle, there are three main

---

<sup>13</sup> Honneth, A., & Ganahl, J. (2014). *Freedom's Right: The Social Foundations of Democratic Life*. Columbia University Press.

<sup>14</sup> Cognitive intelligence and emotional intelligence.



ways of living life. One understands happiness as pleasure; the other is dedicated to practical action to obtain certain honors—to be honored is a good end. But honor, when sought as the extreme pursuit of happiness, can be only a superficial good because when we lose honor, we also lose happiness. Living pursuing honor, with prudence, is healthy because honor aims at excellence, and excellence, in this sense, is more powerful than honor, as excellence is the goal of social and political life. Finally, life as contemplation—intellectual action of an intelligent heart—seems to be the form in which the other two forms of life can be adequately and justly combined for success in the pursuit of happiness.

Thus, happiness is the supreme good we all seek; it lies in how we ethically act during our life, rejoicing in noble actions and feeling happy with the just way of acting. The excellence of action tends to achieve the supreme good, which is happiness. Happiness is, in Aristotle, the sweetest part of life, and to live happily is to love what one loves because those who love know to whom and how they give their love.

In Kant, happiness comes through the dignity of being happy. That is, being worthy of such happiness. This is the consonance of all our maxims with moral law. This consonance objectively conditions the alignment of the desire for happiness with reason. The promotion of the happiness of others, like our own, has as its end the establishment of mutual assistance among human beings and should thus be considered a universal moral duty<sup>15</sup>.

From this, we can extract that if in Aristotle happiness is the purpose of ethics; in Daniel Serrão, the human being is inhabited by a desire for happiness because the heart remains restless until it rests in it; for Kant, the promotion of happiness is a universal moral duty. Three perspectives that do not nullify each other but complement themselves—eurhythmia. In the heart of man dwells the desire to be happy, and the path to happiness is only possible by avoiding fragile forms of happiness<sup>16</sup>.

#### 4.1. FRAGILE FORMS OF HAPPINESS

Ethics urges us to avoid the “fragile forms of happiness” because, even if we cannot entirely avoid them, they are ephemeral. Material wealth, social or political power today is nullified by another tomorrow; momentary pleasure, for example, is important, but more crucial is the wealth of ethical and moral values through which we construct a successful life.

All fragile forms of happiness make the intelligent heart of a person restless. Augustine of Hippo stated that “our heart is restless until it rests in God.” We affirm, as Daniel Serrão does, that the intelligence of the heart remains restless until it embarks on the ethical journey towards happiness. Therefore, happiness will be the tranquility and security of the intelligence of our heart, resulting from reflective intelligence, perceptive awareness of human life and action, and the generation of values arising from the same actions and their transformation into aesthetic, ethical, and rational values<sup>17</sup>.

---

<sup>15</sup> Silva, C. (2012). O conceito de felicidade na filosofia moral kantiana. Principais considerações. *Revista da Faculdade de Letras — Série de Filosofia*, 29(20), 119–131.

<sup>16</sup> Serrão, D. (2014). Responsabilização ética. *Comunicação*. Faculdade de Direito de Lisboa, October 10.

<sup>17</sup> Serrão, D. (2014). Responsabilização ética. *Comunicação*. Faculdade de Direito de Lisboa, October 10.

## **5. ETHICS, ENTREPRENEURSHIP, AND HAPPINESS**

The relationship between ethics and entrepreneurship is substantial for the entrepreneur's ideas to truly address the aspirations of humanity. In the late 20<sup>th</sup> century, the emergence of entrepreneurship in the social, cultural, and economic spheres gained prominence in the media and educational policies, generating the idea that entrepreneurship carries competitiveness as a catalyst for society—organizations and individuals.

In the social context, particularly in the field of social sciences, it is emphasized that entrepreneurship is essential for improving living conditions and personal development. In the economic realm, some authors admit a neoliberal view of entrepreneurship - competitiveness. Recent studies highlight a clear relationship between individuals and entrepreneurship, where one can observe the view of humans as producers of themselves, characterized by initiative, future projection, reflective and flexible intelligence, risk-taking, and, of course, competitiveness. According to this idea, in our perspective, entrepreneurship seems to give way to a competitive spirit, surpassing the collaborative spirit.

The dominant discourse of entrepreneurship presents itself as a set of personal attributes where efficiency, effectiveness, and competence indicate those who achieve personal and professional success in this domain due to their competitive ability. This notion, detached from an ethical commitment, seems to assert that to be an entrepreneur and succeed—personal satisfaction and happiness—competitive determination is consecrated instead of the necessary and always healthy cooperative and collaborative relationship.

It is also noteworthy that the entrepreneurial discourse brings with it the idea of happiness and salvation; freedom and autonomy as a certain telos, in the sense of occupying a strategic place in guiding the behavior of the person who undertakes oneself. The human being—the individual—centered on oneself sees oneself as an actor seeking to 'entrepreneur' one's life and oneself.

In this sense, for the entrepreneur to enjoy happiness and salvation, the notion of speed, of being the first, seems to be imperative. Waldo Emerson, cited by Zygmunt Bauman (2010), presents Ralph's metaphor of thin ice: "When skating on thin ice, salvation lies in speed. Whoever wants to be saved must move at the necessary speed to avoid risking overstressing the resistance of any point." And the author concludes: "In the volatile world of liquid modernity [...], walking is better than sitting, running is better than walking [...]." However, the entrepreneur's path cannot be solitary but supportive. Arriving quickly, being the first to achieve success does not necessarily mean being successful. Success, as we have already mentioned, can bring happy moments, but it is not happiness. The happiness of the entrepreneur is broad only to the extent that the impact of their work on society is broad; the entrepreneur's mission is to create added value not only for oneself but to generate value with ethical significance and positive social and economic impact.

### **5.1. ETHICAL VALUES TO ATTRIBUTE TO ENTREPRENEURSHIP**

Entrepreneurship has gained importance in society. Currently, its moral valorization is based on the idea that entrepreneurship is an axiological virtue. It is already a culturally and socially experienced value in society, akin to the universal values we consider fundamental for humanity. Therefore, entrepreneurship, as a new "value," indicates a system of ideas, truths, beliefs, traditions, principles, purposes that act interdependently and are sustained by social groups whose practice should be disseminated, preserved, and encouraged in schools and universities.

As a purpose, entrepreneurship must respond to a need and not create its own necessity. Even assuming entrepreneurship as a virtuous value, it does not have the whole truth. In this context, ethical values, and principles attribute to entrepreneurship a social and economic mission that involves:



1. Innovation of a good, service, or business model that allows not only the creation of wealth but also the wealth of values, always based on the ethical principle of transparency;
2. Positive impact on the local ecosystem that allows greater value and lower cost, ensuring equity as the ethical principle of social and economic balance;
3. Dissemination of best practices and their replicability in other contexts, promoting an ethic of solidarity;
4. Sharing of knowledge, training, and information for the incubation of sustainable projects, with a view to the principle of autonomy;
5. Creation of effective partnerships that promote the strengthening of gains, valuing the principle of responsibility.

The impact that innovation causes, both in the economy and in the social, cultural, and political reality driven by the above-mentioned ethical values and principles, shows that entrepreneurship as an instrument of change cannot be immune to codes of ethics and conduct and must be guided by respect and compliance with norms and laws. If the ideal of the entrepreneur is based on the principle of innovation—always desirable—the ethical principle of caution—always healthy—cannot be absent.

---

## 5. FINAL REMARKS

---

From what has been discussed, we can deduce that if we live using our ethical capacity of reflective and perceptive intelligence, we will be capable of generating happiness within ourselves that is aesthetic, ethical, and rational.

Aesthetic, because it shows us the beauty of what is beautiful and the beauty that exists within us. Ethical, because it informs us about what is good, what is good within us, and the good we do. Rational, because we act with freedom and autonomy.

It is the autonomy and freedom of the human being that, from its origin, bestows upon it the dignity of being a person, intrinsic because it resides in the ontological reason of the person—in its most intimate self-awareness; inherent because it constitutes the ontic reason of the nature of the human being. Man has, in his intelligence, a law written by the intelligent heart itself; his dignity lies in obeying it, and by it, he will be judged. Consciousness is the most secret center and sanctuary of man, where he is alone with his self-awareness, whose voice is heard in the intimacy of his being<sup>18</sup>.

Therefore, from the origin of human life, dignity is inscribed in the heart of man. It is dignity that grants him freedom and autonomy. The worthy man acts in accordance with his autonomy due to his freedom. From this autonomy and freedom arises his self-determination, which gives him the power to exercise and fulfill, ethically, and no other, the choices he makes as a person.

Those who act ethically always seek not the greater good but the better good. Ethics is then the journey to be happy, as Aristotle suggests, to attain the supreme good—*eudaimonia*—happiness; and as Kant implies, a universal moral duty to be worthy of being happy.

Indeed, ethics is the reason for our happiness; happiness is the highest ethical form of being free and morally responsible.

---

<sup>18</sup> Cf. GS, 16 (A dignidade da pessoa humana, Constituição Pastoral *Gaudium et Spes*.)



From what has been said, we can deduce that if we live using our ethical capacity of reflective and perceptive intelligence, we will be able to generate happiness within ourselves that is aesthetic, ethical, and rational. Aesthetic, because it shows us the beauty of what is beautiful and the beauty that exists within us. Ethical, because it informs us of what is good, what is good within us, and the good we do. Rational, because we act in freedom and autonomy.

It is the autonomy and freedom of the human being that give them, from their origin, the dignity of being a person, intrinsic because it resides in the ontological reason of the person—in their most intimate intimacy, their self-awareness; inherent because it is a constituent of the ontic reason of the nature of the human being. Man has in his intelligence a law written by the intelligent heart itself; his dignity lies in obeying it, and by it, he will be judged. Consciousness is the most secret center and sanctuary of man, where he is alone with his self-awareness, whose voice is heard in the intimacy of his being.

Therefore, from the origin of human life, dignity is inscribed in the heart of man. It is dignity that grants him freedom and autonomy. The worthy person acts according to their autonomy because of their freedom. From this autonomy and freedom arises their self-determination, which gives them the power to exercise and accomplish, ethically, and no other, the choices they make as individuals.

Those who act ethically always seek not the greater good but the better good. Ethics is then the journey to be happy, as Aristotle refers, to achieve the supreme good—the eudaimonia - happiness; and as Kant alludes, a universal moral duty to be worthy of being happy. Indeed, ethics is the reason for our happiness; happiness is the highest ethical form of being free and entrepreneurial and morally responsible.

The entrepreneur's action should always seek the better good (happiness) and promote the greater good (a moral duty). Thus, we can conclude that, by analogy, entrepreneurship and innovation also require ethical endeavor for the activity of entrepreneurship and innovation to be fair and equitable, transparent and responsible; supportive and autonomous. It is up to the entrepreneur to assume the role of a leader in the organization of innovation, promoting strategies based on cooperative sensitivity and not just competitiveness, thereby fulfilling the dictates of ethical values because ethics as the science of behavior that seeks happiness will give them the happiness of the good they produce (economy) and the social good (social responsibility) they achieve as members of society.

The entrepreneur needs the unification and rationalization of knowledge that historically occurred in the past: technical and innovative work was characterized by the search for greater efficiency. That is, it sought efficiency by modifying not so much the tool but the manual skill of man. Currently, two senses run through the idea of entrepreneurship: in a negative sense, the relationship of the person with innovation is lost; in a positive sense, the global level of innovation is gained, where the entrepreneur decides on the criteria of maxims—efficacy and efficiency. Everything that is possible is obligatory, and all obstacles must be overcome.

The modern mindset based on technological entrepreneurship proclaims the insignificance of limits. The ontological and axiological emptiness of human nature surpasses the human condition. Human nature is our essence that is distinct from the human condition. Thus, the human condition must respond to what human nature requires for its survival and development.

Therefore, in the “art of entrepreneurship,” we should ask what, in practice, are the innovations that are peripheral and those that attack our identity.

## REFERENCES

- Andrade, R. (2005) (Ed.). O empreendedorismo na escola. Porto Alegre: Artmed/Rede Pitágoras, 2005.
- Bastos, M.; Ribeiro, Ri. Educação e empreendedorismo social: um encontro que (trans)forma cidadãos. *Revista Diálogo Educacional*, 11(33), 573–594.
- Carvalho, R. (2012). Empreendedorismo, autocrítica e flexibilidade: problematizando traços da cultura gestonária de vida nos discursos de pedagogos em formação. *Currículo sem Fronteiras*, 12(2), 470-498.
- Damásio, A. (2007). Neuroscience and ethics: intersections. *The American Journal of Bioethics*, 7(1), 3–7.
- Drewinski, J. (2009). Empreendedorismo: o discurso pedagógico no contexto do agravamento do desemprego juvenil. *Setor de Educação, Universidade Federal do Paraná*.
- Figueiredo-Nery, P., & Figueiredo, P. (2009). Práticas pedagógicas lúdicas: fontes iniciais para mentes criativas e empreendedoras? *Revista Educação em Questão*, 35(21), 27-52.
- Grande Dicionário da Língua Portuguesa. (2004). Porto Editora.
- GS, 16 (A dignidade da pessoa humana, Constituição Pastoral Gaudium et Spes.)
- Honneth, A., & Ganahl, J. (2014). *Freedom's Right: The Social Foundations of Democratic Life*. Columbia University Press.
- Joseph, D. (2003). *Synaptic Self*. Penguin Books.
- Kant, E. (2001). *Crítica da razão pura* (M. P. dos Santos & A. F. Morujão, Trans.). Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.
- Kant, E. (2004). *Metafísica dos costumes — Parte II — Princípios da doutrina da virtude* (A. Morão, Trans.). Edições 70.
- López-Ruiz, O. (2004). O éthos dos executivos das transnacionais e o espírito do capitalismo. *Instituto de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas, Universidade Estadual de Campinas*.
- Reale, M. (1991). Invariantes axiológicas. *Estudos. av.*, 5(13), 131–144. *Introdução à filosofia*.
- Rose, N. (2001). Inventando nossos eus. In T. Silva (Ed.), *Nunca fomos humanos: nos rastros do sujeito*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 137–204.
- Serrão, D. (2014a). Archeobiologia e Bioética: um encontro não conflituoso. In *Diálogo e tempo. Homenagem a Miguel Baptista Pereira* (A. Borges, Coord.). Fundação Eng. António de Almeida, 235–264.
- Serrão, D. (2014b). Responsabilização ética. *Comunicação*. Faculdade de Direito de Lisboa.
- Silva, C. (2012). O conceito de felicidade na filosofia moral kantiana. Principais considerações. *Revista da Faculdade de Letras — Série de Filosofia*, 29(20).

## ETHICAL STATEMENT

**CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Nothing to declare. **FUNDING:** Nothing to declare. **PEER REVIEW:** Double-blind peer review.



All content from **JER—JOURNAL OF ENTREPRENEURIAL RESEARCHERS** is licensed under Creative Commons, unless otherwise specified and in the case of content retrieved from other bibliographic sources.