

Philosophical and Socio-Cultural Aspects of the Economic Type of Thinking

Vadim Vadimovich Kortunov and Natalya Alekseevna Platonova

Russian State University of Tourism and Service, Pushkino, Moscow region, Russia

Abstract: The subject of money attracts by the fact that is related with all levels of human subsistence. Even restricting ourselves by the task to consider the money as a cultural phenomenon and a question about the place of money in the system of spiritual values, we made ourselves to fundamental rethinking of the basic philosophical statements. In present, the money plays an important role in human life, becoming, thus, a powerful source of formation of the ordinary consciousness and appropriate social behavior. A development of the system of values, a new ideology and a new ethic occurs through the prism of money. Money dictates its own policy, imposes their worldview and philosophy. Moreover, money became important in the development of civilization and culture, giving the new significance of the history, the predestination of the person and the meaning of spiritual life.

Key words: Money as a cultural phenomenon • Financial resources • Money potential • Equivalent of the man's opportunities • The price of the accumulated capital • The purchasing cost • Money possibilities • Possibilities of personality • The system of spiritual values • Commercialization • Spirituality • Role in the development of civilization • The meaning of spiritual life

INTRODUCTION

The possibility of financial resources is infinite for a man who is not aimed to transcend beyond the subject-empirical subsistence. The power of capabilities of the money is limited only by their real amount. The more money, the more opportunities; if money potential is not limited, therefore, there are not limits and the possibilities of its owner. Once again, we would like to state that we do not belittle the capabilities of money and their significance in the economics and everyday life. To affirm that money is an absolute evil and does not bring anything useful into the life of the man and incapables to ensure a man the worthy subsistence, would be utmost sanctimony. In our case, we are talking about the other: the world widespread myth, what money is the absolute equivalent of opportunities of a man and incorrect mixing of money capabilities and possibilities of a man.

Mixing and even complete similarity of spiritual human possibilities and opportunities provided by financial capital grows out of the chaotic weakness of the modern ideology, which is not able to distinguish the spiritual from the material, the culture from civilization, "created" from the proper human. It is notable that this

combination of spirit and flesh has nothing to do with organic, "dialectical" unity of ideas and matter. In the present, the spirit is dissolved in objectivity and a man - in civilization.

This problem is typical for the studies of many modern scientists [1-3]. Furnham A. has developed a questionnaire of sixty statements reflecting the wide range of attitudes, opinions and values related with money. The scale of Furnham was used for study of national, age and gender differences in attitudes to money in forty-three countries [2, 3].

Money as an Opportunity: Identification of inherent value with the price of accumulated capital, opportunities of "myself" with the purchasing possibilities of money is a consequence of the absolute form of extrapolation of financial intentions, which essence was described above. It is easy to note, that this identification with inevitably results in the estrangement of human qualities. Evaluation of oneself, own capacities in accordance to the cash capital generates the psychological dependence of personality on material prosperity. "The I" is how much I do have. Fear of bankruptcy and ruin acquire another meaning. Insolvency is both the deprivation of

accumulated benefits and threatens the complete destruction and the destruction of “myself” that is identified with own capital.

Consideration of a man from the point of view of his solvency resulted in the fact that the value of a man is defined as his purchasing price. A man can do as much as can buy. Consequently, the whole world appears in front of a man as a commodity and evaluated in terms of its venality. Unfortunately, the assimilation of a man and the world to the scheme of “consumer-good” is encouraged throughout the social superstructure of modern society. The statement “he can do whatever he likes” means “he can buy everything”. At the same time, the statement “he can buy everything” implies that “everything can be purchased”, i.e. everything has its purchase price. The market of commodities and services overwhelms the spiritual sector trying to turn a man with his inner world to a trade object. In this sense, the special danger of commercialization and corruption lies in an attempt to empower the spiritual human attributes by the purchase price. Law, morals, art, public opinion, justice and life - all these can be in the form of commodities in case of the corruptibility of certain individuals.

Therefore, the spiritual values cannot have the real price and be purchased or sold; we cannot speak about sellers of spiritual values, but we can talk about their own venality. The certain person is not able to sell law, honor, motherland or morals, but able to sell himself. The essence of treachery is not that someone sold the relative person, faith and love, like many others believes. A man cannot trade someone, someone’s feelings, or emotions. A man can trade only himself, his feelings and his faith, on the stipulation that all these became the commodity and therefore, have lost its original, true and spiritual sense. Ilyin I. [4] admits that: “The any venality - bribes, public corruption, any demagoguery and international mercenary and betrayal are the results of spiritual blindness and the lack of own spiritual dignity. This blindness results in the inability to value gradation of objectives and the deprivation of spiritual dignity creates instable will, unprincipled willingness to give the spiritual, objective and the total for the personal interest and the acquisition”. A man can sell his work, services, or their humanity (spirit), but on conditions that his “humanity” became a commodity. On the level of the spirit, a man does not sell, but can be sold.

Relationships within the scheme “seller-buyer” can exist only within the boundaries of sociality. Numerous researchers are focused on the study of the sociological aspects of money [5].

These relations are impossible outside of sociality. The seller trying to sell a spirit also becomes a commodity. A buyer aspiring to realize himself through the money and identifies himself with his capital, i.e. he becomes money. Any attempts to transfer the scheme “seller-buyer” into the spiritual life are related to estrangement of humanity and into the real life always result in tragedy. A person selling himself and transforming into a commodity, eventually loses himself as a human being and a spiritual one. A man who assesses himself in proportion to the possibilities of his own capital also has to identify own “myself” outside of himself. At the same time, the consciousness of both men is confined on misinterpretation of the subject-empirical subsistence.

In many respects, the hypnotic power of money is a result of their ability and precisely, in their power, when the effect of their use presents only as a possible act. Owner of money always has a choice. He faces an eternal choice, an infinite number of possibilities each of what could become real. Psychologically, a man until the moment of realization has unlimited potentialities, which can be determined only by the power of his imagination.

The first psychological studies of human activities in the economics showed that human behavior in situations related with decision-making regard money, are quite predictable. Thus, a monetary conservatism was identified among the predictable of psychological effects [6]. In 1994, Caskey and St. Laurent found that people resist to the monetary reforms, even these are required.

The researchers of many scientific schools and directions devoted numerous studies to the problems of the psychology of money, for example, experimental psychology [7].

Awareness of money as a power of possibilities, on the one hand and an intuitive understanding that any possibility to the extent of its implementation is self-destructive and on the other, often brings a man to avoid the realization of these possibilities. There is a deadlock condition, which can be called as a syndrome of money accumulation: money became an objective instead of to be a mean. In this case, their potential realization is not important then the fact of possession. There is interesting psychological paradox: “I’m saving the money to be a strong, due to the possibility to realize a capital”, however, “I cannot admit the possibility of the use of the capital, to avoid being weak”. K. Marx observed the paradox of the “hoarding complex”. He wrote in one of his works: “The gatherer of treasures acts as a martyr of exchange value and the pious ascetic at the top of the metal post. He deals only with the riches of its public form

and therefore hides it from the society. He craves the commodities in its constantly suitable form for use and therefore removes it from circulation. He dreams of exchange value and therefore does not exchange. Transitional form of wealth and its petrified form, the life elixir and the philosopher's stone, as in alchemy, are violently colliding with each other. He disclaims any pleasure in his imaginary limitless thirst for pleasures. Wishing to satisfy all needs of society, he hardly satisfies his own natural demands. Preserving wealth in his metal body, he turns it into a ghost [8, p. 116].

Money as a Value: In the conditions, when the attempts to develop the individuality do not bring the desired results and subjectively are unpromising, there is a need in the proof of self-worth and self-sufficiency through the recognition of the fact by external authorities. This statement already contains a fatal contradiction: the crisis of "myself" and own self-sufficiency should be overcome through the recognition of my usefulness beyond the limit of "myself". It is evident that these attempts are no more than an illusion, because evidence the recognition of the insufficiency and dependence of "myself" on external factors.

Feeling of the exhaustion of the spiritual resources creates a hidden inferiority complex. A personality disagrees with the recognition of worthlessness and therefore, instead of increase of its spiritual potential, tries to justify own existence by its own forces and looks for justification from the public authority. A public authority must prove me my usefulness.

According to I. Ilyin, "a man who respects himself only because of his respect for others as a fact, does not respect himself: his spiritual well-being depends on someone's secondary impressions, i.e. from someone's ignorance and incompetence; in fact, he has been ruined by a sense of a little value, vanity and the desire for external success; and if the success and popularity fails him, he ceases to feel his spiritual dignity and loses personality. Likewise, someone who respects himself only for own imaginary, or often external, or empirically-random qualities, i.e. what is not his own spiritual being (for the strength, beauty, or wealth), does not respect himself: his spiritual well-being depends on what belongs to him, but is hardly himself..." [4, p. 160].

This psychological statement provides the possibility to declare itself is implemented on the way of reproductive or destructive self-expression. Large-scale

destructive actions are always receiving the wide publicity and remain in the chronicle of history for a long time. Actions of famous Herostratus, Yurovsky, the Jack the Ripper are stipulated by this manic desire to social significance. We know many examples of modern politicians and public officials, whose activities were dictated by desire for self-affirmation instead of the pain for the motherland. Another way to self-affirmation and attempting to receive the public recognition (without productive actions) is concluded in development of the economic singularity. The economic singularity must compensate the lack of spiritual resources and creates the image of socially recognized value.

If take into account all mentioned above about the money as about a force of opportunities and subjective identification of money possibilities with personal possibilities, the psychological principles of the effort towards economic exclusivity become clearer. Possible economic singularity is experienced as general singularity and public recognition as the purchase and exchange capacity of money to mix with the productive force of personality. There is no difference between the creation and purchasing for the nonprofessional. Externally, the result is hardly distinguishable: in both cases, we observe the fact of subsistence increment, the fact of change and enrichment of reality. What is the difference, create something new or buy it? What is the difference, what lays in the basis of the constructive formation of existence: the individual ability to creative, spiritual activities or possession of money?

The values of the modern liberal promote the confusion in productivity and reproduction definitions, spiritual enrichment and spirit worship. The capital increase is considered as a very useful public step therefore it contributes to the economic burst and prosperity of the country¹. The ability to "make" money is associated with a remarkable intellectual abilities, willpower and unique personality. To change own life, create an image of well-being man and subdue the world are the privilege of the spirit strong personalities. Reflecting and contemplative lifestyle are for the weak persons. This is extravert model of Western type of thinking, which reluctantly accepts the focus on inner life space and desire for self-improvement. Extravert much easier and more prestigious changes the world around himself, than the change itself.

¹We do not disprove the thesis therefore this question is rather economic than philosophical. However, there is no significant direct relationship between country's welfare and private capital stock increase in post-communistic Russia.

The concentration around the personality of the capital and the comparison of the values of own "I" with the digital equivalent of welfare is stimulated by the entire system of democratic values based on the idea of equality. In particular, the idea of equality is considered as providing of people with equal conditions for self-development, to achieve the social advancement and material welfare. The prospect of equal conditions is acceptable for ordinary people: my life depends on myself and I do myself. Public assessment of the significance of personality has the form of material incentives: if society pays tribute to the man, pays him, thus, he has certain merits before the society. If a man is poor, i.e. the society does not encourage the man, thus, his merits before the society are equal to insignificant. Money as a form of economic incentives becomes an indicator of public usefulness of the person and its social value. Equality and equal conditions for the conquest of these social values mean the equal opportunity for everyone to achieve the social inequality.

Thus, psychological assimilation of human value to the price of his prosperity is largely determined by the conditions and traditions of social subsistence. The proclamation of equal conditions for everybody in the achievement of social inequality (economic exclusivity), on the one hand and the principle of material encouragement of socially useful activities, on the other hand, have created a subjective system of values, in which the holding of capital turned into a universal method of assessment of the "I".

Money as an Idea: One of the most remarkable and difficult properties of spirit is concluded in the ability to idealize and spiritualize the objects of the material world. Due to this property spirit, the boundary between it and matter, between "high" and "low" becomes transparent. The ability to comprehensive spiritualization of being extends the boundaries of human subsistence, fills the life with an exalted sense and provides a man with the true freedom. Aside from the ability to spiritualization, the world loses the conceptual contours becoming a pile of physical objects and man degrades towards the status of "the highest stage of evolution of the animal world". Aside from the ability to spiritualization, the human life can only be understood as a group of various physiological activities.

In this regard, the money is an element of reality, which spiritualization and idealization are related with special difficulties and contradictions. Ontologically, the money might not even be the object of subsistence; as

the object, they are devoid of any substance. It is difficult in the material world to find something more symbolic, nominal and conditional, than money. Money never identical itself, these are nothing whether a piece of metal or painted piece of paper. Modern forms of payments confirm this idea. The emergence of the "electronic" money, improvement of various forms of accounting resulted in the fact that the money is lost any concreteness becoming a mere convention. A man or bank may be the holders of billions of dollars without having a single banknote. The practice of loans, overdrafts and debit balances show that money is expressible in negative values. In the modern world, the money becomes a commodity and the subject of speculation losing its own concrete quality - to be constant value. In other words, the money is absolute perfection in the sense that their meaning and essence do not depend on the type of their material embodiment.

Banknote, bank cheque, a coin and the line in financial documents are not the money; these are conditional substantive form of money accepted in society as a mild assumption for the convenience of payments. This form is conditional therefore the gallons of oil, real estate, vodka, weapons or hashish, can substitute it. These are characters and signs of money. It is difficult to find proper money, the essence of money and the idea of money in these items and as good as to look for great or perfect in the art canvases using the chemical analysis. The money is the idea of exchange and purchase characteristic of subject and empirical subsistence.

One of the major mistakes of the Soviet policy in the measures against monetarism consisted in that the monetary relations were understood solely as economic relations based on the social human being. This mistake can be explained, first, by the most principled orientation of Marxist ideology on the primacy of social subsistence related to the public conscience. Secondly and more essential is that the Marxist-Leninist philosophy had not distinguished the money as a thing and the subject and money as the idea and representation. As a result, the measures for artificial stagnation of the monetary, financial system and the elimination of economic incentives are both pushed the idea of money beyond and provided with more sophisticated form of social embodiment. The conviction that the essence and meaning of money are in real money supply resulted in the fact that the fight against monetarism transformed into a struggle with money. While the cash flows were under strict state control, the Soviet people have learned how to

live without cash. Money relations came in the form of barter and direct exchange of services; the symbolism and conditionality of money as a “thing” became clear, when the desire to capital accumulation has transformed to the desire to accumulation of the “useful contacts” and “privileges”. Bodily-objective subsistence, like elsewhere, had own purchase price and could be presented as the commodity; and the absence of the money capital at the most of people resulted to the transformation of the traditional forms of mutual payments.

However, money like nothing else, contributes to “the objectification” of the world. They always represent some objectivity, which participates in absolute terms - in the form of commodity. The idea of money consists in representation of the elements of the subject-empirical subsistence in terms of their purchase (exchange) characteristic. The idea of money premises a number of qualifications and assumptions to the subsistence. Money abstracts the world: the elements of the subsistence are considered as less qualitative. The only characteristic of the world objects recognized by the money is defined as their exchange ability. Karl Marx impartially argues that “as the appearance of money is hardly recognizable, this becomes everything: both commodities and non commodities. Everything becomes the sale object. Circulation becomes enormous social retort, which pulls in everything to release it out in the form of monetary crystal. This alchemy cannot be standing even the relics of saints, even less coarse res sacrosanctae, extra commercium hominum. Just as the money erases all qualitative differences in the commodities, the money erases any distinctions as a radical stabilizer” [10, pp. 142-143].

Thus, the idea of money is in incorporation of whole diversity of the subject-empirical subsistence to the exchange characteristic. This is possible in case of two assumptions: first, the subsistence should become conditional, deprived of its real qualities and secondly, the subjects of subsistence must be attributed artificial quality - exchange properties. Only when these two conditions are fulfilled the empirical world objects can receive the conditional status of the commodities.

In fact, there is a substitution of qualitative characteristics of subsistence by quantitative in the idea of money. Representation of the world as a commodity transforms subsistence into the conventional set of equivalent values. Can a collection of Petrarch’s sonnets be equivalent to sausage link? Whether the opera visit is equal to the underwear package? All this becomes possible only if all listed elements of subsistence are conventionally represented as pure objectivity.

Thus, we can provide a conceptual definition for the money. *Money is the idea of a pure objectivity.* Using this approach, we can make the several conclusions.

First, since money is not an object (or “thing”) and represent some idea, therefore, their meaning and content lie in the area of human consciousness. The influence of money on public relations, formation of ideological orientations is stipulated not only by an objective fact of their presence in the human subsistence, but in the subjective value and meaning for a man.

Secondly, the money is a convention and some assumption. These reflect the real relations and quality of life, but wittingly distort these qualities and relations. This distortion has a right to exist in terms of pragmatic interests of humanity. However, this convention should be evaluated exactly as conscious assumption. Perception of the model of interconnections built with the unconditional idea of money results in ideological distortions and a direct transition into an unreal subsistence.

Thirdly, the idea of money is based on simulation of pure objectivity. The pursuit of pure objectivity signifies the minimizing the spiritual characteristics of subsistence and, ultimately, this is the reverse process of spiritual evolution of the humanity. The idea of money should always keep conditional character and therefore it can be perceived only as a game of pure objectivity. Otherwise, the pure objectivity signifies the negation of the spirit, culture, aesthetic and ethic values and, hence and a person himself.

Money as a Game: Conditionality of reality built with money put a question about the playing nature of the activities related with them. From a logical point of view, this conclusion is justified: if the pure objectivity, which is simulated by the idea of money, is abstract, if it is conditional and realized as the conscious assumption, therefore, any practical activities based on this convention can hardly have pure ontological sense. In other words, an activity based on the idea of money (i.e. on the unreal qualities of subsistence) can be evaluated only as an imitation or the game in the unreal subsistence.

When we talk about the unreality or the convention of pure (absolute) objectivity, we proceed from the fact that the whole world is a spiritual subsistence and indivisible unity of spirit and matter. We cannot deny the fact that the entire evolution of humanity and culture is a progressive spiritualization of subsistence, because of which the world and a man acquire the value, essence and

purpose. Beyond the spiritualization, the world loses the most of characteristics and simply disappears for a man transforming to nobody. Pure objectivity is actually identical to things-in-itself and entirely denies the presence of the subject, the spirit and creativity. For a man, the pure objectivity is nothing therefore the contact is possible only as a theoretical assumption. Therefore, the practical activities aimed at the modernization of pure objectivity, ultimately doomed to failure. However, this activity even as the desire may be evaluated as extremely destructive, as initially was focused on the degradation of the spiritual evolution of humanity.

Thus, the attitude to money, the idea of money and related practical activity correspond to the game, as the realized conventions. This conditional element of the game was described by Johan Huizinga, who wrote: "This "pretending" contains the consciousness of inferiority, "tomfoolery" compared to actual "real" which seems the primary... However,... the idea of "as though" includes "just a game" and be serious and self-oblivion turning to delight; thus, the qualification "as though" is temporary abolished" [10, p. 18].

Huizinga J. describing the properties of the game raises a complicate metaphysical question on the relationship between conditional and absolute reality, about the unsteady frontier between "objective" of human subsistence and immanent reality. However, according to J. Huizinga, the reality of the game is limited by the space-time frames, that always results in "return" of the man into the "commonness".

Further, Huizinga J. makes an important conclusion: "All studies emphasize the impartial nature of the game. Not being the "ordinary" life, it extends outside the direct satisfaction of the needs and passions" [10, p. 66].

Thus, the main criterion of a game is aesthetic and spiritual criterion. Uninterested in the pragmatic result the nature of the game makes it different from the craft activity and unites with creativity. The game, like the art, has the essence and purpose within itself. The game exists just for the game. Even in the games related with passion, the prize or win are secondary having symbolic importance. The game for money degenerates to a craft and "commonness". "Reward is entirely outside the gaming: it means a fair monetary compensation and payment for rendered services or completed work. Nobody plays for reward, everybody works for reward" [10, p. 66].

The "pure money-grubbing does not risk and does not play" in contrast to the gambling attitude of the player [10, p. 67]. I would like to note that even money game, playing in a casino occurs mainly for the game and

secondly, for the winning, which always beyond. Each player realizes that in any case the game in casino can bring income to the owners of the casino. For the roulette player, this game is the exit from "ordinary" to conditional reality. This applies to everybody except for the croupier: the game for him is a profession, trade and commonness. The croupier is not playing, he at work.

In the game, the win and money are the incentive for the game. For financial and entrepreneurial activity, the activities are an incentive for profit. In the gambling, the money exists only for game; in the opposite, the entrepreneurship exists for money. We emphasize that for us the game is not the antithesis of serious action (according to J. Huizinga, this contradiction is doubtful and disproved by the experience of daily observations); game for us is opposition of the conditional action to unconditional nature of the craft. This is especially important in case of opposition of the context of money to monetary relations. Money game is disinterested and conditional perception of pure objectivity; handicraft "money" activity is an attempt to design the unconditional objectivity.

The game, which balances on the border of fictional and ordinary, combines the ability of a person to reproductive perception (i.e. perception of the world as reality or "subjective" type) and the perception of generative (i.e. perception through the inner world of the person by conversion, "subjectivation" of subsistence "using spontaneous activity of mental and emotional forces of a man" [11, pp. 79-80].

E. Fromm notes that both perceptions of the attitude to the world are the features of a normal man. However, elimination of any of these capabilities inevitably results in the deformation of the spiritual life. If a person loses the ability to adequate perception of reality and the "loops" on own perceived reality, he is insane. If a person loses the ability to enrich the world, unable to see the perfect principles of subsistence hidden from the eyes, he becomes a "realist"; his actions are doomed to be unproductive and creative impotence. "Both are sick. Disease of psychotic lost the actual contact with the outside world, results in the fact that his actions become socially inadequate. Disease of the "realist" impoverishes him as a person. <...> "Realism" in contrast to psychonosis, actually completes it" [11, pp. 80-81].

"The game of money", in my opinion, embodies both generative and reproductive ability of the human intellect, allowing him to carry out some activity in "money" sphere and on the other hand, realize the convention and unreality of this activity.

If we accept the thesis about money as pure objectivity, the destructive meaning of commercialization becomes clear. Thus, commercialization is a reduction of endless characteristics of subsistence to quantitatively subject or, the process of “removing” spiritual layers. The commercialization is in opposition to spirituality and civilization, built on the commercial principles, expresses the denial of culture. The culture is an attempt to implement the creative and constructive spirit forces; the civilization expresses a desire of the humanity to implement the utilitarian-biological need. However, if utilitarian-biological implementation of humanity is aimed at sensory-perceptual reactions, the spiritual realization is aimed at ultimate goal of stimulation of transcendental and creative potentials of a man. The goal of culture is spiritualization and “increment” of subsistence; the purpose of civilization is objectification and “objectification” of the spirit. The ideal of culture is the absolute spirituality; the ideal of civilization is pure objectivity.

It should be noted that the penetration of a game element in the commercial and production activities is observed everywhere and conception on the financial activity as the game is widespread along with a concept on financial activities as a craft. In the XX century, the definition of the “business game” and stock exchange operations etymologically were classified as a game: “speculation for the rise”, “speculation for the fall” and “speculation on the equity market”. In the conditions of unstable and unpredictable economics, all long-term and futures bargains (widely used in the world) can be defined as the games: the risk is so high that the economic consequences can hardly be estimated. In general, the growing of popularity of high-risk operations, which outcome cannot be scientifically forecasted, testifies the rebirth of the principles of financial activities. The modern businessman often resembles a gambler than a professional craftsman.

We have encountered with the substitution of financial interest by game incentives in a different forms, in the socialist construction. In conditions, when monetary incentive was opposite of ideological aims, the state had to implement the other non-economic measures into production and financial activities. Different socialist competitions and the struggle for the fulfillment of the plan (i.e. the attempt to establish a record) became the widespread. This contributed to the rebirth of the craft into the game and promoted the formation of a conventional perception of the subjective-empirical

subsistence. Perhaps, this is a reason why the monetarism in the USSR appeared in reduced and milder forms, compared with Western Europe.

CONCLUSIONS

Despite of the heterogeneity of the discussed concepts and the fact that all these derive from different bases, nevertheless, we can state the unanimous recognition of the “duality” of human nature, the presence of “exalted” and “mean” in a man which are in a constant opposition [1].

Although the individual person characterizes by combination of different features of character and orientations, the polarity of the general intentions comprising the basis of spiritual life of a man, reveals the prevalence and domination of one opinion over another. Using this methodological principle, we have allocated two basic types of personality.

The first type of personality is the specific for the current society, concordant with the spirit of modern civilization and mainly directed to the possession, market relations and the basis of its spiritual life is immanent-empirical intention. This personality always characterizes by the monetary approach to life. The power of manifestation of monetarism’s traits can have a wide range from the character of petty bourgeois to market-oriented “panmonetarist”, which embodies the complete denial of the personality. Practical activity of the representative of the perception is invariant: ranging from the inability to create and ending by destructive aggression. Social significance of this type of personality can be differently evaluated depending on the results of its activity, however his spiritually-cultural estimate is always negative or equal to zero.

The second type of personality is characterized by the predominance of transcendent-eidetic intention and orientation of the personality on the subsistence, life and productivity. This type of personality devotes the life to creativity and serving to the exalted manifestations of the spirit. This type despite of diversity of examples is less represented. This type is expressed in the phenomena of genius, the prophet, or the sacred man. As a rule, the tragedy of these people is the inability to adapt to the social environment since their world extends out of ordinary reality and is not determined by the subject-empirical subsistence. This type of people provides enrichment of spirituality and cultural “progress” by serving as a guarantee for the preservation of the

humanity. At the same time, their socio-economic significance can be minimal. The coincidence of socio-economic and cultural-spiritual values of the personality can be called the “happy exception” to the rule.

Can we speak of some third type of personality, which would harmoniously combine the abilities to possession and creativity, aspiration for decent organization of the flesh and the need for spiritual self-expression, rational vision “exalted” and be involved into “mean”? We must talk about this, even if his existence appears rather hypothetical than real. This type of personality can ensure the future of humanity; otherwise, the modern monetarism, like a cancer tumor will destroy the culture and spirituality without any opposition. The destruction of the basic principles of human subsistence can mean only oblivion.

Overcoming of the tragic antinomy spiritual human subsistence, first, must be based on perception of this antinomy and the modern philosophical problems. The historical experience shows that the spirit cannot derive from the triumph of comfort and possession.

A personality, subordinated to the flesh, becomes a flesh, but the flesh subordinated to the spirit is able to spiritualization.

REFERENCES

1. Fehr, E.T., 2001. American Economic Review Tables of Contents.
2. Furnham, A., 1984. Many Sides of the Coin: The Psychology of Money Usage. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 5: 95-103.
3. Furnham, A. and M. Argyle, 1998. *The Psychology of Money*. London: Routledge.
4. Ilyin, I.A., 1992. *The Essence of Legal Awareness*. Moscow.
5. Belk, R.W. and I. Wallendorf, 1990. *Economical Psychology*.
6. Caskey, J.P. and S. St. Laurent, 1994. *Money Credit Banking*.
7. Kagel, J.H. and Å.Å. Roth, 1995. *The Handbook of Experimental Economics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
8. Marx, K. and F. Engels, 1978. *Critique of Political Economy*. Moscow: PSS.
9. Marx, K. and F. Engels, 1969. *Capital*. Moscow, 23: 142-143.
10. Huizinga, J., 1992. *Homo Ludens*. Moscow.
11. Fromm, E., 1993. *Man for Himself*. In *Psychoanalysis and Ethics*. Moscow.