

роде влияет на облик города в целом; базировалось и древнерусское градостроительство. Новый дом должен быть «социален», т.е. не конкурировать с прежней застройкой ни по высоте, ни по прочим архитектурным модулям, но демонстрировать чувство плеча, чувство ансамбля и чувство эстетических идеалов. Данное правило должно распространяться и в случае планирования центров. Возвращение к композициям, когда постройки починаются ансамблевому эстетическому принципу с учетом естественной среды и есть начало биоцентров будущего. Над этим вопросом уже задумываются и архитекторы. В современной архитектуре он называется бионикой - возвращение к природе через подражание ее естественным сооружениям и признакам. Учет природы естественной должен помочь восстановлению утерянного человеком равновесия. Данная работа требует систематической целостной связи пространства, связывания застроенных территорий, пространств, которые поддерживают биос и способствуют его развитию, что невозможно без конструирования социо-экологической иерархии и гармонии - конструирования биоцентра. И обеспечить возврат к гармоничному строительству возможно через признание того факта, что сохранение культурной среды не менее важно, чем сохранение окружающей среды; посредством различения экологии биологической и экологии культурной; ведь несоблюдение законов природной экологии может убить человека, равно как и несоблюдение законов экологии культурной может убить человека нравственно. В такой ситуации, безусловно, требуется работа над новыми подходами и новым сознанием, но новое сознание и новые подходы в организации новых моделей центра требуют возврата к мифическому, атемпоральному целостному сознанию.

Интродукция целостного биоэтического сознания смогла бы способствовать разрешению проблемы (де)централизации. Необходимость соблюдения в обществе принципов социально-экологической ответственности и экологической культуры, их включения в формулирование политики и идеологии государства смогли бы закрепить и направить данный процесс в практическое русло. Результатом такой бы политики стало бы перенесение социально-экономически ориентированной идеологии в плоскость значительно менее конфликтной биоидеологии, которая бы способствовала концентрации общественного сознания на конструировании биоцентров. Возвращение к сознанию утверждающему единство социального мира, стало бы существенным прорывом в международных отношениях, основой нового биоэтического пути мышления, новой биокультуры - культуры демонстрации человеческого достоинства, культурой поддержания жизни и мира на Земле.

Стремление переключения славянского сознания в плоскость биоэтики, способствовало бы достойному разрешению проблемы центриденфикации, решению многих конфликтных проблем государственного и межгосударственного характера.

ECONOMICAL AND CULTURAL VALUES

Valdas PRUSKUS

Department of Philosophy and Political Theory, Vilnius Gediminas Technical University

There exist two main fields for human activity, without which the state can not manage - economy and culture. The result of the human activity in these fields create economical and cultural values (outputs). Namely through this values societies and single individuals presents themselves to the World. Usually economically well developed countries presents themselves through economical values (high quality products and goods), less developed - through cultural

values. (1) Though the creation of economical values can hardly be imaginable without cultural ones. It is obvious that in the all-embracing space of the market is tried to overcome everything (or almost everything) with the level of economic profit. The same concerns cultural values (products and services) which differ from the economical ones.

The sense of the difference is that cultural goods exist like personal items, which are least influenced by the market prices, however, at the same time they are taken in as a social (public) property, though the benefit received from them is not obvious. Cultural products and services have characteristics of individual and public item at the same time. In another words, cultural product always is privately personal but at the same time it is significant not only for certain person who owns the item but also to all society. Cultural products have similar functions as any other goods. Their prices are defined by the market. (5) However, this products have additional qualification, which is not determined by the specific of their use. Cultural good very often needs specific user ready to understand and accept it. It requires from individual not only wish but also readiness and ability to accept it i.e. to satisfy cultural needs, which should be developed more than material ones. Therefore, cultural good at the same time are products and its usage. They could hardly exist one without another. (4) Having it in mind, main differences between economical and cultural values could be defined. (6) Economical values have:

- objectives clearly defined and named according to the generally acceptable and equally understandable standards;
- these objectives are directed to the obtaining of (material) profit (worth of economical value is directly related to the obtained profit);
- profit really exist and is acknowledged by everyone. No doubts or arguments appear concerning its quality and features (exists common settlement);

Meanwhile cultural value:

- it is not defined and named according to the generally agreed and acceptable for everyone's standards;
- it is not (directly) related to the material profit;
- it is not understandable by everyone in a same way and permanent discussions are held concerning it.

Difference between cultural and economical values partly predetermines not equal acceptance of their worth. (9) If economical values have components which can be clearly measured (by appropriate indicators) generally agreed by everyone, then cultural values have no clear and defined shape of existence (exist like subjective perception of the individual) and the main problem lies in the fact that there are not enough objectives, clear and unmeasured indicators (measures), which would enable to find out real worth. This worth to cultural value is given to it by its user.

In spite of it namely cultural values form cultural capital, without which creation and increasing of economical values could hardly be imaginable as well as economical capital.

Basic principle of cultural capital is that it helps to create economical values. Cultural capital could be imagined like tree – trunk with branches. Trunk reflects totality of many existing "capitals" (cultural products and goods); which can be quantitatively measured and evaluated (naming their price). This trunk of cultural capital feeds branches – certain cultural services provided to the society, which in turn can be used for creation of other services and wealth (e.g. material). Cultural capital exist in two shapes – tangible (it can be experienced like really existing, it speaks to us in shape of art pieces) and intangible. (11) This form is understandable like intelligent capital – ideas, faith, values disposed of individuals or groups of people having their own interpretation, which reflects through their created peaces of art, music, literature, which can inspire institutionalization in various ar-

areas of human activities. Therefore, cultural capital existence in tangible and intangible shapes is considerable as a particular property, which provides "food" for inside consumption (in culturing of certain individual) and can be used for creation of not only cultural but also economical values.

Cultural capital stimulating change of human thinking and understanding, changing conscious, rational and ecologically motivated consumption attitude has an influence for economical activity of individual and different social groups. Culture influences economy in three ways. First of all, culture stimulates productivity of economy (efficiency, effectiveness). It happens due to the fact that values fostered by the group of individuals are expanded (beamed) into separate processes of management and manufacturing of production. If cultural values followed by individuals help to make more effective decisions, to accept innovations easier, it stimulates also the development of productivity, finally financial incomes will increase, growing economy will result in increasing of living standards. Secondly, culture may promote to reach for the realisation of justice. Thirdly, culture may have positive influence in seeking for objective basis for economical and social commitment between various social groups. In all three mentioned cases the influence of the culture to the behaviour of individual (social group) is perceptible and can be relatively named due to the clear result.

In general in macroeconomics level this influence of culture to the individual (group) can be observed on the basis of two types of indicators – productivity (efficiency) and justice. Indicator of productivity covers increase of Gross national product (GNP), degree of assimilation of new technologies, level of unemployment, structural and management changes, etc. Indicators of justice covers fairness of distribution (and redistribution) of incomes among various sectors of economics, implementation of social welfare programmes (care about socially supported and enable persons, etc.), existence of communities and social services, etc.

Both groups of criteria are based on the values. Recognising importance of economic values at the same time it is understandable that they are only means (instruments) for creation of appropriate quality of life, which in turn requires appropriate cultural assimilation enabling further development. Therefore, economical level of development still has to be culturally accepted, recognised and expressed. It could be said in other words: economical and cultural values form two main components of economical development. As ecosystems support biosphere, cultural infrastructure supports social universum (stable society) at the same time forming conditions for development of economical powers. From this point of view culture and its values are supporters of essential economical development.

Economical and cultural values ignoring peculiarity of their expression are the result of the creativeness of individual. (10) The creativeness is identical for businessman as for creator of economical values as well as for artist as for creator of cultural values (products and services). The creativeness comprises from three components: 1) imagination; 2) sobriety; 3) taste. The expression of these components in activities of businessman and artist has own particularities.

Imagination helps the artist to concentrate his ideas and try to find the relations among them and in such a way to create formations of new ideas in order latter to materialise them in words, sounds or imagery. Businessman using its imagination may try to guess what kind of goods or services are missing in the market (or in separate area of the market) in order to provide them to the users. But if the artist does not limit his imagination (allows free expression), since he does not have preliminary order to satisfy one or another user of cultural value (it is more matter of the user to accept proposed piece of art (product or service) or not) then a businessman should ground his imagination much more. His imagination is always based on the reality: he has in front the real persons with real possi-

bilities to accept proposed products (innovations). In this sense imagination of the businessman producing economical values is always more realistic than of the artist. (7)

For the artist the sobriety is an instrument (possibility) to control the play of imagination, to keep it in certain frames, not allow to cross them, since otherwise it is risky to loose all relations with reality. For the businessman sobriety means not only that he should not to louse touch with understanding of users needs, but also to be able to satisfy his needs in way understandable and acceptable for him, having in mind his nature, education, etc. as well as to estimate and control his expenditures and incomes with the satisfaction of users needs in order to avoid bankrupt. While artist, though such risk exists (to be not recognised by the user of cultural values and to remain not bought), always has hope to be recognized in future. (8)

Taste for artist is internal feeling, which is followed in distinguishing good and evil, lie and truth and to show this difference in creation. This difference is accepted or not accepted by the user of cultural values. This way it always remains as one of many proposals for the user of cultural values. Meanwhile, taste for a businessman is inside feeling saying what is needed here and now. Therefore for him is more important not "taste of art" (as it is in case of artist) but taste of user. Therefore, most important is, to guess taste of user and to turn it into concrete proposal (good or service). Namely this is main concern of a businessman. Therefore market much more frames activities of the creator of economical values (businessmen) than of artist. (12)

It is not wonder, that actions of the businessman has more rationality. Therefore this not always guaranty success. More, that decision of an individual regarding the choose of goods are influenced by the factors of different levels:

- emotional favour for the good (value)
- comparability of good (value) with task and objectives (importance and necessity of the value for the certain moment in reaching defined tasks)
- attitude of the society to the value (degree of social recognition of the value).

Our activities in respect of good (value) might be motivated variously, however they are always purposeful, rational because of reaching of the result, which would give a satisfaction.

References

1. Gordon D. F. 1968. "Labour theory of value", in *International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences* 16, D.L.Sills ed. New York: Macmilann, p.279-283.
2. Sherburne J. C. 1972. *John Ruskin or the Ambiguities of abundance. A Study in Social and Economic Criticism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
3. Bentham J. 1993. *Works*. Ed. J. Bowring. Edinburg.
4. Clark, C. M.A. 1992. *From natural value to social value*. Chicago: The Free Press.
5. Thompson, B.J., Throsby, C.D., Withers, G.A. 1993. *Measuring Community Benefits from "The Arts"*, *Research Paper 261*, School of economic and financial studies. Sidney: Maquarie University.
6. Connor St. 1992. *Theory and cultural value*. Oxford: Blacwell.
7. Wintle, M. 1996. *Culture and Identity in Europe: Perceptions of Divergence and Unity in past and present*. Adelrshot: Averbury.
8. Smith, T. 1999. *Value and form: formations of value in economics, art and architecture*. Duke University Press, 1999.
9. Throsby, D. 2001. *Economics and Culture*. Cambridge University Press.
10. Meiland J. 1993. "Originals, copies and easthetic value", in Duton D. (ed) *The Forger's Art, Forgery and Philosophy of Art*. Berkeley University Press, p.115-130.
11. Becer, G.S., Murhy, K., Tamura R. 1999. "Human capital, fertility and economic growth", *Journal of political Economy* 98 (Supplement) No.5, p.12-37.
12. Frey, B. 2000. *Art and Economics*. Heidelberg: Springer - Vergal.